

## REVIEW ARTICLE

***The Fijian language.* By Albert J. Schütz.  
Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press,  
1985. xxxii, 688 pp. US\$35.**

Reviewed by D.G. Arms,  
Missionary Society of St. Columban.

### 1. A major contribution

*The Fijian language* is a major contribution to the field of Fijian studies. It is major not just in physical size - more than 700 pages counting introductory material, lengthy appendices etc. - but also in terms of the amount and detail of the grammatical material treated. It is the result of Schütz's continued interest and research in Fijian spanning more than 25 years.

As well as acknowledging his many predecessors in Fijian grammatical study, Schütz points out (p. xxvi) the important role the Fijian Dictionary Project played in his book's preparation. As the Project's first director during the 1970s, Schütz was in an ideal position to tap its valuable resources and build on previous work.

Even taking into account the reservations I have about parts of Schütz's work (see below), the scope and depth of the analysis in *The Fijian language* considerably exceeds that of its predecessors. The author achieves this too with explanations that are lucid, at times leisurely. New ideas are introduced gradually and are well explicated. Although because of the nature of the work 'stylistically pleasing English is not the most important consideration' (p. xxvii), the volume is in fact very readable.

Schütz has an eye for history and it is a feature of his presentation that whole chapters and sections are devoted to what others have said about Fijian. In turn, there is no doubt

that *The Fijian language* will firmly place Schütz in the historical line of major Fijian grammarians, along with Cargill, Hazlewood, Churchward, and Milner. It is an important work, likely to be influential. I will therefore subject several of its major points to close scrutiny in this review. A work that attempts much warrants a more thorough study and criticism than one of more modest scope.

## 2. The scope of the book

While the title might lead the reader to expect some treatment of Fijian's many varieties, its place in the Austronesian language family, and its role in Fiji's multiracial society, Schütz has little to say about comparative or sociolinguistic matters here. *The Fijian language* is in fact a grammar. It is concerned basically with the structure of the language generally known as standard Fijian and the history of the study of that structure.

The marriage between these two themes is not an entirely happy one, however. The historical overview which precedes the grammar proper is interesting but anecdotal. These 70 pages plus the 60 pages of word lists at the end of the volume form a bulky periphery that is of very limited pertinence to the core of the work. They would be more suitably placed in a revised edition of Schütz's *Languages of Fiji* or in a new work on linguistic research in Fiji. Schütz's frequent reference to and discussion of others' viewpoints in the course of the grammar proper is well conceived and usually well executed. My main criticisms of this feature of his presentation are that, firstly, the historical interludes are very uneven as to which grammarians and grammatical points will be treated, and to what depth.<sup>1</sup> Secondly, they are not always models of objectivity. In spite of Schütz's claim to the contrary (p. xxv), others' views are sometimes presented more in terms of his own insights rather than in terms of their own time, terminology and context. Finally, there is at times an exaggerated preoccupation with the originality - some might say idiosyncrasy - of Schütz's own viewpoint.

Although 'this work is not directed towards a particular readership, but simply to those who want to learn more about the Fijian language' (p. xxiv), the book will be of primary interest to linguists and to non-linguists truly interested in the study of the language. It is divided into five sections: I. Background

(pp. 1-71), II Sentences and verb phrases (pp. 73-308), III Noun phrases (pp. 309-382), IV Operations (pp. 383-470), V Phonology (pp. 471-561). Schütz addresses in considerable detail a number of features of Fijian grammar that have, in some cases, been long controversial. The rest of this review will be concerned mainly with his treatment of several of these.

### 3. Grammatical subject

(1) eratou s̄a liu i Nadi na marama  
they now lead to Nadi the women  
'the women have gone ahead to Nadi'

Schütz spends quite a lot of time emphasising the importance of regarding the person-number marker preceding the verb in sentences like (1) as the grammatical subject and claims that his analysis of the Fijian sentence 'differs markedly from previous ones by treating as subjects the so-called pronominal elements that precede the verb' (p. 85). However, not all previous analyses are so markedly different: Milner (1972:54) calls the pronominal elements 'subjective pronouns' and in Arms (1974:25) I mention together the subject pronouns and subject noun phrases. Schütz actually refers to my views on the subject pronouns (pp. 87, 157-8).

Certainly Schütz's view that noun phrases specify the person-number markers<sup>2</sup> has a lot of merit and is well presented (p. 386f), but this does not mean that noun phrases cannot also be subjects. Indeed on p. 316 Schütz himself refers to a noun phrase following the verb phrase as a 'specified subject'. As against this, he declares on p. 385 that the subject is 'formally, a morpheme (or combination of morphemes) representing person and number. It precedes the verb'. There is an evident inconsistency here. If it is this latter statement which is to be believed, then the difference in analysis does not derive from Schütz's 'treating as subjects the so-called pronominal elements that precede the verb' (p. 85), but from his refusing to regard noun phrases as possible subjects. But the fact is they can be subjects (see example (2) below). And surely, even if certain noun phrases are specifying the subject person number markers, it is reasonable enough to term them '(specified) subjects' as Schütz himself does, perhaps inadvertently, on the above-cited p. 316.

