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Abstract

The thesis is in five major parts. The first part, Preliminaries, deals with the basic building blocks on which the grammar is founded; the introductory chapter, the phonology and the word classes.

The second part of the thesis deals with arguments and adjuncts. Chapter 4 outlines Noun Phrase structure and the structure of possessive constructions. Chapter 5 and 6 deal with issues inherent to individual nouns; noun formation in Chapter 5 and gender and agreement in Chapter 6. The morphological processes of noun formation are extremely complex; for example there are at least 86 different ways of forming dual and plural nouns. Chapter 7 discusses nominal adjuncts. Chapter 8 deals with the complex area of deictics, one of the most structurally elaborated areas of the language. There are three paradigms of demonstratives. One is a demonstrative modifier, and two are demonstrative pronouns, which differ in their pragmatic reference; one is used to refer to an entity not uppermost in the minds of the speaker and hearers, and the other is used elsewhere. The relationship between the three demonstrative paradigms is complex and interesting, and is dealt with in some detail. Presentative forms can be created from most of the deictics, as can predicative deictics, by means of additional morphology.

The third part of the thesis concerns predicate structure. Basic clause structure and principles of participant marking are outlined in Chapter 9. Constructions using the Agreement Suffix are examined in Chapter 10. The Agreement Suffix, one of the morphological means of marking participants, is a ubiquitous and important suffix in the language. Focus constructions, discussed in Chapter 11, are another very elaborated area of Lavukaleve morphosyntax. There are three paradigms of focus markers in Lavukaleve. Many different types of constituents can be focussed: a predicate, a sentence, an NP or an adjunct, including nominal adjuncts, adverbs, particles and non-main verbs. When predicates and sentences are focussed, the focus marker is the final element of the sentence. The agreement of the focus marker (with the person, gender and number of either the subject or the object of the clause) shows the domain of focus. When arguments and adjuncts are focussed, the focus marker appears immediately after the argument,
Chapter 12 deals with the expression of tense, aspect and mood. Chapter 13 deals with valency changing, the creation of predicates from words of other classes, as well as other word class-changing morphological processes. The final chapter of this part, Chapter 14, outlines the types of complex predicates existing in the language, including serial verb constructions, verb compounds, verb-adjunct constructions, and predicates involving the Habitual Auxiliary.

The fourth part of the thesis deals with interclausal syntax: clause chaining constructions (Chapter 15) and subordinate clauses (Chapter 16). There are three types of subordinate clauses; one of them, subordinate adverbial clauses, involves a split-ergative marking system. Most other areas of the language have nominative/accusative alignment. The final part of the thesis, discourse organisation, aims to bring together some of the broader areas of importance to Lavukaleve discourse. The expression of questions and negation is described in Chapter 17. In Chapter 18 is a discussion of typical Lavukaleve ways of structuring discourse in narratives for textual cohesion, and an examination of how reference tracking devices operate across a larger section of narrative than a single sentence.

An appendix containing a glossed text forms the final part of this thesis.
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Abbreviations and conventions

A subject of a transitive verb (S is used for both transitive and intransitive subject unless specified in the text)
ABILitative (verb suffix)
ACTion (particle)
ADMONitive (verb suffix)
ANTerior (verb suffix)
Art article
CAUSative (verb suffix)
COMPLetive (verb suffix)
DEMonstrative
DIST1 distal (demonstrative category)
DIST2 unspecified distal (demonstrative category)
du dual
DURative (verb suffix)
DURIMP Durative Imperative (verb suffix)
EFOC focus marker from heo paradigm
EMPHatic (particle)
ex exclusive
EXTended (verb and deictic suffix)
f feminine
FEMinine gender
FOC focus marker from feo paradigm
FOLK people of a place (nominal suffix)
FUTure tense (verb suffix)
GROUP referent forms a group (nominal suffix)
HABitual (verb suffix)
HORTative (verb suffix)
IMPF Imperfective (verb suffix)
in inclusive
INTention (particle)
INTRansitiviser (verb suffix)
k.o. kind of (used in glosses of some nouns)
LOCative (nominal suffix)
LOCEMPH locative emphatic (particle)
LOCZR Locativiser (verb suffix)
m masculine
MASCuline gender
MEDial (demonstrative category)
MOD demonstrative modifier (from hoia paradigm)
MORE (verb suffix)
n neuter
NEGative (verb suffix)
NEUTer gender
NF Non-Finite (verb suffix)
NOMZR Nominaliser (verb suffix)
O object
NP Noun phrase
PCTIMP Punctual Imperative (verb suffix)
PERLative (nominal suffix)
pl plural
PN demonstrative pronoun (from foia paradigm)
POSSEssive (nominal prefix)
POTential (verb suffix)
PREDicative (demonstrative identifier)
PRESent tense (verb suffix)
PROXimal (demonstrative category)
PSNV Presentative (verb suffix)
PSV Possessor-subject verb (verb suffix)
PURPosive (verb suffix)
QFOC focus marker from meo paradigm
RECIProcal (verb suffix)
REDUPlicated
S subject (both transitive and intransitive unless otherwise stated)
SBD subordinate (verb prefix)
sg singular
sp species (used in glosses of some nouns)
SPECifier (adjective)
sth something
SUCCEssive (verb suffix)
SURPrise (verb suffix)
TAM tense, aspect and mood (verbal categories)
VOCative (particle)
PUNCTUATION IN EXAMPLE SENTENCES

in Lavukaleve examples:

comma - non-final rise in pitch
fullstop - sentence-final drop in pitch
exclamation mark - prosodically prominent element inserted into intonation contour
question mark - question intonation
quote marks - direct speech
slash - pause with even pitch (only used where it is relevant to the point under discussion)

In glosses, the gender of a noun is given in brackets after the noun e.g. fish(m).

In glosses, only those verb prefix forms which distinguish between Subject, Object and/or Possessive are glossed as such. All 2nd person forms, and 1st person dual and plural, which do not distinguish these grammatical roles, are unmarked for these roles in glosses, even when their syntactic role is clear.

In translations, square brackets indicate explanatory material not actually present in the text. The letter/number codes at the ends of the translations refer to the exact place in the text from which the example was taken. Those beginning e1, e2 and e3 were either elicited or heard in conversation. Those beginning pr are from the translated prayer services. The rest are from spontaneous narrative texts.
Map 1: The Solomon Islands in the south-west Pacific

Map 2: The Solomon Islands
CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

1.1 LAVUKALEN AND LAVUKALS

Lavukaleve, a Papuan language, is the language of the Russell Islands, which is a group of islands in the Central Province of the Solomon Islands. The Russells consist of one large island Pavuvu ('the mainland', in local terms), which is about 34 kilometres at its widest part and 26 kilometres at its longest, and another largish island, Banika (about 14 kilometres at its widest, and 22 kilometres at its longest), with a hundred or so smaller islands clustered around them. Legend has it that there used to be 100 islands in the Russells, but during a cyclone one sank, leaving the 99 there supposedly are today.

There are perhaps 2000 Lavukal people, by my own estimate, who live in these islands, in eleven or so main villages and a small number of hamlets.

There are many non-Lavukal people also living in the Russells. These include the Tikopians, a Polynesian group who were resettled by the British colonial government in the 1950s from their own island of Tikopia. They now live largely in two villages on Pavuvu: Nukufero and Samata. There are also many non-Lavukal people living in Yandina, the provincial capital. Mostly these people are from Malaita and Guadalcanal, who have come to Yandina for work. There are also non-Lavukal people living in the south of the Russells at Linggatu, working for a logging company which operates on Pavuvu. There are also a couple of villages of non-Lavukal people working for Russell Islands Plantation Estates Limited (RIPEL), a company that owns coconut and cocoa plantations and a small amount of cattle, mostly on Pavuvu. Apart from these areas, the only other non-Lavukal people in the Russells are those few who have married Lavukals and live in Lavukal villages.
There are comparatively few Lavukals working for RIPEL and living in Yandina or the other company centres, and very few Lavukals living outside the Russells. I know of a handful of Lavukal families living in Honiara. Almost all Lavukals live in the villages of the Russells.

These villages range in size from a handful of families to some hundreds of people. Most villages consist of a collection of houses, each with a separate kitchen, loosely organised around the central focal feature, the church. The people of the West Russells belong to the Church of Melanesia, an Anglican church; the East Russells are Catholic.

Most of the villages have been settled in recent times. Originally Lavukal people always lived on the largest island, Pavuvu, but when the British company Levers (now RIPEL) set up their plantations on Pavuvu in the early 1900s, they relocated the Russell people, largely against their people’s will. They were resettled onto the smaller islands surrounding Pavuvu, and the struggle for the right to occupy Pavuvu continues today, and has been intensified by the operations of the logging company at Linggatu, in the south of Pavuvu. Nowadays most Lavukal villages are on the smaller islands.

According to my consultants, the Lavukal people are divided into four tribes: Keruval, Kaiselen, Solovui and Sevev. Black (1963: 13) also mentions two other tribes: Lakwil and Kakau, which were only known in Loun, and which appear to originate in Guadalcanal, a non-Lavukal island outside the Russells. I did not encounter these tribe
names. Black also says that Sevev is also a Guadalcanal tribe; my informants agree that Sevev is a new tribe, but they say it comes from Santa Isabel. These tribes are further divided into clans. A clan is a group of sisters of one mother, so there is no fixed number of them. A person belongs to the clan, and the tribe, of their mother. Clans too are named, with the name of a female ancestor. People must marry outside their clan, and preferably outside their tribe.

Each tribe has a chief, always a man. Chiefdom is inherited through the clan line; the first-born son of the chiefly clan is chief of the tribe (my informants contradict Black (1963: 13), who says there is no chiefly line). The tribal chief administers control of the land and reef owned by the tribe.

Tribes are land-owning units. Different parts of the Russell Islands belong to different tribes. Members of each tribe are dispersed throughout the villages, but there is a preponderance of some tribes in some villages. Thus, people of the Keruval tribe mostly live in Karumulun, Kaiselen mostly live in Marulaon and Loun, Solovui people mostly live in Laola and Hae, and Sevev are mostly in Ale.

There is also a village chief for each village. This is not a hereditary title; the chief, always a man, is elected (although my personal observation is that village chiefdom does tend to run along father-son lines). The village chief has jurisdiction and responsibility over village matters.

Villages usually consist of a group of closely related families living together, usually with one nuclear family per house. Typically, a village is started up by a clan, usually consisting of two or more sisters and their families. Land is owned by women, passed through the matrilineal line, so women, as landowners, are the only ones who have a right to start a new village on previously unused land.

Lavukals live a subsistence agricultural and fishing lifestyle, growing kumara (sweet potato) as a staple food, and supplementing this with other vegetables and fish and seafood. Many people also earn a small amount of money by making copra (dried coconut flesh) from their coconut plantations, and selling it to RIPEL in Yandina. People spend their money mostly on tobacco, rice, tinned fish, clothes, kitchen utensils, petrol for motorised canoe transport, and school fees.

1.2 Lavukaleve

Lavukaleve is the name of the language of the Lavukal people, who belong to Lavukalen, the Russell Islands. These words are analysable: the name of the people consists of the stem lavu (the meaning of which is not known by Lavukals) with the plural suffix -kal. The language name consists of lavukal, the name of the people, together with the word ve ‘pertaining to’ (these are two separate words which have fused in this collocation) meaning ‘pertaining to the Lavukals’. Lavukalen is lavukal,
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again, with the Locative suffix -n; thus, 'the place of the Lavukals'. Lavukalen is the indigenous term for what is known in English as the Russell Islands.

In earlier literature, Lavukals and Lavukaleve are occasionally referred to as Laumbe. Capell (1969) says that Laumbe is the term used by people from Santa Isabel (see map of the Solomon Islands, page xxv) to refer to the Lavukals.

Lavukals divide their language into three main areas. The western area (actually north-western) consists of the main villages of Losiolen, Mane, Leru, Baesen, Marulaon, Karumulun, Ale, Nono and Laola. The central area consists of the village of Hae. The eastern (actually south-eastern) area consists of six main villages: Loun, Moe, Linggatu, Tain, Hoi and Alokan.

These three linguistic areas are characterised by different intonation patterns, all defined with respect to the language of the western area, which is considered by Lavukals of all three areas to be the real language, and the most conservative. The Hae language is characterised by a so-called sing-song intonation pattern. The speech of eastern Lavukals is said to be strong and harsh. The eastern areas have also had far more influence from Solomon Island Pijin and Guadalcanal languages through intermarriage, and there is substantial language mixing. There are no generally recognised lexical or grammatical differences between these language varieties, apart from those resulting from language mixing in the east.

1.3 LINGUISTIC AFFILIATION

Lavukaleve is a Papuan language. The term Papuan is a cover term, used to refer to languages in northwestern Melanesia which are not Austronesian. Papuan languages as a group are a negatively-defined areal grouping, as opposed to Austronesian languages, which are a well-demonstrated genetic grouping. Most Papuan languages are spoken on mainland New Guinea; that is, in Irian Jaya and Papua New Guinea. There are also Papuan languages in island New Guinea, including New Britain, New Ireland, reaching as far west as Timor and Alor, and as far east as the Solomon Islands.

1.3.1 LINGUISTIC PICTURE OF THE SOLOMON ISLANDS

Most of the languages of the Solomon Islands are Austronesian: there are around 63 Austronesian languages in the Solomon Islands (Tryon and Hackman 1983), and a handful of non-Austronesian, or Papuan languages. The classification of some of the languages of the Reef Islands and Santa Cruz has been the subject of some controversy, as to whether they are originally Austronesian, heavily influenced by Papuan languages, or whether they are in fact Papuan, heavily influenced by Austronesian languages (see elsewhere in the language it is not possible to have a plural-suffixed noun with a Locative suffix.)
e.g. Lincoln 1978, Wurm 1978; and Wurm 1982 for a brief overview).

The Austronesian languages of the Solomon Islands can be divided into three major genetic subgroups (Tryon and Hackman 1983: 49 ff.; Ross 1988): firstly North-West Solomonic, which includes all the Austronesian languages of the Solomon Islands from the north-west, down to just above the southern tip of Santa Isabel. North-West Solomonic is part of the Meso-Melanesian cluster and it also includes languages from Bougainville, New Ireland and so on, and is part of Western Oceanic. Secondly, there is South-East Solomonic, which includes everything from the southern tip of Santa Isabel down to Makira. This group is part of Eastern Oceanic. Thirdly, there are the Eastern Outer Islands languages, which are the Austronesian Santa Cruz languages.

The Papuan languages of the Solomon Islands which are still spoken are Lavukaleve, Bilua (spoken on Vella Lavella), Baniata (spoken on Rendova), Savosavo (spoken on Savo Island), and some of the languages of the Reef Islands/Santa Cruz, in the Eastern Outer Islands of Temotu Province (the other languages of Reef Islands/Santa Cruz are Polynesian). It is not clear whether these Papuan languages of the Solomon Islands form a family or not.

1.3.2 PREVIOUS CLASSIFICATIONS OF LAVUKALEVE

Codrington (1885) does not mention Lavukaleve in his vast compendium on the languages of Oceania. Ray (1928) is the first mention of Lavukaleve in print. Ray was the first to recognise Lavukaleve as a non-Austronesian language, and he classified it, together with Bilua, Baniata and Savosavo, as a non-Austronesian language of the Solomon Islands. Lanyon-Orgill (1953) noted its existence as one of the Papuan languages of the Solomon Islands, together with Savosavo, Bilua, Baniata and Kazukuru2. He notes that there is little relationship between these languages; although he does make a claim for their genetic relatedness, and indeed makes a perhaps somewhat wild claim (considering the paucity of the data he was working with) for their relatedness to languages outside of the Solomon Islands:

A glance at the vocabulary shows little internal relationship between them, and in general it must be admitted that from this standpoint the only characteristic which they have in common is that their vocabulary is non-Melanesian. However, we are justified in believing them to be originally of one major stock for their syntax shows features not only common to the Papuan languages of the Melanesian islands, but also to the Papuan languages of New Guinea and the Louisiade Archipelago, and also, in a modified form, to the more archaic dialects of New Caledonia and the New Hebrides, and again – perhaps somewhat surprisingly – to the languages formerly spoken in Tasmania. (1953: 126)

2 Lanyon-Orgill (1953: 124) says that there is a vocabulary of and grammatical notes on Lavukaleve among the Ivens papers in the Library of the School of Oriental Studies. I have not seen these.
Shortly after this, Capell said of Lavukaleve:

The language, generally referred to as Laumbe, is entirely unstudied, although it is known to be non-Austronesian. Its structure appears to be decidedly complicated. Dr. Fox, who has paid some attention to it\(^1\), mentions thirty-nine different ways of showing the plural of nouns. (Capell 1954: 85)

In a later work, Capell explicitly mentions Lavukaleve, Bilua, Baniata and Savosavo as the languages of the Western Solomons that are non-Austronesian, and also mentions the possibility of some of the Reef Islands and Santa Cruz languages as being non-Austronesian (Capell 1962: 371).

Greenberg (1971) follows these earlier analyses in making a claim for the genetic unity of the four languages Lavukaleve, Bilua, Baniata and Savosavo together as non-Austronesian, in his Indo-Pacific Hypothesis. Bilua, Baniata, Savo (Savosavo) and Laumbe (Lavukaleve) “seem to constitute another subgroup” (p. 816): the central Solomon languages. Together with the languages of Reef Islands/Santa Cruz, they form his Central Melanesian group. Note, however, that his evidence rests solely on the basis of comparison of pronouns and 52 lexical items.

Wurm (1972) proposed the East Papuan Phylum, which was revised in Wurm (1975), and more recently stated in Wurm (1982). The proposal is made mostly on the basis of typological features, such as the existence in these languages of genders, a dual number category, an inclusive/exclusive distinction in 1st person non-singular pronouns, four places for stops and nasals, and so on.

Wurm’s East Papuan Phylum includes the area from the north-east and east of mainland PNG onwards: New Britain, Rossel Island, across the Solomon Islands as far as the Reef Islands-Santa Cruz Archipelago. The East Papuan Phylum has three main parts: Bougainville, Reef Islands/Santa Cruz, and Central Solomons-Yele – New Britain. Within Central Solomons-Yele, there are three parts: Central Solomons, the extinct Kazukuru family, formerly spoken on New Georgia in the Solomon Islands, and Yele. The following tree shows Wurm’s (1982) proposal:

\(^1\) Unfortunately it has not been possible to trace the data on which Fox based this comment; or indeed, to find the source of Capell’s comment.
Todd (1975) attempts to formalise the proposal of a genetic relationship between Lavukaleve, Bilua, Savosavo and Baniata, by means of comparison of morphological forms in the four languages. Todd used her own data for the classification, which was far more extensive than the data used by Greenberg and Wurm. She tentatively subgroups Savosavo and Bilua more closely together than Lavukaleve and Baniata, and she also suggests that Yele (Rossel Island) may be part of the same family, based on independent pronoun paradigms, possessive prefixes, noun number suffixes and vocabulary.

If Lavukaleve does have any relatives, these other three Solomon Islands Papuan languages, Savosavo, Bilua, and Baniata are the strongest candidates. However they are structurally very different to Lavukaleve, and indeed to each other, and a genetic relationship may be difficult to demonstrate. As Capell notes, “These languages [Bilua, Baniata, Kazukuru, Lavukaleve and Savosavo] share some common vocabulary, but it is small, and they are more outstanding for their differences not only from [Austronesian languages] but amongst themselves” (1969: 2).

Todd’s work is suggestive, but far more work needs to be done on basic grammatical description of these languages before any firm conclusions about their past are possible. This grammar, as well as that of Obata (in prep.) on Bilua, is a step in this direction.

1.3.3 More Recent Contact

Lavukaleve has long been surrounded by Austronesian languages, but Tryon and Hackman’s (1983) counts of shared lexical items in languages of the Solomon Islands show that it shares comparatively little of their vocabulary; and indeed comparatively
little with the Papuan languages in the area as well.

Shared lexical percentages between the Papuan and Austronesian languages in the Solomons are very low (Wurm 1982: 234). The highest shared lexical percentage between Lavukaleve and a Papuan language is 13.7% (from a comparison of 197 words), with Savosavo (all figures in this section are from Tryon and Hackman 1983). Lavukaleve shares 7.6% of its lexicon with Bilua (comparison of 197 words) and 8.2% with Baniata (comparison of 195 words). Austronesian languages on Guadalcanal, the nearest land mass to the Russells, generally share around 8.5% with Lavukaleve. Poro, spoken on Santa Isabel, shares 8.9% (from a comparison of 190 words), and Nggela, from Florida (and widespread as a missionary-encouraged lingua franca) shares 8.7% (comparison of 196 words), and Langalanga from Malaita shares 8.2% (comparison of 195 words). Most other languages of the Solomons share around 4% or 5% with Lavukaleve.

These shared lexical percentage figures are very low. As a comparison, Austronesian languages in the Solomon Islands tend to share around 30%-50% vocabulary with each other. Lavukaleve shares at most 10.8% with any other Austronesian language (Paripao, a Lengo language from north-east Guadalcanal).

Thorough comparison of Lavukaleve’s grammar with the grammars of nearby Austronesian languages is necessary to determine whether, and what kind of, linguistic borrowing has taken place between them. This thesis is merely the first step in this process.

In various places throughout this thesis, some comparison is made to various Austronesian languages, usually where there is a strikingly similar grammatical pattern to something in Austronesian languages, or evidence of Austronesian loan words in a particular area of Lavukaleve grammar. The Russell Islands are surrounded on three sides by islands with Austronesian-speaking people. Lavukal stories tell of a long history of contact between the people of New Georgia, Santa Isabel and Guadalcanal and the Russells. For this reason, I generally make comparisons with Austronesian languages from those areas. Because of the scarcity of linguistic data from many of these areas, I make most reference to Tolo, a language from south-east Guadalcanal, which has a dictionary and grammatical sketch (Smith Crowley 1986); Cheke Holo, a Santa Isabel language with a dictionary and grammatical sketch (White 1988); and Roviana, a New Georgia language, again with a dictionary and grammatical sketch (Whitehead 1949). I also have recourse to Proto Oceanic reconstructions, especially from Ross, Pawley and Osmond (1998).

It is of course far easier to show that a word is Austronesian in origin, than to show exactly which language Lavukaleve borrowed the word from. When I refer to a word from a particular Austronesian language, I am not making a claim that that was the language from which the word was borrowed into Lavukaleve; I am just showing that
the word is borrowed. Many words are also borrowed from Solomon Island Pijin; these words are usually immediately recognisable.

1.4 Previous Work on Lavukaleve

Ray (1928) presents some data on Lavukaleve (he calls it Laumbe), including a partial pronoun paradigm, some information on numerals, possession and adjectives, a few sentences and a 30-word vocabulary. Capell did some field work on Lavukaleve in 1960, some of which is published in a brief comparative grammatical sketch of Lavukaleve, Bilua, Baniata and Savosavo (Capell 1969). Todd did more field work on Lavukaleve in 1972-1973 and published a somewhat longer comparative sketch of it and Bilua, Baniata and Savosavo in Todd (1975). Black (1963), an ethnographic study of Russell Islanders, is the only other work concerning Lavukal people.

1.5 The Language Situation Today

In 1954, Capell said of Lavukaleve: “It is spoken only by some 250 people, but a record should be made of it before it is swamped by Bugotu. There is no doubt that this is what will ultimately happen” (Capell 1954: 85).

This prediction is based on the fact that Bugotu was for some time the lingua franca of the Melanesian Mission in Santa Isabel and the Russells (Capell 1954: 84), and, given the small number of speakers Capell found, his prediction was reasonable. However things have not developed as he expected. The influence of Bugotu has declined, to the extent that no Lavukal I know speaks it. At the same time, the Solomon Islands has experienced a population explosion; with a growth rate of 3.5% (Solomon Islands National Literacy Committee 1992), the Solomon Islands has more people now than it ever has had. And until recently, this expanded population has been in the villages, living the traditional lifestyle and speaking vernacular languages. Lavukaleve has more speakers now than it has ever had.

However, even though the Lavukal population has grown, Lavukaleve itself is seriously threatened, but the threat comes not from Bugotu but from Pijin and English. Solomon Island Pijin, the lingua franca for the whole country, has a strong influence in the Russells. All radio broadcasts are in Pijin or English. The language of the church (both Anglican and Catholic) is mostly English, although there are some Anglican church services in Lavukaleve (Church of England in New Zealand 1951, c.1973, and Church of England in Melanesia 1975), and translation of more liturgies is in progress. School is conducted in English and Pijin. Apart from the Church of Melanesia orders of service, there are currently no reading materials available to Lavukal people, written in Lavukaleve. The languages of the outside world are Pijin and English. Even though Lavukaleve is the first language for most Lavukals, most people, especially younger people, are also fluent in Pijin. In the West Russells, people live a very traditional
lifestyle and have little access to town and outside influences, and all children grow up learning Lavukaleve as their first language. In the East Russells however, an area much closer to Yandina both geographically and socially, Pijin is slowly taking over, and many families do not speak Lavukaleve to their children. As a result, many of the families I talked to in the East Russells have children who cannot speak Lavukaleve.

This situation of people preferring to use the language of the outside world rather than their vernacular language is a story familiar from all over the world. For the Lavukals, the situation will probably get worse as more people move to town to access outside resources. Experience already shows that when this happens, Lavukaleve may quickly be lost.

1.6 THE NATURE OF THE DATA USED IN THIS THESIS

The data used in this thesis was collected by me, during three field trips taken between 1995 and 1998. A total of ten months was spent in the field. I lived in Mane Village, in the family of Patterson Barua, the chief of the Keruval tribe. It was not chance that led me to this village of all the Russells villages. The West Russells is acknowledged by Lavukals to have the best language speakers, who do not mix their language with Pijin, so it was deemed most suitable for me to learn Lavukaleve in the West. Mane was chosen because Patterson, as well as being a very important man, and therefore an appropriate person to look after a foreigner and teach me the language, is also engaged in translating the prayer book of the Anglican Church of Melanesia into Lavukaleve.

Most of my data consists of recorded stories, told by people from most of the villages of the West Russells. I have about 60 such stories, in total around eight hours of speech. The stories are traditional stories of the Lavukal people (for instance, origin myths, many stories about giants and magical old ladies, stories about magical animals and so on), life histories, stories about particular experiences (for instance getting married, an exciting fishing adventure), history stories (for instance earthquakes and cyclones and how various villages were started, how the Christian church came to the Russells), and procedural texts explaining to me how to do things (for instance how to weave mats, how to make traditional pudding, how to go kite-fishing).

Most of the stories in my corpus are told by men; it is very difficult for women to overcome their shyness of the recording machine; but as people got to know me better, I got more and more stories by women. The stories by women are all told by personal friends in villages where I have spent some considerable time. In villages where I only visited for a few days, I usually only got stories by men. The speakers range in age from late teens to their seventies.

The stories were narrated as monologues, into the tape recorder, with me and usually Patterson present, and, often, with a group of interested listeners also. Most people were very nervous of the tape recorder, and a couple of people wrote their stories down first,
then read them into the machine. These stories were not used for anything involving intonation.

The corpus also consists of some thousands of sentences written down by me, either elicited, or heard in conversation, or explicitly taught to me. There is also Patterson’s translation of parts of the prayer book of the Church of Melanesia.

All the stories were transcribed by Patterson and me, and have been checked at least three times. Elicited sentences also were checked when they were written down. Patterson’s prayer service translations have been checked extensively by him, and also by both of us together.

Patterson acted as my main linguistic informant. We spoke Solomon Pijin for work sessions. I was taught to speak Lavukaleve by everyone I interacted with, which was mostly Patterson and his wife Monica, my neighbour Emily, my friend Marion, as well as most of the Mane children. Most of my interaction in the village was conducted in Pijin initially, moving more to Lavukaleve as I learnt more. I am at best only a partial speaker at this stage.

Most of my time was spent in Mane village, but I also stayed in most of the other villages of the West Russells and collected data from nearly all of them. I have visited some of the Eastern villages; notably Loun and Alokan, but I have no data from there. For logistical reasons of transport difficulties, and also for political reasons to do with my affiliation with Patterson’s faction, I was able to spend very little time in the East. For these reasons, my corpus consists entirely of the speech variety of the West Russells.

1.7 Typological Overview of Lavukaleve

Lavukaleve has a medium-sized consonant phoneme inventory, with three places of articulation for stops (b, t, k) and nasals (m, n, ng). There is a marginal voicing distinction, in the two bilabial stops (p, b) and the two alveolar stops (t, d), but this distinction pertains mostly to loan words. There are three fricative phonemes (f, s, h), two approximants: a voiced velar approximant (g) and an unrounded bilabial approximant (v), and one rhotic and one lateral. There is a five-vowel system (i, e, a, o, u). Unusually for the region there is no contrasting series of oral versus prenasalised stops (although prenasalised allophones of the voiced stops do exist). Syllables can be open or closed, and consonant clusters consisting of two consonants, as well as unlimited vowel sequences, occur frequently. Stress is unpredictable, although it most commonly falls on the initial syllable of a word.

There are two major word classes in Lavukaleve: nouns and verbs. There are also a

---

*All references in this section to typical Papuan and Oceanic patterns are from Lynch (1998).*
large number of minor classes, including adjectives, demonstratives, pronouns, focus markers, postpositions, conjunctions, the Habitual Auxiliary, locationals, demonstrative identifiers and verb adjuncts. There is a definite article, unlike in almost all Papuan languages. It is marked for gender and number, and is the final member of a noun phrase. Many of the Oceanic languages of the Solomon Islands have definite articles, but they precede, rather than follow, their noun.

Nouns are divided into three genders. This is a feature common in languages of the East Papuan Phylum, and rare in Oceanic languages. Gender in Lavukaleve is marked in agreement forms on all noun modifiers, and on verbs through participant marking prefixes and suffixes. Gender distinctions are maintained in singular and dual forms throughout all areas of the language, but are collapsed in the plural. Nouns are overtly marked for number, and the methods of marking number are highly complex and irregular. There are up to 80 different ways of creating dual and plural forms of nouns. Plural formation depends largely on phonological and semantic criteria, and also bears some relationship to gender. Dual formation operates on different principles, largely depending on the phonological shape of the singular noun. There is case marking for three spatial/relational cases, but these have a low functional load. Possession is marked by a prefix on the possessed noun. Types of possession are undifferentiated, as in most Papuan languages, as opposed to Oceanic languages, in which possession is frequently a very complex area. In Oceanic languages, possessive affixes are frequently the same as object affixes; in Lavukaleve, all but one are identical to subject affixes. Like in most Papuan languages, but unlike in Oceanic languages, all modifiers follow their head noun.

Deictics are a highly elaborated feature of Lavukaleve. There are personal pronouns for 1st and 2nd persons, but not for 3rd person. The functional domain of personal pronouns in the 3rd person is filled instead by a demonstrative modifier, and two demonstrative pronouns, all three of which are marked for gender, number and three degrees of distance from the speaker, with a further distinction made in the distal category between specific and non-specific location. The two demonstrative pronouns differ solely in terms of their discourse pragmatics. One is used for a referent which is uppermost in the minds of speaker and addressee. The other is used for a referent who was referred to previously but who is not the last referent to have been mentioned. This demonstrative is used to switch attention between more than one referent in a discourse. The demonstrative modifier and this demonstrative pronoun, along with various other spatial deictics, have derived presentative forms, and also derived predicative forms. There is also a set of demonstrative identifiers which occur in a similar functional domain to the deictic predicates.

Verbs are the most morphologically complex of Lavukaleve words. Person, gender, number and syntactic role (subject and object) are marked by two prefix slots, and suffixes mark tense, aspect, mood and derivational categories such as causative, reciprocal, locativisation, nominalisation, intransitivisation, and intensity. There are also
three categories of subordination, as well as other categories including negation and extendedness, which can be marked by verbal suffixes. Verbs can also take a suffix to mark the gender and number of one participant. This gender/number marking is used to mark the subject of stative/resultative intransitive verbs (as opposed to active intransitive verbs which use a verbal subject prefix to cross-reference their subject), and also on the verbs of relative clauses and focus constructions.

Complex predicates are extremely common, and consist of verb-plus-auxiliary structures, serial verb constructions, and, to a much lesser extent, verb-adjunct combinations. Serial verb constructions are common in both Papuan and Oceanic languages, and adjunct constructions are well known in Papuan languages. Lavukaleve however does not make extensive use of either, preferring separate clauses for combining predicates and other expressions in general for common collocations.

Like many Papuan languages, one of the methods Lavukaleve uses to combine predicates is clause chaining. There are three verbal suffixes used in clause chains, which indicate the temporal relationship of the chained clause to the following clause. However, unusually for a language which has clause chaining, there is no switch-reference marking, and indeed there are no restrictions on argument sharing between chained clauses. Subordination is also a very frequent method of clause combining, and there are a few different semantic types of subordinate clauses. While in almost all areas of its morpho-syntax Lavukaleve is a nominative/accusative language, adverbial subordinate clauses involve a split-ergative marking system in which first and second person subjects follow a nominative/accusative participant marking system whereas third person subjects follow an ergative/absolutive marking system. Relative clauses are internally-headed; their heads are syntactically part of the relative clause, not the main clause.

Constituent order in Lavukaleve is fixed: SV/AOV. Departures from this norm are rare; an argument which is an afterthought can be postposed. Preposing and postposing for emphasis do not occur in Lavukaleve; these pragmatic functions are carried out instead by focus constructions.

Focus is a central part of Lavukaleve morpho-syntax. It is heavily grammaticalised into clause structure, and extremely frequent in discourse. Roughly one third of all clauses have some kind of grammatical focus construction. Any constituent can be focussed, including NPs, postpositional phrases and other nominal adjuncts, adverbs, predicates (either just a verb, or a verb with its object), subordinate clauses, the lexical part of a complex predicate, or indeed whole sentences. There are two different kinds of syntactic focus construction, one with the verb in a special form, used to mark focus on predicates (verb plus object) or whole sentences, and one without this special verb form, used for focussing on arguments, adjuncts and non-main verbal forms. In both construction types, focus is marked by special particles, which occur immediately after the focussed constituent and show agreement in person, gender and number. The scope
of the focus is indicated by the agreement of the focus marker. There are three separate focus markers, which differ in terms of the sentence type with which they occur. One is used only in polar questions; one in content questions and environments expressing particular kinds of emphasis; the third is used elsewhere.

There is a deep relationship between deictics and focus markers involving, among other things, a system of alliterative discord, a type of agreement system in which the form of a deictic in a focus construction requires the form of the focus marker to disagree with it in its initial consonant.

Focus marking and deictics are the most highly elaborated areas of Lavukaleve morphosyntax, and indeed the largest chapters of this description are devoted to these. In these areas Lavukaleve finds grammatical expression of discourse-pragmatic domains of focus, emphasis and activation. Indeed, as is clear from the description to follow, it is not possible to explicate the basic morpho-syntax of Lavukaleve without making constant reference to these pragmatic domains.
CHAPTER TWO

Phonology and morphophonology

2.1 INTRODUCTION

A classical phonemic analysis works well for a description of Lavukaleve phonology. This chapter describes Lavukaleve sounds in terms of phonemes and their allophones. The chapter contains an inventory of the phonemes, followed by a description of their major allophones and their phonetic realisations. The phonological structure of words is described, followed by an analysis of stress rules. Intonation is dealt with briefly, in the final section of the phonological description. The following section of the chapter discusses the few morphophonemic processes in the language. After this is a discussion of orthographic issues.

2.2 THE PHONEMES

The phoneme inventory of Lavukaleve consists of fifteen consonants and five vowels. The consonants and vowels are set out in the following sections:
2.2.1 CONSONANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>bilabial</th>
<th>labiodental</th>
<th>alveolar</th>
<th>velar</th>
<th>glottal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>voiceless stop</td>
<td>(p)</td>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced stop</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nasal</td>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liquid</td>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fricative</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approximant</td>
<td>β</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>η</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phonemes in brackets are marginal phonemes in Lavukaleve; their distribution is discussed in Section 2.3.1 below.

2.2.2 VOWELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>front</th>
<th>back</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 DESCRIPTION OF THE PHONEMES

This section presents a list of the phonemes with their major allophones and phonetic realisations, with examples of each.

2.3.1 STOPS

Stops include the voiceless series /p/, /t/, /k/ and voiced /b/ and /d/. Both /p/ and /d/ are rare phonemes, occurring in few words, a large proportion of which are, in each case, obviously recent loan words. They are considered to be phonemes of Lavukaleve because they are in contrastive distribution with other phonemes.

All stops can occur syllable-initially, but only /t/ and /k/ can occur syllable-finally (see Section 2.6 below).

* /p/ voiceless aspirated bilabial stop

  -> [pʰ]

This phoneme is rare; it occurs in only 14 words in the entire corpus, including six
which are obvious recent loans from Pijin. There are no minimal pairs between this phoneme and the closest other phoneme /b/; but there are sub-minimal pairs (see Section 2.4 below). They are consistently pronounced differently from each other. In addition, speakers clearly see them as different; the two sounds are always written differently by native speakers. These reasons are enough to distinguish /p/ and /b/ as separate phonemes.

examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>phoneme</th>
<th>pronunciation</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hapilo</td>
<td>[hapʰilo]</td>
<td>'wow!'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>para</td>
<td>[pʰara]</td>
<td>'larrikin'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sosopen</td>
<td>[sosopʰen]</td>
<td>'pot' (loan from Pijin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sepul</td>
<td>[sepʰul]</td>
<td>'snatch'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- /t/ voiceless aspirated alveolar stop

  -> [tʰ] ~ [t] /#
  -> [t] elsewhere

This phoneme is sometimes unaspirated when word-initial. This is particularly the case with certain words. For example the exclamation tumai 'really!' is almost always pronounced with unaspirated [t].

examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>phoneme</th>
<th>pronunciation</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tata</td>
<td>[tʰatʰa]</td>
<td>'spider'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keut</td>
<td>[kʰeutʰ]</td>
<td>'skin'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- /k/ voiceless aspirated velar stop

  -> [kʰ]

examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>phoneme</th>
<th>pronunciation</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kariała</td>
<td>[kʰariala]</td>
<td>'easily'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>telako</td>
<td>[tʰelakʰo]</td>
<td>'one'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fa'luk</td>
<td>[fa'luhkʰ]</td>
<td>'cabbage'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The first column in this and similar charts throughout this chapter is in the orthography described in Section 2.12 below.
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• /b/ voiced bilabial stop

  -> [ʰb] ~ [b] /V-V
  -> [b] elsewhere

This phoneme is often prenasalised intervocalically.

examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ho'bea</th>
<th>[ho'bea] ~ [ho'bea]</th>
<th>'good'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>baere</td>
<td>['baere']</td>
<td>'tell a story'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• /d/ voiced alveolar stop

  -> [ʰd] ~ [d] /V-V
  -> [d] elsewhere

Like the other voiced stop /b/, /d/ is often prenasalised between vowels. The phoneme /d/ is very rare; it appears in only 13 words in the corpus, three of which are obvious recent loans from Pijin. The words are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>daeva</th>
<th>'goggles' (cf. Pijin daeva)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dis</td>
<td>'bowl' (cf. Pijin dis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>redio</td>
<td>'radio' (cf. Pijin redio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dia-ria</td>
<td>'where?'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diahi-riahi</td>
<td>'where to?'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doi-roi</td>
<td>'which?'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daine-raine</td>
<td>'tomorrow'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dokulu</td>
<td>'iron bar'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dom</td>
<td>'one' (used for counting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>midua</td>
<td>'bee'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pi'pido</td>
<td>'common screw shell'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de</td>
<td>'here!' (Presentational particle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hide</td>
<td>'thus'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is considered a phoneme because there are minimal pairs contrasting /d/ and the closest phonemes to it, /t/ and /ɾ/ (see below, Section 2.4). It does occur in function words, for example question words doi 'which'; dia 'where'; however in these words it freely alternates with /ɾ/. This alternation between /ɾ/ and /d/ is lexically constrained; it only occurs in a small group of question and time words, and never in any other words containing /ɾ/ or /d/. The alternation between /ɾ/ and /d/ is discussed in Section 2.10 below.
examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dokulu</th>
<th>[ˈdokʰulu]</th>
<th>‘iron’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hide</td>
<td>[ˈhiʔde]</td>
<td>‘thus’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>midua</td>
<td>[ˈmiʔdua]</td>
<td>‘bee’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.2 NASALS

There are three nasal phonemes in Lavukaleve: /m/, /n/ and /ŋ/. Nasal phonemes in Lavukaleve do not have any obvious allophonic variation. Nasals, like stops, can all occur syllable-initially, but unlike some stops, they can also all occur syllable-finally.

- /m/ bilabial nasal

  -> [m]

examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>marigen</th>
<th>[ˈmar.iʔən]</th>
<th>‘yesterday’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lamukas</td>
<td>[ˈlamu.ʔas]</td>
<td>‘thousand’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>houm</td>
<td>[ˈhoun]</td>
<td>‘dolphins’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- /n/ alveolar nasal

  -> [n]

examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nun</th>
<th>[ˈnun]</th>
<th>‘four’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tina</td>
<td>[ˈtʰina]</td>
<td>‘body’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- /ŋ/ velar nasal

  -> [ŋ]

examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nganga</th>
<th>[ŋaŋa]</th>
<th>‘river’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kanongam</td>
<td>[kʰaŋoŋam]</td>
<td>‘ten’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sing</td>
<td>[siŋ]</td>
<td>‘womb’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.3 LIQUIDS

There are two liquid phonemes in Lavukaleve; a rhotic trill /ɾ/ and a lateral /l/. Like
nasals, liquids can occur syllable-initially and syllable-finally.

- /r/ alveolar trill
  -> [ɾ] ~ [ɾ̝] ~ [ɹ] in free variation

This phoneme is usually pronounced as a trill, but can also be pronounced a single tap or, more rarely, a continuant, in all environments.

examples:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ravu</td>
<td>['ra̪u] ~ ['ɾa̪u]</td>
<td>‘blood’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iire</td>
<td>['iire] ~ ['i̯i̯e]</td>
<td>‘yes’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fo'for</td>
<td>[fo'for]</td>
<td>‘fly’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- /l/ alveolar lateral
  -> [l]

examples:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>le'laol</td>
<td>[le'laol]</td>
<td>‘two (f)’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vala</td>
<td>['βala]</td>
<td>‘stomach’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feil</td>
<td>['feil]</td>
<td>‘bow’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.4 FRICATIVES

There are three fricative phonemes in Lavukaleve: /f/, /s/ and /h/. All three fricatives can occur syllable-initially, but only /f/ and /s/ can occur syllable-finally.

- /f/ labiodental fricative
  -> [f]

examples:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>feman</td>
<td>['feman]</td>
<td>‘shark’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lafi</td>
<td>['lafi]</td>
<td>‘water’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lefalef</td>
<td>['lefalef]</td>
<td>‘basket’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- /s/ alveolar fricative
  -> [s]
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examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sie</td>
<td>[ˈsie]</td>
<td>'five'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi'visa</td>
<td>[biˈbisa]</td>
<td>'flower'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toto'as</td>
<td>[tʰoˈtʰo̞as]</td>
<td>'cloud'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- /h/ glottal fricative
  -> [h]

examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hano</td>
<td>[ˈhano]</td>
<td>'then'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lahavarae</td>
<td>[lahaβarae]</td>
<td>'troubled'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.5 APPROXIMANTS

There are two approximants in Lavukaleve: /β/ and /u/. They can occur both syllable-finally and syllable-initially.

- /β/ voiced unrounded bilabial approximant

The symbol /β/ is used in this description to represent a voiced unrounded bilabial approximant. This phoneme is pronounced with the lips spread, not rounded. There is a fricative variant which can occur in any position, but it is relatively uncommon. The symbol /β/ normally refers to a bilabial fricative. The International Phonetics Association has no symbol for the bilabial approximant, probably because the bilabial approximant and bilabial fricative are not distinguished phonemically in known languages of the world. However it is customary to use the /β/ symbol to represent the bilabial approximant in the languages in which it occurs (International Phonetics Association 1999: 9), as has been done here.

examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vatu</td>
<td>[ˈbatʰu]</td>
<td>'head'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sava</td>
<td>[ˈsaβa]</td>
<td>'nine'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma'ruiv</td>
<td>[maˈruïβ]</td>
<td>'wing'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- /u/ velar approximant
  -> [g] ~ [u] / -#
  -> [u] ~ [ɣ] ~ [g] elsewhere
The fricative and stop variants /ɣ/ and /ɡ/ of this phoneme are extremely rare. Almost always there is no obstruction; the [u̯] allophone of this phoneme has the widest distribution and is by far the most common of the three allophones.

examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>word</th>
<th>phoneme</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gonu</td>
<td>[u̯onu]</td>
<td>'turtle'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vuguru</td>
<td>[βu̯uru]</td>
<td>'back'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na'nug</td>
<td>[na'nuŋ]</td>
<td>'thought'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.6 VOWELS

Lavukaleve has a basic five-vowel system, with phonemes /a/, /e/, /i/, /o/ and /u/. There is no contrastive vowel length; long vowels are analysed as identical-vowel sequences (see below, Section 2.5).

- /i/ high front vowel
  - > [i] – [i] unstressed syllables
  - > [i] elsewhere

examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>word</th>
<th>phoneme</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ila</td>
<td>[i̯a]</td>
<td>'fishing net'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bilibili</td>
<td>[bili:bilii]</td>
<td>'hornbill'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- /e/ close-mid vowel
  - > [e]

examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>word</th>
<th>phoneme</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>enga</td>
<td>[e̯a]</td>
<td>'three'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sie</td>
<td>[si:e]</td>
<td>'five'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legis</td>
<td>[leui:s]</td>
<td>'leaf'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- /a/ low central vowel
  - > [a]

examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>word</th>
<th>phoneme</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ara</td>
<td>[a̯a]</td>
<td>'ground'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sava</td>
<td>[saβa]</td>
<td>'nine'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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• /o/ mid back vowel

-> [ɔ] ~ [ɔ]

examples:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>oa</td>
<td>['oa']</td>
<td>'six'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lomo</td>
<td>['lomo']</td>
<td>'beard'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• /u/ high back vowel

-> [ʊ] /m-

-> [u] elsewhere

This vowel drops in height considerably after /m/. It is often impossible to distinguish /o/ and /u/ after /m/, although native speakers always know which vowel phoneme it is (in terms of being able to spell the word consistently with either /o/ or /u/).

examples:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>urio</td>
<td>['urio']</td>
<td>'crab'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vuguru</td>
<td>['βυγαμουρο']</td>
<td>'back'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lalamu</td>
<td>['lalamo']</td>
<td>'morning'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For convenience, the rest of this chapter, and thesis, will use the orthographic conventions as set out in Section 2.12 below except where forms are quoted inside square brackets.

2.4 Minimal contrasts between the phonemes

This section shows minimal or near-minimal pairs involving phonetically close phonemes.

2.4.1 Consonants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th></th>
<th>Medial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p : b</td>
<td>para ‘larrakin’</td>
<td></td>
<td>tapalav ‘white people’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>baere ‘talk’</td>
<td></td>
<td>raba ‘rubber thong’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b : v</td>
<td>baisa ‘let’s go-GROUP’</td>
<td>-ba ‘Durative Imperative plural’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vaisa ‘sister’</td>
<td>-va ‘Punctual Imperative singular’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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b : f  
bei 'shellfish sp.'  natukoba 'wall post'
fei 'scrape'  kofa 'naked'

b : m  
bunu 'big house'
munu 'k.o.leaf'
sabo 'clear garden'
tamu 'no'

v : p  
vilu 'exceed'
piru 'bowline'
sevo 'tabu, don’t'
sepul 'snatch'

p : f  
piru 'bowline'
finu 'belongings'
sepul 'snatch'
tefutefur 'splash'

f : v  
fe 'foot'
tafe 'shelf'
ve 'go'
tave 'be not'

r : l  
re 'say'
er 'front of canoe'
le 'day'
ele 'see it'

d : l  
de 'here!'
midua 'bee'
doi 'where?'
ilua 'place name'

24.2 VOWELS

a : e : i  
la 'feminine singular definite article'
le 'day'
li 'build'
o : u  
ro 'one (feminine singular)'ru 'big (feminine singular)'
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2.5 **Vowel sequences**

Rules of syllable structure are such that very often vowels occur in sequences of two, three, four or more. These vowels are analysed here as vowel sequences, not diphthongs, on phonetic grounds, and on theoretical grounds.

Vowels in non-identical sequences always involve two prosodic peaks, not one, and it is not the case that of the vowels in a sequence, one has more prosodic prominence than the other; all vowels of a vowel sequence are given equal weight (except if one of them is stressed).

In addition, stress is a syllabic phenomenon, and the fact that vowels of a non-identical vowel sequence are syllables, not diphthongs, is shown by the fact that in a vowel sequence it is common for one to receive stress, and not another. For example:

```
o.'as  'bush'
'o.a  'six'
```

All but one of the possible combinations of two-vowel sequences have been found:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AA</th>
<th>AE</th>
<th>AI</th>
<th>AO</th>
<th>AU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>taalea</td>
<td>baere</td>
<td>lai</td>
<td>gao</td>
<td>tau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'shellfish sp.'</td>
<td>'talk'</td>
<td>'rain'</td>
<td>'war canoe'</td>
<td>'limb'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>EE</td>
<td>EI</td>
<td>EO</td>
<td>EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hobea</td>
<td>see</td>
<td>nei</td>
<td>neo</td>
<td>feu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'good'</td>
<td>'be full'</td>
<td>'coconut'</td>
<td>'tooth'</td>
<td>'go up'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>IE</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>IO</td>
<td>IU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fia</td>
<td>sie</td>
<td>iire</td>
<td>ku'kunio</td>
<td>kiu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'lightning'</td>
<td>'five'</td>
<td>'yes'</td>
<td>'knee'</td>
<td>'die'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA</td>
<td>OE</td>
<td>OI</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soa</td>
<td>toe</td>
<td>toi</td>
<td>sooso</td>
<td>houm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'seven'</td>
<td>'branch'</td>
<td>'help'</td>
<td>'neck'</td>
<td>'dolphin'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>UE</td>
<td>UI</td>
<td>UO</td>
<td>UU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kua</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>kui</td>
<td>mutuo</td>
<td>luulu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'moon'</td>
<td>'sun'</td>
<td>'behind'</td>
<td>'straight'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The absence of the /ue/ sequence may be accidental. On the other hand, there is a morphophonemic rule which operates to change the Nominaliser suffix -e to -i after a stem-final -u (see Section 2.9 below). The fact that there are no vowel sequences involving /ue/ may indicate that this morphophonemic rule is in fact a more general
phonological rule which operates to change all /ue/ sequence into /ui/ sequences, regardless of morpheme boundaries. There are no other suffixes involving initial /e/ or prefixes with final /u/.

2.5.1 IDENTICAL VOWEL SEQUENCES OR LONG VOWELS?

Note that the examples above indicate identical-vowel sequences involving all five vowels as well. These have been analysed as identical vowel sequences rather than long vowels for three reasons. Firstly, they are relatively uncommon; if any or all of them are long vowel phonemes, they would have an extremely low functional load. Secondly, there is a full set of non-identical vowel sequences in Lavukaleve; analysing these too as vowel sequences enables the generalisation that V-V combinations are possible with all vowels (with the possible exception, of course, of /ue/). Thirdly, positing identical-vowel sequences rather than long vowels enables simpler more powerful phonotactic rules with respect to syllable structures involving vowel sequences.

The problem of distinguishing identical vowel sequences from stressed syllables is discussed in Section 2.7.3 below.

2.6 SYLLABLE STRUCTURE

Lavukaleve allows consonant clusters at syllable boundaries, and allows unrestricted vowel clusters (except for /ue/, discussed above). Syllables are of the following structure:

\[
\sigma \rightarrow (C_1) V (C_2)
\]

C₁ is any consonant.
C₂ is any of the following consonants: t, k, l, r, m, n, ŋ, s, f, v, g

That is, a syllable can begin with any vowel or any consonant; and a syllable can end with any vowel or any consonant except p, d, b, and h.

In practice, closed syllables are far more common word-finally than word-internally. In fact almost all word-internal closed syllables occur in words which are formally reduplicated, e.g. tamtam 'reef', kelkel 'dugong', funfun 'firefly' (note that there are no words of the form *tam, *kel or *fun in the language today). There are however also rare examples of word-internal closed syllables not in formally reduplicated words, e.g. an’kav ‘pumice’, so it is not possible to account for internal closed syllables by a historical reduplication rule. Word-final closed syllables are far more common. Evidence from noun plural formation strategies (Section 5.6) suggests that there has been a historical process of word-final vowel loss, which would account for the development of these word-final closed syllables.
Many words consist only of vowels. Lavukaleve allows long sequences of vowels. A sentence example is **ngai ui euai** ‘1 (f) eat food’ (1sg food(n) 3sgnO-eat-sgf).

A word can in principle consist of any number of syllables:

\[ W \rightarrow \sigma^* \]

Monosyllabic roots are common. The longest root found is of six syllables: **manogirigiri** ‘seagull sp.’ Most roots consist of two or three syllables. All verb roots are vowel-final.

### 2.7 Stress

Stress is realised as a slightly louder and lengthened syllable. Stress assignment is partly fixed and partly lexically assigned. Most words have stress on their initial syllable. A very small proportion of words (something around 0.05% in the corpus) has stress on their second syllable. Of these, many are old reduplications of the form \( C_aV_bC_aV_bX(X...); \) that is, the word looks as if its first CV syllable has been reduplicated. Others are obvious recent loan words which retain the stress pattern of the original word. For the rest, there is no obvious formal reason for the non-initial stress. It appears simply to be a property of these words. A very few words have stress on their third syllable. Those phenomena relating to mono-morphemic words will be exemplified first. Stress patterns in morphologically complex words will be described after this.

#### 2.7.1 Stress in mono-morphemic words

- Most words have stress on the initial syllable. In particular almost all CVCV words (including all CVCV nouns) are stressed on the initial syllable. For example:

  - **'tata** ‘spider’
  - **'piru** ‘bowline’

  but note also:

  - **ka'so** ‘not know’

- Many two-syllable words of the form CVCVC have stress on the second syllable:

  - **ni'kol** ‘first’
  - **fa' luk** ‘cabbage’
  - **fo'sal** ‘fish’
This is not always the case however:

- Words of the shape \( CV_a V_b C_a V_b X(X...) \), in which the first \( CV \) is identical to the second \( CV \), invariably receive stress on the second syllable:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{tu’tuk} & \quad \text{‘torso’} \\
\text{va’var} & \quad \text{‘talk’} \\
\text{le’lenga} & \quad \text{‘pudding’}
\end{align*}
\]

These words are considered old reduplications because of their initial syllable; the unreduplicated part is not synchronically analysable.

- Words of other syllable structures receive initial or second syllable stress. Some examples:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{VCVV} & \quad \text{e’rau} \quad \text{‘fall’} \\
& \quad \text{‘crab’} \\
\text{CVCVVV} & \quad \text{bu’taeo} \quad \text{‘eagle’} \\
& \quad \text{‘fishing’} \\
\text{CVVCV} & \quad \text{le’usa} \quad \text{‘betel nut slats’} \\
& \quad \text{‘leatherback turtle’}
\end{align*}
\]

Most of the words with stress on the second syllable are nouns. There are also a couple of particles and adjectives, and a handful of verbs.

- A few words have stress on their third syllable:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{fela’koe} & \quad \text{‘village’} \\
\text{mala’gula} & \quad \text{‘bird’} \\
\text{lau’rario} & \quad \text{‘praise’} \\
\text{mita’keu} & \quad \text{‘dog’}
\end{align*}
\]

- Recently borrowed words always receive stress in the place it would occur in the source language (even if extra syllables have been added in order to make the word conform with Lavukaleve phonotactics):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{’kavis} & \quad \text{‘cabbage’ \ (from Pijin ‘kavis)} \\
\text{ta’rak} & \quad \text{‘truck’ \ (from Pijin ‘traki)}
\end{align*}
\]
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'daeva' 'goggles' (from Pijin 'daeva')

- Secondary stress occurs every second syllable in either direction from the syllable with primary stress:

'mano.giri.giri' 'seagull sp'
'lovi.tan' 'eel sp.'
'mita'keu' 'dog'

2.7.2 STRESS IN MORPHOLOGICALLY COMPLEX WORDS

All lexical roots have stress. Generally, affixes do not have their own stress. In certain circumstances, however, the Possessive prefixes cause stress shifts on the words in which they occur.

A lexical root with affixes (not including the Possessive prefixes) will retain its stress even when prefixes occur on the verb:

'liki' 'want'
o-'liki' '[someone] wants it'
o-ma-'liki' 'they want it'

Monosyllabic roots receive stress when affixed:

'na' 'in'
e-'na' 'in it'

However when a noun or verb receives the Possessive prefix, stress shifts occur, under certain very constrained circumstances.

STRESS SHIFTS WITH POSSESSIVE PREFIX ON NOUNS

Suffixes do not affect the position of stress on a noun, but the Possessive prefixes (which are, incidentally, the only prefixes available to nouns) do. If the noun is not monosyllabic, when it gets a Possessive prefix, stress remains in the place it would be if the prefix were not there. But if the noun is monosyllabic and is prefixed, stress moves to the prefix. So for example:

- stress position of nouns of more than one syllable is unaffected by prefixing:

'uia' 'knife'
o-'uia' 'his knife'
'vo'vou' 'boy'
o-vo'vou' 'his boy'
• stress position of monosyllabic nouns moves when noun is prefixed:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'ta</td>
<td>'time'</td>
<td>'o-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'nu</td>
<td>'hair'</td>
<td>'o-nu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'kiv</td>
<td>'clothes (pl)'</td>
<td>'o-kiv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Occasionally this stress shift rule has been noted with nouns of more than one syllable:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'tua</td>
<td>'wife'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'o-tua</td>
<td>'his wife'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is very rare, however.

With nouns that undergo the loss of a final vowel under Possessive prefixing (see below, Section 2.9), when this loss of the final vowel creates a monosyllabic noun, then this stress shift rule applies to some words but not others:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'fina</td>
<td>'belongings'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'e-fin</td>
<td>'our belongings'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

but:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'langi</td>
<td>'name'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'o-lang</td>
<td>'his name'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If there were a fixed rule to cover these situations, it would be possible to say that the two rules, loss of final vowel for prefixed nouns, and stress shift for prefixed monosyllabic nouns, must be ordered with respect to each other. However the fact that both patterns appear shows that the rules do not have a fixed ordering with respect to each other. Rather, it seems each word has its own pattern.

**STRESS SHIFTS WITH POSSESSIVE PREFIX ON VERBS**

There is a construction type in which the subject of certain verbs can be cross-referenced on those verbs by a Possessive prefix instead of the usual subject prefix (or Agreement Suffix). This construction is discussed in Section 13.4 (see also Section 2.9.3 below for description of a morphophonemic rule involved in this construction). What is of concern here is the fact that when verbs receive a Possessive prefix, the stress of the verb moves from its place on the verb root to the Possessive prefix:

'I came', is usually a-'vo, but under the Possessor-subject construction it is:
1) ‘ngavoe
gngavoe
1sgPOSS- come -PSV
I came

Similarly, ‘he went up’ is usually o'feu, but under the Possessor-subject construction it is:

2) ‘ofei
Hamilton
3sgPOSS- go.up -PSV
he went up

The stress on such prefixes is very marked. Occasionally stress does occur in the subject prefix of regular verbs. Normally, ‘he came’ is pronounced with stress on the verb root, but occasionally one hears stress on the prefix instead:

3) ‘ovo
Hamilton
3sgS- come
he came

Possessor-subject constructions seem to be a relatively new construction coming into the language; they are used very commonly by younger people, especially children and teenagers, and almost never by older people. It is possible that the stress pattern of this new and popular construction is leaching into regularly-marked verbs. Formal factors aid the transfer. Possessive prefixes are formally identical to subject prefixes apart from the 1st singular form. So for most forms, only the form of the verb (not including the subject prefix) and the stress pattern mark the fact that the construction is a Possessor-subject construction. The Possessor-subject construction is only available to a very small number of verbs. It is no large step for speakers to start to use this stress pattern on other verbs apart from just the verbs of Possessor-subject constructions.

2.7.3 HEARING STRESS VERSUS IDENTICAL-VOWEL SEQUENCES

It was said above that stress is realised as a longer and louder syllable. There are no long vowels phonemically in Lavukaleve, but there are identical vowel sequences, which are realised essentially as long vowels (see Section 2.5 above). Because of the association between length and stress, and the partly unpredictable nature of stress, it is sometimes a difficult matter in individual words to decide if a vowel sound is long because it is stressed, or long because it is a sequence of two identical vowels. For some words morphophonemic tests can be applied to distinguish between the two analyses.

Stress shift rules such as those described above can be utilised; if it is possible to put the word in question into a construction in which a stress shift rule will apply, one can then
discern whether the syllable in question still sounds long (in which case it is an instance of an identical-vowel sequence) or not (in which case it is a stressed syllable)\(^2\).

### 2.8 Intonation

I have not done an intonational study of Lavukaleve, but it is worth noting a few points. There are two main intonational patterns in Lavukaleve discourse. A very noticeable drop in pitch occurs at the end of intonation patterns which are coextensive with syntactic structures which one would wish to call declarative sentences. Thus, in shorthand, a declarative sentence is characterised intonationally by a final drop in pitch.

There is also a high rising pitch which occurs at the end of certain clause types; this pitch involves a steady intonation across the clause, culminating in a sharp rise on the last syllable of the clause. This kind of intonation pattern occurs on non-final clauses in clause chaining constructions, and in subordinate clauses which precede a main clause. They are always completed - syntactically and intonationally - by a main clause, which has the drop in pitch described above. Note that the few subordinate clause types that can follow their main clause, e.g. purposive clauses, are always pronounced with their own sentence-intonation when they do so, as are the main clauses with which they are in construction. (See Chapters 15 and 16 for a syntactic description of these construction types).

Questions, as in many languages, are also expressed with a rising intonation.

### 2.9 Morphophonemic Operations

There are three kinds of morphophonemic operations: those that add material; those that remove material completely, and those that merely change the quality of phonemic material. In Lavukaleve, there is reduplication; there is a process of glottal stop insertion between vowels at morpheme boundaries; there are processes of vowel deletion; and there is a process involving change of vowel quality. Reduplication is relatively frequent, glottal stop insertion is rare. The other morphophonemic processes are obligatory, and therefore ubiquitous.

#### 2.9.1 Reduplication

Reduplication is a relatively productive process in Lavukaleve. It can apply to words of many word classes, there is a range of actual forms of reduplication which can apply,

\(^2\) One might expect that identical vowel sequences distinguished only by stress, /a'a/ vs. /a/a/ would occur. As it happens, there are no examples of such sequences as /a'a/ in the data. It is not clear whether this is an accidental or motivated gap.
and different forms of reduplication can apply to the same word apparently freely.

Reduplication has been found most frequently on verbs, but also on nouns, adjectives and adverbial particles in the corpus. The exact shape which reduplication takes depends partly on the syllabic form of the word to which it applies. There are three types of partial reduplication, and full reduplication also occurs. Partial reduplication can take the shape of reduplication of an initial CV, CVV or CVCV:

- **CV reduplication**: le ‘see’ le-le; namu ‘shake’ na-namu haua ‘care for’ ha-haua; telako ‘one’ te-telako; rongea ‘play’ ro-rongea; kiu ‘fight’ ki-kiu
- **CVV reduplication**: rao ‘surround’ rao-rao; veo ‘arrive’ veo-veo; ria ‘be cross’ ria-ria
- **CVCV reduplication**: namu ‘shake’ namu-namu; hului ‘go round’ hulu-hului; ruvale ‘huge’ ruva-ruval

Full reduplication also occurs, but only in the following two adverbs in the corpus: karial ‘slowly, gently’ karial-karial, rikai ‘slowly’ rikai-rikai. These are considered reduplications, not two separate repeated words, because they receive one primary stress, on the initial syllable, which is one of the criterion for words (see below).

While vowel-initial words occur in the corpus, there are no examples of reduplicated vowel-initial words (although compare Iloilo ‘different’ discussed below, as a possible example of reduplication in an earlier stage of the language). Similarly, while words of closed syllables occur in the language, there are no examples of closed-syllable reduplication.

Reduplication only applies to word stems, not to affixes on words. Thus kiu ‘die’ can appear reduplicated as ki-kiu, and if it has a subject prefix, its reduplicated form appears as o-ki-kiu (3sgS-DUP-die) ‘he dies’. Similarly the transitive verb volori ‘make’ has been found as e-volo-volori-ne (3sgnO-Dup-make-IMPF ‘[they] were making it’).

Reduplication is relatively flexible, in that the same word can appear with different reduplication patterns. For example I have often heard the adverbial particle leon ‘quickly’, a word frequently heard in conversation, as le-leon, leo-leon and leon-leon, all with the same meaning: ‘hurry up!’. Similarly, compare the forms of the adjective tula ‘small’ in the following examples:

4)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>emina</th>
<th>tutula</th>
<th>la</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e-</td>
<td>mina</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1plexPOSS-</td>
<td>Dup-</td>
<td>1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thing(f) REDUP-</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>-sgf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>our little thing</td>
<td></td>
<td>sgfArt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The precise form of the reduplication does not seem to have a functional difference: the reduplicated forms mean the same thing as each other.

Reduplication is obligatory with the Reciprocal suffix (see Section 13.3.4). In other contexts it often has a semantic function. The word mina ‘thing’ becomes minamina ‘everything’. Similarly lafa ‘place’ when reduplicated is lafalafa ‘every place’. With some verbs reduplication can give an iterative meaning: veo ‘arrive’ veoveo ‘keep touching at’, kini ‘smell’ kinikini ‘keep sniffing around’. With adverbs it can give an intensified meaning: karial ‘slowly’ karialkarial ‘very slowly’. It does not always have a semantic function however: there is no meaning difference between telako ‘one’ and tetelako ‘one’.

There are words which are frozen reduplications: e.g. iloilo ‘different’ (there is no form *ilo), and the verbal adjuncts va’var ‘talking’, fo’for ‘fly’ and so on. See also Section 5.6 for evidence of old reduplications in nouns. These frozen forms suggest that a process of reduplication has been available in the language for some time.

2.9.2 INSERTION OF GLOTTAL STOP BETWEEN VOWELS AT MORPHEME BOUNDARY

When identical vowels come together at morpheme boundaries, a glottal stop is optionally, but very rarely, inserted to break up the vowel cluster: ngo-oatum ‘your uncle’ (2sgPOSS-elder.male) is normally pronounced [gəoatum], but has also been heard as [gəʔoatum] (if this rule does not apply, then this sequence in particular is subject to the next rule to be described, reduction of identical vowels at morpheme boundaries). This process is not obligatory, and is, in fact, quite rare.

2.9.3 VOWEL LOSS

There are three types of morphophonemic operations involving vowel loss. The first is a process which reduces identical vowel sequences at morpheme boundaries. The second is a process of loss of final vowels on nouns to which a Possessive prefix has been attached. The third is a process in which the final /u/ of a verb stem is lost when that verb is in a Possessor-subject construction.

REDUCTION OF IDENTICAL VOWEL SEQUENCES AT MORPHEME BOUNDARIES

When identical vowels come together at morpheme boundaries, one of the vowels is lost. For example, the 3rd singular neuter object verbal prefix e- plus the Subordinate
prefix e- reduce to e-:

6) lar haula emege
   lar hau -la e- e- me -ge
   daylight(n) go ashore -NEG 3sgO- SBD- continue -ANT
   ...daylight had not come yet...

The negative verbal suffix -la plus the singular feminine agreement suffix -a reduce to -la:

7) vonam kini laveala feo.
   vo- nam kini lavea -la -a feo
   3plO- to ACT appear -NEG -sgf 3sgfFOC
   ...they were still playing, but she didn’t show herself to them.

The final vowel of tuna ‘be really’ and the feminine singular Agreement suffix -a reduce to /a/:

8) Ona orea tuna la.
   o- na o- re -a tuna -a la
   3sgfO- in 3sgS- say -sgf be really -sgf sgfArt
   (He took the coconut) To the one she had really said.

Note that this rule of identical vowel sequence reduction applies only at morpheme boundaries. It is not a general rule of the language. Identical vowel sequences are permitted within morphemes; see Section 2.5 above.

Occasionally, when the two identical vowels coming together are both prefixes, particularly if both are o- prefixes, this rule of vowel loss does not apply, but rather both vowels are pronounced as an identical vowel sequence:

9) taragau na fo’sal voko vela
   taragau na fo’sal vo- ko vela
   sea eagle(m) sgmArt fish(pl) 3plO- throw go
   velavel ta oole.
   vela -vel ta o- o- le
   go -COMPL just 3sgfO-3sgS- see
   ...a sea eagle going fishing saw her.

STEM-FINAL VOWEL LOSS AFTER A POSSESSIVE PREFIX

Some vowel-final noun stems, when prefixed with a Possessive prefix, obligatorily lose their final vowel. Such noun stems are almost all disyllabic, of the form CVCV.
For example:
This rule does not apply to all CVCV roots. For example:

- **kala** 'mother'  o-kala 'his mother'
- **gera** 'feeling' o-gera 'his feeling'
- **talu** 'word' o-talu 'his word'

There are approximately twice as many roots which do not lose their final vowel when prefixed with a Possessive prefix as those which do. This rule is discussed in more detail in Section 5.5.

**Vowel loss with Possessor-subject constructions**

Possessor-subject constructions are an unproductive construction type in which the subject of certain intransitive verbs is marked by a Possessive instead of subject prefix, stress shifts to that prefix (see Section 2.7.2 above) and, for the verb stems ending in /u/ that enter this construction, the final /u/ is lost:

10) **Ovai.**

{o-} vau -i
3sgPOSS- go.out -PSV

*He went out.*

11) **Ohai**

{o-} hau -i
3sgPOSS- go.ashore -PSV

*He went ashore.*

12) **Ofei.**

{o-} feu -i
3sgPOSS- go.up -PSV

*He went up.*

See Section 13.4 for discussion of this construction type.

**2.9.4 Change in vowel quality**

There are two morphophonemic processes that change vowel quality. The first is an assimilation process involving the Nominaliser suffix -e--i. The second is a process which changes the last vowel of an utterance when it is being called out.
ASSIMILATION WITH THE NOMINALISER SUFFIX -e--i

The Nominaliser suffix -e--i assimilates in quality with the final vowel of the verb stem:

The suffix is realised as: -e after a stem-final -a or -o
-i after a stem-final -u
-ø after a stem-final -e or -i

For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>honia</th>
<th>honiae</th>
<th>lo</th>
<th>loe</th>
<th>iru</th>
<th>o-irui</th>
<th>ve</th>
<th>ve</th>
<th>lei</th>
<th>lei</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'know'</td>
<td>'knowledge'</td>
<td>'finish'</td>
<td>'the end'</td>
<td>'sleep'</td>
<td>'his sleeping'</td>
<td>'go'</td>
<td>'way, method'</td>
<td>'be'</td>
<td>'being, existence'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first two realisations of the Nominaliser suffix are simply due to a process of assimilation. The vowel is mid after a mid or low vowel, and high after a high vowel. The realisation of the Nominaliser suffix as zero after /e/ or /i/ is an example of the previous morphophonemic rule discussed: reduction of identical vowel sequences at morpheme boundaries. See Section 13.1.1 for discussion of this Nominaliser suffix.

VOCATIVE VOWEL CHANGE

The other kind of morphophonemic change which operates to alter vowel quality is of a rather different nature, and is perhaps not, strictly speaking, a morphophonemic process. Unlike the other morphophonemic processes described above, this process is not just a surface formal phenomenon; its occurrence must be described in terms of its pragmatic environment. It has a meaning, and speakers can choose deliberately whether or not to use it.

When people shout across a distance, the final vowel of the utterance which they shout is replaced by the vowel sequence /ou/, and stress shifts to the penultimate syllable. Thus my name, when shouted, becomes [andze'1ou]; the final /a/ vowel is replaced by /ou/, and stress shifts to the end of the word instead of the second syllable where it appears in normal Lavukaleve pronunciation.

This process very commonly occurs with names, which are commonly shouted. It also affects other types of utterances; 'vulama 'come here!' (come-Durative Imperative singular) becomes [βula'mou] when shouted.

37
Most utterances in Lavukaleve are vowel-final; verbs (the final element of most sentences) are, and most verbal suffixing is; in particular, the kinds of things likely to be yelled at a distance are. Names usually are, and Imperative verbs always are. Of those things liable to be shouted which are not already vowel-final, the last consonant and vowel is deleted before /ou/ is added. Thus the name Patterson, when shouted, becomes [pate'sou].

2.10 ALTERNATIVE REALISATIONS

There are some examples of alternative pronunciations of certain words. These alternative realisations all involve interchange between different phonemes of the language. That is, the alternations neutralise the distinction between otherwise independent phonemes. However, being lexically constrained, and also being optional, it is never the case that ambiguity arises through the neutralisation of these phonemes in the words in which it occurs. In each case, I have written the words in question with their most common pronunciation. The words are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/d/ ~ /r/</th>
<th>ria</th>
<th>['dia] ~ ['ria]</th>
<th>'where to?'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>roi</td>
<td>['doi] ~ ['roi]</td>
<td>'where?'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>raine</td>
<td>['daine] ~ ['raine]</td>
<td>'tomorrow'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the /d/ ~ /r/ alternation only occurs in the words initial position. The word raine also occurs in the word iruraine 'daily'. In this case the pronunciation can only be:

| iruraine | ['iruraine] | 'daily' |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/b/ ~ /v/</th>
<th>beko</th>
<th>['beko] ~ ['beko]</th>
<th>'stone'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vuli</td>
<td>['buli] ~ ['buli]</td>
<td>'behind'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/n/ ~ /l/</th>
<th>mulukuita</th>
<th>[munu'kuita] ~ [mulu'kuita]</th>
<th>'mosquito'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>halangas</td>
<td>['hana'gas] ~ ['halangas]</td>
<td>'coral'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These alternations are all a generationally-based phenomenon. Younger people, in their twenties or younger, tend to pronounce /d/, /b/ and /n/ in certain words where older people consistently pronounce /r/, /v/ and /l/ respectively. This is not a universal generational sound change, but rather is lexically constrained.

