7.9.8. INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK OF LANGUAGE STUDY:
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John A. Z'graggen

7.9.8.1. ANTHROPOS AND THE ANTHROPOS INSTITUTE

In 1906 Fr W. Schmidt, S.V.D., founded the Anthropos periodical and in 1931 the Anthropos Institute in Mödling near Vienna, Austria.¹

In their evangelical work throughout the world missionaries of all denominations came in close contact with tribes which had been unknown or only superficially known. To carry out their evangelical work, they needed a good knowledge of the culture of the people to whom they intended to bring Christianity. Missionaries of the Roman Catholic Church were not only encouraged but also requested in papal instructions and circular letters to study the culture of their people, especially their religion and language. Missionary studies were usually published in ecclesiastical or missionary magazines and were frequently overlooked by academics. It was also observed that such missionary publications had been misinterpreted as fostering theories not in favour of Christian thought. A need was felt to establish a journal of high scientific standard to give missionaries of any church the opportunity to publish their field studies and to express their opinion. This was the main reason for the establishment of the Anthropos periodical in 1906 (Schmidt 1950a:199). To ensure the academic standard of his periodical Schmidt made a name for himself through extensive and numerous publications in the various fields of anthropology and linguistics. In addition a number of fellow priests received full academic training to become experts in various parts of the world (Schmidt 1932:276). With these scholar-priests, wholeheartedly dedicated to research into the culture of homo sapiens, Schmidt founded the Anthropos Institute in 1931. Its headquarters, together with its director, editor and some advisory staff,
are located at present in St Augustin near Bonn, Western Germany, but the rest of the members work all over the world in universities and seminars, or are on special assignments.

Since its foundation, the Anthropos Institute has published a considerable amount of linguistic material in its periodical and in a linguistic monograph series, and in 1953 it initiated the *Micro-Bibliotheca Anthropos* series to make unpublishable manuscripts available to the public. The latter publication series contains valuable contributions to the studies of the languages in the New Guinea area.

The foundation of *Anthropos* encouraged and inspired many missionaries to do research work in the cultures of their people. Members of the Anthropos Institute, especially G. Höltker and A. Burgmann, were active in editing missionary manuscripts. Space and time unfortunately does not allow a summary of the contributions made by associates and friends of the Institute. In the following section a brief account of the contributions made by members of the Anthropos Institute has been given. For a comparison of their views with recent studies the reader is referred to the corresponding parts in volumes I, II, and the present volume.

7.9.8.2. W. SCHMIDT (1868-1954)²

Schmidt, founder of the Anthropos Institute, contributed considerably to the linguistic studies of the New Guinea area, especially in the first decade of this century. Along with S. Ray, Schmidt was regarded as the authority in Oceanic linguistics during the first half of this century. Schmidt (see Schmidt 1899a, 1899c, 1901, 1902) began his research in the Pacific and especially in the New Guinea area with extensive studies of a historical-comparative nature on the Austronesian (at that time called the Malayo-Polynesian) and Papuan linguistic situations. Most of Schmidt's linguistic work was of a comparative nature; even in describing the characteristics of an individual language he was looking beyond the boundaries of that particular language. Structure was for him more important than vocabulary.

Schmidt never visited the Pacific. However, his studies on individual languages based on published and unpublished materials (see e.g. Schmidt 1900, 1901) and his book reviews showed him to be a careful observer and a thorough analyst, though he seems to have been occasionally influenced by his historical theory. For instance, in his review of Hanke's grammar of the Bongu language (Schmidt 1910:605) he observes that only one symbol is used for a voiced bilabial contoid and a corresponding affricate. The researcher into the earlier stages of Austronesian
7.9.8. INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK OF LANGUAGE STUDY: ANTHROPOS INST.

and Papuan linguistic history will find in his book reviews valuable
documents for the understanding of the history of research. For instance,
in Schmidt 1908a, he learns about MacDonald's short-lived hypothesis
about the assumed affinity of the Oceanic languages to the Semitic.