On p. 89 it is said that 'the person-number marker is obligatory and the noun phrase optional'. We must be wary,

though, of this optionality. Schütz alludes to the fact, and it might well be stressed, that within a particular discourse the 'optional' noun phrase may not be so optional at all. Thus in example (1), *na marama* would be a necessary part of the utterance if the women were being introduced into the conversation for the first time or if they had to be distinguished from other role players in the discourse.

A more striking problem for this 'optionality' is presented by sentences like the following:

(2) *rairai vinaka dina o ratou na luvemu*  
look good true art.<sup>3</sup> they the child-your  
'your children are really good-looking'

A more classical rendition of this sentence would have the person-number marker *eratou* occurring initially with the likely (but optional) dropping of the pronoun phrase *o ratou*. Sentences like (2) are often alleged to be bad Fijian, but studying discourse reveals that they are uttered by speakers of excellent Fijian. They are not wayward, and need to be accounted for in the grammar. What is of particular relevance to the argument here is that the full weight of the subject is borne, not by the person-number marker of which there is none, but by the noun phrases.

Another interesting item is subject-less sentences, which are alluded to by Schütz on p. 90 but could be further illustrated by examples such as:

(3) *sā gole*  
now head-off

This sentence can refer to first (inclusive or exclusive), second, or third person, and any number. The usage is perhaps most frequently found as a statement of intention ('I'm/we're heading off') or as a question, ('Are you/they heading off?'). Note that both person and number are left totally unmarked. Although person and number may not precede in the text, the doer of the action is clear from the discourse situation.

#### 4. Identifying and existential

The Fijian language divides verb phrases into four types: active, stative, existential, and identifying (p. 77). The active and stative types will be discussed in the next section.

The identifying verb phrase is illustrated by *e gasenivuli* in the following example:

- (4) *e gasenivuli o koya*  
the teacher art. he  
'he is a teacher'

Linguists have long been aware of this sort of sentence for Fijian. Its existence no doubt contributed in no small manner to Milner's lumping all roots together as bases and not differentiating between nouns and verbs, a position for which he was justly criticized by Biggs and Nayacakalou (1958:81). In spite of Milner's acute awareness of this sentence type and the many examples of it in use that occur in the text and exercises of his grammar, he did not in fact treat it explicitly.<sup>4</sup> Schütz does so, explaining and illustrating the usage fully.

His brief treatment of existential verb phrases such as *e tiko* 'n (5) I find less compelling.

- (5) *e tiko o koya*  
he present art. he  
'he is present'

It is not at all clear how many verbs fit into the *tiko* class which, I feel, may be based on semantics from an English-speaker's point of view. These verbs (pp.100-1) could be classified as active or stative just as readily without stretching the semantics of these classes any more than do some of their present members. The 'numerals' (pp. 101-2) do however constitute a separate class, possessing a number of distinctive syntactic properties.

##### 5. Active and stative

The verb phrase types labelled 'active' and 'stative'<sup>5</sup> by Schütz form a basic dichotomy within Fijian. In his commendable effort to expound this topic thoroughly, Schütz provides many useful insights. It is a great pity therefore that the basis of his treatment, on which so much of the following grammar depends, is seriously flawed. His explanation complicates things unduly while not adequately accounting for all the data. Some of the formal facts to be explained are illustrated in the following examples employing the 'active' verb *vuli* and the 'stative' verb *dola*.

- (6) *era vuli na gone*  
 they study the child  
 'the children studied'
- (7) *era vulica na lēsoni na gone*  
 they study-it the lesson the child  
 'the children studied the lesson'
- (8) *e dola na kātuba*  
 it open the door  
 'the door was open', 'the door was opened'
- (9) *era dolava na kātuba na gone*  
 they open-it the door the child  
 'the children opened the door'

In sentences (6) and (7) the subject is the same (the children) and they are involved in the same action: learning. In sentence (8) the subject of the intransitive verb (the door) is in the same (or a comparable) semantic relationship to the verb as the *object* of the transitive verb in (9); the door is involved in the same state (or action? - see below) of being open or opened.

Schütz is aware of this patterning (p. 114), but chooses to base his fundamental verb classification not on such formal criteria but on a particular view of the semantics of the verbs in question. 'In an active VP, the subject represents the **ACTOR** - someone or something performing an action (in a broad sense) or causing an action to be performed. Thus, in most cases, the actor is controlling the situation ... In a stative VP, the subject represents the **GOAL** - someone or something being acted upon or described. The goal, in contrast to the actor, does not control the situation' (p. 78). This use of semantic criteria seems to me unwise. The formal categories proper to a language very frequently demarcate the relevant semantic categories within that language. To give semantic criteria preference over the formal criteria can be extremely perilous, especially when done by a non-native speaker. Who or what makes the semantic determination as to which is actor and which is goal? While many cases may be straightforward, one cannot help but suspect that the more problematic ones are decided by Schutz on the basis of what is stative in English (in spite of a bold counter-claim in his text (p. 119)).

