

**NORFOLK ISLAND, SOUTH PACIFIC:  
AN EMPIRICAL ECOLINGUISTIC CASE STUDY**

JOSHUA NASH  
*University of Adelaide*

The linguistic ecology of Norfolk Island provides an illustrative case study of the interaction between ecological and linguistic principles. Norfolk Island, an external territory of Australia, is located in the South Pacific. The language of Norfolk Island, Norfolk, is spoken by around four hundred people who are descendants of the *Bounty* mutineers and their Tahitian wives. In light of current theory in ecolinguistics and on research in the Norfolk language, this paper aims to:

1. Give a brief background into the history of ecolinguistics and its relevance to Norfolk and Norfolk Island;
2. Identify suitable levels of analysis, e.g. lexicon, morphosyntax and phonology, appropriate to empirical observation in Norfolk;
3. Show how traditional linguistic analyses in section two can lead to more precise language planning and language policy tools in the social domain of language use and educational objectives on Norfolk Island; and
4. Demonstrate how long term engagement with an isolated and specific speech community such as Norfolk Island can lead to positive results for the academy in terms of methodological refinement and development in ecolinguistics at the same time as being sensitive to the interests and priorities of the speakers of an endangered language.

This paper is the outcome of several years of fieldwork and dealing intimately with the Norfolk Island community. The discussion is the result of working in a linguistics discipline where the primary focus is ecolinguistic theory from an empirical perspective. It is presented as a report-cum-review article rather than as a scientific paper. The basic precedents of ecolinguistics will be presented and then applied to the case of Norfolk Island and Norfolk, the Norfolk Island language. It evaluates ecolinguistic work that has already been undertaken on the island and concludes by putting forward possible research directions for future documenting and theorising about Norfolk. The idea of considering Norfolk Island as an empirical ecolinguistic case study has evolved out of being actively involved and engaged in ecolinguistic fieldwork and data collection for extended periods in this remote, rural and insular community for the purpose of language documentation. Compared to other research fields within linguistics, ecolinguistics is a somewhat underdeveloped field. It is a discipline that is poised between the fields of linguistics, ethnography, philosophy and environmental studies.

## **2. Empirical Ecolinguistics**

The fieldwork experience is extremely important in ecolinguistic research. An understanding of interrelated phenomena particular to the ecolinguistic approach can only occur by interacting in real world situations with members of the speech communities in the actual ecology and place where languages are spoken and used every day. In addition, a diachronic or historical approach is of vital importance to the study of synchronic patterns of language use. Combining historical and existing data is particularly applicable when considering linguistic, cultural and environmental change in fragile and endangered linguistic ecologies. Research in linguistics has generally focussed on analysis of linguistic structure where language is seen as a reified and decontextualised entity that exists separate from the social and natural environment where it is spoken. Sociolinguistic research has contributed significantly to an understanding of language use and language in context<sup>1</sup> just as ecolinguistics has created awareness of language as an ecological phenomenon.<sup>2</sup> Some ecolinguistic research, e.g. detailed lexical analyses of a language's botanical and animal names,<sup>3</sup> has focused on issues of more obscure interest to most linguists to the extent that some would claim that much of what is in the interest range of ecolinguistics does not really concern mainstream linguistics at all. There is still a need, however, for contextually sensitive empirical

analyses that ask questions about interrelationships between language, culture and environment without alienating more common approaches to linguistic analysis.

Fill and Mühlhäusler<sup>4</sup> have summarised the major areas and focus of ecolinguistic theory but are not clear as to what ecolinguistics actually is. Ostler's critique<sup>5</sup> of the approach presented in Fill and Mühlhäusler's volume that "ecolinguistics cannot be seen as any sort of probative or empirical science" illustrates the need to for a clearer methodological and theoretical outline for ecolinguistics, which restates and does not alienate the focus from the general field of linguistics. Scholars and theoreticians have not been explicit enough in clearly stating the theoretical breadth of ecolinguistics and furthermore the practical implications of ecolinguistics for general linguistic theory and the ethnography of communication. Furthermore, there has been a lack of explicit empirical case studies illustrating the practical use of an ecolinguistic methodology and approach to doing linguistics.

