

Multilingualism in the Papuasphere

Christian Döhler

Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and Humanities

1	Contents	
2	1 Introduction	3
3	2 Previous research	4
4	3 Factors influencing multilingualism	6
5	3.1 Language ideology	6
6	3.2 Diglossia	8
7	3.3 Trade	9
8	3.4 Gender	10
9	3.5 Intermarriage	11
10	3.6 Size	13
11	3.7 Geography	14
12	4 Types of multilingualism	14
13	4.1 ‘Small-scale’ or ‘egalitarian’?	15
14	4.2 Receptive multilingualism	16
15	5 Changing multilingual ecologies	17
16	6 Conclusion	18
17	References	19

1 Introduction

Contemporary Melanesia is characterised by extensive societal multilingualism. The phenomenon itself takes on very different forms as it is embedded in diverse language ecologies. Given the diversity of social structures, it is difficult to describe a “typical” multilingual setting in the Papuasphere. I will try nevertheless. In our hypothetical speech community exists a dedicated village language that is connected to that particular place often via association to clans. The villagers will be competent also in the languages of their immediate neighbours. Additionally, some or most individuals may be fluent in, or at least know some phrases of, one or more of the national languages and perhaps also a regional trade language. There might also be ritual languages and registers that only certain individuals have knowledge of, e.g., initiated men (cf. Hoenigman, this volume). On top of this, there might exist a sign language that is spoken only within a particular family or clan (cf. Reed, this volume). In such a setting, a multitude of languages can be witnessed when speakers of different languages come together during special occasions, e.g., for feasts, rituals, or trade contacts, but speaking many languages might be also part of everyday village life, especially in communities that practice intermarriage with speakers of different languages. In this way, Melanesian multilingualism attests to contacts - stable or fluctuating, deep or superficial, precolonial or modern - between peoples across villages, valleys, and islands.

Specific cases of multilingualism are shaped by a mix of demographic and cultural factors, the most important ones being the size of a language community, the prevailing language ideology and the status of the language communities involved. Melanesian societies are characterized by their relatively small size, by a strong connection between language variety and identity, and by an egalitarian status of groups. Gillian Sankoff, who first surveyed and systematized multilingualism in New Guinea, writes that “everyone is ethnocentric about his own variety, but since the groups which agree with him, and analogous groups, are all very small, since people know that other people think their own is the best, and since within a region there is no consensus that a particular variety is the best, the situation is certainly an egalitarian one” (1976: 289). Further factors shaping multilingualism include geography, trade, kinship, individual status and gender. In this way, multilingualism provides a broad avenue of investigation of the social structure of Melanesian speech communities and the social relations that hold between them. It also provides crucial information for explaining linguistic diversity in the region as well as the maintenance thereof.

For the purposes of this chapter, I define multilingualism as the situation where a speaker, or a group of speakers, masters two or more distinct languages (or varieties of the same language). Note that I do not draw a sharp distinction between “bilingualism” - where exactly two languages are involved - and “multilingualism”. Classic studies of multilingualism, for example Gumperz (1982), take as their point of departure a minority group within a larger society. Such language ecologies are often characterized by diglossia (Ferguson 1959, Fishman 1967), in which languages are ideologically ranked and occupy separate functional domains. Diglossic situations do exist in Melanesia, but most of the examples involve one of the national languages as the language of prestige, and

1 as elsewhere in the world, such situations are the result of recent colonial his-
 2 tory. Multilingual ecologies predating the colonial period are much more varied.
 3 Therefore, the chapter places a focus on so-called “small-scale multilingualism”
 4 (Lüpke 2016, Pakendorf, Dobrushina, and Khanina 2021). In small-scale multi-
 5 lingualism the languages involved are of equal rank, spoken by small, egalitarian
 6 groups, and multilingualism tends to be reciprocal, or balanced between those
 7 groups. In the literature, this type of language ecology has been called “egali-
 8 tarian multilingualism” (Haudricourt 1961, François 2012, Evans 2018), “indige-
 9 nous multilingualism” (Vaughan and Singer 2018), or “reciprocal, or balanced
 10 multilingualism” (Jourdan 2007).

11 Following Gumperz (1966) and Silverstein (1998), I use the term “speech com-
 12 munity” for a community of practice, i.e. people in whose lives several languages
 13 may play a role. This term stands in opposition to “language community”, which
 14 takes a language-specific perspective, i.e. speakers of a particular language or
 15 lect. It is notoriously difficult to get a clear definition of the latter, let alone to
 16 obtain definitive figures for numbers of speakers of a particular language. I rely
 17 here on various sources which stem from different time periods. This includes
 18 estimates from public sources like *Ethnologue*, from previous publications (es-
 19 pecially grammars), as well as from fieldwork.

20 Since this volume is dedicated to Papuan languages, I will focus on these, but
 21 will also include Austronesian languages where necessary and appropriate. This
 22 chapter is structured as follows. In §2, I offer a brief overview of the previous
 23 research on multilingualism in the Papuasphere, followed by a survey of social,
 24 demographic and geographic factors that shape multilingualism in §3. In §4, I
 25 discuss different terminology and types of multilingualism. The changing lan-
 26 guage ecology and the endangerment of traditional patterns is the topic of §5. I
 27 conclude in §6 by posing some key problems for future research.

28 **2 Previous research**

29 Some of the earliest European visitors to Melanesia commented on people’s com-
 30 petence in the language(s) of their neighbours. For example, in 1872 the Russian
 31 biologist and anthropologist Nicholas Miklouho-Maclay spent a year in a small
 32 hut on the northeastern coast of New Guinea. During this time, he studied his bi-
 33 ological environment and established good relations with the people of Gorendu
 34 village, who spoke Bongu. On a visit to the nearby island of Bilibili, he notes in
 35 his diary: “I wrote down 15 or 20 words of the Bili Bili dialect, which proved to
 36 be quite different from the language of my neighbours, although identical words
 37 are met with. Many of the inhabitants of Bili Bili, however, know the Bongu di-
 38 alect” (Sentinella 1975: 137). The two languages mentioned by Miklouho-Maclay
 39 are genetically unrelated. The Papuan language Bongu belongs to the Madang
 40 group of the Trans New Guinea family, while Bilibil belongs to the Bel languages
 41 of the Austronesian family. While Miklouho-Maclay was fascinated by the lan-
 42 guage skills of the people he encountered, multilingualism and linguistic diver-
 43 sity was seen as an obstacle for the subsequent colonizers. During the first half
 44 of the 20th century, the study of the languages of the region was part of an effort
 45 to missionize and to rule over the people.

1 The great stock-taking, listing and classifying of the many languages in Melane-
2 sia, especially on the island of New Guinea, began only in the 1950s and 1960s
3 with survey work carried out by Arthur Capell and a number of scholars around
4 Stephen Wurm. The biggest problem in these efforts was to establish language
5 boundaries, i.e. to define language communities. Wurm and Laycock (1961) ex-
6 plain their method as a mix of lexicostatistics and the criterion of mutual intelli-
7 gibility. However, in many cases, the two methods yielded contradictory results,
8 in that an established boundary between two language communities (set at 81%
9 of shared core vocabulary) provided no obstacle to successful communication
10 because one or both language communities were bilingual. Wurm and Laycock
11 explained such cases by using the term “passive bilingualism”, but they brushed
12 aside such social factors by stating that “they should not affect the observer’s
13 judgement” (1961: 136). For the large-scale taxonomic enterprise, multilingual-
14 ism was a problem that had to be overcome.

15 Until the late 1960s, multilingual ecologies were not considered as a field of
16 study by linguists. This is discernible in Salisbury’s introductory remark of what
17 has since become a classic paper on the topic of multilingualism in New Guinea:
18 “recent conversations with linguists have indicated that such situations have, in
19 fact, been rarely described” (Salisbury 1962: 1). The lack of in-depth descriptions
20 led to a misrepresentation of the role of multilingualism. For example, Laycock
21 (1966) saw multilingualism as a phenomenon which came about through the
22 recent introduction of various lingua francas. Comparing New Guinea to the
23 Australian linguistic landscape, he writes that “one would expect a fair amount
24 of bilingualism, but in fact in pre-European times native knowledge of other lan-
25 guages was apparently not as extensive as was, for example, the knowledge of
26 other languages on the part of Australian aboriginals” (1966: 44).

27 The first publication which took on multilingualism was Salisbury (1962); a
28 study of the Emenyo in the highlands region, who speak the Komunku dialect of
29 Siane. Most Emenyo were competent in various dialects of Siane as well as the
30 neighbouring Chimbu language. Salisbury observed that not only was multilin-
31 gualism pervasive in the speech community, but that being multilingual was a
32 source of prestige often used as a rhetorical device. This can be seen in the dif-
33 ference between informal and formal situations. While in informal situations,
34 the Emenyo spoke in the language they felt at ease with, in formal situations,
35 they would often shift to another language or they would continue their speech
36 with a translation into the other language.

37 It was through the work of Gillian Sankoff (1968, 1976, and 1980) that lin-
38 guists became aware of the extent and importance of multilingualism in New
39 Guinea. Sankoff (1968) conducted a detailed study of the Buang speech commu-
40 nity through a combination of descriptive work, sociolinguistic interviews and
41 testing speakers’ competence in different varieties. In this way, she provided
42 a description and analysis of the language competence of the Buang, as well as
43 their language affiliation and identity. Sankhoff (1976) and (1980) provide a sur-
44 vey of earlier descriptions of multilingual ecologies, often made by missionaries,
45 geographers or anthropologists. Laycock (1979: 81) acknowledges her survey as
46 “the most comprehensive account of multilingualism in the New Guinea area to
47 date” and this still holds true today.