For example, a person who is angry is considered to be in a state brought about by outside forces, so *cudru* 'be angry' is classified as stative and the object is now considered to be the actor (p. 118).<sup>6</sup>

- (10) e cudru o koya  
 he angry art. he  
 'he is angry'
- (11) e cudruva na gone o koya  
 he angry-it the child art. he  
 'he is angry at the child'

It can be seen, however, that *cudru* patterns like the 'active' verb *vuli* of examples (6) and (7), and at some level at least belongs to the same class.<sup>7</sup> Schütz does not seem to take care of this. I feel that a number of verbs are, like *cudru*, misclassified.

There is a serious problem with the definition of stative given above (and repeated on p. 102). 'Something being acted upon' (a common designation of the passive) and 'something being described' (a common designation of the adjectival function) are lumped together under the one label 'stative'. Presumably they have some features in common that warrant this, but these are not explained. Just as importantly, there are also significant differences between them. To cite Schütz to himself, 'the label will not make them disappear' (p. 128). While it is good that Schütz defines his terms, it would surely have been preferable to use the term 'stative' in its traditional sense, or if not, at least to emphasize the difference in terminology.

Schütz's S1 verbs<sup>8</sup> are indeed usually stative in the normal sense, but his S2 verbs refer very often to actions not to states even when occurring without the transitive suffix.

- (12) me dola na kātuba  
 that-it open the door  
 'let the door be opened'

Although this might on occasion be understood as requesting a state - that the door be put in the state of being open - it is much more likely to be understood as requesting that an action be performed.<sup>9</sup> An action is being requested here just as much as in the sentence

- (13) mo dolava na kātuba  
 that-you open-it the door  
 'open the door'

'Active' verbs too can present problems for stativity.

- (14) e curu tiko i valenibula o koya  
 he enter stay to hospital art. he  
 'he is entering the hospital'

(15) e curu tiko e valenibula o koya  
 he enter stay in hospital art. he  
 'he is in hospital (having entered)'

Example (15) is a stative use of a so-called active verb. Such uses are possibly exceptional, but these and the other examples above do illustrate that the application of the terms 'active' and 'stative' to the basic verb class division exemplified in sentences (6) to (9) would need much qualification; on the other hand, Schütz's semantic basis for the active/stative division does not genuinely fit the semantics of many verbs as they occur in discourse.

The main problem seems to be the assumption that if the actor is the subject, the verb expresses an action, if the goal, a state. I can find no justifying reason for this. If one is concerned about semantics, the judgement concerning an action or state derives from what the verb refers to (or 'represents' (p. 100)), not from which role is put in subject position. That is more pertinent to the active/passive dichotomy. No matter which role is subject the verb can in theory refer to an action or state. To what extent this is true for individual Fijian verbs in practice is in need of a lot more study.

## 6. Passive

The Fijian language neither employs the term 'passive' nor discusses it. This is surprising in the extreme, considering Schütz's interest in history and the fact that all the preceding grammars treat of a passive. In an article dated 1972 co-authored with Nawadra he did attempt to refute the notion 'passive' for Fijian. Now he apparently wants to write it out of history altogether!

Even when declaring the 'voices' of Fijian to be 'active' and 'stative' (p. 114) he makes no mention of why 'passive' is being ousted. In reality however there seems no good reason at all for not admitting a passive in Fijian. Milner (1972:96-97), among others, gives numerous examples of genuine passive usage. In an example like the following:

(16) keitou            nuitaka ni            na            cigomi e na  
 we (excl.) hope-it that-it future accept in the  
 yalololoma. E nuitaki saka tale gā ni ...  
 generosity. It hope sir again just that ...  
 'We hope it will be accepted graciously. It is also  
 hoped ...'



we have an active usage (*nuitaka*) in the first part and a passive one (*nuitaki*) in the second. The two usages are referring to the exact same type of action, the only differences being that the goal is the object in the first sentence, the subject in the second, and the actor is left unspecified in the second sentence. Even though unspecified, the actor is in fact quite clear. Passives are often used in Fijian to avoid undue repetition of the actor, though they certainly have other uses too. Note that in (16) *cigomi* is also a passive. The speaker could easily have said

- (17) ... *ni onī na cigoma* ...  
... that you future accept-it ...  
'that you will accept it'

but opted not to (re-)specify the actor.

The *lau-* prefix (under Stative Prefixes, p. 218) is also a genuine indicator of passive, usually with extra 'adversative' force. It is not necessarily stative in the traditional sense.

Confusion about the passive in Fijian derives, I believe, from two sources. Firstly, some authors, cf. Biggs (1974:413, 418), seem to imply or even require that a true passive must be capable of expressing the actor. However, even though in Fijian the actor is never expressed, it is implicit and signalled (cf. Schütz p. 391). In any event, in English and many other languages which clearly have a passive, the vast majority of passives do in fact occur without any actor being expressed. Why therefore should the possibility of such expression be made a defining feature? The onus of proof is on those who would make it so.