The nature of linguistic and cultural change necessitates an incorporation of what is otherwise known as extralinguistic or non-living patterns and phenomena. This is a reflection of the fact that any living language is only as strong as the strength of its extralinguistic support network. Essentially, one cannot adequately explain why languages die with exclusive reference to structure. This insight is probably shared by most linguists who have worked with endangered minority languages where imperialism and colonialism are significant causal factors in the processes of language death. These principles have general application although each ecology demands its own specific explanation. Ecologies are also geography specific: the current field of discussion is Australia, Oceania and more specifically the language ecology of Norfolk Island.

Ecolinguistics, or the field of linguistic ecology, is concerned with two major research areas: first, environmental discourse analysis; second, linguistic ecology, i.e. research into the patterned relationship between humans, languages and the environment. This paper is primarily concerned with the second.

There have been several "schools" of ecolinguistics, most notably the "Odense School," e.g. Bang & Døør<sup>6</sup>, and the "Graz School," e.g. Fill<sup>7</sup>), which have been concerned mainly with philosophical issues of interest to European scholars rather than the role ecolinguistics can play in language documentation. There is a stark difference between the analyses of the language of ecology, e.g. environmental discourse analysis and how the media discusses

environmental issues, and the ecology of language, e.g. relations between a large stock of lexical items in a particularly high biota environment, and theoretical and philosophical approaches versus empirical methods. This paper also addresses the difference in geography and research focus between doing ecolinguistics in northern Europe and in Australia and Oceania.

An empirical approach to ecolinguistics has been at the core of the “Adelaide School,” a linguistics discipline that has striven for the past two decades to document, theorise and reclaim and revitalise minority languages and particularly endangered minority languages. For more than a decade researchers from the University of Adelaide have been engaged intimately with the Norfolk Island government, central school and community in creating tools, education programmes and encouraging legislative initiatives that have brought about great change in, for example, the social status of Norfolk and the appearance of Norfolk in the linguistic landscape of the island.

### **3. Lexical studies in Norfolk**

One of the major foci with language work on Norfolk Island has been documenting as many words and spelling variations as possible across different domains. These domains include botanical names, fish and other life form names, placenames or toponyms, personal names and nicknames. This is a major task and has involved amassing secondary historical documents in the form of published books, lists and other sources, maps and school notebooks. These have been collected in parallel with primary fieldwork and interview research during numerous fieldtrips and meetings engaging with hundreds of members of the Norfolk Island community. Two current lexical projects are the creation of a longitudinal lexicography database of Norfolk words and placename documentation. There is positive feedback coming from the Norfolk Islanders that this documentation is a worthwhile venture, although it is apparent that because many knowledgeable Norfolk speakers have passed on, this task would have been more productive had it been undertaken several generations ago. “Salvage linguistics” also has relevance to ecolinguistics.

Collecting names serves as more than just a butterfly collection to be presented to the academy; it crosses several disciplinary boundaries and contributes to creolistics, toponymy, ethnobotany and ethnoclassification, onomastics and general semantic and morphological theory. Lexical studies in Norfolk and the empirical

element of language ecology, i.e. collecting real and “functioning” words in the dynamic language situations where they are used day to day, act as a type of umbrella over which these disciplines are incorporated into an practical method and theory of ecolinguistics. The principal claim under investigation is whether linguistic enquiry should be focussed on the relationship between form and sense alone or the relationships between form and sense *and* reference and denotation. That is, enquiry should go beyond the system of language internal sense relationships to broader social and ecological connectedness and questioning. Preliminary findings suggest that there are measurable relationships between objects, things and places in an ecology and the potential of a particular language to possess and manage the lexical tools required to talk about such an ecology. Distinguishing between Norfolk placenames such as the descriptive “Red Stone,” lesser-known names such as “Now Now Valley” and the Tahitian name of a river “Fata Fata,” and official names recognised by the Australian Government such as “Ball Bay” and “Steels Point” indicate that there are differing levels of linguistic connectedness to place related to different groups who know and use these placenames. These names in turn are related to differing perceptions of the linguistic geography of the island.