2.11 WORDS

So far, and indeed throughout the rest of this work, the concept and extent of words is assumed. In Lavukaleve, the definition of words is a relatively simple matter.
Words can be defined on phonological grounds. One can pause between, but not within, a word; this is Anderson's (1985: 151) idea of "potential pause locations". On another level, words have psychological reality; speakers can pronounce them in isolation and talk about them. Units smaller than a word, however, cannot be easily pronounced or talked about in isolation. Grammatical words are made up of stems plus, in some cases, affixes. Phonological words are in almost all cases coextensive with grammatical words; there is only one case in which a phonological word is different from a grammatical word. This is verb compounds. In verb compounds (see Section 14.2) one grammatical word is made up of two phonological words, each with its own stress. In all other cases, phonological words are the same as grammatical words.

2.12 Orthography

An orthography has been in use for a number of years by the Lavukal community. I follow this established orthography, with a couple of differences. The only respects in which the Lavukals' orthography differs substantially from the IPA conventions are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHONEME</th>
<th>IS WRITTEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/υ/</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/g/</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
<td>ng</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is some debate within the community about how best to represent the phoneme /ŋ/ in the orthography. The symbol ŋ was used for some time, in keeping with the orthographies of other languages of the region. However problems with typesetting mean that usually the bar is left off, and thus phonemes /n/ and /ŋ/ are in practice not distinguished in the orthography. Recent consensus has decided that the digraph /ŋ/ should be used instead of ŋ.

Stress is not marked in the Lavukal orthography, but in this work I do indicate lexical stress, by a straight quote before the stressed syllable: vo'vou, only on those stems in which stress is not on the initial syllable.

Same-vowel sequences are also not represented in the Lavukals' orthography, but I do represent them here in the following circumstances. I always write identical vowel sequences when they are a part of a mono-morphemic word: see 'be full'. However, when two morphemes come together and create an identical-vowel sequence, a morphophonemic rule comes into play to reduce the sequence (see Section 2.9), and these are not represented in the surface forms of words.

Throughout this thesis, four-line example sentences are used. The first line consists of surface forms; the second line consists of underlying forms; the third line is a
morphemic gloss, and the fourth line is a free translation. In many cases, the first and second lines are identical, but it is useful to have the two separate lines precisely for those circumstances in which identical-vowel sequences are reduced; and for the few other morphophonemic processes in the language.
CHAPTER THREE

Word classes

Word classes are recognised on the grounds of morphological possibilities and syntactic distribution, combined with, in some cases, semantics. There are two large open word classes in Lavukaleve: nouns and verbs. There are also a large number of medium-sized to small closed classes. This chapter contains a justification of the classification of these word classes. More details on each of them are found elsewhere in the thesis. However some of the smaller classes which are not discussed elsewhere in the thesis are described more fully in this chapter. Thus there is a description of the counting system, and of some of the more commonly occurring particles.

The following word classes and subclasses must be recognised for Lavukaleve. They will each be discussed in turn.

OPEN:
- nouns
  - common nouns
  - locational nouns
  - place nouns (Section 3.1)
- verbs
  - transitive
  - intransitive
  - ambitransitive (Section 3.2)

CLOSED:
- adjectives (Section 3.3)
  - numbers (3.3.1)
- demonstratives (Section 3.4)
3.1 Nouns

The class of nouns is an open class of words which share the following morphological and syntactic features:

- they function as the heads of NPs
- they have inherent gender
- they can be modified by the demonstrative modifier
- they can take the definite article

There are three subclasses of nouns: common nouns (these include many of what are traditionally termed proper names), locational nouns and place nouns. All of these have the features outlined above. Locational nouns and place nouns differ from common nouns in their ability to function as nominal adjuncts in a clause without appearing in a postpositional phrase.

Locational nouns function as nominal adjuncts using the Locative suffix -n. Common nouns are unable to take this suffix; instead, spatial relations involving common nouns are expressed using postpositional phrases. There are only a small number of locational nouns; it is a closed subclass of the open class of nouns. These include, for the most part, nouns referring to places, positions, body parts and time.
Place nouns can function as nominal adjuncts with no morphological marking. All place nouns are proper names, but not all proper names are place nouns; some are common nouns, some are locational nouns.

Both locational nouns and place nouns can be modified by adjectives and demonstratives, and they have inherent gender.

Nominal adjuncts, including those formed with common nouns in postpositional phrases, with locational nouns using the Locative (and Perlative) suffixes, and with place nouns are discussed in Chapter 7.

There are three genders in Lavukaleve: masculine, feminine and neuter, named for the fact that in the masculine class belong (among other things) most nouns referring to male people, in the feminine class belong (among other things) all nouns referring to female people, and in the neuter class belong very few nouns referring to humans. Nouns have a fixed gender, which controls agreement with its modifiers, and throughout the clause. Note that there are a few nouns which are always plural. Because plural nouns do not have gender, this means that, strictly speaking, there are some nouns which do not have inherent gender. Such nouns are considered a special case of common nouns; the phenomenon is more to do with morphological exigencies of Lavukaleve than with the syntactic distribution of such words. The principles associated with gender assignment are discussed in Chapter 6.

3.2 VERBS

Verbs have the following syntactic and morphological features:

- they function as argument-taking predicates
- they can take subject prefixes, and object prefixes if transitive
- they can take the Agreement Suffix to agree with their nominal arguments
- they can take TAM suffixes
- they can take the Nominaliser suffix -e ~ -i (they have to be nominalised in order to function as head of an NP)
- they can take the Locativiser suffix -I

There are three subtypes of verbs, defined on the basis of their primary valency. Intransitive verbs take only one argument (subject). Transitive verbs take two arguments (subject and object). Ambitransitive verbs can take either one or two arguments, with no morphological affixation to mark the change of transitivity. There are no ditransitive verbs in Lavukaleve (see Chapter 9.3.2 for argumentation for this claim), and there are no verbs with zero valency. All verb stems are vowel-final.
In the corpus around 51% of all verbs are intransitive, around 45% are transitive, and around 4% are ambitransitive.

3.2.1 TRANSITIVE VERBS

Transitive verbs take two arguments, expressed as verbal affixes and/or NPs:

1)  

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{bagatum} & \text{na} & \text{fo'sal} & \text{na} \\
\text{male.giant(m)} & \text{sgmArt} & \text{fish(m)} & \text{sgmArt} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{na} & \text{aole} & \text{le} \\
\text{3sgO-} & \text{3sgS-} & \text{see} \\
\end{array}
\]

...the giant saw the fish

It is a simple matter to tell which verbs are transitive and which are intransitive, because object arguments are obligatorily cross-referenced on all transitive verbs. Subject arguments are not obligatorily expressed, either by overt NP or cross-referencing prefix (see Section 9.7).

3.2.2 INTRANSITIVE VERBS

Intransitive verbs take one argument, expressed as a verbal affix and/or NP:

2)  

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{bagatum} & \text{na} & \text{o}vo \\
\text{male.giant(m)} & \text{sgmArt} & \text{3sgS-} \\
\end{array}
\]

...the giant came

3.2.3 AMBITRANSITIVE VERBS

Ambitransitive verbs are those verbs which can function either transitively or intransitively with no overt morphological affixation to show the change in transitivity. There are only about a dozen ambitransitive verbs in the corpus. Of these, there are two kinds. There are those verbs for which the subject of the intransitive form of the verb corresponds in semantic role to the subject of the transitive form of the verb; and there are those in which the subject of the intransitive form corresponds to the object of the transitive form. In Lavukaleve these two types account for about half of the ambitransitive verbs each. All ambitransitive verbs in the corpus are listed here with their intransitive and transitive glosses:

AMBITRANSITIVE VERBS, S=A TYPE

- **hoa**: poke through, poke something through
- **lai**: paddle, paddle something
- **rau**: go round, surround something
- **sulai**: illuminate, illuminate something
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valiri turn, turn something
vea know, know something
hai do, do something
i do, do something

Ambitransitive verbs, $S=O$ type

ao get in, put something in
fale stand, stand something up
foa go down, take something down
hoi go in, put something in
igu go, take something out
kekea dry out, dry something out
lei be, hang something
vo come, begin something

Note that two of these $S=O$ type verbs, lei and vo, have somewhat unpredictable semantic correspondences (‘be, hang’ and ‘come, begin’ respectively).

Compare the following example of vo ‘begin’ (transitive) with example (2) above using vo ‘come’ (intransitive):

3) iut eavo.
   iut e- a- vo
   youth.group(n) 3sgnO- 1sgS- begin

I began the youth group.

Division of verbs into the two groups above seems to have at least some semantic motivation. Verbs with more agentive intransitive subjects fall into the $S=A$ group, whereas verbs with non-agentive intransitive subjects fall into the $S=O$ group. Note that most motion verbs pattern with $S=O$ verbs, not $S=A$ verbs, as is common in the world’s languages.

Two irregular verbs: tuna ‘be really’ and tave ‘be not’

There are two intransitive verbs which act slightly differently from other intransitive verbs. The verbs are tuna ‘be really’ and tave ‘be not’. (Tuna ‘be really’ is cross-classified as an adjective and a particle). While both tuna and tave are argument-taking predicates, able to cross-reference their subject arguments with verbal morphology, and, in the case of tuna, able to take the Negative suffix -la, neither of them can take any other verbal morphology. Also anomalous is that they can occur immediately following another intransitive verb, but not obviously in construction with that verb. For instance, compare examples (4) and (5), which have tuna and tave functioning as normal argument-taking predicates, with examples (6) and (7), which have tuna and tave immediately following another verb:

45
4) O vona tunala fi man hin kala
   and 3plO- in be.really -NEG 3sgnFOC what(m) 3sgmFOC mother(f)

   ofo'foira.
o- fo'foira
   3sgPOSS- work(f)

   And they really don’t believe in the work of the mother. [i.e. the mother’s work is not real to them]

5) Inu ngobuk tavem.
inu ngo- buku tave -m
   2sg 2sg- conch(m) be.not -sgm

   It’s not your conch.

6) oina kini haulam tunam fin.
oina kini hau -la -m tuna -m fin
   other.MED.sgm ACT go.ashore -NEG -sgm be.really -sgm 3sgmFOC

   ... he didn’t come back ashore.

7) Olang tokam tavem.
olang toka -m tave -m
   because be.strong -sgm be.not -sgm

   Because he didn’t have any strength.

The examples of tuna and tave immediately following another verb are problematic because it is not obvious what relationship they have with that verb. These are different to serial verb constructions in Lavukaleve, because in serial verb constructions in Lavukaleve, the shared subject is cross-referenced only once on the whole predicate, not on each verb as here (see Section 14.1). Also, with tave at least, the intransitive verb which it follows is always from the same semantic type; it is a verb with a modifying meaning, often a verb that is cross-classified as an adjective (see next section).

There are a few possible analyses. One is that such examples show a unique kind of serial verb construction, although this is problematic for the reasons given. Another possibility is that tuna and tave are not verbs in this context, but rather are some unique word class such as agreement-taking adverbial particles. (Section 3.17.1 below shows that adverbial particles do not show agreement). The approach taken here is that the strange behaviour of tuna and tave is a lexical phenomenon, related to their semantic properties of being frequently appropriate as verbal modifiers, while retaining other properties associated with intransitive verbs in Lavukaleve.

Such constructions, with two independent predicates occurring next to each other but not in a serial verb construction and with no overt relationship to each other, only occur with verbs tave and tuna; in all other cases, clauses in sequence must be overtly marked for their relationship with each other, either as subordinate-dependent or coordinate-
dependent or coordinated independent clauses.

3.3 ADJECTIVES

There are only around fifty adjectives in the corpus. There are doubtless more adjectives than this in the language, but it is nonetheless significant that such a small number have been found so far. In many of Lavukaleve’s Oceanic neighbours, it is often a difficult matter to tell whether a particular word is an adjective or an intransitive verb. This situation also occurs in Lavukaleve; they usually appear in the same position in the sentence, and even though intransitive verbs have far more morphological possibilities than adjectives, they often do not avail themselves of them and in fact usually only appear with the Agreement Suffix, as do adjectives. Predicative adjectives are impossible to distinguish from intransitive verbs. However attributive adjectives, as a syntactic class, do occur, and can be easily described by their syntactic and morphological features:

- they occur inside an NP (after the noun, before the definite article, if there is one) modifying a head noun
- they have no inherent gender or number, but agree in gender and number with their head noun, using the Agreement Suffix paradigm also used by verbs
- the only morphology they can receive is the Agreement Suffix

If a word has these features, it is called an adjective. Many adjectives can also appear predicatively; in these circumstances they are indistinguishable from intransitive verbs. For example, compare the following uses of ho'bea ‘good’. In the first example, ho'bea is used attributively, modifying its head noun mina, and occurring inside the NP between the head noun and the definite article. In the second example, ho'bea is used predicatively. It is not possible to tell if it is an intransitive verb, or a non-verbal predicate, with ellipsed head noun:

8) Aka foiga *mina* hobe *la* *feo.*
    aka foiga mina hobe la feo.
    PN.MED.sgn thing(f) good -sgf sgfArt 3sgfFOC

   And it’s a good thing.  
   \[ jo \text{035} \]

9) Aka vovo *la* hobe *ke.*
    aka vovo la hobe -a ke
    girl(f) sgfArt good -sgf EMPH

   And the girl was very beautiful.  
   \[ co \text{151} \]

Note that intransitive verbs, if they are in a clause with stative or resultative meaning, mark their subject using the Agreement Suffix (see Section 10.5); therefore stative/resultative intransitive verbs often appear with the same morphology as adjectives. If a word can be used as a nominal modifier inside an NP, with the above-
mentioned other characteristics, it is an adjective. Each such lexical item may have another, predicative, function, although many do not. If it does, it is considered to be cross-classified as a verb. Unfortunately, for many of the adjectives listed below the corpus is not sufficient to show whether, as well as being used attributively, they can be used predicatively. This area awaits more detailed examination in the future.

Numbers form a subclass of adjectives. They don’t have inherent gender, they occur in an attributive relationship with nouns, but they can take, in addition to agreement morphology (which is only available to ‘one’ and ‘two’), morphology deriving ordinal forms. Some of them can also take morphology deriving higher-number forms. These are discussed separately below.

Because there are relatively few adjectives in Lavukaleve, it is worthwhile to list them exhaustively. Their categorisation is similar to Dixon’s (1982) discussion of semantic types of adjectives.

**DIMENSION**

- **bakel** ‘big’; **monomono** ‘small’; **ru** ‘big’; **tula** ‘small’, **kurai** ‘big’

**AGE**

- **koisove** ‘new’; **lelengisa** ‘young’

**VALUE**

- **ho’bea** ‘good’; **tuna** ‘really’, **iloilo** ‘different’; **kivua** ‘precious’; **laura** ‘great’; **sevo** ‘tabu’; **mea** ‘SPECifier’; **ro** ‘one, unit’, **gilogilo** ‘pure’; **kia** ‘almighty’; **laita** ‘secret/sacred’; **lalamu** ‘early’; **lave** ‘married’; **lulu** ‘righteous/straight’; **taotao** ‘horrible’

**COLOUR**

- **kokoras** ‘black’. Also recent loans from Solomon Pijin: **bulu** ‘blue’; **iala** ‘yellow’; **girin** ‘green’

**PHYSICAL PROPERTY**

- **foko** ‘leaning’; **folufolu** ‘fat’; **kasakasa** ‘thin’; **koekoe** ‘blind’; **lafia** ‘watery’; **fofono** ‘whole’; **nunu** ‘overgrown’; **furifuri** ‘down, low, worst’; **kofa** ‘naked’; **suvi** ‘paralysed’

**HUMAN PROPENSITY**

- **lahavarae** ‘troubled’; **rorora** ‘gentle’; **nura** ‘wild’; **togoloa** ‘divided in beliefs’

---

1 The exact semantic differences between the three words glossed as ‘big’ and the two glossed as ‘small’ require further investigation.
NUMBER
telako ‘one’; lelaol ‘two’; enga ‘three’; nun ‘four’; sie ‘five’; oa ‘six’; soa ‘seven’; sevi ‘eight’; sava ‘nine’; kanongam ‘ten’

Many other words of these semantic types are intransitive verbs. In particular, Dixon’s category of speed is realised by intransitive verbs in Lavukaleve. Note that the only other basic colour terms indigenous to Lavukaleve, apart from kokoras ‘black’ are kelekele ‘white’ (neuter noun); raravu ‘be red’ (intransitive verb) and, interestingly, to’vesa ‘orange’ (word class unknown). The existence of a term for orange suggests that there were other indigenous basic colour terms in Lavukaleve, which have recently been replaced by Pijin terms (cf. Berlin and Kay 1969).

There are a small number of irregular adjectives, which depart from the norm given above in one or more particulars. These irregular adjectives include the following:

- bakel ‘big’, and all the numbers from enga ‘three’ through to kanongam ‘ten’, have the distributional characteristics of adjectives, but fail to show agreement with their head noun.

- ru ‘big’ has an irregular agreement paradigm (see Section 10.1 for the regular agreement forms used by adjectives):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>singular</th>
<th>dual</th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>masc</td>
<td>rua</td>
<td>rual</td>
<td>ruvalev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fem</td>
<td>ru</td>
<td>rul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neut</td>
<td>rugi</td>
<td>rugil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ro ‘one, unit’ also has an irregular agreement paradigm:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>singular</th>
<th>dual</th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>masc</td>
<td>roa</td>
<td>roal</td>
<td>rovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fem</td>
<td>ro</td>
<td>rol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neut</td>
<td>roge</td>
<td>rogel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This adjective ro ‘one, unit’ has rather interesting semantics; it is discussed in Section 4.1.2. Note that mea ‘SPECifier’ also has non-adjectival uses. It is discussed in some detail also in Section 4.1.2.

3.3.1 NUMBERS AND THE COUNTING SYSTEM

The numbers ‘one’ and ‘two’ also have irregular agreement forms: ‘one’ telako (f, n) telakom (m); ‘two’ lelaol (f), lelemal (m), lelagel (n). The other numbers do not agree
with their head noun; in this respect they are like bakel 'big'.

Ordinal numbers are derived, more or less irregularly, from cardinal numbers with the addition of a suffix -ta. The word for 'first' is suppletive. There are only ordinal numbers up to tenth. Beyond that, ordinal numbers are identical to cardinal numbers. Ordinal numbers are as follows:

- first: nikol
- second: leleta
- third: engata
- fourth: nuta
- fifth: sita
- sixth: oata
- seventh: soata
- eighth: sevita
- ninth: savata
- tenth: kanata

It is worth discussing the functional class which expresses the counting system here, even though words for counting do not form one syntactic class.

There are special counting numbers and modifying numbers for 'one' and 'two'. Lavukaleve has a decimal counting system. The following set of number words shows the Lavukaleve counting system. Note that words from the adjective class, and words which are normal nouns, both form part of this counting system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word Class</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adjectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td></td>
<td>telakom (m); telako (f and n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(dom for counting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td></td>
<td>lelemal (m); lelaol (f); lelagel (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(lemal for counting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three</td>
<td></td>
<td>enga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four</td>
<td></td>
<td>nun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five</td>
<td></td>
<td>sie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>six</td>
<td></td>
<td>oaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seven</td>
<td></td>
<td>soa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eight</td>
<td></td>
<td>sevi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nine</td>
<td></td>
<td>sava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ten</td>
<td></td>
<td>kanongam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noun</td>
<td>ten</td>
<td>kane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>derived from adjectives</td>
<td></td>
<td>siehave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>oahave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>soahave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>sevihave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The words for fifty, sixty, seventy, eighty and ninety are derived from the words for five, six, seven, eight and nine respectively, with the addition of suffix -have. It is not clear what word class the derived numbers are; all the examples of each in the corpus are in complex numerical phrases like those outlined below.

To form numbers from eleven to nineteen, the base kane ‘ten’ is followed by the relevant number: kane enga ‘thirteen’; literally ‘ten three’. Either kane or kanongam ‘ten’ can be used to express the number ten, but kane is the base used for forming other numbers.

The word kane ‘ten’ functions as an NP head, taking numeral modifiers, as will be seen in the next paragraphs. It has dual and plural forms: kane is the singular form; kanal is the dual form (two tens); and kanamil is the plural form. However it never occurs in a position which would allow one to tell what its gender is.

The word for twenty is kanal, which is the dual form of the noun kane ‘ten’. To form numbers from twenty-one to twenty-nine, kanal is followed by o ‘and’ and the relevant number: kanal o enga ‘twenty three’; literally ‘two tens and three’.

The word for thirty is kanamil enga, which is the plural form of the number kane ‘ten’, followed by enga ‘three’. To form numbers from thirty-one to thirty-nine, kanamil enga is followed by o ‘and’ and the number: kanamil enga o enga ‘three tens and three’.

The word for forty follows the same pattern as thirty; it is kanamil nun ‘four tens’. Numbers from forty-one to forty-nine are formed using the same strategy as those from thirty-one to thirty-nine.

Numbers from fifty to ninety are formed on a different pattern. They each consist of a single word, the first part of which is a number from five (sie) to nine (sava), followed by the invariant morpheme have, which has no independent meaning. Thus fifty is siehave; sixty oahave. Fifty-three is siehave o enga; this pattern is already familiar.

The word for a hundred was given above: tangalu, a feminine noun. Numbers between 101 and 199 are built from processes already familiar; thus 101 is tangalu o telako ‘one hundred and one’. The noun tangalu has no dual form; two hundred is tangalu lelaol

2 Note the occurrence of -have also in elahave ‘how much’; see below.
'two (f) hundred'. The number for 'two' takes feminine gender to agree with the gender of tangalu. Three hundred and higher use the plural form of the noun, with a number: tangalual enga 'three hundreds'.

The word for a thousand, lamukas, acts in a similar fashion. Two thousand is lamukas lelagel 'two (n) thousand' (with neuter gender to agree with lamukas). Three thousand and higher use the plural form of 'thousand' with a number: lamukasaol enga 'three thousands'.

Ten thousand is expressed by a phrase: lamukasaol vo-na kanongam literally 'thousands of -them ten'. A hundred thousand is formed on a similar pattern, but with the order of words reversed: tangalual vo-na lamukasaol kanongam literally 'hundreds of-them thousands ten'.

One million is mola (n). Two million is mola lelagel 'two (n) million'. Three million is mola enga. This noun, like many in Lavukaleve, does not have dual and plural inflections.

Lavukaleve's decimal counting system is possibly a loan from neighbouring Oceanic languages; Lynch (1998: 144) notes that most Oceanic languages have decimal systems. Laycock (1975: 224) observes that decimal systems are rare in mainland Papuan languages:

> Pure decimal systems characterise many Austronesian languages of Island Melanesia, Polynesia, and Indonesia, but are rarely found within the New Guinea area itself...
> Decimal systems do not appear to exist at all in the non-Austronesian languages of the New Guinea area.

Lavukaleve's lower numbers at least are not, however, cognate with Oceanic numbers. If there has been borrowing, it appears that it is the decimal system that has been borrowed, rather than the terms used to express the system3.

In addition to the counting system, there are also a small number of nouns which refer to a group of ten of various culturally important things. Some of these nouns include feil 'ten dogs'; koku 'ten possums'; kolo 'ten pigs'; lolu 'ten fish'; legom 'ten coconut crabs'; baem 'ten bonitos'; tafor 'ten arm-rings'. These words are regular nouns; they are singular, they have gender, and they have dual and plural forms. So for instance, a group of ten dogs is feil, and a group of twenty dogs is feilal, the dual form of feil.

These nouns can also be combined with numbers in NPs to express groups larger than

---

3 Although cf. Arosi tangarau 'a hundred' and meru 'a thousand' (Capell 1971: 50); Kwaio tangafuru 'ten' (Keesing 1985: 89). These suggest that Lavukaleve's tangalu 'a hundred' and mola 'a thousand' could be borrowings from an Oceanic language (Arosi and Kwaio are both Oceanic languages, spoken on Makira and Malaita respectively).
ten:

10) kolo o telakom
ten.possums(m) and one -sgm

a group of eleven possums  

The nouns are used as regular nouns in sentences, forming the heads of NPs. Note the singular verb agreement:

11) Ngai feil roge a le -ø fi
I see ten dogs. [i.e. I see one lot of ten dogs]

Children, however, tend to use these words as collective nouns, using them in NPs as possessed heads with a possessor noun referring to the super-ordinate category to which the group noun belongs. In the following example, feil, the group noun, is expressed as the possessed head of the NP, with mitakeu ‘dog’ the possessor, referring to the superordinate category. Note there is a number agreement clash in this example: the speaker used a singular noun mitakeu and a plural possessive prefix ma-, to refer to the same entity. It is not clear if this is a mistake or not. More examples would elucidate this point:

12) Ngai mitakeu mafeil roge ale fi.
I see one [group of] ten dogs.

It is not clear whether this type of construction is a stage in language acquisition or a linguistic change in progress.

These group-of-ten nouns bear no formal relationship to the nouns referring to their super-ordinate category. Consider the forms below:

foe ‘pig’ kolo ‘ten pigs’
mitakeu ‘dog’ feil ‘ten dogs’
fo’sal ‘fish’ lolu ‘ten fish’
urio ‘coconut crab’ legom ‘ten coconut crabs’
karu ‘possum’ koku ‘ten possums’
meo ‘bonito’ baem ‘ten bonitos’
sa’sau ‘arm-ring’ tafor ‘ten arm-rings’

Lynch (1998: 245) notes the occurrence of this type of system in some Pacific languages with decimal systems, for example Fijian. Closer to the Russell Islands, Keesing notes a somewhat more elaborated system for Kwaio (1985: 90), an Oceanic language spoken on Malaita.
3.4 **DEMONSTRATIVES**

There are two subtypes of demonstratives: demonstrative pronouns, consisting of two paradigms, *foia* and *oia*, and a demonstrative modifier *hoia* (cited in their feminine singular medial forms⁴). Demonstratives each have a paradigm of inflecting forms, marking gender, number, and three degrees of distance of the referent from the speaker, with a further distinction made in the distal category between specific and non-specific location.

3.4.1 **DEMONSTRATIVE MODIFIER**

A class of demonstrative modifiers is distinguished on the following grounds:

- they form a paradigm of contrasting forms
- they function as nominal modifiers
- they have no inherent gender or number, but take this from their head
- they can take Presentative -*ri*, Predicative -*o/*om*/v and Group suffixes -*sa/-ha*

Demonstrative modifiers can be distinguished from adjectives by the fact that demonstrative modifiers can modify demonstrative pronouns, whereas adjectives cannot. The paradigm for demonstrative modifiers is given in Section 8.5, where their syntactic and morphological properties, and their relationship with demonstrative pronouns, are discussed fully.

3.4.2 **DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS**

There are two demonstrative pronoun stems, *foia* 'she' and *oia* 'the other one' (both cited in their feminine singular medial forms). They are distinguished as a separate word class on the following grounds:

- they each consist of a paradigm of contrasting forms
- they have inherent gender, number and distance specifications, as well as specification for the type of anaphoric reference which they make
- they function as nominal heads
- they cannot be modified by adjectives, though they can be modified by the demonstrative modifier

*Foia* and *oia* are both used to make anaphoric reference to a participant in a discourse.

⁴ All gender-marked forms are cited in their 3rd singular feminine forms throughout this work. This is because for many paradigms, the feminine form is the least marked form.
They differ in that foia is used to make anaphoric reference to an activated referent, one which is uppermost in hearers’ minds, whereas oia is used to make anaphoric reference to a semi-activated referent, one which was uppermost in hearers’ minds until recently. They are not considered personal pronouns, largely because they make obligatory reference to distance from the speaker, which is characteristic of demonstrative pronouns, rather than personal pronouns. A full discussion of these demonstrative pronouns, including justification of their classification, and explanation of the difference between them, as well as discussion of the difference between them and the demonstrative modifier, appears in Chapter 8, where the paradigms of each are presented.

3.5 PERSONAL PRONOUNS

There are first and second person pronouns in Lavukaleve, but no third person pronoun. The functional domain of third person pronouns is filled by demonstrative pronouns instead. Argumentation for this division of the deictic paradigms is presented in full in Chapter 8, where also the paradigm of 1st and 2nd person pronouns is given. Defining features of personal pronouns are:

- they mark person and number of the referent, and inclusion/exclusion of the addressee (only in 1st person non-singular forms)
- they function as nominal heads
- they cannot be modified by adjectives, though they can be modified by the demonstrative modifier
- they take the Group suffixes -ha/-sa

It is perhaps worth noting here that there are no indefinite pronouns in Lavukaleve. Concepts like someone/anyone are expressed using the noun ali ‘man’; no-one is expressed by the NP malav rovo-ru ‘people one.pl-NEG (no people)’ or ali roa-ru ‘man one.sgm-NEG (no man)’. Concepts like something/anything are expressed by the noun mina ‘thing’; nothing by mina ro-ru ‘thing one.sgf-NEG (not a thing)’. Man ‘what’, ami ‘who’, and elahave ‘how much’, all masculine nouns, can also mean ‘whatever’, ‘whoever’ and ‘however much’ respectively. Plural noun elav ‘how many’ can also mean ‘however many’. Roi-doi ‘which’ can also mean ‘whichever’. Concepts like somewhere/anywhere/nowhere, somehow/anyhow and so on are expressed as ‘in a place’, ‘in no place’, ‘in a way’ and so on in Lavukaleve. There are no special expressions for these concepts.

3.6 THE DEFINITE ARTICLE

The definite article consists of a paradigm of inflecting forms which appear with a noun in an NP to mark definiteness. It has the following morphological and syntactic
features:

- it can only occur with a head noun
- it is obligatorily inflected for gender and number to agree with its head, and it can take no further morphological affixation
- only one article can occur per NP
- when it occurs it is always the final word of the NP

The paradigm for the definite article is given in Section 4.1.2, where there is a discussion of its morphological, syntactic and pragmatic features.

3.7 The Focus Markers

There are three paradigms of focus markers, which are marked for person, gender and number of a particular element of the constituent with which they are in construction\(^5\). The three stems themselves have different pragmatic meanings as follows: the meo focus marker is used in polar questions; the heo focus marker is used in information questions, in clauses containing the demonstrative pronoun foia, and to mark strong emphasis; and the feo focus marker is used elsewhere, in other contexts in which focus is marked (the focus markers are cited in their 3rd person singular feminine forms here). The focus markers have the following features:

- they each form a paradigm marked for person, gender and number and they can take no further morphological affixation
- they do not function as the head of a clause; that is, they have no arguments of their own
- they can occur in construction with NPs, adjuncts, verbs or entire sentences
- they are always constituent-final

The syntactic, morphological and pragmatic functions of the focus markers are discussed in Chapter 11. The paradigms are given in that chapter.

3.8 The Habitual Auxiliary

The Habitual Auxiliary is a stem me. It is defined as its own word class on the following grounds:

- it forms the second part of a complex predicate, in construction with a verb
- it cross-references the subject of the predicate of which it forms a part, using either the Agreement Suffix, as verbs can, or its own special set of prefixes

---

\(^5\) What the focus marker agrees with is a matter of some complexity, which is dealt with in Chapter 11.
The form and functions of the Habitual Auxiliary are discussed in Section 14.3.

3.9 POSTPOSITIONS

Postpositions are a small class of words. Their defining features are:

- they occur as the final element of a postpositional phrase
- they obligatorily cross-reference their head noun with an object prefix
- they take no further morphology

The postpositions are:

- na in, on, etc.
- nam to, from
- hal above
- tat on top of
- nal because of
- ham for
- ne with (accompaniment)
- ku like
- kelei near

The last postposition, kelei 'near', belongs in its own subclass as, unlike the others, it can occur with the Locative suffix. Postpositions and postpositional phrases are discussed in Section 7.1. Note there is a conjunction ne 'and', formally identical to ne 'with' (see Section 3.10).

3.10 CONJUNCTIONS

There are seven conjunctions in Lavukaleve: aka ‘and, so then’; taman ‘however’; leta ‘but’; o ‘and, or’; olang ‘because’; ve ‘or’; ne ‘and’. The last can also function as a postposition. Conjunctions share the following features:

- they occur in between a pair of coordinated clauses or NPs
- apart from aka, which can take the Presentative suffix -ri and Predicative -o/om/v, they cannot take any morphological affixation

The use of conjunctions in conjoined clauses is mentioned in Section 15.4.6 and discussed in Section 18.1.3. The Presentative and Predicative suffixes, and aka, are discussed in Sections 8.9.4 and 8.10.3.
3.11 Locationals

Locationals are a loose, heterogeneous class of words that include the **hoka** 'here' paradigm (including **hoka** 'here'; **hoika** 'there, medial; **heaka** 'there, distant'; **hoaka** 'there; unspecified distance'); **ika** 'there', and **koka−oka** 'far', all of which take Presentative suffix **-ri** and Predicative **-o/om/v**, plus a number of other single uninflecting words including **uke** 'near'; **umu** 'under, below'; **vuli** 'behind'; **fain** 'on top'; **fafaril** 'across'; **sangine** 'together'.

These words are grouped together not on morphological grounds; indeed they are morphologically very varied. Rather they are grouped together on the semantic basis that they provide locational specification to a clause. They function as adjuncts, having scope over a whole clause. Some of these words can take the Presentative **-ri**, Predicative **-o/om/v** and Extended **-la**. Their classification as locationals recognises the fact that they form a semantic class. In strictly formal terms, different classes could be recognised, based on whether or not they take either the Presentative **-ri** and Predicative suffix **-o/om/v** (**hoka**, **hoika**, **heaka**, **hoaka**, **aka**, **ika**, **koka** and **oka**) and Extended **-la** (the same group but without **hoaka** and **aka**). Those that do not would then be classified as particles. However it seems descriptively more revealing to think about them in terms of their semantic relationship to each other. In this way, members of the same semantic set like **uke** 'near' (uninflecting) and **koka−oka** 'far' (taking Presentative **-ri** and Predicative **-o/om/v** and Extended **-la**) do not have to be separated.

Those locationals which end in **ka** enter into certain formal and paradigmatic relationships with each other, and with the demonstratives; these forms are discussed in Sections 8.9 and 8.10, where there is also a discussion of the Presentative **-ri** and Predicative **-o/om/v** and Extended **-la**.

3.12 **Nun** 'from'

**Nun** 'from' is a locational particle which differs from the other locationals in that it always occurs together with a nominal adjunct, immediately following it, and together with this nominal adjunct it forms a complex locational adjunct. **Nun** is discussed in Section 7.4.

3.13 Demonstrative identifiers

There is a class of words which are formally related to the **foia** demonstrative pronoun, with the addition of an extra syllable /hV/ after the first syllable of the pronoun, where V takes its form from the vowel of the first syllable of the pronoun.

Demonstrative identifiers only occur in non-verbal clauses, functioning somewhat similarly to predicative deictics. See Section 8.11 for a discussion of them, and a
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comparison with predicative deictics.

3.14 Roi-doī 'Which?'

There is a word roi-doī 'which?' (the forms vary freely; see Section 2.10), a question word, which forms its own word class, on the basis of its morpho-syntactic properties. It functions as the head of an NP, so one might want to call it a noun, but there are two reasons that this is not an appropriate classification. Firstly, it is a criterial feature of nouns that they have their own inherent gender. Roi does not, but instead takes its gender from the word whose status it is questioning. Secondly, it can appear in an NP in apposition with, and before, this noun which it is questioning. Nouns do not do this; two nouns in the same NP must normally appear in a head-modifier relationship, using the possessive construction (see Section 4.2 for discussion of this). The fact that roi can appear in apposition with a noun means that it is not a noun. The fact that it appears before, not after, this noun, means that it could not possibly be modifying this noun; modifiers invariably follow, not precede, their heads. For these reasons, roi is not considered a noun or an adjective, but instead is considered to belong to its own word class.

Other question words are discussed below, Section 3.17.2. Roi is discussed further, along with other question words, in Section 17.1.4.

3.15 Reflexive Muān 'Self'

The reflexive word muān 'self' is in its own word class, as it has features unique to it. It is obligatorily prefixed with a Possessive prefix, to indicate its referent. It may also be preceded by an NP stating this referent. Verbal morphology cross-references the NP (or the referent to which the Possessive prefix refers), not muān itself. Muān is not a noun, as it has no gender, and does not function as the head of an NP, cannot be modified by a demonstrative and cannot take the definite article, does not function as an argument, and therefore it cannot be cross-referenced by a predicate. Muān is called a reflexive word, because one of its functions is reflexive, but it also occurs to indicate that the actor did the action alone, by themselves. In the following example, muān appears with a 1st person singular Possessive prefix, and an NP consisting of the 1st person pronoun precedes it. The verb cross-references the 1st singular subject:

13) Ngai ngamuan ta lava ga ekone
    1sg POSS- self just bamboo(n) sgnArt e- ko -ne
    a- ngoa
    1sgS- stay

ngoa.

I keep on rod fishing by myself.

w1 024
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Reflexive constructions are discussed in Section 13.3.5.

3.16 Verb adjuncts

There is a small closed class of verb adjuncts, consisting of only four words: *fo'for* 'fly, prepare'; *ko'kor* 'tight'; *so'sor* 'fast' and *va'var* 'talking'.

Verb adjuncts only occur in construction with the verb *hai* 'do'; together the words form a kind of complex predicate. They immediately precede *hai*. Nothing can intervene between the verb adjunct and *hai*, and the verb adjunct cannot occur with any other verb than *hai*.

It is easy to distinguish verb adjuncts from other word classes. They are not nominal arguments, because they are never, under any circumstance, cross-referenced by the verb. They are not verbs, because they never receive any verbal morphology; and in addition, verbs are all vowel-final. They are different from particles, both in their fixed position and in their reliance on the presence of *hai* 'do'. It is interesting to note the formal relationship between the four verb adjuncts: they all end in /r/, and they look like older reduplications; the non-initial stress pattern is also suggestive of this (see Section 2.7.1 for a discussion of the types of words which have non-initial stress). If they are old reduplications, it is not at all clear what the unreduplicated words were, or what word class they were. Interestingly, there is a noun *va'var* 'talking' as well.

Note that borrowed verbs also function similarly to verb adjuncts, but in construction with *sia* 'be, become, happen, do' rather than with *hai*. Verb adjunct constructions are discussed in Section 14.4.

3.17 Particles

There are a large number of particles in Lavukaleve; these words take no morphological affixation, and do not occur in close construction with any other word or constituent. They can be divided into smaller subclasses based on their scope across a constituent or clause, and their semantics. Adverbial particles have scope over a clause or a single verb. Hesitation and exclamation particles do not have scope. Other particles have scope over a whole clause. They all function syntactically as adjuncts.

3.17.1 Adverbial particles

There are only ten adverbial particles in the corpus. Most verbal modification is done by full verbal clauses rather than by adverbs. Adverbs are a subclass of particles which can have scope over a single verb (although this is not always the case; they can also have scope over an entire clause). They are all manner adverbs. As there are so few, it is worth giving an exhaustive list, although there are probably more in the language than
occur in the corpus collected so far.

uruala ‘properly’
karial(a) ‘slowly, easily’
rikai ‘quickly’
laketa ‘on foot’
saka ‘fast’
enata ‘at that moment’
leon ‘hurriedly’
la ‘straight away’
hotu ‘at the same time’
tuna ‘really’

Adverbial particles generally immediately precede the verb which they modify, although this is not obligatory. As adverbs are not discussed elsewhere in the thesis, it is worthwhile to show some examples here:

14) ngarolon mina oemegge fi
   nga-rolo -n mina o-e- me -ge fi
   1sgPOSS- mind -LOC thing(f) 3sgf-O- SBD- continue -ANT 3sgnFOC

   leta rikai ngolaila merea fongai.
   leta rikai ngo-lai -la me -re -a fongai
   but quickly 2sg-tell -NEG HAB-NF -sgf 1sgFOC

   ...I (f) kept it inside myself (kept it to myself), and I didn’t tell you quickly.  

15) Emaiguge laketa aka nun aka
   e- ma- igu -ge laketa aka nun aka
   1pl.ex- 3plS- take.out -ANT on.foot then from then

   nun aka nun kini vau, koi Pipisala elavea.
   nun aka nun kini vau koi Pipisala e- lavea
   from then from ACT go.out also Pipisala 1pl.ex- appear

   They took us on foot, on and on and on we went, then we reached Pipisala.  

Apart from these adverbial particles, adverbials can also be derived from intransitive verbs using the suffix -ril. This is discussed in Section 13.2.3.

3.17.2 QUESTION PARTICLES

Question particles include the following: ria-dia ‘where?’; riahi-diahi ‘where to?’ (the r-initial and d-initial forms vary freely; see Section 2.10); ninam ‘when?’; and vala ‘how, what, why?’, a general interrogative. These particles all occur as the first word of a question sentence.

Other question words are intransitive verbs vsasia ‘be where?’ and ela ‘be how many?’; masculine nouns ami ‘who?’; man ‘what?’; elahave ‘how much?’; and the plural noun
elav ‘how many?’’. Question particles and other question words are discussed in Section
17.1.

3.17.3 Time particles

There are three time particles. They are: kosora ‘today’; raine ‘tomorrow’; marigen ‘yesterday’. Note also there is a word movele ‘the day after tomorrow’, which is a
neuter noun. There is no word for ‘the day before yesterday’.

3.17.4 Quantifier particles

There are only two quantifier particles; suni ‘all’ and mail ‘a bit’. Other concepts from
this semantic area are expressed by words of other word classes, e.g. vutia ‘be many’
(intransitive verb); ro-ru ‘none’ (adjective ro ‘one’ with negative suffix); fatu ‘half’
(noun); viluril ‘most’ (derived verb); and fan ‘some’ (noun). They function as
adjuncts.

3.17.5 Vocative particles

There are three vocative particles, which appear at the end of sentences, and provide
illocutionary force to the utterance. Typically they occur with commands and
exhortations. The three particles are na (vocative, singular), nail (vocative, dual) and
nai (vocative, plural). The particles are always spoken as the final word of an utterance,
after an intonation break (indicated below by the slash and comma respectively in the
following examples), and they always receive very strong stress. Their use is only
possible in very informal circumstances. Note that I have translated them as ‘you’,
which, in this context, seems like the closest functional equivalent in English. They do
not, however, make any reference to person, and are not to be understood as pronouns
of any sort. Some examples:

16) E! Ngana lafa ro feo ngonerea / na!
e nga- na lafa ro feo ngo-ne -re -a / na
hey! 1sgO- in part(f) one.sgf 3sgfFOC 2sg- give -FUT -sgf / VOC.sg

Hey! Give me a bit, you! co 024

17) Hamus hobea, na!
ahamus hobea -v na
evening(n) good -sgn VOC.sg

Good night, you! e3 016a

18) Vulamela, nail!
vula -mela nail
come -DURIMP.du VOC.du

Come here, you two! e3 016b
3.17.6 Hesitation particles

Hesitation particles are used as fillers while a speaker decides what to say next. They cannot sensibly be said to have scope. Some of the common ones include a, e, mi, i and mina ‘um’. Mina is also a feminine noun meaning ‘thing’, but in its use as a hesitation particle it appears in sentences not as an argument but rather as a filler, while the speaker thinks of the word they want.

3.17.7 Exclamation particles

There are quite a few exclamation particles, used to show instant reaction and emotion. These words seem to be particularly sensitive to style; this is cross-linguistically common. The following are some of the most common ones:

- eseko ‘wow! is it true?’ (used by younger people)
- hapilo ‘oh my goodness!’ (used by older people)
- e ‘hey!’ (used generally, to get someone’s attention)
- eta ‘wow!’ (exclamation of surprise, used generally)
- sala ‘hey! stop that!’ (exclamation of disapproval, used in admonishing young children)
- tumai ‘really! oh, right!’ (used generally, as a response to information, or giving feedback to a speaker as a way of eliciting more information)
- sie ‘stop that!’ (used only for admonishing dogs)

3.17.8 Relational particles

The following are the most common relational particles: noka ‘even’; tin ‘only’; hide ‘thus’ (used with quoted speech); koi ‘also, too’; ke ‘emphatic’ (provides assertive emphasis to a clause or constituent); vausa ‘finished, enough’ (said at the end of a story).

3.17.9 Miscellaneous particles

There are many other particles, including the following most common ones: iire ‘yes’; tamu ‘no’; maiva ‘maybe’; bae-bai ‘let’s go!’; de ‘have this!’ (presentational particle); nam ‘gimme!’; ta ‘just’, ‘must’; kini-ini action particle; hini beneficiary particle. Bae-bai is anomalous in that it can take the Group suffix (see Section 8.10.1). Because of this, strictly speaking it should not be classified as a particle, but it seems unnecessary to give this word its own word class.

Some of these particles, in particular ta ‘just’, ‘must’ and kini-ini and hini are very
prevalent, and warrant some discussion.

The particle *ta* is extremely prevalent, and has a couple of different meanings. Often it means ‘must’:

19) "Oh! *Ngai koi vela lame kini ngane memal nala* o ngai koi vela la-m me kini nga-ne me -mal nala
   oh 1sg also go 1sgS- HAB ACT 1sgO- with SPEC -du.m mduArt

   *lanam ta akiure*"
   la-nam ta a- kiu -re
   3dumO- to must 1sgS- die -FUT

   "Oh! I too will go to my two brothers, then I must die there"

20) *Hoina nikol ta’vulimal ta okoroire.*
   hoina nikol ta’vulimal ta o- koroi -re
   MOD.MED.sgm first house.posts(pl) must 3sgfO- chop -FUT

   *(He wants to build a house.) He needs to cut posts first.*

More commonly, it has a less immediately obvious meaning, but can often be translated as ‘just’. It seems to provide some sort of emphasis for the next piece of discourse. Typically, it is followed by a pause (indicated by the slash or comma in the next examples), and then a new participant, or a new event, is introduced. For example:

21) *Malav va aunio esiage, maruta la*
   malav va aunio -n e- e- sia -ge ma- ruta la
   people(pl) plArt evening-LOC 3sgnO- SBD-do -ANT 3plPOSS- lamp(f) sgfArt

   *koan omafouge ta,*
   koa -n o- ma- fou -ge ta
   door -LOC 3sgfO- 3plS- put.on -ANT just

   *taragau na hano ove / ruta la omaham.*
   taragau na hano o- ve / ruta la o- ma -ham
   sea.eagle(m) sgmA then 3sgS- go / lamp(f) sgfArt 3sgfO-take-PURP

   *The people, upon evening coming, just put out their light, and the sea eagle went to take the light.*

22) *Vokuire voure,*
   vo- kui -re vo- u -re
   3plO- burn -NF 3plO- eat -NF

   *ngoane ngaog va e- voemege ta /*
   ngaog -ne ngaog vo- e- me -ge ta /
   stay -IMPF stay 3plO- SBD- HAB -ANT just /

   *hano / lokalem na ovoe.*
   hano / lo- kalem na o- vo -e
   then / 3duPOSS- father(m) sgmA 3sgPOSS- come -PSV

   *They cook them and eat them, it just goes on, then the father comes.*
Ta often occurs after a subordinate clause, as in these examples, or after a coordinate-dependent clause in a clause chain, and it seems to be that it is signaling that that piece of the discourse is finishing, and a new one is about to start.

The particle kini ~ ini is glossed ACTion. It is an extremely frequently occurring particle, and unfortunately it is difficult to describe exactly what it means. It often appears directly before an action verb, and is best translated into English as “go and (V)”. It refers to motion or action; and suggests completiveness, or decisiveness in the accomplishment of the action. It refers to reaching a place, or carrying out an action: that is, successful attainment of a goal. It immediately precedes the goal. If the goal is an action, it immediately precedes the (O and) V. If the goal is reaching a place, it immediately precedes the place reached.

The difference between kini and ini is generational. Older people prefer ini; younger people prefer kini. The kini form seems to be gaining ground, in that there are older speakers who alternate between kini and ini, but younger speakers rarely use ini. Note that the generationally-based initial k/o alternation also occurs in the locationals koka and oka ‘far’; see Section 8.9.2 for a discussion. Some examples of kini and ini follow.

23) ama
   aokoge
   aerauge,
   3sgmO- ma a- o- ko -ge
   3sgmO- take 3sgmO- 3sgS- throw -ANT
   kini vatu ga ehaire.
   kini vatu ga e- hai -re
   ACT head(n) sgnArt 3sgmO- takeoff -NF

Taking and throwing him, he fell, and he up and cut off his head.

24) Oefeuge
    ta aka bagatum na kini ovau
    o- e- feu -ge ta aka bagatum na kini o- vau
    3sgfO- SBD- go.up -ANT just then male.giant(m) sgmArt ACT 3sgS- go.out

Upon her going up, then the giant went and came down [from the bush to their village].

25) Velanun
    lai ga hoare evoge ini
    vela -nun lai ga hoa -re e- e- vo-ge ini
    go -DUR rain(n) sgnArt poke-through -NF 3sgmO- SBD- come-ANT ACT
    ukeare lo.
    ukea -re lo
    come.close -NF finish

It went on, and the rain started falling, it up and came close.

26) Kua
    oloe ini
    vela leme.
    kua o- lo -e ini vela le- me
    moon(f) 3sgS- finish -NOMZR ACT go 1plex- HAB

We would up and go at the end of the month.
3 - Word Classes

27) **Vau elaveage.**
emare
sokil

Vau
e-
lavea
gemare
e-
ma
e-
re
sokil
go.out
1plex-
appear
-ANT
1plex-
take
-NF
small.ship(m)

na
emare
kini
Mosibe
eigu.

na
e-
ma
re
kini
Mosibe
eg-
igu
sgmArt
1plex-
take
-NF
ACT
Mosibe
1pl.ex-
take.out

Upon us arriving there, a launch takes us, and took us to Mosibe.

28) "Bagatum na fin kini vau bagatum na fin kini vau male.giant(m) sgmArt 3sgmFOC ACT go.out

ngatulav
va
vokurure
leim
sala!"

It's the giant, he has up and gone out and killed my children! Hey!"

**Hini** (glossed INTention) marks an intended action or intended goal. It refers to something being aimed or destined or given for a purpose or a person. It almost always occurs following the benefactive postposition **ham** "for". It usually appears immediately after the thing which is intended; the intended target/goal, whether this is an action or a person, or an inanimate object.

29) **voham hini talu hobea oeane,**

voham
ham hini talu hobea
-a
o-
ea
-ne
3plO-
for
INT
word(f)
good
-sgf
3sgfO-
talk.about
-IMPF

...we tell them the good news.

30) **voham hini ui sevo ema ve,**

voham
ham hini ui sevo e-
ma
ve
3plO-
for
INT
food(n)
tabu
3sgnO-
take
go

...take Holy Communion to them,

31) **man olikirem na, oham hini avolorima.**

man
o-
liki
re
-m
na
o-
ham hini
a-
volori
-ma

what(m)
3sgS-
want-NF
-sgm
sgmArt
3sgfO-for
INT
3sgmO-
make
-DURIMP.sg

You give her what she wants!

The next sentence is about house-building. Strips of betel tree fibre are used to sew together the sago leaves to make walls:

32) **Nat na aham hini le'usa**

Nat
na
aham
hini
le'usa

sago.palm(m)
sgmArt
3sgmO-
for
INT
betel.tree(f)

feo
ngotatavareia,
ahoaham.

feo
ngotatavari
-re
a
hoa
-ham

3sgFOC
2sg-
split
-FUT
-sgf
3sgmO-
poke.through
-PURP

The betel wood is for the sago; you split [the betel wood] to sew it [i.e. the sago].

co 275

am 057

am 059

b2 011
It is perhaps significant that there is a formally identical intransitive verb *hini* ‘say’, which could perhaps suggest a historical origin for the particle.
CHAPTER FOUR

Noun phrases and possession

This chapter outlines the structure of NPs, and then describes in detail the elements which can modify a head noun. These elements include adjectives (including numbers), demonstrative modifiers and the definite article. Two particularly frequently occurring adjectives, ro ‘one’ and mea ‘SPECifier’ are discussed in detail. The structure of possessive phrases and the semantic characteristics of the possessive construction are also examined.

4.1 THE STRUCTURE OF NPs

An NP consists of a head, and, if this is a noun, it may be followed by optional modifiers including adjectives. The Specifier adjective mea and the adjective ro ‘one’ follow other adjectives and the final slot of the NP is filled, optionally, by the definite article or a demonstrative modifier. If the head is a demonstrative or personal pronoun, the only modification it can have is a demonstrative modifier. This word order of head followed by modifiers is obligatory.

The following schema outlines the maximal structure of NPs in Lavukaleve:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Adj *</th>
<th>mea ‘SPEC’</th>
<th>ro ‘one’</th>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Dem modifier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal pronoun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrative pronoun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dem modifier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.1.1 HEADS OF NPs

Nouns and demonstrative and personal pronouns may function as heads of NPs. The head controls agreement within the NP (and in the clause).

Some examples follow, of an NP consisting of an unmodified noun head, a modified noun head and a personal pronoun head respectively. The relevant NPs are italicised:

1) Velanun - Nun velanun - Nun velanun - Nun kini karokomua oole.
   vela - DUR go - DUR go - DUR kini karokomua ACT gecko(f) 3sgfO- 3sgS- see
   He went on and on and on, then he saw a gecko.

2) amare, lake rugi ga esoire fona.
   a- ma - re lake rugi ga e- soi - re fona
   3sgmO- take - NF road(n) big.sgn sgnArt 3sgnO- follow - NF PN.PROX.sgm
   ...taking it, he went along the big road.

3) Sou ore, okala la "Inu mina ofiva."
   sou o- re o- kala la inu mina o- fi - va
   rise 3sgS- say 3sgPOSS- mother(f) sgfArt 2sg thing(f) 3sgfO-hear-PCTIMP.sg
   She up and said, his mother, "You listen to this."

ELLIPSIS OF HEADS

Heads of NPs can be ellipsed if their referent is retrievable from context. In the following example, the NP bakel sevoa consists of two adjectives and an ellipsed head, which, although not present in the sentence, controls the agreement of sevoa. Note that bakel is an irregular adjective, in that it does not show agreement.

4) (In the evening a steamer (f) came.)
   Bakel sevoa hano mea.
   bakel sevo -a hano me -a
   big tabu - sgf then SPEC - sgf
   Terribly big, that one then [was].

In the next example, savatam na is a headless NP, with understood head fo’sal ‘fish (m)’, which controls the masculine agreement. Example (6), included for comparison, shows that ordinal numbers are syntactically modifiers, not heads, and thus that (5) is indeed an example of nominal ellipsis, and savatam is not the head of its NP:
4 - NPS AND POSSESSION

5) Aka loval sevi fiv malang ga.

then giant.trevally(pl) eight 3plFOC 3plPOSS- name(n) sgnArt

*The eight fishes, they are called loval.*

Savata na fin Fafas hin.

savata -m na fin fafas hin
ninth -sgm sgnArt 3sgmFOC fafas(m) 3sgmEFOC

*The ninth is a fafas.*

6) Kini nei leleta ga esulaire

kini nei leleta -ø ga e- sulai -re
ACT coconut(n) second -sgn sgnArt 3sgnO- illuminate -NF

*I went and shone the torch on the second coconut...*

As one might expect from the above data on nominal ellipsis, headless relative clauses can occur (see also Section 16.3):

7) Matua ona taa la hano kiua.

matua o- na ta -a la hano kiu -a
old.coconut(f) 3sgfO- in be.born -sgf sgnArt then die -sgf

*The [one] born from an old coconut then died.*

4.12 MODIFICATION IN NPS

Adjectives, the demonstrative modifier and the definite article may be used to modify a head noun. Demonstrative and personal pronouns may be modified by the demonstrative modifier only. The maximal NP structure given above makes some broad claims which should be commented on. Firstly, the schema indicates that any number of adjectives may occur in an NP. Actually, in texts no more than three have been found per NP, and elicitation speakers were unwilling to allow more than two or three adjectives within an NP, preferring instead to use a series of shorter sentences, or to use intransitive verbs rather than adjectives. Secondly, while other adjectives can occur in any order with respect to each other, if ro ‘one’ occurs with other adjectives, it must be the final one. The next sections describe in turn the elements which can be used for modification of a head noun.

ADJECTIVES

As described in Section 3.3, adjectives are a closed class with only around fifty members. They occur after a head noun, and they agree in number and gender with their head, using the Agreement Suffix (see Section 10.4). Most adjectives use the Agreement Suffix to show agreement; some, like ro ‘one’, ru ‘big’, telako ‘one’ and lelaol ‘two’ have their own inflectional paradigms. Some, like bakel ‘big’ and the numbers from three to ten do not show agreement. Some examples:
There are two adjectives which deserve special mention here: ro ‘unit, one’ and mea ‘SPECifier’. These adjectives, as well as being extremely frequent, bear some resemblance in terms of their functions to the demonstrative modifier; these interesting features merit discussion.

Ro ‘one’

There is an indefinite adjective ro ‘one’. It also has a special use, not as a modifier but as a head, in which case it means ‘the one’, ‘the other’; that is, it has a definite and/or contrastive meaning.

Ro ‘one’ (cited in the feminine singular form), while functioning syntactically as a regular adjective, is morphologically irregular in that it has its own inflectional paradigm for person/number agreement. It differs from other adjectives morphologically also in that it has a special suffix -ru, added to the inflected word, to negate it. The inflectional paradigm of ro (given also in Section 3.3) is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MASC</td>
<td>roa</td>
<td>roal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>ro</td>
<td>rol</td>
<td>rovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUT</td>
<td>roge</td>
<td>rogel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that having its own inflectional paradigm is not an unusual property of adjectives; the adjective ru ‘big’ also has its own inflectional paradigm (see Section 3.3), but is nonetheless distributionally a perfectly normal adjective.
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If there is more than one adjective in an NP, including ro, ro is always the final one. For example:

11) Ali rua folufolum roa alem fin.
    ali rua folufolu -m roa a- le -m fin
    man(m) big.sgm fat -sgm one.sgm 1sgS- see -sgm 3sgmFOC

I saw a big fat man.

Ro marks an entity as indefinite:

12) "Ngali ra ba kini foe roa
    ngali ra ba kini foe roa
    friend(m) coconut.crab(f) go!sg ACT pig(m) one.sgm
    akula amefoi" hide ore.
    a- kula a- me- foi hide o- re
    3sgmO- run.after 3sgmO- 1duin- hold thus 3sgmS- say

"Friend rat, let's go catch a pig" he said.

13) Velanun velanun velanun velanun
    vela -nun vela -nun vela -nun vela -nun
    go -DUR go -DUR go -DUR go -DUR
    velanun velanun kini savaom roa alere,
    vela -nun vela -nun kini savaom roa a- le -re
    go -DUR go -DUR ACT tree.sp(m) one.sgm 3sgmO- see -NF

They went on and on and on, then they saw a savaum tree, ...

14) Mima hona ana
    Mima hona a- na
    Mima(m) MOD.PROX.sgm 3sgmO- in
    fo'sal rua roa aehoage,
    fo'sal rua roa a- e- hoa -ge
    fish(m) big.sgm one.sgm 3sgmO- SBD- poke.through -ANT
    olav ga hano hale.
    o- lava ga hano hale -ø
    3sgPOSS- bamboo(n) sgnArt then break -sgn

Mima hooks a big fish and his bamboo [fishing rod] breaks.

15) Mima hona hau enata
    Mima hona hau enata
    Mima(m) MOD.PROX.sgm go.asshore fall other.MED.sgn
    hau oiga
    hau oiga
    hau oiga

At that very moment that this Mima went ashore, a wave broke.

In the non-singular, ro means 'some':
16) Kala ngai namu ena
kala ngai namu e- na
mother(f) 1sg place(n) 3sgnO- in

Kaneol rol noa lome
kaneol rol noa lo- me
two.female.relatives one.duf stay 3duS- HAB

Enam ikari fi avere.
e- nam ika -ri fi a- ve -re
3sgnO- to there -PSNV 3sgnFOC 1sgS- go -FUT

Mother, in this place, some [two] sisters are living, there I’ll go. co 031

17) Kini kanage rovo vone va’var hai
kini kanage rovo vo- ne va’var hai -re
ACT family(pl) one.pl 3plO- with talking do -NF

Vomare hau hoire hila.
vo- ma -re hau hoi -re hi -la
3plO- take -NF go.ashore go.in -NF do/say -EXT

And they talked with some families and brought them in. rk1 019

It was mentioned above that ro can be negated, using the suffix -ru, a suffix which only occurs on this word. When negated, ro means ‘none’ or ‘not one’ (see Section 17.2.3):

18) aka malav rovoru ika vela leiv fiv.
aka malav rovo -ru ika ve -la lei -v fiv
then people(pl) one.pl -none there go -NEG exist -pl 3plFOC

...so no people can go there. jo 012

19) Mina roru omala leim fongai.
mina ro -ru o- ma -la lei -m fongai
thing(f) one.sgf -none 3sgfO- take -NEG exist -sgm 1sgfFOC

I never took anything. co2 075

20) Aka siare rovoru felelav fiv.
aka sia -re rovo -ru fele -la -v fiv
then do -NF one.pl -none return -NEG -pl 3plFOC

That’s why none of them returned. jn 055

Ro is a marker of indefiniteness, but one would not want to call it an indefinite article, for a number of reasons. Firstly, it has the syntactic distribution of an adjective. Secondly, it does not have the frequency or obligatoriness which one might expect of an article; it is certainly far less frequent than the definite article. Thirdly, it is not obligatory in indefinite NPs, again unlike the definite article, which is obligatory in all definite NPs (unless there is a demonstrative to express the definiteness). Fourthly, and crucially, it can, under certain constrained circumstances, co-occur with the definite article. The circumstances in which this can happen are as follows.

It was shown above that NP heads can be ellipsed, which results in adjectives looking
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like they are the heads of NPs. The heads of NPs in which ro occurs are particularly frequently ellipsed:

21) aireol lelaol ruiaol feol leiaol.
   aireol lelaol ruiaol -ol feol lei -aol
   2women two.f old.woman -duf 3dufFOC exist -du.f
   ...two old women live there.

   Aka longoae ga akari fl
   aka lo- nga -e ga aka -ri fi
   then 3duS- stay -NOMZR sgnArt then -PSNV 3sgnFOC
   ngoa lomel ro oka mail ro uke mail.
   ngoa lo- me -l ro koka mail ro uke mail
   stay 3sgS- HAB -du one.sgf far a.bit one.sgf near a.bit
   The way they live, one lives far away a bit, and the other lives a bit closer.

In these circumstances, ro usually has a contrastive meaning or it has a definite meaning ‘the one’: both meanings are exemplified in the example above.

And in such circumstances, when ro is in an NP with an ellipsed head, the definite article (or the demonstrative modifier hoia ‘this’) can be present:

22) ta roa hide ore: "E! Ngahouba!
   ta roa hide o- re e nga- hou -ba
   just one.sgm thus 3sgS- say hey! 1sgO- wait.for -DURIMP.pl
   Feu houla ro okoroi" hide ore.
   feu houla ro o- a- koroio hide o- re
   go.up stick(f) one.sgf 3sgfO- 1sgS- chop thus 3sgS- say
   ...then one [boy] says “Hey! You lot wait for me! I’ll go up and chop a stick” he says.

   Hano. Roa na ofeu.
   hano roa nà o- feu
   then one.sgm sgmArt 3sgS- go.up
   Okay. The one [boy] went up.

23) (So he parcelled them [the eggs] in munu leaf, then he gave them to us two [my brother and me] to hold. We held them and came along, I held them.)
   Roa na koi mafan fiv ofoiv hiv.
   roa na koi ma- fan fiv o- foi -v hiv
   one.sgm sgmArt also 3plPOSS- some 3pIFOC 3sgS- hold -pl 3plEFOC
   The other one [i.e. my brother] held some of them too.

24) "Le vala memalen ke" roa hoina ore.
   le vala me- ma- le -n ke roa hoina o- re
   but how 1pl.in-3plS- see -ADMON EMPH one.sgm MOD.MED.sgm 3sgS- say
   “But hang on, they might see us” that other one says.
It is only in this syntactic environment, with an ellipsed head, that ro has a definite/contrastive meaning and is compatible with the definite article and the demonstrative modifier.

Because in these syntactically-constrained circumstances ro can occur with the definite article, one would not want to call it an indefinite article. However, ro certainly does bear a resemblance to an indefinite article when it appears with a noun head. In fact, it bears certain resemblance to the kinds of meanings which the English noun ‘one’, in its non-numeral sense, can have (cf. Givón 1981). It is generally translated as such, as the examples given show. Note that one would also not want to call ro a specific article, largely because it does not refer to specificity.

One could argue that when it appears with a noun head ro is an indefinite article, and when it appears as a head, it is not. However, because of the four reasons outlined above: namely, its relative infrequency, non-obligatoriness, adjective-like distribution and co-occurrence with the definite article, ro is described as an adjective here, although it is acknowledged that it has many properties more usually associated with articles, and possibly at some future stage of the language it will become a fully-fledged indefinite article.

MEA ‘SPECIFIER’

The second adjective which requires discussion is mea, glossed as SPECifier (cited here in the feminine singular form). When it is used in construction with nouns, mea functions syntactically and morphologically as an adjective, occurring between a noun and the definite article. Like other adjectives, it has no inherent gender, but inflects to agree with its head noun, using the Agreement Suffix on the stem me.

In this construction, mea marks out an entity as being a particular one, known to both speaker and addressee. It refers to shared knowledge, shared not because it has been referred to already in the discourse, but shared in the sense that everybody knows it. It refers to common knowledge, common sense and shared knowledge of the world, which is based on the fact that all Lavukals live in the same place, and have always done so (at least in their cultural mythology), and share the same culture and world view. Some examples:

---

1 There are two plural forms in free variation: meav and mev.
This type of referentiality bears a superficial resemblance to what Himmelmann (1996) describes as the recognition function of demonstratives: “Recognitional use of demonstratives ... draws on specific, 'personalized' knowledge that is assumed to be shared by the communicating parties due to a common interactional history or to supposedly shared experiences” (p. 233). However mea differs from recognitional demonstratives in a few ways. Firstly, recognitional demonstratives, as Himmelmann describes them, are used primarily by the speaker to make sure the hearer knows which referent the speaker means, by calling on shared knowledge between the speech act participants:

A central feature of this use is that the speaker anticipates problems with respect to the information used in referring to a given referent. That is, the speaker is uncertain whether or not the kind of information he or she is giving is shared by the hearer or whether or not this information will be sufficient in allowing the hearer to identify the intended referent. Such use could always be (and in fact often is) accompanied by a you know? or remember?-type of tag question. (p. 230)

This is not the case with mea; rather than being an overt manifestation of a speaker’s uncertainty over whether or not their intended referent will be understood, mea is, it
seems, rather an acknowledgment of the fact that the speaker and the hearer share their knowledge and experience of the world. Further, although mea has these referential functions which resemble demonstratives in certain ways, mea is not a demonstrative.

According to two of Himmelmann’s (1996) criteria for what constitutes a demonstrative, mea does not contain reference to distance in its semantics, which demonstratives do, and it is frequently used for first mentions of unique entities, which demonstratives cannot be; this can be seen in examples (28) and (29) below for instance. In addition, mea can co-occur with the definite article, which demonstratives cannot, and it can co-occur with demonstratives, which suggests that it occurs in a different slot from demonstratives. Finally, mea can never appear without a head, unlike demonstratives. For these reasons, mea is not considered a demonstrative, although it is certainly true that its functions do bear some resemblance to some of the functions commonly seen in demonstratives.

Mea is usually translated here using ‘this’ or ‘that’, but the reader should understand these in the sense of ‘this thing that we all know about (because we share a common culture and know the same things)’.

Because it makes overt reference to shared knowledge, mea often occurs with proper nouns, in particular, places and people familiar to all Lavukal people. Such usages cannot be felicitously translated into English.

28) Ma Baesen mea la
  ma Baesen me -a la
  sea.passage Baesen(f) SPEC -sgf sgfArt
  osoire ae lavae lome ga.
  o-soi -re ae lavae lo- me -ø ga
  3sgfO-follow -NF go.up appear 3sgS- HAB -sgn sgArt

It (m) came along and appeared in the sea passage at Baesen. ns 052

29) Hano ka ta roa na Mafur na
  hano ka ta roa na Mafur na
  then LOCEMPH time(m) one.sgm sgmArt Mafur(m) sgmArt
  oae Fean Kengaraon holu mem na
  o- ae Fean Kengaraon -n holu me -m na
  3sgS- go.up Fean Kengaraon -LOC harbour(m) SPEC -sgm sgmArt
  ana golu avaham.
  a- na golu a- va -ham
  3sgmO- in spear(m) 3sgmO- pull -PURP

Once upon a time, Mafur went up to Fean, in this Kengaraon harbour, to go spear fishing.
As some of the above examples have shown, mea can co-occur easily with the definite article and demonstrative modifier. This makes a certain amount of intuitive sense: the definite article and demonstrative modifier, both marking definiteness, refer to an entity as something that both speaker and addressee can be expected to be able to identify. This is consistent with the functions of mea, which marks an entity as one that the speaker knows and expects their addressee to be able to identify. However, even though it makes intuitive sense for mea and the definite article or demonstrative modifier to co-occur, it is still not possible to predict when the definite article or demonstrative modifier would occur with mea and when they would not. This is a subtle area, difficult for a non-native speaker to fully understand.

Even though it is not strictly relevant to NP structure, it is worthwhile, in this discussion of mea, to note that mea can also occur in a non-adjectival use, in construction with particles and nominal adjuncts (i.e. postpositional phrases, locative-marked nouns, and place nouns). In construction with particles and nominal adjuncts it creates either an NP or a nominal modifier phrase with that word or phrase. In (32), the particle hano forms an NP head together with mea, and takes the definite article. In (33), the particle akari ‘like that’, together with mea, modify the head noun le ‘day’. In (34) akari mem functions as the conjoined head (with leftenan, separated by the conjunction ve ‘or’) of the NP leftenan ve akari mem roa ane ‘lieutenant or something like that’:

32) Hano meav va vonam mina roru tamu.
   hano meav va vo- nam mina ro -ru tamu
   then SPEC.pl pl.Art 3pl.O- to thing(f) one.sgf -none no

Those before [i.e. the ancestors] had nothing.

33) Le akari me roge
   le aka -ri me -ø roge
day(n) then -PSNV SPEC -sgn one.sgn

One day, on a certain day [a day like that], you come ashore.
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34)  Mina  leftenan  ve  akari  mem  roa  ane  fl.
mina  leftenan  ve  aka-ri  me  -m  roa  a-  ne  fi
um  lieutenant(m)  or  then-PSNV  SPEC  -sgm  one.sgm  3sgmO-  with  3sgnFOC

It was with a lieutenant or something like that.

In the next set of examples, *mea* is in construction with nominal adjuncts, again forming an NP or nominal modifier with the nominal adjunct. In example (35) the Postpositional phrase *kala okav ena* ‘in the mothers’ group’, with *mea*, functions as a clausal subject: ‘those in the mothers’ group’. In (36) *mea* (followed by *ro*), with the PP *ngai ngane* ‘with me’, forms an NP:

35)  Viluril  kala  okav  ena  mea,
vilu  -ril  kala  o-  kavu  e-  na  me  -v
exceed  -MORE  mother(f)  3sgPOSS-  group(n)  3sgnO-  in  SPEC  -pl

Especially those who join this mothers’ group

36)  ngai ngane  mea  ro  foia  hoika  leia.
ngai  nga-  ne  me  -a  ro  foia  hoika  leia  -a
1sg  1sgO-  with  SPEC  -sgf  one.sgf  PN.MED.sgf  there.MED  exist  -sgf

...I have a sister [lit: a woman with me] over there.

In the following example, the locative-marked noun *loe* ‘end’ (derived from verb *lo* ‘finish’) functions, with *mea*, as a modifier of head noun *nei* ‘coconut’:

37)  Velanun  velanun  kini  nei  oloen  me
vela  -nun  vela  -nun  kini  nei  o-  lo  -e  -n  me  -ø
go  -DUR  go  -DUR  ACT  coconut(n)  3sgS-  finish  -NOMZR  -LOC  SPEC  -sgn
esulaire  foiga,  hano  ngabaik  na  sem.
e-  sulai  -re  foiga  hano  nga-  baik  na  see  -m
3sgnO-  illuminate  -NF  PN.MED.sgm  then  1sgPOSS-  bag(m)sgmArt  fill  -sgm

It goes on and on, then I shine the torch on the last coconut, then my bag is full.

The precise semantic function of *mea* in these constructions is difficult to capture, although it seems to be similar in some respects to the semantic function of *mea* with nouns.

Example (36) shows an idiom in the language; the normal way to refer to a sibling is to use a phrase consisting of the postposition *ne* ‘with’ (correctly prefixed) followed by *mea* (suffixed to show the gender and number of the sibling in question). Literally, the phrase means ‘that one with me/you/etc. who you all know about’. Thus *ngane mea* above is ‘my sister’, and, for instance, *ngone mem* is ‘your brother’ (2sg-with SPEC-sgm). In this idiom, *mea* frequently co-occurs with the definite article and *ro*, the indefinite adjective.
NUMBERS

Numbers are adjectives, and function to modify a head noun within an NP.

If numbers co-occur with other adjectives within an NP, they can appear in either order:

Many nouns have separate forms for dual and plural number. Some nouns, however, do not. If a speaker wishes to refer to two of a noun which does not have a special dual form, the number two is used, together with the singular, not plural, form of the noun, in an NP. For example, the noun sevo (m) ‘vow’, has a singular form sevo, and a plural form sevokal, but no dual form. It is the singular form rather than the plural which is used for two vows:

If a noun does not have a plural form, a number is used, together with the singular form of the noun, as with nei ‘coconut’ in the next example:

Numbers and the counting system are discussed in Section 3.3.1.

