A FOCAL APPROACH TO PROBLEMS OF VERBAL SYNTAX IN FIJIAN

G.B. Milner

One of the paradoxes of the present state of our studies is the contrast between the absolute confidence we have in the organic unity of AN phonological and lexical systems, and our curious reluctance to take full advantage of the fact that AN grammatical systems are also cognate and thus open to analogous procedures of linguistic analysis.

This may be due in part to the great development and considerable achieve-ments of phonetic and phonemic studies during the present century, by contrast with the slower progress of our understanding of morphology and syntax. The renewed interest in linguistic typology and universals of grammar, in recent decades, may also account for a noticeable tendency to analyse AN languages with at least one eye (and sometimes both eyes) on better-known grammatical systems, particularly those of the Western European type like English.

It is also paradoxical and ironical, that the more we condemn traditional school grammar for applying inadequate and obsolete concepts such as the 'parts of speech', declensions and conjugations, which originally go back to the study of Latin and Greek, to non-Western languages, the less we notice our own tendency to write, not grammars of AN languages within their own terms of reference, but grammars of what they appear to be when translated into English and submitted to a framework of analysis established in the tradition of IE grammar.

This is not to say that in order to understand AN grammar, we need to abandon the cardinal points, the main parameters of our linguistic universe, such as verbals and nominals, predication, transitivity or tense and aspect. What is perhaps required of us, however, is that these concepts should be defined more flexibly and adjusted to the needs of Austronesian languages (instead of the reverse as happens so frequently). That is to say we should have the open-mindedness of the discoverer, as well as the courage of the explorer, leaving linguistic universals and typology on a slow burner, at least until we are satis-fied that we really understand the fundamental principles of AN grammar.

Instead of starting from scratch in a neck of the AN woods, as I did many years ago with my little axe, without paying much attention to what greater men had achieved elsewhere before me, it seems to me that we should have more respect for our predecessors. There is after all one language, in the study of which a distinguished tradition of painstaking and thorough grammatical analysis has long been established. One thinks especially of the work of men like Bloomfield and Lopez, as well as others, in Tagalog. Because they achieved so much more than has so far been possible in other AN studies, what the scholars of Tagalog have to say seems to me to be of far greater relevance for the progress of our studies, than the linguistic fashions of the moment.

1

The co-authors of a comprehensive reference work for instance, show that Tagalog, in addition to verbal predication, which they describe as "narrational sentences", has two types of nominal predication, which they call "equational sentences" (Schachter and Otanes 1972:61) and that

> It may be argued that the distinction ... between equational
> and narrational sentences ... is a somewhat arbitrary one,
> and that all Tagalog basic sentences ... are essentially
> equational in nature, involving a balance of two elements -
> the predicate and the topic - against one another   (p.62)

In an instructive article published a few years later, Schachter (1976), states that it is "centrally concerned with the question of whether or not there are identifiable subjects in the sentences of Philippine languages ..." (p.493). His conclusion (p.513), is that "there is in fact no single syntactic category in Philippine languages that corresponds to the category identified as the subject in other languages". Moreover "if the conclusion ... is in fact correct, then obviously it cannot be the case that *subject* represents a linguistic universal" (p.515). More recently, in a renewed study of the same problem (1977a) he states that

> ... since the (Philippine) languages CAN be analysed quite
> satisfactorily as NOT having subjects, I conclude that the
> assumption of the universality of subjects is, in the case
> of Philippine languages, something of a Procrustean bed,
> and see nothing to be gained by forcing the languages into
> this bed.[1]

Just as in the fields of linguistic typology, and universals of grammar, a great deal of theoretical work has turned around the problems raised by the correct identification of subject, actor (or agent), object, goal and topic, and thus of active, passive, or ergative constructions, so in recent studies of Central Oceanic languages, preoccupation with case and voice (*diathèse*, to use a term employed by Tchekhoff (1978:37-57)), has been especially noticeable.[2]

Perhaps one should resist the temptation, at my age, to pose as a prophet and admit instead to the errors of youth. Let me therefore explain that there was a time when, having dismissed verbs and nouns, adjectives and adverbs, as being suitable terms for an adequate description of Fijian, I could yet write about the 'passive' (in spite of the fact that it had no 'agent'), as well as about subjects, objects and transitivity. Yet I was not (and still am not) alone. Biggs for example, in a remarkably shrewd and perceptive article (1974:404-405), where he breaks much new ground, gives his reasons for not abandoning the categories of IE grammar in PN languages. Thus he retains 'actor-subjects' as opposed to 'goal-subjects'. Schütz and Nawadra (1972:97-107), after throwing much revealing light on this vexed question, abandon 'passives' in Fijian but they leave us with 'participles'.

The difficult situation in which one can be trapped by an unguarded use of terms extrapolated from IE grammar, was well described by Clark in the appendix to his review of transitivity and case in Eastern Oceanic (1973:594-598). He accepts an active/passive distinction for some languages, but he leaves us in doubt about Maori (p.598). Surprisingly, he also questions the validity of distinguishing between 'passive' and 'ergative' (p.597). Yet if he does not entirely remove our uncertainty, he has earned our thanks by restating the difference between the two principal verbal constructions in PN (p.569; pp.574-575).[3]

In a wide-ranging survey of Proto-Oceanic grammar, Pawley (1973:116-119)
considers subjects, objects and the order of constituents, as well as transitive
suffixes and verb classification (pp.120-147). Much of his material is drawn
from Fijian (especially pp.137-140) and we are in his debt for recognising the
structural similarity between 'passive' and 'transitive' (p.137), and the pos-
sibility that the so-called 'passive' may be a subclass of the 'stative' (p.139).[4]
Yet he leaves other problems of Fijian verbal syntax unresolved.

In 1976 at the Second Eastern Conference at Ann Arbor (Milner 1979), I sug-
gested that topic and focus, which had been associated in the past mainly with
Tagalog and Philippine linguistics, might offer a productive line of investigation
for Oceanic languages. In the same volume of papers, Ferrell and Stanley (1979:
19-31) make a powerful plea for the relevance of topic and focus to the languages
of Taiwan. In the same publication, Wolff (1979:155-160) shows striking parallels
between the behaviour of noun and verb phrases in Samareño (Philippines), Arosi
(Solomons) and Fijian, and he gives evidence for considering that Oceanic lan-
guages have focus rather than voice. Added weight was given to the view that
focus might be a pan-Austronesian category by Dahl, at the SICAL conference in
Canberra, when he endorsed the validity of the same approach in the case of
Malagasy (1978:383-393). Closer to my own interests and on the same occasion,
Naylor (1978:395-442), in a broadly-based survey of syntactic problems of several
languages (selected from Micronesia, Polynesia and Melanesia), also made a strong
plea for the need to make a new investigation of Oceanic grammar based on the
solid, yet geographically limited, progress made in Philippine and in Taiwan
linguistics.

