

EXPERIENCE VERBS IN MAORI

Winifred Bauer
(Victoria University of Wellington)

1. Introduction

There is a group of verbs in Maori, including, for instance, *kite* 'see', *mōhio* 'know', and *pīrangī* 'desire', whose behaviour with respect to a number of important syntactic processes differs from that of canonical transitives, intransitives and statives. As far as I am aware, the first person to note some of their special properties in print was Sandra Chung in her Harvard dissertation, now published as Chung 1978. She calls them 'middle' verbs, a term which I find unfortunate because of its usual association with the category 'voice': I do not believe that these verbs constitute a separate voice in Maori. They are also mentioned by Reedy in his University of Hawaii dissertation (Reedy 1979), where they are termed 'experience' verbs, and it is Reedy's term which I have chosen to adopt. It is a fairly apt characterization of their semantics; in Fillmorean case grammar terms, they would almost certainly be analyzed as occurring in a frame with an Experiencer case. Neither Reedy nor Chung gives a thorough description of these verbs in Maori, since to do so would have been outside the scope of their work. The aim of this paper is to discuss them in sufficient detail as to establish their significance to the grammar of Maori.¹

Chung's characterization of these verbs is (1978:47):

... perception verbs ('see', 'listen to'), verbs of emotion and other psychological states ('love', 'want', 'understand'), verbs normally selecting animate direct objects, including some communication verbs ('meet with', 'help', 'call'), and verbs such as 'follow', 'wait for' and 'visit'.

She goes on to note that the set of verbs falling into this

class is not exactly the same in all Polynesian languages, and from my investigations in Maori, it would appear that almost none of those in her third category - verbs normally selecting animate direct objects - are clearly experience verbs; *āwhina* 'help', and *karanga* 'call', for instance, appear to be canonical transitives in Maori. The clearest cases of experience verbs in Maori thus fall into the first two categories. The following list contains some of the commoner verbs which appear to be experience verbs in Maori:

<i>ariariā</i>	'resemble'	<i>mōhio</i>	'know'
<i>hihia</i>	'desire'	<i>pīrangī</i>	'want'
<i>hīhiri</i>	'long for'	<i>rongo</i>	'hear'
<i>kite</i>	'see'	<i>tīmanako</i>	'hope, expect'
<i>mahara</i>	'recollect'	<i>wareware</i>	'forget'
<i>mauāhara</i>	'hate'	<i>whakakino</i>	'dislike'
<i>maumahara</i>	'remember'	<i>whakapono</i>	'believe'

2. Syntactic Behaviour Patterns

In the following sections, the syntactic characteristics of these verbs are examined. They are contrasted with both transitive and intransitive verbs, in order to establish their distinctness.

2.1 Obligatory Arguments

There is considerable disagreement about the number of arguments obligatorily required by experience verbs. Speakers are in general agreement that intransitives require only one, i.e. that

- (1) *Ka oma ia*
 unspec run he
 'He ran/runs'

is complete. There is also fairly general agreement that, out of context, canonical transitives require two nominal arguments. Thus

- (2) *Kei te patu ia i te kau*
 non-past beat he DO the cow
 prog
 'He is beating the cow'

is complete, but

- (3) *Kei te patu ia*
'He is beating'

and

- (4) *Kei te patu i te kau*
'Is beating the cow'

are normally described as incomplete, (4) more so than (3). However, with experience verbs, there is considerable disagreement. Consider

- (5) *Ka mōhio ia*
unspec know he
'He knew/knows'.

Some speakers apparently feel that this is complete, while others do not. Most at least find this better than (3). Scholarly opinion similarly differs: Reedy classifies experience verbs as intransitive, requiring only one argument (Reedy 1979:24), whereas Chung regards these verbs as transitive, obligatorily requiring two arguments (Chung 1978:47). The matter is probably impossible to resolve, and is not crucial for the argument here. As long as it is true that (1) is more complete than (5), which is more complete than (3), then it is clear that experience verbs behave differently from the other two groups of verbs on this criterion.

2.2 Preposition of Second Argument

A further point, which is linked with the previous one concerning the transitivity of these verbs, is the characteristic preposition taken by the second nominal argument. Intransitive verbs are not associated with any one preposition in particular; if they have two arguments, the preposition introducing the second argument may be any semantically appropriate preposition. However, canonical transitives most usually take a second argument in *i*, while experience verbs characteristically take a second argument in *ki*. The correlation is by no means exceptionless: *kite* 'see' always takes *i*, and *rongo* 'hear' can take *i*, for instance. Nevertheless, the distinction holds in a sufficiently large number of cases for it to be worth comment.

2.3 Imperatives

Different classes of verbs in Maori form their imperatives in different ways. Intransitives use the stem form of the verb, with or without the imperative marker *e*, depending on their

phonological structure; thus

- (6) *Haere!*
'Go!'

or

- (7) *E oma!*
imp run
mkr
'Run!'

Transitives form their Imperatives using the passive form of the verb, e.g.

- (8) *Patua te kau!*
beat-pass. the cow
'Beat the cow!'

