

Map 5 Locations of languages of the Lower Sepik family

mixed languages (see Dutton 1976). As Austronesian languages are usually typologically very different from Papuan languages and comparatively well studied, these examples of language mixing are not too difficult to identify. Language mixing among Papuan languages, which are often typologically similar, is likely to be even more pervasive, but much more difficult to discover.

7.2 The Lower Sepik family: a comparative study

In this section I will take a detailed look at the Lower Sepik family, a family of six languages spoken in the Sepik basin, with a view to exemplifying how the specialized techniques of the comparative method may be applied to Papuan languages. The languages in this family are Yimas (250 speakers), Karawari (1,500 speakers), Angoram (7,000 speakers), Chambri (1,200 speakers), Murik (1,500 speakers) and Kopar (250 speakers). Map 5 gives the relative positions of the languages. Murik and Kopar are very closely related, almost dialects of the same language, so I will regard them as one for the purposes here. The source of data for each language is as follows: Yimas (own fieldnotes), Karawari (own fieldnotes), Angoram (own fieldnotes; Abbott 1977; and Laycock's fieldnotes of 1959 trip), Chambri (own fieldnotes and Pagotto 1976), Murik (Schmidt 1953; Abbott 1977; 1978; Abbott and Abbott 1978). Consider first the possible cognates in a basic word-list for the five languages shown in Table 2 (K after words in the Murik column indicates Kopar forms). A number of straightforward consonantal correspondences with reconstructed Proto-Lower Sepik (PLS) phonemes are presented in Table 3.

Table 2 Lower Sepik family: basic word-list

		Yimas	Karawari	Angoram	Chambri	Murik
1	'one'	mba-	mba-	mbia-	mbwia-	abe
2	'two'	-rpal	-ripay	-(lɨ)par	-ri	kompari(K)
3	'three'	-ramnaw	-rianmaw	-elim	-ram	kerongo
4	'person'	narmaŋ	yarmas i nar		noran an	nor
5	'male'	panmal	panmari	pondo		puin
6	'female/					
	mother'	ŋay	asay	nuŋor	kaye	ŋai
7	'father'	apwi	anay	apa/ano	kanu	apa
8	'water'	arim	arim	al i m	arim	arim
9	'fire'	awt	awi	aluŋ	ayir	awr
10	'sun'	timal	simari	mbwino	sinmari	ak i n
11	'moon'	mila	tuŋgwi	mile	mw i l	karew an
12	'star'	awak	suŋgwinc irim	arenjo	suŋkwi	moai
13	'canoe'	kay	kay	ke	ke	gain
14	'louse'	nam	yam	nam	kurir	iran
15	'village'	num	imuŋga	num	num	nomot
16	'breast'	ninay	njay	ŋge	niŋke	niŋgen
17	'tooth'	tiriŋ	sisiŋ	sisiŋ	sraŋk	asarap
18	'blood'	yat	yay	ayakone	yari	yaran
19	'bone'	tan i m	tan i m	sal i ŋ	anamp	sariŋib
20	'tongue'	minyiŋ	mum i ny i ŋ	mini ŋ	tibulani ŋk	men i ŋ
21	'eye'	tuŋgurɨŋ	samb i s	tambli	sisiŋk	nabrin
22	'nose'	tikay	ipun	naŋ i m	wambusu	daur
23	'hair'	wapwi	wambi	mbwikmaley	yawi	dwar
24	'ear'	kwanduminj	kwandukas	kwandum	kukunam	karekep
25	'egg'	awŋ	yawŋ	awŋ	awŋk	gaug
26	'leaf'	n i mbrim	yimbr i m	(nam)blum	n i mpramp	nabir i k
27	'tree'	yan	yuwan	lor	yuwan	yarar
28	'yesterday'/					
	'tomorrow'	ŋarɨŋ	ariŋ	nakimin	namas ini ŋ	ŋarɨŋ
29	'oar'	muraŋ	m i naŋ	inap	naŋk	inaŋ
30	'betelnut'	patn	payn	pariŋ	munt i kin	porog
31	'lime'	awi	as	awer	ayir	ayr
32	ʻpig'	numbran	imbian	imbar	numpran	(nim)bren
33	'crocodile'	manba	manbo	walami	ayi	oramen
34	'snake'	wakin	wakin	paruŋ	wan	wakin
35	'mosquito'	nangun	vangun	wawarin	nangun	nauk/nangit(K)

7. Problems of comparative linguistics in Papuan languages 216

Table 2 (cont.)

