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ABSTRACT

This thesis investigates sociolinguistic variation in the Fijian village of Waitabu. The aim is to investigate how particular uses, functions and varieties of language relate to social patterns and modes of interaction. The investigation focuses on the various ways of speaking which characterise the Waitabu repertoire, and attempts to explicate basic sociolinguistic principles and norms for contextually-appropriate behaviour. The general purpose is to explicate what the outsider needs to know to communicate appropriately in Waitabu community.

Chapter one discusses relevant literature and the theoretical perspective of the thesis. I also detail the fieldwork setting, problems and restrictions, and thesis plan.

Chapter two provides the necessary background information to this study, describing the geographical, demographical and sociohistorical setting. Description is given of the contemporary language situation, structure of Fijian (Bouma dialect), and Waitabu social structure and organisation.

In Chapter 3, the kinship system which lies at the heart of Waitabu social organisation, and kin-based sociolinguistic roles are analysed. This chapter gives detailed description of the kin categories and the established modes of sociolinguistic behaviour which are associated with various kin-based social identities.

Chapter 4 focuses on discourse of everyday life, dealing with the general rules and norms by which Waitabu individuals construct their everyday sociolinguistic behaviour including: male and female speech; greetings and leave-taking; deference and politeness markers; and conversational strategies.
Chapter 5 provides detailed investigation of the ceremonial speech event. This event is characterised by special rules of speech and nonverbal behaviour, and is distinguishable by clearly defined opening and closing sequences with set sequencing of components in between. The chapter describes the specific principles and norms governing the linguistic, social and kinesic behaviour.

In chapter 6, the decline of chiefly respect language is described. First, I detail distinguishing lexical, grammatical and speech act features of the speech style traditionally used towards the village chief. Then, I investigate the loss of these specific rules and norms in contemporary Waitabu, exploring factors in this change.

Chapter 7 gives detailed description of dialect levelling evident in Waitabu. The various dialect varieties and their domains are described. Language attitudes and factors conducive to dialect shift are also investigated. Then follows analysis of how individuals creatively use these dialect differences in constructing their sociolinguistic behaviour, to mark certain contexts and role-relationships as distinct. Focus is on the specific rules and norms for sociolinguistic behaviour in the netball peer-group and in interaction with Indians.

Chapter 8 investigates the special patterns of language use which characterise two institutionalised modes of communication in Waitabu society - religion and education.

Chapter 9 gives a summary of the Waitabu investigation.
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Orthography

The Boumān dialect of Fijian has 20 consonant and 5 vowel phonemes. In this thesis, these are represented by the standard orthography which was devised by the early missionaries and has been in use ever since. The consonant phonemes are shown below. The square brackets are phonetic values in terms of the International Phonetic Alphabet where they differ from the orthographic symbol.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSONANT PHONEMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nasal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiceless stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prenasalised stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prenasalised trill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced fricative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiceless fricative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiceless affricate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lateral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>semi-vowel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The five-vowel system is:

- **front unrounded**: i, u
- **back rounded**: o

Vowel length is indicated by a macron. In certain fossilised ceremonial
utterances and chiefly greetings, the vowel sound is extremely long, (drawn out for stylistic effect). To indicate such length, the vowel and macron are reduplicated thus: ēē dīna “it is so” (fossilised ceremonial utterance).

For further details of the phonology of the Boumān dialect, see Dixon (forthcoming: chapter 2).
## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>transitive subject function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASP</td>
<td>aspect marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Boumān dialect of Fijian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.V.K.</td>
<td>Bouma Va'a-kā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cakaudrove dialect of Fijian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.F.</td>
<td>Colloquial Fijian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLL</td>
<td>collective prefix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>complement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONJ</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COORD</td>
<td>coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du</td>
<td>dual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXC</td>
<td>exclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCL</td>
<td>exclamation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HABIT</td>
<td>habitual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>indirect object function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCL</td>
<td>inclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENS</td>
<td>intensifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKR</td>
<td>marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nominaliser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>transitive object function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pa</td>
<td>paucal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART</td>
<td>particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>polite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREP</td>
<td>preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRES</td>
<td>present tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDUP</td>
<td>reduplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>intransitive subject function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.F.</td>
<td>Standard Fijian dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOFT</td>
<td>&quot;softening&quot; particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEC</td>
<td>specifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANS</td>
<td>transitive suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBZR</td>
<td>verbalizer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map 1: The Fiji Islands
Map 2: South-east Vanua Levu and Taveuni
Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. AIM

Sociolinguistics - the study of language in its sociocultural context - investigates how language behaviour is integrated with social behaviour and interaction. Every social world has some kind of communication system in which there develops a special universe of discourse. In each world there are special norms of conduct, modes of sociolinguistic interaction.

The aim of this thesis is to investigate how particular uses, functions and varieties of language relate to social patterns and modes of interaction in the Fijian village of Waitabu. The study will attempt to reveal the basic social groupings and divisions of Waitabu community, and the principles and norms which underly patterns of sociolinguistic interaction between individuals and groups. The investigation focuses on the various ways of speaking which characterise the Waitabu repertoire, and attempts to explicate basic sociolinguistic principles and norms for contextually appropriate behaviour. The general purpose is to explicate what the outsider needs to know to be a functional member of the sociolinguistic community of Waitabu.

The thesis explores the hypothesis that social relationships act as intervening variables between linguistic structures and their realisation in speech. In investigating the social and linguistic factors involved in communication at Waitabu, this study demonstrates that the speaker's selection among semantically, grammatically, phonologically and lexically permissible alternates is both patterned and often predictable on the basis of certain features of the Waitabu social system. The data demonstrates how various social identities stemming from role-relationships and particular contexts/situations are characterised by distinct modes of linguistic behaviour.

It is necessary at the outset to highlight two important points regarding the content and aim of this thesis. Firstly, the study involves normative description, i.e. it seeks to provide an account of the principles and norms underlying Waitabu sociolinguistic behaviour. There are diverse interpretations of "norms" in social science and a vast amount of sociological thought centres on this question.\(^2\) Even within the field of sociolinguistics there are different interpretations of "norm" and "rule".\(^3\) As Cancian (1975:1) states, norms can loosely be defined as shared conceptions of appropriate or expected actions. This study adopts the definition provided by Williams in the *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*: “a norm is a rule, standard, or pattern for action... Social norms are rules for conduct. The norms are the standards by reference to which behaviour is judged and approved or disapproved. A norm in this sense is not a statistical average of actual behaviour but rather a cultural (shared) definition of desirable behaviour.”

In this study, sociolinguistic norms (culturally shared conceptions of appropriate sociolinguistic behaviour) were gauged through:

1. *instruction*. Long informal conversations with individuals in which they would teach me (a newcomer to the Waitabu community) the “correct” mode of sociolinguistic behaviour befitting various social situations. For these individuals, the aim of the exercise was to transmit the knowledge that I needed to communicate appropriately in the community, and develop the skills needed to make use of it.

2. *correction*. Having taught me the basic norms and principles required in various situations (patterns for sociolinguistic behaviour), the instructor would observe my actual sociolinguistic behaviour in daily interaction, correcting my mistakes when I deviated, to a greater or lesser extent, from the accepted rules of conduct.

3. *observation of actual behaviour*. I would then check these norms against actual empirical data by observing and recording various instances of sociolinguistic

\(^2\) e.g. Cancian 1975, Gibbs 1965, Williams 1960, Sherif 1965. Issues include methods of testing the existence of, and description of norms, and the relations between norms and social action.

\(^3\) See Le Page and Tabouret-Keller (1985 :193) for discussion of types of sociolinguistic rules. For formulation of rules, see for example, Gumperz and Herasimchuk (1975) on coding and marking rules; Ervin-Tripp (1972) on rules of alternation and co-occurrence; and also Irvine (1974); Jackson (1974); Philips (1974); Hymes (1972a); Ochs (1984); Reisman (1974); Gumperz (1964, 1977); Goffman (1964); Frake (1972); Salmond (1974). Also Frake (1964), Sacks (1972), Schegloff (1972), Schegloff and Sacks (1984), among others show that sequential ordering of information and selection of information and selection of illocutionary devices and content are rule-governed. Much of this work is discussed in detail in 1.2.
behaviour in a natural context. Any marked deviation from sociolinguistic norms was noted and its cause investigated. In observing sociolinguistic behaviour in natural context, my instructor/s would frequently point out when a person deviated from the accepted sociolinguistic standard, indicating the “proper way” i.e. the more appropriate mode of behaviour. Similar corrections towards the norm were made when replaying recorded speech for transcription after the event. (See also 1.4.3.)

Secondly, it is necessary to highlight the holistic nature of this study. An explicit aim of the thesis is to give a general overview of the Waitabu sociolinguistic community, its component parts, and how these function in relation to the range of modes of speaking which constitute the sociolinguistic repertoire of the group. Such an overview of the entire sociolinguistic community and its component elements is crucial to our understanding of how the sociolinguistic community functions. (Since every part presupposes the whole, one must view the whole in order to appreciate the value - in Saussure’s sense - of the part.) In attempting to do this, the thesis is outside the established mould of sociolinguistic analysis. (Basic concepts and the theoretical perspective of this particular study are discussed in 1.3.) Despite the wide range of research done in the ethnography of speaking to date (see 1.2), there is, to my knowledge, no integrated theoretical framework for writing an ethnography of speaking of a particular sociocultural group, i.e. a concise statement of the principles and norms by which individuals construct their sociolinguistic behaviour. In a similar holistic empirical study of the Kuna Indians, Sherzer (1983) calls for the development of such a theory. See 1.2 for detailed discussion of Sherzer’s work.

An inherent cost/risk of dealing with the range of modes of speaking in the linguistic repertoire of a community (rather than one particular aspect e.g. ceremonial speech style, male Vs female speech) is brevity of description and a somewhat general treatment of certain aspects of sociolinguistic behaviour. Indeed, each of the topics of chapters, or various chapter sections of this thesis may constitute a complete dissertation/volume in its own right. Hence I stress that the goal of this study is to provide only a general sketch of the basic principles and norms by which the Waitabu sociolinguistic community operates. It is hoped that the risk of brevity in treatment of certain aspects of the sociolinguistic system is compensated for, to at least some degree, by the advantage of a general overall perspective of the sociolinguistic system, its component parts and how they interact.

In the remainder of this chapter, I will discuss the ethnography of
communication as it relates to the Waitabu study, in terms of relevant literature, theoretical issues and concepts. Secondly, the theoretical perspective of this thesis is discussed. Thirdly, I detail the fieldwork setting and its selection, and problems and restrictions associated with data collection. The final section outlines the plan of the thesis.

1.2. THE ETHNOGRAPHY OF SPEAKING

The ethnography of speaking is a relatively new area of study within the field on language and society. It is only in the last 20 years that substantial amounts of work have begun to be carried out in this field. The field began in the early 1960's with Hymes (1962) coining the title "ethnography of speaking" and calling for an approach to language and speech which bridges established disciplines such as anthropology, linguistics and sociology (see especially Hymes 1962, 1964a,b). The general aim of the emergent discipline was to investigate the integral relationship between language use and sociocultural organisation, through description of the communicative resources of a speech community and of the organisation of these resources on a sociocultural basis. The field became known by the more general heading "the ethnography of communication" since the publication of a paper by Hymes (1964a) with this title.

Hymes' (1962, 1964a,b) seminal essays outlined the aims and theoretical and practical concerns of the ethnography of communication, highlighting that a fundamental goal was to discover and explicate the competence that enables members of a community to conduct speech. Following this, there emerged collections of papers which served to develop further a theoretical perspective and a rich variety of empirical data from diverse sociocultural groups across the world. Major volumes of papers include: Gumperz and Hymes (1964, 1972); Bauman and Sherzer (1974); Sanches and Blount (1975); Kochman (1972); Bloch (1975); Bright (1966); Saville-Troike (1977); and Baugh and Sherzer (1984).

Other contributions to the field include "Outline guide for the ethnographic study of speech" by Sherzer and Darnell (1972) which includes an outline of information to be collected in doing ethnographies of communication, and serves as a useful guide to the scope and organisation of ethnolinguistic investigation. Saville-Troike (1982) gives a general introduction to the ethnography of communication. Other useful guides to the ethnography of speaking include: Hymes (1972b, 1974a), Sherzer (1977), and the introduction to Bauman and Sherzer (1974).

The ethnography of communication is related to various other lines of
research that have dealt with social factors in speech (Gumperz 1977). These include: ethnomethodology, the sociological analysis of interaction (see for example, Garfinkel 1967, 1972, Sacks 1972, Schegloff 1972, Garfinkel and Sacks 1969); and linguistic pragmatics (for discussion of the scope and definition of this discipline, and for extensive bibliographical coverage, see Levinson 1983). Furthermore, theories of language and its use (from fields such as philosophy, linguistics, anthropology and sociology) have had considerable influence on the ethnography of speaking, witness for example the influence of the following on ethnographic approaches to language and speech: Goffman's frame analysis; Austin-Searle's speech act theory; Brown and Levinson's universals of politeness phenomena; Grice's conversational maxims and implicatures.

The term "ethnography of speaking" covers a broad range of research areas. (Hymes observes in the forward pages of Ochs and Schieffelin (1983) that the title ethnography of speaking is widely used and has "too easily become a label for any study of language use which has an anthropological tinge"). Indeed the emergent discipline has been enriched by a wide range of research including: the ethnography of writing (Basso 1974); narrative analysis (e.g. Darnell 1974, Tedlock 1972a,b); language as a verbal art (e.g. Bauman 1977a,b, Gossen 1974a,b, Foster 1974); sociocultural determinants of language change (e.g. Gal 1976, 1984, Scollon and Scollon 1979); and Bauman (1974) demonstrates the ethnography of speaking extended to historical situations.

The bulk of writings on the ethnography of speaking to date fall into the following basic categories:

1. formulation of theory and concepts dealing with broader issues of method and theory (e.g. Hymes 1962, 1964a,b, 1971a,b, 1972a,b, 1974a,b; Sherzer 1977; Gumperz 1964, 1971, 1972, 1977; Grimshaw 1974; Basso 1974; Bauman 1971, 1975; Saville-Troike 1982 );

2. studies focusing on a particular aspect of sociolinguistic behaviour, such as description of a community's linguistic resources organised as styles of speaking (e.g. men's and women's talk, baby talk); the role of speech in a specific area of social and cultural life (e.g. politics and religion); or analysis of particular speech events (e.g. drinking encounters, greetings, ceremonies);

3. holistic studies of speech communities, investigating the whole linguistic repertoire of a community, i.e. the total range of ways of speaking available to members of a given sociocultural group, and how these relate to the sociocultural organisation (e.g. Sherzer 1983).
Much of the research to date in the field of ethnography of speaking falls into the second category, focusing on particular topics, e.g. description of single speech events, styles of speaking, or the role of speech in a specific area of social and cultural life. This has resulted in a rich variety of empirical data on specific aspects of language use in social context from sociocultural groups spanning most areas of the globe. These studies serve to illustrate how the nature and role of speaking vary from society to society. While such writings cover diverse aspects of language use from radically different societies, they share a common theme of the ethnography of speaking, namely the integral relationship between language use and sociocultural organisation. (The following list is not comprehensive, but rather a selection of titles of studies focusing on single communicative events. Those listed works which relate directly to the Waitabu investigation are discussed in more detail in the relevant sections of this thesis.) Darnell (1974) examines the complex interrelationships between components of the Cree narrative performance. Sacks (1974) analyses the event of joke-telling, examining the sequential organisation of this speech event. Duranti (1981) provides a masterly detailed study of the Samoan Fono. Bauman (1984) describes the speech act of storytelling in dog-trading at Canton, Texas. Frake (1964) analyses the Subanun drinking encounter, a speech event in a Philippine tribal group. Frake (1975) describes sequencing and verbal routine of entering a Yakan home. Ochs (1984) analyses the rules and structure of the kabary performance in Malagasy. Sherzer (1984) investigates the kaa kwento storytelling event among the Kuna Indians of Panama, highlighting the role of cultural beliefs in structuring verbal events. Sherzer (1974) analyses three types of Kuna speech event - Namakke, Kormakke, Sunmakke - each characterised by distinct linguistic and social features. Salmond (1974, 1975) describes Maori ceremonial gatherings. Fox (1974) investigates a speech ritual in Rotinese. Agar (1975) suggests a framework for data arrangement and analysing the speech of the narcotic event. Blount (1975) describes the rules of the kwano kwane (to count ancestors) speech event of reconstructing genealogies, among the Luo of Kenya. Fitzgerald (1975) analyses a single ritual performance among the Ga of Southern Ghana. Brukman (1975) investigates the sexual joking encounters among the Koya of South India. Tannen (1984) provides conversational analysis of a single extended interaction at a Thanksgiving dinner, investigating various features and devices that constitute a conversational style. Irvine (1974) investigates the linguistic routine of greeting among the Wolof, focusing on strategies of status manipulation. Mitchell-Kernan (1972) describes two Afro-American speech acts, signifying and marking.

While there have been many detailed studies of specific aspects of the social dimensions of language use, holistic studies providing a comprehensive ethnography of speaking of a particular social group (i.e. description of the total range of ways
of speaking and their relationship to social organisation) are extremely rare. An integrated theory of the ethnography of speaking of a community has not yet emerged (though various works listed in this chapter, especially those of Gumperz and Hymes, have made invaluable contributions to the development of such a theoretical perspective). In this light, Grimshaw (1974:422) in detailing the goals and directions of a theory of ethnography of speaking, calls for the writing of "sociolinguistic grammars" as an important analytical step for ethnographers of communication.

Bearing this in mind, this thesis is an empirical study of the various ways of speaking available to members of Waitabu community. I thus hope to highlight the need for further developing a theoretical perspective for comprehensive ethnographies of speaking. Other holistic studies to date include: Gossen (1974b) *Chamulas in the World of the Sun: Time and space in a Maya oral tradition*, which is exemplary in presenting a full range of Chamula oral tradition. Gossen demonstrates the intricate relationship between sociocultural notions of time and space as they are mapped out onto patterns of Mayan language use. Note, however, that Gossen's investigation is heavily dependent on idealized recording sessions and reconstructed discourse, rather than speech in natural context.

In *Kuna Ways of Speaking: an ethnographic perspective*, Sherzer (1983) provides the first (and to my knowledge, the only) book-length treatment of the complete range of forms of discourse in a non-literate society, based on naturally occurring speech. Sherzer describes the central role that language and speech play in Kuna culture and society. He details the extensive and incredibly varied set of forms and genres of speaking and chanting, from everyday greetings and reports to public and ritualized performance of myths, stories, tribal history and personal experiences and dreams.

The parallels between this Waitabu investigation and Sherzer's Kuna study are many. Like the Waitabu study, Sherzer's analysis is based on naturally occurring speech, observed and recorded in actual contexts, and studied in terms of its relationship to these contexts. A common aim of the two studies is to bring together and integrate all aspects of language and speech in a social and cultural context for the particular society, i.e. a comprehensive ethnography of speaking. Emphasis is on qualitative description rather than detailed quantitative study of selected linguistic features. In terms of content, both studies contrast everyday speech with ritual, ceremonial speech, and explore the relationship between the two. Similar theoretical themes emerge, such as the integral relationship between patterns of language use and other social patterns (e.g. social structure, religion
etc), and the contrast and relationship between ritual and everyday speech. Both Waitabu and Kuna data highlight the role of speaking in defining, determining and organising social structure. Social roles are defined by and manifested in speech.

In the remainder of this section, I will discuss concepts and theoretical issues of the ethnography of speaking, as they relate to this thesis.

Central to the ethnography of speaking is the concept "communicative competence", which integrates linguistic competence with social, interactional and cultural competence (Hymes 1972a,b, 1974b). As Hymes points out, in order to understand language behaviour, it is necessary to go beyond formal linguistic grammar. Thus, a basic assumption of this thesis is that speakers functioning as members of a sociocultural group have internalised not only the rules of grammar, but also rules of appropriate speech usage which are broadly shared by other members of their society and which they apply in their speech behaviour. In short, for an individual to understand and participate successfully in a sociocultural group, it is necessary to know not only structural rules of language but also the cultural rules that dictate choice of one linguistic variant rather than another.

There have been various descriptions of the communicative competence required for specific speech situations and events. For example, Frake describes the competence/knowledge necessary for interpreting speech acts (and nonverbal behaviour) in entering a Yakan house (Frake 1975) and in a Subanun drinking encounter (Frake 1964). Agar (1975) demonstrates that to be a competent participant in conversations about narcotic events, it is important to have knowledge of appropriate verbage and share the cognitive structure of narcotic event sequences. Bauman (1974) describes the communicative competence necessary to enact the role of "minister" among 19th Century Quakers. Darnell (1974) focuses on the Cree narrative performance, demonstrating the creative and adaptive use of competence.

Certain studies in the ethnography of speaking have highlighted specific theoretical issues relating to competence. Saville-Troike (1982:25-6) analyses the components of communicative competence; Garfinkel (1972) demonstrates that speaking competence is not passive or mechanical, but rather integral to strategies used in the dynamics of interaction. Munby (1977) discusses the application of sociocultural variables in the specification of communicative competence. G. Sankoff (1974) suggests that speaker competence is not totally categorical in nature, but contains some probabilistic and non-deterministic components, thus arguing for the existence of probabilistic rules in describing competence.
The acquisition and development of communicative competence involves learning to produce and perceive functionally meaningful linguistic distinctions and to master rules for language use. Various works demonstrate the way in which acquisition of linguistic competence and acquisition of social competence are intertwined. See for example, Schieffelin (1979, 1984a,b); Ochs and Schieffelin (1979, 1983); Schieffelin and Ochs (1986); Slobin (1967); Blount (1972); Philips (1970); Mitchell-Kernan and Kernan (1975).

As mentioned in 1.1, this study deals with the communicative competence of Waitabu speakers, i.e. the knowledge that the individual needs to communicate appropriately within Waitabu community, and the skills needed to make use of it. In other words, focus is on shared rules of communication and interaction as well as cultural rules and knowledge that are basis for the context and content of communicative events and interaction processes in Waitabu village.

Like other studies in the ethnography of speaking, the priority on modes and functions of language taken in this thesis is a clear departure from the priorities of Chomsky (1968:62) and other formal grammarians, e.g. "If we hope to understand human language and the psychological capacities on which it rests, we must first ask what it is, not how or for what purposes it is used". In this thesis, language and speech, from everyday colloquial to the most ritual routine, are seen, not as deviations from grammar, but rather as creative manipulations of the rich diversity of linguistic resources available for speaking.

In analysing ways of speaking available to members of Waitabu community, another concept of central importance is that of "linguistic repertoire", introduced by Gumperz (1964). The term refers to that totality of linguistic forms regularly employed in the course of socially organised interaction. It includes the number of alternants reflecting contextual and social differences in speech, covering all accepted ways of formulating messages. Empirical data demonstrates that communities differ in the number and variety of significant speech styles composing linguistic repertoire, and in the principle bases of their delimitation. See, for example, Keenan (1974), Sherzer (1974, 1983), Abrahams (1974), Gossen (1974b).

Ways of dealing with the variety of speech styles composing a linguistic repertoire have been made more explicit by Ervin-Tripp (1972), building on the work of Gumperz (1972:21). Ervin-Tripp generalised two basic principles of Saussurean linguistics - syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations - and developed two notions - rules of co-occurrence and rules of alternation. Alternation concerns choice among alternative ways of speaking; co-occurrence concerns interdependence.
within an alternative. The important point is that one can characterise whatever features go together to identify a style of speech in terms of rules of co-occurrence among them. The choice among different styles composing a linguistic repertoire is characterised in terms of rules of alternation. Thus speakers are recognised to have the ability to choose among styles themselves, and the choices have social meaning (Hymes 1974b).

In the linguistic resources composing the verbal repertoire of Waitabu speakers, by rules of co-occurrence there is clustering of certain linguistic features whose configuration forms a distinct speech style appropriate to a particular role-relationship or communicative event. For example, as described in the body of this thesis, women’s speech is characterised by the cluster of features: modulation in pitch; lengthening of the penultimate syllable; high use of “softening” particles; avoidance of swearing and taboo words; and high frequency of isalei exclamation. In contrast, the style of speech appropriate for the church goer social identity involves the cluster of features: humble, deferential style; use of [k] instead of glottal stop; various Old High Fijian grammatical and lexical features; soft, low voice quality. Rules of alternation characterise the choice between such modes of speech, each of which is associated with the particular social identities appropriate in a given social situation or role-relationship.

The notion of “speech event” is central to the ethnography of speaking Hymes (1972a). It is the basic unit for analysis of verbal interaction in speech communities: the speech event is to analysis of verbal interaction what the sentence is to grammar (Gumperz 1972). Speech event analysis is based on the fact that members of all societies recognise certain communicative routines which they view as distinct wholes, separate from other types of discourse, characterised by special rules of speech and non-verbal behaviour and often distinguishable by clearly recognisable opening and closing sequences. Hymes (1972a) provides an outline for heuristic analysis of the components of speech events, stressing the interrelationship between factors such as settings (times and places for events), participants (possible and actual addressees, addressees and audience), purposes (functions and goals of events), linguistic varieties and styles, verbal organisation in terms of consistent speech acts, modes and manners of delivery or performance, norms of interaction and speech genres.

This study of language use in Waitabu community includes analysis of a clear-cut speech event, the ceremony, which is characterised by special rules of speech and nonverbal behaviour, and distinguishable by clearly recognisable opening and closing sequences. Detailed analysis of speech rituals in other sociocultural

To account for the contrast between rigidly patterned speech behaviour of the ceremonial event and the less strictly ordered, more casual everyday speech in Waitabu community, the concept of general vs specific rules is introduced. General rules and norms of sociolinguistic behaviour are those which all members of the sociocultural group adhere to in constructing their everyday behaviour. Specific rules and norms are those which apply in particular sociolinguistic situations, and which serve to narrowly prescribe the mode of linguistic, social and physical behaviour appropriate to that particular situation. Specific rules and norms are associated with "marked" sociolinguistic situations.

A "marked" sociolinguistic situation is one in which the linguistic behaviour of participants is narrowly prescribed by a specialised set of rules and norms. Thus, "marked" sociolinguistic situations include speech events (e.g. the Waitabu ceremony, chapter 5), and certain role-relationships (e.g. vei-vugoni "cross-parent/child", Waitabu villager - Indian), all of which are characterised by specific sets of rules governing sociolinguistic conduct. See chapter 9 for a summary of the marked speech events and role-relationships in Waitabu community. A hypothesis presented in this study of Waitabu data is that the distinct set of specialised linguistic rules is usually accompanied by rules and norms which govern and constrain physical and social behaviour (see 5.4). The speaker is conscious of these social, physical and linguistic constraints, and is often able to verbalise them when instructing a stranger to the sociocultural group how to behave in the particular "marked" situation. (See, for example, the explicit instructions which various speakers issued when teaching me the sociolinguistic etiquette of the netball game, 7.8.2; and the cross-parent/child and opposite-sex sibling relationships, 3.2.1.) In contrast to "marked" situations, less marked situations allow wider scope for a wide range of behavioural possibilities open to participants. There are less restrictions (i.e. rules and norms) on the range of potential actors and the scope of speaker creativity in constructing his sociolinguistic behaviour. It is important to stress two points. Firstly, "unmarked/marked" is not a categorical distinction of "either/or" nature. Rather, there is a cline between more and less highly marked

---

4 By "everyday" sociolinguistic behaviour, I mean that behaviour in which the speaker does not consciously adjust his linguistic and social actions according to a particular set of rules and norms required in a given sociolinguistic situation, i.e. "everyday" sociolinguistic behaviour is characterised by the absence of a particular set of rules and norms which mark that conduct as distinct or "special".
interactions. Secondly, the categories of general/specific and marked/unmarked are not necessarily coincident. While specific rules and norms governing a given speech event commonly qualify it as "marked", it is not the case that non-speech-event everyday behaviour will be totally "unmarked". Obviously, there will be certain rules and norms governing various aspects of everyday interaction (e.g. the joking mode of behaviour between cross-cousins in Waitabu).

This notion of "sociolinguistic markedness" is based on Jakobson's (1971:136) description of the marked/unmarked opposition as "statements of A" versus "no statements of A". Marked sociolinguistic situations are defined by specific rules which serve to constrain physical, social and linguistic behaviour in that limited context. Unmarked, everyday sociolinguistic performances are neutral and comparatively unrestricted by specialised rules. Gumperz (1964:140) describes this phenomenon in terms of co-occurrence restrictions in speech events:

Speech events differ in the rigidity with which such co-occurrence restrictions apply. In some cases (e.g. public ceremonies, religious rituals, etc.) modes of speaking are narrowly prescribed; in others (e.g. conversations among friends, party chitchat) there may be scope for a wide range of alternate sequences.

Thus, in analysing the functioning of a sociolinguistic system, it is necessary to explicate both general and specific rules which govern the pattern of sociolinguistic behaviour of individuals in that system. In other words, we must investigate general rules for everyday sociolinguistic behaviour, as well as specific sets of rules which constrain behaviour in various "marked" sociolinguistic situations. For each "marked" sociolinguistic situation, the sociolinguist must formulate/analyse the particular set of specific rules which govern behaviour of participants in that situation.

The contrast between specific rule-governed speech events and casual everyday language use has been noted by Gumperz (1972:18):

in everyday informal interaction [as compared to distinct speech events], choice of linguistic form tends to be much less constrained and events often merge into one another without perceptible boundaries.

Similarly, Ochs (1984) compares two major modes of speaking in Malagasy - resaka "informal conversation, everyday talk" and kabary "ceremonial speech, oratory" - revealing that the kabary (ceremonial) speech is characterised by specific set of salient rules which govern linguistic performance. In contrast, in resaka (everyday style), rules for speaking are much less explicit. As Ochs demonstrates, structural rigidity is a function of the factors affecting the kabary performance.
Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (1974) examines formal and informal varieties of narrative performance in East European Jewish culture, and notes the specific linguistic, paralinguistic, kinesic, social and setting constraints which characterise the formal performance. Irvine (1984) compares the notion of "formality/informality" of communication across three different sociocultural groups: Wolof and Murse in Africa, and Ilongots in Northern Philippines. She highlights the varied use of the term in sociolinguistic literature. Goffman (1964) contrasts encounters with clear rules for: initiation and termination; the entrance and departure of particular participants; and decorum of space and sound, with unfocused interactions characterised by less explicit constraints.

The various concepts discussed above are those which directly relate to this thesis. For detailed discussion of these and other concepts in the ethnography of speaking, see Saville-Troike (1982), Hymes (1972a).

The Waitabu data presented in this thesis demonstrates various theoretical points. First, the crucial role of interpretation in sociolinguistic behaviour. As Gumperz (1972:15) states:

Communication ... is a two-step process in which the speaker first takes in stimuli from the outside environment, evaluating and selecting from among them in the light of his own cultural background, personal history, and what he knows about his interlocutors. He then decides on the norms that apply to the situation at hand. These norms determine the speaker's selection from among the communicative options available for encoding his intent.

The importance of interpretative ability is a common theme of other interactional studies e.g. Katriel (1986) in her analysis of "Dugri" speech in Israeli "Sabra" culture. Katriel demonstrates that members of the cultural group share similar cultural meanings for interpretation. She shows that while the bluntness of "dugri" speech is acceptable for members of the culture, outsiders not sharing the interpretative framework often consider the "sabra" (native-born Israeli Jew)’s directness as rudeness.

The relation between interpretation and patterns of language behaviour has been made more explicit by the notion of "frame", i.e. category within which meaning must be interpreted (Goffman 1974), i.e. frames serve as instructions on how to interpret a sequence, to distinguish between such acts as jokes, verbal games and the like. (For details, see Goffman 1974, Frake 1977, Tannen 1979, 1984.)

A second related theoretical point which the Waitabu data highlights is the
manipulative or creative use of sociolinguistic rules and norms, thus adding to the work of Sherzer (1974, 1984) on Kuna Indians; Salmond (1974, 1975) on Maori ceremonial rituals; Frake (1964) on Subanun drinking encounters; Darnell (1974) on Cree narrative; Mitchell-Kernan (1972) on manipulation of components of Afro-American speech act, etc. The Waitabu investigation highlights that, rather than passive entities whose sociolinguistic behaviour is predetermined, individuals can manipulate and adapt sociolinguistic rules and norms to suit their particular communicative needs.

Thirdly, this study addresses the issue of signalling social information in communicative behaviour. Gumperz (1972:16) suggests:

In small face to face groups, where speakers have detailed knowledge of each other's background and personal affairs, the signalling of social information is less important than in large diverse industrial societies.

However, the Waitabu data demonstrates that the signalling of social information is all important to speakers in constructing their sociolinguistic behaviour. Although individuals in this closed community have detailed knowledge of each other's background and personal affairs, their sociolinguistic conduct constantly signals social information, e.g. about the type of role-relationship and the participants themselves.

As mentioned in 1.1, another major theoretical issue that this thesis addresses is the hypothesis that social relationships act as intervening variables between linguistic structures and their realization in speech. The Waitabu investigation supports the suggestion that anthropologists' analysis of social constraints governing interpersonal relationships may be utilised in the interpretation of verbal performances. The thesis attempts to highlight the integral and multifaceted relationship between role-relationships and other aspects of social organisation and patterns of language behaviour in Waitabu. Thus it is hoped that the data presented in this thesis will contribute to our understanding of the linguistic repertoire of small, closed communities and the interconnection with social structure.

1.3. THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE OF THIS STUDY

Having placed the Waitabu investigation in the general context of the ethnography of speaking, it is necessary to describe in detail the theoretical perspective of this particular study.
1.3.1. SYMBOLIC INTERACTIONISM

It is not realistic to divorce sociolinguistic performance from other aspects of human behaviour for they are inextricably linked, governed by the same set of principles and norms of the society in question. Thus one may look to a general theory of human behaviour, to sociological thought, for the basis of sociolinguistic analysis. A vast source of sociological literature, especially that of Symbolic Interactionism, has had an important influence on interactional sociolinguistics. Witness, for example, the work of Goffman (1963, 1964, 1967, 1974), Cicourel (1970), Garfinkel (1956, 1966, 1967, 1972). Manis and Meltzer (1972) provide a comprehensive description of the aims, principles and bibliographical listing of works in Symbolic Interactionism. See also Skidmore (1975); Park (1955, 1967); Deegan and Hill (1987); Meltzer, Petras and Reynolds (1975); Perinbanayagam (1985); Ito (1984); Blumer (1972a,b); Moreno (1934, 1953) etc.

While acknowledging the rich range of literature emanating from Symbolic Interactionism, in the following I will focus specifically on the work of George Herbert Mead (a philosopher who greatly inspired the Symbolic Interactionist school of thought), as Mead's writings are a clear manifestation of the basic principles of this school. Furthermore, much work of Mead's followers (e.g. Blumer 1972a,b; Park 1955, 1967; Linton 1936; Moreno 1934, 1953; and Goffman 1963, 1964, 1967, 1974) deals specifically with American society. Such work usually is not concerned with developing theory along the comparative lines that would be needed to do justice to a "traditional/pre-industrial" or "semi-traditional" society such as Waitabu.

Mead views the individual as possessing a self, a mind, and consequently the ability to construct his social performance. This approach to human behaviour is important in explaining sociolinguistic variation for it is congruent with the basic concepts of the sociolinguistic act: namely, sociolinguistic behaviour is a series of performances in which the individual, as actor, varies his roles according to his interpretation of social circumstances. Because the reader may be unfamiliar with sociological analysis, the following explains basic features of Symbolic Interactionist thought, and relates sociolinguistic variation to this general theory of human behaviour.

According to Mead, human society is made up of individuals who have selves, i.e. the human being can be an object of his own actions. He can act towards himself as he might act towards others. We are all familiar with everyday actions whereby the human acts towards himself: he becomes frustrated with himself, takes
pride in himself, argues with himself, is happy with himself, tells himself he should "do this", sets aims for himself, and plans out what he is going to do. The individual is constantly acting towards himself, making indications to himself. The conscious life of the human being, from the time he wakens, to the time he falls asleep, is a continual flow of self-indications, notations of things which he deals with and takes into account.

According to Symbolic Interactionists, this ability of the human being to make indications to himself is the central mechanism with which the individual faces and deals with his world. This mechanism enables the human being to make indications to himself of things in his surroundings and thus to guide his actions by what he notes. To indicate something is to extricate it from its setting, to hold it apart, to give it a meaning, or in Mead's language, to make it an object. The individual is continually designating objects to himself, giving them meaning, judging their suitability to his action and making decisions on the basis of that judgement. This is what is meant by interpretation of acting on the basis of symbols. (See Geertz 1973 "Thick Descriptions"). The human individual thus pieces together and guides his action by taking account of different things and interpreting their significance for his prospective action.

In his masterly summary of Mead's thought, Blumer (1972a:148) describes the relation of the individual to the group thus:

Group action takes the form of a fitting together of individual lines of action. Each individual aligns his action to the action of others by ascertaining what they are doing or what they intend to do, - that is, by getting the meaning of their acts. For Mead, this is done by the individual "taking the role" of others - either the role of a specific person or the role of a group ... In taking such roles the individual seeks to ascertain the intention or direction of the acts of others. He forms and aligns his own action on the basis of such interpretation of the acts of others. This is the fundamental way in which group action takes place in human society.

Individuals think, feel and see things from a standpoint peculiar to the group in which they participate. Most of the situations encountered by people in a given sociocultural group are defined or "structured" by them in the same way. Each person approaches his world from the standpoint of the culture of his group. Each perceives, thinks, forms judgements and controls himself according to the frame of reference of the group in which he is participating. Since he defines objects, other people, the world and himself from the perspective he shares with others, he can visualise his proposed line of action from this generalised standpoint, anticipate the reactions of others, inhibit undesirable impulses, and thus guide his conduct. Once
one has incorporated a particular outlook from his group, it becomes his orientation toward the world, and he brings this frame of reference to bear on interpretation of all new situations, i.e. he "takes on the role of the generalized other". In the course of his association with others, the individual builds up this "generalized other", a set of standpoints common to the group from which he views himself and his behaviour.

Social organisation is prior in the sense that each individual is born into some pre-existent association of human beings. Each social organisation is characterised by a particular set of deeply-engrained modes of interaction. These definite modes of interaction of persons with one another form customs and institutions. Customs and institutions persist because individuals form their personal habits under conditions set by prior customs.

The set of roles allowed and expected of individuals in a given sociocultural system are limited by the kind of social customs and institutions in which he happens to be born and in which he matures into an adult. His memory, his perception, his motives, his interpretation of social situations which confront him are shaped and steered by the specific configuration of roles which he incorporates from his society. In other words, social organisation provides the framework inside of which social and sociolinguistic action takes place. It is important to stress, however, that it is not the determinant of that action. Social organisation enters into action only to the extent to which it shapes situations in which people act, and to the extent to which it supplies fixed sets of symbols which people use in interpreting their situations.

Summarising the essential features of Mead's analysis of human behaviour:

- Human society is made up of individuals who have selves (i.e. make indications to themselves);
- Individual action is constructed by the individual through noting and interpreting features of the situations in which he acts;
- Group or collective action consists of the aligning of individual actions, brought about by the individual's interpreting or taking into account each other's actions.

An important feature of the Symbolic Interactionist approach (and indeed a fundamental tenet of the Cognitive Science movement from 1950 to the present, see

---

5Such customs and institutions are often lexically encoded. For example, in Fijian society there are separate lexical items referring to socially important customs such as veiqaravi "official reception" and unusede "fund-raising gathering".
Gardner 1985) is the ability of the individual to interpret situations which confront him and construct his action accordingly (see 1.2). That is to say, human beings are not mere physical organisms with some kind of organisation responding to the forces which play upon them (as some sociologists and sociolinguists assume). They are not passive entities reacting in a stimulus-response fashion to forces such as environmental and social pressures. Rather, the individual has a mind, i.e. the ability to interpret situations and select his mode of sociolinguistic behaviour accordingly.\(^6\)

The interactionist view takes into account the interpretative ability by which the individual guides (consciously or subconsciously) his own actions. The individual considers the situation in which he is placed, weighs up the particular configuration of features which he sees as meaningful, and constructs his sociolinguistic performance on this basis. Thus, rather than stimulus triggering response, the interpretative process intervenes and is an important factor in the consequent sociolinguistic behaviour.

\[ \text{STIMULI} \rightarrow \text{INTERPRETATIVE PROCESS} \rightarrow \text{RESPONSE} \]

[situation confronting the individual] [sociolinguistic performance]

In short, people act rather than react.

It is important to stress that the interactional perspective by which I describe sociolinguistic rules and norms by which the Waitabu sociolinguistic community functions, is quite different from linguistic theory proper by which rules of linguistic grammar are formulated. Essentially, the theoretical perspective of this thesis derives from sociological and anthropological thought. It does not claim to employ the same concepts, processes or rigorous analytical procedures employed in linguistic/grammatical analysis.

\[1.3.2. \text{FUNCTIONING OF A SOCIOLINGUISTIC SYSTEM}\]

In the following, I will outline a theoretical perspective of how the Waitabu sociolinguistic system functions. It is important to stress that the general system of ideas presented below is but one of many possible sociolinguistic theoretical perspectives. The particular perspective of this thesis was developed as a means of describing and analysing Waitabu sociolinguistic data in a lucid fashion. The

---

\(^6\)“Mind” thus consists of interpretative/understanding ability and “will”. By “will”, I mean the faculty by which a person decides, or conceives himself as deciding upon and initiating action. “Will” is thus a subset of “mind”. For discussion of the human ability to evaluate and self-interpret, see Taylor (1985).
approach is essentially inductive: it is not the case that the Fijian data was chosen as a means of exemplifying a certain theoretical framework. Rather, the perspective developed as I struggled to come to terms with social and linguistic processes which I observed going on around me in the Waitabu community. This theoretical approach may not necessarily be applicable or the most elegant means of analysing other sociolinguistic systems, especially those in radically different sociocultural settings.

The Waitabu sociolinguistic system is composed of individuals who continuously interpret meaningful signals in the social situations confronting them, and construct their sociolinguistic behaviour accordingly. The Waitabu sociocultural group is characterised by a particular range of well-entrenched modes of sociolinguistic interaction. Individuals think, feel and see things from a standpoint peculiar to the group. Most of the situations encountered by people in the group are defined or "structured" by them in the same way (1.3.1). In the process of socialisation, the individual internalises the set of standpoints common to the group (i.e. according to Mead, he develops a "generalized other"). He learns the established roles/modes of behaviour and the meaningful signals/symbols in interaction within the sociolinguistic community. Using this frame of reference, the individual interprets the particular situation confronting him, and constructs his sociolinguistic behaviour accordingly, within the constraints of sociolinguistic roles allowed and expected by individuals in the Waitabu social system.

It is important to distinguish between a sociolinguistic role (i.e. an established mode of sociolinguistic behaviour) and the actual performance/behaviour of individuals. "Role" is an abstract notion. It is an accepted pattern of behaviour which the individual internalises from his sociocultural group. In contrast, "actual sociolinguistic behaviour" consists of empirical actions which we are able to observe.

The distinction between "role" and "actual behaviour" has parallel with Saussure's (1916) distinction of "langue" Vs "parole". "Langue" is a shared pattern, an abstract structure, which is distinct from what is actually said. This corresponds to the sociolinguistic notion of "role". Just as the individual acquires abstract grammatical patterns in the process of language learning, so too he learns set patterns for sociolinguistic behaviour from his sociocultural group. "Parole" is the actual sound produced by speakers. This corresponds to the actual sociolinguistic behaviour of individuals.

In short, the roles of a sociocultural system provide the general framework for
actual sociolinguistic behaviour (just as a grammar provides the structure for linguistic utterances). Actual sociolinguistic behaviour, however, may vary from these roles. Nevertheless, in investigating the functioning of a sociolinguistic system, it is necessary to focus on these abstract roles, for (like a grammar) these provide the general structure for actual behaviour. (See 1.1.)

Within a sociolinguistic system, different individuals have access to a different range of sociolinguistic roles. The distribution of roles to individuals of a sociolinguistic community follows thus:

- Individuals fall into socially-defined categories (delineated by the sociocultural organisation).

- Each social category has access to a particular configuration of social identities. (By social identity, I mean social position or capacity that involves rights and duties distributed to specific others (Goodenough 1969:313).) For example, the social category of tūraga "married man" has access to social identities of: father; peer in yaqona drinking group; ceremonial participant, etc.

- Associated with each social identity is a sociolinguistic role, i.e. an established mode of sociolinguistic behaviour. I use "role" to denote the behavioural norms appropriate to a social identity. Roles in this usage are patterns for behaviour, not patterns of behaviour.

Let us now define these basic concepts and specify how they relate to each other. First it is necessary to clearly distinguish between social category and social identity. A social category is a mutually exclusive group to which the individual belongs according to his stage of life and/ status in the particular sociocultural organisation. As an individual passes through the life cycle, he/she will belong to different social categories. For example, in Fijian society, a male living the full life cycle will belong to each of the following social categories in order: gone "child" → cauravou "youth" → tūraga "married man" → qase "old person". It is important to note that, in Wātawu society at least, social categories are generally ascribed/fixed; they cannot be altered at the whim of the individual. For example, a Fijian cauravou "youth" cannot switch social categories to become qase "old person" or gone "child". At any one stage of life, the individual will usually belong to only one social category.

In contrast, social identities (i.e. social position or capacity that involves rights and duties distributed to specific others) are changeable according to the particular role-relationship or social situation confronting the individual. For example, in Fiji society, an individual belonging to the social category tūraga "married man" may assume various social identities according to the particular social context, e.g. "father" when dealing with his children; opposite-sex sibling
when dealing with those classified as his sisters; ceremonial participant in the ritual of harvest presentation to the village chief. Thus, while the individual described above may alter the social identities which he assumes according to the social situation confronting him, the social category to which he belongs remains fixed. He belongs to a single social category of tūraga "married man", which is a fixed, ascribed status. (Cases of ambiguity in social categories are discussed later in this section.) Note also that social categories are mutually exclusive (the individual usually belongs to only one social category at a given point in his life). In contrast, social identities are not mutually exclusive; as described later in this section, in the dynamics of social interaction, the individual enacts more than one social identity at a time.

SOCIAL CATEGORIES. In investigating sociolinguistic behaviour in a given community, it is, at best, unrealistic to provide a detailed account of the verbal performance of each individual in that community, especially so in larger populations. Rather, individuals within the sociolinguistic community fall into socially-defined categories mentioned above. The salience of these social categories is often reflected in the language system itself. For example, the basic social distinctions of Waitabu society are codified in the vocabulary. As the lexical mapping in the figure below indicates, age, sex and stage in life (e.g. marital status) are the basic principles of social organisation (with the sex distinction being collapsed in the very young and very old categories):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gone</th>
<th>&quot;child&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gone-yalewa*</td>
<td>&quot;young, unmarried girl&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cauravou</td>
<td>&quot;young unmarried man&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marama</td>
<td>&quot;married woman&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tūraga</td>
<td>&quot;married man&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qase</td>
<td>&quot;old person&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Gone-yalewa is a compound noun based on the morphemes gone "child" and yalewa "female". Although a morpheme compound, this term for referring to the category of young unmarried woman, acts as a single lexical item (and is a cohesive, non-interruptable sequence). The salience of the category which it refers to is no less basic than other categories denoted by a single morpheme. See Sahlins (1962:301) for detailed discussion of the gone-yalewa category.

In other words, language reveals salient social distinctions and groupings of individuals. It is around these categories that socially prescribed roles and norms of sociolinguistic behaviour are likely to be based. (See 2.3.5 for detailed discussion of how these social categories relate to Waitabu social structure.)
Rosch's (1974, 1978) notion of "prototype" is useful in our understanding of social categories and the functioning of a sociolinguistic system generally. The basic outline of Rosch's theory is as follows: a category is a number of objects that are considered equivalent. Most, if not all, categories do not have clear-cut boundaries. Rather than be defined by boundary, a category is best defined in terms of the clearest cases of category membership, or prototype, i.e. people view some members as better, or more central members of the category than others. These central members seem to be used in comprehending the category as a whole (although the central members exhibit different cognitive characteristics than non-central members). In other words, for a given category (X) there seems to be a prototypical member, a representation of central members that includes a conception of a prototypical (X), plus various properties that are not shared by all members of X.

Applying this to sociolinguistic behaviour, in the course of the interpretative process, individuals in a sociolinguistic system continually categorise the people and situations which confront them. The sociolinguistic role (i.e. established mode of sociolinguistic behaviour) with which the individual responds will depend largely on how he categorises and interprets these people and events. (This "fluid" use of language as a resource to indicate how the individual interprets people and situations, is well presented in Suharno's (1982) analysis of Javanese, and Erringtons's (1985) investigation of language and social change in Java. These approaches contrast with that of Geertz (1960), who describes the use of Javanese linguistic modes as being more rigid and predetermined.) People select roles on the basis of information stored in terms of prototypes. If an individual is "prototypically" associated with the social category X, then the speaker will select the role or mode of sociolinguistic behaviour appropriate for that prototype X. The prototypes and associated norms of sociolinguistic conduct thus provide target modes of behaviour for individuals in the sociolinguistic system. These social categories, their prototypes, and the sociolinguistic roles associated with each will vary widely among sociocultural groups.

As predicted by Rosch, the social categories of a sociocultural system rarely have clearly defined boundaries. For example, in Fijian society, there is no rigid dividing line between the social categories of marama "married woman" and qase "old person". Rather, the transition of marama to qase is a gradual one (in the same way that the boundary between "mountain" and "hill" is not clearcut). As a married woman becomes older, she becomes a less-central member of the marama category, and shifts closer to the prototype of qase "old person". Whether she is categorised as marama or qase will depend on the particular individual's interpretation.
In some cases, however, the boundary between social categories may be clearly defined by rites of passage (Gennep 1960). For example, the transition between the Fijian social categories of gone-yalewa "young unmarried girl" and marama "married woman" is immediate and clearcut. It is clearly marked by the performance of the marriage ceremony.

1.3.3. DISTRIBUTION OF SOCIAL IDENTITIES AND SOCIOLINGUISTIC ROLES

Members of each social category have access to a certain range of social identities (i.e. social position of capacity that involves rights and duties distributed to specific others). The social identities which a speaker selects are conditioned by the particular social situation or role-relationship. For example, in Fijian society, a member of the gone-yalewa "young unmarried girl" category assumes the social identity of daughter in the relationship with her parents; same-sex sibling with her sisters; opposite-sex sibling with her brothers; student in the school environment; peer with friends of the same age.

In contrast, an individual in the tūraga "married man" category has access to a different range of social identities. He assumes the social identity of husband with his spouse; father with his children; father-in-law with son's wife; grandfather with children's children; peer when drinking yaqona (an intoxicating beverage made from the root of the pepper tree - Fiji's national drink) with his mates most evenings; head and representative of the family unit in formal ceremonies.

These various social identities require different sociolinguistic roles, i.e. established modes of sociolinguistic behaviour.

Having indicated that the concepts of sociolinguistic role, social identity and social category are important to this sociolinguistic analysis, it is necessary to discuss the criteria by which individuals of the sociolinguistic system may be grouped into social categories:

1. language system. Salient social categories are often linguistically coded. Thus, language may be used as an indicator for discovering major social divisions. (This does not mean that all of the social classifications codified in the lexicon will be of equal relevance to the sociolinguistic investigation, or that all important social divisions will be codified in the lexicon. Rather, the language system serves as a general indicator. It is an especially useful starting point when dealing with a radically different sociocultural group.)
2. **Physical and social factors.** The central members of each social category share a common set of physical and social features. The particular combination of features that define a prototype will never be identical for two social categories, e.g. in Waitabu, all central members of the cauravou “young unmarried man” category share a set of features relating to age, sex, and marital status:

- male
- adolescent, or people in their 20s
- unmarried

This cauravou “young unmarried man” prototype is distinguished from turaga “married man” by one primary feature, marital status. On the event of the marriage ritual when the youth takes a spouse, he changes from cauravou to turaga. (This is one of the few cases where that category boundary is clear cut.)

It is important to stress that certain less central members may not bear all of the prototypical features of the category (though there were no such cases in Waitabu village). For example, an unmarried man of 40 years of age or so may be categorised as turaga, despite the fact that his single status does not match the prototype. He is included in the turaga category by virtue of the prototypical feature of age. Similarly, a spinster of 50 years is included in the marama “married woman” category by virtue of age, despite her single status.

The social and physical criteria for defining social categories will vary from culture to culture. Certain salient features such as age and sex are common principles of social organisation, and are likely criteria for many, if not all, societies. However, other features will vary according to the particular sociocultural organisation, e.g. caste in India, class in England.

3. **Range of social identities.** As individuals move through life, they pass through various social categories. Associated with each stage is a series of social identities. The range of social identities characterising a social category is never identical, but there may be considerable overlap. For example, in Fijian, certain social categories have many identities in common (gone-yalewa “young unmarried girl” and marama “married woman” both assume the kin-based identities of daughter, cross-cousin, opposite/same-sex sibling). However, social categories will differ in at least one social identity and this will serve to distinguish one category from another, i.e. a minimal pair effect. (For example, the social identities of wife, daughter-in-law are distinguishing features that set marama “married woman” apart from gone-yalewa “young unmarried girl”.)
SOCIAL PERSONA - COMBINATION OF SOCIAL IDENTITIES

As Goodenough (1969) observes, in actual interaction, the parties to a social relationship do not ordinarily deal with one another in terms of only one identity relationship at a time. Rather, they assume a combination of identities, and hence enact a combination of roles. For such combination of social identities, Goodenough (1969) introduces the term "social persona". Separate social identities form the building blocks of a social persona. In order to investigate a sociolinguistic system and the behaviour of individuals within it, it is necessary to begin by dealing with separate social identities and describe the established mode of sociolinguistic behaviour associated with each, e.g. female/male; ceremonial participant; cross-cousin etc.

Thus, for clarity of description in this thesis, I will deal with the sociolinguistic roles (i.e. established modes of sociolinguistic behaviour) associated with single social identities. The reader should bear in mind that the described roles refer to ideal types; in the dynamics of actual behaviour, the individual may enact a combination of social identities (e.g. father, son-in-law, church-goer when attending a church service with his kin). The consequent observed sociolinguistic behaviour will frequently consist of a merger of the different sociolinguistic roles described in this study.

1.3.4. SUMMARY OF THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

The Waitabu sociolinguistic system consists of individuals who fall into socially defined categories (delineated by the sociocultural organisation). Each social category has access to a particular configuration of social identities and associated sociolinguistic roles. This is illustrated graphically in Figure 1, which summarises the social categories, social identities and associated sociolinguistic roles dealt with in this thesis.

As the figure suggests, the individual in a sociolinguistic system may be viewed as an actor who has different social identities and who accordingly performs different sociolinguistic roles. The selected social identity varies according to the social context or role-relationship. For example, an individual in the gone-yalewa "young unmarried girl" category will select the social identity of gane "opposite-sex sibling", involving a sociolinguistic role characterised by avoidance behaviour with her brother. In contrast, she will assume the social identity of tavale "cross-cousin" involving sociolinguistic behaviour of compulsory joking with her cross-cousin; and the social identity of netball player with her netball peer group, which involves use of a distinct speech style characterised by [k] instead of glottal stop.
Thus, the sociolinguistic role (i.e. established mode of sociolinguistic behaviour) is conditioned by social identities which in turn are determined by the type of role-relationship (predominantly kin-based in Waitabu) and social context (e.g. church, school, ceremony). The individual assesses various meaningful symbols in the sociolinguistic situation confronting him, and constructs his sociolinguistic behaviour usually within the basic framework of established modes of behaviour provided by the sociocultural organisation.