Experience verbs cannot normally be used in true imperatives, like the English statives with which they have a good deal in common semantically. However, even pseudo-imperatives are not constructed like the imperatives of either of the other classes: (9) and (10) are both ungrammatical.

- (9) **Maumahara!*
'Remember!'

- (10) **Maumaharatia te rā whānau o tō whaea!*
remember-pass. the day birth of your mother
'Remember your mother's birthday!'

Pseudo-imperatives are formed with *kia*, e.g.

- (11) *Kia maumahara koe ki te rā whānau o tō whaea!*
subj remember you to the day birth of your mother
'Remember your mother's birthday!'

This construction is not unique to experience verbs, since it is also used for stative verbs in Maori, but it distinguishes experience verbs from both transitives and intransitives.

2.4 Reflexivization

By no means all the verbs in any of the three classes under discussion can take a second argument coreferential with the first, but there are some members of each class which can. Consider first an intransitive case:

- (12) *I uiata a Rewi mōna anō*
past sing pers Rewi about-he self
'Rewi sang about himself'.

Anō is required to ensure that the clitic pronoun *-na* refers to Rewi. Without *anō*, the sentence is at best ambiguous, and the normal interpretation is that a second individual is intended. With transitives, however, *anō* is not required under these circumstances. Consider

- (13) *I whakapaipai a Mere i a ia*
 past prettify pers Mary DO pers she
 'Mary prettified herself'.

The natural reading for this is a reflexive one: *ia* and *Mere* are taken as coreferential. *Anō* can be added for emphasis, but is not required. With experience verbs, as with intransitives, *anō* is required to obtain a reflexive reading:

- (14) *Ka aroha a Marama ki a ia anō*
 unspec pity pers Marama to pers she self
 'Marama felt sorry for herself'.

On this criterion, experience verbs behave like intransitives.

2.5 The Actor-Emphatic Construction

The ability to appear in the actor-emphatic construction also differentiates the three classes of verbs. Transitives regularly use the actor-emphatic:

- (15) *Nā Rewi i patu te kau*
 by Rewi past beat the cow
 'Rewi beat the cow'.

This construction, whose genesis and nature are somewhat in dispute, has the following characteristics: the NP which would be the Subject in an active sentence appears fronted with *nā* or *mā*, depending on tense; the verb is always active; the NP which would be the Direct Object in the active appears without a preposition, immediately following the verb. For further information see e.g. Biggs 1969:73-4, Chung 1978:175ff, and Clark 1976:111ff.

There is some doubt as to the acceptability of intransitives in this construction. Most speakers reject

- (16) ?**Nā Pita i haere*
 by Peter past go
 'Peter went',

yet there is a similar example in Biggs (1969:73): *Mā Pita e haere*. However, the construction is distinct from that with transitives, since there is no non-prepositional argument following the verb.

The actor-emphatic is impossible with experience verbs:

- (17) **Nā Mere i wareware taku ingoa*
by Mary past forget my name
'Mary forgot my name'.

In a sense, this is semantically predictable, since these verbs have experiencers rather than agents or actors as their subjects, and the construction appears to be aptly named. Experience verbs thus differ from both the other classes in respect of this property.

2.6 Relativization

The construction of relative clauses in Maori is an extremely complex topic. (For detailed discussion, see Bauer, forthcoming.) The three classes of verbs considered here differ in the methods open to them for relativizing on their second argument. For simplicity, the following will be the matrix sentence for all the examples here:

- (18) *Ko tēnei te whare*
topic this the house
'This is the house'.

Five different methods of constructing relative clauses need to be considered for each of the classes of verbs.

(a) Transitive verbs

Consider ways of embedding the following:

- (19) *I hanga a Hata i te whare*
past build pers Hata DO the house
'Hata built the house'

(or the structure underlying it) as a relative clause to *whare* in (18).

(1) The method used for constructing relative clauses on Subjects, i.e. delete the coreferential NP (+ preposition) from the relative-clause-to-be, juxtapose the remainder following the antecedent. Thus (19) becomes

I hanga a Hata,

which, embedded in (18) gives

- (20) **Ko tēnei te whare i hanga a Hata*
topic this the house past build pers Hata
'This is the house that Hata built',

which is ungrammatical.

(11) The passive: the underlying DO of the relative-clause-to-be becomes the Subject, and method (i) then applies. Thus (19) becomes

(21) *I hangā te whare e Hata*
past build-pass. the house by Hata
'The house was built by Hata'

(note that some dialects have *hangaia* for *hangā*), then by deletion, becomes

I hangā e Hata,

which, embedded in (18) gives

(22) *Ko tēnei te whare i hangā e Hata*
topic this the house past build-pass. by Hata
'This is the house that was built by Hata'.

This is grammatical, and a very common pattern for relativizing on the DOs of transitive verbs.

(111) The actor-emphatic: the underlying DO is again promoted to Subject, and method (i) applies. Thus (19) becomes

(23) *Nā Hata i hanga te whare*
by Hata past build the house
'Hata built the house',

and after deletion of *te whare* and embedding in (18), this gives

(24) *Ko tēnei te whare nā Hata i hanga*
topic this the house by Hata past build
'This is the house that Hata built'.

