SCHÜTZ REPLY

REPLY by Albert J. Schütz, University of Hawaii and Universität
Hamburg.

I should like to thank David Arms and the editor of <u>Te Reo</u> for
allowing me to respond to this review of *The Fijian language*. My
first response is that I consider it a fair review, and--especially
in terms of the opening and the closing paragraphs--a favourable one,
and for this, I thank the author, not only for the care and attention
to detail with which he has written the review, but also for the same
qualities in the help he gave me while I was still writing the
grammar.

As for the points of disagreement, it is only natural that
different people have different views of the grammar, and I welcome
the chance to explain my point of view on a number of these topics.
In the following discussion, the headings and the numbers refer to
those used by Arms.

2.   The scope of the book

The content of the grammar was dictated by two important obligations.
The first was to the major granting agency, to whom I promised to
write a 'reference grammar'. The other was to the Fijian Dictionary
Project, especially in its wider aims of providing reference books
for teachers in an eventual Fijian language programme in the schools.
Our experience with several language workshops showed that many
Fijian teachers were interested in this part of the history of their
language, so I considered it important that they have access to the
historical materials that I had been privileged to see only through
two decades of research grants. Thus, the combination of both kinds
of information in one volume.

As for the 'uneven' treatment of grammatical points, I simply
considered some more complicated and controversial than others. For
example, the proportionate space alotted to 'transitivity as focus'
versus 'possession' reflects this view.

3.   Grammatical subject

This is an important point of disagreement, for I tried treat the
difference between noun phrases and subjects in such a way that the
distinction is not restricted to just one part of the grammar but
extends through much of it. And I think the treatment of particular
noun phrases as part of the grammatical category 'specification'
does just that: what were once called 'the Fijian genitive' (Milner
1956:21-22; Pawley 1972:35--although not with that label), subject
noun phrases, and object noun phrases can now be explained as
different subtypes of one main category.

Unlike Arms, I do think that previous treatments of 'subject'
were markedly different from the present one. As one example, see
Milner's diagram showing word order. (1956:13), in which a sentence
is labeled as follows:

    (1) e   *lekaleka na lawa*   'the net is short'
       Participle Predicate Subject
(My interpretation is that *e* is third person singular subject, and
that the noun phrase *na lawa* specifies the subject.)

123

In sentences with other than a third person singular subject, however, one of the set of person-number markers occurring 'before the base' was called the subject (p. 52).

Finally, according to some descriptions, many sentences--especially those with third person dual, trial, and plural--contained two elements that were called subjects: the person-number marker, and a noun phrase.

Apparently I was not clear enough in my explanation of the difference between subjects and specified subjects. I do not consider the latter, which are noun phrases, a subtype of the former, but merely one of several types of specification. Perhaps it is the label that is confusing. Incidentally, I don't understand the statement that noun phrases 'can be subjects' and the reference to example (3), in which I see no noun phrase at all.

Example (3) is definitely a challenge to analysis, but I would describe it as a special kind of elliptical sentence (see p. 75). It is in this area of Fijian grammar that Arms has a distinct advantage, because he speaks the language much better than I do, and is familiar with colloquial styles. At any rate, this kind of sentence seems different from those in which the third person singular subject is dropped, because the latter can be understood out of context, and (3) cannot.

4. Identifying and existential

If linguists have 'long been aware' of the identifying construction, they have been--at least according to my knowledge of the literature--unusually reticent about it. But I may have missed the description in my reading.

I think Arm's reservations about the existential category are well founded. It may well have arisen from my Indo-European language point of view . . . but, on the other hand, may be valid from a Fijian point of view. It is one of many problems still to be solved.

5. Active and stative

Arms and I seem to have a major disagreement on this topic, and I shall try to justify my position. Some matters, such as the classification of particular verbs, will remain a problem, because classifications are seldom airtight. But I do not agree that I have not explained the 'formal facts' in examples (6-9). (I hope that 'explain' does not mean 'tell why', but simply 'describe'!) In the two-way classification of verbs into active vs. stative, and one-referent vs. two-referent, I pointed out the difference between the classification of a verbal root and that of a verb that has been derived. The discussion on pp. 113-114 states explicitly that in particular constructions, 82 verbs 'pattern just like A2 verbs'--that is, the actor is expressed by the subject.