120 out of Schmidt's 710 publications are concerned with linguistic
problems throughout the world (see Burgmann 1954a:627, Bornemann 1954)
and many of his anthropological studies contain valuable linguistic
information. 24 publications, including book reviews, deal entirely
or partly with the linguistics of the New Guinea area. The New Guinea
area, with its many Melanesian and Papuan languages, was for him the
start in his publishing career. This is understandable - and research
has to be motivated. The north-eastern portion of the New Guinea main­
land and the large islands to the north had just become a colony of
Germany. A few years before his first publications, missionaries of
the Society of the Divine Word (S.V.D.), a missionary society of which
he was himself a member, arrived at the north-eastern coast of New
Guinea and found themselves in a linguistically complex and largely
unknown area. The situation called for an expert. This was the reason
Schmidt initiated his research and publishing career with New Guinea
studies (Koppers 1956:63). In 1900 Schmidt describes for the first time
the linguistic situation of German New Guinea and summarises all the
material available at that time. Other surveys and summaries followed
in 1920 and 1926 (see below). Through his influence, missionaries such
as Vormann, Klafl, etc. were publishing extensively at the beginning
of this century. But these missionary publications declined in number
as Schmidt got more and more absorbed in other studies in other parts
of the world. Instead of publishing, missionaries stored their mater­
ials mainly in the basement of their cathedral at Alexishafen, all of
which got lost later, in a bombing raid during World War II.

In 1920 Schmidt summarised in a brief and concise form his views with
regard to Austronesian and Papuan languages, when he, the expert in
Oceanic linguistics in general, was invited to write for the Deutsches
Kolonial-Lexikon. Another summary is included in his momentous work
Die Sprachfamilien und Sprachenkreise der Erde in 1926. The two
summaries are complementary.

Many of his findings are now superseded. For instance, not only
Austronesian, but also a large number of Papuan languages divide nouns
into two classes with regard to possession, prefixing and/or suffixing
the possessive pronoun immediately to the noun. The structure of the
genitive, a favourite topic of his, which he pursued throughout the
world and into the deep history of mankind, seems to be overvalued as
a classifying criterion. Structural comparison played a much more
important role to him than lexical. His study on the sound changes and sound correspondences of the Melanesian languages Ulau, Ali, Yakamul, Tumleo, is one of his few detailed word comparisons (Schmidt, Klaffl and Vormann 1905:72-83). Seldom does he express doubts on the accuracy and reliability of the data he did not collect himself.

No doubt, much of his data has to be restudied in the field and supplemented. A comparison of Schmidt's view with the most recent opinions is at this point of time not profitable, since this present volume will summarise and clarify the latest views. In spite of this, a brief account of Schmidt's views on the Austronesian, Melanesian and Papuan languages based on his summary in 1920 and 1926 should be of interest for the history of research in Austronesian and Papuan languages. Space does not, however, allow a review of his frequently discussed views on the Solomon and Torres Strait linguistic situation. The following summary, it is hoped, will review briefly the linguistic knowledge on the Austronesian and Papuan linguistic situation in the first half of this century. There is unfortunately no comprehensive study of the history of linguistic research in the Pacific available for the second half of the 19th and the first half of the 20th centuries. There is a clear break between these two halves of two centuries and the new start, which was initiated by A. Capell and was carried rapidly forward by S.A. Wurm and through his continuing encouragement. Hooley's (1964) and Laycock and Voorhoeve's (1971) studies on the history of linguistic research in New Guinea are not sufficiently detailed, though Laycock's and Voorhoeve's chapters on the history of Papuan linguistic research in (I) 2.1.1. and (I) 2.1.2. give extensive information on this facet of the history of linguistic research in the New Guinea area. Wurm 1972 is a useful summary of linguistic research in the Pacific in general.

7.9.8.2.1. W. SCHMIDT AND THE AUSTRONESIAN LANGUAGEs

In the second half of the 19th century, three language groups were established in the Pacific: Malay (or Indonesian), Polynesian and Melanesian. First they were called 'Malayo-Polynesian', but after the discovery of the Melanesian languages, Schmidt (1899a:245-51) proposed to change this double name to 'Austronesian', which has become a generally accepted name. The three subgroups of Austronesian languages were obviously interrelated. But their historical relationship to each other and the nature of the Melanesian subgroup came under debate at the end of the 19th century. These are the two main points which Schmidt discusses in his first publication on linguistics (Schmidt 1899a)
with vigour and self-assuredness. The two above-mentioned topics became more complex as more and more languages (some of them right in the middle of the Melanesian territory) were discovered which did not fit into the pattern of the Austronesian language group. These languages were generally referred to as non-Austronesian (or non-Melanesian) or Papuan.