(iv) The use of *ai*: this particle is inserted immediately following the verb in the relative clause after deletion, giving

I hanga ai a Hata,

which, embedded in (18) gives

(25) *?Ko tēnei te whare i hanga ai a Hata*
topic this the house past build pro(?) pers Hata
'This is the house that Hata built'.

This construction is accepted by many younger speakers from both major dialect areas, but older speakers strenuously reject it. I have found no textual examples. The question-mark after the gloss for *ai* reflects my own reservations concerning the analysis of this as a pro-form for the deleted NP (see Bauer,

forthcoming), although this is the commonly accepted analysis.

(v) The use of a possessive construction. The genesis of this construction is a mystery, although the surface features of the construction are readily enough described. Consider

- (26) *Ko tēnei te whare a Hata i hanga ai*
topic this the house poss Hata past build pro(?)
'This is the house that Hata built'.

In (26), the underlying Subject becomes a possessor of the antecedent, always taking *a*, regardless of the normal dominant/subordinate relation; *ai* is required following the verb. Not all speakers are familiar with this construction, and I have no written examples, but for those who use it, it appears to be fully productive: any DO of a transitive verb can be relativized on in this manner.

(b) Intransitive verbs

Next, consider the relativization of the second argument of an intransitive verb (an oblique argument). The following example can be taken as representative:

- (27) *I tomo atu a Rewi ki te whare*
past enter away pers Rewi to the house
'Rewi entered the house'.

(i) The method used for Subjects is ungrammatical:

- (28) **Ko tēnei te whare i tomo atu a Rewi*
topic this the house past enter away pers Rewi
'This is the house that Rewi entered'.

(ii) The passive is possible in this particular case, but not regularly so:

- (29) *Ko tēnei te whare i tomokia e Rewi*
topic this the house past enter-pass. by Rewi
'This is the house that was entered by Rewi'.

(iii) The actor-emphatic is rejected (as it is for intransitive verbs in general, see §2.5):

- (30) **Ko tēnei te whare nā Rewi i tomo atu*
topic this the house by Rewi past enter away
'This is the house that Rewi entered'.

(iv) The *ai*-strategy is normal:

(31) *Ko tēnei te whare i tomo atu ai a Rewi*
topic this the house past enter away pro(?) pers Rewi
'This is the house that Rewi entered'.

(v) The possessive construction is impossible:

(32) **Ko tēnei te whare a Rewi i tomo atu ai*
topic this the house pers Rewi past enter away pro(?)
'This is the house that Rewi entered'.

(c) Experience verbs

Now consider methods of relativizing on the second argument of an example like

(33) *I pīrangī a Hata ki te whare*
past want pers Hata to the house
'Hata wanted the house'.

(i) The Subject method is the most common for these verbs:

(34) *Ko tēnei te whare i pīrangī a Hata*
topic this the house past want pers Hata
'This is the house that Hata wanted'.

(ii) The passive is almost always possible:

(35) *Ko tēnei te whare i pīrangitia e Hata*
topic this the house past want-pass. by Hata
'This is the house that was wanted by Hata'.

(iii) The actor-emphatic is ungrammatical, again as would be expected from §2.5:

(36) **Ko tēnei te whare nā Hata i pīrangī*
topic this the house by Hata past want
'This is the house that Hata wanted'.

(iv) The *ai*-strategy is possible, but not usual:

(37) *Ko tēnei te whare i pīrangī ai a Hata*
topic this the house past want pro(?) pers Hata
'This is the house that Hata wanted'.

(v) The possessive construction is also usually possible for those who use it at all:

(38) *Ko tēnei te whare a Hata i pīrangī ai*
topic this the house poss Hata past want pro(?)
'This is the house that Hata wanted'.

The possible relativization strategies are summarized in Table I.

	Transitive	Intransitive	Experience
i Subject-strategy	-	-	++
ii Passive	++	-/+	+
iii Actor-emphatic	++	-	-
iv <i>Ai</i>	?	++	+
v Possessive	+	-	+

Table I: Relativization strategies

Note: ++ indicates the commonest pattern(s); + possible, but with certain restrictions (which differ from case to case); -/+ possible for only some members of the class; - impossible; ? used by younger speakers only.

Thus, with respect to relative clause formation, each group of verbs has its own rules.

2.7 Complementation

Experience verbs also behave differently from intransitives and canonical transitives with respect to complementation. They cannot, in fact, appear in complements introduced by *ki te*, but always require *kia*.

Firstly, consider a complement containing an intransitive verb:

- (39) *Ka whakaaro ia ki te haere ki te tāone*
 unspec decide he to the go to the town
 'He decided to go to town'.

When the Subject of the embedded sentence is coreferential with the Subject of the main clause, *ki te* is the appropriate complementizer, and the Subject of the embedded sentence is obligatorily deleted. Note the ungrammaticality of

- (40) **Ka whakaaro ia kia haere ki te tāone*
 unspec decide he comp go to the town
 'He decided to go to town'.

