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ABSTRACT

A fairly comprehensive treatment of the main features of Tokelauan sentence structure is the central aim. The syntactic analysis is presented within a framework which is an adaptation of Chomsky's 'Standard Theory' but special consideration is given to the problem of squaring a grammar based on formal evidence with a functionally-based analysis of sentences.

The principal modification to the Standard Theory is the readoption of kernel sentences and generalised transformations, i.e. a partial reversion to the transformational model proposed in Chomsky's Syntactic Structures. Thus, the output of the base rules is a set of simple sentence structures, with no embeddings.

The treatment of other aspects of Tokelauan included in this analysis are described below in a brief synopsis of each chapter.

Chapter 1 is introductory, serving to locate the language, place and the people of Tokelau. Previous discussions of the position of Tokelauan within the Polynesian group are reviewed, and a basic vocabulary list is provided together with Cognate percentages shared
by Tokelauan of Samoan, Nanumean Ellice and Sikaiana. The aims and scope of this analysis are then discussed in the context of a brief survey of earlier syntactic studies of Polynesian languages, and of the various grammatical models applied to Polynesian or developed in recent theoretical work on syntax and semantics.

Chapters 2 and 3 are essentially referential, presenting lists of all the grammatical elements and rules to be discussed in later chapters. Chapter 2 has two parts. In Part 1 the segmental phonemes of Tokelauan are described, along with the practical problems associated with the choice of orthographic symbols. In Part 2 the functor (grammatical) morphemes of Tokelauan are listed and their uses exemplified. Chapter 3 lists the categorial rules of the base component and some transformational rules.

Chapters 4-6 discuss evidence for and against the formal analysis outlined in 3. Chapter 4 treats the major categorial (phrase structure) rules, stating the procedures used to determine immediate constituents, and defending potentially controversial parts of the analysis against alternatives. Formal and functional analyses are made independently, then compared.
In Chapter 5, certain transformational rules of Tokelauan are examined with illustrative examples.

The final chapter is in two distinct but related parts. First the grounds on which Hohepa based his ergative-accusative classification of Polynesian languages are summarised, and reviewed in relation to the evidence of Tokelauan. One result is a rejection of the concepts of direct object (and so, of transitivity) and of an active-passive transformation as significant grammatical relations in Tokelauan. The later sections examine certain functional relations associated with the constituent analysis of sentences particularly the functions of case markers. This exercise provides a framework for verb classification in Tokelauan.
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1.1  THE PLACE AND PEOPLE

Tokelau is a group of three atolls - Fakaofo, Atafu, and Nukunonu - lying approximately 300 miles north of Western Samoa between the latitudes 8° and 10° south, and the longitudes 171° and 173° west. Although each island lies well out of sight of the others, Atafu is only 50 miles N.W. of Nukunonu and Fakaofo about 40 miles S.E. of Nukunonu. The islets making up each atoll vary in size from a few square yards to one which is 200 yards wide and 4 miles in length. Maximum elevation is about 15 feet above sea level. Coconut palms dominate the
vegetation which is almost all forest.

A homogeneous language and culture attest the cultural unity of the Tokelauans, and their distinctiveness from other cultural groups in the Central Pacific (but see 1.2)\textsuperscript{1}. The traditional evidence for the peopling of the atolls is contradictory. Hooper and Huntsman (1973:369) comment as follows:

"One group of traditions ascribes the origin of the Fakaof ofo people to the settlers from Samoa (Newell 1895), Rarotonga (Burrows 1923), or Nanumanga in the Ellice group (Powell 1871), while another, declared by one anthropologist to be 'probably derived from Samoa' (MacGregor 1937:17) describes an autochthonous origin".

Whatever the original settlement history, various early historical accounts confirm that during the latter part of the 18th century and for the first half of the 19th century the three islands were a single political, social and demographic unit. On the one hand fairly regular contact and intermarriage between the inhabitants of each island seemed to have existed, as well as a good deal of internal migration and settlement, especially from

---

1. See MacGregor (1937) for a general account of Tokelauan culture and Hooper and Huntsman (1973, 1975 and 1976), Hooper (1969, 1970, n.d.), Huntsman (1971) for in-depth ethnographic studies of Tokelauan Society. I am indebted to Antony Hooper and Judith Huntsman for providing much of the information reported in this section.
Fakaofo to the two other islands. On the other, there was no regular contact with any other island group, although canoes arrived intermittently from other groups in West and Central Polynesia. From about 1860 there was increasingly regular contact with the outside world. In discussing population growth rates for this period Hooper and Huntsman (1973:385) state:

"A number of distinct stages are evident in the overall pattern of growth. The first, from 1863 through the early 1900's, is characterised by immigration, very little emigration, and a high rate of growth. Then developing contacts with Olosega and Samoa led to labour migration which effectively reduced the overall rate of growth, for the next 25 years or so. The third period begins with New Zealand control over the islands in 1926 and lasts until the early 1950's. This was a period of relatively higher and steadily rising growth rates...."

By 1960 there was general concern that the islands were becoming overpopulated. Considerable numbers of Tokelauans emigrated from all three atolls, after 1950, first mainly to Apia in Western Samoa, and, since 1963, on a much larger scale to New Zealand. The migration to New Zealand was encouraged and to a great extent sponsored by the New Zealand Government, and dates from the occasion of Western Samoa becoming an independent state.
Today some 2,000 Tokelauans and part-Tokelauans live in New Zealand, and there are less than 100 in Apia. Contact of some sort between relatives in New Zealand, Samoa and Tokelau is frequent, and a quarterly visit to the Tokelaus by a New Zealand Government supply ship ensures regular communication and population movement amongst the atolls.

In 1971, the population of the Tokelau Islands was 1559, distributed over the three islands in the following numbers: Fakaofo 652; Nukunono 309; and Atafu 598. Quite substantial Tokelauan-speaking populations also live on Swains Island, and in Honolulu, Hawaii, so that the homeland language community is now outnumbered by the communities elsewhere.

On each island the population is concentrated in a single village, situated on the western lee shore in a location where there is access for canoes between the lagoon and the open sea. There are no deep water passes into the lagoons, and visiting ships must lie offshore while cargo and passengers are offloaded into canoes and small boats.

There are four main food crops. The coconut is by far the most important, but breadfruit, pandanus and pulaka (the latter, Cyotospermachamissonis, is grown only on Atafu and Fakaofo) are also of some importance in the diet.
Protein comes primarily from fish supplemented by chickens and pigs. Like all Oceanic atoll peoples, the Tokelauans are excellent fishermen. They apply a wide variety of highly skilled techniques in fishing, which is perhaps their major recreational occupation and a focus of social life as well as supplying the most important of their foodstuffs.

1.2 THE TOKELAUAN LANGUAGE

The language of Tokelau (referred to here as Tokelauan) is a member of the Polynesian group. The 25 or 30 Polynesian languages form a well-marked subgroup within the Austronesian family. Their internal relationships are discussed in 1.2.1. The immediate external relatives of Polynesian are probably the languages of Fiji, Rotuma, and the Central and Northern New Hebrides, (Grace 1955, Pawley 1972) from which Polynesians separated upward of 3,000 years ago. Glottochronological and archaeological evidence indicates that Proto-Polynesian broke up not later than about 200 B.C. (Pawley and Green 1973).

1.2.1 THE POSITION OF TOKELAUAN WITHIN THE POLYNESIAN GROUP

There has been some disagreement about the internal subgrouping of the Polynesian languages. The first systematic treatment was Samuel Elbert's paper "The Internal Relationships of Polynesian Languages and Dialects", published in 1953.
Elbert relied mainly on a modified lexicostatistical technique to determine subgroups. He read the lexicostatistical evidence as indicating that there were two clearly defined primary genetic divisions, East Polynesian and West Polynesian coinciding with the East-West cultural division made by Burrows (1938) and others on the basis of typological comparisons of technology, kinship, religion and mythology. He did not attempt to subgroup the then little-known Polynesian Outliers, except to suggest that Kapingamarangi may have split off about the same time as the East-West separation. Elbert also considered some qualitative (non-statistical) evidence in his 1953 study. Although he said little about it, it is clear that the sequence of phonological changes implied by his reconstructions did not support an East-West division. Presumably for this reason, Elbert sketched an alternative family tree in which some "Western" languages (Samoan, Ellice and Tikopian) grouped with Eastern Polynesian while other "Western" languages (Tongan, Niuean, Futunan and Uvean) were placed in a separate division. Other lexicostatistical studies supporting an East-West division of Polynesian languages include Dyen (1965) and Emory (1963). While Tokelauan was not included in any of these classifications, there is no doubt that lexicostatistically it is very close to certain languages which were classified as West Polynesian, particularly Samoan and Ellice.

In a 1966 paper, Andrew Pawley (1966b) argued, primarily on grounds of comparative morphology, that all well-described
Polynesian languages spoken within the Polynesian Triangle, apart from Tonga, Niue and possibly Uvean, belong in a single subgroup of Polynesian. He called this Nuclear Polynesian (NP). Coordinate with Nuclear Polynesian was a second subgroup, Tongic (TO), to which he assigned Tongan and Niuean. Uvean was left unclassified. He then sub-classified the Nuclear Polynesian languages into an Eastern Polynesian (EP) subgroup and a Samoic (SM) subgroup plus certain Outliers which he was unable to classify further. The critical evidence for these groupings consisted of shared innovations in grammatical functors, supported in some cases by shared phonological and lexical innovations. Tokelauan was placed in the Samoic subgroup of NP languages.

In a second paper, Pawley (1967) provided further evidence in support of Nuclear Polynesian and re-examined the Samoic grouping. By this time better data was available for several Outlier languages, and all the well-described Outliers were assigned to the Samoic group (relabelled Samoic-Outlier (SO)). Although some lower-order groups were discerned within the Samoic-Outlier group, Tokelauan remained an isolate. Pawley's 1967 classification is shown in Fig.1. It should be noted, however, that in 1967, Tokelauan was one of the most-poorly documented Polynesian languages, and Pawley had to rely mainly on a few printed texts for grammatical and lexical data.
FIG. 1. A SUBGROUPING OF POLYNESIAN LANGUAGES

(After Pawley: 1967)
On pp. 274-81 of his 1967 paper, Pawley lists 16 putative innovations as diagnostic of the Samoic-Outlier group. Any language which as some or all of these innovations and none of the innovations characteristic of Tongic or Eastern Polynesian falls into the Samoic-Outlier group.

The fuller data now available for Tokelauan do not require any significant revision of Pawley’s treatment of the language. The sixteen SO innovations are listed below and considered for reflections in Tokelauan (TOK).

1. PSO *se'e 'not' TOK hee
   PSO *se'eki 'not yet' TOK heeki
2. PSO *naa- 'direction prefix' TOK naa-
3. PSO *soko- 'exclusively' TOK hoo-
4. PSO *na 'def.pl.article' TOK naa
5. PSO *oulua '2nd. dual possessor' TOK oulua
6. PSO *se 'indef.sing.article' TOK he
   PSO *ni 'indef.pl.article' TOK ni
7. SO neutral possessive pronouns in the first and third person dual and plural pronouns are not found in TOK
8. PSO *kai 'sequential relationship between actions' is not reflected in TOK (*kai now considered PPN, Pawley (personal communication)).
9. PSO *koi 'present progressive' TOK koi
10. PSO *noko 'past progressive, *ku and *ko
'progressive aspect' are not reflected in TOK

11. PSO *toka- 'human number' TOK toka-

12. PSO *tou '1st. incl. pl.' TOK tou '1st incl. pl. preposed subject' 

13. PSO *'isi 'to have, to be' is not reflected in TOK

14. PSO *a 'generic or plural article' is not reflected in TOK

15. PSO *sina/suna 'some' is not reflected in TOK

16. PSO *naai 'diminutive particle' TOK naai

In his paper Pawley correctly recorded that six of the PSO innovations were reflected in Tokelauan (1-4, 6, 9) while three were not (8, 14, 15). Four further PSO forms for which Pawley did not have data (5, 11, 12, 16) can also be added to the list of Tokelauan reflexes making a total of ten out of the 16 diagnostic features of the Samoic-Outlier sub-group. The TOK reflexes listed by Pawley as e 'indefinite art. sing.', ko 'progressive aspect' and ihi 'to be, to have' were not found by me to occur in Tokelauan. TOK also does not reflect the PSO neutral possessive pronoun forms.
Pawley was unable to further sub-classify Tokelauan, Samoan, the Ellice dialects, Pukapukan and East Uvean.

In a recent survey, Bruce Biggs (1971) classifies some 48 Polynesian dialects into 26 distinct languages. His language units are based "on what is known about mutual intelligibility and structural and lexical similarity, and on what I regard as some kind of consensus of opinion among a number of people with whom I have had discussions" (Biggs, 1971:487). Biggs groups Tokelauan with the two best-known dialects of the Ellice group, Nanumean and Vaitupu, as a single language. There is of course some degree of mutual intelligibility between many pairs of Polynesian languages. From my limited knowledge of Nanumean (described by Ranby 1973), I agree that it is quite similar to Tokelauan. However, I am not certain that the Ellice dialects have special claims to be considered a single language on the grounds of either structural similarity or mutual intelligibility. Possibly Vaitupu and the other Southern Ellice dialects form the link in a dialect chain. Biggs' proposal deserves further study which I have not been able to pursue, except for the lexicostatistical comparisons reported below.

Since Tokelauan has not been included in any of the lexicostatistical classifications published to date, I will give the Tokelauan equivalents of the modified Swadesh 215 word list here, together with the results of comparisons with Samoan,
Nanumean and Sikaiana.

In reckoning cognate totals I have excluded from the list, items which are repeated in the Polynesian languages (e.g. 'skin' 'bark') or which are semantically problematic (e.g. 'cut' and 'cook', each of which have many possible translations). Thus my results are not directly comparable with intra-Polynesian comparisons by other writers who may have used different procedures. The forms which are excluded from cognate consideration are underlined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIG. 2</th>
<th>MODIFIED SWADESH BASIC WORD LIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>uma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animal</td>
<td>manu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ashes</td>
<td>lefulefu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>back</td>
<td>tua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bird</td>
<td>manulele/manu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bite</td>
<td>kati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black</td>
<td>uliuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blood</td>
<td>toto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blow (of wind)</td>
<td>agi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bone</td>
<td>ivi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>breathe</td>
<td>maanava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brother</td>
<td>uho/tuagane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burn</td>
<td>mu/huhunu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dog</td>
<td>kulii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drink</td>
<td>inu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dry</td>
<td>mago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dull</td>
<td>tuka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dust</td>
<td>pefu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ear</td>
<td>taliga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>earth, the</td>
<td>lalolagi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eat</td>
<td>kai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>egg</td>
<td>fuaamoafua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eight</td>
<td>valu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eye</td>
<td>mata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fall</td>
<td>pakuu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>far</td>
<td>mamo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fat(grease)</td>
<td>gako</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>father</td>
<td>tamana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fear</td>
<td>matakau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feather</td>
<td>fulu-maniu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>few</td>
<td>ninaai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fight</td>
<td>miha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fire</td>
<td>afi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fish</td>
<td>ika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five</td>
<td>lima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>float</td>
<td>opeopea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flow</td>
<td>tafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flower</td>
<td>fua-laakau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kill</td>
<td>tamate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>know</td>
<td>iloa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lake</td>
<td>vaituuloto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laugh</td>
<td>kata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leaf</td>
<td>lau-laakau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>left (side)</td>
<td>tauagavale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leg</td>
<td>vae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lie</td>
<td>takoto/pepelo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>live</td>
<td>ola/nofo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liver</td>
<td>ate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long</td>
<td>loa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>louse</td>
<td>kutu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man</td>
<td>tagata/tamaaloa/tino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>many</td>
<td>lahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meat(flesh)</td>
<td>kakano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mother</td>
<td>maatua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mountain</td>
<td>mauga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mouth</td>
<td>gutu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>name</td>
<td>igoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>narrow</td>
<td>vaaiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>near</td>
<td>pili/latalata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neck</td>
<td>ua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new</td>
<td>fou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>night</td>
<td>poo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nine</td>
<td>iva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nose</td>
<td>ihu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not</td>
<td>hee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>old</td>
<td>gatu/matua/tuai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Fijian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sing</td>
<td>uhu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sister</td>
<td>uho/tuafafine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sit</td>
<td>nofo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>six</td>
<td>ono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skin</td>
<td>kili/paku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sky</td>
<td>lagi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sleep</td>
<td>moe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small</td>
<td>taigole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smell</td>
<td>manogi/hogihogi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smoke</td>
<td>ahu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smooth</td>
<td>laamolemole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some</td>
<td>ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speak</td>
<td>tautala/lea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spear</td>
<td>tao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spit</td>
<td>feeanu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>split</td>
<td>ihi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>squeeze</td>
<td>tatau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stab</td>
<td>tui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stand</td>
<td>tuu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>star</td>
<td>fetuu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stick</td>
<td>laakau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stone</td>
<td>fatu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>straight</td>
<td>hako</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suck</td>
<td>mimiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sun</td>
<td>laa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swell</td>
<td>puta/fula/fefete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swim</td>
<td>kakau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
where ifea
white paepae
who koai
wide lauefa/vaalahi
wife aavaga
wind matagi
wing kapakau
wipe holo
with ma
woman fafine
woods togavao
work galue
worm anufe
ye koutou
year tauhaga
yellow hamahama/felo

A total of 176 items were counted in comparisons of Tokelauan with each of Nanumean, Samoan and Sikaiana.

Cognate numbers and percentages are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Comparison</th>
<th>Cognates</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tokelauan/Samoan</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>81.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokelauan/Nanumean</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>75.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokelauan/Sikaiana</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On lexico-statistical evidence only, Tokelauan appears closer to Samoan than to Nanumean.
This is of interest in relation to Biggs' proposal that Tokelauan with Nanumean and Vaitupu constitute a single language. It should be noted that connected Tokelauan speech is not intelligible to Samoans.

1.2.2 PREVIOUS STUDIES OF TOKELAUAN

Little has been published about the Tokelauan language. The American philologist, Horatio Hale, who visited the Tokelaus in the early 1840's, published some descriptive statements about Tokelauan grammar (Hale, 1846) along with a word list. In 1969 David Boardman produced a vocabulary of several hundred Tokelauan words. Recently, John Jensen (1969) also compiled an unpublished word list, somewhat more detailed than Boardman's, based upon his work with Tokelaus in Hawaii. Sister Veronica (n.d.) distributed some type-script notes on aspects of Tokelauan grammar which she had analysed in terms of conventional English grammatical categories. No other descriptive works are known to me.

1.2.3 DETAILS OF RESEARCH FOR THIS STUDY

The principal research for this study was carried out in several spells over a period of three years.

1. Adult Tokelauans are bilingual in Samoan, but Samoans with no previous experience of Tokelauan are unable to follow Tokelauan speech, which exhibits a number of consonant shifts and differences in intonation patterns from Samoan, as well as various lexical and structural differences.
During the second half of 1969 and 1971, and the first half of 1972, I worked with Tokelauan informants in New Zealand. In 1970, I spent five months (April to September) in Fakaofo, and five weeks with a Tokelauan community in Apia, Western Samoa. Intermittently since 1972, I have gathered supplementary data from Tokelauan speakers in Auckland.

The corpus upon which this study is based includes 24 five-inch dual track tapes of texts, elicited utterances and other material. Texts include, discussions in Tokelauan, folk stories, casual conversation, formal speeches and narration of specialised events such as fishing techniques, etc.

My main informant in New Zealand was Ropati Simona, formerly a school teacher in Fakaofo, but resident in Auckland since 1965. In the Tokelaus the whole village on Fakaofo provided a sociolinguistic milieu in which I became a regular participant interacting with virtually the whole population. The principal informants in Fakaofo were Hosea Kilifi, the head teacher at the Fakaofo school, who provided me with a great deal of explanation about the usage of various Tokelauan grammatical constructions; Muti Veniale and Pili Samu, young men who were my fishing companions and friends and who provided most of the casual conversational texts and stories in the corpus.
Mika Sese and Lise Ioane, school teachers who patiently
provided me with a good proportion of my vocabulary list,
and taught me conversational Tokelauan in the initial stages
of my field work; and Pefiloil Muti, wife of Muti, and
companion to my wife and children throughout our stay in
Fakaofo. All these informants also read and speak fluent
Samoan, and some a little English which was most helpful
in certain facets of my fieldwork.

1.3 MODELS OF ANALYSIS

It is widely accepted that descriptions of languages
should be formal and should follow some particular theory
of grammar. The problem for those who would attempt
such descriptions is "which theory to adopt?". As a
result of the preoccupation of linguists over the last 15 years
with theory construction and verification there is an abundance
of models to choose from. Since Chomsky's Aspects of the
Theory of Syntax, (1965) the number of competing formal
theories of sentence structure has multiplied, and one of the
problems is to decide whether these are merely notational
variants or whether these are differences of substance - in
capacity to account for different facts and in asserting
different claims about the nature of language. Yet over the
same period, the field of known linguistic facts seems to
have extended far beyond the capacity of any formal theory
to handle.
One wonders, therefore, whether there is any current linguistic theory adequate to deal with most of the known facts. Despite the fact that the current mainstream theories have a common origin, considerable variation exists among them. Chomsky's *Syntactic Structures* (1957), in which grammar became 'generative' and a transformational component was added to the constituent structure base was at first accepted (or resisted) as a revolutionary approach. It was indeed a revolutionary work; but it now appears to us as an innovation clearly embedded in the older tradition of structural syntax, as for example, described by Harris (1951) and many others and developed by Harris (1957) in ways partially similar to Chomsky. *Aspects* (1965) saw modifications to this early transformational-generative (TG) theory, not the least of which were the development of a clearcut distinction between 'deep' and 'surface' structure, the addition of recursive power (through embedding) to the base (constituent structure) rules, and considerable reorganisation and formalisation of the components in the grammar.

The *Aspects* model, which became known as the Standard Theory (ST), has three major components: a syntactic component which defines a set of abstract sentence structures (Phrase markers); a semantic component, which attributes meaning to the sentence structures and their elements; and a phonological component which is concerned with converting the sentence structures into phonetic form.
The syntactic component comprises a base and a transformational subcomponent. The base generates the underlying structure of sentences which is mapped by a set of rules from the transformational subcomponent into all possible derived sentences. The base is further divided into a categorical subcomponent and a lexicon. The function of the categorical subcomponent is to define sets of grammatical structures, while the lexicon introduces lexical items into these structures.

An attraction of ST was that it seemed to give some new insight into the relation of meaning and syntax. Chomsky proposed that there was a syntactic deep structure that fully determined meaning with the application of lexical insertions and interpretive semantic rules; transformation rules made no contribution to meaning, except in respect of differences of style and perhaps focus or emphasis.

No sooner had scholars begun to apply the Aspects model in depth than they ran into a host of problems. The first modifications were cautious, but by the late 60's many of Chomsky's own students were evolving a much more 'abstract' syntax than Aspects provides for. The tradition known as "Generative Semantics" (GS), initially centred around the work of Lakoff and McCawley in the United States, became the main rival to the Standard Theory.
McCawley (1967) questioned Chomsky's concept of deep structure:

"As an alternative to Chomsky's conception of linguistic structure, one could propose that there is simply a single system of processes which convert the semantic representation of each sentence into its surface structure. Rather they claim that there are successively deeper levels of structure, which ultimately go back to some underlying representation of meaning, and that there is no one level of syntactic structure which can be called the deep structure. These ideas are, I think, finding fairly widespread acceptance among transformationalist and some other linguists."


By the generative semanticists, syntax was viewed as interpretive of semantics. They proposed that the semantic structure is mapped by transformations into a surface structure, with lexical items having their own internal grammar, and some lexical insertions occurring after transformations. They abandoned the idea of a single level of deep structure in syntax, along with the idea of an autonomous syntax, independent of belief systems, pragmatics and the wider system of cultural conventions in general.
While Chomsky maintained that syntax was independent of meaning and use - that strings of words can be determined to be well-formed or ill-formed in isolation, and that a generative grammar provides a set of rules that can generate the well formed strings - the generative semanticists suggested the opposite:

"In generative semantics, syntax is taken to be the study of what strings of words can express what meanings in what contexts".

Lakoff (in Parret, 1974 : 2)

The generative semanticists view rules of syntax not as generating strings of words, but rather as generating relations between strings of words and what they mean relative to given contexts. Thus not only does this school differ from ST in its conception of the relation between syntax and semantics but also in its conception of the scope, the proper subject matter of linguistics. Generative semantics is in Lakoff's view concerned with the social as well as the linguistic contexts of utterances, and considers such features as politeness, relative social status, and formality as significant in determining the meaning of given sentences. Thus the concept of a single literal meaning of $S$ is lost.
Further revisions by Chomsky produced the Extended Standard Theory (EST), reflected in his recent writings, e.g. Chomsky (1972) in which he modified his concept of deep structure, especially in the area of semantics. Semantics remains interpretive of syntax, but transformations are allowed to make certain contributions to meaning. The grammatical role of rules of lexical derivation is enlarged, and that of syntactic transformations is diminished.

Today syntacticians in the American scene are about evenly divided between EST and GS. If the number of professed followers of GS outnumber EST supporters, this is offset by the fact that in practice, most of the descriptive work is still done within a framework that is neutral ground, but which was evolved during the pre-generative semantics era.

As regards the areas of difference, both EST and GS remain largely at a programmatic stage. The blueprints have not yet been drawn in detail. Indeed there are several apparently divergent approaches falling under the rubric of generative semantics, exemplified by the writings of McCawley, Lakoff, Fillmore, Ross and Postal.
A noteworthy development of the late 1960's was the increasingly narrow scope of transformationalist analyses. Publications dealt with restricted problem areas of particular theoretical interest; solutions were sought and sometimes offered as favouring one theory of grammar over its rivals. The latest models have not been applied to entire grammatical systems. The few "full" grammars that have been written are in fact semi-traditional in their informality and somewhat eclectic as to theoretical model.

1.4 PREVIOUS SYNTACTIC WORK ON POLYNESIAN LANGUAGES

Grammatical study of Polynesian languages began in earnest in the 1830's and the next century brought forward some excellent syntactic studies of certain languages, culminating in William's First Lessons in Maori (first edition 1862, last edition 1956), Spencer Churchward's New Samoan Grammar (1951), and C. M. Churchward's Tongan Grammar (1953). This was the era of 'traditional' grammars. Almost all descriptions produced in this period were couched in the Greco-Roman framework; the writers, with some concessions to the genius of Polynesian structure, assumed the universality of the traditional eight parts of speech and other grammatical categories distinguished in European languages.
This era faded with the spread of modern structural linguistics to the Polynesian field in the 1950’s and 60’s. The new standards required a grammar to be exhaustive, formal (explicit) and predictive in its treatment of a particular linguistic level or subsystem.

A survey of formal descriptions of the syntax of Polynesian languages must begin with Biggs’ (1957-1961) ‘phrase’ model. This framework became a paradigm which with slight variations, was applied to Samoan by Pawley (1961, 1966a); to Nukuoro by Carroll (1965); to the Sikaiana verbal phrase by Sharples (1966); to Tongarevan by Yasuda (1968); and to Luangiua by Thorpe (n.d.). A rather similar descriptive model was developed for Rarotongan by Buse (1960, 1963a, 1963b).

In 1967, Hohepa published the first transformational grammar of a Polynesian language, an analysis of Maori, which he based on the Syntactic Structures model. Soon after, several fairly extensive descriptions using the Aspects framework appeared: now the model was applied by Thorpe (1968) to Luangiua, now published as Salmond (1974), by Sharples (1968) to Sikaiana and by Ranby (1973) to Nanumea. A considerable number of papers have appeared treating particular syntactic problems in different Polynesian languages, e.g. Milner (1962, 1973), Hohepa (1966, 1969, 1970), Biggs (1974), Lynch (1972).

1. In fact Hohepa’s dissertation on Maori (written in 1964-65, published in 1967) was the first fully explicit treatment of the syntax of any Oceanic language.
A version of Fillmore’s (1968) case grammar - itself an adaptation of the Aspects model - was applied to several problems of Samoan grammar by a group of San Diego linguists - Chapin (1969), Clark (1969), Grinder (1969) and Pizzini (1969). In the same year, a number of excellent unpublished papers on Maori syntax were produced by an M.I.T. graduate class, and one of these was expanded into a B.A. thesis (Chung 1970). Biggs (1969) developed his phrase model further to provide a syntax of Maori simple sentences. Recently, Emily Hawkins (1975) has produced a syntax of Hawaiian using an eclectic transformational framework of the Aspects-case grammar type.

1.5 AIMS AND SCOPE OF THIS ANALYSIS

With the recent developments in the area of theory construction, especially with EST and GS, I find myself in a different situation from 1967/68, when I wrote a Master’s thesis on the syntax of Sikaiana (Sharples, 1968)\textsuperscript{1}. This was written during the heyday of the Aspects model, and accordingly the analysis was along the lines of the standard theory of TG.

\textsuperscript{1} Sikaiana is a Polynesian Outlier language, spoken by a little over 400 people on Sikaiana (also known as Stewart Island), a small coral atoll located about 100 miles east of Malaita in the Solomon Islands.
The aims of that thesis were twofold: first to produce a linguistic description of a virtually undocumented Polynesian language, and second, to test certain of the more general claims made by Chomsky in Aspects. The Aspects model was of course based primarily on work in English syntax, and at that time had not yet been applied to any Polynesian language. Certain problems were encountered in the application of the model to Sikaiana, and some modifications were suggested. In this analysis of Tokelauan the emphasis will not be in the field of theory construction or verification. Rather the thesis is primarily intended to be a grammar of Tokelauan, aiming at a fairly comprehensive treatment of the main syntactic features of sentences with a special concern for "functional relations".

A secondary but not unimportant intent is to test the adequacy of the model applied to Tokelauan as a means for analysing other Polynesian languages (Chapter 6 is devoted to the analysis of sentences from a number of Polynesian languages). The model chosen is a modification of that used in Sikaiana Syntax, which itself was an adaptation of Chomsky's Standard Theory.

Perhaps the principal reason for the use of the Standard Theory in this analysis of Tokelauan is the difficulties which would arise with the application of the Generative Semantics model or some other non-Standard Theory to produce a grammar, or a partial grammar as is intended here.
After *Aspects*, linguists in transformational grammar virtually stopped writing complete grammars of languages and concentrated on fragments and isolated problems in an attempt to find grounds for choosing between competing theories. No grammar has ever been written in the Generative Semantics model for obvious reasons — it would entail enormous work on semantic structure and belief systems. In practice, syntactic descriptions today remain very largely autonomous, and continue to deal with the syntactic behaviour of morphemes rather than with mapping semantic structures onto surface structures. This analysis is concerned primarily with the operation of the categorial subcomponent and the transformational subcomponent. No full treatment of phonology is offered, although Chapter 2 discusses the orthographic problems which Tokelauan phonology presents, and attempts to justify the orthography adopted here.

The principal modification of the Standard Theory which is utilised in this analysis is the return to the generalised transformations and the notion of 'kernel sentence' proposed in *Syntactic Structures*. The output of the base component is a set of simple sentence structures. This procedure was adopted to restrict the category rules to the more basic underlying constituents of S, and so facilitate comparison with other Polynesian language descriptions.
Also kernel sentences have an intuitive appeal to me as belonging to a level of structure more 'basic' than that which includes conjoined, subjoined, and other types of complex clause-connecting or embedding operations.

It was earlier noted that this analysis will be concerned with certain functional relations. The term 'functional relation' is used here to refer to a grammatical relation between various semantic notions. My treatment of this aspect of the analysis differs considerably from the Standard Theory analysis and is outlined below.

Language functions primarily to transmit ideas. Syntax is a vehicle by which meanings are encoded and decoded by speaker and hearer. This much is generally accepted, whatever variations exist in linguists' conceptions of grammatical structure. I assert, however, that the deep structure category symbols isolated in this analysis reflect deep structure functional notions.

Although in Aspects (especially pp. 68-74) Chomsky recognised the role of certain functional notions in grammar, he did not provide a place for them in his system of categorial and transformational rules. Instead, we find somewhat sketchy references to functional or 'inherently relational' concepts, e.g. the definition of 'Subject' as the 'NP-of-S' (p.68), 'Object' as NP-of-VP (p.69). For Chomsky, such functional relations were defined on the phrase-markers or trees specified by the categorial rules, and so are secondary or interpretive rather than basic in this conception of grammar.
Meaning and use were not considered by Chomsky to be relevant to the well-formedness of strings of words. The Generative Semanticists, as noted above, took the opposite stand. To them syntax was an interpretive tool of semantics.

The stand I propose in this analysis is probably somewhere in the middle of these two viewpoints. Syntax as the principal vehicle of semantics contains deep structures which closely reflect both syntactic and semantic formations. Thus it is held that primary semantic notions will be manifested in the deep structure of the syntax.

In accordance with this view, part of the analysis in the ensuing chapters diverges from a strictly categorial analysis to discuss the functional implications of the delimited constituents. Great importance is placed upon seeking a one-to-one correlation between functional notions on the one hand, and constituent structure on the other.

All functional terms used are defined from within this grammar, and special care has been taken not to 'impose' the functional notions from other language analyses such as those for English upon the functional relations of Tokelauan. It is claimed here that all relevant functional relations within a language are manifested in the syntax of that language, otherwise they can only be at most, externally-imposed theories about that language.
This model of syntax, then, comprises two separate statements. The first is a statement of the syntactic framework containing the basic categorial constituents and showing how they are mapped onto more complex constructions. The second is a statement of the 'functional notions' onto which the speaker of Tokelauan maps the category constituent relations. This functional statement shows how the native speaker uses his language.

1.6 ABSTRACT

Chapter 2 begins with a short discussion of the phonology and orthography and then gives a comprehensive listing and classification of the functor (grammatical) morphemes of Tokelauan, with examples illustrating their use in sentences.

Chapter 3 provides a listing of the categorial rules of the Base component of this grammar and some transformation rules deriving complex structures in Tokelauan syntax.

Chapter 4 discusses the categorial phrase structure rules, while Chapter 5 is concerned with those transformation rules proposed in Chapter 3.

Chapter 6 has two parts. The early sections discuss the Accusative-Ergative classification of Polynesian languages in relation to Tokelauan and other Polynesian languages.
Some criticisms of the application of such a classification to the languages of Polynesia follows. The later sections examine the functional notions associated with the categorial constituent analysis of S provided in Chapter 4. This results in a classification of the verbs of Tokelauan.
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2.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter has two parts.
Section 2.1 contains a brief discussion of the segmental phonemes of Tokelauan, and the symbols which I have selected for the phonemic orthography.

Section 2.2 provides an index of the functor morphemes of Tokelauan with some illustration of their syntactic usage.

2.1 AN ORTHOGRAPHY FOR THE LANGUAGE OF THE TOKELAU ISLANDS

2.1.0 A PHONEMIC ORTHOGRAPHY

In establishing the orthographies of Polynesian languages it has been the practice to choose symbols from the Roman Alphabet.

For English, there is no consistent one-to-one correspondence between the significant sound units (phonemes) of that language and the symbols used to represent them. For example the letter 'a' is used to represent a range of phonemically distinct sounds, as in the following:

want /wɒnt/; fat /faːt/; tall /tɔːl/;

father /faːðər/; removal /rɪmʊvəl/

And conversely, the English phoneme /f/ is represented in the following words by the orthographic symbols f, ph, gh, ff respectively: frail; phrase; enough; stuff.
In the case of Polynesian languages where it is somewhat easier to determine the phonemic structure than in English, a one-to-one correspondence between the segmental phonemes (consonant and vowel phonemes) and the orthographic symbols can be easily and conveniently set up. This use of a phonemic orthography greatly simplifies the writing and spelling of the language.

The official notations of written Polynesian languages to date are very close to being fully phonemic. Exceptions are: failure to distinguish long and short vowels, and the marking of the glottal stop in some languages. Also, the digraphs 'ng' and 'wh' are used in some orthographies to represent single phonemes.

2.1.1 THE PHONEMES OF TOKELAUAN

The phoneme, earlier referred to as a 'significant sound unit' may be more fully defined as: the minimum sound segment whose presence or absence in an utterance effects a change of meaning to the native speaker. Thus in English bin and pin differ in only one phoneme. Similarly, the exclusion of the /b/ phoneme in bin to produce in has a new meaning to the English speaker. [N.B. Because /b/ and /p/ represent distinct sounds to the English speaker, it does not follow that they are universally distinguished.]

Each phoneme is a family or class of phonetic sound.
The members of the class may differ phonetically from one another, but the difference is not significant to the native speaker, e.g. English /r/ may be trilled, flapped or retroflex. Only when two phones contrast are they assigned to separate phonemes.

There are 15 vowel and consonant phonemes in Tokelauan. The five vowels can be represented as: /a, e, i, o, u/. The ten consonant phonemes consist of: three stops /p, t, k/; three nasals /m, n, η/; three fricatives /f, v, h/ and a lateral /l/.

The status of these phonemes are established in the following contrasts:

**vowels:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>taa</th>
<th>'hit'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tai</td>
<td>'sea'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tae</td>
<td>'excrement'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tao</td>
<td>'spear'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tau</td>
<td>'weather'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**consonants:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>paa</th>
<th>'to reach'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>taa</td>
<td>'to hit'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaa</td>
<td>'future inceptive marker'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maa</td>
<td>'embarrassed'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naa</td>
<td>'indefinite plural article'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ηaa</td>
<td>'fish drive'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faa</td>
<td>'four'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vaa</td>
<td>'space'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haa</td>
<td>'sacred'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laa</td>
<td>'sun'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.1.2 TOKELAUAN ORTHOGRAPHY

The following symbols were chosen to represent the written orthography of Tokelauan. The symbols are:

\[ p \ t \ k \ m \ n \ g \ f \ v \ h \ l \ i \ e \ a \ o \ u. \]

The criterion used in making the selection were (a) one-to-one correspondence to phonemic inventory, (b) simplicity (c) acceptability by the Tokelauan people, and (d) historical factors.

Only three symbols are likely to be controversial. These are: \( f \) \( h \) and \( g \). Supporting evidence for their selection follows below.

2.1.3 THE FRICATIVES /h/ and /f/.

A detailed examination of the quality of the two fricatives /h/ and /f/ was necessary in order to determine which symbols would most suitably represent them.

2.1.3.1 FRICATIVE /f/

The fricative /f/ realised by a number of variants, is a voiceless labio-glottal fricative. Articulation occurs in two places at once. Friction ([f] quality) occurs at the lips which show partial closure and rounding ([W] quality) and is accompanied by a characteristic modification of the mouth cavity which in turn is bought about by a simultaneous narrowing in the glottal region ([h] quality) causing friction in the vocal chords.
The following allophonic variation is noted:

(i) before front vowels /i/ and /e/, as in *filemu* 'quiet', and *fenua* 'island', aspiration is strong and the friction caused by the partial closure of the mouth-cavity is accentuated. The realisation of /f/ in this position sounds similar to the English *wh* as in the Standard British English pronunciation of *when*, and is represented phonetically as [ʍ].

(ii) before the low back/central vowel /a/ as in *fano* /go (singular)' , lip closure and rounding is brief and the accompanying oral friction is accordingly reduced. In fast speech, there may be no partial lip closure in which case the resultant sound is similar to the English glottal fricative /h/ as in *hut*, and is here represented as [h].

(iii) before the high/mid back vowels /u/ and /o/, the labial articulation again loses its force, because of the tongue backing which occurs with /f/ if followed by a back vowel. The phonetic symbol for this allophone is [hʷ].
2.1.3.2  FRICATIVE /h/

A further fricative /h/ is phonemically distinct from /f/. This fricative has three distinct allophones:

(i) before front vowels /i/ and /e/, it occurs as a glottal fricative (\(\left[ h \right]\) quality). There is a narrowing in the glottal region causing friction between the vocal chords.

(ii) before back vowels /a/, /o/ and /u/, /h/ is a palatalised glottal fricative. This is caused by the raising of tongue towards the hard palate together with the glottal articulation.

(iii) medially between any two vowels, vibration may accompany the friction of the vocal chords in which case the /h/ is voiced.

2.1.3.3 PHONEMIC CONTRAST /h/ and /f/

The following word examples written both phonemically and phonetically show the distribution of allophones. (The palatalised glottal is written phonetically as \(\left[ h^\gamma \right]\), the glottal allophone as \(\left[ h \right]\) and voicing is not considered in these examples. The allophones of /f/ are as described in 2.1.3.1.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phonemic</th>
<th>Phonetic</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/ahi/</td>
<td>ahi</td>
<td>'to visit'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/afi/</td>
<td>a\textit{\textbf{i}}</td>
<td>'fire'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/heke/</td>
<td>heke</td>
<td>'to slip'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/feke/</td>
<td>meke</td>
<td>'octopus'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/haa/</td>
<td>h\textsuperscript{Y} aa</td>
<td>'sacred'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/faa/</td>
<td>haa</td>
<td>'four'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/oho/</td>
<td>oh\textsuperscript{Y} o</td>
<td>'jump'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ofo/</td>
<td>oh\textsuperscript{W} o</td>
<td>'be surprised'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/huke/</td>
<td>h\textsuperscript{Y} uke</td>
<td>'search for'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/fuke/</td>
<td>h\textsuperscript{W} uke</td>
<td>'open the oven'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The resultant contrasts establish the phonemic status of /\textit{\textbf{h}}/ and /\textit{f}/. The symbols chosen to represent these two phonemes or sound classes are '\textit{h}' and '\textit{f}' respectively.

2.1.4 CHOICE OF SYMBOLS 'f' and 'h'

The reasons for choosing the symbols 'f' and 'h' for the two glottal fricatives are outlined below.

2.1.4.1 SYMBOL 'h'

In place of 'h' the symbol 's' was considered, and rejected. 's' occurs in the Samoan language which is also spoken by the Tokelauans. Where a Samoan word with 's' has a cognate in Tokelauan, the corresponding Tokelauan phoneme is /\textit{h}/.
Since the Tokelauans are aware that Samoan 's' represents a sibilant sound [$s$], it seemed unwise to use the normally sibilant symbol 's' for the glottal phoneme. A second point is that Tokelauans use [$s$] in some words, so that it contrasts with /h/. These words are borrowings, usually from Samoan.

2.1.4.2 SYMBOL 'f'

In the place of 'f', symbols 'h' and 'wh' were considered and rejected. 'h' was rejected because it was required to represent the phoneme /h/.

'wh' was rejected, first on grounds of simplicity. The single letter 'f' is more economical than the diagraph 'wh'. Compare the following words:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Samoan</th>
<th>Tokelauan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fefete</td>
<td>whewhete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fuafa</td>
<td>whuaewha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faifaiva</td>
<td>whaiwhaiwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ofofooga</td>
<td>owhoowhoogi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secondly the 'wh' seems less acceptable to Tokelauans than the 'f'. For example people objected to their island being spelt Whakaowho in place of Fakaofo. It must be noted, however, that the Tokelauans themselves write inconsistently using a mixture of the symbols 'wh', 'f', 'h' and 's'. The same word is often spelt by a single individual in different
ways e.g. foki, hoki; wholau, folau, holau. Thus whatever solution is adopted will not be completely consistent with current Tokelauan usages.