'Focus' has been used by different linguists to refer to different concepts.
As Naylor has stated (1975:16-17), some writers view focus as the highlighting
of a noun, others as a type of emphasis. It is not, however, profitable to fol-
low them, since in many AN languages, including Oceanic, emphasis in the clause
has been correlated with initial or prepredicate position. On this point (1975:
16), she quotes Pike:

> Focus is not emphasis. Focus reports the observer's atten-
> tion to one of several relations – without the essential
> emotional overtones – between a predicate and some other part
> of a clause; the focus-complement substantive topic is viewed
> only in reference to that relationship, not as in focus of
> itself. In emphasis, on the contrary, some one substantive
> is singled out for a direct isolated overlay of emotional con-
> notation .... This formal independence of emphasis allows it
> to function as a variable which is formally separate from the
> focus complement.   (Pike 1963:219) [5]

In a section of the article based on her Canberra paper, Naylor (1978:395-
442) considers in detail the theoretical relevance of focus to Oceanic languages.
Let me quote three short passages from it which need to be remembered:

> Although the surface forms that manifest focus vary from one
> AN language to another, the function is shared by all. It
> is a function that is central to the organisation of dis-
> course in the general and specific senses ... (p.396)

> ... focus is like a prism; it has several facets. Not all
> AN languages overtly encode all of its facets in the syntactic
> structure. Even when the same facet is encoded, the manner
> of encoding varies. Furthermore one facet may be salient in
> one language but not in another. (pp.398-399)

> Topic-and-comment has ... been distinguished from subject-
> and-predicate. The former includes notions that are
> proper to sentence and discourse structure while the latter
> consists of notions that are proper to clause structure;
> i.e. topic-and-comment deals with extra-sentential rela-
> tions while subject-and-predicate deals with sentence-
> internal relations ... (p.402)

In their contribution to the collected papers from the Second Eastern Conference, Ferrell and Stanley (1979:19-31), using material from Taiwan, present an argument for regarding focus in AN as an indispensable category. They illustrate it from Paiwan and their view is particularly interesting because they partly support those of Naylor and also introduce others with a different ground. Thus:

> ... focus in AN is not equivalent to case ... focus is a
> sort of topicalization whose selection has to do with
> discourse continuity .... *Strictly speaking, focus is not*
> *topicalization of one of the overt NPs of the sentence,*
> *but rather of one of the restricted number of underlying*
> *semantic-role categories which NPs may fulfill with ref-*
> *erence to specific verbs* (their italics). This semantic-
> role focus is indicated by the obligatory focus inflection
> on the verb; the occurrence of an overt NP identifying or
> explicating the in-focus element is optional. (p.19)

Particularly striking, moreover, are their remarks on *focus inflections and nominals*, which immediately bring Fijian to mind:

> The semantic content of the verb focus inflections, as
> indicating agent, object, referent, or instrument, is seen
> in their use with nouns. (p.23) e.g.:
>
>   kan-en (1) *food*, (2) *eat* (OF) (< kan *eat*, -en [object])
>   si-kan (1) *eating utensil*, (2) *eat* (IF)
>   si-kasuy *something used as trousers* (< kasuy *trousers*, si-
>   [instrument])

One is at once reminded of similar possibilities in Fijian, as in:

vakabaut- *believe*
na vakabauta *faith, belief*

This feature of Paiwan is one of the essential criteria used by Ferrell and Stanley (p.29) to distinguish focus from case. That is to say, whereas

WITH FOCUS	WITH CASE
The inflected verb can stand as a noun itself (e.g. an IF-inflected verb may be used in a noun slot with the meaning *instrument used for*)	The inflected primary verb can never be used as a noun

This is a distinction which would also be valid for Fijian. To quote the same authors again (p.28): "It is failure to distinguish process from role that in the past has led investigators to confuse AN focus with IE voice, and more recently with IE case".

Another important point (made by Naylor) which is also familiar to students of Fijian and other Oceanic languages, is the following: "... the choice of focus makes a contrastive semantic difference: (thus) a non-definite vs. definite direct object (goal)" (1975:17).

The words "definite" and "non-definite" at once strike a chord for someone used to what has been called by Hazlewood (1872:32-33) and Churchward (1941:17-18; 71-72) "definite transitive" as opposed to "indefinite transitive" in Fijian, or also regarded as an "incorporated object" (Naylor 1978:419), as in the distinction, perhaps by now familiar to many, between for instance:

gunu yaqona *kava-drinking* (or *grog-drinking* for old Fiji hands) and
gunuva na yaqona *drinking the* (or: *some*) *kava* (Milner 1972:26; Wolff
   1979:155; Naylor 1978:417-418; see also Hopper and Thompson 1979:
   257-258 for a similar feature in Tongan)

Let me set out the arguments militating in favour of considering Fijian to have a focus-and-topic system of verbal syntax which, in its essentials, is analogous to that which has been described for Tagalog, but which, in its operation and methods of affixation, differs markedly from the latter. It is necessary, first, to remove the obstacles which have prevented us until now from seeing the wood, as distinct from the trees. That is to say, we must clear the decks by putting the numerous allomorphs of Fijian verbal suffixes into clearer perspective.

Our understanding of this old problem, which had already intrigued Hazlewood before 1850 and which is still with us, has been greatly advanced by several publications during the last 20 years, notably those of Krupa (1966); Arms (1973); Hockett (1976; 1977); Schütz (1981); Geraghty (1983); Clark (1977); and Lichtenberk (1978). It is Arms, however, in his Ph.D. dissertation (1975), who must get the main credit for spelling out in detail the operation of the phonotactic constraints on the occurrence of the thematic consonants in the verbal suffixes (1975:136-147).[6] Unfortunately, the importance of what he states on this subject has perhaps been masked by his suggestion that thematic consonants have semantic or 'phonesthetic' connotations. That is a view which, in certain instances, can be defended and which Hockett (1976; 1977; cf. Milner 1986:note 27; cf. also note 16 below) and Geraghty (1983:267-269) have supported, but one which it is very difficult to reconcile with the operation of phonotactic rules. The latter show remarkable rigour and consistency.