The second source of confusion derives from the lack of certain formal distinctions in English. Compare the following

- (18) The door was closed  
(19) The door was closed right on eight o'clock

Sentence (19) is clearly referring to an action - one that is expressed passively. But (18) could be referring to either an action or state. The distinction is formally marked for a few verbs. Thus the verb 'to open' would occur in the form 'open' to express the state reading for (18), 'opened' to express (passively) the action reading.<sup>10</sup> Surprisingly, Schütz, who drew attention to this very distinction in Schütz & Nawadra (1972:96), has himself failed to take due or accurate account of corresponding distinctions in Fijian.

The forms *sogoti* 'be closed' *dolavi* 'be opened' sometimes have a stative reading as well as the more usual action (expressed passively) one. There is some similarity to English in this. But Fijian is very different from English in that the converse is also true: the forms *sogo* 'be closed' *dola* 'be open, be opened' can have an action (expressed passively) reading as well as a stative one. It must be added, however, that not all verbs behave identically in this, and a lot more study of the phenomenon is required.

## 7. Transitivity

The points I have discussed so far are mostly concerned with transitivity. This topic looms large in *The Fijian language* and there are some further comments that need to be made. Schutz is opposed to a purely formal definition of transitivity,<sup>11</sup> wanting to give semantic criteria a greater role. This in itself is fine, but there needs to be some verifiability for the semantics. He is of the view that when the root form of his A2 and S2 verbs is employed, two referents are in fact implicit - that is, 'inherent in the meaning of the verb' (p. 388). How is this established? No evidence is provided. Compare the following sentences:

- (20) *e cici* 'he ran'
- (21) *e cici i Suva* 'he ran to Suva'
- (22) *e ciciva na vatu* 'he ran over (or to) the rock(s)'
- (23) *e cicivaka na polo* 'he ran with the ball'

It seems quite arbitrary to claim that the sort of goal expressed in (22) is somehow implicit in the verb even when (20) is uttered. Why would the goal of (22) be implicit rather than, say, the locative of (21)? For this and quite a few other verbs, the locative would in fact be the statistically more probable.

The Fijian language also claims there are only two such implicit referents. In that case, when a verb like *cici* (with a choice of two or more transitive suffixes) is employed as in (20), which of the goals is implicit: the goal of (22) or the goal of (23)? If both are implied, there is a hole in the analysis: verbs with three (or more) referents.

For certain 82 verbs there is a prefix which deletes the actor (p. 117), making them therefore 81 verbs. This at least means that the implicit actor in such verbs is not so 'inherent' conceptually to the verb's meaning that it cannot be done without. Schütz must therefore justify why he demands these two implicit referents in the first place. It would appear they are posited on the grounds of whether a verb takes a transitive suffix or not. His views on transitivity may in reality be no less formally and no more semantically based than those of some other grammarians.

Schütz's explanation of the transitive suffixes is well done. He is critical of my view that there is often a semantic correlation between the verb and the consonant employed in its transitive suffix. Since, however, he himself provides meanings for some of the disyllabic endings and makes a suggestion about analogy (p. 159) - a possibility also suggested in Arms (1974: 157-61, 170-2) - I feel he basically concedes the point. There would be no need to posit analogy if there were not in fact a semantic correlation.

Schütz documents a use of the suffix *-taki* that has not been noted before, namely *-taki* meaning 'reason' (pp. 135-7). This is a welcome addition to our grammatical knowledge, but the treatment goes a bit overboard with this new find. In listing the different meanings of the disyllabic transitive suffixes, this usage is ordered first and is called 'a construction of high frequency'. It is in fact rarely found in formal contexts and is not all that common even in informal ones. A number of uses of these disyllabic suffixes seem forced into the 'reason' category when they are really uses of a different sort (e.g. *nui-taki* 'hope', *oso-vaki* 'bark over (or about)', p. 137). While the referent of the object of such verbs may indeed provide a stimulus for the action, there is more than just reason involved. The action is directed 'on, at, over, about, etc.' the object.

In dealing with the indefinite construction, Schütz is inclined to favour Milner's analysis, but is reluctant to term the construction 'intransitive'. 'The construction is not formally transitive ..., but the verb is semantically transitive, since it has the option of occurring in constructions that express both referents' (p. 147). This statement is an effort at a compromise solution, and I feel that a clear decision one way or the other on transitivity may not be useful and may only cloud the linguistic facts (cf. Arms 1974:66).

## 8. Other verb grammar

There is a lengthy discussion of the way verbs change classes. While I would fault parts of this on the grounds of over-generalization and the assumptions made concerning active and stative etc., the discussion covers exhaustively the various construction types and presents many grammatical items in a new and more convincing way.

The treatment of the *vaka-* forms is also good, although, contrary to the author's statement on p. 188, true causatives do occur with some S2 verbs. In Fijian a semantic distinction is preserved between transitive and causative verbs.