Historical evidence is a third factor favouring the choice of 'f'. All Tokelauan /f/ words are derived from Proto-Polynesian words with *f.

One argument against 'f' is that Tokelauans are aware that it represents a different class of sound in Samoan and English, e.g. In the English word fish and the Samoan word faie 'house' the /f/ is labio-dental. It may be argued that since the Tokelauan /f/ sound more like [ʍ] than the labio-dental [f], it should accordingly be represented by a different symbol to the 'f'. It must be noted, however, that the actualisation of /f/ as [ʍ] is limited to occurrence before front vowels. Thus the choice of a suitable symbol based on phonetic similarity to the phoneme /f/ is difficult because of the wide range of phonetic variation. Also the difficulties with any obvious substitute symbol for 'f' (such as wh or h) outweigh this argument.

2.1.5 THE VELAR NASAL /g/

The choice of 'g' or 'ng' for the velar nasal phoneme is based on simplicity and acceptability to the Tokelauans. The single letter 'g' is more economical than the diagraph 'ng'.
Furthermore, Tokelauans find it difficult to change to 'ng' since 'g' has been used consistently for the velar nasal both in Tokelauan and the other Polynesian languages that they know of — such as Samoan.

2.2 THE FUNCTOR MORPHEMES OF THE LANGUAGE OF TOKELAU

Morphemes in Tokelauan may be divided into **FUNCTORS** and **BASES**. Functors, or grammatical morphemes, include all affixes and all particles, and contrast with bases or lexical morphemes.

An index of functors follows in 2.2.1. A lengthier treatment, with illustrative examples and discussion is given in 2.2.2.

2.2.1 INDEX OF FUNCTOR MORPHEMES

A list of the functor morphemes of Tokelauan is given below. A gloss for each morpheme is provided in the column marked **FUNCTION**, while a **REFERENCE** column provides a cross-reference to the morpheme classes discussed in section 2.2.2 where some examples occur of the syntactic usage of the functor morphemes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MORPHEME</th>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a/aa</td>
<td>Dominant possession mkrs</td>
<td>PREPOSITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>person mker</td>
<td>ARTICLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a</td>
<td>passive suffix</td>
<td>SUFFIX II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a</td>
<td>nominalising suffix</td>
<td>SUFFIX II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a</td>
<td>stativiser</td>
<td>SUFFIX II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-aatili</td>
<td>'more than'</td>
<td>MANNER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-aatonu</td>
<td>hesitant inference</td>
<td>CONJUNCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-(C)aga</td>
<td>nominalising suffix</td>
<td>SUFFIX II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-aqia</td>
<td>passive suffix</td>
<td>SUFFIX II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ai</td>
<td>complement proform</td>
<td>ANAPHORIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ake</td>
<td>direction upwards</td>
<td>DIRECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ake</td>
<td>emphatic intensifier</td>
<td>EMPHATIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-(C)aki</td>
<td>reciprocal - plural</td>
<td>SUFFIX I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)te</td>
<td>pronoun mker</td>
<td>ARTICLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atu</td>
<td>'towards hearer'</td>
<td>DIRECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>auaa</td>
<td>reason conjunction</td>
<td>CONJUNCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>non-past</td>
<td>TENSE/ASPECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>agentive mker</td>
<td>PREPOSITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>einaa</td>
<td>optional mker</td>
<td>TENSE/ASPECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faka-</td>
<td>causative prefix</td>
<td>PREFIX III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fe-</td>
<td>reciprocal prefix</td>
<td>PREFIX II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fia-</td>
<td>desiderative prefix</td>
<td>PREVERBAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foki</td>
<td>'also'</td>
<td>ANAPHORIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORPHEME</td>
<td>FUNCTION</td>
<td>REFERENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foko-</td>
<td>Exclusion prefix</td>
<td>PREFIX II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-qa</td>
<td>nominalising suffix</td>
<td>SUFFIX II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-gaapulpulu</td>
<td>coconut number suffix</td>
<td>PREFIX II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-gia</td>
<td>passive suffix</td>
<td>SUFFIX II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h-/he/hee</td>
<td>indefinite singular</td>
<td>ARTICLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hee</td>
<td>dependant negative</td>
<td>NEGATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heeai</td>
<td>sentential negative</td>
<td>NEGATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heeki</td>
<td>proverbial negative</td>
<td>NEGATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hohe</td>
<td>non-particular article</td>
<td>ARTICLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hoo</td>
<td>'continuously'</td>
<td>MANNER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>descriptive case mker</td>
<td>PREPOSITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ia</td>
<td>'then'</td>
<td>EMPHATIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ia</td>
<td>'yonder'</td>
<td>POSITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ia</td>
<td>proper article</td>
<td>ARTICLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ia</td>
<td>number article</td>
<td>ARTICLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-(C)ia</td>
<td>passive suffix</td>
<td>SUFFIX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iee</td>
<td>definite plural</td>
<td>ARTICLES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ifo</td>
<td>direction downwards</td>
<td>DIRECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iloo</td>
<td>comparative</td>
<td>CONJUNCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ina</td>
<td>passive suffix</td>
<td>SUFFIX II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka</td>
<td>contrastive conjunction</td>
<td>CONJUNCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka/kaa</td>
<td>inceptive</td>
<td>TENSE/ASPECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaafaia</td>
<td>future conditional</td>
<td>CONJUNCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kana/kanafaia</td>
<td>past conditional</td>
<td>CONJUNCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ke</td>
<td>purposive</td>
<td>TENSE/ASPECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORPHEME</td>
<td>FUNCTION</td>
<td>REFERENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kehe</td>
<td>'separate'</td>
<td>MANNER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keinaa</td>
<td>optative</td>
<td>TENSE/ASPECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ki</td>
<td>directional case mker</td>
<td>PREPOSITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ko</td>
<td>specifier</td>
<td>PREPOSITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koo</td>
<td>imperative particle</td>
<td>EMPHATIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koi</td>
<td>present progressive</td>
<td>TENSE/ASPECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kua</td>
<td>perfective</td>
<td>TENSE/ASPECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laa</td>
<td>polite anaphoric</td>
<td>ANAPHORIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lau-</td>
<td>fish number</td>
<td>PREFIX II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lava</td>
<td>exactness</td>
<td>INTENSIFIER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lele</td>
<td>intensive</td>
<td>INTENSIFIER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loa</td>
<td>immediacy</td>
<td>MANNER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma</td>
<td>additive</td>
<td>CONJUNCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma</td>
<td>explanatory case mker</td>
<td>PREPOSITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma-</td>
<td>'able to'</td>
<td>PREFIX IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maatua</td>
<td>intensifier</td>
<td>PREBASIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mai</td>
<td>origin case mker</td>
<td>PREPOSITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mai</td>
<td>towards speaker</td>
<td>DIRECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mata</td>
<td>'appears to be'</td>
<td>PREVERBAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mataa</td>
<td>divisional</td>
<td>PREBASIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matuua</td>
<td>intensifier</td>
<td>PREVERBAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meake</td>
<td>immediate sequential</td>
<td>CONJUNCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mo</td>
<td>explanatory case mker</td>
<td>PREPOSITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mua</td>
<td>politeness</td>
<td>INTENSIFIER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORPHEME</td>
<td>FUNCTION</td>
<td>REFERENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na</td>
<td>simple past</td>
<td>TENSE/ASPECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na/naa</td>
<td>negative subjunctive</td>
<td>TENSE/ASPECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-naa</td>
<td>'near hearer'</td>
<td>POSITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naa</td>
<td>definite plural</td>
<td>ARTICLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nae</td>
<td>past progressive</td>
<td>TENSE/ASPECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nei</td>
<td>'now'</td>
<td>POSITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nei</td>
<td>near speaker</td>
<td>POSITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ni</td>
<td>indefinite plural</td>
<td>ARTICLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ni_</td>
<td>quasi-interrogative</td>
<td>ANAPHORIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niee</td>
<td>indefinite plural</td>
<td>ARTICLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o/co</td>
<td>subordinate possession mker</td>
<td>PREPOSITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oi</td>
<td>sequential conjunction</td>
<td>CONJUNCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ona</td>
<td>'because'</td>
<td>CONJUNCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ona</td>
<td>verbal subordinator</td>
<td>TENSE/ASPECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pe</td>
<td>alternant mker</td>
<td>CONJUNCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pea</td>
<td>'persisting'</td>
<td>MANNER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R-)</td>
<td>partial reduplication</td>
<td>PREFIX I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(RR-)</td>
<td>complete reduplication</td>
<td>PREFIX I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-/te-tee</td>
<td>definite singular</td>
<td>ARTICLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taaali</td>
<td>'almost'</td>
<td>PREVERBAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tahi</td>
<td>'other'</td>
<td>ARTICLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tai</td>
<td>'nearly'</td>
<td>PREVERBAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taki-</td>
<td>distributive</td>
<td>PREFIX III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tamaa</td>
<td>diminishing</td>
<td>PREBASIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tau-</td>
<td>'try, about, only'</td>
<td>PREFIX V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.2 ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES AND DISCUSSIONS OF FUNCTORS

This section offers a more extended but informal treatment of Functors.

Sentences illustrating the syntactic use of each functor morpheme are provided together with glosses, sometimes accompanied by extended discussion of details of morphological alternants and semantic and syntactic usages.

Functors are treated under the following headings:

2.2.2.1 CONJUNCTIONS
2.2.2.2 TENSE/ASPECT MARKERS
2.2.2.3 NEGATIVES
2.2.2.4 PREPOSITIONS
2.2.2.5 ARTICLES
2.2.2.6 PREVERBAL PARTICLES
2.2.2.7  PREBASIC PARTICLES
2.2.2.8  PREFIXES
2.2.2.9  SUFFIXES
2.2.2.10 DIRECTION PARTICLES
2.2.2.11 MANNER PARTICLES
2.2.2.12 POSITION MARKERS
2.2.2.13 INTENSIFIERS
2.2.2.14 ANAPHORIC PARTICLES
2.2.2.15 EMPHATIC PARTICLES

A further section 2.2.2.16 discusses the pronouns of Tokolauan.

Each of the above headings subsumes a set of elements sharing some semantic and/or syntactic constant. However, these sets do not necessarily coincide exactly with the grammatical classes distinguished in the formal analysis (Chapters 3-5); rather they are groupings for easy reference which have the convenience of corresponding to traditional grammatical categories.

2.2.2.1  CONJUNCTIONS

ka  CONTRASTIVE CONJUNCTION 'but'
(2.1) e heeki koo iloa faka-
    non-past neg. lstsing know causative
    tokelau ka ko au
    Tok.language but spec lstsing
    ka akoako i te
    inceptive learn Descrmker art
    faka- tokelau
    causative Tok.language

I do not yet understand Tokelauan but I will learn it

(2.2) e tutuha iee -tahi
    non-past same def.pl. other
    mea ka e hee tutuha
    thing but non-past neg same
    iee -tahi mea
    def.pl other thing

Some things are the same but other things are
not the same (i.e. some are different)

ma ADDITIVE CONJUNCTION 'and', 'with'

(2.3) olo koutou ma te
    go 2ndpl with def.sing
    malaga
    voyagers

Go (you pl.) with the voyagers
(2.4)  
na  lea  mai  te  fafine  
past  say  dir.  def.sing  woman  

kua  uma  t-  o  
perfect  complete  def.sing  poss  

-na  lea  atu  ki  ate  
3rd sing  say  dir.  Dirmker  prnmker  

koe  ma  naa  toeaina  
2nd sing  and  def.pl.  elder  

The woman told me that she has already spoken  
to you and the elders  

The Additive conjunction ma is most commonly used to  
conjoin noun phrases as in (2.3) and (2.4) above. It may also  
be used however, to conjoin verb phrases as in (2.5) below.  

(2.5)  
e  hee  he  mea  lelei  
non-past  neg.  indef.sing  thing  good  

te  fano  ki  te  fono  
def.sing  go  Dirmker  def.sing  meeting  

fano  ai  faka-  logo  ci  
go  compl. causative  hear  conj.
otī ki naa mea e
finish Dirmker def.pl thing non-past

fai mai ma lea mai ai
do dir. and say dir. compl.

Te maaloo
def.sing governor

It is not enough to go along to the meeting and just listen to the matters proposed and related by the governor

oi SEQUENTIAL CONJUNCTION (implying sequential relation)
'and' 'and then'

(2.6) kave oi huhunu
take (it) sequ. conj. burn

Take and burn it. (cf (s.36))

(2.7) uhu oi hiva ai
sing sequ. conj. dance compl.

Sing and then dance

(2.8) ko naa tino kua olo
spec def.pl. person perfect go (pl)

ki niuhila oi nonofo ai
Dirmker New Zealand sequ. conj. stay (pl) compl.

The people have gone to New Zealand and settled
Te Keepa was swimming in the sea when suddenly he was bitten by a fish.

Tui was eating the bait when Muti came along and tossed Tui, and then Tui became very angry with
Muti because of his bad behaviour

**pe**  ALTERNANT MARKER 'whether' 'or'

(2.11)  ko  tuu  he  fafine  pe
spec  name  indef.sing  woman  altern.conj

he  tagata
indef.sing  man
Is Tuu a woman or a man?

(2.12)  e  hee  koo  iloa  pe
non-past  neg  1stsing  know  altern.conj

na  fano  ia
past  go  3rdsing
I do not know whether he went

(2.13)  pahi  mai  pe  kua  fia
guess  dir.  altern.conj  perfect  how-many

oo  -ku  tauhaga
poss  1stsing  year
Guess how old I am

**auaa**  REASON CONJUNCTION 'because'

(2.14)  ko  au  kaa  fano  auaa
spec  1stsing  inceptive  go  reasonconj
ko koe kua fia-moe
spec 2ndsing perfect desiderative sleep

I am going because you are tired

(2.15) ko naa tagata iee -ia
spec. def.pl man def.pl post

e hee kaihooa auaa
non-past neg steal reasonconj

e maukoloa
non-past rich

Those people never steal because they are rich

kaafai FUTURE CONDITIONAL CONJUNCTION 'if' 'when'

(2.16) ko au e fano faifaiva
spec lstsing non-past go fishing

kaafai e teka naa
fut.condit non-past pass def.pl

vaiaho e lua
week non-past two

I will go fishing when two weeks have passed
(i.e. in two weeks time)
(2.17)  
\[\text{kaafai} \quad e \quad \text{fai} \quad \text{te}\]
\[
\text{fut.condit} \quad \text{non-past} \quad \text{do} \quad \text{def.sing}
\]
\[
\text{hiva} \quad \text{kaa} \quad \text{hiva} \quad \text{au}
\]
dance inceptive dance lstsing

If a dance is held, I will dance.

The conjunction \text{kaafai} is probably composed of the two morphemes \text{ka} 'anticipatory aspect marker' and the base \text{fai} 'do do'.

\[
\text{kanafai/kana} \quad \text{PAST CONDITIONAL CONJUNCTION} \quad \text{'if' 'when'}
\]

(2.18)  
\[\text{kana} \quad \text{lelei} \quad \text{te} \quad \text{fe}\]
\[
\text{pastcondit.} \quad \text{good} \quad \text{def.sing} \quad \text{recip.pref}
\]
\[
\text{hoko} \quad -\text{taki} \quad -\text{ga} \quad \text{a}
\]
join recip.suff. nom.suff persmker
\[
\text{tagata} \quad \text{tokelau} \quad \text{ma} \quad \text{te} \quad \text{ofiha}
\]
man place and def.sing office
\[
\text{e} \quad \text{lahi} \quad \text{foki} \quad \text{naa} \quad \text{mea}
\]
non-past many also def.pl. thing
\[
\text{e} \quad \text{iloa} \quad \text{e} \quad \text{tagata} \quad \text{tokelau}
\]
non-past know Agmker man place
\[
\text{e} \quad \text{uiga} \quad \text{ki} \quad \text{te}
\]
non-past about Dirmker def.sing
pulepule -ga o t-
administer nom.suff. poss def.sing

o laatou atumotu
poss 3rdpl island

If communications between the people of Tokelau and the administering office had been good, then the Tokelauan people would understand a lot more about the administration of their island

ona 'because' (This morpheme is regarded by the older speakers of Tokelauan to be a borrowing from Samoan 'ona')

(2.19) ona ko te matagi e
because spec def.sing wind non-past

hee hau ai te vaka
neg come compl. def.sing canoe

The boat will not be coming because of the wind

vaagana ai EXCEPTION MARKER 'except'
(2.20) na maua uma a maatou ika
past catch all poss 1stpl.excl fish

vaagana ai koe
except 2ndsing

We all caught a fish except you
(2.21) tuku uma naa kaafilo ki
place all def.pl. fishhooks Dirmker

toto i te polapola
inside Descrmker def.sing basket

vaagana ai te kaafilo fuaefa
except def.sing fishhook big

Put all the fishhooks in the basket except the
big one

It is felt that vaagana ai comprises more than one morpheme.

Its inclusion in this list, therefore, is largely for comparative
purposes.

aatonu HESITANT INFERENC 'then' 'perhaps'

(2.22) kana i ei he
past.condit. Descrmker there indef.sing

fe-hoko-taki-ga lelei aatonu kua
communication good hesit.infer perfect

tatau foki ona iloa lelei
should also verbsubord. know good

e koutou naa mea e
Agmker 2ndpl def.pl. thing non-past
fai -a e te ofiha
do pass.suff Agmker def.sing office

mo tokelau
Explmker place
If all communications were good, then perhaps you should know more about the things done by the office for Tokelau

iloo COMPARATIVE CONJUNCTION 'than' 'compared to'
(2.23) e lahi naa ika a
non-past many def.pl. fish persmker
muti iloo naa ika aa -ku
name than def.pl. fish poss lstsing
Muti has more fish than me

(2.24) e faigataa te galuega nei
non-past difficult def.sing work post
iloo te galuega i falee
than def.sing work descrmker place
The work here is hard compared to the work at Falee
2.2.2.2 TENSE/ASPECT MARKERS

**ka/kaa** IMMEDIATE FUTURE, INCEPTIVE, ANTICIPATORY

(2.25) ko au kaa fano
spec 1st sing inceptive go
I am going (now)

(2.26) kafai e too te ua
if non-past fall def. sing rain

kaa ola naa laakau
anticip. thrive def. pl. tree

When it rains the trees will grow (providing that it rains the trees will grow)

**kua** PERFECTIVE, IMMEDIATE PRESENT

(2.27) kua uma te galuega
perfect complete def. sing work

The work has been completed

(2.28) kua oo -mai koulua
perfect come post. 2nd dual

You (two) have arrived

**na** SIMPLE PAST

(2.29) ko au na koo kai

-a te ika
pass. suff def. sing fish
I ate the fish/it was I who ate the fish

koi  PRESENT PROGRESSIVE

(2.30)  koi  ola  Ø  o
press.prog  well  def.sing  poss
-o  maatua
2ndsing  parent
Are your parents still alive?

nae  PAST PROGRESSIVE

(2.31)  ko  au  nae  fa1  kaukau  ananafi
spec  lstsing  pastprog.  do  swim  yesterday
I was swimming yesterday

(2.32)  ko  tui  nae  i  ei
spec  name  pastprog.  Descrmker  here
i  te  falefono
Descrmker  def.sing  meeting-house
Tui was at the meeting-house

e  NON-PAST

(2.33)  ko  au  e  fano
spec  lstsing  non-past  go
I am (will be) going
Why are you crying?

The house is mine

Take (it) to burn it (take it so that it can be burnt)

I have come in order to do my business

(You) should go carefully

speak
faka- gehegehe
causative slow
Are you able to speak slowly? (Can you speak slowly?)

(2.4) kua tatau i tagata tokelau
perfect proper Descrmker man place

ona faka logologo ki
verbsubord. causative hear Dirmker

ate kilaatou
prnmker 3rdpl

The Tokelauan people should listen to what they (others) say

Ø IMPERATIVE

(2.41) Ø hau
imperative come (sing)

Come!

(2.42) Ø taakokoto ki lalo
imperative lay(pl) Dirmker down

Lie down!
NA/NAA NEGATIVE SUBJUNCTIVE, CAVEAT 'lest' 'should not'  

(2.43) koe naa kake ki te  
2ndsng caveat climb Dirmker def.sing  
laakau naa koe e pakuu  
tree caveat 2ndsng non-past fall  
You should not climb the tree lest you fall  

(2.44) koe na hee kake ki  
2ndsng caveat neg climb Dirmker  
te laakau ko koe naa pakuu  
def.sing tree spec 2ndsng caveat fall  
You should not climb that tree; you will fall  

(2.45) aua' koutou na hee fai  
dont 2ndpl. shouldn't neg do  
kakata  
laugh  
'Stop! don't (you plural) laugh  
The forms NAA and NA are in complementary distribution. NA occurs immediately preceding the negative particle HEE 'not'; NAA occurs elsewhere.
Tonight I might write some letters (perhaps I will write some letters tonight).
naa       lualua
def       ship

No one would go on board the ships because they thought that the ships had come from the heavens, and might carry them off to the heavens if they went aboard

keinaa  OPTATIVE 'should, better (do)'

(2.48)  keinaa  olo  koutou  
optative  go(pl)  2ndpl

You (pl) had better go (you should leave)

The functor keinaa is probably derived from the two morphemes: ke 'purposive' and einaa 'optional marker'.

2.2.2.3  NEGATIVES

hee       PREVERBAL or DEPENDENT NEGATIVE 'not'

(2.49)  ko  au  e  hee  fia
    spec  1stsing  non-past  neg  desiderative

fano

go

I do not wish to go

(2.50)  e  hee  koo  iloa
    non-past  neg  1stsing  know

I don't know
(2.51) e hee kata au i
non-past neg laugh 1st sing Descrmker
te poon nei
def sing night post
I shall not laugh tonight

(2.52) e hee i ei he
non-past neg Descrmker here indef sing
penihina i kinei
gas Descrmker here
There is no petrol here

heeai  SENTENTIAL or INDEPENDENT NEGATIVE 'no'

(2.53) e heeai he peni i
non-past neg indef sing pen Descrmker
kinei
here
There is no pen here

(2.54) e fia inu koe heeai
non-past desiderative drink 2nd sing no
Do you want a drink? no
(2.55) e heeai ni pehe -ga
    non-past neg indef.pl song nom.suff

i te falefono
Descrnker def.sing meeting-house
There is no singing at the meeting-house

heeki PREVERBAL NEGATIVE 'not' 'not yet'

(2.56) ko heeki i ei te teine
    spec neg Descrnker here def.sing girl
The girl is not here yet

(2.57) ko heeki kai te tino
    spec neg eat def.sing person
The man has not yet eaten

(2.58) he aa e heeki fano
    indef.sing what tense neg go
ai koe
compl. 2ndsing
Why did you not go?

(2.59) ko au ko heeki fano
    spec 1stsing spec neg go
I have not gone yet
(2.60) ko au e heeki fano
    spec lstsing tense neg go

I did not go

Discussion on the combinatorial possibilities of the two negatives hee and heeki with the tense aspect markers is provided in Chapter 5, section 5.11.

2.2.2.4 PREPOSITIONS

Members of this class perform diverse syntactic functions and include: the Case markers; Locative Argument marker; Possession phrase marker (or Genitive Argument initiator); and the Specifying particle.

ki DIRECTIONAL CASE MARKER (Dirmker) 'to' 'towards'

(2.61) hau ki loto fale
    come(sing) Dirmker inside house

Come inside

(2.62) e hee matuaa lelei te
    non-past neg very good def.sing

fano -ga o te tino
    go nom.suff poss def.sing person

ki te fenua
    Dirmker def.sing island

It isn't good that he should go to the island
DESCRIPTIVE CASE MARKER (Descrmker) 'in' 'on' 'with'
 'about' 'at' 'of'
(2.63) tuku te kaafilo i
        to place def.sing fishhook Descrmker
        te polapola
def.sing basket
Put the fishhook in the basket

(2.64) nofo i te nofoaa
        sit Descrmker def.sing seat
Sit on the seat

(2.65) na miha na fafine
        past fight def.pl. woman
        i o laa vae
Descrmker poss 3rd. dual leg
The women fought with their legs

AGENTIVE CASE MARKER (Agmker) 'by'
(2.66) na kai e au te ika
        past eat Agmker 1st.sing def.sing fish
The fish was eaten by me

ORIGIN CASE MARKER (Origmker) 'from' 'from whence'
(2.67) e hau mai fea te
        non-past come Origmker where def.sing
tino 
person

tee 
def.sing

-la 
post

Where does that man come from?

mo/ma  EXPLANATORY CASE MARKER (Explmker) 'for' 'concerning'

'about'

(2.68) e  kave  ma  ai  te  peni
non-past take Explmker who def.sing pen

For whom are (you) carrying the pen?

(2.69) e  fooki  mo  ai  te  vaka
non-past give Explmker who def.sing canoe

For whom are you giving the canoe?

(2.70) ka  ko  heeki  fano  ia  sione
but tense neg go propart name

lea  mai  ai  ki  ate
say dir. compl. Dirmker prnmker

au  ko  au  ke  lea
1stsing spec 1stsing purposive say

atu  ki  ate  koe  mo
dir. Dirmker prnmker 2ndsing Explmker

ni  naai  fekau
indef.pl few work
Before Sione left he asked me to speak to you about some business

(2.71) lea  mai  te  tamaaloa  kua
say  dir.  def.sing  man  perfect

uma  t-  o  -na  lea
complete  def.sing  poss  3rdsing  say

atu  ki  ate  koe  ma
dir.  Dirmker  prnmker  2ndsing  Explmker

te  vali  -ga  o  te
def.sing  paint  nom.suff  poss  def.sing

fale
house

The man told me that he has already spoken to you about the painting of the house

The choice of mo or ma is determined by the semantic classes of the Bases related by the preposition. (Refer to Possession markers).

"0/00 SUBORDINATE POSSESSION MARKER, SUBORDINATE GENITIVE ARGUMENT MARKER 'of' 'belonging to'"
DOMINANT POSSESSION MARKER, DOMINANT GENITIVE

ARGUMENT MARKER 'of' 'belonging to'

(2.72)  e  i  te  fale  te
non-past  Descrmker  art  house  def.sing
meakai  a  te  tino
food  poss  def.sing  man

The man's food is in the house

(2.73)  e  oo  -ku  te  fale
non-past  poss  1stsg  def.sing  house

The house is mine

(2.74)  he  aa  te  mea  a
indef.sing  what  def.sing  thing  poss
koe  e  fai
2ndsg  non-past  do

What are you doing?

(2.75)  he  aa  t-  a  koe
indef.sing  what  def.sing  poss  2ndsg
e  fai
non-past  do

What are you doing?
What are you doing?

/o/oo marks subordinate possession, that is where the possessor holds an inferior position or an inalienable relation to the article possessed. For example parts of the body, parents and elders, emotions, and large objects such as a canoe, and non-portable objects such as trees and houses etc. are usually possessed subordinately.

/a/aa marks dominant possession. In such instances the possessor is dominant over the thing possessed, that is, has some control over the item. For example, transportable objects, food and children are usually possessed dominantly.

Nouns in Tokelauan are not subclassified by their co-occurrence with either the dominant possession marker a/aa or the subordinate possession marker o/oo. That is, while nouns most commonly occur with either the dominant possession marker, or the subordinate possession marker, it is possible for most nouns to occur with both.

For example, consider sentence (2.77) below:
(2.77) e aa -ku naa vae
non-past dom.poss 1stsing def.pl leg

The legs belong to me

In this sentence the noun vae 'leg/legs' has been dominantly possessed, that is, it co-occurs with the dominant possession marker aa. This contrasts with (2.78) where vae occurs with the subordinate possession marker oo.

(2.78) e oo -ku naa vae

The legs belong to me

It was noted earlier that 'parts of the body' have been specified to occur with the subordinate possession marker. This is the case in (2.78) where the speaker is obviously referring to his own legs. In (2.77) however, the use of the dominant possession marker aa, implies that the possessor has a dominant relationship to the legs which are possessed by him. Such would be the case if he was talking about some pig's legs in his possession, or table legs, or some legs over which he has independence and some measure of control. Thus upon hearing (2.77) the hearer knows immediately (by the use of the dominant possession marker) that the speaker is not referring to his own legs. If (2.77) is taken to refer to pig's legs, then the subordinate possession marker o would be used to explain the possessive relationship between the pig and its legs. Examine sentence (2.79):
(2.79) e aa -ku naa vae
non-past dom.poss lstsing def.pl leg

o te puaka
sub.poss def.sing pig

The pigs legs belong to me/The pig legs are mine

The legs were a part of the pig's body, thus the subordinate possession of the legs by the pig, is shown by the use of the marker o. The speaker, on the other hand possesses the legs dominantly and accordingly this is marked by the use of the marker aa.

Consider now sentences (2.80), (2.81) and (2.82) below.

(2.80) ko naa laakau o te
spec def.pl tree sub.poss def.sing

fenua tee -nei e
island def.sing post non-past

hee matuua fuaeafa
neg very big

The trees of this island are not very big

(2.81) e oo -ku te
non-past sub.poss lstsing def.sing

laakau tee -ia
tree def.sing 3rd.sing

The tree belongs to me
(2.82) e aa -ku te laakau

non-past dom.poss lstsing def.sing log

The log is mine

The noun for both 'log' and 'tree' in Tokelauan is laakau. In (2.80) and (2.81), the laakau is possessed subordinately marked by the use of o/oo, subordinate possession marker, but in (2.82) (where the tree has been felled and the possessor has some measure of control over it) laakau is possessed dominantly and marked by a/aa.

To summarise our discussion on possession marking, it would seem that all Bases cannot simply be classified for either dominant or subordinate possession, as in the case of vae 'leg'. Rather it appears that both the noun depicting the possessor and that marking the item possessed, and the relationship between them (in terms of dominant and subordinate possession), are all relevant to the choice of the correct possession marker.

ko 'SPECIFIER', FOCUS or TOPIC MARKER

(2.83) ko au na fano ki

spec lstsing past go Dirmker

te falepopo ananafi
def.sing copra-house yesterday

I went to the copra-house yesterday/ It was I who went to the copra-house yesterday
(2.84) ko ananafi na fano ai
spec yesterday past go compl.

au ki te falepopo
1st sing Dirnmker def. sing copra-house

I went to the copra-house yesterday/ It was
yesterday I went to the copra-house

(2.85) ko te tino e hee
spec def. sing man non-past neg

ko te faipule
spec def. sing chief

The man is not the chief

2.2.2.5 ARTICLES

ia NUMBER ARTICLE (artnum)

(2.86) e tolu ia ika
non-past three num. art person

l te falefono

Descrmker art meeting-house

How many people in the meeting-house
hohe  NON-PARTICULAR ARTICLE (n.partic.) 'any'

(2.88)  kave   kehe   naa   kohu   ki
        take  away   def.pl.  clothes  Drmker

hohe    tino
n.partic.  person

Give those clothes away to anybody

The non-particular article hohe, may well be a borrowing from Samoan: so'o 'any' and se 'article'.

COMMON ARTICLES (ARTcom)

te/t-/tee  DEFINITE ARTICLE SINGULAR

(2.89)  ko   tee   nei   t-   o
        spec  def.sing  post  def.sing poss

-ku    fale
1st.sing  house

This is my house

he/h-/hee INDEFINITE ARTICLE SINGULAR

(2.90)  na   maua   he   ika
        past  catch  indef.sing  fish

Did you catch a fish?
naa/Ø/iee  DEFINITE ARTICLE PLURAL

The possessive pronoun form consists of three morphemes: article; possession marker (poss); and pronoun. When the article slot is empty this is understood to represent the definite plural article. A zero (Ø) alternate of the definite article plural is accordingly posited for the possessive pronouns.

(2.92) kikila  ki  naa  tino
look   Dirmker   def.pl   man

Look at the men

(2.93) ko  iee-  nei  Ø  o
spec  def.pl  post def.pl  poss

tataou  fale
3rdplexcl.  house

These are our houses

ni/niee-  DEFINITE ARTICLE PLURAL

(2.94) e  i  ei  ni
non-past Descrmker  here  indef.pl
(2.95) \textit{ni a -ulua hua}
indef.sing poss 2nd.dual drinking-nut
Your drinking-nuts

(2.96) \textit{nrie -tahi hua}
indef.pl other drinking-nut
Some other drinking-nuts

tahi 'other'

The morpheme tahi 'other', can combine with certain allomorphs of the common articles above. The resultant set of 'composite functors' behave syntactically as members of the common article class. These are listed below with sentence examples:

teetahi 'the other'

(2.97) \textit{ko au na hau i}
spec 1stsing past come Descrmker

te vaka tee nei ka ko
art canoe def.sing post. but spec

fefilo\text{\texti}{i} na hau i teetahi
name past come Descrmker the other

vaka
I came on this canoe but Fefilo\text{\texti}{i} came on the other canoe
ieetahi 'the others'

(2.99) e  tutuha  ieetahi  mea  ka
non-past  same  'the others'  thing  but

e  hee  tutuha  ieetahi  mea
non-past  neg  same  'the others'  thing

Some of the things are the same, but the others
are different

tieetahi 'some others'

(2.100) ko  naa  tino  na  o  mai
spec  def.pl  men  past  come  dir

i  tieetahi  vaka

Descrmker 'some others'  canoe

The men came in some canoes

a/ia/(a) te/Ø  PROPER ARTICLE (ARTprop)

The proper article has several alternants. These are
syntactically determined and are listed below with sentence examples.

a  Proper article marking personal names in the constituents
LOCarg, DESCRCase, DIRCase, and ORIGCase

(2.101) kave  ki  a  hela  te  puha
take  Dirmker  persmker  name  def.sing  box
Take the box to Sarah
(2.102) kua puli i a ioane
perfect forget Descrmker persmker name
te o igoa
def.sing poss name
Ioaane has forgotten your name/Your name is
forgotten to Ioaane

ia Proper article marking personal names, pronouns and place names
in the constituent Subject.

(2.103) kua hau ia paamata
perfect come propart name
Paamata has arrived

(2.104) e gali ia fenuatapu
non-past beautiful propart place
Fenuatapu is beautiful

(a) te Proper article marking pronouns in the constituents
LOCarg, DESCRCase, DIRCase, and ORIGCase

(2.105) na kikila atu au ki
past look dir. 1stsing Dirmker

(a) te koe
prnmker 2ndsing
I looked at you
(2.105b) e  i  te  koe  te
non-past    Descrmker    prnmker    2ndsing    def.sing

naifi
knife
You have the knife

Ø    Proper article marking

(a)           personal names, place names, and pronouns in
the constituents AGENTcase, GENarg, and
EXPLcase;

(b)           place names in the constituents LOCarg, DESCRcase
DIRcase and ORIGcase

(2.106a) e  ø  Ø  ia  te  naifi
non-past    poss    propart    3rdsing    def.sing    knife
The knife is his/The knife belongs to him

(2.106b) na  kitea  e  Ø  au
past    see    Agmker    propart    1stsing

la    koe
propart    2ndsing
You were seen by me
2.2.2.6 PREVERBAL PARTICLES

Preverbal particles occur within the Verb phrase, preposed to the Base of the VerbExpandedBase. Class members modify the meaning of the Base which they precede. Members of this class are not mutually exclusive within the phrase.

**fia** DESIDERATIVE 'want' 'wish'

(2.107) ko au e fia fano

spec 1stsing non-past desiderative go

I wish to go

(2.108) e fia kai koe ki

non-past desiderative eat 2ndsing Dirkmker

naa meakai papaalagi
def.pl food european

Do you wish to eat European food?

**toe 'again'**

(2.109) e hee toe olo koutou

non-past neg 'again' go 2ndpl

You (pl) are not to go again

(2.110) e fia toe fano koe

non-past desiderative 'again' go 2ndsing

Do you wish to go again?/Do you wish to go back?
tai/taali 'nearly' 'almost'

(2.111) ko te vaka na taali goto
spec def.sing canoe past '

The canoe nearly sank

(2.112) e katoa te tai lua helau
non-past all def.sing nearly two hundred

Almost two hundred

mata 'appears to be' 'seems like'

(2.113) e mata loa te ako
non-past seems long def.sing learn

-ga o naa hiva
nom.suff poss def.pl dance

The dance lesson seems to be taking a long time

Further examples of Bases which can occur with this
prefix are:

maakeke 'hard' mata maakeke 'appears tough'

ua 'rain' mata ua 'the day seems to be rainy'

faigoofie 'easy' matafaigoofie 'seems quite simple'

piiha 'noise' mata piiha 'seems noisy'

matuua INTENSIFIER 'big' 'very'

(2.114) e lelei ka e hee
non-past good but non-past neg
matuaa lelei
very good

It is all right but it is not very good

2.2.2.7 PREBASIC PARTICLES

Prebasic particles usually occur within the noun phrase, preposed to the Base or the NounExpandedBase. Class members modify the meaning of the Base to which they are affixed.

matua INTENSIFIER 'big' 'very'

(2.115) he matua ika lele
indef.sing big fish very
A very big fish

tamaa 'DIMINISHING' 'small' 'less'

(2.116) he tamaa ika lele

A very small fish

mataa DIVISION, ENTITY, GROUP

(2.117) ko au e fia
spec 1stsing non-past desiderative

talanoa e uiga ki te
speak def.sing about Dimker def.sing

mataa kupu tee nei
division word def.sing post

I wish to discuss this topic
Further examples of `mataa` are:

- **galuega** 'work'  
  **mataa galuega** 'occupation'
- **tupe** 'money' 'allowance'  
  **mataa tupe** 'the specific divisions of the money or allowance'

**naai** 'few' 'indefinite'

(2.118) `ko au ke lea atu`
  spec lstsing purposive speak dir.

`ki te koe mo ni`
Dirmker def.sing 2ndsing Explmker indef.pl

**naai** **fekau**
  few work

I am to speak to you about a few matters

### 2.2.2.8 PREFIXES

A number of prefixes which occur within the ExpandedBase have been simply listed in their order classes.

Prefix V `tau`  
(i)  
endeavour, attempt, persist

(ii)  
about, concerning

(iii)  
only, just, exclusion

(iv)  
diminishing superlative

- **tau-ma-fai** 'to attempt, to try'
- **tau-kikila** 'to look and look, to search for'
tau-kalaga 'to call and call'
tau-tupe 'concerning the money'
tau-toka-tahi 'alone (of person)'
tau-aanoa 'of little importance'

Prefix IV ma 'able to, potential'
ma-fai 'can do'
tau-ma-fai 'to try to do'

Prefix III (a) faka-
(b) taki-

(a) faka-Causative Prefix 'to cause to be'

When prefixed to numerals, faka - has the meaning of 'n times'
faka- lua 'two' fakalua 'twice'

With some adjectives, faka- has the translation of 'to some degree', '-ish':
faka- fafine 'woman' fakafafine 'womanish' 'femininity in a man'

Prefix faka - is also a transformative prefix. Its occurrence with a Base allows that Base to select the Agentive Case.

(2.119) kua faka huhuu te kie
perfect causative wet def.sing cloth
Agmker    def.sing    man
The cloth was wet by the man

(b)   taki- DISTRIBUTIVE PREFIX

(2.120)  
pee    fia    te    tupe    e
how    number    def.sing    money    non-past

fano    ki    naa    mataa    galuega
go    Dirmker    def.pl.    division    work

taki

distributive    other

How much money goes towards each category
of work?

Prefix II

fe-    RECIPROCAL prefix

foko-    EXCLUSION prefix 'alone'
toka-    HUMAN NUMBER prefix
lau-    FISH NUMBER prefix
tino-    BIRDS AND OCTUPI NUMBER prefix
tua-    COCONUT CRAB NUMBER prefix

Examples illustrating this class follow:

hoko 'to join' fe-hoko-taki-ga 'communications'

1.  A further number affix -gaapulupululu 'coconut numbers' is
semantically a member of the Prefix II paradigm, but
occurs formally as a suffix: e tolu-gaapulupululu aku hua
"I have 30 drinking nuts."
iloa 'to know' fe-iloa-aki 'to get together

te ika foko-tahi 'the only fish'

e toka-tolu hefulu aku tino 'I have 30 people

e lau-tolu aku ika 'I have 30 fish'

e tino-tolu aku manu 'I have 30 birds'

e tua-tolu aku ugauga 'I have 30 coconut crabs'

Prefix I  REDUPLICATION

There are two formally and semantically distinct types
of productive reduplication in the language of Tokelau.  (1) Partial
Reduplication (R-): The penultimate syllable of certain Bases is
reduplicated to mark plural actor agreement.

R-  Plural  Actor  Agreement
    kai    'eat sg'    kakai    'eat pl'
    nofo  'sit sg.'    nonofo  'sit pl.'
    taakele 'to bathe sg.'    taakekele 'to bathe pl.'
    matakum 'frightened sg.'    matatakum 'frightened'

(2) Complete Reduplication (RR-): certain Bases of the form VCV
and CVCV are completely reduplicated to mark continuity or
frequency.

RR-  Frequency,  Continuity
    alo    'to row'    aloalo    'to row continuously'
    agi    'to blow (of wind)'    agiagi    'continuous blowing of
                                  the wind'
kata  'laugh'  katakata  'frequent or continuous laughing'

2.2.2.9 SUFFIXES

A number of suffixes which occur within the Expanded Base are listed below in two order classes, members of each class being mutually exclusive. (C stands for a consonant of variable value occurring as the initial segment in several suffixes.)

Suffix I -(C) aki  Reciprocal-plural

The suffix -(C) aki most often occurs in combination with the reciprocal prefix fe-, to form plural and reciprocal markers.

hoko  'to join' fe-hokotaki-ga  'communications'
galue  'to work' faka-galue-aki-ga  'the working administration'

A further form of the reciprocal or derivational suffix, thought to be borrowed from Samoan, is now widely used in Tokelauan. This is ai, which corresponds to Samoan a'i 'derivational suffix'. ai is marked as a borrowing by having zero corresponding to Samoan glottal stop ' . The borrowed form ai occurs in free variation with the Tokelauan form aki.

An example of the suffix ai is provided below together with the correct Tokelauan form aki.

1.

The borrowing of Samoan words with loss of the glottal is common in Tokelauan. For example, Tokelauan has two words for pig: puaka, which is the true Tokelauan form, and puaa which is a borrowing from Samoan pu'a 'pig'. puaa is the commonly used form in Tokelau, but puaka is used by the elders.
fakagalueaiga  'the administration of'
  faka-  galue
  causative pref.  work
  -ai  -ga
  borrowed suff.  nominal suff.

fakagalueakiga  'the administration of'
  faka-  galue
  causative pref.  work
  -aki  -ga
  derivat suff  nominal suffix

Suffix II (i)  -a/-agia/-gia  Passive suffix
               (C) ia/-ina  Passive suffix (nonproductive)
(ii)  -a/-ga/- (C) aga  Nominalising suffix
(iii)  -a  Stativiser 'full of'

-a/-agia/gia  Passive suffix
(2.121)  na  koo  kai  -a  te
  past  lstsing  eat  pass.suff  def.sing

ika
fish

The fish was eaten by me/ I ate the fish
(2.122) na koo kai -agia te
past lstsing eat pass.suff. def.sing
ika
fish

The fish was eaten by me/I ate the fish

Some 'fossilised' forms with -Cia and -ina remain in the vocabulary. (for example: talohia 'to pray', pelogia 'to be deceived'.)