Many years ago Scott (1948:737-752) presented the first analysis of Fijian phonology by a professional phonetician. It includes a table (p.743), which illustrates the almost complete concordance between consonant graphemes and phonemes and evidence for four places of articulation: bilabial, dental, alveolar and velar.

In his Ph.D. dissertation, Arms (1975:136-147) shows that with hardly any exceptions, the place of articulation of any consonant in a Fijian verb base rules out the occurrence in the suffix of a thematic consonant with the same place of articulation. For example, v is ruled out if any one of the following occurs in the base: v, b, m or (subject to certain exceptions)[7] w.

Consonants which cannot occur together in given positions, are said to *dissociate*, or to be *dissociative* (cf. Krupa 1966; Arms 1975:130-147) and the phonotactic rules which can be established accordingly, can be called rules of dissociation.

In a recent article (Milner 1986), I have argued that the operation of those constraints has so far not been analysed with a view to discovering the principles which govern the occurrence of what can be called *heterorganic* or *replacement* consonants, i.e. those substituted for consonants which, but for a phonotactic rule, would normally occur and which I shall call *regular* thematic consonants. As a consequence, the effects of the replacements on the nature of the system of suffixation have been obscured.[8]

In actual fact, if we disregard replacement consonants, that is to say, if we treat them as allomorphs, which, by definition can be subsumed under morphemes, the essential features and principles of the system become much clearer than they have appeared to be until now.

The phonotactic rules can be stated fairly simply by placing consonants which dissociate from one another in the same columns of a table, as shown below. Consonants occurring in verbal suffixes are underlined:

b	.	d	.	dr	q
v		t		r	k
m				n	g
	c		l		
			s		
w					

Two important features should be stressed in connection with this table:

(1) In a *short* suffix (i.e. a monosyllabic suffix),[9] the thematic consonant may be Ø (zero). The suffix is then reduced to -a after a front vowel (and after the open vowel (except in taya *hit*). -ya occurs after a back vowel.

(2) -Ø- and -t- occur very frequently. Together, they account for 569 recorded suffixes in Arms' total list of 1680. They were also the two suffixes which he had the greatest difficulty in correlating with any special semantic connotations (Arms 1975:126; 110-112; 113-114).

As long ago as 1850 (in the first edition of his grammar), Hazlewood proposed the rule that: "... *verbs formed from nouns without prefixing* vaka-, ... shall take na for their termination ..." and "*verbs of motion* ... will take va for their termination" (1872:33). He also added that it was "also true that many other verbs besides those of motion take va, but for these perhaps there is no rule". (p.33).

It is possible, however, that phonotactic rules may determine the occurrence or non-occurrence of -v- as a thematic consonant in the following two ways:

(1) If a "verb of motion" (to use Hazlewood's phrase) has a bilabial consonant in its base, its thematic consonant will not be a *regular* -v-, but a *heterorganic consonant*, i.e. one which is not bilabial.

(2) Conversely, if a base has a -d- or a -t-, this will rule out the occurrence of a *regular* -t- in the suffix (assuming for the moment that some rule governs the occurrence or non-occurrence of -t- as well as of -v-). In that case the *heterorganic consonant* may be -v- or some other consonant.

From a fairly detailed study of verbal suffixes made on the evidence provided by three separate dictionaries,[10] it is possible to establish the following data:

1. Short verbal suffixes

(a) -Ø- and -t- occur as *regular* thematic consonants when the process or action
is carried out near the actor, i.e. in relatively close physical or psycho-
logical space.[11]   The term *static goal* is suggested to describe this type
of suffix. (NB: There seems to be no significant difference of grammatical
function between -Ø- and -t-.   In general either one or the other is used with
any particular base.[12]   -Ø- frequently occurs when the second vowel of the base
is -i-.   Conversely, -t- frequently occurs when the second vowel of the base is
open or back.)

(b) -v- occurs as a *regular* thematic consonant when the process or action is
extended to, or is exercised over a distance, i.e. involves a displacement in
physical or psychological space.[11]   The term *kinetic goal* is suggested to des-
cribe this type of suffix.

(c) A number of minimal pairs can be established so as to validate the distinc-
tion proposed in (a) and (b) above.[13]

(d) HETERORGANIC CONSONANTS

   (i) The following consonants occur most frequently as *replacements* when a
regular thematic consonant would be homorganic with a consonant of the base:

      Instead of -v-: -c-, -k-, -r- and -t-[14]
      Instead of -t-: -c-, -k-, -r- and -v-[15]

  (ii) The following consonants occur least frequently as *replacements* and may
be subject to additional rules: -g-, -m- and -n-.

      -g- is a rare heterorganic consonant.[16]
      -m- is a rare heterorganic consonant.[17] It also occurs occasionally when
       the second vowel of the base is -u-.[18]
      -n- is a rare heterorganic consonant.[19] It occurs mainly as a denominal
       verb suffix and in verbs which, except in derived forms, do not appear to
       occur without a suffix.[20]

(e) ADDITIONAL NOTES

   (i) When a base with a bilabial consonant has a suffix with -t- as a thematic
consonant, or

  (ii) When a base with -t- or -d- has a suffix with -v- as a thematic consonant,
or

(iii) When both a bilabial and -t- or -d- occur in the base, it is more difficult
to determine whether a regular thematic consonant has been replaced, and if so,
to decide which regular consonant is replaced by which other consonant. There
is, however, some indication that -t- may be replaced by -c- and -v- by -r-.[21]

2. Long verbal suffixes

(a) The following consonants occur as thematic consonants of long suffixes:
-c-, -k-, -l-, -m-, -n-, -r-, -t-, -v-, -y-.[22]

(b) Three of these have a special function:

   (i) -y- often occurs in the suffix -yaki when a base is prefixed by vei-. It
denotes that a process or action is exercised in different directions, at random,
indifferently, etc.

(ii) -l- denotes that a process or action is exercised frequently and/or repeatedly.