(24) e vakarogoca na itukutuku

(25) e vakarogoya na itukutuku

he 'vaka'-hear-it the news

Example (24) is an example of the S2 verb *rogo*<sup>12</sup> in intensive (frequentative) use: 'he listened to the news' (and not merely 'he heard the news', which would be the meaning if *vaka-* were omitted). Example (25), on the other hand, is an example of true causative use: 'he caused the news to be heard', 'he spread the news abroad'.

One can be critical of Schütz's comment on previous analyses of *vaka-* that, 'Through several of these treatments, then, there runs a common thread of misanalysis: that the transitive indicators are an inseparable part of the causative construction' (p. 162). Later, however, he has to admit in relation to causatives occurring without such transitive indicators that 'examples of verbs in this "bare" state are somewhat rare' (p. 189). In fact it can be added here that the transitive suffix often has a particular relationship with the *vaka-* prefix in that the particular form of that suffix does not occur without *vaka-*, e.g. *vaka-tu-ri* but not \**tu-ri*, *vaka-yacorí* but *yaco-vi*, not \**yaco-ri*.

The Fijian language provides a more thorough and systematic treatment of the *vei-* prefix than in previous grammars. It also provides a lot of new and interesting information on various other verbal prefixes. The treatment of reduplication and its various functions is particularly detailed and enlightening.

## 9. Verb phrase markers

A very complicated feature of Fijian grammar are the numerous

'verb phrase markers' (Schütz's term) that precede and follow the verb. The Fijian language gives us more on these markers than preceding grammars, particularly in the number and diversity of examples.

In regard to the order of markers Schütz has mainly followed Milner. Milner's tables, however, need considerable qualification and amplification.<sup>13</sup> The markers preceding the verb show considerable order variation as do those immediately following the verb. From my own post-verbal list (Arms 1986:200-1) Schütz has omitted *lesu* 'back', *lō* 'secretly', *yādudua* etc. 'individually', *kaya* 'with it', *makawa* 'a long time ago', *dina* 'truly', *lī* 'pray', *rī* 'indeed' and *kina* 'at it'. The boundary line between markers and other grammatical categories (e.g. adverbs) is not always clear. Although I prefer to treat them as markers, it could be argued that *lesu* and *lō* are adverbial in nature and do not warrant separate mention. *Makawa* and *dina* are not unlike them, but their ordering possibilities argue more strongly for their inclusion as markers. The others certainly need to be included in this section of the text, even if *kaya* and *kina* are in fact pronominal in nature.

Schütz's treatment of special sequences of markers is rather thin, being restricted to pp. 302-3. Even if one wishes to claim that most of these are analyzable as concatenations of separate entities rather than as truly special constructions, it would have been good to exemplify some of the complex possibilities and explain the scope of the respective markers. The number of markers Schütz allows in the noun phrase (chapter 26) is far too limited (cf. Arms 1986:219-20), though admittedly some only occur there under very restrictive conditions.

All in all Schütz's treatment is satisfactory as far as it goes, but the markers are certainly an area of grammar where a lot more research could be done.

#### 10. Other grammar

The chapters devoted to the noun phrase are very competently handled. Schütz makes an excellent case for treating the article *na* as truly a 'definite article'. His chapter on the specification of person-number markers by noun phrases is good in many respects as noted earlier. Modification of both verbs and nouns is excellently treated.

Schütz provides us with more on subordination than previous

grammars. Of the subordinators, *ni* and *se* are treated best. The subjunctive marker *me* could do with more explanation and exemplification. It has some particularly interesting properties. *Me* clauses can sometimes substitute for noun phrases, or act as relative clauses; they are negativized by the special negative *kua* (or *kākua*), but sometimes by the ordinary negative *sega* (cf. Arms 1986:227).<sup>14</sup> More could be given also to *kē* and *kevakā*, especially as to how straightforward and contrary-to-fact conditions - not distinguished by Schütz - are expressed. For *dē*, some examples of its occurrence introducing principal clauses would be useful, and some mention might have been made of the phrase *dē dua* which is also used to mean 'perhaps'.

Although Fijian possession has been much studied, Schütz's presentation is a welcome addition. It is clear and accurate. I do not however see the need for positing the vowel of the possessive markers as intrinsically long: *kē-*, *mē-*, *nō-* (p. 449). If regarded as short, their occasional lengthening can still be explained in terms of preserving an accentual pattern.

It is surprising that in dealing with coordination Schütz makes no mention of coordination without *ka* 'and'. Attention to discourse would reveal that *ka* is rarely used for coordination (or relativisation) in ordinary speech except for a few expressions, e.g. numerals such as *tinikawalu* 'eighteen'. Instead the sentences, clauses, phrases or elements are simply put in sequence, their coordination usually being clear from a slight pause and/or a distinctive intonation contour.

(26) *era lako, lesu tale mai*  
 they go return again hither  
 'they went and came back again'

All Schütz's examples on p. 467 would in fact more normally occur without *ka* in ordinary speech.