-a/-ga/(C)aga Nominalising suffix

The nominal suffix occurs affixed to Bases. In the case of verbs the suffix is transformative, transforming them to nouns.

nofo 'to sit' nofo-a 'seat'
nofo 'to stay' nofo-ga 'the staying, the/residing
fano 'to go' fano-ga 'the going, the journeying'

-a Stativiser 'full, of'
tagata 'man' kua tagata-a 'full of men'
fafine 'woman' kua fafine-a 'full of women'

2.2.2.10 DIRECTION PARTICLES

mai 'hither' 'towards speaker'
(2.123) **fano** kau mai te apa  
go bring dir. def.sing tin  
Go and bring me the tin

*atu* 'thither' 'towards hearer'

(2.124) **fanaatu**  
(go thither) (fano atu) au (go dir.) lstsing  

**taa**  
olo ni  
1stdualincl. go interrog.  
Shall I come over to you and then we'll go?

*a ke* 'direction upwards' 'direction to a known place'  
'direction away (with the speaker or to the speaker at some other time)'

(2.125) **e fanaake koe?**  
Are you coming away with me?

(2.126) **fanaake'**  
Go upward'

(2.127) **fanaake'**  
Go inland'

(2.128) **fanaake ki toku fale**  
Go to my house (I will be there)
ifo 'direction downwards' 'direction towards the sea'

(2.129) fanaifo:
Go down there!

(2.130) fanaifo:
Go seawards

2.2.2.11 MANNER PARTICLES

pea 'persisting' 'nevertheless'

(2.131) fai pea:
Do it! (irrespective) carry on!

hoo 'continuously'

(2.132) ko koe te ulaula hoo:
You smoke continuously (what a heavy smoker you are)

uma 'all' 'both' 'collectively'

(2.133) tuku uma naa hua i
place all def.sing drinking-nut Descrmker

loto i te polapola
in Descrmker art basket

Put all the drinking nuts into the basket
aatili  'in excess'  'more than'

(2.134)  e  toka  lahi  aatili  naa
non-past hum.pref. many  very  def.pl.

tino
man

There are too many people

kehe  'separate'  'differently'

(2.135)  fano  kehe'
Go somewhere else /Go away

loa  'immediacy'

(2.136)  na  hau  loa  te  tino
past  come immediately  art  man

tagi  ai  te  pepe
cry  compl.  def.sing  baby

As soon as the man came, the baby cried

2.2.2.12 POSITION MARKERS

nei  'now'

(2.137)  ko  au  kaa  fano  nei
spec  lstsing  inceptive  go  post

I am going now
Within this class of Position markers, is included a set of eight demonstratives. These demonstratives normally occur postposed to the Base within the phrase, and compromise a paradigm with mutually exclusive membership. Each demonstrative comprises two morphemes: a definite article morpheme, and a position morpheme. The position morphemes are glossed as:

-nei  'near speaker'
-na   'near hearer'
-ja   'distant'

The eight demonstratives are listed below with examples:

**teenei** singular, near speaker 'this'

(2.138) e o -ku te fale teenei
non-past poss lstsing art house this

This house is mine

**jeenei** plural, near speaker 'these'

(2.139) e o -ku naa fale jeenei
non-past poss lstsing def.pl. house these

These houses are mine

**teena** singular, near hearer 'that (by you)'

(2.140) kave te naifi teena
take def.sing knife that

Take that knife (which is near you)
ieena plural, near hearer 'those (by you)"

(2.141) \[\text{ko} \quad \text{naa} \quad \text{hua} \quad \text{ieena}\]
spec def.pl. drinking-nuts those

\[e \quad a \quad \text{te} \quad \text{faipule}\]
non-past poss def.sing chief

Those drinking-nuts (by you) belong to the chief

teeia singular, distant 'that (yonder)'

(2.142) \[\text{ko} \quad \text{ai} \quad \text{te} \quad \text{tino} \quad \text{teeia}\]
spec who def.sing man that

\[i \quad \text{te} \quad \text{vaka}\]
Descrmker def.sing canoe

Who is that man (yonder) on the canoe?

ieeia plural, distant 'those'

(2.143) \[\text{ko} \quad \text{ai} \quad \text{naa} \quad \text{tino} \quad \text{ieeia}\]
spec who def.pl. man those

\[i \quad \text{te} \quad \text{vaka}\]
Descrmker def.sing canoe

Who are those men (yonder) on the canoe?

tee singular, indicated or retrospective. 'this' 'the aforementioned'

(2.144) \[\text{ko} \quad \text{ai} \quad \text{te} \quad \text{tino} \quad \text{tee}\]
spec who def.sing man this/that
Who is this/that man (indicated, aforementioned)

\textit{lee} plural, indicated or retrospective 'these' 'those' 'the aforementioned'?

(2.145) \textit{ko ai naa tino iee}

spec who def.pl. man these/those

Who are these/those men (indicated, aforementioned)?

In the case of the demonstratives \textit{tee} and \textit{iee}, the position morpheme is zero. However, if an object not previously mentioned is referred to, the demonstratives \textit{tee} and \textit{iee} usually accompany some directional gesture on the part of the speaker such as pointing, or nodding to indicate the object he is talking about. If the object has already been mentioned beforehand, or is understood, then the demonstratives \textit{tee} and \textit{iee} may be used as retrospective demonstratives as in (2.146) below:

(2.146) \textit{ko te tino tee nae}

spec def.sing man that pastprog.

moe i te vaka

sleep Descrmker art canoe

That was the man who slept in the canoe

2.2.2.13 \textbf{INTENSIFIERS}

\textit{lele} INTENSIVE 'very
(2.147) Ko te galuega e
spec def.sing work non-past

faigataa lele
difficult very

The work is very hard

lava EXACTNESS 'just' indeed'

(2.148) Ko tino tokelau e vee
spec people place non-past like

lava ni tino maoli
just indef.sing person Maori

Tokelauans are just like Maoris

mua POLITE INTENSIFIER, POLITE REQUESTS

(2.149) Keinaa olo mua

You had better go (if you wish to)

2.2.2.14 ANAPHORIC PARTICLES

Morphemes listed in this class are not introduced in the phrase structure rules. Members have a diverse range of syntactic functions operating at various grammatical levels, and do not form a natural class. How such particles should be introduced into the rules has not yet been determined although ai Complement proform is transformationally introduced.
ai  COMPLEMENT PROFORM 'then' 'accordingly'

The syntactic function of ai is discussed in detail throughout Chapters 4 and 5.

laa  POLITE ANAPHORIC 'then' 'accordingly'

The exact English translation of the particle laa is difficult to establish, but most often it means 'then'.

(2.150)  keinaa olo mua laa

Perhaps you should go then

foki  'also'

This particle functions at several syntactic levels. It implies reference to an earlier mentioned entity, and may relate a constituent to an earlier phrase or to an earlier sentence (refer to discussion, Chapter 4, Sections 4.7, and 4.4.1).

ni  QUASI-INTERROGATIVE TAG

In most instances the particle ni translates as the English expression 'eh'? , with the meaning of 'doesn't it/; 'isn't it'? , except that it also carries the connotation of politeness. When used in normal conversation, it invariably turns a statement into a question and draws the answer 'yes' from the listener.
It is used also in the initial member of a two-move greeting or farewell sequence. For example, a common greeting is maaloo ni 'hello', which is answered maaloo or maaloo lava 'hello' or 'hello indeed'. In farewells, too, the particle would be used by the/first speaker so that one might say tofaa ni 'goodbye' and the reply would be tofaa. That is, the use of ni obligates a reply from the party addressed. Contrast for example sentences (2.151) and (2.152) below:

(2.151) taatou olo ki te hiva
1stplincl. go Dirmker def.sing dance
Let us go to the dance

(2.152) taatou olo ki te hiva
1stplincl. go Dirmker def.sing dance
ni
interrog
Shall we go to the dance?/Let us go to the dance eh?

2.2.2.15 EMPHATIC PARTICLES

koo IMPERATIVE PARTICLE 'then'

(2.153) hau koo!
Come!
(2.154) tuku vee koo,

Leave it as it is (emphatic)

ia EMPHATIC 'then'

The particle ia occurs often in conjunction with the anaphoric particle laa, and while it usually carries the meaning 'then', it functions in the main as an emphatic particle.

(2.155) ko te mea laa ia

spec art thing anaph. emphat

e heeki hau te tino

non-past neg come def.sing man

The thing is, the man never came

ake EMPHATIC INTENSIFIER

(2.156) hau ake

Come here! (promptly)

The particles listed in the classes Manner, Intensifier, Position, and Emphatic, are grouped in the syntactic analysis of Tokelauan, as the constituent Qualifier. That the treatment of such a diverse group of particles is unsatisfactory will be obvious from the examples given in the preceding section. Little work has been done on the syntactic functions of the various Qualifier particles of the phrase.
Rather, most linguists to date have been content to list them in a similar manner to that first proposed by Biggs for Maori (1961). This incorrectly imputes to them all a similar grammatical status within the phrase, and ultimately within the sentence. We follow this tradition only because the details of an alternative classification have not yet been worked out.

2.2.2.16 THE PRONOUNS OF TOKELAUAN

Pronouns in Tokelauan are listed below in three tables. Table A contains the Basic pronoun form. This form of the pronoun occurs in all NPs except those which are preceded by the possession marker ő/a.

Table B contains the pronoun form as used in 'genitive' constructions (that is following the possession marker ő/a), and is labelled the Possessive Pronoun forms.

Table C contains the pronoun forms which may be embedded within the verb phrase. These are labelled Embedded Agentive Pronouns. Examples follow each table.
Table A. **BASIC PRONOUNS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Person</td>
<td>au</td>
<td>kimaaua</td>
<td>kimaatou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusive</td>
<td></td>
<td>kima</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Person</td>
<td></td>
<td>kitaaua</td>
<td>kitaatou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive</td>
<td></td>
<td>kita</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd PERSON</td>
<td>koe</td>
<td>koulua</td>
<td>koutou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd PERSON</td>
<td>ia</td>
<td>kilaaua</td>
<td>kilaatou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kila</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples illustrating Basic pronoun forms

(2.157) ko au kaafano

I am going

(2.158) na kave e ia te moa

He/she took (carried) the fowl

(2.159) na kave e kitaatou te

past carry Akmker 1stplincl. art

puha ki te fale

box Dirmker art house

The box was taken to the house by us
Did you two see the bird?

Your name is forgotten to me.

I have forgotten your name.

The box was taken to them.
(2.163a) kua hau ia
perfect come 3rdsing
He/She has come

(2.163b) ko ia kua hau
spec 3rdsing perfect come
He has come

(2.164a) na olo kimaa
(2.164b) na olo kimaaua
past go 1stdualexcl.
We (two) went

(2.164c) ko kimaa na olo
(2.164d) ko kimaaua na olo
spec 1stdualexcl past go
We (two) went

(2.165) na hau te tino mai
past come def.sing man Origmker
te koutou
prnmker 2ndpl
The man came from you (pl)
Table B POSSESSIVE PRONOUNS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st PERSON EXCLUSIVE</td>
<td>-ku</td>
<td>maa</td>
<td>maatou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st PERSON INCLUSIVE</td>
<td>taaua</td>
<td>taa</td>
<td>taatou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd PERSON</td>
<td>-o/-u</td>
<td>-ula</td>
<td>-utou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>koe</td>
<td>koulua</td>
<td>koutou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd PERSON</td>
<td>-na</td>
<td>laaua</td>
<td>laatou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ia)</td>
<td>laa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of the possessive pronouns with the possession marker o/a, will be illustrated below.

In Tokelauan, possessive pronouns are regarded as occurring in the Base Component in structures corresponding directly to 'Genitive' sentences. (see sections 4.1.4, and 4.1.5 for detailed discussion of this sentence type). An example of a genitive sentence is (2.166):

(2.166)  o  o  -ku  te  fale  
non-past poss 1st.sing def.sing house

The house is mine/The house belongs to me
Sentences such as (2.166) may be embedded in other sentences. The transformation of Relative Possession (Rule $T_8$) deletes the tense marker to leave an embedded sequence (2.167) which has the status of NP.

\[(2.167) \quad \text{te} \quad \text{fale} \quad oo \quad -ku\]
\[\text{def.sing} \quad \text{house} \quad \text{poss} \quad 1\text{st.sing}\]

The house of mine/My house

This structure may in turn be transformed to that corresponding to (2.168) by a reordering transformation (Rule $T_9$).

\[(2.168) \quad t- \quad o \quad -ku \quad \text{fale}\]
\[\text{def.sing} \quad \text{poss} \quad 1\text{st.sing} \quad \text{house}\]

My house

The Relative Possession transformation and the Possessive Pronoun transformation occurs in Chapter 5, sections 5.5 and 5.6 respectively.

The examples which follow illustrate the forms of the pronouns and the possession marker used in constructions such as (2.167) and (2.168). They show firstly the postposed forms (as in (2.167)), and secondly, the forms which are embedded (as in the sequence (2.168)).
One feature of these examples which requires clarification is the selection of allomorphs amongst (a) the common articles; (b) the possession marker; and (c) the pronouns themselves. The various pronoun forms used in the possessive phrase were listed in Table B. The common article forms and the possession marker forms (together with the environments in which they occur) are listed below:

- **Definite, singular article:**
  - te /-noun
  - t- /-poss

- **Indefinite, singular article:**
  - he /-noun
  - h- /-poss

- **Definite, plural article:**
  - naa /-noun
  - Ø /-poss

- **Indefinite, plural article:**
  - ni

- **Subordinate possession marker:**
  - oo /noun-
  - 1st.p.sing
  - 3rd.p.sing
  - o /elsewhere

- **Dominant possession marker:**
  - aa /noun
  - 1st.p.sing
  - 3rd.p.sing
  - a /elsewhere

The two bases used in the examples are:

- **Fale** 'house' (subordinately possessed by humans)
- **Meakai** 'food' (dominantly possessed by humans)
The Possessive Phrase in Tokelauan

SINGULAR pronoun forms

1ST PERSON

(2.169) definite, singular  'my house, my food'
   a. te fale oo-ku
   b. t-o-ku fale
   c. te meakai aa-ku
   d. t-a-ku meakai

(2.170) definite, plural  'my houses, my foodstuffs'
   a. naa fale oo-ku
   b. ø c-ku fale
   b. naa meakai aa-ku
   d. ø a-ku meakai

(2.171) indefinite, singular  'my house, my food'
   a. he fale oo-ku
   b. h-o-ku fale
   b. he meakai aa-ku
   d. h-a-ku meakai

(2.172) indefinite, plural  'my houses, my foods'
   a. ni fale oo-ku
   b. ni-o-ku fale
   c. ni meakai aa-ku
   d. ni-a-ku meakai

2ND PERSON

(2.173) definite, singular  'your house, your food'
   a. te fale o koe
   b.i t-o-o fale
   b.ii (t-o koe fale)
   c. te meakai a koe
   d.i t-a-u meakai
   d.ii (t-a koe meakai)
(2.174) definite, plural 'your houses, your foods'
   a. naa fale o koe
   b.i  ø-o-o fale
   b.ii ø (o koe fale)
   c. naa meakai a koe
   d.i  ø-a-u meakai
   d.ii ø(a koe meakai)

(2.175) indefinite, singular 'your house, your food'
   a. he fale o koe
   b.i  h-o-o fale
   b.ii (h-o koe fale)
   c. he meakai a koe
   d.i  h-a-u meakai
   d.ii (h-a koe meakai)

(2.176) indefinite, plural 'your houses, your foods'
   a. ni fale o koe
   b.i  ni-o-o fale
   b.ii (ni-o koe fale)
   c. ni meakai a koe
   d.i  ni-a-u meakai
   d.ii (ni-a koe meakai)

The forms b.ii and d.ii shown in parentheses, are regarded by older speakers of Tokelauan as 'not true Tokelauan'. Nevertheless they are widely used, and accepted, by younger speakers, especially the children. Alternate forms to be shown in parentheses for the third person singular, and the second person dual are more widely used than those shown above for second person singular. They are regarded by older speakers to be new forms and quite acceptable, although they themselves were never observed by me to use them.
Some younger speakers however use only these 'new' forms, and correspondingly regard the forms used by their elders as 'old' Tokelauan.

### 3RD PERSON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(2.177)</th>
<th>definite, singular</th>
<th>'his house, his food'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.i</td>
<td>te fale oo-na</td>
<td>(his/her)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.ii</td>
<td>(te fale o ia)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.i</td>
<td>te meakai aa-na</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.ii</td>
<td>(te meakai a ia)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(2.178)</th>
<th>definite, plural</th>
<th>'his houses, his foods'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.i</td>
<td>naa fale oo-na</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.ii</td>
<td>(naa fale o ia)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.i</td>
<td>naa meakai aa-na</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.ii</td>
<td>(naa meakai a ia)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(2.179)</th>
<th>indefinite, singular</th>
<th>'his house, his food'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.i</td>
<td>he fale oo-na</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.ii</td>
<td>(he fale o ia)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.i</td>
<td>he meakai aa-na</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.ii</td>
<td>(he meakai a ia)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(2.180) indefinite, plural 'his houses, his foods
   a.i  ni fale oo-na      b.  ni-o-na fale
   a.ii (ni fale o ia)
   c.i  ni meakai aa-na  d.  ni-a-na meakai
   c.ii (ni meakai a ia)

DUAL pronoun forms

1ST PERSON (INCLUSIVE)

(2.181) definite singular 'our house, our food'
   a.  te fale o taaua     b.  t-o taaua fale
   c.  te meakai a taaua  d.  t-o taaua meakai

(2.182) definite, plural 'our houses, our foods'
   a.  naa fale o taaua    b.  o-o taaua fale
   c.  naa meakai a taaua  d.  o-a taaua meakai

(2.183) indefinite, singular 'our house, our food'
   a.  he fale o taaua     b.  h-o taaua fale
   c.  he meakai a taaua   d.  h-a taaua meakai

(2.184) indefinite, plural 'our houses, our foods'
   a.  ni fale o taaua     b.  ni-o taaua fale
   c.  ni meakai a taaua   d.  ni-a taaua meakai
1ST PERSON (EXCLUSIVE)

(2.185) definite singular 'our house, our food'
a. te fale o maaua  
b. t-o maaua fale  
c. te meakai a maaua  
d. t-a maaua meakai

(2.186) definite plural 'our houses, our foods'
a. naa fale o maaua  
b. ø-o maaua fale  
c. naa meakai o maaua  
d. ø-a maaua meakai

(2.187) indefinite singular 'our food, our house'
a. he fale o maaua  
b. h-o maaua fale  
c. he meakai a maaua  
d. h-a maaua meakai

(2.188) indefinite, plural 'our houses, our foods'
a. ni fale o maaua  
b. ni-o maaua fale  
c. ni meakai a maaua  
d. ni-a maaua meakai

2ND PERSON

(2.189) definite singular 'your (2) house, your food'
a. te fale o koulu a  
b. i t-o-ulua fale  
   b. ii (t-o koulu a fale)  
c. te meakai a koulu a  
d. i t-a-ulua meakai  
   d. ii (t-a koulu a meakai)
(2.190) definite plural 'your houses, your food'
a. naa fale o koulua b.i Ø-o-ulua fale
   b.ii (Ø-o koulua fale)
c. naa meakai a koulua
d.i Ø-a-ulua meakai
d.ii (Ø-a koulua meakai)

(2.191) indefinite singular 'your house, your food'
a. he fale o koulua b.i h-o-ulua fale
   b.ii (h-o koulua fale)
c. he meakai a koulua d.i h-a-ulua meakai
d.ii (h-a koulua meakai)

(2.192) indefinite plural 'your houses your food'
a. ni fale o koulua b. ni-o-ulua fale
   b.ii (ni-o koulua fale)
c. ni meakai a koulua d.i ni-a-ulua meakai
d.ii (ni-a koulua meakai)

3RD PERSON

(2.193) definite singular 'their (2) house, their food'
a. te fale o laaua b. t-o laa fale
c. te meakai a laaua d. t-a laa meakai

(2.194) definite plural 'their houses, their foods'
a. naa fale o laaua b. Ø-o laa fale
c. naa meakai a laaua d. Ø-a laa meakai

(2.195) indefinite plural 'their house, their food'
a. he fale o laaua  b. h-o laa fale
c. he meakai a laaua  d. h-a laa meakai

(2.196) indefinite plural 'their houses, their foods'

a. ni fale o laaua  b. ni-o laa fale
c. ni meakai a laaua  d. ni-a laa meakai

PLURAL PRONOUN FORMS

Examples of the plural pronoun forms need not be given here since they correspond to the dual forms in their combinatorial possibilities with the articles, possession marker and the two bases fale, and meakai.

In the examples given above, specifically, it may be noted that: maatou replaces both maa and maaua in (2.185-8); taatou replaces both taa and taaua in (2.181-4); koutou replaces kouluu, and-utou replaces -ulua in (2.189-92); and laatou replaces both laa and laaua in (2.193-6).
Table C  EMBEDDED AGENTIVE PRONOUNS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st PERSON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCLUSIVE</td>
<td>koo</td>
<td>kimaab</td>
<td>kimaatou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCLUSIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kitaa</td>
<td></td>
<td>kitaatou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd PERSON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kee</td>
<td>koulua</td>
<td>koutou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd PERSON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ia</td>
<td>kilaa</td>
<td>kilaatou</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pronoun forms listed in Table C are the forms which the pronouns marking agent or actor must take if they are permuted from the Agentive phrase to occur before the verb.

In the examples which follow, sentences labelled (a) show the Basic pronoun form in the Agentive case, those labelled (b) show its transformation to an embedded pronoun. This pronoun embedding transformation is discussed in Chapter 5, section 5.1.3.

(2.197)  (a)  kua  kave  e  au
perfect  take  Agmker  lstsing

The fowl was taken (transported) by me
(2.197) (b) kua koo kave -a te
perfect lstsing take suff. art
moa
fowl
The fowl was taken by me / I took the fowl

(2.198) (a) na kitea te vaka
past see art canoe
e koe
Agmker 2ndsing
Was the canoe seen by you / did you see the canoe

(2.198) (b) na kee kitea -gia te
past 2ndsing see suff art
vaka
canoe
Was the canoe seen by you / did you see the canoe

(2.199) (a) na kai e ia te ika
past eat Agmker 3rdsing art fish
The fish was eaten by him
(2.199) (b) na ia kai-a te ika
past 3rdsing eat suff. art fish
The fish was eaten by him/He ate the fish

(2.200) (a) na fai e kimaatou naa
past do Agmker 1stplexcl. art
taaga i te hiva
action Descrmker art dance
We did the actions in the dance/ The actions in the dance were done by us

(2.200) (b) na kimaatou fai-a naa
past 1stplexcl. do suff. art
taaga i te hiva
action Descrmker art dance
We did the actions in the dance/ The actions in the dance were done by us

(2.201) (a) na tiaki e koulua
past discard Agmker 2nddual
te palumagoo
art shark sp.
Was the shark discarded by you (dual)
Did you (dual) discard the shark?
(2.201) (b)  

\begin{align*}
\text{na} & \quad \text{koulua} & \quad \text{tiaki} & \quad \text{-gia} \\
past & \quad 2\text{nd} & \quad \text{dual} & \quad \text{discard} & \quad \text{suff} \\
\text{te} & \quad \text{palumagoo} \\
\text{art} & \quad \text{shark} \\
\end{align*}

Was the shark discarded by you (dual)/

Did you (dual) discard the shark?
3.1 LIST OF SYMBOLS

The symbols and abbreviations used in the formal rules and rule discussions throughout the ensuing chapters, are broadly glossed as follows:

\( R_1 \quad R_2 \quad R_{3a} \quad R_{3b} \)  \( \rightarrow \)

read phrase structure rules in this order.¹

\( ( ) \)

rewrite as

enclosed symbol/s optional

\( ( )^n \)

enclosed symbol/s optional and recursive

\{ \}

one line of the enclosed obligatory

(under type print) phoneme string of Tokelauan

- \( \Rightarrow \)

affix boundary

transforms into

¹ In the Base component, the rules are partially ordered. Ordering is shown by the numbering \( R_1, R_2, \) etc. Where a group of rules do not apply in any order relative to each other, they are distinguished as: \( a, b, c, \) etc.
choice of same line throughout rule
obligatory

$X^n$
symbol $X$ is recursive

$X^3$
symbol $X$ is recursive three times

$[ ]_X$
the enclosed symbols are dominated
by the constituent node $X$

$X$
cover term for strings specified
under relevant rule

$Y$
cover term for strings specified under
relevant rule

$Z$
cover term for strings specified
under relevant rule

$T_1$ Oblig.
transformation rule one, obligatory
transformation

$T_2$ Opt.
transformation rule two, optional
transformation

$XYZ$
read constituent $X$, constituent $Y$, and
constituent $Z$, in that order

enclosed constituents occur in free
permutation (free order)

$-X$
symbol $X$ is a suffix

$X-$
symbol $X$ is a prefix

$S$
sentence
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>English Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prop</td>
<td>Proposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mod(al)</td>
<td>modality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arg</td>
<td>Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaseCompl</td>
<td>Case Complement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERBarg</td>
<td>Verbal Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCarg</td>
<td>Locative Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENarg</td>
<td>Genitive Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equatarg</td>
<td>Equational Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPLcase</td>
<td>Explanatory case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENTcase</td>
<td>Agentive case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORIGcase</td>
<td>Origin case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRcase</td>
<td>Directional case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRCase</td>
<td>Descriptive case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Noun Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locmker</td>
<td>Locative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poss</td>
<td>possession marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spec</td>
<td>specifying particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjmker</td>
<td>Subject marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agmker</td>
<td>Agentive case marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explmker</td>
<td>Explanatory case marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origmker</td>
<td>Origin case marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirmker</td>
<td>Directional case marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descrmker</td>
<td>Descriptive case marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOMprop</td>
<td>Proper nominal phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOMcom</td>
<td>Common nominal phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTprop</td>
<td>Proper article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTnum</td>
<td>Number article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTnonpartic</td>
<td>Nonparticular article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTcom</td>
<td>Common article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prep</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERBcomplex</td>
<td>Verbal complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOU Ncompl</td>
<td>Noun complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qual(ifier)</td>
<td>Qualifying particles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERBnuc(leus)</td>
<td>Verbal nucleus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOU Nucl</td>
<td>Noun nucleus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dem(onstrative)</td>
<td>Demonstrative particles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERBexpbase</td>
<td>Verb-expanded-base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir(ection)</td>
<td>Directional particles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREbasic</td>
<td>Preposed adjective particles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr₅</td>
<td>Prefix class 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr₄</td>
<td>Prefix class 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr₃</td>
<td>Prefix class 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr₂</td>
<td>Prefix class 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr₁</td>
<td>Prefix class 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vsuf₁</td>
<td>Verbal suffix class 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vsuf₂</td>
<td>Verbal suffix class 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tense</td>
<td>Tense/aspect markers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neg</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manner</td>
<td>Manner particles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Post
Position
Intens(fier)
Emph(atic)
BASE
Nomsuf
Ø
prn
pro
P-marker
pass
act
trans
intrans
$S_1$
$S_2$
/
-
+
[+X ]
[-X ]
#

Position morpheme
Position morpheme
Intensifying particles
Emphatic particles
lexical item
Nominalising suffix
Zero marker
pronoun
proform
Phrase marker
passive
active
transitive
intransitive
Sentence example 1
Sentence example 2
in the environment of
(after /, and before or after a symbol)
item occurs in this slot 'the environment'
plus (coordinates constituents or strings of constituents)
X is a syntactic feature positively specified for the lexical item which occurs in this environment
X is a syntactic feature negatively specified for the lexical item which occurs in this environment
sentence boundary
(between phoneme strings of Tokelauan) preceding and following morphemes are alternants

constituent \textit{X} is specified positively for the syntactic feature \textit{Y}

\textit{indef(art)}

inddefinite article

def\textit{(art)}

definite article

\textit{indefpl(art)}

inddefinite plural article

def\textit{pl(art)}

definite plural article

\textit{indefsing(art)}

inddefinite singular article

def\textit{sing(art)}

definite singular article

### 3.2 Phrase Structure Rules of the Base Component

\[ \textit{R}_1 \quad \text{Sentence} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{Proposition} \quad \text{Subject} \]

\[ \textit{R}_2 \quad \text{Proposition} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{modality} \quad \text{Statement} \]

\[ \textit{R}_3 \quad \text{Statement} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{Argument} \quad \text{CaseComplement} \]

\[ \text{VERBarg} \]

\[ \text{LOCarg} \]

\[ \text{GENarg} \]

\[ \text{EQUATart} \]

: Argument is subclassified into four types of argument: Verbal argument (VERBarg); Locative argument (LOCarg);
Genitive argument (GENarg); and Equational argument (EQUATarg).

R₅ CaseComplement → (EXPLcase) (AGENTcase) (ORIGcase) (DIRcase) (DESCRcase)ⁿ

CaseComplement consists of five optional case constituents:
Explanatory case (EXPLcase);
Agentive case (AGENTcase);
Origin case (ORIGcase); Directional case (DIRcase); and Descriptive case (DESCRcase).

The number of occurrences of the Descriptive case constituent is probably not constrained by any rule of grammar, but seldom exceeds two.

R₆a LOCarg → Locmker NP
b GENarg → poss NP
c EQUATarg → spec NP
d Subject → Subjmker NP
e AGENTcase → Agmker NP
f EXPLcase → Explmker NP
g ORIGcase → Origmker NP
\( R_{6h} \) \( \text{DIRcase} \to \text{Dirmker} \ NP \)

\( R_{7} \) \( \text{NP} \to \{ \text{NOMprop} \}
\{ \text{NOMcom} \} \)

Noun phrase (NP) is rewritten as either a Proper nominal phrase (NOMprop), or as a Common nominal phrase (NOMcom).

\( R_{8a} \) \( \text{NOMprop} \to \text{ARTprop} \ Noun \)

\( b \) \( \text{NOMcom} \to \{ \text{ARTnonpartic} \} \ NOM \)

\( \{ \text{ARTcom} \ (\text{tahi}) \} \)

\( R_{9a} \) \( \text{VERBarg} \to \text{VERBcomplex} \ (\text{Qualifier}) \)

\( b \) \( \text{NOM} \to \text{NOUNcomplex} \ (\text{Qualifier}) \)

\( R_{10a} \) \( \text{VERBcomplex} \to (\text{PREverb}) \ \text{VERBnucleus} \)

\( b \) \( \text{NOUNcomplex} \to \text{NOUNnucleus} \ (\text{Demonstrative}) \)

\( R_{11a} \) \( \text{VERBnucleus} \to (\text{VERBexpbase}) \ (\text{Direction}) \)

\( b \) \( \text{NOUNnucleus} \to (\text{PREbasic}) \ \text{NOUN} \)

\( R_{12} \) \( \text{VERBexpbase} \to (\text{Pr}_5) (\text{Pr}_4) \ (\text{Pr}_3) (\text{Pr}_2) (\text{Pr}_1) \ \text{VERB} \)

\( (\text{Vsubj}_1) (\text{Vsubj}_2) \)

VERBexpbase has an obligatory Verb, five optional prefixes and two optional suffixes.
R_{13a} modality → tense/aspect (negative)

\{ Manner, Position, Intensifier, Emphatic \}

b Qualifier → [+definite, +singular]

c ARTcom

R_{14i} Locmker → i

\{ 0, a \} 'subordinate possession'
\{ a \} 'dominant possession'

iii spec → ko

iv Subjmker → Ø

v Agmk're → e

\{ mo, ma \}

vi Explmker

vii Origmker → mai

viii Dirmker → ki

ix Descrmker → i

\{ a, (a)te \}
\{ ia \}
Ø

x ARTprop

xi ARTnum → ia

xii ARTnonpartic → hohe
R_{14xiii} \text{ ARTcom} \rightarrow \begin{cases} \text{te} \\ \text{he} \\ \text{naa} \\ \text{ni} \end{cases} \begin{cases} \text{[+definite, +singular]} \\ \text{[-definite, +singular]} \\ \text{[+definite, -singular]} \\ \text{[-definite, -singular]} \end{cases}

\text{xiv} \text{ Direction} \rightarrow \begin{cases} \text{atu} \\ \text{mai} \\ \text{ake} \\ \text{ifo} \end{cases}

\text{xv} \text{ Demonstrative} \rightarrow \begin{cases} \text{teenei} \\ \text{ieenei} \\ \text{teena} \\ \text{ieena} \\ \text{teeia} \\ \text{ieia} \\ \text{tee} \\ \text{iee} \end{cases}

\text{xvi} \text{ PREverb} \rightarrow \begin{cases} \text{fia} \\ \text{toe} \\ \text{tai / taali} \\ \text{mata} \\ \text{matuaa} \end{cases}

\text{xvii} \text{ PREbasic} \rightarrow \begin{cases} \text{tamaa} \\ \text{maatua} \\ \text{mataa} \\ \text{nai} \end{cases}
\( R_{14xviii} \) \( \text{Pr}_5 \) \( \rightarrow \) tau-

\( xix \) \( \text{Pr}_4 \) \( \rightarrow \) ma-

\( xx \) \( \text{Pr}_3 \) \( \rightarrow \) \{ faka- \\
\( \quad \text{taki-} \}

\( xxi \) \( \text{Pr}_2 \) \( \rightarrow \) \{ foko- \\
\( \quad \text{toka-} \}

\( \begin{array} { l }
\text{lau-} \\
\text{tino-} \\
\text{tua-}
\end{array} \}

\( xxii \) \( \text{Pr}_1 \) \( \rightarrow \) The reduplication prefix has two forms as outlined in chapter 2.

\( xx \text{ iii} \) \( \text{Vsuf}_1 \) \( \rightarrow \) -(C)aki

\( xx \text{ iv} \) \( \text{Vsuf}_2 \) \( \rightarrow \) \{ -a / -qia / -agia \}

\( xxv \) tension/aspect \( \rightarrow \) \{ ka / kaa \\
kua \\
na \\
koi \\
nae \\
e \\
ke \\
ona \\
ø 'Imperative marker' \\
naa/na \\
einaa \\
keinaa \}
xxvi negative → \{ hee \}
               \{ heeki \}

xxvii Manner → \{ pea \}
               \{ hoo \}
               \{ uma \}
               \{ aatili \}
               \{ kehe \}
               \{ loa \}

xxviii Position → nei

xxix Intensifier → \{ lele \}
                   \{ lava \}
                   \{ mua \}

xx Emphatic → \{ ko \}
              \{ ia \}
              \{ ake \}

R14 above simply contains a listing of the grammatical elements. The subrules of R14 are not ordered relative to one another, and have been numbered purely for reference.
3.3 THE TRANSFORMATIONAL RULES

SUBJECT SHIFT TRANSFORMATION

\( T_1 \)  Oblig.

Argument  CaseComplement  Subject

\Rightarrow  Argument

Subject  CaseComplement

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{na pehe} & \quad \text{ki te tino} \quad \text{i te mataafaga} \quad \text{te teine} \quad \Rightarrow \\
\text{na pehe} & \quad \text{te teine} \quad \text{ki te tino} \quad \text{i te mataafaga}
\end{align*}
\]

the girl sang to the man at the beach

CASE SCRAMBLING TRANSFORMATION

\( T_2 \)  Opt.

VERBarg  Subject  CASE\(_1\)  CASE\(_2\)  \ldots  CASE\(_n\)

\Rightarrow  VERBarg  Subject

CASE\(_1\)

CASE\(_2\)

CASE\(_n\)

: where CASE\(_1\), CASE\(_2\), and CASE\(_n\) represent the case constituents of CaseComplement.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{na pehe} & \quad \text{ki te tino} \quad \text{i te mataafaga} \quad \text{te teine} \\
\text{na pehe} & \quad \text{ki te tino} \quad \text{te teine} \quad \text{i te mataafaga} \\
\text{na pehe} & \quad \text{te teine} \quad \text{ki te tino} \quad \text{i te mataafaga} \\
\text{na pehe} & \quad \text{te teine} \quad \text{i te mataafaga} \quad \text{ki te tino} \\
\text{na pehe} & \quad \text{i te mataafaga} \quad \text{te teine} \quad \text{ki te tino} \\
\text{na pehe} & \quad \text{i te mataafaga} \quad \text{ki te tino} \quad \text{te teine}
\end{align*}
\]
PRONOUN EMBEDDING TRANSFORMATION

T_3  Opt.

modality  VERB  X  Agmker  NP_  Y
⇒  modality  [ +prn ]  VERB  Vsuf_2  X  Ø  Y

na  kai  te  ika  e  au  i  te  hiipuni
mod.  VERB  X  Agmker  [ +prn ]  Y

⇒  na  koo  kai  -a  te  ika  i  te  hiipuni
mod. [ +prn ] VERB  Vsuf_2  X  Y

The fish was eaten by me with a spoon

FOCUS TRANSFORMATION

T_4  Opt.

X  NP  Y
⇒  ko  NP  X  NP  Y

na  fano  te  tino  ki  te  fenua
⇒  ko  te  fenua  na  fano  te  tino  ki  ei

The man went to the island/ It was to the island that
the man went

na  hau  mai  te  falefono  te  tino
⇒  ko  te  falefono  na  hau  ai  te  tino

The man came from the meeting-house / It was from the
meeting-house that the man came
VERBAL SENTENCE NOMINALISATION

T₅  Opt.
tense  (negative) VERBarg  Subject Y
⇒  DefsingART  (negative) VERBarg Nomsuf poss Subject Y

na  uhu  te pehe  e_te_teine
⇒  te  uhu  -ga  o  te pehe  e_te_teine

The song was sung by the girl / The singing of the song by the girl

FOCUSED SENTENCE EMBEDDING (Generalised transformation)

T₆  Opt.
# X  NP¹  Y #  +  # ko  NP¹  Z #
⇒  # X  NP¹  Z  Y #

S₁  nai kinei te vaka  Locative sentence
The canoe was here

S₂  ko te vaka na fano ai te pepe  Focussed Verbal Sentence
It was on the canoe that the baby went

⇒  nai i kinei te vaka na fano ai te pepe
The canoe that the baby went on was here
NOMINALISED SENTENCE EMBEDDING (Generalised transformation)

\[ T_7 \] Opt.
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\# X \ NP_1 Y \ # \\
\Rightarrow \ # X \ \text{defart} \ V \ \text{nomsuff} \ Z \ Y \ #
\end{array}
\]

: where \( NP_1 \) is one of a small class of (semantically general) elements such as \( \text{te mea} \) 'the thing', \( \text{teeaia} \) 'that' etc.

\[ S_1 \]
\begin{align*}
e \ \text{kino} \ & \text{teena} \\
\text{Verbal sentence}
\end{align*}

That is bad

\[ S_2 \]
\begin{align*}
te \ & \text{fai} \ -ga \ e \ \text{koe} \ o \ \text{te tala} \ ki \ \text{te tamaiti} \ \text{taane} \\
\text{The telling of the story by you to the young man}
\end{align*}

\[
\Rightarrow \ e \ \text{kino} \ \text{te fai} \ -ga \ e \ \text{koe} \ o \ \text{te tala} \ ki \ \text{te tamaiti} \ \text{taane}
\]

The telling of the story by you to the young boy is bad

Your telling the story to the young boy is bad

RELATIVE POSSESSION / LOCATION REDUCTION

\[ T_8 \] Opt.
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\left[ \text{NP} \ \text{tense} \ \left[ \text{LOCarg} \right] \ \right] \ \text{NP} \ \Rightarrow \ \left[ \text{NP} \ \emptyset \ \left[ \text{LOCarg} \right] \right] \ \text{NP}
\end{array}
\]

\begin{align*}
e \ \text{popoto} \ & \text{naa tamaiti} \ e \ i \ \text{te faleaaogqa} \\
\text{The children who are at the school are clever}
\end{align*}

\[
\Rightarrow \ e \ \text{popoto} \ \text{naa tamaiti} \ i \ \text{te faleaaogqa}
\]

The children at the school are clever
POSSESSIVE PRONOUN PREPOSING

\[ T_{9} \text{ Opt} \]

\[ \begin{array}{rllll}
\text{ARTcom} & \text{NOM} & \text{poss} & \text{NP} & \left[+\text{prn}\right] \\
\text{he meakai} & a & \text{koulua} & \\
\text{indefsing food poss 2nd.dual} \\
\end{array} \]

\[ \Rightarrow \begin{array}{rllll}
\text{h-} & a & \text{-ulua} & \text{meakai} & \\
\text{indefsing poss 2nd.dual} & \text{food} \\
\end{array} \]

Your food

INTERROGATIVE SUBJECT DELETION

\[ T_{10} \text{ Opt.} \]

\[ \begin{array}{rllll}
\text{IndefART} & \text{aa} & \text{te mea} & X \\
\end{array} \]

\[ \Rightarrow \begin{array}{rllll}
\text{IndefART} & \text{aa} & \emptyset & X \\
\end{array} \]

\[ \text{he aa te mea} \]

What is it?

\[ \Rightarrow \begin{array}{rllll}
\text{he aa} & \\
\end{array} \]

What?

INTERROGATIVE HEAD SUBSTITUTION TRANSFORMATION

\[ T_{11} \text{ Opt.} \]

\[ \begin{array}{rllll}
\text{IndefART} & \text{aa} & \text{defART mea poss NP} & X \\
\end{array} \]

\[ \Rightarrow \begin{array}{rllll}
\text{IndefART} & \text{aa} & \text{defART} & \emptyset & \text{poss NP} & X \\
\end{array} \]
he aa te mea a koe e fai
what defART poss you tense do

⇒ he aa t- ø aa koe e fai

What are you doing?

**IMPERATIVE SUBJECT DELETION**

T₁₂ Opt.

VERBarg Subject X Y
[+prn+2ndp]

⇒ VERBarg ø X Y

fano koe ki te galuega

⇒ fano ki te galuega

(You) go to work!

**LOCATIVE ARGUMENT TRANSPORTATION**

T₁₃ Opt.

modality LOCarg Subject

⇒ modality Locmker ei Subject LOCarg

e hee i te vaka he hoe
tense neg LOCarg Subject

A paddle is not in the canoe

⇒ e hee i ei he hoe i te vaka

Locmker [+pro] Subject LOCarg

A paddle is not there in the canoe
NEGATIVE LOCATIVE TRANSFORMATION

\[ T_{14} \quad \text{Opt.} \]

\[
\text{tense} \quad \text{negative} \quad \text{LOCarg} \quad \text{he} \quad [+\text{common}] \\
\Rightarrow \text{tense} \quad \text{negative} \quad \text{ai} \quad \text{he} \quad [+\text{common}] \quad \text{LOCarg}
\]

\[ e \quad \text{hee} \quad \_\_\_\_\text{te vaka} \quad \text{he} \quad \text{hoe} \]

A paddle is not in the canoe

\[ \Rightarrow e \quad \text{hee} \quad \text{ai} \quad \text{he hoe} \quad \_\_\_\_\_\text{te vaka} \]

There is no paddle in the canoe
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4.0 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter presented a generative grammar of Tokelauan sentences, i.e., an explicit hypothesis concerning the rules for deriving
sentences. Two sets of rules were given: phrase structure rules, specifying the basic sentence structures of Tokelauan, and transformational rules deriving other (non-basic) sentence structures from the basic structures. In the present chapter, I will present evidence supporting certain aspects of the hypothesis, namely the analysis of the constituent structure of simple sentences, and will defend potentially controversial parts of the analysis against alternative analyses. Complex sentences will be treated in chapter 5.