1.4. FIELDWORK

1.4.1. SELECTION OF FIELDSITE

In choosing a site for a case study of a sociolinguistic system, the Fijian village of Waitabu was selected as it was ideally suited for the following reasons:

1. The size of the village (120 inhabitants approximately) and its relative isolation enabled close observation of the sociolinguistic behaviour of most members of the community. The manageable size of the group made it possible to keep track of communicative links with outside the village (through which new linguistic variation may be introduced).

The choice of a small, relatively-closed community rather than an urban mass society was deliberate. Modern mass societies are made up of a bewildering variety of social worlds. The multitude of communication channels and ease of participation in them leads to simultaneous participation in a variety of these social worlds. Such diversified, pluralistic and transient communication networks in a modern mass society, render it too complex a phenomenon for a preliminary study whose purpose is to examine how a sociolinguistic system functions as a whole. Selection of a smaller, more isolated/closed community with simpler channels of communication is a more suitable and realistic starting point. Methodology for analysing the complex sociolinguistic system in a mass society may be developed later (and probably along different lines to suit the diversified and anonymous character), after we have a better understanding of how simpler, more closed sociolinguistic systems function. For such reasons, the small, relatively-isolated community of Waitabu was chosen.

2. Detailed linguistic documentation has been made of the standard and Boumān dialects of Fijian. Descriptions of the standard dialect have been provided by Churchward (1941), Milner (1956), and Schütz (1986), among others. Dixon's grammar (forthcoming) documents the Boumān dialect, which is the traditional
dialect spoken in Waitabu village. A Fijian-English, English-Fijian dictionary has been compiled by Capell (1941), and a monolingual dictionary is being compiled at the Fijian Dictionary Project, Suva.

3. The Fijian sociocultural structure has also been described in some detail. See, for example, Geddes (1945), Quain (1948), Hocart (1952), Sahlins (1962), Nayacakalou (1978), and Ravuvu (1983).

Such documentation of the grammatical rules and vocabulary of the standard and Bouman dialects, and of Fijian social structure, provides a useful basis for a sociolinguistic analysis.

1.4.2. FIELDWORK SETTING

The data on which this analysis is based was collected in the course of seven months' fieldwork (January - July 1985). Waitabu, a relatively small village of approximately 120 inhabitants, is situated on the east coast of the island of Taveuni (see Map 2). During the period of investigation, I shared in the everyday activities of Waitabu villagers, and lived in a small reed hut (12' x 15') close by the house of the Fijian family who "adopted" me as daughter into their kin network. Through participating in the range of activities in Waitabu daily life (from mat weaving, ceremonies, and yaqona drinking sessions, to daily church, fishing, bathing, carrying buckets of water from water pipe to village, preparing for cyclones ... and house building), I was able to establish close relations with most of the villagers, and observe and learn the complex network of rules and norms by which their sociolinguistic performances are organised.7

As only about half a dozen individuals at Waitabu could speak some English (i.e. construct a simple sentence), the language for everyday communication, and in which the bulk of research was conducted was Fijian, mostly Bouman dialect. Although this was, at first, overwhelming, it was ultimately advantageous, for the people came to take an active interest in my language learning and performance, and would correct my grammatical errors and guide my sociolinguistic performance by explaining in detail which mode of behaviour was appropriate to which role-relationship or social context.

7Detailed explanation of the Waitabu sociolinguistic setting is given in 2.3.
1.4.3. PROBLEMS AND RESTRICTIONS

It is necessary to be aware of various problems associated with data collection in a sociolinguistic investigation for such problems influence the outcome of a field study.

The first set of problems stems from the fact that the presence of an outside investigator in an indigenous group may well affect the "naturalness" of social and linguistic behaviour, thus influencing observations. Skin colour alone made it obvious that I was not Fijian, and though I sought to minimise the differences by acting according to the norms of Waitabu society, it is unrealistic to believe that any European can be fully "accepted": my light coloured skin served as constant reminder of a link with Australian-European society. Nevertheless, having recognised such unavoidable differences, I assumed the role of participant observer, acting and being treated according to the nature of the social context or role-relationship. Within the first month, the novelty of having a papalagi "foreigner" present in the village wore off, and rather than being focus of social groups and gatherings, I was able to take a less-central back seat with other females of my age at church services, ceremonies and in everyday interaction, and simply observe. The people were aware that my purpose was to learn their language and how to use it in various social contexts. This was useful for they came to take pride in my language learning and in an effort to help, would explain the use of various styles, or suggest that I attend certain ceremonies or gatherings in order to observe the type of language used in that particular situation.

The second problem involves the importance of natural context in data collection. There is likely to be considerable difference between how individuals think Fijian should be spoken in a given social context (i.e. normative ideas), and the way they actually do speak in such a situation. In this study, I have attempted to note and distinguish between the normative and the empirical (see 1.1). Description of sociolinguistic norms is important for every typical sociolinguistic performance has a range of variation, and such variants centre around a norm or type. The empirical aspect is equally important for it deals with reality (actual sociolinguistic performances) and enables us to view the range and extent of variation from the norm. As mentioned in 1.1, in the course of the investigation, I had many long informal conversations with individuals in order to gauge their notions of the "correct" mode of behaviour befitting various social situations. I would then observe and tape various instances of sociolinguistic performance, i.e. empirical data. (Over 50 hours of speech in natural context was recorded.) Any marked deviation from sociolinguistic norms was noted, and its cause investigated.
A third set of problems stems from concentration on one individual village. Although focusing on a single community does allow an in-depth investigation of that community, it does not detail if and how the sociolinguistic structure of Waitabu differs from other Fijian villages. The variety of social and linguistic structures across Fijian villages is both complex and subtle. Often the same terms refer to different entities and functions. For example, the *tavale* "cross cousin" relationship is of sociolinguistic interest for it requires a special "joking" mode of behaviour. (In certain other parts of Fiji, this relationship is characterised by avoidance.) In Deuba and Tokatoka (both Vitu Levu villages) *tavale* "cross cousins" are children of cross-siblings. In contrast, in Waitabu, the term *tavale* is used for fourth or more generation descendants of classificatory siblings. I have attempted to overcome such confusion by explaining the entity and function covered by the Fijian terms as they are used in Waitabu. The reader should bear in mind that the sociolinguistic system of Waitabu may not be typical of the bulk of Fijian villages. (I regret the lack of comparative data, but the problems of time and transport were great, and comparative analysis is unfortunately outside the scope of this thesis.)

1.5. DATA COLLECTION AND THESIS PLAN

In order to investigate the range of established modes of sociolinguistic behaviour and their relation to Waitabu social organisation, data was collected according to the following plan:

1. A sociological survey of the 120 inhabitants of Waitabu village was undertaken, obtaining information from each respondent on: age; family tree network; education; communicative links and travel outside the village; exposure to media forces such as radio, newspaper, and video; language and dialect ability; basic domains of language use; attitudes towards different language and dialect varieties. (Such a survey was useful for establishing contact with members of various households.) The information was acquired in a casual manner with questions interspersed through informal "getting-to-know-each-other" style conversation.

2. Through initially participating in the activities of young women such as mat weaving, washing, fishing and cooking, I was able to establish close personal ties, and observe informal conversation. Gradually I expanded my range of friends to a thorough cross-section of the village, and was thus able to observe informal conversation between various members and sub-groups of the sociolinguistic community.
3. Detailed investigation was made of the language of religious institutions, through attending twice-daily church services, and observing the speech styles employed.

4. Study of the education system and the language varieties used in education. (By assuming the role of casual English teacher at the local school, I was able to observe the local education system and its sociolinguistic implications in detail.)

5. Investigation of speech styles used to chiefly caste and elders.

6. The speech styles of ceremonies, meetings and formal social gatherings were examined.

7. In order to investigate the dialect shift from the local Boumān dialect to Standard Fijian, a sample of 20 individuals from a cross-section of the community were selected and studied for their competence, performance and attitudes to both Boumān and Standard Fijian dialects. This involved translation of texts, sentences and word lists, and the recording of stories and conversations in casual, relaxed situations.

8. During my seven months' visit to Waitabu, detailed observations and notes were made of the Waitabu sociolinguistic system and its organisational principles. This involved detailed analysis of the intricate kinship system and the village communication network.

**THESIS PLAN.** This study attempts to bring together and integrate the patterns of language use (ways of speaking) in the social and cultural context of Waitabu society. In investigating the linguistic repertoire and its integral relationship with social structure, it is necessary to explicate both the general rules for everyday sociolinguistic behaviour and the specific rules which apply in a particular sociolinguistic situation and which serve to narrowly prescribe the mode of behaviour appropriate to that particular situation (e.g. ceremony, church service), see 1.2. With this in mind, the thesis is organised on the following plan:

Chapter 2 provides the necessary background information to this study, describing the geographical, demographical and socio-historical setting of the Fiji islands. An account is given of the contemporary language situation and the linguistic diversity of the archipelago. In order to make the thesis more accessible to those not familiar with Fijian, a basic description of the structure of Fijian (Boumā dialect) is provided. Focus is then narrowed specifically to the fieldsite of
Waitabu village, and description is given of language varieties and their use, and social structure and organisation.

In chapter 3, the kinship system which lies at the heart of Waitabu social organisation, and kin-based sociolinguistic roles are analysed. This chapter gives a detailed description of the kin categories and the established modes of sociolinguistic behaviour which are associated with various kin-based social identities. It is demonstrated that individuals possess the ability to manipulate and creatively adapt the kinship system according to his interpretation and communicative needs.

Chapter 4 focuses on discourse of everyday life, dealing with the general rules and norms by which Waitabu individuals construct their everyday sociolinguistic behaviour including: male and female speech; greetings and leave-taking; deference and politeness markers; and conversational strategies. The chapter highlights the integral relationship between everyday language use and social structure and sociocultural values.

Chapter 5 provides detailed investigation of a specific speech event which is an integral aspect of Waitabu lifestyle - the ceremony. This event is characterised by special rules of speech and nonverbal behaviour, and is distinguishable by clearly defined opening and closing sequences with set sequencing of components in between. The chapter describes the specific rules and norms governing the linguistic, social and kinesic behaviour, i.e. the communicative competence required to appropriately interpret or participate in the Waitabu ceremony.

In chapter 6, the decline of chiefly respect language is described. First, I detail distinguishing lexical, grammatical and speech act features of the speech style traditionally used towards the village chief. Then, I investigate the loss of these specific rules and norms in sociolinguistic behaviour towards the chief in contemporary Waitabu, exploring sociocultural factors contributing to this change in mode of sociolinguistic behaviour.

Chapter 7 gives detailed description of dialect levelling evident in Waitabu. The various dialect varieties and their domains are described. Language attitudes and factors conducive to dialect shift are also investigated. Then follows analysis of how individuals creatively use these dialect differences in constructing their sociolinguistic behaviour, to mark certain sociolinguistic contexts and role-relationships as distinct. Focus is on the specific rules and norms for sociolinguistic behaviour in the netball peer-group and in interaction with Indians.
Chapter 8 investigates the special patterns of language use which characterise two institutionalised modes of communication in Waitabu society - religion and education.

A summary of the Waitabu investigation is provided in Chapter 9.
Chapter 2
SOCIOLINGUISTIC PERSPECTIVE

2.1. FIJI OVERVIEW

2.1.1. GEOGRAPHY

The purpose of this chapter is to provide the necessary background information to the investigation by placing Waitabu language and society within the wider context of Fiji and the Pacific, and by providing an introductory sketch of Waitabu social organisation and linguistic variation. First is description of the geography, demography, sociocultural setting, and language variation within the Fijian archipelago. Focus is then narrowed to the fieldsite of Waitabu village, and detailed description is given of the community, language varieties and their use, and social organisation. Social groups of Waitabu are described in relation to the notion of social categories (1.3). Finally, in order to make the thesis more accessible to the reader who is not familiar with Fijian, the basic organisation of Fijian grammar is given in 2.4.

Of the general background information provided in this chapter, it is important to highlight 2.3.3 - 2.3.5 as crucial to understanding the following descriptive chapters. 2.3.3 provides essential information on language varieties and their use in Waitabu. 2.3.4 and 2.3.5 describe the basic principles of Waitabu social organisation which is important to the general analysis.

Fiji is a group of some 330 islands situated in the South Pacific Ocean about 1,300 miles north of Auckland, New Zealand. The islands, about 100 of which are inhabited, straddle the 180th meridian, and lie between 15 and 22 degrees latitude some 1,100 miles south of the equator. See Map 1. The total land area of the archipelago is a 7,161 square miles, and its largest island, Viti Levu, comprises more than half of this area. The larger islands are of volcanic origin while many of the smaller ones are of limestone formation; most of them are surrounded by coral reefs which afford many miles of protected waterways.
Mountain ranges (reaching a height of 4,300 feet above sea level) form a chain from north to south down the centre of the main island, Viti Levu. This topographical boundary divides the archipelago into east and west. There is a marked difference in the climate and type of vegetation between east and west zones of the archipelago. The western division is comparatively dry (annual rainfall averages between 70 - 90 inches) and vegetation is sparse. In contrast, the eastern section is more lush; dense forest growth covers much of the land outside the cultivated areas. The average rainfall of 120 inches per annum is fairly well distributed throughout the year. As the old local chestnut states: “there are only two seasons in these parts - the wet season and the rainy season”.

2.1.2. DEMOGRAPHY

The population of Fiji is about 634,000 and comprises various ethnic groups. The racial composition estimated at the end of 1980 was: Fijians 282,000 (44%); Indians 317,000 (50%); Europeans 4,000 (1%); Chinese 5,000 (1%); Part-European 11,000 (2%); all others, including Rotumans, Tongans and other Pacific Islanders comprise 2%.¹

Approximately 64,000 live in the capital city, Suva. This figure is steadily increasing due to an urban drift from the country areas of Viti Levu and other islands. Details of rural/urban living by ethnic group are shown in Table 2.1.

Table 2-1: RURAL/URBAN LIVING BY ETHNIC GROUP, 1976

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>European</th>
<th>Fijian</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Rotuma</th>
<th>Banaba</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rural</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urban</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Indians form the largest ethnic group comprising half of the total

population. The 61% rural dwellers are confined largely to the coasts of the two main islands, Viti Levu and Vanua Levu, and seldom far from towns. Indians are more prominent than Fijians in business and most of the professions.

Fijians are spread throughout the archipelago, occupying the remotest islands and inaccessible highlands, as well as the towns. As Table 2.1 shows, 70% of the Fijian population is rural-dwelling. A major impetus for Fijians to remain as rural dwellers is that they are, by law, land owners: over 80% of land in Fiji belongs to Fijians (see 2.2.3).

2.1.3. LANGUAGES

There are two major vernacular languages spoken in Fiji - Fijian and Fiji Hindi- and three contact languages -Pidgin Fijian, Pidgin Hindi and Fiji Pidgin English. The language of the former colonial power, English, remains as the principle language of the government, commerce and education.
FIJIAN

There are some 300 dialects\(^2\) of Fijian, i.e. codes with little or no apparent regional variation spoken by people who claim to speak the same code. A dialect/communalect typically covers a number of villages in a geographically-defined area, but may be confined to one village (e.g. Navatu, Bua), or be spread over more than 20 villages (e.g. Namosi, Lau) (Geraghty 1983:17-18). The Fijian dialects form two groups\(^3\): the major linguistic boundary runs down the centre of Viti Levu, and unambiguously divides the dialects into eastern and western divisions. (This major isogloss more or less coincides with the topographical boundary described in 2.1.1.) Dialects within each division are linked in a dialect chain. Map 3 illustrates the major divisions and subgroupings within the Fiji group.\(^4\) A thorough investigation of the internal relationships of the Fijian dialects and their historical development has been made by Geraghty (1983). See also Capell and Lester (1941-42), and Schütz (1962).

In many cases, the differences between neighbouring dialects are small - a few differences in the form of some lexical and grammatical items. Communication is not impeded in any way, but to speakers of these dialects, the few distinctive features are significant enough to be able to pinpoint a person's home locality by his speech. These distinguishing features thus serve as useful sociolinguistic markers of the regional group with which the speaker identifies.

To assist the reader who is not familiar with Fijian, the basic organisation of Fijian grammar is described in 2.4. See also 7.2.

FIJI HINDI

Fiji Hindi, known locally as FIJI BAAT, is the language spoken in Indian homes. Fiji Baat is the common language which developed among indentured labourers from the Uttar Pradesh region. It is based on the dialects of Bihar and Eastern Hindi (Moag 1979:116-117). Description of this language is given in Moag (1977, 1979) and Siegel (1975, 1977). Fiji Hindi is generally considered to be a

\(^2\)These "dialects" are also referred to as "communalects", see Pawley and Sayaba (1971), and Geraghty (1983).

\(^3\)Pawley and Sayaba (1971) argue that eastern and western Fijian form two major subgroups. Geraghty (1983) accepts the western Fijian, but argues that eastern Fijian is not a coherent subgroup but a residual collection of subgroups.

\(^4\)Note that according to Geraghty's subgrouping shown on Map 3, the controversial Kadavu dialect is classed as a dialect of the Eastern language.
degenerate form of Standard Hindi (Siegel 1975:129, Moag 1978b:75). It has little prestige and is never written. It is the same throughout Fiji, except that the varieties spoken by South Indians, Muslims, and Indians living in Labasa (Vanua Levu) all have minor distinctive traits (Moag 1979:121-122).

Standard Hindi is the formal language most commonly used by Fiji Indians. It is used almost exclusively in the domains of religion, public speaking, education, writing, broadcasting, and so on (Siegel 1975:129). Films and recorded music in Standard Hindi are also very popular. Nevertheless, most Fiji Indians have passive rather than active knowledge of Standard Hindi, and younger Indians are increasingly unable to write it (Siegel 1975:129, Moag 1978a:136).

**PIDGINS**

The three hybrid language forms - Pidgin Hindi, Pidgin Fijian and Pidgin English- are used for communication between ethnic groups. Geraghty (1984:53-4) describes their use thus:

There is little voluntary intercommunal activity in Fiji. Most voluntary activities and organisations are along ethnic lines, the minor ethnic groups generally included with the Fijians; moreover, when there is crossover, there are usually more Indians in Fijian activities than vice versa....

So it is with languages. When there is informal intercommunal contact, which occurs most commonly in commercial transactions (in shops, markets, restaurants, buses, and so on), the language is more likely to be Fijian than Hindi, since the proportion of non-Fijians who know Fijian is far higher than the proportion of non-Indians who know Hindi. Another possibility, of course, is English. Each of these three languages is usually used in its pidgin form, though there are numerous levels between the pidgin and the colloquial or standard norm. Each pidgin appears to be relatively uniform, but there are variations in pronunciation determined by the speaker's first language.


**GOVERNMENT LANGUAGE POLICY**

No language has been designated as either the "official" or "national" language of Fiji. The constitution deals only with the language of parliament:
The official language of parliament shall be English, but any member of either House may address the chair in the House of which he is a member in Fijian or Hindustani.

Chapter V (Parliament), Part 4 (Powers and Procedures). (Beede 1971)

In practice, however, the language of both Houses is English. Fijian and Hindi are used only very occasionally.

That English is the major language of government is evident in the following: English is used for almost all correspondence between government officers, although there is no apparent regulation requiring it; the vast majority of government publications, forms, posters and the like are in English only; and there is no requirement that members of the public writing in Fijian or Hindi receive replies in the same language.

**LANGUAGES OF THE MEDIA**

The media of mass communication, once the almost exclusive domain of English, have become increasingly a vehicle for vernacular languages.

The Fiji Broadcasting Commission has two stations. Programs are broadcast in English, Fiji and Hindi. Table 2.2 illustrates that the broadcasting time for the three languages has become more equal in recent years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOURS PER WEEK OF BROADCASTING IN ENGLISH, HINDI &amp; FIJIAN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(from Geraghty 1984:64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fijian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the time of the investigation, there was no television service in Fiji, but press reports in September 1985 indicated that the Fijian Government had agreed to its admission (transmitted via satellite by an Australian company). The video trend had already provided the necessary infrastructure for a television service:
Geraghty (1984:61) estimates that video cassette recorders had brought films into the homes of about 5-7,000 owners by September 1982. This sociolinguistic investigation describes pre-television Fiji. Upon the introduction of t.v., the sociolinguistic complexion may alter considerably.

There are five general interest newspapers. Two, both in English, are published daily. All non-English papers are weekly. Table 2.3 indicates that English has the largest circulation, followed by Fijian and then Hindi.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEWSPAPER</th>
<th>LANGUAGE</th>
<th>PUBLISHED</th>
<th>PER ISSUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiji Times/</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>daily</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Times</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>daily</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji Sun/</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>daily</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Sun</td>
<td>Fijian</td>
<td>weekly</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nai Lalakai</td>
<td>Fijian</td>
<td>weekly</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siga Rama</td>
<td>Fijian</td>
<td>weekly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanti Dut</td>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>weekly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for the number of books for sale in the three main languages, English volumes are estimated in the thousands, Hindi in the hundreds, and Fijian in the tens (Geraghty 1984:60). In the sale of song cassettes, English is less fortunate, constituting only about 10% of the market, the rest being shared evenly between Fijian and Hindi music.

Films are usually in Hindi or English. There are no Fijian language films.

Further details of the sociolinguistic complexion of the Fiji archipelago are provided by Geraghty (1984).
2.2. SOCIOHISTORICAL SETTING

2.2.1. PREHISTORY

The Fijian dialects belong to the Austronesian family of languages. Austronesian has two major subgroups: (a) Formosan, which is comprised of a handful of languages indigenous to Taiwan; (b) the Malayo-Polynesian subgroup which includes Fijian and all of the other languages. Malayo-Polynesian is divided into two extensive branches (eastern and western). In the western branch there are more than 300 languages, spoken in areas such as Malaysia, Indonesia, Borneo, Malagasy, the Philippines, and part of Irian Jaya. The eastern branch—Oceanic—consists of about 500 languages in coastal areas of New Guinea, and on islands in Micronesia, Melanesia and Polynesia. The two closely related Fijian languages belong to the Oceanic group. While subgrouping within this group is controversial, it does seem certain that Proto-Fijian (the ancestor of the modern languages) was a close relative of Rotuman and of Proto-Polynesian (the ancestor of languages such as Tongan, Samoan, Maori, Hawaiian and Tahitian). For detailed discussion of Austronesian and Oceanic subgrouping, see Grace (1959, 1961, 1969), Pawley (1972, 1974), Blust (1974, 1977), Dyen (1960), Pawley and Green (1984), Dixon (forthcoming).

Archeologists and linguists generally agree that Fiji was settled about 3,500 years ago. The major east-west dialect division is an ancient one, traceable to a split in the parent language which probably occurred more than 2,000 years ago. For details of historical reconstruction of the Fijian language, see Geraghty (1983:348-390) and Pawley and Sayaba (1971).

2.2.2. PRE-WHITE CONTACT

Prior to the arrival of white man at the end of the 18th century, there were half a dozen principal Fiji kingdoms, all quite small, usually situated in the areas of greatest Polynesian influence. Unstable and shifting alliances were usually formed under the leadership of a temporarily powerful paramount chief. Around the time of white contact, in Viti Levu (the largest island), the important kingdoms or confederacies were Bau, Rewa and Verata, all in the south-east of the island. On Vanua Levu (the second largest island lying to the north of Viti Levu), Macuata, Bua and Cakaudrove; and in the Lau islands (in the east), Lakeba.

Probably half of the Fiji group lay outside of these so-called kingdoms where, due to geographical isolation, these people maintained a more technically-primitive, independent type of Melanesian culture.5 Throughout the islands, dialect and

dialect groups were coterminus with small political units of a few hundreds or a few thousands of people in a state of endemic and frequently recurring warfare with their neighbours. Certainly warfare and cannibalism were constant pastimes and for such traits the Fijians were notorious among other Pacific islanders and early European explorers and traders alike.

The pre-white contact situation was somewhat resemblant of the feudal states of Europe and Japan - small political units each with their own language form of identity, and characterised internally by a rigid social hierarchy, and externally by shifting alliances to more powerful units.

Prior to the European arrival at the end of the 18th century, Tongan influence was strong, especially in the Lau group of islands. The Tongans, whose islands are poorly endowed with natural resources, needed wood for their canoes, and other artifacts especially pottery (a characteristically Melanesian craft well-developed in Fiji). Fiji also served as an outlet for their surplus population and a more spacious training ground for their warriors. The Fijians, for their part, needed not only the help of politically more astute and militarily more capable Tongan advisers and leaders, but also Tongan artifacts, especially yaqona bowls, bark cloths and mats.

Tongans were by far more dominant than other foreigners in Fiji; in parts of Lau they even outnumbered the Fijians. In the 1860's the Tongan chief Ma'afu, had control over practically all of Fiji except Viti Levu and Lomai Viti. See Sayes (1982:257-306) for detailed description of Fiji's relationship with Tonga. Only in Lau, however, did Tongans make a lasting impression. In Lau there was - and still is - the most elaborate form of a chiefly register to be found in the Fijian archipelago, similar in function to that of Tonga and Samoa, but very different in form, used when talking of a chief. Also, contemporary Lauan dialects are characterised by various Tongan loan words.

Vivid description of the 19th century way of life, when European influence was minimal, is given in Wallis (1851), Williams (1858), and Henderson (1931).

---

*6 It is possible that rigid social hierarchy was due to Polynesian influence, and therefore was most evident in the eastern section of the archipelago where Tongan influence was strongest.

*7 A much less elaborate speech style indicating chiefly respect in Waitabu village is described in chapter 6.

*8 These lexical items usually refer to objects and concepts introduced from Tonga - particularly in the spheres of Church, formal education, Tongan-style bark cloth manufacture, European clothing, horse riding and pig-rearing (Geraghty 1984:74).
2.2.3. CHANGES IN POST-CONTACT PERIOD

The arrival of white man radically altered the sociopolitical complexion of the Fiji islands. The first "hard" date of European contact was over 300 years ago, when the Dutch navigator, Abel Tasman, sighted some islands in the north of the group on February 6, 1643. However, Fiji's reputation as cannibal-ridden and reef-infested deterred visitors until the 19th century when traders discovered large quantities of sandalwood, and then bêche-de-mer.

The second influx of Europeans -the missionaries- had a profound effect on the sociolinguistic situation in Fiji. Their manifest goal was to convert Fijians to Christianity and, as is evident throughout contemporary Fiji, in this they were undoubtedly successful. One of their major weapons was literacy. As Clammer (1976) demonstrates, this force had important ramifications in many aspects of the sociocultural fabric.

The first European missionaries arrived in 1835. Their instructions were to learn the language, devise a spelling system for it, and translate the scriptures and other religious works as soon as possible (Schütz 1972:2). An admirable orthography was devised by David Cargill, one of the earliest missionaries who fortunately was also a talented linguist. This orthography is still in use today, (see Orthography, in the preliminary pages of this thesis).

The arrival of a printing press in 1838 highlighted the need to select one of the Fijian languages as a sole literary medium. (Initially, many religious works were printed in a variety of dialects from the various mission stations -Lakeba, Somosomo (Taveuni), Rewa, Viwa, and Nadi (Bua).) In 1843, the "Bauan" dialect was chosen as the Fijian language since it was the language of the most powerful state at the time and was very similar to Standard Fijian, the existing language of diplomacy. From then on, printing in other Fijian dialects ceased abruptly. As Geraghty (1984:35) notes, however, the language which appeared in books -and eventually became the literary standard- differed noticeably from the actual language of Bau. This literary style, called "Old High Fijian", is described in detail in chapter 9. Schütz (1972) gives a thorough account of early missionary linguistic studies.

*The chief of Bau, Cakabau (born 1817) exerted tremendous influence on events in Fiji until his death in 1883. The pastimes of warring and cannibalism lessened noticeably when Cakabau finally embraced Christianity in 1854. From then on the wars he waged were, in effect, holy wars. The conversion of chiefs was a keystone in the spread of Christianity, for the villagers converted automatically in obedience to their chief.*
FIJI - A BRITISH COLONY

In 1874, Fiji was ceded by a number of its chiefs to Great Britain. The first governor, Sir Arthur Gordon, was sympathetic to the indigenous culture and was determined that the Fijian way of life remain undisturbed. He appointed a commission to enquire into land sales, and consequently over 80% of the land remained in Fijian hands. He also disapproved of Fijians working on plantations and believed Indians would be ideal as labourers.

So in 1879, the first Indian indentured labourers arrived. The Indian population gradually increased as more decided to stay, and leased farming land, set up shops, or became hawkers. By the end of indenture in 1916, they constituted 30% of the total population. This number has continued to increase to the present day.

INDEPENDENCE

On October 10, 1970, Fiji became independent, though remaining a member of the Commonwealth. The years since then have been characterised by the promotion of vernacular languages and associated cultures (e.g. the establishment of the (Indian) Girmit Centre in 1979, and the Fijian Dictionary Project in 1974, both with government assistance). There are signs that language attitudes have been affected by independence:

Ten years later [after independence], English remains unchallenged as the sole language of commerce and industry and the major language of government and education, but there are indications that its prestige is not as great as it was, while that of the vernaculars (or Fijian at least) has risen. Fundamental to this development is the simple fact that Fiji is no longer a colony.

[Geraghty 1984:57]

For detailed documentation of sociocultural change in the white contact period, see Geddes (1959), Clammer (1976), Nayacakalou (1978), and Chao (1980) for a case study of the Rewa area.
2.3. CONTEMPORARY WAITABU VILLAGE

2.3.1. LOCATION

Waitabu village is situated on the east coast of Taveuni\textsuperscript{10} in the north of the Fiji group. See Map 2. It is bordered to the east by the Pacific Ocean and to the west by a rainforest-clad mountain which rises steeply to a height of 4,200 feet. Waitabu is a relatively small village of about 120 people, all of whom are Fijians. There are 18 sleeping houses, facing towards a village green (rārā) which is bordered on one side by sandy beach. Around the perimeter of the village are located small reed or corrugated iron cooking huts, where meals are prepared. Jungle closely hems the village and various paths lead through the undergrowth to gardens which provide much of the food in this basically subsistence lifestyle. Map 4 gives the layout of the village.

Waitabu is half a mile from a dirt road which follows close to the coastline of Taveuni linking the various villages. The Bouma region in which Waitabu is located is at the end of the road. (Rock cliffs, jungle and mountains prevent its extension.) The Bouma region comprises five villages - Lavena, Korovou, Vindawa, Wai and Waitabu. Korovou, the largest village, is the "capital" and there is continual communication among all villages. Inhabitants within the Bouma region claim to speak a common code, the Boumā dialect, although by linguistic criterion there are few, if any, apparent differences from neighbouring dialect forms (see 2.3.3).

2.3.2. EFFECTS OF WESTERNISATION

As a result of contact with European culture, the Fijian economy has altered from one of subsistence agriculture, fishing, hunting and collecting to an economy partly organised on a monetary basis. Coincidentally, many aspects of the traditional social structure have been affected in varying degrees. There is striking variety among Fijian villages, which may be placed on a continuum according to the degree of modernisation. Waitabu village falls towards the traditional end of the scale.\textsuperscript{11}

There is no electricity or running water. Bathing and clothes-washing takes place at a waterpipe about 1/4 mile away. Water is carried in buckets back to the village. There is the odd piece of furniture but this is seldom used. Most activities

\textsuperscript{10}Taveuni is about 26 miles long, and 477 square miles in area. Total population is 10,558, comprising 8,083 Fijians, 1,796 Indians and 679 Europeans.

\textsuperscript{11}As pressures of communication and transport increase with time, Waitabu and other more traditional villages will shift along the continuum towards the other pole of modernisation.
-eating, yaqona drinking, chatting, church services, village meetings—take place sitting cross-legged on the floor.\textsuperscript{12} The economy is basically subsistence with fishing and gardening providing the main food source.

There are some material signs of westernisation: about two thirds of the houses are wooden, with tin roofs. There are a few radios. (Programs which villagers listen to are mostly in Standard Fijian.) A little money (earned through the sale of coconuts to outside) is used to acquire European tobacco, tinned fish, flour and rice from the local store.

Two western institutions—church and the school—have had major impact on the lifestyle and sociolinguistic complexion of the village. Watibau is a Roman Catholic village, and church services are held twice daily. A wooden drum is beaten at six in the morning and at six at night to announce the services. Because Waitabu is a financially poor village and there is no church building, services are held in a different house each day. (Coexisting with Christianity is a deep-seated, though not-so-often discussed belief in traditional Fijian gods. The worshipping of traditional gods, cast as "satanic" by the Church, is still practised, but this is not publicly admitted.)

There are nine primary and three high schools on the island. In the local Bouma school, the medium of instruction is Standard Fijian. A few children attend a "better" Catholic school on the other side of the island which teaches in English. (A detailed sociolinguistic description of the church and the school is given in chapter 8.)

The communicative links between Waitabu and the outside world have increased greatly due to forces of westernisation. There is an airstrip at the northern tip of the island and daily flights operate from Suva. A bus service travels the coastal road three times a day. There is a telephone at Waitabu, but the line travels through swamp and jungle, pinned to coconut trees along the way, and is shared with other villages in the Bouma region. Consequently, communication by this telephone system is often not possible.

Communication outside the village is mainly with other Fijians. Waitabu villagers do not appear to mix voluntarily with Europeans or Indians. Contact with Indians is limited to economic transactions—Indians own most of the small stores.

\textsuperscript{12}Physical height is associated with social height, and it is socially taboo to assume a stance higher than others, or to reach above their heads without first asking permission. Western furniture, which raises the body above floor level, thus renders observing of traditional social etiquette more difficult.
on Taveuni. Europeans own some cattle and coconut plantations and there is very limited contact with Europeans when Fijians are hired for casual work.

2.3.3. LANGUAGE VARIETIES AND THEIR USE

TAVEUNI LANGUAGE SITUATION

The island of Taveuni has four dialects: Vuna, Cakaudrove, Wainikele and Boumā.

Although there are only very slight lexical and grammatical differences among the dialects, these are sufficient for individuals to recognise their own dialect as distinct, and speakers appear to take considerable pride in their own language variety. As a result of increased communication (2.3.2) and traditional exogamous marriage patterns, various features of other Taveuni dialects have infiltrated speech at Waitabu (see chapter 7 for detailed description).

WAITABU LANGUAGE VARIETIES

There are three basic language varieties used in Waitabu:

1. Traditional Boumān (vosa va’a-Boumā), used among elders or by younger people when speaking to elders. (Competence in this code varies widely.)

2. Traditional Boumān and Standard Fijian mix (vei-curu-ma’i “mix together”), has everyday usage by most villagers.

3. Standard Fijian (vosa va’a-Viti), is used in church, school, and as lingua franca when speaking to strangers whose native dialect is not known. Although Waitabu speakers use the single term vosa va’a-Viti to cover the speech used in these domains, linguists distinguish further:
• **Standard Fijian** is used in formal traditional contexts in mixed Fijian society, e.g. political speeches and ceremonies, and when speaking to high status people such as the prime minister.

• **Colloquial Fijian** is used in informal situations, e.g. in Suva street conversations by native Fijian speakers.

• **Old High Fijian** is the literary style, used in newspaper and other writings. This style derives from early missionaries’ idiosyncratic translation of the Bible and religious works.

Distinguishing linguistic features of these codes are listed in Appendix 2.1 at the end of this chapter. In actual usage, however, Waitabu speakers mix the three codes in many combinations. Thus, in this thesis, where the code distinction is not relevant, I will gloss vosa va’ā-Viti as “Standard Fijian”.

Waitabu village is a clear case of dialect diffusion with Traditional Boumān being influenced by Standard Fijian on every linguistic level. Impressionistically, older speakers use and recall many more Boumān features than do younger people (of approximately 20 years of age). The phenomenon of dialect levelling is documented in chapter 7.

One salient phonological feature that distinguishes Boumān (and other northern dialects) from Standard Fijian is the glottal stop, which corresponds to [k] in Standard Fijian. Because it is a feature of a non-standard dialect, glottal stop has no symbolic representation in the Fijian writing system. In this thesis, the glottal stop is represented by ['].

### 2.3.4. SOCIAL ORGANISATION

Waitabu society is hierarchical and status within the social structure is hereditary. The society is composed of kin-residential units. These units are combined in increasingly inclusive larger ones: families are combined into lineages (ito’ato’a); lineages are combined into clans (mataqali). There are two mataqali in Waitabu. This is an important social division for it is a group whose communal activities cover many aspects of village life, (e.g. births, marriages and deaths of individual members are causes of ceremony for the whole group. Also, land is owned by the mataqali.)

The two mataqali form a yavusa which coincides with the village community.\(^{13}\) As members of the same yavusa, Waitabu villagers trace their

---

\(^{13}\)There is much variation in village structure throughout Fiji, e.g. a village may comprise more than one yavusa, or a yavusa may extend over several villages. The number of mataqali and ito’ato’a units comprising a yavusa also varies widely.
descendants on the male line to a common ancestor or ancestor god, and acknowledge the one chief. The hierarchy continues as Waitabu and other villages combine to form the region (vanua) of Bouma. In turn, Bouma and other regions form the district (ti'ina) of Waini'ele. Then, ti'inas combine to form the province (yasana) of Cakaudrove.14 This hierarchical social organisation may be illustrated as:

- **yasana** "province"
- **ti'ina** "district"
- **vanua** "region"
- **yavusa** = Waitabu village

At each level, subgroups are ranked in strict hierarchy, e.g. Vunivesi mataqali is ranked above Waiso'i mataqali. Similarly, within each mataqali the ito'ato'a units are ranked.

At the head of the village hierarchy is the village chief, Tui Nasau. Chiefly status is generally hereditary and handed on by descent in the male line. In theory, the chief has authority over all members of the village and has certain privileges and responsibilities. In general, anything requiring the co-operation of the whole village must receive his authority and consent. However, in practice, erosion of respect for the chiefly position is apparent. This is manifested in the decline of chiefly respect language (described in chapter 6).

Age and sex are other fundamental principles for the ranking of individuals. Within the household, the senior man exercises authority over everyone else; the men over the women; the old over the young. Thus age and sex are important determinants of interpersonal behaviour and consequently of sociolinguistic performances.

---

14 Ti'ina "district" and yasana "province" are non-traditional units introduced by the British administration. Prior to this, there was a traditional unit, matanitū, which corresponded roughly with the contemporary ti'ina.
The kinship system is of primary importance in Waitabu society: it organises economic, political, religious, ceremonial and recreational activity. Waitabu society is patrilocal. Marriage is usually exogamous and much importance is placed on the continuation of the male line in each family. The social norm is for the woman, once married, to shift to and assimilate into the village of her husband. The sociolinguistic implications of these features of Waitabu social organisation are demonstrated in the following chapters.

2.3.5. SOCIAL CATEGORIES AND SOCIAL GROUPS

Nowhere in the world are there societies in which members behave just haphazardly as will or whim sways them. The result would be chaos, anarchy and probably swift annihilation. On the contrary, there are everywhere expected forms of behaviour between people categorised in particular ways. As indicated in 1.3.2, Waitabu villagers are classed into major social categories delineated by the sociocultural organisation. The six basic categories in Waitabu are based on age and sex distinctions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gone &quot;child&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gone-yalewa &quot;young unmarried girl&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cauravou &quot;young unmarried man&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marama &quot;married woman&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tūraga &quot;married man&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qase &quot;elderly person&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individuals from these six basic social categories combine to form groups. The internal relations of most groups in Waitabu society are hierarchical. This hierarchy is manifested in the range and nature of sociolinguistic roles available to members of each social category. For example, individuals from all categories form kin-resident units which combine into increasingly larger units of the hierarchy - the household, ito'ato'a, mataqali. Within each unit, old are ranked above young, men are ranked over women. The heads of units throughout the village hierarchy are males. This ranking principle reserves those roles (established modes of behaviour) characterised by power and authority for male social categories (e.g. cauravou "youth", tūraga "married man", qase "old man"). In contrast, the female social categories (gone-yalewa "young unmarried girl", marama "married woman", and qase "old [female] person") have a range of sociolinguistic roles which are often characterised by subordination and deference. Furthermore, as leaders and representatives of the group at various levels of the hierarchy, the members of male categories have exclusive access to certain speech acts. For
example, the ceremonial performance, involving an intricate and formulaic speech ritual (chapter 5), is conducted only by the male, who represents the unit of which he is head.

The hierarchical organisation delineates certain individuals within these basic social categories for more specific sociolinguistic roles. For example, the social identity of village chief may be played by an individual from the social category of tūraga "married man" or qase "old (male) person". This social identity is limited to only one individual of the Waitabu sociolinguistic community. As a member of the tūraga or qase category, the individual in the position of village chief assumes the same set of kin roles as other individuals in the category -father, brother, grandfather, father-in-law, and so on. However, in addition, he assumes a certain range of sociolinguistic roles related to his chiefly status. For example, as leader of the village unit, the chief is frequently involved in ceremonies; he sits at the top of social gatherings, and is shown social and linguistic deference by other members of the community.

Quain (1948:199) indicates that in traditional society in Northern Fiji, displays of chiefly respect were made to all members of the chiefly caste. However, in contemporary Waitabu society at least, the group of individuals commanding chiefly respect has become restricted to one core member of the chiefly caste -the chief himself (and as demonstrated in chapter 6, there is an erosion of respect even to this individual).

In short, individuals from the six basic social categories are organised, by the social organisation into major kin-based groupings of the household, ito'ato'a, mataqali.

Running across these kinship groupings are other voluntary social groups organised on the basis of age and sex. The members of each age-sex group belong essentially to the same social category, e.g. youth, young girl groups, and so on. These groups are less-rigidly structured than kin groups.

Young unmarried men (cauravou) tend to create an informal organisation of the nature of a gang. At night they go around together, drinking yaqona and singing. The favourite common activity is rugby. The group may all sleep in an empty house in the village if it is available. (Traditionally, the young unmarried men also apparently slept outside their ordinary domestic units in a "bachelors' house".) The young men’s group is loosely structured: there are no initiations, no offices, no titles or the like. After marriage, young men gradually leave the
company of the adolescent gang, especially as they assume responsibilities of parenthood and family life. (As a female researcher, I was unable to act as participant observer in all-male groups.)

Young unmarried girls (gone-yalewa) go about together in smaller groups of about two to four members. Young girls do not have the opportunity to operate consistently as a group: they perform fewer communal economic tasks than the boy’s gang; are tied to their domestic activities during the day; and are not often allowed to run about freely at night. However, in their spare time at the end of the day, young girls do share activities such as netball and playing cards. As described in 7.8.2, certain linguistic features (e.g. pronunciation of [k] instead of the glottal stop of the Boumān dialect) serve as markers of identity for players of a young girls’ netball game.

Married women (marama) do not ordinarily combine in purely social groups. They often organise communal economic activities such as weaving mats for a mataqali or village activity, or religious activities such as the women’s prayer group. Outside these activities, they mostly remain confined to their respective households.

Mature men and elders often gather in the evening for yaqona drinking. These frequent yaqona sessions are held in a different house each night. The sessions, accompanied by guitar playing, singing and conversation usually last until well after midnight.

2.4. THE BASIC ORGANISATION OF FIJIAN GRAMMAR

It would be inappropriate here to provide even a sketch grammar of Fijian since there are available adequate grammars by Milner (1972), Schütz (1986) and Dixon (forthcoming). But it may be helpful to the reader, in studying the examples, to summarise extremely briefly some of the principles of clause structure.

**Predicate.** This is the only obligatory element in a Fijian clause. A sentence can consist of just a predicate, e.g. au la’o “I’m going”.

Every predicate must contain a head. In an intransitive clause the predicate head can be a verb (without the transitive suffix), an adjective, a noun or a pronoun. The head of the predicate in a transitive clause can only be a verb with a transitive suffix, which has the form -Ci or -Caki in Standard Fijian, but -Ci or -Ca’ini in Boumān (7.2.3); here C is a consonant.
If the object is a personal name or a place name, it must be included immediately after the transitive suffix, e.g. **au rai-ci Jone** "I am looking at John"; otherwise an object pronoun (see 7.4.3 and tables 7.2-3) will immediately follow the transitive suffix, e.g. **o rai-ci au** "You are looking at me". The unmarked form of third person singular object is -a, replacing the final -i of the transitive suffix, e.g. **au rai-ca** "I am looking at him/her/it".

Except in an imperative, a predicate must begin with a subject pronoun, e.g. **au "I", o "you (sg)"** (see 7.4.3 and tables 7.2-3).

All other constituents of a predicate are optional. These are:

(a) between subject pronoun and head - tense markers (ā "past", na "future"); aspect markers (sa, sā), and pre-head particles such as qei "and then" (see 7.2.2); via "want to"; rui "to a great extent". (b) after head - post-head particles such as dina "truly"; sara "very"; tī'o "continuous"; tū "permanent state"; be'a "perhaps"; adverbs and demonstratives (7.2.2).

**NOUN PHRASE.** The reference of either subject pronoun or object pronoun in the predicate (or both) may optionally be expanded by a noun phrase, which will normally follow the head. A noun phrase begins with an "article" - if the head of the NP is a common noun then the article is a (which has allomorph na after a preposition, see 7.2.2); if the head of the NP is a personal or place name then the article is o. Adjectives follow the head, e.g. a gone lailai "small child". A demonstrative will come at the end of the NP (7.2.2.). A number specification comes at the beginning of the NP (preceding the article), with the number preceded by e, e.g. e dua a gone "one child".

**POSSESSION.** This is one of the most complex areas of Fijian grammar; reference should be made to the standard grammatical treatises for a full account.

There are bound nouns (for which a possessor should be stated) and free nouns (statement of possessor is optional). Bound nouns take a possessive suffix, e.g. līga-qu "my hand", līqa-mu "your hand". When the possessor is a personal name, a bound noun will take a suffix -i followed by the name, e.g. līqa-i Jone "John's hand". Free nouns are preceded by a possessive pronoun, whose first element shows a classifier choice, e.g. 'e-mu madrai "your (edible) bread", me-mu wai "your (drinkable) water". (There is a full paradigm of possessive pronouns in Tables 7.2-3.) When the possessor is a personal name, possession is shown by a classifier element plus -i, e.g. madrai 'e-i Jone "John's (edible) bread", wai me-i Jone "John's (drinkable) water".
PREPOSITIONS. The main prepositions in Boumān are i "to, at, concerning" and mai "from"; these are replaced by vei before an NP whose head is a pronoun or personal name. Thus i na vale "to the house", i Suva "to Suva", vei Jone "to John", vei au "to me". One further preposition is 'ei - vata 'ei "together with".

DERIVATIONS. There are a number of derivational prefixes, some having a wide syntactic and semantic range. Va'a- may derive adverbs, e.g. levu "big", va'a-levu "greatly", and also verbs, then cooccurring with transitive suffix -ta'ina, e.g. yaga "useful", va'a-yaga-ta'ina "to use"; balavu "long", va'a-balavu-ta'ina "make long". To mention one further example, the prefix i- derives a noun from a verb, e.g. sele "to cut, slice", i-sele "a knife".

LINKING PARTICLES. There are a number of particles that link together clauses, e.g. 'ēva'i ~ 'ē "if", se "or", ni "when, because, that", me "in order to, should". These cohere phonologically with certain of the subject pronouns, e.g. me plus au yields meu.
Appendix 2.1 LINGUISTIC FEATURES OF OLD HIGH FIJIAN, STANDARD FIJIAN, & COLLOQUIAL FIJIAN

(from Geraghty 1984:74)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OHF</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>CF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>relative pronoun</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>o, ka</td>
<td>o, koya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proper article</td>
<td>ka, koi</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you(singular)</td>
<td>ko</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>locative preposition</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>i/va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>directional prep.</td>
<td>ki</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animate preposition</td>
<td>(ki)vei</td>
<td>vei</td>
<td>vei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this</td>
<td>oqo</td>
<td>oqo</td>
<td>qo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that(2nd person)</td>
<td>oqori</td>
<td>oqori</td>
<td>qori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that(3rd person)</td>
<td>koyai</td>
<td>oyai</td>
<td>yai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>today</td>
<td>edaidai</td>
<td>nikua</td>
<td>nikua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuing aspect</td>
<td>$\beta$, $\delta$</td>
<td>se</td>
<td>se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how(verb)</td>
<td>vakaevei</td>
<td>vakaevei</td>
<td>vakacava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palatisation</td>
<td>ti</td>
<td>ti</td>
<td>ji</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 3
KINSHIP

The Waitabu sociolinguistic system is composed of individuals who, as acting units, interpret situations and people which confront them (largely in terms of the standpoint inherited from their cultural group), and construct their sociolinguistic behaviour within the constraints of modes of behaviour laid down by the social organisation. At the heart of the Waitabu social organisation lies the kinship system. Kin categories form basic participant sets in the main fields of social activity -economic, political, religious, ceremonial and recreational. Individuals categorise people who they encounter into various kin groups, and construct their sociolinguistic behaviour according to the kin-based role-relationship that they share with that person. The aim of this chapter is to show how the norms of conduct and modes of sociolinguistic interaction in Waitabu village are strongly influenced by the kinship system.

In this chapter, I will first describe the Waitabu kinship structure\(^1\), its categories and basic organisational principles. Second, I will focus on the sociolinguistic implications of this kinship structure, namely how distinct modes of sociolinguistic behaviour are associated with various role-relationships. Then follows description of how kinship roles are distributed over social categories. Fourthly, we will observe how the individual is able to manipulate the kinship system to suit his communicative needs. Finally, changes in sociolinguistic behaviour for certain kin relationships are described.

As mentioned in 1.1, what follows is a normative description based on instruction and observing speech in natural context. It is important to stress that the following description deals with sociolinguistic roles (established modes of sociolinguistic behaviour) associated with single kin-based social identities. The

---

\(^1\)There is some variation (in category, terminology and behavioural rules) in kinship systems throughout the Fiji islands. Therefore, this description of the Waitabu kinship system will differ slightly from other accounts of Fijian kinship, e.g. Copell and Lester (1945-46); Geddes' (1945) description of Deuba; Nayacakalou's (1955) description of To'ato'a village; Sahlins (1962) on Moala; and Ravuvu's (1971) description of Nakorosule.
reader should be aware that the described roles refer to ideal types; in the
dynamics of actual behaviour, the individual is likely to enact a combination of
social identities (Goodenough 1969) see (1.3.3), and may deviate, to some extent,
from these prescribed norms.

**KINSHIP TERMINOLOGY**

Before describing the kinship system, it is necessary to remark on kin
terminology. There are three sets of kin terms: (a) address; (b) reference; (c)
relationship description. Often, all three sets have the same root form and are
distinguished only by the affixes which they take. For example, for the terms
relating to the cross-cousin relationship, tavale is the most common root:

```
tavale   "cross-cousin" ADDRESS

vei-tavale-ni "COLL-cross-cousin-SUFF" RSP TYPE
```

- Terms of address are usually free nouns, which do not take a bound
affix, e.g. tavale ≠ "cross-cousin", tata ≠ "father".

- Terms of reference are bound nouns, which require a possessive suffix.
These pronominal suffixes signify person (first, second and third), and
number (singular, dual, paucal and plural). For example, tama-qu
[father-1st.sg.POSS.] is the term for "my father"; tama-mudrau
[father-2nd.dual.POSS.] is the term for "your (two) father". A list of
these pronominal possessive suffix forms is given in 7.4.3.

- Terms which describe the relationship itself are formed by attaching the
collective prefix vei-, and the suffix -ni to the term of reference, e.g.
vei-tama-ni "father/child relationship". Vei-X-ni is a Standard Fijian
form widely used in contemporary Waitabu. The traditional Boumān
equivalent tau-X-na (e.g. tau-tama-na "father/child relationship") is
used only occasionally by a few older speakers. Whereas the Standard
Fijian form vei-X-ni is applied productively throughout, the Boumān
dialect has two exceptions which consist of only tau + root : tau-taci
"same-sex sibling relationship"; and tau-wati "husband-wife
relationship". As described in 7.4.4., there is a tendency to "iron-out"
such irregular forms in the dialect levelling process.

As indicated above, there is some variation in kin terms between Standard
Fijian and Boumān dialects. As part of the dialect mixing phenomenon, forms from
both dialects are often used in contemporary Waitabu.

A list of kin terms of address and reference is given in Appendix 3.1 at the
end of this chapter.
3.1. DESCRIPTION OF THE KINSHIP SYSTEM

Waitabu society is patrilineal, with female members "marrying out" into another lineage group², and children belonging to their father's group. The kinship system is basically a "two-section" or "Dravidian" type³, in which Ego classifies people of his own generation, his parents’ generation, and his children’s generation as if they all belong to one or other of only two patrilineages which continually exchange women prescriptively.

It is not the case, however, that the dual organisation of Waitabu kinship involves only two lineage groups. Rather, in reality, individuals from a lineage group marry/enter into affinal relationships with various other lineage groups from outside the village. Thus, the two-section type system is based on the distinction between (a) Ego's patrilineage and (b) other patrilineages, different to Ego, i.e. two major types of relatives are distinguished: (a) lineal or parallel relatives who belong to the same patrilineage as Ego; (b) cross-relatives who have a different patrilineage to Ego.⁴

Two important principles cut across this basic parallel-cross relative distinction: 1. generation; 2. sex.

1. Within a lineage group, all members of the same generational level are regarded as siblings to each other.

Thus, on Table 3.1, females of the same generation as Ego (male) are classified as his sisters (thus 15, 17, 19, 21, 28, 32 are called gane "opposite-sex sibling").

Males of the same generation as Ego are classified as his brothers. 16, 18, 27

²A "lineage group" may be defined as a number of persons of both sexes who consider themselves to be descended along the male line from a known or unknown ancestor.


⁴As Hocart (1952:106) observes, the dual organisation of Cakaudrove (and Waitabu) kinship systems is less clearcut than that of the Lau islands. As described in this chapter, in Waitabu, only mother's brother is classed as cross-parent in Ego's parents' generation. Father's sister and mother's brother's wife are classed as parallel parents. In line with this, the cross-cousin relationship is delayed for two generations; all children and all grandchildren of mother's and father's siblings are regarded as Ego's siblings.
The following genealogical table contains the kinship terms common in Waitabu today. The terms given are terms of address used by Ego. (Those terms in parentheses are terms of reference. In cases of bound nouns, only the root form is given, i.e., the possessive suffix is not included.) Only two terms are not shown on the table: (a) 'ARUA which refers to the relationship between spouses of same-sex siblings, or children of same-sex siblings in the third generation removed; (b) DAUVE which refers to female Ego's sister-in-law.
are tua'a "older brother", and 20, 22, 31 are taci "younger brother".

Within his father's generation, all male members of the same lineage group are classed as fathers (5 and 9 are called tata "father"), and the female members are classed as his father's sisters (7 is called nana "mother").

Members of the same lineage group in Ego's children's generation are all regarded as Ego's children (34, 35, 40, 41 are called luve "child"). In the generation of Ego's children's children (the second descending generation), members are classed as vua "grandchild" (38, 39), and in Ego's parent's parent's generation (the second ascending generation), females are called nau "grandmother" (2, 4), and males are kuku "grandfather".

Thus the system of kinship terminology is classificatory; within the generational level and lineage group, members are related as siblings. Radcliffe-Brown (1950) calls this the principle of unity of the sibling group. This unity "refers not only to the internal unity of the group as shown in the relations of the different members to one another but to the fact that the group may constitute a unity for a person outside it and connected with it by a specific relation to one of its members. Thus a son may, in a particular system, be taught to regard his father's sibling group as a united body with whom he is related as their 'son' ".

2. The second basic principle is distinction of sex within the sibling group. Within the sibling group, individuals are divided into two categories. Opposite-sex siblings are referred to as gane. Same-sex siblings are called by the generic term taci.