48 The research on multilingualism in Melanesia over the past four decades

1 has been narrower in scope. Some authors have approached multilingualism
 2 through working on related issues, for example language contact (Makihara and
 3 Schieffelin 2007, Foley 2010, Reesink and Dunn 2017, Schapper 2020), language
 4 change (Ross 1996), and language ecology (Mühlhäusler 1996). There is also
 5 work that has singled out particular types of multilingualism, for example re-
 6 ceptive bilingualism, also known as dual-lingualism (Lincoln 1976, Lincoln 1979)
 7 or passive bilingualism (Litteral 1978, Thurston 1987), a topic I return to in §4.2.
 8 Other authors have published on the topic with a regional focus, for example
 9 New Britain (Thurston 1987) or Southern New Guinea (Evans 2012), and there
 10 are a number of dedicated case studies of multilingual speech communities, for
 11 example Anggor (Litteral 1978), Kaki Ae (Clifton 1994), Arapesh (Dobrin 2014),
 12 Nmbo (Kashima 2020), Abui (Saad 2020), Idi/Nen (Schokkin 2021) or Komnzo
 13 (Döhler 2021). Comments on multilingualism can also be found in the reference
 14 grammars that have appeared over the years. Unfortunately, these comments
 15 are often side notes in the sections on demography or language vitality. With the
 16 exception of a chapter in Foley’s overview on Papuan languages (1986: 29-35),
 17 there has been no update of Sankoff’s survey and synthesis from the 1960s.

18 **3 Factors influencing multilingualism**

19 In the study of multilingualism world-wide two social factors have been central:
 20 the ranking of language varieties into “high” versus “low” and their functional
 21 differentiation over separate domains of use. This approach has been fruitful
 22 for understanding language ecologies in a (post-)colonial setting as well as in
 23 “superdiverse” urban settings (Blommaert 2013). Recent work under the label of
 24 small-scale multilingualism, however, has widened the perspective on the topic
 25 of multilingualism, thereby revealing a great degree of variation. Several au-
 26 thors have pointed out that “the cultural systems that fall under this umbrella
 27 are extremely diverse” (Vaughan and Singer 2018: 84) and “individual cases of
 28 small-scale multilingualism differ in various social and cultural aspects” (Pak-
 29 endorf, Dobrushina, and Khanina 2021: 2).

30 In this section, I zoom in on different social factors (diglossia, trade, gender,
 31 intermarriage), demographic factors (group size), and geographic factors (prox-
 32 imity) that shape multilingualism in the Papuasphere. Naturally these factors
 33 are interrelated in the most complex ways.

34 **3.1 Language ideology**

35 Before surveying these social factors, it is useful to address the question of how
 36 language relates to the construction of individual and collective identities in
 37 Melanesia. Explicit or implicit ideas about language including its origin and de-
 38 velopment, appropriate use, essential value, and ownership are called *language*
 39 *ideologies* (Woolard 1998). There is enormous variation in the kinds of language
 40 ideologies found in the area and what features contribute to it, too much to cover
 41 in the scope of this chapter. For now, I am only concerned with the construction
 42 of identity.

1 It can be said for Melanesia that the most important unit in the construction
2 of individual as well as group identity is the clan. In most cases, clan member-
3 ship is passed through the father's line of descent, and along with clan member-
4 ship come certain rights and obligations, for example land ownership, knowl-
5 edge about totemic beings and artefacts, rights to perform certain ritual activi-
6 ties, participation in exchange relationships and often enough a distinct way of
7 speaking, or patrilineal.

8 The extent to which language can be a resource for the construction of collec-
9 tive identities ranges from it being a central feature to the complete lack thereof.
10 An example of the latter are the speakers of Greater Awyu languages in South-
11 ern New Guinea, for whom de Vries (2020) claims that small clans are the highest
12 political units and the only feature for establishing group identity: "Language,
13 however, transcends clan boundaries. Many clans share one Greater Awyu vari-
14 ety and some of these clans may be mortal enemies, whereas other clans, speak-
15 ing different languages, may be your own people" (2020: 153). For cultures of
16 the Middle Sepik including speakers of Iatmul, Alamlak, Yimas and Manambu,
17 Foley (2005) makes a similar observation when he writes that "there is no sense
18 of inter-village solidarity based on shared linguistic allegiance; villages speak-
19 ing the same language may have closer cultural and social links to neighbor-
20 ing villages speaking a different language than to each other" (2005: 165). In-
21 stead group identity is based on clan membership which Foley characterizes as
22 "a place of intersection of primordial migrations of totemic ancestors and the re-
23 sulting exchange relationships throughout the region, one which is highly mul-
24 tilingual" (2005: 175). In these two regions, language seems to play little role, if
25 any, in the construction of collective identities.

26 A counterexample comes from the Morehead District in Southern New Guinea.
27 While the clan is also the most important feature for group identity, there is
28 an additional, overarching identity which unites different clans along linguistic
29 boundaries, often mediated by adjacent clan lands. This finds its clearest expres-
30 sion in marriage patterns, which are based on sister-exchange. Ayres makes the
31 following observation: "people who speak the same dialect usually but not al-
32 ways form an exogamous group: A single dialect group may contain two or more
33 local exogamous groups, though it appears that when this situation is found,
34 dialects may be splitting internally" (1983: 138). The association of language,
35 people, and place in the Morehead area is also mythically sanctioned. Williams
36 (1936: 54) provides one episode in the cosmogenesis describing how the land was
37 populated by people who spoke different languages. In the *sak'r* myth, the main
38 character frees different groups of people speaking different languages from a
39 palm tree and when he finally reaches the base of the tree, he recognizes his own
40 people by their words, which are intelligible to him. This myth is widespread in
41 the Morehead District and in indigenous reasoning about the geographic frag-
42 mentation of languages, people would often invoke a tree metaphor, in which
43 they place their own language at the base of the tree, while the surrounding lan-
44 guages occupy the branches and twigs of the tree. Moreover, Ayres (1983: 137)
45 mentions that some of her informants drew on linguistic differences in their
46 characterisation of groups of people. In her example, the speaker used the word
47 for 'fire' to distinguish his own group from another group. In my own fieldwork,
48 one of my Komnzo teachers made a distinction between the people to the East

1 and to the West of the Morehead river by calling the former *yao kabe* ('yao peo-
 2 ple') and the latter *keke kabe* ('keke people'). The first element in the string is the
 3 word for 'no' in the Nambu and Tonda subgroups, respectively, of the language
 4 family.

5 The language community of Bunaq on the island of Timor is another example.
 6 Being the only Papuan language in central Timor surrounded by Austronesian
 7 languages, its linguistic differences are perceived both by Austronesian speakers
 8 and amongst themselves. Schapper writes that "whilst linguistic non-conformity
 9 has set them apart to some degree, it has also led to an inclusive cultural attitude"
 10 (2011: 36). External influence is visible in every aspect of the language, which
 11 points to "millennia of Austronesian contact and multilingualism on the part of
 12 the Bunaq" (Ibid.). Today, all adult Bunaq speak one or more Austronesian lan-
 13 guage, but their Austronesian neighbours almost never learn Bunaq. For the
 14 Morehead district and the Bunaq, one has to conclude that language is an im-
 15 portant feature of group identity.

16 The differences described above pertain to collective identity. However, one
 17 should not assume that this aligns neatly with the construction of individual
 18 identity. For example, de Vries points to the children of bilingual households
 19 of speakers of Greater Awyu languages, who learn and speak both languages
 20 as a way to express their "bilateral identity that is grounded in the links with
 21 father's and mother's clan" (2020: 150). In other words, even though language
 22 plays little role for collective identity, it is an important element "for relational
 23 concepts of personhood, the person as a cluster of dyadic relations. Each rela-
 24 tionship contributes to who you are, is an element of your identity" (2020: 149).

25 After this brief interruption on the topic of language and identity, I turn to
 26 the various social factors that influence multilingualism in Melanesia.

27 3.2 Diglossia

28 Situations of diglossia are characterised by a functional specialisation in which a
 29 'higher' language is associated with broader social identities, political prestige,
 30 and literacy, and a 'lower' language is associated with more specific social en-
 31 tities, lack of higher-order political prestige, and orality (Ferguson 1959). Such
 32 situations are found especially in the context of the national languages, whose
 33 history, spread, and social role has been the topic of a number publications.
 34 For Hiri Motu, see (Mühlhäusler and Dutton 1979, Dutton 1997), for Tok Pisin
 35 (Mühlhäusler 1979, Wurm and Mühlhäusler 1979, Laycock 1982, Romaine 1992),
 36 and for Papuan Malay (Scott et al. 2008, Kluge 2017, Gil 2022, Kluge, this volume).
 37 I will not dwell on them here.

38 In addition to diglossic situations with one of the national languages, there
 39 is also a triglossic situation, in which the functions are more clearly delineated.
 40 The term "triglossic" was introduced by Eastman (1983) extending Ferguson's
 41 term diglossia. A triglossic situation has been described in Makopin, a village
 42 that speaks Mountain Arapesh (Nidue 1990). The three languages used in sepa-
 43 rate domains are: Mountain Arapesh at home and for traditional contexts, Tok
 44 Pisin used in cross-language communication, church, village courts, and in town,
 45 and English used in school and in more formal contexts like the interaction with
 46 government departments. Jendraschek (2012: 8) describes a similar situation

1 for Iatmul speakers during the 1980s, i.e. before Tok Pisin became the first lan-
 2 guage for most children. Saad (2020: 21) characterizes the village of Takalelang
 3 on Alor island as triglossic involving Abui, Alor Malay, and Standard Indonesian.

4 The arrival of Christian missions in the first half of the 20th century and the
 5 spread of Christianity provided an important context for the development of
 6 diglossia. Faced with a mosaic of many, small language communities, the various
 7 missions made strategic choices as to which languages should be used for bible
 8 translations, service, and schooling. In Dutch New Guinea, the Netherlands-
 9 based missionaries (and the Dutch civil servants) as a rule chose Malay as lingua
 10 franca, and this actually pushed out older local and regional trade languages,
 11 such as Patipi on the south coast of the Bird's Head (de Vries 2004: 2). In the
 12 Cenderawasih Bay missionaries initially used Biak, but then switched to Malay
 13 as well. In the eastern half of New Guinea, where German missionaries were ac-
 14 tive in the beginning, soon to be followed by the missionaries from the London
 15 Missionary Society, a different strategy was pursued. Instead of using emerg-
 16 ing contact languages, which eventually became Tok Pisin, missions focussed on
 17 existing trade languages, e.g., Kuanua (Tolai) in New Ireland and New Britain,
 18 Dobu in the D'Entrecasteaux Islands, Suau in the Papuan Tip, Hiri Motu in the
 19 Papuan Gulf, and Kiwai in the Fly River area. All are languages of navigating,
 20 sea- or river-faring peoples, and all but Kiwai are Austronesian languages. Fur-
 21 ther inland, missions chose the Papuan languages they encountered, for exam-
 22 ple Gogodala on the Fly River and Kâte on the Huon Peninsula. As a consequence
 23 some of these languages have grown considerably in their numbers of speak-
 24 ers, and the most extreme example of such an increase is the Wemo dialect
 25 of Kâte, which was spoken originally by around 600 people in a single village,
 26 but reached 75,000 active speakers in the 1970s (Suter 2014). See Sankoff (1980:
 27 120ff.) and van den Berg & de Vries (this volume) for more examples.