Gabelentz and Meyer (1882) and especially Müller (1876-88) proposed, basically on anthropological grounds, the following two theories:

1) The Melanesian languages are a mixture of Malayo-Polynesian with Papuan languages. Residues, especially in the vocabulary which could not be explained as Malayo-Polynesian were taken as non-Malayo-Polynesian or Papuan elements. Such Papuan languages were, for Müller, Mafoor (Numfor) in the north-west of New Guinea, and in the south of Melanesia the languages of New Caledonia, Nengone, Aneitim and Ero'mangan. The Papuans were the original inhabitants of the Melanesian territory.

2) The Polynesian languages are the oldest substratum within the Austronesian language family; the Melanesian languages, with a richer phoneme and formative inventory, are a further development. This richness reached its height in the Indonesian language group.

Codrington's (1885) views differ:

1) The Melanesian languages are not mixed languages. In the present day languages there are no traces of an earlier language as an examination of vocabulary and grammar reveals. Nengone, Ambrym, Santa Cruz and Savo are aberrant, but they are not the remains of an older Melanesian speech.

2) The Melanesians have no doubt the ancient idiomatic usage.

Schmidt (1900, 1901) discusses these two points extensively and proposes his own view which he, however, had to revise later on.

1) Melanesian is the proto-language of the Austronesian language family, and not Polynesian as Müller postulated. His main proofs are:

a) Unity of the pronoun suffixes. The Melanesian languages suffix the possessive pronouns in two ways: 1) immediately to nouns denoting body parts, terms of relatives and parts of a whole, and 11) mediat ely via a particle (or possessive noun) to all other nouns denoting the possessed. Thus two ways are present in Melanesian. The Malay languages retained in their later development only the immediate way whereas the Polynesian languages retained and further developed the mediate way.

b) The Melanesian languages have a plural, dual and trial form for pronouns. Dual and trial are formed by adding the numeral two or three respectively to the plural. The plural form is more original, and dual and trial forms were developed at a later stage as a need for more
precision was felt. In the course of time the Polynesians dropped the plural form and retained only the dual and trial whereas Malay retained only the plural form. The trial in Polynesian languages is nothing other than the plural.

c) The rich phoneme inventory of Melanesian also supports this theory.

d) Residues in Mafoor, Aneitum and Eromanga identified by Müller as Papuan, are of Melanesian origin. Kern (1883, 1906) holds the same view.

In his review of Thalheimer's study of the pronouns in Micronesian languages, Schmidt (1908b:633) abandoned his earlier view. He said that the Indonesian languages were the original languages within the Austronesian languages. The Melanesian languages developed through movements to the east and south-east and through mixing with the aborigines (Papuan) of the new Melanesian territory. The Melanesians retained the immediate way of suffixing the possessive pronouns but developed also, under the influence of Papuan language structure, the mediate way of expressing possession. This seemed to him a more plausible explanation than his earlier view.

2) In his first publication, Schmidt (1899a) definitely rejected Müller's theory that the Melanesian languages were a mixture of Malayo-Polynesian and Papuan. Müller's evidence could, after close inspection, be explained as to be of Austronesian origin. Kern (1883, 1906) independently reached the same conclusion. Real Papuan languages were definitely discovered by Ray on the south coast of New Guinea, but all of them were in the border area of the Melanesian territory. But subsequently more and more Papuan languages were discovered in areas which were assumed to be purely Melanesian territory. Upon this new evidence Schmidt (1902) revised his opinion and formally rehabilitated Müller's opinion with regard to the mixed nature of Melanesian languages. In his latest view, however, he regarded only Melanesian languages in the neighbourhood of Papuan languages as a mixture of Malay and Papuan, i.e. the Melanesian languages on the New Guinea mainland and some languages on New Britain and in the south of Bougainville. The mixed nature of Melanesian is a problem which has worried Schmidt again and again in different publications. The student of his work has a hard time to follow his reasoning on this point. A thorough study of this topic should be worthwhile since a careful study of Melanesian influence on Papuan languages and vice versa is becoming more and more important.