It is important to stress that in the first ascending generation (i.e. Ego's parents' generation), the opposite/same-sex sibling distinction is made only for mother's siblings. For example, mother's brother (11) is classed as cross-parent (mōmō "cross-father"). In contrast, mother's sister is classed as parallel-parent (nana "mother"). This opposite/same-sex sibling distinction is not made for father's siblings. All of father's siblings and their spouses are classed as parallel parents. For example, father's brother (5), and father's sister's husband (8) are

---

5 The term taci has two senses:

1. it is used generically to describe the same-sex sibling relationship, e.g. vei-taci-na;

2. more specifically, it is used to address and refer to younger same-sex siblings, e.g. taci-qu [younger same-sex sibling- lst.sg.POSS.] "my younger same-sex sibling".
called tata "father". Father's sister (7) and father's brother's wife (6) are called nana "mother".

In short, with the single exception of mother's brother (11), all siblings of Ego's parents and their spouses are classed as Ego's parallel parents. Note that although mother's brother (11) is classed as cross-parent (mōmō "cross-father"), his wife is classed as parallel parent (nana "mother").

An age distinction is made within the same-sex sibling group for Ego's and Ego's parents' generation. Ego's same-sex siblings are classed as either tua'a "older same-sex sibling" (27), or taci "younger same-sex sibling" (31). Similarly for Ego's parent's generation: the older brother of Ego's father is referred to as tama levu "big father" (5), and his younger brother is tama lailai "little father". Similarly, parent's sister is referred to as tina levu "big mother" if older than Ego's mother, or tina lailai "little mother" (13) if younger. (The spouses of these classificatory parents are not marked for age by the adjectives levu "big" or lailai "little". Rather they are referred to as simply tina "mother" (6), or tama "father" (14).) The qualifiers levu and lailai do not simply indicate who is younger or older than Ego's parent. They have a deeper meaning of conveying to the member of the lineage or clan, the nature and extent of power, authority and obligations which the older relatives have over the younger members of the family. For example, the elder brother has superior authority over all his younger brothers and their children.

There is no similar relative age distinction made for Ego's opposite-sex siblings, or Ego's cross-parents, or for other cross relatives. All of Ego's opposite-sex siblings are gane, and all of Ego's cross-parents are called nei "cross-mother" and mōmō "cross-father", regardless of their relative age to Ego or Ego's parents.

MARRIAGE is exogamous and Ego's spouse must belong to a different lineage group to Ego. Thus marriage is not permitted between siblings, because siblings have the same lineage group. In Waitabu society, the two generations following a sibling link (on mother's or father's side) are classed as siblings, i.e. if A and B are true siblings (opposite or same sex), then their children regard each other as siblings, and so do their grandchildren. Thus, as siblings, marriage is not permitted within these three generations.

In the fourth generation, a distinction is made between A and B (of generation 1) sharing a same-sex or opposite-sex sibling relationship. If A and B (of generation 1) are same-sex siblings, the fourth generation individuals call each
other 'arua, i.e. parallel cousin, three or more generations removed. Marriage is not permitted between 'arua.

In contrast, if A and B (of generation 1) are opposite-sex siblings, the fourth generation individuals call each other tavale, i.e. cross-cousin, three or more generations removed. Marriage is permitted between tavale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>generation</th>
<th>relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>• A ▲ B ▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>• ▼ ▼ ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>• ▼ ▼ ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>• ▼ ▼ ▲</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(marriage permitted)

It is in the area of classificatory sibling groupings that the Waitabu kinship system differs from other Fijian systems, namely Tokatoka village as described by Nayacakalou (1955) and Deuba village as described by Geddes (1945). In Deuba and Tokatoka (both Viti Levu villages), if A and B of generation 1 are cross-siblings, their children (generation 2) are cross-cousins (tavale), and marriage is permitted. Thus, the Waitabu kinship system appears to delay the cross-cousin (tavale) relationship between descendants of A and B (generation 1) for two generations, by classifying all descendants as classificatory siblings until generation 4, where the tavale distinction is finally made. (Paul Geraghty p.c. reports that a similar delaying of the tavale relationship also occurs in the Cakaudrove region and on the Lauan islands of Oneata and Vanua Balavu. Hocart (1952:3) suggests a Tongan influence in these kinship systems.)

Having dealt with the basic organisational principles of Waitabu kinship, for ease of reference but at risk of repetition, it is necessary to detail the membership of the various kin categories.

In explaining the meaning of classificatory kin terms, the prototype approach to semantics is useful, (see Rosch 1978, Keesing 1985, Wierzbicka 1986). According to the prototype approach, in a given kinship category, there is a prototypical or core member. These central members seem to be used in comprehending the category as a whole, and conception of other members is modelled on this core relationship. For example, the Fijian term tama may be explained as follows:

The term has two meanings. One meaning is the same, or roughly the same, as that English word "father". The second meaning can be stated, roughly, as:
In the following description of Waitabu kinship terms, the core or central member of each category is described first, under (1), and then the less central members of the category are listed.

Table 3.2 provides a general picture of categories and terms of the kinship system. (The terms listed in the table are terms of reference.) As indicated, the major divisions are based on patrilineage, generational level, relative age, and sex.

Focusing first on the second ascending generation, TUBU is the generic term referring to grandparent. Terms of address are more specific.

KUKU is used to:
1. Ego’s parent’s father (Mo.Fa; Fa.Fa; see 1, 3), and by extension;
2. other males of Ego’s parent’s father’s sibling group.

NAU is used to:
1. Ego’s parent’s mother (Mo.Mo; Fa.Mo; see 2, 4), and by extension;
2. other females in the sibling group of Ego’s parent’s mother.

In the second descending generation,

VUA refers to:
1. Ego’s child’s child (So.So; So.Da; Da.So; Da.Da; see 38, 39), and by extension;
2. other members in the sibling group of Ego’s child’s child.

Note that the parallel-cross (same-other) distinction is not made in this second generation removed. For example, father’s father belongs to the same patrilineage as Ego, and mother’s father has a different patrilineage, but both are categorised as kuku “grandfather”. Similarly, son’s son has the same lineage group as Ego, but daughter’s children do not. Nevertheless, Ego categorises all as vua “grandchild” regardless of whether the patrilineage is same or different.

---

6 This method of semantic representation was developed by Wierzbicka (1972, 1980, 1985a).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>generation</th>
<th>same lineage group (parallel relatives)</th>
<th>other lineage group (cross relatives)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td>tubu &quot;grandparent&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td>tama &quot;father&quot;</td>
<td>vugo &quot;cross-parent&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tina &quot;mother&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>tua'a &quot;elder same-sex sibling&quot;</td>
<td>tavale &quot;cross-cousin&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>taci &quot;younger&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gane &quot;opposite-sex sibling&quot;</td>
<td>dauve &quot;sister-in-law&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'arua &quot;parallel cousin&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>luve &quot;child&quot;</td>
<td>vugo &quot;cross-child&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>vua &quot;grandchild&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the first ascending generation,

**TAMA** refers to male members of Ego’s father’s generation, classed in the same lineage group. This category includes:

1. Ego’s father (9), and by association;
2. other men in Ego’s father’s sibling group, of the same patrilineage, e.g. father’s brother (5);
3. by marriage, the spouse of Ego’s parent’s sister (i.e. mother’s sister’s husband (14), and father’s sister’s husband (8)).

As previously mentioned, an age distinction is made within this group. **Tama levu** “big father” refers to individuals older than Ego’s father. **Tama lailai** “little father” refers to individuals younger than Ego’s father.

**TINA** refers to female members of Ego’s mother’s generation, classed in the same sibling group. This category includes:

1. Ego’s mother (10), and by association;
2. other females in Ego’s parent’s sibling group, i.e. father’s sister (7), mother’s sister (13);
3. by marriage, the wife of Ego’s parent’s brother, i.e. father’s brother’s wife (6), mother’s brother’s wife (12).

An age distinction is also made within this group: **Tina levu** “big mother” if older than Ego’s mother; **Tina lailai** “little mother” if younger than Ego’s mother.

In the first descending generation,

**LUVE** refers to members of Ego’s children’s generation who are classed as the same patrilineage. This category includes:

1. Ego’s children (34, 35), and by association;
2. other individuals in Ego’s child’s sibling group of the same patrilineage, e.g. brother’s children (40, 41).

The term **luve** does not distinguish between the sexes, but a separate qualifying term **tagane** “male” or **yalewa** “female” may be used to differentiate between son (**luve tagane**) and daughter (**luve yalewa**).

**VUGO** refers to individuals in the “opposite” lineage group who are one generation (ascending and descending) removed from Ego. This category includes:
1. Ego's cross-parent by blood, i.e. Ego's mother's brother (11);
2. Ego's cross-children by blood, i.e. (male) Ego's sister's children (37);
3. Ego's parents-in-law, i.e. Ego's spouse's parents (23, 24);
4. Ego's children-in-law, i.e. Ego's child's spouse (36);

Vugo is the generic term for all individuals in the cross-parent/child relationship. In addition, there are some specific terms of address:

Nei is used to address cross-mother, i.e. spouse's mother (24);

Mōmō is the term of address for cross-father, i.e. spouse's father (23), mother's brother (11).

Focusing on Ego's generation, categories within Ego's sibling group are:

GANE referring to:
1. Ego's true opposite-sex sibling (28, 32), and by extension;
2. individuals in Ego's sibling group who are opposite sex to Ego and linked to Ego by a true sibling relationship, one or two generations above.

TACI is the generic term for same-sex sibling. Within this category, an age distinction is made.

TUA'A refers to:
1. Ego's true same-sex sibling who is older that Ego (27);
2. child or grandchild of B who is the older same-sex sibling of A, (A being Ego's parent or grandparent).

TACI refers to:
1. Ego's true same-sex sibling who is younger than Ego (31);
2. child or grandchild of B who is younger same-sex sibling of A , (A being Ego's parent or grandparent).

DAUVE. This is the term for the relationship between two female sisters-in-law. There is no corresponding specific term for the relationship between two brothers-in-law; the brother-in-law relationship falls into the broader category of tavale "cross-cousin".
TAVALE, loosely translated as "cross-cousin", refers to those individuals in Ego's generation who are classed in the opposite lineage group to Ego, and who are:

1. linked to Ego by an opposite-sex sibling link, three or more generations removed;

2. siblings-in-law, e.g. spouse's siblings (25, 26). The term tavale covers the relationship between all siblings-in-law, except that between two sisters-in-law. As described above, the sister-in-law relationship is classed separately under a specific term, dauve.

A specific term within the tavale category is matanitauwati which refers to tavale of the opposite sex, who are potential marriage partners.

'ARUA, loosely translated as "parallel cousin", refers to individuals in Ego's generation who are:

1. linked to Ego by a same-sex sibling link, three or more generations removed;

2. spouse of Ego's actual or potential marriage partner, i.e. spouse of Ego's matanitauwati (see above). For example, A is married to B, and C is married to Ego. B and C are brothers. Their spouses (A and Ego) are therefore 'arua. The term 'arua translates literally as "second": Ego is second-in-line to A, for marriage to B.

As this description of the kinship system indicates, Waitabu society is highly structured, in terms of the narrowness of categories of people, and the high precision with which the forms of relationship between these categories are defined. Through the classificatory principle, the kinship network covers the entire village; all individuals are kinsmen to one another. The Waitabu social fabric is, in effect, an intricate network of role relationships, ascribed to a large degree by the kinship system.

Having described how the kinship system divides individuals of Waitabu community into various kinship categories (in relation to Ego), let us now focus on how sociolinguistic performance is constructed on the basis of these kin types.

3.2. ROLE-RELATIONSHIP TYPES & MODES OF SOCIOLINGUISTIC BEHAVIOUR

Kinship classification plays an important part in ordering sociolinguistic behaviour within Waitabu village. In the process of interpretation, the individual classes people who he interacts with into various kinship categories, and constructs
his sociolinguistic behaviour on the basis of this categorisation. Roles (i.e. socially-accepted modes of sociolinguistic conduct) are largely conditioned by kin-based role-relationships which Ego shares with a person. Ego switches roles according to the kin category into which he slots the particular person. In short, different role-relationships require different sociolinguistic performances.

Role-relationships in Waitabu village fall into certain categories according to the degree of avoidance, joking or authority prescribed by the kinship system. The basic role-relationship types are:

1. **avoidance**, with both parties practising mutual restraint;
2. **joking**, marked by mutual freedom and non-restraint;
3. **authority**, with one party deferring to the other, more powerful party.

I will now detail which role-relationships belong to these various categories, and describe the different modes of sociolinguistic behaviour associated with each. Table 3.3 summarises which kin categories require avoidance (heavy shading), joking (light shading), and authority (no shading). As the table indicates, joking and avoidance modes of behaviour are used of Ego's **cross** relatives, while authority-based behaviour occurs among **parallel** relatives.

These distinct modes of sociolinguistic behaviour will now be described in turn.

**3.2.1. AVOIDANCE**

Avoidance and restraint is practised mutually by Ego and the following individuals:

1. **vugo**, i.e. Ego's cross-parents and cross-children (by blood and marriage). (For detailed description of membership of kin categories, see 3.1.)

2. **gane**, i.e. Ego's opposite-sex siblings. (Although they have the same father and therefore belong to the same patrilineage as Ego, opposite-sex siblings are grouped as cross-relatives and require avoidance behaviour by virtue of the fact that upon marriage, the male sibling usually stays in the village to carry on his father's line, while the female sibling crosses to the different lineage group of her husband. Her children will belong to the different lineage group. This distinction of sex within the sibling group and the associated avoidance behaviour manifests an incest taboo within the sibling group.)

The avoidance which characterises these relationships is striking. Casual
Table 3-3: KIN CATEGORIES & MODES OF BEHAVIOUR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>PARALLEL</th>
<th>CROSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>tubu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>tama</td>
<td>vugo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>tua’a</td>
<td>tavale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>taci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gane</td>
<td>dauve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘arua</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>luve</td>
<td>vugo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>vua</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

: avoidance  
: joking  
: authority
conversation and joking are strictly forbidden. In avoiding direct conversation with these individuals, Ego will speak through a third party:

“Sometimes if you are there [in the same room as your cross-sibling], you are smoking eh? Maybe he’s run out of smokes. He’ll tell somebody else to ask you to pass him one so he can have it.”

[S.T. female teacher, 30 years, Boumā]

If conversation does occur, it is restricted to only essential, very serious topics. Speech is slow and deferential. Voice quality is of low soft tone to show respect. As one Waitabu elder explained:

’eirau veivosa’i i na dua na ‘ā dina. E dua ‘ā bibi. ‘Eva’ā e dua ‘ā e na vina’ata vei au, e dua ‘ā dina, e yaga me la’o mai me mai tu’una. Ia, me veivosa’i wale tū gā e na veivosa’i va’aveitālia, e sega ni rawa. E tabu.

“We [me and my cross-parents] talk about true, serious things. If there is something that he really needs from me, he can come here and state so. But just to talk casually, about any old thing, that is not possible. It is forbidden.”

[E.W. male, 60 years, Waitabu]

Requests and commands made by Ego’s gane “opposite-sex sibling” and vugo “cross-parent/child” are taken very seriously and Ego will make all efforts to fulfill them. For example,

Unexpected visitors from another village arrived at Elia’s house, and Elia was alone to entertain them. However, there was no food for their supper. As a last resort, Elia turned to his cross-daughter by blood to prepare food for his visitors. Although busy with preparations for a wedding the following day, the woman explained to me later that she was obliged to perform the request, because they were veivugoni “cross-parent/child”.

The avoidance which characterises vugo and gane relations is reflected in terms of address. It is generally forbidden to address these relatives by their personal names. Avoidance is also reflected in the use of pronouns. Fijian pronouns have a four-way number distinction: singular, dual, paucal and plural. These forms have two functions:

1. to mark true number, e.g. the paucal form is used for a group of three or more people;

2. to mark social status or distance.

Focusing on the social-distancing function, Table 3.4 shows second person
pronoun forms and the social categories they address. The singular pronoun form i'o is used to all individuals in non-avoidance, non-chiefly relationships, i.e. to those individuals marked by no shading or light shading on Table 3.3. Dual and paucal pronoun forms are reserved for avoidance relationships (marked by heavy shading on Table 3.3). The dual pronoun, mudrau, is used to cross-parent/child, and the paucal pronoun, mudou, to opposite-sex siblings. The plural pronoun form munu was used to show chiefly respect when addressing one person. This use of pronouns indicates the following hierarchy of social distance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>number</th>
<th>pronoun form</th>
<th>relationship type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>plural</td>
<td>munu</td>
<td>chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paucal</td>
<td>mudou</td>
<td>opposite-sex sibling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dual</td>
<td>mudrau</td>
<td>cross-parent/child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>singular</td>
<td>i'o</td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contemporary Waitabu, however, sociolinguistic change is evident. Although the categories of opposite-sex sibling, cross-parent/child, (and chief, see chapter 6) are recognised, sociolinguistic behaviour towards individuals in these categories is changing. For example, in the younger generation, opposite-sex siblings often use personal names and singular pronoun forms when addressing each other. Sociolinguistic change is further discussed in 3.5.

Non-linguistic features also reflect the avoidance relationship between veivugoni "cross-parent/child" and velganeni "opposite-sex siblings". There is a strict taboo on physical contact, and it is forbidden for these individuals to wear each other's clothing. (This contrasts with other relationships in the communal society where 'ere'ere "requesting" of clothing and other items is commonplace.) Only for these two avoidance relationships is the speech act of 'ere'ere

---

7 In selecting pronoun form, number has priority over the relationship type. For example, if Ego is addressing a group of seven of his cross-children, he will use the paucal pronoun form (mudou), thus referring to the three-or-more number of the group, rather than the dual form (mudrau) which refers to the cross-parent/child nature of the relationship.
"requesting" restricted. See 4.2.1. Cross-parents/children do not generally eat together, and furthermore, it is forbidden for individuals to eat the same or even left-over food of their cross-parent/child by blood. Cross-parents/children and opposite-sex siblings avoid being alone together in the same place. They do not usually engage in the same work, or in casual voluntary activities (e.g. games, visits to friends, strolling along the beach).

In short, the communication link between Ego and his/her vugo and gane is characterised by avoidance and restraint.

Avoidance behaviour associated with certain kin categories has been reported in other societies. For example, Haviland (1979) describes avoidance/respect language in the Guugu Yimidhirr society of North Queensland. Rumsey (1982) deals with Gun Gunma, an Australian Aboriginal avoidance language and its social functions.

3.2.2. JOKING

Joking is the characteristic mode of behaviour for dauve "sisters-in-law" and for tavale "cross-cousins". Individuals in these kin categories are:

1. individuals who are three or more generations removed from a true opposite-sex sibling link;
2. all siblings-in-law.

This role-relationship type, described by Fijians as tadola "open", is characterised by mutual freedom, familiarity and cooperation at all times:

"This is the sweetest part of all relationships, the veitava\text{leni} [cross-cousin], veida\text{v}en\text{i} [sisters-in-law]. It's the sweetest part of the kinship ... You can share clothes, you can take things away from them. You can do bad things to them. At times you'll be loving each other."

[S.T., female teacher, 30 years, Bouma]

Conversation for these relationships is unrestrained. There is almost no limitation on topics that can be discussed (e.g. "love affairs, sex, anything at all"). Requests and commands are given freely, and may be refused or even joked at, depending on Ego's will. Voice quality in conversation is normal and not marked by the soft, low tone or slow pace that characterises the avoidance relationships described in 3.2.1.

The tavale and dauve relationships are characterised by frequent joking bouts, which usually include "bad" jokes or insults about the individual's
appearance or character. This is illustrated in the spontaneous tavale conversation in Appendix 3.2 at the end of this chapter.

Another example of joking insults in tavale conversation is:

Veitālia o sulu vina‘a mai, seo barasi mai a batimu, e sega ni dua a yalewa e vina‘ati i‘o, nio sā rui tamata loaloa. Tamata ra‘rai cā. [laughter]

“No matter how much you dress up, or brush up your teeth, there’s not one girl who likes you, you are a very black [skin colour] man. You are very ugly.” [laughter]

[M.T. female, 21 years, Waitabu]

Often tavale jokes have sexual reference, e.g. Inoke (male 25 years) and Silipa (female 30 years) are veitavaleni “cross-cousins”. One afternoon the three of us were drinking tea:

Inoke:
\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{a sucu ti'o i vei} \\
&\text{ART milk PRES PREP where} \\
&\text{“Where’s the milk? [for his tea]”}
\end{align*}
\]

Silipa:
\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{va’a-yaga-ta’ina qō} \\
&\text{CAUS-use-TRANS this} \\
&\text{“Use this [indicating her breast]”}
\end{align*}
\]

Inoke:
\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{sega sā maca} \\
&\text{NEG ASP dry} \\
&\text{“No, it’s dry! [i.e. you have no breast milk]”}
\end{align*}
\]

[Both laugh.]

It is not, however, a matter of “anything goes”. As with other relationship types, there are certain rules of behaviour, e.g. dauve and tavale will not joke about the other’s taboo relatives, or about those topics that a particular individual finds truly hurting or insulting, i.e. “the things they cannot stand to joke about” will not be used as joking topics. If an individual is known to be particularly thin-skinned or sensitive on a certain topic, the tavale/dauve will avoid that topic and will instead focus his joking and insults on other areas. In return, the other is expected to respond to the jokes and insults with counter-jokes and insults, or laughter. He must not show offence, or take insult from his tavale/dauve’s joking.

Non-linguistic features also reflect the unrestrained nature of this role-
Close physical contact is permitted. (This is in contrast with other role-relationships. Even husband and wife are not allowed close physical contact in public.)

"Even if I'm just here, even everybody's looking, [even] my mother. Inoke just come, hugs me like this. No problem, everybody knows he's my tavale."

[S.T., female teacher, 30 years, Boumā]

Tavale may take and keep each other's possessions without asking. They participate together in many daily voluntary casual activities such as swimming, and various games.

In short, the communication link between Ego and tavale/dauve is an often-exercised one (i.e. strong and intense), by virtue of the fact that the tadola "open" nature of this relationship is conducive to frequent and unrestrained interaction.

Obligatory joking relationships have also been reported in other societies. For example, Mead's (1934) description of "Kinship in the Admiralty Islands"; Irvine's (1974) description of Wolof society. Certain Australian Aboriginal societies are similar to Waitabu, in containing both joking and avoidance modes of behaviour distributed over kinship categories. Thomson (1935) deals with joking relationships and extreme deference and avoidance relationships in Aboriginal society of North Queensland. McConvell (1982) details modes of joking and avoidance behaviour in Gurindji society of the Northern Territory.

3.2.3. AUTHORITY

This role-relationship type is assymetrical with one party observing inhibitions in his behaviour towards the other. The true parent/child relationship veitamani is a prototypical example. Other relationships involving the authority element are:

1. true siblings of the same sex: elder siblings have authority over their juniors;

2. true grandparent/grandchild.

In all of these relationships, authority is assigned according to the age factor and authority-based behaviour diminishes for less-central, classificatory parent/child and sibling relationships.

I will now focus on the true parent/child relationship, as it is here that assymetry is most strongly emphasised. The relationship is one of respect and
obedience. Parents are freer to speak to the child than is the child to his parents. Parents may instruct, criticise, and scold their child (even an adult child), but the child must not contradict or criticise his parents. Commands are given only by the parent, and must be obeyed by the child.

In conversation, certain topics are taboo. These include love affairs, sex, certain body parts and associated "women's talk", e.g. pregnancy and gossip about any of the above. This taboo appears to be strongest between father and daughter. Mild joking between parent and child is permitted, but within the constraints of the relationship. Jokes of the type one has with tavale "cross-cousin" regarding personal appearance and character are not possible between parent and child.

Non-linguistic features also reflect the asymmetry of the relationship. For example, in Fiji (and many South-east Asian societies), the head of the body has special status, and it is generally forbidden to touch an individual's head. However, in asymmetrical authority-based relationships, the party with authority is permitted to touch the head of the junior subordinate party. The reverse does not apply; it is strictly forbidden for the junior party to touch the head of his elder, or even to reach above his head without asking permission.

In some parts of Fiji, the use of kin terms changes as the life cycle progresses, thus reflecting a shift in dependency in certain relationships. For example, Ravuvu (1971:482) reports that in Nakorosule village, Naitasiri province, Ego refers to his child as naluvequ "my child", when the child is dependent on him. However, in old age, when Ego is dependent on his child, he refers to and addresses his child as tamairau "our father". Such change of kin terms in different life stages does not occur in Waitabu society.

In short, the communication link in authority-based role-relationships (most clearly manifest in true parent/child) is an asymmetrical one, characterised by deference shown to one party, according to relative age.

It would be a radical simplification to suggest that all of the kin relationships described in 3.1 fit neatly into three mutually-exclusive categories of avoidance, joking and authority. A more accurate analysis is a three dimensional diagram with polar extremes, i.e.
Most relationships occur at one of the three polar extremes, e.g. vugo "cross-parent/child" and gane "opposite-sex sibling" at the avoidance pole; tavale "cross-cousin" and dauve "sister-in-law" at the joking pole; and tama "father", tina "mother", tua'a "older same-sex sibling" at the authority pole.

However, certain other relationships are less clearly marked and fall somewhere between the three poles. For example, in contrast to the intense joking of the tavale "cross-cousin" relationship, the 'arua "parallel cousin" relationship is characterised by only mild joking. Furthermore, for authority-based relationships, there is noticeable difference in the behaviour between true and classificatory kin. (This difference in behaviour between true and classificatory kin does not apply to avoidance and joking-type relationships.) True authority-based relationships involve a much more intense degree of authority than do classificatory kin. For example, in contrast to the prototypical true parent/child relationship which involves extreme authority, the less central classificatory parent/child relationship involves only mild authority. Similarly, within the veitacini "same-sex sibling" relationship, true same-sex siblings use intense authority-based behaviour, in contrast to classificatory same-sex siblings, where only mild authority is evident.

This observation of behavioural differences between true and classificatory kin is in line with the prototype theory: for core members of a category, there is a convergence of social identities and role entailments. These features become more diffuse for peripheral members. This also relates to Keesing's (1969:211) claim that there is not always isomorphism between the range of people to whom a kin term is applied, and the range of people to whom a behavioural rule applies.

Terms used by my Waitabu informants to describe the various kin relationships support this three-way polar analysis. Vugo "cross-parent/child" and gane "opposite-sex sibling" relationships are called veitabui "forbidden"; the tavale "cross-cousin" relationship is described as dauveiwali "joking" and tadola "open"; and the parent/child relationship is referred to as veiva'aro'oro'ota'ina "respectful/deferential". Other (non-polar) relationships such as same-sex siblings
are described by referring to more than one of these adjectives, (e.g. classificatory same-sex sibling is described as both veiva’aro’oro’ota’ina "respectful/deferential" and dauveiwali "joking").

For further description of behavioural rules associated with kin categories, see also Nayacakalou (1957), Ravuvu (1971).

In this description of sociolinguistic behaviour associated with kin-based role-relationships, it is evident that the notion of “marked/unmarked” role-relationship is one of degree, rather than a categorical “either/or” distinction. There is considerable variation in the degree of rigidity of constraints governing various role-relationships. For example, the relationships of vei-vugo-ni “cross-parent/child” and vei-gane-ni “opposite-sex sibling” are clear cases of “marked” role-relationships, governed by a set of rigid rules constraining sociolinguistic behaviour. This markedness is reflected in the salience of explicit rules associated with these relationships: Waitabu speakers are very aware of such rules and readily explicate them.

Among other kin-based role-relationships which are less marked, there is variation in the degree to which such constraints govern sociolinguistic behaviour. For example, in the vei-tama-ni “true parent/child” relationship, the behaviour of prototypical true parent/child involves extreme authority and is subject to rigid sociolinguistic constraints. In contrast, the behaviour associated with classificatory parent/child is constrained by the same type of rules, but to a lesser degree. That is, the true parent/child relationship is more marked than the classificatory parent/child relationship in terms of specific constraints governing sociolinguistic conduct.

3.3. SOCIAL CATEGORIES & DISTRIBUTION OF KINSHIP ROLES

Individuals in Waitabu society fall into six basic social categories: gone “child”; cauravou “young unmarried man”; gone-yalewa “young unmarried girl”; tūraga “married man”; marama “married woman”; qase “old person” (see 1.4). Each social category is characterised by a particular configuration of kin-based role-relationships. Thus as the individual passes through different social categories, he enters new relationships and will consequently perform a different range of sociolinguistic roles.

In the gone “child” stage, the individual undergoes primary socialisation. He learns how to interpret objects, people, the world and himself from the perspective of the sociocultural group. (In Mead’s words, he builds up a “generalized other”.)
Ego learns how to categorise individuals into kin categories and is exposed to modes of sociolinguistic behaviour associated with the various role-relationships. Because he is still in the primary stages of socialisation, and still learning modes of sociolinguistic conduct, the child is not expected to adhere to the obligatory avoidance and joking performances that characterise adult life.

However, on entering the cauravou "young unmarried man" or gone-yalewa "young unmarried girl" stages, individuals are expected to maintain avoidance behaviour for their gane "opposite-sex siblings" and vugo "cross-parents/children"; joking performances with their tavale "cross-cousins"; and deference behaviour to their parents and elder siblings.

Upon marriage, when the individual enters the tūraga "married man" or marama "married woman" category, the intensity of avoidance, joking and authority-based behaviour increases. Thus, for the marama, tūraga and qase "old person" categories, the levels of avoidance, joking and authority are highest. Furthermore, upon marriage, the range of role-relationships broadens. Ego assumes sociolinguistic roles of avoidance with parents-in-law, joking with siblings-in-law, and authority on becoming a parent. In other words, upon marriage, the number of individuals to whom Ego shows joking, avoidance and authority-based behaviour increases.

In short, the range of sociolinguistic roles and the level of avoidance, joking or authority associated with each varies according to the social category to which Ego belongs.

3.4. COMMUNICATION NETWORK

3.4.1. ASCRIBED & VOLUNTARY TIES

The communication network of a society is comprised of interactional links between individuals of that society. These links may be:

1. socially ascribed; and/or
2. voluntary links determined by the individual (e.g. personal friendships).

The pattern and intensity of communicative links in Waitabu is strongly influenced by the kinship system, i.e. socially ascribed. For example, the cross-parent/child relationship ve lvugoni is characterised by avoidance of social and verbal interaction, and there is a weak communicative link between individuals sharing this relationship. In contrast, between tavale "cross-cousins", communication is unrestrained and the link is frequently exercised.
Voluntary friendship links are secondary to socially ascribed kinship links in Waitabu. Personal friendship and voluntary sub-groups can be formed only with certain kin types, namely those non-avoidance (i.e. joking and authority-based) relationships which are conducive to frequent social contact and verbal interaction. This is evident in Table 3.5 which gives results of a survey in which 32 individuals were asked the kinship category of their "best friend".

Table 3-5: KIN CATEGORY OF EGO'S BEST FRIEND

| class. | class. | same-sex | cross- | cross- | opposite |
| parent | child  | sibling  | cousin | parent | -sex     |
|        |        |         |        |        | sibling  |
| tama   | luve   | taci    | tavale | vugo   | gane     |

male
16 : 2 2 2 10 - -

female
16 : 4 4 4 4 - -

The important point is that no individual formed voluntary friendships with the avoidance categories of vugo "cross-parent/child" and gane "opposite-sex sibling". All close personal ties were with either cross-cousin, classificatory parent/child (of roughly the same age), or classificatory same-sex sibling.

It must be stressed, however, that the assignment of individuals to kin categories is not totally rigid. As 3.4.2 demonstrates, individuals can manipulate the kinship system to suit their communicative needs.

3.4.2. MANIPULATION OF THE KINSHIP SYSTEM

The individual is not a passive entity whose sociolinguistic behaviour is totally predetermined by the kinship system. The kinship system merely provides the framework in which to act, by setting out the kin-categories and the associated modes of sociolinguistic conduct, i.e. rather than passive entities whose sociolinguistic behaviour is pre-programmed, individuals are more realistically viewed as actors who construct their behaviour within the framework of the kinship system. The individual appears to use the kinship system according to his
communicative needs. For example, Ego may be linked to a person through more than one geneological line; he may interpret/assign more than one kinship meaning to that person. (For discussion of this, see Sahlins 1962:162-167.) In cases of such ambiguity, Ego will select that role-relationship which best suits his social needs.

For example, two youths, Mika (23 years) and Joele (26 years), are related by two different geneological lines. Through the most direct geneological link, they are veivugoni "cross-parent/child", but through a less direct link involving a number of intermediate connections they may be classed as veitacini "same-sex siblings". The two youths are close friends. Because the cross-parent/child relationship involves avoidance behaviour which inhibits communication, the two trace their kinship link through the less direct geneological line by which they are veitacini "same-sex siblings". Intense interaction is permissible for this relationship. This ability of the individual to manipulate the kinship system has been observed in other sociocultural groups. For example, Heath et al (1982) indicate the fluid nature of kinship in various Australian Aboriginal societies. McDowall (1975) notes that the Bun kinship system of Papua New Guinea is extremely elastic.

The important point is that the kin relationship which Ego shares with a person is not always rigidly assigned, but may depend on the individual's interpretation.

If a kin relationship and the associated mode of sociolinguistic behaviour does not suit his communicative needs, Ego may:

1. interpret his relationship with that person through another geneological line (as described above); or
2. alter the sociolinguistic behaviour associated with that kin relationship.
   Such sociolinguistic change is discussed in 3.5.

3.5. SOCIOLINGUISTIC CHANGE

While kin categories of the Waitabu kinship system remain unaltered, there is change in the sociolinguistic behaviour towards certain kin types (i.e. there is functional change, but no structural change). The most obvious change involves the avoidance-type relationships of veivugoni "cross-parent/child" and veiganeni "opposite-sex sibling" which involve restraint and minimal communication. In Waitabu today, certain cross-parents and children, and opposite-sex siblings disregard the prescribed avoidance behaviour, and joke and converse freely. When asked about this, these individuals explained that verbal and social avoidance is inconvenient and hinders necessary communication, i.e. the prescribed mode of sociolinguistic behaviour does not suit their communicative needs.
These individuals also deviate from sociolinguistic norms by using personal names in address, and using the familiar singular pronoun form rather than dual and paucal forms (described in Table 3.4).

Such sociolinguistic change is limited to certain individuals of the younger generation. Many of the older people disapproved of the breaching of sociolinguistic norms, claiming that the individuals involved would be punished by God. As a Waitabu elder stated on seeing two veivugoni "cross-parent and child" converse freely:

\[
\text{erau veivugoni, ia i na gauna yai erau sā dau veiwali. Ia, sa tabu. E na rawa ni vosavosa cala, e kaka.}
\]

“They are cross-parent and child, but now they are always joking. But that’s forbidden. [As a result] it is possible that they will speak badly and stutter.”

[E.W. male, 60 years, Waitabu]

It is not yet clear if the change in the avoidance-based communication link will spread through the entire village social system.

There are no similar signs of change occurring in the authority-based relationships of true parent/child, same-sex siblings, and grandparent/grandchild, or in the joking relationships of tavale "cross-cousin" and dauve "sister-in-law". Individuals in these role-relationships appear to adhere, more or less, to the rules of verbal and social behaviour ascribed by the traditional kinship system. It appears, therefore, that change in the kinship system focuses on the inconvenient barriers to daily communication that avoidance-based role-relationships involve. Individuals tend to change their sociolinguistic behaviour if they interpret it as hindering their communicative needs. (For discussion of factors causing change in the kinship system, see Nayacakalou (1957).)

3.6. SUMMARY

In Waitabu village, the kinship system provides a framework for sociolinguistic conduct, by setting out kin categories and associated modes of behaviour. Individuals categorise people who they encounter into various kin groups and construct their sociolinguistic performance according to the type of kin relationship. There are three basic role-relationship types each involving distinct modes of sociolinguistic behaviour:

1. avoidance, with both parties practiseing mutual restraint;
2. joking, marked by mutual freedom and non-restraint;

3. authority, with one party deferring to the other, more powerful party.

Authority-based behaviour is used for "parallel" relatives (i.e. individuals classed as the same lineage group as Ego). The true father/child relationship is the prototypical case, and authority-based behaviour becomes less intense for classificatory relatives.

Extreme avoidance behaviour is used among cross-parents/children, and opposite-sex siblings, i.e. those cross-relatives who are not marriageable.

Compulsory joking is the mode of conduct between tavale "cross-cousins". This group includes potential marriage partners.

In other words, these established modes of sociolinguistic conduct serve to uphold the incest taboo, by restricting communication between non-marriageable individuals and facilitating communication (through compulsory joking) between those individuals who are potential marriage partners.

The data in this chapter indicates that sociolinguistic behaviour is not entirely predetermined by the kinship organisation. Rather the individual can manipulate the kinship system according to his communicative needs. If the individual views a kin relationship and associated mode of behaviour as conflicting with his communicative needs, he may interpret his relationship with that person through another geneological tie. Alternatively, if this is not possible, the individual may resolve the conflict by altering the sociolinguistic behaviour associated with the kin relationship. Such sociolinguistic change is evident in the avoidance-based role-relationships. Cross-parents/children and opposite-sex siblings of the younger generation view avoidance behaviour as a hindrance to communication, and choose to disregard such social barriers to communication.

The fact that individuals do interpret certain kin relationships according to their communicative needs, and do deviate from established modes of sociolinguistic conduct indicates that the individual is not a passive entity whose sociolinguistic behaviour is automatically triggered by social variables, but is more realistically viewed as an actor with the ability to construct his own sociolinguistic performance according to his interpretations and communicative needs. Deeply-engrained modes of interaction associated with various kin categories provide the basic framework for this sociolinguistic behaviour.
# Appendix 3.1 KIN TERMS OF REFERENCE AND ADDRESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>relationship</th>
<th>reference</th>
<th>address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fa.Fa</td>
<td>tubu-</td>
<td>kuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo.Fa</td>
<td>tubu- / tuka-</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo/Fa.Mo</td>
<td>tubu-</td>
<td>nau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grandchild</td>
<td>vua-</td>
<td>** vua- / NAME</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Father                  | tomo-     | tata    |
| Mother                  | tino-     | nana    |
| Daughter/Son            | luve-     | ** luve- / NAME |

| Mo.Bro                  | vugo- / *gōdena- | mōmō / mudrau [2nd.dual] |
| Spouse's father         | vugo-     | mōmō / mudrau [2nd.dual] |
| Fa.Si                   | tino-     | nana + NAME |
| Spouse's mother         | vugo-     | nei mudrau [2nd.dual] |
| Child's spouse          | vugo-     | ** vugo- / mudrau [2nd.dual] |
| Sister's child          | vugo-     | ** vugo- / mudrau [2nd.dual] |

| Opposite-sex sibling    | gone-     | ** gone- / mudou [2nd.paucal] |
| Older same-sex sibling  | tua'o-    | ** tua'o- / NAME |
| Younger same-sex sibling| taci-     | ** taci- / NAME |
| Parallel cousin         | 'arua-    | 'arua    |
| Cross-cousin            | tavale    | tavale   |
| Sisters-in-law          | dauve     | dauve    |
| Spouse                  | wati-     | ** wati- / NAME |

* These Boumān dialect terms are used only by
a few older speakers in Waitabu. The alternative form listed is more commonly used.

**These terms of reference (root + possessive suffix) are used also as address terms when the speaker wishes to highlight his/her kin link with the hearer. A common context of this use is in requests. By highlighting the kin link, the hearer's kin responsibilities come into focus, and it is more difficult not to fulfill the speaker's need.**
Appendix 3.2 SPONTANEOUS TAVALE (CROSS-COUSIN) JOKING CONVERSATION

The speakers are Naro (male, 73 years) and Josefa (male, 50 years) who share a tavale relationship. This conversation was recorded when Josefa was house-building. Nato strolled over to say hello.

Nato:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{sā yadra vina'a} \\
\text{ASP wake good} \\
\text{"Good morning!"}
\end{align*}
\]

Josefa:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{oh, bula tavale} \\
\text{EXCL. hello cross-cousin} \\
\text{"Oh, hello tavale"} \\
\text{o la'i vei} \\
\text{2sg go where} \\
\text{"Where are you off to?"} \\
\text{o sega ni via 'auta e dua yalewa} \\
\text{2sg NEG want bring 3sg one female} \\
\text{vata 'ei i'o} \\
\text{with PREP 2sg} \\
\text{"Didn't you want to bring a young lady with you?"}
\end{align*}
\]

Nato:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{sā rauta qō} \\
\text{ASP enough this} \\
\text{"That'll do!"} \\
\text{qō e dua na tamata cā} \\
\text{this 3sg one ART man bad} \\
\text{"This is a bad man" [pointing to Josefa]}
\end{align*}
\]

Josefa:

\[
\text{ooh, ah shit! [note English swear words]}
\]

Nato:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{tamata butabutako} \\
\text{man thief} \\
\text{"This man's a thief"}
\end{align*}
\]
Josefa:

\[
qō\ e\ dua\ na\ qase\ sega\ ni
\]
\[
this\ 3sg\ one\ ART\ old-person\ NEG
\]

\[
macala\ qō
\]
\[
clear\ this
\]

"This old man is not all here" [laughter]
Chapter 4

SOCIOLINGUISTIC RULES
FOR EVERYDAY INTERACTION

A sociolinguistic system is composed of individuals who continuously interpret situations and people that confront them, and construct their behaviour accordingly. The process of interpreting and constructing behaviour is far from ad hoc. Rather, the individual interprets (i.e. thinks, feels, and sees things) from the perspective of his sociocultural group, and constructs his sociolinguistic behaviour within the framework of established, deeply-grooved modes of interaction of that particular group. Sociolinguistic behaviour is thus systematically structured in patterns that are daily replicated by the many individuals of a sociolinguistic system.

The main aim of this chapter is to describe entrenched modes of behaviour and some of the main organisational principles of everyday sociolinguistic interaction in Waitabu village, with focus on how these patterns of interaction are intrinsically linked to social divisions and categories, cultural values and attitudes, and behavioural norms. In describing the various rules and norms by which Waitabu villagers construct their everyday sociolinguistic behaviour, I will focus on essential aspects that a stranger to the sociocultural group would have to be aware of, in order to perform appropriately in that group. These aspects include: male vs female speech; acts of giving and taking; deference and politeness markers; formulas for greeting and leave-taking; voice quality; and conversational strategies.

4.1. MALE vs FEMALE SPEECH

In Fiji (and many other socio-cultural groups), the sex difference is an important distinction which is manifested in both social and linguistic behaviour.
4.1.1. SOCIAL VALUES & ATTITUDES

The importance of the male is a key principle in Fijian social organisation. It is a patrilineal society with individuals belonging to the father's group and tracing descent through the male line. Ravuvu (1983:1) states:

This feeling of belonging to the father's group emphasises the importance of the male. It is through the man that the local group continues to exist. He is the protector and provider for the mataqali [clan]. Girls will marry out of their mataqali and serve those of their husbands. Traditional Fijian parents are usually overjoyed if they have sons. To have daughters only is considered with some disquiet and suspicion.

There is evidence that the emphasis accorded to the position and importance of males has been modified in contemporary Fijian society (Ravuvu 1983:2). Nevertheless, the status of female does remain subordinate. This attitude is reflected at the governmental level:

"At a Parliamentary Board meeting ...[it was] said if a woman was elected Leader of the Opposition, the Prime Minister, who was a high chief, would not consult her or have any dialogue with her."

[The Fiji Times July 24, 1985]

Positions of power in Fiji are occupied predominantly by men.¹

In the domain of the home, the husband has considerable authority over his wife who is expected to respect and obey him. The man is head of the house and makes final decisions about family or clan activity. In Waitabu, men normally eat before women, especially at gatherings outside the family circle and on formal occasions. (However, in some households, and in other Fijian villages where social change is evident, they usually eat together.) The males sit at the upper end of the ibe ni 'ana “meal mat” and are served first. The women and girls occupy the lower part by the door, and serve themselves after the men. Females generally occupy a subordinate position in any family situation. In formal gatherings and church services they assume a lower position than the males, from whom they normally sit apart.

The sex difference is marked by a strict division of labour. Certain tasks are considered feminine and others masculine. Women's work includes cooking, washing clothes, household chores, baby sitting, carrying water, fishing with nets and lines,

¹It should be noted that in some areas of contemporary Fiji there are high-titled women. However, no such cases occur in Waitabu.
gathering wild vegetable food and firewood, and weaving mats. Men's work involves tending and bringing food from the gardens, spearing fish and hunting, house building, and making earth ovens. Men and women do not usually mix in daily activities.

In accordance with sociocultural values and beliefs, there are radically different prototypical images of male and female. The aspired male image is one of macho strength and toughness (a Rambo-like hip-swaggering confidence). In contrast, expected and respected female qualities are gentleness, softness, respect and deference. We will now observe how these desired traits are reflected in established modes of linguistic behaviour.

4.1.2. LINGUISTIC DIFFERENCES

In Waitabu, there are predominant speech styles associated with the male-female distinction. As one elder explained, when teaching me how to speak the language:

*A vosa ni tagane e kaukaua. A vosa ni yalewa, e rogo mālua, veido'ado'ai.*

"Men's speech is strong and forceful. The speech of women sounds gentle and respectful."

Pejorative terms are used to describe individuals who do not conform to these sex-based norms. Dra'a dada "soft mouth" is used of men whose speech is not sufficiently "masculine", or who use linguistic markers more characteristic of female speech. A woman whose speech is not sufficiently *malumalumu* "soft, gentle" is often criticised as via-via-tagane "man-like / wanting to be a man".

Linguistic features which distinguish female from male speech include:

1. phonological

(a) intonation

In contrast to the monotonic nature of male speech, female speech is characterised by more intense modulation in pitch, thus creating a sing-song effect. This is best exemplified in the female norm of calling out the name of a female friend when passing by her house. In such name-calling, the penultimate syllable is lengthened, and pitch rises from low to high, falling again on the final syllable. Thus the name Selina is pronounced:

*Selina*
Such intense modulation in pitch is rare in male verbal performances.

(b) *lengthening of the penultimate syllable*

Descriptions of Fijian phonology state that long vowels do not occur in the penultimate syllable of a word (Dixon: chapter 2). This phonological constraint is exploited sociolinguistically: lengthening the vowel of the penultimate syllable is used as a marker of female speech. For example, the term for "net fishing" is pronounced:

- qoli by males, but
- qōli by females.

(c) *deletion of glottal stop in the prefix va'a-

The glottal stop of the causative affix va'a- is frequently omitted in female speech. In Bouma and Standard Fijian, the form vā- is a conditioned allomorph of va'a- occurring before a velar k, g, q. For example, vā-qō (CAUS-this) "like this". However, in women's speech the form vā- occurs in much greater range of environments, i.e. its position is not restricted to contexts where there is a following velar consonant. This combines with (b) above to create a general impression of vowel lengthening. For example, the term for "thank you very much" vina'a va'a-levu (good CAUS.-big) is often pronounced by female speakers as: [vina'a vā-lēvu]. In this example vowels are lengthened by: deletion of the glottal stop in the affix va'a-; and lengthening of the penultimate syllable le.

2. speech acts

*Humble, deferential* nature of female speech: the use of deference and politeness markers (described in 4.3) is far more frequent in female speech. Women tend to make their speech gentle, by using modal particles which serve as softening devices (e.g. mada "please"; yalo vina'a "would you be so kind", see 4.3.3), and speech acts of indirect requests. In contrast, men will tend to use softening devices to a much lesser extent, and more on-record direct commands. The humble, deferential character of women's speech may be attributed to the facts that: (a) they are lower on the social hierarchy, occupy subordinate positions, and must therefore defer more; and (b) the cultural stereotype image is for women to be gentle and respectful.

3. lexicon

(a) *Swearing, taboo words* are more common and acceptable in male speech
than they are in female. Swearing is considered to be unbecoming of women. The most common swear words refer to sexual body parts and usually involve some sexual reference to X's mother or grandmother, (e.g. maga i tina-mu vagina POSS. mother-2sg.POSS. "your mother's vagina"; caiti bū-mu fuck grandmother-2sg.POSS. "fuck your grandmother"). (Blasphemous use of religious terms is extremely rare in this intensely religious community.) Female use of taboo items does occur, but it is restricted to the very limited context of "sex talk" coro vudi (lit. roast skin off . banana). Coro vudi, in which sex-related topics are discussed explicitly, is restricted to all-female or all-male groups, of roughly the same age. Female use of swearing, taboo items outside this limited context is extremely rare.

(b) avoidance of emotive, affectionate terms. Men tend to avoid items that show affection or emotion, for this is considered to be a feminine trait. For example, it is a distinct characteristic of female speech to use terms such as domona "love" when enthusing about non-human referents, e.g.

```
au sā domona dina
1sg ASP love really
"I really love/adore it"
```

The use of domona in this sense is rare in male speech.

4. grammatical items

Isalei / isa, the interjection marking sympathy for the hearer (see 4.5.3), is more frequently used by females than males.

There are also certain particles which are associated with female speech by virtue of their "softening" function. These particles2 are:

- bau "somewhat, rather"
  ```
  sā bau toto'a dina
  ASP PART pretty really
  "It's really rather pretty"
  ```

- to'a "do on an interim basis, for now"
  ```
  qei moce to'a
  COORD sleep PART
  "Bye for now"
  ```

---

2 The glosses of these particles are very rough. As Dixon (forthcoming, chapter 8.3.1) observes, the meaning of these forms varies considerably, according to context.
'oto "brought to a (successful) conclusion"

\[ \begin{align*}
sā & \quad \text{o ti} & \quad \text{ 'oto} \\
\text{ASP} & \quad \text{finish} & \quad \text{PART} \\
\text{"It's finished/complete"} & \\
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
nō & \quad \text{[softener]} \\
\text{'oto} & \quad nō & \quad gā \\
\text{lie down} & \quad \text{PART} & \quad \text{INTENS} \\
\text{"lie down [polite]"} & \\
\end{align*} \]

See Arms (1984), Schütz (1986: chapters 21,22), Dixon (forthcoming: chapter 8) for further description of these forms.

Quantification of these particles was problematic because their occurrence in spontaneous speech was infrequent and sporadic. Bearing this in mind, the result of quantification of these items in 2,000 words of male and female speech is given in Table 4.1.

**Table 4-1:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREQUENCY OF SOFTENING PARTICLES</th>
<th>IN MALE &amp; FEMALE SPEECH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bau</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to'a</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nō</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'oto</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two important points are to be noted from the table:

(a) for the particles to'a and nō, female speakers scored much higher than males. In female speech, there were 11 occurrences of to'a, and 5 of nō. The male score for these two particles was zero.

(b) there were no occurrences of the particles bau and 'oto in either male or female speech.

Despite the non-occurrence of the particles bau and nō in the sample speech of Table 4.1, many speakers in the Waitabu community associated all four particles with female speech, by virtue of the fact that they created a malumalumu "soft, gentle" effect, which was characteristic of women's speech.
5. Formal and ceremonial speech is an exclusively male domain (see chapter 5). Hence, in Waitabu, only males (as representatives and spokesmen for their kin group) are skilled orators. The art of formal ceremonial speech is rarely mastered by female members of the community. Formal ceremonial speech tends to be long-winded, repetitive, sometimes ambiguous in meaning, and punctuated by long pauses. Rather than confront the issue directly, the speaker will "beat around the bush". These features of the male speech domain are also evident (though to a much lesser degree) in everyday male speech. In sharp contrast, women's everyday speech tends to be less ambiguous, less repetitive, and less long-winded. Keenan (1974) also reports a similar phenomenon in the Malagasy community, where female's speech is direct and explicit, in contrast to the indirect style of men.

It is important to note that the above mentioned features are merely tendencies of female speech. The degree to which they occur will vary according to the speaker’s interpretation of situations and the sociolinguistic image they wish to create in response.

The speaker’s ability to pinpoint differences in male and female speech varies widely, according to the individual. Of a sample of 20 speakers, all 20 recognised a general style distinction between male and female speech, describing the contrast as: kaukaua "strong" for men, and malumalumu "soft, gentle" for women. However, only about 11 more linguistically-sensitive speakers were able to pinpoint specific linguistic devices for attaining these styles. Such individuals were aware of male-female speech differences on all of the various levels listed above (e.g. phonological, speech act, lexical, and grammatical).

Differences in male-female speech have been reported in various other sociocultural groups. Sapir (1929) notes that the Yana language of California contained special forms for use in speech either to or by women. Brown and Levinson (1978) describe contrasting styles characteristic of male and female speech in Tenejapa, Mexico. Taylor (1951) notes that in the Island Carib language of Central America, males and females differ in various aspects of their common language including the genders given to abstract nouns. Keenan (1974) investigates contrasting male and female speech norms in Malagasy society. The Milroy s’ (1977) report quantitative differences between men and women’s speech in Belfast. Haas (1944) reports that in the Koasati language spoken in Louisiana, there are linguistic markers of the sex differences between speakers. Haas describes quite regular morphological differences between the verb forms used by males and females, with males typically adding -s to the end of the female forms (e.g. males say lakaws where females say lakaw, both meaning "he is lifting it"). Shibamoto
Smith (1985) investigates the role of language as a vehicle for the social representation of men and women, and demonstrates the way speech-related sex-stereotypes influence perceptions of masculinity and femininity.

This indicates that the sex-difference is a salient factor which finds expression in linguistic variation in many sociocultural groups. A rich area for investigation would be a cross-cultural comparison of male and female speech, involving observation of desired features of the male and female character in each society, and the various linguistic devices and markers used. Important questions must be asked such as: Are speakers aware of differences in male-female language? At what level are they able to pinpoint these differences? What other social factors cut across the sex distinction to affect the pattern of sociolinguistic variation? Do speakers use male and female speech markers consistently? In the case of inconsistency, what factors (e.g. topic, social situation) cause variation in frequency of male-female speech markers?

4.2. GIVING & TAKING

Fijian society is characterised by equal access to economic resources and equality in the distribution of material goods. It is considered prestigious to distribute rather than acquire material wealth. Indeed the Fijian lifestyle is often described as:

\[ \text{bula ni veisollisoli,} \]
\[ \text{bula ni vei'ere'erei} \]

"a life of sharing, a life of requesting"

This section deals with two speech acts which are frequently used in the distribution of goods at Waitabu: (a) 'ere'ere "request"; (b) va'ava'acabo "formal giving".

4.2.1. THE 'ERE'ERE "REQUEST" SPEECH ACT

"'ere'ere" is a commonly-used term which frequently signals the beginning of a speaker's request. It is the speaker's means of stating his/her needs. This performative verb places the speaker in a humble position to the hearer. The speaker is in a state of need; he appeals to the hearer for help, to redress the imbalance.

---

3 For discussion of problems of communalism in contemporary Fiji, see Vusoniwailala (1986).
The term 'ere'ere has been glossed by a variety of English verbs: "to beg", "to ask for" (Capell 1941:95); "to request" (Sahlins 1962). However, the meaning of the Fijian term 'ere'ere does not correspond exactly with any of these English glosses. The 'ere'ere act appears to be culture-specific. Implicit in the meaning of the term is the strong cultural obligation to fulfil any needs. When the speaker humbles himself by stating his need, it is assumed that the hearer is obliged to do his utmost to satisfy that need. This cultural obligation is much stronger than that implicit in English terms such as "request" and "ask for". The English gloss "beg" is also inadequate. Although it contains the necessary elements of a humble speaker placing onus on the hearer to fulfil the stated need, it bears a negative connotation which does not occur in the Fijian term.