Note also that the same applies if the main clause verb is an experience verb, such as *pīrangī*:

- (41) *Ka pīrangī ia {^{*kia} ki te} haere ki te tāone*
 unspec want he go to the town
 'He wanted to go to town'.

Secondly, transitive verbs follow the same pattern:

- (42) *Ka whakaaro ia ki te whakaako i tana tamaiti*
 unspec decide he to the teach DO his child
 'He decided to teach his child'
- (43) **Ka whakaaro ia kia whakaako i tana tamaiti*
 unspec decide he comp teach DO his child
 'He decided to teach his child'
- (44) *Ka pīrangī ia {^{*kia} ki te} whakaako i tana tamaiti*
 unspec want he teach DO his child
 'He wanted to teach his child'.

Now, consider the following with *mōhio* 'know', an experience verb, in the embedded sentence:

- (45) **Ka pīrangī ia ki te mōhio ki te kōtiro rā*
 unspec want he to the know to the girl there
 'He wanted to know that girl'.

This is ungrammatical despite the fact that it conforms to the same constraints as before: the Subject of *mōhio* is coreferential with the Subject of *pīrangī*, and the embedded Subject has been deleted. *Kia* is required for grammaticality:

- (46) *Ka pīrangī ia kia mōhio ki te kōtiro rā*
 unspec want he comp know to the girl there
 'He wanted to know that girl'.

Experience verbs, then, unlike the other two classes, cannot be embedded under *ki te*. In this they are like passives and perhaps statives, although the facts relating to the latter are not clear-cut.

2.8 Nominalizations

The prepositional marker required by the arguments of these verbs when nominalized also provides a distinction between them. Consider first nominalizations of the transitive sentence

- (47) *I patu te tamaiti i te kau*
 past beat the child DO the cow
 'The child beat the cow'.

The following occur

- (48) *te patunga a te tamaiti i te kau*
 the beat-nom of the child DO the cow
 'the child's beating the cow'
- (49) *te patunga o te kau e te tamaiti*
 the beat-nom of the cow by the child
 'the beating of the cow by the child',

(although the last is doubtless more directly derived from the passive). Thus the underlying Subject of the transitive takes *a* for its possessive marker, while the underlying DO takes *o*. With intransitive verbs, however, the underlying Subject takes *o*. Thus the nominalization corresponding to

- (50) *I hoki te tamaiti ki te kāinga*
 past return the child to the home
 'The child returned home'

is

- (51) *te hokinga o te tamaiti ki te kāinga*
 the return-nom of the child to the home
 'the child's returning home'.

(The passive Subject with *o*, as in (49) is a special case of this.)

With most experience verbs, the basic pattern is the same as that for intransitive verbs. Thus the nominalization corresponding to

- (52) *I rongō atu te tangata ki te pūtorino*
 past hear away the man to the flute
 'The man heard the flute'

is

- (53) *te rongōnga atu o te tangata ki te pūtorino*
 the hear-nom away of the man to the flute
 'the man's hearing the flute'.

However, the 'passive' version is not deemed impossible by my informants, although by no means usual:

- (54) *?te rongōnga atu o te pūtorino e te tangata*
 the hear-nom away of the flute by the man
 'the hearing of the flute by the man'.

Kite 'see', however, is somewhat exceptional, since it varies between *a* and *o* for the underlying Subject, depending, it would seem, on the type of Direct Object in any particular case. Thus the following both occur:

- (55) *te kitenga a te tamaiti i tērā manu*
 the see-nom of the child DO that bird
 'the child's seeing that bird'

- (56) *te kitenga o ngā tāngata i te kino o tēnei tūre*
 the see-nom of the men DO the bad of this law
 'the people's seeing the wickedness of this law'.

Experience verbs in general thus nominalize more like intransi-

tives than transitives, but the possibility of forms like (54) makes the case less than clear-cut.

2.9 Ko-fronting of the Second Argument

The data on this topic, as on the remaining three, are less clear than in the previous cases, but nevertheless seem worthwhile mentioning. *Ko* normally fronts Subjects, and only Subjects, in Maori. Thus it cannot be used to front an adverbial phrase with an intransitive verb. From

- (57) *I haere ia ki te tāone*
past go he to the town
'He went to town',

it is not possible to derive

- (58) **Ko te tāone i haere ia*
topic the town past go he
'It was the town he went to'.

Nor can *ko* be used to front the DO of a transitive verb. From

- (59) *I whāngai a Rewi i ngā pōaka*
past feed pers Rewi DO the pig
'Rewi fed the pigs',

it is not possible to derive

- (60) **Ko ngā pōaka i whāngai a Rewi*
topic the pig past feed pers Rewi
'It was the pigs that Rewi fed'.

However, some speakers feel that it is possible to front the *ki*-phrases of at least some experience verbs with *ko*. From

- (61) *I pīrangī ia ki te pounamu anake*
past want he to the greenstone only
'He wanted only the greenstone',

it may be possible to derive

- (62) ?*Ko te pounamu anake i pīrangī ia*
topic the greenstone only past want he
'It was only the greenstone he wanted'.