This sort of coordination also occurs for noun phrases conjoinable with *kei* 'and':

(27) *au raici ira na tamadra kei na tinadra*  
 I see them the father-their and the mother-their  
 'I saw their fathers and mothers'

Though *kei*, unlike *ka*, does occur freely and frequently in speech, in example (27) *kei* or both *kei* and *na* can be omitted, the coordination again usually being clear from a slight pause and/or a distinctive intonation contour.

## 11. Phonology

Schütz's coverage of the phonology of Fijian reflects the particular concern he has had for this in recent times. Acknowledging the excellent foundation laid by Scott (1948), Schütz has made his own contribution here and provided a good detailed description. In the last chapter of the book he details the sounds of Fijian and in the early chapters he describes the evolution of the current alphabet, including the recent introduction of *z* (which has not caught on yet) and reintroduction of *h* (which does sporadically make an appearance).

Schütz gives special emphasis to the syllable, and rightly so. Its importance within Fijian phonological structure is very great. He is undoubtedly correct too in emphasizing its importance more generally.

Vowel length is phonemic in Fijian. Schütz marks it with a macror. rather than with two identical vowels. This is the traditional practice in the few places (mainly linguistic works) where vowel length is marked at all. No matter which way it is written, there is the question of whether long vowels should be treated phonologically as one long syllable or two ordinary syllables. The latter solution seems preferable to me, but a lot depends on how much relative weight is given to the phonetic, phonemic and morphophonemic realities of the language (cf. also Biggs & Nayacakalou 1958:81). Schütz opts arbitrarily (p. 527) for the former solution, but that does not prevent him from terming the two-syllable analysis 'simplistic' (p. 541).

Schütz also marks length on diphthongs throughout his work. This is an irritating example of overkill. The situations where diphthongs are shortened are predictable. If there are exceptions (which is doubtful), it would surely be better to especially mark *those* rather than put length marks over the vast majority of diphthongs. What might need to be marked however are instances where certain vowels occur together but are not functioning as diphthongs, e.g. *taücu* (not \**taucu*) 'come out', *taiki* (not \**taiki*) 'swing around'.

He also proposes as part of the phonological system a unit which he terms a 'measure'. 'The measure is the shortest unit of Fijian speech that can occur alone as a separate utterance' (p. 474). A measure always consists of two or three short syllables with accent on the penultimate, or one long accented syllable optionally preceded by a short one, e.g. *bula*, *vinaka*, *tū*, *oyā*. However, Schütz's proceeding to divide up the entire speech continuum into measures needs more justification.

The first thing we might note is that measures are not marked by any juncture (p. 534), rather 'we hear not the boundaries of the units, but their peaks', 'it is accent that determines the boundaries of the measures' (p. 525). If that is the case, why not mark the accent? Instead, Schütz marks the measures saying, 'once the measure boundaries are marked in a text, the position of the accent can be determined' (p. 525). This seems unnecessarily convoluted. In addition it raises serious questions about the phonological reality of the measure. The fact that an accent must occur after every few syllables is not enough evidence in itself to posit a measure with clear boundaries when in point of fact these boundaries are totally unobservable.

An even more important point is that there are several instances where Schütz's rules about measures and accent (p. 475), summarized above, do not work:

- (28) *na táma i tinána*  
'the father of his mother'
- (29) *è na yasána imatáu*  
'on its right side'
- (30) *è na ikatólu ni síga*  
'on the third day'
- (31) *èra na cakáva*  
'they will do it'
- (32) *mátanivanúa*  
'representative'

In example (28) Schütz would demand that the *a i* of *tama i* be a diphthong and that it be accented, *tamáí*. This may be true for some speakers, but the accent pattern above is a common one - the most common one, I believe. The *a i* here may be regarded as a diphthong and may on occasion be shortened, but certainly not necessarily so. Example (29) is similar, but there is never an accent on the *a i* here nor is it necessarily shortened. And there is definitely no accent on the *i* (which would set up another measure by Schütz's theory). In this example and in (30), even the secondary accent on *e* is often in doubt; there very often seems to be none. In examples (31) and (32) Schütz would claim a minor accent on the *na* and *ni* respectively. The accent pattern seems comparable with the earlier examples, however, and I feel an accent here is demanded more by the theory than by the linguistic facts. Basically these problematic examples have to do with linking particles that are inherently unstressed.

Some additional problems for Schütz's position are posed by



examples like *lōmālāgi* 'heaven', *mātāsāwa* 'beach'. To fit Schütz's theory the measure breaks in these words would have to occur in the middle of the long vowel: *loma.slagi*, *mata.ssawa*. Interestingly, these examples could be handled by Schütz's theory if he were to accept long vowels as phonologically two syllables.

Schütz dismisses 'words' as not being a valid grammatical concept for Fijian (p. 484), yet his dismissal seems to me too facile. Schütz himself certainly appreciates the usefulness of word division from the point of view of readability. Now we certainly do not want to divide the discourse stream anywhere (e.g. mid-syllable, mid-morpheme). Since there are phonological and grammatical facts that might be usefully reflected by positing words, it would have been more productive, I feel, to propose some principles for word division rather than deny their grammatical validity but use them anyway (cf. p. 532).