(iii) -r- denotes that a process or action is exercised with force and/or violence and/or intensity.

(c) The occurrence of thematic consonants in *long suffixes* is subject to the same rules of dissociation which apply to *short suffixes*, except for -t-, which does not dissociate.[23]

(d) -t- occurs as a regular thematic consonant when the process or action is oriented towards:

  (i) an instrument with which it is carried out or exercised,[24] or

  (ii) an object affected by the process or action,[25] or

(iii) an object produced by the process or action.[26]

     The term *instrumental* is suggested to describe this type of suffix.

(e) -v- occurs as a regular thematic consonant when the process or action is carried out or exercised:

  (i) on account of, about, someone or something,[27] or

  (ii) on behalf of, for (the benefit of), someone or something.[28]

     The term *beneficiary* is suggested for this type of suffix.

(f) The distinction between instrumental suffix and beneficiary suffix can be validated by the existence of minimal pairs.[29]

(g) HETERORGANIC CONSONANTS

  (i) -t- is a replacement consonant for -v- in accordance with the phonotactic rules already discussed for the short suffixes.[30]

  (ii) -c-, -m- and -v- are replacement consonants for -t- as a result of what seems to be analogy with the thematic consonant which occurs in the short suffix of the same base.[31]

(iii) -k- and -r-: Only a few instances of -k- as a thematic consonant in long suffixes are attested. At least one instance of -r- without any suggestion of force and/or violence (see (b)(iii) above) is also known.[32] It is not possible at present to account for the occurrence of those two consonants in long suffixes.

  (iv) -n- is also rare in long suffixes. In at least two cases it seems (like -na as a short suffix) to occur as a denominal verbal suffix.[33]

     It is possible now to identify some of the main features of a system of focus-and-topic in the verbal syntax of Fijian. If the evidence before us is sound, as we have reason to believe, we are left with a relatively small number of morphemes which can be firmly linked with two types of *goal focus* (one 'static' and the other 'kinetic'), an *instrumental focus* and a *beneficiary focus*. In order to complete the pattern, however, it is necessary to look for an equiv-alent in Fijian of the *actor focus*, which in Tagalog and other Western Austro-nesian languages, can be identified formally.

Before doing so, let me first recall Naylor's remark that "focus is like a prism .... Not all AN languages overtly encode all of its facets in the syntactic structure" (1978:398-399). Ferrell and Stanley, for their part, state that "... the occurrence of an overt NP identifying or explicating the in-focus element is optional" (1979:19).

Biggs, on the other hand, has drawn our attention to the all-important distinction in Fijian between two classes of verbs, namely "those that choose an actor-subject and those which choose a goal-subject"[34] (1974:418). He returns to this point in the concluding paragraphs of the same article, arguing that one type of suffix "derives actor-subject selecting verbs from goal-subject selecting verbs" while another suffix "Conversely ... derives goal-subject selecting verbs from actor-subject selecting verbs" (p.425).

It would seem that this is a crucial distinction, which needs to be looked at again. Let me however put forward a different explanation for it.

I wish to propose that the principal distinction between these two classes of verbs, which Schütz (1981:201; 1986:112) calls *stative* (i.e. goal-selecting) and *active* (i.e. actor-selecting) is that the expression of focus in one class is the converse of its expression in the other, that is to say they are symmetrically reversible.

Instead of the terms used by Biggs and Schütz, let me first propose that we should speak on the one hand of

ACTOR-ORIENTED VERBS (AOV) (i.e. 'active' according to Schütz and 'actor-subject selecting' according to Biggs), e.g.

gunuv- *drink*, lakov- *go*, raic- *see*, kaniØ- *eat*

and on the other hand of

GOAL-ORIENTED VERBS (GOV) (i.e. 'stative' according to Schütz and 'goal-subject selecting' according to Biggs), e.g.

biut- *leave*, rogoc- *hear*, cakav- *do, make*, sogot- *close*

Stated briefly, the view put forward now is the following:

An AOV without a suffix is in *actor focus*

An AOV with a suffix is in *goal focus*

Conversely:

A GOV without a suffix is in *goal focus*

A GOV with a suffix is in *actor focus*

The last of these propositions will perhaps cause some surprise and perhaps controversy. A careful examination of the evidence, however, can only leave one convinced that no other interpretation of the data will do. Before giving supporting evidence, let me paraphrase the above statements.

If we speak of an ACTOR-ORIENTED VERB, we mean that the role of *actor* is already assumed (i.e. that it is implicit in, part and parcel of, a verb). It therefore does not require a formal exponent and the unsuffixed base (i.e. its unmarked form) is oriented towards the topic NP in the role of *actor*).

Therefore, in an AOV, a short suffix (i.e. a marked form of the base) is available and appropriate when the base is oriented towards the topic in the role of *goal*.

Conversely, if we speak of a GOAL-ORIENTED VERB, we mean that the role of *goal* is already assumed (i.e. it is implicit in, part and parcel of, a verb). It therefore does not require a formal exponent and the unsuffixed base (i.e. its unmarked form) is available and appropriate when the base is oriented towards the topic NP in the role of *goal*.

Therefore, in a GOV, a short suffix (i.e. a marked form of the base) is available and appropriate when the base is oriented towards the topic NP in **the** role of ACTOR.

This last statement will require some theoretical support as well as corroborating evidence.

In the grammatical tradition associated with the study of IE languages, and particularly of Latin and Greek, it has been customary to begin with small segmentary units such as phonemic and morphemic constituents, and only then to study phrases, clauses and sentences. As a result, complete utterances (especially VPs in syntagmatic association with two, three or even four NPs) have received more attention than their frequency of occurrence in spoken (as opposed to written, especially literary) language, would seem to justify. That is to say, we have tended to study model constructions (elicited from informants and divorced not only from their socio-physical environment and subject of discourse, but from their linguistic context) at the expense of living speech. The latter, of course, takes full advantage of situation, shared knowledge and contextual information.

If therefore we attempt to elicit complete sentences or utterances from our AN-speaking informants, as Biggs (1974:401-408) has advocated, we run the risk of overlooking the important role played by anaphora within discourse. Let me illustrate this point from three Fijian riddles and three proverbial expressions (Biggs 1948; Bulicokocoko c.1957; Anon. n.d.). These have been deliberately chosen as examples since, within a given socio-cultural and socio-physical environment, a riddle and a proverb may refer to any subject of discussion whatever, the only prerequisite condition being that speaker and hearer(s) should share the same knowledge.