It is at least much less readily rejected than (60), for example. However, a parallel example with *kite* was rejected:

- (63) **Ko te pounamu anake i kite ia*
topic the greenstone only past see he
'It was only the greenstone he saw'.

Speakers are consistent through time, and reasonably consistent

with each other on this criterion. There are two further points to note. (62) is entirely grammatical with *te mea i pīrangī* 'the thing wanted' for *i pīrangī*, and the acceptability of (62) may be due to the deletion of *te mea*, in which case (62) is not *ko*-fronting of a *ki*-phrase. Secondly, while the strings of (58), (60), (62) and (63) all occur with *ai* following the verb, none of these strings was judged to be a complete, independent sentence by my informants. Thus they are not instances of *ko*-fronting, parallel to the fronting of Subjects.

2.10 Object incorporation

Maori has a construction where a notional Direct Object, if indefinite, can be incorporated into the verb. The construction applies regularly with transitive verbs:

(64) *I tuhituhi reta ia*
 past write letter he
 'He wrote a letter/letters'.

It cannot apply to adverbial arguments with intransitives:

(65) **I haere toa ia*
 past go store he
 'He went to a shop/some shops'.

The construction applies only very erratically with experience verbs: speakers normally reject

(66) **I kite manu a Rewi*
 past see bird pers Rewi
 'Rewi saw a bird/birds'.

Some are unsure about

(67) ?*I pīrangī wahine a Rewi*
 past want woman pers Rewi
 'Rewi wanted a woman/women',

though most accept

(68) *He pīrangī wahine ia*
 a want woman he
 'He's a womanizer',

in the nominal construction. There would thus appear to be a difference in degree, at least, of acceptability with this construction. It is perhaps interesting to note that *kite* 'see', which in marking is like a transitive verb, taking *i*, is not found with this construction.

2.11 Aha-questions

Transitive and intransitive verbs form appropriate responses to *aha*-questions. Thus the following sequences are possible:

(69) Q: *I aha ia?*
past what he
'What did he do/what happened to him?'

A: *I haere ia ki te kura*
past go he to the school
'He went to school'.

(70) Q: *I aha ia?*
past what he
'What did he do/what happened to him?'

A: *I whāngai ia i ngā kāwhe*
past feed he DO the calf
'He fed the calves'.

However, most speakers reject experience verbs as responses to such questions. They find unacceptable the sequence

(71) *Q: *I aha ia?*
past what he
'What did he do/what happened to him?'

A: *I pīrangi ia ki taua wahine*
past want he to that woman
'He desired that woman'.

Some doubt remains, since a few speakers seem to think that it might be possible in certain contexts, although no-one to date has been able to provide me with a clear instance. The sequence is judged more likely if the tense marker is *e...ana*, but even so, examples are not readily accepted. The weight that can be attached to this criterion thus remains somewhat in doubt.

2.12 He in Subjects

He, usually described as the indefinite article in Maori, has a number of restrictions concerning the syntactic positions in which it can occur. It cannot occur in the Subject NP of a transitive verb:

(72) *Kei te patu he tamariki i te kau
non-past
prog beat some children DO the cow
'Some children are beating the cow'.

It does occur, however, in the Subject NPs of intransitive verbs:

- (73) Kei te haere he tamariki ki te toa
non-past
prog go some children to the store
'Some children are going to the store'.

Most speakers find it ungrammatical in the Subject NP of an experience verb:

- (74) ?*Ka kite he tamariki i te tāhāe
unspec see some children DO the thief
'Some children saw the thief',

but there is more uncertainty than with transitive verbs. Again, there may be a difference of degree, though experience verbs are more like transitives in this respect.

3. Borderline Cases

The experience verbs listed above in § 1 fulfil all, or almost all, of the criteria outlined in § 2. However, there are other verbs in Maori whose status as experience verbs is difficult to determine, since they behave like experience verbs with respect to only some of the criteria discussed. The problem will be illustrated with *tūtaki* 'meet'.

3.1 Obligatory Arguments

There is considerable doubt about the completeness of

- (75) ?Ka tūtaki ia
unspec meet he
'He met',

but none about the completeness of

- (76) Ka tūtaki rāua
unspec meet they (dual)
'They met'.

Thus *tūtaki* does not fall neatly into the same slot as any of the three groups discussed above. However, the incompleteness of (75) is more akin to that of transitives than experience verbs according to several informants.

3.2 Preposition of Second Argument

This is always *ki*, the preposition typical of experience verbs.

- (77) *Ka tūtaki a Rewi^{ki} a Mere*
unspec meet pers Rewi pers Mary
'Rewi met Mary'.

3.3 Imperative

It seems to be the case that *tūtaki* does not occur in imperatives. Thus the following are all judged ungrammatical:

- (78) **Tūtaki ki a ia ki te tāone!*
meet to pers he to the town
'Meet him in town!'
- (79) **Tūtakina ia ki te tāone!*
meet-pass. he to the town
'Meet him in town!'
- (80) **Kia tūtaki koe ki a ia ki te tāone!*
subj meet you to pers he to the town
'Meet him in town!'