81
The demonstrative modifier is used to modify a noun or demonstrative pronoun within an NP. It cannot co-occur with the definite article in the same NP.

43) Ngai ta buku hoina anuvea heo.
   ngai ta buku hoina a- nuve -a heo
   1sg just conch(m) MOD.MED.sgm 3sgmO- own -sgf 3sgfEFOC

I own that conch!

44) Kekimare ngoanun ngoanun koa ga
   kekima -re ngoa -nun ngoa -nun koa ga
   listen -NF stay -DUR stay -DUR door(n) sgnArt
   ealare, oekakomeon ta
   e- ala -re o- e- kako -meon ta
   3sgnO- open -NF 3sgfO- SBD- look.out -SURP just
   foina hoina loveare leim. Koan.
   foina hoina lovea -re lei -m koa -n
   PN.MED.sgm MOD.MED.sgm be.stiff -NF exist -sgm door -LOC

Listening, she opened the door and looked around, and the man was stiff (dead). In the doorway.

The latter construction type of a demonstrative modifying a demonstrative pronoun, as well as the forms and functions of demonstratives, is discussed in detail in Section 8.6.

The definite article occurs in the final syntactic slot of an NP. Its form agrees with its head noun in number and gender. It has the following inflectional paradigm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>sg</th>
<th>du</th>
<th>pl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>masc</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>nala</td>
<td>va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fem</td>
<td>la</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neut</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>gala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The definite article marks definiteness. That is, it marks a referent as being one which the speaker knows the identity of, and assumes the addressee knows the identity of as well. Definiteness may come from the referent having unique reference, from being the only one of its kind (and therefore known to the addressee), or from being previously introduced in the discourse. These are all well exemplified in Lavukaleve.

In the following example, the definite article appears with kui 'sun' by virtue of its unique reference; there is only one sun, and the speaker can thus assume the addressee to have a definite referent for it.
A referent can gain definiteness through being previously introduced in the discourse, as the following examples show. In each example, a new referent is introduced as indefinite, without the definite article. It is then referred to as definite, with the definite article, once its definite identity has been established.

The definite article is sometimes used with proper nouns, as in many languages (although not English). The distinctions here are very subtle, and not easily understood by a non-native speaker. For example, compare the following two uses, with and without the definite article. Note that when place names which would normally appear with a Locative suffix have a definite article, they cannot have the Locative suffix, but instead use a postpositional phrase (see Section 3.1 for an account of place nouns, and Chapter 7 for an account for the difference between the Locative suffix and postpositional phrases).
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48) Karumulu la ona vau hului ke.
Karumulu la o- na vau hului ke
Karumulu(f) sgfArt 3sgfO- in go.out go.round EMPH

It went right round Karumulun.

49) Karumulun felere aela foe.
Karumulu n fele re ae la foe
Karumulu LOC return NF go.up NEG 1pl.exFOC

We didn’t go back to Karumulun.

4.1.3 JUXTAPOSED NOUNS

There are occasional examples of two nouns in juxtaposition but these are quite rare. Normally two nouns together must show an overt relationship to each other by using a possessive construction, as shown below (Section 4.2). There are a few examples however in which two nouns appear together to be part of a single NP, with no possessive construction:

50) Nikol lafa ona fo‘foira oia la
nikol lafa o- na fo'foira o- a i -a la
first part(f) 3sgfO- in work(f) 3sgfO- 1sgS-do -sgf sgfArt
feo Honiara taon.
feo Honiara taon
3sgfFOC Honiara town

The first place I did work in was Honiara town.

One perhaps lexicalised example of this is with the phrase mo'sil savu ‘high tide edge’, which refers to the high-tide mark on a beach:

51) Osure lore, omare mo'sil savun
o- su re lo re o- ma re mo'sil savu -n
3sgfO- tie -NF finish -NF 3sgfO- take -NF high.tide edge -LOC

vulanun vulanun hano.
vula -nun vula -nun hano
come -DUR come -DUR then

Having tied her up, they took her and came to the sea shore.

4.2 POSSESSION

Possession is a relatively simple matter in Lavukaleve. Unlike in many of the nearby Oceanic languages, there is only one possessive construction, which is used to express every semantic kind of possession. The possessor is expressed by an optional NP, and an obligatory Possessive prefix which is attached to the head noun of the NP expressing the possessed item. This possessive construction is also used for non-possessive relational meanings. The ensuing discussion will first describe the Possessive prefixes
and structural features of their use, and then exemplify the different semantic relationships which this construction can convey.

4.2.1 STRUCTURAL FEATURES

The Possessive prefix paradigm, which is used to express the possessor, is identical to the verbal subject prefix paradigm (see Section 9.7) in all forms except for the 1st person singular form. The 1st person singular Possessive prefix is \textit{nga}-, which is actually identical to the 1st person singular verbal object prefix (actually 1st dual and plural forms are all also identical in both subject, object and Possessive paradigms). Like the subject prefixes, Possessive prefixes do not mark gender. The paradigm is as follows:

Possessive prefixes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>DU</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1EXCL</td>
<td>nga-</td>
<td>le-</td>
<td>e-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1INCL</td>
<td></td>
<td>me-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ngo-</td>
<td>mele-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>o-</td>
<td>lo-</td>
<td>ma-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When a Possessive prefix is attached to a noun, a morphophonemic rule can come into operation. This rule causes the loss of a final vowel on some vowel-final nouns; consonant-final nouns are unaffected. It cannot be predicted which nouns will be affected by this rule. The formation of possessed nouns is described in Section 5.5.

The following examples show firstly a possessive phrase in which the possessor is expressed simply by a prefix on the possessed noun; secondly, a possessor expressed by an NP plus a prefix, and thirdly a possessor expressed by an NP consisting of a personal pronoun, plus the prefix:

52) \textit{Leta} o\textit{tail} ga tasi \textit{fi} \textit{olei}.

\textit{but 3sgPOSS- house(n) sgnArt sea -LOC 3sgFOC 3sgS- exist}

\textit{But its home was the sea.} \hspace{1cm} ns 065

53) \textit{Navigol} na o\textit{lang} \textit{fi} \textit{David}.

\textit{cyclone(m) sgmArt 3sgPOSS- name(n) 3sgFOC David(m)}

\textit{The cyclone's name was David.} \hspace{1cm} rk2 035
4.2.2 SEMANTIC FEATURES

The possessive construction outlined above is used to express all types of possessive relationships, including alienable, inalienable, generic possessor, body part and kinship possession, as well as part-whole relationships and other relationships of association rather than actual possession. The following examples give some indication of the range of use.

alienable possession:

55) Hoikariom
   Hoikariom -ri -om
   there.MED -PSNV -m/n
   So they all lit their torches...

inalienable possession:

56) Ngai ngalang fi Janet.
   Janet.
   ngai nga-lang fi Janet.
   1sg 1sgPOSS-name(n) 3sgnFOC Janet(f)
   My name is Janet.

generic possessor:

57) Omare,
   Omare, -ma -re vala koi nei ga olem ga
   3sgfO- take -NF how also coconut(n) sgnArt 3sgPOSS- eye(n) sgnArt
   ena efoou.
   ena e- na e- o- fou
   3sgnO- in 3sgnO- 3sgS- put.on
   Taking it, then she put it in the eye of the coconut.

body parts:

58) Aka mafan e etau vofoure fi
   Aka mafan e- e- etau τau vofoure -re fi
   then 3plPOSS- some 1pl.ex 1pl.exPOSS- hands(pl) 3plO- hold -NF 3sgnFOC
   laen ofoure fi songi leme.
   laen o- fou -re fi songi le- me
   line(f) 3sgfO- put.on -NF 3sgnFOC swim 1pl.ex- HAB
   Then some of us held our hands and make a line and we were swimming.
kinship:

59)  | Vala  | mesa  | suni  | fo'foira  | oivele  |
    | 1pl  | 1pl   | 3sg   | 3sg       | 3sg     |
    | IN   | GROUP | FOC   | SBD      | FUT     |

How just 1pl.in GROUP all work(f) 3sgf- do -SUCC

mekala | omelugure.
me- | kala
1pl.in.POSS- mother(f) 3sgFO- 1pl.in- think.of -FUT

How, if we all worked together, would we look after our mother?  

part-whole:

60)  | Houla  | la  | ta'rai | tail  | ga  | okoan  | fi  |
    | island.name(m) | sgm | sgm | sgm | sgm | sgm | sgm |
    | IN   | ART  | ART   | ART  | ART | ART  | FOC |

The tree is in front of the church. [lit: at the door of the church]  

group membership:

61)  | aka  | fo'sal | makom  | hogariom | kini  |
    | 3sgm | sgm   | sgm   | sgm   | sgm   |
    | POSS | ART   | ART   | ART   | ART   |

then fish(pl) 3pIPOSS- school.of.fish(m) MOD.PROX.sgn -PSNV -m/n ACT

ohau.

3sgS- go.shore

...this group of fish came ashore

This possessive construction can also be used to indicate a relationship of association rather than possession. In fact usually the only possible way to have two nouns within the same NP is to put them in a head-modifier relationship using the Possessive prefix. For example:

62)  | Aka  | foiga | molio  | la  | o  | beko  | mina  | an'kav |
    | 3sgm | sgm   | sgm   | sgm | sgm  | sgm | sgm | sgm |
    | POSS | ART   | ART   | ART | ART  | ART | ART | ART |

then PN.MED.sgn tree.sp(f) sgmArt and stone(f) um pumice(m)

obek

3sgPOSS- stone(m) sgmArt float 3plO- SBD- HAB -ADMON thus 3sgnFOC

So [they would take] the molio and the stone - what?- , the pumice stone that can float, ...

63)  | Suvala | na | beko  | ovo 'vou  | fin. |
    | island.name(m) | sgm | sgm | sgm | sgm |
    | IN | ART | ART | ART | ART |

Suvala is a baby stone

Since the possessive construction is used to express relational meanings, some but not
all of which are possessive, it would perhaps have been better to call the prefixes Relational, rather than Possessive. However their most common function is to express possession, thus the choice of name.

Recursive possession can occur:

64) Kini malav va matulav manapikal
kini malav va ma- tulav ma- napi -kal
ACT people(pl) plArt 3plPOSS- children(pl) 3plPOSS- nappy -pl
vomakoge ta, taragau na kini
vo- ma- ko -ge ta taragau na kini
3plO- 3plS- throw -ANT just sea.eagle(m) sgmArt ACT
votogore omav
vo- togo -re o- ma -v
3plO- take.out -NF 3sgS- take -pl

So when the people put out their children's nappies, the sea eagle took them

Negative possession, or not-having, can use this possessive construction, with the negative particle tamu: 'its X is not' (see Section 17.2).

65) "Lokosu foga. Ogan tamu." ore.
lokosu foga o- gan tamu o- re
headless PN.PROX.sgn 3sgPOSS- meat no 3sgS- say

"This one [coconut tree] is headless! It has no fruit." he said.

Rarely, negative possession is expressed using a non-verbal existential construction 'there is no X' (again see Section 17.2). The (non-)possessor can be expressed by a postpositional phrase, usually using postposition nam 'to', as in the following example:

66) Daeva o raba o kaukamea o mina
daeva o raba o kaukamea o mina
goggles(n) and rubber(f) and wire(f) and thing(f)
akari mea la vonam tamu.
aka -ri me -a la vo- nam tamu
then -PSNV SPEC -sgf sgmArt 3pl.O- to no

They had no goggles or rubber or wire or anything like that. [lit: there were no goggles etc. to them]
CHAPTER FIVE

Noun formation

Verbal inflectional processes in Lavukaleve are remarkably regular; all verb stems are completely regular, and apart from a couple of straightforward morphophonemic rules, there is only one form for each verbal affix. Nouns and noun inflections are, conversely, very irregular. In many cases there are slightly different noun stems depending on which suffix or prefix is to be added, and these are unpredictable by rule. In addition, for some categories, the form of the suffix taken by a particular noun cannot be predicted.

There are six formation processes which can apply to noun stems: Locative suffix -n; Perlative suffix -ne; Folk suffix -mil; the possessed noun formation process; dual formations; and plural formations.

This chapter explores factors associated with the formation of noun stems. It describes each of the noun formation types in turn, and explains what morphological regularities can be found, and shows the limitations of such morphological regularities. To begin with (Section 5.1), I will clarify the notions of noun roots and noun stems. Sections 5.2 to 5.6 describe separately the types of formations which may apply to noun stems. Section 5.6, the major part of this chapter, discusses in detail the complex principles associated with the formation of dual and plural nouns.

5.1 INTRODUCTION: LEXICAL ROOTS AND STEMS

All nouns have a citation form. This is the form which the Folk, dual and plural suffixes are added to. In addition to this citation form of the stem, some nouns have a different
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locative stem, which is the stem which the Locative and Perlative suffixes are added to. In many nouns this locative stem differs from the citation stem by the addition of extra material before the suffix. This extra material is unpredictable.

### Citation Stem | Locative Stem + | Gloss
--- | --- | ---
Locative Suffix
safe | safeli-n | ‘(on the) kitchen shelf’
itao | itaoge-n | ‘(in a) different place’

To avoid confusion about the level which the description to come is referring to, I will use the following terminology to refer to different types of nouns or parts of nouns. I will say that every noun is a lexical root. This lexical root may have one or two stems: the citation stem, and the locative stem. The lexical root is in almost all instances formally identical to the citation stem (see Section 5.6 for an instance of where this is not the case).

Also important for the relationship between lexical roots and stems is that many nouns appear in their citation stems as consonant-final, whereas their locative stem is vowel-final, and further, their dual and plural suffixes begin with the same vowel which appears as the final vowel of the locative stem. This might make it seem that the vowel is part of the stem, not part of the suffixes, but, as will shortly be seen, this is not a good analysis. To begin with, consider the following examples:

| Citation Stem | Locative Stem + | Dual Form | Plural Form | Gloss |
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
keker | kekera-n | - | kekeraul | ‘dry place’
namutin | namutina-n | namutinal | namutinaul | ‘mainland’
fongasar | fongasara-n | fongasaral | fongasaraul | ‘walling’
hatal | hatala-n | - | hatalav | ‘bed’
tail | taila-n | - | tailav | ‘house’

Examples like this might make one want to posit an underlyingly vowel-final form for the lexical root; e.g. *kekera, *namutina, etc. However, many consonant-final lexical roots add a vowel to form the locative stem, and add a different vowel for the dual or plural forms. For example:

| Citation Stem | Locative Stem + | Dual Form | Plural Form | Gloss |
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
hamus | hamusi-n | - | hamusaul | ‘night’
tu’tuk | tutuku-n | tutukul | tutukaul | ‘torso’

---

1 Strictly speaking, this stem should be called the locative/perlative stem, but this is a somewhat unwieldy term.
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It is very tempting to posit underlyingly vowel-final forms for some, though not all, lexical roots, and possibly this is the correct historical analysis. But the simplest accurate synchronic account is that there is no necessary formal relationship between citation stems and locative stems.

Note that the various noun suffixes are mutually incompatible; a noun cannot appear with more than one suffix at a time. This means, for instance, that dual or plural-suffixed nouns cannot receive the Locative or Perlative suffix. If a speaker wants to express something like this, they put a dual or plural-suffixed noun into a postpositional phrase, and thus avoid the problem.

5.2 NOUN FORMATION WITH THE LOCATIVE SUFFIX

The Locative suffix is an invariant form -n, which refers to static location in place or time (its semantic features, and the syntactic status of locative-suffixed nouns, are discussed in more detail in Section 7.2). As discussed in Section 3.1, the Locative (and Perlative) suffixes can only be attached to a subclass of nouns, called locational nouns.

As explained above, many nouns have a special locative stem, apart from their citation stem, which the Locative suffix (and Perlative suffix, as will be seen below) must be attached to. Further examples include the following, which show the citation stems of certain nouns, with their corresponding locative stems:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITATION STEM</th>
<th>LOCATIVE STEM + LOCATIVE SUFFIX</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ho'vul</td>
<td>ho'vulu-n</td>
<td>'in the ear'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lar</td>
<td>lara-n</td>
<td>'in the daylight'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>furi</td>
<td>furinge-n</td>
<td>'in the west, weathercoast'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taigin</td>
<td>Taigina-n</td>
<td>'in Guadalcanal'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavukal</td>
<td>Lavukale-n</td>
<td>'in the Russell Islands'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lea</td>
<td>leale-n</td>
<td>'in the cave'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rara</td>
<td>rarava-n</td>
<td>'on the side'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nganga</td>
<td>ngangaoli-n</td>
<td>'at the river'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correspondences between these stems are unpredictable; there is no way of knowing, from the citation stem of a noun, what form the locative stem will be. However there are two discernible patterns of relationship. The first pattern involves all consonant-final lexical roots/citation stems in which a final vowel appears in the locative stem. That this vowel is better analysed as a part of the locative stem, not the Locative suffix, is suggested by the complete unpredicatability of the form of the actual

---

2 One possible exception to this rule is the the indigenous name of the Russell Islands, Lavukalen, which looks like historically as though it consists of root lavu, plus plural suffix -kal, plus Locative suffix -n. The root lavu is not analysable today by native speakers.
vowel. As was discussed above (Section 5.1), this vowel cannot be part of the underlying form of the lexical root/citation stem, as it does not necessarily occur in the citation stems of these words. So the vowel belongs not to the lexical root/citation stem, and not to the Locative suffix, but instead to the locative stem of the word.

The second set of correspondences shows an interesting phenomenon whereby the stem form receives additional material at the end, before the Locative suffix. Examples of this are lea - lealen '(in the) cave'; safe - safelen '(on the) shelf'; nganga - ngangaolin '(at the) river'; rara - raravan '(on the) side'.

As was discussed above (Section 5.1) these locative stems are not general stem forms for all noun suffixes. They are used only for the Locative suffix and the Perlative suffix.

Note, however, that not all nouns have irregular locative stems; for many nouns, the locative stem is identical in form to the citation stem. Put differently, many nouns do not have a locative stem, but instead add a Locative suffix directly to a citation stem. Some examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation Stem</th>
<th>Locative Stem + Suffix</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aunio</td>
<td>aunio-n</td>
<td>'(in the) evening'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tasi</td>
<td>tasi-n</td>
<td>'(in the) sea'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>savu</td>
<td>savu-n</td>
<td>'(on the) edge'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fela’koe</td>
<td>fela’koe-n</td>
<td>'(in the) village'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vatu</td>
<td>vatu-n</td>
<td>'(on the) head'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kui</td>
<td>kui-n</td>
<td>'(in the) sun'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis presented has said that there is an invariant Locative suffix, which is added to sometimes irregularly derived noun stems. It is less descriptively appealing to argue that the noun stems themselves are identical to their citation forms, and it is the Locative suffix which is irregular. Rather it is better to say that the Locative (and Perlative) suffixes are completely regular, and it is the noun stems which may contain irregularities. This is particularly so given that other areas of the language show that noun stems do have an inherent tendency towards unpredictable formal behaviour.

5.3 Noun formation with the Perlative suffix

The Perlative -ne, like the Locative suffix, is only available to a subclass of nouns called locational nouns. The Perlative suffix refers to motion through or along a place or time. This suffix, like the Locative suffix, must be affixed to the locative stem, not the citation stem of the noun.
5.4 Noun formation with the Folk suffix

The Folk suffix -mil derives a noun with the meaning that its referent is an inhabitant of the place mentioned by its noun: 'the folk of X place'. Actually the suffix is very rarely used, and although it is not unproductive it does not come up very often in texts.

This suffix presents an anomaly; in six spontaneous occurrences in the corpus, five are attached to the citation stems of the noun, but one is attached to the locative stem plus Locative suffix. These are the examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITATION STEM</th>
<th>LOCATIVE STEM</th>
<th>-MIL FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tasi</td>
<td>tasi</td>
<td>tasi-mil</td>
<td>'folk from the sea'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>furi</td>
<td>furi</td>
<td>furi-mil</td>
<td>'folk from the west'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vego</td>
<td>vego</td>
<td>vego-mil</td>
<td>'folk from the east'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talaon</td>
<td>Talaon</td>
<td>Talaon-mil</td>
<td>'folk from Talaon'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monggo</td>
<td>Monggo</td>
<td>Monggo-mil</td>
<td>'folk from Monggo'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o'as</td>
<td>o'ase</td>
<td>o'asen-mil</td>
<td>'folk from the bush'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first five words have -mil attached to their citation stems, but the last word, o'asenmil, has -mil attached to the locative stem + Locative suffix form. This is the only instance in the language of one noun appearing with more than one nominal suffix; in all other instances this is not allowed. This anomalous behaviour can probably be attributed to the infrequency of use of this suffix.

5.5 Possessed noun formation

Some vowel-final noun stems, when prefixed with a Possessive prefix, obligatorily lose
their final vowel. Such noun stems are mostly disyllabic, of the form CVCV. For example:

soka 'finger' (f) o-sok 'his finger'
vala 'belly' (n) o-val 'his belly'
ngoro 'snore' (m) o-ngor 'his snore'
beko 'stone' (n) o-bek 'his stone'
vage 'mound' (m) o-vag 'his mound'
fefi 'bottom of pool' (n) o-fef 'its bottom'
komu 'school of fish' (n) o-kom 'its school'
kora 'edge' (n) o-kor 'its edge'
tasi 'sea' (n) o-tas 'its sea'
tome 'hole' (m) o-tom 'its hole'
mima 'way of life' (n) o-mim 'its way of life'
golu 'spear' (m) o-gol 'his spear'
The few non-CVCV words which lose their final vowel are:

houmala 'fish hook' (f) o-houmal 'his fish hook'
houla*) 'tree, stick' (f) o-houl 'his tree'
aro 'language' (n) o-ar 'his language'
a'vuri 'parcel' (m) o-avur 'his parcel'
bua 'banana leaf' (m) o-bu 'his banana leaf'
kua 'tribe' (n) o-ku 'his tribe'
The rule does not apply to all CVCV roots. For example:

kala 'mother' (f) o-kala 'his mother'
gerä 'feeling' (f) o-gera 'his feeling'
talu 'word' (f) o-talu 'his word'
sisi 'nose' (n) o-sisi 'his nose'
buku 'conch' (m) o-buku 'his conch'
kusu 'string basket' (m) o-kusu 'his string basket'

Note that there are one or two words which optionally apply this rule: e.g., rara 'side', orar ~ orara 'its side'; mola 'canoe', omola ~ omol 'his canoe'. For the vast majority of words, however, there is only one correct possessed form. Native speakers always correct a wrong form.

There are approximately twice as many roots which do not lose their final vowel when prefixed with a Possessive prefix as those which do. There is no obvious rule which predicts which nouns will lose their final vowel and which will retain it when possessed.

---

* The /ou/ represents a sequence of two vowels: see Section 2.5.
It appears not to be an alienable/inalienable distinction; there are body parts which lose their final vowel (e.g. finger, belly), and body parts which retain it (e.g. nose, neck). Similarly, there are what would presumably be alienable nouns which lose their final vowel (e.g. spear, stone), and those that do not (e.g. string basket, conch shell).

The vowel loss does not seem to depend on the form of the word either. The CVCV nouns which do lose their final vowel are not obviously formally different to the ones which do not; and likewise there seems to be no obvious link between the non-CVCV ones which lose their final vowel.

One factor which may be relevant is gender. Although among all nouns there is a roughly even spread of masculine, feminine and neuter nouns, among those nouns which lose their final vowel when possessed, of a random sample of 40, 5 were feminine, 10 were masculine and 25 were neuter. That is, there are far more neuter nouns in this group than one might expect. It is not clear, however, exactly what to make of this. There may be a historical reason which is no longer apparent.

The presence of a suffix on a possessed noun means that the final vowel is retained, even on those nouns in which it is normally lost. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Dual</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>koli ‘inside’</td>
<td>okol ‘its inside’</td>
<td>okolin ‘in its inside’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foto ‘middle’</td>
<td>ofot ‘its middle’</td>
<td>ofoton ‘in its middle’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6 DUAL AND PLURAL NOUN FORMATION

Singular nouns are formally unmarked for number with explicit morphology (though see the discussion below about the limited appearance of masculine singular and feminine singular suffixes, Section 5.6.3). The formation of dual nouns and plural nouns operates for the most part independently. Dual formation is largely dependent on phonological criteria. Nouns form their plurals, however, on the basis of membership of one of ten declensions, each declension having its own plural forming strategy (the class labels, named for the most common formative within the declension, are: NONE, KAL, U, VIL, V, L, MAL, N, VERAV, and OTHER). Within each declension, the actual form of the plural marker is determined largely by phonological considerations, which are similar to those which affect dual formation. There is some scope for variation among the affixes selected by a particular noun.

There is much irregularity in dual and plural noun formation; in fact there are at least 86 ways of forming dual and plurals from singular nouns. However, underlying the apparently endless series of exceptions there is a fundamental system upon which most of the dual and plural formations are based. In particular, there are two general rules which hold across all dual and plural formation strategies.

Firstly, a number of words are consonant-final in their citation stems but in their dual
and plural formations add a vowel which is predictable in quality if one considers the word to actually be an old reduplication of an originally CVCV word, which lost the final vowel after reduplication. Some examples are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>DUAL FORM</th>
<th>PLURAL FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vekevek</td>
<td>vekeveke-l</td>
<td>vekeveke-ul</td>
<td>'tree sp.' (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>filifil</td>
<td>filifili-l</td>
<td>filifili-mal</td>
<td>'nail' (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kolukol</td>
<td>kolukolu-l</td>
<td>kolukolu-vil</td>
<td>'pestle' (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lamulam</td>
<td>lamulamu-l</td>
<td>lamulamu-iv</td>
<td>'storm' (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suvisuv</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>suvisuvi-ul</td>
<td>'stonefish' (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negoneg</td>
<td>negonego-l</td>
<td>negonego-ul</td>
<td>'driftwood' (n)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, for example, under this analysis the word vekevek derives from an earlier word *veke. It underwent reduplication, *vekeveke, then subsequently lost its final vowel, thus becoming the consonant-final stem vekevek. Under dual and plural formation, however, the final vowel is reinstated; thus, vekevekel, vekevekeul.

This analysis renders completely predictable the form of the vowel in the dual and plural formations in this type of word. All words of this phonotactic pattern behave in this way. These old reduplications, then, are all analysed as underlyingly vowel-final.

There is another large group of apparently consonant-final nouns which have dual and plural suffixes both starting with the same, unpredictable vowel. It is convenient, and probably historically correct, to think of these noun stems as being underlyingly vowel-final. Under such an analysis their dual and plural formations would thus become completely regular. Examples of such nouns are (I use hyphens to show what the morpheme boundaries would be under this analysis):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>DUAL FORM</th>
<th>PLURAL FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kakal</td>
<td>kakale-l</td>
<td>kakale-v</td>
<td>'older brother' (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mikat</td>
<td>mikate-l</td>
<td>mikate-v</td>
<td>'centipede' (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kolang</td>
<td>kolangi-l</td>
<td>kolangi-v</td>
<td>'shin' (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ku'kut</td>
<td>ku'kuti-l</td>
<td>ku'kuti-v</td>
<td>'midrib' (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vukel</td>
<td>vukelu-l</td>
<td>vukelu-maul</td>
<td>'back of head' (m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under this analysis, the noun stems would be vowel-final, and the dual and plural formations would be the regular formations according to the phonological form and declensional class (if relevant) of that noun stem (see below).

However, importantly, it is not possible to explain all irregular dual and plural formations in this way. Some dual nouns with irregular suffixes are vowel-final. For instance:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>DUAL FORM</th>
<th>PLURAL FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kora</td>
<td>kora-ul</td>
<td>kora-vil</td>
<td>‘rocks at edge of island’ (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mulukita</td>
<td>mulukita-ul</td>
<td>mulukita-vil</td>
<td>‘orange’ (f)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And some consonant-final noun stems have a dual suffix starting with a particular vowel, and a plural suffix starting with a different vowel, or no vowel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>DUAL FORM</th>
<th>PLURAL FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sukafal</td>
<td>sukafal-el</td>
<td>sukafal-aol</td>
<td>‘<em>Acropora pulchra</em> (tree sp.)’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funfun</td>
<td>funfun-il</td>
<td>funfun-aul</td>
<td>‘firefly’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keal</td>
<td>keal-uil</td>
<td>keal-verav</td>
<td>‘trochus’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fe'Iaus</td>
<td>fe'Iaus-ul</td>
<td>fe'Iaus-vutim</td>
<td>‘spider conch’ (m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One would certainly not want to analyse these consonant-final stems as underlyingly vowel-final. It is not clear what to make of these facts. Probably the correct historical explanation is that most, if not all of these nouns, were at one stage vowel-final. This explains those nouns which have identical vowels in dual and plural suffixes. For the other nouns, it could be that after the loss of the vowel, the nouns disregarded their earlier final vowels, and made dual and plural forms on an ad-hoc basis. Without knowledge about earlier stages of the language, it is only possible to speculate.

The second major generalisation that can be made about dual and plural formations, irrespective of declension, concerns those masculine nouns ending in -m, most of which refer to higher animates. Under plural formation, such nouns lose their final -m before receiving their plural suffix:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>PLURAL FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>holovem</td>
<td>holove-v</td>
<td>‘devil’ (m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makatoem</td>
<td>makatoe-v</td>
<td>‘green parrot’ (m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nemem</td>
<td>neme-v</td>
<td>‘brother’ (m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>le'aem</td>
<td>le'ae-v</td>
<td>‘man’ (m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ku'raem</td>
<td>ku'rae-v</td>
<td>‘elder man’ (m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kalem</td>
<td>kale-v</td>
<td>‘father’ (m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tulakom</td>
<td>tulako-v</td>
<td>‘small one’ (m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sokoraem</td>
<td>sokorae-v</td>
<td>‘lizard’ (m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sulum</td>
<td>sulu-verav</td>
<td>‘chief’ (m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leumam</td>
<td>leuma-laul</td>
<td>‘upper lip’ (m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not all masculine stems ending in -m lose their final -m before plural suffixation, however. Some of those which don’t are higher animates, but most are not. Those which don’t:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>PLURAL FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tum</td>
<td>tum-aul</td>
<td>‘husband’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bagatum</td>
<td>bagatum-aul</td>
<td>‘giant’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>savaom</td>
<td>savaom-aul</td>
<td>‘tree sp.’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to’vum</td>
<td>to’vum-kal</td>
<td>‘bubbles’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tamtam</td>
<td>tamtam-aul</td>
<td>‘reef’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beiram</td>
<td>beiram-aul</td>
<td>‘blue-fin trevally’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>farasam</td>
<td>farasam-aul</td>
<td>‘spinefoot (fish sp.)’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ko’rom</td>
<td>ko’rom-aul</td>
<td>‘black surgeonfish’ (m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the duals of such words do not necessarily lose their final -m. The first group below do not, but the second group do:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>DUAL FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ne’mem</td>
<td>ne’mem-al</td>
<td>‘brother’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>le’aem</td>
<td>le’aem-al</td>
<td>‘man’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ku’raem</td>
<td>ku’raem-al</td>
<td>‘elder man’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sokoraem</td>
<td>sokoraem-al</td>
<td>‘lizard’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sulum</td>
<td>sulum-al</td>
<td>‘chief’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leumam</td>
<td>leum-al</td>
<td>‘upper lip’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kalem</td>
<td>kale-l</td>
<td>‘father’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tulakom</td>
<td>tulako-l</td>
<td>‘small one’ (m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This phenomenon of loss of final -m before plural suffixation raises some important issues to do with the meaning of this final -m of masculine nouns. These issues will be discussed below (Section 5.6.3).

5.6.1 Dual Noun Formation

The formation of dual nouns is mostly achieved by suffixing -l, or some form related to -l, most commonly -al or -ol. There are no noun declensions based on dual formation strategies; instead there are a number of strategies of dual formation which are, to a large degree, dependent on phonological criteria. As with other areas of noun formation, there is much irregularity; but there are some basic rules which apply to most nouns at least to some extent. The following section outlines the generalisations which can be made about dual formation, and discusses the exceptions.

Nouns which do not have a dual form

There are many nouns which do not have a dual form. There are two categories of these: nouns for which no dual is possible, and nouns for which the dual form is identical to the singular form (but which, for instance, can be modified by dual demonstratives).
Mass nouns appear to be the only nouns for which duals are impossible. Other nouns, for which the dual form is identical to the singular form, include nouns referring to tiny things which always come in large numbers and which one would not normally count; nouns referring to abstract entities; nouns which it does not make sense to refer to in the non-singular; common food items; nouns referring to things to do with the sea; and body parts. There is much overlap here with nouns which do not have plural forms (see below for discussion of the ‘none’ plural declension); but there are far more nouns which don’t have a dual form than nouns which don’t have a plural form. Further, not all of the nouns which do not have a dual form fall into any of these semantic groups. Some examples of nouns which have no dual form, (but which do have a plural form):

- mass nouns (e.g. sky, thunder)
- nouns referring to entities which are very small and always come in large number (e.g. star)
- abstract nouns (e.g. evening, day)
- other things which it makes no sense to refer to in the non-singular (e.g. reef, different (non-Lavukal) island, fire, mummy)
- common food items (e.g. matal fruit, yam, coconut crab)
- things to do with the sea (e.g. lobster, blue starfish, shark, hermit crab, saltwater eel, stonefish, squirlfish, giant trevally)
- body parts (e.g. shoulder, scab, brain, tongue, vein, heart, bone, knee, liver, forehead, cheek, collarbone, belly, head, back)
- birds (e.g. cockatoo, hornbill, chicken, green parrot, bird, ma’rea parrot)

The following sections outline the dual formatives used for particular phonological forms. Note that this section attempts to generalise about forms found; it deals with common tendencies, not hard and fast rules. It is a post-hoc description, not an attempt at forming predictive rules. There is no necessary rule, for instance, that all vowel-final nouns will suffix -l in the dual.

Vowel-final nouns

Most vowel-final nouns have a dual formed by suffixing -l to the singular form. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>DUAL FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ki’kile</td>
<td>ki’kile-l</td>
<td>‘headhunting axe’ (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ruio</td>
<td>ruio-l</td>
<td>‘bamboo water container’ (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teru</td>
<td>teru-l</td>
<td>‘reed’ (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sugi</td>
<td>sugi-l</td>
<td>‘hornshell’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngia</td>
<td>ngia-l</td>
<td>‘swearing’ (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngiungiu</td>
<td>ngiungiu-l</td>
<td>‘secret’ (f)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Consonant-Final Nouns

Most consonant-final nouns, and a very few vowel-final nouns, form their dual by suffixing -al to the singular form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>DUAL FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aulit</td>
<td>aulit-al</td>
<td>'octopus' (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baik</td>
<td>baik-al</td>
<td>'bag' (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remrem</td>
<td>remrem-al</td>
<td>'mussel sp.' (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sing</td>
<td>sing-al</td>
<td>'womb' (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fakas</td>
<td>fakas-al</td>
<td>'shoulder' (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keruv</td>
<td>keruv-al</td>
<td>'egg' (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foar</td>
<td>foar-al</td>
<td>'passage' (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>navigol</td>
<td>navigol-al</td>
<td>'cyclone' (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mai</td>
<td>mai-al</td>
<td>'lawyer cane thorn' (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simu</td>
<td>simu-al</td>
<td>'clear sandy-bottom patch of reef' (m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Feminine Nouns Ending in -a

Most feminine nouns ending in -a in the singular form, plus a few nouns of other genders and other final phonemes, form their dual by suffixing -ol (the relationship between feminine nouns and nouns ending in -a is discussed in Section 6.1.1):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>DUAL FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kakalea</td>
<td>kakalea-ol</td>
<td>'older sister' (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>binabina</td>
<td>binabina-ol</td>
<td>'war canoe' (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>betea</td>
<td>betea-ol</td>
<td>'grouper' (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kevea</td>
<td>kevea-ol</td>
<td>'soft coral' (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matua</td>
<td>matua-ol</td>
<td>'old coconut' (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buma</td>
<td>buma-ol</td>
<td>'school of small fish' (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ma-ol</td>
<td>'sea between islands' (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaforok</td>
<td>kaforok-ol</td>
<td>'sea slug' (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loi</td>
<td>loi-ol</td>
<td>'puddle in log' (n)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nouns with Other Dual Suffixes

Other dual suffixes are much less common, restricted to, at most, a few words each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>DUAL FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bin</td>
<td>bin-aol</td>
<td>'bean' (f) (loan from Pijin): see below for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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discussion of loan words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Dual Form</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fe’laus</td>
<td>fe’laus-aul</td>
<td>‘spider conch’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lav</td>
<td>lav-eal</td>
<td>‘marriage’ (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mal</td>
<td>mal-eaol</td>
<td>‘forked stick’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kelas</td>
<td>kelas-el</td>
<td>‘skinned havu nut’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funfun</td>
<td>funfun-il</td>
<td>‘firefly’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giale</td>
<td>giale-naol</td>
<td>‘kitchen’ (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>luga</td>
<td>luga-olin</td>
<td>‘bush’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keal</td>
<td>keal-ul</td>
<td>‘trochus’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ha’lema</td>
<td>ha’lema-ul</td>
<td>‘black surgeonfish’ (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erea</td>
<td>erea-v⁵</td>
<td>‘front of canoe’ (n)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Dual Formations

There are a handful of other dual formation strategies, including forms involving minor stem alternations, and suppletion. Forms involving loss of final -m before adding the dual suffix are discussed above. Other forms are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG Form</th>
<th>Dual Form</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kelkel</td>
<td>kelekelel</td>
<td>‘dugong’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>si’kul</td>
<td>si’kual</td>
<td>‘school’ (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koli</td>
<td>kolal</td>
<td>‘interior’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fu’loa</td>
<td>fu’lol</td>
<td>‘floor’ (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ta’raitail</td>
<td>ta’raital</td>
<td>‘church’ (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ali</td>
<td>airal</td>
<td>‘man’ (m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6.2 Plural Noun Formation

Plural noun formation strategies can be divided into ten groups, based on whether or not the noun takes a plural form, and if so, which one. These ten groups are here called declensional classes. Note that these declensional classes have relevance only for plural formation; there are no other correlations between these declensions and the way a noun will form its dual or locative, for instance. Declensional classes exist only for the purposes of classifying nouns according to how they behave with respect to plural formation.

⁵ This dual form is identical to the plural form of this word. This also represents the only example of a dual suffix -v. The suffix -v is, however, a common plural suffix.

⁶ This is actually a phrase involving two words: ta’rai ‘prayer’ and tail ‘house’. However, the fact that this phrase has its own dual form shows that it is at least partly lexicalised. Incidentally, there is no dual form for ‘house’.
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The declensional classes, in order of most to least frequent, are as follows:

1. **NONE**: the noun has no plural form
2. **KAL**: the noun suffixes -kal to form a plural
3. **UL**: the noun suffixes -ul to form a plural
4. **VIL**: the noun suffixes -vil to form a plural
5. **V**: the noun suffixes -v to form a plural
6. **L**: the noun suffixes -l to form a plural
7. **MAL**: the noun suffixes -mal to form a plural
8. **N**: the noun suffixes -n to form a plural
9. **VERAV**: the noun suffixes -verav to form a plural
10. **OTHER**: including suppletion and other irregular formations

The declensions are named for their most basic formative, but within most declensions there are a number of largely phonologically determined subclasses, with slight variations of this basic suffix. The variations mostly involve various vowels preceding the basic form of the suffixes. There are also a number of irregularly formed members in most of the declensions.

Membership of these classes is unpredictable, but there are correlations with gender. Some declensions contain nouns mostly of one gender, while others have a more mixed membership. The following chart shows the relationships between gender and membership of each declension:

![chart showing relationship between gender and plural formation]

The chart is based on a corpus of 669 nouns. The most common declension, **NONE**, in which there is no overt plural form, contains a somewhat larger proportion of neuter nouns than either masculine or feminine nouns. This is related to the fact that mass nouns are often neuter (see Section 6.1.2). The **KAL**, **UL** and **V** declensions have very few
feminine nouns, whereas the Vil declension consists largely of feminine nouns. The L declension has largely feminine and masculine nouns, and very few neuter nouns. Mal, N and Verav are overwhelmingly masculine and neuter. The miscellaneous Other class contains nouns of all three genders, but somewhat fewer neuter nouns. The following chart shows the same information, but this time sorted by gender; it shows the proportion of plural formation strategies occurring with nouns of each gender.

For masculine nouns the most common plural formation strategies are the -kal or -ul suffixes, or nothing at all. There are also a large number of less common strategies for masculine nouns. For feminine nouns, however, there are fewer available strategies. Most common is -vil, or nothing at all, and there are some other infrequent options. For neuter nouns, the most common strategy is to have nothing at all. -Kal is common, -ul and -verav are less common, and there are other rarer strategies.

The None declension contains many mass nouns and other nouns that are semantically incompatible with plurality, but apart from this, and the correlations with gender, there are apparently no other semantic or other generalisations that can be made about class membership. This is perhaps not surprising; in most languages which have inflectional classes there is usually little to be said about what determines membership of the
In the sections to follow, the membership and actual forms of the suffixes of each declension will be discussed. There is a large amount of irregularity, but underlying it all, there is a basic system, and it is this system that I will aim to elucidate.

**THE 'NONE' DECLENSION**

Nouns belonging in this declension have no plural form. As with duals, this could be for two reasons: they could be nouns which cannot refer to plural things (e.g. mass nouns and some abstract nouns) or they could be nouns for which the plural form is identical to the singular form (the rest). They may take plural agreement, if they have a plural referent, but plurality is not marked on the noun itself. This is the only declension which seems to have at least some semantic basis for membership. Many of the nouns are:

- mass nouns (e.g. sand, water, dust, east wind, west wind, wind, earth, flame, algae, bush, rain, smoke, bark, rubbish, sweat, blood, sea, belongings, grass, lightning, deep sea, leaf debris, fog)
- nouns referring to entities which are very small and always come in large numbers (e.g. ant, blue fly, naga ant, louse, louse egg, mosquito, fly, bee (though not all insects))
- abstract nouns (e.g. talking, war, epilepsy, group, year, youth, brotherhood, darkness, secret, life, cancer)
- nouns with a unique referent (e.g. morning star, sun, daddy)
- common food items (e.g., coconut, banana, sugar cane, mango, food, breadfruit, kumara, wild banana, taro, cabbage, fish, meat, fruit, sago)
- things to do with the sea (e.g. starfish, green snail shell, limpet, chiton shell, nautilus, cone shell, damselfish, squirrelfish, se'luk shellfish, snapper, mother of pearl, sea slug, sea urchin, eye of greensnail shell, black surgeonfish, short conch, low tide, dolphin, trumpet emperor fish, sea devil, white seagull, jellyfish, giant trevally (though not all sea creatures))
- body parts (e.g. hair, grey hair, body hair, nose, neck, eye, palm, fat, scab, ulcer, ear, skin, breast, mouth, beard, wing, intestines)

The nouns which belong in this declension are not necessarily the same as the nouns which have no dual form, although, as the semantic groupings indicate, there is some overlap.

**THE KAL DECLENSION**

Nouns of this declension use suffix -kal to form their plural. Most of the nouns belonging to this declension are masculine or neuter, although there are a few feminine nouns. Very many of the words in this class are CVCV in structure, and all except four
(shown below) in the corpus are vowel final.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>PLURAL FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>la</td>
<td>la-kal</td>
<td>‘dream’ (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lata</td>
<td>lata-kal</td>
<td>‘black-lipped clam’ (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mari</td>
<td>mari-kal</td>
<td>‘sacrifice’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>siu</td>
<td>siu-kal</td>
<td>‘kingfish’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sevo</td>
<td>sevo-kal</td>
<td>‘vow’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tove</td>
<td>tove-kal</td>
<td>‘plant shoot’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gilu</td>
<td>gilu-kal</td>
<td>‘grave’ (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kei</td>
<td>kei-kal</td>
<td>‘bait’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koanali</td>
<td>koanali-kal</td>
<td>‘fish sp.’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ila</td>
<td>ila-kal</td>
<td>‘net’ (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mai</td>
<td>mai-kal</td>
<td>‘lawyer cane thorn’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taol</td>
<td>taol-kal</td>
<td>‘towel’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>veur</td>
<td>veur-kal</td>
<td>‘noise’ (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to’vum</td>
<td>to’vum-kal</td>
<td>‘bubble’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaol</td>
<td>kaol-kal</td>
<td>‘raft’ (n)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The KAL class is unique among the suffixial declensions in that it has no subclasses; as will be seen below, for all the other plural suffixes, there are at least a few phonologically determined variants of each plural suffix. For -kal, there is only a single form.

THE UL DECLENSION

The basic form of the suffix for this plural declension is -ul, but there are some variants, which form six subclasses as follows:

I. Vowel-final stems add -ul:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>PLURAL FORM</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>banga</td>
<td>banga-ul</td>
<td>‘cowry’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beko</td>
<td>beko-ul</td>
<td>‘stone’ (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lova</td>
<td>lova-ul</td>
<td>‘giant trevally’ (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soso</td>
<td>soso-ul</td>
<td>‘gutter’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miga</td>
<td>miga-ul</td>
<td>‘fish bone’ (n)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Consonant-final stems add -aul:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>PLURAL FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fakas</td>
<td>fakas-aul</td>
<td>'shoulder' (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gogomet</td>
<td>gogomet-aul</td>
<td>'scab' (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matal</td>
<td>matal-aul</td>
<td>'fruit sp.' (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ta'rak</td>
<td>ta'rak-aul</td>
<td>'truck' (f) (loan from Pijin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kivir</td>
<td>kivir-aul</td>
<td>'pus' (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>namutin</td>
<td>namutin-aul</td>
<td>'mainland' (n)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. One word tavalol ‘saroka vine’ (n) adds -oul: thus tavaloloul.

IV. One word, kelkel (sg) kelekeleul (pl) ‘dugong’ (m) is perhaps an old reduplicated word, in which a lost final vowel is replaced under plural suffixation. This process is completely regular, and was described above. However this stem is irregular in that it adds a medial vowel as well. It appears as though this is another vowel which has been lost that is replaced in the plural. Occasionally unstressed vowels between consonants are elided, for example the place name Pipisala is pronounced variously as [pi:pi'sala] and [pip'sala].

V. Two other words are slightly irregular: lekoleko (sg) lekolekaul (pl) ‘part of coconut tree’ (f); savaom (sg) savamaul (pl) ‘tree sp.’ (m).

VI. Eight words form a subclass of this declension by suffixing various forms all involving -Caul. The suffixes are: -kaul, -naul, -laul, -umaul, -tumaul. The words, with their plural formatives, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>PLURAL FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tara</td>
<td>tara-kaul</td>
<td>'rumble of thunder' (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giale</td>
<td>giale-naul</td>
<td>'kitchen' (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isura</td>
<td>isura-laul</td>
<td>'unripe havu nut’ (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kosovau</td>
<td>kosovau-laul</td>
<td>'plantain’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nugur</td>
<td>nugur-umaul</td>
<td>'current’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vukel</td>
<td>vukel-umaul</td>
<td>'back of head’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vaga</td>
<td>vaga-tumaul</td>
<td>'giant’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leumam</td>
<td>leuma-laul</td>
<td>'upper lip’ (m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last word, leumam, loses its final /m/ too; see discussion above. Note that there is another word similar to the second last word vaga ‘giant’ (m), which is bagatum (pl. bagatumaul). Presumably these two words came from one source, and this perhaps accounts for the plural formation vagatumaul. An alternation between /b/ and /v/ does occur in the language; see Section 2.10. Possibly if more was known about the history of the other words in this subclass, there would be comparable explanations of these plural formations.
THE VIL DECLENSION

This declension has predominantly feminine membership, although masculine and neuter nouns do occur in this class too. Overwhelmingly the nouns of this class end in -a. As noted above (see also the discussion in Section 6.1.1), there is a correlation between feminine nouns and nouns ending in -a, which accounts for this fact. There are seven subclasses of this declension, as follows:

I. The overwhelming majority of words in this declension just add -vil

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>PLURAL FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bo'rea</td>
<td>bo'rea-vil</td>
<td>'arrow' (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>katelea</td>
<td>katelea-vil</td>
<td>'crocodile' (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kota</td>
<td>kota-vil</td>
<td>'joint' (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>levo</td>
<td>levo-vil</td>
<td>'bamboo pipe' (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fetu</td>
<td>fetu-vil</td>
<td>'thumb' (f)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. A few words in this declension lose their final segment or segments before adding suffix -vil:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>PLURAL FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ruima</td>
<td>rui-vil</td>
<td>'old man' (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ruia</td>
<td>rui-vil</td>
<td>'old woman' (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kuio</td>
<td>kui-vil</td>
<td>'inkori fruit' (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nagoliao</td>
<td>nagolia-vil</td>
<td>'blue-ringed octopus' (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fu'loa</td>
<td>fu'lo-vil</td>
<td>'floor' (f) (loan from Pijin)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of ruia and ruima, an alternative way of stating this is that they lose their feminine singular marker -a before adding the plural marker (ruima, despite having a male human referent, belongs to the feminine gender). Then ruim loses its final -m, as many m-final higher animates do before receiving a plural suffix (see discussion above).

As far as the other three words in this subclass are concerned, there is no general phonological reason why they should lose their final vowel before adding -vil. *Kuiovil, *nagoliaovil and *fuloavil would be perfectly acceptable in terms of the phonological structure of the language. These words are just irregularities in the system.

III. Three words add -ovil: hagi (sg) hagiovil (pl) 'dry coconut leaf' (m); bolol (sg) bololovil (pl) 'cartridge' (n); and nat (sg) natovil (pl) 'sago leaf' (m). The latter word is possibly underlingly o-final; there is a similar word nato 'sago fruit' in the language. Also, the dual of nat 'sago leaf' is natol, which suggests again that there is an -o vowel underlingly in the stem. The bolol word adds an o before the -vil to break up an /lv/
cluster; but this cluster is actually allowed between syllables in Lavukaleve; cf. kealverav 'trochuses'. Similarly for hagi, there is no phonological reason why the plural should be hagiovil, not *hagivil. Note that other words ending in -i do just get -vil: keati (sg) keativil (pl) 'cat' (m), marai (sg) maraivil (pl) 'warrior' (m).

IV. One word fokos 'coconut stump' (m) adds -uvil: fokosuvil.

V. Two words add -avil: ofis (sg) ofisavil (pl) 'office' (f) (loan from Pijin); lale (sg) laleavil (pl) 'plant sp.' (f). The first of these uses a vowel to break up the /sv/ cluster; although it is not clear on what grounds the vowel /a/ is chosen as opposed to any other vowel, and it is also not clear that /sv/ is actually an impossible cluster. The second of these words has no phonological explanation. Compare other e-final words in this declension: laike (sg) laikevil (pl) 'cowry' (m); pine (sg) pinevil (pl) 'sweet coconut husk' (f).

VI. One word mal 'forked stick' (m) adds -eavil: maleavil.

VII. One word ko'kol 'sea passage' (n) adds -auvil: ko'kolauvil.

THE V DECLENSION

The basic form of the plural suffix for this declension is -v, but there are eight subclasses of this group. The subclasses are as follows:

I. Vowel-final stems add -v

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>PLURAL FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>foe</td>
<td>foe-v</td>
<td>'pig' (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ki</td>
<td>ki-v</td>
<td>'clothes' (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kivu</td>
<td>kivu-v</td>
<td>'sin' (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sura</td>
<td>sura-v</td>
<td>'ripe havu nut' (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>borokouta</td>
<td>borokouta-v</td>
<td>'old rotten havu nut' (n)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compare isura isuralaul 'unripe havu nut' to sura surav 'ripe havu nut' above.

II. Words ending in -io lose the final -o before adding the plural suffix (this happens in the L declension too, but it is not a general rule for all io-final words):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>PLURAL FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ku'kunio</td>
<td>ku'kuni-v</td>
<td>'knee' (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so'sokio</td>
<td>so'soki-v</td>
<td>'bone' (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tagio</td>
<td>tagi-v</td>
<td>'snake' (f)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Words ending in a consonant add -ev. Note that vowel-final kokoroko, kua and toa
are also in this group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>PLURAL FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>feman</td>
<td>feman-ev</td>
<td>'shark' (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kakal</td>
<td>kakal-ev</td>
<td>'older brother' (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>totoas</td>
<td>totoas-ev</td>
<td>'cloud, sky' (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lav</td>
<td>lav-ev</td>
<td>'marriage' (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mikat</td>
<td>mikat-ev</td>
<td>'centipede' (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kokoroko</td>
<td>kokoroko-ev</td>
<td>'chicken' (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kua</td>
<td>kua-ev</td>
<td>'coconut tree' (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toa</td>
<td>toa-ev</td>
<td>'banana tree' (m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is possible that the apparently consonant-final words in this group underlingly end in -e. Some support for this notion for some of the words comes from the dual suffixes of lav, kakal and mikat, which are all -el. This may be true for some words, but the word feleas (sg) feleasv (pl) 'young grass' (n) has dual suffix feleasl, not *feleasel as one would predict if its stem were indeed underlingly e-final. Note also that there is no phonological motivation for the form of the suffix for kua; compare fua (sg) fua (pl) 'wasp' (m).

IV. Six words ending in -a lose their final -a before being suffixed with -ev:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>PLURAL FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fiata</td>
<td>fiat-ev</td>
<td>'thunder' (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kimita</td>
<td>kimit-ev</td>
<td>'mat' (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kokotea</td>
<td>kokot-ev</td>
<td>'sharp rock' (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malagula</td>
<td>malagul-ev</td>
<td>'bird' (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kera</td>
<td>ker-ev</td>
<td>'paddle' (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mola</td>
<td>mol-ev</td>
<td>'canoe' (n)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first three words are feminine, and thus could be losing the final -a vowel before plural suffixation in accordance with the general rule discussed below, but the other words are masculine and neuter. Also, appealing to the general 'loss of final -a in feminine nouns' rule would not explain why -ev, not -v, was suffixed.

V. Three words are suffixed with -av:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>PLURAL FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ha'tal</td>
<td>ha'tal-av</td>
<td>'bed' (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lake</td>
<td>lake-av</td>
<td>'fire', 'road' (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tail</td>
<td>tail-av</td>
<td>'house' (n)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note the homonym lake 'entrance channel' (n) which forms its plural in group I: lakev (see Section 5.6.3 where this is discussed).
VI. Four words are suffixed with -iv:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>PLURAL FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fokosu</td>
<td>fokosu-iv</td>
<td>‘tree stump’ (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sasa</td>
<td>sasa-iv</td>
<td>‘green coconut leaf’ (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vu’vul</td>
<td>vu’vul-iv</td>
<td>‘heart’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ku’kut</td>
<td>ku’kut-iv</td>
<td>‘midrib’ (n)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The latter two may have an underlying final -i vowel: the dual formative for these two words is -il. The first two cannot be explained in this way; they just suffix -l for the dual.

VII. Two words ending in -i suffix -ov:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>PLURAL FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>langi</td>
<td>langi-ov</td>
<td>‘name’ (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>femi</td>
<td>femi-ov</td>
<td>‘face’ (n)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that fagi ‘island’, though it ends in -i, belongs in group I and forms its plural as fagiv.

VIII. One word kolang ‘shin’ (n) adds -iov. This word may be underlyingly *kolangi, as it forms its dual by adding -il too. This would mean it belongs to group VII above.

THE L DECLENSION

The segment /l/ is more typically associated with the dual category in Lavukaleve. It is common throughout many of Lavukaleve’s grammatical paradigms with this function, and it also marks dual forms of nouns. However it does also occur in this one declension as a marker of plurality.

There are six subclasses in this declension, as follows:

I. Those words which end in -a suffix -l (there are only two such words in the corpus):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>PLURAL FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lea</td>
<td>lea-l</td>
<td>‘cave’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sova</td>
<td>sova-l</td>
<td>‘group frenzy’ (f)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Words which end in -io lose their final -o before suffixing -al (these words are all feminine, as indeed almost all words ending in -io are (see Section 6.1.1)):
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urio uri-al ‘coconut crab’ (f)
falio fali-al ‘fingernail’ (f)
fukio fuki-al ‘kidney’ (f)
lafio lafi-al ‘well’ (f)
sagio sagi-al ‘line’ (f)

III. Words which end in consonants suffix -aol:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>PLURAL FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gurugurur</td>
<td>gurugurur-aol</td>
<td>‘noise of canoe’ (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sukafal</td>
<td>sukaf-aol</td>
<td>‘Acropora pulchra (tree sp.)’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foforok</td>
<td>foforok-aol</td>
<td>‘bicolour parrotfish’ (m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. Words which end in -i, -u or -e suffix -al (and to’vum and vais also belong to this class):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>PLURAL FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lovu</td>
<td>lovu-al</td>
<td>‘branch’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simu</td>
<td>simu-al</td>
<td>‘star’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toe</td>
<td>toe-al</td>
<td>‘branch’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honi</td>
<td>nohi-al</td>
<td>‘nape’ (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bili</td>
<td>bili-al</td>
<td>‘puddle in rock’ (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to’vum</td>
<td>to’vum-al</td>
<td>‘bubble’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vais</td>
<td>vais-al</td>
<td>‘older brother’ (m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. One word fa ‘hip joint’ (f) suffixes -oaol: faoaol.

VI. One word la’mar ‘ground nuts’ (n) suffixes -ail: la’marail.

THE MAL DECLENsION

There are only four subclasses of this small all-masculine declension. They are:

I. Most words suffix -mal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>PLURAL FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>buku</td>
<td>buku-mal</td>
<td>‘conch’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gaikoko</td>
<td>gaikoko-mal</td>
<td>‘canoe’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>felfel</td>
<td>felfel-mal</td>
<td>‘butterfly’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koli</td>
<td>koli-mal</td>
<td>‘biscuit’ (m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Three words suffix -imal: sokil (sg) sokilimal (pl) ‘small boat’; vu’vul (sg) vu’vulimal (pl) ‘heart’; ta’vul (sg) ta’vulimal (pl) ‘housepost’. The underlying stems of these words could be i-final. Vu’vul was mentioned above as being very likely i-final.
III. One word loses its final -l before suffixing -mal: katil (sg) katimal (pl) ‘adze’. Note that this is not a phonologically required rule; cf. felfel above, which just suffixes -mal directly.

IV. One word kafol ‘mangrove crab’ suffixes -emal: kafolemal (pl). As the dual suffix for this word is -el, this stem is possibly underlyingly e-final.

THE N DECLENSION

All members but one of this small declension are masculine or neuter. Many are monosyllabic, or of CVV structure. There are three classes, which are as follows.

I. All members but two are vowel-final, and suffix -n for the plural. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>PLURAL FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>haa</td>
<td>haa-n</td>
<td>‘liver’ (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hou</td>
<td>hou-n</td>
<td>‘cheek’ (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fe</td>
<td>fe-n</td>
<td>‘foot’ (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va</td>
<td>va-n</td>
<td>‘vine’ (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tulai</td>
<td>tulai-n</td>
<td>‘toilet place’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hoho</td>
<td>hoho-n</td>
<td>‘rafter’ (n)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. One word lalog ‘lee side of island’ (n), suffixes -en: lalogen (pl) ‘lee sides of islands’.

III. One word feil ‘bow’ (m) suffixes -an: feilan (pl) ‘bows’.

THE VERAV DECLENSION

All members of this small declension form their plurals in the same way, by suffixing the form -verav. Some stems are vowel-final, some are consonant-final, but this does not affect the shape of the plural suffix. One word sulum ‘chief’ (m) loses its final -m before suffixing -verav, in compliance with the general rule mentioned above and discussed in more detail below that higher animate masculine nouns ending in -m lose the -m before adding the plural suffix.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>PLURAL FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kua</td>
<td>kua-verav</td>
<td>‘wrinkles on hand’ (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>losi</td>
<td>losi-verav</td>
<td>‘basket’ (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fakon</td>
<td>fakon-verav</td>
<td>‘snub-nosed emperor fish’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tail</td>
<td>tail-verav</td>
<td>‘house’ (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fela’koe</td>
<td>fela’koe-verav</td>
<td>‘village’ (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hai</td>
<td>hai-verav</td>
<td>‘point’ (n)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### THE ‘OTHER’ DECLENSION

There are a small number of words which form their plurals by suppletion, loss of final syllables, or various other irregular one-off strategies. An exhaustive listing of those in the corpus follows:

- **I. Suppletion.** All of these terms are common kin and human classification terms. Note the gender distinction between ‘girl’ and ‘boy’ is collapsed in the plural; both are just ‘children’. Collapse of gender distinctions in the plural is a pervasive feature throughout the language.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>PLURAL FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aira</td>
<td>homelav</td>
<td>‘woman’ (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ali</td>
<td>malav</td>
<td>‘man’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vo'vou</td>
<td>tulav</td>
<td>‘boy’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vo'vo</td>
<td>tulav</td>
<td>‘girl’ (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vaisa</td>
<td>nemev</td>
<td>‘younger sister’ (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ta</td>
<td>tafa</td>
<td>‘woman’ (f)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last correspondence, **ta tafa**, could be suppletion or it could be suffixation.

- **II. Loss of final syllable:**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>PLURAL FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>galengam</td>
<td>galeng</td>
<td>‘boy’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>houla</td>
<td>houl</td>
<td>‘tree’ (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kuisa</td>
<td>kuis</td>
<td>‘bottle’ (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soka</td>
<td>sok</td>
<td>‘finger’ (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suta</td>
<td>sut</td>
<td>‘giant clam’ (f)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is perhaps pertinent to note that all of those words that just lose a final -a, are feminine.
5.6.3 DISCUSSION OF DUAL AND PLURAL FORMATIONS

The descriptions above of dual and plural formation strategies have raised a number of issues. This section attempts to make some generalisations about dual and plural formation. It also points to some caveats about the extent to which these phenomena can be analysed as rule-governed and the extent to which they must be seen as unpredictable. This is particularly the case with respect to the phenomenon of the masculine singular and feminine singular suffixes, which has been mentioned above, but which needs further discussion. Also of particular interest are how borrowed words behave under dual and plural formations; the phenomenon of multiple dual/plural formation strategies for the same noun; homonyms; and the question of nouns which are always plural, and have no singular or dual forms.

THE MASCULINE AND FEMININE SINGULAR SUFFIXES

One issue which arises from the preceding data is that of singular marking. It is possible to analyse the final /a/ in some feminine nouns, and the final /m/ in some masculine nouns, as gendered singular markers: /a/ for feminine singular and /m/ for masculine singular. This analysis has neat correlations with other gender/number agreement marking in Lavukaleve. That is, -a is the feminine singular Agreement Suffix used in verbs and adjectives; and -m is the corresponding masculine singular form. Also, this analysis accounts for the loss of /a/ before some dual and plural suffixes (e.g. ruia 'old woman' (f) ruivil 'old women (pl)'), and similarly the loss of /m/ before some dual and plural suffixes (e.g. sulum 'chief' (m), suluverav 'chiefs (pl)'). It certainly seems that it is an accurate historical analysis. However, it is not the case that all final -m segments occur on masculine singular nouns, or all final -a segments occur on masculine singular nouns. Thus the analysis only has limited application. The reasons are as follows.

Firstly, with respect to /a/ as a feminine singular marker, while many feminine nouns do end in /a/, many do not, and further, many non-feminine nouns end in /a/. Similarly, while many masculine nouns end in /m/, not all do; and a few non-masculine nouns do end in /m/: for example: e.g. unifom ‘uniform’ (f); aram ‘sand’ (n); kastom ‘custom, culture’ (n). This means that the suffixes are not general throughout the language. Two of these three words are loans, it is true, but some of the above examples (see also below) have shown that loan words are very deeply incorporated into the plural formation system, and generally act for these purposes in the same way as indigenous words.

Secondly, with respect to the loss of -a on feminine nouns, and -m on masculine nouns, it is not the case that this always happens before dual or plural suffixation. Firstly, it is not just feminine nouns which lose a final /a/ before a number suffix; in fact, neuter nouns can too. For example the plural form of mola ‘canoe’ (n) is molev. Similarly the plural of kera ‘paddle’ (n) is kerev. Secondly, not all m-final masculine nouns lose this /m/ before a plural suffix: tamtam ‘reef’ (m), tamtaul (pl); ko’rom ‘black
surgeonfish (m)’ ko’romaul (pl); kovekukuam ‘puddle on ground’ (m), kovekukuamaul (pl).

Thus, a final /m/ or /a/ usually, but not always, corresponds with a masculine or feminine noun respectively. Presumably these segments are remnants of a previously productive nominal gender-marking system. But for a synchronic analysis of Lavukaleve, it is not useful to see stem-final /a/ and /m/ as anything other than unanalysable parts of their noun stems.

The loss of final vowels, including /a/ and all other vowels, in dual and/or plural formation is in no way related to the process described in Section 5.5 of loss of final vowels in Possessed nouns. The group of nouns that lose their final vowels under Possessed noun formation bear no particular relationship with the nouns that lose their final vowel under dual and/or plural formation. The two are completely separate morphological processes.

BORROWED WORDS AND DUAL AND PLURAL FORMATION

Obvious recent loan words behave exactly as words which are presumably indigenous with respect to their dual and plural formations. That is, duals of borrowed words are formed according to the same phonological criteria as duals of indigenous words. Borrowed words are assigned to one of the ten plural declensions as far as can be seen on the same basis as indigenous words; they are certainly apparent in most of the ten declensions, and not obviously more represented in one declension than another. There are no examples of borrowed words in some of the smaller declensions; probably simply because there are few indigenous words in them anyway. It is certainly not the case that all borrowed words are confined to one or two declensions. And within each declension, borrowed words behave exactly as indigenous words do, operating under the same phonological considerations as indigenous words. Some examples of dual and plural formations of words known to be loans:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>DUAL FORM</th>
<th>PLURAL FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KAL declension</td>
<td>taol (m)</td>
<td>taolal</td>
<td>taolkal</td>
<td>‘towel’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buti (n)</td>
<td>buti</td>
<td>butikal</td>
<td>‘shoe’</td>
<td>Solomon Pijin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vil declension</td>
<td>belo (f)</td>
<td>belol</td>
<td>belovil</td>
<td>‘bell’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ofis (f)</td>
<td>ofisal</td>
<td>ofisavil</td>
<td>‘office’</td>
<td>Solomon Pijin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UL declension</td>
<td>planteson (f)</td>
<td>planteson</td>
<td>plantesonaul</td>
<td>‘plantation’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wof (f)</td>
<td>wof</td>
<td>wofaul</td>
<td>‘wharf’</td>
<td>Solomon Pijin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verav declension</td>
<td>bin (f)</td>
<td>binaol</td>
<td>binverav</td>
<td>‘bean’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mal declension</td>
<td>gaikoko (m)</td>
<td>gaikokol</td>
<td>gaikokomal</td>
<td>‘canoe’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V declension</td>
<td>kokoroko (m)</td>
<td>kokoroko</td>
<td>kokorokoev</td>
<td>‘chicken’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None declension</td>
<td>wo</td>
<td>wo</td>
<td>wo</td>
<td>‘war’ (f)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MULTIPLE DUAL/PLURAL MARKING STRATEGIES FOR A NOUN**

A striking feature of plural noun formation, and, to a lesser extent, dual noun formation, is that it is not uncommon for one noun to have different dual or plural forms. Often one speaker will use one dual or plural form, and another speaker will use a different one. In some cases the same speaker will use different dual or plural forms on different occasions.

With respect to dual marking, in every case where there is an alternative dual marking strategy, one of the alternatives is no marking at all. In other words, for many nouns, dual marking is optional. Some examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>DUAL FORMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>foe ‘pig’ (m)</td>
<td>foe or foe ‘two pigs’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>luat ‘vein’ (n)</td>
<td>luatal or luat ‘two veins’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vu’vul ‘heart’ (m)</td>
<td>vu’vulil or vu’vul ‘two hearts’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nana ‘shadow’ (f)</td>
<td>nanaol or nana ‘two shadows’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are no discernible semantic differences between these dual variants.
Many words show alternate plural marking strategies. These include nouns of all three genders, and the interchange between different suffixes shows some interesting tendencies. Some masculine and neuter nouns show some interchange involving -kal. Thus for example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>PLURAL FORMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vage ‘mound’</td>
<td>vagen or vagekal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bili ‘puddle’</td>
<td>bilial or bilikal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hai ‘headland’</td>
<td>haiverav or haikal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are also alternative masculine and neuter forms which involve other variants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORD</th>
<th>PLURAL FORMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>masiv ‘year’</td>
<td>masivaul or masiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tail ‘house’</td>
<td>tailverav or tailav</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>namu ‘place’</td>
<td>namuv or namu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For feminine nouns which have alternative plural marking strategies, one of the alternatives is always -vil. Thus, for example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORD</th>
<th>PLURAL FORMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>solo ‘mountain’</td>
<td>solokal or solovil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tata ‘spider’</td>
<td>tata or tatavil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fiata ‘gun’</td>
<td>fiatev or fiatavil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tagio ‘snake’</td>
<td>tagiv or tagiovil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This pattern suggests that -vil is replacing other feminine plural-marking strategies, perhaps indicating a process of regularisation.

It can be seen from these few examples that some of the words which show alternative number-marking strategies are very common, frequently-used words (e.g. namu ‘place’, tail ‘house’, masiv ‘year’) whereas others are much less frequent (e.g. fakon ‘k.o. fish’; bili ‘puddle’, fiata ‘gun’).

It seems that there are generational differences between the use of some of these forms. Older people tend to use the less regular forms, and teenagers and children tend to use the more regular forms, especially the -kal and -vil alternatives, which require less morphophonemic alternations, and can easily attach to any phonological stem type.

**HOMONYMS**

Homonyms provide evidence that while phonological criteria are important, they are not the only means by which the dual or plural form of a noun is determined. In some cases, two homonyms have the same dual and/or plural form; in other cases, they are different.
Below are some examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG FORM</th>
<th>DUAL FORM</th>
<th>PLURAL FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ara</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>'east wind' (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ara</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>'grass' (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fia</td>
<td>fial</td>
<td>fiakal</td>
<td>'body painting' (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>'lightning' (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hai</td>
<td>hai</td>
<td>haikal</td>
<td>'point' (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hai</td>
<td>hai</td>
<td>hain</td>
<td>'forehead' (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hoho</td>
<td>hohol</td>
<td>hohon</td>
<td>'rafter' (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hoho</td>
<td>hohol</td>
<td>hohonokal</td>
<td>'redtail snapper' (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hou</td>
<td>hou</td>
<td>houn</td>
<td>'cheek' (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hou</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>'smoke' (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kala</td>
<td>kalaol</td>
<td>kalavil</td>
<td>'mother' (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kala</td>
<td>kala</td>
<td>kalaul</td>
<td>'collarbone' (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koli</td>
<td>kolal</td>
<td>kolaual</td>
<td>'interior' (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koli</td>
<td>kolil</td>
<td>kolimal</td>
<td>'biscuit' (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ko'mua</td>
<td>ko'muaol</td>
<td>ko'muavil</td>
<td>'story' (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ko'mua</td>
<td>ko'muaol</td>
<td>ko'muavil</td>
<td>'female giant' (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kua</td>
<td>kua</td>
<td>kuavil</td>
<td>'moon' (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kua</td>
<td>kuaol</td>
<td>kua</td>
<td>'eye of greensnail shell' (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kua</td>
<td>kua</td>
<td>kuav</td>
<td>'coconut tree' (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kua</td>
<td>kual</td>
<td>kuaverav</td>
<td>'wrinkles on hand' (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la</td>
<td>lal</td>
<td>lakal</td>
<td>'dream' (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la</td>
<td>lal</td>
<td>lakal</td>
<td>'coconut husk' (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la</td>
<td>lal</td>
<td>lavil</td>
<td>'soft part of baby's head' (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lake</td>
<td>lake</td>
<td>lakeav</td>
<td>'fire' (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lake</td>
<td>lake</td>
<td>lakeav</td>
<td>'road' (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lake</td>
<td>lake</td>
<td>lake</td>
<td>'jellyfish' (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lake</td>
<td>lakel</td>
<td>lakev</td>
<td>'entrance channel' (n)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of these alternatives may simply be due to the fact that even the same nouns often do have alternative dual and plural marking strategies.

**Nouns which are obligatorily plural**

There are a small number of nouns which are obligatorily plural in terms of their agreement and cross-referencing. These pluralia tantum nouns sometimes refer to things which usually or always include many items (e.g. *neo* 'teeth'). Most are mass nouns (e.g. *leruv* 'flesh', *gigil* 'measurements', *vui* 'breath', *kirav* 'smell', *ura* 'steam'). One further word is hard to understand from an outsider's point of view: *isia* 'boat stern'. There are no words which are obligatorily dual.
CONCLUSIONS

It is possible, as has been shown, to reduce some of the complexity of Lavukaleve's dual and plural formations by positing a couple of phonological rules, a small number of unpredictable declensional classes, and masses of exceptions. With Hausa, a language of a similar degree of complexity to Lavukaleve in its plural formations, internal reconstruction has enabled a much better understanding of the plural formation system (Hellwig and McIntyre (to appear)). If the history of Lavukaleve were known, or if there were extant close relatives of Lavukaleve, much more of the apparent randomness could well shown to be part of a larger pattern.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value 1</td>
<td>Value 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 3</td>
<td>Value 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 5</td>
<td>Value 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 7</td>
<td>Value 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 9</td>
<td>Value 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 11</td>
<td>Value 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table contains placeholders for values.
CHAPTER SIX

Gender and agreement

Gender is a category which belongs to nouns, but is reflected syntactically by agreement in other word classes. I use the term 'gender' in the traditional sense, to refer to the type of system which Derbyshire and Payne (1990) call "gender concordial classifiers"; and Aikhenvald (1994) calls "grammaticalised gender systems", which are a type of her "noun classification systems". The discussion to follow has as its general theoretical underpinning Corbett's (1991) approach to the formal and functional analysis of gender as an agreement category.