FIRST RIDDLE: 'Who is the visitor who always comes twice, in the day-time and at night-time?' Answer: 'The tide' (Biggs 1948:43)

> O cei na   vūlagi // ka   dau lako mai vakarua ...
>   ANAPHORIC ACTOR   TOPIC   AOV
> *Who (is) the visitor   who   always   comes   twice ...*

That is to say lako, an ACTOR-ORIENTED VERB, *without* a suffix, is in ACTOR FOCUS, i.e. oriented towards a NP in the role of ACTOR. ka dau lako mai vakarua (*who always comes twice*) is a relative clause, with anaphoric relation to na vūlagi (*the visitor*). When the relative particle ka occurs, the third person singular pronoun in preverbal position is Ø (i.e. 'deleted'). The TOPIC NP here is thus absent. (It will be remembered that "the occurrence of an overt NP identifying or explicating the in-focus element is optional" (Ferrell and Stanley 1979:19).)

SECOND RIDDLE: 'There is a pond full of water. A white cloud forms (in the middle of it) which drinks up the pond'. Answer: 'A coconut: When it's about to germinate, the milk dries up because the pith absorbs it' (Biggs 1948:343, no.10).

```
... e dua na  ō  vulavula ... ka Ø  gunuva    maca   na   drano
          non-focus
    anaphoric actor              AOV            GOAL TOPIC
    one the cloud white      which drinks-it dry    the  pond
```

That is to say gunuva, an ACTOR-ORIENTED VERB, *with* a suffix, is in GOAL
FOCUS, i.e. oriented towards a NP in the role of GOAL. The non-focus actor NP
is Ø for the same reason as in the previous example.

```
... sā maca na   kena wai // ni  Ø  sā  gunuva   na  vara
        ANAPHORIC
        GOAL TOPIC                    AOV      non-focus actor
    is dry  the  its  water because has drunk-it the pith
```

(The last two examples, with a reversal of relations, are thus better
accounted for in terms of topic-and-focus than of subject and object.)

FIRST PROVERBIAL EXPRESSION: 'As soon as the chiefs assemble, I shall be chewed'
(famous words, said to have been uttered by the kava (yaqona) shrub)
(Bulicokocoko 1957:28).

```
Era   soqo    gā   na tūraga // au    qai  mama
                                GOAL TOPIC  GOV
They assemble just the chief    I(me)  then  chew
```

That is to say mama, a GOAL-ORIENTED VERB, *without* a suffix, is in GOAL
FOCUS, i.e. oriented towards a NP (in this case a preverbal pronoun) in the role
of GOAL. There is no non-focus actor NP.

SECOND PROVERBIAL EXPRESSION: 'The field has been raised' (i.e. 'The home team
has been beaten'). For instance: 'The Suva team have raised the field' (Anon.
n.d.:30,no.32).

```
Sā lave na  rārā  //  (Sā druka  na    itaukei)
   GOV GOAL TOPIC
is lift the field      (is defeat the  homelander)
```

That is to say, lave, a GOAL-ORIENTED VERB, *without* a suffix, is in GOAL
FOCUS, i.e. oriented towards a NP in the role of GOAL. As in the previous
example, there is no non-focus actor NP.

```
Era    sā mai    laveta     na   rārā / na mata qito mai Suva
(ACTOR           GOV     non-focus goal    ACTOR TOPIC
  TOPIC)
They    is come and lift-it  the   field / the team sport from Suva
```

That is to say, laveta, a GOAL-ORIENTED VERB, *with* a suffix, is in ACTOR
FOCUS, i.e. oriented towards a NP in the role of ACTOR. The topic consists of
two discontinuous NPs: a preverbal pronoun in the third person plural (Era) and
a postverbal NP na mata qito (mai Suva).

THIRD RIDDLE: 'Two men forever fighting. One of them gets the upper hand for
a long while, but one day he falls asleep. As he lies asleep his blanket is
very thick and heavy. *Then along comes his enemy whom he used to defeat*, sits
on top of him and overcomes him'. Answer: 'A man and grass. In his lifetime,
he keeps down the weeds in his garden, but when he dies and lies under the earth,
the weeds grow on top of him' (Biggs 1948:345,no.24).

Sā qai lako mai na kena meca / ka Ø rawai koya e liu
               non-focus   ACTOR GOV
               anaphoric goal   TOPIC
is then come the his enemy who defeat him before

That is to say, *rawai*, a GOAL-ORIENTED VERB, *with* a suffix, is in ACTOR
FOCUS, i.e. oriented towards a NP in the role of ACTOR. This is a particularly
interesting example: the anaphora relates to a 'mooted' actor last mentioned
three sentences previously (i.e. 'one of them gets the upper hand'). It is very
difficult to see how one could decide, on grounds of case relations within the
sentence alone (i.e. without recourse to lengthy discourse analysis) that na
kena meca was in fact *not* the 'subject' of rawai. However, because a GOV *with* a
suffix is oriented, as I hope to have shown, towards a NP in the role of ACTOR
and although this may seem startling, even a zero ACTOR topic, as in this case,
there is an adequate safeguard against ambiguity.[35]

THIRD PROVERBIAL EXPRESSION: 'The pig was killed because his legs carried
him' (i.e. if a man gets into trouble in another village and is beaten up, he
should not feel sorry for himself, he had no business to go there in the first
place) (Bulicokocoko 1957:34).

Moku na vuaka / ni kauta na yavana
       non-focus   GOV   ACTOR TOPIC
       anaphoric goal
kill the pig / because carry-it the leg-his

That is to say, *kauta*, a GOAL-ORIENTED VERB, *with* a suffix, is in ACTOR
FOCUS, i.e. oriented towards a NP in the role of ACTOR. Here also case grammar
and IE sentence-based relations tempt one at first flush to translate this by
'The pig was beaten because he carried his legs' when in fact the opposite is
intended. There seems to be no alternative explanation to considering the focal
orientation of the verb (in this case a GOV with a suffix in ACTOR focus) to be
the deciding factor.[36]

In conclusion let me (at the risk of claiming to remember more school Latin
than I could justify) quote a sentence attributed to William of Occam, an English
Franciscan friar of the 14th century, born in Ockham in Surrey and a famous
theologian of his day: *'Non prodest fieri per plura quod potest fieri per
pauciora'*, i.e. 'There is no advantage in achieving with more categories what
can be achieved with fewer'.