It does occur in hortatory sentences with *me*, often referred to as the "weak imperative", but this is not imperative in form. In this respect, then, *tūtaki* is like some other experience verbs.

3.4 Reflexivization

To obtain a reflexive reading for *tūtaki*, *anō* is required, thus:

- (81) *Ka tūtaki ia ki a ia anō*
unspec meet he to pers he self
'He met himself'.

This behaviour is shared by intransitive and experience verbs.

3.5 Actor-emphatic Construction

Tūtaki is rejected in the actor-emphatic construction by most speakers, although a few accept it:

- (82) **Nā Rewi i tūtaki a Hata*
by Rewi past meet pers Hata
'Rewi met Hata'.

This is more like intransitive and experience verbs than transitive verbs.

3.6 Relativization

The common strategy for relativizing on the *ki*-phrase with *tūtaki* is the Subject-strategy. Thus if

- (83) *I tūtaki a Rewi ki ngā tāngata*
 past meet pers Rewi to the people
 'Rewi met the people'

is embedded as a relative clause to *tāngata* in

- (84) *Ko ētahi o ngā tāngata nō Te Kaha*
 topic some of the people belong Te Kaha
 'Some of the people belong to Te Kaha',

ki ngā tāngata is deleted from (83), and the remainder is embedded to give

- (85) *Ko ētahi o ngā tāngata i tūtaki a Rewi*
 topic some of the people past meet pers Rewi
nō Te Kaha
 belong Te Kaha
 'Some of the people Rewi met belonged to Te Kaha'.

This means that *tūtaki* relativizes like an experience verb, since this is the construction which is distinctive for experience verbs.

3.7 Complementation

Tūtaki can only occur in complements introduced by *kia*, and not *ki te*:

- (86) *Ka pīrangi a Hata {^{kia}_{*ki te}} tūtaki ki a Rewi*
 unspec want pers Hata meet to pers Rewi
 'Hata wanted to meet Rewi'.

Again, this is typical of experience verbs.

3.8 Nominalization

Nominalizations with *tūtaki* show the following pattern: from

(87) *Ka tūtaki te tamaiti ki tana teina*
 unspec meet the child to his(sg) younger brother
 'The child met his younger brother',

can be derived

(88) *te tūtakitanga o te tamaiti ki tana teina*
 the meet-nom of the child to his younger brother
 'the child's meeting his younger brother',

but the following 'passive' nominalization was rejected:

(89) **te tūtakitanga o tana teina e te tamaiti*
 the meet-nom of his younger brother by the child
 'the meeting of his younger brother by the child'.

It is difficult to determine whether this is more in line with intransitive than with experience verbs, but it is at least clear that *tūtaki* does not behave like a transitive verb in this respect.

3.9 Ko-fronting

The second argument does not front with *ko*:

(90) **Ko Rewi i tūtaki a Hata*
 topic Rewi past meet pers Hata
 'It was Rewi whom Hata met'.

However, it is unclear what conclusion can be drawn from this.

3.10 Object Incorporation

This construction does not occur with *tūtaki*:

(91) **Kei te tūtaki hoa ia*
 non-past
 prog meet friend he
 'He is meeting a friend/friends'.

This is characteristic of intransitive and experience verbs.

3.11 Aha-questions

Tūtaki appears to be acceptable in the answer to this type of question:

(92) Q: *I aha ia?*
 past what he
 'What did he do/what happened to him?'

A: *I tūtaki ia ki tana tamaiti*
 past meet he to his child
 'He met his child'.

This is typical of transitive and intransitive verbs.

3.12 He in Subjects

There appears to be no doubt about the acceptability of *he* in the Subject NP of a sentence with *tūtaki*:

(93) *Ka tūtaki he tamariki ki te tāhae*
 unspec meet some children to the thief
 'Some children met the thief'.

This characterizes intransitive verbs.

3.13 Summary

Table II charts the possible classification of *tūtaki* for each criterion.

	Transitive	Intransitive	Experience
1	?		
2			+
3			+
4		+	+
5		+	+
6			+
7			+
8		+	+
9	?	?	
10		+	+
11	+	+	
12		+	

Table II: Operational criteria for *tūtaki*

It appears from this that *tūtaki* behaves in a manner compatible with its being an experience verb with respect to the majority of the more clear-cut criteria. It is also clear that on none of these criteria is its behaviour unambiguously like that of a transitive verb. However, with respect to a third of the criteria, it cannot be assigned to the experience group. Such verbs might, of course, be changing category: *tūtaki* may have been an experience verb, but be moving towards the category

intransitive. Verbs like *tūtaki* provide problems for any attempt to account for the experience verbs in a grammar, because of their unpredictability.