The phenomena of *ulu* 'head' plus *-gu* 'my' giving *ulūgu*, and *cōla* 'carry' plus *-ti* 'transitive' giving *colāti* 'illustrate the "accent shift", which is more accurately described as an obligatory realignment of syllables at the end of a phrase' (p. 478). It is true that nouns like *ulu* are usually (but not always) at the end of a phrase, but verbs like *colati* are very frequently not at the end of the phrase. Rather than 'obligatory realignment', the most that should have been proposed in terms of Schütz's theory is that, historically, occasional or frequent realignment was analogically extended to all cases.

A more convincing position, however, is the traditional one of positing 'words' with predictable penultimate accent and positing cliticization, i.e. addition of a single-syllable suffix, as demanding the 'accent shift'. Comparable to the examples of the above paragraph we have *bū* 'grandmother' plus *-gu* giving *būgu*, and *cā* 'bad' plus *-ti* giving *cāti*. Here the addition of the clitics has brought about vowel shortening. But there are other clear examples of this taking place. The tables on pp. 433, 436, 438, 442 and 444, set out what happens when a subordinating conjunction (e.g. *dē* 'perhaps') and a person-number marker (e.g. *ra* 'they') come together (namely *dēra*). The loss of vowel length, where it occurs, becomes predictable if we posit cliticization, whereas in the analysis provided these cases are just random occurrences that have to be learnt.<sup>15</sup>

In short, a theory of words and cliticization would better systematize and explain the facts. There may be fuzzy areas indeed, where difficult or arbitrary decisions will be called for, but these are no more insuperable barriers for such a theory than

they are for Schütz (cf. p. 523 fn 2, and p. 527).

The Fijian language goes into considerable detail in discussing phonological phrases, intonation and phonological sentences. Scott's and Milner's treatments are good, but Schütz takes us well beyond them. His treatment of the phonological phrase in itself and in relation to the overall intonation of the sentence is particularly worth noting.

## 12. Conclusion

The grammar proper comes to a rather abrupt conclusion. In spite of his stated interest in discourse (p. xxvi), Schütz does not treat of discourse as such, nor does he provide us with any substantial text. This is a considerable lack. From the point of view of phonology, it would have been far preferable, surely, to have recorded a modern text and analyzed it, rather than refer the reader (pp. 509-10) to records made for Milner's grammar. Quite apart from improved recording techniques in the meantime, Milner's records appear to consist of sentences from his grammar read outside any living context. From the point of view of syntax, the limitations of isolated sentences and phrases, which form the vast majority of Schütz's examples, are considerable. A transcribed and annotated text with written commentary could have done so much to round off the work nicely.

Schütz's opus concludes with his early word lists (of limited general interest), a truly magnificent bibliography (the product of very diligent research), and a comprehensive index. The text appears to have been produced off a computer, using a good dot-matrix printer. While the purist may prefer more stylish print, I found it perfectly adequate and clear. Only the reproduction of the first publication in Fijian (pp. 585-9) and of Cargill's dictionary page (p. 617) lacked clarity, at least in my copy. The volume has its share of misprints but most of these are self-correcting and a very minor inconvenience. The only blemishes that may confuse the reader are the omission of one or more lines at the foot of p. 482, and footnote 8's being indicated by a 7 on p. 554.<sup>16</sup>

I am very conscious at this stage of the fact that, having praised Schütz's work at the beginning of this review, I have spent much time disagreeing with what he has had to say. Firstly, let me stress that such areas of disagreement do not detract from the very many areas of agreement, on most of which there has seemed little point in commenting. But linguists will,

and should, refer to Schütz's work frequently for information on Fijian grammar, and it seems advisable therefore to point out weaknesses in his treatment lest his presentation be accorded even greater authority than it is due.

No self-respecting linguist wanting to know about Fijian can afford not to be conversant with *The Fijian language*. While not 'the last word' on Fijian, it is a commendable work, sifting as it does the views of many linguists and adding Schütz's own insights gleaned over many years and in dialogue with well-qualified colleagues. Oceanic and Austronesian linguists will find it a valuable source of information, and it undoubtedly provokes thought on some of the crucial issues of this language family. Even granted that a fair proportion of its large size is taken up with historical data and discussion, it is without doubt one of the most comprehensive grammatical works on any language in the Pacific.

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup>For example, six pages (pp. 164-9) are devoted to discussing others' views on 'transitivity as focus', only half a page (p. 465) to others' views on possession. Examples of my other two criticisms will be evident later in this review.

<sup>2</sup>Milner and I use the term 'subject (or subjective) pronouns' whereas Schütz uses the term 'person-number marker'. This does not of course constitute a difference of analysis in itself. It can be further noted here that Schütz terms the person-number markers *e* and *-a* 'third person singular' (p. 252). They can however have non-singular reference, and some other term, e.g. 'unmarked' (cf. Arms 1974:29-30), is preferable.