#### **4. Norfolk Morphosyntax**

The primary sources for analysis of Norfolk morphosyntax are the most comprehensive published grammar of Norfolk, known as “Buffett’s system,”<sup>8</sup> and Mühlhäusler’s outline of the more and less common morphological and syntactic forms.<sup>9</sup> What these studies have demonstrated is the caution required when arriving at any kind of standard with respect to what is grammatically and socially acceptable in Norfolk. For example, the complex Norfolk pronoun system suggests that words like “acklan,” a first person plural pronoun, a term used to refer specifically to the Norfolk Islander population of Pitcairn on the island, involves both grammatical and social criteria and designations. The use of “yorlyi” (second person plural, generally referring to Norfolk Islanders) and “auwas” (second personal dual, only referring to Norfolk Islanders) as tools to create and manage social space based on race relations in the small island society indicates the crucial role language plays in creating and maintaining or breaking social ties.

The underlying point of contention when dealing with an unfocused language without set parameters of linguistic conduct

and explicit linguistic role models is that native speakers are usually not in a position to make statements or explain why certain constructions are grammatical and why others are not. What is deemed a grammatically acceptable placename form can be driven by the semantics and social sense of how and where a placename is and may be used. For example, while the placename “Ralph & Enid’s Side” (Ralph and Enid’s Place) on the west coast of Norfolk on Headstone Road uses the Norfolk word “side,” and is considered a Norfolk name also because it refers to Norfolk Islanders who live there, its syntax is not typical of Norfolk placenames but rather appears in English form, i.e. proper noun + possessive + generic noun,

What has arisen and continues to arise during every fieldtrip where more and more data are collected is the fact that what is grammatical for one speaker may not be agreed upon by another speaker although they inhabit the same “speech community.”<sup>10</sup> Asking informants to specify their preference by grammatically ranking certain forms over others is a useful methodological tool in deciding and defining borders in syntactic description; patterns tend to develop quickly and there appears a large amount of consistency across informants. This method has played an important part in gathering large amounts of data for analysis of, for example, multifunctionality<sup>11</sup> and the relationship between placename form and semantics.<sup>12</sup> This work has shown that Norfolk appears as a linguistic anomaly: it is a mixture of English, Tahitian and St Kitts Creole<sup>13</sup> elements, which are present in varying degrees based on other broader social and ecological reasons. For example, the use of Norfolk, which in the past used to be termed “breaking the King’s crown,” can be linked inversely with positive relations with Australia. That is, when relations are bad, social and linguistic delineation is stronger and more Norfolk tends to be used. Lexical evidence derived from the Norfolk internet forum confirms this, as shown by Mühlhäusler in another paper from 2008.<sup>14</sup> For example, there was a significant increase in the amount of Norfolk used on the forum after the murder on Norfolk Island in 2002. Why various archaic and seemingly unnecessary forms, e.g. three possessive constructions (myse table, one I table, one table fer me), persist in Norfolk is unknown. Norfolk presents what appears to be a cumulative grammar where grammatical and socially beneficial linguistic forms are not discarded. This reflects a possible relationship between grammar, an insular mentality and a subconscious adherence to tradition rather than change, e.g. celebrating Tahitian and St Kitts Creole

elements. At the same time, declining numbers of Norfolk speakers and overall grammatical attrition, e.g. pluralisation of nouns and more intricate inflectional verb morphology, are appearing, suggesting that obtaining more contemporary primary syntactic data and analysing these via modern empirical methods may lead to a better understanding of both Norfolk's linguistic structure and what Norfolk is and how it can be perceived grammatically and socially within the ecological niche and framework where it is spoken.

### **5. Norfolk Phonology**

As Norfolk is not a focussed language, a diachronic description of its phonology is difficult to establish. Its insider nature, lack of a standard, well-accepted and utilised orthography and small number of speakers has provided few reliable historical sources which can be drawn on. Family variation and the fact that there were very remote areas where Norfolk residents had little contact with other Norfolk and/or English speakers around the turn of last century has meant that certain variant pronunciations, e.g. no semantic contrast between short and long vowels, e.g. "paaloo" (masturbation) and "paloo" (berley) were previously distinct but have become less so, and retention of word final consonants, have become accepted in Norfolk.

Discrepancies in the interpretation of Norfolk phonology is the result of lack of a standardised system which has most likely arisen from the lack of preconceived ideas about what the language should be and who its role models are. The main issue is one of perceiving the social climate of meaning creation, i.e. using a short or a long vowel may have serious semantic consequences, within the context of day-to-day speech. What is of issue, however, is that for an insider such points of contention may go unnoticed. A consistent and reliable account of Norfolk phonology can and will only result from long term detailed data gathering with native Norfolk speakers, coupled with other less broad speakers from other categories of the Norfolk speech community. (See Laycock's short term field work, which was written up in 1989,<sup>15</sup> in comparison to Harrison longitudinal research into Norfolk phonology, which was published in 1985.)