4. Accounting for the Facts

There are at least three different ways of accounting for the data presented above which merit some attention, although it seems to me that none of them has sufficient superiority over the others to warrant adoption. I shall refer to the three as the transitivity-cline hypothesis, the verb-feature hypothesis, and the separate class hypothesis.

4.1 The Transitivity-Cline Hypothesis

This hypothesis suggests that transitivity is a cline from highly transitive verbs (e.g. *patu* 'hit, beat, kill') on the one hand to highly intransitive verbs (e.g. *oma* 'run') on the other. On this hypothesis, experience verbs cluster in a middle section of the cline, and show mixed behaviour patterns as a result.

Some of the data presented above can be explained readily by such an approach. The clearest case is the obligatory arguments: two arguments are obligatory at the transitive end of the scale, only one is obligatory at the intransitive end, and experience verbs fall between: they are better with one than transitives, but not as clearly acceptable as intransitives. The preposition might also be accounted for by this approach. The preposition *i*, according to such an approach, might mark the most transitive cases, including some experience verbs like *kite* 'see'; *ki* might then mark other semantically close arguments, but give way to a diversity of prepositions as the argument is less closely linked to the verb, and more semantically independent. (This proposal for *i* and *ki* is not unlike that suggested by Johansen (1948:28ff).) *He* in Subjects also behaves in this way.

The data on reflexivization also fit with this hypothesis in a slightly different fashion. Transitives do not require *anō*, experience verbs and intransitives do. Thus there is one division on the cline. The same might be said to be true of the actor-emphatic: again, transitives are distinguished from the remainder. However, this is less clear, since (i) there appears to be some doubt about the impossibility of intransitives in this construction, and (ii) intransitives lack a second argument to fulfil the position of the unmarked post-verbal NP. Similarly,

Object Incorporation and Nominalizations can be seen as constructions which draw their boundaries between transitives and the rest.

However, the remainder of the properties - imperatives, relativization, complementation, *ko*-fronting and *aha*-questions - do not seem to fit well with this hypothesis. If the hypothesis were true, it would be expected that experience verbs would form imperatives either like intransitives or like transitives, but they do not. In this respect they behave, in fact, most like statives. Similarly, with complementation and *aha*-questions, it is not the transitivity cline that is relevant: transitive and intransitive behave alike. The data on *ko*-fronting also appear inexplicable by this hypothesis, since the second arguments of transitive and intransitive verbs behave alike. But the strongest challenge to this hypothesis comes from the data on relativization. While the behaviour with four of the constructions discussed might be explained by such a hypothesis, it is clear that the behaviour with the Subject-strategy cannot be. Here, the construction is impossible at both the transitive and intransitive ends of the cline. The hypothesis would therefore predict that it would also be impossible at any intermediate point on the cline. However, it is not merely possible for experience verbs to relativize using this strategy, but normal for them to do so.

It thus appears that while some behavioural properties can be accounted for by such a hypothesis, it does not account for all the facts observed.

4.2 The Verb-Feature Hypothesis

According to this hypothesis, the behaviour of verbs is to be accounted for by semantic features of the verbs, such as whether they are voluntary, agentive, causative, punctual etc. actions. One of the biggest difficulties in assessing such a hypothesis is that there is no complete subcategorization according to such features available in advance. However, it is possible to indicate the kinds of features which might account for the data, and some associated problems.

The first feature which might account for a number of these properties concerns the nature of the Subject. Let us call this having an agentive Subject, a Subject voluntarily involved in instigating the process of the verb. Such a property probably accounts for behaviour with respect to imperatives: the Subjects of transitives and many intransitives have this property, and have corresponding imperatives; the Subjects of experience verbs do not have this property, and accordingly, there are no true

imperatives. In this, experience verbs are like statives. (Note that the use of the passive for transitive imperatives is odd under this explanation.) The data on complementation might also be explained thus: only agentive Subjects can be deleted by *ki te* complementation (see the claim in Dik 1978:119f.). Experience verbs and passives, which do not have agentive Subjects, do not occur under *ki te*. However, there is some doubt about stative verbs with *ki te* complementation: some speakers accept some of them, so that there is some doubt about the validity of using agentivity as the deciding factor here. *Aha*-questions may also be explained by this feature, but again statives provide a difficulty, since some of them, at least, e.g. *mate* 'lack', are accepted in the answers to such questions.

A second feature which might account for some of the data is causation. At least some scholars (e.g. Anderson 1971:64ff.) have suggested an analysis where transitive verbs like *hit* have a feature causative, which distinguishes them from intransitives, amongst others. The data on the actor-emphatic might be explained by such a feature: only verbs with the feature [causative] may occur in this construction. (Note that a different explanation would be required if intransitives can appear in the actor-emphatic.) Experience verbs are non-causative, and so do not appear in the actor-emphatic. The facts about nominalizations might also be explained thus: only causative verbs take *a* for the causer. The data on reflexivization could be made dependent on this feature, although the lack of obvious semantic connection between causation and reflexivization makes this less compelling.