The meaning of 'ere'ere is more clearly expressed in the following semantic formula:

I want you to do X
I think you have to do it
I think you understand that it will be bad for me if you don't do it
I will have bad feelings towards you if you don't

Bearing in mind the culture-specific nature of 'ere'ere, in this thesis the term is glossed, very roughly, as "request".

The term 'ere'ere is a reduplicated form of the verb 'erea "request". Unlike other words formed by the productive process of reduplication, 'ere'ere can be used as a transitive verb, i.e. interchangeably with 'erea:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{au } & \text{'ere'ere} \quad \text{\"erea a omu māsese} \\
1sg & \text{request } \quad \text{ART 2sgPOSS match}
\end{align*}
\]

"I request your matches"

It is interesting that no other reduplicated form has this transitive verb quality. Such unique grammatical character appears to reflect the special sociolinguistic status of the term. 'ere'ere has an important sociolinguistic function; it is commonly used as a device in the distribution of economic resources in Waitabu community.

In essence, the 'ere'ere system is a form of aid given to those who need it by those who can afford it. The very frequency of the 'ere'ere act in daily interaction demonstrates the importance of this device in the distribution of economic resources.

---

4 Paul Geraghty (p.c.) reports that in Colloquial Fijian (spoken in and around Suva) that the 'ere'ere form does not function as a transitive verb; it does not take an object. This differs from Waitabu, where speakers frequently use the form as a transitive verb followed by an object NP, e.g. au 'ere'ere a dua (1sg request ART light) "I request the light". (In such an utterance, there is no pause phenomenon to indicate juxtaposition of two separate phrases.)
economic resources. In Waitabu, it is the prevailing form of economic transaction among kinsmen as individuals. More goods change hands through 'ere'ere than through any other form of distribution, except family pooling.

The 'ere'ere act is not restricted to special occasions, but occurs daily and constantly. It may be performed by any able speaker of the community (adult or child, male or female), as needs for goods and services arise. There appear to be few, if any, restrictions on the type of goods which an individual may request. Even the prize Fijian wealth, the whale's tooth, may be requested if the individual need is great enough.

The 'ere'ere act is not restricted to requesting material items. It is also a polite form of request used for asking the hearer to perform an action:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{au} \quad 'ere'ere & \quad \text{mo} \quad \text{la'o} \quad \text{i} \\
1sg \quad \text{request} & \quad \text{COMP}-2sg \quad \text{go} \quad \text{PREP}
\end{align*}
\]

Vidawa

Vidawa

"I request you to go to Vidawa"

or when asking the hearer's permission:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{au} \quad 'ere'ere & \quad \text{meu} \quad \text{gole} \quad \text{mada} \\
1sg \quad \text{request} & \quad \text{COMP}-1sg \quad \text{go} \quad \text{please}
\end{align*}
\]

"I request [your permission] that I go, please"

This section focuses on the 'ere'ere of material items. The function of 'ere'ere as a polite form of request is dealt with in 4.3.3.

The 'ere'ere act varies in length, degree of formality, and directness of the request according to the speaker's interpretation of the situation confronting him. Upon receiving the requested item, there is no lengthy speech act of thanks. (Usually the recipient thanks the donor by simply using terms such as vina'a va'alevu "thankyou very much".) Two important factors taken into account by the speaker in constructing his 'ere'ere act are: "heaviness" of the request; and, type of role-relationship.

1. "heaviness" of the request

Participants being constant, there is tendency to vary the 'ere'ere speech according to the social value attached to the item requested. Small items (e.g. bangles, matches) tend to attract short, direct requests. More valuable items (e.g. pigs, money, and whale's teeth which require greater sacrifice by the donor) are
often preceded by a "warming-up" speech, and involve more indirect forms. This is well exemplified in the following requests which I received from my classificatory mother. The first ‘ere’ere was for a box of matches (to light a kerosine lamp). It is short and direct. In contrast, the second request for money ($12) was preceded by a "warming-up" speech (discussing the weather, my progress in language learning, the tidy state of my reed hut [!], and the fan she planned to weave for me). The request itself is longer and more polite than the first.

(a) Request for matches

[A.B. enters the hut, sits, and begins her request immediately. There is no warm-up speech.]

A.B. : au ’ere’ere a omu māsese
       "I request your matches"

[matches are given]
A.B. : vina’a va’alevu
       "thankyou very much"

(b) Request for money

[A.B. enters, and sits cross-legged on floor. There is a five minute warm-up speech. Then begins the request proper.]

A.B. : o yau ’ere’ere, Aneta. Au ’ere’ere va’abībī.
     Au ’ere’ere vei ’emudrau ni ’ā baleti Qalo.
     Yalo vina’a mo solia vei au na llavo.
     Au ’erea wale gā e tini’arua a dola.
     "I beg of you, Aneta. I request seriously/heavily.
     I request from you for the sake of Qalo [her daughter].
     Please, give me money.
     I request only $12."

[money is given]
A.B. : Io, vina’a va’alevu sara Aneta.
     Au ’ere’ere meu sā lesu tale i na qou vale.
     "Well, thank you very much, Aneta.
     I request [permission] that I may
     return to my house."

[A.B. female, 45 years, Waitabu]

While the "heaviness" of the request may influence the form of the ’ere’ere speech, a more important factor, by far, is the type of role-relationship between donor and recipient.
2. type of role-relationship

Although the 'ere'ere act may be performed by any able speaker, the range of individuals who fill the hearer position tends to be restricted to certain relationship types. There are two basic rules determining who an individual may 'ere'ere from:

(a) Requesting from taboo relatives (vugo "cross-parent/child"; gane "opposite-sex sibling") is generally avoided. These relatives are only very rarely the target of Ego's 'ere'ere performance. The speaker may make only very solemn requests to these kin types, and then only as a last resort. Such requests are taken extremely seriously, and every effort is made to fulfil the demand. (See 3.2.1 for an example of cross-parent/child request.)

(b) Of individuals in the non-avoidance kin categories, the speaker will 'ere'ere most freely from those with whom he has developed close personal ties. I observed and asked some 20 people at Waitabu which persons they 'ere'ere from most frequently, and which persons they felt free to request from. The unanimous response to both questions was: "those people I know well", or "those people I get along well with".

There is a marked difference in the 'ere'ere speech act between avoidance and non-avoidance kin types. The speech acts contrast in the following features:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AVOIDANCE</th>
<th>NON-AVOIDANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. rarely performed</td>
<td>frequently performed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. humble, polite</td>
<td>not so humble, casual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. use of softening</td>
<td>less softening words used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>words</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. indirect</td>
<td>direct, to the point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. long length</td>
<td>short in length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. taken seriously,</td>
<td>obligation to fulfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hearer is obliged</td>
<td>request is less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to fulfill request</td>
<td>strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(For example, see 4.2.1.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For individuals with limited primary ties (such as young women who have recently married into the village), the 'ere'ere act is not frequently performed. Until such time that her own network of close primary ties is established, the young bride will avoid the 'ere'ere speech act, and relies on her husband to fulfill her requests. As one newly-married female explained to me:

O yau, au sega vakadua ni bau kerekere na veivale wale gā. Au maduā. Au sega ni rawa ni kerekere. Au na qai tukuna vua
"I never request from any of the houses at all. I am embarrassed. I cannot request. I tell my husband to fetch [what I need]. It is difficult for me to request. I cannot request in this village."

[R.S. female, 22 years, Waitabu]

In short, the 'ere'ere speech act is an important linguistic device which serves the sociocultural norm of equal distribution of economic resources. While 'ere'ere is a common everyday speech act performed by any able member of the community, social divisions (namely avoidance/non-avoidance based kin distinctions) limit the range of individuals to whom this speech act may be directed.

4.2.2. FORMAL GIVING VA'AVA'ACABO

In contrast to the recipient-initiated 'ere'ere act, another speech act used in the distribution of material goods is va'ava'acabo "formal giving". This verbal act is donor-initiated, and manifests the sociocultural norm of the speaker being humble and self-effacing in relation to the hearer who is placed in an elevated position.

The va'ava'acabo act may be performed by adult males and females. In practice, however, it is most commonly performed by men, because as heads and representatives of kin groups, males act as spokesmen for their groups on formal/public occasions. Women perform the va'ava'acabo giving act only occasionally, at all-women's meetings, or if there is no male present. Investigation revealed that only five females in Waitabu claim to have performed a va'ava'acabo presentation.

The va'ava'acabo performance requires verbal skill. Individuals who give a bad/clumsy verbal performance are criticised as: tamata sega ni tāto'a "person inexperienced in speaking"; or tamata sega ni 'ilā a itovo va'avanua "person who does not know traditional customs of the land".

Va'ava'acabo is a more formal and structured sociolinguistic act than the 'ere'ere request. The donor usually conforms to the following pattern of topics:

1. describe the gift, commenting on its small size;

2. state the reason for giving, and the use of the gift to the recipient;

3. ask forgiveness for the small size or inferior quality of the gift.
The target impression of *va'ava'acabo* is for the donor to appear humble in relation to the recipient. Downgrading of the item is the main device used to attain this impression. When referring to the gift, the speaker avoids use of the specific everyday term. Instead he makes indirect reference to the item, also using qualifying words which serve to downgrade. If the everyday term is used, qualifying words implying small size and inadequacy will occur in the same noun phrase. For example,

```
e dua wale gā sāsā lailal
3sg one only INTENS broom small
"Only one small broom [for one or many fair-sized brooms]"
```

The item is usually described by various synonyms, all of which serve to downgrade the gift, the act of giving, and consequently the donor himself. The synonyms fall into certain semantic categories:

1. function
2. generic
3. small size, diminished number
4. old, worn state
5. source
6. small part/section of the item
7. Western good

The following examples illustrate these categories:

1. function. Terms focusing on the function of the item include:
   e.g. karasini "kerosine"
   ```
i-va'a-udre ni cina
   NOM-CAUS-light POSS light
   "thing for lighting your lamp"
   ```

   e.g. sē ni 'acu "flowers"
   ```
i-va'a-boi vina'a ni vale
   NOM-CAUS-smell good POSS house
   "thing that makes the house smell good"
   ```
e.g. i-lo'lo'o "pillow"

"ā va'a-mahumalumu ni omu
thing CAUS-soft POSS 2sg.POSS
i-’oto-’oto
NOM-lie-down-REDUP
"thing to soften your sleeping place"

e.g. i-seru "comb"
qato "bangles"
i-sau "earrings"

"ā ni teu-teu
"thing for decorating/dressing up one's self"

In order to downgrade the gift, the item may be referred to by a secondary, not primary, function. The implication is that the gift is not adequate/suitable for the use which it is primarily intended. For example, in Waitabu, vegetable leaves drau ni 'acu are used for two purposes: (a) protein section of a meal; (b) to line the base of a pot when cooking fish. In order to downgrade the gift, the donor often refers to the secondary, less-important function:

```
{ me boto ni l'a
  COMP base POSS fish
  "[thing] to put under the fish [in the pot]"
```

2. generic. Items may be collapsed under a generic term:

e.g. loga "mat"
l-ubi "blanket"
i-lo'ilo'o "pillow"
i-sulu "clothes"

& other possessions may be referred to as :

i-yau "goods/ possessions"

e.g. Starch-based foods are called by their generic term:
'ā'ana dina.
dalo "taro"
uvi "yam" 'a'ana dina
manio'e "tapioca" "starch food gen."

3. smaller size. The item is often referred to by terms denoting a smaller size than the actual gift, thus referring to its inadequacy. This is a common function of diminutives in many languages, e.g. Slavonic, Romance and Baltic language groups. See Bratus (1969) for detailed description of this and other functions of diminutives in Russian.

Examples from Fijian include:
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e.g. pua’a “pig”
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{luve ni pua’a} \\
\text{child POSS pig}
\end{align*}
\]
“piglet [referring to a large animal]”

e.g. i-lavo “money”
\[
\begin{align*}
vica wale gā a sede lailai \\
\text{few only INTENS ART cent small}
\end{align*}
\]
“only a few cents [for a gift of many dollars]”

e.g. tabua “whale’s tooth”
\[
\begin{align*}
bati-na lailai \\
tooth-POSS small
\end{align*}
\]
“little tooth”

4. old state. The item may be referred to by terms suggesting an old, inferior, worn-out state:

e.g. loga “mat”
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{madra ni loga “old, worn-out mat”} \\
\text{[for a new item]}
\end{align*}
\]

e.g. i-sulu “clothes”
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{madra ni sulu “rags” [for new clothes]}
\end{align*}
\]

5. source. The item may be referred to by its source material or source of acquisition:

e.g. tēpeli “table”
\[
\begin{align*}
i-dabe-dabe “chair” \\
\text{ti’i ni da’ua “piece of wood “} \\
\text{[Agathis vitiensis, kauri]}
\end{align*}
\]

e.g. keki “cake”
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{raisi “rice”} \\
\text{falawa “flour”} \\
\text{suika “sugar”}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{‘ā lailai ‘au mai na sitoa} \\
\text{“small things from the store”}
\end{align*}
\]

6. small section. Reference is often made to a small part or section of the item:
e.g. moto "spear"
   ↓
   mata ni moto "spear point"

e.g. tabua "whale's tooth"
   ↓
   wā ni 'amunaga
   "string attached to whale's tooth"

7. foreign. The item may be categorised according to its foreign nature. Any foreign (non-traditional) item may be referred to as:
   \[
   \begin{align*}
   & i-yau \quad va'a-pāpālagi \\
   & NOM-good \quad ADVERB-foreign \\
   & "foreign good"
   \end{align*}
   \]

   It is interesting to observe that newly-introduced Western goods may be categorised as either:

   (a) foreign ; or

   (b) an existing class (i.e. focusing on function, old state, etc.)

   This indicates that "Fijian vs foreign" is a salient distinction in the contemporary Fijian world view.

   It is important to note that the two most treasured Fijian items, tabua "whale's tooth", and yaqona "Piper methysticum, tree and root" are less prone to downgrading than other goods. These items, as symbols of the Fijian culture and ceremony, are usually referred to as:
   \[
   \begin{align*}
   & 'amunaga "traditional wealth" \quad \text{for tabua} \\
   & vatu tabu "sacred stone" \\
   & \text{i-sevu "yaqona presentation" for yaqona}
   \end{align*}
   \]

   Such items are usually presented in ceremonies and not by everyday giving acts.

   **ACT OF RECEIVING**

   In response to the speech act of giving described above, the recipient constructs an acceptance speech in which the target impression is to upgrade the gift, and consequently elevate the status of the donor. Thus the recipient assumes the opposite target impression to that of the donor; he seeks to counteract the preceding verbal display which denigrates the donor and the gift.
In the acceptance speech, the recipient will usually:

(a) say "thank you very much", and clap (with cupped hands - the Fijian gesture of receiving);

(b) accept the gift, referring to it in complimentary terms (especially its size and usefulness);

(c) comment in detail on its usefulness, and how he will use it;

(d) bless the donor in the Christian religious tradition;

(e) if it is a very formal acceptance speech, the recipient will utter a fossilised word sequence which is used in ceremonial presentation. This, however, is done only for very large gifts to formalise the transaction. (Such fossilised word sequences are described in detail in chapter 5.)

In referring to the gift, the recipient usually uses the general term i-yau "good / possession", followed by a complimentary qualifier. For example,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{i-yau} & \quad \text{cēcēre} \\
\text{NOM-good} & \quad \text{exalted} \\
\text{"exalted good"}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{i-yau} & \quad \text{dina ni loloma} \\
\text{NOM-good} & \quad \text{really POSS love} \\
\text{"gift given in true love or good feeling"}
\end{align*}
\]

The specific everyday term may be used, but it is usually qualified by upgrading words which show respect:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{e.g.} & \quad \text{everyday term + va'a-tūraga "noble"} \\
& \quad \text{vei-do'a-do'ai "respected"} \\
& \quad \text{cēcēre "exalted"}
\end{align*}
\]

It is important to note that in these acts of giving and receiving, the gift may be referred to by more than one synonym. For example, flowers may be called either:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ʻā} & \quad \text{i-va'a-rai-rai vina'a ni} \\
\text{thing NOM-CAUS-look-REDUP good POSS} \\
\text{vale} & \quad \text{house} \\
\text{"things to make the house look good"}
\end{align*}
\]


Choice of synonym will depend on the speaker's interpretation and construction of the particular act. The important point is that the indirect speech of va'ava'acabo "giving" is fluid, and permits speaker creativity. This contrasts with more rigid systems of indirect speech, such as the Guugu Yimidhirr brother-in-law speech style, in which the everyday form has an established substitute in the avoidance style (Haviland 1979).

In short, the Fijian speech norm that it is polite to be vague and non-specific, is manifested in the va'ava'acabo speech act by indirect reference to the gift. When referring to the gift, specific everyday terms are avoided. Instead, synonyms with more general reference are used. The resultant linguistic effect is collapsing of terms and parsimony. There is a direct contrast in the way the gift is referred to by the donor and the recipient. The indirect reference of the gift is geared towards downgrading by the donor (e.g. inferior quality and small size are focus), and upgrading by the recipient (chiefly qualities of the gift are highlighted).

(For comparison of the speech acts of va'ava'acabo formal giving, and ceremonial giving, see 5.4.)

4.3. DEFERENCE & POLITENESS MARKERS

The Fijian social structure is hierarchical: individuals are ranked within the family group. Each family group is ranked within the mataqali "clan", and in turn the mataqalis of the village are ranked in order (see chapter 2). The main criteria for ranking within each unit are age and sex: females defer to males; youth defers to age. On the basis of these two principles, sociolinguistic interaction in Waitabu village is characterised by the desired traits of respect veido'ài and deference va'aro'oro'o, with the individual deferring to those higher than himself on the social hierarchy. Breaching of the sociolinguistic norms of deference and politeness is often corrected by idioms such as:

\[
\text{va'a-māsima-ta'ina mada omu vosa}
\]

\[
\text{VERBZR-salt-TRANS please 2sg.POSS word}
\]

"please salt your speech"
Individuals who use insufficient degrees of politeness are criticised as veibeci "disrespectful", or viavialevu "acting big", i.e. assuming a sociolinguistic stance too high.

This section focuses on linguistic devices which serve to mark and maintain distance in the social hierarchy.

4.3.1. PLURAL PRONOUN

The use of plural pronoun nu to refer to a singular addressee is an indicator of extreme deference. Traditionally, this plural form was used to show deference to persons of chiefly rank and senior/elderly individuals. However, in contemporary Waitabu, its use as a deference marker is restricted to high ranking leaders, such as provincial chiefs and the prime minister, and when speaking in prayer to the Christian God. (As detailed in chapter 6, the plural pronoun form is only rarely used to the village chief today.)

It is important to note that there has been a functional split in the plural pronoun form. The Bouman dialect second person plural form is slightly different from the Standard Fijian equivalent. (Other second person pronoun forms remain the same.)

Standard Fijian: nī
Bouman dialect: nū

Before contact with Standard Fijian, the nū plural form of Bouman probably had the same two functions as the nī form of Standard Fijian:
1. referring to many, in the true plural sense;
2. marker of deference.

In contemporary Bouman, however, due to the functional split, speakers utilise the plural forms of both dialects:

nū is used exclusively as a respect marker;

nī is used in the true plural sense.

The development of the Bouman form nū as a respect marker has probably developed from the tendency to use more traditional Bouman dialect forms when speaking to village elders. Age warrants respect in Fijian society; thus the Bouman form nū became associated as a respect marker. The other plural form, Standard Fijian nī, was used to cover the other function of marking true plural, i.e.
This use of the plural pronoun form to a single addressee as an indicator of respect or social distance is a widespread sociolinguistic phenomenon. Brown and Gilman (1960) describe the T/V cases for French, German, Spanish and Italian. Slobin (1963) provides data for Yiddish; Friedrich (1972) for Russian; Comrie (1975) for other Slavic languages; Hollos (1975) for Hungarian; Paulston (1975) for Swedish; Neustupny (1968) for Czech; Jain (1969) for Hindi; Lefebvre (1975) for Quechua; Levinson (1977) for Tamil; Thorne (1975-76) for Welsh; and Gregersen (1974) for many African languages.

4.3.2. SUPRASEGMENTAL FEATURES

Voice quality is an important indicator of respect in Fijian. The greater the intended degree of politeness, the more slowly and softly one speaks. Rhythm and pitch are made more even, creating a soft, monotonic impression. Thus, in order to defer to an individual ranked high on the social hierarchy, the sociolinguistic norm is to make one's speech very low in volume, gentle in tone, and slow in speed. The intensity of these features lessens as the social distance between Ego and the hearer decreases, i.e. voice quality varies in a continuum-like effect. At one pole is extremely polite speech (e.g. very low, gentle, monotonic voice is used in prayer when addressing the ultimate authority of the Christian God). At the opposite pole is non-polite speech (e.g. loud, fast-pace speech with wide pitch variation is used by the village chief when haranguing youths who disobey his commands). Voice quality is also discussed in 4.5.1. Geertz (1960) reports that in Javanese society, there is a similar use of suprasegmental features through varying tone, loudness and speed in this manner, to indicate respect.

4.3.3. REQUESTS

In Fijian, forms of request vary according to the degree of politeness which the speaker wishes to show the addressee. As indicated, the appropriate respect level is largely determined by the relative position of speaker and hearer in the social hierarchy. In any sociolinguistic system, there are various strategies used in performing face-threatening actions, such as requests. As Brown and Levinson (1978) describe, these range from:
These strategies are associated with varying degrees of politeness, ranging from bald, on-record strategies in which politeness is minimal, to off-record strategies in which the hearer is shown much respect. I will now describe the range of linguistic devices which serve these strategies for making requests in Fijian.

1. direct imperative

   e.g. la'o "go!"

   Such direct commands, using only the bare verb root with no softening forms, are bald, on-record. This form of request shows minimal politeness. It is used frequently in authority-based relationships (e.g. parent/child, chief/villager), where the speaker's position of power and authority over the hearer warrants absence of politeness markers.

2. softening words

   There are two standard devices which, by showing redressive action, serve to "soften" commands. The function of these forms is to elevate the hearer, and indicate politeness and respect. The forms are:

   (a) mo VERB mada "please"

   e.g. la'o "go"

   ↓

   mo la'o mada "please go [polite]"

   (b) yalo vina'a "would you be so kind" [lit. good spirit]

   This form usually occurs in clause-initial position, and precedes the request. The two softening devices may combine to indicate added respect and politeness. For example,
I'alo vina'a mo solia mada
spirit good COMP-2sg give please

vei au e dua a iri
PREP 1sg 3sg one ART fan

"Would you be so kind as to give me a fan, please?"

(See 4.1.2 for softening particles bau, nō, 'oto, to'a.)

3. 'ere'ere request

au 'ere'ere mo la'o
1sg request COMP-2sg go

"I ask that you go"

Use of 'ere'ere/'erea to introduce the complement clause stating the request indicates politeness and respect for the hearer. It is an on-record act; the speaker's intention is unambiguously stated by 'ere'ere, the performative verb of request (see 4.2.1). However, unlike direct commands using the bare imperative, an 'ere'ere request has redressive action to the hearer. As described in 4.2.1, this performative verb places the speaker in a humble position to the hearer. The speaker is in a state of need and appeals to the hearer for help. Respect is shown by the speaker humbling himself. This is a common form of request in Waitabu village, used typically to show respect (veido'ai) to the hearer.

4. irrealis

The standard irrealis phrase used is e rawa be'a [+ request].

e rawa be'a ni na tu'una
3sg able perhaps PART FUT say

vei au
PREP 1sg

"Please tell me [extremely polite]"

(lit.) "it is possible, perhaps, that I will be told"

On surface impression, the use of irrealis in requests appears to be off-record: the speaker's intention of request is disguised, and not clear. The utterance could equally be interpreted as a statement of possibility (in this case, the possibility that "I will be told"). However, in actual fact, this off-record indirect mechanism has become fully conventionalised as to become on-record. It is now generally recognised as an indirect form of request which shows extreme respect (e.g. villager to provincial chief). Such conventionalised indirectness is also evident in English, in question-requests such as "Would you mind passing the salt?".
These linguistic devices may be used in combination, according to the degree of politeness which the speaker wishes to create:

- **non-polite**
  - **direct imperative** la'o "go!"
  - **softening words** yalo vina'a mo la'o mada "please go"
  - **performative verb** au 'ere'ere mo la'o mada "I request you to go"
  - **irrealis** e rawa be'a mo la'o mada "it is possible, perhaps, that you go"

- **extremely polite**

In this section, we have described various linguistic devices which serve to mark distance in the social hierarchy. These include: plural pronoun of respect; suprasegmental features; "softening" items and irrealis forms. A striking feature of the Fijian respect system is that, although backed by a rigid hierarchical social structure, the use of honorifics is extremely limited. (By "honorifics" I mean direct grammatical encodings of relative social status between participants, or between participants and persons/things referred to in the communicative event.) In contemporary Waitabu, there is only one kind of honorific⁵ - the use of non-singular pronouns to singular addressees. This restricted use of honorifics contrasts sharply with other societies with rigid social hierarchies such as Javanese (Geertz 1960, Suharno 1982), and Japanese (Harada 1976). Both of these languages have elaborate honorific systems involving considerable lexical and morphological substitution. In any utterance, the speaker must choose from a range of forms and thus indicate how he interprets the role-relationship.

In contemporary Waitabu sociolinguistic community which is characterised by a modicum of honorifics, there is a different kind of linguistic means of showing deference within the rigid social hierarchy. Rather than using lexical substitution, politeness is indicated through the addition of various linguistic signals of respect. Another conversational strategy for indicating respect is use of vague, indirect and long-winded speech (4.5.3), i.e. the existing everyday lexical items are utilised by devices such as repetition, ellipsis and non-specific reference to create a lengthy, ambiguous speech style for marking respect. This strategy is particularly evident in male speech on formal occasions, e.g. meetings, ceremonies.

⁵A chiefly respect vocabulary has been reported in some Fijian dialects (Hale 1846; Geraghty 1984:33), but few speakers in contemporary Waitabu recall these forms. For further detail, see chapter 6.
4.4. GREETINGS & LEAVE-TAKING

Acts of greeting and leave-taking are important indicators of the individuals communicative competence. Such acts function as structured "entries" and "exits" from sociolinguistic interaction. For each utterance there is an appropriate verbal response. Failure of greeting or response indicates that the party is unwilling to engage in sociolinguistic interaction. It is compulsory for the hearer to respond verbally. To respond by extra-linguistic signals alone, such as a smile or nod, is against sociolinguistic rules. As one elder criticised my initial greeting responses of smiling:

'ēva'ā o sega ni sauma mai, sa wili mo i'o yalewa cā

"If you do not answer (verbally), it's understood that you are a bad woman"

Furthermore it is sociolinguistic etiquette to utter the addressee's name following the greeting form. Mutual name utterance is important. Asymmetrical name use (i.e. A greets B, and pronounces B's name; B responds, but does not pronounce A's name), is a signal of insult or lack of respect to the individual whose name was not pronounced.

In Fijian, forms used in greetings and leave-taking are relatively fixed and formulaic.

4.4.1. GREETINGS

The forms of greeting vary according to:

1. time of day;
2. type of activity;
3. type of role-relationship.

1. time of day

There are different greeting forms depending on the time of day. On the first meeting in the morning:

Greeting:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{yadra} \\
\text{wake} \\
\text{"good morning"}
\end{align*}
\]
Response:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{yadra} & \quad \text{vina'a} \\
\text{wake} & \quad \text{good} \\
\text{"good morning [reply]"}
\end{align*}
\]

On consequent meetings, and in afternoon and night:

Greeting:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{bula} \\
\text{health/life} \\
\text{"good health"}
\end{align*}
\]

Response:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{bula} & \quad \text{vina'a} \\
\text{health} & \quad \text{good} \\
\text{"good health [reply]"}
\end{align*}
\]

The above greetings may combine with, or be replaced by, information-seeking greetings described in 2 below.

2. type of activity

Waitabu village is a small, close-knit society in which emphasis is placed on sharing and communal activity, rather than individual privacy. (In Fijian, there is no term for privacy\(^6\), the nearest estimation being the root forms \textit{vuni} “hide” and \textit{tabogo} “hidden from sight”.) Knowledge regarding the individual's whereabouts and actions is considered to be communal information. Formulas for greeting often take the form of information-seeking questions. For example,

---

\(^6\) The lexicalised concept of "privacy" appears to be unique to certain Western European languages, such as English and German.
On meeting a person going somewhere:

Greeting:

\[
\text{gole ti'o i vei} \\
\text{la'i vei} \\
\text{go ASP PREP where} \\
\text{"where are you going to?"}
\]

Response:

\[
\begin{align*}
& (au \ sā) \ la'i \ X \\
& 1sg. \ ASP \ go \ X \\
& "(I'm) going to X (place)"
\end{align*}
\]

On seeing a person return from somewhere:

Greeting:

\[
\text{lesu mai vei} \\
\text{return PREP where} \\
\text{"where have you come from?"} \\
\text{o ā ti'o mai vei} \\
\text{2sg PAST ASP PREP where} \\
\text{"where have you been?"}
\]

Response:

\[
\begin{align*}
& (au \ lesu) \ mai \ X \\
& 1sg \ return \ PREP \ X \\
& "(I'm returning) from X (place)"
\end{align*}
\]

or explanation of whereabouts.

The response to information-seeking greetings must contain factual information in answer to the question. This compulsory truth element contrasts to question-greetings in English, e.g. "How are you?", in which the response is geared towards creating a "nice" impression, rather than presenting the speaker with a factual answer. (See Leech 1983, *Principles of Pragmatics.*) In Fijian, non-factual or facetious answers to question-greetings are a breach of sociolinguistic etiquette.

The communal nature of Waitabu society is also exemplified in the special forms of greeting associated with the activity of eating. On seeing a person pass nearby when one is having a meal, it is obligatory to invite them to share, using the greeting form:
mai 'ana
come eat

or: va'asigalevu
[come and have] lunch [or whatever the meal is]

response:
vina'a
'thanks' [if declining]

[No verbal response is necessary if the individual accepts.]

Such sociolinguistic etiquette is rigidly observed, and omission of the greeting attracts social criticism. As one woman stated when an individual who was eating failed to issue the greeting inviting us to share his food:

\[
\begin{align*}
o & \text{ 'ea tamata }'\text{ana-}'\text{ana cā} \\
& \text{{ ART 3sg man eat-REDUP bad}} \\
& \text{he is a man who eats badly}
\end{align*}
\]

3. type of role-relationship

The form of greeting varies according to the nature of the role-relationship. Respect may be indicated by inclusion of non-singular pronouns when addressing a single addressee. For example, the dual pronoun form drau, which is used when speaking to a cross-parent/child vugo (see 3.2), also occurs in greetings to these individuals:

non-avoidance : yadra

avoidance (cross-parent) : drau yadra

"good morning"

In addition to the pronoun forms, social distance was traditionally encoded in special greeting forms (tama) used for chiefs. These forms, described in chapter 6, are rarely used in Waitabu village today. Irvine (1974) reports similar encoding of status in Wolof greeting forms.

4.4.2. LEAVE-TAKING

There are various formulae for making an exit from social interaction. On leaving someone at any time of day, the standard formula is:

Exit marker:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{moce} & \\
\text{sleep} & \\
\text{"goodbye"}
\end{align*}
\]
The form of the leave-taking utterance varies according to the type of role-relationship. For individuals of relatively equal status, the leave-taking formula has the form of reciprocal requests/commands:

Exit marker:
\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{o ti'o mada} \\
&2sg \text{ stay please}
\end{align*}
\]

"you stay"

Response:
\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{o la'o} \\
&2sg \text{ go}
\end{align*}
\]

"you go"

If the person leaving is of higher rank than the hearer, the utterance is a statement of his intention to depart, and the response is a polite request:

Exit marker:
\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{au sā la'o} \\
&1sg \text{ ASP go}
\end{align*}
\]

"I am going"

Response:
\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{o la'o mada} \\
&2sg \text{ go please}
\end{align*}
\]

"you go please"

In contrast, when the speaker is of lower social status than the hearer, the leave-taking utterance is more polite. Rather than state his intention to depart, the speaker requests permission to leave. The hearer's response is a command, indicating permission granted.

Exit marker:
\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{au 'ere'e re meu la'o} \\
&1sg \text{ request COMP-1sg go}
\end{align*}
\]

"I ask that I may go"
Responses:
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{io} & \quad \text{la'o} \\
\text{yes} & \quad \text{go} \\
\text{"yes, go"} &
\end{align*}
\]

Signals indicating the individual's exit from the interaction are compulsory. Failure to indicate an exit through standard linguistic devices implies that the preceding interaction was unsatisfactory. There is a special idiom for criticising an individual who breaks the sociolinguistic rule of leave-taking:
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{curu} & \quad \text{va'a-toga} \\
\text{go through} & \quad \text{ADVERB-Tonga} \\
\text{"go out like a Tongan"} &
\end{align*}
\]

i.e. to leave impolitely, without signalling an exit, like the foreigners from Tonga.

4.5. FIJIAN ETHOS & THE NATURE OF THE FIJIAN LANGUAGE

The Fijian "ethos" -the structure of assumptions, values, and meanings which underlie particular and varying expressions of cultural behaviour (Epstein 1978:122)- derives much of its character from established patterns of sociolinguistic behaviour. The Fijian "character" has been described as: softly-spoken, placid, slow to anger, quick to appease, humble, self-effacing, polite and respectful, generous, relaxed and living for the present -tomorrow will take care of itself (see Ravuvu 1983, 1985:9-12).

Although such a description may attract the criticism of radically simplifying the complex and diverse nature of social behaviour into the simplistic stereotyped concept of national character or personality, it is important to recognise that the gut impression of "national character" is not totally ficticious. Rather, the features of the "Fijian personality" are, in fact, socially-desired traits and behavioural norms which are frequently displayed in established modes of sociolinguistic interaction. That is to say, the impression of a "Fijian ethos" stems from observation of well-entrenched modes of social and linguistic behaviour, into which the individual has been socialised. In the following, I will focus on some of the basic rules for everyday sociolinguistic conduct (at various linguistic levels - phonological, grammatical, conversational strategies) which contribute to our general impression of the Fijian ethos.
4.5.1. VOICE QUALITY

A basic rule which is conducive to the impression of the "softly-spoken" Fijian is that verbal interaction must be conducted in a "soft, gentle hushed voice" (Ravuvu 1983:104). Speech tends to be low in volume, gentle in tone, and (for males in particular, see 4.1.2) monotonic with little variation in pitch. In Fijian, enthusiasm is shown by verbal means (e.g. choice of lexicon), and not by variation in intonation and loud voice (as is the norm in cultures such as Italy and Spain, and English-speaking communities in U.S.A. and Australia). Command of these suprasegmental features are important in the Fijian speaker's communicative competence, for they function as signs of respect towards the hearer. See 4.3.2.

4.5.2. MINOR FOCUS ON AGENTIVITY

In Fijian society, there is a tendency to focus on the state of affairs, and to accept things as they are, rather than focus on the cause of the situation. A general attitude of life among Fijians is that life is to be lived and enjoyed in the present situation. It is for man to accept the present state of affairs that God has planned, and not to question the cause of the state. As the Fijian idiom states:

\[
\begin{align*}
tamata \ sā & \ na'i-na'i, \ kalou \ sā \\
man \ & \ ASP \ plan-REDUP \ god \ ASP \\
lewā \ & \ decide \\
"man may plan, but God will decide"\end{align*}
\]

This tendency to focus on the state rather than the entity which brought that state about is reflected on the grammatical level. Transitive constructions (which often imply agentivity) are used much less frequently than intransitive constructions. Dixon (forthcoming) counts that in a sample of Fijian texts, 70% of clauses were intransitive, as opposed to a mere 30% transitive constructions.⁷

The same tendency of focusing on the state rather than the entity responsible for that state is well exemplified in the common phrase:

\textit{sega ni macala} "it is not clear".

---

⁷This does not imply that the concept of causation is not linguistically encoded. The verbal prefix \textit{va'a-} is a common device used for this purpose (see Arns 1974; Schütz 1986: chapter 15; Dixon forthcoming: chapter 17.2). Nevertheless, the tendency is to highlight the state itself, rather than the cause of that state.
This is the standard means for stating "I do not know the answer to a question, or certain information". The important point is that focus is not on the person who does not know (the link between the speaker and the state of not knowing is not codified). Instead, focus is on the state of affairs - namely, that the information is not clear. In effect, the phrase "takes the agentivity out of ignorance". It is part of the more general tendency to deal with the state of affairs, rather than the entity which brought the state about.

4.5.3. CONVERSATIONAL STRATEGIES

Various conversational strategies in Fijian reflect sociocultural values and attitudes. This section focuses on certain linguistic devices which reflect the desired traits of avoiding conflict and confrontation; being humble and self-effacing; and being "nice" to the hearer.

Linguistic devices which serve the orientation towards social harmony and avoiding conflict are:

1. **vague and indirect speech.** To the non-native speaker, certain styles of Fijian appear long-winded and often ambiguous. It is polite to be vague. Rather than directly stating an opinion, it is conversational strategy to "beat around the bush", never saying what one really thinks, and only referring indirectly to an issue that may cause direct confrontation. Vague and indirect speech is most clearly manifested in formal speech, e.g. ceremonies. This domain is exclusive to men (4.1.2.): Geertz (1960) reports that "indirectness" is an important cultural value manifested in various forms of the Javanese culture. Eades (1982) demonstrates that Australian Aboriginal sociolinguistic norms favour "indirectness"; and Keenan (1974) reports that in Malagasy, direct confrontation and overt expressions of anger are rare. Wierzbicka (1985b) investigates different senses of "indirectness" in various sociocultural groups.

2. **small talk.** Neutral topics -such as the weather- are common in conversation. Small talk is safe; it is more conducive to social harmony than potentially explosive issues.

3. **"isalei" sympathy marker.** The term isalei / isa is a common exclamation which roughly translates as "I sympathise with you, i.e. I want you to know that I am thinking of you. I think well of you. I understand what you feel. I can imagine that I feel the same, i.e. I share your feeling".

This "be-nice-to-the-hearer" device is used to show sympathy in both good
and bad situations. For example, Selina and Mere (two female friends) were sitting mat-weaving. After some minutes of silence, Mere smiles at Selina and says: “isa Selina!”, thus indicating that she is thinking of Selina and sharing her feeling of well-being. In contrast, isalei is often used to show pity for an individual who is in an unsatisfactory situation:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{isa} & \quad \text{Silipa tauvimate} \\
\text{EXCL} & \quad \text{Silipa sick} \\
\text{“poor Silipa [who is sick]”} \\
\text{isalei} & \quad \text{Ropate va’arau la’o} \\
\text{EXCL} & \quad \text{Robert prepare go} \\
\text{“poor Robert [who is] preparing to go”}
\end{align*}
\]

[In Fijian society, leaving one’s home and kindred is considered as an unsatisfactory state.]

In this way, the isalei device serves to maximise harmony and minimise conflict through signalling the speaker’s solidarity and sympathy with the hearer.

When these various conversational strategies fail to resolve a conflict, another sociolinguistic device remains:

4. “isoro” ceremony. This is an institutionalised means of dissolving conflict. It is a formal apology, made in ceremonial style, in which the wrong-doer humbles himself, admits his wrong deed, and begs for forgiveness. (Detailed description of such sociolinguistic rituals is given in chapter 6.)

Other desired traits in Fijian society are: to be yalo mālua “humble” and self-effacing; and to show loloma “love and kindness” and veido’ai “respect” to all. Thus, rather than state spontaneous opinions and feelings, the sociolinguistic norm is to “be nice” to, and to appear humble in relation to the hearer. Sociolinguistic devices for achieving this include:

1. deference and politeness markers (see 4.3)

2. repaying of compliments. It is sociolinguistic etiquette to elevate the hearer by compliments. In turn, the hearer is obliged to downgrade himself by stating the opposite, i.e. denying the compliment, or repaying the compliment. (See Pomerantz 1978 for investigation of various compliment response strategies.) Denial and repayment of a compliment are exemplified in the following compliment exchange ritual between two young Waitabu women:
Sera:
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{oi} & \quad \text{o} & \quad \text{l'o} & \quad \text{rai-rai} & \quad \text{vina'a} \\
& \quad \text{EXCL} & \quad \text{ART} & \quad \text{2sg} & \quad \text{look-REDUP} & \quad \text{good} \\
\end{align*}
\]
"Hey! you're looking good"

Filo:
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{sega} & \quad \text{o} & \quad \text{dai} & \quad \text{au} & \quad \text{rai-rai} & \quad \text{cā} \\
& \quad \text{NEG} & \quad \text{2sg} & \quad \text{joke} & \quad \text{1sg} & \quad \text{look-REDUP} & \quad \text{bad} \\
\end{align*}
\]
"No, you're joking. I look bad"

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{rai-rai} & \quad \text{vina'a} & \quad \text{o} & \quad \text{i'o} \\
& \quad \text{look-REDUP} & \quad \text{good} & \quad \text{ART} & \quad \text{2sg} \\
\end{align*}
\]
"It is you who looks good"

Similarly, an "in" term that was currently in vogue during the fieldwork period in Waitabu was wānanavu "great". This form is frequently used (especially by adolescents) in giving compliments. It is sociolinguistic etiquette to repay the compliment, repeating the term:

Akeneta:
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{na} & \quad \text{'ā'ana} & \quad \text{yai} & \quad \text{e} & \quad \text{wānanavu} \\
& \quad \text{ART} & \quad \text{food} & \quad \text{this} & \quad \text{3sg} & \quad \text{great} \\
\end{align*}
\]
"this food is great [tasting]"

Angela:
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{sega} & \quad \text{wānanavu} & \quad \text{o} & \quad \text{i'o} \\
& \quad \text{NEG} & \quad \text{great} & \quad \text{ART} & \quad \text{2sg} \\
\end{align*}
\]
"No, it is you who is great!"

3. avoidance of boasting. This ultimate speech act of self-elevation is viewed with social distaste and is extremely rare. The negative attitude towards self-elevation is reflected in various idioms:

qoroqoroya mata iluvena
"praising the face of his own child"

dau cavucavuta a yacana vakakā
"keeps mentioning his own name, parrot-fashion"

uvu 'ena davui
"blows his own conch/ triton shell"

English is similar to Fijian, in assigning negative value to acts of self-elevation (Pomerantz 1978) -witness the idiom for boasting: "blowing his own
This negative connotation associated with self-elevation is, however, not universal. Reisman (1974) reports that in Antiguan society, boasting (self-elevation) and cursing (down-grading of hearer) are conventional verbal acts with positive sociolinguistic connotation.

4.6. CONCLUSION

In this chapter, we have described certain established patterns of everyday interaction in the Waitabu sociolinguistic system. Within this framework, using the same basic shared principles, individuals interpret and construct their behaviour. The modes of interaction described in this chapter are intrinsically linked to social divisions and categories, sociocultural values and attitudes, and desired personality traits. For example, Fiji is a rank-type society - it is characterised by equality in distribution of material wealth and inequality in the distribution of power. These larger-scale social facts are embodied in and exist in sociolinguistic behaviour: speech acts of requesting 'ere'ere, and formal giving va'ava'acabo, are important linguistic devices which serve the sociocultural norm of equal distribution of economic resources. Furthermore, the social structure limits the range of individuals to whom the 'ere'ere speech act may be performed: it is rarely directed to those individuals in avoidance-based kin categories.

Waitabu is a hierarchical society with unequal distribution of power. This structure is manifested in, and maintained by, linguistic politeness and deference markers. Age and sex are the basic ranking criteria. Recall from chapter one that by these two principles, individuals of the sociolinguistic system are organised into social categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gone &quot;child&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cauravou &quot;unmarried youth&quot;</td>
<td>gone-yalewa &quot;unmarried girl&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tūraga &quot;married man&quot;</td>
<td>marama &quot;married woman&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qase &quot;old person&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The individual's sociolinguistic behaviour is strongly influenced by the social category to which he/she belongs. For example, individuals in the gone-yalewa "unmarried girl" category must defer, socially and linguistically, to those older (i.e. individuals in the tūraga, marama, and qase categories). Also, there is a
marked difference in the styles of male and female speech, manifested on the phonological, grammatical, lexical and speech act levels. The young girl thus constructs her speech around the predominant female speech style which is more malumalumu "soft, gentle", and deferential than the male style.

More abstract factors, such as sociocultural values and attitudes, are also manifested in sociolinguistic behaviour. The desired trait of being humble and self-effacing is manifested in: compulsory repaying of compliments; avoidance of boasting speech acts; and compulsory downgrading devices in the va'ava'acabo giving act. The emphasis on social harmony and avoidance of direct confrontation is reflected in: conversational strategies of vague and indirect speech; use of small talk and sympathy-marking interjections; and isoro, the formal ceremonial apology. In short, a complex network of broad social facts influences established patterns of sociolinguistic behaviour in Waitabu village.
Chapter 5

SPEECH RITUAL
-THE LANGUAGE OF CEREMONIES

5.1. INTRODUCTION

The Fijians have a highly developed ceremonial system, expressed through yaqona ceremonies, ritual presentation of whale's teeth, and other objects. Ceremony is an important aspect of the Fijian culture. It is a frequent and integral part of village life, marking stages in the life cycle, changes in social status, and other socially significant events. Indeed, each individual in Waitabu community has to pass through, and participate in, various ceremonial events in order to be and to feel a complete social person. Ravuvu (1985) states in his masterly investigation of how the Fijian ethos is manifested in the ceremony:

Traditional Fijian ceremonies continue to exist as a model for life. They reflect Fijian world view, and define the social and political structures, religious beliefs, values and practices inherent in Fijian communities.

The ceremony is, in effect, the flower of the Waitabu lifestyle. There is marked enthusiasm for ceremonies in contrast to apathy to other activities in the humdrum routine of daily village life.

The ceremonial performance is a clear-cut speech event, with distinct markers for beginning and end, and set rules for the sequence of activity in between. As a sociolinguistic act, it is much more highly structured than other everyday sociolinguistic performances, see 1.2. An individual who breaches the sociolinguistic etiquette of the ceremony is criticised as 'sa'asa'a "clumsy, awkward, inexperienced", or si'a vābe'a "bald like a flying fox (not knowing how to behave on ceremonial occasions)". The aim of this chapter is to describe this rigidly patterned speech event and its various linguistic features. Following this, ceremonial
giving is compared to va'ava'acabo giving (described in 4.2.2).\(^1\)

It must be noted that the ceremonial performance varies throughout the Fijian archipelago. Thus, this description of the Waitabu ceremony may differ, to a greater or lesser extent, from that of other areas, e.g. Ravuvu's (1985) account of Matanisau, Lutu, and Laselevu villages in central Viti Levu; Williksen-Bakker's (1984) description of Suvavou, an urban village near Suva.

5.1.1. PARTICIPANTS

There are two parties involved in the ceremony - the donor and the recipient. Each party is represented by one speaker, though if the recipient is of high status (e.g. village chief) he will speak only briefly; the bulk of the acceptance speech is performed by his spokesman, or by a leader of the opposite clan.

Ceremonial speech is restricted to males, for, in Waitabu society, the ceremonial system is organised on the basis of the kinship structure, and males represent the kingroup of which they are head. Thus, the speech rituals may be performed by individuals from the social categories of cauravou "young unmarried man", tūraga "married man", and qase "old person [in this case, old male]". Cauravou "young unmarried men" usually perform their first ceremonial speech around the age of 16 years, when they make their first isevu "harvest crop presentation". The most frequent performers in ceremonies are qase "old [male] person". (These individuals, by virtue of their seniority and sex, are ranked high on the social hierarchy, and are representatives of kin groups at various levels - family unit, ito'ato'a, and mataqali. Hence, their frequent involvement in ceremonies.) There is considerable variation in the oratorical skill of ceremonial performers. The older males (qase) are usually most skillful and provide masterly verbal displays on which younger men model their linguistic performances.

In Waitabu village, no females perform ceremonies. As subordinates, women do not take any active part in formal rituals. They usually assume an inferior role and sit quietly behind the men. (The closest that women come to formal ceremonial speech performances is the women's church meeting (bose ni soqosoqo va'amarama), which is usually composed of prayers and hymns, and followed by informal chatter.)

---

\(^1\)This chapter has been influenced by Hymes' seminal work on the grid of features of speech events. Hymes 1964a, 1972a provides an outline for heuristic analysis of components of speech events, stressing the relationship between factors such as: participants; setting; purposes; topic; linguistic varieties and styles; verbal organisation in terms of component speech acts; modes and manners of delivery; norms of interaction.
Salmond (1974, 1975) reports a similar situation in Maori society, where ceremonial speech performances are restricted to males, especially elderly males. Likewise, Duranti (1981) observes that in the Samoan fono, only (male) orators and chiefs can attend, and only a restricted group actively participates in it.

5.1.2. THE GIFT

The Fijian ceremony involves the presentation of certain items, of high ceremonial value. The type of ceremony determines the nature of the gift. Tabua "whale's tooth" - the most treasured Fijian wealth - is presented at only the most significant ceremonies, thus indicating the importance of the particular ritual. As Brewster (1937:40) notes:

Tabua are the greatest of Fijian treasures, breathing of mystery and religion, objects of veneration from before the time of native memory.

Thus, the tabua is presented in important ceremonies such as: the ireguregu ceremony which pays respect to the family of an individual who died during X's absence from the village; and the isoro ceremony, in which the donor begs forgiveness for a wrong-doing. (See Brewster (1922:17-36; 1937:40-51), Roth (1953:96-106), Williksen-Bakker (1984:91-115) for description of the source of the whale's tooth, its social significance, and its use in ceremonies.)

Yaqona (Piper methysticum) is the second most-treasured traditional Fijian good. (The term yaqona refers to both the plant and the drink made from it by steeping pulped fresh root or powdered dried substance in an appropriate amount of water.) It is presented ceremonially in various forms - powdered, dried root, or (in order to impress on important occasions) the whole green bush. The yaqona plant may be presented immediately after the presentation of a tabua "whale's tooth" at an especially formal event, to reinforce the expression of goodwill conveyed by the tabua. Otherwise, it is presented alone, still representing a high token of goodwill on the part of the donors, in ceremonies such as cavudraudrau "pulling of leaves" to welcome an important guest, or in the iseivusevu ceremony requesting entry into the village.

Tabua and yaqona are the most frequent ceremonial items. Other ceremonial gifts are loga "mats woven from dried pandanus leaves" (used in many life cycle ceremonies, and to welcome important guests), token portions of harvest.

As Mauu (1925) demonstrates in his volume *The Gift*, in a wide cross-section of cultures, gifts which appear spontaneous and voluntary are, in fact, obligatory and instrumental, and linked with broader social meanings and norms. This obligatory and instrumental nature of the gift is clearly exemplified in Fijian ceremonial giving.
crops (used in the isevu "offering the first fruits of the harvest"), and magiti "food for feast".

It is important to note the symbolic value of ceremonial gifts:

They [gifts] are used as a medium through which the expression of respect, loyalty, welcome, acceptance are conveyed publicly. They are symbolic of the pious wishes and feeling of their donor in relation to their recipient.... [The whale’s tooth] is the highest symbol of respect, deference, loyalty, goodwill, acceptance, recognition and even submission, an individual or a group may offer to anyone.

[Ravuvu 1985:18-19]

5.1.3. POSTURE AND POSITION

The ceremony is characterised by clearly-structured physical and social behaviour. There are set principles governing seating position (see Ravuvu 1985):

1. separation of different interest groups. The donor and recipient groups sit separately, on opposite sides of the house.

2. cohesion of common interest groups. Members of the same interest group sit in close proximity to each other.

3. centrality/height of the leaders. The speaker representing each group sits highest (i.e. closest to the sleeping section of the house), facing the speaker of the other group. Other individuals sit facing towards the speakers.

4. proximity of followers in descending order of status. Behind the speaker, members of each group are seated according to their status, which is largely determined by seniority and sex:

5. segregation of sexes. Males sit highest, closest to the speaker. If present, females (who are more subordinate) sit towards the low end of the house, closest to the main door.

6. segregation by age. More senior individuals sit closest to the speaker. Younger members are seated towards the lower end of the house, according to their relative age. (Children are not usually permitted to attend ceremonies.) The principle of sex usually has priority over the principle of seniority, i.e. males usually sit higher than females regardless of relative age, e.g. a youth of 20 sits higher than a woman of 45 years.

The seating etiquette is illustrated in Figure 5.1.

There are also rules governing seating posture. In ceremonial performances, men sit faite "cross-legged, Tongan style" (the term itself being a Tongan loan). Females sit with legs folded to one side, dabe va’ayalewa. Only in the formal, ceremonial context is this different seating posture for male and female assumed; in
Figure 5-1: SEATING POSITIONS IN CEREMONY
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more relaxed everyday activities, both male and female sit in faïte manner, “cross-
legged, Tongan style”. Also, there is a special posture that the speaker assumes
when presenting or accepting the whale’s tooth. When handling this treasured item
which represents everything that is valuable and worthwhile within Fijian society,
the speaker must assume kneeling position.

Much social significance is placed on the ceremony. It is a solemn occasion:
signs of frivolity are forbidden; background noise is minimised. For further
description of the social aspects of the Fijian ceremony, see especially Ravuvu
(1985), and also Quain (1948:329-373), Roth (1953), Ravuvu (1983:45-69),

5.1.4. RANGE OF CEREMONIES

In Waitabu, the ceremony is an important and frequent social device. Rituals are performed for a wide range of activities including: a foreigner’s request
to enter the village (isevusevu); presentation of harvest crops (isevu); formal
apology for wrong-doing (isoro); taking a child to its mother’s village for the first
time (‘au mata ni gone); welcoming an important guest (a sequence of up to
eight ceremonies). In addition, there are numerous ceremonies associated with the
human life cycle - birth, death and marriage. The wide range of ceremonies which
are performed in contemporary Waitabu are listed in Appendix 5.1 at the end of
this chapter. See also Williksen-Bakker (1984), Ravuvu (1985), and Dari and
Petit-Skinner (1985) for detailed listing of ceremonies performed in other
contemporary Fijian communities.

The 12 sample ceremonies on which this analysis is based (i.e. those which I
was able to witness and record) belong to the following types:

isevusevu  “request to enter village”
isevu      “offering of first fruits of harvest”
isoro      “formal apology for wrong-doing”
iqaloqalo  “swimming to the boat”
uru ni hulla “lowering the flag”
iva’amama  “drying out”
cavudraudrau “pulling the leaves”
va’atale    “farewell”

* Ceremonies marked with an asterisk are traditional rituals to
  welcome an important guest. Titles are inherited from tradition;
  the activity implied by the title is not actually performed.

I have not recorded any life cycle ceremonies relating to birth, death or
marriage. I understand, however, that the basic linguistic formulas and patterns
described in this chapter apply also to these life cycle rituals. (See Quain 1948,

Also, there are various pre-white contact ceremonies which are no longer performed in Waitabu, e.g. va'aunu "a series of ceremonies for the installation of the village chief". (See Dari and Petit-Skinner (1985) for detailed description of these ceremonies.) The chief of contemporary Waitabu, Tui Nasau, assumed the position upon his father's death some 35 years ago, but there was no chiefly installation ceremony. Villagers from the other clan claim that, because the ceremony was not performed, Tui Nasau's chiefly power is questionable. As Gennep (1960) demonstrates, the ceremony is important in marking status or change of status of individuals within the society. Failure to perform the speech ritual of va'aunu means that the chief's status is uncertain and not definite; it has not been socially recognised through institutionalised ceremonial means. This failure to perform the chiefly installation ceremony is one factor in the decline of chiefly respect (chapter 6). For further description of bygone religious ceremonies, see Brewster (1922:88-97).