Our concept of simple sentence corresponds essentially to the kernel sentence in the formulation of transformational grammar presented in Chomsky's *Syntactic Structures*. A kernel sentence corresponds to a sentence structure which is generated by the phrase structure rules, and which has not been subjected to any transformation. However, kernel sentences have been one of several casualties as the TG model has developed. Since *Aspects* it has become the general practice for the base rules to allow sentences to be embedded within sentences. In *Aspects* Chomsky removed embeddings from the category of transformational rule, treating embedded sentences as constituents in the phrase structure rules. The innovation has received general acceptance by those who work in the TG framework.

The advantage of this step was that it placed all recursive power in the base rules, limiting transformations to the functions of deriving diverse surface structures. A disadvantage was that it did away with the intuitively appealing concept of kernel sentence.
The base rules in this grammar do not allow sentences to be embedded within sentences. Thus we return essentially to Chomsky’s original concept of kernel sentence to arrive at the definition of simple sentence used in the present work. A simple sentence in Tokelauan is any sentence whose surface structure is specified by the base rules.

Before embarking on a defence of the phrase structure rules proposed for Tokelauan in chapter 3, I will make brief mention of the scope of this analysis and the method followed.

It is now a widely accepted principle that, in order to determine the ‘descriptive adequacy’ of his grammar, the analyst must show that it characterises the linguistic categories and relationships that are significant for the native speaker. In practice, this means that the most adequate grammar is one consistent with the widest array of evidence about the way speakers construct and interpret utterances in their language.

While a number of difficulties arise in justifying a particular grammatical analysis, the anthropological linguist with limited control over his target language faces special problems in eliciting reliable judgments about its structure. He has available to him a few informal tests, such as the minimal pair test, ways of establishing grammatical and semantic acceptability, tests for productivity of morphemic units and constructional patterns, procedures for determining whether an
utterance is ambiguous, whether two utterances are transformationally related, etc.

In the absence of other evidence, he is often forced back on justifying his analysis with those familiar arguments of 'economy' and 'generality' which are of uncertain empirical value. While in principle the distinction between an economical description and an adequate grammar is easy to draw, in practice it cannot always be maintained as well as we would like.

The method I have chosen to support the selection of the phrase structure rules listed in chapter 3, is to present a formal constituent analysis of simple sentences in Tokelauan. I have selected a range of five structurally different simple sentence types found in Tokelauan and I will proceed to analyse these into formal constituents in the ensuing sections. The absence of explicit discussion of the reasons for choosing a particular analysis is, in my opinion, one of the major defects of most linguistic studies. The present discussion of Tokelauan simple sentences will undoubtedly prove to be unsatisfactory in many respects, while in parts of the discussion I will appear to be labouring over obvious truths. Still, I believe that insights into the techniques and requirements of arriving at a linguistic analysis have at least as much value (for linguists) as the completed grammatical analysis of a particular language.

I will analyse each simple sentence and then propose a set of rules to correctly characterise its structure. As each sentence type is analysed, I will compare the resultant set of rules with those
arrived at in the analysis of other sentences, and reformulate if necessary. Thus, the bulk of this chapter consists of analysis and then formulating rules, further analysis and rule formation, and so on. Constituents are accordingly isolated, proposed, modified and often relegated to a higher or lower level rank within the constituent structure of S. While this 'cloak and dagger' technique of arriving at a set of rules for the major constituents of S may at times confuse (if not annoy) the reader, it is nevertheless, indicative of the frustrations of determining and justifying a constituent analysis, and does make explicit the reasons why I choose one particular analysis in favour of another. In short, the method of analysis has two parts: the isolating of formal constituents of S, and ranking these constituents in a hierarchy.

The procedure which I will follow in this analysis will be to isolate a sequence as a potential constituent, and examine its distributional possibilities, to see if it behaves as a unit under various tests. There are certain conditions which a given morpheme sequence must meet before it can be regarded as a grammatical constituent. It must behave as a unit grammatically and must cohere semantically. Phonological unity may be a supporting fact, but it is not a necessary condition (that is, not all constituents are marked by stress, intonation or pause patterns).

Grammatical tests for unity include the capacity to substitute for a single morpheme (or some other minimal member of the constituent category); capacity to be moved around intact (permutability within the sentence with or without trace forms); dispensability; and behaviour under particular transformations such as embedding and focus transforms.
Certain semantic requirements must also be borne in mind in applying these grammatical tests, such as the semantic coherence of the isolated unit, and its semantic relations with other elements.

Similarly there are certain conditions which a set of disparate morpheme sequences, each individually a constituent, must meet before they can be assigned to the same class. They must, for example, share similar combinatorial privileges, and perform a similar function in the sentence.

Two lengthy sections of this chapter 4.1 and 4.3 - are accordingly devoted to the constituent analysis of Tokelauan simple sentences in the manner described above. This exercise is concerned with justifying the phrase structure rules 1-6 of the categorial component of this grammar.

Section 4.2 discusses certain functional notions of Tokelauan simple sentences, and seeks some correlation between such notions and the formal constituents isolated in 4.1.

Section 4.4 discusses evidence in support of the constituent analyses of the noun phrase and verbal argument constituents.

Sections 4.5 - 7 deal with specific topics within the categorial analysis of S. 4.5 discusses subject marking in Tokelauan simple sentences.

Section 4.6 produces evidence for distinguishing between 1 NP sequences isolated as Locative Argument constituents and those 1 NPs of Descriptive Case.
4.7 provides some comment on conjunction in grammar.

4.1 A CONSTITUENT ANALYSIS OF SOME TOKELAUAN SIMPLE

SENTENCES

The following categorial rules describe the major constituent
structure of Tokelauan simple sentences.

\[ \begin{align*}
R_1 & : \text{Sentence} \rightarrow \text{Proposition Subject} \\
R_2 & : \text{Proposition} \rightarrow \text{Modality Statement} \\
R_3 & : \text{Statement} \rightarrow \text{Argument CaseComplement} \\
        & \quad \{ \text{VERBarg} \} \\
        & \quad \{ \text{LOCarg} \} \\
        & \quad \{ \text{GENarg} \} \\
        & \quad \{ \text{EQUATarg} \} \\
R_4 & : \text{Argument} \rightarrow (\text{ORIGcase}) (\text{DIRcase}) \\
        & \quad (\text{DESCRcase})^n (\text{EXPLcase}) \\
        & \quad (\text{AGENTcase})^1 \\
R_5 & : \text{CaseComplement} \rightarrow \text{Locmker} \quad \text{NP} \\
R_6 & \quad \text{a. LOCarg} \rightarrow \text{poss} \quad \text{NP} \\
        & \quad \text{b. GENarg} \rightarrow \text{spec} \quad \text{NP} \\
        & \quad \text{c. EQUATarg} \rightarrow \text{Subjmker} \quad \text{NP} \\
        & \quad \text{d. Subject} \rightarrow \text{Agmker} \quad \text{NP} \\
        & \quad \text{e. AGENTcase} \rightarrow \text{Explmker} \quad \text{NP} \\
        & \quad \text{f. EXPLcase} \rightarrow \text{Origmker} \quad \text{NP} \\
        & \quad \text{g. ORIGcase} \rightarrow \text{NP} \\
\end{align*}\]

1. Component case constituents of CaseComplement should
   read linearly, as:
   \((\text{ORIGcase}) (\text{DIRcase}) (\text{DESCRcase})^n (\text{EXPLcase}) (\text{AGENTcase})\).
h. DIRcase → Dirmker NP
i. DESCRCase → Descrmker NP

It is noted that the Descriptive case constituent (DESCRcase) can occur several times in one simple sentence. Extended discussion of the functions of DESCRcase occurs in chapter 6, section 6.3.

Some of the details of rules 1–6 will now be supported by arguments concerning the constituent structure of several types of sentence.

4.1.1 SIMPLE SENTENCES IN TOKELAUAN

The sentence types to be discussed are represented by the following five sentences.

(4.1) e i te falefono
tense prep def.sing meeting-house
     te tino
def.sing person(man)
The man is at the meeting-house

(4.2) e o te tino te fale
tense poss def.sing man def.sing house
The house belongs to the man

(4.3) na fano te tino ki
tense go def.sing man dirmker
The man went to the hospital at the island

The fish was eaten by me at the beach

The man is a chief

4.1.2 DISPENSIBILITY: OPTIONAL DELETION OF PARTS OF THE SENTENCE

Discussion with informants indicates sentences (4.1), (4.2) and (4.5) to be minimal sentence forms, i.e. no morpheme may be omitted without producing an incomplete construction or a non-sentence. In sentences (4.3) and (4.4) however, certain constituents can be omitted without affecting the sentential status of the product. Thus, the phrases ki te falemai and i te fenua in (4.3) and e au and i te mataafaga in (4.4) may be omitted, and so it seems reasonable to regard these as constituents.
Sentences resulting from the omission of the above phrases are as follows:

(4.6) na fano te tino ki te falemai 'the man went to the hospital'
(4.7) na fano te tino i te fenua 'the man went at the island'
(4.8) na fano te tino 'the man went'
(4.9) na kai e au te ika 'the fish was eaten by me'
(4.10) na kai te ika i te mataafaga 'the fish was eaten at the beach'
(4.11) na kai te ika 'the fish was eaten'

4.1.3 PERMUTATION OF POSSIBLE CONSTITUENTS OF S.

4.1.3.1 FREE PERMUTATIONS

We may now note the following sentences which are all acceptable versions of (4.4)

(4.12) na kai e au i te mataafaga te ika
(4.13) na kai te ika e au i te mataafaga
(4.14) na kai te ika i te mataafaga e au
(4.15) na kai i te mataafaga te ika e au
(4.16) na kai i te mataafaga e au te ika
In (4.4) and (4.12-16) there is free ordering between the sequences e au, te ika and i te mataafaga. This suggests that each of these is (at some level) a constituent of S. Granting this, we are left with na kai (tense verb) as a further constituent by virtue of the fact that it is not assignable to any of the permutable sequences.

In (4.3), the sequences te tino (art. noun), ki te falemai, and i te fenua are permutable.

Further evidence must now be sought to establish whether there are higher order constituents which subsume two or more of the permutable constituents.

The following sentences (4.17) and (4.18) are transformations of (4.3) and (4.4) respectively:

(4.17) ko te tino na fano ki te falemai i te fenua
       It was the man who went to the hospital at the island

(4.18) ko te ika na kai e au i te mataafaga
       It was the fish which was eaten by me at the beach

Here, te ika and te tino are permuted to sentence-initial position following the specifying particle ko. This focus transformation is discussed in some detail in section 5.2.
What is significant at this point is the fact that the Art-noun sequence can occur preceding the tense-verb sequence in the sentence. The obligatory pairing of the Art-noun sequence in (4.17) and (4.18) with the specifying particle ko is not particularly relevant at this stage, since it will be shown later that all sequences which are able to permute to sentence-initial position, are obligatorily paired with ko. The relative freedom of occurrence of the Art-noun sequence, however, is further grounds to propose that it is a constituent in the analysis of S. The constituent Art-noun may now be referred to as Noun Phrase (NP).

(4.19) na kai e te tino te ika i te mataafaga

The fish was eaten by the man at the beach

By comparison with (4.4), sentence (4.19) reveals that the pronoun au of (4.4) has equal grammatical status to the sequence te_tino in (4.19). But it has not been established that all the Art-noun sequences in sentences (4.3) and (4.4) have equal or coordinate status within S. However, at this stage, we may label all Art-noun sequences as NP and seek further information about their relative grammatical status. The constituents delimited earlier may now be labelled as follows:
In (4.3):  
\[ \text{ki te falemai} \quad \text{'Direction phrase'} \quad \text{(DP)} \]
\[ \text{i te fenua} \quad \text{'Locative phrase'} \quad \text{(LP)} \]

In (4.4):  
\[ \text{e au} \quad \text{'Agentive phrase'} \quad \text{(AgP)} \]
\[ \text{i te mataafaga} \quad \text{'Locative phrase'} \quad \text{(LP)} \]

The state of our analysis may now be reviewed by giving the following partial Phrase-Markers (4.20) and (4.21) of (4.3) and (4.4) respectively:

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{NP} & \text{DP} & \text{LP} \\
\text{na fano} & \text{te tino} & \text{ki te falemai} & \text{i te fenua} \\
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{AgP} & \text{LP} \\
\text{na kai} & \text{e au} & \text{te ika} & \text{i te mataafaga} \\
\end{array} \]

The NPs \text{te tino} in (4.20) and \text{te ika} in (4.21) are differentiated from the other NPs of the two sentences by two features of their behaviour. These are: their occurrence in the sentence is essential to meet the requirement of grammaticality (note earlier discussion on minimal sentence forms); and they may permute to sentence-initial position in the focus transform. Further distributional facts must now be taken note of.
4.1.3.2 CONDITIONED PERMUTATIONS

In sentence (4.3) (described by P-marker (4.20) above), the constituents DP and LP cannot permute to sentence initial position. Thus the following sequences are ungrammatical:

\[(4.22) \quad *ki \text{ te falemai na fano te tino i te fenua} \]
\[(4.23) \quad *ko \text{ ki te fale mai na fano te tino i te fenua} \]
\[(4.24) \quad *i \text{ te fenua na fano te tino ki te falemai} \]
\[(4.25) \quad *ko \text{ i te fenua na fano te tino ki te falemai} \]

On the other hand, the NPs in (4.3) can permute to sentence-initial position:

\[(4.26) \quad ko \text{ te falemai na fano te tino ki ei i te fenua} \]

*It was to the hospital that the man went at the island*

\[(4.27) \quad ko \text{ te fenua na fano ai te tino ki te falemai} \]

*It was at the island that the man went to the hospital*

As with all sentences with a focussed NP, there is a shift of emphasis in meaning. The ko-marked NP is important or focused on, as when supplying information in answer to a question such as - 'where on the island did the man go?', 'where did the man go to hospital?'. 
It appears that the NPs from within both the Direction Phrase and the Locative Phrase (refer P-Marker (4.20)) may permute to sentence-initial position, while the initiating particles marking the DP and LP constituents cannot. Furthermore, when the NP te falemalai is moved out of the DP and placed in the sentence-initial position before the tense and verb morphemes as in (4.26), a proform ei obligatorily replaces it in the vacant position in the DP. In the case of (4.27) when the NP te fenua of the LP is permuted to sentence-initial position, the preposition i which marks the LP disappears, and the proform aj obligatorily occurs immediately postposed to the verb.

We may now note then that (i) the constituents DP and LP cannot occur preposed to the tense-verb constituent; and (ii) when the NPs of the DP or LP are preposed to the tense-verb sequence a trace of the NP, namely the proform ei or ai, is left. This contrasts with (4.17) where no such proform remained when the NP te tino (of (4.3)) was moved to the front of S.

Similarly with (4.4), (refer P-Marker (4.21)), the constituents AgP and LP cannot be permuted to occur before the verb, but their NPs may. Sentences (4.28) and (4.29) show the focused NP of the LP and the NP of the AgP respectively:

(4.28) ko te mataafaga na kai ai e au te ika

It was on the beach that I ate the fish
(4.29) ko aū na koo kai -a te ika i te mataafaga

It was I who ate the fish at the beach

Again, in (4.28) the shadow pronoun ai occurs immediately postposed to the verb.

When the NP of the AgP is permuted to sentence-initial position, a trace of that NP obligatorily occurs between the tense morpheme and the verb, and the verb takes a suffix a.

An examination of further sentences shows that there is a set of nominal phrase-types whose occurrence is dependant on the class of verb in the sentence. That is, certain verbs select certain nominal phrases as necessary or optional clause-mates. This allows us to subclassify these verbs according to their privileges of co-occurrence with nominal phrase-types. These nominal phrase types in question are referred to as 'cases' in this grammar, and a full range of case types of Tokelauan are listed below with examples.

(a) Descriptive Case i te fale
    Descrмker NP

(b) Direction Case ki te fale
    Dirмker NP

(c) Origin Case mai te fale
    Origмker NP
The P-Markers (4.20) and (4.21) of sentences (4.3) and (4.4), may now be modified to include the terminology. Sentence (4.3), which is repeated below, has the partial P-Marker (4.30).

(4.3) na fano te tino ki te falemai i te fenua

The man went to the hospital at the island

(4.30) [Diagram]

Sentence (4.4) repeated below, now receives the partial P-Marker (4.31).

(4.4) na kai e au te ika i te mataafaga

The fish was eaten by me at the beach
To summarise the analysis of sentences (4.3) and (4.4): we have established an unmarked Noun Phrase constituent (NP) which has a wide range of permutability within the sentence. Other NPs combine with certain markers to form Case constituents (cases). These cases have co-occurrence restrictions with the verb types, always occur postposed to the verb, and freely permute with the unmarked NP constituent.

It should be noted that the \( i \) NP constituents of verbal sentences of the type (4.3) and (4.4) have now been classified as Descriptive case constituents (DESCRcase), and that the preposition \( i \) (formerly labelled prep) is now called the Descriptive case marker (Descrmker).

4.1.3.3 A SINGLE CONSTITUENT FOR CASE

Since all case constituents have the same permutation privileges, and because the selection of any case is dependant upon the choice of the verb, I have relegated them to a single paradigmatic set of constituents (which, we may note are not mutually exclusive). This set will be treated as a single constituent, called 'CaseComplement', to be discussed in 4.1.8. P-Marker (4.30) can now be further modified to (4.32) below:
The relative status of the tense-verb constituent, Case Complement and the unmarked NP constituent has not yet been determined.

### 4.1.4 A PRELIMINARY SET OF RULES FOR VERBAL SENTENCES

The minimal sentence forms of (4.3) and (4.4) were given in (4.8) and (4.11) respectively. These are:

(4.8) \( \begin{array}{c} \text{na} \\ \text{fano} \\ \text{te} \\ \text{tino} \end{array} \)

- tense
- go
- Art
- man

The man went

(4.11) \( \begin{array}{c} \text{na} \\ \text{kai} \\ \text{te} \\ \text{ika} \end{array} \)

- tense
- eat
- Art
- fish

The fish was eaten

Without taking account of the problem of the Case Complement at this point (see 4.1.8 for a detailed discussion), we may regard sentences (4.8) and (4.11) as derived from the following phrase structure rules:

\[ R_1 \quad S \rightarrow \text{Verbal} \quad \text{NP} \]

\[ R_{2a} \quad \text{Verbal} \rightarrow \text{tense} \quad \text{verb} \]
These rules yield the following P-Marker:

\[
\begin{align*}
S & \quad \text{Verbal} \quad \text{NP} \\
& \quad \text{tense} \quad \text{verb} \quad \text{Art} \quad \text{noun} \\
& \quad \text{na} \quad \text{fano} \quad \text{te} \quad \text{tino} \\
& \quad \text{na} \quad \text{kai} \quad \text{te} \quad \text{ika}
\end{align*}
\]

Such rules, however, cannot apply to sentences (4.1) and (4.2) repeated below.

(4.1)  e  i  te  falefono  te  tino  \\
       tense prep  Art  meeting-house  Art  man  \\
       The man is at the meeting-house

(4.2)  e  o  te  tino  te  fale  \\
       tense poss  Art  man  Art  house  \\
       The house belongs to the man

The preposition  i  in (4.1) is still labelled as prep, since it has not been established whether or not it is a descriptive case marker as in the verbal sentences (4.3) and (4.4).

Sentence (4.1) comprises the sequence: tense prep NP NP: and (4.2) the sequence: tense poss NP NP. These differ from those analysed in (4.33) in that they have no verb.
Following the tense marker, we find prep NP in (4.1), and poss NP in (4.2). By comparing the structure described in (4.33) for (4.8), we are led to posit the following structure: prep NP is a constituent of (4.1) and has the same grammatical status (occurs at the same level of rule) within the analysis of S, as the verb in (4.33); and poss NP is a constituent of (4.2) and also has the grammatical status equivalent to the verb.

To begin our analysis of (4.1) and (4.2) we may examine whether the final NP of these sentences has the same freedom of movement as the unmarked NP of the verbal type sentences. This is shown in the following examples where the final NP of (4.1) and (4.2) is focused.

(4.34) ko  te  tino  e  i  te  falefono
      It is the man who is at the meeting-house

      The man is at the meeting-house

(4.35) ko  te  fale  e  o  te  tino
      The house belongs to the man

      It is the house that belongs to the man

The final NP of (4.1) and (4.2) can permute to sentence-initial position in the same manner as the unmarked NP of the verbal type sentences without requiring any proform to replace it in sentence-final position.
4.1.5 A CONSTITUENT ANALYSIS OF SOME VERBLESS SENTENCES

We now proceed to examine (4.1) and (4.2) (both of which are verbless sentences) in some detail. In particular we will seek evidence to determine whether the sequences prep NP (of (4.1)) and poss NP (of (4.2)) are constituents of S.

In (4.36) and (4.37) below the prep NP of (4.1) and poss NP of (4.2) are focused in sentence-initial position.

(4.36) ko te falefono e i ei te tino
At the meeting-house there is a man
It is at the meeting-house where the man is

(4.37) ko te tino e o ia te fale
It is the man to whom the house belongs

In (4.36) the proform ei obligatorily occurs in place of the topicalised NP in the sequence prep NP. While this suggests that the prep NP sequence may in fact be a constituent, further proof is required. What is clear from sentence (4.36), however, is that the NP of the sequence prep NP does not have the same free permutation privileges as the final NP of (4.1) and the unmarked NP of the verbal sentences (4.8) and (4.11). Rather it behaves like the NP of the Case constituents discussed earlier where the NP was bound to a marker particle, and required a proform to replace it when focused.
Similarly, in (4.37) the proform *ia* was required to replace
the focused NP from the sequence *poss NP*.

An examination of further sentence-types shows that the
sequences *prep NP* and *poss NP* do occur in other environments,
and that their derivation can be traced to simple sentences of
the type (4.1) and (4.2). Consider complex sentence (4.38) below:

(4.38) na koo kitea te vaka o te tino
      past listsing see NP poss NP
      o te nuku
      poss NP

I saw the canoe of the man of the village

This sentence, which contains two *poss NP* sequences, may be
derived from sentences (4.39a), (4.39b) and (4.39c)

(4.39a) na koo kitea te vaka
        I saw the canoe

(4.39b) e o te tino te vaka
tense poss def.sing man defsing canoe
The canoe is the man's/The canoe belongs to the man

(4.39c) e o te nuku te tino
tense poss def.sing village NP
The man belongs to the village/The man is from the village
Sentences (4.39b) and (4.39c) are then transformed to (4.40a) and (4.40b) respectively, by the focus transformation, and then are embedded in (4.39a) to produce (4.40c).

(4.40a) \text{ko te vaka e o te tino}

It is the canoe which belongs to the man/It is the canoe which is the man's

(4.40b) \text{ko te tino e o te nuku}

It is the man who belongs to the village/The man belongs to the village

(4.40c) \text{na koo kitea te vaka e o te tino e o te nuku}

I saw the canoe which belongs to the man who is from the village

The tense markers \text{e} are then deleted by the relative possession transformation to produce (4.38) above.

Analogous to the derivation of (4.38), sentence (4.41) can be derived by parallel transformations showing the presence of \text{prep NP}

sequences which have their origin in sentences of the type (4.1).

(4.41) \text{na koo kitea te vaka}

tense prn see def.sing canoe

\text{i te namo i fakaofo}

I saw the canoe in the lagoon at Fakaofo
That prep NP and poss NP should be regarded as constituents of (4.1) and (4.2) is further supported by the fact that neither prep nor poss occurs in Tokelauan without a following NP.

To summarise the analysis thus far, the following grammatical relations have been revealed: In (4.1), S comprises the constituents tense, prep NP and NP. The prep NP is here labelled Locative, and the preposition i (formerly prep) is called a locative marker (Locmker) in contrast to the preposition i which has been labelled Descrmker in verbal sentences (4.3) and (4.4).

Because of the ability of the NP constituent of (4.1) to be focused without leaving a proform, and because it is unmarked by a preposition or a case marker, we propose that it has the same grammatical status as the corresponding NP in verbal sentences. The following rules are postulated to represent the constituent structure of (4.1).

(i) S \rightarrow Proposition NP
(ii) Proposition \rightarrow tense Locative
(iii) Locative \rightarrow Locmker NP
(iv) NP \rightarrow Art Noun

In (4.2), S comprises the constituents tense, poss NP and NP. The constituent poss NP is here labelled Genitive and analogous to the case of (4.1), the sequences tense Genitive and NP are posited as immediate constituents of S. Rules formalising this constituent structure are:
(i)a \quad S \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{Proposition NP}

(ii)a \quad \text{Proposition} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{tense Genitive}

(iii)a \quad \text{Genitive} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{poss NP}

(iv)a \quad \text{NP} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{Art Noun}

4.1.6 \quad \text{CO-ORDINATION OF PROPOSED RULES WITH MODIFICATIONS}

There are now three sets of rules posited to describe the structure of sentences of the type: (4.3) and (4.4) (verbal sentences); (4.1) Locative sentences (one containing the constituent Locative) and (4.2) Genitive sentences (a sentence containing the constituent Genitive). These may all be collapsed into the rules listed below:

\begin{align*}
R_1 & \quad \text{Sentence} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{Proposition NP} \\
R_2 & \quad \text{Proposition} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{Tense Argument} \\
R_3 & \quad \text{Argument} \quad \rightarrow \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Verbal} \\
\text{Locative} \\
\text{Genitive}
\end{array} \right. \\
R_{4a} & \quad \text{Locative} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{Locmker NP} \\
R_{4b} & \quad \text{Genitive} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{poss NP} \\
R_5 & \quad \text{NP} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{Art noun}
\end{align*}

In the earlier discussion of sentences (4.3) and (4.4) the constituent CaseComplement was posited as coordinate with the verb (refer P-Marker (4.32)), but its grammatical relation to NP was not ascertained.
Since NP has now been analysed as a primary constituent of S (rule 1 above), CaseComplement may be introduced into the rules as a constituent of Verbal by the rule 4c below.

\[ R_{4c} \]  
\[ \text{Verbal} \rightarrow \text{Verbcentre (CaseComplement)} \]

CaseComplement can be expanded into the cases or phrase-types earlier listed, by \( R_{5b} \):

\[ R_{5b} \]  
\[ \text{CaseComplement} \rightarrow \text{(Origincase)(Agentivecase)} \]
\[ \text{(Explanatorycase)} \]
\[ \text{(Directioncase)} \]
\[ \text{(Descriptivecase)} \]

NB. Constituent cases of CaseComplement should read linearly as: (ORIGcase)(AGENTcase)(EXPLcase)(DIRcase)(DESCRcase).

These cases can be expanded as listed below:

- **Descriptivecase**: \[ \rightarrow \text{Descricmker} \text{ NP} \]
- **Origincase**: \[ \rightarrow \text{Origmker} \text{ NP} \]
- **Directioncase**: \[ \rightarrow \text{Dirmker} \text{ NP} \]
- **Explanatorycase**: \[ \rightarrow \text{Explmker} \text{ NP} \]
- **Agentivecase**: \[ \rightarrow \text{Agmker} \text{ NP} \]

These later rules can be incorporated into the collated rules to provide a set which will generate sentences (4.1.4) of our original corpus:

\[ R_1 \]  
\[ \text{Sentence} \rightarrow \text{Proposition NP} \]

\[ R_2 \]  
\[ \text{Proposition} \rightarrow \text{Tense Argument} \]
\[ \{ \text{Verbal} \} \]
\[ \{ \text{Locative} \} \]
\[ \{ \text{Genitive} \} \]

\[ R_3 \]  
\[ \text{Argument} \rightarrow \{ \text{Verbal} \} \]
\[ \{ \text{Locative} \} \]
\[ \{ \text{Genitive} \} \]
In the above listing of the preposition markers which distinguish the various cases and the locative and genitive arguments ($R_6$), there is an obvious generalisation which has not been adequately captured—that each rule rewrites a constituent as NP preceded by the corresponding preposition. Fillmore (1968:33) suggests a universal convention of the general form 'Case Category $\rightarrow$ K + NP,' where K is eventually realised as various prepositions, postpositions and case affixes.
4.1.7 A MODALITY CONSTITUENT

The constituent 'tense' can now be replaced by a modality constituent which includes both tense/aspect and negative.

Examples of sentences with the negative modality constituent are:

(4.42) e hee i te falefono te tino
       tense neg Loomker Art meeting-house Art man
       The man is not in the meeting-house

(4.43) e hee o -ku te fale
       tense neg poss 1st sing Art house
       The house is not mine

(4.44) ko au ka hee fano
       spec 1st sing tense neg go
       I will not go / I am not going (now)

There is no strong formal evidence for the inclusion of negative in a single constituent with tense/aspect, except that it always occurs after the tense aspect marker, even after transformations involving adjacent constituents. For example note transformations (4.46) and (4.48) of the sentences (4.45) and (4.47) respectively:

(4.45) ka hee kave e au te hua
       tense neg carry Agmker 1st sing Art drinking-nut
       I will not carry (transport) the drinking-nut
Sentence (4.46) is the result of a pronoun embedding transform where the pronoun in the Agentive case (au in (4.45)), is embedded between the tense marker and the verb. If a negative constituent is present in the sentence as in (4.46) then the pronoun is embedded between the negative and the verb (koo in (4.46)).

In (4.48), the locative constituent (i te falefono) has been permuted to occur after the NP constituent, and has been obligatorily replaced by the proform ai. Again the tense and the negative remain together.

An alternative formal analysis to a modality constituent is to posit tense/aspect and negative as separate and co-ordinate constituents. Evidence for this analysis exists in that semantically both tense/aspect and negative refer to the whole sentence and thus could be regarded as higher predicates. Although this treatment of negative has been rejected in favour of a modality constituent lack of any conclusive evidence requires that this matter be given further attention.
This problem does serve to illustrate, however, that in some areas the choice of the best IC analysis is not clearcut.

4.1.8 THE CONSTITUENT STATUS OF CASE COMPLEMENT

4.1.8.1 'TIME LOCATIVE' SEQUENCES

The next rules to be modified are $R_3$ and $R_4$. The constituent CaseComplement which is shown in $R_4$ to be a constituent of Verbal is in fact found to occur with both Locative and Genitive sentence types. In particular, the Descriptive Case when used to express time, can occur in Genitive and Locative sentences.

(4.49) e fano te tino i te aho-haa

tense go Art man Art Sunday

The man is going on Sunday

(4.50) nae i te falesono te

tense Locmker Art meeting-house Art

tino i te aho-haa

The man was at the meeting-house on Sunday

(4.51) nae oo -ku te falesing i

tense poss 1st sing Art house

Art aho-haa

Art Sunday
The house was mine last Sunday

In sentences (4.49-51) the phrase `i te aho-haa` expresses a time in which the Verbal, Locative and Genitive Arguments took place. Thus we see that the function of the sequence as a 'time locative' is consistent for each usage. The problem is to discover whether the constituent structure of each occurrence of `i te aho-haa` is the same, and whether its role in each of the sentences is also the same.

**4.1.8.2 HYPOTHESES**

Several solutions seem plausible. The most likely three are considered here. They are:

A. The phrase `i te aho haa` is a time locative phrase, and quite separate from the Descriptive Case `i NP` which occurs in Verbal Arguments:

B. The phrase `i te aho haa` is a Descriptive Case constituent in the verbal usage (4.49), and is a Time locative in the Genitive and Locative sentences (4.50) and (4.51)

C. `i te aho haa` is a Descriptive Case constituent in all three instances.
4.1.8.3  \textit{i-NP LOCATIVES IN OTHER POLYNESIAN LANGUAGES}

Before considering the above hypotheses, we may note that analyses for the Polynesian languages of Futuna, Sikaiana, Maori and Luangiu do distinguish between an \textit{i-NP} locative constituent and a further \textit{i-NP} sequence which occurs following the verb. Such analyses give plausibility to hypothesis A proposed in the previous section. We may note these distinctions before discussing the case for Tokelauan.

For Futunan, Biggs (personal communication) distinguishes between ablative and locative constituents which both have the form \textit{i-NP}. He finds that any locative constituent may occur before or after a verb, but an ablative can only occur after a verb. This feature is illustrated by the Futunan sentences in (4.52) and (4.53) below. (The constituent glosses are those distinguished by Biggs.)

(4.52a) \begin{align*}
\text{kua puli} & \quad \text{le sele} & \quad \text{i le ala} \\
\text{Vp} & \quad \text{Nom} & \quad \text{Loc}
\end{align*}

The knife has been lost on the path

(4.52b) \begin{align*}
\text{i le ala} & \quad \text{kua puli} & \quad \text{le sele} \\
\text{Loc} & \quad \text{Vp} & \quad \text{Nom}
\end{align*}

The knife has been lost on the path

(4.53a) \begin{align*}
\text{kua puli} & \quad \text{le sele} & \quad \text{i le toe} \\
\text{Vp} & \quad \text{Nom} & \quad \text{Ablative}
\end{align*}

The knife has been lost by the child
(4.53b) *i le toe kua puli le sele

Sentence (4.53b) was not an acceptable utterance in Futunan.

Such a distinction does not exist in Tokelauan as shown by the equivalent Tokelauan sentences (4.54 a-d) below:

(4.54a) kua galo te naaifi i te auala

The knife has been lost on the path

(4.54b) ko te auala kua galo ai te naaifi

On the path the knife has been lost

(4.54c) kua galo te naaifi i te tamaiti

The knife has been lost by the child

(4.54d) ko te tamaiti kua galo ai te naaifi

The child lost the knife

Instead in Tokelauan, the i NP constituents equivalent to those classified by Biggs for Futunan as Locative and Ablative, show no distinction under focussing. Furthermore, permutations such as Biggs' (4.52b) are non-grammatical in Tokelauan – note (4.55a) and (4.55b).

(4.55a) *i te auala kua galo te naaifi
(4.55) *i te tamaiti kua galo te naaifi

In the language of Sikaiana, distinction between a locative $i$ $NP$ constituent and an indirect object $i$ $NP$ constituent is also formally evident. Locative constituents can permute to sentence-initial position without a change of meaning, but when $i$ $NP$ indirect-objects occur initially, there is a change of meaning. The illustrative examples in Sikaiana which follow are drawn from Sikaiana Syntax (1968: 136):

(4.56a) t tamalaa ni kai i te hale
        Nom   Vp   LP

The man ate at the house

(4.56b) i te hale t tamalaa ni kai
        LP   Nom   Vp

The man ate at the house

(4.57a) t tamalaa ni kite i te hale
        Nom   Vp   NOM(Indirect-Object)

The man saw the house

(4.57b) i te hale t tamalaa ni kite
        At the house the man saw (something)$^1$

1. It can be seen by the meaning of this sentence that it is not derived from a transformation of sentence (4.57)a, but rather contains the constituents LP, Nom, Vp, and has had the Indirect-Object or NOM deleted.
For Maori, Hohepa (1967) distinguishes an i\_NP locative constituent from an i\_NP indirect-object

Thorpe (1968) also distinguishes between two kinds of i\_NP sequences in verbal sentences in Luangiu, one of which functions as a locative.

4.1.8.4 HYPOTHESIS A

Returning to our discussion of the Tokelauan sequence i\_te\_aho\_haa as it occurs in sentences (4.49 -51) we can examine hypothesis A in the knowledge that it does have a precedent in other Polynesian language analyses.

Hypothesis A classifies the phrase i\_te\_aho\_haa as a Time locative phrase, and quite separate from the Descriptive Case i\_NP which occurs in Verbal arguments. This solution requires that a formal distinction be shown between an i\_NP DescriptiveCase constituent, and an i\_NP Time locative constituent.

In both Locative and Genitive sentence-types (such as (4.50) and (4.51)), all i\_NP sequences refer to Time. With Verbal sentences, the Descrmlker i may have a variety of translations preceding an NP. Note sentences (4.58 - 63)
(4.58) na miha na fafine i te auala
past fight Art women Descrmker NP
The women fought on the road

(4.59) na miha na fafine i te puaka
past fight Art women Descrmker NP
The women fought over / about the pig

(4.60) kua huhuu te kie i te ua
tense wet Art garment Descrmker NP
The garment was wet by the rain

(4.61) na kai te tamaiti i te folaaaoa
tense eat Art child Descrmker NP
The child ate (of) the bread

(4.62) nae nofo te toeaina i te fenua
tense stay Art oldman Descrmker NP
The old man stayed at the island

(4.63) na nofo te tino i te vaka
tense sit Art man Descrmker NP
The man sat in the canoe
In sentences (4.58 - 63) the range of translations for the Descriminator \_i\_ is: 'on' (the road); 'about' (the pig); 'by' (the rain); 'of' (the bread); 'at' (the island); and 'in' (the canoe). Despite the wide range of functions of these \_i\_NP sequences, there is no distributional evidence to support a distinction between Descriptive Case and Time locative constituents.

Under the focus transform, where the NP of the \_i\_NP is permuted to sentence-initial position, sentences (4.49) and (4.58 - 63) behave the same. In each case the proform ai obligatorily occurs following the verb. As examples, sentences (4.49) and (4.60) are focused in (4.64) and (4.65) respectively:

(4.64) \[ \text{ko te aho-haa e fano ai} \]
\[ \text{spec Art Sunday tense go proform} \]
\[ \text{te tino} \]
\[ \text{Art man} \]
\[ \text{On Sunday the man will be going} \]

(4.65) \[ \text{ko te ua kua huhuu ai} \]
\[ \text{spec Art rain tense wet proform} \]
\[ \text{te kie} \]
\[ \text{Art garment} \]
\[ \text{It was the rain which wet the garment} \]
Thus the sequence _i_te_ aho-haa behaves no differently from other _i_ NP sequences, and must be regarded as a Descriptive Case constituent. In verbal sentences in Tokelauan, therefore, there is no distinction made between _i_ NP sequences of different meaning, and hypothesis A is not supported.

4.1.8.5 HYPOTHESIS B

Hypothesis B is that _i_te_ aho_haa is a Descriptive Case constituent in verbal sentences such as (4.49) while in genitive and locative sentences (4.50-1), it is time locative phrase.

Examination of further examples (not cited here) has shown that there is no distributional evidence supporting a distinction between those _i_ NP (such as _i_te_ aho_haa) sequences occuring in verbal sentences and those occuring in locative and genitive sentences. Also it seems logical that identical sequences of morphemes with identical 'meaning' should in fact have a single derivation. That is, since _i_te_ aho-haa means 'on Sunday' in all three instances, it would seem absurd to regard two of the usages as time locatives and the other usage as something else. This second proposal is thus discounted.

4.1.8.6 HYPOTHESIS C

The third hypothesis is that the sequence _i_te_ aho-haa is Descriptive Case in all three sentences. It will
be recalled that (4.50) and (4.51) were verbless sentences. Thus we are proposing to extend the use of the term case to refer to relations between constituents in non-verbal sentences. Some discussion is called for.

At the onset of this enquiry I assumed that case-relations exist only in verbal sentences, and that cases express relation strictly between the NPs and the verb. However, as we have seen verbless sentences of the locative and genitive types are also present in Tokelauan. I found semantic and formal relationships between the NPs and genitive and locative Arguments essentially identical to those which exist between the NPs and verbal Arguments. The prepositions and NPs concerned are identical and the same semantic contrasts are present.

Thus, the category CaseComplement constituent can be extended to non-verbal sentences and introduced in an earlier rule. It now combines with the constituent Argument which includes Locative and Genitive Arguments as well as Verbal Arguments. Some restriction could at some later stage be placed upon Locative or Genitive Arguments so that they only select the Descriptive Case and in particular with bases of time.
To sum up this discussion of the sequence \textit{i} \text{te} \text{aho-haa}, we have noted that there is no evidence supporting a Time locative constituent. On the contrary there is evidence that all occurrences of \textit{i} \text{te} \text{aho-haa} and other phrases denoting time behave formally in an identical manner to other \textit{i} \text{NP} sequences labelled Descriptive Case. Hence time phrases are regarded as exponents of Descriptive case.

4.1.9 RULE REVISIONS

The two modifications discussed in the previous section, (viz the expansion of the \textit{tense} constituent to include Modality (tense plus negative); and the shifting of the CaseComplement constituent from Verbal to occur with the Argument constituent in an earlier rule), can now be incorporated into the rules.

The new rules are:

\[
\begin{align*}
R & \quad S & \quad \rightarrow & \quad \text{Proposition} \quad \text{Subject} \\
R_2 & \quad \text{Proposition} & \quad \rightarrow & \quad \text{Modality} \quad \text{Statement} \\
R_3 & \quad \text{Statement} & \quad \rightarrow & \quad \text{Argument} \quad (\text{CaseComplement}) \\
R_4 & \quad \text{Argument} & \quad \rightarrow & \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{VERBarg} \\
\text{LOCarg} \\
\text{GENarg}
\end{array} \right. \\
R_5 & \quad \text{CaseComplement} & \quad \rightarrow & \quad (\text{ORIGcase}) \quad (\text{DIRcase}) \quad (\text{AGENTcase}) \\
& & & \quad (\text{EXPLANcase}) \quad (\text{DESCRcase})^n
\end{align*}
\]
The term Statement has been introduced into the rules to maintain the binary analysis of Proposition since the constituent CaseComplement has been made co-ordinate with Argument.

In Rule 1 the term Subject has replaced NP. Subject therefore, is a categorial symbol to mark the NP immediately dominated by S. From our earlier discussion on the analysis of Locative, Genitive and Verbal sentence types, subject can also be defined by its syntactic marking as: that NP which is unmarked.

Sentences (4.66), (4.67) and (4.68) below illustrate the first constituent breakup of S into Proposition and Subject.
(4.66) kua taamate e au tau moa
Proposition Subject
Your fowl has been killed by me/I killed your fowl

(4.67) kua puli too igoa i (a)te au
Subject Proposition
Your name is forgotten to me/I have forgotten your name

(4.68) na kitea e te tino ia koe
Proposition Subject
You were seen by the man/The man saw you

4.2 A DISCUSSION OF CERTAIN FUNCTIONAL NOTIONS OF LANGUAGE

So far this chapter has been concerned with formal criteria for establishing the constituent structure of simple sentences. Selected evidence has been offered to provide a categorial analysis of Verbal, Locative and Genitive simple sentence types. Although passing reference has been made to function (4.1.8), the grammatical rules set out in 4.1 are postulated solely on the basis of distributional facts. Of the original corpus of simple sentences (i.e. (4.1-5)), sentence (4.5) has not yet been considered. However, it is convenient at this point to digress from the categorial analysis to consider the role of functional interpretations in grammatical analysis.
The importance of function to linguistic analysis was aptly described by Jeffrey Heath (1975) in his paper "Some Functional Relationships in Grammar".