In 1920 Schmidt summarised his view on the Austronesian languages as follows:

The Austronesian languages form one family with the Austric languages. The Jesuit missionary P. Hervas was the first to recognise the
Austronesian language family, with basically three subgroups. Indonesian developed into Melanesian which mixed with Papuan, and from Melanesian to Polynesian. The main characteristic features of Austronesian are:
1) Basically the same phoneme inventory, though Melanesian and Polynesian lost some of the original phonemes. 2) Sameness in the formation of words. 3) Similarity of personal pronouns, demonstratives, interrogatives and numerals.

7.9.8.2.2. W. Schmidt and the Melanesian languages

Gabelentz (1861-79) was first to describe the Melanesian languages as a group. Gabelentz and Meyer (1882) and later Müller (1876-88) regarded the Melanesian languages as a mixture of Malayo-Polynesian with the languages of the aborigines in Melanesia, and believed that Polynesian developed into Malay (see above). Kern (1883, 1886, 1906) noticed a closer relationship between Melanesian and Polynesian languages. Codrington (1885) points out the general unity of the Melanesian language group. Polynesian is for him a descendant of Melanesian. Thalheimer (1908) grouped the Micronesian languages with the Melanesian group, except for Chamorro and Palau.

For Schmidt (1920c) the Melanesian languages were an independent and peculiar descendant within the Austronesian language family. They developed from Malay into Melanesian and developed further into Polynesian. The Polynesian languages originated in the languages of the southern Solomon Islands. The bulk of the Melanesian area languages were Austronesian. They were not a mixture of Malayo-Polynesian and Papuan in the sense Müller had postulated it, except in the neighbourhood of the Papuan language area.

The Melanesian territory consisted of: New Caledonia, Loyalty Islands, New Hebrides, Banks Islands, Santa Cruz, Fiji, Rotuma, the Solomon Islands, Bismarck Archipelago, Admiralty Islands, Gilbertese and Marshall Islands, Ponape and the Carolines. On the New Guinea mainland, Melanesian-Papuan languages were found on the south coast from Cape Possession to the east and on the north coast in pocket areas and the adjacent islands. Within the Melanesian territory Schmidt found also a group of Polynesian languages, which could be explained as a re-immigrated group. They were on small islands adjacent to the New Hebrides, the Solomon Islands, and the Bismarck Archipelago, i.e. part of Uvea in the Loyalty Islands, Futuna, Fate, part of Sesake, Tikopia, islands near the New Hebrides, some of the Swallow Islands near Santa Cruz, Rennell, Bellona, Ontong Java (Liuenlua), Marqueen Island (Tauu), Tasman Island (Nukumanu), Fead Island (Nuguria), and Sikayana.
Schmidt found the following features to be characteristic of Melanesian languages:

Phonology: As a rule the Melanesian languages have dropped final fricatives, nasals and r, l.

Word formation: Loss of the Indonesian infixes. For a list of common prefixes and suffixes in Melanesian see Schmidt 1920c:540.

Grammar: There is no overt number and gender marking. But number marking in pronouns is very explicit. Melanesian languages of an older substratum (New Caledonia, Loyalty Islands and some of those on the New Guinea mainland) have formed an additional dual form. Most Melanesian languages have formed a dual and a trial form. Melanesian languages of the youngest substratum (southern Solomons, some languages of the New Hebrides, Nengone, Rotuma, New Ireland (Neu Mecklenburg), Marshall Is (Kusaie), developed an additional quatrial (quartal) form. Dual, trial and quatrial are formed by adding the corresponding numeral to the plural pronoun form. A typical Melanesian feature is the division of nouns into two classes. (Class 1: Body parts, terms of relatives, and parts of a whole which suffix the possessive markers immediately to the noun base, and class 2: all other nouns plus the exceptions of class 1, which suffix the possessive pronoun to a particle or possessive noun, thus mediately to the noun.) The number of possessive nouns indicating different relationships of the possessor to the possessed varies from one to four. The Melanesian languages postpose the genitive whereas the Papuan languages prepose them. Schmidt's description of the verb structure is rather confusing; the interested reader is referred to Schmidt 1920c:542.