5.2. ISEVU CEREMONY - A REFLECTION OF SOCIAL HIERARCHY

The isevu "offering of the first fruits of harvest" ceremony is sociolinguistically significant for, unlike other ceremonies, it is performed at each level of the social hierarchy, i.e. the levels of the social structure are indicated simply by the repeated performance of this ritual.

In the isevu ceremony, each youth presents a token portion of the first crops from his garden each year to the individual ranked next above him. So the chain begins with the sibling group: the youngest brother gives to the next eldest brother etc., who gives to the eldest brother. This eldest sibling then presents to his father, the head of the family unit. Family units form sub-clans ito'ato'a which are ranked into clans mataqali (see 2.3.4). Thus the leader of each family unit gives to the leader of the ito'ato'a. And, in turn, the leader of each ito'ato'a makes an isevu presentation to the leader of his mataqali "clan". The leader of the mataqali (and there are only two in Waitabu) then presents an isevu to the village chief, who is top of the hierarchy. (The chief will then redistribute the harvest crop presentations down through the village, by a feast for all village members.) Thus the following pattern of social organisation emerges:
The important point is that the repeated occurrence of this single ceremonial speech performance serves as an overt demonstration of the Waitabu social hierarchy.

5.3. LINGUISTIC FEATURES

The ceremonial verbal performance is very formulaic. It is characterised by rigid patterning on various levels: the scope of topics; set ordering of topics; fossilisation of utterances into standard meaning blocks; and use of distinct formal linguistic features. A striking semantic feature of ceremonial speech is vagueness, i.e. often reference is non-specific and meaning is obscure.

5.3.1. LIMITED RANGE OF TOPICS

There is striking consistency in the scope of topics covered by ceremonial speech:

1. reference to the gift. (The donor downgrades the gift, referring to its small size by terms such as batina lailai "little tooth". In contrast, the recipient upgrades the same item, making reference to its large size and noble quality by terms such as 'amunaga "treasured wealth");

2. praise of the Christian God, and (what they believed to be) God's plan that the ceremony be performed;

3. complimentary reference to the other party and their noble qualities;

4. blessing of both parties, the village and its people, in both the traditional and Christian religious traditions;
5. name and purpose of the particular ceremony;

6. comment that the speech is of long duration (even if the performance is very short).

Each of these six topics were dealt with in all 12 sample ceremonies (though not always in the above order). The themes of discourse did not vary outside this range, thus suggesting rigidification of topics.

5.3.2. Formulaic Ordering of Topics

Ceremonial speech is highly patterned. Tables 5.1 and 5.2 show the rigid formula which emerged from the analysis of the 12 sample ceremonies.

5.3.3. Fossilised Word Sequences

One main distinguishing feature of formal, ceremonial speech is the use of fossilised utterances which must occur at set stages throughout the performance. The function of these fossilised sequences is to signal the beginning, intermediate, and end stages of the ceremony. Such unvarying utterances provide the skeletal framework of the ceremonial act. While the individual speaker has scope to compose the bulk of wording in the main body of his speech (within the constraints of the set range and order of topics, and use of ceremonial jargon), he is not permitted to vary the fossilised sequences, or the order in which they occur. For description of fossilised terms in Trobriand social rites, see Malinowski (1935:213-240).

Examples of fossilised sequences in Waitabu ceremonies are indicated by the boxes in Tables 5.1 and 5.2, which show the ceremonial structure. The fossilised utterances vary slightly according to the type of gift which is presented. For example, in the tabua "whale's tooth" presentation, the opening fossilised sequence is:

Donor: Āā ! oi oi oi !

Indicating "I am about to present a whale's tooth"

Recipient: Āā ! oi oi oi ! tabua levu yā ī !

Indicating "I acknowledge the presentation of this large whale's tooth"

In contrast, for the presentation of mats, yaqona and harvest crops, this fossilised sequence is replaced by timed clapping, which signals the beginning of the ceremony. Further variation between the fossilised utterances of tabua and yaqona presentations is listed in Tables 5.1 and 5.2.
### Table 5.1: CEREMONIAL FORMULA, PART 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORDER</th>
<th>DETAILS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D: introduction</td>
<td>Donor announces that he is ready to begin the presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AA! OI OI OI</strong></td>
<td>(This utterance is replaced by timed clapping in the yaqona ceremony)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• address</td>
<td>Donor addresses the recipient using highly respectful terms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| R: **AA! OI OI OI**
  
  **TABUA LEVU YĀ I** | (This utterance is deleted in the yaqona ceremony) |
| D: * name & purpose of ceremony
  * reference to gift (downgrading)
  * praise of Christian God
  * complimentary reference to recipient and his noble qualities
  * thanks | |
| comment on length of speech | |
| address | Donor honours & addresses the recipient |
| D: **SOSO RATU!** | |
| R: **YEE!** | |
| D: **A VURA!** | (This utterance is deleted in the yaqona ceremony) |
| ALL: **YEE!** | |
**Table 5-2: CEREMONIAL FORMULA, PART 2**

**SPEAKER:**

D = donor  
R = recipient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORDER</th>
<th>DETAILS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R: acceptance</td>
<td>Recipient announces acceptance of the ceremonial gift (optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MANA!</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D&amp;R: <strong>DE DINA</strong></td>
<td>(timed clapping)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R: acceptance</td>
<td>Recipient accepts the gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>praise &amp; thanks</td>
<td>Recipient praises the item, and thanks the donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bless all</td>
<td>Recipient blesses the donor, the village, and asks that God may watch over them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MANA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ALL:** **DE DINA! AMUDUO!**

| (timed clapping) | |
| DUO | (timed clapping) |
| thank each other | |

**NOTE** This is the formula for a whale's tooth presentation. There is some variation in the order of topics indicated by asterisk *. Such variation suggests that there is some scope for creativity within the rigid structure of the ritual verbal performance.

**NOTE:** Fossilised utterances are shown by boxes. Differences between the fossilised utterances of yaqona and whale's tooth presentations are noted in the column marked details.
It is now necessary to observe how these fossilised sequences relate to the notion of "word" in Fijian. The word may be defined by two sets of criteria:

1. phonological

2. grammatical.

As Dixon (forthcoming) demonstrates, phonological and grammatical word boundaries do not always coincide in Fijian. A similar discrepancy between phonological and grammatical word boundaries is evident in the fossilised utterances of ceremonies.

1. phonological criteria

Criteria for phonological word in Fijian are:

(a) primary stress is placed on the penultimate syllable of the phonological word;

(b) diphthong formation. Certain sequences of vowels will form a diphthong within a phonological word, but not across a phonological word boundary.

Note also that a reduplication boundary is always a phonological word boundary.

By these criteria, the fossilised sequences may be divided into several phonological words. Take, for example, the fossilised utterance beginning a tabua presentation:

\[\tilde{\text{Aa}}! \text{ oí oí oí ! tabúa levu yá } \dot{\text{i}}!\]

Evidence that this utterance is composed of several phonological words is:

(a) several syllables receive primary stress;

(b) the vowel sequence \([o + i]\) forms a diphthong showing that it is one phonological word.

It is not always the case that a fossilised sequence contains several phonological words. Shorter sequences of one or two syllables take only one primary stress and thus consist of only one phonological word. For example:

\[\text{mána ! : indicating "the presentation is complete"}\]
yee ! : indicating "it is so / yes"

2. grammatical criteria

The main criteria for grammatical word in Fijian are:

(a) **non-interruptability** (cohesiveness). Elements of a grammatical word cannot be interrupted;

(b) **non-permutability** (order). Elements cannot occur in any other order or sequence.

By this criteria, each fossilised sequence resembles a single grammatical word. The elements of a fossilised sequence must occur in set order; their order cannot be rearranged or interrupted by other elements.

**Semantically**, the component phonological words of a fossilised utterance do not usually bear identifiable meaning. Rather, it is the sequence block as a whole which is the minimal meaning unit. The meaning occurs predominantly on the sociolinguistic level: it signals various stages of the ceremony. The following lists the fossilised utterances of the tabua presentation ceremony, and their sociolinguistic meaning/ signal. Underlined are those few terms which occur in everyday speech. (The brackets indicate utterance sets. The contents of each set are not interruptable by any other elements.)

**Aa oi oi oi !**
"I am about to present a whale's tooth"

**Aa ! oi oi ! tabua levu yā i**
"I acknowledge the presentation of this large [levu] whale's tooth [tabua]"

Soso ratu
"the offering has been made"

**Yee !**
"it is so / yes"

A vura
"I accept the whale's tooth/ you have appeared on the surface; made your situation known"

**Yee**
"it is so / yes"

mana
"the presentation is complete"

**Ēe dina ! amuduo !**
"it is true [ēe dina]. Thank you"
The sociolinguistic meanings given above for each fossilized sequence are based on speaker explanation. Speakers were unable to explain the meaning of most of the component elements within each sequence (except for those few everyday items underlined). They did not consider fossilized utterances or the component phonological words to have the same status as everyday words. As one speaker explained when I asked him the meaning of fossilized sequences:

\[ e \text{ d tëdrë balea ni sega ni vosa dina } \]

"It is difficult [to answer your question] because it isn't a real word."

[J.C. 50 years, male, Waitabu]

In short, the fossilized utterance is an uninterruptable sequence of the same status as a grammatical word. This sequence may be composed of one or more phonological words. Meaning coincides with the grammatical word boundary: the complete utterance is the minimal meaningful unit, serving as a sociolinguistic indicator of the stages within the ceremonial performance, i.e.

- phonological word
- grammatical word
- minimal meaningful unit

5.3.4. CEREMONIAL FORMS

1. pronouns

Ceremonial speech is characterised by a high frequency of paucal (mudou) and plural (munū) second person pronouns. In contrast, singular (i'o) and dual (mudrau) forms are comparatively rare. A survey of the 12 sample ceremonies revealed that of the total 320 pronoun forms:

- 105 (33%) were plural
- 161 (50%) " paucal
- 19 (6%) " dual
- 35 (11%) " singular

Two major reasons for the high frequency of paucal and plural forms are:

(a) ceremonial speech is formal and polite. Thus pronoun forms indicating extreme respect are used. As indicated in 4.3.1, the ceremony is the last domain where plural pronouns of respect are still used to individuals within Waitabu village. Similarly, Salmond (1974) notes that the Maori ceremony is the last
domain for the use of traditional linguistic forms. While English is replacing Maori in many everyday contexts, Maori continues as the ritual language of the ceremony. Likewise, Hill (1973) reports that the dying Luiseno language of Southern California is very rarely used in everyday contexts, but does continue to be used in ceremonies.

(b) the speaker in a ceremony represents the members of his kin group. Thus, non-singular pronouns are used in reference to the many individuals of the group.

2. substitution of everyday terms for ceremonial terms

Substitution of everyday terms with ceremonial forms occurs on the levels of lexical item, phrase and sentence:

(a) lexical. Certain everyday items are replaced by formal, ceremonial vocabulary. In some cases of lexical substitution, the ceremonial form does not occur in everyday Waitabu speech:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Everyday</th>
<th>Ceremony</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yaco</td>
<td>tadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mate</td>
<td>ta'ali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vinavina'a</td>
<td>uliva'i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"arrive"  "dead"

In other cases, the forms do occur in everyday speech, but in the ceremonial context there is some variation in meaning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Everyday</th>
<th>Ceremonial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tūraga &quot;chief&quot;</td>
<td>gone tūraga &quot;child chief&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gone &quot;child&quot;</td>
<td>[term of respect]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>omu iti'oti'o &quot;your residence&quot;</td>
<td>yavu tabu &quot;sacred foundation&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yavu &quot;foundation&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;your noble residence&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tabu &quot;sacred, noble&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) On the phrase level, there are set respect phrases which have frequent occurrence in ceremonial speech. (I have not heard these in everyday speech; such forms appear to be exclusive to formal ceremonial language (Paul Geraghty: p.c.)):
na i-sērau va'atūraga
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ART} & \quad \text{NOM-presence} & \text{chiefly} \\
& \quad \text{"chiefly presence"}
\end{align*}
\]
e dolodolo tabu va'atūraga
\[
\begin{align*}
3\text{sg} & \quad \text{doorway} & \text{sacred} & \text{chiefly} \\
& \quad \text{"the honoured house of the chief"}
\end{align*}
\]

(c) Often entire sentences are rephrased to give a more polite, softer effect. For example, the everyday sentence:

\[
\begin{align*}
tārova & \quad a & \quad \text{cagilaba} \\
\text{stop} & \quad \text{ART} & \quad \text{cyclones} \\
& \quad \text{"stop the cyclones!"}
\end{align*}
\]

in ceremonial speech becomes:

\[
\begin{align*}
rūrū & \quad tū & \quad a & \quad \text{cagi} & \quad \text{ni} & \quad \text{yaba'ī} \\
\text{calm} & \quad \text{ASP} & \quad \text{ART} & \quad \text{wind} & \quad \text{POSS} & \quad \text{year} \\
& \quad \text{"may the yearly winds be calm"}
\end{align*}
\]

3. addition of adverbs of respect

In order to create an impression of high respect, certain adverbs are plugged into an everyday sentence structure. The adverb forms include:

va'a-tūraga (ADVER~chief) "in a chiefly manner"
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{na} & \quad \text{i-la'o-la'o} & \quad \text{va'atūraga} & \quad \text{mai} & \quad \text{Suva} \\
\text{ART} & \quad \text{NOM-go-REDUP} & \text{chiefly} & \text{PREP} & \text{Suva} \\
& \quad \text{"the chiefly journey from Suva"}
\end{align*}
\]

va'a-vanua (ADVER~land) "dignified, of the land"
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{na} & \quad \text{i-veisotari} & \quad \text{va'a-vanua} \\
\text{ART} & \quad \text{NOM-meeting} & \text{dignified} \\
& \quad \text{"the dignified meeting"}
\end{align*}
\]

va'a-ro'o-ro'o (ADVER~respect-REDUP) "respected"
\[
\begin{align*}
i & \quad \text{na} & \quad \text{i-yalo} & \quad \text{va'aro'oro'o} \\
\text{PREP} & \quad \text{ART} & \quad \text{NOM-spirit} & \text{respect} \\
& \quad \text{"in a spirit of respect"}
\end{align*}
\]

3 While the glosses for these terms are rough, the concepts embodied in them are encompassing, with physical, social and cultural connotations. See Ravuvu (1985:1-12) for detailed description of the meaning of these terms.
These adverbs do occur in everyday speech to show respect to certain people and items. However, impressionistically, the frequency of these forms is much higher in ceremonial speech. A comparison of the 12 sample ceremonies with everyday conversations totalling the same length (approximately 4,000 words) was made, and the results are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ceremony</th>
<th>everyday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>va'atūraga</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va'avanua</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va'aro'oro'o</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures indicate that:

(a) the frequency of these adverbs is much higher in ceremonial speech than it is in everyday conversation. No occurrence of these forms was recorded in this sample of everyday speech (though they do occur occasionally in some recorded narratives);

(b) by far the most frequent adverb in ceremonial speech was va'atūraga "chiefly". 115 forms were counted as opposed to 14 for va'avanua "dignified", and 4 for va'aro'oro'o "respected".

Analysis shows that there are four main semantic fields, which the adverbs qualify:

(a) the recipient;

(b) the gift;

(c) the village and the land of Fiji;

(d) Fijian customs and behavioural norms.

4. set phrases and sentences

Another striking feature of ceremonial language is the frequent occurrence of established phrases and sentences. It appears that such forms are standard expressions in the speaker’s stock of ceremonial utterances.

* e.g. { tautani tū gā a māliwa ni cā
  "cast out the bad which is in our midst"
  
* e.g. { bula vina’a ti’o, a tūraga ’ei na marama, cauravou ’ei
  na gone yalewa, me yaco vei ira, ’ena baisave, i na loma
  ni ’oro o Naisaqai
  "May you be healthy, men and women, youths and maidens
  right down to the children of the village of Naisaqai."
e.g. { e dua batina lailai 'eitou mai laveta ti'o i na isērau va'atūraga

"This is only one small tooth which we are raising up towards your noble presence/glory."

e.g. { me siga vina’a dina ti’o a vanua,
me rawarawa tū a ca’aca’a

"May the weather [and general situation] be fine and may work be easy."

e.g. { dava'atūraga mada

"Let us respect one another/ act in a noble manner."

5.3.5. SEMANTICS

Ceremonial speech tends to be long-winded and low in content. Often the meaning is obscure. Waitabu speakers themselves recognise this as a feature of ceremonial speech. For example, my language helpers often could not grasp the precise meaning of ceremonial sentences. When asked the meaning, a common response was: sā sega ni macala, ia sā 'eneyai, a vosa ni veiqaravi “It is not clear, but ceremonial speech is like that”. Such obscurity relates to the Fijian speech norm that it is, in many circumstances, polite to be vague and indirect (see 4.5.3). It should be noted at this stage that the term “indirect” has various senses (Wierzbicka 1985b). In male ceremonial speech, “indirect” speech is recognised linguistically by non-specific reference, e.g. in the isoro ceremony, in which the speaker begs forgiveness for a wrong-doing, there is no specific reference to the wrong-doing itself. This is illustrated in the following example: NL (female 50 years) fell seriously ill. The illness (medically analysed as sugar diabetes) was attributed to her family’s wrong-doings. Members of NL’s family thus made an isoro presentation to ask the chief’s forgiveness, (the chief is viewed as the link with the spirit world), and thus placate the spirits so that she might recover. In the isoro ceremony, there was no specific reference to any wrong-doing. Rather, the speakers tended to “beat about the bush”, referring only to their “weakness” malumalumu. (In contrast, “indirect” female everyday speech (4.1.2) has different linguistic manifestation, namely off-record speech acts such as disguised requests. In both instances, the speaker’s “indirectness” signals respect.)

A second semantic feature of ceremonial speech is that the common linguistic assumption that “each word has a meaning” does not apply to the fossilised sequences of phonological words. As described in 5.3.3, the entire fossilised sequence forms a minimal meaning unit. The component phonological words often have no meaning, but the utterance as a whole functions as a signal.
It may be argued that, unlike everyday conversation, much of the verbal behaviour in the ceremony is not really aimed at conveying semantic information at all. Rather, ceremonial behaviour is geared to fulfilling a required set of ritual steps in structured sequence. Just as on the micro level, the fossilised sequence of phonological words forms a minimal sociolinguistic signal, so too on the macro level, the segments of the ceremonial act, taken in isolation, are not meaningful. It is the completed overall act, consisting of highly structured sequences, that bears sociolinguistic meaning. In other words, the component units of a ceremony are structured in a "syntagmatic chain". This complete sequence bears sociolinguistic significance, i.e.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>fossilised utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>donor's speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>fossilised utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>recipient's speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>fossilised utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>thanks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

completed ceremony

sociolinguistic meaning: request for permission to enter village
(if sevu sevu ceremony, etc.)

An interesting analogy to the structured ceremonial sequence is the morpheme. The morpheme is composed of phonemes which (like the component stages of a ceremony) are arranged in rigid sequence. The sequence of phonemes cannot be interrupted or altered in their order. Each isolated phoneme does not bear meaning. Rather, meaning exists in the complete sequence, i.e. in the sequence of phonemes as a whole. Thus, morpheme = ceremony; phoneme = component parts of the ceremony.  

The ceremonial event is topic of a vast and rapidly increasing range of anthropological and recent sociolinguistic literature. A frequently occurring theme of this literature is the rigid patterning of ceremonial speech. For example, Keenan (1974), Ochs (1984) describes the kabary "ceremonial" highly stylised, formulaic speech style in Malagasy; Fox (1974) investigates a Rotinese speech ritual; a detailed description of ritual events among the Kuna Indians of Panama is provided by Sherzer (1983); Fitzgerald (1975) analyses ritual performances among the Ga of southern Ghana; Duranti (1981) provides detailed description of a ceremonial act in Samoan society; Salmond (1974, 1975) reports on the clearly-

---

4This phoneme-morpheme analogy raises two important questions: (a) how likely is this interpretation to be in line with expert native exegia? (b) why don't the Fijian speakers simply substitute a non-ritual, briefer, matter-of-fact statement? Such issues have been addressed by almost a century of rival and varied anthropological literature. For discussion of these issues with relation to the Fijian ceremony, see Ravuvu (1985).
structured nature of the Maori ritual; Malinowski (1935) deals with language formulas of speech rites in Trobriand society, and so on.

Complete transcription of a ceremony (uru ni 'uila “lowering of the flag” to welcome an important visitor) is given in the Appendix at the end of this thesis.

5.4. COMPARISON OF VA'AVA'ACABO & CEREMONIAL GIVING

The relation between patterning in ritual speech and aesthetic patterning in everyday speech has attracted much attention in the ethnography of speaking in recent years, see for example, Ochs (1984), Gossen (1974), Haviland (1977), Sherzer (1983). This section explores the relation between everyday and ritual speech by comparing two acts of giving: the va'ava'acabo speech act (described in 4.2.2) and the ceremony. The va'ava'acabo and the ceremony are similar in that they involve the norm of donor downgrading and recipient upgrading the item. There are, however, important differences between these two sociolinguistic acts. Ceremonial giving is more specialised, more restricted than the act of va'ava'acabo giving in various senses:

1. participants

Va'ava'acabo giving may be performed by a broad range of social categories - adolescent or older, male or female. In contrast, only a limited portion of these individuals are permitted to act in the ceremony. Ceremonial speech is exclusive to males, especially males of high status and seniority. This contrast is graphically illustrated in the following diagram: light shading indicates those social categories which perform va'ava'acabo giving; the smaller subsection of this group which performs ceremonial speech is shown by heavier shading.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>female</th>
<th>male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gone-yalewa</td>
<td>gone-yalewa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;young unmarried girl&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gone &quot;child&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cauravou</td>
<td>cauravou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;young unmarried man&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marava</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;married man&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;married woman&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;elderly person&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. gift

Va'ava'acabo giving involves almost any type of gift. In contrast, the type of gift presented at ceremonies is limited to only a few prestigious traditional items (e.g. tabua "whale's tooth", yaqona, mats and token crops).

3. symbolic value

The ceremonial performance symbolises a group's recognition of status, or change of status of one or more of its members. In contrast, va'ava'acabo giving is much less symbolic: the speech act does not bear deeper social meaning. Also, unlike the ceremonial gift, the item presented in va'ava'acabo giving is taken on face value and has little or no symbolic meaning.

Focusing now on the linguistic level, the scope of speaker creativity is extremely limited in the ceremonial act:

4. formulaic sequence

Ceremonial speech has a rigid formula; it is a highly patterned speech performance, consisting of clearly-structured sequential units. In contrast, va'ava'acabo giving is much less formulaic, with greater scope for speaker creativity.

5. fossilised word sequences

Utterances are also more formulaic in ceremonial speech. Ritual speech is characterised by fossilised sequences which must be pronounced in set order, at set stages of the ceremony. Such prescribed fossilised utterances do not occur in va'ava'acabo giving, except on very rare occasions to formalise the transaction.

6. respect items

Ceremonial speech is characterised by high frequency of respect forms (e.g. use of respect adverbs such as va'atūraga "chiefly", va'avanua "dignified"; and other ceremonial lexicon, phrases and sentences). This is not a common feature of va'ava'acabo giving.

7. obscure meaning. The meaning of certain ceremonial utterances is often unclear. In contrast, the meaning of all sentences in the va'ava'acabo speech act is perfectly clear; constructions are geared to conveying semantic information. Recall from 4.5.3, the sociolinguistic norm that it is polite to be vague and non-specific. The ceremony, which is extremely formal and polite, thus utilises more
vague and non-specific speech. In contrast, the va'ava'acabo act which is less formal than ceremonial giving, involves speech whose meaning is less obscure.

In short, comparison of va'ava'acabo and ceremonial acts of giving reveals that the ceremony is a more limited, specialised act. In explaining the contrast between va'ava'acabo and ceremonial acts, it is useful to introduce the notion of "sociolinguistic markedness", see 1.2. A "marked" sociolinguistic act is limited and specialised, set apart by various linguistic and sociolinguistic features that distinguish it from everyday speech performances.  

Everyday sociolinguistic acts tend to be "unmarked", neutral, with less restrictions on the range of potential actors, and scope of speaker creativity in constructing his sociolinguistic behaviour. In contrast, "marked" sociolinguistic acts (such as the ceremony) are characterised (and "marked" as being different to everyday behaviour) by more specialised rules which serve to limit and define: the range of participants and items involved; the contexts in which they may be performed; and verbal behaviour. The speaker's verbal performance is limited by rigid formulaic structure, established scope of topics, and prescribed use of ceremonial forms and fossilised utterances.

This notion of sociolinguistic markedness vs unmarkedness is a useful one in analysing variation in a speech community. The markedness approach does not attempt to slot all sociolinguistic variation into neat boxes and correlate each of these boxes with isolated social features. Rather, it focuses on "marked" role-relationships and social situations (i.e. those which demand distinct kinesic, spatial and social behavioural patterns that differ from everyday norms), and observes the linguistic behaviour associated with the particular "marked" role-relationship /situation.

It is necessary to distinguish between the nature of various constraints (e.g. linguistic, social, kinesic, setting) which may characterise a particular "marked" sociolinguistic situation. Indeed, across a range of different sociocultural groups, there is likely to be wide variation in the configuration of type and degree of constraints governing "marked" sociolinguistic situations. The data presented in this study suggests that in the Waitabu sociolinguistic system, social, kinesic and spatial constraints tend to coincide with a set of constraints governing linguistic behaviour.

5 This notion of "unmarked" vs "marked" sociolinguistic acts is in line with Jakobson's (1971:136) description of the marked-unmarked opposition as "statements of A" versus "no statements of A". Marked sociolinguistic performances are defined by the existence of specific sociolinguistic rules which apply to that limited context. Unmarked, everyday sociolinguistic performances are neutral and comparatively unrestricted by specialised rules.
For example, the cross-parent/child and opposite-sex sibling relationships involve behaviour which is rigidly constrained by a specific set of physical and social rules (e.g. strict taboo on physical contact). These relationships are also marked by linguistic rules (e.g. compulsory use of non-singular pronoun forms; casual conversation and joking strictly prohibited) see chapter 3. Similarly, the rigid social, kinesic and spatial constraints governing the Waitabu ceremony co-incide with strict rules governing language behaviour.

From this, the following hypothesis emerges for the Waitabu data:

**HYPOTHESIS**: Those situations and role relationships which are marked as distinct from neutral, everyday behaviour (by special physical, spatial and social behavioural patterns and rules) tend to attract "marked" linguistic performances (i.e. where verbal behaviour is limited by specialised rules).
## Appendix 5.1 RANGE OF CEREMONIES PERFORMED IN CONTEMPORARY WAITABU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceremony</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Gift</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>isevusevu</td>
<td>request for permission to enter village</td>
<td>yaqona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isevu</td>
<td>presentation of first harvest crops</td>
<td>token crops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isoro</td>
<td>begging forgiveness for wrong-doing</td>
<td>tabua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ireguregu</td>
<td>to honour those who died during X’s absence from the village</td>
<td>tabua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uliva’i</td>
<td>thanks ceremony for feast, etc.</td>
<td>tabua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va’atale</td>
<td>farewell, performed at the end of an important person’s visit</td>
<td>tabua</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ceremonies to welcome an important guest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceremony</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Gift</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cavui’ele’ele</td>
<td>hoisting the anchor</td>
<td>tabua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iqaloqalovi</td>
<td>swimming to the boat</td>
<td>tabua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iva’asobu</td>
<td>coming onto dry land</td>
<td>tabua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uru ni ‘uila</td>
<td>lowering the flag</td>
<td>tabua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iva’amāmaca</td>
<td>drying out possessions</td>
<td>tabua, mats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cavudraudrau</td>
<td>pulling leaves</td>
<td>yaqona, bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iwase ni waqona</td>
<td>food after yaqona drink</td>
<td>pig, taro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rova</td>
<td>woman of high rank runs with tabua</td>
<td>tabua</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Traditional Fijian ceremonies relating to marriage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceremony</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Gift</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ila’ola’ovi</td>
<td>ask girl’s parents for her hand in marriage</td>
<td>tabua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iva’amāmaca ’ei</td>
<td>performed after church service</td>
<td>tabua, mats, bark cloth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nai vola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itatauva’i</td>
<td>girl’s parents ask that she be well cared for</td>
<td>tabua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tevutevu</td>
<td>traditional marriage ceremony</td>
<td>tabua, mats, yaqona</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Traditional ceremony relating to birth

tunudrā feast for mother’s family feast and newborn child

va’abogivā for both mother’s and tabua, yaqona, feast father’s family

va’alutunivicovico to mark dropping of feast, mats, bark cloth the umbilical cord

’au a mata ni gone bring child to mother’s clothing, bark cloth for first time

i’oti ni ulu first cutting of the bark cloth ni gone child’s hair

Traditional ceremony relating to death

sō mate funeral service tabua, yaqona, mats, feast, bark cloth

There are also two feasts to mark stages in the mourning period: waqona ni ’asiviti last feast and yaqona in honour
atonitoni marking end of period in which it is forbidden to of the deceased laugh or be joyous to signify that his life is finished
Chapter 6
DECLINE IN THE SPEECH STYLE OF CHIEFLY RESPECT

We have so far observed established modes of sociolinguistic conduct that have continued through from the pre-white contact era to the present day (e.g. rigidly patterned ceremonial speech; avoidance, joking and authority-based behaviour associated with kin categories; male vs female speech styles). In this chapter, I will focus on the decline of a traditional mode of sociolinguistic behaviour - namely the speech style used to show respect to the village chief. Such change in sociolinguistic behaviour is intrinsically linked with broader social change. In the post-white contact period, the power of the Waitabu village chief has declined. Although the social position of chief (as head of the village hierarchy) still exists, there is evidence of striking change in sociolinguistic behaviour towards the chief. In sociological terms, while there is no categorical/structural change (the social category of chief still exists), there is functional change (i.e. change in the way the chief and villagers interact).

In this chapter, I will first describe the traditional mode of sociolinguistic behaviour towards the village chief. Then, decline in this mode of sociolinguistic conduct in contemporary Waitabu is dealt with. Finally, I will discuss factors in the decline of this chiefly respect style.

6.1. TRADITIONAL SITUATION

The social identity of “village chief” (i.e. the social position involving specific rights and duties) is restricted to only one individual, usually from the social category of either tūraga “married man”, or qase “old [male] person”. The position of village chief as head of the village hierarchy is, ideally, inherited patrilineally in the genealogical senior line. The village chief should be the genealogically senior male member of the chiefly ito'ato'a, the eldest son in the eldest line of sons. In practice, however, the heir to the chiefly title is not always clearcut. Various individuals may contest the position of chief (see Quain 1948:205ff). As Sayes (1982:131-132) demonstrates in her investigation of chieftainship in Cakaudrove:
There was no requirement that a [chiefly] title should be succeeded to on a purely ascriptive basis. Succession rules are ambiguous, and this allowed the most politically competent tūraga to achieve the title.

In contemporary Waitabu, villagers report that the practice is for elder members of the chiefly ito'ato'a to meet and select one of its members to be chief. Normally, the chosen individual is the eldest son of the previous chief (as is the case with Tui Nasau, the current chief), but not necessarily so. Criteria such as righteousness of one's past conduct, and social support, are important in the claim to the chiefly title.

Traditionally, the successor of the chiefly title was installed by a sequence of ceremonies called va’aunu. This important ritual served to formalise and cement the individual’s assumption of the chieftainship (see Williams 1858:24; Roth 1953:68-9; Williksen-Bakker 1984; Ravuvu 1985:538; Dari and Petit-Skinner 1985:11-36). The chief was considered to possess a spiritual power, called kaukaua ni tūraga “strength of the chief” or the well-known Oceanic term mana. Such power is transmitted with the “blood” and its strength is great in chiefly lines because these descend from heroic ancestor deities. Through their connection with these ancestor deities, chiefs were considered to have a certain call on these ancestors: spirits, it was believed, readily act on the chief’s behalf. For example, the spiritual power of the chief includes power over prosperity of the land. Thus the isevu ceremony (the yearly tribute of the first fruits, see chapter 5), is given to the chief in order that the land might prosper.

In the traditional Fijian village, the sole duty of the chief was to rule and make decisions regarding the running of the village. The chief did not engage in physical work. In his behaviour, he was expected to show itovo va’atūraga “chiefly qualities”, disapproving of violence and discouraging it among his subjects; disregarding personal slights and never raising his voice above a mild polite conversational tone (Quain 1948:203 ; Ravuvu 1983:103-6).

In turn, there were rigid rules governing the villagers’ behaviour towards their chief. The target of such behaviour was to indicate extreme social deference:
At the eating mat, all wait until he of chiefly caste has tasted his food, then they clap with cupped palms before beginning to eat. In former times only chiefs could sit “in the manner of Tonga” with legs crossed, tailor fashion; commoners squatted on their heels or sat with one leg flexed to the fore and the other to the side. In former times only chiefs could walk in the manner of Tonga, with arms swinging; the arms of commoners, when not laden with burdens, were clasped before the body, which was bent forward as they walked about the village with bowed heads.

[Quain 1948:194-5]

It was forbidden for a commoner to be in close physical proximity to a chief, to stand in his presence, or to reach above his head. If the chief approached a villager along a road, the villager would sit until the chief had passed. As the chief approached, the (seated) villager would call out a tama, i.e. a special greeting used to show respect to the chief. (Tama are described in more detail later in this section.) For further description of deferential social behaviour to the chief, see Williams (1858:38).

Physical/material signs also marked a person of chiefly position. Sahlin (1962:319) reports that in old Moala, village chiefs were entitled to certain insignia of rank, including a faufau “turban of thin bark cloth”, turtle shell breast ornaments, and malo “ceremonial loincloth with long trains”. In the village setting, the chief’s house was usually the biggest and best constructed in the community. It normally stood higher than all other houses and was located in the socially high part of the village. See Dari and Petit-Skinner (1985) for detailed description of a Fijian chief’s life, his deferential treatment, and associated ceremonies.

Such physical signals and rigid social conduct were accompanied by a set of strict linguistic norms governing the individual’s verbal behaviour towards the chief. The distinct chiefly respect speech style was characterised by the following features:

1. **indirect communication.** The communicative link between the chief and commoners was often indirect and conducted through a third party. The chief’s orders were not issued by the chief himself. Rather, they were verbalised by his spokesman (matanivanua). Similarly, rather than speak directly to the chief, the villagers would communicate with him through his spokesman.

2. **tama,** fossilised word sequences marking respect to the chief, were used for greeting the chief or when passing his house. These chiefly greetings replaced the everyday greeting forms, (e.g. yadra “good morning”, bula “good day”, described in 4.4). The chiefly greeting forms differ for male and female speakers
(thus demonstrating the salient sex distinction in Fijian society)¹:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{male} & : \text{mai} ! \, \ddot{o}o \ddot{a} ! \quad \text{"call of chiefly respect when encountering the chief during the day"} \\
\text{female} & : \text{mai na va'adooe} ! \\
\end{align*}
\]

Like the fossilised sequences of ceremonial speech (described in 5.3.3), the individual segments of these fossilised chiefly greetings do not bear indentifiable meaning. Rather, it is the entire tama utterance that is the meaningful unit. A different utterance of chiefly respect when encountering the chief during the day. This form was used by both male and female (though, as subordinates, women would often avoid announcing their presence).

3. address terms. Special respect terms were used for addressing the chief. It was forbidden to address him by name. A common device to show chiefly respect was a diminutive² term of address: the Waitabu chief was addressed as rālai "the smallest". Similarly, the chief was often referred to and addressed as laisave tūraga Boumān dialect, (gone tūraga Standard Fijian) meaning "child chief", with the diminutive form laisave/gone "child" being added to the everyday form tūraga "chief". (This diminutive form is still used today, but only in the domain of ceremonies. See 5.3.4 and 6.2.)

4. Pronouns were used as an indicator of chiefly respect. The chief was addressed and referred to by plural pronoun forms. For example, when addressing a chief, the second person plural pronoun nū was used, not the common singular form o:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{nū va'acegu rātū} \\
\text{*o "you rest, chief [extremely polite]"}
\end{align*}
\]

(As described in 3.2.1, dual and paucal forms are also used to mark social distance in other role-relationships which are characterised by restrained communication. For example, the avoidance relationship of veivugoni "cross-parent/child" is characterised by the use of the dual pronoun form, while the avoidance-based opposite-sex sibling relationship (veiganeni) involved use of the paucal pronoun form.)

¹ The tama forms vary throughout the Fiji Islands. For example, see Williams 1858:38; Quain 1948:195; Roth 1963:94-6.

² To my knowledge, such use of a diminutive form to indicate respect is unusual. For description of the function of diminutives in other languages, see Gooch (1967) on Spanish and Sapir (1949a) on Nootka.
5. addition of adverb - va'acā. Va'acā, the Boumān dialect adverb (saka in Standard Fijian) marking chiefly respect, was frequently used to signal the speaker's deference when addressing the chief. The Boumān form va'a-cā "ADVERBALIZER-bad" has two functions:

(a) In the everyday, non-chiefly context, va'acā functions as a post-verbal adverb and is glossed with its literal meaning "badly". For example,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{sa rui ca'a va'acā a tā yai} \\
\text{ASP really do badly ART thing this}
\end{align*}
\]

"this job was badly done"

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{vola-vola va'acā} \\
\text{write-REDUP badly}
\end{align*}
\]

"write badly"

(b) When used as a signal of chiefly respect, va'acā functions as a superlative with positive connotation. In this chiefly respect context, the term is best glossed as "excellent/exalted". (Similar examples of negative-value morphemes which are used as superlatives with positive connotation occur in English, e.g. terribly nice, awfully good.)

The form va'acā has wider positional possibilities in its function as signal of chiefly respect, than in its function as everyday adverb "badly". In its everyday function, va'acā "badly", like other adverbs, occurs either immediately after the verb, or at the end of the predicate (i.e. slots 4 and 8, Dixon forthcoming: chapter 8.1). In its function as chiefly respect signal, va'acā occurs in these slots and also clause-initially and clause-finally.

Thus, it is useful to distinguish between the two functions of va'acā by employing terms such as "sentence adverb" for the chiefly respect signal, and "VP adverb" for everyday use of va'acā. As an independent signal of chiefly respect, the sentence adverb has scope over the whole sentence; its function is not just restricted to modifying other parts of speech within the VP. Thus its position is more flexible; it may be fronted to prominent clause-initial position (as speakers prefer) in order to highlight the speaker's respect to the chief. In contrast, the everyday use of va'acā (VP adverb), in its function of VP modifier, has scope only over the verb. As noted, its position is limited to only two post-verbal slots within the VP.

The relatively free position of va'acā as chiefly respect marker is illustrated in the example below:
va'acā

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{nu} & \quad \text{a} & \quad \text{la'o} & \quad \text{mai} & \quad \text{i} & \quad \text{na} & \quad \text{gauna} \\
2pl & \quad \text{PAST} & \quad \text{go} & \quad \text{PREP} & \quad \text{PREP} & \quad \text{ART} & \quad \text{time} \\
\text{cava} & \quad \downarrow \\
\text{what} & \\
\text{"at what time did you come here? [extremely polite]"}
\end{align*}
\]

The following examples further illustrate the use of the adverb va'acā to signal chiefly respect.³

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{rālai} & \quad \text{nu} & \quad \text{va'acā} & \quad \text{mai} & \quad \text{i} & \quad \text{na} \\
\text{chief} & \quad 2pl & \quad \text{ADVERB} & \quad \text{here} & \quad \text{PREP} & \quad \text{ART} \\
\text{gauna} & \quad \text{cava} \\
\text{time} & \quad \text{what} \\
\text{"At what time did you [arrive] here, o chief?"}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{nu} & \quad \text{moce} & \quad \text{mada} & \quad \text{va'acā} \\
2pl & \quad \text{sleep} & \quad \text{SOFT} & \quad \text{ADVERB} \\
\text{"Goodbye [said to chief]"}
\end{align*}
\]

[N.M. female, 55 years, Waitabu]

6. lexicon. It has been reported that a different vocabulary was used for referring to the chief's actions or body. Hale (1846:382-3) lists 24 chiefly reference items. Paul Geraghty (p.c.) has collected approximately 40 items from Totoya island in the Lau group where the chiefly lexicon is reputed to have originated (possibly due to Tongan influence⁴). While it is difficult to estimate what might have been the full extent of the chiefly respect style in the past, it is likely that there was not a chiefly respect term for every predicative item in the language. Rather, chiefly reference items probably replaced only more basic/common items referring to the chief's body parts, his actions and associated objects. In his comparison of respect styles in Fijian and two other Pacific languages, Koch ⁵ reports a striking similarity in the semantic fields of respect styles across the three languages. In all three languages, the respect lexicon covers: body parts; body actions; and objects closely connected to the body. Blixen (1966) observes similarities in chiefly respect styles in the Western Polynesian languages of Uvea, Samoa, Tonga, Niue and Futuna.

³These examples were provided by village elders, upon my request. All four elders stressed that such displays of verbal respect no longer occur to the village chief in contemporary Waitabu.

⁴As described in chapter 2, there was strong Tongan influence in the eastern Lau islands last century. Tongan has a more elaborate system of respect speech with three levels of polite vocabulary used to: king; other royals; and everyday politeness vocabulary, of about three dozen terms. There appears to be, however, no evident formal similarity between Tongan and Fijian speech styles.

⁵This study was pointed out to me by Paul Geraghty (p.c.). As the study is still in progress, I was unable to obtain access to Koch's work.
The Fijian chiefly reference terms are based on everyday lexical forms. For example:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{everyday} & \text{chiefly} \\
\text{mate} & \text{"die"} & \rightarrow & \text{bale (lit. "fall")} \\
\text{ulu} & \text{"head"} & \rightarrow & \text{vanua i ca'e (lit. "place above")}
\end{array}
\]

This lexical replacement of the everyday term by a semantically related item signals respect by virtue of its indirect reference (see 4.5.3). Similar phenomenon of politeness through indirect reference occurs in Australian Aboriginal languages, e.g. Guugu Yimidhirr brother-in-law style (Haviland 1979), Dyirbal mother-in-law style (Dixon 1972), and in English euphemisms (e.g. die = pass away).

Because these respect items are no longer used or recalled by contemporary Bouman speakers, I am unable to provide a comprehensive list of the chiefly respect forms of the Bouman dialect. The following forms were elicited from elderly speakers in the nearby village of Naiselesele. (The Waini’ele dialect spoken in Naiselesele appears to be identical to the Bouman dialect, although speakers claim, yet cannot pinpoint, differences.) Naiselesele speakers could recall, but claim no longer to use, the following respect lexicon:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{everyday} & \text{chiefly} & \text{gloss} \\
\text{ulu} & \text{vanua i ca'e} & \text{"head"} \\
\text{tama} & \text{itubutubu tûraga} & \text{"father"} \\
\text{tina} & \text{itubutubu marama} & \text{"mother"} \\
\text{ulumatua} & \text{drä tabu} & \text{"first born"} \\
\text{ibulubulu} & \text{sau tabu} & \text{"graveyard"} \\
\text{mate} & \text{bale} & \text{"die"}
\end{array}
\]

In short, the chief-commoner relationship was an assymetrical one. Individuals deferred socially to the chief who, in turn, bore the authority and responsibility of village decision making. Such deferential social and physical conduct towards the chief was accompanied by marked linguistic behaviour, which was distinguished from everyday interaction by the following features:

1. indirect communication (through the chief’s spokesman);
2. tama, special greetings which signal chiefly respect;
3. avoidance of the chief’s personal name, and use of diminutive terms of address (e.g. râlai);
4. plural pronoun forms for addressing and referring to the chief;
5. adverb of extreme respect va’acâ;
6. special lexicon showing chiefly respect.
(For description of the speech style marking chiefly respect in other languages, see Newell (1892), Milner (1961), and Duranti (1981:86) on Samoan; Blixen (1966) on Uvea (Wallis Islands); Churchward (1953) on Tongan.)

6.2. DECLINE IN THE SPEECH STYLE OF CHIEFLY RESPECT

In contemporary Waitabu, the village chief still occupies the position at the top of the social structure, and functions as village head, making ultimate decisions on village issues, representing his village at province meetings and ceremonies, providing leadership to villagers, and dealing with any problems/conflicts that threaten harmony within Waitabu community. In physical behaviour, too, his chiefly status is still evident. For example, on entering a house, the chief sits at the upper end, and it is generally forbidden for another person to sit in a higher position than the chief. Another example is te'ite'i, the Fijian custom of ornamenting one's hair with flowers. In contemporary Waitabu, it is still a sign of chiefly status to wear ite'ite'i "flowers for ornamenting the hair" behind only one ear. Individuals of non-chiefy rank must wear ite'ite'i on both sides of the head. For a commoner to wear only one flower, in chiefly fashion, is considered a severe breach of social norms and is criticised as via-via-tūraga "aspiring to be chief".

However, while the village chief still functions as head of the village hierarchy, the chief's power is no longer absolute. The colonial period equipped each village with a government representative (tūraga ni 'oro) to make decisions regarding health, transport and other government-related activities. The extreme social deference that marked the traditional chief-commoner relationship has noticeably weakened in contemporary Waitabu society. Villagers no longer sit on the ground and utter tama as their chief approaches. The chief wears no material sign of his chiefly title (except sometimes the single ite'ite'i flower ornamenting his hair), and in Waitabu today, the chief's house is not larger or positioned higher than other houses in the village. Many of the younger men question the chief's authority, and at times do not carry out his orders.

This undermining of chiefly respect is reflected in the loss of the chiefly respect speech style within Waitabu village. The chief-commoner role-relationship is no longer characterised by distinct linguistic behaviour. The verbal signals of respect described in 6.1 and which were exclusive to the chief-commoner role-relationship have been dropped. For example,

1. the chief and commoners now communicate directly. There is no longer indirect communication through a spokesman (matanivanua), except in the ceremony;
2. the greeting of chiefly respect (tama) is used very rarely, and usually only in association with ceremonial preparation;  

3. rālai, the diminutive form of address is no longer used to the village chief. Another diminutive form, laisave tūrāga "child chief", is still used, but only in the ceremony;  

4. the chief is constantly addressed and referred to by singular, not plural, pronoun forms;  

5. va'acā, the adverb of extreme respect, is no longer used to the village chief;  

6. there is no evidence of the use of the chiefly respect lexicon described in 6.1.  

Certain of these markers of chiefly respect are reportedly still used, but not to the village chief. Speakers claim that today these respect signals are used only to the leaders of the province or the nation, e.g. the chief of Cakaudrove province, or the Prime Minister. In other words, there has been a narrowing of the target of chiefly respect:

```
use of linguistic markers showing chiefly respect

- village chief  
- province chief  
- Prime Minister
```

The respect markers still claimed to be commonly used for addressing such exalted status as province chiefs are restricted to a few grammatical items:

1. the diminutive form of address, rālai;  

2. the adverb of extreme respect, va'acā;  

3. plural pronoun form, nū.

Speakers reported that the special respect lexicon was not used: e yali va'adua, "It [the chiefly lexicon] is lost for good".

---

6 In seven months of fieldwork, I witnessed the calling of the chiefly tama only twice. On both occasions it was by an elderly man as he approached the chief's house to partake in a ceremony. In everyday activities, the chief is greeted with everyday forms, i.e. no special tama form is used in greeting him.

7 Actual meetings between high chiefs (such as the province leader) and Waitabu villagers are extremely rare. There was no such occasion during my fieldwork period. Thus, the information presented here on speech styles used to high chiefs is based on speaker hearsay, and on elicitation from elderly speakers at Naiselesele, capital village of the Waini'ele district. Because the chief of Naiselesele is chief of the entire Waini'ele district (comprising Bouma, Qeleni and other areas) he is shown more linguistic and social respect than ordinary village chiefs. Naiselesele villagers still use the following signals of respect: tama chiefly greeting forms; nū plural pronoun; va'acā adverb of chiefly respect; rālai special chiefly address term. Speakers report the chiefly respect lexicon is no longer used.
In short, the range of verbal signals to mark chiefly respect has diminished. (Speakers only recall a few grammatical, but no lexical, items.) So too has diminished the range of chiefs to whom the chiefly respect style is used. The Waitabu chief is now outside this range.

THE CEREMONY

Only one social domain remains where verbal signals of respect are used to the village chief—the ceremony (described in chapter 5). As leader of the village hierarchy, the chief is often involved in ceremonial presentations, e.g. the isorosoro ceremony, a formal apology for wrong doing; the isevusevu ceremony, a stranger's request to enter the village; and the isevu ceremony, the yearly tribute of first fruits.

In the formal context of the ceremony, the village chief is still accorded social and linguistic respect. It is the chief who drinks the first bowl at the yaqona ceremony, and he is seated at the head of the ceremony. Linguistically, deference to the chief is shown in ceremonies by:

1. use of the plural pronoun;
2. diminutive forms of address, e.g. laisave tūraga "child chief".

(Other linguistic signals of respect in the ceremonial context are detailed in chapter 5.)

It is necessary to ask why the ceremony remains as the isolated domain of linguistic deference to the village chief. Possible explanations include:

1. the formal context of the ceremony requires polite, respectful speech;
2. the highly-patterned rigidified nature of ceremonial speech is not conducive to innovation. The formulaic acts are perpetuated by virtue of their rigid form, where as spontaneous daily verbal interaction (without the formulaic constraints) is a more volatile indicator of social change. 8

ATTITUDES TO THE DECLINE OF THE CHIEFLY RESPECT STYLE

A sample of 35 speakers was taken to gauge attitudes towards the village

---

8 The relation between formal situation and sociolinguistic conservatism is a complex and quite general issue (e.g. compare address forms between university staff in the common room vs a formal faculty meeting). See Irvine (1984) for comparison of the notion of "formality" and associated constraints across three different sociocultural groups, Ilongot, Wolof and Murse. Irvine highlights the varied use of the term and explores the relationship between formality and sociolinguistic conservatism.
chief and the decline in chiefly respect. The sample included 15 individuals over 35 years (7 male, 8 female), and 20 individuals under 35 years (10 male, 10 female). The following questions were asked:

1. Do you ever use the words nū (plural pronoun), va'acā (adverb of extreme respect), or rālai (diminutive term of address) to Tui Nasau (the village chief)?

2. When you see Tui Nasau (the village chief), how do you greet him?

3. Do you think it is a good or bad thing that the language of chiefly respect is not used very much to Tui Nasau?

4. If Tui Nasau gives you an order, do you ever not do as he commands? Why?

Summarising the response to these questions, none of the 35 sample speakers claimed to use the verbal signals of respect to the village chief. This supports the observation that there has been a decline in the chiefly respect style.

77% of the sample speakers (27 of the total 35) viewed the loss of the chiefly respect style as a "bad thing". These same individuals considered it compulsory to defer to and fulfill the chief's commands. They claimed never to disobey the chief, explaining that the chief possessed mana, a spiritual power (see 6.1), and that they would become ill or injured as punishment for not fulfilling his orders. Thus spiritual power and its ability to inflict harm on those who disobey the chief's will appears to be a major stimulus in deferential behaviour towards the chief. In the words of one young Waitabu girl:

"If we don't do [what the chief commands], we may become sick or get injured. You can become ill because [the chief] told you to do something and you did not fulfill his order."

[A.V. female, 14 years, Waitabu]

In contrast to this, 13% of the sample speakers (8 of the total 35, all of them male under 35 years), did not view the loss of the chiefly respect style as "bad". Consistently, the same 8 were the only individuals who claimed not always to fulfill the chief's commands. The common reason given for this was that the chief's judgement was "uneducated" and "sometimes incorrect".

---

9 These questions were asked in an informal context, interspersed in relaxed conversation. This survey was made in the final month of fieldwork, after I had established close personal links with the informants, so as to minimise the "politeness factor" in their statements of attitudes.
6.3. FACTORS IN THE DECLINE OF CHIEFLY RESPECT

Decline in the speech style of chiefly respect may be linked with broader social change that has occurred in the post-white contact era. Prior to white contact, the village was a much more structurally self-contained unit (what anthropologists call "integral") in the sense that there was less contact with, and less material and social dependency on the outside world. Ultimate power in this closed society was vested in the village chief. Today, the social structure is more open-ended (i.e. a "sectional" community, structurally part of a wider entity). There is increasing contact with the outside world, and incorporation of new concepts, values and materials. New aspirations, values and ideals are introduced from contact with modern urbanised society of the capital city, Suva. (For example, radio programs, newspapers, video films have been introduced, and some villagers have lived in Suva for periods of a year or more.)

Education is a main source through which Western ideals and aspirations are introduced. The school plays an important role in the lives of the younger generation, and most individuals below 30 years of age have received 6-10 years of schooling. Such education is based on, and promotes, individual thought and motivation. It broadens the individual's perception, encourages his questioning ability, and increases his awareness of different social behaviour and values. Thus the education system may alter the individual's perspective of the traditional hierarchical social structure and the fixed hereditary status of the chief. Such change in values is evident in the attitudes of village youths, who hold more westernised values. For example, as described in 6.2, they claim not to always obey the chief on the grounds that his decision is often uneducated and incorrect.

The Waitabu villagers themselves attribute the diminishing power of the chief and the decline in the speech style of chiefly respect to three basic factors, all of which are aspects of the social change which has occurred in the post-white contact period:

1. Education (discussed above) is pinpointed by members of the community as a major factor in the decline of chiefly respect:

I na gauna yai, e sega ni va'ayacori tauco'o. E levu a tabagone i na gauna yai era sā saqata ti'o va'amālua. They start to clash for the rights of the chief to be theirs. Ia mayā, sā cā ti'o, sa la'i yali 'ina va'amālua, a veiwa'aro'oro'ota'i vua tūraga. Baleta ni sa curu mai qō a vuli, eh?
"At the present time, [the chief's commands] are not completely fulfilled. There are many school leavers now who are stirring [questioning the chiefly system]. They start to clash now for the rights of the chief, claiming the chief's rights to be theirs. But, the gradual loss of respect for the chief is bad. [It is] because of the introduction of education, eh?"

[J.C. male 50 years, Waitabu]

"It [behaviour displaying chiefly respect] is changing now because more people are educated, they don't listen to the chief now. Even Tūgā [chief of Waitabu] is not educated, eh? But some of those people have been to high school, and they think they know too much. And they know what the tūraga [chief] say, and they say: "No, you don't know, it should be done this way". Then when Tūgā say yes to them for the first time, they go "mmm! Tūgā respects us!" That's the kind of feeling they have in them."

[S.T. female teacher, 30 years, Bouma]

2. Another factor is failure to perform the chiefly installation ceremony. The ritual of installing the chief was not carried out when Tui Nasau's father died some 35 years ago. This is seen by some Waitabu villagers today (mainly those individuals belonging to the different mataqali "clan" to Tui Nasau) as a sign that there is some doubt about the acceptance and authority of the chief. The ceremony is an important ritual marking change of status (see chapter 5). The fact that this installation ritual was not performed appears to indicate that his claim to the chiefly title is not cemented or absolutely recognised. As Ravuvu (1985:538) states:

Unless a chief is ceremonially installed and offered the 'first cup' of yaqona vakatūraga, his power remains very much secular. Once installed, the chief becomes sacred. He acquires the sanction and support of the spirit world and is provided with the power of the ancestral gods.

(Failure to perform the ceremonial installation of the chief has been reported in other areas of Fiji in the post-contact period by Roth 1953:68ff.)