"Because linguistic systems have been designed (by evolution) to carry out communicative functions, it follows that many individual elements of these systems also have functions - some great, some little. I think it is important for linguists to try to discover the functions of these elements (e.g. morphological oppositions, syntactic rules). This is a difficult task because there are so many different kinds of functions: an element may convey semantic information on the surface, it may simplify the production and decoding of utterances, it may have socio-linguistic or affective functions, etc. It may even have several functions at once. Furthermore, it is usually impossible to interpret the function of a particular element in isolation; rather, we must consider its interaction with other elements in the system. Despite these problems, we must not continue to regard functional interpretations of grammatical phenomena as either hopeless or useless."

Heath, 1975 : 90
In accordance with the model used (refer chapter 1, section 1), I will propose a functional definition of sentence and a breakdown into functional units. These will then be compared to the rules which were formulated by non-functional criteria. Some attempt will be made to justify the functional analysis of S by reference to native speakers' use of the languages of Tokelauan and English. However, it must be emphasised that in no circumstances have functional notions alone been used to determine constituent structure in this analyses.

"Although functional interpretations must be based on accurate formal descriptions of linguistic data, we need to recognise that functional relationships among grammatical elements are entirely distinct from formal relationships."

Heath, 1975 : 90

4.2.1 **A FUNCTIONAL DEFINITION OF SENTENCE**

In the analysis of language the linguist examines the speech patterns of the informant. While the natural unit of speech might be a category such as 'utterance', 'unit of discourse', 'turn at talking', analyses to date (and this one as well) have been much more concerned with the 'complete' and 'independent' sentence.
This to a large extent ignores such extra-sentential features as contextualisation, retrospective reference, gesture substitution or supplementation, intonation and the fact that a large number of acceptable utterances are in fact sentence fragments or other ungrammatical strings, while other sentences are used in a metaphorical sense.

A sentence is here defined as a Topic and Comment. If we accept the requirements that a sentence must be both grammatical and meaningful, then this definition will stand. The grammaticality requirement is concerned with the categorial components. But the minimal functional definition (i.e. meaningfulness) requires two functional constituents: the Comment or the thing said; and the Topic, the thing about which the comment says something.

Compare the following sentences in English and Tokelauan:

(4.69) \textit{the man smokes} \hspace{1cm} \text{Topic Comment}

(4.70) \textit{she hit the pig on the nose with her shoe} \hspace{1cm} \text{Topic Comment}

(4.71) \textit{the house is mine} \hspace{1cm} \text{Topic Comment}
(4.72)  \textit{e i te mataafaga tino}

Comment

The man is at the beach

This definition is similar to that accepted by Biggs (1974) for subject and predicate.

"My grade-school teacher (and Edward Sapir) said that the subject is 'what we are talking about'. The subject is 'given'. The predicate is the 'new' information - what is said about the subject."


My functional notion Topic corresponds to Biggs' 'what we are talking about', which he calls subject, and my notion Comment corresponds to his Predicate - 'what is said about the subject'.

A similar distinction was also noted by Lakoff who states:

"Rational thought requires a distinction between things named, and what is said about those things."

Lakoff, (1972 : 77)
The 'topic' or the 'what we are talking about' of S must be distinguished from the discourse notion 'topic' which has been described by Chafe (1972) and others.

In a recent paper entitled "Topic as a Discourse Notion", Keenan and Schieffelin (1976) provide a systematic study of the way in which topics-of-discourse are initiated, sustained and dropped in naturally-occurring discourse. They take as their definition of discourse - topic: the proposition (or set of propositions) about persons, objects or ideas, about which the speaker is either providing or requesting new information.

The concept of topic which I claim for all Tokelauan and English simple sentences, however, corresponds to the traditional grammatical concept of 'logical subject', that entity about which something is predicated - asserted, affirmed or denied - in a given proposition.

Hockett (1958) in discussing predicative constructions recognises a 'topic' and 'comment' notion in English sentences.

"The most general characterisation of predicative constructions is suggested by the terms 'topic' and 'comment' for their ICs: the speaker announces a topic and then says something about it."

Hockett, 1958 : 201
Hockett examines a number of English sentences and notes that 'topics are usually also subjects, and comments are predicates: as in John/ran away.' In considering certain 'derived' sentences, however, he finds that the topic is not always the subject. However, if we exclude derived sentences that deviate from the basic sentence structure by virtue of having undergone certain transformations, such as left dislocation or focusing, then Hockett's 'topic' notion will coincide with mine and correspond to the 'logical subject.'

In this analysis, the constituent which has the semantic function of topic corresponds to the formal constituent Subject of the sentence, and the comment corresponds to the Proposition. Both Subject and Proposition must be present before the sentence meets the requirement of meaningfulness. The exception to this rule is when either constituent is omitted, but where the constituent is understood by both speaker and hearer. For example in the English imperative, the Subject (which is the person addressed) may be omitted since both speaker and hearer know what the subject is. Thus look!' and pass the butter!' are meaningful sentences in English.

In certain circumstances, the Proposition may be omitted. For example rain!' would be a meaningful utterance if said by one of a group of people about to embark on a picnic, or if said to a woman who had washing outside on the clothes line to dry.
In such cases the "NP" has a possible meaning like: "speaker has perceived NP and considers its presence or existence worthy of remark." Utterances such as rain are difficult to treat without recourse to general discourse factors and extra linguistic considerations. No formal treatment is attempted here.

In most Polynesian languages there is a small subset of sentences which appear to have no subject, but which are accepted by speakers as a complete utterance. Such sentences are concerned with natural phenomena such as weather. This feature is illustrated by sentence (4.73) from Tokelauan, and (4.74) from another Polynesian language, Tongan.

(4.73) kua pō

It is night/Night has fallen

(4.74) (TONGAN) na'e mafuike

past earthquake

There was an earthquake

(C.M.Churchward, 1953 : 70)
To account for this class of sentences, Rule I will have to be modified to $S \rightarrow$ Proposition (Subject), so that the subject is not obligatory. Selectional restrictions, however, will ensure that only members of a small class lexical items (times of day, weather phenomena, etc) can be inserted in a subjectless structure. Thus the principle that Subject is an indispensable constituent of $S$ at the level of deep structure remains true for the vast majority of Tokelauan sentences.

4.2.2 A DEFINITION OF SUBJECT

In sentences (4.69-72) functional constituent relations were easily established. That is it was a simple matter to delimit the topic and the comment. In certain sentences it is not so obvious.

For example, in the following sentences of Tokelauan, it is difficult to ascertain which constituent is the topic under the present definition.

(4.75a) $\text{na kai e au te ika}$

The fish was eaten by me/I at the fish

(4.75b) $\text{na ako te teine i te hiva e te tino}$

The girl was taught the dance by the man/The man taught the dance to the girl

However, sentences (4.76a) and (4.76b) are minimal forms of (5.75a) and (4.75b) respectively.
(4.76a)  na kai te ika
          The fish was eaten

(4.76b)  na ako te teine
          The girl learned

Both (4.76a) and (4.76b) are minimal sentence forms and meet the requirement of meaningfulness (having both topic and comment which are easily distinguished in terms of our functional definition). This functional analysis corresponds to the categorial analysis where (4.76a) and (4.76b) meet the requirement of grammaticality (Proposition plus Subject).

We may note that the examples (4.77a, b and c) below (constructed from (4.75a) and (4.75b)), were not recognised as complete sentences by speakers of Tokelauan.

(4.77a)  * na kai e au
          Was eaten by me

(4.77b)  * na ako i te hiva
          Learnt the dance

(4.77c)  * na ako e te tino
          Was taught by the man
Each of the above sentences were regarded as incomplete by the native-speaker. In each case this can be explained in terms of our functional analysis, and we may note that it is the topic that is missing. The sequences (4.77a, b, and c) also fall short of the requirements of grammaticality. Sentence (4.77a) comprises the major constituents: VerbalArgument AgentCase; (4.77b) comprises: VerbalArgument AgentiveCase. In all instances the constituent subject is required before the sentences are grammatically acceptable.

It has been shown that a functional analysis of S corresponds to the analysis based on grammatical criteria, at least as far as rule I. The categorial analysis defines S as Proposition + Subject. In direct correspondence to this analysis, a functional definition of S is proposed as: Comment + Topic.

Sentences (4.75a) and 4.75b) may now be described with both functional and categorial glosses in (4.78) and (4.79) respectively.

\[(4.78)\quad na\quad kai\quad e\quad au\quad te\quad ika\]

Comment Topic

Proposition Subject

was eaten by me

The fish was eaten by me
(4.79) na ako e te tino i te hiva te teine

Comment Topic

Proposition Subject

Was taught the dance by the man The girl

The girl was taught the dance by the man

The use of seemingly functional terms in the categorial analysis in the earlier sections can now be seen to have been deliberate. Although in such an analysis they are merely labels for grammatically derived constituents and as such carry no meaning, in a functional analysis, they express this writer's view on how the Tokelauans understand their language.

From the preceding discussion, we can arrive at functional and categorial definitions of subject. Functionally, the Subject is the constituent which has the semantic role of Topic. Categorically, the subject is that NP without which the sentence does not meet the requirements of grammaticality. This latter formal definition of subject was also given by Biggs:

"In languages with which I am familiar, there is in many sentences containing more than one noun phrase, just one that is indispensible. Without it the sentence would lose its sentence status, which is to say it would no longer be a predication. The indispensible noun phrase is the subject of the sentence."

Biggs, (1974:404-5)
The coincidence of the formal constituent 'subject' with a functionally defined unit is also found in Bigg's treatment of Polynesian. He writes:

"Typically in those languages with which I am familiar, the indispensibility criterion and the 'what are we talking about' criterion select the same subject - it's hard to see how it could be otherwise."

Biggs, (1974 : 405)

In Tokelauan, the subject in almost all instances is unmarked.

Proposition, defined functionally as a comment upon the subject, is illustrated in the following sentences of Tokelauan and English.

(4.80) the dog was chewing the bone with his sharp teeth
      Subject Proposition

(4.81) I had some money in my pocket yesterday
      Subject Proposition

1. The unmarked NP of Subject is handled in later categorial rules by positing a subject marker which is actualised as zero (Ø)
(4.82) the canoe is mine
Subject Proposition

(4.83) the new hotel is at the beach
Subject Proposition

(4.84) nae i te falefono ananafi te teine
Proposition Subject
The girl was in the meeting-house yesterday

(4.85) nae ooku ananafi te fale
Proposition Subject
The house was mine yesterday

(4.86) na kave e te tino i te vaka ki te teine
Proposition
te fau
Subject
The head-dress was taken to the girl by the man on the canoe

Rule 2 (Proposition \(\rightarrow\) Modality Statement) has little functional significance. It is concerned with separating tense/aspect and negative from the rest of the proposition. This modality can be seen to be present in all the examples (4.80-6).
The functional evidence supporting rules 3 and 4, which are concerned with the division of S into argument types and case types, is discussed at considerable length in chapter 6. In particular, discussion centres on the co-occurrence of case types with the argument types.

In Locative sentences (those containing the constituent Locative Argument) and Genitive sentences (those with a Genitive Argument constituent), the Descriptive Case is the only case category which may occur, and in each instance it has the functional gloss of Time locative.

In an essentially categorial analysis of verbal sentences the selectional restrictions operating between verbs and the cases can be stated as follows: verbs are subclassified by their possible occurrence and non-occurrence in certain categorial environments (i.e. with the case constituent categories). That is, since the case constituents are distinguished on formal grounds, and since also certain verbs may or may not occur with the various cases, it is within the bounds of a categorial analysis to subclassify the verbs by their occurrence with the cases.

An alternative statement of the selectional restrictions between the case constituents and verbs might be: verbs are inherently subclassified to select various case constituents. Since verb classes cannot be distinguished formally, such a
claim amounts to a semantically based classification.

The point being disputed here is seen to be of major importance in chapter 6. Do the case constituents select the verbs and so subclassify them (as required by an essentially categorial analysis), or do the verbs themselves select what cases may co-occur with them? Further discussion of this issue is deferred to chapter 6, section 6.4.

The suitability of rules 3 and 4 to formally characterise the structure of English and certain other Polynesian languages is also discussed there.

4.3 **NP + NP - TYPE VERBLESS SENTENCES**

In our formal analysis of corpus sentences in section 4.1, we discussed evidence for the constituent structure of example (4.1), a Locative sentence; (4.2), a Genitive sentence; and (4.3) and (4.4), verbal sentences. This section is concerned with an analysis of example (4.5), the final sentence in our original set exemplifying five structural types.

4.3.1 **FORMAL AND FUNCTIONAL ANALYSIS**

Sentence (4.5) is an example of an NP + NP construction and is repeated below:

(4.5) he faipule te tino

indefing chief defsing man

The man is a chief
The structure of (4.5) differs from each of the previously analysed simple sentences (4.1 - 4). There is no tense marker, no verb, and no preposition NP sequence. Sentence (4.5) has the surface structure:

(4.87)

```
S
  \---\
   NP  NP
       \-\-\-\-\-
        inef.art noun def.art noun
           he    faipule    te    tino
```

Verbless sentences in Polynesian languages have long been a problem to linguists. Those of the type (4.5) have resisted attempts by transformational grammarians to relate them to other types. In discussing verbless sentences in Samoan, Clark (1969 : 43) writes:

"The most important type of verbless sentence excluded from consideration here is that exemplified by 'O le lelelo Ioane. "John is a policeman". Such sentences are not clearly related to any other type, verbless or not, and their true grammatical nature is still a mystery to me."

The only permutation transform allowed with sentence (4.5) is the focussing of the NP te tino to occur in sentence-initial position before the NP he faipule. In this event, te tino is obligatorily preceded by the specifier ko:
(4.88)  ko  te  tino  he  faipule
spec  dense  man  dense  chief

It is the man who is the chief/The man is a chief

No proform or trace is required to replace the focused
NP constituent here.  In verbal, locative and genitive
sentences it is only the 'NP-of-subject' which can be focussed
without leaving a trace of some kind.  Thus we have one
argument for regarding te  tino as the subject of (4.5).  That is,
on the present evidence it seems preferable to regard verbless
sentences of the type of (4.5) as a distinct kind of simple
sentence whose immediate constituents are:

S  \rightarrow  NP  +  NP  : where the second NP is the subject
and the first is the proposition.

A case for an NP + NP -type of simple sentence might
also be argued on functional grounds.

In the discussion of simple sentences (4.1-4) in section
4.2, subject was defined functionally as the 'topic' or 'that
which is talked about'.  Whereas subjects have one basic
function, propositions of simple sentences have diverse functions.
For example, subjects may do something (as in (4.3));  have
something done to them (as in (4.4));  be in a certain position
(as in (4.1));  or be possessed (as in (4.2)).
If (4.5) is to be analysed as Proposition + Subject (where proposition refers to comment and the subject is the topic) we see yet another function of the proposition. This function I have termed 'equational' and may be also observed in the following Tokelauan verbless sentences (4.89-91):

(4.89) \[ \text{he} \quad \text{peeni} \quad \text{teenei} \]
\[ \text{indef.art} \quad \text{pen} \quad \text{this} \]
This is a pen

(4.90) \[ \text{ni} \quad \text{puaka} \quad \text{naa} \quad \text{tino} \]
\[ \text{indef.art} \quad \text{pig} \quad \text{def.art} \quad \text{man} \]
The men are pigs

(4.91) \[ \text{he} \quad \text{tino} \quad \text{valea} \quad \text{koe} \]
\[ \text{indef.art} \quad \text{person} \quad \text{mad} \quad \text{2nd.sing} \]
You are a mad person/You are mad

Together with the meaning (4.5) 'the man is a chief', sentences (4.89-91) express a relationship equivalent to that expressed by the verb to be in the English Translations - an equational relationship.

There is no verb to be in Tokelauan, and the hypothesis is that in sentences of the type (4.5), the proposition holds an equational relationship with the subject. Compare the following three English sentences and their Tokelauan translation equivalents.
(4.92a)  this is a pen
(4.92b)  this is worthless
(4.92c)  this is ridiculous
(4.93a)  he peeni teenei
          This is a pen
(4.93b)  e tauaanoa teenei
          This is worthless
(4.93c)  e valea teenei
          This is ridiculous

In the Tokelauan sentences, the equational sentence (4.93a) is quite clearly distinguished grammatically from the 'stative' sentences, refer (4.93b) and (4.93c). Stative sentences are formally defined and discussed in detail in chapter 6, section 6.3. In functional terms, they denote a state about the subject.) That is, (4.93a) has the article he introducing the proposition, while (4.93b) and (4.93c) take the tense/aspect marker e. In functional terms (4.93a) is also distinguished from (4.93b) and (4.93c). In (4.93b) and (4.93c) the proposition simply asserts something about a property of the subject, whereas in (4.93a) the object denoted by the proposition he peeni is actually equated or identified with the subject.

In the English examples the equational sentence (4.92a) is also formally distinguished from the stative sentences (4.92b) and (4.92c) by its use of the article a. Thus (4.92a) and (4.93a) - the equational sentences which express the verb to be - contrast formally with the stative type sentences (4.92b,c) and (4.93b,c).
4.3.2 PHRASE STRUCTURE RULES FOR EQUATIONAL SENTENCES

The categorial analysis so far proposed for equational sentences in Tokelauan is $S \rightarrow$ Proposition Subject (where both constituents are NP).

Equational sentences containing functor morphemes of tense/aspect, negation and specification, also occur in Tokelauan. This section is concerned with discerning the selectional restrictions operating between the constituent classes tense/aspect, genitive and specifier within equational sentences. The result is a subset of rules to categorise the structure of equational sentences.

Sentences (4.94 - 6) listed below, appear semantically to be equational type sentences but each contains some structural variation from the NP + NP type described in the above rule.

(4.94) $ko\, he\, faipule\, te\, tino$

spec  indef.art  chief  def.art  man

The man is a chief.

(4.94) has the same gloss as (4.5) but contains the specifier $ko$ in the Proposition.

(4.95) $e\, hee\, he\, faipule\, te\, tino$

non-past  neg.  indef.art  chief  def.art  man

The man is not a chief.
This sentence expresses the negative relations of (4.5) and contains the tense/aspect marker e and the negative morpheme hee in the Proposition.

(4.96) nae he faipule te tino
pastprog indef.art chief def.art man

The man was (was being) a chief

Sentence (4.96) includes the tense/aspect marker nae in the Proposition.

The structural description NP + NP for equational sentences must now be modified to include these sentences containing the elements modal and specifier.

Certain constraints operate, however, between the constituents modal, specifier and NP (of the Proposition) as illustrated by the following examples all of which are unacceptable in Tokelauan

(4.97a) *e hee ko he faipule te tino
(4.97b) *nae ko he faipule te tino
(4.97c) *hee he faipule te tino
(4.97d) *hee ai he faipule te tino

The solution adopted here is to posit all three (modal spec NP) as constituents of the Proposition and then list the following restrictions: (a) The negative hee is obligatorily paired with the tense marker e 'non-past'.
(b) The tense/aspect marker *nae* 'past-progressive' can occur in the proposition without the negative.  
(c) The specifying particle *ko* cannot occur after the modal constituent.  

As with other sentence types, the subject can permute to sentence-initial position in the focus transform. Sentence examples (4.98), (4.99) and (4.100) are subject focus transforms of (4.94), (4.95) and (4.96) respectively.

(4.98)  
\[
\text{ko te tino he faipule}
\]

The man is a chief/It is the man who is a chief

(4.99)  
\[
\text{ko te tino e hee he faipule}
\]

It is the man who is not a chief/That man is not a chief

(4.100)  
\[
\text{ko te tino nae he faipule}
\]

It is the man who was a chief/That man was a chief

Again, the permuted subject is obligatorily initiated by the specifying particle *ko*. In the case of (4.98) the specifying particle *ko* (from (4.94)) preceding the indefinite article *he* is obligatorily deleted.

The equational type sentences so far considered all contain indefinite propositions, i.e. the article in the NP is the indefinite article.
When the article is definite, the co-occurrence restrictions between the modal and the specifying particle are different.

Sentences (4.101) and (4.102) below contain definite propositions. (4.103) and (4.104) are their respective subject focus transformations.

(4.101) ko te faipule te tino
spec def.art chief def.art man

The man is the chief

(4.102) e hee ko te faipule
tense neg spec def.art chief
te tino
def.art man

The man is not the chief

(4.103) ko te tino te faipule
spec def.art man def.art chief

It is the man who is the chief/The man is the one who is the chief

(4.104) ko te tino e hee ko
spec def.art man tense neg spec
te faipule
def.art chief
The man is not the chief/That man (emphatic) is not the chief

The five sentences listed below as (4.105a - e) are unacceptable.

(4.105a) *ko te tino ko te faipule

(4.105b) *e hee te faipule te tino

(4.105c) *nae te faipule te tino

(4.105d) *ko te tino e hee te faipule

The major co-occurrence restrictions operating between modal, specifier, and NP (where the article is the definite article) include the following: (a) the negative hee is obligatorily paired with the tense marker e (non-past); (b) the tense/aspect marker nae 'past progressive' cannot occur in the proposition; (c) the specifying particle is obligatory after the modal constituent; (d) the specifier is obligatory with the proposition and for marking the focussed subject; (e) when the subject is focussed to occur before the negative, the focus marker of the proposition remains.
The articles of Tokelauan deserve deeper study than I have been able to give them. It seems that there are a number of important differences between definite and indefinite articles. For example the definite article implies reference to an aforementioned thing or to something understood by the hearer, and thus could well be transformationally derived.

We have observed that selectional restrictions between the component constituents of the proposition of equational sentences differ according to the choice of the article. What is significant at this stage of the analysis, however, is not the selectional restrictions between modal, specifier and NP, but the fact that they all occur as component constituents of the proposition in equational sentences.

To conclude this section, we note that some support has been offered for the following constituent analysis of equational sentences:

(a) Equational S \rightarrow Proposition Subject
(b) Proposition \rightarrow modal Statement
(c) Statement \rightarrow Argument CaseComplement
(d) Argument \rightarrow EquationalArgument (necessary because there are other types of Arguments)
(e) EquationalArgument \rightarrow specifier NP

The selectional rules operating between the various constituents can be listed in a separate part of the grammar.
4.3.3 PHRASE STRUCTURE RULES FOR SENTENCE

Having discussed the analysis of the several types of simple sentences exemplified by (4.1-5), we are now in a position to fully collate the rules given for the various sentence types into a sequence of six rules:

\[ R_1 \text{ Sentence } \rightarrow \text{ Proposition Subject} \]

\[ R_2 \text{ Proposition } \rightarrow \text{ modality Statement} \]

\[ R_3 \text{ Statement } \rightarrow \text{ Argument CaseComplement} \]

\[ R_4 \text{ Argument } \rightarrow \{ \text{ VERBarg LOCarg GENarg EQUATart} \} \]

\[ R_5 \text{ CaseComplement } \rightarrow (\text{EXPLcase} \text{ AGENTcase} \text{ ORIGcase}) \text{ (DIRcase) (DESCRcase)}^n \]

\[ R_6 \text{ (a) LOCarg } \rightarrow \text{ Locmker NP} \]

\[ \text{ (b) GENarg } \rightarrow \text{ poss NP} \]

\[ \text{ (c) EQUATarg } \rightarrow \text{ spec NP} \]

\[ \text{ (d) Subject } \rightarrow \text{ Subjmker NP} \]

\[ \text{ (e) AGENTcase } \rightarrow \text{ Agmker NP} \]

\[ \text{ (f) EXPLcase } \rightarrow \text{ Explmker NP} \]

\[ \text{ (g) ORIGcase } \rightarrow \text{ Origmker NP} \]

\[ \text{ (h) DIRcase } \rightarrow \text{ Dirmker NP} \]

\[ \text{ (i) DESCRcase } \rightarrow \text{ Descrmker NP} \]
We should note here that the DESCRC case can occur several times in one simple sentence. For an extended discussion of the functions of the DESCRC case see chapter 6, section 6.3.

Rule 6d (the expansion of Subject) will be discussed in section 4.5 of this chapter.

4.4 THE CONSTITUENTS OF NOUN PHRASE AND VERBAL ARGUMENT

Sections 4.1 and 4.3 have been concerned with justifying phrase structure rules 1-6 which specify the major constituents of S. In the following sections discussion is centred around the internal structure of the lower order constituents, NP and VerbalArgument (VERBarg).

4.4.1 TWO TYPES OF NOMINAL PHRASE

The relevant rules analysing NP are listed below

\[
\begin{align*}
R_7 & \quad \text{NP} \quad \rightarrow \begin{cases} 
\text{NOMprop} \\
\text{NOMcom}
\end{cases} \\
R_8(a) & \quad \text{NOMprop} \quad \rightarrow \begin{cases} 
\text{ARTprop} \quad \text{NOUN} \\
\text{ARTnum}
\end{cases} \\
R_8(b) & \quad \text{NOMcom} \quad \rightarrow \begin{cases} 
\text{ARTnonpartic} \quad \text{NOM} \\
\text{ARTcom (other)}
\end{cases} \\
R_9(b) & \quad \text{NOM} \quad \rightarrow \text{NOUNcomplex (Qualifier)} \\
R_{10}(b) & \quad \text{NOUNcomplex} \quad \rightarrow \text{NOUNnucleus (Demonstrative)} \\
R_{11}(b) & \quad \text{NOUNnucleus} \quad \rightarrow \text{PREbasic} \quad \text{NOUN}
\end{align*}
\]
P-Markers illustrating the structure of NP are given below:

(4.106)

```
(4.107)
```

Rule 7 divides NP into two classes. NOMprop is an NP with a proper noun preceded by a proper noun article a. NOMcom is an NP which contains a common noun. This analysis is preferred over the familiar alternative which first divides NP into Article plus Nominal:

(4.108a) NP → Article Nominal

and then divides nominal and article into several types:
(4.108b,i) Nominal \( \rightarrow \) \{NOMcom, NOMprop\}

(4.108b,ii) Article \( \rightarrow \) \{ARTcom, ARTprop\}

Rules (4.108a - b) maintain the generalisation that there is an 'article' class which initiates a nominal complex. Such a category of articles has been posited by linguists for several other Polynesian languages\(^1\). However, apart from the fact that ARTcom and ARTprop both precede the head of an NP, they have nothing at all in common\(^2\). Furthermore, the rules posited in (4.108) require that selectional restrictions between the articles and the nominal types be added in the form of context sensitive rules.

The division shown by \( R_7 \) was, however, posited on the basis of both distributional and functional evidence.

---


---

2. The article ARTnum (ia) listed in \( R_8b \) has a distribution restricted to common nouns which denote or refer to number and thus need not concern us here. The other article ARTnonpartic (hohe) has a similar distribution to ARTcom. Our discussion, therefore, can be confined to the two articles ARTcom and ARTprop, and whether or not they should be grouped together as an article class. Sentence examples illustrating the syntactic distribution of all articles were provided in chapter 2, section 2.
Principal distributional evidence is:

(a) the article ARTcom always occurs with the constituent NOMcom (a nominal constituent containing a common noun), and never with NOMprop (a nominal constituent with a proper noun), while the article ARTprop always occurs with the constituent NOMprop and never with NOMcom;

(b) certain co-occurrence restrictions exist between various members of the particle class of NOMcom, and ARTcom (for example, singular and plural members of ARTcom must correspond to the singular and plural members of the demonstrative class) while in the case of NOMprop, these classes of particle do not occur.

The claim in functional terms for preferring $R_7$ to the alternative analysis proposed by (4.108) is that there is no natural class 'article' and no natural class 'nominal'. Although in a structural description of Tokelauan, articles would be diagnostic for noun bases (as opposed to, say, verb bases), I consider articles to be a feature of the BASE they precede, these being common or proper. Evidence supporting this claim can be observed in the use of the constituents NOMcom and NOMprop by the native speakers. The issue is essentially the difference between 'proper' type nouns as in NOMprop and 'common' type nouns as in NOMcom.
Common nouns comprise a class of terms (distinguished) formally in Tokelauan from proper nouns as shown above) which are used by a speech community to distinguish between different articles, concepts, or 'things'. The range of things which are differentiated and named may vary from speech community to speech community. For example, Tokelauan has seven common names for the fruit of the coconut tree (depending on the stage of growth), while English has only one.

Proper nouns, on the other hand, are names given to already named things to distinguish them from other things of the same type, or to provide a personal term of reference. Thus while a group of houses with several shops may be termed a town in N.Z. English, each town has its proper name, just as each person has a personal name which distinguishes him from other people.

The point being argued here is that each time a personal name is used in speech, some information is given which could be expressed by common nouns. For example, in English, we may say:

(4.109) John bought a dress for Mary in Ruatoria

This statement assumes that the hearer knows who John and Mary refer to, and what Ruatoria refers to. If the hearer was not familiar with these proper names, then the speaker would have to say:
(4.110) A man called John bought a dress for a woman called Mary in a town called Ruatoria.

Thus using only common nouns from (4.110) we understand

(4.111) The man bought a dress for the woman in the town.

Sentence (4.111) describes the facts accurately, but (4.109) by the use of proper nouns particularises the man, the woman and the town. Thus functionally, proper nouns are used in quite different sense to common nouns, and hence it is felt that NPs with common nouns should be distinguished from NPs with proper nouns at the highest possible level.

It is noted here that various common nouns and technical terms may also be paraphrased in more general terms in a similar manner to proper nouns. For example, sentence (4.112) could have the more general form (4.113) which in turn could have the more general form (4.114).

(4.112) The chief stabbed the terrier
(4.113) The man stabbed the dog
(4.114) The person stabbed the animal

While sentence (4.114) tells us what actually happened, sentences (4.113) and (4.112) are more specific. We learn that the person is a man, and the man is a chief, and also that the animal is a dog, and the dog is a terrier.
The use of proper nouns, however, still differs from common nouns in two ways: (a) It particularises the 'thing' referred to, so that it cannot refer to any other similar thing. Sentence (4.112) which is more specific than both (4.113) and (4.114), could still refer to any chief, and any terrier. Sentence (4.115), however, which substitutes proper nouns for the chief and the terrier, refers particularly to one specific chief, and one specific terrier.

(4.115) Henry Tuisavalou stabbed Flip

(b) Proper nouns also personalise the 'thing' referred to. That is, proper nouns provide a term of reference by which the 'thing' named may be addressed or referred to, and in the case of non-human 'things', by which it may be personified.

It is clear from the preceding discussion that any detailed semantic analysis of language would have to take into account the subdivision of common nouns. Such a feature is not restricted to common nouns, but may apply to verbs as well. Take, for example the verb used in the preceding examples, stab. The meaning of stab is quite clear to English speakers, and they would use the verb to describe a particular action. But if we examine this action, it can be seen that stab is actually a complex action involving other component actions and intentions and requiring the use of several
instruments. For example one common understanding of the meaning of the word *stab* may be roughly: to move the arm deliberately and forcefully holding a sharp object in the hand so as to pierce the skin of something animate with the intent of doing bodily harm to it. Thus verbs as well as common nouns may be subclassified according to generality. Proper nouns, on the other hand cannot be subclassified.

In a paper entitled 'This Paper is called Names' (1970), Ross Clark analyses the class of nouns called 'proper nouns'. He argues that most of the popular distinctions which are claimed to exist between 'names' and 'definite descriptions' do not distinguish proper nouns from other nouns or noun phrases in English. Using sentences such as *Henry, who plays the bassoon*, is a *pederast* and *The Henry who plays the bassoon is a pederast*. Clark produces both syntactic and semantic evidence refuting a proper/common noun class distinction. Following Sloat (1969) he argues against dual entities in the lexicon for terms such as *Henry*, where *Henry* is listed as a true proper noun, and then listed also a common noun with the meaning "person-named-Henry". Instead, he asserts:

"...there is a single lexical item *Henry*, with a single meaning, which is peculiar only in that it is subject to a special rule which deletes the definite article under certain conditions. The single meaning
of this noun is roughly 'person-named 'Henry'.'

Clark, 1970:2.

While my conclusions on a proper common noun distinction for the analysis of Tokelauan are in direct contrast to those of Clark for English, I do not disagree with many of his arguments—nor do I intend to dispute the point at length here. On balance therefore, the distinction between proper nouns and common nouns is maintained in Tokelauan on the following grounds:

(1) Tokelau is a small speech community, and with their special naming system, full names do uniquely specify individuals. In speech situations where only one name is used (which may be shared by others), the context of the conversation almost always ensures that the hearer knows which particular person is being referred to.

(2) Certain markers occur with Tokelauan names and never occur with common nouns, while the article always occurs with common nouns and not with names.

(3) I share the well established if not traditional intuition amongst numerous linguists and philosophers that proper nouns are different from common nouns.
4.4.2 THE CONSTITUENTS OF NOMINAL

Rules 9b, 10b and 11b provide a constituent analysis of nominal. The maximum constituent string allowable by these rules is shown in (4.116) below, which provides the constituents with its class members.

(4.116)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREbasic</th>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Demonstrative</th>
<th>Qualifier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>maatua</td>
<td>'big, very'</td>
<td>teenei lele</td>
<td>'very'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tamaa</td>
<td>'diminishing'</td>
<td>ieenei lava</td>
<td>'just'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mataa</td>
<td>'division'</td>
<td>teena mua</td>
<td>'politeness'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naa</td>
<td>'few'</td>
<td>ieena ai</td>
<td>'accordingly'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>teelia laa</td>
<td>'then'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ieelaa foli</td>
<td>'also'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tee ni</td>
<td>'exclamation'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iee koo</td>
<td>'emphatic 'then'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>akia</td>
<td>'emphatic intensifier'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no strong distributional evidence for the binary analysis provided by rules 9b, 10b, and 11b. Functionally, however, there are some grounds for positing a binary analysis of NOM and the minor constituents of NOM. If we examine the meaning of example (4.107), repeated here with its phrase-marker:
we can see that the minor constituents are not co-ordinate in functional terms. TheQualifier foki 'also' refers to the complete NOUNcomplex tamaa-fale teeia 'small house there', thus functionally it lies outside, or is co-ordinate with NOUNcomplex.

Similarly, the demonstrative teeia 'there', refers non only the NOUN fale 'house', but to the sequence labelled NOUNnucleus tamaa-fale 'small house'. Hence the constituent demonstrative is posited as co-ordinate with NOUNnucleus.

4.4.3 THE CONSTITUENT STRUCTURE OF VERBAL ARGUMENT

The relevant rules analysing VERBarg are:
$R_9$ (a) \( \text{VERBarg} \rightarrow \text{VERBcomplex (Qualifier)} \)

$R_{10}$ (a) \( \text{VERBcomplex} \rightarrow \text{PREverb} \text{VERBNucleus} \)

$R_{11}$ (a) \( \text{VERBNucleus} \rightarrow \text{VERBexpbase (Direction)} \)

$R_{12}$ \( \text{VERBexpbase} \rightarrow (Pr_5)(Pr_4)(Pr_3)(Pr_1) \text{VERB } (Vsuf_1)(Vsuf_2) \)

The maximum string of constituents allowable by these rules is portrayed in (4.117)

$$\text{(4.117) PREverb Pr}_5 \text{ Pr}_4 \text{ Pr}_3 \text{ Pr}_2 \text{ Pr}_1 \text{ VERB Vsuf}_1 \text{ Vsuf}_2$$

Direction Qualifier

While it is possible in principle to have a VERBarg with 11 component constituents as in (4.117), no such maximal expansion was ever elicited from my informants. However, no two constituents of the VERBarg were incompatible and so they have been listed in the manner of the rules above to allow maximum co-occurrence. The exact co-occurrence restrictions on the 11 component constituents are difficult to ascertain and could in fact result in the need to posit extra order classes. (4.118) and (4.120) are examples of Verbal arguments, with their respective P-Markers (4.119) and (4.121). (The constituent modality is also included in the examples).

$$(4.118) \text{ ke } \text{ toe } \text{ fe- } \text{ iloa } \text{ -aki } \text{ ai }$$

tense/asp again recip. know Vsuf Qual.

To get together again
(4.119)  
Modal
    VERBcomplex
        PREverb
            to
            e
        VERBnucleus
            fe-
            ilka
        VERBexpbase
            Pr_2
            VERB
            Vsuf_1
            -aki
            ai

(4.120)  
e  fia  fooki  atu  lava

  tense  desire  give  direction  indeed

We wish to give (something) to you

(4.121)  
modal
    VERBarg
        VERBcomplex
            PREverb
                ei
                fia
                fooki
            VERBnucleus
                atu
            VERBexpbase
                Direction
                lava

The constituent Qualifier is further expanded in rule 13b
to include four classes of particles. These classes are based
on the functions of the respective particles, and are not strict order
classes.
R₁₃ (b) Qualifier → \{ Manner, Position, Intensifier, Emphatic \}

To date, little work has been done on the exact syntactic status of the so-called 'modifying' particles which occur postposed to the base within the phrase in Polynesian languages. It was noted in chapter 2, in the discussion of the emphatic particles, that the grouping of these particles into classes, and their respective grammatical functions, is an ad hoc solution which follows the conventions established in previous descriptions and grammars of Polynesian languages.¹

A deeper examination of their complete role in syntax is not attempted in this grammar.

In the analysis of VERBarg, the rules 9a, 10a and 11a are binary rules (similar to those which analyse Nominal (9b, 10b and 11b)). Proof offered for this analysis is the same as that given in the nominal counterpart. That is, in functional terms the Qualifier ai in (4.118) refers to the complete VERBcomplex toe fe -iloa -aki 'meet again' and thus the two constituents are posited as co-ordinate. Similarly, the PREverb toe 'again' refers to the VERBnucleus fe-iloa-aki 'to meet'.

¹. See, for example, Biggs (1961), Carroll (1965), Pawley (1966a) and Hohepa (1967).
In the case of example (4.120) the constituent PREverb \textit{fia} 'desire to' refers to the constituent VERBnucleus \textit{fooki} atu 'to give (to hearer)' and accordingly the two constituents are posited as co-ordinate.

4.5 SUBJECT MARKING IN TOKELAUAH SIMPLE SENTENCES

The constituent subject was isolated by the very first rule:

\[ R_1 \quad \text{Sentence} \rightarrow \text{Proposition} \quad \text{Subject} \]

Subject was further expanded in rule 6d to include a marker:

\[ R_{6d} \quad \text{Subject} \rightarrow \text{Subjmkre} \quad \text{NP} \]

A number of P-markers based on these rules are now provided for the sentences (4.1), (4.2), (4.3) and (4.102) given earlier. These contain a locative argument (4.122), a genitive argument (4.123), a verbal argument (4.124) and an equational argument (4.125).
(4.122)  
Sentence
  /   
/     
Proposition   Subject
  |      /  
  |   Modal   Argument
  |      /   
  |   Statement  LOCarg
  |     /  
  | Locmker   NP
  |     /  
  |   ARTcom   NOUN
  |     /  
  | te   falefono  Ø
  |     /  
The man is at the meeting-house

(4.123)  
Sentence
  /   
/     
Proposition   Subject
  |      /  
  |   Modal   Statement
  |      /   
  |   Argument  GENarg
  |     /  
  | poss   NP
  |     /  
  |   ARTcom   NOUN
  |     /  
  | te   tino  Ø
  |     /  
The house belongs to the man
The man went to the hospital at the island

The man is not the chief
Although it was earlier noted the $R_d$ expands Subject to include a subject marker as well as an NP, in none of the above P-markers is there an overt element to mark subject.

There are some possible exceptions to the generalisation that subject nominals are unmarked. Consider now sentences (4.126), (4.127) and (4.128), which replace the art noun subject sequences of examples (4.122), (4.124) and (4.125) with a personal name.

(4.126)  
e i te falefono ia Tui

Tui is at the meeting-house

(4.127)  
na fano ki te falemai i te fenua ia Tui

Tui went to the hospital at the island

1. Note that the constituent order in (4.127) and the P-Marker (4.124) is not the preferred order in Tokelauan. The Subject constituent usually occurs immediately after the Verbal argument, or (if it is present) after the Agentive case. Thus, the preferred order of constituents for these sentences are given below as (4.124a) and (4.127a):

(4.124a)  
na fano te tino ki te falemai i te fenua

VERBarg  Subject  DIRcase  DESCRcase

(4.127a)  
na fano ia Tui ki te falemai i te fenua

VERBarg  Subject  DIRcase  DESCRcase
(4.128) e he ko te faipule ia Tui

Tui is not the chief

In each of these sentences, the particle ia occurs before the proper name Tui. The question arises whether ia is a case marker or an article.

When the proper name Tui occurs in other constituents, it is marked in the following manner: In DIRcase - aTUI; in ORIGcase - a TUI; in AGENTcase - Ø TUI; DESCRCcase - a TUI; and in EXPLcase - Ø TUI. Thus rather than being a general Subject marker with a Ø allomorph (posited where the Subject is not a personal name), ia is more likely to be an allomorph of the personal name marker which has the other allomorphs a and Ø. The distribution of the personal article forms with personal names may be stated as:

ia when personal name is Subject
a when personal name is in the LOCarg, DESCRCase, DIRcase, or ORIGcase
Ø when personal name is in the AGENTcase, EXPLcase or GENarg.

This solution seems more acceptable than treating ia and a as an overt subject marker. Since an NP with Art common-noun never takes an overt subject marker, the latter treatment would result in two markings for a single basic case. Moreover, since an
NP with a personal name is marked by a and ia which are phonologically similar, this is a further reason for regarding particles a and ia as a feature of personal names, and not as markers of the case of the subject NP.

In considering further examples, it was seen that all proper nouns were marked in certain environments. (see chapter 2 - Proper Article). Thus, the feature of marking personal names can be extended to the marking of proper nouns. This marking of proper nouns is captured by R₇ and R₈ of the grammar.

R₇ NP → \{ NOMprop \}
    \{ Nomcom \}

R₈ₐ NOMprop → ARTprop NOUN

R₈ₐ NOMcom → \{ ARTnum \}
            \{ ARTnonpartic \}
            \{ ARTcom (other) \}

To interpret R₇ and R₈ above (excluding any reference to ARTnum, ARTnonpartic, and the constituent (other) there are two types of NP: an NP with proper nouns which are marked by a proper article; and an NP with common nouns which are marked by the common article.

The subject NP in Tokelauan sentence, therefore is not marked overtly. Conversely non-subject (indirect) NPs are marked overtly for case, by the case markers e, i, ki, mo/ma, and mai. They are also marked for Genitive argument by o for the Locative argument by i, and for the Equational argument by ko. Thus, the NP which is not marked overtly in Tokelauan simple sentences is the subject of that sentence.
All other elements in the sentence belong to the proposition. Because certain transformational privileges are available to the NP labelled subject, which are not available to non-subject NPs, then subject cannot be represented in the rules simply as NP. Of course, the fact that this NP is the only NP which is not overtly marked in simple sentences, is in itself a marking feature. This is handled in the rules by the convention of using '∅' (zero) as the subject marker.