Schmidt finds it difficult to subgroup the Melanesian languages. The concept of grouping languages into families, stocks etc. was as yet unknown. In contrast to the Polynesian languages, the Melanesian languages differ among themselves considerably in vocabulary and grammar. From this Schmidt concludes a prolonged settlement of the Melanesian area and feels that Papuan languages with their notorious diversity might account for this diversity. Each island has its own language and some have even two and three. Schmidt proposes then the following subgrouping for which he in 1920 gives some criteria to justify his subgrouping.


2) Central Group: the remainder of the New Hebrides, Banks Islands, Fiji Islands, and the southern Solomons as far as Bougainville. The
latter are the youngest substratum from which the Polynesian languages originated, and are more closely related to the Melanesian languages in southern British New Guinea.

3) Northern Group: northern Solomon Islands, New Britain (Neu-Pommern), New Ireland (Neu-Mecklenburg) and probably the Admiralty Islands.

4) Isolate: Santa Cruz. They are more archaic and closely related to the Torres Strait languages.

5) Melanesian-Papuan languages: Barrioi, Kilenge, Upper-Mengeni (New Britain) and in the south of Bougainville: Mono, Uruava, Torau, and New Guinea mainland.

6) Micronesian languages: Caroline Islands, Yap, Ponape, Gilbert Islands, Marshall Islands and Nauru.

7) Transition languages from Melanesian to Polynesian: south coast of British New Guinea, central New Hebrides, central Solomon Islands.

7.9.8.2.3. W. SCHMIDT AND THE PAPUAN LANGUAGES

Gabelentz and Meyer (1882) and later Müller (1876-88) were first to observe aberrant languages within the Austronesian language family. They called them Papuan or non-Malayo-Polynesian (later non-Austronesian). Their proofs were however rejected. Ray (1892) was the first scholar to discover unmistakably Papuan languages on the south coast of New Guinea. Schmidt (1900-01) discovered the separate existence of Melanesian and Papuan languages on the north coast of New Guinea. As more and more Papuan languages were discovered in Melanesian territory they appeared to be the remnants of a pre-Austronesian population.

Papuan languages were found on the New Guinea mainland in some pocket areas on the coast, and in the smaller adjacent islands. The interior was still unknown. Papuan languages known outside New Guinea were 1) Savo in the Solomon Islands, and the languages of South Bougainville, 2) Baining and Sulka on New Britain, 3) Tidore and Ternate on Halmahera Island. More were expected to be discovered in the largely unknown areas.

Schmidt found no evidence for a Papuan language family. The name Papuan meant simply not belonging to the Austronesian language family. Papuan languages were regarded as an agglomeration of genetically unrelated, radically different languages, differing from each other more radically in vocabulary than in grammar and which were spoken only in a few villages each. This is the view still held nowadays by linguistically ignorant people. A genius such as Schmidt found no common
vocabulary, and found even the pronouns differing. In the structure, however, he found some characteristic features which he used to identify a language as Papuan or Austronesian, but they gave him not enough evidence to postulate a genetic relationship. Such common features are summarised in Schmidt 1920a:18, and 1926:154. The main points are:

1) occurrence of the fricatives $x, y, \rho, \xi$ and the affricates $ts, bw, t\xi$. 2) Preposing of the genitive. 3) No Papuan language divides nouns into a two-class system a) terms of relatives - body parts - part of a whole, and b) all other nouns plus the exceptions of a). 4) The personal pronouns have only singular, plural and dual forms but no trial. The dual form is frequently derived from the singular form.

5) No difference is made between an inclusive and exclusive form of the first person plural pronoun form. 6) The languages frequently distinguish masculine and feminine forms with the third person singular pronoun. 7) The languages have a pair counting system. 8) The languages show a complex structure of the verb.

Schmidt, so much interested in comparison and classification of languages, came quickly to a solution in Austronesian language grouping. But he felt lost with regard to the classification of Papuan languages; probably he concentrated too hard on discovering one single Papuan language group. Schmidt (1920a:19, 1926:150ff.) lists the then known Papuan languages based on geographical grounds. But hints of two major groupings are given. Group 1: Miriam and probably Tauata in British New Guinea, Valman and Monumbo on the north coast of New Guinea (which are fairly closely related to each other despite their distant geographical location), then Baining, Telei, Nasioi, Koromira and Savo in the New Guinea island area, and finally the Halmahera languages in Dutch New Guinea. Group 2: the rest of the then known Papuan languages. Characteristic features of the first group based on H. Potter's unpublished study are: a) grammatical gender and different forms for masculine and feminine third person singular pronouns, b) no difference between first person plural pronoun inclusive and exclusive except in Miriam, c) occurrence of $r, l$ initially except in Masio and more variations in final phonemes.