3. Another factor which is viewed as important in the decline of the power of the village chief was the appointment of an independent government representative within the village. As mentioned in 6.2, the appointment of a government representative (tūraga ni 'oro), to make decisions regarding health, transport and other government-related activities, established another source of authority besides the village chief. For description of such appointments by the Fijian administration in the post-contact period, see Ravuvu (1983:112-3). It should be noted, however, that the decline of authority alone does not

---

10 Waitabu villagers did not appear to know why the chiefly installation had not taken place. The common response to my query was: sa sega ni macala "it is not clear".
automatically trigger the loss of sociolinguistic deference. For example, extreme
deferece is still used towards constitutional monarchs such as the Emperor of
Japan and the Queen of England despite their greatly reduced authoritative
function in contemporary society. This indicates that attitudinal factors (discussed
above) may be paramount in the loss of sociolinguistic deference.

In addition, the introduction of Christianity has undermined the belief in the
chief as God himself. Since the Christian religion was established well over a
hundred years ago, and given its association with technology, power and knowledge
of the West, the Christian God has been considered supreme over all local gods,
placing the chief in an equivocal position.

Summarising, data presented in this chapter demonstrates that socially-
accepted modes of sociolinguistic behaviour may alter over a period of time. The
position of village chief has altered in the post-contact period, due to various social
factors which are part of broader social changes triggered by the forces of outside
contact on a comparatively closed, structurally self-contained village unit. Although
the chief still functions as head of the village hierarchy (in decision
making etc.), his authority is less absolute and is often questioned by members of
the younger generation.

Reflecting this social change, individuals alter their mode of sociolinguistic
behaviour towards the chief. The traditional speech style of chiefly respect
-characterised by the plural pronoun, the adverb of extreme respect va'acā,
diminutive terms of address rālāl, and a special lexicon - is no longer used in
daily interaction with the village chief. (Only in the formal, rigidly-patterned
speech event of the ceremony are certain verbal signals of chiefly respect sometimes
evident.)

Thus, while the social identity of village chief still exists, the interpretation
(expectations and perceptions) of this identity appears to have altered. For
example, many youths aspire to a westernised lifestyle, values and images, and do
not regard the ascribed position of chief as the source of ultimate authority. The
sociolinguistic behaviour which the individual constructs on the basis of this
interpretation is altered accordingly.

The data presented in this chapter supports the notion of "sociolinguistic
markedness". Recall from 5.4, that "marked" sociolinguistic behaviour is identified
by various linguistic rules which govern and restrict verbal conduct, thus
distinguishing "marked" verbal behaviour from more relaxed, less restricted
It was hypothesised that the set of linguistic rules are often accompanied by rules for physical and social behaviour. This hypothesis is supported by the traditional Fijian system of chiefly respect: the strict rules governing verbal behaviour towards the chief (i.e. tama, the special greetings signalling chiefly respect; plural pronoun; rālai, the form of chiefly address; and chiefly lexicon) were accompanied by rigid rules for physical and social conduct (e.g. established sitting and walking positions, see 6.1).

As demonstrated in this chapter, this sphere of "marked" sociolinguistic behaviour towards the Waitabu village chief has been lost. The linguistic signals of chiefly respect are very rarely used. It is theoretically significant that, in this instance of loss of sociolinguistic markedness, the linguistic level is most affected; all linguistic features marking chiefly respect have been dropped. In contrast, while many social and physical rules have been dropped (e.g. the custom of sitting, head bowed, if the chief approached along a road), the loss is not so absolute. Various social and physical constraints still remain in contemporary Waitabu (e.g. ite'ite'i flower adornment custom; the chief's seating position in the highest section of the house; and the chief as focus of the ceremony).
Chapter 7

DIALECT MIXING

7.1. INTRODUCTION

An integral aspect of the linguistic repertoire of Waitabu community is the
diversity of linguistic resources available to the speaker through dialect variation.
The aims of this chapter are: (a) to describe dialect variation and the
phenomenon of dialect levelling in Waitabu community, and to explore social
factors in this linguistic change; (b) to investigate how speakers creatively employ
this dialect variation in their linguistic repertoire by manipulating dialect differences
to suit their communicative needs and to index certain role-relationships.

First, I will describe the traditional Boumān dialect and how it differs from
Standard Fijian. Then, I will focus on contemporary Waitabu, listing the range of
language varieties which stem from dialect mixing, and the domains in which they
are used. Next, the extent of the dialect levelling phenomenon is gauged, by
selecting a sample of 20 individuals from a cross-section of the community, and
studying their competence and performance through translation of sentences and
word lists, and texts recorded in a casual context. Fourthly, social forces which
affect the pattern of dialect mixing are investigated, e.g. intermarriage. Next is
attitudes to dialect mixing, and then I will investigate factors conducive to the
maintenance and decline of the Boumān dialect. The next section investigates how
Waitabu speakers creatively employ dialect differences. Social uses of the dialect
differences are observed, i.e. how the individual uses dialect differences for different
social relationships and contexts, e.g. in the netball game and to Indian merchants.
This will demonstrate an important theme of the thesis, namely that the individual
is not a passive entity in the dialect levelling process. Rather, speakers are aware
of salient dialect distinctions and use these differences to mark certain
sociolinguistic situations as distinct.

The Fiji archipelago is characterised by considerable linguistic diversity.
There are approximately 300 dialects, i.e. codes with little or no apparent regional
variation spoken by people who claim to speak the same codes (see 2.1.3). In Fiji,
as elsewhere in the world, such linguistic diversity is diminishing, as a result of expansion of languages/dialects of greater political and cultural potency. This is evident in the spread of English, Russian, Spanish and Mandarin Chinese at the expense of indigenous, less-politically prestigious languages and dialects throughout the world. In Fiji, dialect levelling is apparent as the Standard Fijian dialect\(^1\) spoken in the capital city of Suva, gradually infiltrates the various local dialects. Standard Fijian (vosa va'a-viti) is based roughly on the Bau dialect. Over a century ago, the dialect of Bau island off the eastern coast of Viti Levu was adopted as lingua franca due to recognition and support of the Christian church. Used first in church services, it was eventually adopted for political and educational purposes. In contemporary Fiji, it is understood and spoken by almost all Fijians, regardless of the nature of their local dialect. In the course of its use as lingua franca, Standard Fijian has influenced local dialects. Mixing of Standard Fijian with various local dialects has been reported by Gatschet (1885), Schütz (1963), Geraghty (1983).

7.2. TRADITIONAL BOUMĀN DIALECT

In the pre-white contact period, the traditional Boumān dialect was constantly changing, due to forces such as: (a) marriage across dialect boundaries; and (b) splitting, merging and shifting of villages due to warfare and politiking. Furthermore, there was intrusion of Tongan linguistic forms, due to the expansion of the Tongan kingdom under Ma'afu in the 19th century (see 2.2.2). By “traditional Boumān”, I mean that dialect form recalled by elders of the Wāitabu community which has been documented by Dixon (forthcoming). (Due to lack of written records, it is not possible to pinpoint traditional Boumān at an earlier stage.)

Traditional Boumān differs from Standard Fijian on the phonological, morphological, grammatical and lexical levels:

\(^1\)Although speakers use a single term vosa va'a-viti to refer to the Standard Fijian dialect, linguists distinguish further: “Standard Fijian” is used in formal traditional contexts, e.g. political speeches, ceremonies, and when speaking to high status individuals, e.g. the Prime Minister. “Colloquial Fijian” is used in informal situations, e.g. in Suva street corner conversations by native Fijian speakers. Differences between these two codes are listed in the Appendix to chapter 2. In this chapter, spoken varieties of speech are compared, i.e. spoken Boumān and spoken Colloquial Fijian. Note that for consistency, I shall refer to the spoken Colloquial variety by the generic term vosa va'a-viti “Standard Fijian” (SF).
7.2.1. PHONOLOGICAL FEATURES

1. k → glottal stop

The voiceless velar stop [k] of Standard Fijian corresponds to glottal stop [ʔ] in the Bouman dialect. For native speakers, this is the most salient feature which distinguishes Bouman from the Standard Fijian dialect. Note, however, that [k] is maintained for a few items. These include:

- most English loans, e.g. motokā "motorcar";
- some time words, e.g. yabaki "year";
- some words said to be of Standard Fijian origin, e.g. kece "all".

For more detail, see Dixon (forthcoming:chapter 2).

2. voiceless bilabial stop /p/

Unlike Standard Fijian where /p/ only occurs in English loan words, /p/ has a fair functional load in the Bouman dialect. In Bouman, items containing /p/ appear to have two sources:

- loan words from Tongan (e.g. pito "navel", pato "duck"), and from English (e.g. patipati "putput (boat)", Peritānia "Britain");
- indigenous items, from earlier historical stages of the Bouman dialect (e.g. pu'u "angry", pono "catch an animal". See Geraghty 1983:98-120.)

7.2.2. GRAMMATICAL ITEMS

1. pronouns

The pronoun paradigms of Standard Fijian and traditional Bouman have the same categorical distinctions. For example, both have a four-way number distinction (singular, dual, paucal, plural), and first, second and third person categories with an inclusive-exclusive contrast for first person. Both dialects also have seven forms for each person -cardinal, subject, object, possessive suffix, and three possessive pronouns marking edible, drinkable and neutral possession. See Milner (1972:78-79) and Dixon (forthcoming:chapter 6).

There are, however, many formal differences. For example:
(Pronoun paradigms of Standard Fijian and traditional Boumān are given in 7.4.3.)

2. nominal article

In traditional Boumān, the article used with common nouns is a (except when preceded by a preposition, the allomorph na is used). In contrast, Standard Fijian has only one form na, used throughout, e.g.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{S.F.} & \quad e & \text{ā} & \text{raica} & \text{na} & \text{tabua} \\
\text{B.} & \quad & & & & \\
& \quad 3sg & \text{PAST} & \text{see} & \text{ART} & \text{whale's tooth} \\
& \quad \text{"He saw the whale's tooth"}
\end{align*}
\]

3. discourse marker

The Standard Fijian discourse marker (glossed as "and then" or "and the next thing was"), is qai. The corresponding Boumān form is qei. For example,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{S.F.} & \quad \text{au} & \text{sā} & \text{qai} & \text{"ilā} \\
\text{BOUMĀN} & \quad & & \text{qei} & \\
& \quad 1sg. & \text{ASP} & \text{then} & \text{know} \\
& \quad \text{"And then I realised"}
\end{align*}
\]

4. negative marker

The negative marker preceding the verb is sega ni in Standard Fijian, and cau in traditional Boumān. For example,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{BOUMĀN} & \quad \text{au} & \text{cau} & \text{rogoca} \\
\text{S.F.} & \quad & \text{sega ni} & \\
& \quad 1sg & \text{NEG} & \text{hear} \\
& \quad \text{"I didn't hear it"}
\end{align*}
\]

5. classifiers

Fijian has a set of classifiers which can be used with most (but not all)
nouns, and which indicate the nature or use of the referent of that noun. The semantic basis of the classifier sets is (very roughly) an edible/ drinkable/ neutral distinction. There is some variation in classifier forms between the Boumān and Standard Fijian dialects:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{S.F.} & \text{BOUMĀN} \\
\text{neutral} & \text{ne-} \\
\text{edible} & \text{ke-} \\
\text{drinkable} & \text{me-}
\end{array}
\]

These prefix classifiers occur in two positions:

(a) in possessive pronouns, e.g.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ke-na} & \quad \text{ika} \\
\text{edible-3sg} & \quad \text{fish} \\
\text{"his fish"} & \\
\text{me-na} & \quad \text{ti} \\
\text{drinkable-3sg} & \quad \text{ti} \\
\text{"his tea"}
\end{align*}
\]

Variation in pronoun forms are dealt with in 7.4.3.

(b) plus possessive -i, when preceding a proper noun. Thus, the neutral possessive marker for a proper noun is ne-i in Standard Fijian, and we-i in Boumān:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{S.F.} & \quad \text{cakacaka} \quad \text{ne-i} \quad \text{Mere} \\
\text{BOUMĀN} & \quad \text{we-i} \\
\text{work} & \quad \text{neutral.POSS} \quad \text{Mary} \\
\text{"Mary's work"}
\end{align*}
\]

The edible possessive marker is ke-i in Standard Fijian, and 'e-i in Boumān. For example,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{S.F.} & \quad \text{ika} \quad \text{ke-i} \quad \text{Mere} \\
\text{Boumān} & \quad \text{\text{"e-i}} \\
\text{fish} & \quad \text{edible.POSS} \quad \text{Mary} \\
\text{"Mary's fish"}
\end{align*}
\]

The drinkable possessive marker is the same (me-i) in Boumān and Standard Fijian.
Standard Fijian has two series of demonstratives. One comes at the end of a predicate or an NP. The other follows a preposition. In contrast, traditional Boumān has a single series, spanning both functions. These are listed below, along with Cakaudrove dialect forms, which will be referred to in our discussion of dialect mixing (7.4.6). Note that like Standard Fijian, the Cakaudrove dialect has two series of demonstratives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Fijian</th>
<th>Cakaudrove</th>
<th>Boumān</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STANDARD FIJIAN</strong></td>
<td><strong>CAKAUDROVE</strong></td>
<td><strong>BOUMĀN</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. at end of predicate or NP</td>
<td>qo ke</td>
<td>yai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. after a preposition</td>
<td>k-</td>
<td>y-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>that/there (mid-distant, near addressee)</strong></td>
<td><strong>qori kei</strong></td>
<td><strong>May-</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. at end of predicate or NP</td>
<td>qori kei</td>
<td>yai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. after a preposition</td>
<td>qori kei</td>
<td>yai</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.3. MORPHOLOGY

The non-monosyllabic transitive affix form of Standard Fijian is -Caka. The corresponding form in traditional Boumān is -Ca'ina. For example,

| S.F. | BOUMĀN | "use"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yaga</td>
<td>&quot;ta'ina&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;use&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taka</td>
<td>&quot;ta'ina&quot;</td>
<td>TRANS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.4. LEXICON

It is likely that traditional Boumān had about 80% of its vocabulary either identical or closely cognate (substituting glottal stop for k) with Standard Fijian. Differences occur in both core and peripheral lexical items. Examples of differences in peripheral vocab are:

...
More common vocabulary examples include:

S.F.  

wadra-va  pula-a/-ca
"open eyes wider"

kusima-taka  bacelo-ta'ina
"hungry for flesh food"

i-qila  i-dumu
"bamboo staff for reaching item high out of reach"

7.3. DIALECT VARIETIES & THEIR DOMAINS IN CONTEMPORARY WAITABU

As a result of dialect mixing, a number of language varieties have emerged in Waitabu. Each variety is used in a particular domain. First, there are the two uncontaminated dialects:

STANDARD FIJIAN (vosa va'aviti) is heard on the radio, and used in school and as lingua franca when speaking to strangers whose native dialect is not known.²

TRADITIONAL BOUMĀN, used among elders or by some younger people when speaking to elders.

The mixing of these two dialects is called vosa veicuruma'i "mixed-up speech". There is much variation encompassed in this term. The variation forms a continuum. At the polar extremes are:

BAU GATO which refers to Standard Fijian dialect spoken with glottal stop instead of [k]. "Bau" is the dialect which was adopted as lingua franca, and upon which Standard Fijian is based. "Gato" is a verb glossed as "speak with glottal stop (instead of [k])". In other words, speakers take the most salient feature of the Boumān dialect [k → '], and apply it to Standard Fijian. They lose

²"Standard Fijian" here is a general term, covering the two codes distinguished by linguists: Colloquial Fijian and Standard Fijian (see 7.1). Waitabu speakers mix features of both in spontaneous speech.
most/all other features of traditional Boumān (phonological, grammatical and lexical items), and maintain only the most distinctive feature \([k \rightarrow ']\). This is sufficient to mark a dialect difference from Standard Fijian, and identity with the Boumā region. For example,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Boumān</th>
<th>muna'a</th>
<th>&quot;speak&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Fijian</td>
<td>tukuna</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bau Gato</td>
<td>tu'una</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above example, speakers of Bau Gato do not use the traditional Boumān form muna'a. Instead, they apply the \([k \rightarrow ']\) rule to the Standard Fijian form tukuna, to get tu'una, a form based on Standard Fijian, but marked as Boumān by the salient glottal stop feature.

Bau Gato is spoken mainly by children of about 10 years who have little command of traditional Boumān features. It is also spoken by individuals from outside the village who, in attempting to assimilate the Boumān speech patterns, apply the most salient feature, \([k \rightarrow ']\), to their Standard Fijian speech.

At the other polar extreme is BOUMĀ VA'AKĀ which refers to the Boumān dialect spoken with \([k]\) instead of glottal stop. The title is glossed as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOUMĀ VA'AKĀ</th>
<th>bu'ama</th>
<th>→ kā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dialect name</td>
<td>VERB'ZR</td>
<td>k sound</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| "Boumān dialect pronounced with a \([k]\)"

As indicated, in Waitabu the \([k : ']\) phonological option serves as an important marker of speech identity, signalling either identity with Waitabu village (use of glottal stop), or identity outside the Cakaudrove area (use of \([k]\)). Recall that in Bau Gato, the \([k \rightarrow ']\) rule is applied to Standard Fijian items. Boumā Va'akā is the reverse phenomenon of Bau Gato. In Boumā Va'akā, the opposite applies. The rule \([' \rightarrow k]\) is applied to Boumān dialect items. For example,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARD FIJIAN</th>
<th>tukuna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRAD. BOUMĀN</td>
<td>muna'a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOUMĀ VA'AKĀ</td>
<td>munaka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to note that Boumā Va'akā is only a speech tendency with infrequent manifestation, rather than a distinct speech style with frequently occurring markers. Boumān and Standard Fijian differ for, at most, only approximately 20% of vocabulary. Thus only about 20% of lexical items, (and
some with very limited frequency), can serve as markers of Boumā Va'akā speech.

Boumā Va'akā is spoken only by:

1. Those women married into the village who do not assimilate linguistically intoWaitabu, (i.e. they do not use the salient glottal stop feature), but who have mixed Boumān dialect items into their vocabulary. They appear unaware of this lexical intrusion from the Boumān dialect, and apply the [' → k] rule to all items in their speech. These speakers appear to retain the [k] as a matter of pride/principle.

2. Children, in their early years of school. On entering the school system, young children appear to have a relatively high frequency of traditional Boumān terms. (This is largely due to the fact that they have learnt the more traditional speech of their mothers, who are major language expositors during these early years (7.5.4).) However, Standard Fijian (using [k]) is the language of the classroom. Thus, young children are reported to apply the most salient feature of Standard Fijian [' → k] to their existing vocabulary. The result is Boumā Va'akā.

Boumā Va'akā and the speech of married women and pre-school children is described in more detail in 7.5.

It must be stressed that Bau Gato and Boumā Va'akā are two polar extremes of the variety encompassed in the continuum of dialect mixing. As 7.4 shows, the bulk of everyday verbal interaction in Waitabu village falls somewhere in between these two extremes.

Summarising, dialect mixing and the consequent language varieties in Waitabu may be graphically represented. Applying the salient phonological [k : '] option to the Standard Fijian and Boumān dialects, four distinct varieties emerge:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>phonological feature</th>
<th>[k]</th>
<th>[']</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STANDARD FIJIAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Fijian</td>
<td>(e.g. tukuna)</td>
<td>(e.g. tu'una)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOUMAN LEXICON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boumā va'akā</td>
<td>(e.g. munaka)</td>
<td>(e.g. muna'a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Boumān</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.4. GAUGING THE EXTENT OF DIALECT MIXING

Having described the linguistic varieties that stem from the mixing of Standard Fijian and traditional Boumaan, it is necessary to gauge the extent of the dialect levelling phenomenon in Waitabu, by observing and quantifying actual language behaviour.

7.4.1. METHOD

In order to systematically investigate the dialect shift from Boumaan to Standard Fijian, a sample of 20 individuals from a cross-section of the community was selected. These speakers ranged in age from 10 - 65 years. The data was collected by two different methods: (a) structured elicitation of grammatical and lexical items and sentences; (b) texts recorded in a relaxed atmosphere.

(a) In elicitation sessions, the same set of tests (lexicon, pronouns, and sentences) was presented for translation into Boumaan. Elicitation took the form of a language lesson; the speaker was requested to teach me to say the word or sentence in his/her "straight" Boumaan. In this way, the careful speech of each informant was directly comparable, without the complication of variation triggered by sociolinguistic variables.

(b) Narratives were recorded in an informal context (e.g. around the yaqona bowl, mat weaving, in the presence of peers). The awareness of the tape recorder was minimised by placing it under books or clothing. ³

Ideally, an investigation of speech variation/dialect levelling should include quantification of the same set of linguistic features, in both formal elicitation and the relaxed speech of narratives. This, however, is not always possible because: (a) certain features have a low frequency in texts. For example, some of the least common pronoun forms and certain lexical items have only sporadic occurrence in texts, and are easier gauged through structured elicitation; (b) other features are better suited to text quantification rather than structured elicitation. For example, grammatical items: in translating test sentences, some speakers focused only on lexical items and tended to delete or simply repeat the Standard Fijian grammatical items in their efforts to recall the lexical forms. Such data on

³Permission to record the individual's speech had been given at an earlier stage. Once they had become used to the tape recorder, very few of the 20 speakers appeared to suffer from tape recorder shyness. In fact, some speakers regarded story telling and elicitation as a competition among themselves. Social importance was attached to the order in which I worked with individuals. It was necessary to work with the chief first, for he is head of the village hierarchy.
grammatical items is not a true indication of the individual's Boumān speech; (c) the discourse marker qei was problematic because the acoustic difference between the Standard Fijian form (qai) and the Boumān equivalent (qei) is minimal and often the speakers' pronunciation lay somewhere between the two. For this reason, this feature was not included in the quantification.

Bearing these problems in mind, the extent of dialect levelling was gauged according to the following plan:

1. an overall view of the levelling phenomenon was gained by presenting each speaker with 25 Standard Fijian sentences for translation into the Boumān dialect; Then, focusing on specific dialect features,
2. the pronoun paradigm, and core and peripheral lexicon were gathered through elicitation sessions;
3. understanding ability of traditional Boumān vocabulary was tested by a 12-item word list;
4. other features were quantified in more casual, narrative speech. (This was possibly due to the relatively high frequency of these features in texts.) The features quantified were:
   - negative morpheme cau
   - demonstratives
   - neutral possessive marker wei
   - transitive affix -Ca'i'ma
   - nominal article a
   - glottal stop

7.4.2. TEST SENTENCES

In order to gain an overall view of the dialect levelling phenomenon, each speaker was presented with a uniform set of 25 Standard Fijian sentences for translation into Boumān. These sentences contained a total of 67 opportunities to switch to the Boumān dialect. The quantified features included 53 lexical items, and 14 grammatical items (5 demonstratives, 5 pronouns, 2 negative morphemes, and 2 transitive suffixes). (The set of test sentences is given in the appendix at the end of the thesis.)

The results are summarised on Table 7.1, and then graphically displayed on Figure 7.1, which plots the percentage score in relation to age. A detailed table of individual scores for each item is provided in the appendix at the end of this volume. The results indicate that:
1. There is a general tendency for the scores to lower with age, indicating a decline in traditional Boumān features, e.g. the highest score was 93% by an older speaker, NW 62 years. Scores gradually decline with age. The lowest score was 15%, by the youngest speaker, EN 10 years.

2. The scatter effect of points on Figure 7.1 indicates, however, that the correlation between age and competence in these Boumān features is not perfect. For example, AQ (45 years) scored 43%, a lower score than MR, MC, MV and QL who are very much younger. These speakers scored 53% - 63%.

7.4.3. PRONOUN PARADIGM

The pronoun paradigm for Standard Fijian is given in Table 7.2, and the traditional Boumān paradigm is shown in Table 7.3. As mentioned in 7.2.2, the Boumān dialect has the same pronoun categories, but differs from Standard Fijian in the forms of the pronouns. The differences between Standard Fijian (S.F.) and Boumān pronoun forms are accounted for by six recurrent features:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOUMĀN FEATURE</th>
<th>S.F. FEATURE</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. nu</td>
<td>nī</td>
<td>2nd person plural morpheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ta</td>
<td>da</td>
<td>1st person inclusive morpheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e.g. eta : eda (1st.INCL. plural.SUBJ.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. we</td>
<td>no / {da}</td>
<td>1st person inclusive morpheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e.g. wetaru : nodaru (1st.INCL. dual.SUBJ.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. wei</td>
<td>nei</td>
<td>(for 1st excl.non.sg.Poss.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e.g. weirau : neirau (1st excl.dual.Poss.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ø</td>
<td>n / # - o</td>
<td>e.g. ona : nona (3rd sg.Poss.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. glottal stop</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>e.g. 'eirau : keirau (1st excl.dual.OBJ.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are also certain other items whose variation in form is not covered by the recurrent features:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>age</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>total score of 67 opportunities</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>EW</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>JC</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>79.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>76.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>AQ</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>LN</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>IW</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>QL</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>WT</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>MV</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f: female  
m: male
FIGURE 7.1  SCORES OF TEST SENTENCES CORRELATED WITH AGE
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The 20 sample speakers were asked to give the Boumān equivalent of the Standard Fijian pronoun forms. The results are summarised in Figure 7.2.

They reveal that:

1. Features are changed in definite order: 1,2,3,4,5. For example, if a speaker changes feature 5, then he will also change features 1,2,3 and 4. Thus, if the speaker uses the Standard Fijian form nona (3rd sg.POSS.), (adding initial [n], feature 5 [ø : n /#-o]), he will also use Standard Fijian form neirau (1st dual EXC.) (changing initial [wei] to [nei], feature 4 [wei : nei]. Note that [nu : ni] is the first feature to be dropped; [ø : n /# - o] is the last to be lost.

2. The glottal stop feature (see feature 6, [' : k]) is maintained by all speakers. It is the most salient feature of the Boumān dialect, and is the marker of Bau Gato (see 7.3).

3. The loss of Boumān pronoun features correlates very roughly with age. This is more clearly demonstrated in Figure 7.3 which correlates each speaker's age with the number of Boumān features he or she retains. The downward slope of the graph indicates a decline in the Boumān pronoun features among younger speakers.

It is important to note that the 2nd person plural morpheme {nū}, which is the first feature to be dropped, is still used by speakers, but not in the function of the true plural. As described in 4.3.1 and 6.2, the form {nū} is now used as a respect marker when addressing chiefs of high status. In other words, whereas the traditional Boumān pronoun nū had two functions (a) marking true plural; and (b) respect marker), in contemporary Waitabu this form has been restricted to just one of these functions - marker of respect. The Standard Fijian form nī has been adopted to refer to plural number.

Investigation of the pronoun exceptions (i.e. varying forms not covered by the recurrent features) revealed that:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>FIRST</th>
<th>INCLUSIVE</th>
<th>SECOND</th>
<th>THIRD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sg</td>
<td>au</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ko (o)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dual</td>
<td>keirau</td>
<td>(e) daru</td>
<td>ko drau (o drau)</td>
<td>(e) rau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paucal</td>
<td>keitou</td>
<td>(e) datou</td>
<td>ko dou (o dou)</td>
<td>(e) ratou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plural</td>
<td>keimami</td>
<td>(e) da</td>
<td>ko ni (o ni)</td>
<td>(e) ra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| OBJECT  | | | |
|---------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|
| sg      | au    | —         | iko    | koya  |
| dual    | keirau| kēdaru    | kemudrau| rau   |
| paucal  | keitou| kedatou   | kemudou | iratou |
| plural  | keimami| keda    | kemunī  | ira   |

| CARDINAL | | | |
|----------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|
| sg       | yau   | —         | iko    | koya  |
| dual     | keirau| kēdaru    | kemudrau| (i) rau |
| paucal   | keitou| kedatou   | kemudou | (i) ratou |
| plural   | keimami| keda    | kemunī  | (i) ra |

| SUFFIX  | | | |
|---------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|
| sg      | -qu   | —         | -mu    | -na   |
| dual    | -i CARD| -daru   | -mudrau| -drau |
| paucal  | -i CARD| -datou  | -mudou | -dratou |
| plural  | -i CARD| -da     | -munī  | -dra  |

| POSSESSIVE NEUTRAL | | | |
|---------------------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|
| sg                  | noqu  | —         | nomu   | none  |
| dual                | neirau| nōdaru    | nomudrau| nōdrau |
| paucal              | neitou| nodatou   | nomudou | nodratou |
| plural              | neimami| noda    | nomunī  | nodra |

| POSSESSIVE EDIBLE   | | | |
|---------------------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|
| sg                  | qau (kequ)| —         | kemu   | kena  |
| dual                | keirau| kēdaru    | kemudrau| kēdrau |
| paucal              | keitou| kedatou   | kemudou | kедratou |
| plural              | keimami| keda    | kemunī  | kедra |

<p>| POSSESSIVE DRINKABLE | | | |
|----------------------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|
| sg                   | megu  | —         | memu   | mena  |
| dual                 | meirau| mēdaru    | memudrau| mēdrau |
| paucal               | meitou| medatou   | memudou | medratou |
| plural               | meimami| meda    | memunī  | medra |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>FIRST</th>
<th>EXCLUSIVE</th>
<th>INCLUSIVE</th>
<th>SECOND</th>
<th>THIRD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sg</td>
<td>au</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dual</td>
<td>'eirau</td>
<td>(e)taru</td>
<td>{ (o) drau</td>
<td>(e) rau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paucal</td>
<td>'eitou</td>
<td>(e)tatou</td>
<td>{ (o) dou</td>
<td>(e) ratou</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plural</td>
<td>'eimami</td>
<td>(e)ta</td>
<td>{ (o) nū</td>
<td>(e) ra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td>sg</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>i'o</td>
<td>'ea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dual</td>
<td>'eirau</td>
<td>'ētaru</td>
<td>'emudrau</td>
<td>rau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paucal</td>
<td>'eitou</td>
<td>'etatou</td>
<td>'emudou</td>
<td>iratou</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plural</td>
<td>'eimami</td>
<td>'eta</td>
<td>'emunū</td>
<td>ira</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARDINAL</td>
<td>sg</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>i'o</td>
<td>'ea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dual</td>
<td>'eirau</td>
<td>'ētaru</td>
<td>'emudrau</td>
<td>(i) rau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paucal</td>
<td>'eitou</td>
<td>'etatou</td>
<td>'emudou</td>
<td>(i) ratou</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plural</td>
<td>'eimami</td>
<td>'eta</td>
<td>'emunū</td>
<td>(i) ra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUFFIX</td>
<td>sg</td>
<td>-qu</td>
<td>-mu</td>
<td>-na</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dual</td>
<td>-i CARDINAL</td>
<td>-i CARDINAL</td>
<td>-mu CARDINAL</td>
<td>-drau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paucal</td>
<td>-i CARDINAL</td>
<td>-i CARDINAL</td>
<td>-mu CARDINAL</td>
<td>-drau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plural</td>
<td>-i CARDINAL</td>
<td>-i CARDINAL</td>
<td>-mu CARDINAL</td>
<td>-drau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSSESSIVE NEUTRAL</td>
<td>sg</td>
<td>qo'oyau</td>
<td>omu</td>
<td>ona</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dual</td>
<td>weirau</td>
<td>wētaru</td>
<td>omudrau</td>
<td>ōdrau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paucal</td>
<td>weitou</td>
<td>wetatou</td>
<td>omudou</td>
<td>odratou</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plural</td>
<td>weimami</td>
<td>weta</td>
<td>omunū</td>
<td>odra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSSESSIVE EDIBLE</td>
<td>sg</td>
<td>qa'ayau</td>
<td>'emu</td>
<td>'ena</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dual</td>
<td>'eirau</td>
<td>'ētaru</td>
<td>'emudrau</td>
<td>'ēdrau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paucal</td>
<td>'eitou</td>
<td>'etatou</td>
<td>'emudou</td>
<td>'ēdratou</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plural</td>
<td>'eimami</td>
<td>'eta</td>
<td>'emunū</td>
<td>'ēdra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSSESSIVE DRINKABLE</td>
<td>sg</td>
<td>meqa'ayau</td>
<td>memu</td>
<td>mena</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dual</td>
<td>meirau</td>
<td>mētaru</td>
<td>memudrau</td>
<td>mēdrau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paucal</td>
<td>meitou</td>
<td>metatou</td>
<td>memudou</td>
<td>medratou</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plural</td>
<td>meimami</td>
<td>meta</td>
<td>memunū</td>
<td>medra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**FIGURE 7.2** ORDER OF DROPPING BOUMÄN DIALECT PRONOUN FEATURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>NM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>LN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>AQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>TR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>JC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>EW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>IW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>MC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>MV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>MR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>QL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>WT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>AV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>EN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: lines and arrow indicate that the aligned Boumän feature/s are dropped.
FIGURE 7.3  NUMBER OF BOUMAN PRONOUN FEATURES RETAINED

- Number of features retained

- Diagram showing age vs. number of features retained for different pronouns.


- Age ranges from 70 to 10 years.
1. None of the 20 speakers recalled the three traditional Boumān possessive forms: meqa'ayau "1st sg. POSS.drinkable"; qa'ayau "1st sg.Poss.edible"; and qo'oyau "1st sg.Poss.neutral". Only one speaker, NW 62 years, recognised these forms, but explained that they were no longer used in the Waitabu community. She had heard them used only in her childhood.

2. Many speakers used a different set of first person possessive forms which they claimed to be Boumān. These forms occur in Cakaudrove dialect, and may be borrowed from that dialect. (It should be noted that qau "1st POSS.edible" occurs also in Standard Fijian. Boumān speakers, however, recognised this as a Boumān item, and kequ as the Standard Fijian equivalent.) The "New Boumān" forms are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(NEW BOUMĀN)</th>
<th>S.F.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st sg.POSS. EDIBLE</td>
<td>qau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRINKABLE</td>
<td>meqau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUTRAL</td>
<td>qou</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because contemporary Waitabu speakers recognise these forms as Boumān, and distinct from Standard Fijian forms, they were counted as Boumān. Figure 7.4 summarises the speakers' retention of the four Boumān pronoun forms. The striking feature of the table is that older speakers recalled more Boumān forms than did younger speakers. Younger speakers tended to use many more Standard Fijian forms. For example, the seven speakers who retained all of the four Boumān features were aged 41 years and older. The score is much lower in the younger generation. All 10 speakers under the age of 25 years retained two or less of the pronoun exceptions.

7.4.4. LEXICON

The 20 speakers were tested for their ability to recall traditional Boumān vocabulary. Two 12-item word lists of Standard Fijian items were presented to each speaker for translation into Boumān. One list contained "core" vocabulary (common lexical items with high frequency in everyday speech). The other contained more "peripheral" lexicon (items less frequently used). (Both lists are given in the appendix at the end of this volume.)

The results are given in Table 7.4, and graphically displayed in Figure 7.5 and Figure 7.6. They indicate that:

---

4 An indication of vocabulary ability had been gained from the general test in 7.4.2 which contained 53 lexical items of the total 67 features tested. The results shown in Table 7.1 suggest that there is a decline in Bouman terms among younger speakers.
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### TABLE 7.4  LEXICAL TESTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>age</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>core</th>
<th>peripheral</th>
<th>understanding test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>total:</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>EW</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>JC</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>AQ</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>LN</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>IW</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>QL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>WT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>MV</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. There is a steady decline in scores among younger speakers, for both core and peripheral lexicon;

2. Comparison of peripheral and core vocabulary scores revealed no striking difference between the two. Core vocabulary scores were only an average 1.5 points above peripheral vocab scores.

It is important to note that certain Boumān lexical items were recalled by all 20 speakers. The items were loga "mat"; dai "joke"; 'acu "tree, wood". Like the phonological feature of glottal stop, these terms served as shibboleths of the Boumān dialect. They were often used in everyday speech, and many Waitabu speakers regarded them as important markers of the dialect.

In short, there is a general decline in Boumān vocabulary as age decreases. Younger speakers lose many lexical features, and recall only a few common items. In contemporary Waitabu, these items serve as salient markers of the Boumān dialect.

The process of "ironing-out" irregular forms by analogising them with regular patterns was demonstrated in the lexicon test. Fijian has a set of kin terms which describe the actual kin relationship between two people (see 3.0). In Standard Fijian, the terms are formed productively by adding the collective prefix vei- and suffix -ni to the kin term of reference, e.g. vei-tama-ni "father-child relationship". In the Boumān dialect, different prefix and suffix forms are used: the Boumān equivalent to Standard Fijian vei-X-ni is tau-X-na. Whereas the Standard Fijian form vei-X-ni is applied productively throughout, the Boumān dialect has two exceptions which consist of only tau- + root: tau-taci φ "same-sex sibling relationship", and tau-wati φ "husband-wife relationship". In the lexicon tests, speakers showed a tendency to "iron-out" these irregular forms. All but three older speakers analogised on the regular forms and applied the tau-X-na formula productively throughout. Thus, the exceptions, tau-taci φ and tau-wati φ were changed to tau-taci-na and tau-wati-na. This tendency to iron out irregularities has been reported in other language levelling situations, e.g. Haviland (1979:232) on Guugu Yimidhirr, Donaldson (1980:157) on Ngiyambaa, and Schmidt (1985:78-86) on Dyirbal.
7.4.5. UNDERSTANDING TEST

Having observed the speaker's ability to recall and produce traditional Boumān lexical items, it is necessary to investigate understanding ability. In order to test understanding ability, speakers were presented with a 12-item word list of Boumān terms and asked to explain what each item meant. In their responses, most speakers gave the Standard Fijian equivalent. Sometimes the meaning of the Boumān form was explained in one or two sentences. Both types of explanation were counted as signalling understanding of the Boumān term.

The results are given in Table 7.4, and graphically displayed in Figure 7.7. The striking features of the test are:

1. All speakers achieved a high score. Scores ranged from 9 - 12 points, with 14 of the 20 speakers gaining the maximum 12 points;

2. Only among younger speakers did understanding ability score diminish slightly. Five speakers aged from 12 - 22 years scored 10 - 11 points, and the youngest informant aged 10 years scored the lowest mark of 9 points.

Comparison of understanding ability and lexical production tests (see also Table 7.4) reveals that understanding ability scores were much higher than production scores. For example, peripheral vocab production scores ranged from 2 - 12 with only one speaker scoring the maximum 12 points. In contrast, understanding ability scores were much higher: scores ranged from 9 - 12 points with 14 speakers achieving the maximum 12 points.

The discrepancy between understanding and production skills has been reported in other language/dialect levelling situations. For example, Dorian (1981:155) notes a discrepancy between the two skills in semi-speaker Gaelic:

while most of the ESG [East Sutherland Gaelic] semi-speakers produce a Gaelic with very evident deficiencies, their receptive control of the language is outstanding.

A similar phenomenon has been noted in the Yimas language of New Guinea (Foley forthcoming), and among speakers of the dying Dyirbal language of North Queensland, Australia (Schmidt 1985:23-4).

5 In administering this test, I assumed the role of language learner. I claimed not to understand the meaning of the Boumān form, and asked the informant to explain what it meant.
7.4.6. FREQUENCY OF BOUMĀN GRAMMATICAL FEATURES IN TEXTS

Boumān grammatical features were quantified in texts of the 20 sample speakers. The results, summarised in Table 7.5, reveal the following:

1. Cau, the Boumān negative morpheme, was dropped by all 20 speakers. In all cases, this Boumān dialect form was replaced by the Standard Fijian form sega ni. For example,

BOUMĀN

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{au} & \; \text{ā} \; \text{cau} \; \text{la'i} \; \text{qoli} \\
\text{1sg} & \; \text{PAST} \; \text{NEG} \; \text{go} \; \text{net-fishing} \\
\text{"I didn't go net-fishing"}
\end{align*}
\]

S.F.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{au} & \; \text{ā} \; \text{sega-ni} \; \text{la'i} \; \text{qoli} \\
\text{1sg} & \; \text{PAST} \; \text{NEG} \; \text{go} \; \text{net-fishing} \\
\text{"I didn't go net-fishing"}
\end{align*}
\]

(A similar tendency to drop the Boumān form cau was evident in the 20 test sentences described in 7.4.2. Only one of the 20 speakers (LN 41 years) used the Boumān form, and then in only one of two opportunities.)

2. A, the Boumān nominal article form (when not preceded by a preposition), was maintained by older speakers, but lessened in frequency among younger speakers. As Table 7.5 shows, 7 older speakers (41 - 65 years) used this Boumān form in 100% of opportunities. This score gradually declines as age diminishes: the youngest speaker (EN 10 years) had 0% use of the Boumān form. She used the Standard Fijian form na throughout. Examples of a by an older speaker, and na by a younger speaker are:

AQ 45 years

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ia} & \; \text{l'a} \; \text{lelevu} \; \text{a} \; \text{ulavi} \; \text{a} \\
\text{but} & \; \text{fish} \; \text{big} \; \text{ART} \; \text{species} \; \text{ART} \\
\text{tā} & \; \text{species} \\
\text{"But they are big fish, the ulavi and tā species"}
\end{align*}
\]

EN 10 years

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{'eitou} & \; \text{ā} \; \text{'auta} \; \text{na} \; \text{lawa} \\
\text{1pa.EXC.} & \; \text{PAST} \; \text{carry} \; \text{ART} \; \text{net} \\
\text{"We carried the net"}
\end{align*}
\]

3. -Ca'ina, the non-monsoyllabic Boumān transitive suffix form was
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>age</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>negative marker CAU</th>
<th>nominal article A</th>
<th>transitive affix CA'INA</th>
<th>neutral possessive marker WEI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># total opport.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% freq</td>
<td>% freq</td>
<td>% freq</td>
<td>% freq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>EW</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>JC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>AQ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>LN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>IW</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>QL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>WT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>MV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓: indicates retention of the Boumän form WEI
-: indicates no opportunities occurred in texts of this speaker
0: indicates Boumän form WEI was not used
maintained by all 20 speakers. As Table 7.5 indicates, in no cases was the Standard Fijian suffix -Caka used. This suggests that, unlike many other dialect features, this morphological feature of the Boumān dialect has not been dropped; it appears to be widely used by a cross-section of the community. Examples of the Boumān transitive suffix form -Ca'ina in texts are:

IS 22yrs

\[ \begin{align*}
&2sg \text{ VBZR-use-TRANS ART coconut COMP} \\
&\text{va'a-lolo-ta'ina} \\
&\text{CAUS-milk-TRANS} \\
&\text{"You use coconuts to get coconut milk [for cooking]."}
\end{align*} \]

FL 12yrs

\[ \begin{align*}
&\text{ART fishing 1pl.EXC. HABIT} \\
&\text{va'a-ro'o-ro'o-ta'ina} \\
&\text{VBZR-respect-TRANS} \\
&\text{"Net fishing has a certain etiquette that we respect"}
\end{align*} \]

(High frequency of the Boumān form -Ca'ina was also evident in the results of the test sentences where all but two of the 20 speakers used the Boumān affix.)

4. Wei is the Boumān form of the neutral possessive marker preceding a proper noun. The Standard Fijian form is nei. Examples of the Boumān and Standard Fijian possessive articles are:

NW 62yrs

\[ \begin{align*}
&\text{ca'aca'a wei Sepo} \\
&\text{work POSS NAME} \\
&\text{"Sepo's work"}
\end{align*} \]

MR 27yrs

\[ \begin{align*}
&\text{lawa nei Vero} \\
&\text{net POSS NAME} \\
&\text{"Vero's net"}
\end{align*} \]

This feature was investigated in the texts. There were no occurrences in four of the texts, and only one or two occurrences in each of the other 16 texts. The results, correlated with age, are presented in Table 7.5.

Results indicate that many older speakers used this form, but its use diminishes in the younger generation, e.g. all five oldest speakers (49 - 65 years) used it in their texts, but only one of the young speakers in the 10 - 18 year age group did.
5. \([k \rightarrow \text{glottal stop}]\). This most salient feature of the Boumān dialect was maintained throughout the texts of all 20 speakers. In the 20 texts, there were only two instances of \([k]\). These were by a 17 year old speaker, in pronouncing the Standard Fijian term kece "all". (As mentioned in 7.2.1, \([k]\) is sometimes maintained by Boumān speakers when pronouncing Standard Fijian forms.) The following example shows such a use of \([k]\). Note that other terms, e.g. ʻiʻa "fish", are pronounced with a glottal stop.

Q.L. 17 years

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{na qai wasea a ʻiʻa me wase} & \\
& \text{then share ART fish COMP share} \\
\text{kece vei ʻeda} & \\
& \text{all 1pl.INCL.} \\
\text{"[We] divide up the fish, sharing them all among us"}
\end{align*}
\]

6. demonstratives

There is considerable variation in demonstrative forms of the Boumān, Standard Fijian and Cakaudrove dialects.\(^6\) The following example illustrates the difference in the dialect forms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOUMĀN</th>
<th>dabe i yai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STANDARD FIJIAN</td>
<td>e ke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAKAUDROVE</td>
<td>i qē</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

sit PREP here

"[You] sit here!"

A complete list of demonstrative forms in all three dialects is given in 7.2.2.

The speakers' texts were quantified for demonstrative forms from the three dialects. Two important points regarding quantification should be noted:

1. Only 13 of the 20 texts (those which contained at least five occurrences of demonstratives), were quantified. The other seven texts contained only between zero and two demonstrative forms;

2. Some demonstrative forms occur in more than one dialect, and this is problematic in quantification. For example, the form ʻyā occurs in \(S.F.\) and \(R.\) dialects. To overcome this problem, ʻyā was not included in the count. Also, only those demonstrative forms which are distinctively Cakaudrove (i.e. they appear in no other dialect), are counted as Cakaudrove dialect. For example, the form qō which occurs in both Standard Fijian and Cakaudrove dialects \(L.\) is counted as Standard Fijian.

\(^6\) Cakaudrove is the neighbouring dialect to Boumā and the high prestige dialect of Taveuni island. There is high intrusion of Cakaudrove forms into Waitabu village, and this is clearly evident in demonstrative forms.
The results, presented in Table 7.6, indicate that:

1. There is a decline in the use of Boumān forms, especially among younger speakers. For example, four older speakers aged between 50 and 65 years used Boumān forms for 40-60% of total opportunities. In contrast, all other nine speakers (aged between 10-59 years) used no Boumān demonstrative forms;

2. There is a noticeable intrusion of Standard Fijian and Cakaudrove demonstrative forms. Use of Cakaudrove demonstratives is particularly evident among the younger speakers. For example, the two youngest speakers (aged 10 and 12 years) used 100% and 80% respectively of Cakaudrove forms in their texts.

In short, the results suggest that the use of traditional Boumān demonstrative forms is diminishing. In this aspect of the language, Standard Fijian is not the only replacing dialect. Rather, widespread intrusion of Cakaudrove dialect forms is evident. (Intermarriage and strong communication links with the Cakaudrove region are possible factors in this dialect mixing, see 7.5.)

7.4.7. SUMMARY OF TESTS

The results indicate that there is noticeable dialect levelling in Waitabu village, as various features of the traditional Boumān dialect weaken and are replaced by Standard Fijian forms. It is interesting to observe which linguistic features show a tendency to change, i.e. which Boumān dialect features are dropped or weaken before others.

There is evidence of weakening of all features except the salient phonological feature of glottal stop; the transitive affix form -Ca'ina7; and a small percentage of lexical items. These features were used by all 20 speakers, in 100% of opportunities.

Many of the Boumān dialect features showed gradual weakening among younger speakers. These features included: peripheral and core lexical items; pronoun forms; and the grammatical features such as nominal article [a], possessive marker [wel], and demonstratives. It is important to note that demonstrative forms show evidence of intrusion from the Cakaudrove dialect as well as Standard Fijian.

7Although this bound morpheme appears resistant to change, it cannot be assumed that morphological diffusion is unlikely in other language contact situations. Evidence of morphological and morphosyntactic diffusion has been noted in various contact situations, e.g. Heath (1978) in Arnhem Land languages of north Australia; Silverstein (1977:154) in Chinookan; Clyne (1980) on the speech of Dutch and German immigrants in Australia; Foley (1986) in the Sepik Region of Papua New Guinea.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>age</th>
<th>speaker</th>
<th>total opportunities</th>
<th>% Boumán</th>
<th>% Cakaudrove</th>
<th>% S.F.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>EW</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>JC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>AQ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>LN</td>
<td>1 (CAK)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>IW</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>1 (CAK)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>QL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>WT</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>MV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Boumān forms appear to have been lost completely. (There were no occurrences of these Boumān forms in texts; most speakers did not recall them, and claimed never to use them.) These features include: the negative marker cau; possessive pronoun forms meqa'ayau "1st.sg.POSS.drinkable", qa'ayau "1st sg.POSS.edible", qo'oyau "1st sg.POSS.neutral"; and certain lexical items, e.g. purelulu "Wednesday".

The Waitabu dialect levelling data illustrates an important sociolinguistic principle which may be called "economy of distinctions":

In a contact situation where an indigenous language variety is being infiltrated by a more prestigious language variety, speakers of the indigenous code will maintain a reduced number of distinguishing features, if they wish to mark their language as distinct from the replacing language.

In the Waitabu situation, many traditional Boumān features have weakened or been lost. Speakers economise on the number of distinguishing features which mark their Boumān speech as distinct by reducing the range of Boumān dialect features to a minimal number. This reduced range of distinguishing features includes the phonological feature of glottal stop, the transitive affix -Ca'ina, and a few common lexical items, e.g. dai "joke", loga "mat".

It is important to note that this small set of remaining distinguishing features also occurs in the Cakaudrove dialect. Thus, at this late stage of levelling of the Boumān dialect, (i.e. in the speech of young Waitabu speakers), there are no features which distinguish Boumān from the Cakaudrove dialect. That is, for the younger speakers at Waitabu, the dialect levelling process has eliminated the bundle of isoglosses which mark the Boumān area as a separate dialect area. Traditionally, Boumān and Cakaudrove dialects were quite similar. Geraghty (p.c.) estimates 96% common grammatical and lexical items. It appears that demonstratives; the pronoun feature ta (1st plural inclusive morpheme); and 3-4 lexical items were the main linguistic markers which separated Boumān from the Cakaudrove dialect.

Despite the loss of these features which distinguish the Boumān dialect, speakers continue to call their speech vosa va'a-Boumā "Boumān dialect". When asked how their Boumān speech differed from the Cakaudrove dialect, speakers could not pinpoint any distinguishing feature, but claimed that differences did nevertheless exist:
sā sega ni macala, ia e duidui

"It is not clear, but it is different."

7.5. INTERMARRIAGE - AS A SOCIAL FACTOR CONDUCIVE TO DIALECT LEVELLING

The Fijian marriage system, like many other aspects of Fijian social organisation, is patrilineal. Marriage is usually exogamous and much importance is placed on the continuation of the male line in each family. The social norm is for the woman, once married, to shift to and assimilate into the village of her husband (see 3.1). According to this ideal, the mobile section of the marrying population would be female. At Waitbau this is the case: only two men have married into the village.

Such an institutionalised norm has far-reaching implications for the sociolinguistic situation at Waitabu, for it defines the female population as the group which instigates much of the linguistic diffusion and change. Women, when marrying into Waitabu, bring with them the speech habits of their birth village. A similar phenomenon has been reported in the Yimas society of Papua New Guinea by Bill Foley (1986). Exchange of women is an important factor in linguistic diffusion in this community.

So, in investigating the phenomenon of linguistic diffusion in Waitabu community, we must focus careful attention on the female population.

7.5.1. FEMALE POPULATION OF WAITABU

Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total population</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>married female</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


(Map 5) gives a breakdown of the birth areas of the married women. The important points to note are:

1. less than half (9 of 22) of married women have Boumān as their birth dialect;

2. 8 of the 22 came from the Cakaudrove region. Dialects in this region are
quite similar to Bouman (see 7.4.7), and have the glottal stop feature;  

3. 5 came from distant areas whose dialects were quite different from Bouman, and had no glottal stop feature.  

7.5.2. THREE BASIC SPEAKER GROUPS  

Married women can be divided into three sociolinguistic types:  

1. those who were born in the Bouman area and speak the Bouman dialect;  

2. those who marry into the village and assimilate to the Bouman dialect. Many of the women (8 of the total 22) come from the Cakaudrove region where speech is characterised by the phonological feature \([k \rightarrow \text{glottal stop}]\). Thus, for these individuals, linguistic assimilation (judged by \([k \rightarrow \prime]\) ability/use) is no real problem;  

3. those who marry in, but do not linguistically assimilate. There is a small group of women who have married into Waitabu village, but who still strongly identify with their own dialect and village of birth, or with Standard Fijian. I will now focus in detail on this group.  

7.5.3. NON-ASSIMILATING FEMALES  

There are about four individuals in Waitabu who do not use the distinctive glottal stop feature. These women come from non-glottal stop areas of Tailevu and Lau. (The fifth woman from a non-\([k \rightarrow \text{glottal stop}]\) area (Labasa, see Map 5) does assimilate by changing \([k]\) to glottal stop in her speech. A possible factor in her use of glottal stop feature is that her native dialect contains glottal stop (corresponding to \([t]\)).)  

The four non-assimilating females appear to have good relations with other villagers, and they do not form any in-group among themselves on the basis of their “outsider-hood”. Nevertheless, the Waitabu people are very aware of their failure to drop the \([k]\) from their speech, and often comment on the “inability” to use the village language. As one elder commented when a non-assimilating female was speaking:  

\[\text{one of the eight women is from the neighbouring Wainilele dialect region, which appears to be linguistically identical to Bouman. (Speakers claim, but cannot pinpoint, differences between the two.)}\]

\[\text{One female came from the Labasa area, which has a glottal stop feature, but corresponding to [t], rather than [k] as in Bouman, e.g. S.F. vinakata corresponds to vinaka'a "want".}\]
Rogoci 'ea mada. E sega ni rawata, sega ni via vosa gato eh. E duidui a ona vosa.

"Listen to her. She cannot, doesn't want to speak with a glottal stop. Her speech is different."

[N.W. female, 52 years, Waitabu]

The four women are, in effect, linguistically marked members of the community. Their speech is not stigmatised, however, due to the fact that the [k] feature is associated with Standard Fijian - the language of the school, the church, and the radio.

The speech of the non-assimilating women is not homogenous. Rather, it can be divided into two types:

1. **Standard Fijian** is used by the two younger women (from Tailevu and Lau) who married in just last year. (Standard Fijian is the dialect spoken in the Tailevu area. The woman born in Lau spent 10 years in Tailevu, and claims to speak Standard Fijian. There is no evidence of Lau dialect grammatical or lexical features in her speech.)

2. **Boumā Va'akā** is used by the two older women. As mentioned in 7.3, Boumā Va'akā is the tendency to apply the rule [ʼ → k] to Boumān dialect items.

The time factor appears to be important in determining the degree to which a woman uses Boumā Va'akā. It requires considerable time for an individual to pick up Boumān items and incorporate them into her vocabulary. Thus, the older women, with greater exposure to the Boumān dialect, appear to use some Boumān items (with [ʼ → k] rule). In contrast, the two younger women who married-in last year have not mastered Boumān items, and speak Standard Fijian. Time will tell if these younger females eventually: (a) adopt the [k → ʼ] feature of the Waitabu majority; or (b) remain linguistically marked by using [k], and gradually apply this [k] feature to Boumān terms, i.e. the Boumā Va'akā tendency.