NOTES

1. Yet in a review published in the same year (Schachter 1977b) he states that
    "Philippine languages should perhaps be classified as CASE-PROMINENT LAN-
    GUAGES: i.e. languages whose structure favors a description in which a major
    role is assigned to case relations" (p.710).

2. As the references given in two earlier articles show (Milner 1962; 1979:2
    and 14, note 2), interest in these problems of AN grammar, particularly
    among Dutch linguists, goes back at least to the end of the 19th century
    (see also Tchekhoff 1978, especially her reference to Dirr (p.198) and

Schuchardt (p.202)). As has been pointed out before (Martinet 1965) a number
of Western European languages are almost incapable of predicating anything
without at least a token or dummy subject. For instance in English when
talking about the weather: 'It is raining' or about abstract matters: 'It
occurs to me that'. Latin however is not so dependent on formal predication
as in ablative absolute constructions: *mutatis mutandis* 'if the necessary
changes are made' or with infinitives: *laborare est orare; humanum est errare*
'to work is to pray; to err is human'. Martinet also shows that idiomatic
and colloquial constructions such as *Y a* in French and *There's* in English
cannot be considered to incorporate a subject in the strict sense of the
term.

3. What he calls the 'A verbs' follow Pattern 2 only, whether they are suffixed
    or unsuffixed, that is to say they have an unmarked NP and an NP marked by
    e or 'e. 'B verbs' on the other hand:

    (i) *without a suffix*: follow Pattern 1 (an unmarked NP and an NP marked
        by i, 'i or ki
    (ii) *with a suffix*: follow Pattern 2 (Clark 1973:569; 574-575).

    In his doctoral dissertation Foley (1976) points out the correspondence
    between Polynesian A and B verbs on the one hand and Fijian *stative* and
    active verbs (to use the terms suggested by Schütz (1981:201)), respectively.
    Biggs (1974:424) describes the same categories in Fijian as goal-subject
    selecting and actor-subject selecting verbs respectively. In the present
    article I shall use the terms 'actor-oriented' and 'goal-oriented' verbs,
    respectively.

4. Pawley states that this suggestion was originally made to him by Schütz
    (1973:180,note 22).

5. Paraphrasing this view in her own words, Naylor writes as follows:

    > Topic and focus (in its highlighting function) belong to
    > the system by which the clause is organized as a message ....
    > Focus as the indicator of the participant role of the topic
    > is at the same time a function in the system of transitivity
    > - the organization of the clause as expression of extra-
    > lingual reality. Emphasis, as a way of rendering something
    > especially significant, with emotional overtones, is
    > analyzable within the framework of the unmarked-marked
    > distinction, which cuts across both systems. (1975:17)

6. Albert Schütz informs me (in a private letter) that David Arms' dissertation
    was the first full analysis of these phenomena to be published, but Bruce
    Biggs was already discussing consonant restrictions in the early 1960s.
    Paul Geraghty (1973) wrote an article on this subject and Peter Lincoln
    also studied the same problem.

7. For instance -c- is a replacement consonant for -v- in mawac- (*steam +*) *hit,
    spread to*, lawac- *start weaving (mat)*, kālawac- *step, stride over*, but not
    in liwav- *blow on* or dewav- (of disease) *spread to, infect* (see also note
    9 below).

8. Arms did in fact consider such cases, for instance on pp.151-154 and
    especially in the note to p.152, but he seems to see a conflict between
    phonotactic rules and the semantic factors which he associates with indi-
    vidual thematic consonants. I see no conflict, since the phonotactic rules
    appear to operate rigorously, though not always clearly, since more than one
    rule may be involved within the same base (see in particular note 21 below).

The term *heterorganic* has been suggested to me by my colleague Eugénie Henderson who has used it in her own work to describe analogous phenomena in Khasi (Munda).

9. Following Geraghty (1983:260-270), I shall refer to *short* (i.e. monosyllabic) and to *long* (i.e. disyllabic) suffixes. In *short* suffixes:

-l- does not occur.
-d- and -t- dissociate, except in (vaka)dinat- *bear out, confirm*.
-r- and -n- dissociate, except in karon- *greatly value, take great care of*. (NB: Paul Geraghty informs me that karon- is probably cognate with qāraun- and that the restrictions may not be so strict at the distance of two vowels.)

Note also that -w- and -c- are two 'grey areas', i.e. peripheral cases where the evidence is conflicting. (For -w- see note 7 above.) -c- in some cases does not dissociate: cat- *disliking, hating*, colat- *carry on the shoulder*, cukit- *dig up the ground*. In other cases there is some evidence that -c- and -t- do dissociate. For instance, -v- in cakav- *do, make* may be a replacement for -t- because of c- in the base, see also note 21 below.

In *long* suffixes:

-g- does not occur.
-l- and -r- occur in suffixes which have specialised functions ('repetition' and 'intensity, force or violence' respectively).

10. I have consulted the dictionaries of Hazlewood, an unpublished dictionary by J. Neyret (which exists in typescript form and is available in the library of the National Archives of Fiji as well as in the library of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London). I am also indebted to Tevita Nawadra, Director of the Fijian Dictionary Project, for his permission to consult his files between July 1980 and March 1981.

11. Naylor (1975:21-22) uses the term to describe the 'locative' focus -an, i.e. "location in physical and psychological space".

12. When, as happens in a number of cases, both occur after the 'same' base, there is a difference of lexical range of application which sometimes suggests that two homophonous bases are represented: e.g. bulia *form, shape*; bulita *adorn (a canoe) with white shells* (buli). qalia *roll, twist (sinnet) on thigh*; qalita *snatch a corpse after a battle*. (NB: bulita and qalita appear in Hazlewood's dictionary.)