In 1900 Schmidt already had doubts on the applicability of traditional principles in comparative linguistics for the New Guinea area. In his last summary (Schmidt 1926), he felt a classification of Papuan languages had to start with grammar, rather than vocabulary, which is more diverse than structure. With reference to 1926, such a classification was only of limited use, and was suitable to indicate only a certain probability of a genetic relationship within a language group.
Höltker visited the islands Karkar, Manam and Blupblup and large parts of the Bogia subdistrict at the north-east coast of New Guinea. Most of his publications are primarily concerned with various topics in anthropology, but some of them contain valuable linguistic information (e.g. Höltker 1947, 1964). Höltker (1932b:964, fn.20) lists in his fieldwork report the following Papuan languages or language groups in the area between the mouth of the Sepik River and the town of Madang:
1) Marangis, Watam-Marangis-Kayan, Boroi (Watam, Kaian, Gamei),
2) Nubia-Bosngun (Awar, Bosman), 3) Mikarew-Ariaw (Mikarew), 4) Kire-Puire (Giri), 5) Tangum-Igom (Tangum, Igom), 6) Monumbo-Ngaimbom (Monumbo, Lilau), 7) Wadaginamb (Wadaginam), 8) Murusapa-Sarewa (Moresada), 9) Awarken (Andarum), 10) Wangam (Kopar), 11) Moando (Kaukombaran family). Watam, Kaian, Gamei and Mikarew form a related group which Z'graggen (1971) calls the Ruboni language stock. The Moando or Kaukombaran languages are related to the Bongu language in Astrolabe Bay. Though Hölktker offers no evidence, he was the first to postulate a relationship between languages of the Adelbert Range and the Rai Coast. Ulingan and Waskia (Tokain) are said by him to be aberrant Papuan languages, but he gives no data. The Melanesian languages listed by him are: Medibur-Toto (Medebur), Sarang-Megiar (Megiar), Matukar (Matukar), Sek and Slar-Ragetta (Gedaged).

Höltker (1932b), according to his field report, learned the Awar language, collected ample text material and produced an extensive dictionary, which however, he never published. In 1938 he published a first wordlist of the Gapun language which he collected with Fr J. Much, S.V.D., and he regards this language as an isolate. Laycock (1973) classifies Gapun with Bungain as forming a sub-phylum within the Sepik-Ramu Phylum. In his study on the Giri people (1961) Hölktker incorporates a first short wordlist of the Giri language. In 1952 he edited Fr Tranel's study of the Tani people which includes a first Tani wordlist. In 1964, Hölktker published extensive corrections to Vormann and Scharfenberger's 1914 study of the Monumbo language. His essay on Pidgin English as vehicle of communication by the Catholic Mission (Hölktker 1945) is also valuable.

Luzbetak carried out fieldwork in the New Guinea Highlands from October 1952 to April 1956. His studies were primarily ethnographic, with a special interest in native religion. An important linguistic interest of his was the phonology of the Middle Wahgi, but for
J.A. Z'GRAGGEN

comparative reasons he covered a much larger area. Luzbetak carried out a large amount of morphological and syntactic analysis of some highland languages and dialects, e.g. the Tabare dialect with Fr McVinney (Luzbetak and McVinney 1954), the Kup, Minj, Nondugl, and Ambang dialects of the Wahgi language, and he carried out a full grammatical study of the Banz dialect (Luzbetak 1954). Luzbetak also served on the Papua New Guinea Government's Commission on Languages for Standardising Pidgin Orthography in the mid-1950s. He also carried out some experiments in literacy, especially in studying the effectiveness and practicality of a phonemic alphabet for the highland languages. Hamp (1957) praises Luzbetak's study on the Middle Wahgi phonology (Luzbetak 1956) as a capital contribution to our knowledge of the languages of New Guinea. Unfortunately, most of his field material is as yet unpublished.