Documenting placename phonology is important for analysing the ability of these names to resist attrition over time, to help in etymologising about the origin of placenames and to aid in creating more accurate placename maps. Because Norfolk has been a socially

stigmatised language and because fading memories and intra-familial demographics have had their effect on the attrition of older Norfolk placename forms, there has been a significant shift in the semantics and pragmatics of placename usage. Large domains of the Norfolk lexicon have become diminished, e.g. exclamations (“enwah!”—of course!), life form names (“nanwi”—dream fish) and placenames (“Side Saff Fly Pass”—Where the Waves Crash). This has had an effect on Norfolk phonology, with the result being that newer speakers commonly do not know older pronunciations and know fewer words and grammatical forms related to these older pronunciations. Older Norfolk speakers often comment that younger speakers “no longer speak broad enough” or “speak Norfolk with an Australian accent.” Such statements are in line with Harrison’s observation<sup>16</sup> that the stable diglossic situation asserted by Flint in 1979 no longer existed.<sup>17</sup> In 1989 Laycock claimed there existed a variety of “instant Norfolk,” i.e. minimal use of a few emblematic Norfolk tokens and idioms, e.g. “auwas” (our), “acklan” (the Norfolk Islanders), “sullen” (people), was in common usage when he was doing fieldwork in the late 1980s. This variety seems to have persisted until today, and Ingram and Mühlhäusler have claimed it is hard to imagine any variety of Norfolk that does not involve an element of code switching or code mixing with English, no matter how broad the Norfolk variety may be.<sup>18</sup> Even the broadest Norfolk speakers comment sentimentally that they are not at all broad compared to the old Pitcairners.

#### **6. Fieldwork, Linguistic Analysis and Language Planning and Policy Issues on Norfolk**

Norfolk presents the field linguist with a small remote island holding a small population where numerous social networks exist. Questioning and data elicitation or gathering can be tricky and is best done with informants after introductions have been made through already established contacts. Often one must be patient as what may appear as the most simple question may not get the answers one wants on the first sitting. Obtaining this type of data requires time, trust and in-depth interaction with the community, something that is paramount to acquiring good data and “treading lightly” on a fragile linguistic ecology that is remote and insular and where interview conditions can be laborious and trying.

Extensive field research and background into the nature of the history of the Norfolk language have illustrated the urgent need to document this information and the realisation that the combined



knowledge and information of more experienced informants cannot give a complete and exhaustive account about the history of the lexicon or placename inventory on Norfolk. Furthermore, due to the passing on of many of the older generation who had a greater knowledge than current generations, it will be extremely difficult to get an accurate picture of the past. Many local people are still quite reluctant to give away knowledge about the history of the Island, something very common in insular island communities. It must be emphasised that although Norfolk has recently been made co-official with English with the *Norfolk Island Language (Norf'k) Bill* (2004),<sup>19</sup> the only language within Australia and its territories to be made so, and the recognition of its endangered status by UNESCO in 2007,<sup>20</sup> Norfolk is far from being considered a healthy language with a sustainable future. The acknowledgement of Norfolk's importance in maintaining the history and cultural heritage of the Pitcairn descendants on the island is agreed upon but this has had little effect on increasing actual language usage or creating native speakers of Norfolk. There are still a large number of both older and younger Norfolk speakers who are still not able to write Norfolk fluently despite many the directives and education programmes put in place by the Norfolk Island government and school. Ingram and Mühlhäusler (2004: 781) illustrate how such issues relate practically to language standardisation issues:

At present, the Norfolk Islanders are in the process of deciding on questions such as language name, lexical and grammatical norms, writing system and social role. To turn a large number of individual ways of speaking into a language in the sense of a modern standard language is a difficult technical and political process which leaves much room for conflict. It would seem very unwise for an outsider to tell people what their language is, or what it should be.