28 These cases of mission-propagated languages show the typical diglossic func-
 29 tional specialisations in domains of language use. These languages were being
 30 learnt by so many speakers precisely because they were church languages, and
 31 at the time churches provided the only way to have one's children educated in
 32 the official schooling system. While this process began during the colonial pe-
 33 riod, one should not conclude that there was no functional differentiation in
 34 pre-colonial times. This is found especially in the context of trade.

35 **3.3 Trade**

36 The exchange of trade items has always been a common contact scenario in
 37 Melanesia. While trading relations were just one among many reasons to in-
 38 teract, I will focus in this section on cases, in which trade seems to have been
 39 the most important reason for contact between peoples speaking different lan-
 40 guages. Two types of situation fit this scenario. First, there can be trade with
 41 groups who live far away. Secondly, there can be trade between neighbouring
 42 groups, who - for other reasons - did not have regular relations.

43 Examples of long distance trade include the spread of some of the coastal
 44 languages, usually Austronesian languages. For example, in the famous Kula
 45 trade circuit, Dobu was used as lingua franca in the Trobriand islands (Mali-
 46 nowski repr. 1978 (1922)). Malinowski points to an asymmetric relationship in

1 that Dobu was learnt by other groups, but Dobu speakers hardly ever learnt the
 2 language of their trade partners, even though some of these groups, for exam-
 3 ple the speakers Kiriwini, “enjoy the same general prestige” (repr. 1978 (1922):
 4 31ff.). Similar points can be made about the Motu people, who used a simplified
 5 version of their language, called Hiri Motu, during their annual trading voyages
 6 along the Gulf of Papua (Dutton and Brown 1977).

7 Examples for trade relations between neighbouring groups, who did not in-
 8 teract regularly, come from the Sepik River basin. Williams (1993) documents
 9 a number of Papuan-based contact languages, and it is striking that the major-
 10 ity of his examples come from this area. The state of documentation of these
 11 contact languages is very uneven, and some had fallen out of use long before
 12 the time of their documentation. Nowadays, most of them have been replaced
 13 by Tok Pisin. In the literature, these contact languages are often characterized
 14 as being a simplified version of one language with influence from the other lan-
 15 guage. For example, Yimas-Alamblak pidgin is classified as a “trade pidgin based
 16 on vernacular Yimas” and characterized as exhibiting “major structural simpli-
 17 fication and reduction vis-à-vis vernacular Yimas” (Williams 2000: 41). Foley
 18 (2013) mentions distinct contact languages for different trade pairings: Yimas-
 19 Alamblak, Yimas-Arafundi and Yimas-Karawari.

20 Another example is Arafundi-Enga pidgin, which was used during trade con-
 21 tacts between the Imboin Arafundi in the Sepik and the Maramuni Enga from
 22 the highlands. This contact language attests to the existence of a cultural link
 23 between the Highlands and the Sepik Lowlands. Maramuni Enga speakers trav-
 24 elled to Arafundi speaking villages to trade tobacco and netbags for betel nut,
 25 lime and kina shells. Williams identifies Imboin villages as the places where
 26 these exchanges took place. As the trading involved only men, knowledge of the
 27 contact language was limited to them. There was no intermarriage between the
 28 two groups. Williams describes Arafundi-Enga pidgin as a “simplified Enga with
 29 significant input from Arafundi” (1993: 361). See also (Williams 1995) for a de-
 30 scription of the pronominal system of Arafundi-Enga pidgin. Another example
 31 is Kwoma-Manambu pidgin, as discussed in Aikhenvald (2008: 597) based on a
 32 text sample in Bowden (1997: 337).

33 The hierarchical aspect does not seem to be as important in these situations
 34 as it is with today’s big national languages. Often the groups in contact were
 35 of similar size. It is the functional differentiation that plays a bigger role, as
 36 these languages were spoken only during special occasions, and often only by a
 37 (male) subset of the population. In fact, the rightful use of such contact languages
 38 was often conditioned by clan membership. For the Sepik, Foley (2005: 169)
 39 points out that not only the rights to trade but the trade language itself was the
 40 birthright of individual clans passed on by fathers to their sons.

41 3.4 Gender

42 Multilingualism is quite often gendered in the Papuasphere (cf. Foley 1986: 29-
 43 30), which follows from the more general observation that the lives of women
 44 and men tend to be quite separated. This can have the effect that women are less
 45 mobile, have less political influence, and hence do not have the same amount of
 46 exposure to other languages. On the other hand, Laycock (1979) points out that

1 “because of the widespread pattern of virilocal residence, however, women are
2 more likely to acquire fluency in the language of the village they have married
3 into” (1979: 90). He concludes that “men are more likely to have a smattering of
4 many languages, but may know none of them perfectly” (Ibid.).

5 In the literature, one can find a number of comments suggesting that men
6 were more multilingual than women. Aikhenvald (2008: 25) mentions this for
7 the knowledge of Iatmul by speakers of Manambu in the Sepik. Other authors
8 point to women’s limited competence in neighbouring languages, for example in
9 the Momu language community in Sandaun Province (Honeyman 2016: 13) or
10 in Abawiri in the Mamberamo River Basin (Yoder 2020: 15). Pennington (2016)
11 writes about the speakers of Ma Manda on the Huon peninsula that the only
12 group “which appears to be monolingual are elderly women” (2016: 28), while
13 “men are commonly quite adept with the neighboring Erap languages” (Ibid.).
14 For the speakers of Angor in the Sandaun Province, Litteral (1978) comments
15 that “passive bilingualism was extremely limited or nonexistent among Anggor
16 women” (1978: 26). Stebbins, Evans, and Terrill (2017) write about the Papuan
17 languages spoken in the Solomon Island that “in the west Russells many people,
18 particularly women, only speak Lavukaleve” (2017: 876). I have made the same
19 observation about speakers of Bine in Southern New Guinea, where 11 out of 12
20 Bine monolinguals in the village of Irukupi were elderly women.

21 The picture is a little more complicated in cases where intermarriage with
22 other language groups is common, but not the norm. For example, Stasch (2007)
23 writes about the speakers of Korowai, a language of the Greater Awyu family in
24 Southern New Guinea, that “women are sometimes particularly associated with
25 multilingualism in languages other than Indonesian, because intermarriage be-
26 tween Korowai and neighboring people is common, and it is usually women who
27 change residence” (2007: 101). At the same time, knowledge of Indonesian is
28 common for men, but not for women.

29 In cases, where intermarriage with other language groups is pervasive, gen-
30 der may not be a relevant factor in the prediction of multilingualism. An exam-
31 ple of this is the Morehead district in Southern New Guinea with its widespread
32 pattern of direct sister-exchange. Here, exogamy is based on clan as well as on
33 place. Since many of the languages spoken in this area are rather small, the
34 likelihood of growing up in a multilingual household is very high. For exam-
35 ple, Kashima found that for the speakers of Nmbo, gender “is highly socially
36 differentiated, but this differentiation does not readily translate into linguistic
37 differences” (2020: 77), which holds true for both language internal variation
38 and knowledge of other languages. In other words, men and women are equally
39 multilingual.

40 3.5 Intermarriage

41 Intermarriage between language communities seems to provide the ideal condi-
42 tions for high levels of multilingualism. Another example from the Morehead
43 district is the village of Rouku, where Komnzo is spoken (Ayres 1983, Döhler
44 2018). The people of Rouku practise sister-exchange based on a mix of clan as
45 well as place exogamy. The notion of place happens to overlap with language va-
46 riety, i.e. all Komnzo-speaking clans claim prior unity at a place called *farem kar*.

1 Ayres states that exogamy “is sometimes explained as a rule of dialect exogamy:
2 “*We should not intermarry because we talk the same language*” is a phrase some-
3 times stated by informants” (1983: 186). As a consequence of this quasi-linguistic
4 exogamy, in which women shift to the village of their respective husbands, chil-
5 dren acquire not just the languages of both parents, but often the languages of
6 their aunts and grandmothers, who might come from yet another language com-
7 munity. Hence, speech communities in the Morehead district are highly multi-
8 lingual.

9 There are other cases that attest to a strong connection between intermar-
10 riage and multilingualism. One example is Yeri, a Torricelli language spoken
11 in a single village of the same name (Wilson 2017). Yeri speakers practise in-
12 termarriage with surrounding villages, and Wilson (2017: 5ff.) observes that,
13 historically, this produced a pattern of multilingualism, which is now replaced
14 by the widespread use of Tok Pisin. Priestley (2008) paints a similar picture for
15 Koromu, a language on the Rai Coast, spoken in several villages. Although mar-
16 riages within the Koromu area are preferred, “a tradition of interaction between
17 the Koromu speech community [i.e., language community (CD)] and neighbour-
18 ing language groups is indicated by bilingualism, intermarriage, trade ...”, but
19 “since 1975 fewer people speak these languages because there is more commu-
20 nication in Tok Pisin” (2008: 18). It seems that the situation in Yeri and Koromu
21 before the arrival of Tok Pisin might have been more like the language ecology
22 in the Morehead district.

23 While exogamy with different language groups is a good indicator for high
24 levels of multilingualism, the reverse is not true. Language communities who
25 practise endogamy with respect to language boundaries can still be multilingual,
26 but the additional languages would be acquired later in life, and often multilin-
27 gualism is conditioned by social factors such as status, age and gender. We have
28 seen some examples of this in the case of trade languages and in the cases of
29 bilingualism with one of the national languages.

30 The sharp division between endogamy and exogamy with respect to a lan-
31 guage community is in fact misleading, as there are many examples which fall
32 somewhere in the middle. For example, Awiakay is spoken in the village of Kan-
33 jimei in the Sepik region (Hoenigman, this volume). Hoenigman describes the
34 community as “largely endogamous” (2015: xvii) and elsewhere as “not having
35 been multilingual in local languages for several decades” (2015: 260). At the
36 same time, the Awiakay are not completely isolated from their neighbours with
37 whom they can converse using Tok Pisin. Hoenigman points out that there is
38 “passive bilingualism” of some speakers with Imanmeri (Hoenigman 2007: 260),
39 as there are just a few marriages with surrounding villages who speak Inman-
40 meri, but also Asangamut and Ambonwari (2007: 30). Thus, outside marriages
41 and multilingualism in this community are sprinkled over the population, which
42 thwarts a clear decision for or against exogamy.