13. For instance:
sokot- *sail (in) a certain wind or weather*
sokov- *sail through or towards*
rokot- *bend (bow or stick)*
rokov- *bow to, pay respect to*
kosot- *cut something with shell or knife*
kosov- *cut lengthwise; cut across*

14. For instance:
Replacement of -v- by -c-: vukac- *fly towards*; kuvuc- *(of smoke) puff against*
kawac- *go over, cross (a bridge)*

Replacement of -v- by -k-: virik- *throw something at*; dumuk- *push upwards (with a pole)*; yawak- *get away from*

Replacement of -v- by -r-: vocer- *paddle to (a place)*; caber- *carry something up*; cabor- *offer up*

Replacement of -v- by -t-: kevut- *climb down along or towards*; kabat- *climb up to*; robot- *extend over*

15. For instance:
Replacement of -t- by -c-: tukuc- *lower (something suspended)*; taloc- *pour carefully*; talac- *remove, shift*

Replacement of -t- by -k-: dirik- *smash (shell), knock (tabua)*; natuk- *knead*; tonok- *poke with finger +*

Replacement of -t- by -r-: taqar- *lay, place (on top of)*; utur- *place end to end*

Replacement of -t- by -v-: dolav- *open*; takiv- *draw water*; kotiv- *cut, clip (hair, paper +)*

16. e.g. tarog- *ask (a question)*; bilig- *push*; vivig- *roll (a mat, etc.)*. There is some evidence to suggest that in some cases 'semantic analogy' may be one of the factors involved. For instance olog- *wrap in a bundle*; salag- *wrap in leaves for cooking*.

17. e.g. sodom- *insert, fit (s.th. cylindrical)*; daram- *slip (into ring or sheath)*.

18. e.g. curum- *go through, go in (or out)*; nanum- *keep in mind, think of*; sucum- *give birth to, suckle*.

19. e.g. tawan- *settle in, occupy*; tokon- *prop up*; yaben- *lead, support (old or sick person when walking)*.

20. e.g. qāraun- *look after, take care, beware*; kumun- *store up, collect*; tukun- *tell*.

21. For instance:
(i) -t- may be replaced by -c- in: dabec- *sit on*; davoc- *lie on*, and that
(ii) -v- may be replaced by -r- in: (vaka)daber- *set down, place in sitting position*; (vaka)davor- *place (child, etc.) in lying position*
but the evidence is conflicting. Thus in cakav- *make, do*, -t- may be replaced by -v-. It is also important to note that in some cases, the occurrence of replacement consonants which cannot be accounted for by the phonotactic rules given above, can be explained by diachronic factors. That is to say, in some favourable positions a PAN consonant may have been retained owing to the fact that its modern reflex coincides with an acceptable replacement consonant. See for instance tagic- *cry for* (i.e. to obtain something) (Milner 1986).

22. Each of them in long suffixes is followed by -aka (or -aki). It should be noted that *-gaka (or *-gaki) does not occur, but -laka (-laki) does, although -l- does not occur as a thematic consonant in short suffixes. (NB: -g-, which does not occur in long suffixes, does so in short.)

23.   e.g. tagotaka *borrow temporarily*, qitotaka *play with (ball, etc.)*, ridotaka *hop with something*. In addition to its use with bases that can also be followed by short suffixes, -taka (-taki) is frequently used to derive denominal verbs.

It is especially interesting to note that although -t- in a long suffix (-taka or -taki) does not dissociate from t or d in the preceding base, -vaka (or -vaki) occur in a number of cases where -taka (or -taki) might have been expected to occur for reasons which are discussed in the next two paragraphs and illustrated in notes 24 to 28. A possible reason is that the *long* suffix after certain bases is formed by analogy with the thematic consonant in the *short* suffix. For instance:
ladevak- *jump with something* (by analogy with ladev- *jump over*)
talevak- *return s.th. borrowed* (by analogy with talev- *go again to*)
takivak- *scoop, ladle (with s.th.)* (by analogy with takiv- *draw (water)*
(See also note 31 below.)

24.   For instance:
instrument: viritak- *throw*; cokatak- *hurl*; nimatak- *use as a bailer.*

25.   *object affected:* drōtak- *run away with*; kabatak- *climb (carrying s.th.)*; karatak- *propel, punt (a canoe, etc.).*

26.   *object produced:* kāsivitak- *spit (saliva, etc.)*, vekacak- *pass (a stool), excrete (faeces).* (NB: -c- replacing -t- by analogy with vekac-; see note 31.)

27.   For instance:
on account of, about: rogovak- *spread report on account of*; dredrevak- *laugh about (or over)*; surevak- *beg earnestly, entreat for.*

28.   *on behalf of, for the benefit of:* serevak- *sing about*; osovak- *bark because of*; drōvak- *run away because of.*

29.   e.g. seretak- *sing (a song)*
serevak- *sing (about s.th.)*
tagitak- *utter (a cry, etc.)*
tagivak- *cry on account of s.th., lament*

30.   e.g. valatak- *fight for s.o. (or s.th.)*; vūnautak- *preach on (a topic)*; meketak- *sing and dance on account of.*

31.   Thus cicivak- seems to be formed by analogy with ciciv-, likewise kilicak- (kilic-), mīcak- (mic-), curumak- (curum-), lakovak- (lakov-).

32.   For example -kak- occurs in rukak- *curse* and tavukak- *singe (pig)*. -rak- occurs in wārak- *wait for* without any association with force, violence or intensity.

33.   cōnak- *cover floor with grass and/or mats*; savenak- *hang (sail) by the* save (save is the name of a rope hanging from the mast-head).

34.   He goes on to say that Fijian in this respect "is reminiscent of Polynesian languages such as Futunan and perhaps Tongan and Samoan" but "quite unlike English where ... all verbs are actor-subject selecting, until they are passivised" (Biggs 1974:418). One could argue, however, that English

reflects an analogous distinction, at least covertly, if not overtly. Thus a door may 'open' or 'shut' but one can hardly say that *'milk drinks' or that *'bread eats'. Likewise in the imperative, 'eat' and 'drink' can be used without an overt object, but 'open' and 'shut' cannot be so used, except perhaps by a dentist.

35. In order to make absolutely sure that there was no ambiguity, I asked Tevita Nawadra, the Director of the Fijian Dictionary Project, what he would have said if, in fact, it had been 'his enemy who used to defeat him'. His answer was: Sā qai lako mai na kena meca, ā dau rawai koya e liu. Here rawai is also in ACTOR FOCUS (as indicated by the suffix) but na kena meca is the anaphoric ACTOR TOPIC.