While Norfolk is changing and becoming more and more exposed to outside linguistic scrutiny via the academy and through signage, television and the media, what is required lest the language as it is today be lost, is documentation. Although it is possible that insider placenames for little known offshore locations and rare words of Tahitian origin in Norfolk may never be known or used again, this “rats in alcohol” creation of a museum of the Norfolk language is an initial step in the language planning strategies and language policy creation; without a language, and more specifically a written code that is documented, recognised and researched, there can be no

question of language planning and policy making. This is why the increased appearance of Norfolk in the public sphere, e.g. house and business signage, is vital for the survival of the language. This aesthetic consideration for what Norfolk is and how it should appear publicly is important for the tourism industry and for how Norfolk speakers' linguistic self esteem and pride can be monitored.

The majority of the contemporary work into language planning on Norfolk Island has been undertaken by Mühlhäusler<sup>21</sup> and a draft school grammar<sup>22</sup> and draft dictionary of Norfolk words have also been produced.<sup>23</sup> A database of over 1000 placename entries has been written up as part of the author's doctoral degree.<sup>24</sup> The results of this research will have an impact on how Norfolk could be publicly and privately written, how Norfolk appears on signs and the appearance of more placename signs, business names in Norfolk and directional signs on Norfolk. These issues are of a more legal than a linguistic nature; it is possible through employing modern linguistic methods and by having positive dealings with Norfolk speakers that a realisable language policy congenial to the Norfolk Islanders and the academy can be instigated. These fieldwork dealings have taken place on an official level with the government, museum and school as well as on an individual basis, with much primary data being obtained through long-term engagement with knowledgeable local informants. As regards toponymy (placename research) Berleant-Schiller<sup>25</sup> reminds us:

Long-term field research in toponymy is by nature slow, but it is far from unrewarding. It allows the researcher not only to gather primary data, in this case place names, but to observe the culture in which they are embedded and their relationship to changes in land use and landscape. The researcher can experience the place and its people, incorporate local language and speech into the study, and elicit the contributions of native speakers. Far from being misinformed, local residents are the only sources of local speech, oral tradition, and place names that are not on maps or that differ from those maps. They are also the only providers of information that leads to an understanding of indigenous systems of knowledge and ways of ordering and classifying the world.

Traditional linguistic analyses can lead to more precise language planning and language policy tools in the social domain of language use and education by identifying grammatical information relevant to understanding the history and evolution of languages and through modernising languages, e.g. establishing writing systems.

Creating neologisms in the target language rather than employing external borrowings, assessing priorities for the appearance of languages in the public sphere and in signage and producing educational tools aimed at increasing language use at school and in Norfolk homes are other means through which the linguistic status of Norfolk can be made more prominent. The creation of the Norfolk Language Camp at the Norfolk Island Central School, an annual camp where upper level school children spend a weekend hearing and speaking Norfolk, and participation in language documentation and history through the local newspaper *The Norfolk Islander* are all elements in increasing the linguistic and social status of Norfolk.

The *Norfolk Island Language (Norfolk) Bill* (2004) made Norfolk an official entity. It simply states that Norfolk exists and that there should be no discrimination against people on Norfolk Island based on what language, i.e. English or Norfolk, they speak at home or in public. Since 2004, little has been done with this legislation. The steps to be taken once legislation has been written are the creation of a language policy, devising an action/implementation plan and carrying out this plan by putting it into action and enforcing it.

An ecological perspective of language sees spelling reform, bilingual signage, naming research, toponymy and creation of a cultural map as interrelated and integral points to be addressed in formulating a language policy for Norfolk Island. Cooperation from relevant stakeholders in the administration and the school is essential in producing a document that is not only implementable but also practical and applicable to Norfolk Island today and in the future. This document should contain a statement as to why Norfolk is important to preserve as cultural heritage, an outline of its history and origin in relation to Pitcairn Island and the Pitkern language, an understanding of the current state of the Norfolk language, e.g. number of speakers, varieties of the language, how and where it is spoken, variations in how it is written and a compilation of a relevant bibliography of the language. The perceived threats to the future of the language, encouraging locals and outsiders to learn the language, outlining the desired outcomes from implementing the policy and a brief implementation plan are also required for Norfolk to be perceived not only as a serious language but also a means of expression to be used in broader social and political domains where English is typically the language of choice.