A similar pattern emerges for women marrying into other villages in the Boumān region. Of the women who do not assimilate linguistically, it is the older individuals who show the Boumā Va'akā tendency. The younger women have not incorporated any Boumān forms into their vocabulary.\(^{10}\)

\(^{10}\)The best exponent of Boumā Va'akā was the district nurse based in the Boumān village of 'orovou. She married into the village 15 years ago, and has incorporated many Boumān lexical items into her speech. In true Boumā Va'akā style, Kalisia pronounces all words with [k] rather than glottal stop. A possible reason for her persistent use of [k] is her role of government nurse, a role which is associated with the government in Suva, and which marks her as different from other villagers.
SIMILARITY BETWEEN THE LAU DIALECTS & BOUMĀ VA'AKĀ

The Lau dialects of Eastern Fiji have some strong similarities with the Boumān dialect. Many grammatical and lexical items are identical. Paul Geraghty (p.c.) estimates that Boumā and Vanua Balavu (the northernmost island of the Lau group) have about 85% of grammatical and lexical items in common. Of the 31% of Boumān grammatical and lexical items which differ from Standard Fijian, 25% occur in Vanua Balavu (Paul Geraghty, p.c.). However, the Lauan dialects are distinguished from Boumān by use of [k], instead of glottal stop. For example,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VANUA BALAVU (LAU)</th>
<th>wākolo</th>
<th>&quot;road&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOUMĀ</td>
<td>wā'olo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOUMĀ VA'AKĀ</td>
<td>wākolo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANDARD FIJIAN</td>
<td>gaunisala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the forms described as Boumā Va'akā in 7.3 are often identical to Lau dialect forms, it could be argued that the Boumā Va'akā phenomenon is simply a diffusion of Lau dialect forms into Waitabu village. However, the notion of Boumā Va'akā ("Boumān spoken with [k]") cannot be cancelled out for the following reasons:

1. The two main Boumā Va'akā agents claim to have had no significant contact with the Lau islands or inhabitants. They are both from Tailevu, near Suva;

2. These two individuals do not recognise their speech as Lau dialect, but rather as Standard Fijian;

3. Boumā Va'akā is also used by young children in their first years of schooling (7.3, 8.2). Inquiries to parents and teachers revealed that these children have had no exposure to Lau dialects;

4. For the few items that do differ between Vanua Balavu and Boumān

---

11 There is considerable linguistic variation among the Lau islands. I select the dialect of the northernmost island of the Lau group (Vanua Balavu) for comparison with the Boumān dialect. Due to their close proximity on the dialect chain, Boumān is more similar to the dialect of Vanua Balavu, than it is to other, more distant Lauan dialects. The data on Lauan dialects was provided by Paul Geraghty (p.c.).

12 Geraghty's estimates are very conservative, based on 100 grammatical and lexical items, which were chosen to indicate maximum dialect differences. Dixon's count (of only lexical items) gives a much higher estimate of common forms between Boumān and Standard Fijian -80%, cf Geraghty -69%.
dialects, both adult and child agents of Boumā Va'akā use the Boumān forms. (If the k-based speech of these individuals was due to diffusion from the Lau dialect, we would expect use of the Vanua Balavu and other Lau forms, rather than Boumān.) Note the differences between Boumā Va'akā and Vanua Balavu items in the example below:

"angry" puku (B.V.K.)         cudru (VANUA BALAVU)
   pu'u (BOUMAN)               " (S.F.)

"thief" butako (B.V.K.)       driva (VANUA BALAVU)
   " (S.F.)
   buta'o (BOUMAN)

Other forms (not containing the [k : ] option) also differ between Vanua Balavu and Boumān dialects. When tested, all Boumā Va'akā agents used the Boumān form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOUMAN</th>
<th>VANUA BALAVU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>inanoa</td>
<td>niyavi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uca</td>
<td>lagi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laisave</td>
<td>lalai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loga</td>
<td>yaba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yavi</td>
<td>kayavi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This indicates that there are two sources of the same phenomenon:

1. Lau dialect;

2. individuals who apply the [’ → k] rule to the Boumān dialect in order to mark their identity with an area or institution outside the village. (For example, women who marry into Waitabu but still identify with their village and dialect of birth; and young children in their early years of school who apply the [’ → k] rule to their Boumān speech in efforts to assimilate to the language of the classroom, Standard Fijian.)

7.5.4. SPEECH OF PRE-SCHOOL CHILDREN

The role of the married female in instigating linguistic diffusion and change in Waitabu is well manifested in the speech of young children. In the process of language acquisition, these young children imitate and learn the speech of their mothers.13 (Females, in their role as childminders, have more intense contact with children in their formative years, than do males.)

---

13 Ochs 1982 observes a similar phenomenon in Samoan society: children are exposed to and imitate their caretaker's speech habits. For example, the low incidence of the ergative case marker in caretaker speech also occurs in children's speech.
A child whose mother speaks a non-Boumān dialect is likely to pick up these non-Boumān features. In this way, features from other dialects may be introduced and transmitted in the Waitabu community. The tendency of the child to take up the speech behaviour of his mother was noted by a teacher at the local Boumān school:

'I na gauna ni ra la'o mai, era sega ni rawa ni vosa va'a-Viti. 'Èva'a 'ai Cakaudrove a tina-na, a gone e sa qai vosa va'a-Ca'audrove. Ia, 'èva'a e 'ai Lau, a tina-na, a gone e sa qai vosa va'a-Lau. Au sā qai 'ilā. 'eneyai eh.

"When they [young children] come here [to school], they cannot speak Standard Fijian. If the mother is from Cakaudrove, the child speaks Cakaudrove dialect. But if the mother is from Lau, [the child] will then speak Lau. I then know [where the mother comes from, by the child's speech]. Like that eh?"

[F.M. female teacher, Bouma primary school]

As previously mentioned, many of the women who marry into Waitabu come from the Cakaudrove region. This is conducive to diffusion of Cakaudrove dialect forms into the Waitabu community. Such diffusion is evident in the widespread use of Cakaudrove demonstratives described in 7.4.6.

The following conversation between Kalisito, a pre-school child, and his grandmother demonstrates the child's use of Cakaudrove demonstrative forms, despite his grandmother's efforts to correct his speech to the traditional Boumān form. The child's mother is, of course, from Cakaudrove.

KALISITO:

'auta tū 'ene-qē
 carry ASP like-this(CAKAUDROVE)

"Carry it like this!"

GRANDMOTHER:

sega Kalisito 'auta tū
NEG NAME carry ASP

'ene-yai
 like-this(BOUMĀN)

"No Kalisito. [Say] carry it like this."

[She corrects his use of Cakaudrove demonstrative to the Boumān form.]

GRANDMOTHER:

tu'una
 say

"Say it!"
7.6. ATTITUDES TO DIALECT MIXING

Individuals in the Waitabu community are well aware of the intrusion of Standard Fijian forms into their speech. Both older and younger speakers pinpoint the onset of loss of Bouman features to the younger generation, (about 30 years and below):

"The youths, young girls and children (of Waitabu) are not proficient in the real Bouman dialect. Their speech is very mixed up. They don't use real Bouman words like *mayā* [demonstrative, "there (distant)"] or *weta* [1st.plural.INCL. pronoun]. Some children speak only Bau Gato [Standard Fijian pronounced with a glottal stop]."

[NW female, 62 years, Waitabu]

In order to gauge attitudes towards the dialect mixing phenomenon, the sample 20 speakers (aged 10 - 65 years) were asked the following questions:

1. Do you think Standard Fijian is replacing the Bouman dialect?

2. Is this a good or bad thing?

3. Will the Bouman dialect disappear eventually?

4. If you had to choose, would you select to improve your knowledge of Standard Fijian or of Bouman?

5. Do you ever correct a person's speech if he/she speaks Standard Fijian to you in the village?

6. Does anybody ever correct your speech if you speak Standard Fijian or mixed-up Bouman?
Results revealed that all 20 individuals recognised that there was widespread intrusion of Standard Fijian forms into the Boumān dialect. Only five speakers (all aged over 41 years) viewed this Standard Fijian intrusion as a negative thing. The other individuals were non-committal, regarding it as neither good nor bad. No person believed that the Boumān dialect would eventually totally disappear. The reason consistently given for this was that the glottal stop feature was kaukauna "strong".

The Boumān dialect did not appear stigmatised. Most people viewed it in a positive light and showed a willingness to learn more traditional Boumān forms. 18 of the 20 individuals preferred to learn more Boumān, while only two people (aged 17 and 14 years) showed preference for Standard Fijian.

**ABSENCE OF THE CORRECTIVE MECHANISM**

Although older speakers recognise the widespread intrusion of Standard Fijian forms in the speech of the younger generation, they do not attempt to uphold traditional Boumān linguistic norms by correcting young speakers. None of the 20 sample speakers reported correction of Standard Fijian to Boumān norms, and in 8 months of fieldwork, I observed only one instance of the corrective mechanism. This instance is described in 7.5.4. Possible factors linked with the lack of the corrective mechanism in Waitabu are:

1. Standard Fijian and the Boumān dialect are recognised as varieties of the same language. They have the same phonology and 80% vocabulary in common. Intrusion of a variety of the same Fijian language is more subtle and more acceptable than intrusion of language forms from a different ethnic group, e.g. Indian.

2. Standard Fijian forms are introduced by prestigious institutions such as the Church, the school, and the radio. The forms associated with these institutions tend to bear a positive, rather than negative connotation, and are less prone to be the target of the corrective mechanism.

**7.7. FACTORS CONDUCIVE TO THE MAINTENANCE & DECLINE OF THE BOUMĀN DIALECT**

Major factors linked with dialect mixing and loss of Boumān dialect features are:

1. **Intermarriage.** This is a main source of linguistic diffusion and change.
Women, when marrying into Waitabu, bring with them the speech habits of their birth village (see 7.5). These linguistic habits are often transmitted to their children, i.e. by speaking either a different dialect or Standard Fijian to their children, the parental generation ceases to transmit pure Boumān. (This is not a new factor; intermarriage was an institutionalised norm prior to white contact.)

2. compulsory education. This factor is recognised by members of the Waitabu community as a main reason for loss of Boumān dialect features. As one elderly speaker stated:

Na vosa va’a-Boumā, sa mai yali ti’o. Sā yali sara va’a-levu, baleta ni ... a vuli eh. Sa la’o mai a vuli.

"The Boumān dialect is being lost. It is lost to a great extent because of schooling, eh. [Because] schooling was introduced."

[J.C. male, 50 years, Waitabu]

Education provides a destructive force for the Boumān dialect on various levels:

(a) schools provide another context for communication in Standard Fijian;

(b) by an all-Standard-Fijian curriculum, the Waitabu students are denied the opportunity of learning their Boumān dialect at school;

(c) education promotes Standard Fijian, and in doing so, casts the Boumān dialect as a less prestigious code.

Such a phenomenon is not unusual. For example, in Syria, Aramaic, immediate descendent of the language spoken by Christ, is about to die. It is being replaced by Arabic, Syria’s national language, which is taught in state-run schools (Sydney Morning Herald, January 2, 1984). Similarly, in Aboriginal Australia, education which promotes English is a major factor in the decline of various Aboriginal languages, e.g. Bavin and Shopen (1985), Schmidt (1985).

3. The church is another institution which promotes Standard Fijian forms, and not the local Boumān dialect. (See 8.1.)

4. media. None of the media forces employ the Boumān dialect. For example, the radio programs listened to in Waitabu are in Standard Fijian. Videos are in English. (These have the additional effect of creating desires, images and expectations that conflict with traditional culture.) Newspapers are in Standard Fijian and English, and books are mainly English, except for the Bible which is
written in a special style of Standard Fijian (see chapter 8). Such media promotion of Standard Fijian and English creates the impression that the Boumān dialect is a less prestigious code.

5. increased communication with other dialect regions has led to the usage and acceptance of Standard Fijian as a lingua franca. Standard Fijian is now commonly employed as code for communication in interaction with people outside the Boumā area.

6. centralisation in Suva. There is a high urbanisation trend throughout Fiji (Lodhia 1977, 1982), and many young people leave their village for education and/ employment in Suva. Due to high unemployment and pressure of kin ties, they may return to their village, bringing with them Standard Fijian and aspirations of westernisation.

While such factors are conducive to the decline of the Boumān dialect, there do exist certain forces which counteract this demise. Such forces are important in guaranteeing the maintenance of the Boumān dialect in Waitabu village, albeit a language variety marked by only a few distinguishing features, e.g. glottal stop, transitive affix -Ca’ina, and some lexical items. Forces include:

1. pride and loyalty in the Boumā region. Individuals in Waitabu take extreme pride in their Boumān origins. This is evident in both older and younger generations. Such loyalty to the Boumān region furnishes the need for a language of identity.

2. A radio program (Noda vosa “Our language/speech”) by the Fijian Dictionary Project is broadcast weekly throughout Fiji. It serves the important function of increasing awareness and esteem of the various local dialects throughout Fiji.

3. change in school policy. Up until the last decade, it was education policy to punish use of the local dialect in the classroom. Change to a more tolerant policy has reduced the stigma cast on the Boumān dialect. In the classroom today, students are no longer punished for their use of the Boumān dialect. The teacher is instructed simply to repeat the child’s speech in Standard Fijian.

In short, a complex network of factors will influence the decline or maintenance of the Boumān dialect. These include: education policy; loyalty and pride in one’s homeland; mass media; societal trends such as westernisation; and
features of social organisation such as intermarriage, etc. As these change, it is likely that language attitudes (which govern the fate of the Bouman dialect) will also alter.

7.8. SOCIAL USES OF DIALECT DIFFERENCES

7.8.1. USING THE DIALECT CONTINUUM AS A RESOURCE

In 7.4, we established a continuum with polar extremes of traditional Bouman and Standard Fijian, along which speakers were ranked according to their performances in test sentences and word lists. Results indicated that speaker placement on the continuum correlated roughly with age: older speakers tend to retain more traditional Bouman features than younger speakers. Such data, obtained through structured elicitation, represents a particular speech genre: the speaker's careful elicitation speech, his/her "best" Bouman.

In this section, I wish to observe more spontaneous speech, and investigate to what extent do speakers "control" the continuum as a resource, and to what extent are they "controlled" by it. Are speakers limited to a set place on the continuum, or do they vary their speech according to the interpretation of social circumstances?

In order to gauge the extent to which speakers "control" the continuum, I observed (and where possible recorded) the spontaneous speech of 10 of the 20 sample speakers as well as two women who married-in but did not linguistically assimilate (see 7.5.3). The 12 individuals covered a wide cross-section of Waitabu community (6 male, 6 female, with ages ranging from 10-62 years). In order to observe their speech, I accompanied each individual in his/her various daily activities for several days. I did not highlight the fact that I wished to observe language behaviour (to do so would make individuals self-conscious of their speech, and increase the likelihood that they alter their linguistic behaviour). Rather, I informed each person that I wanted to observe first hand various Waitabu customs and daily activities, thus taking attention away from their linguistic performance.

I was thus able to observe each individual in a wide range of sociolinguistic situations: church, net-fishing, netball, yaqona drinking, chatting to peers and to elders. Unfortunately, it was not always possible to record this speech: often the person I was accompanying insisted that it was not practical or appropriate to
carry a recorder on many activities, e.g. netball, church, net-fishing.\textsuperscript{14}

Also, in various situations, the observed speech was outside recording range. For example, in yaqona drinking sessions, individuals sit in circle formation, facing towards the tanoa “yaqona bowl”. So as not to draw attention to the recorder, it was necessary to place it behind my back. This position was outside the recording range of conversation within the circle.

Thus, due to such technical problems, it was not possible to record all 12 speakers in a wide range of sociolinguistic situations. I found it more practical to observe carefully, making notes and recordings where possible. Hence, the following observations are based on first-hand observation of the individual’s speech performance (and supported by recordings where they exist) rather than quantification of recorded data alone.

The following patterns emerged from the observation of the speech behaviour of the 12 individuals:

1. Certain individuals are restricted to only a small section of the continuum. They do not move along the continuum by altering the degree of Boumān/Standard Fijian features according to the particular context.

These individuals include:

(a) women marrying-in, who do not assimilate linguistically. In all observed speech over the wide range of contexts (church, peer conversation, kitchen gossip), both individuals consistently used the [k] instead of Boumān glottal stop feature. Furthermore, there was no use of any Boumān lexical or grammatical features in their entire observed speech.

This lack of Boumān features in the speech of these individuals is reflected in a sample of their speech to peers, which was recorded and quantified. The results are presented in Table 7.7. As the table shows, in this spontaneous speech, there was no (0%) occurrence of the following Boumān dialect features: glottal stop; pronoun forms; demonstratives; lexicon; and transitive suffix -Ca'ina.

Thus, these individuals appear to be restricted to a very limited section of the continuum, namely that section close to the Standard Fijian pole.

\textsuperscript{14}I did make several abortive attempts to record speech in various contexts, e.g. by wearing the recorder wrapped in a plastic bag around my neck, when net-fishing in waist-deep water. Such an exercise, however, was futile for, rather than be the passive observer, I inevitably became the centre of attention!
(b) younger speakers, with Bau Gato tendency. As indicated in 7.4, younger Waitabu speakers (10-15 years) have command of only a few traditional Boumān features: glottal stop; -Ca’ina transitive suffix; and a few lexical items, e.g. loga “mat”; ‘acu “wood”; and dai “joke”. This limited command of Boumān dialect features is reflected in younger speakers’ spontaneous speech which was observed in various sociolinguistic situations. Table 7.7 quantifies the occurrence of Boumān dialect features in spontaneous speech to peers. As the table indicates, the only Boumān dialect feature which was used in speech to peers was the salient phonological feature, glottal stop (94-100%). There was 0% use of Boumān demonstrative and pronoun forms. (Note that the transitive suffix, and the few lexical items “mat”, “wood”, “joke”, have relatively low frequency, and did not occur in the sample of recorded speech.)

In short, younger speakers and non-assimilating married women who do not command many traditional Boumān dialect features, are restricted to a very limited section of the continuum. They have a limited dialect resource/range with which to construct their speech.

2. Other speakers had greater control of the continuum as a resource. They were not restricted to set places on the continuum, but rather varied their sociolinguistic performance (i.e. moved along the continuum by varying the degree of Boumān/Standard Fijian features) according to their interpretation of sociolinguistic situations.

The important point which emerged from the observation of the speakers in a wide variety of sociolinguistic situations was that:

Speakers (all of whom had demonstrated command of Boumān features in elicitation sessions) shifted the greatest distance along the continuum towards the Standard Fijian pole in certain sociolinguistic situations and role-relationships which were associated with non-traditional Fijian activities or individuals. These situations included: netball, rugby and card games; church; and when conversing with strangers and Indians. In such contexts and role-relationships, speakers tended not to use Boumān dialect forms, but rather shift to Standard Fijian forms, including the phonological feature [k] instead of glottal stop, and Standard Fijian lexical and grammatical items.

In order to demonstrate this shift along the continuum in certain “marked” contexts and role-relationships, I will focus on the speech of four gone-yalewa “young girls”, members of a young girls’ peer group, whose ages ranged from 12 -
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>glottal stop</th>
<th>pronouns</th>
<th>demonstratives</th>
<th>lexicon</th>
<th>CA'INA affix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES female 55 yrs</td>
<td>0/61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0/19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM female 25 yrs</td>
<td>0/83</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0/10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC male 50 yrs</td>
<td>71/71</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8/10</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>9/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LN male 41 yrs</td>
<td>69/69</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6/12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL female 12 yrs</td>
<td>75/80</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0/15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN female 10 yrs</td>
<td>78/78</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0/17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22 years. This set of speakers was selected for detailed observation simply because, as a young female, I was able to interact most freely with them, sharing in daily activities and chores. It was considered socially appropriate that I mix mostly with this group of young females in work and in leisure: voluntary social groupings in Waitabu are based on the criteria of age and sex (see 2.3.5). Because of my ascribed status of young female, I was unable to interact freely with, and make detailed observation of the speech of, the all-male groups of the community, e.g. youths’ gangs. Furthermore, because I had established close ties with my female peers, it was possible to tape their speech. They were, by far, the most relaxed and indifferent to the presence of the tape recorder.

TECHNIQUE

In investigating the spontaneous speech of the four gone yalewa “young unmarried girls”, I taped conversation in various activities, e.g. netball games; church; talking to Indian merchants; kitchen gossip among themselves; and talking to village elders. The sessions involved speakers conversing in a relaxed atmosphere. Speakers were often unaware that their speech was being recorded at the time. To ensure consistency, I taped conversations on various occasions over the fieldwork period. For each of the contexts, I quantified the frequency of Boumān (cf Standard Fijian) forms for pronouns; demonstratives; transitive affix -Ca‘ina; lexicon; and the phonological feature of glottal stop. The results are presented in Table 7.8.

The following important points are indicated from the table:

1. Speech of the netball game, church, and conversations with Indians involved very low or zero frequency of Boumān dialect forms. This low frequency characterised all of the linguistic features which were quantified (pronouns 0%; demonstratives 0-5%; transitive affix -Ca‘ina 0%; lexicon 0%; glottal stop 0-10%).

2. In contrast, in other sociolinguistic situations of chatting to peers and to older members of the community, the frequency of Boumān dialect features was much higher.15 For example, pronouns 48-50%; demonstratives 33-37%; transitive affix 100%; lexicon 30-32%; glottal stop 94-96%.

In short, there is a marked contrast between the speech of netball, church

15Note that there was only slight variation in the frequency of Boumān features in the speech to peers as opposed to the speech used to elders. This indicates that these younger speakers did not switch to a more traditional Boumān dialect style when conversing with older speakers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>netball</th>
<th>church</th>
<th>talking to Indians</th>
<th>kitchen gossip with peers</th>
<th>talking to Waitabu elders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pronouns</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstratives</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-CA'INA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lexicon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glottal stop</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and conversing with Indians (characterised by low frequency of Boumān forms), and the speech used to peers and elder members of the community (characterised by much higher frequency of Boumān forms). In the three sociolinguistic situations of the netball game, the church ceremony and conversing with Indians, the four speakers used a high frequency of Standard Fijian features (e.g. \([k]\) instead of glottal stop; S.F. pronouns, demonstratives, transitive affix -Caka, and lexicon). Thus, in these situations, the speakers did not use their “full” command of Boumān (their “best” Boumān). Rather, they employed the Boumān - Standard Fijian continuum as a resource, and moved rightwards along the continuum to the Standard Fijian pole (by using a high frequency of Standard Fijian rather than Boumān features in their speech).

Speakers appeared to be aware of this switch from Boumān to Standard Fijian. I questioned 20 speakers from a wide cross-section of the community, asking if and when they used vosa va’a-Viti “Standard Fijian”, or vosa va’a-kā “speech with \([k]\) (in contrast to glottal stop of Boumān)”. All 20 speakers answered that they used vosa va’a-Viti “Standard Fijian” in games (netball, rugby, card games); in church; and when speaking to Indians and strangers whose native dialect they did not know.

In the words of one gone-yalewa in the netball peer-group when teaching me the game (linguistically and technically):

I na gauna ni qito, Aneta, e dodonu mo vosa va’akā, tauvata a gauna ni lotu. E ‘ili’ili, eh, mo vosa va’akā

“When playing netball, Aneta, it is necessary to speak pronouncing the \([k]\), just the same as in church. It’s appropriate, eh, to pronounce \([k]\).”

[F.L. female, 12 years, Waitabu]

A salient reason for the use of Standard Fijian forms in situations of the netball game, the church ceremony, and speaking to Indians, is that all activities are associated with foreign (i.e. non-Boumān) individuals or customs. All three have been introduced in the post-Western era, and regarded as strictly non-traditional, non-Boumān activities.

Having identified the netball game, the church ceremony, and conversing with Indians as distinct situations characterised by non-Boumān speech features, I will now describe the sociolinguistic performance of each in more detail. In the remainder of this chapter, I will investigate how the speaker utilises dialect distinctions in certain contexts and relationships. First, I will focus on the speech of a young girls’ netball game. Secondly, Indian Fijian -a simplified language
variety for communicating with Indians- is dealt with. In both of these domains, the speaker marks the role-relationship or context as distinct from other everyday interaction by using a non-Boumān variety of language. (The language of the church is described in detail in 8.1.) An important theme of this section is that the individual is not simply a passive entity in the dialect levelling process. Rather, speakers at Waitabu are aware of salient dialect distinctions and may use these differences to mark certain social contexts and relationships as distinct.

7.8.2. YOUNG GIRLS' NETBALL SPEECH

The netball game is a clearly-defined sociolinguistic event, with distinct markers for beginning and end, and set rules for activity in between. It is characterised by various physical and linguistic rules that govern/constrain behaviour.

In order to observe this sociolinguistic event, I joined a netball peer-group, consisting of four young girls, aged between 12-22 years. The four girls met late each afternoon, after completing their daily domestic duties, to practise netball on the village green. The games were relaxed and informal. The following observations are based on detailed observation and recording of 10 games.

The netball game is characterised by strict rules governing physical movement. For example, each player is restricted to a set area of the court, depending on her position in the game, e.g. goal keeper covers the end quarter of the court. Other rules prescribe the nature of physical movement, e.g. it is forbidden to run when holding the ball, and so on.

These strict rules governing physical behaviour are accompanied by set patterns of linguistic behaviour. The following features characterise netball speech:

1. short length of utterances. The average length of utterances in seven observed games was three syllables. Most utterances consisted of single words and phrases, rather than complete clauses (with NP and VP).

2. direct imperatives and declarative statements. The bulk of utterances were of three types:

   (a) direct imperatives, e.g.
   
   !lako!
   
   go
   
   "start play!"
(b) declarative statements, e.g.

```
out!
"[ball is] out!"
```

curu
```
enter
"[ball has] entered [goal ring]", i.e. goal scored.
```

(c) vocatives. (The ball-holder's name is called, in order to get her attention.)

3. lack of politeness markers. There was 0% occurrence of the linguistic markers of respect and politeness described in 4.3, e.g. mada "please"; yalo vina’a "if you would be so kind". Instead of off-record requests, on-record commands (such as mai "here! [Throw me the ball here]"") were common.

4. restricted range of topics. All utterances referred directly to the netball game itself. There was no reference to other topics outside this sociolinguistic event.

5. lexicon -high frequency of English terms. There are various ways in which a lexicon accommodates new concepts and items of a foreign culture. These include: extension of old meanings; coining new words using the original language base; use of loan words; and lexical substitution of the foreign word, without assimilation to the native sound system. Of these four devices, lexical substitution is by far the most common in the netball game, followed by loan words:

(a) lexical substitution (i.e. use of English forms without assimilating them to the Fijian phonological system), is frequently used for technical netball terms and numbers. (It is a netball convention that scores be called in English numerals, e.g. "two - one to Waitabu"). Items exemplifying such lexical substitution include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fijian</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>obstruction</td>
<td>dragging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goal shooter</td>
<td>contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wing attack</td>
<td>free pass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such use of lexical substitution is significant in that it demonstrates speakers' command of the English phonological system.

(b) loan words, i.e. English words which have been assimilated to the Fijian sound system, include terms such as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fijian</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wini</td>
<td>&quot;win&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lusi</td>
<td>&quot;lose&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pola</td>
<td>&quot;ball&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that in the above examples, the English forms are adapted to the Fijian
phonotactic structure by the addition of a word-final vowel. (In Fijian, all words are vowel-final. A detailed discussion of Fijian loan words and patterns of phonological assimilation is provided by Schütz (1978).)

6. **Standard Fijian grammatical items.** As Table 7.8 (in section 7.8.1) indicates, Boumān grammatical features (pronoun and demonstrative forms) are rarely used in netball speech. Rather, there is a high frequency of Standard Fijian grammatical items. For example, a common catch-phrase when claiming the ball was:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{oqō} & \quad \text{noqu} \\
\text{this} & \quad 1sg.POSS \\
\text{"This [ball] is mine"}
\end{align*}
\]

Both items (demonstrative oqō "this" and pronoun noqu "1sg.POSS") are Standard Fijian forms. Speakers claimed that use of the Bouman equivalent yai qou was not 'ili'ili "appropriate".

7. **use of [k] instead of glottal stop.** The most salient feature of netball speech is the use of [k], instead of glottal stop. Speakers are conscious of the switch to [k] in the domain of the netball game, and regard it as the most suitable code for this domain:

\[\text{'eimami sega ni va'ayagata'ina a vosa va'a-Boumā dina i na gauna ni qito. Sega. 'eimami vosa va'a-kā} \]

"We don't use the Boumān dialect when playing [netball]. No, we speak with [k] [instead of glottal stop]."

[F.L. female, 12 years, Waitabu]

In short, the netball game is a "marked" sociolinguistic situation. It is characterised by specialised rules which distinguish it from neutral everyday behaviour. These specialised rules and norms demand special physical, spatial and linguistic behaviour, which marks the sociolinguistic activity as distinct. Linguistically, netball speech is characterised by a high frequency of English lexicon, and Standard Fijian features such as [k] instead of glottal stop, and Standard Fijian grammatical items. Speakers are aware of this code switch. They thus utilise dialect differences in order to mark the netball game as distinct from other everyday interaction.
Another domain where Waitabu speakers drop Boumān dialect features is in interaction with Indians. The role-relationship between the Indian and the Waitabu villager is characterised by a special speech style called vosa va'a-idia va'a-viti "Indian Fijian".

Although there are approximately 1,800 Indians on Taveuni island, interaction between these individuals and Waitabu villagers is limited to economic transactions. (As mentioned in 2.1.2, Indians in Fiji are prominent in business activity.) The nearest Indian settlement to Waitabu village is at Waibula, some four miles to the north. Indians from Waibula run a delivery service almost daily to Waitabu, to sell items such as food, soap and cigarettes. This is the main interaction with Indians. Although surface relations in these economic transactions appear smooth, there is evidence of deep-seated tension between the two groups. Waitabu villagers often criticise the entrepreneurial activities of the Indians, who are commonly referred to as mata ilavo "money face". A common Waitabu catch-phrase is: 'ai idia vina'a, 'ai idia mate va'adua "a good Indian is a dead Indian". In short, Waitabu villagers and Indians form two mutually exclusive groups, whose interaction is restricted to monetary transaction.

The speech style which characterises this role-relationship differs markedly from the speech of everyday interaction used within Waitabu village. Distinguishing features of Pidgin Fijian are:

1. **use of [k] instead of glottal stop**

   \[
   \begin{array}{llll}
   \text{PIDGIN FIFI} & \text{ko} & \text{iko} & \text{lako} & \text{ki} \\
   \text{BOUMĀN} & o & i'o & sā & la'o & i \\
   \end{array}
   \]

   vei

   vei

   where

   "Where are you going?"

2. **use of Standard Fijian grammatical and lexical items**

   (a) nominal article na, (instead of Boumān form a), e.g.

   \[
   \begin{array}{l}
   \text{solia mai na kā oqō na isulu} \\
   \text{give here ART thing this ART clothes} \\
   \text{"Give me that dress"}
   \end{array}
   \]
(b) demonstrative qo/oqo\textsuperscript{16} (instead of Boumān form yai):

\begin{verbatim}
na kā qō
\end{verbatim}

\textit{ART thing this}

"this thing"

(c) transitive suffix -Caka (instead of Boumān form -Ca'ina):

\begin{verbatim}
yaga-taka qō
\end{verbatim}

\textit{use-TRANS this}

"Use this!"

(d) lexical items, e.g. use of S.F. form ibe, instead of Boumān form loga:

\begin{verbatim}
solia mai na ibe (*loga)
give here ART mat
\end{verbatim}

"Show me the mat!"

3. Simplification of the Fijian grammatical structure is also evident. Often grammatical particles are deleted. For example, the marker of a fronted peripheral NP ('ina), preposition (ni), and the subject pronoun (o) are often omitted:

BOUMĀN

\begin{verbatim}
ni naica o na la'o mai 'ina
\end{verbatim}

\textit{PREP when 2sg FUT go here MKR}

"When will you come here?"

PIDGIN FIJIAN

\begin{verbatim}
naica lako mai
\end{verbatim}

\textit{when go here}

"When will you come here"

Similarly, in the example below, the aspect marker ti'o is deleted, leaving only basic lexical items. Word order becomes set, with the subject NP in sentence-initial position:

BOUMĀN

\begin{verbatim}
e ca'aca'a ti'o o Jone
\end{verbatim}

\textit{3sg work ASP ART John}

"John is working"

\textsuperscript{16}qo is the spoken Colloquial Fijian form, while oqo is the written Standard Fijian equivalent. Both forms are used in Indian Fijian.
PIDGIN FIJIAN

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Jone cakacaka} & \quad \text{John work} \\
\text{"John is working"}
\end{align*}
\]

Simplification is also evident in the generalisation of via, as a single term meaning "want". In Boumān and Standard Fijian dialects, there are two separate terms:

(a) via is a pre-head predicate modifier:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{au} & \quad \text{via} & \quad \text{la’o} \\
\text{1sg} & \quad \text{want} & \quad \text{go} \\
\text{"I want to go"}
\end{align*}
\]

(b) vina’ata is a verb, which can be followed by a noun phrase:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{au} & \quad \text{vina’ata} & \quad \text{a} & \quad \text{niu} \\
\text{1sg} & \quad \text{want} & \quad \text{ART} & \quad \text{coconut} \\
\text{"I want a coconut"}
\end{align*}
\]

or by a ni or me clause:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{au} & \quad \text{vina’ata} & \quad \left\{ \text{me-u} \right\} & \quad \text{la’o} & \quad \left\{ \text{ni-u} \right\} \\
\text{1sg} & \quad \text{want} & \quad \text{COMP-1sg} & \quad \text{go} \\
\text{"I want to go"}
\end{align*}
\]

In Pidgin Fijian, this grammatical difference is collapsed and the single term via is used in all environments:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{au} & \quad \text{via} & \quad \text{voli} \\
\text{1sg} & \quad \text{want} & \quad \text{buy} \\
\text{"I want to buy [something]"}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{au} & \quad \text{via} & \quad \text{niu} \\
\text{1sg} & \quad \text{want} & \quad \text{coconut} \\
\text{"I want a coconut"}
\end{align*}
\]

These are the most common features of Pidgin Fijian as used in Waitabu. Further and more detailed observation of Pidgin Fijian is given by Geraghty (1978), Moag (1978b), and Siegel (1983).

Waitabu speakers are well aware of the linguistic switch made when speaking to Indians. They recognise it as a unique linguistic code, simplified to suit the Fijian ability of non-native speakers. In the words of one young Waitabu speaker:
When I speak to an Indian, they [Indians] know a type of Fijian speech, [but] it isn’t Bau dialect, it isn’t Bouman dialect or Standard Fijian. It is simplified because [Fijian] is difficult for them. They don’t know [the Fijian language] very well.

In short, Waitabu villagers mark their role-relationship with Indians as distinct from other interaction within the community by using a special linguistic variety, Pidgin Fijian. Due to their interpretation of the Indians’ limited competence in the Fijian language, Waitabu speakers modify their speech in two important ways:

1. radically simplifying the structure, by omitting complex grammatical particles, and rigidifying word order;

2. use of Standard Fijian features, including grammatical and lexical features, and the phonological feature [k] instead of glottal stop.

7.9. SUMMARY

The Waitabu sociolinguistic community is undergoing a process of dialect levelling, as the Standard Fijian dialect, the lingua franca of the Fijian archipelago, gradually infiltrates and replaces traditional Bouman dialect items.

The process of dialect levelling is graphically illustrated in Figure 7.8. As the figure shows, the Bouman dialect is becoming more diluted with each generation. “Traditional Bouman” is the purest form of dialect spoken by males (and some locally-born females) of the older generation. This language variety is gradually diluted with each generation of women marrying-in from outside the Bouma region. Intrusion of Standard Fijian is another major factor in this linguistic change. It is promoted by forces such as education, religion and the mass media. The language variety which results from the dialect levelling process is Bau Gato (Standard Fijian pronounced with a glottal stop). Through retention of this single salient phonological feature, the Bouman speech (which manifests identity with the Bouma region) is still marked as distinct from Standard Fijian. This Waitabu data demonstrates the sociolinguistic principle of “economy of distinctions”:

In a contact situation where an indigenous language variety is being
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infiltrated by a more prestigious language variety, speakers of the indigenous code will maintain a reduced number of distinguishing features, if they wish to mark their language as distinct from the replacing language.

The Boumān linguistic change involves certain phenomena common to language/dialect contact situations, e.g. ironing out of irregularities (irregular kinship terms are analogised on the pattern of regular forms, and thus altered to the productive pattern); intrusion of grammatical and lexical forms from the dominant replacing dialect.

There is considerable variation in the tendency of Boumān linguistic features to change. Certain features appear resilient to change (e.g. the salient phonological feature of glottal stop, the transitive affix form -Ca’ina, and a few lexical items). Many of the Boumān dialect features showed a gradual weakening among younger speakers (e.g. peripheral and core lexical items, pronouns, nominal article form [a], possessive marker wei, and demonstratives. Demonstrative forms show evidence of intrusion from the Cakaudrove dialect, as well as Standard Fijian). Other Boumān forms (e.g. negative marker cau, certain possessive pronouns, and some lexical items) appear to have been lost completely.

Waitabu speakers are not passive entities in this dialect levelling process. Rather, individuals are aware of salient dialect distinctions, and use these differences to mark certain sociolinguistic contexts and role-relationships as distinct. For example, the netball game and interaction with Indians are two domains which speakers mark as distinct from other everyday neutral interaction by using a non-Boumān variety of language.

In other words, many individuals are not restricted to set places on the Boumān - Standard Fijian continuum. Rather, they vary their sociolinguistic performance (i.e. move along the continuum) according to their interpretation of sociolinguistic situations. Evidence indicates that speakers shift towards the Standard Fijian pole in certain situations associated with non-Boumān individuals and activities.
Chapter 8

CHURCH & SCHOOL

So far in this thesis I have described various modes of linguistic behaviour which constitute the linguistic repertoire of Waitabu speakers. This chapter focuses on another integral component of that repertoire, namely the established patterns of verbal behaviour associated with institutionalised modes of communication in Waitabu society - religion and education.

The church and the school are two western institutions which have had a major influence on the sociolinguistic community of Waitabu, by acting as catalysts for the dialect levelling phenomenon, providing two new sociolinguistic contexts which require distinct modes of sociolinguistic behaviour, and introducing a set of non-traditional values and aspirations. In this chapter, I will focus on these two sociolinguistic domains, and the modes of linguistic behaviour associated with each.

8.1. THE CHURCH

The first missionaries arrived in the Lau group of the Fiji islands in 1835.1 The introduction of Christianity had widespread effects on Fijian society. For example, practices such as cannibalism and constant warfare were eradicated. The Fijian people were provided with a new strict moral code that governed dress and social behaviour. For description of the effect of Christianity on Fijian society, see Derrick (1946) and Routledge (1985).

On the sociolinguistic level, Christianity was to have an important impact on language use. The Christian missionaries gave the Fijian people literacy. (A detailed discussion of the widespread effects of literacy on Fijian society is given by Clammer 1976.) Furthermore, the church provided a new variety of the Fijian language - Old High Fijian. This language variety eventually became the literary

---

1 The first European missionaries who arrived in Fiji on October 12, 1835, were Wesleyan. Roman Catholic missionaries appeared later, in 1844. In the race to win converts, Wesleyan and Catholic missionaries became, to the confusion of the Fijians, engaged in a bitter religious war (Geraghty 1984:38). In Fiji today, 219,937 individuals are Wesleyan; 49,826 are Catholic; 9,370 are Seventh-day Adventist; 7,188 Assembly of God; 5,756 Anglican; and 619 Presbyterian. (Fiji Handbook 1980:115)
The aim of this section is to describe the language of the church. First, I will outline the religious scenario in contemporary Waitabu—namely, the co-existence of Catholicism and traditional religion. Secondly, I will outline different linguistic varieties within the domain of the church: the language of the Bible; sermons and spontaneous prayers; and standard prayers. And thirdly, linguistic features of Old High Fijian are described.

8.1.1. CO-EXISTENCE OF TWO RELIGIOUS TRADITIONS

In contemporary Waitabu, Christianity and the traditional Fijian religion co-exist. Traditional religion involves belief in the invisible supernatural power of spirit gods of a cosmological nature, as well as spirits of dead ancestors and other kinsmen. These spirits are regarded as having the power to cause good and bad, life and death. It is believed that they watch over, guide and control people's activities and all other earthly things. (Detailed description of traditional Fijian religion is given in Brewster (1922:88-97, 209-235, 249-260); Williams (1858:chapter 6); Ravuvu (1983:chapter 4).)

However, belief in the traditional Fijian spirits (which the Christian missionaries cast as satanic) is not openly admitted. As Ravuvu (1983:93) states:

Although today no Fijian will publicly profess to be a follower of the traditional Fijian religion, there are still clear traces of belief in the supernatural beings ... Traditional beliefs in the power of the ancestral gods and other supernatural spirits to affect things are still used in private and in public.

Despite the lack of verbal acknowledgement, underlying belief in the traditional spirit world is manifested in various aspects of social behaviour in Waitabu. For example, it is forbidden to sit or stand in the doorway of a Fijian house, for this is believed to be the home of the traditional spirit which protects the house and its members. Lamps are kept burning throughout the night in each house to ward away evil spirits. Also, illness and displays of outrage or bad temper are attributed to the individual being possessed by evil spirits.

The contrasting traditional Fijian and Christian religions form a secretive/private vs public dichotomy: in contrast to the traditional Fijian religion, the Christian faith is much more publicly acknowledged. Waitabu village appears to be, (on surface impression), a model for the conversion of a community to
Roman Catholicism. Church services are held twice-daily. At six o'clock each morning and night, the wooden drum (lali) calls people to worship using a one-time war beat. There is no church building in Waitabu (due mainly to lack of finance), and services are held in a different village house each day in rotation. In the church services, individuals sit cross-legged on the floor, heads bowed. Seating is segregated: males sit toward the higher section of the house; females and children (as subordinates) sit apart, towards the lower end. Grace is said before every meal, and prayers are offered before and after most daily activities, e.g. fishing, trips to the gardens.

Clammer (1976:101-130) details the process of acceptance of Christianity in Fiji, and consequent social change. Tippet (1980) describes how the Christian religion has been adapted/"contextualized" to the Fijian way of life. He also highlights how aspects of traditional Fijian religion and society were congruous with, and thus conducive to, the adoption of Christianity.

In the following, I will describe the language of the Christian church, as used in Waitabu. Due to the clandestine nature of traditional spiritual worship in contemporary Waitabu, I was unable to investigate the language of traditional Fijian religion. Only one individual was willing to acknowledge his use of traditional spirit worship, and that only at a time in the past. In this context, he claimed to have used the Bouman dialect. I had no access or permission to observe this speech domain.

8.1.2. LANGUAGE VARIETIES WITHIN THE CHURCH DOMAIN

There are three basic language varieties used in the church domain - the language of: 1. the Bible; 2. standard prayers; 3. spontaneous sermons and prayers.

1. The Bible, the first literary work in Fijian, contains the most concentrated form of Old High Fijian features. Many of the distinguishing features of Old High Fijian result from the idiosyncratic translations of early missionaries. As Geraghty (1984:35) states:

What had become literary Fijian was, quite simply, Fijian as the missionaries spoke it; and they seem to have spoken it rather poorly, for a number of reasons. Paramount among these is that they were under pressure, both from their supervisors and from Fijian converts, to learn the language and produce translations quickly. John Hunt, the translator

---

2This term was, I believe, coined by Geraghty (1984). It refers to the speech variety created by early missionary-translators, which became associated with the Church. Old High Fijian has now developed into the literary standard.
of the New Testament, "was able to preach at Rewa five weeks after landing there ...after one year, he had translated Luke and twelve chapters of Exodus" (Wood 1978:88). This most unseemly haste -the whole New Testament was completed by 1847- was not conducive to quality ...

In this way, original translation "mistakes" became fossilised in print. The Fijian populace appear not to have questioned, nor recognised, the missionaries' idiosyncratic\(^3\) use of the Fijian language as "incorrect". This lack of corrective mechanism may be attributed, in part, to the exalted position of the Church\(^4\).

In true Fijian hierarchial tradition, the word of power and authority was accepted as truth, and not questioned on any level:

The missionaries' Fijian became accepted as the model variety in those domains associated with them -church, education and literature. Illustrative of the admiration with which it was viewed until recently is the story of the revised (1902) translation of the Bible, which is still in use today. Much of the work was done in England, during the translator's retirement, and the result, not surprisingly, was what is probably the most inaccurate and unidiomatic Fijian translation of anything currently in print.

[Geraghty 1984:36]

Features of Old High Fijian (based on the missionaries' translation of the Bible) are described in 8.1.3. For discussion of problems associated with Bible translation, see Nida (1964).

2. **standard prayers.** In each Fijian Catholic church service, there is a standard set of prayers. These prayers contain Old High Fijian features, but not of the same high frequency as the Bible. Like the language of the Bible, these prayers are characterised by use of the phonological feature \([k]\), rather than the glottal stop of the Boumān dialect. Waitabu villagers are adamant that standard prayers be pronounced with \([k]\) and not the glottal stop of the local dialect. For example, when learning to say the Fijian Catholic grace, I pronounced glottal stop rather than \([k]\), in an effort to assimilate to the local speech style. This use of glottal stop was immediately corrected. It was later explained that use of glottal stop in formal prayer to the Lord was rogō ca “bad sounding”.

\(^3\)There is considerable variation in the styles of Bible translators. For example, if a certain Old High Fijian feature was favoured by a translator (e.g. se/sē aspect collapse) that feature occurs with high frequency in that particular section of the Bible.

\(^4\)An associated factor in the acceptance of missionary speech is the Fijian social norm of avoiding face-to-face conflict and contradiction. This sociolinguistic characteristic is still evident in contemporary Waitabu. For example, in the course of learning Fijian in Waitabu, I noticed that certain villagers would repeat my grammatical errors (in order to avoid my embarrassment by drawing attention to the mistake), rather than correct my speech. Further evidence of the "be-nice-to-the-speaker" norm is described in 4.5.3.
Standard prayers are learnt by heart in childhood years, through daily exposure in church services. The complete list of standard prayers is available in printed form in Nai Vola ni Masu “The Book of Prayer”.

3. **sermons and spontaneous prayer.** Weekly sermons and daily spontaneous prayers are impromptu and are often spoken in the Boumān dialect, for this is the language variety in which the speaker (both catechist and villager) is most comfortable. Some features of Old High Fijian (e.g. fossilised phrases/idioms from the Bible, see 8.1.3) do occur in sermons and spontaneous prayer, but only occasionally.

I will now describe in detail the features of Old High Fijian. This description is based on the language of the Bible, the book of prayer, and six church services recorded in Waitabu.

**8.1.3. FEATURES OF OLD HIGH FIJIAN**

Old High Fijian differs from Colloquial Fijian⁵ and the Boumān dialect in the following features:

1. **use of low back vowel** [a]. The pronunciation of Catholic priests and catechists (Fijian and European) is characterised by the low back vowel [a] (close to cardinal 5) articulated with the tongue far back in the mouth. This contrasts with the equivalent low vowel [ʌ] (close to cardinal 4) of Colloquial Fijian and Boumān, which is more central. The low back vowel [a] appears to be a salient characteristic of church pronunciation. For example, on several occasions, I witnessed Waitabu children (aged 4-9 years) playing “church”. (This involved imitating the church leader giving his sermon.) The children’s imitation was punctuated by pronunciation of the far back, low vowel [a], thus indicating the salience of this feature.

Paul Geraghty (p.c.) reports that intonation is another phonological feature of Old High Fijian. Geraghty observes that the intonation pattern of Bible reading and sentences is often distinct from that of everyday speech, and is based on the intonation of European/Australian priests and missionaries. To my knowledge, a study of intonation in everyday Fijian or church language has not yet been made.

---

⁵At this stage, it is necessary to distinguish between “Colloquial Fijian”: informal spoken Fijian, and “Standard Fijian”: formal Fijian used in political speeches etc. For purposes of comparison with Old High Fijian, we will use Colloquial Fijian. Standard Fijian, the more formal code, is strongly influenced by Old High Fijian, and thus is unsuitable for comparative purposes.
2. reanalysis of aspect marker [sa] as a verb marker. In Old High Fijian there is a tendency to excessively use the form sa, placing it before almost every verb (i.e. as a verb marker), and not in its usual function as a marker of aspect. In Colloquial Fijian, there are two aspectual forms se and sa (Arms 1978). Although similar in form, the two particles have distinct aspectual meaning:

sā "now, at the present time"

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{e sā levu na ibe} \\
&\text{ASP many ART mat} \\
&\text{"There are now many mats"}
\end{align*}
\]

se "as yet, still, continuation of present state"

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{e se levu na ibe} \\
&\text{ASP many ART mat} \\
&\text{"There are still many mats"}
\end{align*}
\]

The early Bible translators erred two-fold in their analysis of these aspect markers:

(a) they collapsed the two particles under a single form sa;

(b) they failed to recognise either aspectual meaning of sā and sa/se, and mistranslated sa as a verb marker. Consequently, in Bible translation, there is a strong tendency to use sa productively before the verb, e.g.

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{ia ni ra sa curu ki vale} \\
&\text{CONJ when 3pl ASP enter PREP house} \\
&\text{"And when they were come into the house,"}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{era sa raica na gone lailai} \\
&\text{3pl ASP see ART child small} \\
&\text{"they saw the young child."}
\end{align*}
\]


This differs from Colloquial Fijian, where the two particles occur only to mark a subtle aspectual distinction, e.g.

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{\footnotesize 6 This is also a feature of "foreigner" Fijian. Foreign language learners, like the missionaries, often have difficulty mastering the subtle aspectual distinction, and interpret the sa form as having a more general function of verb marker. For description of "foreigner talk", see Geraghty (1978).}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{\footnotesize 7 In the Bouman dialect, the forms differ slightly: se of Standard Fijian is pronounced as sa. Thus, the two aspect markers are distinguished only by vowel length: sa vs sā.}
\end{align*}
\]
A detailed description of the se/sā confusion and its history is provided by Arms (1978). For example, Arms (1978:1245) reports that the collapsing of sā and se under a single form sa was further supported by the prominent politician, Sir Ratu Sukuna. Sukuna claimed that se was an aberration which should be replaced by the "proper" form sa. His word had profound influence on both spoken and written Fijian. For example, to this day, Fijian newspapers edit out se aspect markers, and substitute sa.

A similar decision which served to perpetuate the collapsing of sā and se was made by the Roman Catholic church in the 1970's. It was decided that sa should be the standard form (thus replacing se) in all Roman Catholic literature, and that all se forms which had previously escaped editing in the Bible and other church literature should be weeded out (Arms p.c.).

Thus, the form se rarely occurs in written Fijian (Bible or newspaper). The infrequent sighting of se in Fijian literature may be attributed to oversight of the editorial eye.

3. obligatory marking of past tense. In Bible Fijian, past tense is obligatorily marked by the pre-verb particle a. In Standard and Colloquial Fijian and Boumān, past tense marking is not compulsory, especially in narratives where the past context is established at the beginning of the text, making use of past tense markers later in the narrative redundant.

As a result of Bible translation using a as obligatory past tense marker, and sa as obligatory verb marker, it is a common feature of Bible language that many sentences begin with a sa. For example:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{A} & \quad \text{sa} & \quad \text{qase} & \quad \text{mai} & \quad \text{ko} & \quad \text{Eparaama} \\
\text{PAST} & \quad \text{old} & \quad \text{PART} & \quad \text{ART} & \quad \text{Abraham} \\
\text{"And Abraham was old,"} \\
\text{sa} & \quad \text{vuqa} & \quad \text{na} & \quad \text{nona} & \quad \text{yabaki} \\
\text{ASP} & \quad \text{many} & \quad \text{ART} & \quad \text{3sg.POSS} & \quad \text{year} \\
\text{"and well stricken with age:"
}\end{align*}
\]
4. **Wrong Order of Grammatical Elements.** The Fijian language is characterised by a rich range of grammatical elements which occur in almost set order in noun and verb phrases (see Arms 1984). In the language of the Bible and standard prayers, the grammatical elements are often placed in wrong order. For example, in the standard prayer below, the demonstrative oqō "this", is incorrectly placed before tale gā "also". (In Standard Fijian, the demonstrative occurs at the end of a NP.) For example,

**Standard Fijian**

```
na i-tiko-tiko tale gā oqō
ART NOM-stay-REDUP also INTENS this
```

This wrong ordering is possibly due to analogy with the quantifier floating phenomenon in English. In English, the term "also" does not have fixed position: "also this house" cf "this house also".

5. **Unskilled Use and Omission of Grammatical Elements.** The use of many grammatical elements in Fijian is complex (see Arms 1984a, Schütz 1986), with many forms bearing nuances difficult for the non-native speaker to grasp. Missionary translators dealt with this problem by omitting many grammatical elements from their translation into Fijian. Thus, native Fijian speakers describe church Fijian as "bare", i.e. using only those items which convey salient semantic information.
The "bare" nature of Church Fijian was recognised by Hazlewood (1850:60-61), who exemplifies the contrast between Old High Fijian, and Fijian as spoken by a native speaker. (The grammatical items which were omitted from the Bible translation are underlined. Interlinear glosses are supplied by the author of this thesis.)

*Native speaker amendment*

**Bible translation**

A cava na ka ena caka e na vukuna na tamata sa mokuta na kai Filisitia oqo

**Native speaker amendment**

{a cava dina sara mada gona na ART what really very POL DEM ART}

{ka ena caka thing FUT do}

"What shall be done to the man,"

{ni na mani mokuti la na COMP FUT then hit SPEC ART}

{kai Filisitia ko lana source Philistine ART ?}

"that killeth this Philistine?"

[Old Testament, I Samuel 17:26]

Unfortunately, as a non-native speaker of Fijian, with limited experience and exposure to the language (about one year), I have not yet mastered the nuances of many Fijian particles, and thus am unqualified to comment further on their use or misuse in Church Fijian.

6. **fossilisation.** In Old High Fijian, certain separate grammatical items are interpreted as fossilised units:

(a) *kece ga* "all". In Standard and Colloquial Fijian, the form *kece* "all" (equivalent to *tauco'o* in Bouman) can occur alone, or it may co-occur in the same predicate with (but not necessarily contiguous with) the intensifier *ga*. In Bible Fijian, the two forms are analysed as a single item *kecega* "all". This fossilised form is used productively in the Bible, and has become a stylistic feature of Church Fijian, especially sermons:
A possible explanation for the analysis of kecega as a single item is that it has been analogised with tale+gā "also". In Colloquial Fijian, the form tale "also" and gā (intensifier) do co-occur relatively frequently. Early missionary translators thus analysed talegā as a single item:

\[
\begin{align*}
sa & \text{ kaya } talegā & ko & kojā \\
& ASP & say & also & ART & 3sg
\end{align*}
\]

"And he said [also]..."

[New Testament, Mark 4:26]

The analysis of kecega "all" as a single item appears to be in analogy with the form talegā "also", which is common in Colloquial Fijian.

(b) ki vei. In Old High Fijian, kivei is frequently used as an allative marker "to", before pronouns and proper nouns (Geraghty 1976). In Colloquial Fijian, Standard Fijian and the Boumān dialect, the combination ki vei does not mark allative. Vei alone is used as allative marker for pronouns and proper nouns:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{keimāmā } lako & \text{ vei } Filo/ira \\
1EXC.pl & \text{ go } PREP & Filo/3pl
\end{align*}
\]

"We went to Filo/them"

i is the allative marker for common nouns. (ki is the Lau dialect equivalent.)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{keimāmā } lako & \text{ i } \text{ na } sitoa \\
1EXC.pl & \text{ go } PREP & ART & store
\end{align*}
\]

"We went to the store"

It is possible that use of kivei as an allative marker is a Lau dialect influence. (Recall from 8.1.1 that the earliest missionaries to Fiji first came to the Lau group of islands, and the Lau dialects provided their first exposure to the Fijian language. It is not surprising, therefore, that Lau dialects strongly influenced the early missionaries' Bible translations.) In Lauan\(^8\), the ki vei sequence is a directional preposition, used before pronouns and proper nouns, meaning "to":

\(^8\)All Lauan data and examples were provided by Paul Geraghty (p.c.).
It is plausible that many missionary translators adopted the Lau dialect form kivei as allative marker thus:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ko } & \text{lako } \text{ mai kivei au} \\
\text{2sg } & \text{go } \text{ here PREP 1sg} \\
\end{align*}
\]

"You come here to me!"