Gender is an extremely important and pervasive category in Lavukaleve syntax. Gender agreement occurs in most words in a sentence; and as discourse typically contains much ellipsis of nouns, gender is useful for reference tracking. There are three genders in Lavukaleve. They are named masculine, feminine and neuter, on the grounds that the so-called 'masculine' class contains, among other things, the nouns which refer to human males; the 'feminine' class contains, among other things, the nouns that refer to human females; and the 'neuter' class contains mostly non-human referents.

All nouns have an inherent gender, but this gender is in most cases not marked overtly on nouns (although see Section 5.6 on the relationship between gender and plural formation of nouns). All modifiers in an NP, except for possessors (and a few other minor lexically-determined exceptions), agree in gender with the head noun. That is, gender is marked on adjectives, demonstratives, and the definite article. In addition, most clausal elements which cross-reference to a nominal argument are also marked for the gender of their nominal argument. So object prefixes, the Agreement Suffix, and the focus markers are also marked for the gender of the noun to which they refer. Thus gender is a pervasive feature of Lavukaleve morpho-syntax.
6.1 GENDER ASSIGNMENT

There are roughly equal numbers of masculine, feminine and neuter nouns in Lavukaleve. The following chart shows the proportions of nouns in the corpus belonging to each gender (in a count of 805 nouns).

That is, masculine nouns account for 32% of all nouns, neuter for 30% and feminine 33%. The 'other' category, 5% of nouns, consists largely of obligatorily-plural nouns, which show no gender.

Nouns are assigned to one of three genders on the basis of both formal and semantic factors (using Corbett's (1991) distinction). All nouns derived with nominalisers are neuter or feminine, depending on the nominaliser. The final segment of other nouns largely determines what genders they can potentially belong to. Beyond this point, semantic factors come into play. The following sections discuss the kinds of criteria which are important in determining gender assignment.

6.1.1 FORMAL ASSIGNMENT OF GENDER

There are two types of formal assignment of gender: morphological and phonological assignment. Both of these are important in Lavukaleve. There are two morphological rules:

- Nouns formed with the neuter Abstract Nominaliser -e ~ -i are neuter

In fact most underived abstract nouns are neuter also (see discussion below). However the morphological rule is much stricter than the semantic rule: there are no derived abstract nouns which are not neuter, but there are a few underived abstract nouns which are not neuter.
• Nouns formed with the feminine Abstract Nominaliser -io are feminine

In fact, almost all nouns ending in -io are feminine; see below. See Section 13.1 for an account of these two nominalisers.

Phonological assignment depends on the final segment or segments of a noun. The rules are:

• Nouns ending in -io and -f are feminine (e.g. louaio ‘yellow mullet’, laffio ‘well’, tagio ‘snake’, haikio ‘shout’, kiokio ‘kingfisher’, aunio ‘evening’, urio ‘coconut crab’, lefalet ‘basket’)

• Nouns ending in -m and -n are masculine (e.g. lamulam ‘storm’, leumam ‘upper lip’, fafanem ‘leaf sp.’, rom ‘coconut branch’, houm ‘dolphin’, feman ‘shark’, lovitam ‘saltwater eel’, funfun ‘firefly’, sigun ‘birth hut’)

• Nouns ending in -ae and -r are neutral (e.g. taukae ‘grater’, lekaua ‘cuttlefish’, kakaleua ‘brotherhood’, folufolua ‘fat’, lar ‘daylight’, hovir ‘cough’, fegir ‘sweat’, veur ‘noise’, huluhulur ‘flame’)  

• Nouns ending in -e, -ng, -g, -i, -l, -s, -t and -v are masculine or neuter (e.g. fe ‘foot’ (n), safe ‘shelf’ (n), ge ‘bottom’ (m), kage ‘plant sp.’ (m), negoneg ‘driftwood’ (n), fangfang ‘tumour on tree’ (m), filang ‘weathercoast’ (n), sing ‘womb’ (m), lagol ‘lee side of island’ (n), na’nug ‘thought’ (m), fai ‘shin’ (m), lai ‘rain’ (n), lari ‘lime’ (n), mari ‘sacrifice’ (m), felfel ‘butterfly’ (m), bomil ‘leaf sp.’ (n), falis ‘gum’ (n), legis ‘leaf’ (n), o’as ‘bush’ (m), halangas ‘hard coral’ (m), sot ‘crown of tree’ (n), nanas ‘orchid’ (m), maruiv ‘feather’ (n), tovutov ‘bubble’ (m)).

There are some exceptions to most of these rules. A strikingly large proportion of the exceptions are recent loan words. In fact recent loan words rarely belong to the gender which would be expected from principles of phonological assignment. For example, there are only four words ending in -m which are not masculine. One is iuniform ‘uniform’ (f), and one is kastom ‘custom, accepted practice’ (n). (See below for an account of principles for the assignment of gender to loan words.) Similarly, of the 10 words ending in -n which are not masculine, 9 are obvious recent loan words from Solomon Pijin: taon ‘town’ (f), laeman ‘lemon, bush lime’ (f), laen ‘line’ (f), reven ‘stripe’ (from ‘ribbon’) (f), bin ‘bean’ (f), planteson ‘plantation’ (f), paniken ‘cup’ (n), sosopen ‘pot’ (n) and sipun ‘spoon’ (n). Also, the one word ending in -s which is not masculine or neuter is ofis ‘office’ (f). Of the two words ending in -t which are not masculine or neuter, one is singeret ‘cigarette’ (f). Of the 6 words ending in -i which are not masculine or neuter, three of them are suti ‘torch’ (f) (from English ‘shoot light’ via Solomon Pijin), meleni ‘melon’ (f) and tarai ‘prayer’ (f) (cf. tarai ‘pray’ in Cheke Holo, an Austronesian language spoken in Santa Ysabel (White 1988)). Of the two non-masculine, non-neuter words ending in -l, one is baol ‘bowl’ (f). And finally, there are only two words ending in -k which are not masculine or neuter, and they are tarak ‘truck’ (f) and tepok ‘kapok’ (f), both from Solomon Pijin.
There are only a small number of other exceptions to the phonological principles laid out above. A few of these are clearly loan words from Austronesian languages, and it is indeed possible that they all are. The following is an exhaustive list of them:

- **ba'balé** 'hut' (f) cf. Proto Oceanic *pale* 'open-sided building' (Green and Pawley 1998: 49)
- **kilekile/ki'kile** 'axe' (f) cf. Proto Oceanic *kiRam* 'axe' (Osmond and Ross 1998: 88)
- **kiokio** 'kingfisher' (m) cf. Cheke Holo *khiokhio* 'beach kingfisher' (White 1988)
- **totogale** 'picture' (f) cf. Cheke Holo *thotogale* 'picture, drawing, photograph' (White 1988)
- **tutupi** 'fist' (f) cf. Cheke Holo *tutupi* 'fight, hit with fists' (White 1988)
- **pine** 'sweet coconut husk' (f)
- **si'val** 'mango tree' (f) (cf. mango fruit *si'val* (m))
- **lom** 'inherited useful trees' (n)
- **mangit** 'Indian mackerel' (f)
- **ta'tavi** 'sea urchin' (f)
- **remrem** 'mussel sp.' (n)
- **ha'hamio** 'ant sp.' (m)
- **kilimar** 'flock of white seagulls' (m)
- **aram** 'ground' (n)
- **namutin** 'mainland' (n)
- **fongasar** 'walling of house' (m)
- **nugur** 'sea current' (m)
- **lagari** 'choice' (f)

Gender assignment systems based on phonological criteria are found in mainland Papuan languages, notably of the Torricelli and Lower Sepik families (Foley 1986: 85); Yimas is discussed also in Corbett (1991: 55-7). Arapesh and Yimas are two of the best-known systems; but Lavukaleve is much more modest in its gender system than either of these two languages. In both Arapesh and Yimas, for a large proportion of nouns at least, there is overt phonological marking of their gender membership. Thus for Yimas, there are around 12 genders (Foley 1986 calls them noun classes) of which four have semantic assignment, and the other eight are for inanimate nouns, and have phonological assignment. Of the genders with phonological assignment, there are seven subclasses, each one marked by the final segments of nouns, as well as through extensive agreement throughout the sentence. The difference between Lavukaleve and a language like Yimas is that in Yimas, the phonologically determined genders have no exceptions; every noun of a particular gender has its correct phonological form. In Lavukaleve, by contrast, there are exceptions for almost all of the phonological assignment rules; and furthermore, some phonological forms are not covered by phonological rule at all (e.g. nouns ending in -a, -o and -u). Lavukaleve has the same
kind of system as languages like Yimas and Arapesh, but to a much lesser degree.

It seems, then, that for Lavukaleve phonological criteria operate for the majority of indigenous words. But there is more to the assignment of gender than just phonological criteria. Many of the phonological criteria separate out feminine nouns from masculine and neuter nouns, but most of the phonological rules do not distinguish between masculine and neuter. Also, nouns ending in -a, -o and -u are roughly evenly divided between all three genders. So there are many nouns left unaccounted for by phonological assignment. The genders of these nouns depend to a large extent on semantic criteria. These semantic criteria are discussed next.

6.1.2 SEMANTIC ASSIGNMENT OF GENDER

There is some relationship between the gender of a noun and the semantic nature of the referent of a noun. In the examples to follow, the overlap between phonological and semantic assignment is clear.

Feminine nouns include:
- female human beings and mythical creatures, for example: aira 'woman'; homela 'woman'; veua 'girl'; tua 'wife'; ruia 'old woman'; vaisa 'younger sister'; kakalea 'older sister'; vovo 'daughter, girl'; kala 'mother'; vava 'mummy'; ta 'woman'; kom'ua 'female giant'
- also one word referring to a male human being is classified as feminine gender: ruima 'old man'. This word is discussed below.
- all reptiles except sokoraem 'lizard', for example: katelea 'crocodile'; tagio 'snake'; karokomoa 'gecko', and note also ku'kulia 'frog' (turtles are not classed as reptiles, and are masculine, like animals)
- some birds, for example: bu'taeo 'eagle'; hamanau 'hawk'; kilimarea 'white seagull'; kuku 'dove'; nioko 'megapode'; siviroko 'parrot'
- some insects, for example: ku'kuia 'ant'; midua 'bee'; mulukuita 'mosquito'; sou 'fly'
- some fish, for example: betea 'grouper'; fainama 'snapper'; mangit 'Indian mackerel'; meo 'tuna'; toukolo 'damselfish'
- most fruits, for example: nato 'sago fruit'; kuio 'inkori fruit'; mulukita 'orange'; hau 'pana'; homolo 'fruit'; mogea 'wild apple'; ngotea 'young coconut fruit'; pine 'sweet coconut husk'; matua 'old coconut fruit'
- most trees producing edible fruits, for example: kevasa 'ngali nut tree'; kino 'cutnut tree'; le'usa 'betel nut tree'; nato 'sago palm tree'; uaeo 'breadfruit tree'
- long things, for example: uia 'knife'; vagea 'hoe'; bo'rea 'arrow'; dokulu 'iron pole'; fiata 'gun'; kaukamea 'wire'; laigio 'string'; lomosa 'long-beam'; natukomba 'wall post'; piru 'thin cable'; reven 'stripe, ribbon'; sagio 'line'; talio 'cable'; raba 'rubber thong for fish-spear'; tos 'torch'; mota 'spine'; rala 'edge of
pandanus leaf; fa ‘timber logs’; fetu ‘thumb’; soka ‘finger’; gusio ‘little finger’; himara ‘axe’; kaeta ‘spider web’; kakasa ‘firewood sticks’; lakea ‘ladder’; levo ‘bamboo flute’; ruio ‘bamboo water container’ (made of a section of bamboo stem); sa'sakio ‘paddle’; tagio ‘snake’; vagea ‘hoe’

Masculine nouns include:
- male human beings, nouns referring to male roles, and mythical figures: bagatum ‘male giant’; kalem ‘father’; ne’mem ‘brother’; tum ‘husband’; tasiu ‘brothers in religious order’; mamam ‘daddy’; ali ‘man’; holovem ‘devil’; ku’raem ‘village elder’; marai ‘warrior’; para ‘larrikin’; karomalan ‘enemy’
- substantial, roundish things, for example: ankav ‘pumice’; a’vuri ‘parcel’; bunu ‘type of big house’; fina ‘belongings’; lea ‘cave’; fa’luk ‘cabbage’; halangas ‘hard coral’, fangfang ‘tumor on tree’; fufu ‘stomach’; keva ‘basket (big type)’; ko’bau ‘club’; suma ‘taro’; vu’vul ‘heart’
- all animals: foe ‘pig’; mitakeu ‘dog’; karu ‘possum’; kusukui ‘rat’; lekofat ‘flying fox’; gonu ‘turtle’; beata ‘leatherback turtle’
- some birds: belama ‘frigate bird’; kaikal ‘cockatoo’; kiokio ‘kingfisher’; makatoem ‘green parrot’; manogirigiri ‘seagull sp.’; mala’gula ‘bird’
- some insects: felfel ‘butterfly’; fua ‘wasp’; funfun ‘firefly’; ha’hamio ‘ant’; lai ‘louse’; mikat ‘centipede’; naga ‘ant sp.’
- some fish: beiram ‘blue-fin trevally’; fasas ‘two-spotted red snapper’; farasam ‘spinefoot’; feman ‘shark’; lemkut ‘large-eye bream’; moge ‘dogtooth tuna’; siu ‘kingfish’; maleut ‘trevally’; fo’sal ‘fish’
- most high prestige and staple foods, for example: fa’luk ‘cabbage’; uvi ‘yam’; uvikola ‘cassava’; umalau ‘sweet potato’; suma ‘taro’; maki ‘ngali nut pudding’; bua ‘wild banana’

Neuter nouns include:
- only one human noun: tu’tul ‘baby’.
- no birds or insects, but some fish and shellfish: kuilak ‘abalone’; lata ‘black-lipped clam’; kavis ‘squirrelfish’; teo ‘k.o. squirrelfish’; rolo ‘coral trout’; sera ‘fish sp.’
- water terms, for example: lafi ‘water’; fau ‘low tide’; tasi ‘sea’; hoj ‘deep blue sea’; nganga ‘river’; baff ‘well’; i’sima ‘lake’; loi ‘puddle in tree’; bili ‘puddle in rock’; hoitug ‘deep pool’; fefi ‘bottom of pool’; ko’kol ‘sea passage’; kekera ‘reef, shallow sea’; lai ‘rain’; vulit ‘liquid’
- terms to do with the passage of time, for example: hamus ‘evening’; hamusive ‘night’; lalamo ‘morning’; le ‘day’; movele ‘day after tomorrow’; dani ‘dawn’; uik ‘week’
- many things to do with important traditional and sacred things, for example: gilu ‘grave’; gali ‘war canoe’; sagul ‘traditional medicine’; mima ‘church, way of life’; sa’sau ‘arm-ring’; lom ‘useful trees inherited through clan lines’; gao ‘stone canoe’
- many words referring to parts of houses, and utensils used around the house: tail ‘house’; koa ‘door’; safe-tafe ‘shelf’; le ‘oven’; lelehoe ‘oven’; kula ‘roof’; hoho
rafter'; fofo 'basin'
- many body parts, for example: tau 'limb'; vala 'belly'; ravu 'blood'; keruv 'egg'; haa 'liver'; keut 'skin'; lemi 'eye'; folufoluae 'fat'; nalo 'guts'; leu 'mouth'; sooso 'neck'; fulu 'tail'; nu 'hair'; vatu 'head'; sisi 'nose'; feo 'palm'; lomo 'beard'; femi 'face'; nget 'shark or dolphin fin'; hou 'cheek'; fegir 'sweat'; honi 'nape of neck'; tu'tuk 'torso, trunk'
- abstract terms, for example: lalo 'peace'; mate 'war'; laketei 'life'; lav 'marriage'; iut 'youth'; tonga 'chance'; natu 'olden ways'; hove 'goodness'; koro 'darkness'

Size and shape are often important in gender assignment in the languages of the world. But one noteworthy feature of Lavukaleve is that long things are feminine and round things are masculine, rather than the other way around, which is more common. Alamblak for instance (Bruce 1984: 97) has long things assigned to masculine gender and round squat things to feminine gender, as does Mianmin (Foley 1986: 81), to name just two examples.

All these semantic principles are more in the nature of weak tendencies than predictive associations. For example, although long things are often feminine, kolukol 'pestle' is masculine, and kemus 'rope' is neuter. Some time words are not neuter, e.g. aunio 'evening' (f). Many body parts are masculine or feminine, e.g. falio 'fingernail' (f); kotovanga 'throat' (f); lausu 'thigh' (f); guguru 'back' (f); fai 'chin' (m); fakas 'shoulder' (m); hani 'vulva' (m); ho'vul 'ear' (m); runai 'elbow' (m). Many other similar counter-examples exist.

6.1.3 DISCUSSION OF GENDER ASSIGNMENT

Formal assignment principles are more regular and transparent than semantic assignment principles. This suggests that the formal system is the first step in determining gender for most nouns already existing in the language, and only after that does the semantic system come into operation.

The fact that exceptions to the phonological assignment system are almost all recent loan words suggests that the phonological assignment system is less important now in determining gender than it once was. Today the morphological and semantic systems, and concept-association, are more important in assigning gender to new nouns than phonology is. It is worth looking more closely at how recent loan words are assigned gender.

RECENT LOAN WORDS

There are 48 obvious recent loan words in my corpus of around 800 nouns. For about half of these, the gender they receive can be understood in terms of the principles outlined above. For the other half, the principles behind their gender assignment remain
opaque.

A very few of the recent loans (mostly from Pijin) receive gender by phonological assignment: redio 'radio' is feminine, as are almost all words ending in -io. Wof 'wharf' and sef 'cupboard' (from 'safe', as in 'meat safe') are feminine, as are all words ending in -f. Baik 'bag', lanis 'launch, small boat', and taol 'towel' are all masculine; all words with these endings are either masculine or neuter. (There is an indigenous word sokil 'small boat' which is semantically close to lanis, and which is also masculine. This kind of semantic analogy is a common way of assigning gender to loan words in the languages of the world (Corbett 1991: 77). There are other instances in Lavukaleve; this point is expanded upon below.) These are the only recent loan words which comply with the gender suggested by their phonology.

Many of the other words appear to have semantic gender assignment. So for example suti 'torch', laen 'line', reven 'stripe', raba 'rubber thong' and singeret 'cigarette' could all be feminine by virtue of being long things. For laen, there is a semantically close indigenous word sagio 'line' which is also feminine.

Similarly, bin 'bean', laeman 'lime', manioko 'pawpaw', meleni 'watermelon', to'mato 'tomato' and viningga 'chili' are all feminine, as are most fruits.

Keati 'cat' is masculine as all animals are. Iut 'youth' and kastom 'custom, customary ways, accepted practice' are neuter like most abstract nouns. Compare also the indigenous word with a parallel meaning to kastom: mima 'way, accepted practice, traditional custom', which is neuter. Dis 'dish', paniken 'cup', baket 'bucket'; sopu 'soap'; si'pun 'spoon' and sosopen 'pot' are neuter as are most utensils used around the house. Kisin 'kitchen' is neuter like most words referring to houses and parts of houses.

Corbett (1991) says that it is rare, and ill-attested, for languages to have different gender assignment rules for borrowed words than for indigenous words. I am not proposing that Lavukaleve has different rules entirely for borrowed than indigenous words. Rather, I suggest that both borrowed words and indigenous words are assigned gender according to two different, though overlapping systems, but it is the relative importance of these systems that differs for borrowed versus indigenous words. Thus for indigenous words, phonological rules are the most important for assigning gender to nouns, and semantic rules are secondary. For borrowings however, semantic rules are the primary consideration for gender assignment, and phonological rules are secondary.

Put slightly differently, it is possible that phonological rules may have been more important in earlier stages of Lavukaleve, but more recently semantic rules have become more important.
Homonyms

There are many homonyms in Lavukaleve, and it is interesting to note that in some cases they take the same gender, but in other cases their genders differ. Thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Gloss and Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hai</td>
<td>‘point, promontory’ (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hai</td>
<td>‘forehead’ (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simu</td>
<td>‘star’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simu</td>
<td>‘coconut shoot’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lake</td>
<td>‘fire’ (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lake</td>
<td>‘road’ (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lake</td>
<td>‘jellyfish’ (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lake</td>
<td>‘entrance channel from deep sea through reef to an island’ (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tara</td>
<td>‘rumble, as of thunder’ (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tara</td>
<td>‘fleet of canoes’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soka</td>
<td>‘starfish’ (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soka</td>
<td>‘finger’ (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kala</td>
<td>‘mother’ (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kala</td>
<td>‘collarbone’ (n)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The closer semantically the words are, the more likely they are to have the same genders. This is natural; some of these words are clearly chance homonyms, whereas others are really the same word. So for example hai meaning ‘point, promontory’ is probably the same word as hai meaning ‘forehead’, and they have the same gender; but probably kala meaning ‘mother’ is a chance homonym with kala meaning ‘collarbone’, and they have different genders.

Exploitation of Gender for Semantic Purposes

In most cases, gender is a fixed feature of a noun, but it is possible in Lavukaleve, though rare, for the gender of a noun to be changed for semantic purposes. There are a few instances in the corpus of a masculine or neuter noun being treated as a feminine noun, to express the fact that it is very small. Consider the following examples:

1) ba kini foe roa akula amefoi
   ba kini foe roa a- kula a- me- foi
   go'sg ACT pig(m) one.sgm 3sgmO- run.after 3sgmO- 1duin- hold
   ...let’s go catch a pig...
In the first of the above examples, foe ‘pig’ is shown controlling masculine agreement, as it normally does. However in the second example, foe is feminine. This is a device deliberately exploited by the speaker for a particular semantic purpose. The speaker has just asked the evil giant if he could use the giant’s fire. He wants to cook a pig he has just caught, but he doesn’t want to tell the giant that, because he knows the giant will take the pig from him if he knows about it. He is eventually forced to admit to the giant that he wants the fire to cook the pig on it, but he tries to claim that the pig is only very small, and thus not worth the giant’s attention. To emphasise the tiny size of the pig, the speaker uses feminine agreement instead of the usual masculine. The next pair of examples shows a similar situation:

The first of the above examples shows mola ‘canoe’ acting in its normal way as a neuter noun, taking neuter agreement. In the second example, however, it takes feminine agreement. The speaker deliberately uses feminine agreement to emphasise the smallness of the canoe in this situation. It is not known if a noun can also be treated as masculine or neuter to make a particular point; nor indeed what the point made would be.

Note that it is not obvious from the corpus of feminine nouns that small things are associated with feminine gender, but two different speakers on different occasions did make this association, as the above examples show. It is difficult to know what to make of this.

6.2 Agreement

Gender is expressed in Lavukaleve primarily through agreement, not through the form of the noun itself, despite the importance of phonological form of the noun for gender assignment. Almost all nominal modifiers agree with their head nouns; that is, the definite article, adjectives, demonstrative modifiers and the focus markers. Also
demonstrative pronouns show gender agreement. Further, some elements agree with nouns across the clause. Verbal prefixes which cross-reference objects (but not those which cross-reference subjects) show gender agreement, as does the verbal Agreement Suffix. Actually, all these elements show not just gender but also number agreement. For most forms, gender and number are expressed together in portmanteau morphemes. An example of this concordance shown in different word classes throughout the sentence:

5) airaol le'laol ruiaol feol leiaol.
airaol le'laol ruia -ol feol lei -aol
women.du(f) two.f old.woman -du.f 3dufFOC exist -du.f

...two old women live there.

Throughout the language, however, all gender distinctions are shown only in the singular and dual numbers; plural forms never express gender. This is true not just of morphological affixes and grammatical words, but also of many lexical items (e.g. vo'vou 'boy child', vo'voul 'two boys'; vo'vo 'girl child', vo'vol 'two girls; tulav 'children (either/both sexes)'). That is, there is a syncretism of the three genders in the plural number. This collapse of gender distinctions in the plural number is the kind of syncretism which Corbett (1991: 190 ff.) calls convergence, and is a relatively common phenomenon in the languages of the world. The only thing perhaps slightly less common is the fact that gender distinctions are maintained throughout the dual number, and converge only in the plural.

Having stated what kinds of elements must agree, it should be noted that there are some instances of these elements in Lavukaleve which cannot show gender agreement. There are some lexical restrictions to the rule that all adjectives must always agree in gender with their head noun: the adjective bakel 'big' does not show gender/number agreement, and the numbers from three to ten, which are also adjectives, do not show gender/number agreement. Otherwise, all those elements mentioned above that agree in gender must always obligatorily show gender agreement. This is normally a straightforward matter; however there is one word ruima 'old man' which has anomalous agreement properties. This word is the topic of the next section.

THE HYBRID NOUN RUIMA 'OLD MAN'

Corbett (1991: 183 ff.) defines hybrid nouns as those nouns which "neither simply take the agreement of one consistent agreement pattern nor belong to two or more genders". There is one word in Lavukaleve like this: ruima 'old man'. All nouns referring to human males are masculine in gender, except for ruima. This word always takes a feminine, not masculine, definite article:
6) ruima  la  * ruima  na
ruima  la
old.man  sgfArt

the old man

But it takes either masculine or feminine agreement in other word classes. Typically it takes masculine pronouns and demonstratives, and feminine adjectives and verbal agreement:

7) "Vasiam  oina  ruima  la?"
vasia  -m
be.where  -sgm
other.MED.sgm
old.man  sgfArt

"Where is that other one, the old man?"
mn2 041

8) Okay. Velanun  aka  ruima  ro  na'nug  aofou.
okay go  -DUR  then  old.man  one.sgf
na'nug  a-  o-  fou

Okay. It went on, then one old man had an idea.

rk1 045

9) ruima  la  hano  kiua.
ruima  la  hano  kiu  -a
old.man  sgfArt  then  die  -sgf

...the old man was dead.

jt2 052

Often, though, speakers hesitate over which agreement pattern to use, and frequently use a combination of both, or use one gender for agreement, then repeat themselves using the other gender. In the following example, note the changes in gender agreement between intonation units (slashes represent pauses on level pitch):

10) aka  roa  /  ruima  ro  feo  /  olang  fi  Tagoila.
aka  roa  /  ruima  ro  feo  /  o-  langi  fi  Tagoila
then  one.sgm  /  old.man  one.sgf
3sgFOC  /  3sgPOSS- name(n)  Tagoila

...then there was one [man], one old man, his name was Tagoila.

jt2 008

11) Hoinari  ruima  /  hoiariom
hoina  -ri  ruima  /  hoia  -ri  -om
MOD.MED.sgm  -PSNV  old.man  /  MOD.MED.sgf  -PSNV  -m/n
olang  fi  /  Runa.
o-  langi  fi  /  Runa
3sgPOSS- name(n)  3sgnFOC  /  Runa

That old man, his name was Runa.

jt2 050

The anomalous agreement properties of ruima are due to the fact that it is assigned to the feminine gender, even though it denotes a human male referent. Ruima is the only word in Lavukaleve which behaves in this anomalous way with respect to its agreement properties. Interestingly, the other human noun which could potentially have anomalous agreement patterns is tu'tul 'baby', which is neuter. However I have never observed
any anomalous agreement patterns associated with this word; it invariably takes neuter agreement. Normally if speakers are discussing a particular baby they will refer to it with a gendered noun, e.g. vo'vou 'boy' or vo'vo 'girl', instead of using tu'tul. Tu'tul is more usually used in the abstract, talking about non-particular cases; such cases are easily compatible with neuter gender.

NON-PROTOTYPICAL CONTROLLERS AND DEFAULT AGREEMENT

The fact, stated above, that gender agreement is obligatory in all elements which are able to show gender, presents problems occasionally. Corbett (1991: 203 ff.) discusses the two types of problems typically associated with languages like Lavukaleve which have so-called “enforced” gender. The first problem arises when gender agreement depends on a head which is not itself specified for gender. The second problem arises when the speaker is unable to specify the gender of a referent. Lavukaleve deals with the two problems in different ways.

In those cases in which gender agreement is controlled by an element which does not have gender, Lavukaleve obligatorily uses 3rd person singular neuter agreement, henceforth called “default agreement”.

This kind of agreement can be seen for instance when the focus markers are in construction with, and hence must agree with, an adjunct (first two examples) or a verb (third example):

12) spepat vona fi fo'foira oai.
    spepat vo- na fi fo'foira o- a- i
    spare.parts(pl) 3plO- in 3sgnFOC work(f) 3sgfO- 1sgS- do

...I worked on spare parts.  co2 001

13) atas fi beko ovo'vou roa fifire oai.
    a- tat fi beko o- vo'vou roa fifi -re o- a- i
    3sgmO- on.top 3sgnFOC stone(f) 3sgPOSS- boy(m) one.sgm sit -NF 3sgS- exist

One baby stone sits on top of it.  sv 004

14) eui ekuire, ui eu fi leme.
    e- ui e- kui -re ui e- u fi le- me
    1plexPOSS- food(n) 3sgnO- burn -NF food(n) 3sgnO- eat 3sgnFOC 1plex- HAB

...cooking our food, we eat it.  mt 019

Default agreement can also be seen in certain situations in discourse, when a speaker wants to say that things continued on in the same manner for some time before a new event occurred. The normal way to say this is to use the verb me 'continue', in a subordinate clause using the Anterior suffix -ge, the subject of which is specified only by a 3rd singular neuter prefix. Because it is a verb of a subordinate adverbial clause, the third person intransitive subject is expressed using an object prefix (see Section 16.1
for an explanation of this). What is of concern here is only that there is no true subject; but filling the subject position on such verbs is a 3sg prefix, of neuter gender. An example:

15) Aka hano ogaikoko na leam.
aka hano o- gaikoko na lea -m
then then 3sgPOS- canoe(m) sgmArt burst -sgm

Then his canoe broke.

Aka emege aokefeuri.
aka e- e- me -ge a- o- ke feu -ri
then 3sgnO- SBD- continue -ANT 3sgmO- 3sgS- push.off go.up -CAUS

It went on like that, then he pushed [his canoe] up [on shore].

A third situation in which default agreement can be seen is with the non-pronominal use of a demonstrative, which is used more or less as a sequencing device between clauses, much like the colloquial English ‘okay’. See Section 8.4.3 for a discussion of this. The important point here is that although a demonstrative is used, it does not have a nominal antecedent in this function; and the form used for this function is the singular neuter medial demonstrative pronoun. This, then, is another instance of neuter gender being used when there is no controller gender. An example of this usage:

16) Le ga eveage, ofeu.
le ga e- e- vea -ge o- feu
day(n) sgnArt 3sgnO- SBD- emerge -ANT 3sgS- go.up

Next day, she went up [to the bush].

Ofei foiga.
ofeu -i foiga
3sgPOSS- go.up -PSV PN.MED.sgn

She went up, okay.

Feunun feunun feunun ta
feu -nun feu -nun feu -nun ta
go.up -DUR go.up -DUR go.up -DUR just

tulav va foiva suni ika rongeane fi ngoa mame.
tulav va foiva suni ika rongeane-ne fi ngoa ma- me
children(pl) plArt PN.MED.pl all there play -IMPF 3sgnFOC stay 3plS- HAB

She went up, went up, up, up, but all her children were there, playing.

RESOLUTION

The second problem with enforced agreement systems comes about when a speaker is unable to specify agreement. This situation could come about for two reasons. Firstly, the speaker may not know the gender of a referent. Secondly, the language may not allow the correct agreement required. This latter situation could happen if there are two participants of different genders. (If there are more than two participants, plural
agreement is used, which does not distinguish gender. However with two participants, dual gender/number agreement is used, and gender must be distinguished.) If there are two participants of the same gender, there is no problem. If there are two participants of different genders, and at least one of the participants is masculine, then masculine agreement is used. Thus:

17) **Aira la o vo’vou na vasiama?**

   *aira la o vo’vou na vasia -mal*

   *woman(f) sgArt and boy(m) sgmArt be.where -du.m*

   *Where are the woman and the boy?*

If, however, there are one feminine and one neuter participant, speakers cannot use feminine or neuter dual agreement (or masculine), but instead must use plural agreement. As gender distinctions do not occur in the plural number, this strategy neatly sidesteps the problem. (This and the previous example are elicited. Perhaps not unsurprisingly, this kind of example is rare in natural discourse.):

18) **Paniken ga o kuisa la vasia?**

   *paniken ga o kuisa la vasia -v*

   *cup(n) sgnArt and bottle(f) sgmArt be.where -pl*

   *Where are the bottle and the cup?*

This kind of system is what Corbett (1991: 279) calls syntactic resolution of gender conflicts; resolution is achieved using syntactic principles.

If a speaker does not know the gender of a referent, they can either avoid agreement, or, they can use question words like **man** ‘what’; **ami** ‘who’ and **elahave** ‘how much’, in which case gender is syntactically assigned, because these question words are masculine nouns. Thus:

19) **Man hin?**

   *man hin*

   *what(m) 3sgnEFOC*

   *What is it?*

These question words still take masculine agreement even when their referent is known to be feminine. Consider for example the following sentence, in which **man** ‘what’, with a masculine demonstrative, is used to refer to **ruia** ‘old woman’, a feminine noun. In this story, an old woman is born from a magical rotten coconut, to the surprise of the boy, who is the speaker in the second sentence:

---

1 My examples may seem somewhat unnatural; but compare them with Givón’s (1972: 82) example of gender resolution in Chibemba: “The book, the bed and the peanut are here” (quoted in Corbett 1991: 275).
20) matua la "Pak!" oerege taman ruia.
matua la pak o-e-re -ge taman ruia
old.coconut(f) sgfArt bang! 3sgfO- SBD- say -ANT but old.woman(f)

...the old coconut goes "Bang!" but it's an old woman!

Olere ta "Eta ngakala man hona koi?"
o- le-re ta eta nga-kala man hona koi
3sgfO- see -NF just Wow! 1sgPOSS- mother(f) what(m) MOD.PROX.sgm also

Seeing her, "Hey! My goodness [lit: my mother], what's this now?" [the boy says].  co 242 243
**CHAPTER SEVEN**

Nominal adjuncts

This chapter discusses four kinds of adjuncts involving nouns in Lavukaleve, which mostly express location. There are three basic types: those involving nouns in postpositional phrases, those involving the Locative and Perlative suffixes on nouns, and those involving place nouns. In addition, there are complex adjuncts involving any of these plus a particle **nun** 'from'. These phrase types share a similar function syntactically, in that they are all phrases which are not subcategorised for by the predicate. They differ in their internal structures. Different subclasses of nouns are able to participate in each of the different types of nominal adjuncts. Common nouns appear in postpositional phrases. Locational nouns, a small subclass of nouns, are the only nouns which can appear with the Locative and Perlative suffixes. Place nouns, another subclass of nouns, are the only nouns which can appear as an adjunct without overt marking in the form of a Locative or Perlative suffix or postposition (see Section 3.1). Both locational and place nouns can also be used with postpositions. Note that demonstratives and locative deictics are discussed elsewhere (Chapter 8).

The following examples illustrate the three basic types of nominal adjuncts with the intransitive verb **feu** 'go up':

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postpositional phrase:</th>
<th>Feuma!</th>
<th>Feuma</th>
<th>tutum</th>
<th>anam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feuma</td>
<td>feu -ma</td>
<td>feu -ma</td>
<td>tutu -m</td>
<td>a- nam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go.up -DURIMP.sg</td>
<td>go.up -DURIMP.sg</td>
<td>grandparent -sgm</td>
<td>3sgmO- to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heaka feu</td>
<td>lake emava!&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heaka feu</td>
<td>lake e- ma -va</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there.DIST1 go.up</td>
<td>fire(n) 3sgnO-take -PCTIMP.sg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Go up! Go up to that old man over there! Go up and take [his] fire!*

---
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Locational noun plus Locative suffix:

2) **Otairire** *lore, aka mafeu o’asen.*

\[
\begin{array}{lllll}
\text{o-} & \text{tairi} & \text{-re} & \text{lo} & \text{-re aka ma- feu o’as -n} \\
3\text{sgfO- divide} & \text{-NF finish} & \text{-NF then} & \text{3plS- go.up bush -LOC} \\
\end{array}
\]

*When he had divided the work, they went up to the bush.*

Place noun:

3) **Makaol ga emarenun feu Singafeun fi mangoa.**

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{ma-} & \text{kaol ga e- ma} & \text{-re -nun feu Singafeun fi mangoa.} \\
3\text{plPOSS- raft(n) sgnArt 3sgnO- take -NF -DUR go.up Singafeun 3sgnFOC} \\
\text{ma- ngoa} \\
3\text{plS- stay} \\
\end{array}
\]

*They took their raft and went up to Singafeun and stayed there.*

7.1 Postpositional Phrases

There are nine postpositions in Lavukaleve. They are:

- na in, on, etc.
- nam to, from
- hal above
- tat on top of
- nal because
- ne with (accompaniment)
- ku like
- kelei near
- ham for

Postpositional phrases involve a postposition, which is obligatorily prefixed with an object prefix cross-referencing a noun or pronoun, and an optional NP which has this cross-referenced noun or pronoun as head. The NP, if it appears, immediately precedes the postposition. The following example shows, first a postpositional phrase in which the full NP has been ellipsed and only the prefixed postposition appears; and secondly, a postpositional phrase involving a full NP with postposition following it.
The position in a sentence of the postpositional phrase is not fixed, but usually it immediately precedes the object NP, if present, or the verb. The following examples illustrate this:

5)  

O'as ga ena mitakeumal vomare
o'as ga e- na mitakeu -mal vo- ma -re
bush(n) sgnArt 3sgnO- in dog -pl 3plO- take -NF

He took the dogs up to the bush...

6)  

O'as ga ena huruv.
O'as ga e- na huru -v
bush(n) sgnArt 3sgnO- in go.inside -pl

They go into the bush.

However this position is by no means obligatory; in the first of the following examples an adverb intervenes between postpositional phrase and object, and in the second, the postpositional phrase is sentence-final:

7)  

ta hona hola na ana

ta hona hola na a- na
time(m) MOD.PROX.sgm tree.sp(m) sgmArt 3sgmO- in

uruala fo'sal vokure hila malei.

...now they don't [know how to] kill fish with hola poison properly.

8)  

Foia ngosurea heo legis ga ena.

Foia ngosu -re -a heo legis ga e- na
PN.MED.sgf 2sg tie -NF -sgf 3sgfEFOC leaf(n) sgnArt 3sgnO- in

It's that one you tie for the kite [lit: leaf].
Each of the postpositions will be discussed separately in the following sections.

NA 'IN', 'ON', ETC.

This is by far the most common postposition, and it has a very broad range of functions and meanings. It is used to express any locational relation, and also has a general relational function. For the sake of consistency, na is universally glossed as ‘in’.

Its meanings can be broadly divided into two types: locational (including meanings such as in, inside, on, to, with, by, near, etc.) and relational (referring to NPs expressing instrument, purpose, recipient, reason, experiencer, material, time, goal, out of, into, with respect to, in a language). Copious examples of na can be found throughout this thesis. Included here are a few examples only, showing some of the range of meanings:

10) Ika fi lolei. Nganga na ana.

The two are there. By the river.

11) Vokikiare "Man ana hide" hi mevo?" hide aereege.

He asked them "For what [i.e. why] have you come like this?" he said.

12) Tail ga nat ana fi

The house is made from sago.
NAM ‘TO’

The most common use of nam (glossed as ‘to’) is to express the goal of motion. It is also, very rarely, used to express other goals: addressee (i.e. the goal of speech) and recipient (i.e. goal of a gift). It is also found expressing location: at, on or in a place, in which use it overlaps with na ‘in, on, etc.’.

13) Laloveige laevege, 3dumO- call -ANT 3duS- SBD- go-ANT
   la-  lo-  vei -ge  la-  e-  ve-ge
   ta aka vau lofoa oiaol lonam.
   lvau lo- foa oiaol  lo- nam
   just then go.out 3duS- go.down other.MED.duf 3dufO- to

They call them, then they two [boys] go out and go down to the two girls.  ja 277

14) Vau va’var lohai ruia la onam.
   vau va’var lo- hai ruia la o- nam
   go.out talking 3duS- do old.woman(f) sgfArt 3sgfO- to

They go out and talk to the old woman.  ja 401

15) Ruimal nala o lovovol la
   ruimal nala o lo- vovo -l la
   old.people.du(m) mduArt and 3duPOS- daughter(f) -du dufArt
   feu ika ngoa voemege
   feu ika ngoa vo- e- me -ge ngoa
   go.up there stay 3plO- SBD- HAB -ANT stay
   voemege nganga na anam.
   vo- e- me -ge nganga na a- nam
   3plO- SBD- HAB -ANT river(m) sgmArt 3sgmO- to

The two old people and their daughters went up there and stayed and stayed, at the river. ja 299

Nam is used, rarely, to express a negative possessor:

16) Hano meav va vonam mina roru tamu.
   hano meav va vo- nam mina ro -ru tamu
   then SPEC.pl plArt 3pl.O- to thing(f) one.sgf -none no

For those before [i.e. the ancestors] there was nothing.

   Daeva o raba o kaukamea o mina
   daeva o raba o kaukamea o mina
   goggles(n)and rubber (f) and wire(f) and thing(f)
   akari mea la vonam tamu.
   aka -ri me -a la vo- nam tamu
   then -PSNV SPEC -sgf sgfArt 3plO- to no

They had no goggles or rubber or wire or anything like that.  cs2 002-003
HAL 'ABOVE'

**Hal** means ‘above’; it refers to an entity which is higher than, and not touching, another entity. This is quite a rare word; there are no spontaneous textual examples of it. The first example below is elicited; the second is from the Lavukaleve translation of the Church of Melanesia prayer service. Note its metaphorical use in this example. This is possibly a calque from English.

17) **Totoas na solo la ohal fi olei.**

`totoas na solo la o- hal fi o- lei`

*cloud* *mountain* *above* *exist*

*The cloud is above the mountain.*

18) **Mina onal Lod na God lauram aesiage:**

`mina o- nal Lod na God laura-m a- e- sia -ge`

*thing* *because* *God* *great* *do* *ANT*

*For the Lord is a great God:*

`o sulum lauram aesiage`

*chief* *great* *do* *ANT*

*and a great king above all gods.*

**TAT 'ON TOP OF'**

**Tat** refers to an entity which is on top of a surface, touching it.

19) **e wof otat fi fifire**

`e wof o- tat fi fifi -re`

*wharf* *on.top* *sit* *ANT*

**Lukariare ngoa leme.**

*lukaria -re ngoa le- me*

*group.together* *stay* *HAB*

*...we were sitting down on the wharf, as a group.*

20) **(I make the pudding.)**

**Nikol bomil ga umu efou, etat simiu ro**

`nikol bomil ga umu e- fou e- tat simiu ro`

*first* *leaf.sp* *under* *put.on* *on.top* *red.leaf* *one.sg*

*First I put a bomil leaf underneath, and on top one simiu leaf...*
Nal 'because'

Nal means ‘because’. The object prefix cross-references to the noun referring to the reason. Nal almost always occurs in a fixed expression mina onal ‘thing (f) 3sgfO-because: because of the thing’, in which mina is a shorthand way of referring to the reason:

22)  

Mina   onal  Mima  na  folufolum  tunam  siare
mina  o- nal  Mima  na  folufolu -m  tuna -m  siare
thing(f) 3sgfO- because  Mima(m)  sgfArt  fat -sgm  really -sgm  do -NF

[Mima can’t get into his friend’s canoe] Because Mima is really fat...  

In the translated prayer services, nal also has the meaning ‘through, by means of’. This is a small semantic extension from the more common meaning of ‘because’. There are no spontaneously occurring examples of nal with this meaning in the corpus:

24)  
suni  mina  sikala  o  matea  hamus  hoga  ena
suni  mina  sikala  o  matea  hamus  hoga  e- na
all  thing(f)  be.bad and  dangers  evening(n)  MOD.PROX.sgn  3sgnO- in

me  -re -la  o- na  Jisas  Karais  eLod
continue-FUT -sgf  sgfArt  3sgfO- in  Jesus Christ(m)  lpl.exPOSS- Lord(m)

na  anal.  Amen.
na  a- nal  amen
sgfArt  3sgfO- because  amen

...keep us from all troubles and dangers of this night, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.  
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**NE ‘WITH’**

Ne is used to mark an accompanying entity. It is used when accompanier and accompanied are human, or animals, or inanimate objects.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vaunun</td>
<td>vaunun</td>
<td>mamitakeunal</td>
<td>va</td>
<td>vone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vau</td>
<td>-nun</td>
<td>vau</td>
<td>-nun</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>mitakeu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go.out</td>
<td>-DUR</td>
<td>go.out</td>
<td>-DUR</td>
<td>3pIPOSS-</td>
<td>dog</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...they go out, go and go and go, with their dogs.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foiga</td>
<td>hola</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>olegis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foiga</td>
<td>hola</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>o-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN.MED.sgn</td>
<td>tree.sp(m)</td>
<td>sgmArt</td>
<td>3sgPOSS-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then they would mix the hola leaf with them [the pumice and molio fruit].

When ne ‘with’ appears without the object prefix it is best seen as a conjunction. It joins constituents of equal syntactic status, as in the two NPs below:

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airal</td>
<td>mima</td>
<td>emare</td>
<td>vo</td>
<td>votal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>airal</td>
<td>mima</td>
<td>e-</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>-re</td>
<td>vo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>men.du</td>
<td>way.of.life(n)</td>
<td>3sgnO-</td>
<td>take</td>
<td>-NF</td>
<td>come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nala</td>
<td>final</td>
<td>Sepo</td>
<td>ne</td>
<td>Laumate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nala</td>
<td>finala</td>
<td>Sepo</td>
<td>ne</td>
<td>Laumate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mduArt</td>
<td>3dumFOC</td>
<td>Sepo(m)</td>
<td>with</td>
<td>Laumate(m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two men who brought the church were Sepo and Laumate.

**KU ‘LIKE’**

Ku expresses similarity to something else. It can also express a meaning of ‘sort of, almost, nearly’, particularly when it is used with time expressions.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malav</td>
<td>o’asen</td>
<td>nun</td>
<td>kini</td>
<td>vauv</td>
<td>voku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malav</td>
<td>o’as</td>
<td>-n</td>
<td>nun</td>
<td>kini</td>
<td>vau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people(pl)</td>
<td>bush</td>
<td>-LOC</td>
<td>from</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>go.out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fi</td>
<td>efoa</td>
<td>taon</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>onam.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fi</td>
<td>e-</td>
<td>foa</td>
<td>taon</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>o-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sgnFOC</td>
<td>1pl.ex-</td>
<td>go.down</td>
<td>town(f)</td>
<td>sgmArt</td>
<td>3sgfO-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We went down to the town like people who’ve come out from the bush.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nun</td>
<td>voku</td>
<td>mail</td>
<td>fi</td>
<td>foa.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nun</td>
<td>vo-</td>
<td>ku</td>
<td>mail</td>
<td>fi</td>
<td>foa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four(pl)</td>
<td>3plO-</td>
<td>like</td>
<td>a.bit</td>
<td>3sgnFOC</td>
<td>go.down</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was perhaps four o’clock when we went down.
KELEI ‘NEAR’

Kelei means ‘near’, usually in the spatial, but also in the temporal sense.

30) Aka nun aka nun vau Goa akelei nun
aka nun aka nun vau Goa a- kelei nun
then from then from go.out Isabel(m) 3sgmO- near from
huluire kini mahau.
  hului -re kini ma- hau
go.round -NF ACT 3plS- go.ashore

*They went on and on, they went out to near Isabel, then they turned around and came back in.*

31) Aka vomare velanun velanun
aka vo- ma -re vela -nun vela -nun
then 3plO- take -NF go -DUR go -DUR
kini aunio okelei mail fi.
kini aunio o- kelei mail fi
ACT evening(f) 3sgfO- near a.bit 3sgnFOC

*He took them, it went on, and it was nearly evening.*

Kelei is unusual among postpositions in that it can take the Locative suffix, seemingly with no different meaning than without it. Apart from kelei, only nouns take the Locative suffix; but kelei is not a noun in such examples, because it still has the object prefix, which is unavailable to nouns:

32) lafa onam loveala fagi rogeru
lafa o- nam lo- vea -la fagi roge -ru
part(f) 3sgfO- to 3sgfO- emerge -NEG island(n) one.sgn -none

*...there were no other islands near to the place.*

HAM ‘FOR’

The postposition ham ‘for’ is used to indicate a beneficiary. It is formally identical to, and has an obvious semantic relationship with, the verbal Purposive suffix (see Section 16.2).

33) aham maki na ata fi lome.
a- ham maki na a- ta fi lo- me
3sgmO- for nut.pudding(m)sgmArt 3sgmO- pound 3sgnFOC 3sgS- HAB

*...he goes inside, and she makes maki for him.*
7.2 Nominal Adjuncts using the Locative and Perlative Suffixes

The Locative suffix has an invariant form -n, and the Perlative suffix has invariant form -ne. The complex morphological formation of nouns with these suffixes is described in Chapter 5. This section simply describes the types of nouns which can take the Locative and Perlative suffixes, and the syntactic function of such suffixed nouns.

Adjuncts involving Locative and Perlative-marked nouns do not form full NPs. The NP consists only of a noun (which may have a Possessive prefix), but there is no article, and no modification.

7.2.1 Nouns with the Locative Suffix

The Locative suffix refers to general static location, both temporal and spatial. Semantically it has a similar function to the postposition na ‘in’, but whereas any noun can take part in a postpositional phrase, nouns which can take the Locative suffix belong to a certain restricted subclass of nouns, called locational nouns. This set contains a number of semantic classes: time nouns, place nouns, body parts, nouns referring to places, positional nouns, and other miscellaneous nouns.

A sample of nouns which take the Locative suffix, with their suffixed form, is given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEMANTIC CATEGORY</th>
<th>CITATION FORM</th>
<th>LOCATIVE FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>time:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kunuhani</td>
<td>kunuhani</td>
<td>‘afternoon’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aunio</td>
<td>aunion</td>
<td>‘evening’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lalamu</td>
<td>lalamun</td>
<td>‘morning’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hamus</td>
<td>hamusin</td>
<td>‘night’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lar</td>
<td>laran</td>
<td>‘day’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>place names:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goae</td>
<td>Goaen</td>
<td>‘Isabel’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taigin</td>
<td>Taiginan</td>
<td>‘Guadalcanal’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavukal</td>
<td>Lavukalen</td>
<td>‘Russell Islands’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 There is one exception to this in the corpus: aunion la ona ‘evening(f)-LOC sgfArt 3sgfO-in’ ‘in the evening’. This example has been checked, and was accepted by speakers; but it is the only example of a locative-marked noun receiving the definite article (and, further, a postposition).
### Body Parts:
- Gata: 'top of head'
- Tu'tuk: 'torso'
- Ho'vul: 'ear'
- Fem: 'face'

### Place Nouns:
- Tail: 'house'
- Furi: 'weathercoast'
- Lea: 'cave'
- O'as: 'bush'
- Fela'koe: 'village'
- Koa: 'door'
- Keke: 'dry place'
- Itau: 'different place'
- Savu: 'edge'
- Hoi: 'deep sea'
- Nganga: 'river'
- Houhouma: 'smoky place'
- Tasi: 'sea'

### Positional Nouns:
- Erea: 'front'
- Mutuo: 'behind'
- Kora: 'end'
- Leura: 'outside'
- Rarava: 'side'
- Rolo: 'inside'
- Koli: 'inner part'
- Foto: 'middle'
- Lai: 'top'

### Other Nouns:
- Aro: 'language'
- Tonga: 'chance'
- Ta: 'behalf'

Note that there are more nouns in some of these semantic groups which do not take the Locative suffix, but instead take a postposition to form a locational phrase. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic Category</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Postpositional Phrase</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time:</td>
<td>Le</td>
<td>Le ena</td>
<td>'day'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masiv</td>
<td>Masiv ana</td>
<td>'year'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
place nouns:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tangki</td>
<td>water tank'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fagi</td>
<td>'island'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lou</td>
<td>'edges'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma</td>
<td>'sea passage between islands'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i'sima</td>
<td>'lake'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no rule which will predict whether a noun will take a Locative or Perlative suffix or a postposition.

Locative-suffixed nouns function syntactically as adjuncts. They can appear anywhere in a sentence. Some examples:

35) "Okay. When some of those people hang their lamp in the doorway, you go and take it" she said.

36) "...her boy goes out and hides in the bottom of the tree."

If a speaker wants to modify a Locative-marked noun, or make it definite by using the definite article, they must use a postpositional phrase instead of a simple Locative suffix on a noun. For example, fela'koe 'village' is a locational noun; that is, it normally takes a Locative suffix to form a locational phrase. However in the following example, it is modified and must therefore take a postposition instead:

37) in a big village
7.2.2 Nouns with the Perlative Suffix

The Perlative suffix -ne refers to motion through some material or terrain such as bush, or motion along a line, for instance a shore line. The Perlative suffix is quite rare. This makes it difficult to tell if it is restricted like the Locative suffix in the nouns which it can appear with, or whether it can appear more generally. All of the nouns it occurs with in the corpus belong to that subclass of nouns which is compatible with the Locative suffix (see discussion above). As with the Locative suffix, some of these nouns have special forms when they appear with the Perlative suffix; this is discussed in detail in Chapter 5. Again like nouns with the Locative suffix, nouns suffixed with the Perlative form sentential adjuncts. Some text examples of Perlative adjuncts:

38) "Malav hova vone o'asene
malav hova vo- ne o'as -ne
people(pl) MOD.PROX.pl 3plO- with bush -PERL
kelearev va, sagio la ona
kelea -re -v va sagio la o- na
walk -NF -pl plArt line(f) sgfArt 3sgfO- in
vau voigu", hide voerege.
  vau vo- igu hide vo- e- re -ge
go.out 3plO- take.out thus 3plO- SBD- say -ANT
"Those people who are going walking through the bush, go out from the line" he said. kg1 005

39) Oraravane ta huluire taogene vela lome.
o- rarava -ne ta hului -re itao -ne vela lo- me
3sgPOSS- side -PERL just go.round-NF different.place-PERL go 3sgS- HAB
He would go alongside of her, then turn and go a different way. ch 014

40) Motoka vula lome ga raravane otin.
  motoka vula lo- me -Ø ga rarava -ne o- tin
  car come 3sgS- HAB -sgn sgfArt side -PERL 3sgPOSS- only
[When] a truck came, it would just go along the side (of the road). co2 086

7.3 Place Nouns

The subclass of nouns called place nouns consists only of proper names referring to places; and only some of these. Most proper names referring to places are locational nouns or common nouns; that is, they can appear with the Locative suffix or in a postpositional phrase when functioning as an adjunct. However some place names are able to form bare adjunct phrases. That is, they form adjunct phrases without the Locative suffix, and without the use of a postposition. To understand the distinction between regular place names and these special place nouns, compare Karumulu (the name of a village in the central Russells), a locational noun which takes the Locative suffix when functioning as an adjunct, with Mane (the name of a village in the West
Russells), which can function as an adjunct without any suffixation or use of postpositions:

41) Aka foiga Karumulun fi amalukari.

aka foiga Karumulu -n fi a- ma- lukari
then PN.MED.sgn Karumulu -LOC 3sgnFOC 3sgmO- 3plS- keep

And then in Karumulun they buried him.

42) Ali na ta hona Mane fi olei.

ali na ta hona Mane fi o- lei
man(m) sgmArt time(m) MOD.PROX.sgm Mane(f) 3sgnFOC 3sgS- exist

The man is now in Mane.

Around half of the place names recorded in the corpus are locational nouns, and thus act like Karumulu, and most of the rest are place nouns, and act like Mane. It is perhaps noteworthy that place names which have only recently started to be talked about, like Yandina (the capital of the province), Honiara (the capital of the Solomon Islands), and Australia all act like Mane; that is, they are place nouns, which do not take the Locative suffix or postpositions when functioning as adjuncts, but rather are bare adjuncts.

Most place names do not have a meaning; that is, they are special names, not common nouns co-opted for the purpose of fixed reference to a place. However there are some place names which do have a meaning. These all function as common nouns, and occur in Postpositional phrases when they form adjuncts:

43) Kini foa Vaga Ofe enam siare.

kini foa vaga o- fe e- nam sia -re
ACT go.down giant 3sgPOSS- foot(n) 3sgnO- to do -NF

They reached Giant’s Foot (place name).

7.4 Complex Nominal Adjuncts with nun ‘from’

There is a particle nun ‘from’ which, together with an adjunct, forms a complex adjunct expressing the notion of movement from the location or time expressed by the other part of the nominal adjunct. Nun always immediately follows the adjunct with which it occurs. The types of adjuncts which nun most frequently occurs with are nominal adjuncts: postpositional phrases, nouns with Locative and Partitive suffixes, and place

---

2 Note that places names of the Karumulu type are always referred to with their Locative suffix in Pijin and English; thus Karumulu.

3 Actually, Mane village and Karumulun village were both founded well within living memory, as all the villages were (the Lavukals were forcibly removed from Pavuvu early this century). However even though these villages were founded recently, the village names are the same as the island names, and presumably the islands were already named in Lavukaleve; thus one cannot make any argument from village foundation dates about the productivity of naming strategies.
nouns.

44)  

Goa anam nun mina holovem na ve naumal na
Goa a- nam nun mina holovem na ve naumal na
Isabel(m) 3sgmO- at from um devil(m) sgmArt or god(m) sgmArt

amakikiarige ta...
3sgmO-

[Coming] from Isabel, they asked the devil or god [where he was]...

45)  

Tome na lotailan nun avure,
Tome na lo- tail -n nun a- vu -re
hole(m) sgmArt 3duPOSS- house -LOC from 3sgmO- dig -NF

lofei umune.
3duPOSS- go.up -PSV under -PERL

They dug a hole from their house going underground up [to the bush where the giant was].

46)  

Ali na Adina nun Mane foam.
ali na Adina nun Mane foa -m
man(m) sgmArt Yandina from Mane go.down -sgm

The man starts from Yandina towards Mane.

Nun is also found with deictics, such as aka 'then', ika 'there' and words from the hoka paradigm (see Chapter 8 for a description of all these). See example (30) and the following:

47)  

Aka ikari nun fi, emare,
aka ika -ri nun fi e- ma -re Charles Fox
then there -PSNV from 3sgnFOC 1pl.ex- take -NF ship.name(n)

ena foa Vera Naaso emalufu.
e- na foa Vera Naaso e- ma- lufu
3sgmO- in go.down Vera Naaso 1pl.ex- 3plS- leave

It was from there, they took us on the Charles Fox (a ship) to Vera Naaso and dropped us [back home].

48)  

Selwyn hoaka nun kini vaum.
Selwyn hoaka nun kini vau -m
Selwyn there.DIST2 from ACT go.out -sgm

It went out from way over there at Selwyn [College].

Nun can also be found in construction with aunio 'evening', and more rarely with one-off expressions which seem to be thought of by the speaker as a spatial or temporal setting. In these cases, it means something more like 'during':
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49) Aka leae *aunio nun*, aere *fi*,
aka le- ae aunio nun ae re fi
then 1duex- go.up evening from go.up -NF 3sgnFOC

filangen lehului.
filange -n le- hului
weathercoast -LOC 1duex- go.round

Then during the evening we go up, we go round to the weathercoast.

50) Galengam nun si'kul ena nikol vere.
galengam nun si'kul e- na nikol ve re
boy(m) from school(n) 3sgnO- in first go -NF

From a young boy [lit: during boyhood], I first went to school.
There are certain things which one language can do supremely well, which it would be almost vain for another to attempt. Edward Sapir, *Language*

**CHAPTER EIGHT**

**Deictics**

8.1 **Introduction**

The deictics to be considered in this chapter are of two main types. There are the pronoun/demonstratives, and the locative deictics. Apart from these, there is also a third, very rare set of demonstrative identifiers.

The pronoun/demonstratives include first and second person pronouns, two paradigms of demonstrative pronouns (*foia* and *oia*), and a paradigm of demonstrative modifiers (*hoia*) (these words are referred to in their feminine singular medial forms throughout the discussion). The demonstratives mark gender, number and three degrees of distance of the referent from the speaker, plus making another distinction in the distal form between specific and nonspecific distance. It is shown below that *hoia* is a demonstrative modifier and *foia* and *oia* are demonstrative pronouns which differ in their degree of activation in the discourse. The three-way distinction which is drawn between *foia*, *hoia* and *oia*, is a complex and problematic area in the description of Lavukaleve morpho-syntax; and an important one in terms of fundamental morpho-pragmatic categories of the language.

The locative deictics are for the most part syntactically simpler than the demonstratives. They include the four-member paradigm *hoka/holka/heaka/holaka* 'here/there/there far/there far, unspecified'; *koka–oka* 'far'; *uke* 'near'; *ika* 'there'; *aka* 'then, next, so, etc.'; *igala* and *gala* 'there' and *ka* 'locational emphatic'. These forms, for the most part, function as locational adverbs, that is, syntactically they are adjuncts.

Both the pronoun/demonstratives and locative deictics can appear with certain suffixes: Group suffixes -*sa* (ungendered) and -*ha* (feminine), the Extended -*la*, and the Presentative and Predicative suffixes -*ri* and -*om/v* respectively. Only certain of the
deictics can appear with each of these suffixes.

To begin with the first and second person pronouns will be examined. Following this is a discussion of demonstratives foia, hoia and oia. Each paradigm is discussed separately, then the relationships between them are examined. Each of the locative deictics is discussed in turn. The penultimate part of the chapter discusses the morphological affixes available to these deictic words. The final section examines the infrequently-occurring set of demonstrative identifiers.

It would take far more time and space than is available to cover all aspects of the forms and use of Lavukaleve’s deictics. In the discussion to follow, I mention only briefly the spatial functions of these deictics, and instead concentrate on a description of their morpho-syntax and some aspects of their use in narratives. This chapter does not cover pronominal affixes; their use is treated in Section 9.7.

8.2 FIRST AND SECOND PERSON PRONOUNS

8.2.1 FORM

First and second person pronouns in Lavukaleve are marked for person and number. First person non-singular pronouns are also marked for inclusion/exclusion of the addressee. Pronouns are not marked for syntactic function. The paradigm is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>DU</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 EXCL</td>
<td>ngai</td>
<td>el</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 INCL</td>
<td>mel</td>
<td>me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>inu</td>
<td>imil</td>
<td>imi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dual forms are identical to plural forms, with the addition of /l/. The segment /l/ is a pervasive dual marker in the language, but in other areas of the language, e.g. lexical items, it is attached to the singular form of the word, rather than to the plural form, to create a dual.

The only further affixial morphology available to first and second person pronouns is the Group suffixes -sa and -ha. They are discussed below (Section 8.10.1).

8.2.2 FUNCTIONS

First and second person pronouns are mostly only used for special emphasis. All the information contained in first and second person pronouns is also contained in the largely obligatory verbal cross-referencing and agreement morphology (see Section 9.7); thus, the free pronoun forms are not needed for disambiguation or identification of arguments. In fact, they contain rather less information than verbal cross-referencing
8 - DEICTICS

morphology, as they do not specify gender and convey no information about syntactic function.

Pronouns function as the heads of NPs (see Section 4.1.1). The following set of examples illustrates the use of free pronouns in texts:

1) \textit{Imil} rara roge ena vomelesu ga
   \begin{align*}
   \text{imil} &\quad \text{rara} &\quad \text{roge} &\quad \text{ena} &\quad \text{vomelesu} &\quad \text{ga} \\
   2\text{du} &\quad \text{side(n)} &\quad \text{one.sgn} &\quad \text{3sgnO- in} &\quad \text{3plO- tie} &\quad \text{sgnArt}
   \end{align*}

\textit{You two go to the other side where you tied them up.} \quad \text{mt 027}

2) \textit{Ngai} volere hi lame.
   \begin{align*}
   \text{ngai} &\quad \text{volere} &\quad \text{hi} &\quad \text{lame.} \\
   1\text{sg} &\quad \text{3plO- see} &\quad \text{-NF} &\quad \text{do/say} &\quad \text{1sg- HAB}
   \end{align*}

\textit{I would watch them.} \quad \text{jo 046}

3) \textit{Aka} e velanun hano fina na elufum ke.
   \begin{align*}
   \text{aka} &\quad \text{e} &\quad \text{velanun} &\quad \text{hano} &\quad \text{fina} &\quad \text{na} &\quad \text{elufum} &\quad \text{ke.} \\
   \text{then} &\quad \text{1pl.ex go} &\quad \text{-DUR} &\quad \text{then} &\quad \text{belongings(m) sgmArt} &\quad \text{1pl.ex- leave -sgm EMPH}
   \end{align*}

\textit{We went on, we left our belongings. Inside the houses.} \quad \text{ef 022}

The circumstances governing the use of free pronouns in texts have not been explored; presumably their appearance can be accounted for in terms of information structure, but the details await further research.

Pronouns are also frequently found functioning resumptively, that is, following and in juxtaposition with the NP to which they refer:

4) \textit{Lavukal} e ta ana legis
   \begin{align*}
   \text{Lavukale} &\quad \text{e} &\quad \text{ta} &\quad \text{ana} &\quad \text{legis} \\
   \text{Lavukals} &\quad \text{1pl.ex time(m)} &\quad \text{3sgmO- in leaf(n)}
   \end{align*}

\textit{When we Lavukals are preparing a kite to fly, the first thing [to get] is the sago.} \quad \text{eg 002}
And we, the people [lit. the people we] didn’t die. [i.e. none of us people died]
### foia ‘she’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PROXIMAL</th>
<th>MEDIAL</th>
<th>DISTAL 1</th>
<th>DISTAL 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>MASC</td>
<td>fona</td>
<td>foina</td>
<td>feana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>fo</td>
<td>foia</td>
<td>fehea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEUT</td>
<td>foga</td>
<td>foiga</td>
<td>feaga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DU</td>
<td>MASC</td>
<td>fonala</td>
<td>foinala</td>
<td>feanala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>fol</td>
<td>foial</td>
<td>feheaol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEUT</td>
<td>fogala</td>
<td>foigala</td>
<td>feagala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td></td>
<td>fova</td>
<td>foiva</td>
<td>feava</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some examples:

6) Foiga matail
foiga ma- tail hi
PN.MED.sgn 3plPOSS-house(n) 3sgnEFOC

*That’s their house.*

7) Lake ga esoire
lake ga e- soi re fova vau me -v
road(n) sgnArt 3sgnO- follow -NF PN.PROX.pl go.out HAB -pl

*Following the road they go out.*

8) Foia omavel
foia o- ma -vel lo- feu
PN.MED.sgf 3sgfO- take -COMPL 3duS- go up

*Taking it [the pana (f)] they went up.*

9) Foanun foanun
foa -nun foa -nun dia dia
go.down -DUR go.down -DUR where where

*[He] went down and down "Where [is it]? Where [is it]?"*

"Feana heana heana heana
feana heana heana heana
PN.DIST1.sgm MOD.DIST1.sgm MOD.DIST1.sgm MOD.DIST1.sgm
foa. Hoikariom."

foa. hoika -ri -om
go.down there.MED -PSNV -m/n

*"It (m) is far away, way way way down. It’s there".*

8.4.2 Functions

There are four terms in the **foia** deictic system, all speaker-anchored. There are three
degrees of distance. The closest one, fo 'that one (f), near', glossed PROXimal, is used prototypically for a referent close to the speaker. Usually, this means within touching distance or close to touching distance. The next distance, foia 'that one (f) a little distance away', glossed MEDial, is prototypically used for referents within the vicinity. For example, during a conversation someone not in the conversation but within calling range could be referred to using the medial form. The third distance, the fehea form 'that one (f), far', glossed DISTal 1, refers to someone or something very far away, say on the next island, or in another country. The fourth form, fohoa, glossed DISTal 2, is used to refer to someone an unspecified but long distance away. This form is used for a referent a long way away, in situations in which the speaker does not want to specify exactly where. The lack of specification is usually because the speaker is uninterested in being precise about distance; they just want to say the referent is not close. This form is far less common than the first three.

Note that the differences between fo/foia/fehea/fohoa (and ho/hoia/hea/hoa) are described by consultants in terms of distance from the speaker, and this does seem to be their prototypical use. But their actual use in texts is more to do with the speaker’s representational point of view in the story, or apparent viewpoint, rather than pure distance from the speaker.

All four distance forms are used for situational and recognitional uses, and the proximal and medial forms are used for discourse deixis and tracking, but it seems the two distal forms are not used for these latter functions.

Like first and second person pronouns, the demonstrative pronoun foia is very frequently used resumptively. This is possible for the proximal, medial and distal 1 forms, although it is not clear whether the distal 2 forms can be used in this way:

10)  Aka losokilio tula la fe foia
    aka lo- sokilio tula -a la fe foia
    then 3duPOSS- small.ship(f) small -sgf sgfArt even PN.MED.sgf

    hoika lei.  
    hoika lei -a
    there.MED exist -sgf

    Their small boat, it was there.  

    11) Ngotea la foia hano lea.
        ngotea la foia / hano lea -a
        young.coconut(f) sgfArt PN.MED.sgf / then burst -sgf

        The young coconut, it burst open.  

    12) Hano keati fona kiliriare leim koi.
        hano keati fona kiliria -re lei -m koi
        then cat(m) PN.PROX.sgm be.hopeful -NF exist-sgm also

        The cat, he was hopeful [of catching fish] too.
The definite article in the first two examples shows that the resumptive pronoun is not in the same NP as the head noun, because definite articles are invariably the final element of an NP. The construction is analysed as two NPs in juxtaposition. Small particles occasionally intervene between the two NPs, as in example (10), but this is uncommon. Usually the two NPs are contiguous. When they are contiguous, there is not usually an intonation break between the NP and the resumptive pronoun (pauses on even pitch are indicated by slashes in the above examples).

This resumptive pronoun use is by no means obligatory, although it is relatively common, particularly in the narrative genre. A full-scale study has not been done, but it is possible that this resumptive use is a topic construction. Two resumptive uses never occur in one sentence.

8.4.3 A GRAMMATICALISED USE OF FOIGA

By far the most common foia demonstrative pronoun form, simply in terms of frequency in texts, is the singular neuter form foiga. In the majority of cases, the antecedent of foiga is not an entity but an entire proposition. This use of foiga often occurs between two clauses to link the clauses in a temporal sequence (something like English ‘then’, ‘after that’, or, more colloquially, ‘okay’); this is a discourse deixis function. In this function it is not an argument of a predicate, but rather an adjunct. Some examples of this use of foiga:

14) Mavai foiga oinala foa fufumal.
   ma- vau -i foiga oinala foa fufu -mal
   3plPOSS- go.out PSV PN.MED.sgn other.MED.dum go.down lie -du

   They go, then, the two boys lie down.

15) Vomare fela'koen voevole aka foiga
   vo- ma -re fela'koe -n vo- e- vo -le aka foiga
   3plO- take -NF village -LOC 3plO- SBD- come-POT then PN.MED.sgn

   vofare, voune sia mame.
   vo- fa -re vo- u -ne sia ma- me
   3plO- bake -NF 3plO- eat -IMPF do 3plS- HAB

   Taking the fish back to the village, when they come, then, okay, they would bake them and eat them.
16) **Kuin** voko lo, foiga.
    kui -n vo- ko lo foiga
    sun -LOC 3plO- throw finish PN.MED.sgn

*Having [put them] in the sun, okay.*

17) **Na’hou** ekove leme.
    na’hou e- kove le- me
    tree.sp 3sgnO- look.for 1pl.ex- HAB

*We go and find a nahou tree.*

18) **Foiga** ke!
    foiga ke
    PN.MED.sgn EMPH

*That's enough!*

This is a common expression of annoyance, frequently heard in conversation, meaning something like “That’s enough! Stop annoying me!” Some further examples from the corpus:

19) **Aerege** ta "Aka le foiga ke".
    a- e- re -ge ta aka le foiga ke
    3sgmO- SBD- say -ANT just then but PN.MED.sgn EMPH

*He said this, then "Okay, well, that's it then".*

The next example is from the last sentence of a story:

20) **Foiga** tin. **Foiga** tin ke!
    foiga tin foiga tin ke
    PN.MED.sgn only PN.MED.sgn only EMPH

*That's all. That's it!!*

8.5 **Hoia**

The **hoia** stem is a demonstrative modifier, meaning ‘this [N]’, ‘that [N]’. It takes its specifications for gender and number from its nominal head, and also marks distance. Note that the paradigm is identical to that shown above for the demonstrative pronoun **foia**, except for the initial consonant, and feminine Distal forms. In feminine Distal
forms, forms with fehe- and foho- in the foia paradigm are different in this hoia paradigm: sequences hehe and hoho are avoided:

hoia 'this'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PROXIMAL</th>
<th>MEDIAL</th>
<th>DISTAL 1</th>
<th>DISTAL 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG MASC</td>
<td>hona</td>
<td>hoina</td>
<td>heana</td>
<td>hoana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEM ho</td>
<td>hoia</td>
<td>hea</td>
<td>hoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEUT ho</td>
<td>hoiga</td>
<td>heaga</td>
<td>hoaga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DU MASC</td>
<td>honala</td>
<td>hoinala</td>
<td>heanalal</td>
<td>hoanala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEM hol</td>
<td>hoialol</td>
<td>heaol</td>
<td>hoal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEUT hogala</td>
<td>hoigala</td>
<td>heagala</td>
<td>hoagala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>hova</td>
<td>hoiva</td>
<td>heava</td>
<td>hoava</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some examples:

21) Ana eonege ta olakun
    maki hoina aune.
    nut.pudding(m) MOD.MED.sgm 3sgmO- eat -IMPF

She gave it to him, but he didn't want to eat that nut pudding.