For the whole complicated topic of verb classification, I tried to combine semantic and formal criteria. Thus, the classification rests not only on the roles of the participants of the action or state, and the number of entities involved, but also on the potential of expressing them formally. For example, see p. 110 for the criterion for an A1 verb: 'There is no goal, either implicit or formally expressed.'

I thoroughly agree that the 'more problematic' cases of classification might have been decided, unconsciously perhaps, on the basis of English, but--and here is a kind of escape clause--the classification of *all* verb roots is not the function of the grammarian, but of the lexicographer. The decisions of how the roots are to be labeled in the dictionary are made by native speakers of Fijian. The grammarian has merely provided a framework, which may have to be altered somewhat.

The idea that the subject of a stative verb represents the goal was certainly not original; it seemed to be the usual way that Austronesian linguists handled the matter. I am half a world away from my files right now, but from the sources at hand, perhaps the following two examples will suffice. First, 'there are just two verb classes in Fijian, a goal-subject selecting class . . . and an actor-subject selecting class . . .' (Biggs 1974:424). Next, in her case grammar of Hawaiian, Hawkins (1979:16-19) had as one of four verb classes 'Statives', which require the Object case.

6. **Passive**

The difficulties referred to in this section can be dealt with quickly: different people define 'passive' in different ways. I consider a passive sentence an opposition to an active sentence, therefore requiring that all the information in the latter be at least potentially contained in the former. The fact that languages that do have a passive construction often *choose* not to indicate the actor has no bearing on the argument, for in Fijian, the elimination of reference to the actor is not a matter of choice but of *necessity.*

This feature has led to a difficulty in terminology. Clark (1974:6; referred to in Biggs 1974:418) called the construction a 'pseudo-passive', which is not a term that one would like to use repeatedly. My primary wish was not to eliminate the term 'passive', but to emphasize the relationship of this particular construction to other statives, and to the several degrees of specification, thus tying together some parts of the grammar that were previously treated separately. I agree with Arms, however, that the term should have been discussed from a historical perspective.

7. **Transitivity**

I confined Fijian transitivity to the treatment (semantically) of actor, action/state, and goal; and (formally) of subject, verb, and object. Arm's discussion of locative or directional goals, as manifested by such phrases as *i Suva* 'to Suva', is an important point. Here, I have been rather more formal than semantic, for although sentences (20-23) clearly seem semantically similar, according to my definition, (21) lies outside the topic at hand.

Although (22) and (23) show that from one point of view some verbs have more than two implicit referents, it is clearly stated on p. 394 that 'a sentence can indicate only one goal at a time (within the area of formal transitivity)'.

10. Other grammar

I strongly disagree that there is no need to indicate that the vowel of the possessive marker is 'intrinsically long'. The shortening of long vowels in the possessive markers is exactly like other vowel shortening, described on pp. 528-29. I cannot imagine how this feature could be described in terms of preserving an accentual pattern (which pattern?), and the term 'occasional lengthening' reminds me of the nineteenth-century term 'euphony'.

The point that coordination often occurs without *ka* 'and' is well made.

11. Phonology

I have discussed the matter of the interpretation of long vowels at greater length elsewhere, and I wouldn't describe my choice as an arbitrary one, having given the greatest weight to phonetic evidence.

Marking diphthongs long in the appropriate environments was simply an effort toward consistency. I would not recommend it as an orthographical practice.

I agree that sequences of vowels that normally can diphthongize but don't in particular cases (usually the result of morphology) need to be identified in some way.