4.6 1 NP SEQUENCES OF LOCATIVE ARGUMENT AND DESCRIPTIVE CASE

In rule 6a LOCarg was expanded as comprising the constituents Locmker NP; and in Rule 6i, DESCRcase was expanded as Descrmker NP. Both the Locmker and the Descrmker have the Tokelauan form 1. The question arises, how are 1 NP LOCarg constituents distinguished from those of DESRcase? That is, what are the grounds for differentiation between the two like sequences?

The sentences (4.129) and (4.130) below, have the respective P-Markers (4.131) and (4.132).

(4.129) nae i te mataafaga te faipule
pastprog at Art beach Art chief

The chief was at the beach (was being at)
The chief was sitting at the beach.
In (4.131) the sequence **i te mataafaga** is a LocArgument constituent, which denotes the location of the chief (i.e. at the beach). In (4.132), **i te mataafaga** is a DescrCase constituent, but also functions to mark location. In this case it complements the verb **nofo** 'to sit', and refers to the location where the sitting took place. Thus functionally both occurrences of the sequence **i te mataafaga** denote location or serve as locatives. Structurally, however, one sequence is labelled Locativeargument while the other is called a Descriptivecase constituent.

The reason for regarding these like-sequences as structurally distinct constituents may be observed in the focus transformation. Under focus, an NP may be permuted to sentence initial position where it becomes the focus of the sentence. In all cases of focussing, except with the NP of subject, some proform is required by the particular case or Argument to replace the permuted NP. The focus transforms of the NP **te mataafaga**, from the Locative Argument in (4.131), and the Descriptive case in (4.132), are provided below in sentences (4.133) and (4.134) respectively.

(4.133) **ko te mataafaga nae i ei te faipule**
It was on the beach where the chief was

(4.134) **ko te mataafaga nae nofo ai te faipule**
It was on the beach where the chief was sitting
In (4.133) the following changes have taken place from (4.131): the NP *te mataafaga* from the Locative argument constituent is permuted to sentence initial position to occur with *ko* the 'specifying particle' or 'focus marker'; the locative marker *i* of the Locative argument remains, and is obligatorily paired with the proform *ei*.

In (4.132), the NP *te mataafaga* from the constituent DESCReCase is also permuted to sentence-initial position to occur with the focus marker *ko*; the Descrmker *i* of the DESCReCase is deleted and the proform *ai* occurs in its place (or indeed in the place of the whole DESCReCase constituent) immediately after the verb.

In all cases in which the NP of DESCReCase constituent is focused the proform *ai* obligatorily occurs after the verb and the Descrmker is deleted. This occurs irrespective of whether the DESCReCase has a locative meaning, or whether it does not as in examples (4.53-56) of this chapter. It is clear, therefore, that the sequence *i* NP of the DESCReCase has a different structural derivation from the *i* NP of LOCarg since they behave differently under the same transformation.
It is possible, however, for a LOCarg to be embedded in a separate sentence, and then be reduced to relative location. In this case it appears on the surface like a descriptive case constituent, but under the focus transformation it behaves quite differently from true DESCRC case. For example, (4.135) may be focussed as in (4.136), and then embedded in sentence (4.137). The tense marker could then be deleted by the Relative Location transformation (T₇, discussed in chapter 5), to produce the complex sentence (4.138).

(4.135) e i te vaka te teine
tense locmker Art canoe Art girl

The girl is in the canoe

(4.136) ko te teine e i te vaka

It is the girl who is in the canoe

(4.137) na kai te manini e te teine
tense eat Art fish sp. Agmker Art girl

The girl ate the manini/The manini was eaten by the girl

(4.138) na kai te manini e te teine i te vaka

The manini was eaten by the girl in the canoe/The girl in the canoe ate the manini
Since the sentence (4.138) has a derivation involving (4.135-137), and since it means 'the girl (who was located) in the canoe ate the manini', then the sequence i te vaka cannot be focused, since it is dominated by the NP te teine; From this example, and others provided in chapter 5 in a discussion on relative location, and relative possession, it becomes evident that in Tokelauan, no NP which is dominated by another NP can be focused.

The whole embedded sequence te teine i te vaka in (4.138), however can be focused as in (4.139):

(4.139) ko te teine i te vaka na ia kai-a te manini

It was the girl on the canoe who ate the manini

If, on the other hand, (4.138) had the meaning of 'In the canoe, the girl ate the manini', then it would be a simple sentence where i te vaka is a DESC case constituent related both functionally and structurally to the verb kai 'to eat'. In this case the NP of i te vaka could be focused in the manner of all Descriptive case constituents.

4.7 CONJUNCTION IN GRAMMAR

This final section of chapter 4 contains a few remarks concerning conjunction.
Although this chapter has dealt with simple sentence structures, a brief mention of conjunction is included here, since I have not had the time to develop any in depth analysis of conjunction.

In the following Tokelauan sentences (4.140) and (4.141) the additive conjunction *ma* 'and' appears on the surface to conjoin the two verbal constituents *fai mai* and *lea mai* in (4.140), while in (4.141) the two NPs *ate koe* and *naa toeaíina* are conjoined.

(4.140) \(\text{fakalo} \text{g}_{\text{ki}}\text{ naa mea } \text{e } \text{fai mai}\)  
listen to artpl things tense do dir

\(\text{ma } \text{lea } \text{mai ai } \text{te maaloo}\)  
and say dirn. DescPrfm Art governor

Listen to the things proposed and related by the Governor.

(4.141) \(\text{kua } \text{uma } \text{t-o-na } \text{lea } \text{atu } \text{ki}\)  
tense finish his speak dirn to

\(\text{a } \text{te koe } \text{ma } \text{naa } \text{toeaíina}\)  
PrArt you and Artpl elders

His speaking to you and the elders has finished/ He has finished speaking to you and the elders

English also has a large range of constituents which can appear in the surface structure to be conjoined by the additive conjunction 'and'.
(4.142) I went to town today and my wife sat in the car
(4.143) I went to town today and sat in the car
(4.144) I saw the knives and the spoons

The three sentences above using the conjunction and,
show: conjoined sentences (4.142); conjoined verb phrases
(4.143); and conjoined NPs (4.144). Thus it would appear that
in both English and Tokelauan conjunction may apply at several
different levels (at least in the surface structure) of the
constituent analysis. Accordingly, one possibility of treating
conjunction would be to postulate conjunction at the respective
constituent level that it occurs. That is, in the three examples
above, additive conjunction (and), would be postulated at precisely
those levels of occurrence. For (4.142) additive conjunction would
be proposed as a co-ordinate constituent of S; for (4.143) it would
be proposed as co-ordinate with VP; while for (4.144) conjunction
would again be introduced at the NP level.

There is however, another analysis which seems preferable.
Conjunctions can be introduced at only one level - that of S -
and sentences which have, on the surface, other types of
conjoined constituents, can be derived from conjoined Ss. For
example,

(4.143) I went to town today and sat in the car
would be derived from

(4.145) *I went to town today and I sat in the car*

by a conjunction - reduction transformation which reduces conjoined sentences having partially identical structures to single sentences with conjoined lower constituents. The advantage of this solution is that it captures the semantic relation between sentences like (4.143) and (4.145), locating the essentially single meaning of each conjunction at a single point in the deep structure.

In Tokelauan, all examples of conjunction can be traced back in the manner explained above, to derive from at least two separate simple sentences (as discussed by Chomsky (1957: 36)). However, while conjunction would be introduced at S level in this grammar the type of rule to do so is not formulated here. Probably some form of conjunction transformation could be developed. For example in the manner of the ideas expressed in Chomsky (1957) and more extensively formulated in Gleitman (1965:273-4) (for co-ordinate conjunction) a set of transformation rules at sentence level could be formulated.¹

---

¹ In *Sikaiana Syntax* (1968:166), it was observed that several of the modifying particles which occur postposed to the base within the Sikaiana phrase, functioned (in part at least) as conjunctions. Such is also the case in Tokelauan. An example is the anaphoric conjunction foki 'also'. foki refers to something earlier mentioned, and this referent may be in a previous phrase, argument or even sentence. Thus any proposals for handling conjunction in Tokelauan or any Polynesian language for that matter, could well consider these particles denoting retrospective reference such as 'also' 'consequently', 'accordingly', etc.
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5.0 INTRODUCTION

In section 1.5 I outlined the scope of this study. It was noted that the principal modification of the Standard Theory which is utilised in this analysis is the return to generalised transformations and the notion of 'kernel sentence' proposed in *Syntactic Structures*. Accordingly, the output of the base component is a set of simple sentence structures. These structures are mapped by the transform rules of the transformational component into complex sentence structures. Transformational rules are thus either *singular* or *generalised*. *Singular* transform rules operate on a single P-marker; examples are the permutation transformations (section 5.1), and the focus transformations (section 5.2). Generalised transform rules operate on a set of P-markers, such as the sentence embedding transformations (section 5.4).
Chapter 5 is concerned with discussing those transformational rules listed in chapter 3 as applying to Tokelauan sentence structures.

Section 5.1 discusses permutation rules affecting the major constituents of $S$.

Section 5.2 is concerned with focusing. Any NP in a Tokelauan simple sentence may be shifted to sentence initial position. Accordingly there is a shift in sentence meaning with the fronted NP becoming 'emphasised' or 'focused'. 5.2 describes the constituent rearrangement when the NPs of Subject, Argument and Case Complement are focused in sentence-initial position. Sub-section 5.2.6 produces evidence which suggests that the formal constituent Explanatory Case delimit ed in the phrase structure rules has two distinctive underlying case forms.

5.3 discusses verbal sentence nominalisation, a process where Tokelauan verbal sentences are reduced to NP status.

5.4 deals with sentence embedding. In 5.4.1, focused sentences are embedded in matrix sentences to produce relative clause formations. 5.4.2 is concerned with coreferential NP embedding where nominalised sentences are embedded in matrix sentences. In 5.4.3 some discussion follows on semantic and structural ambiguity in Tokelauan and English complex sentences arising from nominalised sentence-embedding.
Section 5.5 discusses the Relative Possession/Location Reduction transformation which reduces relative clauses containing possession and locative arguments to prepositional phrases.

5.6 handles possessive pronoun preposing, 5.7 and 5.8 illustrate two relatively simple interrogative transformations and 5.9 makes a passing reference to imperative subject deletion.

Two locative argument transformations are discussed and compared in section 5.10. Constituent changes and meaning shift are analysed when left-to-right transportation of the locative argument occurs in sentences containing the simple negative hee 'not'.

A final section 5.11 (Actualisation of Negatives), looks at the combinatorial possibilities of the negatives hee 'not' and heeki 'not yet' with the tense/aspect particles.

5.1 PERMUTATION RULES

5.1.1 SUBJECT SHIFT

The constituent Subject was generated by rule 1 of the categorial rules to occur as the final constituent of S. It was observed by me, however, that Subject more commonly occurred immediately post-posed to the Argument constituent of simple sentences. Thus, the preferred order of major constituents is Argument Subject Case Complement, resulting in a discontinuous Proposition constituent.
This re-ordering of constituents is required by the transformation rule $T_1$.

**Subject Shift**

$T_1$ Oblig.

Argument CaseComplement Subject

$\Rightarrow$ Argument Subject CaseComplement

Sentence (5.1) illustrates this permutation, where (5.1)a. is the base sentence and (5.1)b. is the derived form:

(5.1)a. na həvali mai te fale i te auala te teine  
Argument CaseComplement Subject
walked from the house along the road the girl

$\Rightarrow$ b. na həvali te teine mai te fale i te auala  
Argument Subject CaseComplement
walked the girl from the house along the road

The girl walked from the house along the road

### 5.1.2 CASE SCRAMBLING

While there is a preferred order of major constituents Argument, Subject and CaseComplement (provided for by $T_1$), free permutation exists between the various case members of the constituent case complement and the subject. This scrambling is depicted in $T_2$. 
\[ T_2 \text{ Opt.} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Case_1</th>
<th>Case_2</th>
<th>\ldots</th>
<th>Case^n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

⇒ Argument | Subject | Case_1 | Case_2 | Case^n |

The permutation possibilities within sentence (5.2) are provided below where (5.2)a. is the base sentence and (5.2)b-f are the derived forms.

(5.2)a. \text{na kai te ika e au i te hiipuni}

VERBarg Subject AGENTcase DESCRcase

The fish was eaten by me with a spoon

⇒ b. \text{na kai e au te ika i te hiipuni}

⇒ c. \text{na kai e au i te hiipuni te ika}

⇒ d. \text{na kai te ika i te hiipuni e au}

⇒ e. \text{na kai i te hiipuni te ika e au}

⇒ f. \text{na kai i te hiipuni e au te ika}

Although \( T_2 \) allows numerous possible orders, the chances of some combinations occurring in natural speech are very small. As with the major constituents discussed in 5.1.1, there seemed to be a scale of preferred order. In testing the various combinations of the case constituents with the informants, a variety of comments were received implying preferred order: "Yes, that is the best way of saying it", "that is a common way of saying it"; "Yes that is
another way of saying it" , "that way is right but not common" ;
"Yes! that is correct but not as correct as the other way" , etc.

The most preferred order of constituents is: Argument
Subject , Case₁ Case₂ etc. When the agentive case (AGENTcase)
is present in the sentence , however , the preferred order is:
Argument AGENTcase Subject Caseₙ , where caseₙ is any case
or cases other than AGENTcase.

5.1.3 PRONOUN EMBEDDING

The pronoun embedding transformation is an important T-rule
which applies to pronominal agents in transitive sentences.
Changes effected by this transformation are: (a) incorporation of
the pronoun into the verbal phrase, (b) deletion of the agentive
case marker , and (c) obligatory pairing of the verb with a suffix -a,
-gia, and -agia.

While this transformation ( T₃ below) is optional, the
derived form occurs more frequently than the base form especially
in answer to questions about the pronoun agent.

PRONOUN EMBEDDING TRANSFORMATION

T₃ Opt


\
\text{modality} \quad \text{verb} \quad X \quad \text{Agmker} \quad \text{NP} \quad \text{Y} \\
\Rightarrow \text{modality} \quad \text{NP} \quad \text{verb} \quad \text{Vsuf₂} \quad X \quad \emptyset \quad \text{Y} \\


Example (5.3) below provides a lineal comparison of a simple sentence in Tokelauan, and the derived sentence after $T_3$.

(5.3)a. \( na \ kai \ e \ ia \ te \ ika \)
\begin{align*}
\text{past} & \text{ eat} \ Agmker \ 3rdsing \ defart \ fish \\
\Rightarrow \ b. \ na \ ia \ kai \ -a \ te \ ika \\
\text{past} & \text{ 3rdsing} \ eat \ Vsuf_2 \ defart \ fish
\end{align*}
The fish was eaten by him/He ate the fish

The complete list of pronoun forms which occur before the verb are given in chapter 2, table C and may be compared with the Basic pronoun forms listed in table A, also in chapter 2.

5.2 FOCUS RULES

Any NP in a Tokelauan sentence may be shifted to sentence-initial position. The fronted NP then becomes focused; it is obligatorily preceded by the 'specifier' ko. In the case of NP in cases other than subject a shadow pronoun remains in the position vacated by the fronted NP. The form of the pronoun which results from this transformation varies according to the particular constituent status of the permuted NP, as does its location within the sentence.

The transformation describing focusing follows:-
At most, $T_4$ must be regarded as a provisional formulation of the process of focusing, since considerable variation exists in the form and position of the shadow proform in the derived sentence.

5.2.1 SUBJECT FOCUS

When the Subject is moved to sentence-initial position, no proform is required to replace or mark the displaced NP. Examples of subject focus with the different argument types are given below.

(5.4)a  na kai e au te ika i te hiipuni

VERBarg  AGENTcase  Subject  DESCRIPTION

The fish was eaten by me with a spoon

$\Rightarrow$  b.  ko te ika na kai e au i te hiipuni

It was the fish that was eaten by me with a spoon

The fish was eaten by me with a spoon

(5.5)a  e i te falefono te tino

LOCarg  Subject

The man is at the meeting house
b. ko te tino è i te falefono
   It is the man who is at the meeting-house
   The man is at the meeting-house

(5.6)a e o te tino te vaka
   GENarg      Subject
   The canoe belongs to the man

b. ko te vaka e o te tino
   The canoe belongs to the man/It is the canoe
   which belongs to the man

(5.7)a he faipule te tino
   EQUATarg      Subject
   The man is a chief

b. ko te tino he faipule
   The man is a chief / It is the man who is a
   chief

For each of the derived sentence examples (5.4b–7b), two
English translations have been given. Focusing of an NP allows
that NP to be 'brought into centre stage' in the sentence-meaning,
in either of two ways: the NP is either 'emphasised' (e.g. the
man is the chief), or 'particularised' (e.g. it is the man who is
the chief). The contrast available to the English speaker between
emphasis (by prosodic means) and particularisation (by pseudo-
clefting, etc.) is not readily made in Tokelauan.

5.2.2 DESCRIPTIVE CASE FOCUS

NPs other than subject leave a copy behind when they
are fronted. In the case of the NP of DESCRcase, the proform
is ai as shown in the following rule:

\[(5.8)a.\] modal \text{VERB} \text{arg} X \text{Descrmker} NP Y

\[\Rightarrow b. \text{ko} \text{ NP modal} \text{VERB} ai X \emptyset Y\]

An example is:

\[(5.9)a.\] \text{na kai e au i te hiipuni te ika}\n
The fish was eaten by me with a spoon

\[\Rightarrow b. \text{ko te hiipuni na kai ai e au te ika}\]

It was with a spoon that I ate the fish

We can now see that the two focussing rules given so far are
essentially similar, except in the matter of the pronominal trace.
More properly, the focusing rule of Tokelauan (T₄) (and I suspect for
all Polynesian languages) should simply show a copying of the NP in
the focus position with the specifying particle ko. The actualisation
of the original NP as a proform would be handled by a general rule
covering pronominalisation. No such general rule has been yet
proposed for Tokelauan. Also, an ai-movement rule would be
required to ensure that the proform ai which replaces the permuted
NP of DESCRcase does occur immediately postponed to the verb.
(5.29)a. modal Locmker NP Subject
⇒ b. ko NP modal Locmker ei Subject

(5.30)a. nae i niuhila te foomai
The doctor was (staying) in New Zealand
⇒ b. ko niuhila nae i ei te foomai
It was at New Zealand where the doctor was (staying)

5.2.8 GENITIVE ARGUMENT FOCUS

When the NP of the genitive argument constituent is shifted to sentence-initial position it is paired with the specifying particle ko, and replaced by the appropriate pronoun representing the person and the number of the NP. This feature of pronoun representation of the NP was discussed in the section dealing with Agentive case focusing, (5.25). When the focused NP is itself a pronoun, no constituent or morpheme change occurs except for the focusing of the pronoun with the specifying particle. Such an example is provided below in (5.31). It contrasts with (5.32), where the permuted NP is not a pronoun and thus requires pronoun representation in the place of the permuted NP.

(5.31)a. e o ia te fale
The house belongs to him
⇒ b. ko ia e o ia te fale
It is to him that the house belongs
(5.32)a. 
\[ e \ a \ \text{nna\ tino} \ \text{te\ pehe} \]
The song belongs to the men/ The song is the mens'

\[ \Rightarrow b. \ \text{ko}\ \text{nna\ tino} \ e \ a \ \text{kilaatou} \ \text{te\ pehe} \]
It is to the men that the song belongs

As noted earlier, (5.22) in a discussion of DESCRCase focus what we are calling the 'focus transformation' here actually has two parts. Focusing proper should be limited to the rule in which the permuted NP is copied, with a later pronominalising rule handling the variety of proforms required by the respective NPs placed in focus. A copying rule alone would be sufficient to characterise genitive argument focusing in sentence (5.31) which has a pronoun as the NP of GENarg.

5.3 VERBAL SENTENCE NOMINALISATION

Verbal sentence nominalisation reduces a verbal sentence to an NP, as follows:

\[ T_5 \ \text{Opt.} \]
\[ \text{tense} \ (\text{neg}) \ \text{VERBarg} \ \text{Subject} \ Y \]
\[ \Rightarrow \ \text{defart} \ (\text{neg}) \ \text{VERBarg} \ \text{Nomsuf} \ \text{poss} \ \text{Subject} \ Y \]

Such a transformation is required for two reasons. First, certain surface NPs appear to be transformationally related to full
sentences; that is $T_5$ is a productive rule, such that nominals can be formed freely from sentences with a regular meaning relationship holding between the two. Second, as the present grammar does not allow for embedding of $S$ in the phrase structure rules, a transformational rule is needed to reduce $S$ to NP, so that the derived NP can appear in the places where ordinary NP appear. $T_5$, therefore, applies only to nominalise verbal sentence structures for the purpose of embedding them in another sentence.

We may note the structural changes which take place with the application of $T_5$ by looking at the following:

\[(5.33)a. \quad \text{na fano} \quad \text{te tino} \quad \text{ki te fenua}\]

The man went to the island

\[\Rightarrow \quad b. \quad \text{te fano} \quad -ga \quad o \quad \text{te tino} \quad \text{ki te fenua}\]

The going of the man to the island

The tense marker is replaced by the definite singular article; the verbal argument is nominalised by the addition of the nominalising suffix; and the possession marker is included to place the nominalised VERBarg in a 'genitive' relationship to the subject.

In verbal sentence nominalisation, the nominalised verb always becomes the head of the NP in a 'genitive' relationship to the
subject of the base sentence. The genitive relationship is marked by ৐. It is not necessary, however, for the Subject to occur immediately postposed to the verb in both the sentence-form to be transformed and the derived NP. For example, sentence (5.34) below is a simple sentence generated by the PS rules with the subject in sentence-final position.

(5.34)  

na fano i te lualua ki Niuhila te teine

The girl went on the ship to New Zealand

This sentence is nominalised in (5.35):

(5.35)  

te fano -ga i te lualua ki Niuhila o te teine

The going of the girl on the ship, to New Zealand

It has been noted in earlier discussion of functional relations that the cases place the NP in a particular semantic relationship with the verb, (i.e. they complement the verb). This complementation of the verbal argument (now a noun) by the cases still persists within the nominalised NP. Thus, in (5.36) the base sentence has a verbal argument which is complemented by a descriptive case constituent, a direction case constituent and an agentive case constituent. In the derived NP of (5.36) these cases still complement the verbal argument, despite the fact that it has been nominalised.
(5.36)a. na kave e te teine i te vaka ki te fenua te puha
The box was taken by the girl on the canoe to the island

⇒ b. te kave -ga e te teine i te vaka ki te fenua o te puha
The taking of the box by the girl on the canoe to the island

5.4 SENTENCE EMBEDDING

5.4.1 FOCUSED SENTENCE EMBEDDING

Any focused sentence may be embedded in the NP of another sentence. In such instances, the NP of the matrix sentence must be identical to the NP which is the head of the focused sentence. The focused sentence is embedded en bloc into the matrix sentence sharing the common NP. The specifier ko is deleted. The structural changes in such embeddings are as follows:

FOCUSED SENTENCE EMBEDDING (Generalised Transformation)

\[
T_6 \quad \text{Opt.}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\# X \ NP_1 Y \# + \# ko \ NP_1 Z \#
\Rightarrow \# X \ NP_1 Z Y \#
\end{array}
\]

In \( T_6 \), the constituents \( X \ NP_1 Y \) form the matrix sentence and \( ko \ NP_1 Z \) are constituents of the focused sentence.

In the examples which follow, \( S_1 \) is the matrix sentence and \( S_2 \) represents the focused sentence which is embedded by the transformation.
(5.37)

\[ S_1 \quad \text{na koo kitea te vaka} \quad \text{(verbal matrix)} \]
I saw the canoe

\[ S_2 \quad \text{ko te vaka na fano ai te tino} \quad \text{(focused verbal sentence)} \]
It was on the canoe that the man went

\[ \Rightarrow \quad \text{na koo kitea te vaka na fano ai te tino} \]
I saw the canoe upon which the man went

(5.38)

\[ S_1 \quad \text{ko te vaka na taali goto} \quad \text{(focused verbal matrix)} \]
The canoe nearly sank

\[ S_2 \quad \text{ko te vaka e o te tino} \quad \text{(focused genitive sentence)} \]
The canoe belongs to the man

\[ \Rightarrow \quad \text{ko te vaka e o te tino na taali goto} \]
The canoe which belongs to the man nearly sank

(5.39)

\[ S_1 \quad \text{e i te falefono te tamaaloa} \quad \text{(locative matrix)} \]
The man is at the meeting-house

\[ S_2 \quad \text{ko te tamaaloa nae moe i tona vaka} \quad \text{(focused verbal S)} \]
The man was sleeping in his canoe

\[ \Rightarrow \quad \text{e i te falefono te tamaaloa nae moe i tona vaka} \]
The man who was sleeping in his canoe is at the meeting-house
(5.40)

\[ S_1 \quad \text{ko Iona te foomai} \quad \text{(equational matrix)} \]

The doctor is Iona

\[ S_2 \quad \text{ko te foomai e nofo i luga i te vaka} \quad \text{(focused verbal S)} \]

The doctor is sitting on board the canoe

\[ \Rightarrow \quad \text{ko Iona te foomai e nofo i luga i te vaka} \]

The doctor sitting on board the canoe is Iona

(5.41)

\[ S_1 \quad \text{e a te tino te laakau} \quad \text{(genitive matrix)} \]

The radio belongs to the man

\[ S_2 \quad \text{ko te laakau nae i te koe} \quad \text{(focused locative)} \]

You had the radio

\[ \Rightarrow \quad \text{e a te tino te laakau nae i te koe} \]

The radio that you had belongs to the man

(5.42)

\[ S_1 \quad \text{na kau mai te hua e te teine ki te tamaaloa} \quad \text{(verbal matrix)} \]

The coconut was brought by the girl to the man

\[ S_2 \quad \text{ko te hua e i te polapola} \quad \text{(focused locative)} \]

The hua is in the basket

\[ \Rightarrow \quad \text{na kaumai te hua e i te polapola e te teine ki te tamaaloa} \]

The drinking-nut which is in the basket was brought by the girl to/for the man
5.4.2 NOMINALISED SENTENCE EMBEDDING

Nominalised verbal sentences (containing the nominalising suffix) may be embedded in an NP of another sentence. Unlike focused sentence embedding, there is no condition of formal identity, but the matrix NP is in some sense understood as being coreferent with the embedded nominalised S. The structural conditions and changes are specified in T₇:

NOMINALISED SENTENCE EMBEDDING (Generalised Transformation)

\[
T₇ \quad \text{Opt.}
\]

\[
\# \quad X \quad \text{NP}_1 \quad Y \quad \# \quad \# \quad \text{defart} \quad V \quad \text{nomsuff} \quad Z \quad \#
\]

\[
\Rightarrow \quad \# \quad X \quad \text{defart} \quad V \quad \text{nomsuff} \quad Z \quad Y \quad \#
\]

:where \( \text{NP}_1 \) is one of a small class of (semantically general) elements such as \textit{te mea}

'\text{the thing}', \textit{teeria} 'that' etc.

In \( T₇ \), \( X \) \( \text{NP}_1 \) \( Y \) are constituents of the matrix sentence,

and \( \text{defart} \) \( V \) \( \text{nomsuff} \) \( Z \) are constituents of the nominalised sentence.
Where the coreferential NP of the matrix sentence is a demonstrative, it remains in the derived sentence and precedes the embedded nominalised sentence. Subsequent deletion of this demonstrative is optional. Some examples illustrate:

(5.43)

$S_1$ \[ ko \ te \ mea \ na \ koo \ kitea \] (verbal matrix)
I saw the thing/ I saw it

$S_2$ \[ te \ kai \ -ga \ o \ te \ meaika \ e \ te \ fafine \] (nominalised verbal sentence)
The eating of the fish by the woman

$\Rightarrow$ \[ ko \ te \ kai \ -ga \ o \ te \ meaika \ e \ te \ fafine \ na \ koo \ kitea \]
I saw the eating of the fish by the woman
The eating of the fish by the woman was seen by me

(5.44)

$S_1$ \[ e \ lelei \ teelia \] (verbal matrix)
That is good

$S_2$ \[ te \ fano \ -ga \ o \ te \ tino \ i \ te \ vaka \ ki \ te \ fenua \] (nominalised verbal sentence)
The going of the man on the canoe to the island
\[ e \text{ lelei (teelaa) te fano-ga o te tino i te vaka ki te fanua } \]

The going of the man on the canoe to the island is good

5.4.3 AMBIGUITY FROM EMBEDDING OF NOMINALISED VERBAL SENTENCES

Certain complex sentences in English which involve the embedding of nominalised verbal sentences, such as the shooting of the hunters was bad, are semantically and also structurally ambiguous. If we are to ignore contextualisation (since utterances of the type above are only ambiguous if cited without a normal conversational context) then the problem of which meaning is applicable cannot be resolved. Furthermore, the sentence remains structurally ambiguous.

Structurally ambiguous sentences of this type do not occur in Tokelauan. I will illustrate by examining an ambiguous sentence in Tokelauan which contains an embedded nominalisation. Next I will examine the English sentence the killing of the man was not good, and compare the analysis with that obtained for Tokelauan.

The complex sentence (5.45) can have the two readings (1) and (2) below:

(5.45) \[ e \text{ hee matuua lelei te kai-ga o te ika } \]

The eating of the fish is not very good

(1) The eating of the fish (by someone) is not very good

(2) The fish's eating (of something) is not very good
The ambiguity of the sentence-meaning in (5.45) is contained in the phrase te kaiga o te ika. From our previous discussion we see that the immediate source of te kaiga o te ika must have been (5.46)

(5.46) na kai te ika
past eat art fish

(1) The fish was eaten

or (2) The fish ate

In this sentence te ika is the Subject, and kai is the verb. Thus, despite the fact that we do not know which reading is intended in the complex sentence (5.45) we can still trace its history. (5.46) above was nominalised to (5.47) below:

(5.47) te kai -ga o te ika
'The eating of the fish'

(5.47) was then embedded in (5.48).

(5.48) e he matuaa lelei + Demonstrative

The demonstrative was then deleted to leave the complex sentences (5.45). Thus the semantic ambiguity does not reflect a structural ambiguity, i.e. one surface form with two different underlying structures. Rather the ambiguity can be traced to the two distinct interpretations of the relations between verb and NP in (5.46) which are:
(a) The fish ate (something), or
(b) The fish was eaten (by something)

Thus the particular meaning intended by the speaker depends on the particular verb-meaning intended by him. The verb kai can mean 'to eat' or 'to be eaten'.

If sentence (5.46) were extended to incorporate certain other information, such as additional cases, a unique reading might be obtained. For example, if (5.49) was the initial verbal sentence, this would be nominalised to (5.50), and embedded in (5.48) to give the complex sentence (5.51) which is unambiguous.

(5.49) na kai te ika e te tino
The fish was eaten by the man

(5.50) te kai -qa o te ika e te tino
The eating of the fish by the man

(5.51) e hee matuaa lelei te kai -qa o te ika e te tino
The eating of the fish by the man is not very good

The meaning of (5.51) is quite clear simply because of the presence of the agentive case constituent e te tino, showing that te ika must be the goal, not the actor, of kai. Similarly in (5.52) below, the initial verbal sentence contains the descriptive case constituent i te mounu, which makes it quite clear that
te ika is the actor. This sentence is nominalised to (5.53) and the final complex sentence (5.54) is also unambiguous.

(5.52)  na kai te ika i te mounu
The fish ate the bait

(5.53)  te kai -qa o te ika i te mounu
The eating of the bait by the fish/ The bait-eating of the fish

(5.54)  e hee matuaa lelei te kai -qa o te ika i te mounu
The bait-eating of the fish is not very good
The eating of the bait by the fish is not very good

To summarise, we see that complex sentences (5.51) and (5.54) are unambiguous since they both contain markings on oblique case NP which make explicit the relation between the verb and subject NP. Sentence (5.45), on the other hand is lexically ambiguous, since there is no such additional case material to show which meaning of the verb kai was intended by the speaker. Structurally, however, none of the sentences (5.51), (5.54) and (5.45) are ambiguous. In each case te ika is the subject of the verb kai. To this construction, na kai te ika can be applied the rules for the nominalisation of verbal sentences, and the embedding transform, and we arrive at sentences such as (5.51), (5.54) and (5.45). Conversely we are able to distinguish
the sequence *te kai -ga o te ika* as an embedded nominalised verbal sentence. Then, from our knowledge of the process of verbal sentence nominalisation, we infer that the sequence *te ika* 'the fish' must have been the subject of the basic sentence. Thus, this analysis of Tokelauan allows only a single derivation of nominalised verbal sentences, and consequently structural ambiguity does not arise.

English sentences such as the killing (eating, painting, carrying, stroking, hiding) of the man was not good are of the same type as (5.45). Out of context, such sentences are also ambiguous. For instance:

(5.55) The killing of the man was not good
(a) The man's killing (something) was not good
(b) The man's being killed was not good

As in the previous example from Tokelauan, the ambiguity arises from the possibility that (5.56)

(5.56) The killing of the man

may have been derived from either (5.57)

(5.57) The man killed

or (5.58)

(5.58) The man was killed
This is because kill in English is similar to the Tokelauan verb kai 'to eat' in that it can be used 'actively' or 'passively' i.e. with actor or goal subject.

But whereas the form of the active verb in English is different from that of the passive verb, the single verb form kai in Tokelauan can mean either 'to eat' or 'to be eaten'. The point of our contrasting Tokelauan verbs of the type kai and English verbs of the type kill is that whereas ambiguous nominal sentences in English can be traced to distinct underlying forms, in Tokelauan they cannot. There is an inherent ambiguity in verbs like kai. (The problem is resolved by surface grammatical markings on English verbs; Tokelauan lacks such devices).

Verb subclassification is treated in sections 6.3 and 6.5. It will be seen there that kai represents a larger class of verbs which may take actor or goal subjects without any overt voice-marking on the verb stem.

5.5 RELATIVE CLAUSE REDUCTION

Rule T₆, sentence embedding, allows sentences to be embedded as relative clauses in the NP of another sentence. T₈ deletes the tense marker in two types of relative clauses: Locative and Genitive relatives. The net result of T₈ is to produce either
relative location phrases or relative possession phrases.

**RELATIVE POSSESSION / LOCATION REDUCTION**

\[ T_8 \quad \text{Opt.} \]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NP} \quad \text{tense} \quad \left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{LOCarg} \\ \text{GENarg} \end{array} \right] \quad \text{NP} \\
\Rightarrow \quad \text{NP} \quad \emptyset \quad \left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{LOCarg} \\ \text{GENarg} \end{array} \right] \quad \text{NP}
\end{array}
\]

Our first example illustrates Relative Possession Tense Deletion. (5.59) is the verbal matrix sentence into which sentence (5.60) with focused genitive or possessive NP is embedded to produce (5.61). \( T_8 \) then applies (optionally) to produce (5.62).

(5.59)  
\[ \text{e hau te tino i te vaka} \]  
The man is coming in the canoe

(5.60)  
\[ \text{ko te vaka e o Ioaane} \]  
The canoe belongs to Ioaane

or,  
It is the canoe which belongs to Ioaane

(5.61)  
\[ \text{e hau te tino i te vaka e o Ioaane} \]  
The man is coming in the canoe which belongs to Ioaane

(5.62)  
\[ \text{e hau te tino i te vaka o Ioaane} \]  
The man is coming in the canoe of Ioaane

or,  
The man is coming in Ioaane's canoe
Relative location tense deletion is illustrated by the following: (5.63) is the verbal matrix sentence into which the focused locative sentence (5.64) is embedded to produce (5.65). Then deletes the tense marker in (5.65) yielding (5.66)

(5.63) e popoto naa tamaiti

The children are clever

(5.64) ko naa tamaiti e i te faleaaoga

The children are at (the) school

or, It is the children who are at school

(5.65) e popoto naa tamaiti e i te faleaaoga

The children who are at school are clever

(5.66) e popoto naa tamaiti i te faleaaoga

The children at the school are clever

or, The school children are clever

\( T_8 \) is called relative possession/location reduction because it reduces relative clauses containing possession and locative arguments to prepositional phrases. This may be illustrated by examining the two separate derivations of the ambiguous string (5.67).
(5.67) \( \text{na miha naa fafine i te puaka i te auala} \)
(a) The women fought on the road about the pig
(b) The women fought about the pig (which was) on the road

The sentence which has meaning (a) is derived by the subject shift transformation \( T_1 \) from the simple sentence (5.68), where \( i \text{ te puaka} \) and \( i \text{ te auala} \) are both Descriptive case Constituents.

(5.68) \( \text{na miha i te puaka i te auala naa fafine} \)
\( \text{VERBarg DESCRCase DESCRCase Subject} \)

The women fought on the road about the pig

The sentence (5.68) has the P-marker (5.69) showing the coordinate status of the two \( i \_NP \) sequences.