22) "Sala! Ngavo'vou sevitam na
    sala nga- vo'vou sevita -m na
    hey! 1sgPOSS- boy(m) eighth -sgm sgmArt
    o- levo oku tuna fi
    3sgPOSS- bamboo.flute(f) 3sgfO-like really 3sgnFOC
    levo hoia ofi lame" ore.
    levo hoia o- fi la- me o- re
    bamboo.flute(f) MOD.MED.sgfl 3sgfO- hear 1sg- HAB 3sgS- say

"Hey! It sounds like the bamboo flute of my eighth son, that bamboo pipe I'm hearing!" she said.
23) "Onu ga ema rumaul

8-DEICTICS

8-DEICTICS

3sgPOSS-hair(n) sgnArt 3sgnO-take room -pl

iloilo
hoiva
vona
esula

iloilo -v hoiva vo- na e- su -la
different -pl MOD.MED.pl 3plO-in 3sgnO-tie -EXT

esula
keleava"
hide ore.
e- su -la kelea -va hide o- re
3sgnO-tie -EXT walk -PCTIMP.sg thus 3sgS-say

"Take his hair, then walk around and tie it up all over the place in those different rooms" she said.

24) Aka Suvala heana fin aea rem hin.

aka Suvala heana fin aea re m hin
then Suvala(m) MOD.DIST1sgm 3sgmFOC 1sgS-talk.about-FUT -sgm 3sgmEFOC

I'll talk about that Suvala island over there

In Lavukaleve, nominal heads can be ellipsed. In such cases hoia looks like it is the head of an NP; a better analysis, however, is that it is a modifier of an ellipsed head. Consider the following examples. In the next example, hoia 'these' is used to refer to the fish mentioned in the previous sentence. The giant is actually apparently looking at the fish as he says hoia:

25) Aevauge, bagatum na

a- e- vau -ge bagatum na
3sgmO-SBD-go.out -ANT male.giant(m) sgmArt

fele vore, fo'sal va voole.
fele -re vo -re fo'sal va vo- o- le
return -NF come -NF fish(pl) plArt 3plO- 3sgS- see

Volere, "Ami okiv hova?"

vo- le -re ami o- ki -v hova
3plO- see -NF who 3sgS-shoot -pl MOD.PROX.pl

Seeing them, "Who shot these?"

In the next example, the first NP is hoanala, with the nominal head (referring to the mother and the boy) understood. The second NP (roal hoanala) repeats hoanala, adding further clarification, to show that the speakers means the pair previously mentioned (the pair the story is about). Roal is an adjective, not a noun (see Section 4.1.2 for a discussion of roa). Both roal and hoanala are modifying the same ellipsed noun(s), those referring to the mother and boy. Hoanala cannot be a head here, modified by roal; if it were, it would have to precede, not follow, roal:
But those two [the older boy and his mother], that pair [sit] far away [from each other]. co 269

And another similar example, again with an NP with two modifiers and an ellipsed head:

They slept, then next day, this one, the younger one, said "Oh!..."

See Section 8.6.2 below for further discussion in support of this point.

8.5.1 The distance parameter

As with the demonstrative pronoun foia, there are four distinctions made in the hoia forms; three degrees of distance, and a further distinction in the distal term between specified and unspecified location. In Lavukaleve, as is the case in many other languages, the distance parameter in these deictics is also used anaphorically in texts, to distinguish between referents closer and further away in terms of the apparent viewpoint of the speaker in the story. Only the proximal ho `this' and medial hoia `that' can be used for referring to established referents in a discourse; that is, tracking and recognitional uses.

The three degrees of distance are the same for hoia as for the demonstrative pronoun foia discussed above. Thus the closest one, ho `this', glossed PROXimal, is used for a referent close to the speaker. Usually, this means within touching distance, or uppermost in a speaker's mind. The next distance, hoia `that, near', glossed MEDial, is for referents within the vicinity. In discourse someone not uppermost in the speaker's mind could be referred to using this form. The third distance, the hеа form `that, far', glossed DISTal 1, refers to someone or something very far away, say on the next island, or in another country. The fourth form, hoа, glossed DISTal 2, is used to refer to someone an unspecified but long distance away. This form is used for a referent who is a long way away, if the speaker does not want to be particularly precise about exactly where. As with fоhoа, this form is far less common than the first three.

8.6 Foia and hoia

The relationship between the foia and hoia stems is complex and interesting and, from
the point of view of Lavukaleve morpho-syntax a fundamentally important one. In the above descriptions it was said that foia stems are demonstrative pronouns, and hoia stems are demonstrative modifiers. These terms are applied for descriptive convenience; these words must be referred to in some way. But the distinction between them is not so clear-cut as these labels suggest. The purpose of this section is to try to clarify the structural relationship between them.

It was shown above that there are strong formal similarities between the demonstrative modifier (hoia stems) and the demonstrative pronoun (foia stems). There are, however, strong arguments for distinguishing them as separate word classes with different meanings deriving from their different syntactic distributions.

8.6.1 MORPHOLOGICAL CRITERIA FOR DISTINGUISHING FOIA FROM HOIA

Foia and hoia cannot take all of the same morphology. Both can take the Group suffixes -sa and -ha (as can first and second person pronouns). However only hoia can take the Presentative -ri and Predicative -o/om/v (see Section 8.10 below). Foia cannot take the Presentative and Predicative suffixes.

8.6.2 SYNTACTIC CRITERIA FOR DISTINGUISHING FOIA FROM HOIA

The main syntactic difference between foia stems and hoia stems is that foia stems can freely occur as head of an NP, and normally do, whereas hoia stems cannot occur as heads of their NPs, but must have a nominal head. This claim needs to be examined.

Firstly, foia stems can be modified by hoia stems, but hoia stems cannot be modified by hoia stems. Recall that Lavukaleve NP structure is such that the first element of an NP is the head, and this is followed by dependents, which agree in gender and number with that head (see Section 4.1). Consider the following sentences:

28) Foina hoinariom masiv hin.
    foina hoina -ri -om masiv hin
    PN.MED.sgm MOD.MED.sgm -PSNV -m/n year(m) 3sgmEFOC

    That was the year.

29) *Hoia hoinariom masiv hin.
    hoina hoina -ri -om masiv hin
    MOD.MED.sgm MOD.MED.sgm -PSNV -m/n year(m) 3sgmEFOC

Hoia stems can, and freely do, modify foia stems, but hoia stems cannot modify other hoia stems. This distributional fact suggests that foia is a head, whereas hoia is a modifier.

Further evidence to support the analysis that foia is a head and hoia a modifier is that
foia can freely occur as the sole member of an NP (recall that heads are the only members of NPs that can freely occur as the sole members of NPs), whereas hoia stems cannot:

30) Fona
   fona
   PN.PROX.sgm
   This is the year.
   masiv hin.
   masiv hin
   year(m) 3sgmEFOC

31) *Hona
   hona
   MOD.PROX.sgm
   masiv hin.
   masiv hin
   year 3sgmEFOC

Sentences with a hoia stem as sole member of an NP are consistently rejected in elicitation. Note however that such constructions do occur in texts; in a text there would be understood to be an ellipsed head here. However the fact that such constructions cannot occur in elicited speech suggests that without context the construction is not grammatical. A possible account of this is that NPs in which hoia stems appear to be the sole member of the NP involve ellipsis.

Note that the difference between sentences such as (28) and (30) is that (28) is a very strong, emphatic statement; the speaker is telling the story of when a big cyclone came to the islands, and trying to recall the exact year when it happened. Example (30) is a much less marked way of saying this.

Further, foia cannot modify nouns:

32) Ali hoina
   ali hoina
   man MOD.MED.sgm
   Look at that man.
   ngolem.
   ngo- le -m
   2sg- see -sgm

33) *Ali foina
   ali foina
   man PN.MED.sgm
   ngolem.
   ngo- le -m
   2sg- see -sgm

Structures do occur in which a noun is followed directly by either a foia or hoia stem. However, such structures, while appearing identical on the surface, actually are fundamentally different; and in fact have different meanings derivable from this different fundamental structure:

34) Ali hona.
   ali hona
   man(m) MOD.PROX.sgm
   This man.
In example (34) the hoia stem is modifying the noun ali 'man'. Under the analysis proposed here, the whole is an NP; with head noun and demonstrative modifier. Example (35) is, in contrast, a predication, as the translation indicates. It is a verbless sentence consisting of two NPs, ali na and fona. The position in which the definite article can occur is significant. Definite articles are always the final element of the NP in which they appear (see Section 4.1.2).

Thus, there are syntactic and morphological differences between the hoia stems and foia stems which require them to be clearly distinguished at some level. Foia stems can freely be NP heads, while hoia stems cannot out of context, in situations where ellipsis cannot be involved. Foia stems cannot modify nouns; whereas hoia stems usually do. Different syntactic distribution is a criterion for different word classes. For these reasons, it makes descriptive sense to regard foia stems as demonstrative pronouns, and hoia stems as demonstrative modifiers.

8.7 OIA

8.7.1 FORM

The forms of the oia deictic are shown in the following paradigm. Note that the forms are identical to those of the demonstrative pronoun foia and demonstrative modifier hoia, except for the lack of initial consonant. Note also that the oia stem only has two degrees of distance, proximal and medial; unlike the foia and hoia stems, the oia stem has no distal forms. In fact, the proximal degree is marginal; only the singular neuter proximal form appears in the corpus, and attempts at elicitation of other proximal forms were unsuccessful. In fact, the singular neuter oga form was rejected in elicitation by some speakers, even though I have recorded it in use by others.
oia 'the other one'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PROXIMAL</th>
<th>MEDIAL(^1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Masc</td>
<td>- oina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fem</td>
<td>- oia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neut</td>
<td>oga oiga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DU</td>
<td>Masc</td>
<td>- oinala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fem</td>
<td>- oial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neut</td>
<td>- oigala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td></td>
<td>- oiva</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.7.2 Functions

Oia is another demonstrative pronoun, with much more restricted circumstances of use than the more general foia. It is used only for tracking (making reference to usually major participants in order to keep track of them throughout a narrative). But within this general tracking function, oia has a specific domain of usage. It is used to refer to an entity who is not the most activated one at the moment of speech. In practice, this means that someone who was in the conversation some short time ago will be referred to using oia, to mean 'the one who I talked about before'. In narratives, oia is used most commonly to reactivate a non-activated participant.

In this description, Chafe's (1987; 1994, especially pp. 53-56 and Chapter 6) notion of activation is used\(^2\). He distinguishes between three levels of activation. That is, out of all the many concepts people have in their minds at any one time,

\[\text{an active concept is one that is currently lit up, a concept in a person's focus of consciousness. A semi-active concept is one that is in a person's peripheral consciousness, a concept of which a person has a background awareness, but which is not being directly focused on. An inactive concept is one that is currently in a person's long-term memory, neither focally nor peripherally active. (1987: 25)}\]

Activation is a matter of degree. An entity, once active, gradually loses its active status over time. Lavukaleve neatly encapsulates the degree of activatedness of a pronoun

---

\(^1\) The terms 'Proximal' and 'Medial' are not so immediately relevant for the oia demonstrative, but are retained because of morphological parallels with the foia and hoia demonstratives.

\(^2\) This term 'activation' is borrowed from discourse analysis and psycholinguistics, in order to describe the semantic-pragmatic functions of the oia pronoun, especially with respect to how it differs from foia. But in using the term, I do not necessarily subscribe to all the theoretical concerns of the area from which the term is taken. I only use the concept with respect to reference tracking; the wider implications of activation in the language are not dealt with here.
referent with the distinction between foia and oia. Foia is used to refer anaphorically to participants which have become somewhat less activated; these are semi-active entities, in Chafe’s terms. It is used in situations in which there is more than one main participant, essentially to switch activation between participants. Chafe makes the point that more than one entity cannot be activated at any one time. As one entity is activated, another loses its activation. Oia makes overt the change in activation levels caused by the switch of attention between participants.

Some examples should make this clearer. In the following excerpt, there are two sets of participants: a boy and a group of giants. The oia stem is used when the speaker switches attention between the two sets of participants. In the first sentence, the giants are the active participant. In the second, the first clause is a head-tail linkage clause, with the giants still as active participant. Oina is then used to switch activation from the giants back to the boy (who were last heard about two sentences back as lying in wait for the giants). So the boy is now the active participant, and the activation of the giants recedes. The third sentence starts with a similar head-tail linkage, with the boy still as active participant, then oiva is used to switch activation back to the giants. The giants then become the active participant of the next few clauses (slashes indicate pauses on even pitch in the next examples).

36) Lelaol loelakoge, bagatumaul va vov.
lelaol lo- e- lako -ge bagatum -aul va vo -v
two.f 3dufO- SBD- cry -ANT male.giant -pl plArt come -pl

Two o'clock sounding, the giants came.

Voevoge, oina / fiata la one fufum.
vo- e- vo -ge oina / fiata la o- ne fufu -m
3plO- SBD- come-ANT other.MED.sgm / thunder(f) sgfArt 3sgfO- with lie.down-sgm

Them coming, he (the other one) lay with his gun.

Fufure aemege, kini
fufu -re a- e- me -ge kini
lie.down -NF 3sgmO- SBD- continue -ANT ACT

oiva eraula hano vokila
oiva erau -la hano vo- ki -la
other.MED.pl fall -EXT then 3plO- shoot -EXT

laemege vokila laemege hano.
lama- e- me -ge vo- ki -la la- e- me -ge hano
3sgmO- SBD- HAB -ANT 3plO- shoot-EXT 3sgmO-SBD- HAB -ANT then

He stayed lying down, then they (the other ones) all landed and [he] kept on shooting them [as they landed].

Kiure lov.
kiu -re lo -v
die -NF finish -pl

They all died.
Similarly, consider the following sentence, from a story about two brothers.

37)  Oina / vuli mem na / 
oina / vuli me -m na / 
other.MED.sgm / behind SPEC -sgm sgmArt / 
okala la one / ofeu 
o- kala la o- ne / o- feu 
3sgPOSS- mother(f) sgfArt 3sgfO- with / 3sgS- go.up 
aka nikol mem na aka oina vau / 
aka nikol me -m na aka oina vau / 
then first SPEC -sgm sgmArt then other.MED.sgm go.out / 
fo’sal va vokurune / 
fo’sal va vo- kuru -ne / 
fish (pl) plArt 3plO- hit -IMPF / 

He (the other one) - the younger one - went up [to the bush] with his mother, then the older one, he (the other one) went out catching fish

The following excerpt comes a little later in the same story. The older brother goes out hunting with his mother, the younger brother stays at home, and then the older brother comes back and refuses to give the younger boy any food:

38)  Vaure, vokurure, koi akari / 
vau -re vo- kuru -re koi aka -ri / 
go.out -NF 3plO- hit -NF also then -PSNV / 
nikol mem na akari tin omuan tin. 
nikol me -m na aka -ri tin o- muan tin 
first SPEC -sgm sgmArt then -PSNV only 3sgPOSS- self only 

Going out, they (the mother and oldest boy) killed [fish], and again the older boy did the same thing; [ate] by himself.

Oina / ngoane. 
oina / ngoa -ne 
other.MED.sgm / stay -IMPF 

He (the other one) just stayed.

Voula leim fin. 
vo- u -la lei -m fin 
3plO- eat -NEG exist -sgm 3sgmFOC 

He didn’t eat them [the fish].

Kini hauvele / oina 
kini hau -vele / oina 
ACT go.ashore -SUCCE / other.MED.sgm 
volaire / ta hi lome. 
vo- lai -re / ta hi lo- me 
3plO- disallow -NF / just do/say 3sgS- HAB 

When he came ashore, he (the other one) disallowed [the fish] [to the younger boy].
As a further example, consider the following abridged excerpt, from a story about a group of people who steal food from another village, and have a trick played on them in retaliation. Oiva is used to switch activation between the participants, the two groups of people. In the final sentence, note the use of oina to switch activation from one man to another.

(\textit{The people who the story is about went to another village and stole some food.})

\begin{verbatim}
39) Oiva le ga eveage,
oiva other.MED.pl le ga e- e- vea -ge
taman losiv va otinav.
voekakomeon taman losiv va otinav.
3p1O- SBD- look.out but basket -pl plArt be.empty -pl

They (the other ones) (i.e. the owners of the stolen food) next day looked out but the baskets were empty.

"Sala! Ami ta / ui ga eum hin?"
sala ami ta / ui ga e- u -m hin
hey! who(m) just / food(n) sgnArt 3sgnO- eat -sgm 3sgmEFOC

"Hey! Who ate our food?"

Mangoae foiga\(^3\). ma-ngoae -e foiga
3p1S- stay -NOMZR PN.MED.sgn

That was their way.

Akari fi, siane mangoare / lalu eine.
aka -ri fi sia -ne ma-ngoae -re / lalu e- i -ne
then -PSNV 3sgnFOC do -IMPF 3p1S- stay -NF / stealing 3sgnO- do -IMPF

It was like that, they lived by stealing.

Akari sianun ta fi aka,
aka -ri sia -nun ta fi aka
then -PSNV do -DUR just 3sgnFOC then

olva / mina / na’nug roa amalugu.
olva / mina / na’nug roa a- ma- lugu
other.MED.pl / um / thought(m) one.sgm 3sgmO- 3p1S- think

It went on like that, then they (the others) (i.e. the owners of the stolen food), had a thought.

("Hey, let’s do something." They took suta shells and mangrove crabs and other crabs and things like that that bite people. They took them, they brought them to their houses, and after they had eaten, everyone put some of these things in their food baskets. They put them in, then they slept.)
\end{verbatim}
They slept and slept and slept, then they (the others) said "Let's go!"

(They went to steal.)

One [man] went to the house, put his hand in a basket, and something bit him. "Ow!"
then when he said it, he (the other man, i.e. the house owner) got up and killed him. jn 041-052

This last use of oina is interesting. Usually, the oia pronoun is used to reactiviate a previously activated participant, but here there is a use of oia apparently as the first mention of a participant. However, even though this is the first mention of the house owner, his existence has been implied. He is one of those people who in the previous sentence had put crabs and so on into baskets. So the use of oina reactivates him as an active participant, even though he is in actuality only one of the group who was active previously. Following Chafe’s analysis one could say that the man is active through belonging to the “set of expectations associated with a schema”. That is,

[when] a schema has been evoked in a narrative, some if not all of the expectations of which it is constituted presumably enter then semi-active state. From that point on, they are more accessible to recall than they would have been as inactive concepts. (1987: 29)

This is the reason that oia is used in the last sentence of the above extract.

8.7.3 Oia in Typological Perspective

It is important to point out that oia is not simply a contrastive pronoun. Its function is not to contrast one entity with another; or to pick out one entity from a group of
referents. Fillmore (1982: 54) mentions a deictic in Bakwiri, used for what he calls “serial order”, generally translatable as ‘the other’. This is not the function of oia in Lavukaleve. Oia is not used for listing or contrasting two or more elements. For this function, ro ‘one’ is used (see Section 4.1.2 for a discussion of ro), thus ro...ro means ‘one...the other’. The gloss used here for oia, ‘other’, is not a translation but rather an attempt to capture some aspects of this rather complex pragmatic function in one English word.

Similarly, the function of oia is not the same as Nunggubuyu’s contrastive pronoun. Nunggubuyu has a pronoun which is used as follows:

It specifies, roughly, a switch from one topic to a new one (from the preceding clause to the one containing the Contrastive pronoun). One particularly appropriate discourse frame is that consisting of two adjacent clauses involving distinct referents performing parallel activities, particularly when these activities differ in one focal feature. A gloss such as ‘X, on the other hand, ...’ is semantically appropriate... Another important frame is role reversal, with the same verb as in the preceding clause, but with subject and object roles reversed. (Heath 1983: 135)

Nunggubuyu’s contrastive pronoun operates in the same general discourse area as Lavukaleve’s oia, but clearly its use is different.

Lavukaleve’s foia/oia pronoun distinction is functionally somewhat similar to a pronoun system reported for Kaulong (Ross, forthc.), an Oceanic language of New Britain. Kaulong has three sets of third person pronouns, one neutral, one for identical-reference and one for switch-reference. Lavukaleve’s foia/oia distinction could be thought of as a switch-reference system, but it has important differences. It is not grammaticalised to the degree which systems described in these terms are. Switch-reference systems are usually syntactically-controlled, to the extent that the use of the switch or identical marker depends entirely on the syntactic environment of the reference, whether that is a clause or a sentence or something else. Lavukaleve’s system is not grammaticalised to this extent; the environment of use of the oia pronoun cannot be described in morpho-syntactic terms, but rather must be described in terms of pragmatics, based on some notion of what the speaker is thinking. If one were to describe it as a switch-reference system, one would still have to rely on some notion of activation, or some other pragmatic account, to explain the environments of its use.

The third person/fourth person (or proximate/obviate) pronoun distinction in Athapaskan languages is also in a similar discourse area as oia, but with important differences. In Blackfoot, for instance, if there are two or more animate nouns in the same sentence, one must be cross-referenced as proximate (major third person), one as obviate (minor third person) (Frantz 1991: 11-12). The speaker can choose which is which, based on which is preferred as the more prominent participant in the discourse. In Slave (Rice 1989), the conditions for using third versus fourth person are more complicated, and depend on the syntactic role of each participant, humanness,
agentivity, degree of control and so on. But in both languages, the fourth person is used when there is already a third person referent within the same sentence. Lavukaleve’s oia pronoun differs from this kind of system, not only in that it is not as grammaticalised, but also in that sentence boundaries are not relevant for oia. In addition, as I understand it, 3rd/4th person assignment is fixed throughout a section of discourse; the speaker chooses which referent is to be which and they remain that way. Oia, however, is often used for alternately referring to different entities. Lastly, oia can be used, even when no other competing participant has been mentioned, to mean something like ‘that one from before (who you might have forgotten about)’. This is quite different from the fourth person function in Athapaskan languages.

8.7.4 OIA AND FOIA

While both foia and oia are demonstrative pronouns, the essential difference between them is that oia is used specifically for the purposes of reactivation, whereas foia is used for already-active entities. Most commonly, foia is used to refer to an entity mentioned in the same or a recent intonation unit, either resumptively or not:

40) Ae falere aekakomeon
ae fale -re a- e- kako -meon
go.up stand -NF 3sgmO- SBD- look.out -SURP
ta tagio ru la foia fufurene.
ta tagio ru la foia fufu -re -ne
just snake(f) big.sgf sgfArt PN.MED.sgf lie.down -NF -IMPF

He stood up, looked around, and the big snake, it was lying there.

41) Hona akari akari siare mi ruia oma
hona aka -ri aka -ri sia -re mi ria o- ma
MOD.PROX.sgm then -PSNV then -PSNV do -NF um old.woman(f) 3sgfO- take
foia onal kini kiure olei.
foia o- nal kini kiu -re o- lei
PN.MED.sgf 3sgfO- because ACT die -NF 3sgS- exist

That’s why this man took an old woman and because of it she [i.e. the old woman] died.
8.7.5 MORPHO-SYNTACTIC PROPERTIES OF OIA

Oia is a head, not a modifier, so the following construction is impossible:

43) * Marigen ali oina alem fin.
   marigen ali oina a- le -m fin
   yesterday man(m) other.MED.sgm 1sgS- see -sgm 3sgmFOC

   Yesterday I saw that man.  
   e1 068e/1

Compare the demonstrative hoina in this position:

44) Marigen ali hoina alem fin.
   marigen ali hoina a- le -m fin
   yesterday man(m) MOD.MED.sgm 1sgS- see -sgm 3sgmFOC

   Yesterday I saw that man.  
   e1 068e/2

Oia can be modified by a relative clause, unlike foia (and hoia) (see Section 16.3):

45) Kini evoge oiva
   kini e- e- vo -ge oiva
   ACT 3sgnO- SBD- come -ANT other.MED.pl

   soiv va hoika tam enga ve.
   soi -v va hoika tam enga ve -e
   run.away -pl plArt there.MED man(m) three go -NOMZR

   It coming, then those who ran away were three men.  
   jn 145

It was shown above that first and second person pronouns and the demonstrative pronoun foia can function resumptively, in juxtaposition and agreement with an NP. This is not possible for oia, but it is interesting to note that oia itself can be the NP for which foia is the resumptive pronoun:
In examples like this, *oia* is used to refer to a semi-active entity, then *foia* is used, resumptively, to refer to it once it has been reactivated.

*Oia*, then, is a demonstrative pronoun used to refer to a participant which has become semi-activated. *Foia* is a demonstrative pronoun used to refer to an activated participant. Reference to the distinction between an activated and a semi-activated participant has been grammaticalised in Lavukaleve, but there is no pronoun grammaticalised for reference to an inactive participant. This is because pronouns are not used for inactive participants; they are only used for participants which are at least partially activated in the minds of hearers (Chafe 1987: 26; Dryer 1996: 481).

Syntactically, *oia* is like the demonstrative pronoun *foia* in that it is a head, but, unlike *foia*, it can be modified by a relative clause, and it can itself take *foia* as a resumptive pronoun. Morphologically, *oia* is like *hoia* (taking -ri and -o/om/v) rather than *foia* (which doesn’t take -ri and -o/om/v). All three take the Group suffixes -sa/-ha.

### 8.8 SUMMARY OF PRONOUNS AND DEMONSTRATIVES

Personal pronouns are for first and second person only. There are two paradigms of demonstrative pronouns, *foia* and *oia*, which differ in terms of the discourse activation...
of their referent; and there is a demonstrative modifier hoia.

There are no third person pronouns in Lavukaleve, although foia and oia are possible candidates. Himmelmann (1996: 211-215) provides a methodology for distinguishing third person pronouns from demonstratives, but even he admits that it is difficult to apply, and certainly my data does not contain such examples as would be necessary for a rigorous distinction to be made. Foia and oia are considered demonstrative pronouns here rather than personal pronouns largely because they are marked for degrees of distance (even though only marginally in the case of oia). The grammatical category of distance is more usually associated with demonstratives than with personal pronouns.

8.9 LOCATIVE DEICTICS

There is a rich proliferation of locative deictics in Lavukaleve. One set of these is based on the form ka, with various vowel and consonant alternations making a total of nine different forms. There are also a few locative deictics not based on ka. The forms can be divided into sets of alternating paradigms, based on possibilities of morphological affixation, parallels with other deictic paradigms, and sets of minimally contrasting forms.

The locative deictics are as follows:

- **hoka** ‘here, proximal’
- **hoika** ‘there, medial’
- **heaka** ‘there, distal 1’
- **hoaka** ‘there, distal 2’
- **koka**–oka ‘far’
- **uke** ‘near’
- **aka** ‘then’, ‘thus’, ‘so’, ‘and’, ‘next’, etc.
- **ika** ‘there, unmarked’
- **ka** locational emphatic
- **gala–igala** ‘there’

Koka, oka, aka and ika share with hoka/hoika/heaka/hoaka the ability to occur with the Presentative -ri and Predicative -o/om/v (see Section 8.10.3). The other locative deictics cannot take any morphology.

They all function in a similar way, as sentence-level adverbal modifiers, i.e. syntactically adjuncts. The only exception is hoka/hoika/heaka/hoaka, which can also occasionally occur inside an NP.
8.9.1 HOKA, HOIKA, HEAKA, HOAKA

Hoka, hoika, heaka and hoaka form a morphological paradigm based on changing medial vowels, which serves to mark three degrees of distance, plus a fourth, unspecified but distal category. The system is the same as that described from the f/h/oia stems above, both in terms of form and function. Presumably the historical origin of these forms is the demonstrative modifier hoia plus locative emphatic ka.

Some examples:

49) Mima hona Kiolen ngoa mem fin, ngai hoka.
Mima hona Kiolen ngoa me -m fin ngai hoka
Mima MOD.PROX.sgm Kiolen stay HAB -sgm 3sgmFOC 1sg here.PROX

This Mima (m) lives at Kiolen, me here.

50) "Ngane mem foina ae falel hoika lei-m."
nga- ne me -m foina ae fale -l hoika lei-m
1sgO- with SPEC-sgm PN.MED.sgm go.up stand -LOCZR there.MED exist-sgm

"My brother, he lives up there."

51) Vegoa heaka nun fi negore ovo.
vego -a heaka nun fi nego-re o- vo
east -INTR there.DISTI from 3sgnFOC float -NF 3sgS- come

It floated from over there in the east.

52) Gosu na fin ane nikol Banik hoaka ongoa.
Gosu na fin a- ne nikol Banik hoaka o- ngoa
Gosu(m) sgmArt 3sgmFOC 3sgmO- with first Banika there.DIST2 3sgS- stay

It was with Gosu that she first stayed way over there at Banika.

MORPHOLOGICAL AND SYNTACTIC FEATURES

These locative deictics usually appear with a noun referring to a location, which states overtly the specific location to which they refer, typically immediately after it. See for example (51) and (52) above, and the following:

53) Aka Lavukalen hoka marai mem na
aka Lavukale -n hoka marai me -m na
then Russell.Is. -LOC here.PROX warrior(m) SPEC -sgm sgmArt

olang fi Todou.
o- langi fi Todou
3sgPOSS- name(n) 3sgnFOC Todou(m)

So here in the Russells there was a warrior, his name was Todou.

They can also appear before the noun:

177
8.9.2 **Koka–oka 'far'**

These two locative deictics mean 'far'. The two forms are generational alternants. Older speakers prefer *oka*, while younger speakers prefer *koka*. Note that this initial *k-o* generational-based alternation also exists in *kini-ini* (see Section 3.17.9). The alternate forms mean exactly the same thing; there is simply a preference for one form or the other, depending on the age of the speaker.

While the locative deictics just discussed, *hoka-hoika-heaka-hoaka*, point to a particular place which is usually further specified by a locational noun, *koka* and *oka* just give an indication of distance. *Koka–oka* can appear in any adjunct position in the sentence.

Note that *hoka* 'here' described in the previous section has a strong formal similarity to *koka–oka*. One might expect that *hoka* could be polysemous; that it could also mean 'near', in parallel with the *koka–oka* 'far' meanings. This, however, is not the case. *Hoka* can never mean 'near'. This meaning is expressed by *uke* 'near' (see below).

Some examples of *koka* and *oka*:

55) Efela'koe  ga  koi  koka  fi  olei.
    e-  fela’koe  ga  koi  koka  fi  o-  lei.
1pl.exPOSS- village(n) sgnArt also far 3sgnFOC 3sgS- exist

*Our village was a long way away.*

56) "Fagi  koka  lei  heaga  enam  nun!"
    fagi  koka  lei  -o  heaga  e-  nam  nun
    island(n) far exist -sgn MOD.DIST1.sgn 3sgnO- to from

*(Where is that canoe from?) "From that island far away!"*

57) Kini  kulukulumal  vokinun  vokinun
    kini  kuluku  -mal  vo-  ki  -nun  vo-  ki  -nun
    ACT  pigeon  -pl  3plO- shoot -DUR 3plO- shoot -DUR

    vokila  kini  oka  osia.
    vo-  ki  -la  kini  oka  o-  sia
    3plO- shoot -EXT ACT far 3sgS- do

*He went shooting pigeons, on and on, and reached far away.*
8. DEICTICS

58) Soi fi lome. Oka mail.
soi fi lo- me oka mail
run.away 3sgnFOC 3sgS- HAB far a.bit

He runs away. Quite far away.

Note that there are some examples of koka-oka and heaka co-occurring in a sentence:

59) Heaka heaka oka oka mev va
heaka heaka oka oka me -v va
there.DIST1 there.DIST1 far far SPEC-pl plArt

(He sent word to the people) Everywhere, all those from faraway places

60) Velanun velanun velanun velanun ini oka heaka.
vela -nun vela -nun vela -nun vela -nun ini oka heaka
go -DUR go -DUR go -DUR go -DUR ACT far there.DIST1

(He follows them) They go go go far away over there.

Note also example (56) above with the demonstrative modifier heaga. The co-occurrence of koka-oka with Distal 1 demonstratives and locative deictics suggests that they fall into a similar distance range.

8.9.3 UKE 'NEAR'

Uke 'near' belongs in the same semantic set as koka-oka. It is an uninflecting locative deictic:

61) Lefela'koe lefela'koe ga uke tamu.
le- fela'koe ga uke tamu
1duexPOSS- village(n) sgnArt near no

Our village is not close.

Oka tuna ta olei. Lefela'koe ga.
koka tuna ta o- lei le- fela'koe ga
far really just 3sgS- exist 1duexPOSS- village(n) sgnArt

It is far away, our village.

62) "Fova mekelein leiv. Uke leiv hova."
fova me- kelei -n lei -v uke lei -v hova
PN.PROX.pl 1pl.in- near -LOC exist-pl near exist -pl MOD.PROX.pl

"They're close to us. These [ones] are close."

8.9.4 AKA 'THEN'

The word aka 'then, next, so, etc.' can take the Presentative -ri and Predicative -o/om/v. Aka (always glossed as 'then') usually serves as a clause-introducer, with a meaning like 'and', 'so', 'thus', 'then', 'next', and so on. (See also Sections 15.4.6 and
18.1.3, where *aka* is mentioned in its capacity as a coordinating conjunction.) Strictly speaking, of course, *aka* is not a locative deictic; it does not refer to location at all. However, it is a deictic, and on formal and morphological grounds it is useful to consider it in this section.

63) Ongoa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ongoa</th>
<th>telako</th>
<th>koi</th>
<th>felere</th>
<th>koi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o-ngoae</td>
<td>telako</td>
<td>koi</td>
<td>felere</td>
<td>koi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sgS-stay</td>
<td>-NOMZ</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>also</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Losiole</td>
<td>hoka</td>
<td>ini</td>
<td>foalam</td>
<td>fin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Losiole</td>
<td>ini</td>
<td>foa</td>
<td>-la</td>
<td>-m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Losiole</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>go.down</td>
<td>-NEG</td>
<td>-sgm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Losiole</td>
<td>3sgmFOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Kolo] stays, and he doesn’t go back down here to Losiole.

Aka Mofe ne Okali honala ta hoka

aka Mofe ne Okali honala ta hoka

then Mofe with Okali MOD.PROX.dum just here.PROX

ngaomal hinala Losiole. n

nga -mal hinala Losiole -n

stay -du 3dumEFOC Losiole -LOC

Then Mofe and Okali stay here at Losiole.

64) aira la raul tuna ta navalia lome.

aira la raul tuna ta navalia lo-

woman(f) sgfArt really really just fast 3sgS- HAB

... the woman really and truly fasted.

Aka koi, hano mina o-omi mamea ro,

aka koi hano mina o- mi ma- me -a ro

then also then thing(f) 3sgfO- make 3pIs-HAB -sgf one.sgF

mavalav vosu mame.

ma-vala v -v vo-su ma- me

3pIPOSS- belly -pl 3pI-O-tie 3pI-S- HAB

Then too, one thing which they did before, they tied their bellies.

65) Akariom

aka -ri -om tin fi

then -PSNV -m/n only 3sgmFOC

It’s just like that.

IKA ‘THERE’

The meaning of *ika* is more elusive than *aka*. It too can take Presentative -ri and Predicative -o/om/v. It seems to be yet another locative deictic, with meaning of ‘there’ in its very broadest sense. It seems to be an unmarked form, in that it contains absolutely no information about distance or location. All it says it that the thing or situation to which it refers had an existence in space (either physical, for things, or conceptual, for situations). It is often used with the intransitive verb lei ‘exist’ to say
that a thing had a physical existence. It is also often used to refer to a whole situation, rather than a concrete entity. **Ika** can also take the Extended suffix -la (see below, Section 8.10.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>66</th>
<th><strong>Foiga</strong></th>
<th><strong>oa’vuri</strong></th>
<th><strong>ika</strong></th>
<th><strong>legis</strong></th>
<th><strong>ana</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>foiga</td>
<td>o-</td>
<td>a’vuri</td>
<td>ika</td>
<td>legis</td>
<td>a-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PN.MED.sgn** 3sgPOSS- parcel(m) there leaf(n) 3sgmO- in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>fafanem</strong></th>
<th><strong>hi</strong></th>
<th><strong>mamem</strong></th>
<th>na</th>
<th><strong>ika</strong></th>
<th><strong>tamu</strong></th>
<th><strong>fi</strong></th>
<th><strong>olei.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fafanem</td>
<td>hi</td>
<td>ma-</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>-m</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>ika</td>
<td>tamu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

leaf.sp(m) do/say 3plS- HAB -sgm sgmArt there no 3sgnFOC 3sgS- exist

*He tried to parcel them, but the leaf they call fafanem, there wasn’t any.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Legis</strong></th>
<th><strong>munu</strong></th>
<th>o</th>
<th><strong>aka</strong></th>
<th><strong>mev</strong></th>
<th><strong>ta</strong></th>
<th><strong>ika</strong></th>
<th><strong>leiv.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>legis</td>
<td>munu</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>aka</td>
<td>-ri</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>-v</td>
<td>ta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

leaf(n) leaf.sp(m) and then -PSNV SPEC -pl just there exist -pl

*There were just munu leaf, and everything like that.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>67</th>
<th><strong>&quot;O! Roa ika tamu&quot; hivel.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o roa</td>
<td>ika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oh</td>
<td>one.sgm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Oh! There’s no-one there" he said.

8.9.5 **KA ‘LOCATIVE EMPHATIC’**

The word **ka** acts as an emphatic marker for locational nouns and other nominal adjuncts. It occurs immediately after a nominal adjunct or locativised verb, or the particle **hano** ‘then’. It means ‘right then’, ‘right at that place’ and so on. Some examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>68</th>
<th><strong>Hano</strong></th>
<th><strong>ka</strong></th>
<th><strong>ta</strong></th>
<th><strong>vala</strong></th>
<th><strong>foina</strong></th>
<th><strong>tunam</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hano</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>vala</td>
<td>foina</td>
<td>tuna</td>
<td>-m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

then LOCEMPH but how PN.MED.sgm be.really -sgm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>mamina</strong></th>
<th><strong>heo,</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ma-</td>
<td>mina</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3plPOSS- thing(f) 3sgfEFOC

*But right then, that (fish poison[m]) was really their thing*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>69</th>
<th><strong>Aka</strong></th>
<th><strong>ana</strong></th>
<th><strong>lain</strong></th>
<th><strong>ka</strong></th>
<th><strong>vatu</strong></th>
<th><strong>roge</strong></th>
<th>fi</th>
<th><strong>lei.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aka</td>
<td>a-</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>lai</td>
<td>-n</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>vatu</td>
<td>roge</td>
<td>fi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

then 3sgmO- in top -LOC LOCEMPH head(n) one.sgn 3sgnFOC exist

*Then right on top of it (the rock) there is one skull.*
Ngiure ae falel ka ngoanun ngoanun ta
hide -NF go.up stand -LOCZR LOCEMPH stay -DUR stay -DUR time(m)

They were hiding right up there, then this one who owned the arrow, [he said] "Man!"  ja 242

8.9.6 GALA – IGALA 'THERE'

These two words are extremely rare in the corpus; there are no more than a handful of examples of each. They both are similar to ika 'there', discussed above, in that they seem to refer to an unspecified location; perhaps simply referring, like ika, to the fact that an entity has an existence in space. It is possible that igala and gala are variants of the same form. See in particular example (72) below, where both forms are used in close succession. It is also possible that gala-igala are themselves both variants of ika 'there', plus the Extended suffix -la, which is discussed below (Section 8.10.2).

71) Vau igala keleane ngoa voemege
vau igala kelea -ne ngoa vo- e- me -ge
go.out there walk -IMPF stay 3plO- SBD- HAB -ANT

They go out there, they paddle all around ja 089

72) Vuvurane igala keleanun keleanun
vuvura -ne igala kelea -nun kelea -nun
go.all.about -IMPF there walk -DUR walk -DUR
dani ga ekige, elere,
dani ga e- e- ki -ge e- le -re
dawn(n) sgnArt 3sgnO- SBD- dawn -ANT 3sgnO- see -NF
malav va mafan ika
malav va ma- fan ika
people plArt 3plPOSS- some there
volufure o'asene gala kini vau mao.
vo- lufu -re o'as -ne gala kini vau ma- ao
3plO- leave -NF bush -PERL there ACT go.out 3plS- go.in

They go all about there, go on and on, then dawn comes, they see day coming, they leave some people there, the rest go out there from the bush and get in [the canoe].   jn 163

73) Nerealav gala keleanun keleanun
nera -la -v gala kelea -nun kelea -nun
be.close -EXT-pl there walk -DUR walk -DUR
ta aka kafol roa aole.
ta aka kafol roa a- o- le
just then mangrove.crab(m) one.sgm 3sgmO- 3sgS- see

He went close to shore there, then he saw a mangrove crab. co 018
They go up through the bush, there are no gardens there.  

(Through the middle of the grass there.)

8.10 MORPHOLOGY OF DEICTICS

There are four suffixes applicable to deictics. Three of these, the Group, Presentative and Predicative suffixes can only apply to deictics. Each suffix applies to just a subset of all deictics. The morphology is set out here, together with an indication of which deictics it can occur with. The rest of this section describes each suffix in more detail:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MORPHOLOGICAL AFFIX</th>
<th>ON WHICH DEICTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Group -sa, -ha        | foia ‘she, etc.’  
oia ‘the other’  
hoia ‘this’  
(also on first/second person pronouns) |
| Extended -la          | hoka/hoika/heaka ‘here/there/there far’  
koka–oka ‘far’  
i ka ‘there’  
hoia ‘this’  
(also on verbs) |
| Presentative -ri and  | hoia ‘this’  
oia ‘the other’  
aka ‘then’  
i ka ‘there’  
hoka/hoika/heaka ‘here/there/there, far’  
igala ‘there’ |
| Predicative -o/om/v   |                                                                                  |

8.10.1 THE GROUP SUFFIXES -SA AND -HA

The suffixes -sa (glossed as GROUP) and -ha (GROUP.f) can appear on non-singular first and second person pronouns, as well as on foia/hoia/oia stems, to indicate that the referents of the word are viewed by the speaker as a unified group. They are only used with reference to humans. The -ha suffix marks a group consisting only of feminine
referents, and the -sa suffix marks a group irrespective of the gender of its members: that is, a group marked by -sa can consist either of only masculine referents, or of masculine and feminine referents, or of only feminine referents. The feminine Group suffix -ha is much less common then the non-gendered suffix -sa. The suffixes are optional, and indeed occur only rarely. The Group suffix -sa has also been found on the particle bae–bai ‘let’s go’. Some examples of the Group suffixes:

76) "Man tunam hin imisa fe?"
man tuna -m hin imi -sa fe
what(m) be.really -sgm 3sgmEFOC 2pl -GROUP even

"What’s so great, you lot?"

77) Aka hovasariom voemege ngai
aka hova -sa -ri -om vo-e-me -ge ngai
then MOD.PROX.pl -GROUP -PSNV -m/n 3plO- SBD- continue -ANT 1sg
ini vone hau a-hoi.
invo ne hau a-hoi
ACT 3plO- with go ashore 1sgS- go in

These ones [this lot] went on, then I joined in with them.

78) Foare fovasa vela mev.
foa -re fova -sa vela me -v
go.down -NF PN.PROX.pl -GROUP go HAB -pl

They go down, they all go.

Vala! Galeng magroup la kekerav tavev fiv!
vala galeng ma-group la kekerav -v tavev -v fiv
how boys 3plPOSS- group(f) sgfArt small -pl be.not -pl 3plFOC

My word! The group of boys is not small!

79) Kavukavu. Oivasa makav Lemi Rugi,
Dup- kavu oiva -sa ma- kavu lemi rugi
REDUP- group other.MED.pl -GROUP 3plPOSS- group(n) eye(n) big.sgn
Tau Sosona, Vala Rugi.
tau sosona -Ø vala rugi
limb(n) be.long -sgn belly(n) big.sgn

They divided into groups. Those in one group: Big Eye, Long Arm and Big Belly.

80) Aka ta honariom ana
aka ta hona -ri -om a-na
then time(m) MOD.PROX.sgm -PSNV -m/n 3sgmO- in
inha ini tam vona soa esia.
inha ini tam vo-na soa e-sia
1pl.ex -GROUP.f ACT number(pl) 3plO- in seven 1pl.ex- do

At that time, we [in our group] were seven in number.

Contrast this example with the following, from the same story, talking about the same group of people, a group of women who started the Mother’s Union in a particular
village. In the above example, the group of women is referred to using the female group suffix -ha. In the next example, however, the same group of women is referred to using the other, ungendered Group suffix -sa:

81) **Hoikariom**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hoika</th>
<th>-ri</th>
<th>-om</th>
<th>esa</th>
<th>-sa</th>
<th>ini</th>
<th>tam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>there.MED</td>
<td>-PSNV</td>
<td>-m/n</td>
<td>1pl.ex</td>
<td>-GROUP</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vona</td>
<td>kanal</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>enga</td>
<td>e-</td>
<td>sia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3plO-</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>twenty</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>three</td>
<td>lpl.ex-</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*From there, we [our group] became 23 in number.*

8.10.2 **The Extended Suffix -la**

The Extended suffix -la is added to the locative deictics hoka/hoika/heaka ‘here/there/there, far’ (but not hoaka ‘there, far unspecified’); koka-oka ‘far’; ika ‘there’ and the demonstrative modifier hoia ‘this’. Added to hoia ‘this’ it creates a word meaning ‘this way’. Added to hoka/hoika/heaka, ika and koka-oka, it creates a word meaning ‘from here/there/ etc.’. In other words, it indicates that the reference of the deictic is not a single point, as it usually is, but an extended range. It only occurs on deictics used in clauses with motion predicates. The name ‘extended’ is taken from the literature on Inuktitut (see e.g. Denny 1982: 360), where the term exists in opposition to ‘nonextended’, or ‘restricted’, and refers to “stretches or areas of space” rather than things located on one spot.

This suffix is also used on the interrogative ria ‘where’ to express a similar meaning (see Section 17.1.4); and on verbs, to indicate that the action is carried out all over the place, or again and again, that is, iteratively or distributively. See Section 12.4.5 for a discussion of its use with verbs.

82) **Heagala**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>heaga</th>
<th>-la</th>
<th>vaum.</th>
<th>vaum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOD.DIST1.sgn</td>
<td>-EXT</td>
<td>vau</td>
<td>-m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Where is the giant?) He went out that way.*

83) *(He grabbed it fully (taking it in his arms) and they rolled around wrestling, out to the sea.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hano</th>
<th>heagala</th>
<th>veomal.</th>
<th>veomal.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hano</td>
<td>heagala</td>
<td>veo</td>
<td>-mal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>then</td>
<td>MOD.DIST1.sgn</td>
<td>-EXT</td>
<td>arrive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The two went all over the place.*
84) Foare umua heakala ae lavea
go.down -NF under -sgf there.DIST1 -EXT go.up appear
oiga enata ae molev va mafoton
other.MED.sgn that.moment go.up canoes plArt 3plPOSS- middle-LOC

She goes way down there, then she comes up, in the middle of the canoes.

With ika ‘there’ the Extended suffix produces a word usually meaning ‘from there’:

85) (I have left that place he took me from, I’m staying up here. I have never stepped on the ground.)

Ikala loolo mola okolin
ika -la loolo mola o- koli -n
ta ame.
ta a- me
just 1sgS- continue

From there I came straight here in a canoe.

The word heagala, consisting of heaga ‘that’ plus Extended -la, often has an idiomatic meaning ‘everywhere’ (see also 82 and 83 above):

86) Ami inu okala vom ngomele
ami inu oka -la vo -m ngo- me -le
who(m) 2sg far -EXT come -sgm 2sg- continue -POT
Australia nun heagala vom ngomele...
Australia nun heaga -la vo -m ngo- me -le
Australia from MOD.DIST1.sgn -EXT come -sgm 2sg- continue -POT

Whoever you are, if you come from far away, from Australia, everywhere far, if you come...

8.10.3 THE PRESENTATIVE SUFFIX -RI AND THE PREDICATIVE SUFFIXES -O/-OM-V

The Presentative suffix -ri appears on demonstratives hoia ‘this’ and oia ‘the other’ (although not on foia ‘she’); and on the locative deictics hoka/hoika/heaka ‘here/there/there far’; aka ‘then, so, etc.’, ika ‘there’ and igala ‘there’. The Presentative suffix itself can be followed by the gender-marked Predicative suffixes -o (feminine) and -om (masculine/neuter). These suffixes derive predicative deictics from -ri forms. First the meaning of the Presentative suffix will be examined; after this is a discussion of the gender-marked Predicative suffixes.

The Presentative suffix -ri derives a presentative form of a deictic, something like the French voilà. Presentatives also occur in languages closer to the Solomons, for example in Maybrat, a West Papuan Phylum language (Dol 1998). Presentatives are described by Anderson and Keenan as demonstratives “which are used to indicate an item’s location or to signal its appearance in (or relative to) the observational field of the Sp[eaker]”
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(1985: 279). Fillmore's Sentential Demonstrative is essentially the same phenomenon as what is here described as a presentative demonstrative:

A Sentential Demonstrative ... is a demonstrative that can stand alone as a sentence, having what can be called a Presentative function. These are sentences whose meanings are something like 'Behold!' or maybe 'Look at this!'. Latin ecce, French voilà, Serbo-Croatian evo, are examples of Sentential Demonstratives. Often a noun or pronoun indicating the object being presented occurs in construction with a Sentential Demonstrative, as in French Le voilà, Serbo-Croatian Evo ga, both meaning 'Here he is'. (1982: 47)

This is the most common pragmatic function of Lavukaleve's Presentative suffix. There are a couple of other related functions associated with this suffix. If a deictic is used on its own as a single-word utterance, as, for instance, the answer to a question where? or how?, it must appear with the Presentative suffix. For example, in showing someone how to do something, an action will be accompanied by the single-word utterance:

87) Akari!
aka -ri
then3 -PSNV

[Do] like that!

As a single-word utterance, aka alone, without the Presentative suffix, would be ungrammatical.

The -ri form is also the form used for pointing; that is, when accompanied by a gesture, a deictic will be in the -ri form. So for example, in one situation, when a group of speakers was looking at pictures of fish on a poster, trying to think of the name of each one, people would point to a fish and ask each other:

88) Honari?
hona -ri
MOD.PROX.sgm -PSNV

This one?

The function of enabling a demonstrative or locative deictic to be used as the sole word of a single-word utterance holds for all words on which the Presentative suffix can appear. Other functions of the Predicative suffix vary according to the word with which it appears, and are described separately below.

4 The term 'Presentative' is perhaps a bit unfortunate, as it is also used for, e.g. 'presentative constructions', which is a rather different phenomenon. However, I continue to use the term, following Fillmore, in order to avoid perhaps more confusion.

5 Aka means, in various contexts, 'so', 'then', 'and', 'thus', 'next' and so on. However for the sake of consistency it is invariably glossed as 'then'.
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In practice, the semantic function of this suffix can be very difficult to capture. It does sometimes have an obviously Presentative meaning, and this function is the most clearly apparent one (hence the name). However there are other functions which do not seem to be Presentative, but yet which are not clearly ascribable to any other semantic realm. Part of the problem is that Presentatives are not well described in the typological literature, and their semantic variation is not well understood. More work on semantic typology in this area would possibly help to shed light on the semantics of these derived deictics in Lavukaleve.

The Predicative suffix -o/om/v (feminine singular, masculine/neuter singular and plural respectively) is added to a deictic which has the Presentative suffix already attached. The Predicative suffix derives deictic predicates, which agree in gender and number with any referent of the speaker’s choosing. The deictic predicates thus derived are clauses in their own right.

The following table outlines the meaning differences between bare deictics, deictics with Presentative -ri, and deictics with the gender/number-marked Predicative suffixes (discussed below, Section 8.10.4). Note that the latter suffixes can only occur on deictics already suffixed with Presentative -ri:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BARE</th>
<th>-RI</th>
<th>-O/om/v</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IKA</td>
<td>there</td>
<td>there†</td>
<td>it’s there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AKA</td>
<td>then/so etc.</td>
<td>like that</td>
<td>it’s like that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOKA/HOIKA/HEAKA</td>
<td>here</td>
<td>here†</td>
<td>it’s here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGALA</td>
<td>there</td>
<td>there†</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOIA</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>that one</td>
<td>it’s that one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIA</td>
<td>the other</td>
<td>the other one</td>
<td>it’s the other one</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† See discussion to follow for pragmatic usage of this form.

The discussion will examine each deictic with -ri in turn, and then will move on to the gender/number-marked Predicative suffixes.

**THE PRESENTATIVE SUFFIX WITH IKA ‘THERE’**

It was stated above (Section 8.9.4) that ika ‘there’ is a locative deictic which has a very broad, under-specified meaning, referring to the existence of something in space. The meaning change associated with the Presentative suffix on ika makes anaphoric reference to a specific location previously mentioned in the discourse. Compare the following examples with those given above for unsuffixed ika:
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89) Aka Kiolen heaka fi mafifi.
aka Kiole -n heaka fi ma- fifi
then Kiole -LOC there.DIST1 3sgnFOC 3plS- sit

There at Kiolen they were.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ikari</th>
<th>fifire</th>
<th>ngoanun</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>aka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ika</td>
<td>-ri</td>
<td>fifi</td>
<td>-re</td>
<td>ngoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there</td>
<td>-PSNV</td>
<td>sit</td>
<td>-NF</td>
<td>stay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>then</td>
<td>ke.</td>
<td>lavukal</td>
<td>va</td>
<td>vone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavukal</td>
<td>va</td>
<td>vone</td>
<td>maalia</td>
<td>ke.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavukals</td>
<td>pIArt</td>
<td>3plO-</td>
<td>with</td>
<td>3plS-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So they were there, and they all made friends with the Lavukals.

90) (They reached an island).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ikari</th>
<th>Kusuvau</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>ome.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ika</td>
<td>-ri</td>
<td>Kusuvau</td>
<td>fi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there</td>
<td>-PSNV</td>
<td>island.name</td>
<td>3sgnFOC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There at Kusuvau, it was.

91) (Above me, where the road ends, one saroka tree stands.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ngana'nug</th>
<th>na</th>
<th>ana, ikari</th>
<th>tuna</th>
<th>fi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nga-</td>
<td>na'nug</td>
<td>na a-</td>
<td>na ika -ri</td>
<td>tuna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buku na</td>
<td>amaifu</td>
<td>fi</td>
<td>hi</td>
<td>lame.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buku na</td>
<td>amaifu</td>
<td>fi</td>
<td>hi</td>
<td>lame.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conch(m)</td>
<td>sgmArt</td>
<td>3sgmO-</td>
<td>3plS-</td>
<td>sing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In my thought, it was really there that they blew the conch.

The Presentative suffix with Aka 'then', 'next', 'so', etc.

Aka 'then', 'so', 'next', 'and', and so on, takes on an idiomatic meaning 'like that', 'in that way' when it appears with the Presentative suffix:

92) Kini ro onam veore, ro
kini ro onam veo -re ro
ACT one.sgF 3sgF to arrive -NF one.sgF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>onam veore, akari siala.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o- nam veo -re aka -ri sia -la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sgF to arrive -NF then -PSNV do -EXT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I'd go to one (office (f), as a security guard), then go to another, and keep doing like that.
8 - DEICTICS

93) Taragau na aolaile fi kini houla,
taragau na a- o- lai -le fi kini houla
sea.eagle(m) sgmArt 3sgmO- 3sgS- tell -POT 3sgnFOC ACT tree(f)
fagi roge ena omare vore,
fagi roge e- na o- ma -re vo -re
island(n) one.sgn 3sgnO- in 3sgS- take -NF come -NF
akari sianun sianun hano
aka -ri sia -nun sia -nun hano
then -PSNV do -DUR do -DUR then

[She] told the sea eagle to go to one island, take a stick, and continue like that (i.e. taking sticks one by one)...
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94) Mina teovil va matongan
mina tevo -vil va ma- tonga -n
um table -pl plArt 3pIPOSS- chance -LOC

akari selen afou mame.
aka -ri selen a- fou ma -me
then -PSNV money(m) 3sgmO-put.on 3pI- HAB

They would put out the money on each of the tables in turn like that.

c02 067

See also the example of aka as a single-word utterance shown above (example 87).

The Presentative suffix with hoka/hoika/heaka 'here/there/there far'

The meaning of -ri with hoka/hoika/heaka is very difficult to discern. In many cases, -ri forms seem to mean very much the same as non-ri forms.

Note that -ri is not used with the fourth member of this paradigm, hoaka 'there, far unspecified': (see above, Section 8.9.1, for discussion of the paradigm). Compare the following suffixed examples with the examples of hoka/hoika/heaka shown above:

95) "Aka kosora iru meire ga
aka kosora iru me- i -re -ø ga
then today sleep 1pl.in- do -FUT -sgn sgnArt

2sg there.MED -PSNV
2sg here.PROX -PSNV 2sg

heakari akari fi meirure."
heaka -ri aka -ri fi me- iru -re
there.DIST1 -PSNV then -PSNV 3sgnFOC 1pl.in- sleep -FUT

"So today, the way we'll sleep, you there (pointing), you here (pointing), you over there (pointing), we'll sleep like that."

c03 383
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"Hokari ngai ngalufuveli fi.
hoika -ri ngai nga-lufu -vele fi
here.PROX -PSNV 1sg 1sgO- leave -SUC 3sgnFOC

"Leave me here.

Inu hokari daeva siane ngai
inu hoka -ri daeva sia -ne ngai
2sg here.PROX -PSNV diving do -IMPF 1sg

nganehourene".
ngae- ne- hou -re -ne
1sgO- 2sgS- wait for -FUT -IMPF

You go diving here, waiting for me".

(They paddled and paddled and paddled, then (they reached) Sokopi.)
Hoikari mala'gulev kilikil na olako.
hoika -ri mala'gulev kilikil na o- lako
there.MED -PSNV birds(pl) bird.sp(m) sgmArt 3sgS- cry

There some birds - a kilikil bird - cried.

"Hoikari hoikari ngahouma!"
hoika -ri hoika -ri nga-hou -ma
there.MED -PSNV there.MED -PSNV 1sgO- wait for -DUR IMP.sg

"There, wait for me there!"

THE PRESENTATIVE SUFFIX WITH IGALA 'THERE'

There are only two examples in the corpus of igala 'there' appearing with the Presentative suffix. This is not enough to allow an understanding of the role of -ri when it appears with this word, and it is difficult to speculate. Compare the following examples with those given above for igala (Section 8.9.6):

99) Rale ke rale fi arere,
rale ke rale fi a- re -re
north EMPH north 3sgnFOC 1sgS- say -FUT

iga mesa -ri fi o- vo
there -PSNV 3sgnFOC 3sgS- come

North, I [should] say north, from there it (the cyclone) came.

100) Malaita o Goa mfot ena fi
Malaita o Goae ma- foto e- na fi
Malaita and Isabel 3plPOSS- middle(n) 3sgO- in 3sgnFOC

iga mesa -ri fi navigol honari -ri o- vo
there -PSNV 3sgnFOC cyclone(m) MOD.PROX sgm -PSNV 3sgS- come

In between Malaita and Isabel, it was there that the cyclone came from.
When hoia demonstrative forms appear without -ri, it was shown above (Section 8.5) that they function as nominal modifiers. That is, they appear following and agreeing with a head noun, inside an NP.

With -ri, however, the syntactic function of the hoia forms changes. They occur far more frequently without a head noun; 46% (of 93) examples of hoia with -ri are without a head noun, as opposed to 9% (of 77) examples without the -ri suffix. Thus -ri seems to tend to make hoia into a nominal head. This syntactic difference correlates with the meaning difference: with -ri, the demonstrative, translated as ‘this one’, has a presentative meaning:

101) nalo ga ta lana one hi.
    nalo ga ta la-na o-ne -∅ hi
    intestines(n) sgnArt just 3dumO- in 3sgS- give -sgn 3sgnEFOC

...then he just gave the offal to [the two boys].

"Hogari
    hoga -ri ta hobeae -∅ hi
    MOD.PROX.sgn -PSNV just good -sgn 3sgnEFOC
    Foga ui hi" hivel
    foga ui hi hi -vel
    PN.PROX.sgn food(n) 3sgnEFOC do/say -COMPL

"This one is good. It is food" he said...

102) (The people I lived with, one, his name was Hugo, one's name was Mofe, one's name was Saisal, one's name was Seka.)
    Foiva vone fo'foira oaiv hiv.
    foiva vo-ne fo'foira o-a-i -v 3sgfO- 1sgS- do -pl 3plEFOC
    PN.MED.pl 3plO- with work(f) 3sgfO- 1sgS- do -pl 3plEFOC

Hoivar.
    hoiva -ri
    MOD.MED.pl -PSNV

It was with them that I did work. Those ones.

There are also many examples in which hoia suffixed with -ri is adnominal:

103) Nei hogari ema vau.
    nei hoga -ri ema vau
    coconut(n) MOD.PROX.sgn -PSNV 3sgnO- take go.out

This coconut, take it out.

In examples where hoia plus -ri seems to be in an NP with a head noun, the semantic difference between suffixed and unsuffixed forms is not always so obvious. Compare for example the following two sentences:
Every day our mother is always talking like that about that distant island.

Oiari forms are quite infrequent in the corpus. They still function as NP heads, and are cross-referenced by verbs, as are oia forms, but there is a difference: oia means something like ‘she, that, the other’ (see Section 8.7 above for a full account of the meaning of oia); oiari means something like ‘the other one’. The -ri form is also used in presentative contexts.

That one was Tagoila, over at Kiolen, and he had one particular friend.

Everything was straightened out.

With that one we went back up.

8.10.4 The Predicative Suffixes

There are three forms of the Predicative: -o (feminine singular), -om (masculine/neuter
singular), and -v (plural), which can be added to a deictic which has the Presentative suffix -ri already attached, to derive a predicate. Thus, the demonstrative hoïna ‘this’ becomes hoïnari ‘this one’ with the Presentative suffix, and hoïnariom ‘it’s this one (m/n)’ with the masculine/neuter Predicative suffix.

Predicative deictics are common among the world’s languages; for example Heeschen (1982) mentions a predicativising derivation for demonstratives in Eipo, a Papuan language spoken in the Eastern highlands of Irian Jaya. Further afield, Denny (1982) discusses a predicative derivation for Inuktitut deictics. Predicative demonstratives are also mentioned in the typological literature: discussion of a recent treatment (Diessel 1999) appears below, but first is an examination of Lavukaleve’s predicative deictics.

Lavukaleve’s Predicative suffixes are available to all of those deictics which can receive Presentative -ri, except for igala ‘there’.

Consider the following examples of the Predicative suffixes with different deictics hoïna ‘this’, oia ‘the other’, hoka ‘here’, aka ‘then’ and ika ‘there’:

The Predicative suffix(es) with hoïna:

108) (“Let’s go cut down a sago tree” they said.)

Ta fi aka kini nat na
just 3sgnFOC then kini nat na

alere
a- le -re ho -ri -om
3sgmO- see -NF MOD.PROX.sgf -PSNV -m/n

Seeing a sago leaf, “It’s this one [that we should cut]!”


foiga mina a- tigiri -a feo hoïna -ri -om
PN.MED.sgn thing(f) 1sgS- say -sgf 3sgfFOC MOD.MED.sgf -PSNV -m/n

Okay. I said that. It’s that one [that I told you].

The Predicative suffix(es) with oia:

110) (...on this facing side is a dry coconut.)

Oïariom.
oia -ri -om feo ngo- ma -re -a heo
other.MED.sgf -PSNV -m/n 3sgfFOC 2sg- take -FUT -sgf 3sgfEFOC

It’s that one, you take it.

---

6 This may simply be a gap in the data: igala ‘there’ is very infrequent.
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111) **oiariom**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>oia</th>
<th>-ri</th>
<th>-om</th>
<th>o-</th>
<th>mi</th>
<th>-la</th>
<th>-m</th>
<th>fin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>other.MED.sgf</td>
<td>-PSNV</td>
<td>-m/n</td>
<td>3sgfO-make</td>
<td>-NEG</td>
<td>-sgm</td>
<td>3sgmFOC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...he didn’t do it (the thing (f) that she told him to do) [i.e. it’s that one, he didn’t do it]

The Predicative suffix(es) with **hoka**:

112) **Kolo**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>inu</th>
<th><strong>hokario</strong></th>
<th>a</th>
<th><strong>Mofe</strong></th>
<th>inu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kolo inu hoka</td>
<td>-ri</td>
<td>-o</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Mofe inu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolo 2sg here.PROX</td>
<td>-PSNV</td>
<td>-f</td>
<td>um</td>
<td>Mofe 2sg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**hokario**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Okali</th>
<th>inu</th>
<th><strong>hokario</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hoka</td>
<td>-ri</td>
<td>-o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>here.PROX</td>
<td>-PSNV</td>
<td>-f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okali 2sg here.PROX</td>
<td>-PSNV</td>
<td>-f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kolo, you’re here (pointing), um, Mofe, you’re here (pointing), Okali, you’re here (pointing).

113) **Ama**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lo</th>
<th><strong>fi</strong>,</th>
<th>koi</th>
<th>fele</th>
<th>aluri</th>
<th><strong>hi</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ama</td>
<td>lo</td>
<td>fi</td>
<td>koi</td>
<td>fele</td>
<td>a-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sgmO-</td>
<td>take</td>
<td>finish</td>
<td>3sgnFOC</td>
<td>also return</td>
<td>3sgmO-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having taken it [the keel], I go back and straighten it [the canoe] again.

**Hoikariom**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hoka</th>
<th><strong>hano</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mode.MED</td>
<td>-ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>then</td>
<td>-PSNV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It’s there. Okay.

The Predicative suffix(es) with **aka**:

114) **Foiga**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>akariom</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>o’asene</th>
<th>kelea</th>
<th>ga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>foiga</td>
<td>aka</td>
<td>-ri</td>
<td>-om</td>
<td>fi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN.MED.sgn then</td>
<td>-PSNV</td>
<td>-m/n</td>
<td>3sgnFOC</td>
<td>bush</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>o-</th>
<th>talu</th>
<th>la</th>
<th>o-</th>
<th>ve</th>
<th>-e</th>
<th>o-</th>
<th>lei</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3sgPOSS-</td>
<td>word(f)</td>
<td>sgnfArt</td>
<td>3sgS-</td>
<td>go-</td>
<td>-NOMZR</td>
<td>3sgS-</td>
<td>exist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That’s how the story of the walk in the bush goes. [lit: okay, it’s like that, the going of the walk in the bush]

The Predicative suffix(es) with **ika**:

115) *(They went down to the lake, to its opening, and he left them there.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ikariom</strong></th>
<th><strong>vofoure</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ika</td>
<td>-ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there</td>
<td>-PSNV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was there he left them.

There is one syntactic context in which a predicative reading for the -o/om/v suffixes seems at first glance problematic. The -o/om/v suffixes can occur on **hoia** in contexts in which it appears that **hoia** is functioning as an adnominal modifier. In many of these adnominal-looking contexts, it is easy to get a predicative reading for the demonstrative:
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116) LiRe ke. Stori horio, Ko'mua horio
   Iire ke stori ho -ri -o ko'mua ho -ri -o
   yes EMPH story(f) MOD.PROX.sgf -PSNV -f story(f) MOD.PROX.sgf -PSNV -f

   Tam enga Losiole me hoga etav fiv
   tam enga Losiole -n me -o hoga e- ta -v fiv
   man(n) three Losiole -LOC SPEC -sgn MOD.PROX.sgn 3sgnO- clear -pl 3plFOC

   Aearrev hiv.
   a- ea -re -v hiv
   1sgS- talk.about -FUT -pl 3plEFOC

   Yes. It's this story, it's this story, it was three men who cleared Losiolen, I'll talk about them.

   Foia ko'mua horio. LiRe.
   foia ko'mua ho -ri -o iire
   PN.MED.sgf story(f) MOD.PROX.sgf -PSNV -f yes

   That is this story. Yes. fk 001-002

But in other contexts, a predicative reading seems more problematic:

117) Eku fi koi gaumen o
   e- ku fi koi gaumen o
   3sgnO- like 3sgnFOC also government and

   MiMa laketei ho'bea hogariom
   mima laketei ho'bea -o hoga -ri -om
   way.of.life(n) life(n) good -sgn MOD.PROX.sgn -PSNV -m/n

   OLou va fiv.
   o- lou va fiv
   3sgPOSS- edge(pl) plArt 3plFOC

   It was like that, they were also the end of government and religion [lit. way of life] and this good life. jh 020

118) Ngalakun lafa
    nga- laku -n lafa
    1sgPOSS- hate -LOC part(f)

    Hoia ri om otigirine.
    hoia -ri -om o- tigiri -ne
    MOD.MED.sgf -PSNV -m/n 3sgfO- tell -IMPF

    I (m) don't want to say that bit. jn 109

119) Aka malav hogariom kaso
    aka malav hova -ri -om kaso -v fiv
    then people(pl) MOD.PROX.pl -PSNV -m/n not.know -pl 3plFOC

    So these people were ignorant! jn 001

The italicised strings in the above examples seem on the surface to be single NPs consisting of nominal head and demonstrative modifier. There is no evidence that the hoia demonstratives are syntactically any different from bare hoia demonstratives in such examples. However it can be argued by analogy from the use of the predicative deictics in other contexts that these are in fact predicative deictics, just as the others are.
So for instance under this analysis the string **malav hovariom** in example (119) would not be an NP consisting of a head noun **malav** followed by attributive modifier **hovariom**, functioning as subject argument of intransitive verb *ka'so*. Rather, the structure would be as follows. **Malav** is an NP consisting solely of a head noun, which is the subject argument of the predicate **hovariom**: ‘it is these people’. Thus, a more literal unidiomatic translation for the whole sentence would be ‘So it’s these people, they don’t know [anything]’. And (117) ‘It’s like that, it’s this good life, the government and church, they were the end of them’; and (118) ‘It’s that bit, I don’t want to say it’.

These adnominal-looking appearances of **hovariom** are particularly frequent in the string **ta hovariom ana** ‘at that time’:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>120</th>
<th>Aka</th>
<th>ikari</th>
<th>homelav</th>
<th>fiv</th>
<th>mev</th>
<th>hiv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aka</td>
<td>ika</td>
<td>-ri</td>
<td>homela</td>
<td>-v</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>then</td>
<td>there</td>
<td>-PSNV</td>
<td>woman</td>
<td>-pl</td>
<td>3plFOC</td>
<td>SPEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ta</em></td>
<td>hovariom</td>
<td><em>ana</em></td>
<td>Red Cross</td>
<td>ena.</td>
<td>Red Cross</td>
<td>e-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ta</em></td>
<td>hoina</td>
<td>-ri</td>
<td>-om</td>
<td>a-na</td>
<td>Red Cross</td>
<td>e-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time(m)</td>
<td>MOD.MED.sgm</td>
<td>-PSNV</td>
<td>-m/n</td>
<td>3sgmO-</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>Red.Cross(n)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*And there were women at that time in the Red Cross.*

The italicised string looks on the surface like a postpositional phrase, consisting of NP **ta hovariom** and postposition **ana**. But here too it can be argued by analogy that **hovariom** is a predicative demonstrative. The structure of the string is as follows. **Ta** is a head noun, the subject argument of **hovariom**; thus, together they form a clause meaning ‘it is that time’. The postposition has an ellipsed NP head (as is common); the whole string means ‘it’s that time, at it (there were women in the Red Cross)’. This is the usual and idiomatically correct way of expressing time frames in stories.

**The agreement system of the Predicative suffixes**

There are two kinds of agreement which are pertinent to deictics suffixed with *-ri-o/om/v*. There is the inherent agreement of demonstrative stems, and the gender/number agreement of the Predicative suffixes.

Locative deictics do not have inherent agreement properties, but **hoia** ‘this’ and **oia** ‘the other’ do. As was discussed earlier in this chapter, **hoia** and **oia** stems inherently mark the categories of number, gender and distance, and predicativised demonstratives which are based on these **hoia** and **oia** stems retain these agreement properties.

The other type of agreement, the type under discussion here, which all deictic predicates may display, is shown by agreement of the Predicative suffixes as follows:
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- -o Predicative (feminine singular)
- -om Predicative (masculine/neuter singular)
- -v Predicative (plural)

The masculine/neuter singular suffix is by far the most frequent of these, and the plural suffix is actually very rare.

The referent which the deictic form agrees with may be the noun associated with the deictic (if there is one), but it is by no means the case that it must be. It may be the subject, object, complement or oblique argument of a nearby clause. It may be the topic of the discourse, or the topic of a local piece of the discourse. There are absolutely no syntactic constraints on what the predicate suffix may agree with. The only constraint is the common sense one that the referent must be able to be retrieved by the hearer. Most frequently the Predicative suffix will agree with the head noun of the deictic.

Some examples of masculine/neuter singular agreement:

121) Elikire, homela olere o
   e- liki -re homela o- le -re o
   3sgnO- want -NF woman(f) 3sgfO- see -NF and

   hoiariom  alikia.
   hoia -ri -om a- liki -a
   MOD.MED.sgf -PSNV -m/n 1sgS- want -sgf

   Wanting it [marriage (n)], I (m) saw a girl and it’s that one that I wanted. m1 005

122) molio ohomolo,
   maka koi an’kav, beko nego
   molio o- homolo maka koi an’kav beko nego
   tree.sp(f) 3sgPOSS- fruit(f) then also pumice(m) stone(f) float

   mem na,
   me -m na
   HAB -sgm sgmArt

   ...molio fruit and also pumice, the stone that floats, ...

   Hoinalariom  koi lamare hi mame.
   hoinala -ri -om koi la- ma -re hi ma- me
   MOD.MED.dum -PSNV -m/n also 3dumO- take -NF do/say 3plS- HAB

   They would also take those two. cs2 015, 017

123) Akariom
   mina mea feo.
   maka -ri -om mina me -a feo
   then -PSNV -m/n thing(f) SPEC -sgf 3sgfFOC

   So it’s this thing.

   Aka honariom
   maka hi lamem
   maka hona -ri -om a- na hi la- me -m
   then MOD.PROX.sgm -PSNV -m/n 3sgmO-in do/say 1sg- HAB-sgm

   It’s this one I’ll talk about. rk2 003-005

198
Some examples of feminine singular agreement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>124)</th>
<th>Mina</th>
<th>horio</th>
<th>ta</th>
<th>hona</th>
<th>neuriae</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>thing(f)</td>
<td>mod.prox.sgf</td>
<td>-psnv</td>
<td>-f</td>
<td>time(m)</td>
<td>mod.prox.sgm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vuti</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>togoloa</td>
<td>vuti</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>lei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be.many</td>
<td>-sgn</td>
<td>and divided</td>
<td>be.many</td>
<td>-sgn</td>
<td>3sgS-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It’s this thing - now there is much argument and division.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>125)</th>
<th>Foia</th>
<th>ko’mua</th>
<th>horio.</th>
<th>lire.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PN.med.sgf</td>
<td>story(f)</td>
<td>mod.prox.sgf</td>
<td>-psnv</td>
<td>-f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That’s this story. Yes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tam enga</th>
<th>hovasario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tam</td>
<td>enga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man</td>
<td>three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hova</td>
<td>karumulun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hova</td>
<td>Karumulun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOD.prox.pl</td>
<td>Karumulun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These three men, these Okali, Kolo and Mofe, lived at Karumulun.