43 The link between intermarriage and multilingualism can also be absent or
44 unimportant, which seems to be the case for the speakers of Greater Awyu lan-
45 guages. De Vries (2020) summarizes the multilingual situation by stating that:
46 “marriage across language and language family boundaries was and is a fre-
47 quent phenomenon among Greater Awyu speakers. It is not preferred nor avoided:
48 language is simply not an issue in relations between clans, nor in marriage or in

1 any other area” (2020: 190).

2 **3.6 Size**

3 The size of a language community is a measure that is relatively easy to obtain
4 from publications, although authors are often not clear in their definition of lan-
5 guage community. Nevertheless, size has been used for the classification of mul-
6 tilingualism in Melanesia. For example, Sankoff (1980) groups the different set-
7 tings into very small, medium, and large language communities.

8 Sankoff observes that speakers of smaller languages are often competent in
9 their neighbours’ bigger languages. An example comes from Island Melane-
10 sia from the Touo language community (1,980 speakers). See also Dunn & Ter-
11 rill (this volume). Stebbins, Evans, and Terrill (2017: 869) mention that most
12 speakers of Touo are multilingual in the Austronesian languages Roviana (9,900)
13 and/or Marovo (8,100), as well as Solomon Island Pijin. Note that it is the rela-
14 tive size that counts here, as the bigger languages might be small themselves.
15 Laycock (1965: 131) provides an example of this from the Upper Sepik, where
16 Ngala speakers (134) are competent in Wogamusin (336). In many cases, how-
17 ever, the neighbouring languages are considerably larger, as it is with Marori
18 speakers (119) in Southern New Guinea who are surrounded by Marind speak-
19 ers (10,000+). All Marori are competent in Marind as well as in Papuan Malay
20 (Arka 2012: 151).

21 Another configuration involves small languages in contact with language com-
22 munities of similar size. This is the case for the Tonda languages in Morehead
23 district. Most languages of this group are spoken in a single village by only a few
24 hundred speakers, for example Anta (150), Komnzo (250), Wära (300), Blafe (350),
25 and Warta Thuntai (400). As described above, there is widespread intermarriage
26 between these villages and as a consequence multilingualism is reciprocal and
27 balanced (Evans, Arka, et al. 2017).

28 For medium-sized languages, Sankoff concludes that “there has existed a fair
29 amount of bilingualism in border areas and among the smaller or more isolated
30 segments of any linguistic group, but that multilingualism is unlikely in the cen-
31 tral areas of large linguistic groups” (1980: 104).

32 For the large languages in the highlands, Sankoff discusses the border areas
33 of Chimbu and Huli respectively, multilingualism was a “common phenomenon
34 whose incidence was principally dictated by demography. Language differences
35 were not in and of themselves considered as barriers to communication” (1980:
36 109). There are exceptions to the widespread multilingualism in the Papuas-
37 phere, and some language descriptions make no reference to multilingualism
38 other than with the national languages. A simple reason could be that a lan-
39 guage community is very large and the specific village, on which the description
40 is based, is surrounded by villages speaking the same language. For example,
41 in his grammar of Menya (25,000 speakers), Whitehead (2004) only mentions
42 bilingualism with Tok Pisin, but not with any of the surrounding languages. Of
43 course, one cannot take the absence of evidence as evidence of the absence of
44 multilingualism.

3.7 Geography

Geography plays a role in a number of ways. First, we have seen in the preceding section that for medium-sized and for large language communities, multilingualism existed only in the border areas. Hence, the geographic proximity between villages belonging to different language communities is important, not so much the size of a language community per se. Laycock (1979: 93) describes this as the ‘wash’ scenario, where two languages can be said to wash into each other. He places this in opposition to the ‘swamp’ scenario, in which members of a language community are all competent in (all of) the surrounding language(s), but not vice versa. We have seen this above for Bunaq and Marori.

Second, geography (or better: location) might give one group an advantage and thereby be an incentive for other groups to learn their language rather than vice versa. Laycock (1979) provides the example of Iatmul, whose speakers reside in the most navigable part of the Sepik River, and therefore Iatmul speakers control and link a larger cultural area. It is no surprise then, that many of the surrounding language communities use Iatmul as a local lingua franca, even if they are considerably larger than Iatmul, as is the case with Abelam. As a result of this situation, Iatmul speakers did not have to acquire the languages of their neighbours and many were monolingual before the spread of Tok Pisin (Jendraschek 2012: 14).

Lastly, geography (or better: geographic isolation) might be a reason for the absence of multilingualism, or at least for it being restricted. For the language communities of Qaqet on East New Britain (Hellwig 2019: 5) and Abui on Alor (Kratochvíl 2007: 4), there is a lower level of multilingualism in the inland villages as compared to the more accessible coastal villages. A clear case is the language community of Yéli Dnye. Ignoring the influx of English through schooling, Levinson concludes that “most children are raised essentially monolingual in Yéli Dnye” (2022: 10). The reason is that the language is spoken on Rossel Island some 450km off the main coast of Papua New Guinea. Another example comes from Kulick’s description of Tayap, which is spoken in the small isolated village Gapun between the Sepik and Ramu rivers. Kulick and Terrill (2021) describe Gapun as “far from roads of any kind and is difficult to reach. It lies in a mosquito- and leech-infested swamp in the middle of the rainforest” (2021: 1). Again it seems that there was virtually no multilingualism with surrounding languages. Nowadays Gapuners are shifting to Tok Pisin, which is also used for inter-village communication (Kulick 1992, Kulick & Dobrin, this volume).

4 Types of multilingualism

In this section, I will briefly compare some of the types of multilingualism that are found in the Papuasphere. Nowadays, there is almost universal diglossia involving a local language and one of the national languages. In precolonial times, there was a wide diversity of types of multilingualism that are sometimes squeezed under umbrella terms like small-scale multilingualism or balanced multilingualism. In the following, I discuss cases that exemplify the different aspects of multilingualism that are addressed by these terms.

1 Before that, I want to mention that the two main types of multilingualism, i.e.,
 2 diglossia and small-scale multilingualism, often co-exist. Returning to our exam-
 3 ple of the Morehead District, it is the local languages that are used in everyday
 4 inter-village communication. Women who have married into a village are often
 5 numerous enough to form their own little language enclave, and, in that sense
 6 the local languages are also used in everyday intra-village communication. Peo-
 7 ple often speak their respective patrillects, which creates so-called dual-lingual
 8 conversations, a topic which I address below. In the Morehead District, I have
 9 witnessed this also for public speeches, where a speech or a testimony at a village
 10 court was given in one of the neighbouring languages without the need for trans-
 11 lation into the local language. Hence, small-scale multilingualism is the norm in
 12 this area. At the same time, there is a situation of diglossia in the domains of
 13 the church, the schooling system and the public administration, all of which are
 14 conducted in English. For example, Komnzo speakers grow up learning the sur-
 15 rounding languages, but they also acquire English at school, possibly Tok Pisin
 16 when they travel and work in Kiunga or Daru, and they pick up a few phrases
 17 and words in Papuan Malay when they cross the border to Indonesia for trading.
 18 Most people over the age of 60 are fluent in Hiri Motu as this was the language
 19 of instruction in the schools as well as in church. Hence, there is a co-existence
 20 of the two types of multilingualism.

21 **4.1 ‘Small-scale’ or ‘egalitarian’?**

22 The label “small-scale” implies that the languages involved are often small in
 23 terms of number of speakers. While this is true in many cases in Melanesia,
 24 the question remains open whether it is size of the language communities that
 25 captures the situation best. We saw that for medium and large languages, it is
 26 the border areas where speech communities are found that are multilingual due
 27 to intermarriage. One should keep in mind that exogamous groups are rarely
 28 based on language in Melanesia. Instead, exogamy is based on smaller and more
 29 localised units like the village or the clan. These units are often of comparable
 30 size regardless of the size of the language community. Moreover, what is called
 31 language community in this chapter, i.e., the area or the population in which one
 32 language can be used to communicate, might not share any kind of political or
 33 otherwise identifying unity, as we have seen in §3.1 for speakers of Greater Awyu
 34 languages and for the Middle Sepik. One might add the same observation for big
 35 languages in the highlands, for which Salisbury (1962) in the case of Siane and
 36 Chimbu and Rappaport (1966) in the case of Maring mention a lack of political
 37 unity. Thus, the label “small-scale” is correct in that the groups who become
 38 bilingual in each other’s language are small, but it would be a mistake, at least
 39 in the Papuan context, to link “small scale” to the number of speakers.

40 In this light, it makes more sense to highlight the egalitarian status of those
 41 groups of people who are bilingual. Sankoff describes the language ideology in
 42 this way: “each village feels its own dialect to be the best, and accentuates its
 43 particular features especially in contrast with those other varieties it is most fa-
 44 miliar with” (1976: 289). In the context of the Banks Islands in Vanuatu, François
 45 (2012) - based on earlier work in New Caledonia by Haudricourt (1961) - has used
 46 the label “egalitarian multilingualism”. Evans (2018) defines the term “in the

1 sense that each group sees their own language as appropriate and emblematic
 2 for their own social unit, while conceding the equivalent role to other languages
 3 in the broader social universe” (2018: 915), which reminds us of the quote from
 4 Sankoff mentioned at the beginning of this chapter. In my view “egalitarian mul-
 5 tilingualism” captures the Melanesian situation well.