Some feature relating to the degree to which the action of the verb directly affects the second argument of the verb may also be required (see e.g. Chung 1978:79f.) to predict the occurrence of the passive in Maori. Such a feature might conceivably account for such data as the typical preposition: *i* is used for arguments directly affected, *ki* for arguments not directly affected. However, there are plenty of exceptions to this: *kite* 'see' and *āwhina* 'help' take *i* for instance. (Most of the exceptions appear to be in this direction.) Object Incorporation might conceivably be dependent on such a property: only directly affected arguments can be incorporated. However, this would lead to expectations that experience verbs could not incorporate their Objects in general, although it is not clear that this is the case.

There are three pieces of data which it seems to me difficult to attribute plausibly to a semantic feature. The first of these is *ko*-fronting. This normally applies to all Subjects, regardless of the semantic properties ascribed to their verbs. Any semantic feature would thus have to associate the second

argument of experience verbs with the full range of possible Subject NPs, not only of basic sentences, but also of derived sentences. Any such feature would have to be so general that it would not specify exclusively the second arguments of experience verbs as opposed to transitive verbs. Precisely the same problem arises with the Relativization data. In addition, it has also to be considered in this connection that Keenan & Comrie (1977) have demonstrated that for a very large number of diverse languages, it is grammatical relations that are relevant for determining relativization patterns. It would therefore be somewhat surprising if semantic features turned out to be crucial for Maori, especially considering that the grammatical relation Subject is treated uniformly, regardless of semantic features. However, it is not satisfactory to claim that semantic features and grammatical relations together will account neatly for these data, since it is not the case that all the NPs usually counted as Direct Objects relativize in the same way.

The final piece of data which does not obviously seem to be attributable to verb features is the distribution of *he*. There seems very little reason to postulate a semantic feature relating to definiteness which would group in one category the Subjects of monovalent verbs (including passives) and of verbless sentences, and in another category all other arguments. Here, as in the two previous cases, it appears necessary to refer to grammatical relations, but in addition, it seems necessary to specify that experience verbs, however they are defined, behave differently from other verbs.

An additional problem relating to this hypothesis is, of course, that it can always be made to work, by the adoption of some arbitrary feature; but unless the features have some independent motivation, there is little value in it.

4.3 The Separate Class Hypothesis

This hypothesis merely claims that experience verbs constitute a separate sub-class of the category verb, and is probably the least interesting hypothesis discussed. Most linguists appear to accept that statives constitute a separate class of verb in Maori. The criteria for establishing such a class are largely formal: statives do not have a passive form; but they occur in verbal contexts. There are a number of associated operational criteria - the causer, if stated, is marked by *i*; they occur with "explanatory pseudo-predicates" (Biggs 1969:125); and they take *kia* for imperatives. Experience verbs are not formally distinct from transitive and intransitive verbs. The question then is whether differences in behaviour, operational criteria, are

sufficient grounds for establishing classes. The crucial data here are those concerning relativization, complementation, imperativization and *aha*-questions, where experience verbs behave differently from either of the other classes from which they are formally indistinct. In particular, the data on relativization proved resistant to explanation by either of the other hypotheses.

The great problem for this hypothesis is the fact that not all the experience verbs behave identically with respect to all the criteria discussed here. The usefulness of the "separate class" hypothesis diminishes as the boundaries of that class are seen to be fuzzy.

5. Final Remarks

It seems unprofitable at this juncture to choose between the three explanations provided. This paper will have achieved its major aim if it has focussed attention on the problem of this group of verbs whose apparently erratic behaviour confuses many learners and complicates the description of so many grammatical processes in Maori.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, J.M. 1971. *The grammar of case: towards a localistic theory*. Cambridge: C.U.P.
- Bauer, W. 1982. Relativization in Maori. *Studies in Language* 6: 305-342.
- Biggs, B. 1969. *Let's learn Maori: a guide to the study of the Maori language*. Revised edn., 1973. Wellington: A.H. & A.W. Reed.
- Chung, S. 1978. *Case marking and grammatical relations in Polynesian*. Austin & London: University of Texas Press.
- Clark, R. 1976. *Aspects of Proto-Polynesian syntax*. Auckland: Linguistic Society of New Zealand.
- Dik, S.C. 1978. *Functional grammar*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Johansen, J.P. 1948. *Character and structure of the action in Maori*. (Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser, Vol 31, no. 5.) Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
- Keenan, E.L. & B. Comrie. 1977. Noun Phrase accessibility and universal grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8:63-99.
- Reedy, T.M. 1979. *Complex sentence formation in Maori*. PhD thesis, University of Hawaii.

NOTE

- ¹ I wish to thank Bill Parker, Ruka Broughton, and the students of Maori 213 in 1980-1981, who provided me with the data presented here. I would also like to record my considerable debt to those who participated in the discussion of this paper at the 4th N.Z. Linguistics Conference: Ross Clark, Chris Corne, Ray Harlow, Chris Lane (in particular for drawing my attention to the relevance of the data on nominalizations), Andy Pawley. None of them is responsible for what I have made of their comments. Lastly, I wish to thank Laurie Bauer for reading various drafts, and for presenting the paper to the conference in my absence.