7.9.8.5. H. AUFENANGER

In 1933, Aufenanger came to New Guinea for the first time, as a missionary. He spent many years in New Guinea doing research in anthropology and linguistics in addition to his missionary duties. His contributions to our knowledge of Gende (1938, 1952, 1953c) and Nondugl, a dialect of Wahgi (1953a, 1953b), are extensive. His dictionary and grammar of Biyom has got lost. Of interest also is his introduction to Salisbury's vocabulary of the Siane language (Aufenanger 1956). The majority of Aufenanger's publications are of an ethnographic nature, but many of his publications also contain valuable linguistic materials such as technical terms, myths, stories, sayings with a hidden meaning, etc. (Aufenanger 1953b, 1953c, 1960, 1962, Aufenanger and Höltker 1940).

7.9.8.6. A. BURGMANN

Burgmann edited the journal Anthropos from 1959-1968. In 1953 Bornemann and Burgmann initiated the 'Micro-Bibliotheca Anthropos', a publication series which publishes manuscripts not publishable in printed form, but which are nevertheless of high value as a source of information. Burgmann gave short introductions to these manuscripts in Anthropos. Within the New Guinea area they are the following: Gende (1953a), Chimbu (1953b), the Nondugl dialect of Wahgi (1953c), Konua (Kunua) (1954a), Lir (1954c), Ubil (1961a), Tuna (Gunantuna) (1961b), Sulka (1962), Alüban (Arapesh) (1963), Tangga (1966c, 1972), Pala (1966b). In his study of 1968 Burgmann investigates the origin of the word 'Tamberan'.
Z'graggen began his linguistic fieldwork in New Guinea in August 1964 in the coastal area of the Madang District, at first part-time and as much as his missionary duties allowed him. The complex linguistic situation at the mission station Mugil on the north-eastern coast of the Madang District awakened in him the interest for comparative linguistic and survey studies. From March 1966 to June 1969, he worked under the auspices of the Australian National University. His findings on the linguistic situation of the western Madang District are summarised in Z'graggen 1971. To assist missionaries in the field to handle various language problems independently, he studied a combination of linguistic discovery procedures and pattern practice language learning methods in 1970. A basic understanding of the techniques of the substitution frame would help the missionary in the field to discover the meaningful parts of speech; the same frame could then be used and expanded at will into a pattern practice device. This method was found to be of limited use and was not developed further. In January 1971, he resumed his fieldwork in the Madang District area with the aim of a complete linguistic survey of the Madang District. Summaries of the results were published in Z'graggen 1975 and in (I) 2.8.2. and (II) 4.4.1. There is a great need for linguistic survey studies on the district (now province) and national level. Districts (now provinces) will most likely remain important political units for a long time and an adequate knowledge of the linguistic composition should prove helpful to the administration and educational agencies. Linguistic complexity is a characteristic of the New Guinea area and thus is something a Papua New Guinean should be taught in school. Linguistics has a great task and responsibility in this respect.
J.A. Z'GRAGGEN

NOTES

1. For more general studies on the Anthropos Institute see Schmidt 1932, 1950a, Rahmann 1956 and Burgmann 1966b. The author prepared this summary in response to an invitation by Professor S.A. Wurm to write it for this volume. It was prepared at Alexishafen in October 1973. The author has been a member of the Anthropos Institute since 1970, but has been in contact with members of the Institute since 1956. He was not personally acquainted with the founder and only a little acquainted with the contributors to New Guinea linguistics. For this reason, this chapter is based on publications and some letters to the author. It is hoped that this study gives a fairly complete account of the contributions made by members of the Anthropos Institute to the linguistics of the New Guinea area.

2. For further information on Schmidt's work and personality the reader is referred to: Koppers 1956, Henninger 1956, Burgmann 1954b, Bornemann 1954.

3. The following quotation might be of interest to the historian of Papuan linguistics:

Die geographische Sprachenmannigfaltigkeit ist dabei so gross, dass in Neuguinea, wo diese Sprachen in geschlossener Reihe aneinander stossen, jedes Gebiet von ein paar Meilen im Durchmesser seine eigene von denen der anstossenden Gebiete radikal verschiedene Sprache aufweist, so dass hier wohl fur die ganze Erde der Gipfelpunkt extensiver und intensiver Sprachenzersplitterung erreicht ist. (Schmidt 1920a:18)

4. Names in parentheses are names newly adopted by Laycock (1973) and Z'graggen (1971).
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