An example of plural agreement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>126)</th>
<th>Hokariv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hoka</td>
<td>-ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>here.prox</td>
<td>-psnv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hokari</td>
<td>fi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hoka</td>
<td>-ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>here.prox</td>
<td>-psnv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hokari</td>
<td>fi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hoka</td>
<td>-ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>here.prox</td>
<td>-psnv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We were here, I was like this: here I sat; here he sat.

There are some interesting observations that can be made about the use of the Predicative suffix. Firstly, although there is so much freedom with respect to the structural relationship between the gender agreement suffix and what referent it is agreeing with, it is interesting to note that there are very strong tendencies among individual speakers at particular times to use the suffix to agree with a referent in a particular syntactic relationship to it. For example, some speakers during a story show a tendency to use the gender suffix to agree with subjects in their discourse; others tend to use it to agree with places; others again tend to have it agreeing with postpositional objects. So, while it is true that speaker is completely free to use the gender suffix to agree with any referent, in fact, speakers in particular situations show a tendency to use the suffix to agree with the same kind of referent.
For example with one speaker, Abel Moran, during one story he told, 95% of his uses of the gender suffix in one story are to agree with the topic of the entire discourse, himself (it is a life story). Another speaker, Frank Koau, in one story never used the gender suffix to agree with the topic, but in 44% of cases he used it to agree with a place; and 33% of its uses are to agree with the head noun of the deictic. Raymond Kolo, however, in one story tended to prefer to have the suffix agreeing with the subject of the deictic predicate; 79% of his usages show this pattern.

As a final observation, the form of the gender agreement in the Predicative suffix is noteworthy. There is a derivational suffix -io, which, added to transitive verb stems, forms feminine abstract nouns (see Section 13.1.2). This is interesting in terms of gender marking in Lavukaleve. Usually in Lavukaleve, feminine gender (in the singular number) is associated with final -a (see Chapter 6); but these two morphemes, the feminine abstract nominaliser -io, and the feminine Predicative suffix -o, are the two places in which feminine gender is marked not by -a but by a form including -o. One could stretch the similarity further by speculating that the feminine Predicative suffix could actually be, historically if not synchronically, -io, with a loss of one of the /i/ vowels at the morpheme boundary between -ri and the feminine form -(i)o itself. Of course there is no way to test this hypothesis, as the Predicative feminine gender suffix can only appear following the Presentative suffix -ri.

8.11 DEMONSTRATIVE IDENTIFIERS

We have not quite exhausted the description of Lavukaleve’s deictics yet. There is one further set of deictics: demonstrative identifiers. The term is from Diessel (1999), who distinguishes demonstrative identifiers from sentential demonstratives (or predicative demonstratives), on the grounds that demonstrative identifiers only occur in identificational sentences (e.g. There is your sheep) (Diessel 1999: 10-15).

Formally, demonstrative identifiers in Lavukaleve are identical to foia demonstrative pronouns, but with the addition of an extra syllable /hV/ after the first syllable of the pronoun. The V takes its form from the vowel of the first syllable of the pronoun. Thus foga ‘singular proximal neuter demonstrative pronoun’; fohoga ‘3rd person singular proximal neuter demonstrative identifier’7. It is not clear whether this is a synchronic process, or whether it just that the paradigm is morphologically transparent. Lavukaleve’s other deictic (and other) paradigms are for the most part morphologically transparent.

7 Note there is no paradigm corresponding to the medial pronoun paradigm. Note also that the Distal 1 and Distal 2 feminine forms of these demonstrative identifiers are identical to the Distal 1 and Distal 2 feminine foia demonstrative pronoun stems. It appears that the two paradigms have collapsed in these categories.
These demonstrative identifiers are very rare. They are used to make a predication about the location of an entity in space. That is, while the singular proximal neuter demonstrative pronoun **foga** means ‘it, proximal neuter singular’, **fohoga** means ‘it is here, proximal neuter singular’. They can only occur in non-verbal clauses, functioning as non-verbal predicates, often with ellipsed subjects. They are most commonly heard in answer to the question ‘where?’:

127) **Vasia?**
vasia -a
be.where-sgf

*Where is she?*

**Fohoa**
fohoa
3sgfDIST2PRED

*She’s over there.*

Some more examples:

128) '''O! Fohoga meui''
o fohoga oh 3sgnPROXPRED
1pl.in.POSS- food(n)

*"Oh! It’s here, our food!"*

129) **Ali na**
ali na
man(m) sgmArt

**fohoana oka.**
fohoana koka
3sgmDIST2PRED far

*The man is far away.*

130) **Vaunun**
vaunun vaunun vaunun vaunun
vau -nun vau -nun vau -nun vau -nun
go.out -DUR go.out -DUR go.out -DUR go.out -DUR

**Vaunun**
vaunun vaunun uke siavel
vau -nun vau -nun vau -nun uke sia -vel
go.out -DUR go.out -DUR go.out -DUR near do -COMPL

*"Vasiav?"*
vasia -v fohova
be.where -pl 3plPROXPRED

*They go out, go go go, then when they get near "Where are they?" [they said] "They’re here."*

8.12 **Summary**

In this chapter the deictics of Lavukaleve were examined. There are three types of demonstratives: a paradigm of demonstrative modifiers (**hoia**) and two paradigms of demonstrative pronouns (**foia** and **oia**), which differ in terms of the activation levels of the entities to which they refer. It was shown that there are no third person pronouns, instead the demonstrative pronouns fill this function. There are, however, first and second person pronouns.

There are also many locative deictics, most based on forms ending in **ka**. There are four
CHAPTER NINE

Overview of clause structure, predicate types and core participant marking

The aims of this chapter are twofold. The first part of this chapter describes and justifies the theoretical premises on which the analysis of the syntactic structures of Lavukaleve is founded, and outlines the grammatical terminology used in this thesis. In addition, there is a discussion of which arguments are core arguments and how they are expressed.

Secondly, the chapter provides a brief overview of clause structure, constituent order, predicate types and core participant marking, in order to enable the reader to parse sentences in the rest of the description without necessarily having read every word of the grammar. As these parts of the chapter are intended as an overview, structures are discussed briefly, with cross-references to detailed discussions of each construction type elsewhere in the thesis.

9.1 BASIC CLAUSE STRUCTURE

Basic clauses in Lavukaleve consist maximally of a predicate, which is the head of the clause, two core NPs (subject and object arguments of the predicate), and any number of adjuncts, which may be various types of nominal adjuncts, adverbs or particles. There are no verbs whose argument structure requires an adjunct.

9.2 CONSTITUENT ORDER

The predicate is typically the final constituent of the clause (see below for a definition of predicates; prototypically, it means a verb, or anything that acts like a verb). Core
NPs precede the verb; if there are two, the subject must precede the object. There is thus a fairly strict constituent order for basic Lavukaleve clauses: SOV (or, using Dixon’s (1979) syntactic primitives, which are introduced below, SV/AVO).

Adjuncts may appear anywhere between these NPs and the predicate, although they may not intervene between elements of the NP. A textual example of a near-maximal clause:

1) [Aka] [taragau na ne ruia la] [nikol]

In example (1) above, constituents are separated with square brackets. There are two NPs; taragau na ne ruia la, the subject; and tail fi, the object (with a focus marker). The predicate is lovolori hi (with a focus marker), and there are two adjuncts, both particles, aka and nikol. Focus markers can occur at the end of any type of constituent; they are a ubiquitous feature of Lavukaleve syntax, and it is almost impossible to quote an example without at least one focus marker in it; indeed it would be misleading to try. For a discussion of the morpho-pragmatics of focus marking in Lavukaleve, see Chapter 11.

Most clauses in Lavukaleve, however, consist of many fewer elements than this maximal pattern implies; indeed there is no example in the corpus of a maximal clause as outlined above. The only obligatory constituent of a clause is the predicate; all other members are optional, and in particular, core NPs are often not present in clauses. Basic clauses, then, typically consist of a predicate, preceded by some adjuncts, and possibly one or more NPs. A textual example of a more typical type of clause structure:

2) [Kini] [ngoham] [fo'sal] [voakuru].

In this example, there is an adjunct, kini, followed by another adjunct, ngoham, followed by an object NP, fo'sal, followed by the predicate, voakuru.

It was stated above that there was a fairly strict constituent order SOV/AVO. This is for the most part true; if both subject and object NPs occur before the predicate, they must occur in that order, and usually the predicate is the final element of the sentence. However it is not unknown for one of the NPs, usually the subject NP, to appear after the predicate. If this does happen, there is almost always an intonation break between the predicate and the NP. Many such constructions seem to be repair constructions, in
which the speaker, having omitted to mention the NP subject overtly, then wonders whether the hearer understood it properly, and adds it in as an afterthought.

3) **Lafi** eure aka **mina** ro -ru
lafi 3sgnO- eat mina one.sgF-none
water(n) -NF

*Drinking the water, then she didn’t say anything. The old woman.*

There are examples in which a core NP consisting of a demonstrative modifier appears after the predicate with no intonation break between the predicate and it. In Section 11.4.2 it is argued that these are not anomalies of constituent order, but rather are in fact examples of demonstratives functioning as focus markers.

Adjuncts, too, can appear after the predicate, usually as an afterthought. Note the intonation, indicated by the punctuation:

4) **Lo** fi, **ohan** va **vofou,**
lo 3sgnFOC 3sgPOSS- va 3plO- put.on
fi ha -n pla 3plO- vn
ohan rib.of.canoe -pl plArt

*Having finished, I make the ribs, I hammer them. With nails.*

It was stated above that adjuncts can appear between any of the other constituents in a clause. All syntactic and semantic types of adjuncts can and do occur in any of the adjunct positions within a clause.

### 9.3 Syntactic Functions and Grammatical Relations

#### 9.3.1 Syntactic Functions

The grammatical relations of Lavukaleve will be established using the universal syntactic primitives A, S, and O of Dixon (1979, see also 1994), as defined rather more narrowly by Andrews (1985).

For Andrews, the syntactic functions of A and O (‘grammatical functions’ in his terminology) are defined in terms of the prototypical core arguments of prototypical Primary Transitive Verbs; verbs which take two arguments, the semantic roles of which are Agent and Patient (e.g. ‘kill’) (1985: 68). The syntactic function of A is “an NP in a transitive sentence receiving the treatment normally accorded to the Agent of P[rimary] T[ransitive] V[erbs]; an O is an NP in a transitive sentence receiving the treatment
normally accorded to the Patient of a PTV.” (1985: 98). The syntactic function of S is that of “[an] NP in an intransitive sentence that is receiving the treatment normally accorded to the single argument of a one-argument predicate” (1985: 68).

9.3.2 Grammatical relations

The syntactic functions of A, S and O are unproblematic in Lavukaleve; however for the purposes of describing Lavukaleve morpho-syntax, rather than using A, S and O, it is simpler and descriptively more revealing to use the grammatical relations of subject and object. These grammatical relations are defined in terms of A, S and O. Subject is, again using Andrews’ definition, “the grammatical relation, if there is one, that is associated with A and S function; object the grammatical relation, if there is one, that is associated with O function” (1985: 103).

The following section justifies the theoretical and descriptive validity of the grammatical relations of subject and object for Lavukaleve.

Subjects

In almost every area of Lavukaleve, A and S pattern the same way in morphological terms, and O patterns differently. Thus, on the basis of certain morphological tests, a grammatical relation of Subject can be set up. None of Lavukaleve syntax is based on constructions which require a pivot. Conjoined clauses of the sort ‘the man hit the woman and ran away’ (to use a time-honoured example) are expressed by clauses joined in either subordinate-dependent or coordinate-dependent structures; in either case, arguments tend not to be shared at the morpho-syntactic level, or at least, to not be necessarily shared. That is, one could say ‘him hitting the woman, the man went away’; ‘him hitting the woman, she went away’; ‘him coming, he hit the woman’; ‘him coming, the woman hit him’ and so on. In all cases, arguments are expressed by pronominal affixes, except where this is precluded by combinatorial restrictions on affixes. However, throughout most of its morphology, Lavukaleve is a nominative/accusative language. The only area of exception is in adverbial subordinate clauses, which show a split-ergative pattern, in which 1st and 2nd person subjects follow a nominative/accusative marking system and 3rd person subjects follow an ergative/absolutive marking system: see Section 16.1.

Lavukaleve has no case marking for core argument roles, but its pronominal verb prefixes are marked for grammatical relations. Compare the following:

5) ali na okiu
   ali na o- kiu
   man(m) sgmArt 3sgS- die

the man died
6) ali na mola ga eole
   ali na mola ga e- o- le
   man(m) sgmArt canoe(n) sgnArt 3sgnO- 3sgS- see

   the man saw the canoe

7)aira la ali na aole
   aira la ali na a- o- le
   woman(f) sgfArt man(m) sgmArt 3sgmO- 3sgS- see

   the woman saw the man

When the NP ali na is in S or A function, it is marked by the subject prefix o-. When ali na is in O function, it is marked by a different, object, prefix, a-.

The Present Tense marker marks the number of an argument in either S or A function, and does not mark the number of an argument in O function.

8) Irunu.
   iru -nu
   sleep -PRES.sg

   He is sleeping.

9) Foe na akovenu.
   foe na a- kove -nu
   pig(m) sgmArt 3sgmO- look.for -PRES.sg

   [He] is looking for the pig.

10) Malav va keleanuv.
    malav va kelea -nuv
    people(pl) plArt walk -PRES.pl

    The people are wandering around.

11) Foev va vokovenu
    foe -v va vo- kove -nu
    pig -pl plArt 3plO- look.for -PRES.sg

    [He] is looking for the pigs.

At the morphological level, then, in main clauses Lavukaleve treats NPs in A and S function alike, and those in O function differently.

Semantic roles associated with the grammatical relation of subject in Lavukaleve include agent (e.g. kuru 'kill'), experiencer (e.g. le 'see'), patient (e.g. kiu 'die') and possessor (e.g. nuve 'own').

OBJECTS

As there are no ditransitive verbs in Lavukaleve, it is no difficult matter to establish
which NPs have the grammatical relation of object. For Lavukaleve, any core syntactic function which is not an A or an S is an O; any grammatical relation which is not a subject is an object. The morphological and syntactic criteria adduced above for the justification of the subject relation work also, in converse, for the justification of an object relation.

Many languages of the world allow at least a few ditransitive verbs. Lavukaleve, however, does not. Typically ditransitive verbs such as ‘give’, ‘show’ and ‘tell’ are transitive verbs in Lavukaleve. They have two core arguments, and an optional postpositional argument.

For example ne ‘give’ is subcategorised for a subject and an object, which express the giver and the gift, respectively, and optionally takes a postpositional phrase to express the recipient. In the following example, the giver is ‘she’, expressed as the 3sgS prefix on `eonege; the gift is ‘it (the food)’, expressed as the 3sgnO prefix on the same verb; and the recipient is ‘her husband’, expressed in the postpositional phrase ‘to her husband’ (otum na ana):

12) otum na ana eonege fi
   otum na a- na e- o- ne -ge fi
   3sgPOSS- husband(m) sgmArt 3sgnO- in 3sgnO- 3sgS- give-ANT 3sgnFOC
   ...she gave it (the food (n)) to her husband

And a structurally similar example, but with no recipient expressed:

13) Eonege emare ovai.
    e- o- ne -ge e- ma -re o- vau -i
    3sgnO- 3sgS- give -ANT 3sgnO- take -NF 3sgPOSS- go.out -PSV
    He gave it [to the boy] then, taking it, he (the boy) went down.

The verb tai can mean ‘show’ or ‘tell’. When it means ‘show’, the thing shown is expressed as object, and the recipient is expressed as an optional postpositional phrase:

14) ona nei ga enetaire.
    o- na nei ga e- ne- tai -re
    3sgfO- in coconut(n) sgmArt 3sgnO- 2sgS- show -FUT
    ... you will show the coconut to her.

15) Lofela’koe ga etailamal final.
    lo- fela’koe ga e- tai -la -mal finala
    3duPOSS- village(n) sgmArt 3sgnO- show -NEG -du.m 3dumFOC
    The two [boys] didn’t show their village (to us).

But when tai means ‘tell’, the recipient is expressed as object and the message as direct speech functioning as a paratactic adjunct to the verb:
Then his wife told him:

"O! Vo'vou roa fin vomare kini feum o vo'vou roa fin vo- ma -re kini feu -m boy(m) one.sgm 3sgmFOC 3p1O- take -NF ACT go.up -sgm

"Oh! One boy brought them up."

Then "I am a tuna fish from the sea" [she] told them.

Similarly, with other verbs of speaking, the hearer is the object and the message is not an object but rather a paratactic adjunct expressed as direct speech:

One would not want to call the speech here a paratactic complement along the lines of Noonan (1985, sp. 55 ff.). The speech is not syntactically linked in any way to the clause which contains the verb of speech.

Thus, other possible candidates for the object grammatical relation are easily distinguished from objects.

Semantic roles associated with the grammatical relation of object in Lavukaleve include patient (e.g. kuru ‘hit’) and theme (e.g. le ‘see’), and also the gift of ne ‘give’, and the recipient of tai ‘tell’.
9.4 Core and Oblique Functions

Core functions are, according to Andrews (1985: 81) "by definition A, S and O, and whatever other grammatical functions are sufficiently like them to be plausibly grouped with them and opposed to the others, which are the oblique functions". For Lavukaleve, the core/oblique distinction is a simple one: subject and object are core; everything else is oblique.

9.4.1 Oblique Functions

NPs in Lavukaleve which are not subjects or objects are all oblique, and come under the general term used in this thesis: adjuncts. Adjuncts are by definition not part of the obligatory elements of a clause. They come in a variety of forms and functions. Adjuncts encompass semantic roles such as instrument, location, time, goal, source, and so on. There are three types of adjuncts involving nominals (all discussed in Chapter 7): postpositional phrases; locational nouns with the Locative or Prative suffixes; and place nouns. Place nouns, a very restricted set of nouns, are the only nouns which can function as adjuncts with no affixation or postposition to show their role. The following examples show, respectively, a postpositional phrase, a locational noun with the Locative suffix; and a place noun:

20) Lokala la onam lovau. 
lo- kala la o- nam lo- vau
3duPOSS- mother(f) sgfArt 3sgfO- to 3duS- go.out
They go out to their mother.

ja 348

21) Aavala loolo vau fela'koen. 
 a- a- vala loolo vau fela'koe -n
3sgmO- 1sgS- pull straight go.out village -LOC
I pull it [the canoe] straight out to the village.

cp 031

22) Ninam hi nikol Mane ngovo? 
ninam hi nikol Mane ng- vo
when 3sgnEFOC first Mane 2sg- come
When did you first come to Mane?

e3 012a

9.4.2 The Expression of Core Arguments

Core arguments, subjects and objects, can be expressed either by verbal affixation, or by NPs, or both, or neither. Verbal affixes include the pronominal subject and object prefixes; the Agreement Suffix; and the Present Tense suffixes. Examples of each of these possibilities follows.
Core argument (subject) expressed by verbal affixation only:

23) han va vozkovere.
   ha -n va vo- a- kove -re
   rib.of.canoe -pl plArt 3plO- 1sgS- look.for-FUT
   I look for some [roots to make into] canoe ribs.

Core argument (subject) expressed by NP only:

24) Hano foe na foa isi lava ga efalere
    hano foe na foa isi lava ga e- fale -re
    then pig(m) sgmArt go.down back.of.canoe bamboo(n) sgnArt 3sgnO- stand.sth.up -NF
   Then the pig goes down to the back, puts up the bamboo...

Core argument (object) expressed by both verbal affixation and NP:

25) Houl makalaul alerev
    houl ma- kalaul a- le -re -v
    trees(pl) 3plPOSS- roots(pl) 1sgS- see-FUT -pl
   I will see tree roots

Core argument (subject) not expressed:

26) Aka vomare vere, hano.
    aka vo- ma -re ve -re hano
    then 3plO- take -NF go -NF then
   [He] took them [the clothes] away.

Object arguments must always be expressed by verbal affixation at least, if not also by an NP. The expression of subject arguments by affixation is a matter of some complexity; in some constructions subject affixes must appear, in some they cannot appear, and in some they are optional. In coordinate-dependent clauses (see below, Section 9.7.4 and Chapter 15), the subject cannot be expressed by an affix on the predicate. In sentence-focus clauses a subject affix must appear on the predicate (see Chapter 11.3.2). In adverbial subordinate-dependent clauses, subjects must be expressed by affixation (but using a split-ergative marking system; see Section 16.1). In all other cases, a subject affix may appear on the predicate, but it is optional. In all of these cases, whether or not a subject affix appears on the predicate, an overt NP referring to the subject may occur.

Core arguments, then, are most commonly expressed by verbal affixation, with, optionally, an NP as well (see Section 18.2 for a discourse-based account of the expression of arguments by NPs and affixation versus by affixation alone).

One could argue that the core arguments in Lavukaleve are the pronominal prefixes on the predicate, not the overt NPs. Such an analysis would be by no means unique to Lavukaleve; Foley (1986: 227-235) claims this for Yimas, and Van Valin and LaPolla (1997: 33-34) for Lakhota. Van Valin and LaPolla point out in addition that the idea is not new, citing von Humboldt (1836) as using this type of analysis for Classical Aztec and Boas (1911) for Chinook.
Under this analysis, overt NPs, when they appear, are an optional elaboration of the obligatory verbal affixes, and could be thought of in syntactic terms as being in an appositional relationship to the pronominal affixes.

For Lavukaleve, one would have to account for the fact that there are circumstances in which the subject affix (thus the expression of the core subject argument) is not allowed to appear, but the NP referring to the subject can. This happens for instance in coordinate-dependent clauses, where subject prefixes are incompatible with coordinate-dependent verbs (see below, Section 9.7.4 and Chapter 15 for discussion of these). If pronominal prefixes are the core arguments, and NPs are paratactic adjuncts to these, it is difficult to understand the syntactic status of NPs when there is no verbal affix.

Foley's (1991) response to a similar question in Yimas (in situations where a pronominal prefix does not occur but an NP does) is to argue that there is in fact a zero pronominal prefix there, holding the core argument slot. However I am reluctant to posit zero pronominal prefixes where there is no direct evidence for them.

A second caveat to an argument for the core status of pronominal affixes versus NPs, is as follows. The term used above, 'pronominal affixes' includes the verbal prefixes on predicates, Habitual Auxiliary prefixes, Present Tense suffixes, Imperative suffixes and the Agreement Suffix (see Section 9.7 below). However there is a problem. Whereas the pronominal prefixes only ever express subject and object, the two arguments that one would want to call core in Lavukaleve, the Agreement Suffix can agree with not only subject or object, but also oblique arguments such as postpositional objects, in focus constructions and relative clauses. One would not want to call such arguments core, simply because they can, in certain specific circumstances, be marked by the Agreement Suffix.

There is a third major problem, related to the same issue of the morphological material available to mark arguments. Although one could think of the verbal and Habitual Auxiliary prefixes as arguments (in that they mark person, gender, number and grammatical function), and possibly one could think of the Present Tense suffixes (which mark Present Tense, and number of the subject) and Imperative suffixes (which mark one of two types of Imperative mood, and number of the subject) in the same way, it is much harder to think of members of the Agreement Suffix paradigm as arguments. The Agreement Suffix forms only mark gender and number, and make no reference to other important categories of referents, such as person or grammatical function. The case for the core argument status of the Agreement Suffix would be very hard to sustain.

None of these problems are fatal to an analysis of verbal affixes as core arguments and NPs as paratactic adjuncts to these. However there is a certain counter-intuitiveness to such an argument; and it requires positing zero affixes in places where there is no direct
evidence for them. Perhaps a simpler and more intuitive account is that verbal affixes and NPs together express core arguments. Different combinations of these exist to express different pragmatic meanings.

Throughout this thesis, I refer to the pronominal prefixes as ‘cross-referencing prefixes’. This should not be taken to mean that the NPs are syntactically prior in any way.

9.5 Clause types

Clauses in Lavukaleve divide into two major types: independent (main) and dependent. Dependent clauses themselves are of two types: subordinate-dependent and coordinate-dependent. The following diagram outlines types of clauses in Lavukaleve:

```
clause types
  independent  dependent
    subordinate  coordinate
       adverbial  purposive  relative
```

My terminology follows that of Foley (1986) in describing Iatmul, which (like many Papuan languages) shares with Lavukaleve certain fundamental features in its clause linking strategies. Foley argues for a distinction between main, subordinate-dependent and coordinate-dependent verbs, defining subordinate verbs in the following way:

The subordinate clause functions like a part of the main clause, and this relation of a part within the whole, or embeddedness, is how I will define subordination. Verbs of such subordinate clauses, although fully specified in Iatmul for status and for person and number of the actor, are necessarily linked to a main clause, and are therefore not independent. I will refer to such verbs of subordinate clauses as 'subordinate-dependent' and fully inflected verbs of main clauses as 'independent'. (1986: 177)

and coordinate-dependent clauses as follows:

...clauses containing [coordinate-dependent] verbs are not considered subordinate. They do not function as arguments of some main clause. They do not function as embedded parts within a whole, but are linked to a fully inflected verb in a linear string, much like beads on a necklace. Because the linking of the clauses is at the same structural level, rather than as part within whole, I regard such clauses as coordinate and verbs of such clauses as 'coordinate-dependent'. (1986: 177)
This classification is particularly revealing for Lavukaleve. The classification of Lavukaleve’s clauses, with morpho-syntactic criteria, is as follows:

**MAIN (INDEPENDENT) CLAUSES**
- can stand on their own as a complete sentence
- mark their own core participants using pronominal affixation on the predicate
- specify their own TAM

**SUBORDINATE-DEPENDENT CLAUSES**
- are embedded (have a part-whole relationship with main clauses)
- function as modifiers of main clauses
- mark their own core participants (some types using a split-ergative system) on the predicate

**COORDINATE-DEPENDENT CLAUSES**
- are syntactically and semantically dependent on a main clause, but are not syntactically or semantically a part of that clause
- do not mark their own subject participants (but do mark their objects)

Since in Lavukaleve clauses are headed by and are often coextensive with predicates, the classification holds both for clauses and predicates. Some examples of these three types follow:

**MAIN:**

27) **Oeraule** fi, **ona** gigil **voamare**.

\[
\begin{array}{llllllllllll}
\text{O} & \text{e} & \text{r} & \text{a} & \text{u} & \text{le} & \text{fi} & \text{o} & \text{n} & \text{a} & \text{g} & \text{i} & \text{l} & \text{vo} & \text{a} & \text{m} & \text{a} & \text{re}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{llllllllllll}
3 & 3g & 0 & - & S & B & D & - & \text{fall} & \text{POT} & 3 & 3 & g & F & O & - & \text{in} & \text{measurements(plt)} & 3 & 3 & p & O & - & 1 & g & S & - & \text{take} & \text{-FUT}
\end{array}
\]

*When it [the tree (f)] falls down, I will take the measurements of it.*

**SUBORDINATE-DEPENDENT:**

28) **Voevoge,** **olina** fiata la **one** **fufum**.

\[
\begin{array}{llllllllllll}
\text{V} & \text{o} & \text{e} & \text{v} & \text{o} & \text{ge} & \text{olina} & \text{fi} & \text{a} & \text{t} & \text{a} & \text{l} & \text{ne} & \text{fufu} & \text{m}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{llllllllllll}
3 & 3 & p & O & - & S & B & D & - & \text{come-ANT} & \text{other.MED.sgm} & \text{thunder(f) sgmArt} & 3 & 3 & g & F & O & \text{with} & \text{lie.down-sgm}
\end{array}
\]

*Upon them coming, he lay with his gun.*

The example above shows a main (independent) clause italicised. It stands alone as a viable syntactic unit, provides its own specification for subject, and also object, it has the Future tense marked on it, and has an adjunct, the postposition *ona*.

The example above contains a subordinate clause (italicised). Syntactically it is an adverbial clause, modifying the main clause **olina fiata la one fufum**. It is marked with the Anterior suffix, which indicates that the clause means ‘upon V happening’. That is, it provides a temporal starting point for the action of the main verb. The subject participant ‘they’ is expressed on the subordinate verb by means of the prefix **vo**-(intransitive third person subjects of adverbial subordinate verbs are marked
morphologically as objects; see Section 16.1 for more on this).

COORDINATE-DEPENDENT:

29) Aka fiata lelaol lomare, lofoure, aka fiata lelaol.
then thunder(f) two.f 3dufo- take -NF 3dufo- put.on -NF
koan ka ririgoiare fi olei.
doors -LOC LOCEMPH prepare -INTR -NF sgnFOC 3sgS- exist

Then taking two guns, getting them, getting ready, he stood right in the doorway.  

The example above shows three coordinate-dependent clauses (with verbs lomare, lofoure and ririgoiare). Each is dependent for the interpretation of their subject reference on the final verb olei. As it happens, no TAM is marked on the main (independent) verb, but the time reference of the coordinate-dependent clauses is assumed to be that of the main (independent) clause. The verbs of all three coordinate-dependent clauses are overtly marked as such, with the Non-Finite suffix -re. The relationship between the coordinate-dependent clauses and the independent clause is one of temporal succession. Fuller discussion of each of these clause types appears in Chapter 15.

9.6 Predicate Types in Lavukaleve

A predicate is the head of a clause, the element which takes arguments and which carries pronominal affixation, in appropriate clause types, for at least one core argument. The following predicate types exist in Lavukaleve:

- Simple verbs
- Serial verbs in serial verb constructions and verb compounds
- Habitual Auxiliary verbal complexes
- Predicates formed with verbal adjuncts
- Non-verbal predicates
- Deictic predicates

9.6.1 Simple Verb Predicates

Simple verb predicates consist of a single lexical verb. The verb may be transitive or intransitive, and carries the participant marking appropriate for the clause type, and TAM specifications of the clause in which the predicate appears. In the following example, there are two simple verb predicates. The first is a transitive verb ho, marking its object argument by affixation, and functioning as the head of a coordinate-dependent clause (see above); and therefore not marking its subject argument by affixation. The second simple verb predicate is the intransitive verb iru, marking its subject argument...
and functioning as the head of a main clause.

30) **Ohore,**
51sgO- ho -re
3p1S- put.inside -NF
5ma- iru

_Putting it (f) inside, they slept._

9.6.2 SERIAL VERB CONSTRUCTIONS AND VERB COMPOUNDS

Serial verb constructions function in a similar way to simple verb predicates; but structurally they consist of two or more lexical verbs which together act as a single unit in terms of taking subject arguments and TAM specifications. Serial verb constructions share their subject arguments, and if there is more than one transitive verb in the construction, these share their object arguments. Verb compounds consist of two verbs in juxtaposition functioning in every respect as a single predicate. The two constructions differ in that every transitive verb of a serial verb construction must prefix its object, whereas the entire verb compound only prefixes its object once.

Some examples of subject and object marking in serial verb constructions and verb compounds follow. See Section 14.1 for a much fuller justification and discussion of these constructions.

Serial verb constructions:
31) **"Oma vulama".**
5o- ma vula -ma
3sgfO- take come -DURIMP.sg

"Bring it (f)." [i.e. you take it and come]

32) **kokotev vona lain heka hano ae kaegoav.**
 kokotev vo- na lai -n heka hano ae kaego -v
sharp.rocks(pl) 3plO- in top -1.OC there.DIST1 then go.up be.on.top-pl

... they go up on top of a sharp rock.

Verb compounds:
33) **kiu mev feiere vosoufaleri,**
 kiu me -v fele -re vosoufaleri, -pl return -NF 3plO- rise stand -CAUS

die SPEC -pl return -NF 3plO- rise stand -CAUS

... [we] help the sick to stand up again [lit: stand the dying back up].

34) **Ngagaikoko na akevaubre.**
 nga- gaikoko na a- ke vau -ri -re
1sgPOSS- canoe(m) 3gmArt 3sgmO- push.off go.out -CAUS-FUT

_I push out my canoe._
9.6.3 Habitual Auxiliary verbal complexes

Verbal complexes consist of a lexical verb in construction with the Habitual Auxiliary (see Section 14.3 for discussion). The members of the verbal complex function as a single predicate. They share their arguments, and participant marking is shared between them, in a very particular way. The Habitual Auxiliary can only ever mark the subject (S/A), never the object, argument (with one exception, in focus constructions, see below Section 9.7.2, and Chapter 11). Note however that in subordinate constructions the Habitual Auxiliary, like intransitive verbs, uses object prefixes to cross-reference the subject argument in the third person, in what is essentially a split-ergative marking system. This is discussed in Section 16.1. The verb can only cross-reference the object, if it is transitive, never the subject. The auxiliary can use either a special subject prefix, or else the Agreement Suffix, to cross-reference the subject. The following are examples of these verbal complexes:

Intransitive:

35) Vala! Malav va foiva meo vohane ngoa mev.
vala malav va foiva meo vo- ha -ne ngoa me -v
how people(pl)plArt PN.MED.pl tuna(pl) 3plO- clear -IMPF stay HAB -pl

Hey! Those people are staying there catching bonito.

Transitive:

36) aluluri lulu -ri leme.
a- lulu -ri le- me
3sgmO- straight -CAUS 1plex- HAB

...we sort it out

In each of the above examples, the Habitual Auxiliary me immediately follows a verb, and, together with that verb, forms the predicate of the clause. There is a subject prefix or suffix on me, and, if the verbal complex is transitive there is an object prefix on the verb. Verbal complexes take their valency from the verb of the complex; me is not a verb and has no valency.

9.6.4 Predicates formed with verbal adjuncts

Complex predicates formed with Verbal Adjuncts consist of two parts; the adjunct expresses the lexical meaning of the predicate and takes no morphology, and it occurs with a semantically rather empty verb, either hai ‘do’ or sia ‘be, become, happen, do’ (always glossed ‘do’), which takes any appropriate verbal morphology. Verb adjuncts are a small closed class. Those which occur with sia are mostly loan verbs, and the construction is used mainly to enable these loan verbs to be used in Lavukaleve sentences. Some examples:
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37) Malá'gul na hogala fi fo'for haire ove.
malá gula na hoga -la fi fo'for hai -re o- ve
bird(m) sgmArt MOD.PROX.sgn -EXT 3sgnFOC fly do -NF 3sgS-go

The bird flies past.

38) Feure aka feu bekoul vona va'var ohai.
feu -re aka feu bekoul vo- na va'var o- hai
go.up -NF then go.up stones 3plO- in talking 3sgS- do

He went up and talked to the stones [i.e. gravestones].

39) lake rugi ofoton fi stop masia.
lake rugi o- foto -n fi stop ma- sia
road(n) big.sgn 3sgPOSS- middle -LOC 3sgnFOC stop 3plS- do

...they stopped in the middle of the big road.

Verbal adjunct constructions are discussed in Section 14.4.

9.6.5 NON-VERBAL PREDICATES

Non-verbal clauses consist of a non-verbal predicate and its subject argument. These subject arguments are different from the subjects of verbal clauses, which were defined in terms of morphological tests (i.e. cross-referencing). Non-verbal subject arguments can be defined as the other NP argument of a clause with a non-verbal predicate. The non-verbal predicate can consist of an NP, or a particle (italicised in the following examples):

40) "O! Fova suni ngatulav hova!"
o fova suni nga- tulav hova
oh PN.PROX.pl all 1sgPOSS- children(pl) MOD.PROX.pl

"Oh! These are all my children!" [lit: these ones are all these my children]

41) Ta hona mina akari mea roru tamu.
ta hona mina aka -ri me -a ro -ru tamu
time(m) MOD.PROX.sgm thing(f) then -PSNV SPEC -sgf one.sgf -none no

But now there is nothing like that. [lit: a thing like that is not]

Occasionally, a subject may be ellipsed if it is understood:

42) Aka vasa fin.
aka vasa fin
then fence(m) 3sgmFOC

[It was] a fence.
9.6.6 Deictic Predicates

Deictic predicates are derived from certain deictics by means of the Predicative suffixes -o (feminine singular), -om (masculine/neuter singular), and -v (plural), attached to the deictic in combination with the Presentative suffix -ri. The Predicative suffixes derive a predicate from an adverbial or adnominal modifier or a nominal head. Thus, the demonstrative hoina ‘this’ becomes hoinari ‘this one’ with the Presentative suffix, and hoinariom ‘it’s this one’ with the masculine/neuter singular Predicative suffix. Such predicates are restricted syntactically in that they cannot take any verbal morphology, and can only take one argument.

Some examples:

44) Oivasa makav Lemi Rugi, Tau Sosona, Vala Rugi.
   oiva -sa ma- kavu lemi rugi tau sosona vala rugi
   other.MED.pl -GROUP 3plPOSS- group eye big.sgn limb be.long belly big.sgn
   Those in one group: Big Eye, Long Arm and Big Belly.
   kavu roge.
   MOD.MED.pl -PSNV group(n)one.sgn
   Those ones were one group. [lit: it was those ones, one group]

45) "Fova haul hokariom."
   fova haul -l hoka -ri -om
   PN.PROX.pl go.ashore -LOCZR here.PROX -PSNV -m/n
   "They are here on the shore now".

46) Akariom tin fi.
   aka -ri -om tin fi
   then -PSNV -m/n only 3sgnFOC
   It's just like that.

Discussion of deictic predicates is in Section 8.10.4.

9.7 Core Participant Marking

Affixial participant marking is accomplished by means of:

- verbal prefixes, indicating person and number of subject and person, number and gender of object (discussed in this chapter)
• the Agreement Suffix, marking gender and number of a core argument; which core argument depends on various factors to do with focus and clause type (Chapter 10, Chapter 11)
• prefixes on the Habitual Auxiliary, marking person and number of subject (Section 14.3)
• Present Tense agreement, indicating number of the subject (Section 12.2.2).
• Imperative suffixes, indicating one of two types of Imperative mood, and number of subject (Section 12.4.2).

The focus markers also have a role in participant marking; but as they always cross-reference to the same argument which the Agreement Suffix marks, their role may be subsumed under that of the Agreement Suffix for the purposes of this discussion. Clauses have a different kind of participant marking system depending on whether they are focus constructions or not (focus constructions account for about 1/3 of all clauses).

The paradigms of affixes which are used to accomplish participant marking appear here:

**VERBAL SUBJECT PREFIXES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>DU</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1EXCL</td>
<td>a-</td>
<td>le-</td>
<td>e-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1INCL</td>
<td>ngo-</td>
<td>ne-</td>
<td>me-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ngo-</td>
<td>mele-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>o-</td>
<td>lo-</td>
<td>ma-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference between the two forms given for 2nd singular is that ne- is used when it is the second prefix on a predicate (i.e. if an object prefix is present). The ngo- prefix is used otherwise. Compare example (14) with the following:

47) Ria ngo-ma-m hin?
ria ngo- ma -m hin
where 2sg- take -sgm 3sgmEFOC

*Where did you take it (m) [from]*?
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VERBAL OBJECT PREFIXES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>DU</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1EXCL</td>
<td>nga-</td>
<td>le-</td>
<td>e-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 INCL</td>
<td>ngo-</td>
<td>mele-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ngo-</td>
<td>mele-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 MASC</td>
<td>a-</td>
<td>la-</td>
<td>vo-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 FEM</td>
<td>o-</td>
<td>lo-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 NEUT</td>
<td>e-</td>
<td>le-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the 1st person dual and plural prefixes, 3rd person feminine singular and dual, and the 2nd person prefixes (apart from ne-), do not distinguish subject and object.

THE AGREEMENT SUFFIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>DU</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MASC</td>
<td>-m</td>
<td>-mal</td>
<td>-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-aol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUT</td>
<td>-ø</td>
<td>-gel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that strictly speaking the Agreement Suffix is not one suffix but a whole paradigm of number/gender-marked forms, but I use the term as shorthand.

HABITUAL AUXILIARY SUBJECT PREFIXES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>DU</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 EXCL</td>
<td>la-</td>
<td>le-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 INCL</td>
<td>ngo-</td>
<td>mele-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ngo-</td>
<td>mele-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>lo-</td>
<td>ma-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Habitual Auxiliary subject prefixes are the same as verbal subject prefixes (except for ne-), but with an initial I- before vowel-initial forms.

PRESENT TENSE SUBJECT AGREEMENT

| SINGULAR SUBJECT | -nu-ø |
| DUAL SUBJECT    | -nu-l |
| PLURAL SUBJECT  | -nu-v |

The Present tense marker is -nu, and the following material marks subject agreement. Note that /l/ and /v/ are pervasive in Lavukaleve as markers of the dual and plural
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categories respectively.

IMPERATIVE SUFFIXES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR SUBJECT</th>
<th>PUNCTUAL IMPERATIVE</th>
<th>DURATIVE IMPERATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-va</td>
<td>-ma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ila</td>
<td>-mela</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-iva</td>
<td>-ba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The verbal pronominal prefixes, Habitual Auxiliary prefixes, Present Tense suffixes and Imperative suffixes are referred to as cross-referencing affixes throughout this thesis. Further, the names 'cross-referencing affixes' versus 'Agreement Suffix' suggest that these two sets of affixes have different basic functions. This is partly true; the appearance or otherwise of the Agreement Suffix is controlled almost entirely by pragmatic-syntactic factors; it is a necessary element of Sentence-Final focus constructions, relative clauses and stative/resultative intransitive predicates for instance. The appearance of the cross-referencing affixes, however, is not circumscribed in this way; rather, they are the default way of referring to an argument by means of verbal morphology.

A further major difference between them is that the verbal pronominal cross-referencing prefixes mark person, whereas the Agreement Suffix does not. This is an important distinction to make; the cross-referencing prefixes are much more like pronominal arguments themselves (see above, Section 9.4.2), whereas the Agreement Suffix is much more like a marker of agreement with an argument; hence its name.

9.7.1 AFFIXIAL PARTICIPANT MARKING IN SIMPLE VERBAL NON-FOCUS CLAUSES

There is a general principle of participant marking in simple verbal predicates in Lavukaleve that each core participant can be marked by affixation a maximum of once per predicate. From this general principle follow many of the structural rules of participant marking in Lavukaleve. These rules are described briefly here and discussed in more detail in the chapters concerning each construction type.

Participant marking by affixation in simple verbal non-focus clauses depends in part on the transitivity of the predicate. Transitive predicates may mark both their core arguments with prefixes; the first prefix position marks the object argument, the second prefix position marks the subject argument:

48) Leta velanun velanun ta mina oavea.
    leta vela -nun vela -nun ta mina o- a- vea
    but go -DUR go -DUR but thing(f) 3sgfO- 1sgS- know

But things went on, and now I know something.
Intransitive verbs mark their subject with a cross-referencing prefix if the predicate is to be interpreted with an active meaning, or the Agreement Suffix if the predicate is to have a stative/resultative meaning (see Section 10.5):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>49)</th>
<th>felere</th>
<th>kini</th>
<th>mae.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fele</td>
<td>-re</td>
<td>kini</td>
<td>ma-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>return</td>
<td>-NF</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>3plS-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>go.up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...they went back up [to Yandina].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>50)</th>
<th>Aeloge,</th>
<th>aka</th>
<th>ngai</th>
<th>ikari</th>
<th>lom.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a-</td>
<td>e-</td>
<td>-ge</td>
<td>aka</td>
<td>ngai</td>
<td>ika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sgmO-</td>
<td>SBD-</td>
<td>finish</td>
<td>-ANT</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>1sg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>there</td>
<td>-PSNV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>finish</td>
<td>-sgm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It (that time (m)) finishing, then I (m) was finished there.

9.7.2 AFFIXIAL PARTICIPANT MARKING IN SIMPLE VERBAL FOCUS CLAUSES

There are three types of focus, corresponding to three types of focus constructions: argument focus, sentence focus and predicate focus (see Chapter 11 for a detailed account of these types). Each is marked morphologically by a focus marker, and Sentence-Final focus constructions also have the verbal Agreement Suffix agreeing with a constituent of the clause. The Agreement Suffix agrees with the object argument of a transitive predicate focus clause, the subject argument of a transitive sentence focus clause, or the subject argument of an intransitive clause. The constraint that each core argument can be expressed by affix a maximum of once per predicate means that, if one argument in a focus clause is marked by the Agreement Suffix, it cannot also be marked by a prefix; and further, if the other argument is expressed affixially it must be expressed by a prefix.

Object agreement (predicate focus):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>51)</th>
<th>Aka</th>
<th>mina</th>
<th>hano</th>
<th>maririgoiria</th>
<th>feo.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aka</td>
<td>mina</td>
<td>hano</td>
<td>ma-</td>
<td>ririgoi</td>
<td>-ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>then</td>
<td>thing(f)</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>3plS-</td>
<td>prepare</td>
<td>-CAUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-sf</td>
<td>-sgf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3sgfFOC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

They prepared (every)thing.

Intransitive subject agreement (sentence focus):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>52)</th>
<th>Ena</th>
<th>hururea</th>
<th>finu.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e-</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>huru</td>
<td>-re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sgnO-</td>
<td>go.inside</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>finu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-NF</td>
<td>-sgf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2sgFOC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You (f) will go inside it.

Transitive subject agreement (sentence focus):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>53)</th>
<th>Lafi</th>
<th>ga</th>
<th>vula</th>
<th>lome</th>
<th>ga</th>
<th>evealav</th>
<th>fiv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lafi</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>vula</td>
<td>lo-</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>-s</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>e-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water(n)</td>
<td>sgnArt</td>
<td>come</td>
<td>3sgS-</td>
<td>HAB-sgn</td>
<td>sgnArt</td>
<td>3sgnO-</td>
<td>know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How the water came, [they] didn't know.
9.7.3 **Summary: Basic Principles of Participant Marking**

The following principles hold for participant marking on simple verbal predicates:

1. Each participant can be marked by affix only once per predicate.
2. Objects must be referred to by an affix on the predicate; subjects do not have to be.
3. On intransitive verbal predicates, a cross-referencing prefix is used if the predicate is to be interpreted as active; the Agreement Suffix is used if the predicate is to be interpreted as stative/resultative.
4. In a Sentence-Final focus construction, the Agreement Suffix always cross-references one core argument, and, if the predicate is transitive, a prefix cross-references the other.

9.7.4 **Participant Marking in Non-Simple Verbal Predicates**

Sections 9.7.1 and 9.7.2 describe the basic participant marking systems. There are adjustments to the basic system to be found in non-simple predicate types, as described below. For detailed discussion the reader is advised to consult the chapters mentioned.

In verbal complexes (which consist of a verb plus the Habitual Auxiliary), the Habitual Auxiliary marks subject, and the verb, if transitive, marks the object (see above and Section 14.3). In the following example, the object is marked by affixation on verb, and the subject is marked by affixation on Habitual Auxiliary; a focus marker (with default, i.e. 3rd singular neuter, agreement) intervenes between verb and Habitual Auxiliary:

```
Aka ta ana war loham orem
aka ta a- na war lo -ham o- re -m
then time(m) in war(f) finish say -sgm

ana fi minamina la suni okeuri fi mame
a- na fi Dup- mina la suni o- keuri fi ma- me
3sgmO- in 3sgnFOC REDUP- thing(f)sfgArt all 3sgfO- carry 3sgnFOC 3plS-HAB
```

> When the war was said to be finished, they loaded everything up.

Also, see Section 14.3.1 for discussion of one situation in verbal complexes where a single participant is cross-referenced in two different places in one predicate, in violation of the first principle given above.

In serial verb constructions (see above and Section 14.1), all transitive members of the serial verb construction mark their object, which must be shared by each transitive verb; but the subject can be marked only once, on the final verb of the construction. In the following example, the object is marked by affixation on every transitive verb, and the subject is only marked, in the form of the Imperative suffix, once:
Rule them and lift them up for ever.

Subordinate-dependent adverbial clauses have their own special type of participant marking system (see Section 16.1), a split-ergative system in which an intransitive verb marks a third person subject using an object prefix, and an invariant prefix e- appears in the subject prefix slot (first and second person subjects, and marking of transitive verbs, are unaffected). The next example illustrates this. The intransitive subject of kiu 'die' is marked by an object prefix:

Upon her dying, then the other woman [their mother] said 'Man!' 

In coordinate-dependent clauses (see Chapter 15), subjects of coordinate-dependent predicates cannot be marked by affixation on coordinate-dependent predicates, but only on the final, independent, predicate of such chains:

He went up, and killed eight possums and took them and went out.

From the general principles of participant marking which were described in Sections 9.7.1 and 9.7.2, and summarised in Section 9.7.3, follow all the rather complex participant marking phenomena which appear in the many variants of predicate types. By way of magnification, some more complex examples are shown here. Such structures as are shown below are by no means uncommon; in fact, they are somewhat more common than the simple structures by which the basic principles of the system were elucidated. Basic principles upon which these predicates are affixed are numbered according to the summary in Section 9.7.3.

The italicised part of the next example is a complex predicate consisting of a serial verb construction. The second verb of the serial verb construction (fale 'stand') carries the Negative suffix, but the scope of negation is across the whole predicate, as is normal for serial verb constructions. Participants are each marked once on the predicate, as per Principle 1. As this predicate is part of a focus construction (with focus marker fongai) the subject argument is marked by the Agreement Suffix on the second verb of the predicate (and on the focus marker), as per Principle 4.
I (f) have never stepped down on the ground.

The next example shows a habitual verbal complex, also negated, and also in a focus construction. The focus construction requires the subject to be indicated with the Agreement Suffix on the last element of the predicate (as per Principle 4); in this case, the Habitual Auxiliary. The other argument, the object, is marked by affixation on the first element of the predicate, the lexical verb:

We can't know, [the time (m)] when the hole was shut.

In the next example, the predicate consists of a serial verb construction eo hai `go.around do' acting together as the verbal part of a verbal complex with the Habitual Auxiliary. As both verbs are intransitive, their shared subjects are not marked on them; rather, the subject of the entire predicate is expressed once (as per Principle 1), on the Habitual Auxiliary:

I would go round with the offices (i.e. go round wherever there were offices, checking them).

The next example is not so much a complex predicate as a series of chained and embedded predicates. Negore is a coordinate-dependent clause, dependent on the verb vofoirene. Because negore ‘float’ is coordinate-dependent and intransitive, it receives no participant marking (see above, this Section). Voeleile ‘when they were’ is subordinate-dependent; its main clause is also that of the verb vofoirene. Voeleile is intransitive, and is, in this construction, involved in the type of subordination (with the Potential -le) that requires intransitive subjects to be marked as objects (see above, this Section). Vofoirene ‘holding them’, the main verb on which all these verbs ultimately depend, is transitive, and thus must mark its object by affixation (as per Principle 2), but it does not mark its subject by affixation (see Section 12.3.1).
We came ashore again; the women and children and everything got back in and when they were floating again [the men] held them. In the canoes.
CHAPTER TEN

The Agreement Suffix

Throughout this thesis, much mention is made of the Agreement Suffix and its use in various constructions. It was stated in Chapter 9 that there are two transitive and intransitive affixial participant marking patterns for basic Lavukaleve clauses. That is, an intransitive clause may mark its subject participant with either a prefix or a suffix on the predicate, and a transitive clause may mark its subject and object participants on the predicate with either two prefixes, or a prefix and a suffix. In the latter case, subject and object may be marked by either prefix or suffix, as long as each argument is marked once and only once.

The Agreement Suffix is used as the marker of an argument of a predicate in certain grammatical environments. These environments are as follows: the Agreement Suffix is used on the final predicate of a relative clause to mark the head of the relative clause construction; it is used to mark a certain argument in focus constructions (the choice of argument is a matter of some importance, see below); and it is used to mark the sole argument of a stative or resultative intransitive predicate when not in a focus construction. The Agreement Suffix is also used on adjectives, to express agreement of the adjective with its head noun.

Rather than discussing the Agreement Suffix per se, in this chapter the kinds of constructions the Agreement Suffix occurs in are discussed. The functions of the Agreement Suffix are by no means pragmatically unconnected, and the aim here is to bring together all of these uses of the Agreement Suffix in one place, to show the pragmatic functions of this ubiquitous and important suffix in Lavukaleve morphosyntax.

Firstly, the formal features of the Agreement Suffix will be examined. Then the
discussion will move on to its uses. Its use in relative clauses, focus constructions and adjectives will be examined in turn, then the discussion moves on to its use with stative and resultative clauses.

10.1 FORMAL FEATURES

The Agreement Suffix is, strictly speaking, not a single suffix but a paradigm of suffixes. Its forms mark gender and number, as the following paradigm shows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>DU</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MASC</td>
<td>-m</td>
<td>-mal</td>
<td>-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-aol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUT</td>
<td>-@</td>
<td>-gel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.1.1 THE EXISTENCE OF A ZERO

The 3rd singular neuter form is said, throughout this thesis, to be zero, and it is glossed in example sentences as such. This zero morpheme has not been posited lightly. There are three good reasons for saying that Lavukaleve has a zero morpheme for its 3rd singular neuter Agreement Suffix form. Firstly, although there is no direct evidence of the 3rd singular neuter Agreement Suffix form, it can be demonstrated that it alternates with the other forms of the Agreement Suffix. Consider for example the following data (it is elicited, because minimal trios tend not to occur naturally). The Agreement Suffix is glossed throughout this chapter in bold:

1) Marigen holu roa alem fin.
   marigen holu roa a- le -m fin
   yesterday harbour(m) one.sgm 1sgS- see -sgm 3sgmFOC
   Yesterday I saw a bay.
   e1 009a

2) Marigen solo la alea feo.
   marigen solo la a- le -a feo
   yesterday mountain(f) sgfArt 1sgS- see -sgf 3sgfFOC
   Yesterday I saw the mountain.
   e1 009b/1

3) Marigen fagi ga ale fl.
   marigen fagi ga a- le -@ fl
   yesterday island(n) sgnArt 1sgS- see -sgn 3sgnFOC
   Yesterday I saw the island.
   e1 009b/2

In the first example of the above trio, the masculine singular Agreement Suffix -m occurs marking the masculine singular object holu roa 'a harbour'. In the second example, the feminine singular Agreement Suffix -a occurs marking the feminine
singular object solo la 'the mountain'. In the third example, there is no overt marking on the verb for the singular neuter object fagi ga 'the island'. However, by comparison with the other sentences, one could say there is a zero morpheme there (as the gloss indicates).

The second reason for positing a zero morpheme here is that when sentence-final focus markers such as those in the above sentences occur after a verb, the verb must appear with the Agreement Suffix. This is one of the rules of Lavukaleve (see Chapter 11, and the discussion below). If one say that there is no 3rd singular neuter Agreement Suffix, then one could be forced to change the rule of the verb morphology in focus constructions to make an exception for 3rd singular neuter arguments. This is a descriptively unappealing analysis.

The third reason for positing a zero morpheme is that in Lavukaleve, it is obligatory for all transitive predicates to mark their objects. (This rule was first stated in Section 9.7). Objects may be marked cross-referenced with a prefix from the object prefix paradigm, or with the Agreement Suffix. If one said that 3rd singular neuter objects are not cross-referenced with the Agreement Suffix, then one would be forced to amend the rule that all transitive predicates obligatorily cross-reference their objects, to make an exception for 3rd singular neuter objects under circumstances where they would be expected to be marked by the Agreement Suffix (of course, in constructions involving object prefixes, they still are marked). This again is descriptively unappealing.

Of course, on some level, the 3rd singular neuter Agreement Suffix is just not there. But in terms of the description of the language, positing a zero in this position simplifies the analysis and allows more powerful generalisations of processes in Lavukaleve which probably do have some claim to linguistic reality. For this reason, the 3sgn Agreement Suffix is considered to be of the form -0.

Note, however, that it is only posited and glossed in example sentences in circumstances in which it is certain that another form of the Agreement Suffix would appear. That is, it is always posited (and glossed) when it is the object of a transitive predicate, or in a sentence-final focus construction; because the rules of Lavukaleve morpho-syntax mean that any other form of the Agreement Suffix would appear in those circumstances. But when a 3rd singular neuter argument is subject of a verb, it is not always certain if the Agreement Suffix would occur or not, because subject marking is, in many constructions, not obligatory. In such circumstances, the 3rd singular neuter Agreement Suffix is not posited and glossed in example sentences.

10.2 The Agreement Suffix in relative clauses

The Agreement Suffix is used obligatorily on the final predicate of a relative clause to cross-reference the head of a relative clause construction. Relative clause constructions (which are discussed in more detail in Section 16.3) in Lavukaleve are internally-
headed. That is, the head functions syntactically as part of the relative clause. The relative clause contains at least one verb, the final one of which is marked with the verbal Agreement Suffix, plus any full NPs associated with the verb, any adjuncts, and finally the definite article. Relative clauses can contain quite complex internal structures, involving subordinate clauses and clause chains for instance (see for example (6) below, which has a relative clause containing a clause chaining construction). The final verb in the relative clause receives the Agreement Suffix. The Agreement Suffix and the definite article agree in number and gender with the head. For example:

4) (Then an island formed)

\[
\text{Lafa ona falere omea la ona.}
\]

\[
\text{In the place where she was standing.}
\]

5) Mina onal suluverav volugui ga

\[
\text{Mina o- nal suluverav vo- lugu -i ga}
\]

\[
\text{Because it was important to respect the chiefs, and what the chiefs said.}
\]

6) (The giant saw the fish(m).)

\[
\text{Aleire olufum na.}
\]

\[
\text{The one that he had left hanging.}
\]

7) ofeil aham hide ola ga

\[
\text{...he took his bow that (his mother) had made for him and his two arrows and}
\]

\[
\text{with them he went out.}
\]

Relative clauses are the only construction types in Lavukaleve in which a verb with the Agreement Suffix is followed immediately by the definite article. In all other construction types, if a verb is followed by the definite article, the verb must have been
nominalised, with the Nominaliser suffix (described in Section 13.1). Only in relative clauses can a non-nominalised verb be followed immediately by the definite article. Note that relative clauses are nominal modifiers; in this sense, the use of the Agreement Suffix on relative clauses exactly parallels its use on adjectives (see below), marking the agreement of the dependent constituent on which it appears with the head of that constituent.

Note also that in relative clauses and focus constructions, the Agreement Suffix on a predicate can index an argument in subject, object or postpositional object function. In all other construction types, the Agreement Suffix on predicates only indexes subjects or objects. In relative clauses, the Agreement Suffix always indexes the head, and as the head may be in the syntactic roles of subject, object or postpositional object, the Agreement Suffix in relative clauses may in fact index arguments in the syntactic role of object of postposition.

10.3 THE AGREEMENT SUFFIX IN FOCUS CONSTRUCTIONS

The Agreement Suffix is used to cross-reference a particular argument of a focus construction. It is shown in Chapter 11 that there are two syntactic types of focus constructions in Lavukaleve, shown by different agreement patterns of the Agreement Suffix and focus markers. The Agreement Suffix and the focus marker always agree with the same entity, and thus always agree with each other. The two syntactic types of focus, named for the position of the focus marker in the construction, are Sentence-Internal focus constructions and Sentence-Final focus constructions. The former is the construction used to express argument focus; it is not of concern here, as it does not involve the Agreement Suffix.

Sentence-Final focus constructions with simple verbal or complex predicates do involve the Agreement Suffix. They consist of a sentence-final focus marker, in construction with a predicate marked with the Agreement Suffix, and they can be used to express either sentence focus or predicate focus. Which one of these two types of focus is intended is shown by the agreement of the Agreement Suffix and focus marker. The Agreement Suffix and focus marker agree with the object of a transitive clause to show predicate focus; and the subject of a transitive clause, and the subject of an intransitive clause to show sentence focus.

Predicate focus (Agreement Suffix and focus marker agree with object):

8) "Eta! Ngai fe hoigala keleanun
eta ngai fe hoiga -la kelea -nun
Wow! 1sg even MOD.MED.sgn -EXT walk -DUR
amam fin ke.
a- ma -m fin ke
1sgS- take -sgm 3sgmFOC EMPH

"Well! I just went around there a bit and took it [the fish (m)]."  

co 022
9) 
(I go up to pull the canoe out from the bush.)

Malav  

fiv  

aveirev  

hiv.

malav  

fiv  

a-  

vei  

-re  

-v  

hiv

people(PL)  

3PLFOC  

1SG-  

call  

-FUT  

-PL  

3PLFOC

I will call some people [to help me].

Sentence focus (Agreement Suffix and focus marker agree with subject):
10) Aka  

sia  

re  

ta  

hona  

malav  

mev

aka  

sia  

-re  

ta  

hona  

malav  

me  

-v

then  

DO  

-NF  

time(MOD)  

MOD.PROX.SGM  

people(PL)  

SPEC  

-PL

maku  

vea  

mev  

fiv,

ma-  

kua  

e-  

vea  

me  

-v  

fiv

3PLPOSS-  

tribe(N)  

3SGN-O  

know  

HAB  

-PL  

3PLFOC

maval  

vea  

mev  

fiv.

ma-  

vala  

e-  

vea  

me  

-v  

fiv

3PLPOSS-  

clan(N)  

3SGN-O  

know  

HAB  

-PL  

3PLFOC

That’s why these people of today know their clan and tribe.

11) Tasi  

gga  

otinau  

fi  

ofoina

tasi  

ga  

o-  

tinau  

fi  

o-  

foi  

-na

sea(n)  

SGNART  

3SGPOSS-  

body(n)  

3SGNFOC  

3SGN-  

hold  

-DUR

efoum  

hin  


3SGN-O-  

make  

-sgm  

3SGMFOC

The sea is his and he made it.

12) alailav  

fiv.

a-  

lai  

-la  

-v  

fiv

3SGN-O-  

tell  

-NEG  

-PL  

3PLFOC

...they didn’t tell him

The morpho-syntactic distinction between Predicate Focus and Sentence Focus cannot be expressed in intransitive clauses; the Agreement Suffix and focus marker agree with the subject in both cases, thus Sentence focus is expressed:

13) Taataul  

vona  

malav  

mev  

fiv  

vov  

hiv.

taataul  

vo-  

na  

malav  

me  

-v  

fiv  

vov  

-v  

hiv

different.islands(PL)  

3PLO-  

in  

people(PL)  

SPEC-PL  

3PLFOC  

COME  

-PL  

3PLEFOC

They were people from all different islands who came.

In negative clauses (for example (12) above), the Agreement Suffix is used to cross-reference the subject (S/A) of the negated verb. That is, negative clauses obligatorily

1 The predicate here is a complex predicate consisting of a verb plus the Habitual Auxiliary. Participant marking is shared between the elements of the predicate, with the auxiliary taking the Agreement Suffix. This kind of predicate is discussed in Section 14.3.
involve (in terms of their morpho-syntax at least) a sentence focus construction; it is not possible to mark predicate focus in negative clauses. Negation is discussed in general in Section 17.2, and with particular reference to focus constructions in Section 11.3.2.

In all Sentence-Final focus constructions, the Agreement Suffix must obligatorily agree with the same element that the focus marker agrees with. Together, the Agreement Suffix and focus marker serve to show morphologically what type of focus a particular construction is expressing.

There are rare examples in which a transitive predicate receives the Agreement Suffix to mark an argument, but there is no focus marker, and the construction is not a relative clause. For example:

14) Akovere kini amare hano maum.
   a- kove re kini a- ma re hano ma u -m
3sgmO- look.for -NF ACT 3sgmO- take -NF then 3p1S- eat -sgm

*They searched for him, then they took him and ate him.*

15) Maki na oum o suma na oum
   maki na o u -m o suma na o u -m
   nut.pudding(m) sgmArt 3sgS- eat -sgm and taro(m) sgmArt 3sgS- eat -sgm
   o vala fe orere.
o vala fe o re -re
and how even 3sgS- say -FUT

*He was eating the maki, he was eating the taro, what can he say?*

16) Osooso ga haire, lokurum ke.
   o sooso ga hai re lo kuru -m ke
3sgPOSS- neck(n) sgmArt do -NF 3duS- hit -sgm EMPH

*Chopping his head off [lit: doing his neck], they killed him.*

Such examples can always have a focus marker inserted after the verb with the Agreement Suffix on it; in fact it appears that these examples are a fast-speech casual expression of a focus construction. When transcribing such constructions, informants usually correct them by inserting a focus marker. Similarly, when asked if such strings are grammatical, informants usually give a preferred version with a focus marker. So example (14) above is, according to native speakers, better expressed as the following:

17) Akovere koi kini amare hano maum fin.
   a- kove re koi kini a- ma re hano ma u -m fin
3sgmO- look.for -NF also ACT 3sgmO- take -NF then 3p1S- eat -sgm 3sgmFOC

*They searched for him again then took him and ate him.*

Without the focus marker the sentences are grammatical, but are dispreferred by speakers, even though they do (rarely) occur in natural speech. Note that most of the examples of this phenomenon in the corpus are given by just two speakers.
It seems, then, that these sentences are focus constructions without the focus marker. Constructions involving the Agreement Suffix on the verb, without any grammatical environment to account for it, can be seen themselves as the equivalent of focus constructions proper, at least in casual speech.

10.3.1 Omission of the Agreement Suffix in Sentence-Final Focus Constructions

While the Agreement Suffix is an integral part of Sentence-Final focus constructions, it occasionally happens that in an otherwise normal Sentence-Final focus construction the Agreement Suffix is omitted. This only occurs with the plural Agreement Suffix, and only in casual speech. For example:

18) Aka mataliovil va ta hatafare lo hiv.
   aka ma-talio-vil va ta hatafa-re lo hiv
   then 3plPOSS-cable-PL plArt just snap-NF finish 3plEFOC
   Then their ropes snapped.

19) Foiga sevokal enga ama hiv.
   foiga sevo-kal enga a-ma hiv
   PN.MED.sgn vow -PL three 1sgS-take 3plEFOC
   Those were the three vows I took.

20) Aka homelav vutiv koi fo'foira hori
   aka homela-v vuti -v koi fo'foira ho hori
   then woman-pl be.many-pl also work(f) MOD.PROX.sgf -ri
   ona hau hoila fiv.
   o-na hau ho-i-l-a fiv
   3sgfo-in go ashore go in -NEG 3plFOC
   So lots of women, too, they don't join this work.

The fact that this only happens with the plural Agreement Suffix may suggest that it could be a phonologically-determined phenomenon, but there are no other examples in the language of word-final /v/ being omitted.

Native speakers produce these sentences, but they correct them if I produce them, and when transcribing such sentences produced by other native speakers they often accept them only reluctantly, preferring to restore the Agreement Suffix on the verb. Note that the absence of the Agreement Suffix on transitive predicate focus sentences leads to the anomalous situation that the verb is not cross-referenced for its object, which all transitive verbs in Lavukaleve must be.

10.4 The Agreement Suffix with Adjectives

The Agreement Suffix occurs obligatorily on all regular adjectives in an NP to agree in
number and gender with the head noun of the NP. For example:

21) Hano. Foe na alolege ta hano
hano foe na a-lo-le -ge ta hano
then pig(m) sgmArt 3sgmO- 3duS- see-ANT but then

mitakeumal nurav va hano
mitakeu mal nura -v va hano
dog -pl wild -pl plArt then

aure tutuk ga malori.
a-u re tutuku ga ma-lo -ri -Ø
3sgmO- eat -NF middle.of.body(n) sgmArt 3plS- finish -CAUS -sgn

okay. They saw the pig, but the wild dogs had eaten the torso. hr1 030

22) Homelav vutiv fiv
homela -v vuti -v fiv
woman -pl be.many -pl 3plFOC

kavuv iloilo vona hau hoi mev.
kavu -v iloilo -v vo na hau hoi me -v
group -pl different -pl 3plO- in go.ashore go.in HAB -pl

They are many women, who join the different groups. emk 008

23) man ho'beam na, foina sulum na,
man ho'bea -m na foina sulum na,
what(m) good -sgm sgmArt PN.MED.sgm chief(m) sgmArt

...whatever was good, that one [was for] the chief. ch 007

Note that the plural suffix on the nouns in example (22) is not the Agreement Suffix; it is one of many suffixes used to create plural noun forms. See Section 5.6.2 for a discussion of plural suffixes in nouns. The segment /v/ is pervasive as a marker of plurality throughout the language.

If there is more than one adjective in an NP, each one has its own Agreement Suffix. That is, the Agreement Suffix is the property of an individual adjective, rather than a whole modifier phrase:

24) Ali rua folufolum keaki mem roa alem fin.
ali rua folufolu -m keaki me -m roa a-le -m fin
man(m) big.sgm fat -sgm hungry SPEC -sgm one.sgm 1sgS- see-sgm 3sgmFOC

I saw a big fat hungry man. e1 023e

In the above example, there are three adjectives in one NP. The first adjective in the sequence, rua ‘big’, is an irregular adjective with its own inflectional paradigm, so it does not take the Agreement Suffix (see Section 3.3). But the second adjective, folufolum ‘fat’, has the Agreement Suffix, as does the third. The expression of ‘hungry’ is actually formed by a complex phrase involving keaki, plus Specifier adjective mea (see Section 4.1.2), which carries the Agreement Suffix.
The Agreement Suffix is used on independent intransitive predicates to cross-reference the subject in a stative or resultative clause. Subjects of intransitive predicates in independent active clauses (where ‘active’ means non-stative/resultative) are cross-referenced by subject prefixes from the verbal subject prefix paradigm.

The Agreement Suffix is used on all types of predicates in focus constructions; in such cases, the presence of the Agreement Suffix can be accounted for by the presence of the focus marker. The following section concerns the use of the Agreement Suffix on independent intransitive predicates which are not in focus constructions.

The terms ‘state’ and ‘event’ are used as a priori notions here. The terms ‘stative’ refers to something which is conceptualised as a state. The term ‘resultative’ refers to something which is conceptualised as an event which leads to a state: in Nedjalkov’s (1988: 6) terms, “the resultative expresses both a state and the preceding action it has resulted from”. In describing this use of the Agreement Suffix, I use these two terms because they are common in linguistics, but in Lavukaleve there is no justification for separating the two functions. They are treated as one phenomenon. Lavukaleve grammatically encodes stativeness, and does not take into account whether or not the state implies a previous event.

To begin with, consider the following examples of the Agreement Suffix marking the subjects of stative (examples (25), (26) and (27)) and resultative (examples (28), (29) and (30)) intransitive predicates:

25) Inu ngobuk | tavem.
   inu ngo- buku tave -m
   2sg 2sg- conch(m) be.not -sgm

   It’s not your conch.  v1 013

26) Lalasir o neano ta vutiv hiv.
   lalasir o neano ta vuti -v hiv
   cruelty and ill-treatment just be.many -pl 3plEFOC

   Cruelty and ill-treatment abound.  jh 033

27) Asure avalanun feiriav.
   a- su -re a- vala -nun feiria -v
   3sgmO- tie -NF 3sgmO- pull -DUR be.tired -pl

   They tied it and pulled it and pulled it [until they were] tired.  sv 008
Vaurire, ngoane ngoa voemege, sulum

28) vau.out -CAUS -NF stay -IMPF stay 3piO- SBD- HAB-ANT chief(m)

na kini vau laveam.

Going out, they waited, then the chief arrived.

29) kui na foam.

...the sun has gone down.

30) Taragau na rikairikai aelakoge ta
taragau na Dup- rikai a- e- lako -ge ta
sea.eagle(m) sgAmArt REDUP- quickly 3sgmO- SBD- cry -ANT just
ovo'vou na vau houla ro ogean hano
ovo'vou na vau houla ro o- oge -n hano
3sgPOSS- boy(m) sgAmArt go.out tree(f) one.sgf 3sgPOSS- bottom -LOC then

The sea eagle is crying without stopping, and the boy goes out and is hiding in the bottom of the tree.

The terms stative and resultative refer to a property of a contextualised clause, not of an individual lexical item. Thus, most predicates can appear in either stative/resultative or active configurations.

In the following two pairs, compare the use of the Agreement Suffix to mark the subject, with the use of the verbal subject prefixes:

31) Hano melei tuaol la kiuaol.

Your two wives are dead.

32) Honariom ana koi ngakalem okiu.

In this year, also, my father died.

In (31), kiu ‘die’ is used with the Agreement Suffix to refer to a state which the two wives are in. In (32), it is looking at the event as one of the things that happened in the year rather than looking at the state that the father was in.
Almost all intransitive predicates can occur in either stative/resultative or active contexts. For most events it is usually possible to think of a stative, or more particularly resultative, reading under which they could be conceptualised. For some events, it is difficult to think of them in an active context, for example tave 'be not' or raravu 'be red'. However most intransitive predicates in Lavukaleve typically occur in one configuration, but can also occur in the other.

Most uses (about two thirds) of the Agreement Suffix on intransitive predicates are stative; the rest are resultative. Selection of stative or resultative meaning depends largely on the semantics of the predicate type. In particular, motion predicates with the Agreement Suffix have a resultative rather than stative meaning, as do predicates expressing meteorological phenomena. For example, consider the following motion predicates with the Agreement Suffix. When motion predicates are used with the Agreement Suffix they refer to the attainment of a location:

In (33), erau emphasises a state resulting from the previous action of stumbling; the boy stumbled then was fallen. In (34) erau refers to jumping out as one in a series of actions.
The Agreement Suffix is very often used with intransitive predicates referring to meteorological phenomena. These are typically resultative uses, referring to the state resulting from an action/event:

41) Aka ta ana el lefelem na le ga
then time(m) 3sgmO- in 1duex- return -sgm sgmArt day(n) sgnArt
airia -ø ke.
open -sgn EMPH

Then when we came back, dawn came.

40) Ngoa loemege hano koro ga fau.
stay 3sgfO- -HAB -ANT then darkness(n) sgnArt happen -ø
She stays on, and darkness comes.