(5.69)

```
S
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposition</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERBarg</td>
<td>CaseComplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRCase</td>
<td>DESCRCase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descrmker</td>
<td>NP Descrmker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP Submker</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na miha</td>
<td>i te puaka i te auala Ø na fafine-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
The sentence which has meaning (b) is derived from a complex sentence by relative location reduction. (5.70) below is the verbal matrix sentence into which the focused locative sentence (5.71) is embedded to produce (5.72). \( T_8 \) then deletes the tense marker nae 'past progressive' in (5.72) to produce (5.73).

(5.70) na miha i te puaka naa fafine
Verb DESCRCase Subject
The women fought about the pig

(5.71) ko te puaka nae i te auala
It was the pig which was on the road
The pig was on the road

(5.72) na miha i te puaka nae i te auala naa fafine
The women fought about the pig which was on the road

(5.73) na miha i te puaka i te auala naa fafine
The women fought about the pig on the road

Finally Subject Shift would permute naa fafine to follow the verb miha producing (5.67). P-marker (5.74) of (5.73) illustrates the non-coordinate status of the two i NP sequences.
Relative location shown in P-marker (5.74) results from the embedded LOCarg in the DESCRcase constituent. The NP te puaka, therefore, is coordinate with the LOCarg and is the head of the complex NP of the DESCRcase.

5.6 POSSESSIVE PRONOUN PREPOSING

Possessive Pronoun Preposing applies to certain constituents of nominalised verbal sentences and complex NPs of relative possession derived by $T_8$, namely to constituents of the form poss NP where NP is [[pronoun]]. The possessive marker plus pronoun is preposed to the head nominal. Possessive pronoun preposing is illustrated in $T_9$: 
T₉ Opt.
\[
\text{ARTcom NOM poss } [\text{NP}_{+prn}^{+prn}]
\Rightarrow \text{ARTcom poss } [\text{NP}_{+prn}^{+prn}] \text{ NOM}
\]

While T₉ is an optional transformation the derived (preposed) structure is more commonly used than the postposed structure. The morphophonemic changes affecting the articles, and the possession markers are discussed in chapter 2, section 2.2.2.16 where a large range of examples illustrating T₉ are provided. Two further examples (5.75) and (5.76) are included below.

(5.75a) he meakai aa -na
indefsing food poss 3rdsgprn
⇒ b. h- a -na meakai
indefsing poss 3rdsgprn food
His food

(5.76a) naa fale o maaua
defplart house poss 1stdualexcl.prn
⇒ b. ⌀ o maa fale
defplart poss 1stdualexcl.prn house
Our house

5.7 INTERROGATIVE SUBJECT DELETION

Interrogative Subject Deletion provides for a common variant of 'what?' and certain types of 'why?' questions. The basic
form of equational questions contains the sequence 
\text{he} \_aa\_te\_mea \text{'a what the thing'}. In simple equational 
interrogatives \text{te mea} alone is the subject and \text{he aa} 
the proposition. In complex interrogative sentences \text{te mea} 
is the head of the subject NP (in functional terms, the item 
which the base \text{aa} 'what' questions). In the Interrogative 
Subject Deletion transformation (T_{10}) \text{te mea} is deleted.

\[ T_{10} \quad \text{Opt.} \]
\[ \text{Indefart} \quad \text{aa} \quad \text{te mea} \quad X \]
\[ \Rightarrow \quad \text{Indefart} \quad \text{aa} \quad \emptyset \quad X \]

(5.77) illustrates deletion of a simple subject:

(5.77)a. \text{he} \_aa\_te\_mea 
\text{indefart} what \text{defart} thing
What is the thing? /What is it?

\[ \Rightarrow \quad \text{b.} \quad \text{he} \quad \text{aa} \]
\text{indef} what
What?

In complex equational interrogatives only the head of the 
subject, \text{te mea}, is deleted, as illustrated in (5.78):
(5.78)a  he  aa  te  mea  na  fano  ai  koe
  indefart  what  defart  thing  past  go  pro  2ndsing

  What was the thing/reason why you went?

  \[\Rightarrow\]  b.  he  aa  ø  na  fano  ai  koe
  Why did you go?

5.8 INTERROGATIVE HEAD SUBSTITUTION

  With interrogative sentences where the subject is a clause
  containing the sequence ; defart mea poss NP X, the 'dummy
  base' mea may be deleted.

\[
T_{11} \text{ Opt.}
\]

  Indefart  aa  defart  mea  poss  NP  X
  \[\Rightarrow\]  Indefart  aa  defart  ø  poss  NP  X

(5.79)a.  he  aa  te  mea  o  te  tino  e  ogofia
  indefart  what  defart  thing  poss  defart  man  tense  pain

  What is the thing of the man which is hurting? / Where is
  the man hurting?

  \[\Rightarrow\]  b.  he  aa  t- ø  oo  te  tino  e  ogofia
  What is the thing of the man which is hurting? / Where
  is the man hurting?
5.9 IMPERATIVE SUBJECT DELETION

Imperative Subject Deletion, which provides for the deletion of the subject of imperative sentences is common to all Polynesian languages. The form of this transformation is stated in chapter 3, under $T_{12}$.

5.10 LOCATIVE ARGUMENT TRANSFORMATIONS

There are two transformations to be considered under this heading. $T_{13}$, Locative Argument Transportation is similar to $T_{14}$, Negative Locative Transformation.

In locative argument focusing, discussed in 5.2.7, the NP of the locative argument is fronted and leaves the trace $ei$. Locative argument transportation works differently. The whole locative argument (Locmker NP) is moved to the right of the subject. The locative marker $i$ is copied and $ei$ remains as the trace of the NP. $T_{13}$ illustrates this process:

LOCATIVE ARGUMENT TRANSPORTATION

$T_{13}$ Opt

modal LOCarg Subject

$\Rightarrow$ modal Locmker $ei$ Subject LOCarg

With $T_{13}$ there is a shift of emphasis in the derived sentence meaning. This shift is illustrated by (5.80):
(5.80)a. e hee i te vaka he hoe
nonpast neg Locmker art canoe indefart paddle
Is not in the canoe, a paddle
(A paddle is not in the canoe)

⇒ b. e hee i ei he hoe i te vaka
nonpast neg Locmker pro indefart paddle Locmker art canoe
Is not there, a paddle in the canoe
(A paddle is not there, in the canoe)

In (5.80)a the negative hee applies directly to the actual
location i te vaka 'in the canoe', while in (5.80)b, the negative
refers to the 'general location' i ei 'there' which is described by the
transported locative argument as being 'in the canoe'. That is, in
(5.80)b, the fact that the paddle is not there (in location) is
emphasised, rather than 'the paddle simply not being in the canoe'.
The meaning shift brought about by T₁₃ is more clearly illustrated
in (5.81) where there is no negative morpheme present:

(5.81)a e i te vaka he hoe
nonpast Locmker art canoe indefart paddle
A paddle is in the canoe
⇒ b. e i ei he hoe i te vaka'
nonpast Locmker pro indefart paddle Locmker art canoe
There is a paddle in the canoe
In the Negative Locative Transformation the locative argument
is moved to the right of the subject, as in $T_{13}$. But in this
instance the trace is $ai$ and the locative marker $i$ is not copied:

**NEGATIVE LOCATIVE TRANSFORMATION**

$T_{14}$ Opt.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{tense} & \quad \text{neg} & \quad \text{LOCarg} & \quad \text{indefart} & \quad [\text{+common}] \\
\Rightarrow \text{tense} & \quad \text{neg} & \quad ai & \quad \text{indefart} & \quad [\text{+common}] & \quad \text{LOCarg}
\end{align*}
\]

With $T_{14}$, there is a shift of emphasis of the negative from
applying to the Locative argument in the base sentence, to referring
to the subject in the derived sentence. This meaning shift is
illustrated in (5.82):

(5.82)a. $\text{e} \quad \text{hee} \quad i \quad \text{te} \quad \text{vaka} \quad \text{he} \quad \text{hoe}$

nonpast neg Locmker art canoe indefart paddle

A paddle is not in the canoe

$\Rightarrow$ b. $\text{e} \quad \text{hee} \quad ai \quad \text{he} \quad \text{hoe} \quad i \quad \text{te} \quad \text{vaka}$

nonpast neg pro indefart paddle Locmker art canoe

There is no paddle in the canoe

The negative locative transformation only applies when the
subject NP is common and indefinite. Thus (5.83) with a definite
article cannot be transformed by $T_{14}$ to (5.84) which is ungrammatical
in Tokelauan. Similarly, (5.85) without the negative constituent
cannot be transformed to (5.86) - which is also a nonsentence.

(5.83) e hee i te vaka te hoe
nonpast neg LOCarg defart [+common]

The paddle is not in the canoe

(5.84) *e hee ai te hoe i te vaka

(5.85) e i te vaka he hoe
nonpast LOCarg indef [+common]

A paddle is in the canoe

(5.86) *e ai he hoe i te vaka

The fact that (5.84) is ungrammatical is consistent with the meaning shift brought about by $T_{14}$. That is, the indefinite article is required for negative locative transformations since in the derived sentence the sense of 'nothing' or 'no subject' is portrayed. The feature 'definite' is in opposition to this negative indefinite concept of 'nothing'.

To illustrate the contrast and the variation in the meaning of the various transformed locative sentences, a range of examples are presented below. (5.87)a, and (5.88)a, are simple locative sentences. (5.87)b, (5.87)c and (5.87)d are derived from transformations of (5.87)a, while (5.88)b, (5.88)c, (5.88)d and (5.88)e are transformed from (5.88)a.
(5.87)a. e i te falefono he faipule

tense LOCarg Subject

Is at the meeting-house, a chief
A chief is at the meeting-house

(5.87)b. ko he faipule e i te falefono

It is a chief who is at the meeting-house
A chief is at the meeting-house

(5.87)c. ko te falefono e i ei he faipule

At the meeting-house, there is a chief
It is at the meeting-house where a chief is

(5.87)d. e i ei he faipule i te falefono

is there a chief at the meeting-house
A chief is there at the meeting-house

(5.88)a. e hee i te falefono he faipule

is not in the meeting-house a chief
A chief is not in the meeting-house

(5.88)b. ko he faipule e hee i te falefono

It is a chief who is not at the meeting-house
A chief is not at the meeting-house
(5.88)c. ko te falefono e hee i ei he faipule
At the meeting-house a chief is not there
It is at the meeting-house where a chief is not there

(5.88)d. e hee i ei he faipule i te falefono
is not there a chief at the meeting-house
A chief is not there at the meeting-house

(5.88)e. e hee ai he faipule i te falefono
is not a chief at the meeting-house
There is no chief at the meeting-house

As a final word on negative locative constituents in Tokelauan, we can observe the possible negative replies to two questions containing LOCarg constituents. The allowable replies support the analysis of a difference in the scope of negation in the pairs (5.80) and (5.82), and (5.88)d and (5.88)e.

Sentence (5.89) below, when said with interrogative intonation inquires particularly whether any person is in the lagoon.

(5.89) e i te namo he tino?
Is anybody in the lagoon?

A complete sentence answering this question is (5.90). The more usual elliptical answers (5.91), 5.92) can be seen to be
abbreviations of (5.90).

(5.90)  e  hee  ai  he  tino  i  te  namo

There is nobody in the lagoon

(5.91)  e  hee  ai  he  tino.

There is nobody

(5.92)  hee ai

No!

Because Tokelauan speakers interpret (5.89) as questioning the presence of the person (the subject) rather than the location, the answer accordingly brackets the negative with the subject.

In the case of (5.93), however, what is questioned is the location. The negative answers accordingly refer to the location.

(5.93)  e  i  ei  he  tino  i  te  namo?

Is somebody there in the lagoon?

(5.94) is the full answer to question (5.93), while (5.95) and (5.96) are the usual abbreviations.
(5.94) e hee i ei he tino i te namo
Somebody is not there in the lagoon

(5.95) e hee i ei he tino
A person is not there/Somebody is not there

(5.96) e hee i ei
Is not there

5.11 ACTUALISATION OF NEGATIVES

In chapter 2, three forms are listed under the heading Negatives: hee, preverbal or dependent negative 'not'; heeai, sentential or or independent negative 'no'; and heeki, preverbal negative 'not' 'not yet'. Negatives have been assigned to the modal constituent: they generally occur with another element of the modal, namely, a tense/aspect marker.

The exception is the form heeai, which was described in chapter 2 as being a composite form containing the two morphemes hee 'not' and ai LOCarg proform. Some evidence of this was discussed in the previous section (5.11) in a discussion of the Negative Locative transform. It may well be, however, that the morpheme ai in heeai, is a general proform or a anaphor which can refer to a great variety of grammatical
constructions. For example the negative heeai 'no' can be given in answer to a variety of questions with quite different grammatical structure.

Negative hee 'not' combines with the tense/aspect markers in simple negative sentences. Examples (5.106), (5.107) and (5.108) below illustrate this feature with corresponding affirmative and negative sentences.

(5.106)a. ka fano au
I will go

(5.106)b. ka hee fano au
I will not go

(5.107)a. ko au kua fano
I have been

(5.107)b. ko au kua hee fano
I have not been

(5.108)a. ko au e fano
I am going

(5.108)b. ko au e hee fano
I am not going
The negative *heeki* 'not yet' does not combine with any of the tense/aspect class markers which are listed in chapter 2. Instead, it always follows the particle *ko*.

(5.109)  
\[ \text{ko heeki i ei te teine} \]

The girl is not yet here

*ko* was not listed in the class of tense/aspect markers in chapter 2, although it obviously has some claims to belong there. It is difficult to ascertain the precise function of the particle. It could be treated as an allomorph of some other tense/aspect marker which is actualised as *ko* when paired with the negative form *heeki* 'not yet'. This solution was adopted when it was found that *ko* stood in complementary distribution with *e* 'non-past', with *ko* occurring with the negative *heeki* 'not yet' and *e* elsewhere as illustrated in the following sentences (5.108)a. (5.108)b and (5.110).

(5.108)a.  
\[ \text{ko au e fano} \]

I am going (I will go)

(5.108)b.  
\[ \text{ko au e hee fano} \]

I am not going (I will not go)

(5.110)  
\[ \text{ko au ko heeki fano} \]

I have not yet gone
It appears that, hee combines with all members but one of the class of tense/aspect markers to express the corresponding negative. The one exception is na. To negate a proposition in the past tense it is necessary to use the negative heeki, 'not yet' and the non-past tense/aspect form e. Compare (5.111) and (5.112):

(5.111) \( ko \ a u \ n a \ f a n o \)
I went

(5.112) \( ko \ a u \ e \ heeki \ f a n o \)
I did not go

Sequences like (5.113)

(5.113) \( *k o \ a u \ n a \ h e e \ f a n o \)
I did not go

pairing the simple negative hee with the tense/aspect marker na 'past', were not observed to occur, and I was told that they are 'bad Tokelauan', and that one must use \( e \) heeki.

Several analyses inter-relating the negatives and the tense/aspect markers seem plausible, including the following which I adopt here:
na ~ e  'simple past'
e ~ ko  'non-past'
hee ~ heeki  'simple negative'
heeki  'not yet'

In this analysis, all homophonous morphs are in complementary distribution: e 'simple past' only occurs before the simple negative heeki, while e 'non-past' never does. Similarly, the simple negative form heeki occurs only after e 'simple past' while heeki 'not yet', cannot. ko occurs with heeki 'not yet' while e non-past cannot.

The use of heeki as an allomorph of hee paired with e to mark past negative, could have developed (at least in part) to protect a contrast with the form of the negative subjunctive na + hee. In the morpheme listing in chapter 2, naa was glossed as the negative subjunctive or caveat, and translated 'last', 'should not'. The use of this morpheme is illustrated in (5.114):

(5.114)  aua'.  koe naa pakuu
         dont!  lest you fall

When this particle naa occurs with the simple negative hee, it is shortened to na.

(5.115)  aua'.  koutou na hee fai kakata
         Don't (i.e. stop)! don't you people laugh!
Thus while the sequence na hee can occur in Tokelauan, it does not mean simple past negative, but the negative subjunctive, or negative caveat.

An interesting point regarding the use of negatives and sentence-meaning can be noted from the following comparisons. In the first place, when the simple negative is paired with most tense/aspect markers, it has the expected effect of negating the proposition.

When the negative follows the caveat or subjunctive particle naa, on the other hand, this is not so. That is, hee does not negate sentences containing naa. Rather the negatives hee and naa reinforce each other to produce a strong negative subjunctive. Contrast the meanings of (5.116) and (5.117):

(5.116) aua' koe naa kake ki te laakau
      Don't: you should not climb the tree (in case you fall)

(5.117) aua' koe na hee kake ki te laakau
      Don't: you should not climb the tree (in case you fall)

Thus while in some languages such as Standard English a second negative cancels a first negative, such is not the case in Tokelauan.¹

¹ The same phenomenon occurs in the languages of Futuna (Biggs, personal communication), and Sikaiana (Sharplees, 1968).
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Following ideas expressed by Kenneth Hale, particularly in his review (Hale (1968b)) of Hohepa's (1967) grammar of Maori, Patrick Hohepa wrote an article, "The accusative-to-ergative drift in Polynesian languages" (Hohepa, 1969) which was to stimulate a lively debate and a good deal of further research on the comparative syntax of the Polynesian language group. In this paper he
classified some 20 of the Polynesian languages into three typological
groups according to syntactical criteria; ergative (Niuean), accusative
(Eastern Polynesian and some others) and ergative-accusative (Tongan,
Samoan and some others). He concluded that the ergative and the
ergative-accusative languages had developed out of an earlier
(Proto-Polynesian) accusative type through the process of "drift," and
that his process was continuing. Hohepa predicted that all
Polynesian languages would eventually be purely ergative in typology.

John Lynch (1972) concerned himself with placing Tongan within
this ergative-accusative cleavage of Polynesian languages. He
discussed the active-passive relation and stative constructions found
in Tongan, and agreed with Hohepa about the ergative-to-accusative
drift in this language. Sandra Chung (1972) explored aspects of
case- and possessive-marking in Polynesian and found evidence which
she regarded as consistent with Hohepa's hypothesis of a widespread
drift from accusative to ergative. In a chapter in his doctoral thesis,
Ross Clark (1973a) reviewed the situation for the whole Polynesian
group. Clark concluded that the direction of change was essentially
the reverse, i.e. that Proto-Polynesian was an ergative-accusative
language and that the accusative type was an innovation of the
Eastern Polynesian subgroup. Bruce Biggs (1974), reacting to the
terminological confusion generated by the debate, made certain new
proposals about the nature of subjects, passives and verb classes in
Polynesia.
The first two sections of this chapter discuss Hohepa's hypothesis in relation to Tokelauan. The structure of Tokelauan transitive sentences is reviewed and compared with Hohepa's reconstructed Proto-Polynesian structures. Clues are sought which might illuminate the sequence of changes leading to the present Tokelauan structures.

Section 6.3 is concerned with a functional analysis of the case categories of Tokelauan. Considered in conjunction with the formal analysis of case given in chapter 4, it provides a set of criteria for defining the verb classes of Tokelauan.

Since a good deal of the analysis of Tokelauan discusses semantic notions, particularly in chapters 4, 5 and 6, section 6.4 can be regarded as a 'parting shot' to justify my preoccupation with functional considerations in arriving at a grammar of Tokelauan.

Some verbs are listed in 6.5 illustrating the method of verb classification.
6.1 SOME ERGATIVE-ACCUSATIVE CLASSIFICATIONS

6.1.1 HALE (1968a), (1968b).

Kenneth Hale (1968a) divided certain of the languages of Australia into those characterised by a set of typological features which he called accusative structures, and those exhibiting a set of structures which he labelled ergative. His accusative-type languages overtly mark an active-passive relation; his ergative languages do not. Hale found that the ergative languages do not show the active-passive relation because the structures which he called ergative are in complementary distribution with the structures he called passive in the accusative type languages. He then extended this argument to claim that the ergative construction is historically the same as the passive.

In discussing Hohepa's (1967) treatment of the passive suffixes of Maori, Hale (1968b) applied an ergative-accusative typological framework to certain of the languages of Polynesia. He concluded that these languages may also be classified into accusative and ergative types, and found that Maori is an accusative language, while Tongan is ergative.

6.1.2 HOHEPA (1969)

Accepting the validity of Hale's framework, Hohepa (1969) applied it to a wide range of Polynesian languages. The criteria adopted by him are outlined below.

"Accusative constructions are defined as follows: surface 'subject' is marked in an identical manner in transitive and
intransitive sentences; an overt marker indicates that the verb
is in the passive voice; an overt case marker indicates the
'agent' of the passive sentence. Ergative constructions, on
the other hand, have these features; the marker for surface
'subject' of an intransitive sentence is not the same as the
marker for surface 'subject' of a transitive sentence; the
'object' of a transitive sentence has the same marker as the
subject of an intransitive sentence. There is no overt
marker for the passive voice."

Hohepa, 1969, p.296-7

Hohepa found that the ergative-accusative distinction
typologically divided Polynesian languages into three groups.
His three language groups are listed below:-

1. (pure) ergative languages: Niuean

2. (pure) accusative languages: Maori, Rarotongan,
   Tahitian, Hawaiian, Marquesan (both N.W. and
   S.E.), Easter Island, Mangarevan and Nukuoro.

3. (typologically mixed) ergative-accusative languages:
   Tongan, Samoan, Pukapukan, Rennellese, Tikopian,
   Ellice, Sikaiana and Luangiua.

The ergative-accusative languages are those which were found
to contain both ergative and accusative patterns.

Hohepa went on to attempt an historical explanation of the
development of the three types, and to examine Hale's thesis that
the ergative construction derives from the passive construction. A summary of Hohepa's findings and conclusions follows:

Active and passive voice are distinguished in some Polynesian languages. In the pure accusative languages verbs in the passive voice are marked by a suffix of the form -(C) (i)a. The agent of the passive verb is marked by the particle e or 'e. Active sentences have an unmarked verb; an 'actor' subject (marked for the nominative case, usually by zero); and a 'goal' object phrase (marked for the accusative case, usually by i or ki).

In mixed ergative-accusative Polynesian languages the passive suffix has been lost or is in the process of being lost. Sentence patterns in the various languages exhibit the following stages in the loss of passive suffixation: (1) regularisation of the many variants of the passive suffix, first to a few alternants, and then to a single form; (2) reduction from right to left of the phoneme content of the suffix; (3) change of function of this reduced form; (4) complete loss of the suffix.

Providing sentence examples from Tongan, Hohepa then makes the claim that with the loss of suffixation, there is a loss of active accusative sentence types as defined by him above, and correspondingly there is a reinterpretation of the former passive sentences as active.

Niuean is regarded by Hohepa as a true ergative language.
By comparing Niuean structures with Tongan 'equivalents' he maintains inferentially that the ergative structures have resulted from the deletion of the passive suffix.

6.1.3 LYNCH (1972)

In a later paper, Lynch (1972) investigates the position of Tongan in the ergative-accusative classification of the Polynesian languages. Following Hale (1970), Lynch lists the following typological differences between languages with accusative structures and languages with ergative structures:

"Accusative structures are characterised by the overt marking of the active-passive relation, and by the identical marking of the surface subjects of both transitive and intransitive verbs, surface objects of transitive verbs being marked in a different manner. Ergative structures on the other hand, overtly mark surface subjects of intransitive verbs and surface objects of transitive verbs in an identical manner (by what are called nominative markers), while marking surface subjects of transitive verbs differently (by ergative markers); in these structures also the active-passive relation is not overtly marked."

Lynch, 1972, p.5

Lynch discussed a variety of constructions in Tongan, and concludes that some can be related as active versus passive, i.e.
show an accusative pattern, while others show no such relation, but are ergative. The question arises: was Tongan once purely ergative or purely accusative? Lynch goes on to accept Hohepa's contention that the ergative in Tongan has developed out of the passive, saying that "syntactic drift in Tongan is towards the increasing use of ergative structures ....", and that "one may certainly agree with his (Hohepa's) conclusions that all Polynesian languages, if they persist, will .... through language drift ... become ergative languages."

(Lynch, 1972, p.17)

Lynch identifies as ergative structures in Tongan those where the agent is marked by the preposition 'e, and the goal by 'a (nominative case) which have no active counterparts. He also identifies passive structures, where the verb is marked overtly for the passive by -Cia, and which do have active sentence counterparts. With the verb tanu 'to bury', he finds that the passive form of the verb (tanu-mia) is in free variation with the forms tanu-'i and tanu. He concludes that -'i is a regularised form of the passive in Tongan (following Hohepa), but posits a zero member of the -Cia suffix to account for the passive use of tanu without a suffix.

"In Tongan .... one alternant -'i, is becoming predominant, while in a number of verbs passive markers are being replaced by Ø producing surface ergative structures."

Lynch, 1972, p.11
Thus although Lynch identifies ergative constructions in Tongan (see above), he regards these as passives with a \( \emptyset \) passive suffix. On this basis, he argues that Tongan is neither ergative (as maintained by Hale), nor accusative-ergative (as classified by Hohepa), but an accusative language. It may be noted here, however, that upon the evidence produced by Lynch, Tongan conforms structurally to Hohepa's mixed ergative-accusative group. Lynch's classification of it as an accusative language is merely a terminological distinction to support his hypothesis that Tongan ergatives are in fact passive constructions with a zero suffix.

6.1.4 SUMMARY AND ORIENTATION

The methods used by Hohepa and Lynch to classify various of the languages of Polynesia in the ergative-accusative division of languages have in essence been similar. Both agree on a number of typological features which distinguish ergative structures from accusative structures, based on Hale's framework, and then examine certain languages for the presence or absence of these forms. Hohepa offers a reconstruction of Proto-Polynesian and a hypothesis about the sequence of changes (or pattern of 'drift') by which some languages have diverged from the prototype. During the discussion of the transitive and stative constructions found in Polynesian languages, both writers put forward a number of claims about the nature of the active and passive voice contrast including
assertions about 'subject', reinterpretation of passive sentences as active, etc. which I cannot support.

The following section discusses active and passive voice in Tokelauan in relation to the findings of Hohepa and Lynch. Critical discussion of the typological features informing the Hohepa-Lynch analysis will be delayed until 6.2.7.

6.2 ACTIVE AND PASSIVE SENTENCES IN TOKELAUAN

We may now examine data from Tokelauan. This language was not included in Hohepa's classification although he does note (1969:298) that Tokelauan "has ergative structures".

6.2.1 THE PASSIVE VOICE IN TOKELAUAN

Sentences (6.1) and (6.2) are fully grammatical sentences in Tokelauan, while (6.3) and (6.4) are not.

(6.1) na kave te hua
past take art coconut

The coconut was taken (transported)

(6.2) na kave te hua e au
past take art coconut Agmker lstsing

The coconut was taken by me

(6.3) *na kave e au
past taken Agmker lstsing

(6.4) *na kave au i te hua
past taken lstsing prep art coconut
Does Tokelauan have a passive? Consider, first, functional criteria. Basic to all definitions of the passive voice is the functional notion of \textit{goal-subject}, that is, that the subject suffers the action of the verb. Note for example, the following typical classical definitions of passive:

(a) "the form of the verb which expresses that the subject is acted upon".

\textit{Collins National Dictionary (1966)}

(b) "comprising those forms of transitive verbs that attribute the verbal action to the person etc. to whom it is directed (the logical object)".

\textit{The Concise Oxford Dictionary (1956)}.

Both functional definitions of passive express what we have called a 'goal-subject' relationship between subject nominal and verb.

Sentences (6.1) and (6.2) conform to the classical requirements (except that there is no special 'form of the verb', as required by definition (a) above), and so may be considered passive sentences. (6.3) was regarded by my informants as an incomplete sentence. That is, while the marked agentine phrase is dispensable in a complete sentence with the verb \textit{kave} (see (6.1)), the unmarked goal phrase is obligatory. The goal phrase must be equated with subject because it is both unmarked and indispensable.

The so-called passive suffix found in certain other Polynesian languages is not regularly reflected in Tokelauan passive verbs. Sentences (6.5), (6.6) and (6.7) are further examples of passives.
containing a suffixless verb.

(6.5) na kai te magoo e au
past eat art shark Agmker 1st sing
VERB Goal-SUBJECT AGENTIVE

The shark was eaten by me

(6.6) na inu e te teine te hua
past drink Agmker art girl art drinking nut
VERB AGENTIVE Goal-SUBJECT

The drinking nut was drunk by the girl

(6.7) na kitea e koe te vaka
past see Agmker 2nd sing art canoe
VERB AGENTIVE Goal-SUBJECT

The canoe was seen by you

Sentence (6.4) is a completely ungrammatical string. It corresponds formally to the active transitive sentences in which cognates of kave occur in some Polynesian languages. That (6.4) does not occur in Tokelauan is consistent with Hohepa's and Lynch's hypothesis that with the loss of the passive suffix on some or all passive verbs, the use of those verbs in accusative constructions is also lost and the passive construction now stands alone without an active counterpart. However, it is not the case that Tokelauan completely lacks an active transitive construction or that it completely lacks verbal suffixes cognate with PPN -(C)ia.
as we see in the following sections.

6.2.2 THE ACTIVE VOICE IN TOKELAUAN

The verbs *kai* and *inu* which figure in the passive sentences (6.5) and (6.6) also occur in a different type of transitive construction:

(6.8)  
na kai au i te magoo  
past eat 1st sing prep art shark  
VERB SUBJECT OBJECT (or Accusative CASE)  
I ate the shark/I ate shark

(6.9)  
na inu te teine i te hua  
past drink art girl prep art drinkingnut  
VERB SUBJECT OBJECT  
The girl drank the coconut/The girl drank coconut

Sentences (6.8) and (6.9) conform to the pattern proposed by Hohepa et al. as characteristic of Polynesian active accusative sentences.

Basic to the definition of active voice is the functional notion of *actor-subject*.

(a) "Implying action by the subject"  
Collins National Dictionary (1966)
"...comprises all forms of intransitive verbs and those forms of transitive verbs that attribute the verbal action to the person or thing whence it proceeds (the logical subject), as: We punished him....".

The Concise Oxford Dictionary (1956)

These formal conditions are met by examples (6.8) and (6.9) provided that the subject is identified as the actor rather than the goal. Proof of this analysis lies in the fact that (6.10) and (6.11) are accepted sentences in Tokelauan, while (6.12) and (6.13) are not. That is, it is assumed that the subject of the verb is a necessary constituent of S (refer to subject definition, Chapter 4, sections 4.2.1-2).

(6.10) na kai au
past eat lstsing
I ate

(6.11) na inu te teine
past drink art girl
The girl drank

(6.12) *na kai i te magoo
past eat prep art shark
*... ate of the shark
(6.13) \textit{*na inu i te hua}  
past drink prep art drinkingnut  

\textit{*... drank of the coconut}

\textit{kai} and \textit{inu} are exceptional among transitive verbs. They are the only clearcut examples we have of verbs which occur with the same meaning in both active and passive constructions.\(^1\) Why these two verbs \textit{kai} and \textit{inu} have been retained in their active use is not known. Perhaps the fact that they are amongst the most frequently used verbs is relevant ('eat' and 'drink' are both in Swadesh's basic list), but no serious explanation is volunteered here concerning their retention.

Note that, as the active use of \textit{kai} is now in contrastive distribution with the passive use, sentence (6.10) is ambiguous. Just as an actor-subject verb may occur with only the subject constituent so a goal-subject verb may do so, as in (6.1). Sentence (6.10), therefore, may mean either 'I ate' or 'I was eaten'.

Sentence (6.14) which has a 'more natural' passive subject, perhaps illustrates this ambiguity more forcefully than (6.10).

\(^1\) Other verbs of Tokelauan can occur in both active and passive constructions but in all cases there is a slight meaning change outside of the active and passive meaning relationship. For example \textit{havali} 'to walk' or 'to be traversed'. Refer to 6.5 for examples and discussion.
(6.14) na kai te magoo
The shark ate / The shark was eaten

(6.11) is not ambiguous since the verb inu 'drink' requires an animal actor-subject or a liquid goal-subject. Thus, te teine 'the girl' must be the actor-subject. In contrast kai 'eat' can take both an animal actor-subject and an animal goal-subject.

6.2.3 PRONOUN EMBEDDING AND VERB SUFFIXATION

We have established that Tokelauan has passive sentences but that there is no overt marker to show that the verb is in the passive voice. We have seen also that the PPN active transitive sentence forms have with two exceptions, been lost in Tokelauan. Attention can now be directed to a form of suffixation which does exist in Tokelauan. Sentence (6.2) which is repeated below, can be transformed into (6.15) by (a) preposing the agentive pronoun to the verb (pronoun embedding), (b) deleting the agent marker e, and (c) attaching a suffix -a to the verb.

(6.2) na kave te hua e au
past take art drinkingnut Agmker 1stsing VERB SUBJECT AGENTIVE
The drinkingnut was taken (transported) by me

(6.15) na koo kave -a te hua
past 1stsing take suffix art coconut
The drinkingnut was taken by me / I took the drinkingnut
The pronoun embedding transformation was discussed in detail in 5.1.3. It is significant that only the agentive pronouns may be embedded in this manner, that is, when they derive from an agentive phrase. Now as the agentive phrase occurs only when the verb is used passively, the suffix which is obligatorily attached to the verb in the pronoun embedding transform, historically may well reflect the Proto-Polynesian suffix which was, according to Hohepa and Lynch, used to mark the passive use of the verb. The question arises whether Tokelauan previously attached a suffix to all passive verbs and if so whether this suffix can be shown to be identical with the still-productive suffix which appears with verbs taking embedded pronouns.

Whatever the historical origins and uses of -(C)(i)a it is clear that synchronically the suffix is not a passive-marker. The verb kai 'to eat' was used passively in (6.5) and actively in (6.8). These sentences are repeated below, together with (6.16) which contains an embedded pronoun.

(6.5) na kai te magoo e au
VERB SUBJECT AGENTIVE
The shark was eaten by me

(6.8) na kai au i te magoo
VERB SUBJECT ACCUSATIVE/OBJECT
I ate the shark
(6.16) na koo kai -a te magoo
past lstsng eat suffix art shark

The shark was eaten by me/I ate the shark

The passive use of kai in (6.5) is not marked by a suffix. In (6.16) kai occurs in the passive voice and does take a suffix which has the same canonical form as that proposed by Hohepa et al. for the passive suffix of Polynesian languages. However, since kai in (6.5) has no passive suffix, the suffixation of kai in (6.5) has no passive suffix, the suffixation of kai in (6.16) on the evidence available can only be attributed to the presence of pronoun embedding.

6.2.4 SOME RELICS OF PASSIVE SUFFIXATION

One reason for believing that Tokelauan once exhibited wider use of suffixes of the form -(C)(I)a is that several verbs exhibit petrified suffixes which correspond in form to productive passive suffixes in other languages, for example the verbs talohia 'to pray' and tukua 'to leave'. However, these Tokelauan forms no longer contrast with an active form of the verb.

There is at least one verb stem in Tokelauan which does add a suffix when it occurs in the passive voice. The verb is pepelo.

1. Cf. Samoan tatalo, passive talosia 'to pray'; tu'u, passive tu'ua 'to leave'.

'to deceive, lie to.' Sentence (6.17) below is an active sentence containing the verb pepelo and has its passive counterpart in (6.18).

(6.17) na pepelo au ki te faipule
past deceive 1stsing Dirmker art chief
I deceived the chief

(6.18) na pelo -gia e au te
past deceive suffix Agmker 1stsing art
faipule
chief
The chief was deceived by me

In (6.18) the function of the suffix -gia can only be to mark the passive voice, since (6.19) without the suffix -gia is not an acceptable utterance in Tokelauan.

(6.19) *na (pepelo) e au te faipule
( pelo )
Compare also (6.20)

(6.20) na koo pelo -gia te faipule
past 1stsing deceive pass.suff art chief
The chief was deceived by me/I deceived the chief

The suffix in this instance might be attributed to the passive use of the verb pepelo, since embedded agent constructions are stylistic variants of passives with prepositional agents.
These three sets of facts, taken together, suggest that at some stage in the history of Tokelauan some or all verbs regularly took a \(-\text{C}(\text{l})\text{a}\) suffix in passive constructions.

So far, our Tokelauan material appears to be consistent with the claims of Hale, Hohepa and Lynch, about the direction of change in Polynesian syntax; there has been a decline in Tokelauan in the use of the passive suffix to mark the passive voice of the verb in sentences of the formal structure of (6.1), (6.2), (6.5) and (6.7). However, with this set of verbs, when the pronoun of the agentive phrase is embedded in the verb phrase, the passive suffix is still required.¹

Let us now turn to another group of three verbs: taa, iloa and kitea. Compare (a), (b) and (c) in each of the following sets of sentences.

\[(6.21a) \quad \text{na taa e au te kulii}^2\]
\[
\text{past hit Agmker 1st sing art dog}
\]

The dog was struck by me

1. The present facts of Tokelauan could be handled in the way Lynch proposed to handle Tongan: by positing an obligatory suffix to mark the passive voice of verbs, and by allowing a \(\emptyset\) allomorph for those instances where the suffix is not present. This treatment is not adopted here, since there appears little purpose in postulating underlying accusative structures which never appear in the surface structure.

2. The form kulii for 'dog' is used only by older speakers, others preferring the Samoan borrowing maile.
(6.21b) na koo taa te kulii
past lstsing strike art dog
The dog was struck by me / I struck the dog

(6.21c) na koo taa -gia te kulii
The dog was struck by me/ I struck the dog

(6.22a) na iloa e au te tino
past know Agmker lstsing art man
The man was known by me

(6.22b) na koo iloa te tino
past lstsing know art man
The man was known by me / I knew the man

(6.22c) na koo iloa -gia te tino
The man was known by me/ I knew the man

(6.23a) na kitea e au te kulii
past see Agmker lstsing art dog
The dog was seen by me

(6.23b) na koo kitea te kulii
past lstsing see art dog
The dog was seen by me / I saw the dog
(6.23c) na koo kitea -gia te kulii
The dog was seen by me / I saw the dog

With this set of verbs, suffixation is optional with embedded agent pronouns. Again this is not inconsistent with Hohepa's hypothesis in that the optional status of the suffixes with these three verbs might be interpreted as the first step towards their becoming optional with all transitive verbs in Tokelauan, and towards their ultimate outright loss. However, this interpretation is not required by the facts available to us.

6.2.5 REINTERPRETATION OF PASSIVE SENTENCES AS ACTIVE SENTENCES

Hohepa (1969, p.314) suggests this as the typical direction of 'drift' in Polynesian languages: following the loss of the -(C)(i)a suffix and the loss of the active accusative counterparts of agentive constructions there is a reinterpretation of the former passive sentence as active. Hale (1968, b) states that the passive suffix in Tongan has assumed a new function, that of marking transitivity.¹

Hypotheses about 'active' and 'passive' interpretations are difficult to prove for the want of any established semantic tests. None of the three previous writers tell us how we know a sentence is interpreted 'actively'.

¹ Lynch disputes this last claim (1972, p.9) and maintains that 'i still marks the passive voice in Tongan.
With Tokelauan it is certainly difficult to establish whether there has been some reinterpretation such that formerly passive sentences are now active. However, we may note that sentences of the type (6.21c), (6.22c) and (6.23c) above (which have an embedded pronoun), have been given two distinct English translations, one in the passive and the second in the active voice. This has been done largely because there is some reason to believe that the native speaker of Tokelauan, by embedding the agent pronoun in the verb. This appears to give the sentence an 'active' meaning. Evidence supporting this theory comes mostly from the discourse circumstances in which the Tokelauan speakers use the embedded pronoun form.

When the agentive phrase containing a noun is permuted to sentence initial position where it is the 'focus' of the sentence, there is a copying rule which requires that the pronoun coreferential with the focused noun be embedded in the VP.

For example, when the agentive phrase of sentence (6.24) is focused as in (6.25), a pronominal copy of the noun is obligatorily embedded in the verb phrase. That is, since pronoun embedding is a requirement for agentive phrase focusing where the NP of the agentive (and correspondingly the coreferent pronoun) are brought into focus, it may well be that all instances of pronoun embedding (as in (6.21c), (6.22c) and (6.23c) bring the pronoun into focus (within the sentence meaning) and imply the active voice.
(6.24) na tiaki e tiimi te palumagoo
past discard Agmker name art shark sp.
The shark was discarded by Tiimi

(6.25) ko tiimi na ia tiaki
spec p.name past 3rdSing discard
-gia te palumagoo
It was Tiimi who discarded the shark sp.

6.2.6 SUMMARY

Our discussion in this section has shown that Tokelauan possesses both active and passive verbs in terms of the definitions provided in 6.2.1 and 6.2.2. Examples were provided to show that: (1) suffixation is not a regular feature of Tokelauan passive verbs. (2) However, a form of suffixation still exists as a productive process in association with pronoun embedding. (3) There are some other relics of PPN -(C)(l)a suggesting that at an earlier stage in the development of Tokelauan this suffix regularly appeared on some or all passive verbs. (4) While there may also have been a loss of active accusative uses of some verbs in Tokelauan, we found no compelling evidence to support Hohepa's claim that passive sentences without active counterparts are now interpreted as active sentences.
6.2.7 REJECTING TRANSITIVITY AND THE PASSIVE TRANSFORMATION

(a) SUBJECTS, OBJECTS AND TRANSITIVITY

Following the example of Aspects, Hohepa and Lynch appear to define 'subject of a verb' as the NP-of-S, and 'direct object' as the NP-of-VP, on the assumption that the immediate constituents of S are an NP and a Predicate Phrase, and one immediate constituent of the Predicate Phrase is a VP which contains the verb plus one NP.

This procedure does not solve the problem of identifying subject and direct objects. It simply replaces it with the problem of determining the constituent structure of sentences. Like many linguists, Hohepa and Lynch simply equate NP-of-S with actor-of-verb. Similarly, NP-of-VP is equated with the goal or patient of the action. The confusions resulting from this procedure have been demonstrated by Biggs (1974). In the following discussion of 'subject', 'object' and transitivity in Tokelauan I present certain views quite similar to those of Biggs. Our positions were arrived at independently, though reinforced by several conversations.

In the phrase structure rules posited in Chapter 3, the subject constituent is identified as the unmarked and obligatory NP in a sentence. In some sentences this NP is the actor of the verb, in some it is the goal, in others it is the entity in the state denoted by the (stative) verb.

There is no direct object constituent or relation.
The constituent 'proposition' is expanded into a number of Argument constituents (including verb), and a number of case constituents. The latter are each expanded into a case marker plus an NP. No one case is analysed as having an especially close grammatical association with the verb (i.e. as being the NP-of-VP or direct object).

The absence of a direct object means of course that transitivity in its traditional narrow grammatical sense is also absent. We are free to redefine a transitive sentence as any sentence with a case constituent other than subject. We could also define a transitive verb more narrowly, as any verb which can occur in a sentence with a nominal marking actor and a nominal marking goal - or formally, as any verb which can take Subject NP plus an Agent NP or a Subject NP plus a Descriptive Case NP. But these definitions are of no particular value in a grammar of Tokelauan. For a discussion of the reasons for doing away with the concept of 'direct object' see 4.1.

(b) **REJECTING THE PASSIVE TRANSFORMATION**

One reason for recognising a direct object relation in some languages is that the passive transformation must be formulated as applying to the NP-of-VP. Only NP-of-VP can be promoted to the surface subject under passivisation. Along with transitivity our analysis of Tokelauan also dispenses with the passive transformation.
There are only two obligatory constituents in both active and in passive constructions in Tokelauan: subject and verb. Other constituents, such as NP marking goal, agent, time, location etc., are optional and structurally peripheral. Passives are not derivable from active structures in the present analysis. Rather, active and passive sentences of Tokelauan are generated independently by the Phrase Structure Rules. This treatment leaves few problems, because most verbs can occur only with an actor-subject or only with a goal-subject. Only a very few verbs can occur in both active and passive sentences (see 6.5). The passive uses of such verbs are easily handled as the result of lexical derivations.

In the case of languages usually considered to have a productive passive transformation, such an analysis would obviously require stronger justification. Nevertheless, I would extend the treatment of Tokelauan passives as lexically-derived to a language such as Maori, though a full account of the arguments cannot be given here. Basically, I would argue that in Maori we are dealing with an almost fully productive process of lexical derivation, which is possibly developing into a true syntactic transformation. A syntactic passive transformation incorrectly treats active and passive sentences as semantically equivalent and functionally interchangeable. However, there is apparently a slight meaning difference between many active and passive verbs in Maori (see Clark 1973b), the use of passives being reminiscent of the perfective or durative aspect associated with 'passives' in Samoan (Milner 1973) and Tongan (Churchward 1953).
Such a transformation also misleads in presenting active and passive sentences as basically tripartite in structure - assigning equal status to the agent of the verb and the goal. Whereas only the goal is conceptually and grammatically basic in passives and only the actor is basic in active constructions. The basis of the voice contrast is the distinction between actor-subject and goal-subject. This distinction can be handled satisfactorily by derivational rules of the sort already required in the grammar of Maori. (Compare the productive rule which derives universal verbs from stative verbs by prefixing whaka-.) Historically, the division between verb stems that are inherently goal-subject and actor-subject-selecting, is an ancient one in Oceanic languages (see Pawley 1973, Biggs 1974), and the active-passive 'transformation' displayed by Maori and its congener is arguably grafted onto this original division between verb classes.

6.3 A FUNCTIONAL ANALYSIS OF CASE CATEGORIES AND VERB CLASSIFICATION IN TOKELAUAAN

This section examines the semantic (functional) notions associated with the categorial constituent structural analysis of the Tokelauan sentence provided in Chapter 4. In particular, the case categories which were established on formal grounds are examined in terms of their 'case relations' or 'participant roles'. The main result of this analysis is a classification of verbs based
on the selectional restrictions between cases and verbs. The earlier subsections of 6.3 are concerned primarily with distinguishing Stative, Active and Passive verbs.

6.3.1 STATIVE VERBS AND CASE

While most authorities agree that statives are a distinct class of verbs in all Polynesian languages, finding satisfactory formal criteria to define a class of stative verbs in Polynesian languages has long been a problem. Descriptions until recent times have generally appealed at least partly to meaning to delimit this verb class. Biggs comments:

"Statives have always been distinguished from other verbs by Polynesianists because of a semantic difference in the relationship between the verb and a nominal phrase initiated by a particle which is a reflex of *PPN *tì. After other verbs, *tì marks the goal of the action, but following a stative verb it marks the cause or agent of the state indicated by the verb."

Biggs, 1974:408

Hohepa (1969 : 303), provides a functional definition:

"...members of the verb class identified as Statives [in Polynesian] are inherently passive....". Reviewing statives within the framework of accusative structure, Lynch writes:
"... Stative verbs may be accounted for within this accusative framework, not by assigning to them a feature + passive, but rather by obligatorily marking them as taking unspecified agents, thus explaining why they always act passively in surface structures."

Lynch, 1972 : 16

The following sentences show the stative verb huhuu 'wet' in Tokelauan.

(6.26) kua_huhuu     te_kie
perf. wet       art garment
The garment is wet

(6.27) kua_huhuu     te_kie     i_te_tino
perf. wet       art garment   prep art man
The garment was wet by the man

(6.28) kua_huhuu     te_kie     i_te_ua
perf. wet       art garment   prep art rain
The garment was wet by the rain
Stative verbs can occur with the prefix faka- 'causative', in which event the meaning is modified, the verb is transformed into a passive verb and accordingly acquires the case-combinatorial possibilities of all passive verbs. (Examples of sentences with the passive verb faka-huhuu are (6.29), (6.30) and (6.31), below.)

In (6.26) the verb huhuu occurs with the NP te kie which is the subject of the sentence. The only additional NPs which can occur with stative verbs are those of the type i NP (in the formally delimited Descriptive Case) as illustrated by (6.27) and (6.28). These i NP sequences which can co-occur with stative verbs (i te tino in (6.27) and i te ua in (6.28)), have been glossed quite differently by various linguists. A common view is that described above by Biggs where the preposition i marks the 'actor' or 'causative agent' of the verb.

This claim is disputed according to the following arguments. IN (6.27) and (6.28) the prepositional phrase introduced by i appears to express an agent: te tino 'the man', in (6.27) and te ua 'the rain', in (6.28). By contrast, in (6.29) the agent of the verb faka-huhuu 'to be made wet' is introduced by the particle e.

(6.29) Kua faka - huhuu te kie e te tino
perf.causative wet art garment by art man
The garment was wet by the man

Do we have two agent markers? In (6.30) we find both i- and e- phrases in the same sentence:
(6.30) kua faka - huhuu te kie e te tino
perf. causative wet art garment by art man
i te ua
prep art rain

The garment was wet by the man in/with the rain.

Here it is apparent that e marks animate agent, while i introduces te ua 'rain', a natural force, and as it is impossible to interchange e with i in (6.30), we can conclude that i marks instrument rather than an agent. Similarly we find (6.31) is good, but (6.32) is ungrammatical.

(6.31) kua faka - huhuu te kie i te ua
perf. causative wet art garment prep art rain

The garment was wet by the rain

(6.32) *kua faka - huhuu te kie e te ua
perf. causative wet art garment by art rain

What, then, of (6.27) where i te tino appears to be the agent? I suggest that (6.27) have a verb huhuu which cannot take an agent, and that i here marks the instrument or cause.

At this point we may note that all e NP sequences do function semantically as the agent of the verb. Only animate agents may occur with the preposition e, and only verbs denoting actions and processes, rather than states, can take an agent introduced by e.
If we consider the semantic proposition being discussed in (6.28) (6.30) and (6.31), we see that the role of the rain \textit{te}\_{ua}\textit{ is the same in all instances. That is, the rain got onto the garment and caused it to be wet. If the reference is to the same physical process in all three sentences, it seems unjustified to consider the rain as the agent in (6.28), but as the instrument or cause in (6.30) and (6.31) simply because an animate agent is also present in (6.30) and (6.31).

Now consider (6.33), (6.34) and (6.35):

\begin{align*}
\text{(6.33) } & \\ & kua\_ faka\_ pukupuku \te_{laakau} e\_ au \\
& \text{perf. causative - short art stick by prn.} \\
& i\_\_ te\_ toki \\
& \text{prep art axe} \\
& \text{The stick was shortened by me with the axe}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{(6.34) } & \\ & kua\_ kave\_ naa\_ hua \quad i\_\_ te\_ vaka \\
& \text{perf. take art drinking nut prep art canoe} \\
& e\_\_ te\_ tino \\
& \text{by art man} \\
& \text{The drinking nuts were taken by the man on the canoe}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{(6.35) } & \\ & na\_ kai \te_{uto} \quad i\_\_ te\_ hiipuni \\
& \text{past eat art coconut apple prep art spoon}
\end{align*}
e te tino
Agmker art man

The coconut apple was eaten by the man with a spoon

These sentences seem to confirm our suspicion that i te tino and i te ua in (6.27) and (6.28) mark instrument. If this were the case we could make the generalisation that with both passive verbs and statives i marks the instrumental case. But this claim may be challenged by consideration of the following sentences both of which contain stative verbs.

(6.36) kua puli t-oo igoa i te tino
perf.forgot poss. prn name prep art man

Your name was forgotten by the man

(6.37) kua galo te tupe i te tino
perf.lost art money prep art man

The money was lost by the man

The English translations of (6.36) and (6.37) imply that i te tino is the agent and indeed it was actually the man who did the forgetting in (6.36), and the losing in (6.37). Now, in the earlier discussion of (6.28) and (6.30), it was established that agents of passive verbs are marked by e not i. For a stative verb to take an agent in e it was necessary for the prefix faka- to be added, transforming the stative to a passive verb. It may be then that statives are incapable of taking agents, and that translations of (6.36) and (6.37) are misleading. The question arises whether a semantic contrast exists distinguishing i te tino as 'agent' of a stative sentence and e te tino as
agent of the corresponding passive sentence.

Before we take up this question, it will be helpful to examine the contrasting semantic relationships between the three main verb classes and the subject nominal.

6.3.2 ACTIVE AND PASSIVE VERBS

First let us consider verbal sentence-types other than those containing stative verbs. It was observed in the previous section that in sentences with e NP the verb denotes an action or process with the agent or actor in the agentive case (e NP). In such sentences it can be said that the verb is grammatically passive in that the actor or the agent is not the subject, while the NP which is the subject is the patient or goal of the action as shown in the configuration (6.38):

(6.38)  

| passive verb | goal-subject | (agent) |
| agent | e NP is optional. |

Many examples illustrating this configuration have been given, e.g. (6.29), (6.35). The arguments so far have been concerned with semantic relations. A first approximation at a formal definition of passive verb is:

(6.39)  

Any verb which may occur with the agentive phrase (marked by e) is a passive verb.

A different verb class is illustrated in (6.40), (6.41) and (6.42) below:

(6.40)  

| kua fano | te tino | i te vaka | ki te teine |
| go | the man | in the canoe | to the girl |

The man has gone on the canoe to the girl
(6.41) na kikila te tino i naa mata ki te ika
looked the man the glasses to the fish
The man looked at the fish with the glasses

(6.42) na nofo te tino i te nofoa
sat the man on the chair
The man sat on the chair

In each of the last three examples, the subject (as defined in chapter 4) is the actor, the performer of the action. The verbs in these examples represent a class which cannot take an agentive phrase (e.NP) to mark actor. As they always take an actor-subject, they are appropriately called active verbs. Configuration (6.43) shows the pertinent functional relations in active sentence types:

(6.43) active verb actor-subject
: agent e.NP cannot occur.

A first approximation of a formal definition of an active verb is:

(6.44) Any verb which cannot occur with an agentive phrase (e.NP) is an active verb

6.3.3 A DEFINITION OF STATIVES:

Having proposed active and passive sentence configurations, we may now return to stative verbs. Sentences (6.28) and (6.36) are repeated below:
(6.28)  kua  huhuu   te  kie   i  te  ua

The garment was wet by the rain

(6.36)  kua  puli   too  igoa   i  te  tino

your name  was forgotten  by the man

It was established that  i  te  ua  in (6.28) was not an agentive phrase, and that stative verbs do not allow  e  NP agentive phrases to co-occur. In this last respect statives resemble active verbs. But we must now note that the subjects of (6.28) and (6.36) appear to be in a "patient" relationship with the verb: in this respect statives resemble passive verbs. The formal definition of active verbs given in (6.44) is now a problem since it also applies to stative verbs, and it is apparent that stative verbs can be distinguished in functional terms from both active and passive verbs.

An obvious semantic explanation for the fact that statives cannot take agents is: stative verbs may resemble passives in that their subject is the patient, but they cannot take a  e  NP phrase denoting an actor or dynamic agent, because they do not denote an action but rather a state. Attempts to assign an agent of actor reading to  i  NP causal complements of stative verbs have been misguided - the result of influence of English translations on the analysis of Polynesian sentences. A translation which is awkward but accurately represents the sense of (6.28) would be: "the cloth has become in a wet state, due to the rain". For (6.36) the translations would be: "your name is in a forgotten state, due to the man".
Evidence supporting this interpretation of statives as depicting a state instead of an action comes from the use of verbs in the imperative. The imperative voice requires that the verb of command should express an action. Statives cannot be used in the imperative. Both active and passive verbs, on the other hand, may be used imperatively as illustrated in the following examples:

(6.45) \[ \text{fano} \quad \text{ki te falefono} \]
active verb DirCase
Go to the meeting house!

(6.46) \[ \text{kave} \quad \text{te puha} \quad \text{ki gaauta} \]
take the box inland
passive V subject DirCase
Carry the box inland!

(6.47) \[ \text{*puli} \quad \text{te igoa} \]
forget deaising name
stative subject

(6.48) \[ \text{*huhuu} \quad \text{te kie} \]
dry deaising garment
stative subject
In terms of the formal distribution of verbs, the imperative now provides a distinction between active and stative verbs.\(^1\) Active verbs can occur in an imperative construction while statives cannot.

The formal criteria for distinguishing the verb types of Tokelauan are shown in Chart (6.49):

(6.49) *Syntactic privileges defining verb-types*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERB-CLASS</th>
<th>Agentive Phrase</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stative</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, the problem still remains of how to treat the \(_i\) NP sequences of sentences containing stative verbs. This can be discussed if we reclassify the verb types in Tokelauan, not according to the additional phrases which may occur with the verb and the subject, but rather according to the functional relationship between the subject and the verb.

---

1. The use of the imperative for distinguishing formally between active and stative verbs was used by Biggs (1974: 408) in a discussion of Futuman and other Polynesian languages. A similar is made for Fijian by Pawley (1973 : 132), who observes, however, that *most, but not all* active verbs of the ‘optional transitive’ class can imperativise in their simple unsuffixed form. It may be that this qualification applies to Polynesian active verbs.
6.3.4 VERB CLASSES IN TOKELAUAN: A FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION

In the previous sections an attempt, only partially successful, was made to formally distinguish three major verb classes in Tokelauan. In order to differentiate the stative class from the others, it appears that we need to incorporate functional criteria. Accordingly, a set of functional definitions follows.

Verbs in Tokelauan fall into three principal classes: passive, active and stative. These classes are distinguished by the following criteria:

(6.50) **Passive verbs**: Verbs denoting an action or a process which take a goal-subject (that is, verbs which hold a passive relationship with the subject).

(6.51) **Active verbs**: Verbs denoting an action or process which take an actor-subject (that is, verbs which hold an active relationship with the subject).

(6.52) **Stative verbs**: Verbs denoting a state of the subject.¹

---

¹ Since statives denote a state of the subject, rather than an action, consideration of whether statives take a goal-subject or actor-subject is unnecessary.
Minimal sentences containing these verb-types are listed below:

(6.53)  
\[ \text{kua}_kave \quad \text{te}_hua \]  
passive verb subject  
The drinking nut was taken/transported

(6.54)  
\[ \text{kua}_fano \quad \text{te}_tino \]  
active verb subject  
The man has gone/The man has left

(6.55)  
\[ \text{kua}_huhuu \quad \text{te}_kie \]  
stative subject  
The garment is wet (is in a wet state)

Correlations of the functional and formal criteria raises a number of issues, which we will take up in 6.4. Before attempting this task it is necessary to review the semantics and selectional restrictions of the case-markers.

6.3.5 THE MEANINGS AND SELECTIONAL RESTRICTIONS OF CASE-MARKERS

There are five cases in Tokelauan: Agentive, Origin, Directional, Descriptive and Explanatory. ¹

¹ In chapter 5, section 5.2.6 we suggested that Explanatory Case marker mo/ma is not a discrete underlying element, but is derived by transformation from either of two sources i and ki. However, since this case conforms to the above requirement of placing the NP in a particular descriptive relationship with the Argument, and since it also conforms to certain distributional privileges of other case categories such as permutations, it is convenient here to discuss it as though it had a status equal to the primary cases.
The respective markers for these cases are:

- **e**  Agentive
- **mai** Origin
- **ki** Directional
- **i** Descriptive
- **mo/ma** Explanatory

Co-occurrence privileges of cases with the verb types are shown below:

(6.56) **Co-occurrence of Verb Classes and Cases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>Agentive</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Directional</th>
<th>Descriptive</th>
<th>Explanatory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stative</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis proceeds on the assumption that each case holds a unique semantic relationship with the verb (where the argument is a verbal argument). That is, each case marker contains some semantic constant which characterises that particular case apart from the others. We turn now to the meanings of the case-markers.

The directional case marker **ki** contains the semantic constant 'direction', and is often accurately translated by English 'to' or 'towards'. It frequently introduces the goal of a verb of motion:
(6.57)  kua _fano  te _tino  ki _te _fenua  
went  the man  the island  
verb  subject  DirCase  
The man has gone to the island.

(6.58)  kua _kave  te _hua  ki _te _teine  
transported  the coconut  the girl  
verb  subject  DirCase  
The coconut was taken to the girl.

(6.59)  *kua _nofo  te _tino  ki _te _nofoa  
sat  the man  the seat  
verb  subject  DirCase  
The man sat to the seat.

Thus Tokelauans do not speak of 'a man sitting to a seat', but rather 'on a seat', with a descriptive case complement, as in (6.60) below:

(6.60)  kua _nofo  te _tino  i _te _nofoa  
sat  the man  the seat  
verb  subject  DescrCase  
The man sat on the seat.

The verbs _fano and _kave each contain the semantic component of 'directional action' and therefore can co-occur with the directional case.
nofo does not contain this component, and cannot occur with ki.

The foregoing discussion shows that chart (6.56) is insufficient and misleading. It shows only which cases may occur with the various verb classes. For example, active verbs are marked + for directional case and this is shown in (6.57). But the active verb nofo, 'to sit' among many others, cannot co-occur in the sentence with the directional case.

Further examples (not given here) reveal that other positive specifications on chart (6.56) are in fact negative for some verbs. This means that in the first place, only the negative specifications on (6.56) are absolutely correct; and secondly that verbs are subclassified by their co-occurrence privileges with the cases, quite independently of the active-passive -stative classification.

An adequate description of the semantics of verb classes therefore, must contain at least two parts. Verbs are subclassified by:

(a) the functional relationship between the subject and the verb (into active, passive or stative verbs) and

(b) an inherent list of semantic features (which select certain cases which my co-occur).

The semantic constant contained by the Explanatory, case markers mo/ma was shown in 5.2.6 to be that denoting 'explanation', 'benefit' of 'purpose'.
The Agentive case marker, as already noted in this analysis, denotes the animate 'agent' or 'actor'. The restriction of this case type to occurrence with passive verbs only is logical since stative verbs denote states rather than actions, and since with active verbs the semantic notion 'actor' is contained in the subject.

With the Origin case marker mai the semantic constant is 'source' or 'origin' as illustrated by (6.61):

(6.61) \[ \text{na hau} \quad \text{te teine} \quad \text{mai fakaofa} \]

verb \hspace{1cm} subject \hspace{1cm} OrigCase

The girl came from Fakaofa.

6.3.6 THE DESCRIPTIVE CASE

The Descriptive case has a wider range of meaning than the other cases. An examination of the functional relationship of the Descriptive case with the verb suggests that in English this case is subdivided by the use of different English prepositions into several cases. Sentences (6.62 - 6.67) illustrate the Descriptive case in Tokelauan.

(6.62) \[ \text{na hawali} \quad \text{te tino} \quad \text{i} \quad \text{te auala} \]
past walk \hspace{1cm} art man \hspace{1cm} Descrmker art road

The man walked along the road.

(6.63) \[ \text{na miha} \quad \text{na fafine} \quad \text{i} \quad \text{taii} \]
past fight \hspace{1cm} def.pl woman \hspace{1cm} Descrmker place

The women fought at Taii.
(6.64) na ako te teine i te hiva
past learn defsing girl Descrmker defsing dance
e te tino
Agmker defsing man
The girl was taught (about) the dance by the man

(6.65) kua huhuu te kie i te tino
perfect wet defsing garment Descrmker defsing man
The garment was wet by the man

(6.66) na kai e te tino te meakai
past eat Agmker defsing man defsing food
i te hiipuni
Descrmker defsing spoon
The food was eaten by the man with a spoon

(6.67) na kai te pepe i te popo
past eat defsing baby Descrmker defsing coconut flesh
The baby ate (of) the coconut flesh

Because of the wide range of semantic relations marked by ḵ, the very general term 'descriptive case marker' has been chosen.¹

¹. Descriptive case marker ḵ is distinguished in the P.S.G. rules from a Locative Argument marker ḵ. Discussion supporting this distinction occurs in chapter 4, section, 4.6.
Essentially, ɪ introduces complements which describe circumstances associated with the action of state specified by the verb. The role relations marked by ɪ is variable, but the variation is predictable (up to certain limits) according to the semantic features and grammatical properties of the verb and the subject and descriptive case nominals.

With the exception of Hohepa (1967), who treats all occurrences of ɪ in Maori as manifesting a single morpheme, syntactic descriptions of Polynesian languages have generally recognised a number of distinct prepositions having the form ɪ. If we followed other analyses of Polynesian languages the preposition introducing the various ɪ NP sequences in (6.62 - 6.67) would receive a variety of formal and functional categorisations, such as 'locative marker', case-marker of 'direct object', 'indirect object' or 'instrument', 'agent marker', 'near-goal marker' and 'cause-marker'.

This wide range of interpretations can be attributed to a number of factors, besides the variations inherent in the use of ɪ. To begin with, variation between the various models has resulted in the use of sets of terms reflecting quite different conceptual frameworks. Secondly, the application to Polynesian languages of grammatical and functional terms which have been established as relevant for English has often obscured formal grammatical correspondences in the Polynesian languages. And thirdly, in transformational grammars, case-markers are sometimes not present in the phrase structure rules but are introduced by transformations to account for the diverse manifestations of certain NP.
For example, underlying subjects are transformed into surface agents by the conventional English passive transformation; the preposition by is introduced transformationally, not by the phrase structure rules. The cases which are delimited here for Tokelauan were established on formal criteria. With the exception of the explanatory case constituent, as noted earlier, each formally distinct case is treated as a deep structure category.

We can illustrate the variant functions of i, as well as the predictable nature of the variation, by considering sentences (6.68), (6.69) and (6.70).

(6.68)  kua huhuu te kie i te ua
         was wet       the garment      the rain

         The garment was wet by the rain

(6.69)  kua kai te tino i te falaoa
         eaten         the man         the bread

         The man ate (of) the bread

(6.70)  kua fakauliuli too kili i te laa
         Your skin was blackened by the sun
In sentence (6.68), the sequence i  te  ua is in the Descriptive case. It denotes the 'source' or 'cause' of the garment's wetness. With stative verbs, like huhuu, i can only mark source, cause or location. With an argument like te ua 'the rain' these are non-distinct in Tokelauan. To be wet in the rain is to be wet because of the rain.

Sentence (6.69) contains the sequence i  te  falaoa. Here the descriptive case denotes what the man ate. With active verbs, like kai, i denotes either location or the range of functions implied by the term 'goal' or 'patient'. Again, these are arguably non-distinct roles in Tokelauan. With a verb like nofo 'sit' (see (6.60)), the place that is sat on is both the location and patient. With a verb like kai 'eat' (in 6.69) te falaoa 'the bread' is predictably the patient or goal, since te tino is the actor-subject.

In (6.70) the sequence i  te  laa marks the non-animate source of the 'blackening of the skin'. The subject of (6.70) is a goal-subject, and the verb is passive, hence the non-animate cause must be stated in the Descriptive case. Compare (6.71) which has a human agent, necessarily marked by e.

(6.71) kua fakaauliuli too kili e  te  tino
blackened your skin the man
Your skin was blackened by the man
With passive verbs as with statives, it may be interpreted as marking source/cause or location. In the case of te laa, 'the sun' in (6.70) the two cases are probably non-discrete. That is, to be blackened in the sun is also to be blackened because of the sun.

6.3.7 SUMMARY

The main points which have been established in the discussion of 'case-meaning' are listed below.

Cases for Tokelauan which were distinguished in chapter 4 on strictly formal evidence, have also been differentiated on functional grounds. Verbs are sub-classified as either passive, active or stative verbs by formal criteria on the one hand, and by functional considerations on the other. Verbs are further sub-classified by their co-occurrence privileges with the case categories.

6.4 FUNCTIONAL VS. FORMAL CRITERIA FOR LANGUAGE DESCRIPTION

The analysis so far has presented both functionally - and formally-based interpretations of the structure of Tokelauan sentences. Both formal and functional evidence have come strictly from the Tokelauan examples cited in this analysis, rather than from appeal to a priori arguments or general theoretical principles deriving from work on other languages. That is, all category symbols such as NP, Article, Argument, Subject etc are defined with reference to formal criteria exhibited in Tokelauan, and, similarly, functional concepts like Case, Argument, Subject, Passive, etc. are defined with
reference to semantic and formal features distinguishable in the data. Thus the analysis is really two analyses; it can be discussed in terms of formal evidence or in terms of functional evidence. Ideally, formal and functional criteria should independently yield the same grammatical categories, and we have proceeded on the assumption that this is so. In practice, however, there are often difficulties in correlating formal and functional categories, as illustrated by the discussion of verb classifications.

I propose now to extend the discussion to a brief consideration of the relative status of syntax and semantics in language use and linguistic analysis. For example, the question arises whether verbs are classified syntactically (by the language user) by the presence or absence of certain syntactic cases in the sentence, and by use in certain syntactic environments (such as in the imperative); or whether they are classified by the functional relationship between the subject and the verb (into passive, active and stative verbs), and an inherent list of semantic features (which select which case categories may and may not co-occur).

I take the generative semanticist's position that meaning is primary and form is secondary in the grammar - in the linguist's grammar and in the native speaker's grammar which the former tries to describe. In this model, therefore, the functional classification of verbs is regarded as a correct interpretation of the 'native speaker's intuition' on how he perceives language. The syntactic verb classified merely provides the 'rules' for the expression of the notions already selected in the native speaker's mind using functional
criteria. Some discussion on this point follows:

In the first place the minimal forms of Tokelauan verbal sentences contain the constituents Argument and Subject. If the verb contained in the Argument is to be selected by formal criteria, this means that the cases which provide this classification have been deleted. That is, the formal definition of a passive verb is any verb which may take the gentive case (an e IP)

Thus one is left with the assumption that in instances of sentences containing the two constituents argument (with a passive verb) and subject, this verb was selected by the presence in the sentence of an agentive case constituent, which must have been subsequently deleted.

Under the formal definition, passive verbs are selected by criteria which may not even be in the sentence, unless these criteria are posited as being present for the verb selection and then deleted.

A second objection to the formal classification as being relevant to the native speaker's selection of the verb classes, is the use of 'negative' criteria for verb selection. Stative verbs are distinguished formally from active verbs by the formal 'fact' that statives never occur in the imperative. This does not provide satisfactory evidence for the selection of the stative verb in the environments in which it can occur. For example, sentence (6.72) has a stative verb, while (6.73) has an active verb, but both appear structurally 'identical'.
(6.72) kua puli too igoa i (a) te au
perf.forgot your name prep listsing
V argument subject DescrCase
Your name is forgotten to me

(6.73) na nofo te tino i te nofoa
past sit art man prep art seat
V argument subject DescrCase
The man sat on the chair

Thus, the formal distinction between stative and active verbs does not account for the selection of the stative verb in (6.72), since sentences (6.72) and (6.73) have nothing whatsoever to do with the imperative.

Negative criteria are also used in the formal distinction between active and passive verbs. Active verbs are defined as that verb which can occur in the imperative, and which cannot take the agentive case. Such a formal definition does not distinguish (6.73) from (6.74) below, which has a passive verb but which appears structurally identical to both (6.73) and (6.72).

(6.74) kua kave naa popo i te lualua
perf take art coconuts prep art ship
V argument subject DescrCase
The coconuts were transported by ship
It is provided as an illustration of the earlier discussion of both case-meaning and verb-classification.

Verbs are inherently marked for certain semantic features which enable them to select certain 'case' material with which they may co-occur. These semantic features of verbs and the relevant cases which they select are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic feature of verb</th>
<th>Case selected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Origin</td>
<td>Origin Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>Explanatory Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction</td>
<td>Direction Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>Agentive Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Descriptive Case</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All active and passive verbs in Tokelauan are marked for the features description and explanation and consequently all of these verbs can take both the descriptive and explanatory cases.

All stative verbs are marked for the feature Description. In 5.2.6 it was argued that the Explanatory case is a subcase of both, derived from either the Descriptive case, or the Direction case. In instances where a verb is not marked for the feature Direction, the derivation of the possible Explanatory case constituent can be traced back to the Descriptive case.
The analysis in the phrase structure rules of the major constituents of S provides a further argument supporting a functional classification of verbs. Both the verb (contained in the verbal argument) and the subject are obligatory constituents of S. The cases which are definitive for the verb classes in a formal classification were marked as optional constituents. This means that all verb classes can occur formally in minimal sentence forms without any of the cases. Such a feature requires that verbs be classified at the 'two constituent' level (verb-subject), and that verb-classification not rely upon optional criteria. The functional classification does operate at this level, the formal classification cannot.

Also, the functional analysis of S revealed that the central 'idea' of the proposition was expressed in the verb, while the cases simply modified this idea by supplying extra information. Thus in functional terms the case information is peripheral, an optional addition to the information contained in the verb. One would therefore expect the verb (the obligatory and nuclear element in the proposition) to select the additional case information and not vice versa. Such is the case in a functionally-based classification of verbs.

6.5 VERB TYPES IN TOKELAUN

This section lists a number of verbs with sentence examples and other information concerning their use and classification.
English translations of Tokelauan sentences are given a literal rather than an idomatic rendering, in an attempt to stay close the structure of the Tokelauan originals.

Verb I  \[\text{fano}\] 'to go' \hspace{2cm} \text{(singular)}

+ Active  + Explanation  + Description  + Direction  + Origin

- Passive  

- Stative

(6.75) \[\text{na } \text{fano} \hspace{0.5cm} \text{te teine} \hspace{0.5cm} \text{mai te fale} \hspace{0.5cm} \text{ki te tai}\]

past go  subject  OrigCase  DirectCase

The girl went from the house to the sea

(6.76) \[\text{na } \text{fano} \hspace{0.5cm} \text{te teine} \hspace{0.5cm} \text{i te vaka} \hspace{0.5cm} \text{mo te galuega}\]

went  subject  DescrCase  ExplCase

The girl went in the canoe to work

Verb 2  \[\text{nofo}\] 'to sit, stay' \hspace{2cm} \text{(pl. nonofo)}

+ Active  + Explanation  + Description

- Passive  

- Stative
(6.77) na nofo te tino i te nofoa
sat subject DescrCase
The man sat upon the chair

(6.78) na nofo te tino i te fenua mo te galuega
stayed subject DescrCase ExplanCase
The man stayed on the island to work

Verb 3 taakele 'to wash (of the body), to bathe' (pl. taakekle)
+ Active, +Explanation +Description + Origin + Direction
- Passive
- Stative

(6.79) na taakele te tino ki te lotu
bathed subject DirCase
The man washed for Church

(6.80) na taakele te teine mai pataliga
bathed subject OrigCase
The girl washed at Pataliga

(6.81) na taakele naa tamaiti mo te kaiga i te namo
washed Subject ExplanCase DescrCase
The children washed for the feast in the lagoon
Verb 4  

miha  'to fight' 

+ Active  
+ Explanation  + Description  + Direction  + Origin  

- Passive  

- Stative  

(6.82)  

na _ miha  

naa _ fafine  

i _ te _ auala  

fought  

subject  

DescrCase  

The women fought on the road  

(6.83)  

na _ miha  

naa _ fafine  

ki _ te _ tai  

mo _ te _ puaka  

fought  

subject  

DirectCase  

ExplanCase  

The women fought to the sea over the pig  

(6.84)  

na _ miha  

naa _ fafine  

mai _ te _ fale  

i _ te _ puaka  

fought  

subject  

OrigCase  

DescrCase  

The women fought from (in) the house about the pig  

Verb 5  

kave  'to transport, take somewhere'  

- Active  

+ Passive  
+ Explanation  + Description  + Origin  + Direction  + Agent  

- Stative  

(6.85)  

na _ kave  

te _ hua  

e _ te _ teine  

ki _ te _ tino  

took  

subject  

AgentCase  

DirCase  

The drinkingnut was taken by the girl to the man
The girl was taken on the canoe for the work

Verb 6

fooki 'to give, pass something'

- Active

+ Passive + Explanation + Description + Origin + Direction + Agent

- Stative

The coconut was given to the girl by me

The line was given out from the canoe for the fishing by me

Verb 7

huhuu 'to be wet'

- Active

- Passive

+ Stative + Description + Explanation
(6.89)  kua huhuu  te kie  i te tino
        was wet  subject  DescrCase

The garment was wet, due to the man

(6.90)  kua huhuu  naa laakau  mo te galuega
        was wet  subject  ExplCase

The logs were in a wet state for the work
(i.e. Too wet to be worked with)

The expression of the Explanatory case with stative verbs is
rare and possibly the result of a transformation. Sentence (6.90) is
arguable derived from (6.91) and (6.92) below.

(6.91)  kua huhuu  naa laakau
        was wet  subject

The logs were in a wet state

(6.92)  e  fai  naa laakau  ki  te galuega
        nonpast  to use  defpl  logs  for  art  work

The logs will be used for the work

Verb 8  galo 'forget'

- Active

- Passive

+ Stative + Description
(6.93)  kua galo  t-oo igoa  i a te au
forgot  subject  DescrCase

Your name is forgotten to me (I have forgotten your name).

Other examples of stative verbs include puli 'to forget', uliuli 'to be black', mamafa 'to be heavy', uma 'to finish', loa 'to belong' etc.

Verb 9  galo 'to lose, be lost'
+ Active  + Explanation + Description + Direction + Origin
+ Passive  + Explanation + Description + Agent
- Stative

(6.94)  kua galo  au  i tco tupe
lost  subject  DescrCase

I have lost your money

Verb 10  havalii 'to walk, be walked on, traversed'
+ Active  + Explanation + Description + Origin + Direction
+ Passive  + Description + Explanation + Agent
- Stative

(6.95)  na havalii  te tino  i te auala  ki te tale
walked  subject  DescrCase  DirCase

The man walked on the road to the house
(6.96) \text{na havali te auala e au} \\
walked on subject AgCase \\
The road was walked upon by me \\
The road was patrolled by me \\

The common usage of the verb \text{havali} is in the active voice. However, the passive usage in (6.96) emphasizes the fact that agent had previously been over or traversed that particular territory.

Verb 11 kai 'to eat, be eaten' \\
+ Active + Explanation + Description + Direction + Origin \\
+ Passive + Explanation + Description + Direction + Origin + Agent \\
- Stative \\

(6.97) \text{na kai te ika i te mounu} \\

eat subject Descriptive Case \\
The fish ate the bait / The fish ate of the bait \\

(6.98) \text{na kai te ika ki te mounu} \\

eat subject DirectionalCase \\
The fish ate the bait / The fish swam straight to the \\
bait and ate it
(6.99) \[ \text{na kai \te mounu \ e \te ika} \]

eat subject AgCase

The bait was eaten by the fish/The fish ate the bait

With the verb kai, there is no preferred usage. That is it is used equally in both the active and passive voices.

Verb 12 \[ \text{uku 'to dive, be dive for'} \]
+ Active \[ + \text{Explanation} + \text{Description} + \text{Direction} + \text{Origin} \]
+ Passive \[ + \text{Explanation} + \text{Description} + \text{Agent} \]
- Stative

(6.100) \[ \text{na uku \te tino \ i \te vai \ ki \te maamaa} \]

dived subject DescrCase DirectCase

The man dived for the ring in the water

(6.101) \[ \text{na uku \te maamaa \ e \te tino \ i \te vai} \]

dived subject AgCase DescrCase

The ring was dived for in the water by the man

The active use of the verb uku 'dive' is the most common

Verb 13 \[ \text{ako 'to learn, be learnt, taught'} \]
- Active
+ Passive \[ + \text{Explanation} + \text{Description} + \text{Origin} + \text{Direction} + \text{Agent} \]
- Stative
(6.102) na ako te hiva e te teine  
learnt subject AgCase  
The dance was learnt by the girl (The girl learnt the dance)

(6.103) na ako te teine i te hiva  
The girl learnt the dance  
The girl learnt about the dance  
The girl was taught the dance

(6.102) and (6.103) exhibit the same verb and the same two NPs but differ in case-marking. Apparently (6.103) conveys the active meaning of the verb ako; whereas in (6.102), te hiva 'the dance' is obviously the goal subject, since the actor is marked in the Agentive case. Since te teine 'the girl' is the subject, and te hiva 'the dance' is in the Descriptive case, and since this sentence also fits active sentence patterns, one is tempted to mark te teine 'the girl in (6.103), as the actor subject. Observe, however, that (6.103) can be expanded to incorporate an agentive phrase:

(6.104) na ako te teine i te hiva e te tino  
learnt subject DescrCase AgCase  
The girl was taught the dance by the man

This shows that the verb ako in (6.103) is a passive verb and te teine 'the girl' is the goal subject. There is no verb of equivalent semantic range in English, and we must make do with the multiple glosses 'to learn, be learnt, be taught'.
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This can be seen in (5.9) where \( a_i \) representing the descriptive case NP \( te_{hiipuni} \), is moved to a position in the sentence immediately after the verb \( kai \).

5.2.3 DIRECTION CASE FOCUS

When the NP of the Direction case constituent (DIRcase) is focused, what is left behind is \( ki_{ei} \), i.e. the Dirmarker \( ki \) + the proform \( ei \):

\[(5.10)a. \quad \text{modal VERBarg} \ X \ ki \ NP \ Y \ \text{Subject} \]
\[\Rightarrow b. \ ko \ NP \ \text{modal VERBarg} \ X \ ki \ ei \ Y \ \text{Subject} \]

Here we see that, in contrast to Descriptive case focusing, the proform which replaces the permuted NP is paired with the case marker, and is not required to follow the verb. The resultant sequence Dirmarker \( ei \) can permute freely with \( X \) and \( Y \) and Subject in the manner allowed by \( T_2 \) (Case scrambling transformation).

Direction case focusing is illustrated by (5.11), while (5.12), (5.13) and (5.14) provide other versions of (5.11) resulting from the application of the scrambling T-rule \( T_2 \).

\[(5.11)a. \quad na \ fano \ ki \ te \ fenua \ i \ te \ vaka \ te \ tino \]
The man went to the island on the canoe
\[\Rightarrow b. \ ko \ te \ fenua \ na \ fano \ ki \ ei \ i \ te \ vaka \ te \ tino \]
It was to the island that the man went on the canoe
(5.12) ko te fenua na fano te tino ki ei i te vaka

(5.13) ko te fenua na fano te tino i te vaka ki ei

(5.14) ko te fenua na fano ki ei te tino i te vaka

5.2.4 ORIGIN CASE FOCUS

Origin case behaves like Descriptive case. When the NP of Origin case is focused, the proform ai occurs after the verb and the Origin case marker (Origmarker) is deleted:

(5.15)a. modality VERBarg X Origmarker NP Y

⇒ b. ko NP modality VERBarg ai X Ø Y

This formal similarity between the descriptive and origin case focusing, is to some extent countered by the fact that the origin case constituent rarely occurs in the same simple sentence as the descriptive case constituent. Also, verbs which can take an origin case complement are few compared to those which are compatible with descriptive case and the other case types. They are restricted semantically to those containing some reference to an origin or previous location. For example, the English verb come has its Tokelauan equivalent in the two forms hau and omai. These verbs denote previous location in the sense that one must come from somewhere.

Sentence (5.16) contains both an origin case and a descriptive case constituent. Sentence (5.17) illustrates the focusing of the NP of the origin case, while in (5.18) the NP of the descriptive case
is focused.

(5.16)  na hau  te tino  mai te fenua  i te vaka
VERBarg  Subject  ORIGcase  DESCRcase
The man came from the island in a canoe

(5.17)  ko te fenua  na hau  ai te tino  i te vaka
It was the island from whence the man came in the canoe

(5.18)  ko te vaka  na hau  ai te tino  mai te fenua
It was in the canoe that the man came from the island

5.2.5  AGENTIVE CASE FOCUS

When the NP of the agentive case is focused, the already-discussed pronoun embedding (rule T3) is obligatory. In the manner of the other focus transformations, the permuted NP is paired with the specifying particle ko. Constituent change with agentive case focusing is shown in (5.19) below.

(5.19)a.  modal  VERBarg  X Agmker NP Y
\[\Rightarrow b. ko \quad NP \quad modal \quad [\text{pr}3] \quad VERBarg \quad Vsuf_2 \quad X \quad \emptyset \quad Y\]

When the permuted NP of the agentive case is a pronoun, pronoun embedding occurs exactly as shown in T3. When the NP of the agentive case is not a pronoun, that 3rd person pronoun which agrees in number with the agentive NP is embedded. For example, if the NP were naa tino 'the (several) men', the pronoun which would
be embedded is kilaatou, 3rd person plural. If naa tino referred to only two men, then the pronoun would be kilaa third person dual. If the NP of the agentive case were an individual personal name the pronoun would be ia, third person singular. These points are illustrated by (5.20-22).

(5.20)a.       na     kai  e    ia    te  meaika
             past  eat Agmker 3rdsing art fish
The fish was eaten by him

⇒ b. ko  ia   na  ia  kai  -a   Ø  te  meaika
     spec 3rdsing past 3rdsing    eat Vsuf\textsubscript{2} art fish
It was he who ate the fish

(5.21)a.       na     kave  te  hua   e  Fefilo\textsubscript{i}
The drinkingnut was taken (transported) by Fefilo\textsubscript{i}

⇒ b. ko  Fefilo\textsubscript{i}  na  ia  kave  -a   te  hua
It was Fefilo\textsubscript{i} who took the drinkingnut

(5.22)a.       na     tiaki  -gia  te  palumago  e  naa  tino
The shark was discarded by the men

⇒ b. ko  naa  tino  na  kilaatou  tiaki  -gia  te  palumago
It was the men who discarded the shark

5.2.6 EXPLANATORY CASE FOCUS

The preposition mo~ma marks what is here called the Explanatory case (EXPLcase). The semantics of this preposition
are discussed below. NPs of EXPLcase can also be focused:

\[(5.23)a\]
\[\text{na kakau mo te faituu te tino}\]

The man swam for the team

\[\Rightarrow b. \quad \text{ko te faituu na kakau ai te tino}\]

It was for the team that the man swam

In this example we see a formal likeness to DESCRcase focusing. The proform \textit{ai} appears immediately after the verb and the explanatory case marker is deleted. In fact, the products of the focusing transformations are identical for both cases. Compare sentence (5.24)a, which has a DESCRcase constituent that is focused in (5.24)b.

\[(5.24)a.\]
\[\text{na kakau i te faituu te tino}\]

The man swam for the team

\[\Rightarrow b. \quad \text{ko te faituu na kakau ai te tino}\]

It was for the team that the man swam

Comparing (5.23)a and (5.24)a, we see that they have the same translation in spite of the formal contrast between \textit{mo} and \textit{i}. Comparing (5.23)b and (5.24)b, we see that they are also formally identical.

These examples suggest that the case relationship (i.e. the semantic relation held between the VERBarg and the NP (as defined in 4.1.8) in (5.23)a is identical to that in (5.24)a.
The term 'descriptive case' was given to \textit{i-} NP complements because they cover such a variety of semantic notions. (The range of semantic notions covered by the preposition \textit{i} (of the descriptive case constituent) is discussed in detail in chapter 6, section 6.3.6). The particular notion covered by \textit{i te faituu} in (5.24)a, seems to be 'benefactive', but in other contexts \textit{i-} complements denote location, position, manner, agent and instrument.

Examine now example (5.25) below:

(5.25)a. \quad \text{na hau \, mo \, te galuega \, te tino}

The man came for/to work

\Rightarrow \quad \text{b. \, ko te galuega \, na hau \, ki \, ei \, te tino}

It was to work that the man came

Sentence (5.25)a, has an explanatory case constituent \textit{mo te galuega}, which expresses 'purpose'. When this phrase is focused the following changes occur: (a) the focused NP is paired with the specifying particle \textit{ko}; (b) \textit{ei} appears in place of the focused NP; (c) the case-marker \textit{mo} is replaced by \textit{ki}. \textit{ki} is the preposition which marks direction case NPs.

Compare now example (5.26), which illustrates direction case focusing.

(5.26)a

\quad \text{na hau \, ki \, te galuega \, te tino}

The man came for/to work

\Rightarrow \quad \text{b. \, ko te galuega \, na hau \, ki \, ei \, te tino}

It was to work that the man came
We see that the product of explanatory case focusing in (5.25)b, is identical to the product of direction case focusing (5.26)b. This is puzzling. Why should Explanatory case focusing produce two different kinds of structures when in each other case focusing produces only one? Why should the particle ki, which appears in the phrase structure rules as a marker for the Direction case, be inserted by a transformation to replace a different underlying case marker me/mo, the marker for Explanatory case?

While it is not uncommon to find two formally identical derived sentences with different structural histories, the meanings of such sentences will normally be different, that is, we will have an ambiguous form. In this case, we appear to have the same meaning, as well as the same form, derived from two different underlying structures. Some re-examination is in order, both of our assertions about the semantics of certain case-markers and of our ideas about the nature of case-marking systems in general.

In our earlier discussion the following semantic relationships were expressed by the case categories under consideration.
If we accept these semantic notions as being significant case relations in the language of Tokelauan, we are led to posit four cases underlying the three under discussion here, which have been posited in this analysis. This may be represented diagrammatically by (5.28) below.

The Direction case was set up on both semantic and formal grounds. On the semantic side, it was determined that certain \textit{ki NP} sequences denote the 'direction' of the act specified by the verb. The act is directed 'towards' or 'at' a goal or target.
This is most straightforward when motion is implied, but with non-motion verbs \( \text{ki} \) may indicate 'direction of attention'
e.g. \( \text{kikila ki} \) 'look at'.

The question now arises whether the 'purpose' relation is distinct from 'direction'. Clearly purpose action is goal-directed.

We find no semantic distinction between (5.24)a and (5.23)a. It follows that the particle \( \text{mo} \) must mark the same case relations as the descriptive case marker \( \text{i} \), in these examples. Similarly, if (5.26)a is equivalent to (5.25)a then \( \text{mo} \) must in this instance mark the case as the direction marker \( \text{ki} \). Since we know that \( \text{i} \) is distinct in form and function from \( \text{ki} \), we are tempted to analyse the problem as follows. \( \text{mo} \) is derived by transformation from Dirmker \( \text{ki} \) and Iscirmker \( \text{i} \), i.e. is a surface variant of these two particles. Under certain conditions underlying \( \text{i} \) and \( \text{ki} \) can each be replaced by \( \text{mo} \), namely in those contexts when \( \text{i} \) and \( \text{ki} \) have the case meaning 'Explanation, beneactive, purposive'.

Of course this simply creates a new problem. The T-rules must be sensitive to an underlying distinction between \( \text{i} \) and \( \text{ki} \) as 'Explanatory' case markers in certain contexts and as markers of
other case relations in other contexts. How can this be handled by a case model which assigns case-marking to single elements like \( i \) and \( ki \)? If the elements are not distinct the T-rules will not work. Normally the solution would be to distinguish \( i_1 \) from \( i_2 \) and \( ki_1 \) from \( ki_2 \). But this seems ad hoc and against our intuitions.

What may well be required is a revision of the original assumptions about the grammar of case, as advanced by Fillmore (1968) and later elaborated with changes of detail by him and others. One assumption has been that each distinguishable semantic role or case relations has the status of a prime in the grammar, i.e. is a distinct entity in the deep structure. It seems just as reasonable to assume that certain roles are non-distinct, non-contrastive, the semantic differences being either predictable because the roles are in complementary distribution for freely variant. This position is taken by Pawley and Reid (1976) for example, in a study of the development of case-marking in Austronesian languages. They state (p.24) that two semantically distinct roles are in complementary distribution when each occurs in a different grammatical environment. For example, "in Fijian, Agents occur as subject of agentive verbs and Experiencers occur as subject of psychological verbs; again, Instruments occur as direct object of instrumental verbs, while Concomitants and Causes occur as direct objects of psychological verbs. There is no overlap; the variation is
predictable, and thus one basic category (Actor in one case, Accessory in the other) will suffice instead of two. The differences can be 'read off' the wider syntactic context, the association of particular nominals, verbs and case-markers, rather than representing an ambiguity in the role structure of particular case-markers".

In these terms, our present problem is to isolate the variables which will allow us to predict the stated variations in the meaning of i on the one hand, and of ki on the other. I would expect the conditioning factors to be certain semantic features of verbs and nominals and their relations, but at present cannot state the conditions.

5.2.7 LOCATIVE ARGUMENT FOCUS

The focusing of the NP of Locative argument constituents was described in 4.6. This transformation was offered as proof for distinguishing between a Locative argument constituent and a Descriptive case constituent, both of which have the same surface structure _i NP. In focusing DESRcase NP the proform a_ replaces the fronted NP and the preposition i (Descrmker) is deleted, while in focusing LOCarg the proform a replaces the fronted NP of LOCarg and the preposition _i (Locmker) remains.

The structural changes in Locative Argument Focusing are stated in (5.29) and illustrated in (5.30).