6 4.2 Receptive multilingualism

7 In many contact situations in the Papuasphere, multilingualism is reciprocal,
 8 meaning that both groups involved are proficient in each other’s languages. In
 9 most cases, this reciprocal competence leads to a pattern in which a speaker
 10 understands the other language but responds in his or her own language. The
 11 term “passive bilingualism” was used for this early on (Wurm and Laycock 1961:
 12 136), but it often remained unclear what the adjective “passive” refers to. Do
 13 passive bilinguals only understand a few phrases of the other language, or are
 14 they fluent in it? Have they acquired the other language(s), or is the other lan-
 15 guage only very similar? Do they avoid speaking the other language merely
 16 for ideological reasons? Despite the lack of a clear definition, “passive bilin-
 17 gualism” has since appeared in many descriptive works (Litteral 1978, Sankoff
 18 1980, Thurston 1987, Mühlhäusler 1996, Hoenigman 2007). There are a num-
 19 ber of terms from very different areas of linguistic research that have also been
 20 used for this, such as “lingua receptiva” (Rehbein, ten Thije, and Verschik 2011),
 21 “non-accommodating bilingualism” (Bilaniuk 2010), or “receptive multilingual-
 22 ism” (ten Thije and Zeevaert 2007, Singer and Harris 2016, Singer 2023). The
 23 latter has become widely accepted in the literature. The term “receptive multi-
 24 lingualism” explicitly leaves open whether comprehension is based on linguis-
 25 tic similarity, on acquired knowledge, or on both (Riionheimo, Kaivapalu, and
 26 Härmävaara 2017). It also encompasses a wide range of motivations and ap-
 27 plications ranging from conversational practices to literacy skills. A somewhat
 28 narrower term, applied only at the level of conversation, was coined by Lincoln
 29 (1979) for the kinds of situations, in which interactants converse in their respec-
 30 tive languages. He suggests “dual-lingualism”, which he defines as “the pattern
 31 of language use such that in conversations between speakers of two different
 32 languages each consistently speaks one language in response to utterances in
 33 the other language” (1979: 65). Note that there is a terminological problem with
 34 dual-lingualism, when there are more than two languages involved (tri-lingual?
 35 quadri-lingual? multi-lingual?).

36 Lincoln observed such a conversational practice during his fieldwork on Bou-
 37 gainville between a Motuna speaking husband and his Banoni speaking wife.
 38 The pattern has been reported from other parts of the Papuasphere. For ex-
 39 ample, Salisbury (1962) mentions the existence of trilingual conversations in
 40 the highlands: “a Ramfau wife speaking in Ramfau to her son who replied in
 41 Komunku and who was supported by his wife speaking in Dene. Individuals
 42 often understood other languages but replied in their own, although on other
 43 occasions they might speak in different languages. I observed similar multilin-
 44 gualism in other western villages of Komunku tribe, or when accompanying Ko-
 45 munku tribesmen into Dene territory” (1962: 2). In her description of Yeri, Wil-
 46 son (2017) writes in a footnote that “when the group involves older speakers of

1 several languages, it is not uncommon for each speaker to speak their own lo-
 2 cal language” (2017: 9). For the Morehead district, I have witnessed dual- and
 3 tri-lingual conversations in the villages of Rouku, Morehead, Yokwa, Weam, and
 4 Indorodoro during my fieldwork.

5 There can be several reasons for receptive multilingualism. In cases where
 6 contact between language communities is sporadic, it could be imperfect learn-
 7 ing on both sides. Also, it could be that the languages involved are very similar.
 8 For North West New Britain, Thurston (1987) claims that structural similarities
 9 “facilitate what Lincoln (1975, 1979) calls dual-lingualism, a system of commu-
 10 nication in which speakers of different languages converse with little or no dif-
 11 ficulty simply by speaking their own languages. It also makes it easier for a per-
 12 son to actually learn to speak the language of a neighbouring group.” (1987: 29).
 13 Furthermore, receptive multilingualism can be the result of cultural norms. For
 14 the Morehead District, there appears to be no lack of competence or fluency.
 15 The structural difference of a given language pair ranges from dialectal differ-
 16 ences, e.g., between Komnzo and Wära, to genetically unrelated languages, e.g.,
 17 between Nen and Idi. The prevailing language ideology seems to be one that
 18 dictates loyalty to one’s patriline. Schokkin (2021) shows how different posses-
 19 sive strategies in Idi relate to speakers’ multilingual profiles. In a sociolinguistic
 20 interview – held in Idi – a speaker uses a close possessive construction for his
 21 patriline Idzuwe, but a distant possessive construction for Idi.¹ Loyalty to one’s
 22 patriline means that speakers remain in a dual-lingual conversation mode unless
 23 communication breaks down. Finally, the reason for receptive multilingualism
 24 could be opportunistic, i.e., where everyone is multilingual, there is no need to
 25 accommodate.

26 Receptive multilingualism in general, and dual-lingualism in particular, ap-
 27 pears to have a wide geographic and cross-cultural distribution, ranging from
 28 Vanuatu (François 2012: 94), to Bougainville (Lincoln 1979), New Britain (Thurston
 29 1987: 29), the New Guinea highlands (Salisbury 1962), Southern New Guinea
 30 (Evans 2018, Kashima 2020, Schokkin 2021 and my own fieldwork), as well as
 31 Eastern Indonesia (Gil, pers. comm.). From this observation we can conclude
 32 that it was formerly a widespread feature of the Papuasphere, and there are
 33 good reasons to cast the net even wider and postulate receptive multilingual-
 34 ism as a deep-time Sahul feature, as such practices are also attested in Australia
 35 (Dawson repr. 2009 (1881), Sutton 1997, Evans 2011, Singer 2023).

36 5 Changing multilingual ecologies

37 With the arrival and the spread of “intrusive *lingue franche*” (Foley 1986: 36),
 38 drastic changes occurred in the ecologies of Melanesian speech communities
 39 (Mühlhäusler 1996). Sankoff (1976) already noted that “the symmetrically egalit-
 40 arian relationship which existed among local languages - Tok Ples - has already
 41 been irrevocably altered by the spread of Tok Pisin and of English” (1976: 308).

¹The interview is all the more interesting because Idzuwe speakers have shifted to Idi. This shows how speakers “hold on to their linguistic affiliations for quite a long time, even when no one actively speaks the language anymore and only a handful of words are remembered by elderly people” (Schokkin 2021: 306).

1 Thirty years later Aikhenvald (2008) speaks of a “gradual disintegration of tradi-
2 tional multilingual patterns” (2008: 25).

3 Traditional multilingualism, as described in this chapter, is critically endan-
4 gered in all parts of Melanesia, and comments to this effect are widespread in
5 the literature. Thurston (1987) writes for *New Britain*: “Tok Pisin is so useful as
6 a lingua franca, it has supplanted the former high degree of multilingualism that
7 was characteristic of the area” (1987: 27), and “before Tok Pisin, people gener-
8 ally had larger inventories of languages in which they were competent” (1987:
9 95). About the Angor, Litteral (1978) writes that Tok Pisin is “replacing the func-
10 tion of passive bilingualism in the intertribal communicative network” (1978:
11 27). Similar points have been about Kilmeri (Gerstner-Link 2018: 29), Arapesh
12 (Dobrin 2014: 143), Yeri (Wilson 2017: 7), Ma Manda (Pennington 2016: 28), and
13 Koromu/Kesawai (Priestley 2008: 18).

14 The change brought about by the spread of the national languages can be de-
15 scribed as a multi-stage process. Aikhenvald (2002) observes a general tendency
16 towards the reduction of traditional multilingualism by “first ‘enriching’ it with
17 one (or more) of the newly introduced lingua franca(s), then losing some of the
18 languages, and then perhaps losing all the traditional languages” (2002: 25).

19 6 Conclusion

20 In a more general comment on the richness that Papuan languages offer to re-
21 searchers, Heeschen (1998) writes that “small and smallest speech-communities
22 mix, languages disappear, speakers of the same language differentiate them-
23 selves from each other, speakers of different languages confederate and form
24 marriage alliances, and (...) multilingualism is a characteristic of man’s social na-
25 ture” (1998: 16). Traditional patterns of multilingualism are in danger of being
26 lost and one of the goals of this overview chapter is to highlight their importance
27 for linguistic research.

28 I hope to have shown that traditional multilingualism in the Papuasphere
29 varies enormously at all levels: in conversational practices, individual compe-
30 tence, motivations for becoming multilingual, and the extent to which multilin-
31 gualism correlates with social factors. There is also variation in the level of en-
32 dangerment of these patterns ranging from near-total in areas such as the Sepik
33 and the Torricelli Mountains to relative stability in the Morehead District. Given
34 the lack of detailed description of multilingual situations, one of the most ur-
35 gent tasks is to dedicate more research to it and be observant about multilingual
36 ecologies.

37 Apart from the already large descriptive task, there are a number of specific
38 puzzles that invite more focused research. For example, Lincoln (1976: 99) at-
39 tributes the surprisingly small amount of contact-induced language change be-
40 tween some of the languages on Bougainville to dual-lingualism (see also Evans
41 and Palmer 2011). Multilingualism thus predicts less change due to external
42 pressures. At the same time, Thomason (2007: 58) sees multilingualism as factor
43 facilitating deliberate language change, and also Evans (2018) points to higher
44 rates of change. Another puzzle is the lack of reports of code-switching or code-
45 mixing, at least when focusing on situations where none of the lingua francas are

1 involved. Is this because there are no relevant studies, or because researchers
 2 are not interested, or rather because of a purist language ideology? For Australia,
 3 Vaughan and Singer (2018) mention that receptive multilingualism “may scaf-
 4 fold a minimization of code-switching” (2018: 84). To approach this topic, our
 5 understanding of language ideology in Melanesia needs to be explored in more
 6 detail, for example, the differences in the role of language for the construction of
 7 collective identities. In the Middle Sepik, Foley (2005) points out how a notion of
 8 linguistic purism is not really applicable, while in the Morehead District it seems
 9 to be ubiquitous. Given the dwindling number of languages and more generally
 10 the loss of linguistic diversity, Melanesia is also (sadly) a good place to exam-
 11 ine the role of multilingualism in situations of language attrition and death. For
 12 example, François (2012) claims that multilingualism “allows the language shift
 13 to be a slow process, spanning over several generations”, while being “key to
 14 the maintenance of linguistic diversity” (2012: 94). Other authors see multilin-
 15 gualism as a way of preserving, or even creating linguistic and cultural diversity
 16 (Mühlhäusler 1996, Singer and Harris 2016, Evans 2019).

17 It is such puzzles for which Melanesia offers a fascinating field of study for
 18 anthropological linguistics, sociolinguistics, historical linguistics as well as lan-
 19 guage contact, thus confirming Salisbury’s early observation that the Papuas-
 20 phere provides “laboratory conditions (...) for the study of the phenomena of
 21 bilingualism and linguistic change” (1962: 12).