39) Ngai nageare kium nganu ga hano ngamemela
fear -NF die -sgm then 1sgPOSS- body.hair(f)
soua ke.
sou -a ke
rise -sgf EMPH
I was scared to death, and my hair, and the hairs on my body were standing on end.

38) Lea na ana rolon ka hano hurum.
cave(m) sgmArt 3sgmO- in go.inside LOC LOCEMPH then go.inside -sgm
He was right inside the cave.

37) Fo’sal na ngomam na ane
fish(m) sgmArt 2sg- take-sgm sgmArt 3sgmO- with
kikiuala vaum.
He fought with the fish you took, he’s gone out.

The Agreement Suffix is one verb lako ‘cry, make characteristic sound’, which sometimes appears with the Agreement Suffix. In some of these cases a stative/resultative reading is not obvious:

42) Ini kui na aere kini gatan siam.
ACT sun(m) sgmArt go.up -NF ACT top.of.head -LOC do -sgm
The sun went up; it reached overhead.
43) Afu lemege ta nau na otor a
3sgmO- sing 1plex- HAB -ANT just earthquake(m) sgArt 3sgPOSS- rumble(f)
a- fu le- me -ge ta nau na o- tara
We were singing when the earthquake rumbled.

44) (Inside there he slept, washed, cooked and ate his food, then waited for the time.)
Le'laol lakoao l ko.
le'laol lako -aol ko
Two (o'clock) sounded again.
two.f cry -sgf EMPH

Felere mavoe bagatumaul va.
fele -re ma- vo -e bagatum -a ul va
return -NF 3plPOSS- come -PSV male.giant -pl plArt

The giants came back.

45) Lai voemege lai voemege lai
paddle 3plO- SBD- HAB -ANT paddle 3plO- SBD- HAB -ANT paddle
lai vo- e- me -ge lai vo- e- me -ge lai paddle
voemege kilimar na la kom.
vo- e- me -ge kilimar na lako -m
3plO- SBD- HAB -ANT flock.of.white.seagulls(m) sgArt cry -sgm

They paddled and paddled and paddled, then the flock of seagulls cried.

"E! Laiba! Ukeare lore fi melei".
hey! paddle-DURIMP.pl come.close -NF finish -NF 3sgnFOC 1pl.in-exist

"Hey! Paddle! We're close now!"

While a stative/resultative meaning is not obvious in such examples, it is quite possible that this is the kind of meaning the speaker was intending. If 'crying out' is conceptualised as a bodily state in the same way that 'being seated' is, then a stative/resultative reading for these examples follows easily.

The fact that this verb la ko 'cry' is the only one with which stative/resultative meanings are not clear could be something to do with the meaning of the verb itself. Significantly however, this is the only intransitive verb with which a stative/resultative meaning is not obvious when it is used with the Agreement Suffix. All other cases are far more clearly semantically driven.

The semantics of Lavukaleve's system of participant marking of intransitive predicates are similar to the semantics of active/agentive participant marking systems described by Mithun (1991). In Guarani, Lakhota, Central Pomo, Caddo and Mohawk the subjects of intransitive verbs are marked either in the same way as transitive subjects or in the same
way as transitive objects, depending on the semantics of the verb; Mithun analyses these as an active/agentive alignment system. However even though semantically the use of the prefix versus the Agreement Suffix in Lavukaleve's independent non-focus intransitive predicates is similar to the active/agentive participant marking systems described by Mithun, formally the system in Lavukaleve is not an alignment system; it is not the case that there are two kinds of intransitive subjects, one marked like objects, one marked like transitive subjects, as in Mithun's languages. Rather, there are two participant marking systems available: one uses the same system as used by transitive verbs; one uses the system used in focus marking, in marking the heads of relative clauses, and in marking adjectives to agree with their head nouns. The choice between the systems in intransitive predicates is based on a semantic distinction between stative/resultative and active clauses.

10.6 CONCLUSIONS

The Agreement Suffix is an important part of relative clause constructions, focus constructions, adjectives and stative/resultative clauses. There is a semantic or pragmatic connection between these uses.

Schachter (1973) suggests that there is a semantic link between focus constructions and relative clauses, involving foregrounding:

...just as the focus construction reflects the assignment of special communicative prominence to one part of an underlying sentence, so, I would suggest, does the relative construction. In the case of the focus construction, greater prominence is assigned to that part of the underlying sentence which is identified as relatively new information in the resultant construction, i.e. the focused constituent. In the case of the relative construction, greater prominence is assigned to that part of the underlying sentence which determines the function of the resultant construction, i.e. the head noun. While the basis for the foregrounding is quite different in the two cases, the foregrounding itself — the divisions of a sentence into a more prominent part and a less prominent part — is essentially the same. (Schachter 1973: 44)

This approach shows a possible functional account of the use of the Agreement Suffix in both relative clauses and focus constructions in Lavukaleve. There is also a common functional link between relative clauses and adjectives in that both relative clauses and adjectives function to modify nouns (Schachter also makes this link overt (1973: 42-43)).

Further, the use of the Agreement Suffix on relative clauses and adjectives can be related to its use on stative/resultative predicates. This relationship does not lie in the concept of foregrounding; in fact Hopper and Thompson (1980, especially p. 285) show that stative clauses tend to be backgrounded, not foregrounded. Rather, the relationship lies more in the functional and in some cases formal overlap between adjectives and
stative verbs in Lavukaleve, as indeed in many languages (see Section 3.3).

It is important to note that, as far as the rest of Lavukaleve morpho-syntax is concerned, the Agreement Suffix is completely different in its nature from the verbal subject and object prefixes, which also occur on predicates to mark participants. The Agreement Suffix is used in pragmatically constrained environments. It never indicates the syntactic function of the argument with which it agrees, although other features of the construction in which it occurs may mean that one can tell what the syntactic function of the argument it agrees with is. It does not indicate focus alone, but, with a focus marker, it indicates particular kinds of focus, depending on its agreement.
CHAPTER ELEVEN

Focus constructions

11.1 INTRODUCTION

There are three focus markers in Lavukaleve, functioning in a grammaticalised focus system, which is a very prominent part of the language. Syntactically the focus markers are independent words which occur in construction with the constituent immediately to their left. This is often an NP, but can also be an adjunct, a dependent clause, a predicate and its object or an entire sentence.

There are two constructions in which the focus markers take part: a Sentence-Final focus construction, in which the focus marker is in construction with a predicate plus its object or a sentence, and appears at the end of the sentence; and a Sentence-Internal focus construction, in which the focus marker is in construction with a non-predicating constituent, and appears sentence-internally. The focus marker expresses focus on the constituent with which it is in construction. So Sentence-Final focus markers express focus on either a sentence or a predicate plus its object; and Sentence-Internal focus markers express focus on an argument, an adjunct, a non-main verb, and the first part of a complex predicate. Constructions involving focus markers are extremely common in Lavukaleve; focus markers occur in approximately 35% of all sentences in the corpus.

This chapter describes the morphological and syntactic features of the focus markers, the syntactic constructions which they occur in, and the pragmatic functions of these constructions. Section 11.2 describes the forms and syntax of the focus markers themselves. The major part of the chapter (Section 11.3) describes the constructions in which the focus markers occur. Section 11.3.2 describes in detail Sentence-Final focus constructions. Section 11.3.3 describes Sentence-Internal focus constructions. Section 11.6 brings up some important issues. Section 11.5 discusses those situations in which
there is more than one focus marker in one sentence. Section 11.6.1 describes those situations in which more than one focus marker occurs within one sentence. Section 11.6.2 shows that the focus markers are not copulas, although they share certain functions which copulas have in some languages. Section 11.6.4 notes the functional similarity between Lavukaleve focus constructions and English accent prosody. While the beginning of Section 11.2 gives a brief outline of the difference between each of the three focus markers, Section 11.7 describes each of them in detail. Section 11.8 is a brief summary of the main features of the focus system in Lavukaleve.

Throughout this chapter I use the term ‘construction’ in the sense of the correspondence between a morpho-syntactic structure and its pragmatic/semantic functions. So ‘focus constructions’ are those constructions which have a particular morpho-syntactic structure, and express a particular pragmatic meaning.

11.2 MORPHOLOGY AND SYNTAX OF THE FOCUS MARKERS

The focus markers are independent words which form their own word class. The three focus markers each form a paradigm of suppletive forms marked for person, gender and number. The three different focus markers are meo, heo and feo (cited throughout in their 3rd person singular feminine form). Each one is used for a different sentence type. Meo is used in polar questions. Heo is used in certain syntactic environments such as information questions, or where there is a demonstrative pronoun foia in the clause, or as the second focus marker in a focus-echo construction. Heo can also be used to express strong emphasis; this use of heo rather than feo or meo is not obligatory (unlike the others), but a pragmatic choice made by a speaker for a certain effect. The third focus marker, feo, is the unmarked one; it has the widest distribution and the least constraints on its use. It is used in all situations where grammatical focus is to be expressed, apart from those using heo or meo. In this sense, feo can be viewed as the default focus marker.

11.2.1 PARADIGMS OF THE FOCUS MARKERS

These three paradigms are identical but for the initial consonant:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>DU</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 EXCL</td>
<td>fongai</td>
<td>foel</td>
<td>foe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 INCL</td>
<td>formel</td>
<td>fome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>finu</td>
<td>fimil</td>
<td>fimi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 MASC</td>
<td>fin</td>
<td>final(a)</td>
<td>fiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 FEM</td>
<td>feo</td>
<td>feol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 NEUT</td>
<td>fi</td>
<td>figel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The **heo** focus marker:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>DU</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 EXCL</td>
<td>hongai</td>
<td>hoel</td>
<td>hoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 INCL</td>
<td>homel</td>
<td>home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>hinu</td>
<td>himil</td>
<td>himi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 MASC</td>
<td>hin</td>
<td>hinal(a)</td>
<td>hiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 FEM</td>
<td>heo</td>
<td>heol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 NEUT</td>
<td>hi</td>
<td>higel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The **meo** focus marker:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>DU</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 EXCL</td>
<td>mongai</td>
<td>moel</td>
<td>moe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 INCL</td>
<td>momel</td>
<td>mome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>minu</td>
<td>mimil</td>
<td>mimi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 MASC</td>
<td>min</td>
<td>minal(a)</td>
<td>miv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 FEM</td>
<td>meo</td>
<td>meol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 NEUT</td>
<td>mi</td>
<td>migel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The forms given with final -a in brackets alternate freely with the variants without a final -a.

The first and second person forms of these paradigms show close formal similarity with the free pronouns, consisting of C(o) plus the pronoun form. There is also a slightly less strong formal relationship with the demonstratives. See Sections 8.4.1, 8.5 and 8.7.1 for the paradigms. Note also that, as well as having a formal relationship with demonstratives, the focus markers have a certain functional overlap with them in some contexts; this is discussed in Section 11.4.2.

### 11.2.2 SYNTACTIC STATUS

The focus markers occur following and in construction with predicates plus their objects, sentences, and non-predicating constituents. In the first example below, a focus marker is in construction with the second NP of a non-verbal clause, in the second with a temporal adjunct, in the third with a non-main verb (in this case a coordinate-dependent verb in a clause chain) and in the fourth with an intransitive predicate. Throughout this chapter the focussed constituents are italicised in the Lavukaleve; and in the English translation the focussed element is in bold; the rest of this chapter justifies the claims implicit in this.

1) **Ui ga** *solokal enga fiv.**  
   *ui ga* solo -kal *enga fiv*  
   food(n) sgnArt mountain -pl three 3plFOC  
   
   *There were three heaps of food.* (lit. *the food was three heaps*)
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11.2.3 WHAT DO THE FOCUS MARKERS AGREE WITH?

If the focus marker is in construction with (and, therefore, expresses focus on) a sentence, it agrees with one of the core arguments in that sentence; determination of which argument, if there is more than one, depends on factors to be explained at length below. If it is in construction with a simple verb or complex predicate plus object in transitive sentences) it agrees with the object in transitive sentences. If it is in construction with an argument, it agrees with that argument in person, gender and number. If it is in construction with an adjunct, a particle, a non-main verb or the first part of a complex predicate, it shows default agreement; that is, it appears in its 3sg neuter form. Examples of some of these agreement patterns follow:

Intransitive verbal clause (agreement with sole argument):
5) "Hm. Ra 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Hm. Ra</th>
<th>inu luluilam</th>
<th>finu</th>
<th>ke!&quot;</th>
<th>ore.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hm</td>
<td>ra</td>
<td>inu</td>
<td>luluilam</td>
<td>finu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hm</td>
<td>coconut.crab(m)</td>
<td>2sg</td>
<td>wipe.bum</td>
<td>NEG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Hmm, Crab, you didn't wipe your bum!" he said.

Transitive sentence, agreement with object:
6) Mina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mina</th>
<th>loveneria</th>
<th>feo</th>
<th>koi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mina</td>
<td>lo-</td>
<td>veneri</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thing(f)</td>
<td>3duS-</td>
<td>ask.for</td>
<td>-sgf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two (boys) asked for something.
Transitive sentence, agreement with subject:

7)  Foina  kini  alem  hin  Kusuvau
foina  kini  a-lem  hin  Kusuvau
PN.MED.sgm  ACT  3sgmO-see  3sgmEFOC  island.name

_He had gone and seen him at Kusuvau._

Non-verbal clause, agreement with subject:

8)  Ngai  teacher  fongai.
ngai  teacher  fongai
1sg  teacher  1sgFOC

_I'm a teacher._

Non-verbal clause, agreement with complement:

9)  Foina  olang  hi.
foina  olangi  hi
PN.MED.sgm  3sgPOSS-name(n)  3sgnEFOC

_That was its name._

Note that when the focus marker is agreeing with a first or second person pronoun, the speaker has a choice of whether the focus marker should agree in person and number, or just gender and number, with that pronoun. That is, a speaker can use either the corresponding first or second person focus marker, or they can use a third person focus marker, to agree with a first or second person pronoun. For example:

10)  Ngai  feo.
ngai  feo
1sg  3sgfFOC

_It's me (f)._

11)  Ngai  fongai.
ngai  fongai
1sg  1sgFOC

_It's me [i.e. I'm me]_

So speakers can say *ngai fongai* as in example (11), but there is a tendency to prefer not to use personal pronoun-focus marker sequences. Thus, speakers tend to prefer *ngai feo* rather than *ngai fongai*. Similarly, speakers prefer *inu feo* (2sg 3sgfFOC) over *inu finu* (2sg 2sgFOC). There is certainly no syntactic constraint on any of these combinations. The choice of using a focus marker to agree with a first or second person pronoun in person and number rather than number and gender does not have any implications for the focus system to be described. Focus relations are unchanged.

The next section discusses the syntactic constructions in which the focus markers appear.

---

Both subject and object are 3rd person masculine singular, but the fact that the verb prefix is an object prefix means that the verb suffix and focus marker are in agreement with the other argument, the subject.
and shows that the different constructions in which the focus markers occur, and the agreement patterns which they display, correlate with different types of focus.

11.3 THE TWO TYPES OF FOCUS CONSTRUCTION

11.3.1 INTRODUCTION

There are two syntactic construction types in which a focus marker can occur: Sentence-Final and Sentence-Internal focus constructions. Both construction types are a vehicle by which a speaker can mark a particular proposition as being focussed in a particular way. The discussion that follows has as its theoretical basis Lambrecht’s (1994) theory of information structure (see also Lambrecht 1987, Lambrecht and Michaelis 1998 among others), as a useful and revealing way to understand the forms and functions of those constructions involving focus markers in Lavukaleve.

I employ Lambrecht’s definition of focus as a starting point towards understanding what focus means in Lavukaleve, but exactly what pragmatic situations focus constructions are used for should become clear through the data itself. Even without an a priori definition of what focus is, it is clear that there is an overt focus marking system in Lavukaleve. The particular pragmatic functions expressed by this system emerge from the analysis of the various constructions involved. Saeed (1984: 19) makes a similar observation for Somali, another language with a grammatical focus system.

Lambrecht’s idea of focus is a refinement of the traditional view of focus as new information. Under his analysis, focus does not function to mark a constituent as new: for one thing, it is not constituents alone that convey new information, but rather, the conveying of information (old or new) comes about via the establishment of relations between elements of the proposition (1994: 46-50). Indeed, focus functions “not to mark a constituent as new but to signal a focus relation between an element of a proposition and the proposition as a whole” (p. 210). (Note that “a focus relation is the pragmatic relation between a denotatum and a proposition” (p. 210)). And further,

I do not define the focus of a sentence as ‘the new information’ ... Rather I claim that the focus is to be understood as a formal scope indicator, i.e. as a grammatical signal indicating the scope of the assertion expressed by a sentence or proposition. The focus indicates which portions of the sentence are asserted and which portions are pragmatically presupposed. (1987: 374)

Further, the focus of a sentence

is seen as the element of information whereby the presupposition and the assertion differ from each other. The focus is that portion of a proposition which cannot be taken for granted at the time of speech. It is the UNPREDICTABLE or pragmatically NON-
Focus occurs over a domain: "[t]he syntactic domain in a sentence which expresses the focus component of the pragmatically structured proposition" (p. 214). This focus domain is phrasal, not lexical, because it is the relationship between propositions, not the mere appearance of lexical items, which serves to convey focus. Thus, focus domains are always either predicates, arguments, or whole sentences.

Accordingly, there are for Lambrecht three types of focus: predicate focus, argument focus and sentence focus. Predicate focus is "the unmarked subject - predicate (topic-comment) sentence type ... in which the predicate is the focus and in which the subject (plus any other topical elements) is in the presupposition" (p. 222). Argument focus is where the "focus identifies the missing argument in a presupposed open proposition" (p. 222). (‘Argument’ includes any non-predicating expression, including adjuncts.) This is focus of the ‘identification type’ of the traditional literature. Sentence focus is where “the focus extends over both the subject and the predicate (minus any topical non-subject elements)”. This is equivalent to the ‘event-reporting’ or ‘presentational type’ of focus in the literature (p. 222).

If one prefers a more semantic definition of focus which works well for the kinds of pragmatic functions that focus constructions are used for in Lavukaleve, Dik’s (1989: 277) definition is useful. For Dik, focal information is “that information which is relatively the most important or salient in the given communication setting, and considered by [the speaker] to be most essential for [the addressee] to incorporate into his pragmatic

---

2 Lambrecht’s ideas on focus are not uncontroversial. Dryer (1996) argues that Lambrecht’s definition of focus is flawed because, among other things, the definition relies on a notion of pragmatic presupposition which does not distinguish between two possible types of pragmatic presupposition: that involving shared beliefs between speaker and hearer, and that involving shared mental representations by speaker and hearer. Dryer argues convincingly that these must be distinguished. Also, Lambrecht’s definition says that the presupposition part of a proposition is non-focal. Dryer’s main intention is to show that, contrary to wide belief, non-focus is not the same thing as presupposition.

In a later paper, Lambrecht and Michaelis (1998) distinguish between three types of pragmatic presupposition: knowledge presupposition, consciousness presupposition and topicality presupposition, which “correspond to different kinds of assumptions a speaker may have concerning the addressee’s state of mind at the time of an utterance” (1998: 494). Nevertheless the definition of focus used in this later paper retains the ambiguity discussed by Dryer. However a minor adjustment to Lambrecht’s definition, replacing ‘presupposition’ with ‘activation’, would, I think, solve Dryer’s problem with the definition.

In any case, for the purposes of the current discussion, it does not actually matter that Lambrecht’s definition of focus is theoretically flawed in this respect. My central argument is that Lavukaleve has overt morpho-syntactic expression of different types of focus; it has three different focus constructions, and these three constructions correspond closely to Lambrecht’s three focus types. In Lavukaleve, what is and what is not in focus is clearly marked by the focus construction type used.
information". This definition is criticised for its vagueness by Dryer (1996: 518), but it still gives a useful idea of what focus means for Lavukaleve.

It is important to point out that focus is not always contrastive; contrast is just one of the attributes that renders an element particularly noteworthy and thus likely to be focussed. Lambrecht denies the existence of contrastive focus as a grammatically identifiable subcategory of focus, and indeed in Lavukaleve it is not a separately grammatically marked type of focus; however, one of the functions of focus in Lavukaleve is to express contrast.

Lambrecht's three-way analysis works very neatly for Lavukaleve. The two focus construction types, Sentence-Final and Sentence-Internal focus constructions, differ syntactically in what constituents they are in construction with and what agreement they show; and they differ pragmatically in what type of focus they express. Sentence-Internal focus constructions are used to express argument focus; Sentence-Final focus constructions are used to express either predicate focus or sentence focus. Focus markers are used in Lavukaleve precisely to show, by means of their agreement, the scope over which focus is asserted.

As an initial illustration, consider the following examples. Example (12) shows no grammatically marked focus (see Section 11.6.1). The two examples after this show the Sentence-Internal focus construction. Both express focus on a particular argument: the object in (13) and the subject in (14). In these two examples, there are actually two focus markers; the second functions as an echo of the first. For the moment, the second of each should be ignored, it is immaterial to the present discussion (see Section 11.5.1 for an explanation of them).

(no grammatically marked focus)

12) Ali na aira la oole
   ali na aira la o- o- le
   man(m) sgmArt woman(f) sgfArt 3sgfO- 3sgS- see
   The man saw the woman.

---

3 Lambrecht's term 'predicate focus' gives rise to an unfortunate terminological confusion. In his term 'predicate focus', 'predicate' refers to a verb plus its object. Elsewhere in this thesis, the term 'predicate' refers to a simple verb or a complex constituent functioning as a verb. It does not include the verb's object. I want to retain Lambrecht's term, for transparency, but to avoid confusion, I will always say what kind of predicate I am referring to when I use the term. In the phrase 'predicate focus', 'predicate' always refers to Lambrecht's sense, of verb plus object. Otherwise, I will always specify which sense I mean the term in.
11 - FOCUS CONSTRUCTIONS

(argument focus: answers 'What did the woman eat?')

13) [Aira la]_{SUBJ} [fo'sal fin]_{OBJ} ousm hin

aira la  fo'sal  fin  o-u  -m  hin
woman(f) sgfArt fish(m) 3sgmFOC 3sgS- eat -sgm 3sgmEFOC

The woman ate a fish.

14) [Aira la feo]_{SUBJ} [fo'sal na]_{OBJ} aua heo

aira la feo  fo'sal  na  a-u  -a  heo
woman(f) sgfArt 3sgfFOC fish(m) sgfArt 3sgmS- eat -sgf 3sgFEOC

The woman ate the fish.

Examples (15) and (16) show the Sentence-Final focus construction. Example (15) has the focus marker agreeing with the object argument, and expresses focus on the predicate (the verb plus object). Example (16) has the focus marker agreeing with the subject argument, and expresses focus on the whole sentence.

(predicate focus: answers 'What did the man do?')

15) [Ali na]_{SUBJ} [(aira la)_{OBJ} o'lea feo]_{PRED}

ali na a'ira la  o-le-a  feo
man(m) sgfArt woman(f) sgfArt 3sgS- see -sgf 3sgfFOC

The man saw the woman.

(sentence focus: answers 'What had happened?') (repeated from above, (7))

16) Foina kini alem hin Kusuvau.

foina kini  a-le  -m  hin  Kusuvau
PN.MED.sgm ACT 3sgmS- see -sgm 3sgmEFOC island.name

He had gone and seen him at Kusuvau.

The following table shows in summary form the two main focus construction types to be described in Lavukaleve. Sentence-Final focus constructions are the constructions involved in what is traditionally termed wide focus; or in the terms used here, from Lambrecht, sentence and predicate focus. Sentence-Internal focus constructions are the constructions involved in narrow focus; that is, so-called argument focus. The table summarises the information to be explained in the rest of the chapter.

The presence/absence of the definite article in this near-minimal pair is immaterial here.
11.3.2 **Sentence-Final focus constructions**

In Sentence-Final focus constructions, the focus marker appears as the last element of a sentence; this sentence may be verbal or non-verbal.

Verbal Sentence-Final focus constructions take the form of a transitive or intransitive clause, with whatever that entails, followed by a focus marker. The one specific requirement is that the predicate (verb or Habitual Auxiliary) of a verbal Sentence-Final focus construction must appear with the Agreement Suffix (see Chapter 10), agreeing with the focus marker. Rarely, a plural Agreement Suffix may be omitted. This is not completely ungrammatical, but it is not considered good Lavukaleve (see Section 10.3.1). For non-verbal Sentence-Final focus constructions, it is the same except that as there is no verb or Habitual Auxiliary, there is no Agreement Suffix.

The role of the focus marker in Sentence-Final focus constructions is to mark the construction as having focus. These construction types can involve one of two types of focus; either focus on the predicate or focus on the whole sentence. It is the agreement of the focus marker that indicates which kind of focus is intended.
It is easiest to see the difference between sentence focus and predicate focus in transitive sentences, so transitive focus constructions will be discussed first.

Sentence-Final focus constructions in Lavukaleve in which the focus marker agrees with the object NP (or complement of a non-verbal clause) involve predicate focus. The focus domain extends from the focus marker at the end of the sentence to the object NP which appears before the verb; for the purposes of focus marking this domain of verb plus object is called a predicate here, following Lambrecht. (Recall that Lavukaleve has fixed constituent order of S(O)V.) Predicate focus is the most usual, frequent, and pragmatically unmarked type of grammatically marked focus.

For sentence focus, the focus marker agrees with the subject NP, the first core element of a sentence. Thus the signal is that the focus extends from the focus marker at the end of the sentence through to the beginning of the sentence. The focus domain is the sentence. Sentence focus is much less frequent, and is pragmatically much more marked, than predicate focus.

The subjects and objects of such sentences do not have to be expressed by full NPs; it is the verb agreement which shows the scope of focus, and even if the overt NPs are ellipsed, the verb agreement still tracks the scope intended.

**Predicate focus in transitive sentences**

The following examples show predicate focus sentences with the focus marker agreeing with the object argument. In the first example, an older brother is jealous of his younger brother, who has gone away and come back with a beautiful young wife. In this sentence, he asks how the younger boy came to get this lovely wife:

17) (*"Hey! Where did you get this woman from?"")

"Et![ Ngai fe mina keleanun amaa feo ke!"]

eta ngai fe mina kelea -nun a- ma -a feo ke

Wow! 1sg even thing(f) walk -DUR 1sgS- take -sgf 3sgfFOC EMPH

"Well! I was just walking around and I took her!"

The focus is not just on the woman, but rather on the whole act of taking the woman; thus, it is on not just the object but the on verb as well as the object.

In the next example from the same story, the older brother has gone out and got his own wife, after following his younger brother’s directions. However he followed the directions rather poorly, and ended up with an old ugly wife instead, who he mistreats. In this sentence, his mother is criticising him for mistreating his wife, saying in effect that he only has himself to blame:
("Why are you being so horrible to her, you're the one who wanted her!")

18) **Olikire ngomaa feo ke!**

You wanted her, you took her!

Again, focus is on the whole acting of taking the woman, not just on the woman herself. The same situation obtains in the next example.

Later in the same story, the younger brother finds out his older brother tried to have sex with his, the younger brother's, wife while he was away. He wants to kill his older brother, but his wife dissuades him, suggesting instead they go back to live with her parents, and thus get away entirely from the elder brother. The younger brother won't do this; as he explains, it would be humiliating to take her back, after having stolen her in the first place:

19) **Olang ngai kini akari aamaa finu**

Because I (m) took you (f), so I can't take you back.

In the next example from later in the same story, the younger brother has indeed killed his older brother out of jealousy. His young wife has been told by her now-dead mother, in a dream, to leave her husband and go and live with her relatives. She refuses, however, saying her place is with her husband, no matter what he may do to her, and that whatever he says, she must obey him. Note the object NP is this case is a relative clause, the head of which is man 'what (m)', so the focus marker takes masculine agreement. There is no overt NP referring to the subject:

20) **aka ngatum man olikirem na**

The speaker uses the focus construction to indicate that she will obey her husband; the focus is not just on the object 'what my husband wants', but rather on the whole

---

5 The second clause here is a negative focus construction, with subject agreement: see examples (30) - (33) and accompanying discussion.
verb+object constituent; she expresses focus on the whole event of doing what her husband wants.

The next example is taken from a story about a giant who tricks two boys into letting him steal their pig. He offers to butcher it for them, and as he cuts it up, he throws away each bit of meat into the river, saying it is not fit for eating, until there is no more edible meat left. The two boys don’t realise that the giant has previously tied a bag in the river downstream, and thus all the discarded bits of pig meat are being collected safely in his bag, while they themselves end up with nothing. In the sentence below, the giant has thrown away all the flesh, and only the intestines are left. The speaker expresses this with focus on giving the bad bits:

21) Sianun sianun sianun kini
sia  -nun sia  -nun sia  -nun kini
 do -DUR  do -DUR  do  -DUR ACT

nalo  ga ta lana  one  hi.
nalo  ga  ta  lana  o-ne  -Ø  hi
intestines(n)  sgnArt just 3dumO- in 3sgS- give -sgn 3sgmEFOC

It went on and on and on, then he just gave the intestines [the inedible bits] to them [the two boys].

In the next example, predicate focus appears on the questioned element in this content question:

22) O! Man ngona onem  hin?
o  man  ngo-na  o-ne  -m  hin
oh  what(m) 2sg- in 3sgS- give -sgm 3sgmEFOC

Oh! What did she give to you? [lit: she gave what to you?]

These types of sentence are very common. They all have focus on the whole predicate (verb plus object), not just on the object. If speakers wish to focus on an object argument, they use a Sentence-Internal focus construction (described in Section 11.3.3), with a focus marker in construction with the object, as in the following example. In this example, the focus marker occurs immediately after the object, not after the verb, and the verb does not have the Agreement Suffix agreeing with the object:

23) Maki fin ata lome.
maki  fin  a-ta  l0-me
nut.pudding(m) 3sgmFOC 3sgmO- pound 3sgS- HAB

She was making nut pudding.

SENTENCE FOCUS IN TRANSITIVE SENTENCES

The next set of examples show transitive sentences with focus marker agreement with the subject NP; these express sentence focus. Focus on a whole sentence is highly marked,
and generally only used when the whole sentence contains unexpected or surprising information, or is presentational. The following example is the opening sentence to a story about the origins of the village Losiolen. The sentence focus is accounted for by the presentational context.

24) **Iire ke. Stori horio, ko'mua horio**

   ire ke stori ho -ri -o ko'mua ho -ri -o

   yes EMPH story(f) MOD.PROX.sgf -PSNV -f story(f) MOD.PROX.sgf -PSNV -f

   tam enga Losiole me hoga etav fiv

   tam enga Losiole me -ø hoga e- ta -v fiv

   man(m) three Losiole(n) SPEC -sgn MOD.PROX.sgn 3sgn0- clear -pl 3plFOC

   **Yes. This story, three men cleared this Losiolen**

Sentence focus is also used in situations where something happens counter to expectations. In the next sentence the speaker has just been startled by an arrow landing next to her with no warning, and then is further surprised to see the addressee, who had sneaked up behind her. She asks the question, expressing surprise that the man in front of her might own the arrow, although it is clear that she had no expectation of who the owner is (so this isn’t contrastive focus):

25) "**Tumai, inu ta mina onu vem hin?"**

   tumai inu ta mina o- nuve -m hin

   really?! 2sg just thing(f) 3sgfO-own -sgm 3sgmEFOC

   "True? Are you (m) the owner of the thing?"

In the following example the speaker is talking about the olden days, when people used to obey their chiefs, and contrasting that with the perceived disobedience in villages now. He uses sentence focus in this sentence for a strong statement, that those people then obeyed the chiefs’ word, which makes an explicit contrast with the people of today. The speaker is talking to an audience of younger people, and he is perhaps slightly defensively making a strong point, using the marked sentence focus construction, to achieve this.

26) **Matalu ofi mev fiv.**

   ma- talu o- fi me -v fiv

   3plPOSS- word(f) 3sgfO- hear HAB -pl 3plFOC

   They would obey their word.

The next example also is not unexpected or exciting but rather contrastive. The people today know their clan, not like the people before who didn’t know what clan they belonged to. This is seen as a crucial difference between olden days, when only chiefs knew what clan people belonged to, and now; because knowing what clan you belong to means, among other things, that you have the knowledge to fight about land ownership.
Examples like the sentence above bring up one important issue. It was said earlier that sentence focus is focus over an entire sentence, from the first element, the subject NP, through to the verb. But often adjuncts come before the subject NP in a sentence, and in this case it is not completely clear whether the focus extends over them, as part of the sentence, or whether the focus starts at the subject. The analysis offered here, that focus marker agreement indicates scope, suggests that adjuncts before the subject do not form part of the scope of focus, and that the focus does indeed only starts at the subject. It does suggest however that adjuncts between the subject and the verb are within the scope of focus. This is a very difficult matter to test, and it needs to be investigated more thoroughly.

Note that sentence focus is pragmatically marked. This means that such sentences are heard in texts, but out of context sentences in elicitation are usually rejected by speakers:

Sentence focus is incompatible with out-of-context elicited examples because it is so pragmatically marked; it exists to express particular pragmatic meanings, which in general do not come up in non-contextualised speech. In out-of-context sentences a more marked focus construction is unexpected, and therefore difficult to interpret, and thus speakers usually assume such a construction is a mistake in focus marker/verb agreement.

The next four examples are negative Sentence-Final focus constructions, in which the focus marker always shows subject agreement (i.e. sentence focus) in Lavukaleve. This represents a grammaticalisation of the pragmatic functions of the focus marker in negative constructions. In negative focussed sentences, the focus marker is no longer signalling a pragmatic choice of focus marking; instead the focus marker has become obligatory, and the pragmatic function is lost:
30) **Ali na aira la olelam fin.**

*The man didn’t see the woman.*

31) **Leta mina roru olelav fiv.**

*But they saw nothing.*

32) **"Tamu. Ngaulam fin.**

"No. He didn’t eat me."

33) **Aka Hanggere na ona fo’foira oilam fin.**

*And Hanggere did not do work with her either.*

The language does not provide a special mechanism to express a focussed subject or object with a negative Sentence-Final focus construction. For example, (30) above, *The man didn’t see the woman*, using subject agreement, would also be used as the way to express *It was the woman that the man didn’t see*. That is, there is no grammatical construction for expressing focus on an object in a negative sentence focus construction. Similarly, there is no grammatical construction for expressing focus on a subject in a negative sentence focus construction (*It was the man who didn’t see the woman*).

So far the discussion has been confined to focus constructions with transitive sentences. It has been shown that object agreement in Sentence-Final focus constructions correlates with predicate focus, and subject agreement in Sentence-Final focus constructions correlates with sentence focus. Intransitive and single-NP non-verbal sentence-final focus constructions have more limited agreement possibilities, and thus it is impossible to make so many distinctions in them.

**INTRANSITIVE CLAUSES**

Intransitive clause constructions always show agreement with the subject. Thus, in the terms in which transitive clauses have been analysed, intransitive Sentence-Final focus constructions all show sentence focus. It is not possible for such sentences to show predicate focus, as there is no object NP for the focus marker to agree with. Some examples:
34) (The husband had killed the other man already. The woman, not knowing this, cooked the food to give to the man)

Akaoia ige latenam fin hide.
aka oia ige latena -m fin hide
then other.MED.sgf maybe be.alive -sgm 3sgmFOC thus

And she [thought] he was alive.

35) (The old man had been killed by enemies. He had gone to another island, and his friends got suspicious when he didn’t return)

O. Tutum honari felelam fin.
o tutu -m hona -ri fele -la -m fin
oh grandparent-sgm MOD.PROX.sgm -PSNV return -NEG -sgm 3sgmFOC

Oh. This old man hasn’t returned.

36) (There are many women who don’t join the Mother’s Union)

Olang mafan akari malav
olang ma- fan aka -ri malav
because 3plPOSS-some then -PSNV people(pl)

vomire vofoui ena halekov fiv.
vo- mi -re vo- fou -i e- na haleko -v fiv
3plO- make -NF 3plO- put.on -NOMZR 3sgnO- in be.unwilling -pl 3plFOC

Because some of them are unwilling to care for or love people. [lit: some of them are unwilling for caring for or loving people]

Non-verbal clauses

Non-verbal clauses function in this respect similarly to verbal clauses. The focus marker in non-verbal Sentence-Final focus constructions can in theory agree with either of the two NPs that may be present, although in practice it is very difficult to find an example showing the focus marker agreeing with one NP but not the other, because the complement in almost all cases is the item of equation or identification with the subject, and thus they both have the same agreement properties. Therefore, sentence focus and predicate focus are distinguished in two-NP non-verbal clauses, but in practice often the difference cannot be seen. There are some examples however which are clear:

Agreement with subject:

37) E ngotulav tin foe.
e ngo-tulav tin foe
1pl.ex 2sg-children(pl) only 1pl.exFOC

We’re just your children.

38) Inu kofa finu.
inu kofa finu
2sg naked 2sgFOC

You’re naked.
Agreement with complement:

39) foiga malangiov hiv.
    foiga ma-langiov hiv
    PN.MED.sgn 3plPOSS- names(pl) 3plEFOC

... that was their names.

Negation is not usually expressed in a focus-marked non-verbal clause. To negate a non-verbal clause, there are two frequently used strategies. Speakers usually either change the construction and use a verb with a negative meaning in the focus marker clause (thus, not using a non-verbal clause) (e.g. 40), or use a non-verbal clause with the negative particle tamu ‘NEG’, but no focus marker (e.g. 41). The focus marker does not normally co-occur with the negative particle.

40) Hori ko'mua tavea feo
    ho ko'mua tavea feo
    MOD.PROX.sgf -PSNV story(f) be.not -sgf 3sgfFOC

This one is not a history

41) Aka roaru koi ngane tamu.
    aka roa -ru koi nga-ne tamu
    then one.sgm -none also 1sgO- with no

There was no-one with me.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

There is, then, a Sentence-Final focus construction in Lavukaleve which allows two different focus structures. These focus structures are signalled by agreement of the focus marker. It is not simply the case that the focus marker agrees with what it is focussing on, but rather it works by signalling the extent of the focus through the sentence. The appearance of the focus marker signals that focus is an issue in the sentence. The agreement which the focus marker displays tells the hearer what the domain of the focus is. Thus, Lavukaleve marks the distinction between these two types of focus grammatically.

In predicate focus, agreement extends from the focus marker at the end of the sentence to the object argument, which occurs before the verb. Basic constituent order in Lavukaleve is S(O)V. In sentence focus, agreement extends throughout the entire sentence from the focus marker at the end through to the first element of the sentence, the subject. Ellipsed NPs do not matter for the scope of focus; the focus construction utilises obligatory verbal and focus marker morphology to express scope, and it does not in fact matter whether or not the actual NP arguments are there for the scope to obtain. It is not clear to what extent adjuncts are included in Sentence-Final focus constructions.

Predicate focus is the most common, unmarked focus type in Lavukaleve. This is what one would expect from Lambrecht’s definition. A focussed predicate is what would in
other terms have been called the comment of a topic-comment structure: "when the focus is marked on the object ... this is a grammatical signal that the unmarked relation between presupposition and assertion obtains" (Lambrecht 1987: 374). In Lavukaleve, Sentence-Final focus constructions in which the focus marker agrees with the object are predicate focus constructions. They are the unmarked Sentence-Final focus construction type; both in pragmatic terms and in terms of distribution.

Sentence focus is a pragmatically (and distributionally) very highly marked focus construction. In Lavukaleve it is used for situations involving very strong, often contrastive focus. All negative Sentence-Final focus constructions take this form too. Lambrecht points out that sentence-focus constructions are usually used for presentational sentences involving all-new information. 'Presentational', refers to structures that "are used to introduce an NP referent, or the concept associated with some NP, into the universe of discourse" (1987: 375). Such sentences have also been referred to as thetic (e.g. Lambrecht 1987. Note though, that Sasse (1987) expresses unease at such a correlation of thetic utterances with sentences involving focus on the entire statement.)

For Lambrecht, "[Sentence focus] structures express propositions in which the assertion extends over the entire proposition, they exhibit a certain "all-new" character which distinguishes them from [predicate focus] structures" (1987: 379). This all-newness of presentational, sentence focus structures also, in many languages, becomes associated with situations involving unexpected or surprising information: "The less the cognitive status of the NP referent warrants the use of the [sentence focus] structure, the more the construction will give rise to the implicature that the piece of information expressed in the [sentence focus] structure is of special importance" (1987: 379). These types of pragmatic functions are indeed present in Lavukaleve sentence-focus constructions.

It is possible, and indeed common, in Lavukaleve to express focus on a particular argument. In this case, the focus marker is still involved, but instead of a Sentence-Final focus construction, a Sentence-Internal focus construction must be used. The next section describes these.

11.3.3 SENTENCE-INTERNAL FOCUS CONSTRUCTIONS

In Sentence-Internal focus constructions the focus marker is in construction with a non-predicating constituent. That is, the focus marker follows it and, if applicable, agrees in person/gender/number with it. The non-predicating constituents can be arguments or adjuncts. I follow Lambrecht in using the term 'argument focus' to label this focus type. It will be shown below that the same construction type that serves to convey focus on an argument or an adjunct can also be used to convey focus on a non-main verb or the first
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part of a complex predicate\(^6\).

This argument focus construction type is similar to what is commonly referred to as narrow focus, as opposed to the wide focus of the sentence focus and predicate focus constructions discussed above.

If the focussed constituent is an NP, the focus marker agrees in person, gender and number with it. If the focussed constituent is not an NP, the focus marker receives default agreement, that is, it appears in its 3rd person singular neuter form.

It is easiest to see argument focus operating with NP arguments. The following examples compare Sentence-Internal focus sentences with their non-focus marked counterparts. The minimal/near-minimal pairs are elicited; they are useful to make the structures immediately apparent. Textual examples will be discussed after this.

The first two examples are near-minimal pairs, the first has no grammatically marked argument focus, the second has argument focus shown by the focus marker after the object:

\(42\) *Ngai* *sa* *volikire* *alei*

\small

\begin{verbatim}
ngai  sa  vo- liki  -re  a- lei
1sg  bananas(pl) 3plO- want -NF 1sgS- exist
\end{verbatim}

*I want bananas.*

\(43\) *Ngai* *totonga* *feo* *olikire* *alei.*

\small

\begin{verbatim}
ngai  totonga  feo  o- liki  -re  a- lei
1sg  money(f) 3sgfFOC 3sgfO- want -NF 1sgS- exist
\end{verbatim}

*I want money.*

The next three examples show the difference between a focussed NP and a non-focussed NP. Many of the examples to follow actually contain two focus markers in one sentence. This is an extremely common construction type in Lavukaleve. This type of sentence, the focus-echo construction, is discussed in more detail in Section 11.5.1 below. The second focus marker must always be the heo focus marker, and it must always agree with the first focus marker. At this point, only the first, italicised focus markers are relevant.

Example (44) is a basic Sentence-Final focus construction, showing predicate focus (see above). (45) and (46) show argument focus; (45) (repeated from 13) has a focussed object, (46) a focussed subject. The second shows focus on the fish, and the third on the woman.

---

\(^6\) Lambrecht uses the term "argument" in this context to refer to NPs and adjuncts, including adverbials. Thus I extend Lambrecht’s perhaps already-overextended term. This is perhaps an unfortunate use of a well-established term; but I prefer to avoid introducing a new term and possibly further confusion.
The following examples show some of the possibilities of what can be a focussed constituent under argument focus. Note that argument focus is often, but by no means always, contrastive. Example (48) is contrastive; it was the fourth canoe, as opposed to the third, which was mentioned last. However, there are many non-contrastive examples of argument focus: (47) contains no idea of contrast; there is no other entity which the speaker or addressee could have in mind. Similarly (49), (51) and (54) contain no idea of contrast.

- NPs: NPs in Sentence-Internal focus constructions have almost all of the structural possibilities of other NPs. They can be modified, they can contain the definite article, they can consist of personal pronouns or demonstrative modifiers, and they can be in any syntactic function within the clause. They cannot, however, consist of demonstrative pronouns, either from the foia or the oia paradigms. These examples contain, respectively, a modified indefinite NP in S function; a definite NP in S function; an NP in O function; an NP which is a demonstrative modifier; an NP which is a personal pronoun, and an NP which is the subject of a non-verbal clause.

47) Aka sulum ovo vol le'laol feol ika leiaol.
then chief(m) 3sgPOSS- daughter-du two.f 3dufFOC there exist-du.f

Two daughters of the chief lived there.

48) Aka nuta ga fi soire hau me.
then fourth -sgn sgArt 3sgnFOC run.away -NF go.ashore HAB -sgn

Then the fourth [canoe] runs away to shore.
We two want a big house.

"Was it these two at our bonito fishing?" [i.e. was it these two who were there when we were fishing for bonito?]

Two boys were [the whale's] sons.

Finished, she took it out, and the cooked taro, then into a small basin, um, she put the nut pudding.

Go back, then on the day after tomorrow, you two come back, then you two stay.
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55) ngai koi ika fi alei tasin ka
ngai koi ika fi a-lei tasi -n ka
1sg also there 3sgnFOC 1sgS- exist sea -LOC LOCEMPH

... I'll be right there in the sea

- An adverb or particle:

56) Two o'clock ku mail fi felere evo.
Two o'clock ku mail fi fele -re e- vo
Two o'clock like a.bit 3sgnFOC return -NF 1pl.ex-come

At almost two o'clock we came back.

- A non-main verb. The non-main verbs in question are subordinate-dependent verbs marked with the Anterior suffix -ge, the Potential -le, the Surprise -meon, or coordinate-dependent verbs marked with the Non-Finite -re, Completive -vel or Successive -vele. This kind of construction is similar in nature to a focussed NP or PP or other adjunct. These are Sentence-Internal focus constructions in which the constituent focussed on is a non-main verb. These non-main clauses could be seen as adjuncts to the main clause.

57) negore iutiare fi malei mola ga ena.
negore iutia re fi ma-lei mola ga e-na
float -NF look.on -NF 3sgnFOC 3plS- exist canoe(n) sgnArt 3sgnO- in

...they float, staring at the canoe.

58) El mi tail ga ehanae
el mi tail ga e-hana -e
1duex um house(n) sgnArt 3sgnO- open -NOMZR
elikire fi lelei.
e-liki -re fi le-lei
3sgnO- want -NF 3sgnFOC 1duex- exist

We two - um - we want to open the house.

59) Kini aehauge fi,
kini a-e-hau -ge fi
ACT 3sgmO- SBD- go.asore -ANT 3sgnFOC
ane ngaurial va vokuire.
a-ne nga-urial va vo-kui -re
3sgmO- with 1sgPOSS- coconut.crabs(pl) plArt 3plO- burn -NF

Upon him coming ashore, I cook my coconut crabs with him.
As well as non-main verbs, it is possible to focus on the first part of complex predicates (see Chapter 14); for instance, the first verb of a serial verb construction:

61) Koi imi koi fele vilure kini hau fi melei.
    koi imi koi fele vilu -re kini hau fi me-lei
    also 2pl also return exceed -NF ACT go.ashore 3sgnFOC 2pl- exist

You have come back too far, you have come in

And the first, lexical part of a Habitual Auxiliary verb complex:

62) oiva kini negore mi ngoa fi mame
    oiva kini nego -re mi ngoa fi ma-me
    other.MED.pl ACT float -NF um stay 3sgnFOC 3plS- HAB

...they stayed there floating...

Subordinate clauses in the languages of the world are usually thought of as presupposed information, rather than asserted information, and thus are unlikely to be focussed. In many languages it is not possible to focus on a subordinate clause; Somali for instance, which has a pervasive grammaticalised focus system, is typical in not allowing focus marking in subordinate clauses (Saeed 1984: 24). However Lavukaleve very frequently focuses on dependent clauses. In Lavukaleve the reasons for this may lie in the types of information typically supplied by dependent and main clauses respectively.

Firstly, dependent structures in Papuan languages are typically used to carry the event line of the narrative forward. Anything which carries the event line forward is new, newsworthy, rather than presupposed information. This is the case, for example, in examples (59) and (60).

Further, complex clause and sentence structures in Lavukaleve typically encode semantically full verbs as dependent verbs, and aspectual verbs as main verbs. This means that the lexically most important part of a sentence is typically the dependent verb, rather than the main verb. This can be seen clearly in sentences like (57) and (58), which both contain focussed coordinate-dependent clauses carrying the main semantic weight of the sentence, with the main clauses in each providing aspectual information. A similar type of situation occurs in serial verb constructions and verbal complexes with the Habitual Auxiliary ((61) and (62) respectively). So often argument focus constructions focus on the part of a complex structure which carries the most semantic weight. In these
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terms, such constructions make sense.

11.4 Two Rare Phenomena

The basic morpho-syntactic features of the focus system have been outlined above, and further important issues to do with focus marking are discussed further below. But first, there are two phenomena to do with the focus system, both of them rare, which should first be mentioned. The first is that occasionally a Sentence-Final focus construction, rather than a Sentence-Internal focus construction, can be used to express focus on a postpositional phrase. The second is that there are some instances in the corpus in which a demonstrative modifier occurs in the position in which a focus marker would be expected, in a Sentence-Final focus construction.

11.4.1 Another Way of Expressing Argument Focus of PPs

It was shown above that in Sentence-Final focus constructions the focus marker always agrees with the subject or object; and they express sentence or predicate focus accordingly. For expressing focus on an adjunct, a Sentence-Internal focus construction is almost always used. However there are extremely rare examples (three in the entire corpus) of a Sentence-Final focus construction, where the focus marker agrees not with the subject or object but with a postpositional phrase, and expresses argument focus on that postpositional phrase:

63) Foiva vone fo'foira oaiy hiv. Hoivari.
fouva vou- he fo'foira o- a i -v hiv hoiva -ri
PN.MED.pl 3p1O- with work(t) 3sgfO- 1sgS- do -pl 3plEFOC MOD.MED.pl -PSNV

I worked with them. Those ones. co2 020

64) Aka homelav enga fiv vone elei.
akha homela -v enga fiv vou- ne e- lei
then woman -pl three 3plFOC 3plO- with 1pl.ex- exist

Vone kele a lame hiv'.
vo- ne kele la- me hiv
3plO- with walk 1sg- HAB 3plEFOC

We had three women with us. I would go around with them. co2 027-028

These constructions are accepted by speakers, but are definitely not the preferred way of expressing focus on a postpositional phrase.

11.4.2 Demonstratives Instead of Focus Markers in Sentence-Final Focus Constructions

There are a handful of examples in the corpus in which a demonstrative modifier (that is, 7 The plural Agreement Suffix has been omitted from lame as occasionally happens (see Section 10.3.1).
a demonstrative from the hoia paradigm) occurs in sentence-final position, after a verb which has one of its core arguments marked with the Agreement Suffix, with the Agreement Suffix and the demonstrative agreeing with the same referent, and with no intonation break between verb and demonstrative:

65) Volere, "Ami okiv hova?"
   vo-le ami o-ki v hova
   3plO- see -NF who(m) 3sgS- shoot -pl MOD.PROX.pl

Seeing them, "Who killed these?"

   fova me-kelei-n lei v uke lei v hova
   PN.PROX.pl 1pln- near -LOC exist -pl near exist -pl MOD.PROX.pl

They're close to us. Close to us.

At first sight these appear to be examples of an NP appearing after the verb, in contradiction to the constituent-order generalisation made in Section 9.2. However, a better analysis is possible.

Firstly, the only NPs which can appear in this position are demonstrative modifiers. No other NP types can do this. Secondly, the verb of such clauses always involves the Agreement Suffix. Thirdly, the demonstrative and Agreement Suffix always agree. These points suggest that the demonstrative in such constructions is in fact functioning as a focus marker, in a Sentence-Final focus construction. There is some deep overlap between focus markers and deictics, as evidenced by the relationship between f- and h-stems in both demonstratives and focus markers (see Section 11.7.1), and in these constructions it seems that the demonstrative is functioning as a focus marker.

Note that in both of the above examples, the hoia demonstrative modifier is used. There are no examples of a demonstrative pronoun (that is, a demonstrative from the foia or oia paradigms) in this function. This may be an accidental gap in the data, as these constructions are extremely uncommon, or it may be that it is only possible for hoia to do this.

11.5 MORE THAN ONE FOCUS MARKER IN ONE SENTENCE

It is very common in Lavukaleve for more than one focus marker to occur in one sentence. There are two types of construction which need to be discussed in this respect. Firstly, there are focus-echo constructions, in which there are two agreeing focus markers, one focussing on an argument, and the other at the end of the sentence. The second type, true multiple-focus sentences, contain more than one constituent in argument focus.
In the focus-echo construction there are two agreeing focus markers. The second focus marker must always agree with the first in gender and number, but not necessarily person. The first is a Sentence-Internal focus marker, expressing focus on an NP argument, and the second is a Sentence-Final focus marker. The verb appears with the Agreement Suffix. The following pair of examples is repeated from above (45 and 46) (in these two examples, italics only indicate the focus markers, not the domain of focus):

67) *Aira la fo'sal fin oum hin.
   aïra la fœsal fin o- u -m hin
   woman(f) sgfArt fish(m) 3sgmFOC 3sgS-eat -sgm 3sgmEFOC  
   The woman ate a fish.

68) Aira la feo fo'sal na aua heo.
   aïra la foœsal na a- u -a heo
   woman(f) sgfArt 3sgfFOC fish(m) sgmArt 3sgmO-eat -sgf 3sgfEFOC  
   The woman ate the fish.

The first focus marker in each sentence expresses argument focus. To explain the second focus marker in (67) one could say the second focus marker is agreeing with the object NP, thus it is expressing predicate focus, and in (68) it is agreeing with the subject NP, thus expressing sentence focus. There are major flaws with this line of argumentation however.

Firstly, the shape of the second focus marker is entirely constrained. It must be from the heo paradigm (see below, Section 11.7.1) and it must agree with the same entity that the first focus marker agrees with. So, if the first focus marker agrees with the object NP, so must the second focus marker; it cannot agree with the subject NP:

69) *Aira la fo'sal fin oum heo.
   aïra la fœsal fin o- u -m heo
   woman(f) sgfArt fish(m) 3sgmFOC 3sgfO-eat -sgm 3sgfEFOC

That the agreement of the second focus marker is completely prescribed by the first focus marker indicates that the second focus marker in these constructions has a different function from the sentence-final focus markers of single-focus marker sentences. It cannot distinguish between sentence or predicate focus, as the speaker cannot choose which NP it should agree with.

There is a second flaw with that analysis. It is contradictory to say, for instance, that one sentence can have both argument focus and sentence focus. Sentence focus is used to show that the whole of the sentence is an assertion; all of it is equally focussed information, the fact that the whole thing is of interest is what is being marked by the sentence focus construction. However to say that argument focus can occur within a sentence-focus-marked sentence is to say that actually one of the arguments is specifically
focussed on, at the same time as saying that the whole sentence is equally focussed. A similar problem obtains with saying that a sentence can have both argument and predicate focus.

A better analysis is that the role of the second focus marker is to provide extra strong focus on the focussed argument. This is supported by the fact that the second focus marker expresses further agreement with the focussed argument; and also that its form is the heo emphatic focus marker. The second focus marker is a reiteration, or an echo of the first. This occurs most commonly in Lavukaleve when there is argument focus on an NP, rather than other types of non-predicating constituents.

Note that example (51) above shows that the second focus marker in a focus-echo construction agreeing in gender and number but not person with the first focus marker. This occurs if the first focus marker is a first or second person form; in such situations the second focus marker may be a third person form.

11.5.2 Multiple-focus sentences

In Lavukaleve it is possible to have more than one instance of argument focus in a single sentence. One common type of multiple-focus sentence is lists. Each element of a list can occur with its own focus marker. This type of multiple-focus is not problematic; one can easily understand the pragmatic motivation behind focussing separately each item of a list:

(They took everything and put it inside the huge hole)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Erufulain</th>
<th>feo,</th>
<th>o</th>
<th>bolol</th>
<th>fi,</th>
<th>o</th>
<th>motoka</th>
<th>feo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>erufulain</td>
<td>feo</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>bolol</td>
<td>fi</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>motoka</td>
<td>feo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plane(f)</td>
<td>3sgfFOC and</td>
<td>cartridge(n)</td>
<td>3sgnFOC and</td>
<td>car(f)</td>
<td>3sgfFOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>minamina</td>
<td>mate</td>
<td>ofin</td>
<td>ofin</td>
<td>na</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>Dup-</td>
<td>mina</td>
<td>mate</td>
<td>o-</td>
<td>fina</td>
<td>o-</td>
<td>fina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>REDUP-</td>
<td>thing(f)</td>
<td>war(f)</td>
<td>3sgPOSS-</td>
<td>belongings(m)</td>
<td>3sgPOSS-</td>
<td>belongings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mi</td>
<td>tome</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>ana</td>
<td>fi</td>
<td>olei.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mi</td>
<td>tome</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>a-</td>
<td>na fi</td>
<td>o-</td>
<td>lei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>um</td>
<td>hole(m)</td>
<td>sgmArt</td>
<td>3sgmO-</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>3sgnFOC</td>
<td>3sgS-</td>
<td>exist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planes, cartridges, cars, everything to do with the war, everything to do with it, um was inside the hole.
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71) (Some strangers had stolen food out of the people's food baskets. One of the group had an idea to fill up their food baskets with biting animals, so if the strangers came again, they would put their hands inside the baskets to steal the food, and instead get bitten by animals)

\[ Sut fiv o kafol fin o \]
\[ giant.clams(pl) 3plFOC and mangrove.crab(m) 3sgmFOC and \]
\[ ra fiv o man malav vou mem \]
\[ coconut.crabs(pl) 3plFOC and what(m) people(pl) 3plO- eat HAB -sgm \]
\[ vou mem na mina omama. \]
\[ vo- u me -m na mina o- ma- ma \]
\[ 3plO- eat HAB -sgm sgmArt thing(f) 3sgfO- 3plS- take \]

\[ Suta shells and mangrove crabs and coconut crabs and whatever bites people, they took it \textit{[lit: the thing]}. \]

The next example is similar; the two focused elements, 'held hands' and 'made a line', can be thought of as two events in a list of events that occurred at that time:

72) (During a big cyclone the speaker and some friends got washed into the river and were in danger of drowning.)

\[ Aka mafan e etau \]
\[ aka ma- fan e e- tau \]
\[ then 3plPOSS-some 1pl.ex 1pl.exPOSS- hands(pl) \]
\[ vofoire fi \]
\[ vo- foire -re fi \]
\[ 3plO- hold -NF 3sgnFOC \]
\[ laen ofoure fi songi leme. \]
\[ laen o- fou -re fi songi le- me \]
\[ line(f) 3sgfO- put.on -NF 3sgnFOC swim 1pl.ex- HAB \]

\[ Then some of us held hands and made a line and we were swimming. \]ef 024

A slightly different kind of situation occurs in the following examples:

73) \[ Malaita o Goae mafot ena fi \]
\[ Malaita o Goae ma- foto e- na fi \]
\[ Malaita and Isabel 3plPOSS- middle(n) 3sgnFOC 3sgnFOC \]
\[ igalari fi, navigol honari ovo. \]
\[ igala -ri fi navigol hona -ri o- vo \]
\[ there -PSNV sgnFOC cyclone(m) MOD.PROX.sgm -PSNV 3sgS- come \]

\[ In between Malaita and Isabel, it was there that the cyclone came from \]rk2 019
Here both focussed elements have the same real-world referent; the second mention of each is a rewording of the first, and, like the first, it is focussed.

In other contexts however it seems that more than one element of the sentence is newsworthy in its own right; more than one element is the asserted part of the sentence. In the following example, for instance, people have been worried about the disappearance of an old man, who they fear has been murdered. In the example, they find his canoe floating. From this they guess that he must be near. It is significant that he is near; and the existence of the canoe in itself is also significant:

In the next, longer, example, the first focus marker is part of the idiomatic expression *akari fi* ‘it’s like that’; the second and third appear with the significant bits of information which the sentence conveys: pointing out an island, and pointing out the fact that these two magical old women live there. The third sentence of the example points out two further significant facts: that one lives at one end, and that there is a coconut tree there:
"Every day our mother is always talking and talking like that about that island there, two old women live there.

The way they live, like that, one lives far away a bit, and one lives a bit closer.

Then one of them, at the end of the island where she lives, there's one coconut tree co 033-035

---

8 In this sentence, airaol le'laol and ruiaol are both NPs. Ruiaol is a more specific rendition of airaol le'laol, a correction by the speaker.
77) **Noka akari** siriae **ehaivele** ta  
    noka ak -ri siriae e- hai -vele ta  
    just then -PSNV catch.fish -NOMZR 3sgnO do -SUCC just  

    ngane me na ngana akari  
    nga ne -m na nga na aka -ri  
    1sgO with SPEC -sgm sgmArt 1sgO in then -PSNV  

    sia laemege fi aka  
    sia la e- me -ge fi aka  
    do 3sgmO- SBD- HAB -ANT 3sgnFOC then  

    foiga ena ngai fe keleane  
    foiga e- na ngai fe kele -a  
    PN.MED.sgn 3sgnO- in 1sg even walk -IMPF  

    kiuham hide fi kele la-me.  
    kiu -ham hide fi kele la- me  
    die -PURP thus 3sgnFOC walk 1sg- HAB  

> Whenever my brother goes fishing he does such and such to me, so because of that, I'm walking around (wanting) to die.

78) **Tailav va fiv raul tuna engoa ga fi**  
    tail -v va fiv raul tuna e- ngoa e ga fi  
    house-pl plArt 3plFOC really really 1pl.ex- stay -NOMZR sgnArt 3sgnFOC  

    raul tuna eririgoia.  
    raul tuna e- ririgoi  
    really really 1pl.ex- prepare  

> (During the cyclone) we worried a lot [lit: we were really] about our houses, our living, we really prepared.

79) **Aliare fi aka roa ruima ro feo**  
    alia -re fi aka roa ruima ro feo  
    make.friends -NF 3sgnFOC then one.sgm old.man(f) one.sgF 3sgfFOC  

    olang fi Tagoila.  
    o- langi fi Tagoila  
    3sgPOSS- name(n) 3sgnFOC Tagoila(m)  

> They made friends, then there was one old man, his name was Tagoila.

In multiple-focus sentences it is not possible to focus on more than one core NP per sentence. This kind of construction is only possible for at most one core argument, and (it seems) any number of adjuncts or non-main verbs.

In Lavukaleve, then, it is possible to pile up focussed element after focussed element. In languages with grammatical focus marking, it is common for only one instance of this to be allowed per sentence. Lambrecht (1994: 237-8) notes that English does not allow more than one grammatically focus-marked (i.e. clefted) element in a sentence. There is a basic principle which many languages follow, which limits the amount of focussed information which can appear in one sentence. Givón (1975) argues, from comparison of focus constructions in Bemba, Rwanda and Zulu, that “there exists a strategy of information processing in language such that the amount of new information per a certain unit of...
message-transaction is restricted in a fashion — say ‘one unit per proposition’ ” (p. 202, his emphasis). Pawley and Syder (1977; 1983) make a similar point with their “one-clause-at-a-time” hypothesis. Du Bois (1987: 826), on this topic, formulates a “One New Argument constraint”, which says that speakers prefer to introduce a maximum of one new argument per clause. He explains this in terms of a processing limitation: “New (previously inactive) information appears to be more difficult to process, and hence most subject to constraint” (Du Bois 1987: 846).

However languages with focus marked by accent prosody generally tend to allow more than one focussed item per sentence, but still only one per intonation unit. Chafe’s (1987: 31-32; 1994) proposal of a “one new concept at a time constraint”, specifies that only one piece of new information occurs within one intonation unit, not within one clause or proposition or sentence. English, for instance, does allow more than one focussed element marked by pitch accent per sentence, but only one per intonation unit (Chafe 1994: 108-119).

The issue revolves around what a language takes as the relevant domain for the purposes of focus marking. For English, the relevant domain over which focus marking by prosody can apply is the intonation unit; whereas the domain over which grammatical focus marking by clefts can apply is the sentence. For Lavukaleve, the relevant domain over which grammatical focus marking can apply is not one sentence; there is no constraint that only one element can be focussed per sentence. Instead, the rule seems to be that only one core NP, plus any number of adjuncts, can receive argument focus per sentence.

This is not a unique feature of Lavukaleve. Some other languages which have grammaticalised focus marking allow more than instance of focus per sentence. For instance Yukagir marks focus of a core argument by suffixation on the verb and the relevant NP (Fortescue 1996). It also marks focus on adjuncts by postposing the adjunct. It is possible to have focus on both a core argument and an adjunct in the same sentence, using both the suffixation and postposing methods. It is not, however, possible, to focus on two core arguments in one sentence, or, as I understand it, on two adjuncts in one sentence. Yukagir is slightly different from Lavukaleve in that it uses two entirely different strategies to mark different kinds of focus in one sentence, but nonetheless the pragmatic fact of multiple-focus marking is comparable to Lavukaleve.

Roviana, an Oceanic language spoken on islands adjacent to the Russells, marks focus using a special set of focal pronouns (Corston 1996). These have not been described in detail, and it is not completely certain from the description that they are indeed marking focus rather than, say, emphasis, but there are examples in Corston’s work of more than one of these being used, with different reference, within a single sentence. If they are focus pronouns then they are an example from a language close to Lavukaleve of multiple-focus marking in one sentence.
11.6 FURTHER DISCUSSION

11.6.1 NO MARKED FOCUS

Not all Lavukaleve sentences have marked focus; in fact only about a third do. Under Lambrecht’s analysis, all sentences convey information; they all have information structure, and thus they all have focus. This is certainly true for Lavukaleve, as for all languages. The above analysis has suggested that are two types of sentences in Lavukaleve: those with grammatical focus constructions, and those without. By this, however, it should not be understood that those sentences which do not employ a focus construction do not have focus. Rather, in those sentences which do not employ focus constructions, speakers are still conveying information about something; they are still dividing their speech into presupposition and assertion; but they are not making this distinction grammatically overt in the way a focus construction does. In other languages with grammatically marked focus systems, for example Somali (Saeed 1984), the focus system is likewise not used in every single sentence of the language.

If one thinks for a moment of focus constructions like Lavukaleve’s, or Somali’s, as operating in a broadly similar functional domain as, for example, cleft constructions in English (although Lavukaleve’s focus system and English clefts are very different types of phenomena; see next section), then one can more easily understand why they are not used for every sentence. In English, every sentence has information structure, but only some have cleft constructions to make overt this information structure. In Lavukaleve, an equivalent situation obtains, although the proportion of sentences with focus constructions is far higher, corresponding to their considerably wider syntactic possibilities, than clefts in English.

11.6.2 DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN FOCUS MARKERS AND COPULAS

Sentence-Internal focus constructions share many similarities with cleft constructions in other languages. Functionally, they often serve to express the same kinds of pragmatic meanings as cleft constructions with copulas do in languages that have them (see e.g. Stenson (1981) on Irish). They serve to mark focus on a particular argument, and, especially when the Sentence-Internal focus marker occurs in construction with a constituent at the start of the sentence, one could interpret the Sentence-Internal focus constituent as a copula clause, at the front of, and in construction with, the main clause. However Lavukaleve focus markers cannot be analysed as copulas.

The focus marker is not obligatory in non-verbal predications. All the examples given above could equally well appear without the focus marker. The distribution of focus markers in non-verbal clauses is identical to their distribution in verbal clauses. In both cases, it is pragmatic factors of focus marking which determine whether these words will appear in a clause or not; whether the clause is verbal or non-verbal is irrelevant. Rather, non-verbal clauses, like verbal clauses, may or may not be grammatically marked for
focus, and thus can appear with or without the focus marker, on those grounds alone.

There are two further major syntactic objections to treating the focus markers as copulas. The first is that normally, the constituent which the focus marker is in construction with does not move to the front of the sentence. Instead it stays in its place within the clause. The focus marker appears immediately after it. Consider the following example:

80) Aira la umalau o uvikola fiv onorev hiv.
    donna la kumara(m) and cassava(m) 3pIFOC 3sgS- plant -pl 3pIEFOC

The woman planted kumara and cassava.

It is possible to say umalau o uvikola fiv, aira la onorev hiv, but usually people don’t. They leave the focussed constituent in place in the clause. The fact that these focussed constituents are not extracted makes a cleft analysis problematic.

There is a further problem with analysing Lavukaleve focus markers as copulas, even if one does not argue that sentences like these are clefts. If one argues that the Sentence-Internal focus marker is a copula, then one would be forced to say that in Lavukaleve it is possible to intersperse a main clause with an embedded copula clause. That is, in the above example (80), one would have to say that umalau o uvikola fiv is a copula clause, embedded in the sentence aira la onorev hiv. These objections make very unattractive the analysis that clauses with Sentence-Internal focus markers are copula clauses.

11.6.3 FOCUS SYSTEM VERSUS ALIGNMENT SYSTEM

It is possible to be misled by the agreement patterns of the Agreement Suffix on the verb and the focus marker into thinking that they form part of a syntactic alignment system. Consider for example, that in positive clauses the verbal Agreement Suffix and focus marker generally agree with O of a transitive clause and S of an intransitive clause; and that the verbal Agreement Suffix and focus marker agree with A/S in negative clauses. This phenomenon might suggest that the verbal Agreement Suffix and focus marker are actually forming part of a split-ergative agreement system determined on purely syntactic principles. There are a number of reasons why this analysis would be unsatisfactory. Firstly, not all positive clauses have the verbal Agreement Suffix and focus marker agreeing with O; sometimes they agree with A. So one would have to find syntactic reasons why in these cases agreement was with A, not O. One could argue that the split-ergative system was based on partially syntactic and partially pragmatic principles; and this kind of system does occur (rarely) in the languages of the world (see e.g. Dixon 1994: 211). But such an analysis would fail to account for the pragmatic function of the focus marker in the sentences in which it occurs; and it would miss the generalisation that the agreement of the focus marker (and verbal Agreement Suffix) can be predicted without
exception by knowing which part of a sentence is being focussed on.9

11.6.4 A TYPOLOGICAL NOTE

Lambrecht and Polinsky (1997) propose some typological universals with respect to the grammatical encoding of sentence focus. They argue that there is a formal, paradigmatic relationship between predicate focus and sentence focus constructions in languages: “[sentence focus] constructions have the form they do because they are to be minimally distinct from corresponding [predicate focus] constructions within a given language” (Lambrecht and Polinsky 1997: 191).

As a corollary of this, as sentence focus involves lack of a topic-comment structure, it is important that the subject of a sentence focus construction must be marked in such a way that it cannot be interpreted as a topic; thus, “[sentence focus] marking crucially involves DETOPICALIZATION of the nominal constituents involved” (p. 191). This detopicalisation can be accomplished in one of two ways: either by cancelling formal properties typically associated with topic arguments; or by coding the subject of a sentence focus construction formally in a way typically associated with focus arguments. This leads to their Principle of Subject-Object Neutralisation, which says that subjects of sentence focus constructions are grammatically coded with properties typically associated with objects; and their Principle of Topic Cancellation, which says that the subject of a sentence focus sentence cannot be coded in a similar formal way to topics.

In English, sentence focus is marked formally by a prosodic accent on the subject NP. This marking type, they say, comes about through paradigmatic opposition to predicate focus marking in English, in which the prosodic accent is on the object: “the position of the accent on the subject noun in the [sentence focus] construction is the result purely of a formal requirement: the need to indicate a paradigmatic contrast” (p. 195). They present a typology of formal marking of sentence focus, as opposed to predicate focus: sentence focus marking in a given language may involve prosodic inversion, that is, giving the sentence focus subject the prosodic accent usually associated with an object (or predicate); changes to linear order; making the subject a single constituent within the predicate (syntactic inversion); making the subject a non-topic; giving it non-nominative case marking; or giving the verb impersonal agreement. Lavukaleve does not fit with any of these formal marking strategies, but even though the material it uses to mark sentence focus versus predicate focus is not covered in Lambrecht and Polinsky’s typology, the system it uses to mark the opposition between sentence focus and predicate focus is exactly parallel to those used in many other languages.

That is, focus marker agreement in sentence focus and predicate focus constructions in

---

9 Note that a split-ergative system does exist elsewhere in Lavukaleve. In subordinate adverbial clauses first and second person subjects follow a nominative/accusative participant marking system, and third person subjects follow an ergative/absolutive marking system: see Section 16.1.
Lavukaleve works exactly like accent prosody in English. In English predicate focus constructions, there is an accent on the object. In Lavukaleve predicate focus constructions, the focus marker agrees with the object. In English sentence focus constructions, there is an accent on the subject, because sentence focus marking is in paradigmatic opposition to predicate focus marking. In Lavukaleve sentence focus constructions, the focus marker agrees with the subject. In both languages, sentence focus marking operates in paradigmatic opposition to predicate focus marking.

11.7 The three focus markers feo, heo and meo

The three focus markers are associated with different sentence types. In the next sections the three focus markers will be discussed and exemplified. All three of the focus markers are used in the constructions described above, expressing predicate, sentence and argument focus.

The meo focus marker

Meo is used only in polar questions. It agrees in person, number and gender with the questioned element:

(Sentence focus)
81) Lamulam na alelam minu?
   lamulam na a-le-la-m minu
   storm(m) sgmArt 3sgm0-see -NEG +sgm 2sgQFOC

   _Don't you see the storm?_ 

82) "Valai mina roaru kiulam min?"
   vala mina roa -ru kiu -la -m min
   how thing(f) one.sgm -none die -NEG +sgm 3sgmQFOC

   _"How now? Did no-one die?"_

(Predicate focus)
83) Foe roa makururem min?
   foe roa ma-kuru-re-m min
   pig(m) one.sgm 3plS-hit -FUT +sgm 3sgmQFOC

   _Will they kill a pig?_

84) Sterry min?
   Sterry min
   Sterry(m) 3sgmQFOC

   _Is it Sterry?_
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85) "Ta! *imil *minal
   ta      imil      minal
   just 2du 3dumQFOC

   "Hey! Are you two here?!"