The complex history of the Norfolk language and the fact that it has taken so long to be recognised co-officially despite the best

efforts of some outsiders in previous times to have it removed altogether from the daily linguistic repertoire of Norfolk has meant that it has suffered greatly in terms of a decrease in speaker numbers and its linguistic richness and diversity. It appears that a laissez-faire stance similar to typical modern market-based approaches to maintaining linguistic diversity and the social status of languages will not work in the case of Norfolk and Norfolk Island. Various linguistic levels have been outlined which are aimed at identifying what an ecolinguistic approach to language documentation and fieldwork methods may be to develop a holistic language policy that is subsequently implemented. Any language policy for Norfolk must remain sensitive to the needs of speakers of the language and must include and realise the uniqueness of Norfolk to a broader reading of the history of Norfolk Island and what such a case study has to offer methodological and theoretical inroads into ecolinguistic theory.

## 7. Conclusion

Experience observing the Norfolk language has shown that an acute empirical investigation lends itself well to outlining general principles involved in any ecolinguistic analysis. Such analyses could be labelled *empirical minimalism*. This method focuses on documenting and analysing language ecologies that are manageable. In particular, this method advocates looking at small islands with small populations and a brief settlement history. By doing so such a process treats each language ecology as a unique and specific situation.

Treating particular language ecologies as distinctive and singular case studies for observing interconnections between language and environment is an important element in what descriptive ecolinguistics has striven to achieve. As each ecology is unique, the generalisability of particular results to different social and natural ecologies is potentially limited, although it has been claimed in this paper that linguistic work on Norfolk Island lends itself well to general linguistic enquiry as well as what is labelled ecolinguistics. As there is yet to be established a tried and tested methodology and theory of ecolinguistics, the method described in this paper is common and acceptable to descriptive linguistics while incorporating principles common to an ecolinguistic analysis, e.g. being parameter rich and possibly conclusion poor.

Often we take for granted that taking a diachronic perspective will help with a synchronic analysis. The complex social and environmental history of Norfolk reveal that this is not necessarily

the case, as the memory of past events cannot be separated from the present ecological situation. Previous classifications have labelled Norfolk a canonical creole, a pidgin, a cant, a dialect, a mixed dialect or New English. What is questionable, however, is what these classifications can do to help researchers obtain data, analyse them and employ them in making sense of the language and its history and use. Research into Norfolk seems to highlight the importance of new and singular perspectives of doing ecolinguistic work; what works for Norfolk may not be applicable to other language ecologies and languages.

Ecolinguistics, particularly in the European context (e.g. Bang and Døør, 2007; Fill, 1993, 1996), has commonly been treated from a philosophical rather than from an empirical perspective. The goal, advocated in this paper, by contrast, has been to be staunchly empirical. While empiricism cannot survive in the (eco)linguistic sphere without philosophical reflection, the logical approach of speculating about the nature of ecolinguistics and actual language ecologies seem not to offer empirical ecolinguistics very much. Creating “data cemeteries” and large “butterfly collections” of unanalysed data is also not ideal. The challenge is to create functional interconnections between philosophical and empirical approaches to ecolinguistics and to apply such an integrated approach to practical problems faced by the users of languages.

#### NOTES

- 
- <sup>1</sup> William Labov, *The Social Stratification of English in New York City* (Washington DC: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1966); Dell Hymes, “On communicative competence,” in *Sociolinguistics: Selected Readings*, ed. John B. Pride and Janet Holmes (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972).
  - <sup>2</sup> Einar Haugen, *The Ecology of Language* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1972).
  - <sup>3</sup> Peter Mühlhäusler, *Language of Environment: Environment of Language* (London: Battlebridge, 2003).
  - <sup>4</sup> Alwin Fill, “Ecolinguistics: State of the Art 1998,” in *The Ecolinguistics Reader: Language, Ecology and Environment*, ed. Alwin Fill and Peter Mühlhäusler (London: Continuum, 2001), 43–56.
  - <sup>5</sup> Nicholas Ostler, “Little Jack Homer’s Christmas Pie: Review of Alwin Fill & Peter Mühlhäusler eds. *The Ecolinguistics Reader: Language, Ecology and Environment*,” *Foundation For Endangered Languages*. Foundation For Endangered Languages, 2001. Web. (viewed 15 October 2011) <<http://www.ogmios.org/1711.htm>>.