	Yimas	Karawari	Angoram	Chambri	Murik
36 'chicken' 37 'sago grub' 38 'sago palm' 39 'sago refuse'	nakwan wun t i num tiki	yakwan wun simasum	kilikala wurin (t)uli(no) tikir	nakwan wun t i num	goabar kamur dun
40 'pound sago' 41 'wash sago' 42 'hear' 43 'hit' 44 'eat' 45 'go' 46 'faeces'	ind pan- tuku- and i - tupul- am- wa- milim	pan- suku- andu- kurar- am- kuria- m i ndi	pan- tuku- and i - ti- am- kal- m i ndi	pun- tuku- and i - dii- am- wa- munjar	pon- tokun- d i n- di- min- on- mindin
 47 'spine of leaf' 48 'leg' 49 'big' 50 'cold' 	kiniŋ pamuŋ kipa- tarik	kiniŋ pamuŋ kupa- sarik	kin i ŋ namuŋ kupa- popant	k ini ŋk namaŋk wupa- saruk	k i niŋ namoŋ(K) apo- seripatin(K)

Table 3 Lower Sepik phoneme correspondences: consonants

PLS	Yimas	Karawari	Angoram	Chambri	Murik	Examples
*p	р	р	р	р	р	2, 5, 30, 40, 49
*m	m	m	m	m	m	3, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 20, 44, 46, 48
*w	w	w	w	w	w	25, 34, 37
*k	k	k	k	k	g/k	13, 24, 47, 50
*ŋ	ŋ		ŋ		ŋ	6, 28
*y	y	у	y	у	у	18, 27
*r	r	r	1	r	r	2, 3, 4, 8, 26, 28, 50
	t	у	r	r	r	2, 9, 18, 30, 32
		*r -	→ Yt/#,	n *r	$\rightarrow \mathbf{K} y/a$	r
			l/i			
*t	t	s	t	t	t	38, 39, 41
*s	r/t	S	s	s	s	10, 12, 17, 50
		*s 1	nerges with	h*rinY	and *t i	n K
*n	n	n	n	n	n	5, 16, 32, 34, 37, 47
	n	у	n	у	n	4, 14, 15, 32, 35, 36
		*n	→ K <i>y</i> /#			

The voiced stops and the homorganic nasal-plus-stop clusters present greater problems. Chambri has the most complex system of stops, contrasting plain voiced and voiceless stops and pre-nasalized voiced and voiceless stops, although the voiced pre-nasalized stops are rare in Chambri. In final position Chambri

7.2 The Lower Sepik family: a comparative study

217

PLS	Yimas	Karawari	Angoram	Chambri	Murik	Examples
*mp	mb	mb	mb	mp	b	21, 26
	m	m		mp	b	19, 26
		*mp	\rightarrow Y, K, A	A <i>m</i> /	#	
*mb	mb	mb	mb	mb	b	1
*ŋk	ŋg	ŋg	ŋg	ŋk	(ŋ)g	12, 16
	ŋ	ŋ	ŋ	ŋk	ŋ/g	17, 20, 25, 29, 30, 47, 48
		*ŋk	→ Y, K, A	. ŋ/	# ^a	
*ŋg	ŋg	ŋg	-	ŋg	k/ŋg(K)	b 35
(*nt)	no exa	mples				
*nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	d/nd ^c	42, 46

 Table 4 Lower Sepik phoneme correspondences: pre-nasalized stops

^a The split in Murik between g and η for $*\eta k$ in final position is unexplained.

^b Why Murik shows k rather than the expected g here is unclear.

^c The alternations in the Murik reflexes could be the result of initial versus intervocal position; other examples of pre-nasalized reflexes are intervocalic: (16) 'breast' and (35) 'mosquito'.

neutralizes this to a simple plain versus pre-nasalized stop contrast, with the stop realized as voiceless. Yimas and Karawari are the simplest, contrasting a plain voiceless stop with a pre-nasalized stop which varies freely between voiced and voiceless. The contrast between Chambri pre-nasalized voiceless and voiced stops is neutralized in Yimas and Karawari: compare (12) 'star' with (35) 'mosquito'. As there is no apparent conditioning factor for this Chambri contrast, we must assume it reflects the situation in the proto-language.

Murik stops are intermediate in complexity. It contrasts plain voiceless and voiced stops, but has pre-nasalized voiced stops only. The plain and pre-nasalized voiced stops generally correspond to pre-nasalized stops in other languages. Consider the correspondences in Table 4. For the plain voiced stops the data are very sketchy. Only (43) 'hit' provides any evidence for a plain voiced stop in the proto-language. In this word Chambri and Murik show d, while Yimas and Angoram have a voiceless correspondent. The Chambri d is the crucial evidence; it is difficult to explain away. It could not arise from a pre-nasalized stop because in Chambri they do not undergo simplification. I tentatively reconstruct *d for this correspondence:

PLS	Yimas	Karawari	Angoram	Chambri	Murik	Examples
*d	t	-	t	d	d	43
			_			