36. According to Tevita Nawadra, it would also be possible here to have na yavana in focus in the role of GOAL. Since, however, we are dealing with a GOAL-ORIENTED verb, if it was oriented towards a GOAL TOPIC it would, by definition, not have a suffix. The only possibility, therefore, would be: Moku na vuaka, e kau na yavana *The pig has been killed, its legs have been carried away* (or: *someone has carried away its legs*). The implication would then be that a pig had been slaughtered, cut up and its legs taken somewhere else for whatever reason (distribution, roasting, etc.).

POSTSCRIPT

REFERENCES

ANON.

   n.d.   Idioms (list prepared for use in Fijian schools). TS.

ARMS, D.G.

   1973   Whence the Fijian transitive endings? *Oceanic Linguistics* 12:503-558.

   1975   Transitivity in Standard Fijian. Ph.D. thesis, University of Michigan, 1974. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms International.

BIGGS, B.G.

   1948   Fijian riddles. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 57:342-348.

   1974   Some problems of Polynesian grammar. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 83:401-426.

BULICOKOCOKO, S.T.U.

   c.1957   Fijian idioms, expressions, proverbs and colloquialisms. TS.

CAPELL, A.

   1941   *A new Fijian dictionary*. Sydney: Australasian Medical Publishing Company.

CHURCHWARD, C.M.

   1941   *A new Fijian grammar*. Sydney: Australasian Medical Publishing Company.

CLARK, R.

   1973   Transitivity and case in Eastern Oceanic languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 12:559-605.

   1977   Eastern Oceanic transitive suffixes and the genesis of rules. Paper presented to the Austronesian Symposium, L.S.A. Summer Institute, University of Hawaii.

DAHL, O.C.

   1978   The fourth focus. In Wurm and Carrington, eds 1978:383-393.

FERRELL, R. and P. STANLEY

   1979   Austronesian versus Indo-European: the case against case. In Naylor, ed. 1979:19-31.

FIRTH, J.R.

   1948   Sounds and prosodies. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 127-152.

FOLEY, W.A.

   1976   Comparative syntax in Austronesian. Ph.D. thesis, University of California, Berkeley.

GERAGHTY, P.

   1973   Some aspects of case-marking in Fijian. Term paper, University of Hawaii.

   1983   *The history of the Fijian languages*. Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication No.19. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

HAZLEWOOD, D.

   1872   *A Fijian & English and an English & Fijian dictionary ... and a grammar of the language ...* edited by J. Calvert. 2nd edn; 1st edn 1850. London: Sampson Low, Marston.

HOCKETT, C.F.

   1976   The reconstruction of Proto Central Pacific. *Anthropological Linguistics* 18:187-235.

   1977   Proto Central Pacific: addenda. *Anthropological Linguistics* 19:242-250.

HOPPER, P.J. and S.A. THOMPSON

   1980   Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56:251-299.

KRUPA, V.

  1966   The phonemic structure of bi-vocalic morphemic forms in Oceanic
           languages. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 75:458-497.

LICHTENBERK, F.

  1978   Thematic consonants in Manam transitive verbs. *Anthropological
           Linguistics* 20:185-193.

MARTINET, A.

  1965   La construction ergative. In: *La linguistique synchronique*, 206-
           222. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

MILNER, G.B.

  1962   Active, passive, or perfective in Samoan: a fresh appraisal of the
           problem. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 81:5-18.

  1972   *Fijian grammar*. 3rd edn. Suva: Government Press.

  1979   On the centrality of Austronesian syntax. In Naylor, ed. 1979:1-17.

  1986   On prosodic relations between Fijian bases and verbal suffixes.
           In J.H.C.S. Davidson, ed. *Contributions to South East Asian lin-
           guistics: Essays in honour of Eugénie Henderson*. London: School
           of Oriental and African Studies. (In the press.)

NAYLOR, P.B.

  1975   Topic, focus, and emphasis in the Tagalog verbal clause. *Oceanic
           Linguistics* 12-79.

  1978   Toward focus in Austronesian. In Wurm and Carrington, eds 1978:
           395-442.

  1979   Linking, relation-making, and Tagalog syntax. In Naylor, ed. 1979:
           33-50.

NAYLOR, P.B., ed.

  1979   *Austronesian studies: papers from the Second Eastern Conference on
           Austronesian Languages*. (Michigan Papers on South and Southeast
           Asia 15, 1979). Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan.

NEYRET, J.

  1935   Fijian-English dictionary. TS.

PAWLEY, A.

  1973   Some problems in Proto-Oceanic grammar. *Oceanic Linguistics* 12:
           103-188.

PIKE, K.L.

  1963   A syntactic paradigm. *Language* 39:216-230.

SCHACHTER, P.

  1976   The subject in Philippine languages: Topic, actor, actor-topic, or
           none of the above? In C.N. Li, ed. *Subject and topic*, 493-518.
           New York, Academic Press.

1977a   Reference-related and role-related properties of subjects. In P. Cole and J.M. Sadock, eds *Syntax and semantics*, vol.8: *Grammatical relations*, 279-306. New York: Academic Press.

1977b   Review of Ramos, T.V. *The case system of Tagalog verbs*. *Language* 53:707-711.

SCHACHTER, P. and F.T. OTANES

1972   *Tagalog reference grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

SCHÜTZ, A.J.

1981   Specification as a grammatical category in Fijian. In J. Hollyman and A. Pawley, eds *Studies in Pacific languages and cultures: In honour of Bruce Biggs*, 197-207. Auckland: Linguistic Society of New Zealand.

1986   *The Fijian language*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press. (In press.)

SCHÜTZ, A.J. and T.R. NAWADRA

1972   A refutation of the notion "passive" in Fijian. *Oceanic Linguistics* 11:88-109.

SCOTT, N.C.

1948   A study in the phonetics of Fijian. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 12:737-752.

TCHEKHOFF, C.

1973a   Some verbal patterns in Tongan. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 82:281-292.

1973b   Verbal aspects in an ergative construction: an example in Tongan. *Oceanic Linguistics* 12:607-620.

1978   *Aux fondements de la syntaxe: l'ergatif*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

WOLFF, J.U.

1979   Verbal morphology and verbal sentences in Proto-Austronesian. In Naylor, ed. 1979:153-167.

WURM, S.A. and Lois CARRINGTON, eds

1978   *Second International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics: proceedings*. *PL*, C-61.