22 References

- 23 Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (2002). “Traditional multilingualism and language en-
 24 dangerment”. In: *Language Maintenance for Endangered Languages: An Ac-
 25 tive Approach*. Ed. by David Bradley and Bradley Maya. London: Curzon Press,
 26 pp. 24–33.
- 27 Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (2008). *The Manambu Language of East Sepik, Papua
 28 New Guinea*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 29 Arka, I Wayan (2012). “Projecting morphology and agreement in Marori, an iso-
 30 late of Southern New Guinea”. In: *Melanesian Languages on the Edge of Asia:
 31 Challenges for the 21st Century*. Ed. by Nicholas Evans and Marian Klamer.
 32 Language Documentation & Conservation Special Publication No. 5. Univer-
 33 sity of Hawai’i Press, pp. 150–173.
- 34 Ayres, Mary C. (1983). “This side, that side: Locality and exogamous group def-
 35 inition in Morehead area, Southwestern Papua”. PhD thesis. University of
 36 Chicago.
- 37 Bilaniuk, Laada (2010). “Language in the balance: The politics of non-accommodation
 38 in bilingual Ukrainian-Russian television shows”. In: *International Journal of
 39 the Sociology of Language* 201, pp. 105–133.
- 40 Blommaert, Jan (2013). *Ethnography, Superdiversity and Linguistic Landscapes:
 41 Chronicles of Complexity*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. DOI: 10.21832/9781783090419.
- 42 Bowden, Ross (1997). *A Dictionary of Kwoma: a Papuan Language of North-East
 43 New Guinea*. Canberra: Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies.
- 44 Clifton, John M. (1994). “Stable multilingualism in a small language group: the
 45 case of Kaki Ae”. In: *Language and Linguistics in Melanesia* 25, pp. 107–124.

- 1 Dawson, James (repr. 2009 (1881)). *Australian Aborigines. The Languages and*
 2 *Customs of Several Tribes of Aborigines in the Western District of Victoria, Aus-*
 3 *tralia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 4 de Vries, Lourens (2004). *A short grammar of Inanwatan, an endangered language*
 5 *of the Bird's Head of Papua, Indonesia*. Pacific Linguistics 560. Canberra: Re-
 6 search School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University.
- 7 de Vries, Lourens (2020). *The Greater Awyu Languages of West Papua*. Vol. 657.
 8 Pacific Linguistics. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- 9 Dobrin, Lise M. (2014). "Language shift in an 'importing culture': the cultural
 10 logic of the Arapesh roads". In: *Endangered languages: Beliefs and Ideologies*
 11 *in Language Documentation and Revitalization*. Ed. by Peter K. Austin and Ju-
 12 lia Sallabank. Proceedings of the British Academy. Oxford: Oxford University
 13 Press, pp. 125–148. DOI: 10.5871/bacad/9780197265765.003.0007.
- 14 Döhler, Christian (2018). *A grammar of Komnzo*. Berlin: Language Science Press.
 15 DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.1477799.
- 16 Döhler, Christian (2021). "Birds and places: What the lexicon reveals about multi-
 17 lingualism". In: *International Journal of Bilingualism* 25.4, pp. 1142–1157. DOI:
 18 10.1177/13670069211023158.
- 19 Dutton, Thomas E. (1997). "Hiri Motu". In: *Contact languages: a wider perspective*.
 20 Ed. by Sarah Grey Thomason. Vol. 17. Creole language library. Amsterdam:
 21 John Benjamins, pp. 9–41. URL: 10.1075/c11.17.05dut.
- 22 Dutton, Thomas E. and Herbert A. Brown (1977). "Hiri Motu: the language itself".
 23 In: *New Guinea area languages and language study, vol. 3: Language, culture,*
 24 *society, and the modern world*. C-40. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics, pp. 759–93.
- 25 Eastman, Carol M. (1983). *Language Planning: an introduction*. Novato: Chandler
 26 & Sharp Pub.
- 27 Evans, Bethwyn and Bill Palmer (2011). "Contact-induced change in Southern
 28 Bougainville". In: *Oceanic Linguistics* 50.2, pp. 483–523.
- 29 Evans, Nicholas (2011). "A tale of many tongues : documenting polyglot narrative
 30 in north Australian oral traditions". In: *Indigenous language and social iden-*
 31 *tity: papers in honour of Michael Walsh*. Ed. by Brett Baker et al. Canberra:
 32 Pacific Linguistics. Chap. 16, pp. 275–295.
- 33 Evans, Nicholas (2012). "Even more diverse than we had thought: The multiplic-
 34 ity of Trans-Fly languages". In: *Melanesian Languages on the Edge of Asia:*
 35 *Challenges for the 21st Century*. Ed. by Nicholas Evans and Marian Klamer.
 36 Language Documentation & Conservation Special Publication No. 5. Univer-
 37 sity of Hawai'i Press, pp. 109–149.
- 38 Evans, Nicholas (2018). "Did language evolve in multilingual settings?" In: *Biol-*
 39 *ogy & Philosophy* 32.6, pp. 905–933. DOI: 10.1007/s10539-018-9609-3.
- 40 Evans, Nicholas (2019). "Linguistic divergence under contact". In: *Historical Lin-*
 41 *guistics 2015: Selected papers from the 22nd International Conference on His-*
 42 *torical Linguistics, Naples, 27-31 July 2015*. Ed. by Michela Cennamo and Clau-
 43 dia Fabrizio. Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 348. Amsterdam/Philadelphia:
 44 John Benjamins, pp. 564–591.
- 45 Evans, Nicholas, I Wayan Arka, et al. (2017). "The languages of Southern New
 46 Guinea". In: *The languages and linguistics of the New Guinea area: A compre-*
 47 *hensive guide*. Ed. by Bill Palmer. Vol. 4. The World of Linguistics. Berlin: de
 48 Gruyter Mouton, pp. 641–774. DOI: 10.1515/9783110295252-006.

- 1 Ferguson, Charles A. (1959). “Diglossia”. In: *Word* 15, pp. 325–340.
- 2 Fishman, Joshua (1967). “Bilingualism With and Without Diglossia; Diglossia With
3 and Without Bilingualism”. In: *Journal of Social Issues* 23.2, pp. 29–38.
- 4 Foley, William A. (1986). *The Papuan languages of New Guinea*. Cambridge: Cam-
5 bridge University Press.
- 6 Foley, William A. (2005). “Personhood and linguistic identity, purism and vari-
7 ation”. In: *Language Documentation and Description* 3, pp. 157–180. DOI: 10 .
8 25894/1dd280.
- 9 Foley, William A. (2010). “Language Contact in the New Guinea Region”. In: *The*
10 *Handbook of Language Contact*. Ed. by Raymond Hickey. Blackwell Handbooks
11 in Linguistics. Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 795–813.
- 12 Foley, William A. (2013). “Yimas-Arafundi Pidgin”. In: *The survey of pidgin and*
13 *creole languages. Volume 3: Contact Languages Based on Languages from Africa,*
14 *Asia, Australia, and the Americas*. Ed. by Susanne M Michaelis et al. Oxford:
15 Oxford University Press. URL: <https://apics-online.info/surveys/69>.
- 16 François, Alexandre (2012). “The dynamics of linguistic diversity: egalitarian mul-
17 tilingualism and power imbalance among northern Vanuatu languages”. In:
18 *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 214, pp. 85–110.
- 19 Gerstner-Link, Claudia (2018). *A Grammar of Kilmeri*. Pacific Linguistics 654. Berlin/Boston:
20 De Gruyter Mouton.
- 21 Gil, David (2022). “Multilingualism”. In: *The Malayo-Polynesian Languages of South-*
22 *east Asia*. Ed. by S. A. Adelaar and Antoinette Schapper. Oxford: Oxford Uni-
23 versity Press.
- 24 Gumperz, John J. (1966). “Linguistic and social interaction in two communities”.
25 In: *American anthropologist* 66.6, pp. 137–153.
- 26 Gumperz, John J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Studies in Interactional Sociolin-
27 guistics 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 28 Haudricourt, André-Georges (1961). “Richesse en phonèmes et richesse en locu-
29 teurs”. In: *L’Homme* 1.1, pp. 5–10.
- 30 Heeschen, Volker (1998). *An Ethnographic Grammar of the Eipo Language*. Vol. 23.
31 Mensch, Kultur und Umwelt im Zentralen Bergland von West-Neuguinea. Berlin:
32 Dietrich Reimer.
- 33 Hellwig, Birgit (2019). *A grammar of Qaqet*. Mouton Grammar Library 79. Berlin/Boston:
34 de Gruyter Mouton.
- 35 Hoenigman, Darja (2007). “Language and Myth in Kanjime, East Sepik Province,
36 Papua New Guinea”. MA thesis. Ljubljana: Ljubljana Graduate School of the
37 Humanities.
- 38 Hoenigman, Darja (2015). “The talk goes many ways - Registers of language and
39 modes of performance in Kanjime, East Sepik Province, Papua New Guinea”.
40 PhD thesis. Canberra: Australian National University.
- 41 Honeyman, Thomas (2016). “A grammar of Momu, a language of Papua New
42 Guinea”. PhD thesis. Australian National University.
- 43 Jendraschek, Gerd (2012). “A grammar of Iatmul”. PhD thesis. Universität Regens-
44 burg.
- 45 Jourdan, Christine (2007). “Linguistic Paths to Urban Self in Postcolonial Solomon
46 Islands”. In: *Consequences of Contact: Language Ideologies and Sociocultural*
47 *Transformations in Pacific Societies in Pacific societies*. Ed. by Miki Makihara
48 and Bambi B. Schieffelin. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 30–48.