(33) *e vinaka ruarua*  
it(?) good both  
'they're both good'

(34) *taura kece*  
take-it(?) all  
'take all of them'

<sup>3</sup>'Art.' here stands for 'proper article'. The common article *na* is glossed simply as 'the'.

<sup>4</sup>This is undoubtedly because Milner was struck by the similarity

of structure between this and other sentence types and was reluctant therefore to highlight, or even recognize, a certain difference.

<sup>5</sup>I referred to 'events' and 'states' in Arms 1974:74, 'eventive' and 'stative' in Arms forthcoming: sec. 6. The problem with using 'active' here is that the term has traditionally been used in contrast to 'passive'. Schütz does not in fact employ the term 'passive', but it is nevertheless confusing to have 'active' as a term in two dichotomies: active/passive, active/stative.

<sup>6</sup>This in fact seems contradicted by a statement on p. 250 which implies that objects are only goals. One wonders how Schütz would analyze *e cudruvi* 'someone is angry at him', more literally 'he is being angered at'.

<sup>7</sup>*Cudru* fits Schütz's *dau* test for actives too, *na tamata dau cudru* not *na tamata cudru* 'the angry man'.

<sup>8</sup>A1, A2, S1, S2 are Schütz's abbreviations for active or stative, one or two referent verbs. It can be pointed out here that although many S1 verbs occur readily as noun modifiers, e.g. *na tamata lila* 'the thin man', S2 verbs, contrary to what Schütz indicates, occur there far less readily. Phrases like *na katuba dola* (p. 415) 'the open door' are often odd or impossible and need to be properly relativized *na katuba e dola* 'the door that is open'. In addition, there may be more active verbs that can be used in this way than Schütz thinks (p. 103). One even gets contrasts such as *na tamata laba* 'the murderer (specific instance)' and *na tamata dau laba* 'the murderer (general characterization)'. Conversely, 'stative' verbs also occur in this construction with *dau*. Schütz's 'functional criterion' for active/stative must be treated with considerable caution.

<sup>9</sup>Examples (12) and (13) are in the imperative mood, but the same applies to other moods and tenses. The present (unmarked) tense indicative is probably the one that takes a stative reading most often.

<sup>10</sup>Actually 'opened' (and 'closed') can also occur in (18) with a stative reading conveying that the state is the result of an action, and not merely neutral. The same distinction seems to exist between *dolavi* 'opened' (resultant state) and *dola* 'open' (neutral state) when the two forms are used statively. The same contrast applies for a number of other verbs too.

<sup>11</sup>While Schütz regards my approach as 'strictly formal' (p. 158).

he actually quotes (p. 157) my own work (Arms 1974:17-18) where express reference is made to semantic as well as formal criteria.

<sup>12</sup>Rogo sometimes occurs as an A2 verb: *era rogo* 'they hear'.

<sup>13</sup>This was done in Arms 1986. Unfortunately Schütz received that paper too late to make more than a few minimal modifications to his text. At least two of the alternative orderings that can occur are actually exemplified in his book *dau gai* (p. 269), *rui mani* (p. 382).

<sup>14</sup>Some further examples would be:

(35) *na kā bībī modou masu*  
the thing important that-you pray  
'the important thing is that you pray'

(36) *e sega ni dua me sega ni kilā*  
it not that one that-he not that know-it  
'there isn't one who wouldn't know'

<sup>15</sup>There are other cases of this not mentioned by Schütz. Thus *á* 'past' plus *-ra* etc. (the person-number markers) gives *ára* etc., *sá* 'now' plus *-ra* etc. gives *sára* etc. Also, *sá* plus *na* gives *sána*, *á* plus *se* gives *áse*.

<sup>16</sup>Also, there should be either no macron on the *mai* in the two examples at the top of p. 513, or else the measure dot should occur after the *mai* and not after the following syllable.

REFERENCES

Arms, David G. 1974. *Transitivity in Standard Fijian*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan.

----- 1986. Surface order in the Standard Fijian Verb Phrase. *Focal I: papers from the Fourth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, ed. by Paul Geraghty et al., 199-230. Pacific Linguistics, C-93.

----- Forthcoming. Verb orientation in Fijian. *Languages of the Central Pacific*, ed. by J.H.C.S. Davidson. London: School of Oriental and African Studies.

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

- Biggs, Bruce G. & Rusiate R. Nayacakalou. 1958. Review of Milner 1956. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 67:80-83.
- Milner, George B. 1956. *Fijian grammar*. Suva: Government Press.  
 ----- 1972. *Fijian grammar* (3rd edition). Suva: Government Press.
- Schütz, Albert J. 1972. *The languages of Fiji*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.  
 ----- & Tevita R. Nawadra. 1972. 'A refutation of the notion "passive" in Fijian', *Oceanic Linguistics*, 11.2: 88-109.
- Scott, Norman C. 1948. A study in the phonetics of Fijian. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*, 12:737-52.