- 
- <sup>6</sup> Jørgen Bang and Jørgen Døør, *Language, Ecology and Society: a Dialectical Approach*, ed. Sune V. Steffensen and Joshua Nash (London: Continuum, 2007).
- <sup>7</sup> Alwin Fill, *Ökolinquistik – Eine Einführung* (Tübingen: Narr, 1993); Alwin Fill, “Ecolinguistics: State of the Art 1998,” *Arbeiten aus Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 23.1 (1998): 4-16.
- <sup>8</sup> Alice Buffett, *Speak Norfolk Today: an encyclopaedia of the Norfolk Island language* (Norfolk Island: Himii Publishing Company, 1999).
- <sup>9</sup> Peter Mühlhäusler. “Norfolk Island—Pitcairn English (Pitkern Norfolk): Morphology and Syntax,” in *A Handbook of Varieties of English, Vol. 2: Morphology and Syntax*, ed. Bernd Kortmann, Edgar W. Schneider, Kate Burridge, Rajend Mesthrie, and Clive Upton (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2004), 1142–1202. Print.
- <sup>10</sup> I use inverted commas as the term “speech community” regarding Norfolk and Norfolk Island is a rather hazy concept with much contention and possible disagreement.
- <sup>11</sup> Peter Mühlhäusler. “Diachronic Approaches to Ecolinguistics: The changing language ecology of Norfolk Island,” in *Language, Signs and Nature: Ecolinguistic Dimensions of Environmental Discourse*, ed. Martin Döring, Hermine Penz, and Wilhelm Trampe (Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 2008), 219–34.
- <sup>12</sup> Joshua Nash. “Toward a Typology of Norfolk.” *8<sup>th</sup> International conference on Oceanic Linguistics (COOL 8), Auckland, New Zealand, 4-8 January 2010*. Conference paper.
- <sup>13</sup> St Kitts is a creole spoken on the island of St Kitts in the Caribbean.
- <sup>14</sup> Peter Mühlhäusler. *Ibid.*, 2008b.
- <sup>15</sup> Donald C. Laycock, “The status of Pitcairn-Norfolk: creole dialect, or cant,” in *Status and Function of Languages and Language Varieties*, ed. Ulrich Ammon (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989), 608–29.
- <sup>16</sup> Shirley Harrison. “The social setting of Norfolk speech.” *English World-Wide* 6.1 (1985): 131-153.
- <sup>17</sup> Elwyn Flint. *Norfolk tapes and transcripts*. N.d. Fryer Library, Brisbane: University of Queensland.
- <sup>18</sup> John Ingram and Peter Mühlhäusler. “Norfolk Island-Pitcairn English (Pitkern Norfolk).” *A Handbook of Varieties of English, Vol 1: Phonology*. Ed. Bernd Kortmann, Edgar W. Schneider, Kate Burridge, Rajend Mesthrie, and Clive Upton. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2004. 780-802.
- <sup>19</sup> Norfolk Island Language (Norfolk) Act No. 25 of 2004. 21 Dec. 2004.
- <sup>20</sup> United Nations. Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. “Degree of Endangerment of the Norfolk Language (Norfolk Island, South Pacific).” UNESCO, 2007.

- 
- <sup>21</sup> Peter Mühlhäusler. "A Language Plan for Norfolk Island." *Language Endangerment and Language Maintenance*. Ed. David Bradley and Maya Bradley. London: Routledge Curzon, 2002. 167-181.
- <sup>22</sup> Christine Eira, Melina Magdalena, and Peter Mühlhäusler. *Draft Norfolk School Grammar*. Adelaide: Discipline of Linguistics, University of Adelaide. N.d.
- <sup>23</sup> Christine Eira, Melina Magdalena, and Peter Mühlhäusler. *A Draft Dictionary of the Norfolk Language*. Adelaide: Discipline of Linguistics, University of Adelaide. 2002.
- <sup>24</sup> Joshua Nash. "Insular Toponymies: Pristine Place-Naming on Norfolk Island, South Pacific and Dudley Peninsula, Kangaroo Island, South Australia." Diss. U of Adelaide, 2011.
- <sup>25</sup> Riva Berleant-Schiller. "Hidden places and creole forms: Naming the Barbudan landscape." *Professional Geographer* 43.1 (1991): 92-93.