- 1 Kashima, Eri (2020). “Language In My Mouth: Linguistic Variation in the Nmbo
2 Speech Community of Southern New Guinea”. PhD thesis. Canberra: Australian
3 National University.
- 4 Kluge, Angela (2017). *A grammar of Papuan Malay*. Studies in Diversity Linguistics. Berlin: Language Science Press. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.376415.
- 6 Kratochvíl, František (2007). *A Grammar of Abui: A Papuan Language of Alor*. 157.
7 Utrecht: LOT.
- 8 Kulick, Don (1992). “Language shift as cultural reproduction”. In: *Culture change,
9 language change - case studies from Melanesia*. C-120. Canberra: Pacific Lin-
10 guistics, pp. 7–26.
- 11 Kulick, Don and Angela Terrill (2021). *A Grammar and Dictionary of Tayap*. Vol. Pa-
12 cific Linguistics 661. Berlin: DeGruyter Mouton. DOI: 10.1515/9781501512209.
- 13 Laycock, Donald C. (1965). *The Ndu Language Family (Sepik District, New Guinea)*.
14 Pacific Linguistics C-1. Canberra: Australian National University.
- 15 Laycock, Donald C. (1966). “Papuan Pidgin: Aspects of bilingualism in New
16 Guinea”. In: *Te Reo: Journal of the Linguistic Society of New Zealand* 9, pp. 44–
17 51.
- 18 Laycock, Donald C. (1979). “Multilingualism: Linguistic Boundaries and Unsolved
19 Problems in Papua New Guinea”. In: *New Guinea and neighboring areas: a
20 sociolinguistic laboratory*. Ed. by Stephen A. Wurm. The Hague: Mouton de
21 Gruyter, pp. 81–99.
- 22 Laycock, Donald C. (1982). “Tok Pisin: A Melanesian solution to the problem of
23 Melanesian linguistic diversity”. In: *Melanesia: Beyond Diversity*. Ed. by R. J.
24 May and Hank Nelson. Vol. I. Canberra: Research School of Pacific Studies,
25 Australian National University, pp. 263–271.
- 26 Levinson, Stephen (2022). *A Grammar of Yéî Dnye: The Papuan Language of Rossel
27 Island*. Pacific Linguistics 666. Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/
28 9783110733853.
- 29 Lincoln, Piet C. (1976). “Banoni, Piva, and Papuanization”. In: *Papers in New Guinea
30 Linguistics No. 19*. Ed. by G. P. Reesink et al. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics,
31 pp. 77–105.
- 32 Lincoln, Piet C. (1979). “Dual-Lingualism: Passive Bilingualism in Action”. In: *Te
33 Reo: Journal of the Linguistic Society of New Zealand* 22, pp. 65–72.
- 34 Litteral, Robert (1978). “Changes in the Bibriari communicative system”. In: *Lan-
35 guage Planning and Grammatical Typologies*. Ed. by John Murane. Working
36 Papers in Papua New Guinea Languages 24. Summer Institute of Linguistics,
37 pp. 25–30.
- 38 Lüpke, Friederike (2016). “Uncovering small-scale multilingualism”. In: *Critical
39 Multilingualism Studies* 4.2, pp. 35–74.
- 40 Makihara, Miki and Bambi B. Schieffelin, eds. (2007). *Consequences of Contact:
41 Language Ideologies and Sociocultural Transformations in Pacific Societies in
42 Pacific societies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 43 Malinowski, Bronislaw (repr. 1978 (1922)). *Argonauts of the Western Pacific: An
44 Account of Native Enterprise and Adventure in the Archipelagoes of Melanesian
45 New Guinea*. London: Routledge.
- 46 Mühlhäusler, Peter (1979). “Code Switching in Papua New Guinea: Local Lan-
47 guages Versus New Guinea Pidgin, Hiri Motu and English”. In: *New Guinea*

- 1 *and neighboring areas: a sociolinguistic laboratory*. Ed. by Stephen A. Wurm.
 2 The Hague: Mouton, pp. 157–175.
- 3 Mühlhäusler, Peter (1996). *Linguistic ecology: Language change and linguistic im-*
 4 *perialism in the pacific region*. London and New York: Routledge.
- 5 Mühlhäusler, Peter and Thomas E. Dutton (1979). “Papuan Pidgin English and
 6 Hiri Motu”. In: *New Guinea and neighboring areas: a sociolinguistic laboratory*.
 7 Ed. by Stephen A. Wurm. The Hague: Mouton, pp. 209–223.
- 8 Nidue, Joseph A. (1990). “Language use in a New Guinea village: A triglossic pro-
 9 file of Makopin I”. In: *Language and Linguistics in Melanesia* 21, pp. 47–69.
- 10 Pakendorf, Brigitte, Nina Dobrushina, and Olesya Khanina (2021). “A typology
 11 of small-scale multilingualism”. In: *International Journal of Bilingualism* 25.4,
 12 pp. 835–859. DOI: 10.1177/13670069211023137.
- 13 Pennington, Ryan (2016). “A grammar of Ma Manda. Papuan language of Morobe
 14 Province, Papua New Guinea”. PhD thesis. Cairns: James Cook University.
- 15 Priestley, Carol (2008). “A grammar of Koromu (Kesawai), a Trans New Guinea
 16 language of Papua New Guinea”. PhD thesis. Canberra: Australian National
 17 University.
- 18 Rappaport, Roy (1966). “Ritual in the ecology of a New Guinea people : an anthro-
 19 pological study of the Tsembaga Maring”. PhD thesis. New York: Columbia
 20 University.
- 21 Reesink, Ger P. and Michael Dunn (2017). “Contact phenomena in Austronesian
 22 and Papuan languages”. In: *The languages and linguistics of the New Guinea*
 23 *area: A comprehensive guide*. Ed. by Bill Palmer. Vol. 4. The world of linguistics.
 24 Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter Mouton, pp. 939–985.
- 25 Rehbein, Jochen, Jan D. ten Thije, and Anna Verschik (2011). “Lingua receptiva
 26 (LaRa) – remarks on the quintessence of receptive multilingualism”. In: *Inter-*
 27 *national Journal of Bilingualism* 16.3, pp. 248–264. DOI: 10.1177/1367006911426466.
- 28 Riionheimo, Helka, Annekatrin Kaivapalu, and Hanna-Ilona Härmävaara (2017).
 29 “Introduction: Receptive multilingualism”. In: *Nordic Journal of Linguistics*
 30 40.2, pp. 117–121.
- 31 Romaine, Suzanne (1992). “The Status of Tok Pisin in Papua New Guinea: The
 32 Colonial Predicament”. In: *Status Change of Languages*. Ed. by Ulrich Ammon
 33 and Marlis Hellinger. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 229–252. DOI: 10.
 34 1515/9783110851625. 229.
- 35 Ross, Malcolm D. (1996). “Contact-induced change and the comparative method:
 36 Cases from Papua New Guinea”. In: *The comparative method reviewed: regu-*
 37 *larity and irregularity in language change*. Ed. by Mark Durie and Malcolm D.
 38 Ross. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 180–217.
- 39 Saad, George M. (2020). “Variation and change in Abui: The impact of Alor Malay
 40 on an indigenous language of Indonesia”. PhD thesis. Leiden: Universiteit Lei-
 41 den.
- 42 Salisbury, Richard (1962). “Notes on bilingualism and language change in New
 43 Guinea”. In: *Anthropological Linguistics* 4.7, pp. 1–13.
- 44 Sankoff, Gillian (1968). “Social aspects of multilingualism in New Guinea”. PhD
 45 thesis. Montreal: McGill University. URL: [https://escholarship.mcgill.
 46 ca/concern/theses/ff365770g](https://escholarship.mcgill.ca/concern/theses/ff365770g).

- 1 Sankoff, Gillian (1976). “Political power and linguistic inequality in Papua New
2 Guinea”. In: *Language and Politics*. Ed. by William M. O’Barr and Jean F. O’Barr.
3 Berlin/Boston: Mouton de Gruyter. Chap. 14, pp. 283–310.
- 4 Sankoff, Gillian (1980). “Multilingualism in Papua New Guinea”. In: *The social life
5 of language*. Ed. by Gillian Sankoff. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania
6 Press, pp. 95–132.
- 7 Schapper, Antoinette (2011). “Crossing the border. Historical and linguistic di-
8 vides among the Bunaq in central Timor”. In: *Wacana, Journal of the Human-
9 ities of Indonesia* 13, pp. 29–49.
- 10 Schapper, Antoinette (2020). “Linguistic Melanesia”. In: *The Routledge Handbook
11 of Language Contact*. Ed. by Evangelia Adamou and Yaron Matras. London:
12 Routledge. Chap. 24, pp. 480–502.
- 13 Schokkin, Dineke (2021). “The integration of languages and society. A view from
14 multilingual Southern New Guinea”. In: *The integration of language and so-
15 ciety: A cross-linguistic typology*. Ed. by Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, R. M. W.
16 Dixon, and Nerida Jarkey. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 288–311. DOI:
17 10.1093/oso/9780192845924.003.0009.
- 18 Scott, Graham R. et al. (2008). *Tong pu bahasa: A preliminary report on some
19 linguistic and sociolinguistic features of Papuan Malay*. Sentani: SIL Interna-
20 tional.
- 21 Sentinella, Charles L. (1975). *Mikloucho-Maclay: New Guinea Diaries, 1871-1883,
22 translated from the Russian with biographical and historical notes*. Madang:
23 Kristen Pres.
- 24 Silverstein, Michael (1998). “Contemporary transformations of local linguistic
25 communities”. In: *Annual Review of Anthropology* 27.1, pp. 401–426.
- 26 Singer, Ruth (2023). *Indigenous multilingualism at Waruwi. Cultivating linguistic
27 diversity in an Australian community*. New York: Routledge. DOI: 10.4324/
28 9781003244363.
- 29 Singer, Ruth and Salome Harris (2016). “What practices and ideologies support
30 small-scale multilingualism? A case study of Waruwi Community, northern
31 Australia”. In: *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 241, pp. 163–
32 208. DOI: 10.1515/ijsl-2016-0029.
- 33 Stasch, Rupert (2007). “Demon language: The otherness of Indonesian in a Papuan
34 community”. In: *Consequences of Contact: Language Ideologies and Sociocul-
35 tural Transformations in Pacific Societies in Pacific societies*. Ed. by Miki Mak-
36 ihara and Bambi B. Schieffelin. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 96–124.
- 37 Stebbins, Tonya, Bethwyn Evans, and Angela Terrill (2017). “The Papuan lan-
38 guages of Island Melanesia”. In: *The languages and linguistics of the New Guinea
39 area: A comprehensive guide*. Ed. by Bill Palmer. Vol. 4. The world of linguis-
40 tics. Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter Mouton, pp. 775–894.
- 41 Suter, Edgar (2014). “Kâte *he* ’hit’ and *qa* ’hit’: a study in lexicology”. In: *Language
42 and Linguistics in Melanesia* 32.1, pp. 18–57.
- 43 Sutton, Peter (1997). “Materialism, Sacred Myth and Pluralism: Competing Theo-
44 ries of the Origin of Australian Languages”. In: *Scholar and sceptic: Australian
45 Aboriginal studies in honour of L. R. Hiatt*. Ed. by Francesca Merlan, John Mor-
46 ton, and Alan Rumsey. Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press, pp. 211–242, 297–
47 309.