This is not the place to restate my evidence for the measure as a unit in the phonological hierarchy, for I have the feeling of having done so too many times already. The strongest evidence is the patterning of 'minimum utterances'--that is, utterances with just one accent peak. But to defend the analysis, let me repeat that marking the accents would be just as efficient; I prefer indicating the units themselves so that we can become accustomed to thinking of them as units, just like syllables or phrases. As for the problem with boundaries, linguistics seems to be full of units with fuzzy boundaries, such as syllables, or even 'segments', as any basic work with acoustic phonetics will show.

With reference to (28-30), I tried to point out, first, that it is the accent that determines measure boundaries, not the other way round. One can hardly demand that the accent occur other than where it does. Next, it is an important feature of Fijian phonology that every occurrence of a sequence such as *a + i* (except across certain morpheme boundaries) is only a *potential* for a diphthong. For instance, in some styles of speaking (and in certain dialects), the *ai* in *raica* 'see it' is not accented on the first element, and therefore is not a diphthong. However, in other speech styles, *a* and *i* diphthongize even over measure boundaries.

Examples (31) and (32) are certainly problems and Arms may be correct in his assessemnt, for measures formed from a combination of usually unaccented syllables are very weakly accented. It is a problem that needs further study, but the acoustic measurement of intensity is complicated by a plethora of variables.

I hear the accents in the next examples as *lomàlági* and *matàsáwa*; thus the measure divisions are . *lomà* . *lagi* . and . *matà* . *sawa* . This is a difference of opinion that cannot be easily resolved in our present geographical situation.

The tables on pp. 433ff. were meant to show mostly irregular morphophonemic changes. All the additional examples cited by Arms, including those in note 15, are handled by the vowel-shortening

rule. In no sense whatsoever are they 'just random occurrences that have to be learnt'.

A 'theory of words and cliticization' sounds like a very unlikely tool to systematize and explain the facts about accent placement. I have yet to find an adequate definition of 'word' for Fijian (or for a Polynesian language), and most of the treatments of cliticization I have read recently (for Polynesian) have confused phonology and morphology. For example although Chung (1978:31-37) began by emphasizing the phonological properties of such forms, many of the examples that follow do not fit the explanation (e.g. Tongan *ou* and *nau*, Samoan *matou*, *bu*, and *ia*). Arm's short description of cliticization is more precise, but by calling something a 'suffix', one has already made an a priori decision about words. Finally, the description of vowel shortening in the grammar accounts for much more data— even potential shortening across phrase boundaries, which occurs in normal speech. However, should someone form another theory and apply it to Fijian, I am more than willing to read it and (perhaps) be convinced.

Finally I am in complete agreement that a discussion of discourse would have been welcome. Many of the topics, however, were treated from the point of view of discourse—for example, specificity and the definite article. Although it is quite correct that most of the examples were given as isolated sentences or phrases, a great many of them include the sources so that the reader can find the context. Still, a unified treatment would have been better, and as a matter of fact, an early outline of the grammar ended with a chapter entitled 'Beyond the sentence'. As it turned out, however, it was beyond me. Discourse is a complex topic, the methodology is not well defined, and it would have added years to the completion of the grammar. So I opted for publication over perfection.

Unfortunately, the publisher attached the word 'definitive' to the catalog description of the book, but it goes without saying that *The Fijian language* is not 'the last word' on Fijian: such a work, even if it were possible, would kill any intellectual interest in the topic.

REFERENCES

Biggs, Bruce. 1974. Some problems of Polynesian grammar. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 83:401-26.

Chung, Sandra. 1978. *Case marking and grammatical relations in Polynesian.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Clark, Ross. 1974. Transitivity and case in Eastern Oceanic languages (quoted in Biggs 1974 from a mimeographed version; another version was published in *Oceanic Linguistics,* 12 (1973): 559-605).

Hawkins, Emily A. 1979. *Hawaiian sentence structures.* Pacific Linguistics, Series B - No. 61

Milner, George B. 1956. *Fijian grammar.* Suva: Government Press.

Pawley, Andrew. 1972. On the internal relationships of Eastern Oceanic languages. *Studies in Oceanic culture history,* vol.3, ed. by R.C. Green and M. Kelly. Honolulu, Bishop Museum *Pacific Anthropological Records,* 13.