(Book of Prayer, "Morning Prayer" p.3.)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ia } & \text{ ni ratou sa lako kivei} \\
\text{CONJ } & \text{ when 3pa ASP go PREP} \\
\text{Reuel} \\
\text{NAME} \\
\text{"And when they came to Reuel"} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(Old Testament, Exodus 2:18)

\[
\begin{align*}
o & \text{ iratou na tagane na luve i} \\
\text{ART 3pa ART men ART child POSS} \\
\text{Mirari maivei Jeesala} \\
\text{Merari PREP Jaziah} \\
\text{"The sons of Merari by Jaaziah"} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(Old Testament, I Chronicles 24:27)

(See also the use of mai vei in the pseudo-passive construction, later in this section.)

Mai vei does not occur as an ablative marker in Colloquial Fijian or Boumān. Its occurrence in Standard Fijian may be attributed to Old High Fijian influence. In Colloquial Fijian and Boumān, the ablative marker for common nouns is mai:

\[
\begin{align*}
e & \text{ "Return again here"} \\
\text{3sg PAST return again here ART beach} \\
\end{align*}
\]

1In Colloquial Fijian and Boumān, the form mai vei occurs only where mai is a post-verbal particle, and so here we are not dealing with a preposition mai vei, but with the post-verbal particle mai, followed by the preposition vei.
Veib is the direction marker used for pronouns and proper nouns, e.g.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>loloma</th>
<th>vei</th>
<th>keirau</th>
<th>ruarua</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>love</td>
<td>PREP</td>
<td>1EXC.dual</td>
<td>both</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Love from us both"

A possible explanation for the use of maivei in Old High Fijian is analogy with kivei, the Old High Fijian allative form described above\(^{10}\). In other words, in analogy with the Old High Fijian allative marker kivei, early missionary translators combined the two separate ablative markers, mai and vei, to get maivei. Like the allative kivei, the ablative/source maivei was used as a preposition before proper nouns and pronouns: \(^{11}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e dua na</th>
<th>yalewa</th>
<th>duasusu</th>
<th>gone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3sg</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>ART</td>
<td>female nurse child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maivei</td>
<td>iRA</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>yalewa Iperu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREP</td>
<td>3pl</td>
<td>ART</td>
<td>female Hebrew</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"a nurse of the Hebrew women"


Such use of maivei was supported by the fact that in Colloquial Fijian, the idiosyncratic form maivei does occur in question greetings (see 4.4.1), with the meaning "direction from". For example,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lesu</th>
<th>mai vei</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>return</td>
<td>PREP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Where have you come from?"

The orthography of Old High Fijian (in Bible and standard prayers) supports the claim that kecega "all", talega "also", maivei "by/from", kivei "to", are interpreted as single items. In all cases, the particle combinations are written as single units. For further description of Fijian prepositions, and the development of the forms maivei and kivei in literary style, see Geraghty (1976).

7. coordinator ka "and". Ka "and" is a feature of Old High Fijian. For example,

---

\(^{10}\)Unlike kivei, the form maivei does not occur in the Lauan dialect (Paul Geraghty p.c.).

\(^{11}\)In Old High Fijian and Standard Fijian, the preposition forms maivei and kivei combine with the 3rd singular pronoun form koya to get maivua "from him/her", and kivua "to him/her". This is based on analogy with the Colloquial Fijian morphological combination: vei + koya - vua. The terms maivua and kivua do not occur in Colloquial Fijian.
In Bible Fijian, the form ka “and” also occurs in sentence-initial position, possibly due to literal translation from English:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ka } & \text{ raica, sa kau mai vua} \\
\text{CONJ } & \text{ see ASP bring PART to-3sg} \\
& \text{e dua na tamata} \\
& \text{3sg one ART man}
\end{align*}
\]

“And, behold, they brought to him a man”

[New Testament, Matthew 9:2]

In Colloquial Fijian and Boumān, there is no coordinator ka. Instead, the common clause linkage devices are juxtaposition, or use of coordinator qai “then”. For example,

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{e } \tilde{a} \text{ lako mai qai kana} \\
& \text{3sg PAST go here then eat}
\end{align*}
\]

“He came and then ate”

The Old High Fijian use of ka as a clause coordinator is most likely a Lau dialect influence\(^\text{12}\). Note the following example of everyday Lau dialect usage:

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{ko unu } \tilde{t} \text{ oti ka ko qai lako} \\
& \text{2sg drink tea finish and 2sg then go}
\end{align*}
\]

“You finish breakfast and then go”

The ka “and” coordinator, which was originally introduced into literary Fijian through Bible translation, has now become a distinctive feature of written Fijian, and frequently occurs in newspaper language. A well-entrenched example of the use of ka is the Fijian coat of arms:

\[\text{[Old Testament, Genesis 28:16]}\]
rerevaka na kalou ka doka na
fear ART god and respect ART
tui
chief
"Fear God and honour the king"

8. [k]-initial grammatical items. In Old High Fijian, certain grammatical elements have an initial [k] that does not occur in Standard Fijian, Colloquial Fijian, Bau or Bouman dialects. It is likely that this feature is due to influence from the Lau dialect. The grammatical elements which have initial [k] are:

(a) ki preposition "to". The corresponding form in Standard Fijian, Colloquial Fijian, and Bouman is i. For example,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O.H.F.</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>sa</th>
<th>kaya</th>
<th>vua</th>
<th>ko</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.F.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Where are [you] going?"

(b) ko article before proper names and pronouns. This form occurs in Old High Fijian and Lau dialects. The corresponding form in Colloquial Fijian and Standard Fijian, Bau and Bouman dialects is o. For example,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O.H.F.</th>
<th>ia</th>
<th>ko</th>
<th>iko</th>
<th>Solomoni</th>
<th>na</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.F.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Solomon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"And Jesus said unto him"

[New Testament, Mark 10:18]

(c) koi article for pronouns. In Old High Fijian, another form koi is used in variation with ko, for pronouns (but not proper nouns). For example,
This article koi does not occur in Lau, Boumān, Bau, Standard Fijian or Colloquial Fijian. (As mentioned, in Lau the proper noun article is ko. In Standard Fijian, Colloquial Fijian, Bau and Boumān, it is o), i.e.

C.F./S.F. LAU O.H.F.

1pl.EXC.CARD. o keimami ko keimami koi keimami

2pl.CARD. o kemunī ko kemunū koi kemuni

The use of koi in Old High Fijian may be attributed to misanalysis of the Lau dialect pronoun forms by early missionary linguists. The misanalysis may have developed by the following reasoning:

(i) The singular cardinal pronoun forms in the Lau dialect are:

1sg.CARD. ko you
2sg.CARD. ko iko
3sg.CARD. ko i koya

(ii) In analysing the Lau cardinal forms, however, early missionary linguists separated the segment koi as a pronominal article, i.e.

1sg.CARD. koi au (by analogy with the 1sg subject pronoun au)

2sg.CARD. koi ko

3sg.CARD. koi koya

This koi form was then generalised as a pronoun article, and was used productively before other cardinal pronoun forms in Old High Fijian, despite the fact that in Lau there is no i element in the cardinal 1st and 2nd person non-singular pronoun forms, i.e.

LAU O.H.F.

1st.INC.dual ko kētaru koi kedaru
" paucal ko kepatou koi kedatou
" plural ko kefa koi keda

2nd.dual ko kemudrau koi kemudrau
" paucal ko kemudou koi kemudou
" plural ko kemunū koi kemuni

(d) koi "you" (2nd person singular subject pronoun). This [k]-initial form
occurs in Old High Fijian and Lau dialects. In contrast, [o] is the Standard and Colloquial Fijian, Bau and Boumān dialect equivalent. For example,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{O.H.F.} & \quad \text{kevaka ko na vakasaqari koya} \\
\text{C.F.} & \quad o \quad " \quad " \\
\text{if} & \quad 2sg \quad \text{FUT} \quad \text{search} \quad 3sg
\end{align*}
\]

"If thou seek him,"

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{O.H.F.} & \quad \text{ko na kunei koya} \\
\text{C.F.} & \quad o \quad " \quad " \\
2sg & \quad \text{FUT} \quad \text{find} \quad 3sg
\end{align*}
\]

"he will be found of thee"

[Old Testament, I Chronicles 28:9]

(e) koya "there (distant)" demonstrative. This feature occurs in Old High Fijian (but not in Standard Fijian, Colloquial Fijian, Lau or Boumān dialects). The Boumān form is mayā. It corresponds to oyā in Standard Fijian and Lau, and to yā in Colloquial Fijian.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{O.H.F.} & \quad \text{na tamata kecega e na} \\
\text{S.F.} & \quad " \quad " \quad " \quad " \\
\text{ART} & \quad \text{man all PREP ART} \\
\text{yasana koya} & \quad " \quad \text{oyā} \\
\text{land} & \quad \text{that}
\end{align*}
\]

"[And Laban gathered together] all the men of the place"

[Old Testament, Genesis 29:22]

There are two possible explanations for the use of the [k]-initial form koya in Old High Fijian:

(i) koyā occurs in the Gau and Beqa dialects (Paul Geraghty p.c.). It is possible that certain Bible translators were influenced by these dialects.

(ii) Bible translators regarded [k]-initial grammatical elements as more correct. This is illustrated in their use of [k]-initial forms described above. [o]-initial forms were considered to be degenerate, (in the same way that shortened English forms were regarded as less formal and less correct than longer forms, e.g. is not → isn't; has → 'as). It is possible, therefore, that the addition of [k] to the form oyā was due to analogy with other [k]-initial particles, which were considered as more correct, pure forms of the Fijian language.

9. pseudo-passive. Old High Fijian is characterised by a pseudo-passive
construction based on literal translation of the English passive. The pseudo-passive construction differs from the normal Fijian passive by its inclusion of a demoted agent NP which is marked by maivei.

Let us observe this difference in more detail. In dialects of Fijian, a passive is derived from a transitive clause by:

(a) O (object NP) becomes S (subject) of the passive sentence (which is intransitive);

(b) the verb has a special passive form, usually a suffix ending in -i;

(c) A (agent NP) is not formally expressed.13

For example,

TRANSITIVE:

\[
(3sg) \text{ASP} \text{ close-TRANS ART door ART}
\]

Filo

"Filo has closed the door"

PASSIVE:

\[
\text{ASP close-PASS ART door}
\]

"The door has been closed"

In the pseudo-passive construction of Old High Fijian, the agent NP does not have to be deleted. It may be included and if so, is marked by the preposition combination maivei. This is parallel to the demoted agent of the English passive, which is marked by preposition "by":

OLD HIGH FIJIAN:

\[
\text{ASP close-PASS ART door PREP Filo}
\]

"The door has been closed by Filo"

The pseudo-passive construction, introduced initially by Bible translators, has spread to newspaper and radio language, e.g. Geraghty (1976) refers to the construction as "Radio Fiji passive". Today it is a distinguishing feature of

13 There are varying opinions regarding the frequency of the agent NP's occurrence in a passive construction. Dixon (forthcoming: chapter 18.6) and Arms (1974) claim that the A NP is normally (but not always) deleted. In contrast, Schüts and Nawadra (1972) and Geraghty (1976) claim that the A NP is always omitted.
Standard Fijian (see Schütz and Nawadra 1972) and there is evidence that it has spread to the Bouman dialect of Waitabu (Dixon forthcoming: chapter 18.6). The pseudo-passive construction does not appear to be a Lau dialect influence. Paul Geraghty (p.c.) reports that there is no maivei agent NP in the passive construction of either traditional or contemporary Lau.

10. rigid V-O-S word order. In Colloquial Fijian, the order of NPs and VPs is not rigid: basically, the predicate is followed by NPs, but NPs can be fronted before the predicate. For example,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{e a raica} & \quad \text{na vonu} & \quad \text{o Filo} \\
\text{v} & \quad \text{o} & \quad \text{s} \\
\text{e a raica} & \quad \text{o Filo} & \quad \text{na vonu} \\
\text{v} & \quad \text{s} & \quad \text{o} \\
\text{o Filo} & \quad \text{na vonu} & \quad \text{a raica} \\
\text{s} & \quad \text{o} & \quad \text{v}
\end{align*}
\]

"Filo saw the turtle"

In contrast, in Old High Fijian, there is a strong tendency for rigid V-D/IO-S word order. For example,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{sa} & \quad \text{qai} & \quad \text{kacivi} & \quad \text{ira} & \quad \text{kecega} & \quad \text{na} & \quad \text{qase} \\
\text{ASP} & \quad \text{then} & \quad \text{call} & \quad \text{3pl} & \quad \text{all} & \quad \text{ART} & \quad \text{elder} \\
\text{ni} & \quad \text{Isireli} & \quad \text{ko} & \quad \text{Mosese} \\
\text{POSS} & \quad \text{Israel} & \quad \text{ART} & \quad \text{Moses} \\
\text{"Then Moses called for all the elders of Israel"}
\end{align*}
\]

[Old Testament, Exodus 12:21]

(Note that only very rarely do Object and Indirect Object occur together in Old High Fijian and Colloquial Fijian constructions.)

11. lexicon. Certain Fijian forms are used in a different sense/context in Old High Fijian. For example, the term tūraga refers to "chief" or "master" in Colloquial Fijian. It is a descriptive, not a vocative term, i.e. it is used to refer to, but not to address, the chief.

In Old High Fijian, tūraga is used as a vocative term, when addressing the Lord in prayer. For example,

\[\text{14} \text{For detailed description of ordering of elements within a sentence, see Arms (1984).}\]

\[\text{15} \text{The vocative tūraga also occurs in "foreignor Fijian" (i.e. simplified speech to Indians and Europeans). It is not considered to be correct speech in conversation between native Fijian speakers.}\]
Turaga Jisu Karisto, ko ni a
chief Jesus Christ ART 2pl PAST

kaya
say

"Lord Jesus Christ, thou has said "

[Book of Prayer, Communion Rite, p21]

INTRUSION OF LAU DIALECT LEXICON

In Old High Fijian, there is evidence of intrusion of Lau dialect vocabulary. (This is in line with the intrusion of Lau grammatical forms described earlier in this section.) This Lauan influence may be attributed to the fact that the first missionaries (Cargill and Cross) were based in Lau, and started their linguistic work there. Lau dialect items which occur frequently in Bible translations include:

le'utu veikau "wilderness"
bulumakau bulumakau "cow"
itovocă "sin"

12. loan words from Indo-European languages. In Old High Fijian, there is a high frequency of religious terms which are loans from Indo-European languages. Many of the terms in Roman Catholic Fijian are derived from Latin, French and English. (French influence is attributed to French Catholic missionaries, see Geraghty 1984:37.) For example,

Papitema baptême "baptize"

Garasia gratia "grace"
Panem (ACC) "bread [of communion]"
Sacramentum "sacrament"
Missa "mass"

Faca [fa'aso] father
Kosipeli gospel
Lesoni lesson
Same psalm

---

16 These terms were provided by Paul Geraghty (p.c.).

17 Father David Arms provided his list of religious loan words and their origin.
Detailed description of loan words in Fijian and their phonological patterning is given in Schütz (1978).

In addition to these loan words which are used mainly in the domain of the Church, the influence of Christianity is also evident in everyday lexicon. For example, Fijian terms for days of the week include:

- siga tabu (lit. sacred day) "Sunday"
- lotu levu (lit. big church) "Thursday" [The Wesleyan church held its main service on Thursday]
- siga vakaraubuka (lit. day of preparing firewood) "Friday"
- siga vakarauwai (lit. day of preparing water) "Saturday"

*Friday and Saturday were so named because it was necessary to collect firewood and water in preparation for the day of rest, Sunday, when work is forbidden.

The influence of Christianity is also evident in the sociolinguistic performance of the village ceremonies, described in chapter 5. As mentioned in 5.3.1, an essential component of the ceremonial ritual is the act of blessing in the Christian religious tradition.

13. mistranslations as idioms. Certain "badly translated" phrases and clauses of Old High Fijian have become fossilised as idioms. For example, in Standard Fijian, the verb vua means "bear fruit". In Old High Fijian, early bible translators produced a much longer and grammatically incorrect translation by:

(a) interpreting the term vua as a noun, and adding the transitive verbal suffix -taka to get vua-taka. This is not a Standard Fijian verbal form; the term vua functions as both noun and verb in Standard and Colloquial Fijian;

(b) adding a cognate object NP vua-na (fruit-POSS) "its fruit". Such inclusion of cognate object is redundant, for this semantic information is inherent in the verb itself. (It is parallel to the following ungrammatical English sentence, where inclusion of the cognate object [flowers] is unnecessary: *The tree flowered flowers last spring.)*

The resultant Old High Fijian sentence is:
This sentence has become a common idiom in church language, meaning "may it be fruitful".

Another example of productive use of mistranslations is the Old High Fijian comparative construction. In Colloquial Fijian, comparative constructions use the particle kei, e.g.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{erau duidui X kei Y} \\
3\text{dual differ x PREP y}
\end{align*}
\]

"They are different, X and Y"

In Old High Fijian, the kei particle is frequently replaced by mai:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{erau duidui X mai Y} \\
3\text{dual differ x PREP y}
\end{align*}
\]

"They are different, X and Y"

The use of the mai ablative form is probably due to literal translation of the English construction: "X is different from Y".

8.2. EDUCATION

The school is another western institution which has instigated major social and linguistic change in Waitabu. First, I will briefly describe the education system. Second, language varieties used within the school domain are dealt with. Third is the impact of education on Waitabu community and the Bouma dialect.

8.2.1. DESCRIPTION OF THE EDUCATION SYSTEM

There are 12 schools on Taveuni island (nine primary and three secondary). Education is compulsory between the ages of 6 - 14 years, and most Waitabu children attend the local government primary school at the Bouma village of 'Orovou, two and a half miles away. Bouma school has 5 teachers and 185 students.

---

Footnote 18: Four of these are government schools. Others are run by religious institutions, e.g. Roman Catholic church. In Fiji generally, only 4% of schools are wholly controlled by the government; 90% are government aided; and 6% are independent. Most schools are controlled by local committees, a substantial minority by churches (Geraghty 1984:66). The first schools in Fiji were run by the Church -literacy was essential for conversion to Christianity. However, as Geraghty (1984:41) reports, by the 1920s, the Government was increasingly obliged to take over schools from the church.
A few students attend a "better" Catholic school at Wairiki on the other side of the island. At Wairiki, there is also a secondary school (17 teachers and 294 students) which Waitabu students attend if continuing on to secondary education.

The primary school has seven classes, with Class 1 beginning at five years of age. The curriculum includes: Vernacular (Standard Fijian); English; Maths; Social Science; Arts and Crafts; Physical Education; and Elementary Science from class 3 and above. The secondary school at Wairiki teaches English, Maths, Science, Modern Studies, History, Religion, Woodwork (for boys) and Home Economics (for girls). This contrasts with the early days of education in Fiji, when the curriculum was totally religious. The Church established schools because literacy and education were seen as essential for converting the masses to Christianity. For description of the early days of Fijian education, see Clammer (1976:54-70), Geraghty (1984). Detailed description of contemporary Fijian education is given in Cato (1951), Whitehead (1981), Education for Modern Fiji: Report of the Fiji Education Commission 1969, and Lasaqa (1984:81-97).

8.2.2. SCHOOL AS A DOMAIN OF VERBAL INTERACTION

STANDARD FIJIAN. The oral language of the classroom at Bouma primary school is Standard Fijian. All classes (except English) are taught in this code. Standard Fijian often functions as a lingua franca in the classroom; it is an essential vehicle for communication for those teachers who have come from different dialect areas. Reading and writing skills are taught in Old High Fijian, the literary style.

The classroom is the child's first direct exposure to Standard Fijian. From the first day of school, the student is actively encouraged to speak in Standard Fijian. While teachers no longer punish the child's use of the Bouma dialect, they promote Standard Fijian by repeating any Bouma utterances in Standard Fijian. (This policy of non-punishment is based on the advice of staff of the Fijian Dictionary Project, namely Paul Geraghty and Tevita Nawadra.)

As a result of the promotion of Standard Fijian in the classroom, children come to associate Standard Fijian (especially its most salient feature [k], instead of glottal stop) with the classroom and learning. As one student stated when I used

---

19 Only one teacher at the Bouma primary school speaks the Bouma dialect. Others come from different dialect areas, e.g. Macuata, Ovolau.
the Boumān dialect instead of Standard Fijian in the classroom:

E dodonu mo vosa vaka-kā i na vale ni koro ni vuli. Vosa gato, sega!

"You must speak with [k] [i.e. Standard Fijian] in the school room. To speak with glottal stop [i.e. Boumān dialect], no [it's forbidden]!"

[E.M. male, 9 years, Bouma]

Teachers report that in their early years of schooling, students tend to apply the [k] feature of Standard Fijian to their speech which contains Boumān dialect lexical items, i.e. in an effort to assimilate to classroom speech, they apply the most salient feature of Standard Fijian [k], to their existing vocabulary. The resultant linguistic variety is Boumā Va'akā, i.e. Boumān dialect pronounced with [k] instead of glottal stop (see 7.3).

In the playground, the students speak a Boumān-Standard-Fijian mix, alternating between the use of [k] and glottal stop, and Boumān and Standard Fijian lexical and grammatical items.

ENGLISH. English is taught at Boumā primary school but the students' understanding and production ability is extremely poor, e.g. not many students are able to construct a basic English sentence. A survey of 30 students in classes 1-6 revealed that for all students, English was the least popular subject. Teachers recognise the poor understanding and production skills:

Here is English not spoken well in our school. Very few in class 6, class 7 can speak English, only for a line or just a short conversation. I find a big difference [in English competence in Boumā as compared to other schools] because I taught in a town school in Lami [Suva area]. I taught in English to class 5. Ask them in English, they answer back in English. But here [Boumā primary school] even in class 6 [English competence is poor]. See, if you ask her or him in English, she won't respond.

[SL female, 30 years, teacher, Boumā primary school]

See let alone understanding the question, eh? That's one thing, it's a pity on them, eh? Say if I ask them "Why you are late?". They just answer "I am late". They don't understand it.

[S.L. female, 30 years, teacher, Boumā primary school]

Possible factors for poor competence in English are:

---

20 In order to observe the Boumān school system, I sat in on a variety of classes over a period of four months. In return for this liberty, and in order to justify my presence in the classroom, I taught English to various classes.
1. limited exposure to the English language. The only exposure to English is in the classroom, ranging from two hours per week for class 1 to five or six hours per week for class 6.

2. English appears as a code of limited immediate use. It is not used in everyday village life or in any other domains outside the English lesson. Thus, Boumān students question its utility and worth as a code of communication.

3. Boumān primary teachers are aware that their own English is not perfect. The awareness may result in a relative lack of confidence and enthusiasm in English teaching.

In contrast, in other Taveuni schools, English competence is much higher. For example, at Wairiki primary school, I found students in class 3 to be of higher standard than class 6 students of Bouma.

The relatively poor English ability of Boumān students is a major handicap for their secondary education. At Wairiki secondary school (which most Boumān students attend if they do continue on to secondary education, and few do), English is the language of instruction. Furthermore, English is actively promoted in the playground; use of Standard Fijian or local dialects is punished. This problem of the Boumān students is recognised by Wairiki teachers:

Bouma students, you know, are some of the brighter students that come through, but they have some difficulty with the language English ... Bouma students find it very difficult to talk in English more than others they are lagging behind.

[M.R. male, 30 years, head teacher, Wairiki secondary school]

Thus poor English ability appears to be a major handicap and deterrent for Waitabu students who continue on to secondary schooling.

8.2.3. IMPACT OF EDUCATION ON WAITABU COMMUNITY

The education system has triggered major social and linguistic change in the Waitabu community. Historically, literacy was an essential tool for converting the Fijian populace to Christianity. Its social consequences are detailed in Clammer (1976). In contemporary Waitabu, the education system has increased the individual's awareness of alternative value systems and modes of behaviour. Individuals who have passed through the education system (which is based on individual thought and achievement) may come to question traditional social values and modes of behaviour of the traditional hierarchical society. Such conflict is
exemplified in the village youths questioning the ascribed authority of the village chief (6.2).

Linguistically, the school is a major force in the dialect levelling process, through its promotion of Standard Fijian (see 7.7). It is in the school where the child learns Standard Fijian, and use of this code rather than the local Bouma dialect is actively encouraged throughout his school career.

The teacher plays an important role in the dialect levelling process, for he provides a linguistic target upon which the child models his speech. In the child’s earlier years, the mother/caretaker is the child’s main language identity figure (see 7.5.4). However, on entering school, the child establishes a close role-relationship with the teacher. The child thus broadens his social world, and adopts the teacher as a figure on which to model his speech behaviour. The role of the teacher in influencing children’s speech is recognised thus:

When these people [Waitabu students] come to school ... they switch onto my own vernacular dialect [Standard Fijian]. And like Miss Vodo. Some of her children now, after about say nine weeks of school now eh, switching over to her dialect ... The teacher really turns these people from their own dialect.

[S.L. female, 30 years, teacher, Bouma primary school]
Chapter 9
SUMMARY OF THE WAITABU INVESTIGATION

The chapter summarises the findings of the sociolinguistic investigation of Waitabu village.

The sociolinguistic behaviour of individuals in the Waitabu community is governed by rules and norms delineated by that sociocultural group. These rules mark out various established modes of sociolinguistic behaviour (i.e. sociolinguistic roles), around which the individual constructs his conduct.

Sociolinguistic rules and norms fall into two basic types:

1. general rules and norms which all members of the sociocultural group adhere to in constructing their everyday sociolinguistic behaviour, e.g. rules and norms for politeness and deference; male vs female speech; greetings and leave-taking; acts of giving and taking.

2. specific rules and norms which apply in “special marked” sociolinguistic situations, and which serve to narrowly prescribe the mode of sociolinguistic behaviour appropriate to that particular situation.

It is important to stress two points. Firstly, “unmarked marked” is not a categorical distinction of “either/or” nature. Rather, there is a cline between more and less-highly marked interactions. Secondly, the categories of general specific and marked unmarked are not necessarily coincident. While specific rules and norms governing a given speech event commonly qualify it as marked, it is not the case that non-speech-event everyday behaviour will be totally unmarked. Obviously, there will be certain rules and norms governing various aspects of everyday interaction.

Let us focus first on general rules and norms for everyday interaction. Modes of everyday sociolinguistic behaviour in Waitabu are intrinsically linked to the social organisation. At the heart of the Waitabu social organisation is the kinship system. Kinship groupings form the basis of much economic, political and
recreational activity in the village. The kinship system provides the framework for sociolinguistic conduct, by setting out kin categories and associated modes of behaviour. Individuals categorise people who they encounter into various kin groups, and construct their sociolinguistic performance according to the type of role-relationship. There are three basic role-relationship types each involving distinct modes of sociolinguistic behaviour:

1. **avoidance**, with both parties practising mutual restraint, is used among vei-vugo-ni "cross-parent/child" and vei-gane-ni "opposite-sex sibling". Sociolinguistic interaction is extremely restricted for individuals linked by this relationship. If interaction does occur, personal names are avoided; non-singular pronoun forms are necessary and serve as linguistic devices to mark social distance and respect. The dual pronoun form mudrau is used for addressing cross-parent, and the trial form mudou is used for opposite-sex siblings.

2. **joking**, marked by mutual freedom and non-restraint, is the mode of conduct between vei-tavale-ni "cross-cousins". The communication link between vei-tavale-ni is an often-exercised one (i.e. strong and intense), by virtue of the fact that the compulsory joking nature of this relationship is conducive to frequent and unrestrained interaction.

3. **authority-based** behaviour is assymetrical, with one party deferring to the other, more powerful party. Authority-based conduct is used for "parallel" relatives (i.e. individuals classed as the same lineage group as Ego). The true father/child relationship is the prototypical case, and authority-based behaviour becomes less intense for classificatory relatives.

In this way, the kinship system determines the nature and intensity of sociolinguistic interaction between individuals in the Waitabu community. (This is true of many pre-industrial societies, and is a common finding in the ethnography of speaking.) These established modes of sociolinguistic conduct have important social function. They serve to uphold the incest taboo, by restricting communication between non-marriageable individuals, and facilitating communication (through compulsory joking) between those individuals who are potential marriage partners.

Other aspects of the social structure and divisions are also intrinsically linked to modes of sociolinguistic interaction. For example, Fijian society is hierarchical, with unequal distribution of power. The basic ranking criteria is age and sex: males are ranked above females; seniority is ranked above youth. This structure is
manifested in, and maintained by, linguistic politeness and deference markers. Also, there are distinct male and female speech styles. Linguistic features which distinguish female from male speech include: intonation; penultimate syllable lengthening; high frequency of deference and politeness markers; and certain lexical items. Women's speech tends to be less ambiguous, less repetitive and less long-winded than male speech.

Sociocultural values, attitudes and desired personality traits are also reflected in patterns of everyday sociolinguistic behaviour. Speech acts of request 'ere'ere, and formal giving va'ava'acabo are important linguistic devices which serve the sociocultural norm of equal distribution of economic resources. Communal sharing of information is also considered important, e.g. knowledge regarding the individual's whereabouts and current actions. This is reflected in greeting formulas which often take the form of information-seeking questions, e.g. la'i vei "Where are you going?".

The desired trait of being humble and self-effacing is manifested in: compulsory repaying of compliments; use of deference and politeness markers; avoidance of boasting; and the va'ava'acabo act of formal giving. The target impression of the va'ava'acabo act is for the donor to appear humble in relation to the recipient. Downgrading of the gift is the main device used to attain this impression. Use of the specific everyday term of reference is avoided. Instead, the item is usually described by various synonyms, which serve to downgrade the gift, the act of giving, and consequently the donor himself.

Avoiding conflict and confrontation is another desired sociocultural trait. Linguistic devices which serve the orientation towards social harmony and avoiding conflict are: use of vague, indirect speech; small talk which is safe and more conducive to social harmony than potentially explosive issues; isalei exclamation, which signals the speaker's solidarity and sympathy with the hearer; and the isoro -a formal ceremonial apology which is an institutionalised means of dissolving conflict.

Having dealt with the basic general rules and norms for everyday sociolinguistic interaction, let us now focus on specific sets of rules and norms which restrict linguistic behaviour in particular sociolinguistic situations. In the Waitabu sociolinguistic system, there are various "marked" situations in which verbal performance of participants is constrained by a set of distinct linguistic rules which characterise the particular situation. Usually, such linguistic constraints are accompanied by specific rules governing physical and social behaviour. In Waitabu,
"marked" sociolinguistic situations which require distinct modes of sociolinguistic behaviour, include the ceremony, the netball game, the church service, and interaction in role-relationships of cross-parent/child, opposite-sex siblings and villager/Indian.

The ceremony is a rigidly patterned formulaic speech event, much more highly structured than other everyday linguistic behaviour. It is characterised by a set of specialised rules which serve to limit and define: the range of participants (to only adult males); range of items for presentation; and posture and seating positions of participants. Linguistic rules narrowly prescribe the following aspects of verbal behaviour: limited range of topics; formulaic ordering of topics; fossilised word sequences which must occur at set stages throughout the performance; and special ceremonial items and phrases.

The Catholic church service is another "marked" sociolinguistic situation in which linguistic, physical and social behaviour is narrowly prescribed by specific rules and norms. Linguistically, verbal conduct in the church service is based on a special speech style -Old High Fijian. Some features of Old High Fijian result from "mistakes" in the early missionaries' translation of the Bible which have become fossilised in print. These features include: pseudo-passive; excessive use of aspect marker sa; obligatory marking of past tense; unskilled use of grammatical elements; and creation of [k]-initial grammatical items. This language variety eventually became the basis for the literary standard, i.e. the written Fijian style, used in newspapers, books and writing in schools.

In the netball game, behaviour was similarly constrained by strict rules and norms governing: physical movement; setting; range of topics of conversation; atmosphere of the activity; type of speech acts; level of politeness; voice quality; length of utterances; and linguistic forms.

Certain role-relationships are also characterised by "marked" sociolinguistic behaviour. The vei-vugo-ni "cross-parent/child" and vei-gane-ni "opposite-sex sibling" relationships involve sociolinguistic conduct which is rigidly constrained by a specific set of linguistic and physical rules.¹ For example, casual conversation and joking in these relationships is strictly forbidden. If conversation does occur, it is limited to only essential, very serious topics. Speech must be slow and

¹For clarity of description of the kinship system, these avoidance-based relationships were dealt with above in the same section as other kin-relationships which require unmarked, everyday sociolinguistic behaviour. The reader should note that in contrast to other kin relationships, avoidance-based relationships are marked as distinct by rules and norms which constrain social, physical and linguistic behaviour.
deferential, and voice quality of low soft tone to show respect. It is forbidden to address these relatives by their personal names. Instead, non-singular pronoun forms are used. These linguistic constraints are accompanied by rigid physical rules, e.g. there is a strict taboo on physical contact.

Another "marked" role-relationship in which linguistic behaviour is narrowly prescribed by specific rules and norms is the villager-Indian one. The role-relationship between the Indian and the Waitabu villager is characterised by a speech style called vosa va’a-Idia va’a-Viti "Indian Fijian". This linguistic style differs markedly from the speech of everyday interaction used in Waitabu village. Distinguishing features are: use of [k] instead of glottal stop; use of Standard Fijian grammatical and lexical items; and simplification of the Fijian grammatical structure, by omitting certain grammatical particles, and rigidifying word order. These linguistic rules are accompanied by social constraints. It is an unstated rule among Waitabu villagers that interaction with Indians be limited to economic transactions.

While such established modes of sociolinguistic behaviour provide the framework for sociolinguistic conduct in Waitabu, it must be stressed that sociolinguistic conduct is not absolutely predetermined. The Fijian data indicates that the individual is not a passive entity whose sociolinguistic behaviour is an automatically triggered response to stimuli in the social situation. Rather, individuals in the Waitabu community have the ability to construct their own sociolinguistic performance. For example, Waitabu villagers can manipulate the kinship system according to their communicative needs. If an individual views the avoidance-based kin relationship that he shares with X as hindering his communicative needs, he may interpret the kin link through another genealogical line (and categorises X in a kin category that permits intense sociolinguistic interaction).

Alternatively, if this is not possible, the Waitabu villager may resolve the conflict by deviating from the prescribed mode of behaviour, i.e. he/she may alter the sociolinguistic behaviour associated with the kin relationship. Such sociolinguistic change is evident in the avoidance-based relationships of vel-vugo-ni "cross-parent/child" and vel-gane-ni "opposite-sex sibling": certain younger generation speakers view avoidance behaviour as a hindrance to their communicative needs, and choose to disregard such established modes of avoidance conduct.

Another example of Waitabu villagers deviating from established modes of
sociolinguistic behaviour is in the decline of the speech styles of chiefly respect. Traditionally, the relationship between Waitabu villager and the village chief was a "marked" one, with interaction being rigidly constrained by a distinct set of physical, social and linguistic rules. For example, it was forbidden for a commoner to be in close proximity to a chief, to stand in his presence, or to reach above his head. Linguistically, a distinct speech style marking chiefly respect was characterised by: indirect communication via a third party; tama, fossilised word sequences marking respect to the chief; special terms of address; use of plural pronoun to signal extreme respect; respect adverb va'acā; and a special lexicon for referring to the chief's actions or body.

In contemporary Waitabu village, this speech style of chiefly respect is no longer used to the village chief. Although the village chief still performs important functions in Waitabu and is treated respectfully, the villagers' interpretation (expectations and perception) of this social identity appears to have altered. For example, many youths aspire to a westernised lifestyle, values and images, and do not regard the ascribed position of chief as source of ultimate authority. The sociolinguistic behaviour which the individual constructs on the basis of this interpretation is altered accordingly; hence, linguistic signals of respect are no longer used to the village chief.

In short, the fact that Waitabu individuals do interpret certain kin relationships according to their communicative needs, and do deviate from established modes of sociolinguistic conduct (e.g. chiefly respect, avoidance of certain kin categories) indicates that the individual is not a passive entity whose sociolinguistic behaviour is automatically triggered by social variables, but is more realistically viewed as an actor with the ability to construct his own sociolinguistic performance according to his interpretations and communicative needs.

A sociolinguistic phenomenon which has recently emerged in the post-European contact period is dialect levelling. This process of dialect levelling may be attributed to social forces such as intermarriage, increased communication, pressures of the media, and westernised institutions of the church and the school. As a result of such pressures, the Boumān dialect, spoken traditionally in Waitabu, is gradually mixing with the Standard Fijian dialect, the lingua franca of the Fijian archipelago. Standardised tests reveal that in contemporary Waitabu, many distinguishing grammatical and lexical features of the Boumān dialect have weakened or been lost. The Boumān dialect is becoming more diluted with each generation; use of Boumān features diminishes among younger speakers.
It is not, however, a case of dialect death. Boumān speech (which manifests identification with the Boumān region) is still marked as distinct from Standard Fijian by the retention of a small set of Boumān features. These include: the salient phonological feature of glottal stop; a small percentage of lexical items, e.g. dai “joke”, loga “mat”; and the transitive affix form -Ca’ina.

The Waitabu data demonstrates the sociolinguistic principle of “economy of distinctions”: in a contact situation where an indigenous language variety is being infiltrated by a more prestigious language variety, speakers of the indigenous code will maintain a reduced number of distinguishing features, if they wish to mark their language as distinct from the replacing language.

Waitabu speakers are not passive entities in this dialect levelling process. Rather, individuals are aware of salient dialect distinctions, and use these differences to mark certain sociolinguistic contexts and role-relationships as distinct. For example, the netball game and interaction with Indians are two domains which speakers mark as distinct from other everyday neutral interaction by using a non-Boumān variety of language. In other words, many individuals are not restricted to set places on the Boumān-Standard Fijian continuum. Rather, they vary their sociolinguistic performance (i.e. move along the continuum) according to their interpretation of sociolinguistic situations.

This thesis has demonstrated how particular uses, functions and varieties of language relate to social patterns and modes of interaction in the Fijian village of Waitabu. The study has attempted to reveal the basic social groupings and divisions, and principles and norms by which individuals and groups operate linguistically, and the consequent pattern of their verbal interaction. In describing the various ways of speaking which characterise the Waitabu repertoire, this study has aimed to explicate certain basic sociolinguistic principles and norms for contextually appropriate behaviour, i.e. the basic knowledge necessary for an outsider to be a functional member and to participate appropriately in the sociolinguistic community of Waitabu.

As a study in the ethnography of speaking, the thesis highlights the rich variety of modes of sociolinguistic behaviour characterising the Waitabu community. The theoretical perspective of the investigation (deriving largely from interactional sociolinguistics and the symbolic interactionist school of thought) views the Waitabu sociolinguistic community as consisting of many individuals who fall into socially-defined categories (delineated by the sociocultural organisation).
Each social category has access to a particular configuration of social identities (i.e. social position or capacity that involves rights and duties distributed to specific others), e.g. father, peer in *yaqona* drinking session, ceremonial participant. Associated with each social identity is a sociolinguistic role, i.e. an established mode of sociolinguistic behaviour. Thus "role" is used to denote the behavioural norms appropriate to a social identity. Figure 1.1 summarises the social categories, social identities and associated sociolinguistic roles dealt with in this thesis. As indicated, sociolinguistic behaviour is conditioned by social factors such as the type of role-relationship (predominantly kin-based in Waitabu society) and social context (e.g. church, school, ceremony).

The data presented in the thesis highlights the crucial role of interpretation in sociolinguistic behaviour. It is shown that the individual assesses various meaningful symbols in the sociolinguistic situation confronting him, and constructs his sociolinguistic behaviour within the basis framework of established modes of behaviour delineated by the Waitabu sociocultural organisation.

Another related theoretical point which the Waitabu data illustrates is the manipulative or creative use of the sociolinguistic rules and norms which constitute communicative competence. For example, chapter 3 shows how Waitabu villagers are able to manipulate the kinship system and associated modes of sociolinguistic behaviour. Rather than passive entities whose sociolinguistic behaviour is predetermined by rules and norms, Waitabu individuals are shown to use their communicative competence creatively to suit their particular social and communicative needs.

Next, the study addresses the issue of signalling social information in communicative behaviour. As demonstrated by the data, the signalling of social information is all-important to the Waitabu villagers in the construction of their sociolinguistic behaviour. Although individuals in this closed community have detailed knowledge of each other's background and personal affairs, their sociolinguistic conduct constantly signals social information, e.g. about the type of role-relationships and the participants themselves. Such data contradicts the suggestion by Gumperz (1972:16) that in small face-to-face groups, where speakers have detailed knowledge of each other's background and personal affairs, the signalling of social information is less important than in large diverse industrial societies.

The important point is that, before generalisations about differences between pluralistic mass societies and smaller closed communities can be drawn, much
further detailed investigation is required of a wide range of sociolinguistic systems, their basic social categories and social identities, and how these relate to the established modes of sociolinguistic behaviour which characterise each sociocultural group.

In demonstrating the integral and multifaceted relationship between patterns of language behaviour and role-relationships and other aspects of social organisation in Waitabu, this study supports the hypothesis that social relations act as intervening variables between linguistic structures and their realisation in speech. It is illustrated that the speaker's selection among phonologically, grammatically, semantically and lexically permissible alternates is both patterned and frequently predictable on the basis of certain features of the Waitabu social system.

It is thus hoped that this investigation will contribute to our understanding of the linguistic repertoire of a small, relatively closed community and its interconnection with social organisation. In the absence of an integrated theory of the ethnography of speaking of a given community, this study underlines the need for the development and elaboration of a theoretical framework for analysis of speech to proceed hand in hand with detailed ethnographic investigation of particular communities.
Appendix A
TEST SENTENCES

1. O Ruci e dua na gone velavela
   "Ruth is a cheeky child"

2. E dau villika na vatu, sa qai viritaka
   "She is always picking up stones, and throwing them"

3. Na gone-yalewa oqo, e a sisi e na sosoh, sa qai tagi vakalevu
   "This young girl slipped in the mud, and then cried a lot"

4. Ko ta kei naa, erau dau cudrucudru
   "Mother and father were angry"

5. Erau a kanakuita-taki koya
   "They spanked her"

6. E a qai mataveveku o Ruci
   "Ruth was then upset"

*************

7. Edatou na lako ki matasawa ni di na mati
   "We three will go to the beach at low tide"

8. Edatou na cici e na gaunisala oyaha
   "We'll run along that path"

9. Edatou via raica na vuaka ni veikau
   "We want to see the wild pig"

10. Ni oti oyaha, Ropate kei au, keirau na lesu tale ki neirau vale
    "After that, Robert and I will return to our house"

*************

11. Isalei o Seru, e a mateni tale e na bogi
    "Poor Serul He was drunk again last night"

12. E liu, e a dau gunu yaqona gaa e na veiyakavi
    "Before, he used to drink yaqona every night"

13. E didivara ko koya. E sega ni rawa ni rogoca e dua na ka
    "He's deaf, and can't hear a thing"

14. E sega tale gaa ni rogoca rawa na lali kau e na mataka lailai
    "He also can't hear the wooden drum in early morning"
15. Na qase ogō, e dau kaka e na veigauna kece
   Ia dau yalo vinaka ko koya
   "This old man always stutters, but he is kind"

16. E ō tukuna vei Ropate na bui ni gone:
   "The old woman said to Robert:"

17. kevakā ko debe vakaqō, e na nūnū na yavamu
   "If you sit like this, your foot will become numb"

18. kua ni duri, ia mo davo gā
   "Don't sit up, just lie down"

19. kua ni lasu
   "Don't joke!"

20. E levu na cakacaka nei Mere
    "Mary has lots of work"

21. E dau vakasaqara na kākana dina
    kei na rourou mei coi
    "She cooks starch food and dalo leaves done
     in coconut milk as protein"

22. Ni katalau oti, e dau masi veliti
    "When breakfast is finished, she washes the dishes"

23. E dau vakausuai e na mataka lai'ai
    "She puts on her work clothes early in the morning"

24. Ni oti oyā, e dau sāsāmaki e na ibe
    "After that, she sweeps the mats"

25. Sa qai laki savasava
    "Then she goes washing clothes"

26. E veisautaka na nona isulu sava savā
    sa qai vakallīliga e na wā
    "She turns the clean clothes inside out,
     and then hangs them on the line"

27. E bulagi kedatou kākana
    "Our food is stale"

28. Au nanumi iko, sega ni guilecava
    "I remember you, [I] haven't forgotten"

29. E ō cici vakatotolo na gone siosio
    "The inquisitive child ran quickly"

30. E ō sega ni raica na talo-na
    "She didn't see its trunk"
Appendix B

CORE & PERIPHERAL VOCABULARY TEST

### PERIPHERAL VOCABULARY (S.F. — BOUMÂN)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.F.</th>
<th>BOUMÂN</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>butu-ka</td>
<td>pa'i-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>wadra-va</td>
<td>pulu-ca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>kusima-taka</td>
<td>baca'elo-ta'ina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>siosio</td>
<td>palipali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>vei-wati-ni</td>
<td>tau-wati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>meme</td>
<td>si'ita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>sautăninini</td>
<td>goqonini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>suaka</td>
<td>pasa'a/peso'a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>bulagi</td>
<td>bulasi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>vei-taci-ni</td>
<td>tau-taci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>vaka-isuai</td>
<td>va'a-dreu-dreu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>qiqi</td>
<td>tōlili</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CORE VOCABULARY (S.F. — BOUMÂN)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.F.</th>
<th>BOUMÂN</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>gone</td>
<td>laisave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>gaunisala</td>
<td>wā'oilo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>vuaka</td>
<td>pua'a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>lesu tale</td>
<td>viro ube</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>cici</td>
<td>'ada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>cudru</td>
<td>pu'u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>kaya/tu'una</td>
<td>muna'a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>mataka lailai</td>
<td>saubogicācā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>kau</td>
<td>'acu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>ibe</td>
<td>loga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>lasu</td>
<td>dai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>davo</td>
<td>'oto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix C

## UNDERSTANDING TEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOLMĀN</th>
<th>S.F.</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. dridri</td>
<td>vuce</td>
<td>swelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. va'a-sa'ilia</td>
<td>vaka-raica</td>
<td>look for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. yadi-va'ina yidi-va'ina</td>
<td>digi-taka</td>
<td>choose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. supē</td>
<td>luka</td>
<td>snot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. mani-a</td>
<td>nanu-ma</td>
<td>think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. matālīgo-ca</td>
<td>guileca-va</td>
<td>forget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. qaco</td>
<td>qesa</td>
<td>burnt crust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. papa</td>
<td>vata</td>
<td>board/flat surface to put things on foot asleep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. qanū</td>
<td>nūnū</td>
<td>trunk-POSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. tamo-na</td>
<td>tolo-na</td>
<td>roll up (pandanus leaves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. peu'a</td>
<td>veveu</td>
<td>cover (the head)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. pulou-na</td>
<td>tuvikalou</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Appendix D

SCORES PER ITEM IN TEST SENTENCES
| SPEAKERS | 10  | 12  | 14  | 15  | 16  | 17  | 18  | 22  | 24  | 27  | 30  | 34  | 35  | 36  | 37  | 39  | 40  | 45  | 50  | 56  | 60  | 65  | 70  | 75  | 80  | 85  | 90  | 95  | 100 |
|----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| laisave (gone) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| dradranu (velavelā) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| tomlia (vilika) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| olota'ina (viritaka) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| tindara (sisi) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| lope (sosō) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| tata (tā) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| nana (nā) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| pu'u (cudrucudru) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| rubila'ina (kanakuitatākī) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| pepe'u (veveku) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| ***** |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| matavura (matāsawa) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| qitāmati (dīnamatī) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 'ada (cici) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| wā'olo (gaunisala) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| bō'a (raica) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| pua'a ni cōcō (vuaka ni veikau) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| viro (lesu) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| ube (tale) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| ***** |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| mada (liu) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| unu (gunu) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| waqona (yaqona) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| yavi (yakvi) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| dūdū (dīdivara) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 'acu (kau) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| saubogicācā (mataka lailai) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| samila (kaka) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| tauco'o/co'o (kece) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| ***** |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| N  | 10 | 12 | 14 | 15 | 17 | 18 | 21 | 22 | 24 | 27 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 34 | 41 | 45 | 49 | 50 | 59 | 60 | 62 | 65yrs |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| M  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |

muna'a (tukuna/kaya)
'ena marama (bui ni gone)
'ene yai (vaka ogō/ vā qō)
qanū (nūnū)
'oto (davo)
daí (lasu)
ti'o (dabe)

*****

waci (rourou)
lava (coi)
umū (katalau)
 dere (masi)
va'adreu (vakāsua)
saubogică (mataka lailai)
carama'i (sāsāmaki)
 loga (ibe)
va'acevea (vakaliliga)
sasu (wā)

*****
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEAKERS</th>
<th>TOTAL SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>65yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

URU NI 'UILA CEREMONY

This ceremony, literally translated as "lowering of the flag", is one of a sequence of verbal rituals performed to welcome an important guest. The item presented is a whale's tooth. In this particular ceremony, the guest is an Indonesian Catholic priest who visited the village for two days. As the guest could not speak Fijian, the recipient speech was performed by his spokesman, the village catechist.

SPEAKERS:
D = donor
R = recipient

D: ĀĀ! OI OI OI
[fossilised sequence to indicate beginning of ceremony]

Va'atūraga ti'o i na ila'ola'o va'atūraga
i vale levu qo duru tabu, i na lkelesia,
i na talai ni 'alou, se liga ni tūraga
mai lomalagi 'ei vuravura

"Oh honoured one who has made this chiefly journey
in the name of the sacred Christian kingdom,
as God's messenger, as the arm of our father
in heaven and on earth"

R: ĀĀ! OI OI OI. TABUA LEVU YĀ Ī
[fossilised sequence]

D: I na saubogicācā ni siga ni'ua

"It is yet early morning"

E dua a batina lailai 'elou mai laveta ti'o
i na ise'rau va'atūraga

"This is [only] one small tooth which we are raising
up to your chiefly presence"

'Emunū sa raica ti'o, nū sa 'ilā ti'o
i na 'ena ivalavala 'ei na 'ena itovo
i na vanua na lomani o Viti
'ā 'ena iva'arau, na 'ena veiro'oro'ovi
'ei na 'ena do'ai 'ei na 'ena va'alagilagi
tale gā munū la'o ti'o mai

"You (polite) view this whale's tooth and you will
understand that it signifies the custom of our
beloved land of Fiji to respect and pay homage to,
and also to praise your coming here"
A tūrāga, matua tabu veiliuta'i ti'o se ca'aca'a ti'o i na otatou vanua lomani o Viti 'ei Rotuma

"Oh holy priest who works and gives leadership in our beloved land of Fiji and Rotuma"

A 'amunaga 'eitou mai laveta ti'o a i-uru ni 'uila i na ila'ola'o va'atūrāga se ta'osovi ni waqa tabu, me cegu a 'ele va'adua i na vanua sā nanumi me tadu 'ina i na ila'ola'o va'atūrāga

"The treasure [whale's tooth] which I raise up signifies the 'lowering of the flag' stage of this chiefly journey. That is to say, it signifies the interruption of your sacred boat on its chiefly journey, in order that you may anchor and come onto land"

La 'ena 'amunaga 'eitou sā mai laveta ti'o i na isērau va'atūrāga

"Thus we raise up this treasure before your chiefly presence"

'Ēvaʻā e rui lailai, 'erei i na ila'ola'o va'atūrāga me vosoti a velā co'o sara i na iva'ayacori ti'o

"If it is too small, in the name of your chiefly journey, we beg forgiveness for all that has caused it to be"

Munū na va'aogai ti'o 'ina, matua tabu, i na siga levu ni siga ni'ua me va'ā a weimami ivalavala se weimami itovo ni 'ena veiro'oro'ovi va'aViti se va'aveiwe'ani

"You have been busied this midday, Father, with our Fijian customs that signify respect and friendship"

Ni da ti'o e na ikelesia ... sā dodonu mai 'ina ti'o oda bula i na vuravura ni'ua

"May we be true to our Christian belief in our lives on earth today"

O 'ea ona qō 'enā 'amunaga 'eitou sa va'amamasu

"Here is the treasure with which we give praise"

'Ēvaʻā e lailai, 'erei me levu

"If it is small, I beg that it [be seen as if it were] large"

R: E levu

"It is big"
Me ra raica o ira a lewe ni vanua o Naisaqai o ira sa ti’o e muri, o ira a we’a ni vanua se na drā ni vanua o Naisaqai o ira sa ti’o

"May the people of Naisaqai [yavusa name] witness this, those of this generation and of generations to come"

Era sā va’anuinui vina’a tū i na munū yaco ti’o mai a matua tabu ni siga ni’ua

"They were full of hope that you might come here today, Father"

Era nuita’ina tū me da na duavata na ’erea va’atūraga ‘alou bula da qarava a veirqaravi munū yaco ti’o mai ’ina i na ’ena lagilagi e do’ai e ro’ovi e lagilagi va’acērecēra va’alevu ni’ua

"They hope that we may act as one in worshipping our chiefly Lord in this ceremony on the occasion of your arrival today, in the glory of respect, reverence and heavenly worship"

'Eimami ’ilā ni na yaga vei ’eimami

"We realise the worth/value of this for us"

Vei ’emunū tale gā i na omunū itavi omunū ’ilā ’ina, e dua itavi levu, nū na mai solia bula va’ayago va’ayalo tale gā

"And also for you in your duty which, as you know, is a great duty in giving us health in body and also in spirit"

’Ilā ni sa balavu a vosa ni ’amunaga, a iqaloqalovi (error) se ta’osovi ni waqa tabu

"I realise that this speech of iqaloqalovi ceremony (error: should have said urū ni ’uila) has been long"

O va’atūraga ti’o, va’atūragata’ina ti’o na ila’ola’o tabu, i na matua tabu, i na tūraga bete, na iliuli i Viti ‘ei Rotuma

"In honour of the chiefly sacred journey of Father, priest and leader of Fiji and Rotuma"

SOSO RATU !
(fossilised sequence)

ALL: YEE !
(fossilised sequence)

D: A VURA !
(fossilised sequence)

ALL: YEE !
(fossilised sequence)

R: MANA !
(fossilised sequence)
Mm! Au ciqoma dina ti'o, a vatu tabu
'amunaga ni vanua va'atūraga o Nasau

"I accept this dignified treasure of the chiefly land of Nasau"

Au cabe ca'e ti'o yane i na ikelesia,
va'atūraga bisopi, i na ona liga ni ca'aca'a
Father Lambert me va'ā munū sa raica na ona
dabe to'a ni'ua

"I offer it up to the Christian church, to the chiefly bishop, and to his work-hand, Father Lambert, who you behold seated here today"

A iuru ni 'uila, 'eirau tarā ti'o i na
iyalo va'atūraga, na iyalo va'aveido'ai,
va'acērecērei ti'o a iti'oti'o va'atūraga,
a itūtū va'avanua

"We accept this 'lowering of the flag'
presentation in chiefly spirit, in a spirit of respect and exaltation for this chiefly, dignified place"

Me 'alougata ti'o a omudou vanua i na
veigauna sa bera tubu ti'o mada gā a lotu
me da bula ti'o

"May your land always be blessed, now and in times to come. Let the Church prosper so that we may live healthily"

MANA !
(fossilised sequence)

ALL:
EE DINA !
(fossilised sequence)

AMUDUO !
(fossilised sequence)

[timed clapping]

DUO !
(fossilised sequence)

[timed clapping]
References


Lexicography and Conceptual Analysis. USA: Ann Arbor, Karoma.