- 1 ten Thije, Jan D. and Ludger Zeevaert, eds. (2007). *Receptive multilingualism: lin-*
 2 *guistic analyses, language policies, and didactic concepts*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia:
 3 John Benjamins.
- 4 Thomason, Sarah G. (2007). “Language contact and deliberate change”. In: *Jour-*
 5 *nal of Language Contact* 1.1, pp. 41–62. DOI: 10 . 1163 / 000000007792548387.
- 6 Thurston, William (1987). *Processes of Change in the Languages of North-Western*
 7 *New Britain*. Pacific Linguistics: Series B 99. Canberra: Research School of Pa-
 8 cific and Asian Studies, Australian National University.
- 9 Vaughan, Jill and Ruth Singer (2018). “Indigenous multilingualisms past and present”.
 10 In: *Language & Communication* 62, pp. 83–90. DOI: 10 . 1016 / j . langcom .
 11 2018 . 06 . 003.
- 12 Whitehead, Carl (2004). “A reference grammar of Menya, an Angan language of
 13 Papua New Guinea”. PhD thesis. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.
- 14 Williams, Francis E. (1936). *Papuans of the Trans-Fly*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 15 Williams, Jeffrey P. (1993). “Documenting the Papuan-based pidgins of insular
 16 New Guinea”. In: *Atlantic Meets Pacific: Global Views of Pidginization and Cre-*
 17 *olization*. Ed. by Francis Byrne and John Holm. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John
 18 Benjamins, pp. 355–370.
- 19 Williams, Jeffrey P. (1995). “A note on the pronominal system of Arafundi-Enga
 20 Pidgin”. In: *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 10.1, pp. 171–175. DOI: doi :
 21 10 . 1075 / jpcl . 10 . 1 . 09jef .
- 22 Williams, Jeffrey P. (2000). “Yimas-Alamblak tanim tok: an indigenous trade pid-
 23 gin of New Guinea”. In: *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 15.1, pp. 37–
 24 62.
- 25 Wilson, Jennifer (2017). “A Grammar of Yeri - a Torricelli language of Papua New
 26 Guinea”. PhD thesis. Buffalo: State University of New York.
- 27 Woolard, Kathryn A. (1998). “Introduction: Language ideology as a field of in-
 28 quiry”. In: *Language ideologies: Practice and theory*. Ed. by Bambi B. Schief-
 29 felin, Kathryn A. Woolard, and Paul V. Kroskrity. Oxford: Oxford University
 30 Press, pp. 3–49.
- 31 Wurm, Stephen A. and Donald C. Laycock (1961). “The Question of Language and
 32 Dialect in New Guinea”. In: *Oceania* 32.2, pp. 128–143.
- 33 Wurm, Stephen A. and Peter Mühlhäusler (1979). “Attitudes towards New Guinea
 34 Pidgin and English”. In: *New Guinea and neighboring areas: a sociolinguistic*
 35 *laboratory*. Ed. by Stephen A. Wurm. The Hague: Mouton, pp. 243–262.
- 36 Yoder, Brendon E. (2020). “A grammar of Abawiri, a Lakes Plain language of
 37 Papua, Indonesia”. PhD thesis. Santa Barbara: University of California. URL:
 38 <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4mj571tr>.

1 Appendix

Table 1: The languages which appear in this chapter

Language	Family, branch	ISO	Glotto	Source
Anggor	Senagi	AGG	ango1254	Litteral 1978
Abawiri	Lakes Plain, East Lakes Plain	FLH	foau1240	Yoder 2020
Abelam, Ambulas	Ndu, Nuclear Ndu	ABT	ambu1247	Laycock 1979
Abui	Timor-Alor-Pantar	ABZ	abui1241	Kratochvíl 2007, Saad 2020
Alamblak	Sepik, Sepik Hill	AMP	alam1246	Foley 2005
Arafundi-Enga-Pidgin	creole	n/a	araf1245	Williams 1993
Arapesh, Mountain Arapesh	Nuclear Torricelli, Kombio-Arapesh-Urat	AON	bumb1241	Nidue 1990, Dobrin 2014
Awiakay	Arafundi	n/a	awia1235	Hoeningman 2007, Hoeningman 2015
Banoni	Austronesian, Malayo Polynesian	BCM	bann1247	Lincoln 1976, Lincoln 1979
Biak	Austronesian, Malayo Polynesian	BHW	biak1248	de Vries 2004
BiliBil	Austronesian, Malayo Polynesian	BRZ	bilb1241	Sentinella 1975
Bine	Eastern Trans-Fly	BON	bine1240	Döhler, this volume
Bongu	TNG, Madang	BPU	bong1291	Sentinella 1975
Buang	Austronesian, Malayo Polynesian	n/a	buan1245	Sankoff 1968
Bunaq	Timor-Alor-Pantar	BFN	buna1278	Schapper 2011
Chimbu	TNG, Chimbu-Wahgi	n/a	cent2120	Salisbury 1962; Sankoff 1980
Dobu	Austronesian, Malayo Polynesian	DOB	dobu1241	
Eipomek	TNG, Mek	EIP	yapu1240	Heeschen 1998
Ghari	Austronesian, Malayo Polynesian	GRI	ghar1239	Lincoln 1976
Gogodala	Suki-Gogodala	GGW	gogo1265	
Greater Awyu	TNG, Asmat-Awyu-Ok	n/a	grea1275	de Vries 2020, Stasch 2007
Hiri Motu	creole	HMO	hiri1237	Mühlhäusler and Dutton 1979, Dutton 1997
Huli	TNG, Enga-Kewa-Huli	HUI	huli1244	Sankoff 1980

Continued from previous page

Language	Family, branch	ISO	Glotto	Source
Iatmul	Ndu, Nuclear Ndu	IAN	iatm1242	Laycock 1979, Aikhenvald 2008, Jendraschek 2012
Idi	Pahoturi River	IDI	idii1243	Evans 2012, Schokkin 2021
Kaki Ae	isolate	TBD	kaki1249	Clifton 1994
Kâte	TNG, Finisterre-Huon	KMG	kate1253	Suter 2014
Kilivila	Austronesian, Malayo Polynesian	KIJ	kili1267	Malinowski repr. 1978 (1922)
Kilmeri	Border, Bewani	KIH	kilm1241	Gerstner-Link 2018
Kiwai	Kiwaian	KIW/KJD	kiwa1251	
Komnzo	Yam, Tonda	TCI	wara1293	Ayres 1983, Döhler 2018, Döhler 2021
Koromu, Kesawai	TNG, Madang	XES	kesa1244	Priestley 2008
Korowai	TNG, Asmat-Awyu-Ok	KHE	koro1312	Stasch 2007
Kwoma-Manambu pidgin	creole	n/a	kwom1264	Bowden 1997, Aikhenvald 2008
Lavukaleve	isolate	LVK	lavu1241	Stebbins, Evans, and Terrill 2017
Ma Manda	TNG, Finisterre-Huon	SKC	sauk1252	Pennington 2016
Manambu	Ndu, Nuclear Ndu	MLE	mana1298	Foley 2005, Aikhenvald 2008
Marind	Anim, Marind-Boazi-Yaqai	MRZ	nucl1622	
Marori	isolate	MOK	moro1289	Arka 2012
Marovo	Austronesian, Malayo Polynesian	MVO	maro1244	
Menya	Angan, Nuclear Angan	MCR	meny1245	Whitehead 2004
Momu/Fas	BaiBai-Fas	FQS	fass1245	Honeyman 2016
Motu	Austronesian, Malayo Polynesian	MEU	motu1246	Mühlhäusler and Dutton 1979, Dutton 1997
Motuna, Siwai	South Bougainville, Buinic	SIW	siwa1245	Lincoln 1976, Lincoln 1979
Nen	Yam, Nambu	NQN	nenn1238	Evans 2012, Evans 2019, Schokkin 2021
Ngala	Ndu	NUD	ngal1300	Laycock 1965
Nmbo	Yam, Nambu	NMC	namb1293	Kashima 2020
Papuan Malay	Austronesian, Malayo Polynesian	PMY	papu1250	Scott et al. 2008, Kluge 2017, Gil 2022, Kluge, this volume
Patipi	Austronesian, Malayo Polynesian	SKZ	pati1239	de Vries 2004

accepted author manuscript

Continued from previous page

Language	Family, branch	ISO	Glotto	Source
Qaqet	Baining	BYX	qaqe1238	Hellwig 2019
Roviana	Austronesian, Malayo Polynesian	RUG	rovi1238	
Savosavo	isolate	SVS	savo1255	Lincoln 1976
Siane	TNG, Kainantu- Goroka	SNP	sian1257	Salisbury 1962
Solomon Island Pijin	creole	PIS	piji1239	Stebbins, Evans, and Ter- rill 2017
Suau	Austronesian, Malayo Polynesian	SWP	suau1242	
Tayap	isolate	GPN	taia1239	Kulick 1992, Kulick and Terrill 2021, Kulick & Do- brin, this volume
Tok Pisin	creole	TPI	tokp1240	Mühlhäusler 1979, Wurm and Mühlhäusler 1979, Laycock 1982, Romaine 1992
Touo	isolate	TQU	touo1238	Stebbins, Evans, and Ter- rill 2017, Dunn & Terrill (this volume)
Wogamusin	Sepik, Iwam- Wogamus	WOG	woga1249	Laycock 1965
Yélî Dnye	isolate	YLE	yele1255	Levinson 2022
Yeri	Nuclear Torricelli, West Palai	YEV	yapu1240	Wilson 2017
Yimas	Lower Sepik Ramu, Lower Sepik	YEE	yima1243	Foley 1986, Foley 2005
Yimas- Alamblak- Pidgin	creole	n/a	yima1235	Williams 1993, Williams 2000, Foley 2013
Yimas- Arafundi- Pidgin	creole	n/a	yima1244	Williams 1993, Foley 2013
Yimas- Karawari- Pidgin	creole	n/a	yima1245	Williams 1993, Foley 2013

accepted author manuscript