THE HEØ FOCUS MARKER

There are two uses of heö. One is automatic on the choice of certain syntactic elements; the other is to express strong emphasis. There are some syntactic environments which require the use of heö. These environments are: content questions, the second focus marker of a focus-echo construction, focus clauses which contain a foia demonstrative pronoun, and focus clauses in which a constituent is emphasised using the emphatic particle ta. In these environments, if any focus marker is used it must be heö rather than meö or feö. In other environments, heö may be used to express strong emphasis. This is particularly the case with contrastive emphasis, which is almost always expressed using heö. For this pragmatic purpose, feö may be always used instead of heö, but if it is, the strong emphasis reading associated with heö will be lost.

- Content questions

Heö contrasts with meö in that while they are both used to form questions, meö is only used in polar questions and heö is only used in content questions. Compare the two focus markers in the example below, which is taken from natural conversation. The speaker was trying to make out the identity of a dark figure approaching the house one night:

86) Ami *hin? Buga *minu?
   ami hin Buga minu
   who(m) 3sgmEFOC Buga 2sgQFOC

   Who is it? Is that you, Buga?

Some textual examples:

87) Kamu na *aosege  ta, hano leaev galeng
   kamu na a-  o- se -ge  ta  hano leaev galeng
   shit(m) sgmArt 3sgmO- 3sgS- defecate-ANT just then men(pl) boys(pl)

   va aka mare "Man *hin *ana  vea lome?
   va aka ma- re man hin a- na vea lo- me
   plArt then 3plS- say what(m) 3sgmEFOC 3sgmO- in emerge 3sgS- HAB

   She shitted, then the boys said "What [place] did it come out from?"
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88) Hai! Le vala hi vokuru mame tam?

Hai! But how are they killing them [the fish], man?

89) Elahave hin ovum.

How much did he dig?

- **Heo** as the second focus marker of a focus-echo construction

Heo is also used as the second focus marker in a construction described above (Section 11.5.1) as a focus-echo construction. Constructions of this type are argument focus constructions, with the added feature that as well as having a focus marker in construction with the focussed argument, inside the sentence, they also have a second focus marker, agreeing with the same argument, at the end of the sentence. It was suggested above that this kind of construction expresses particularly strong argument focus.

In (90), the feo focus marker (in this case fi) is used to focus on the adjunct kosora ‘today’ and the heo focus marker (hi) is the second focus marker, agreeing with the first:

90) "Kosora fi melele hi.

"Today is your day. (Today I’m going to eat you two!"

In the following example, feo is used to express focus on the subject NP malav vutiv and heo is the second focus marker, agreeing with the first:

91) Aka malav vutiv fiv vo hiv

So, there were many people that came, on that day.

---

10 The plural Agreement Suffix has been omitted from vo ‘come’, as occasionally happens (see Section 10.3.1).
Further examples:

92) Aka gao lelagel figel hokala
aka gao lelagel figel hokala -la
then war.canoe(n) two.n 3dunFOC here.PROX -EXT
vela megel higel.
vela me -gel higel
go HAB -dun 3dunEFOC

Two war canoes used to go from here.

93) Mina hano loea feo ikari mea heo.
mina hano loea feo ikari mea -a heo
um then tree.sp(f) 3sgfFOC there -PSNV SPEC -sgf 3sgfEFOC

Before, there was a loea tree in that place.

Note that the first focus marker of this construction type can be any of the three focus markers as appropriate. The second, however, must always be heo. In the following example, the first focus marker is the heo form because the clause is an information question. The second focus marker is heo because, as the second focus marker of a focus-echo construction, it has to be:

94) Melena ami hin akari siam hin?
mele-na ami hin akari -ri sia -m hin
2du-in who(m) 3sgmEFOC then -PSNV do -sgm 3sgmEFOC

Which one of you two did this? [lit: Who of you two did this?]

• With an emphasised constituent

In focus clauses which have a constituent emphasised by the use of the particle ta ‘just, only’, heo must normally be used. Ta ‘just’ always immediately follows the constituent which it emphasises:

95) Ngai ta anuvem hin
ngai ta a- nuve -m hin fin
1sg just 3sgmO- own -sgm 3sgmEFOC 3sgmFOC

Only I (m) own it (m).

In the above example, although both participants are 3rd singular masculine, one can tell that ngai is the subject and ‘it’ is the object because of the context; the sentence means ‘I own it’, not ‘it owns me’. The focus marker and the object marker agree with the same referent, which must be the subject because the verbal prefix cross-references the object.

96) Ngai ta buku hoina anuvea heo
ngai ta buku hoina a- nuve-a heo feo
1sg just conch(m) MOD.MED.sgm 3sgmO- own -sgf 3sgfEFOC 3sgfFOC

Only I (f) own that conch.
Examples do occur in which *ta* 'just' co-occurs with a *feo* focus marker (e.g. example 102) but in elicitation such sentences are rejected in favour of variants with the *heo* focus marker.

- **Strong emphasis**

*Heo* may be used in situations where the speaker wishes to convey strong emphasis. The emphasis is associated not just with the constituent with which the focus marker agrees, but over the whole sentence. The emphasis may be of various kinds.

In the first example, a story-teller, Savaka, is telling a story about a fish poison, called *hola*. Savaka introduces the story, talking about what the ancestors used to do in the olden days, then saying that this is going to be a story about *hola*. Then he turns to a man at his side and says "That's your name!", to general laughter from the audience. He is making a pun; the word *hola* also means 'liar'. The construction Savaka uses to make the pun is this (small caps are used to show strong emphasis here):

98) **ngoalang** hi
    ngo-a- langi hi
    2sg- A- name(n) 3sgnEFOC

*It's your name!*  

The following would also be a perfectly acceptable sentence:

99) **ngoalang** fi
    ngo-a- langi fi
    2sg- A- name(n) 3sgnFOC

*It's your name!*  

That is, the clause could be constructed using either *heo*, as Savaka used, or *feo*. However if *feo* was used, the emphatic point would not be made; and the statement would no longer be a joke.

In the following pair, either *heo* or *feo* may be used, but using *heo* is more emphatic. It is contrastive here; the speaker is referring to the two people who started the village of

11 The *-a-* in the first of these examples is a meaningless syllable added by the speaker for special humorous effect, during the story from which the sentence is taken. When I elicited the second example, my informant added the *-a-* as well, in parallel with this example which I had just given him for comparison. Both sentences could occur without it.
Losiolen, emphasising that they, rather than anyone else, were the originators of the village. This is a very important point as far as the speaker and audience are concerned, because there is a land dispute over Losiolen, and the speaker is saying that these people (his direct ancestors), not any others, are the ones who were in Losiolen first, and thus can legitimately lay claim to Losiolen land:

100) Hano nikol vov fiv.
    then first come -pl 3plFOC

They came first.

101) Hano nikol vov hiv.
    then first come -pl 3plFOC

They came first.

Again in the next pair of examples from the same story, using heo emphasises that it was only those two people, no-one else, who were in Losiolen. The version with feo does not contain this emphasis, and does not make any allusion to the land claim.

102) Aka Mofe ne Okali honala ta hoka
    then Mofe with Okali MOD.PROX.dum just here.PROX

ngoamal finala Losiolen.

So these two Mofe and Okali were the ones who stayed here in Losiolen.

103) Aka Mofe ne Okali honala ta hoka
    then Mofe with Okali MOD.PROX.dum just here.PROX

ngoamal hinala Losiolen.

So these two Mofe and Okali were the ones who stayed here in Losiolen.

In the following pair of examples as well, either feo or heo could be used, but the use of heo indicates that the speaker is making an emphatic point that only certain plants are useable for making kites. The sentence with feo just makes the statement.

104) Legis ekae omi tuna fi.

That's the special thing for kite-flying.
105) **Legis ekae** omi tuna hi.

Legis e- kae e o- mi tuna -ø hi
kite(n) 3sgPOSS- put.up -NOMZR 3sgPOSS- special.thing(n) be.really -sgn 3sgEFOC

*THAT’S THE SPECIAL THING for kite-flying.*

Similarly, **heo** is used in the next example to make the point that it REALLY happened like that. The speaker is taking about a very exciting time when an earthquake came, and caused the ground to bubble up. The version with **feo** lacks this emphasis.

106) **Ona to’vum aene siam**

O- na to’vum æ -ne sia -m
3sgfO- in bubbles(m) go.up -IMPF do -sgm

hin hoigariom.

hin hoiga -ri -om
3sgmEFOC MOD.MED.sgn -PSNV -m/n

*The bubbles REALLY went up in it like that.*

107) **Ona to’vum aene siam**

O- na to’vum æ -ne sia -m
3sgfO- in bubbles(m) go.up -IMPF do -sgm

fin hoigariom.

fin hoiga -ri -om
3sgmEFOC MOD.MED.sgn -PSNV -m/n

*The bubbles went up in it like that.*

- Sentence-Final focus constructions with **foia** demonstrative pronouns

If a clause with a Sentence-Final focus construction contains a demonstrative pronoun from the **foia** paradigm, then the **heo** focus marker, rather than **feo**, is used. For example:

108) **Foina masulum hin.**

Foina ma- sulum hin
PN.MED.sgm 3plPOSS- chief(m) 3sgmEFOC

*He is their king.*

109) **Foia lafa tula heo.**

Foia lafa tula -a heo
PN.MED.sgf part(f) small -sgf 3sgEFOC

*That’s a little thing.*
110) **Foiva hano soiv hiv**

Foiva hano soi -v hiv
PN.MED.pl then run.away -pl 3plEFOC

They then ran away...

111) **foiva ngomarev hiv.**

foiva ngo-ma -re -v hiv
PN.MED.pl 2sg- take -FUT -pl 3plEFOC

... you will take them.

112) **Foiga Lavukale emi leme hi.**

foiga Lavukale e- mi le- me hi
PN.MED.sgn Russell.Is. 3sgN- make 1plex- HAB 3sgnEFOC

That [is what] we did in the Russells.

The previous examples all show foia demonstrative pronouns in subject or object function. Foia demonstratives in postpositional phrases are uncommon, but there are examples of these in Sentence-Final focus constructions in the corpus (Section 11.4.1 explains that Sentence-Final focus constructions expressing focus on postpositional phrases are very rare). The following example shows a foia demonstrative pronoun in a postpositional phrase, in a clause with a Sentence-Final focus construction. The focus marker is from the heo, not feo paradigm:

113) **Foina ane kelea lamem hin.**

foina a- ne kelea la- me -m hin
PN.MED.sgm 3sgmO-with walk 1sg- HAB -sgm 3sgmEFOC

I would go round with him.

It is perhaps significant that in argument focus constructions while it is possible to focus on an NP, this NP cannot consist of a demonstrative pronoun from the foia paradigm. So the question whether a foia demonstrative pronoun in argument focus would occur with a feo or heo copula does not arise.

Unlike the demonstrative pronoun foia, personal pronouns do not affect the form of the focus marker; see for example (37) and (38) above. Neither do demonstrative pronouns from the oia paradigm:

114) **Oiariom feo ngomarea heo.**

oia -ri -om feo ngo-ma -re -a heo
other.MED.sgf -PSNV -m/n 3sgFFOC 2sg- take -FUT -sgf 3sgFFOC

You take that one.

Demonstrative modifiers (from the hoia paradigm) also do not affect the form of the focus marker. In the following example, a hoia demonstrative is the subject of a Sentence-Final focus construction with a feo focus marker:
Incidentally, hoia demonstratives can co-occur with the heo focus markers: see for example (96) above.

If the focus marker is marking a Sentence-Internal focus construction, the presence of a foia demonstrative pronoun does not affect the form of the focus marker. In the following example, the focus marker, which is in an argument focus construction focussing on the first part of the complex predicate ovu lome is unaffected by the presence of the subject foina:

Note that there are no restrictions on the use of the demonstrative pronoun foia with the meo focus marker. This phenomenon only affects the ffeo and heo focus markers.

This phenomenon is one that deserves some attention. Deictics and focus markers can co-occur; however the way in which they can co-occur is tightly constrained. That is, h-stem deictics (in other words, demonstrative modifiers from the hoia paradigm) and f-stem focus markers (from the feo paradigm) can co-occur, and f-stem deictics (demonstrative pronouns from the foia paradigm) and h-stem focus markers (from the heo paradigm) can co-occur, but an f-stem deictic (foia) can’t co-occur with an f-stem focus marker (feo). If a focus clause contains a foia pronoun, the ffeo focus marker cannot be used; instead heo must be used.

This phenomenon is an obligatory syntactic phenomenon, not a stylistic or pragmatic choice which speakers can make. Because it is automatic on the choice of a focus construction which contains a demonstrative pronoun, it is not a pragmatic variable that speakers can manipulate. For this reason, it is best seen as a kind of agreement phenomenon; one could think of it as alliterative discord. Alliterative concord is a type of agreement system whereby the head, on which agreement depends, contains material which is identical to the material showing agreement on other word classes. Corbett (1991: 117) says, with reference to Swahili gender agreement:

1. the noun itself includes a form which is identical to the gender agreement marker and which clearly indicates the gender of the nouns;
2. the same gender agreement marker is used for different agreement targets.

In Lavukaleve, the situation is similar to this. One could think of the deictic as the head,
the form of which determines the agreement of the focus marker. An f-stem deictic head (pronoun foia) requires an h-stem focus marker (heo). An h-stem deictic head (hoia) allows an f-stem focus marker (feo). This is alliterative discord in the sense that the agreement markers, f and h, occur on both of the word classes concerned; as markers of agreement. Concord implies identity; these markers however, agree, as it were, by disagreeing. This, then, is alliterative discord.

There is also an interaction between f and h within the focus markers; recall that if there are two focus markers in construction with each other (i.e. in focus-echo constructions), the first may be either feo or heo, but the second must be heo, not feo. The interaction between f/h stems in focus markers is somewhat different from the f/h interaction between deictics and focus markers. With focus markers, the interaction between f- and h-stems is due to a cumulative effect of a combination between emphasis and focus, and arises as a corollary of the respective functions of the f-stem and h-stem focus markers.

**The Feo Focus Marker**

Feo is the “elsewhere” focus marker; that is, it is used in all contexts where a focus marker is needed but the conditions are not appropriate for meo or heo. It is used in statements, not in questions, and in clauses in which there is no foia demonstrative pronoun, and where there is no strong emphasis. Examples have occurred frequently throughout this chapter, and more need not be repeated here.

**11.8 Summary**

There are three focus markers in Lavukaleve, which are used in different constructions. The constituent with which the focus marker is in construction is the focussed constituent. Many different types of constituents can be focussed: a predicate plus its object, a sentence, an NP or an adjunct, including nominal adjuncts, adverbs, particles, non-main verbs and the first part of complex predicates.

When predicates and sentences are focussed, the focus marker is the final element of the sentence; thus, these constructions are called Sentence-Final focus constructions. The agreement of the focus marker determines the domain of focus, thus sentence focus and predicate focus are distinguished by the agreement shown on the focus marker.

When arguments are focussed, the focus marker appears immediately after the argument, sentence-internally; thus the constructions are called Sentence-Internal focus constructions.

As a point of embarkation, Lambrecht’s definition of focus was used; he regards focus as a scope indicator, related to phenomena of assertion and presupposition. Lavukaleve’s use of focus differs in some respects from many other languages, for example in its
frequent focus-marking of dependent clauses, but it was pointed out that since Lavukaleve so clearly marks what is and what is not focussed, it is no difficult matter to determine what is focussed in Lavukaleve; and thus an understanding of the pragmatics of focus marking in Lavukaleve can be arrived at empirically.

It was also shown how Lavukaleve’s focus marking system grammaticalises Lambrecht’s three-way division of focus into sentence, predicate and argument focus in an extremely clear way; in fact, Lavukaleve is a better exemplar of his three-way division than English or the other languages he uses.

Some aspects of Lavukaleve’s focus marking system are highly unusual. For instance it is unusual for a focus marker to show agreement, and to be so heavily grammaticalised as Lavukaleve’s obviously is. Further, it is impossible to describe the basic morpho-syntax of Lavukaleve without having recourse to information structure. This is not uncommon in languages; what is uncommon is the extent to which the categories of information structure pervade Lavukaleve’s grammar.
CHAPTER TWELVE

Tense, aspect and mood

12.1 INTRODUCTION

All morphological categories of tense, aspect and mood (TAM) are marked by suffixes on verbs (see Chapter 14 for discussion of how these suffixes operate in complex predicates). There are two Tense categories: Present and Future; there are two Aspect categories: Imperfective and Durative; and there are six Mood categories: Admonitive, Durative Imperative, Punctual Imperative, Hortative, Abilitative and Extended.

TAM is not an obligatorily marked category; even when semantically appropriate, there is no obligation for speakers to use it. Most TAM suffixes are incompatible with most other verbal morphology.

Further, most of these affixes cannot combine with each other. The following table sets out the TAM suffixes, and their combinatorial possibilities with other verbal morphology:
Combinatorial Possibilities of TAM morphology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TENSE</th>
<th>Prefixes</th>
<th>Suffixes</th>
<th>other TAM</th>
<th>AGR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>SBD</td>
<td>CAUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASPECT</th>
<th>Prefixes</th>
<th>Suffixes</th>
<th>other TAM</th>
<th>AGR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Durative</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfective</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes††</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOOD</th>
<th>Prefixes</th>
<th>Suffixes</th>
<th>other TAM</th>
<th>AGR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Punctual Imperative</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durative Imperative</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hortative</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admonitive</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abilitative</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes††</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'Yes' means the affixes can co-occur on one verb. An x means they cannot.
† Number of subject is marked in the Present Tense suffix.
†† Rare.

The table makes clear that object cross-referencing is compatible with all TAM morphology, but subject cross-referencing is much less so. Generally only one TAM category can be marked per verb.

TAM is not the complex and elaborated area that it is in some East Papuan Phylum languages, for instance Yele (Henderson 1995) or Motuna (Onishi 1994). In both of these languages, there are highly elaborated TAM categories, expressed by extremely complex agglutinative verbal morphology. Lavukaleve’s system, by contrast, is relatively simple, with few contrasts and simple morphological means of expressing them.

12.2 TENSE

There are two morphologically marked tense categories in Lavukaleve: the Present Tense and the Future Tense. The Present Tense morphology contains information about the number (sg/du/pl) of the subject, whereas the Future Tense marker just marks Future Tense. Neither the Present Tense nor the Future Tense markers are obligatory in contexts in which they are semantically appropriate, and in fact in many verb forms they
are disallowed. Tense cannot be marked on subordinate adverbial or coordinate-dependent verbs, and Tense marking cannot co-occur on the same verb as aspect or mood marking.

Because Present Tense and Future Tense marking are not obligatory even in semantically appropriate and morphologically allowed contexts, there is no reason to suggest that there is, in structuralist terms, a Past Tense marked by zero. Such an analysis would force one to distinguish between unmarked Present or Future Tense marking, and zero Past Tense marking; such a distinction would be difficult to sustain, in theory and in practice.

12.2.1 The Future Tense

The Future Tense is marked by verbal suffix -re. The Future Tense category marks an event or state as being located in a time which is after now. In Chung and Timberlake’s (1985) terms, it is an absolute tense marker, marking time with respect to the speech event. Some examples:

1) Efuluge fi aka lekalem na aka
   e- e- fulu-ge fi aka le- kalem na aka
   3sgO- SBD- blow-ANT 3sgnFOC then 1duexPOS- father(m) sgmArt then
   ore "Vo’voul vala hi mesiare" ore.
   o- re vo’vou -l vala hi me- sia -re o- re
   3sgS- say boy -du how 3sgnEFOC 1pl.in- do -FUT 3sgS-say

   It [the wind] was blowing, and our father said “Sons, what will we do?” he said.   mt 008

2) “O! Le akari me ena fi kini afeure”
   o le aka -ri me -o e- na fi kini a- feu -re
   oh day(n) then -PSNV SPEC -sgn 3sgnO- in 3sgnFOC ACT 1sgS- go.up -FUT

   “Oh, some day, I’ll come again”   mn2 023

3) mola ehoae ena fi va’var ahaire.
   mola e- hoa -e e- na fi va’var a- hai -re
   canoe(n)3sgnO-poke.through -NOMZR 3sgnO- in 3sgnFOC talking 1sgS-do -FUT

   ...I will talk about building canoes.   cp 001

The most common use of the Future Tense marker, and the one exemplified above, is for prediction of events. It can also be used to indicate that the speaker thinks an event should occur:
4) Aka daine kini aefeule,
a- raine kini a- e- feu -le
then tomorrow ACT 3sgmO- SBD- go.up -POT

foiga anelaire.
a- ne- lai -re
PN.MED.sgn 3sgmO- 2sgS- tell -FUT

Then tomorrow if he comes, you should tell him.

5) Iru fi oire mene hoka metailan.
iru fi o- i -re me- ne hoka me- tail -n
sleep 3sgnFOC 3sgS- do -FUT 1pl.in- with here.PROX 1pl.in.POSS- house -LOC

He'd better sleep with us two here in our house.

6) Aka kini tataveuaera la oesiale,
aka kini tataveua -re -a la o- e- sia -le
then ACT be.missing -NF -sgf sgfArt 3sgfO- SBD- do -POT

ovea mame.
o- vea ma- me
3sgfO- know 3plS- HAB

If anything was missing, they would have known it.

The Future tense marker is also found much more rarely expressing irrealis rather than future time meaning:

7) "O kosora mefo'sal rovoru vokurula merev fome"
o kosora me- fo'sal rovo -ru vo- kuru -la me -re -v fome
oh today 1pl.in- fish(pl) one.pl -none 3pl.O- hit -NEG HAB -FUT -pl 1pl.inFOC

"Oh, today we won't catch any fish"

There is a morpheme formally identical to the Future Tense marker, which marks coordinate-dependent verbs which form a sequence with the following clause. It can be easily distinguished from the Future Tense marker on morphological and semantic grounds. A verb marked by the Non-Finite suffix cannot receive subject cross-referencing, can receive certain Aspect marking, and has no constraints on time reference. Conversely, a Future Tense marked verb can easily occur with subject cross-referencing (as shown in the above examples), cannot receive Aspect marking (as mentioned above) and can only have future time reference. The Non-Finite suffix is discussed in Section 15.4.4.
In passing, it may be mentioned that there is a third, rare, circumstance in which a suffix of the form -re can appear, on an independent predicate but with no future time reading.

8) *(Chiefs don't work for the good of the village any more.)*

Mamuan minaoae eliki mev siare.
ma- muan minoa -e e- liki me -v sia-re
3pIPhOSS- self be.rich -NOMZR 3sgnO- want SPEC-pl do -NF

*Because they want riches for themselves.*

These situations are the ones in which the -re-marked predicate can have the Imperfective Aspect or Durative suffix as well. For example:

9) Janet kimita otat fufurene.
Janet kimita o- tat fufu -re -ne
Janet(f) pandanus(f) 3sgfO- on.top lie.down -RE -IMPF

*Janet is lying on a mat.*

This kind of morphological combination of the -re plus the Imperfective Aspect marker is semantically similar to a simple Present Tense suffix:

10) Janet kimita otat fufunu.
Janet kimita o- tat fufu -nu
Janet(f) pandanus(f) 3sgfO- on.top lie.down -PRES.sg

*Janet is lying on a mat.*

These sentences were both produced spontaneously by native speakers; but native speakers find it difficult to say what the meaning difference between them is.

It is difficult to know how to understand these sentences with independent non-future predicates with the -re suffix. It is not clear whether they are aberrant examples of the Future suffix, aberrant examples of the Non-Finite suffix, or something else entirely. However, although such sentences are perfectly acceptable to speakers, they are very rare in the corpus.

12.22 The Present Tense

The Present Tense marks an event as being ongoing at the time of speech. The morpheme marking the Present Tense also marks number\(^1\) of the subject (S/A):

---

\(^1\) This is not the Agreement Suffix: the Agreement Suffix has gendered dual forms -mal--aol--gel, and marked singular forms also. The segment /v/ is a pervasive feature of dual forms throughout Lavukaleve; and similarly /v/ is ubiquitous in plural forms.
A rare variant of this suffix is -no --nol --nov. These two forms of the suffix reflect variant pronunciations. They mean the same thing.

The Present Tense suffix is not obligatory, and in fact cannot be used on a verb which has any other morphology apart from object marking.

The Present Tense suffix is actually quite rare in texts, but it is extremely common in conversation. Texts in my corpus are mostly about events in the past, or habitual events using habitual aspectual morphology. When the Present Tense marker does come up it is usually in the context of quoted speech, or for vivid impact, using the so-called “historical present” (Chung and Timberlake 1985: 213), which is a common phenomenon cross-linguistically.

In natural conversation, however, the Present Tense marker is extremely common, particularly in interchanges like example (14) below, where someone asks the whereabouts of a woman, and is answered with what the woman is doing: She’s sleeping, she’s making pudding, she’s swimming, and so on.

Some examples of this tense marker in use:

11) Mina ogera oakige

God oveio o "God ngaveinu" hide are.
God o- ve -io o God nga- vei -nu hide a- re
God 3sgS- go -NOMZR.f and God 1sgO- call -PRES.sg thus 1sgS- say

I felt God’s call, and I said “God is calling me”. am 023

12) Felenu?
fele -nu
return -PRES.sg

Are you going back? co 227

13) Ukeanu?
uka -nu
come.close -PRES.sg

Is it coming close? gm 097

14) Vasia? Irunu
vasia -a iru -nu
be.where-sgf sleep -PRES.sg

Where is she? She’s sleeping. e3 037h/1
Another answer to the question asked in the last example could be irua (sleep-sgf) ‘she’s asleep’. This is a stative verb, using the Agreement Suffix (see Section 10.5), rather than a Present Tense-marked verb.

Note that the fact that the Present Tense suffix contains subject number marking has an interesting result. In Lavukaleve, information about an argument of a verb can only be cross-referenced once (if at all) per verb. So the fact that the number of the subject is cross-referenced by the tense suffix means that information about the subject cannot be marked elsewhere on a Present Tense-marked verb, for example by a prefix or by the Agreement Suffix.

Morphological Present Tense marking is relatively rare. It is far more common in Lavukaleve for present time reference to be marked phrasally than morphologically. The usual way to do this is to use a clause chain involving one or more lexical verbs plus the verb lei ‘exist’, particularly with non-punctual verbs (see Chapter 15 for a discussion of clause chains). The next two (elicited) examples contrast a present-time reference sentence and a past time reference sentence respectively.

15) Kimita ona fifire fi olei.
   kimita o- na fifi-re fi o- lei
   pandanus(f) 3sgfO- in sit -NF 3sgnFOC 3sgS- exist
   He is sitting on a mat (now).

16) Marigen kimita ona fi ofifi.
    marígen kimita o- na fi o- fifi
    yesterday pandanus(f) 3sgfO-in 3sgnFOC 3sgS- sit
    Yesterday he sat on a mat.

In the first sentence, present time reference is indicated by the verbal complex fifire olei (with a focus marker marking focus on the lexical verb fifi). The lexical verb is marked with the Non-Finite suffix; a literal translation of this sentence would be ‘Sitting on the mat he is’. Contrast this with the second sentence, in which past time reference is shown by the particle marigen ‘yesterday’, and the predicate is a simple verb.

Following are textual examples to further illustrate clause chains with coordinate-dependent lexical verbs and the finite verb lei ‘exist’ with present time reference:
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17) "O! Ngai fe mina ngane mem kini
    o ngai fe mina ngane me -m kini
    oh 1sg even um 1sgO- with SPEC -sgm ACT

    hoka vore mina oma la
    hoka vo -re mina o- ma-a la
    here.PROX come -NF thing(f) 3sgS- take-sgf sgfArt

    oku mea ona hide fi vore alei".
    o- ku me-a o- na hide fi vo -re a- lei
    3sgFO- like SPEC -sgf 3sgFO- in thus 3sgnFOC come-NF 1sgS- exist

"Oh! My brother came here, I am come [lit. coming, I exist] to get what my brother got". co 165

18) Ngotua la omare kini feula ngolei.
    ngo-tua la o- ma-re kini feu -la ngo-lei
    2sg- wife(f) sgfArt 3sgf-take -NF ACT go.up -NEG 2sg- exist

You aren’t taking your wife up! [i.e. you haven’t brought your wife up [with you]]  co 254

19) "E! Laiba! Ukeare lore fi melei".
    e lai -ba ukea -re lo -re fi me- lei
    hey! paddle-DURIMP.pl come.close -NF finish -NF 3sgnFOC 1pl.in-exist

"Hey! Paddle! We’re close now!"

20) Oia fe nei ga eveare fi oli.ei.
    oia fe nei ga e- vea -re fi o- lei
    other.MED.sgf even coconut(n) sgArt 3sgnO- know -NF 3sgnFOC 3sgS- exist

That other woman knows about the coconut.  co 117

21) lire. Lafi elikire fi alei".
    lire lafi e- liki -re fi a- lei
    yes water(n) 3sgnO- want -NF 3sgnFOC 1sgS- exist

"Yes. I want water".  co 195

12.3 ASPECT

There are two aspectual categories marked morphologically in Lavukaleve. There is an Imperfective Aspect, marked by suffix -ne, and a Durative Aspect, marked by the suffixes -nun ~ -na.

Aspect marking is not obligatory, and it cannot co-occur with Tense, Mood or most other verbal morphology. No Aspectual category can occur on negated verbs, or verbs marked with any other suffix. Because Aspect-marked verbs cannot receive the Agreement Suffix (see Chapter 10), they cannot occur in certain types of focus constructions (see Chapter 11), or relative clauses (see Section 16.3). Aspect-marked verbs can occur with object and, rarely, subject cross-referencing prefixes.
12.3.1 The Imperfective Aspect Suffix -ne

The Imperfective Aspect marker -ne is used for events or states which have no necessary endpoint, and which tend to be extended through time. It means that the action is still going on at the time of reference. It contains no reference to the time with respect to the speech event (i.e. tense). The following elicited pair of sentences (each one frequently heard in conversation) makes transparent the semantic difference between the Imperfective and the Present Tense suffixes. Example (22) is repeated from above (14):

22) Vasia? Irunu
vasia -a iru -nu
be.where -sgf sleep -PRES.sg
Where is she? She’s sleeping. e3 037h/1

vasia -a iru -ne
be.where -sgf sleep -IMPF
Where is she? She’s still sleeping. e3 037h/2

The Imperfective Aspect suffix can co-occur with the Non-Finite suffix (but not the Future Tense suffix, which is formally identical to the Non-Finite suffix: see above for an explanation of the difference). An Imperfective-marked verb can receive object and (rarely) subject cross-referencing prefixes. There is no other morphology with which the Imperfective suffix can co-occur.

The following examples of the Imperfective Aspect suffix are taken from texts:

24) Otua lomuan beko la otat falere
o-tua lo-muan beko la o-tat fale -re
3sgPOSS- wife(f) 3sgfO- self stone(f) sgfArt 3sgfO- on.top stand-NF
kakone otum na aham.
kako -ne o-tum na a- ham
look.out -IMPF 3sgPOSS- husband(m) sgfArt 3sgmO- for
His wife stood alone on top of the stone, looking out for her husband. gm 021

25) Levo la ofure rongeane.
levo la o-fu -re rongea -ne
flute(f) sgfArt 3sgfO- sing -NF play -IMPF
They were playing blowing the flute.

Hoigari ena ta vonam kini olavea.
hoiga -ri e-na ta vo-nam kini o-lavea
MOD.MED.sgn -PSNV 3sgmO- in just 3plO- to ACT 3sgS- appear
Then she showed herself to them. jn2 041-042
Ekelagurire foiva soire kini

makala one lugaulin ka ngiurene.

Setting fire to it, they ran away, and went and waited for their mother [who was] hiding in the bush.

One idiomatic expression always involves the use of Imperfective -ne. The noun laku 'hate' is used, with a Locative suffix, and a Possessive prefix to express the experiencer, as a kind of paratactic adjunct to a main clause with verb suffixed with -ne:

... he didn't want to talk about her or do anything. [lit. in his hate was talking about her and doing anything]

This construction is also discussed in Section 17.2.7.

12.3.2 THE DURATIVE ASPECT SUFFIXES -NUN AND -NA

The Durative Aspect indicates that an action is extended through a very long length of time. Typically a verb plus Durative suffix is repeated, often ten or more times, to indicate that things went on in the same way, or the same thing kept happening, for a very long time. This is a very common stylistic device in narratives. The two suffixes -nun and -na differ in that -na is a rare form used exclusively by old people, whereas -nun is used primarily by younger people. They mean the same thing. It is certainly always possible to use either in all contexts which I have explored. I have never heard the suffix -na in conversation, but it is not uncommon in narrative monologues by old people.

Verbs marked with either of the Durative suffixes can appear with the Non-Finite suffix, object cross-referencing prefixes, and no other verbal morphology.

I continued working there, then finished, and the war was nearly over.
29) Akari sianun sianun fi
aka -ri sia -nun sia -nun fi
then -PSNV do -DUR do -DUR 3sgnFOC

kini ta hoinariom olo.
kini ta hoina -ri -om o- lo
ACT time(m) MOD.MED.sgm -PSNV -m/n 3sgs- finish

*It continued on like that, then that time ended.*

30) Hano. Aira la ngoanun ngoanun
hano aira la ngoa -nun ngoa -nun
then woman(f) sgfArt stay -DUR stay -DUR

ovo'vou na bakel siam.
o- vo'vou na bakel sia -m
3sgPOSS- boy(m) sgmArt big do -sgm

*Okay. The woman lived on and on, her son grew big.*

The next two examples show the use of -na on two verbs which are also only used by old people, *voi* 'come' and *vei* 'go'. These verbs are formally similar to *vo* 'come' and *ve* 'go'; which are widely current. The combinations *voina* and *veina* have been largely replaced by *vulanun* (*vula-nun* 'come-DUR') and *velanun* (*ve-la-nun* 'go-DUR'). *Vula* and *ve* are not synchronically analysable (for example into *vu* or *ve* plus Extended -la), they are just two common verbs, used primarily by younger people.

31) Voina voina voina kini onam
voi -na voi -na voi -na kini o- nam
come -DUR come-DUR come -DUR ACT 3sgfO- to

olavea "Oi Valai!"
3sgS- appear hey! how

*He went and went and went, and reached her. "Hey! What's up!"*

32) Veina veina veina veina veina koi kini oerau.
vei -na vei-na vei -na vei-na vei -na koi kini o- erau
go -DUR go-DUR go -DUR go -DUR go -DUR also ACT 3sgS- fall

*He went on and on and on, then he too went down.*

33) Feuna feuna feuna feuna feuna
feu -na feu -na feu -na feu -na feu -na
go.up -DUR go.up -DUR go.up -DUR go.up -DUR

feuna koi omafu.
feu -na koi o- ma- fu
go.up -DUR also 3sgfO- 3plS- sing

*She went up, up, up, then they all were still playing [the flute].*
There are six morphologically marked categories of mood in Lavukaleve: Admonitive -n; Punctual Imperative -va-ila-iva; Durative Imperative -ma--mela--ba; Hortative -me; Abilitative -nen--nan; and Extended -la.

Mood is not an obligatory category in contexts in which it is semantically appropriate; and the presence of Mood marking is incompatible with much other verbal morphology. The verbs on which these mood suffixes occur cannot mark any categories of Tense, Aspect or other Moods. Neither can they be negated; and because they cannot have the Agreement Suffix (see Chapter 10) they cannot occur in most types of focus constructions (see Chapter 11) or relative clauses (see Section 16.3). All Mood-marked verbs can, if transitive, appear with an object cross-referencing prefix, but some (the Imperatives, the Hortative and the Extended) cannot occur with subject cross-referencing prefixes. The Admonitive and Abilitative can cross-reference their subjects with prefixes.

Other clause types expressing mood-like categories include Purposive and Potential clauses. These categories are marked by suffixes on verbs, but, unlike the Mood suffixes, verbs with such suffixes form subordinate clauses. These are discussed in Chapter 16.

12.4.1 THE ADMONITIVE

There is a cluster of related meanings associated with the Admonitive suffix -n. The core meaning, in terms of frequency at least, is the one which the suffix has been named for: it is used to warn against something, telling the hearer to avoid something bad happening. It sometimes contains an implied command to not do something. The suffix is also used for a negative imperative; telling the hearer not to do something, with no implication of avoiding anything bad that might follow from ignoring the command. The suffix is also used to indicate that something bad might happen, without any implied command to avoid it, or not do something. This is a deleterious possibility usage (in the words of Bybee, Perkins and Pagliuca (1994: 211)). The suffix can, more rarely, be used as an irrealis marker; to mean that something may happen, whether good or bad, again with no implication that the speaker should do or not do anything to avoid it. Lastly, the suffix may be used as an exhortative, asking that something, usually good, should happen. This use is restricted to prayer.

These meanings, for the sake of clarity, can be schematised as follows:

- Don’t! (negative imperative)
  (No implication of trying to avoid something bad)
- Avoid something bad! (admonitive)
  (Warning, sometimes an implied negative imperative)

- Something bad might happen! (deleterious possibility)
  (Pointing it out, with no implication of commanding the hearer to avoid it)

- Something might happen! (irrealis)
  (No indication of whether the something is good or bad, and no implication that the hearer should avoid it)

- May something happen! (exhortative)
  (Asking that something, usually good, may happen. Used in prayer.)

This is a large semantic range for one morpheme, but one can clearly see the semantic connections between each of the meanings. The final use, the exhortative, is perhaps surprising given the first few meanings; but it can be understood it in terms of a slight alteration of the irrealis meaning of `something might happen’ to wanting something to happen.

Bybee et al. (1994: 211) talk of an admonitive modality, which involves the speaker issuing a warning to the addressee. They mention Alyawarra and Slave as two languages in which a deleterious possibility marker is the same as an admonitive marker. This is certainly the situation in Lavukaleve. Clearly at some level these meanings are all closely related.

The following examples show the meanings of the suffix -n more clearly. Note that for the sake of consistency, this suffix is universally glossed ADMONitive, irrespective of its actual meaning in the context.

**NEGATIVE IMPERATIVE**

The negative imperative use of the suffix commands the hearer not to carry out the action of the verb. There is no necessary implication that bad results will follow if the hearer ignores the command. The admonitive in the negative imperative meaning is often accompanied by sevo, a particle meaning ‘tabu/holy’, which can also be used by itself to tell someone to stop doing whatever it is they are doing.

```
34) "Sevo. Oma onekole oeraun."
    sevo  o-  ma  o-  ne-  ko  -le  o-  erau  -n
    tabu/holy 3sgF- take 3sgF-2sgS- throw -POT 3sgS- fall -ADMON

"Careful! Don't throw [the coconut] down."
```
35) "Sevo onelufun"
   sevo o- ne- lufu -n
   tabu/holy 3sgfO- 2sgS- leave -ADMON
   "Don't leave it".

36) Onefoin!
   o- ne- foi -n
   3sgfO- 2sgS- hold -ADMON
   Don't touch!

37) Sevo meirun kosora fi koro ofau.
   sevo me- iru -n kosora fi koro o- fau
   tabu/holy 2pl- sleep -ADMON soon 3sgnFOC darkness(n) 3sgS- happen
   Don't go to sleep yet; it's still early.

ADMONITIVE AND DELETERIOUS POSSIBILITY

The following examples each have two instances of the suffix -n. In each case, the first instance is a warning not to do something (admonitive), and in the second instance the suffix is marking the fact that something bad might happen as a result of ignoring the warning (deleterious possibility).

38) Sevo kua ga ena umu ngoffin.
   sevo kua ga e- na umu ngo- fifi -n
   tabu/holy coconut.tree(n) sgnArt 3sgnO- in under 2sg- sit -ADMON
   Don't sit under the coconut tree.

Erau nei ngokurun.
   erau nei ngo- kuru -n
   fall coconut(n) 2sg- hit -ADMON
   A coconut might fall and hit you (which would be bad).

39) Sevo hoika ngoven, kokoroko la ngokin.
   sevo hoika ngo- ve- n kokoroko la ngo- ki -n
   tabu/holy there.MED 2sg- go-ADMON chicken(f) sgnArt 2sg- shoot -ADMON
   Don't go there; the chicken might peck you (which would be bad).

IRREALIS

These examples show the suffix indicating that something may happen; the event is not necessarily good or bad:

40) "Vulaba! Ui rugi hoga ele memen".
   vula -ba ui rugi hoga e- le me- me -n
   come -DURIMP.pl food(n) big.sgn MOD.PROX.sgn 3sgnO- see 2pl- HAB-ADMON
   "Come! So you can see the big feast."
41) ali ele elikivele ikari ae
ali e- le e- liki -vele ika -ri ae
man(m) 3sgnO- see 3sgnO-want -SUCC there -PSNV go.up

ele laemen
e- le la- e- me -n
3sgnO- see 3sgnO- SBD- HAB -ADMON

Anyone who wants to see it can go up and look there.

42) fo'sal va kiuvele aka nego voemen hide.
fo'sal va kiu-vele aka nego vo- e- me -n hide
fish(pl) plArt die -SUCC then float 3plo- SBD- HAB -ADMON thus

... when the fish die, they may float.

43) Ngaseri voemen o
nga- seri vo- e- me -n o
1sgO- be.surprised.by 3plo- SBD- HAB-ADMON and

ngaliki voemen
nga- liki vo- e- me -n
1sgO- want 3plo- SBD- HAB -ADMON

They may be surprised by me and they may want me.

EXHORTATIVE

This meaning is found only in the prayer services. It is used to mark exhortations to God. It may be that examples of this meaning are only found in the prayer services simply because this is the only context in which exhortations normally occur.

44) Lod mene ngoa laemen.
Lod me- ne ngoa la- e- me -n
Lord 2pl- with stay 3sgmO- SBD-HAB -ADMON

May the Lord be with you

45) Ena hini ngolatleu lemen
e- na hini ngo- lateleu le- me -n
1pl.ex- in INT 2sg- be.merciful 1pl.ex-HAB -ADMON

e ngo veneri fi leme.
e ngo- veneri fi le- me
1pl.ex 2sg- ask.for 3sgnFOC 1pl.ex- HAB

Have mercy on us, we pray you.

12.4.2 THE IMPERATIVES

There are two Imperative paradigms, each one with three members, marked for number (singular, dual and plural). These Imperatives have 2nd person reference. Similar command-type morphology for 1st inclusive reference is the Hortative -me (discussed below, Section 12.4.3). Note also the 3rd singular exhortative form, one of the uses of
the Admonitive suffix -n (discussed above, Section 12.4.1), which also falls into a similar semantic area. The Imperative forms discussed in this section are all positive; the negative imperative is expressed by the Admonitive suffix -n (see above, Section 12.4.1).

The Imperatives can co-occur with subject prefixes, rarely, and they can have overt NPs expressing the subject (usually inu ‘2nd singular’). But usually, as the examples show, there is no overt mention of the subject, as its reference is assumed.

The two Imperatives differ in their meanings. The Punctual Imperative (glossed PCTIMP) is so-named because it is used with verbs whose action can be carried out to completion instantaneously. The Durative Imperative (glossed DURIMP) is used on the type of verbs that would be expected to take some time to carry out to completion. This Durative Imperative is also used as the command form for verbs which have no necessary endpoint. The addressee is expected to begin, but not complete, the action instantly. The forms of the Imperatives are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PUNCTUAL IMPERATIVE</th>
<th>DURATIVE IMPERATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>-va</td>
<td>-ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DU</td>
<td>-ila</td>
<td>-mela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>-iva</td>
<td>-ba</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of the aspectual nature of the difference between these, some verbs are usually found only with Punctual Imperatives, and some only with Durative Imperatives. However, for many verbs there is a certain overlap; either Imperative can be used, with difference illocutionary force resulting from the choice.

For example, ngoa ‘stay’ usually only takes the Durative Imperative:

46) Ngoama!
    ngoa -ma
    stay -DURIMP.sg
    You stay!

This is a command, but it cannot, because of the nature of the verb, be carried out to completion immediately. On the other hand, a verb like foa ‘put something down’, will normally take the Punctual Imperative:

47) Foava!
    foa -va
    go.down -PCTIMP.sg
    Drop it!

The action is instantaneous, and the speaker expects the command to be carried out instantly.
The distinction between Lavukaleve’s two Imperatives is primarily one of aspect. Superficially similar systems occur in other languages, but these are clearly distinct from Lavukaleve’s system. For instance in Yele (Henderson 1995), an East Papuan Phylum language, and, further afield, Kewapi (Yarapea 1993) and Hua (Haiman 1980), there are two Imperatives, an immediate and a deferred or future Imperative. The former is used for actions which the speaker wants to be carried out immediately, the latter for actions which should be carried out later on. Thus it is not the lexical semantics of the verb that is important, but rather how soon the speaker wants the result to occur.

As further exemplification of Lavukaleve’s Imperatives, consider also the following pair of examples. The first, Durative Imperative, is used on the verb ‘go out’; going to the island of Isabel takes a considerable amount of time, and the addressee is expected to start, but not complete, the action instantly. The second sentence uses the Punctual Imperative to command the hearer to start the canoe engine; the hearer is expected to start and complete the action instantly:

48) Vauma Isabel onam!  
  go.out Isabel o- nam  
  Sleep!

49) Engine la ovaliriva.  
    engine la o- valiri -va  
    Start the engine!

On the other hand, contrast the different meaning which the two Imperatives take when suffixed to the same verb stem:

50) Iruma!  
    iru -ma  
    sleep -DURIMP.sg  
    Sleep!

51) Iruva!  
    iru -va  
    sleep -PCTIMP.sg  
    Shut your eyes!

When the Durative Imperative is attached to the verb ‘sleep’, it is taken to mean that the hearer should do something which cannot be completed instantaneously, but should nonetheless be started now; thus, ‘sleep!’ When the Punctual Imperative is attached to the verb ‘sleep’, it is taken to mean that the hearer should do something they can complete instantly; thus, ‘shut your eyes!’ is the interpretation people would assume.
Sometimes much the same event can be interpreted as Punctual or Durative. Compare the following uses of Imperatives with the verb *huru* 'go inside'. In the first example, the action is presumably thought of as capable of instantaneous completion, and the Punctual Imperative is used. In the second example, the Durative Imperative used implies that the action is thought of as necessarily taking some time:

52) **Kini huruva!**
    
    kini  huru -va  
    ACT  go.inside -PCTIMP.sg
    
    *Go inside!*

53) **Huruma!**
    
    huru  -ma  
    go.inside -DURIMP.sg
    
    *Go inside!*

Further examples of both Imperatives follow:

54) "**Kini vaula**" hide ore.
    
    kini  vau -ila  hide o-re  
    ACT  go.out -PCTIMP.du  thus 3sgS-say
    
    "You two come down" she says.

55) **Ngotau efouva** efoa.
    
    ngo-tau  e-fou -va  e-foa  
    2sg-limb(n)  3sgO- put.on -PCTIMP.sg  3sgO-take.down
    
    *Put your hand down [in the sea].*

56) "**Melefo'sal voku**" voumela" hide ore.
    
    mele-fo'sal  vo-kui -i  vo-u -mela  hide o-re  
    2du-fish(pl)  3plO-burn -NOMZR  3plO-eat -DURIMP.du  thus 3sgS-say
    
    "You two eat your cooked fish" he says.

57) "**Ngoane ngoa**" hivel.
    
    ngoa  -ne  ngoa-ba  hi  -vel  
    stay -IMPF stay -DURIMP.pl  do/say -COMPL
    
    "You lot just keep staying here" she said.

12.4.3 THE HORTATIVE

The Hortative suffix *-me* is quite rare. The Hortative means 'let's'; it indicates a suggestion on the part of the speaker that the addressee(s) and the speaker do something. It can not be used to mean 'let him/them do it'; there is no 3rd person Hortative form in Lavukaleve.

The Hortative is used to include the speaker and either a single addressee or a group of addressees; no distinction is made morphologically between singular, dual or plural...
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addressees:

58) "Bai feleme!" hide ore.
    bae fele -me hide o- re
    let's.go return-HORT thus 3sgS- say

"Let's go back!" he said.

59) Oile
    o- o- i -le
    ta'rai siame
    3sgfO- 3sgS- do -POT prayer(n) do -HORT

Let us pray

60) "E! Tulav! Baisa
    e tulav bai -sa
    filangene vaume".
    hey! children(pl) let's.go! -GROUP weathercoast -PERL go.out -HORT

"Hey kids! Let's go out along the weather coast".

61) Bae velame hoaka.
    bae vela -me hoaka
    let's.go go -HORT there.DIST2

Let's go there.

The Hortative often occurs with the idiomatic expression oile ‘let’s (lit: if it does it)’ (discussed in Section 16.1.6), as in example (59). It also frequently occurs with the particle bai-bae which means ‘let’s go’, ‘let’s do it’, as in examples (58), (60) and (61).

12.4.4 THE ABILITATIVE

The Abilitative -nen--nan (glossed ABIL) is suffixed to a verb to express ability: either in terms of physical or social capacity, or in terms of permission. The Abilitative covers the same semantic domain as Bybee et al.'s (1994: 179) term “root possibility”, an agent-oriented modality (in their terms), which “reports on general enabling conditions and is not restricted to the internal condition of ability, but also reports on general external conditions, such as social or physical conditions”. In addition, it covers Bybee et al.'s “permission” category, a speaker-oriented modality in which a speaker grants permission for an addressee to perform an action. It is common cross-linguistically, as Bybee et al. point out, for grammaticalised permission modality to develop from root possibility modality.

A verb suffixed with the Abilitative -nen--nan can receive subject and object prefixes, but no further suffixes. That is, a verb marked with the Abilitative is incompatible with Tense, Aspect or further Mood marking, negation, or subordination.

The two forms -nen and -nan are in free variation. The former, -nen, is much more common than the latter, but both are acceptable in all contexts. There are no obvious
social or geographical factors determining the distribution of the two suffixes.

General physical enabling conditions:

62) Kui ana omakole onemanen
   kui a- na o- ma- ko -le o- ne- ma -nen
   sun(m) 3sgmO- in 3sgfO- 3plS- throw -POT 3sgfO- 2sgS- take -ABIL
   When they put it out in the sun you will be able to take it.

Permission:

63) "Ui rugi daine mere."
   ui rugi raine me -re -Ø
   food(n) big.sgn tomorrow continue -FUT -sgn
   "There will be a big feast tomorrow."

64) O hano emenen kilekile kosora
   o hano e- me -nen kilekile kosora
   and then 1pl.ex- continue -ABIL axe(f) today
   mea inu ona ngoekurunen ke.²
   me -a inu o- na ngo- e- kuru -nen ke
   SPEC-sgf 2sg 3sgfO-in 2sg- 1pl.ex-hit -ABIL EMPH
   Before, we could kill you with an axe.

   Aka siare ta hona mina akari
   aka sia re ta hona mina aka -ri
   then do -NF time(m) MOD.PROX.sgm thing(f) then -PSNV

   mea tamu Christianity hano sia.
   me -a tamu Christianity hano sia
   SPEC-sgf no Christianity then do
   Now things are not like that, now we have Christianity.

Physical enabling conditions have only been found in elicitation:

65) Mola ga ngomuan enefonen?
   mola ga ngo-muan e- ne- fo -nen
   canoe(n) sgnArt 2sg- self 3sgO- 2sg-lift -ABIL
   Can you lift a canoe by yourself?

² The arguments in this sentence are rather confused. Presumably ‘we’ is the subject, ‘you’ is the object and ‘axe’ is a postpositional object, which has become separated from its postposition ona. Postpositional objects appearing separate from their postpositions are not attested elsewhere in the corpus.
12.4.5 The Extended

The Extended suffix is added to verbs to mean that the action is carried out all over the place, or again and again. It is often used to refer to fishing activities, or hunting, where the activity is carried out by moving around, largely at random and over a large area, looking for fish or animals.

The verbs on which the Extended suffix occurs can have no other suffixes, and cannot take a subject prefix; they can only take an object prefix. There is a formally identical suffix -\textit{la} which occurs on deictics, which changes the reference of the deictic from referring to a single point, to referring to an extended range. See Section 8.10.2 for an account of this suffix on deictics. This is the reason for the name Extended for this suffix, rather than Distributed, which is perhaps more common for verbal affixes with this function.

Some examples of the use of the Extended suffix:

66) \begin{align*}
\text{Ta} & \quad \text{vo'vou} \quad \text{roa} \quad \text{fo'sal} \quad \text{vokila} \\
\text{ta} & \quad \text{vo'vou} \quad \text{roa} \quad \text{fo'sal} \quad \text{vo-} \quad \text{ki} \\
\text{just} & \quad \text{boy(m)} \quad \text{one.sgm} \quad \text{fish(pl)} \quad \text{3plO-} \quad \text{throw} \\
\text{kini} & \quad \text{ofeu} \quad \text{lanam.} \\
\text{kini} & \quad \text{o-} \quad \text{feu} \quad \text{la-} \quad \text{nam} \\
\text{ACT} & \quad \text{3sgS-} \quad \text{go.up} \quad \text{3dumO-} \quad \text{to} \\
\end{align*}

\text{Then one boy was spearing fish all about, and went up to the two.} \quad \text{mn2 003}

67) \begin{align*}
\text{ane} & \quad \text{filofiloiala} \quad \text{vau} \quad \text{tasin} \quad \text{hano} \\
\text{a-} & \quad \text{ne} \quad \text{filofiloia} \quad \text{-la} \quad \text{vau} \quad \text{tasi} \quad \text{-n} \quad \text{hano} \\
\text{3sgmO-} & \quad \text{with} \quad \text{wrestle} \quad \text{-EXT} \quad \text{go.out} \quad \text{sea} \quad \text{-LOC} \quad \text{then} \\
\end{align*}

\text{(He grabbed the fish, tackling it in his arms) and wrestled around with it, out to the sea...} \quad \text{mn2 037}

68) \begin{align*}
\text{Avala} & \quad \text{avala} \quad \text{avala} \\
\text{a-} & \quad \text{va} \quad \text{-la} \quad \text{a-} \quad \text{va} \quad \text{-la} \quad \text{a-} \quad \text{va} \quad \text{-la} \\
\text{3sgmO-} & \quad \text{pull} \quad \text{-EXT} \quad \text{3sgmO-} \quad \text{pull-EXT} \quad \text{3sgmO-} \quad \text{pull} \quad \text{-EXT} \\
\text{lolo} & \quad \text{vau} \quad \text{Negea} \quad \text{ohain.} \\
\text{lolo} & \quad \text{vau} \quad \text{Negea} \quad \text{0-} \quad \text{hai} \quad \text{-n} \\
\text{straight} & \quad \text{go.out} \quad \text{Negea} \quad \text{3sgPOSS-} \quad \text{point} \quad \text{-LOC} \\
\end{align*}

\text{He fished and fished and fished until he reached Negea Point.} \quad \text{s1 005}
He stayed lying down, then they [the flying giants] all landed and he kept on shooting them [as they landed], then...

mn3 066
CHAPTER THIRTEEN

Word-level derivation: word class changing and valency changing

Nominalisation is a common and productive process in Lavukaleve. There are two different kinds of nominalisation: the very productive suffix -i ~ -e, which, added to verb stems, derives an abstract noun; and the less productive -io, with a similar function.

Other word class changing phenomena are rare; there is a Locativiser suffix added to verbs; adjectives can, rarely, be changed into verbs with the addition of the Causative suffix; and there is a suffix that is attached to intransitive verbs to form adverbs.

There are a number of valency changing processes. The one valency increasing process is the Causative construction, and there are three valency decreasing constructions: a construction involving an Intransitiviser suffix -a; an Impersonal construction, and a Reciprocal construction. There is in addition one construction which could be described as valency rearranging, in which subjects of certain verbs are marked using prefixes from the Possessive, not subject, prefix paradigm.

Note that as well as word-level derivation there is also phrasal-level word-class changing in Lavukaleve. It was shown in Section 4.1.2 that the word mea 'SPECifier', normally an adjective, has a non-adjectival use in which it can occur in construction with a particle or a nominal adjunct to derive an NP or nominal modifier phrase. See the above-mentioned chapter for discussion of this.

This chapter discusses in turn each of the word class changing and valency changing constructions in Lavukaleve. The first section deals with nominalisations. The discussion continues in the second section with other word class changing phenomena. The third section deals with valency changing constructions. The final section discusses the valency
rearranging Possessor-subject construction.

13.1 NOMINALISATION

13.1.1 THE NEUTER ABSTRACT NOMINALISER -e--i

There are three methods by which verbs can be nominalised. Most common is the use of the suffix -e--i (glossed NOMZR). This is a very productive suffix, which can be added to transitive or intransitive verbs.

This suffix is one of the few morphemes in Lavukaleve which is subject to a phonological rule. Its form undergoes vowel harmony with the height of the previous vowel of the verb to which it is suffixed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verb ends in</th>
<th>form of Nominaliser suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-à, -o, -e</td>
<td>-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-u, i</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the rule of reduction of identical vowels at morpheme boundaries, which is a general feature of the language (discussed in Section 2.9.3), comes into operation with nominalised verbs which end in -e and -i. This rule means that in practice one cannot hear the suffix when it is attached to a verb stem ending in /e/ or /i/. However, there is no zero nominalisation in Lavukaleve, and all verbs ending in /a/, /u/ and /o/ must use this suffix in order to become nouns; so it is no difficult matter to say that on verb stems ending in /e/ and /i/ the Nominaliser suffix is obligatorily used, then lost due to morphophonemic processes. Some of the verbs in the table below illustrate this.

The Nominaliser suffix derives an abstract neuter noun from any transitive or intransitive verb. Semantically, this is action/state nominalisation; that is, it is the kind of nominalisation in which the derived noun expresses the name of the action or state expressed by the verb (Comrie and Thompson 1985: 349).

For example, compare the following verbs with their corresponding derived nouns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>DERIVED NOUN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lo ‘finish’</td>
<td>loe ‘end’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ve ‘go’</td>
<td>ve ‘going, way’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honia ‘know’</td>
<td>honiae ‘knowledge’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iru ‘sleep’</td>
<td>irui ‘sleep’ (noun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i ‘do’</td>
<td>i ‘deed’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fact that all nouns derived with this suffix are neuter is an example of morphological gender assignment; but there is also a semantic association that many underived abstract
nouns are of neuter gender. See Section 6.1 for a discussion of the principles of gender assignment.

A verb suffixed with the Nominaliser suffix may carry with it any of the arguments and adjuncts normally available to that verb, and carries cross-references for these arguments with subject and/or object prefixes, as the principles of participant marking outlined in Section 9.7 dictate.

Derived nouns have the following nominal features: they function as the heads of NPs, and can thus appear with the definite article, they serve as arguments of verbs or postpositions, and they may take the Locative suffix. The question of whether or not they can take Possessive prefixes is a slightly complicated one, which requires some discussion.

Nouns index possessors using a set of prefixes from the Possessive paradigm. This nominal Possessive prefix paradigm is formally identical to the verbal subject prefix paradigm except for one form. The 1st singular Possessive prefix is nga-, whereas the 1st singular subject prefix is a-. Thus for most derived nouns appearing with a pronominal prefix, one cannot tell whether the prefix is a Possessive or a subject prefix, as theoretically it could be either. Some examples will make these points clear. Compare the prefixes referring to 1st person singular with those referring to 3rd person plural:

1) nga- gaikoko
   1sgPOSS- canoe
   my canoe

2) a- vo -e
   1sgS- come -NOMZR
   my beginning

3) a- vau
   1sgS- go.out
   I went out

4) ma- gaikoko
   3plPOSS- canoe
   their canoe

5) ma- vo -e
   3plS- come -NOMZR
   their beginning

6) ma- vau
   3plS- go.out
   they went out

So derived nouns take subject prefixes, not Possessive prefixes. This leads to a further point. The fact that a verb complete with subject and object prefix indexing can be nominalised shows that the nominalising process happens after the verb has been indexed.
for these arguments. That is, the bare verb stem is not nominalised; instead, the verb with its arguments, which may be cross-referenced with prefixes, is nominalised. The following examples illustrate this point:

7) Aka namu ehae fi aeare hi.

aka namu e- ha - e fi a- ea - re - ø hi
then place(n) 3sgnO- clear -NOMZR 3sgnFOC 1sgS- talk.about -FUT - sgn 3sgnEFOC

I'll talk about clearing a garden.

8) Leta aka oinala lotokae o lolaurae

leta aka oinala lo- toka - e o lo- laura - e
but then other.MED.mdu 3duS- be.strong -NOMZR and 3duS- great -NOMZR

vona fi, kini mima hoga otoka ke,
vo- na fi kini mima hoga o- toka ke
3plO- in 3sgnFOC ACT way.of.life(n) MOD.PROX sgn 3sgS- be.strong EMPH

But through the strength and the power of those two, the church became strong.

9) o si'kul ena koi tulav vona

o si'kul e- na koi tulav vo- na
and school(n) 3sgnO-in also children(pl) 3plO- in

honiae eko e,
honia -e e- ko - e
know -NOMZR 3sgnO- throw -NOMZR

...and (we work) in school also, teaching the children, [lit: throwing knowledge to the children]

The following tables set out the nominal morphology and other nominal characteristics of the derived nouns, and also the verbal morphology and other verbal characteristics of them.

### Nominal Features of Derived Nouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>have gender</td>
<td>yes (obligatorily neuter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have number</td>
<td>yes (obligatorily singular)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have person</td>
<td>yes (obligatorily 3rd person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>function as arguments</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>take Locative/Perlative/Folk suffixes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>take definite article</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>take number suffixes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>take possessive prefixes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To conclude, then, verbs may carry verbal morphology and arguments of their own, and they may retain these when they are nominalised. However once they have been nominalised they also have the noun-like properties of functioning as the heads of NPs, appearing with the definite article, serving as arguments of verbs and postpositions, and taking the Locative and Perlitative suffixes. They do not, however, take Possessive prefixes.

The following examples illustrate some of these features. The first example shows a derived noun suffixed with the Locative suffix, which, together with me ‘SPEC’ functions as an adjective modifying nei ‘coconut’ (see Section 4.1.2 for a discussion of the function of mea ‘SPECifier’).

10) nei oloen me esulaire foiga,
nei o- lo e -n me -ø e- sulai -re foiga
coconut(n) 3sgS. finish -NOMZR -LOC SPEC -sgn 3sgnO-illuminate -NF PN.MED.sgn

...I shine the torch on the last coconut [lit. the coconut at the end]  w2 050

In the next example there is a derived noun from a serial verb construction vala i ‘pull do’. The serial verb construction has an object prefix on the first verb, a subject prefix and Nominalising suffix on the second, and is followed by the neuter singular definite article. The NP is the object of the postposition enal.

11) Akari avala loi ga
aka -ri a- vala lo- i -i ga
then -PSNV 3sgmO- pull 3duS- do -NOMZR sgnArt
enal fi losok va malaa.
e- nal fi lo- soka va ma- laa
3sgmO- because 3sgnFOC 3duPOS- fingers(pl)plArt 3plS- imprint

Because of their pulling like that, their fingers left an imprint.  v1 029

In this example, the derived noun is followed by a neuter singular definite article, and serving as the subject of the verb aokuruge, cross-referenced by the 3sg subject prefix.
A clausal complement of the verb liki ‘want’ is expressed using a verb nominalised with suffix -i--e. There are no complement clauses in Lavukaleve; the object of verbs like liki are nominalisations.

They came, saw it, tied it up and wanted to pull it out.

No! I want to take my arrow.

The Feminine Abstract Nominaliser suffix -io is an unproductive derivational suffix which attaches to transitive verb stems to form feminine nouns.

Examples of feminine nouns derived with this suffix from transitive verbs:
This Nominaliser suffix -io in almost all cases attaches to stems ending in -i. The general morpho-phonemic rule of vowel cluster simplification when identical vowels come together at morpheme boundaries (see Section 2.9.3) comes into play in these cases. However words such as houio < hou 'wait' and luguio < lugu 'think' show that the form of the suffix is actually -io, not -o.

The transitive verb to which -io attaches is often a derived verb form, with the Causative suffix -ri (discussed below).

These resulting feminine nouns derived with this Nominaliser suffix -io are abstract nouns. There is no obvious semantic difference between words derived with the Feminine Abstract Nominaliser -io and with the Neuter Abstract Nominaliser -e--i. However, the main difference between the two is that nominalisations in -io do not take arguments or adjuncts, whereas nominalisations in -i--e do.

A further difference between the two nominalisers is that nouns derived with -io may take dual and plural number suffixation; whereas nouns derived with -i--e may not. Thus: laurario, laurariol, lauriariovil 'praise (sg/du/pl)'; liki, likiol, likiovil 'desire (sg/du/pl)'; mifouio, mifouiol, mifouiovil 'love (sg/du/pl)'. All nominalisations with -io derive their dual and plural suffix forms in the same way, suffixing -l for dual and -vil for plural. (See Chapter 5 for more on the principles of dual and plural suffixation.) Note that such forms have only occurred in elicitation, and not in natural speech. For some of them, e.g. 'love, dual' it is doubtful whether they really have a place in normal spoken language. However it is nonetheless significant that these nominalisations in -io allow dual and plural forms, even if only in principle, whereas the nominalisations in -i--e never do, even in principle.

Another important difference between the -io and -i--e nominalisers is that the latter is extremely productive, whereas the former is not. It may also be significant that almost all of the examples of -io in the corpus are to be found exclusively in the translated prayer services. This could be for a number of reasons, possibly related to stylistic phenomena.

In three examples, -io is added to an adjective or intransitive verb to derive a feminine form of that word. Normally one would expect the feminine singular Agreement Suffix -a in this situation, but there are three examples of -io. Presumably this is a carry-over phenomenon from the Feminine Abstract Nominaliser -io. The words are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>furifurio</th>
<th>adjective (f)</th>
<th>'low'</th>
<th>furifuri</th>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>'low'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kuraio</td>
<td>adjective (f)</td>
<td>'big'</td>
<td>kurai</td>
<td>adjective</td>
<td>'big'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sasavalio</td>
<td>intransitive verb with feminine subject</td>
<td>'be unwilling (f)'</td>
<td>sasavali</td>
<td>intransitive verb</td>
<td>'be unwilling'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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13.2 Other Word Class Changing Phenomena

These include the Locativiser, attached to intransitive verbs to derive adverbs; verbalisation with Causative -ri; and derivation of adverbs from intransitive verbs with suffix -ril.

13.2.1 Locativiser

The Locativiser suffix -l generally attaches to intransitive verbs of motion, for example vau ‘go out’; vea ‘emerge’; hau ‘go ashore’; feu ‘go up’; fale ‘stand up’; foa ‘go down’. The suffix creates an adverbial adjunct which can take no further morphological inflection. The word thus derived means ‘in the location of the direction specified by the verb’. Thus vea ‘go out’, veal ‘outside’. Feu ‘go up’, feul ‘upwards’; hau ‘go ashore’, haul ‘shorewards’. Examples of this suffix:

15) Vea falere veal fi vea
vea fale -re vea -l fi vea
emerge stand -NF emerge -LOCZR 3sgnFOC emerge
falere suni lafa telakon.
fale -re suni lafa telako -n
stand -NF all part(f) one -LOC

We came out and stood outside, we went and stood in one place.

16) Aka foiga vaure, felere kini hau
aka foiga vau -re fele -re kini hau -l
then PN.MED.sgn go.out -NF return -NF ACT go.ashore -LOCZR

After that they went back out then they came ashore.

17) Ae erufulain otam ga enam ke foal
ae erufulain o- tama ga e- nam ke foa -l
go.up plane(f) 3sgPOSS field(n) sgnArt 3sgnO to EMPH go.down -LOCZR
ka fi ofoare.
ka fi o- foa -re
LOCEMPH 3sgnFOC 3sgS go.down -FUT

He goes down to the lower side of the airfield.

18) Olang feu k a lake sil
olang feu -l ka lake si -l
because go.up -LOCZR LOCEMPH road(n) cover -LOCZR
saroka ro feu lei a
saroka ro feu lei -a
banyan.tree(f) one.sgf go.up exist -sgf

Because right above me, where the road ends, one banyan tree stands up there.

As the above example shows, the Locativiser also attaches to a verb si ‘cover’, which is a transitive verb not referring to motion. Si ‘cover’ is anomalous in its use of the
Locativiser. Apart from it being the only transitive and non-motion verb which can appear with the Locativiser, its semantics do not really fit with the others when they have the Locativiser, and also, as the above example shows, it takes an object argument (lake ‘road’ in this case) but has no object prefix. This is not possible for any other construction in Lavukaleve. The Locativiser is not very productive, and no other transitive verbs have been found occurring with it.

13.2.2 VERBALISATION

Very rarely, verbs can be derived from adjectives with the Causative suffix -ri (which is discussed in its more common valency changing function below, Section 13.3.1). This process is extremely restricted in the language. In fact, the only examples in my corpus are from the translated prayer service, and even then only with three adjectives: laura ‘great’, sevo ‘tabu/holy’ and kivua ‘precious’. These words, when suffixed with the Causative suffix, can function as full transitive verbs. The semantics of these derived verbs are not always predictable from the meanings of the adjectives, however. Thus laura ‘great’ corresponds to laurari ‘make great’ but sevo ‘holy’ corresponds to sevori ‘bless’ (i.e. ‘make holy’); and kivua ‘precious’ corresponds to kivuari ‘praise’ (i.e. ‘make precious’).

The following examples show each of these three words first as an adjective, and second as a verb suffixed with the Causative suffix:

19) ngolatleurae laura ga
    ngo-lateleura -e laura -∅ ga
    2sg- be.merciful -NOMZR great -sgn sgnArt
    ena evail vofoima
    e- na evail vo- foi -ma
    3sgnO- in safely 3plO- hold -DURIMP.sg
    ...and by your great mercy keep us safe

20) le suni makivuv vona sisiafoa
    le suni ma- kivuv -v vo- na sisiafo -a
    but all 3plPOSS- sin -pl 3plO- in clean -INTR
    na’nug lulum ana ngolaurari
    na’nug lulu -m a- na ngo- laura -ri
    thought(m) be.straight -sgm 3sgmO- in 2sg- great -CAUS
    voemen.
    vo- e- me -n
    3plO- SBD- HAB -ADMON
    ...that they may be made clean from all their sins, and serve you [lit. make you great] with a quiet mind.

pr 192 pr 012
13.2.3 DERIVED ADVERBIAL ADJUNCTS WITH -RIL

A suffix -ril is added to intransitive verbs to derive adverbial adjuncts meaning ‘more X’. For example:

This is certainly not a productive process in the language. Probably the existence of these three adjectives used as verbs is brought about by the exigencies of translating English religious language into Lavukaleve, a task which calls for a certain amount of ingenuity, requiring extension not only of existing Lavukaleve concepts, but also of common ways of expressing ideas.
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**ae** ‘go up’, **aeril** ‘go up more’:

25) Ikari negore ngoanun ngoanun ngoanun
there -PSNV float -NF stay -DUR stay -DUR stay -DUR

ovui aeril voesiage kariala songire
3sgPOSS- wind(pl) go.up -MORE 3plO-SBD- do -ANT easily swim -NF

ohai.
3sgPOSS- go.ashore -PSV

He kept on floating then he breathed a bit better [lit. his breath went up more], then he swam slowly to shore.

**kurai** ‘be big’, **kurairil** ‘be bigger’:

26) Aka masivaual nun,masivaual nun, hogariom.
aka masiv -aul nun masiv -aul nun hoga -ri -om
then year -pl four year -pl four MOD.PROX.sgn -PSNV -m/n

Volorire, koi si’kul kurairil me, roge
vo- lo -ri -re koi si’kul kurai -ril me -o roge
3pI0- finish -CAUS -NF also school(n) be.big-MORE SPEC-sgn one.sgn

ena ave.
e- na a- ve
3sgnO- in 1sgS- go

So four years, having finished the four years, then I went to a bigger school.

**vilu** ‘exceed’, **viluril** ‘exceed more’ (infelicitous in English):

27) Aka ngavo’vou inu porofet ana viluril
aka nga- vo’vou inu porofet a- na vilu -ril
then 1sgPOSS- boy(m) 2sg prophet(m) 3sgmO- in exceed -MORE

merem finu:
me -re -m finu
HAB -FUT -sgm 2sgFOC

And you, my child, shall be called the prophet of the most high

The derived adverbial adjunct can also mean ‘almost X, a bit of X’:

**liliihoa** ‘make a cross’, **liliihoiaril** ‘make a bit of a cross’:

28) Ngotau liliihoiaril vofouva.
ngo-tau liliihoa -ril vo- fou -va
2sg- limb(pl) make.a.cross -MORE 3pI0- put.on -PCTIMP.sg

Cross your legs a bit.

**veo** ‘arrive’, **veoril** ‘almost arrive’:

29) E hau Mane veoril ta esia.
e hau Mane veo -ril ta e- sia
1pl.ex go.ashore Mane arrive -MORE just 1pl.ex- do

We almost reached Mane.
The suffix can also be added to deictic koka 'far'; kokaril 'a bit far'.

30) Ta kokaril aesi ale ta fi.
just far -MORE 3sgmO- SBD- do -POT just 3sgnFOC

I just waited a little while.

13.3 VALENCY CHANGING

13.3.1 THE CAUSATIVE SUFFIX -RI

The Causative suffix -ri is most commonly used on intransitive verbs, although very rarely, verbs can be derived from adjectives with this suffix (see Section 13.2.2 above). It changes the valency of intransitive verbs, such that the subject (S) of the intransitive verb corresponds semantically to the object of the causativised verb; and a new subject (A) is introduced to the causativised verb. This subject is the semantic agent of the derived verb. The Causative suffix can occur on any semantically suitable intransitive verb stem, including both stative verbs (example 32) and active verbs (example 34 and others).

Unlike most other verbal morphology, the Causative suffix can co-occur with TAM and other verbal morphology; it is the only such stem-forming affix in Lavukaleve. It is by far the most productive of the word-class changing affixes.

Compare the following non-Causative and Causative examples:

kiu 'die' vs. kiuri 'kill':

a- kuru-re ma- u -m a- ma- u -ge o- kiu
3sgmO- hit -NF 3plS- eat -sgm 3sgmO- 3plS- eat -ANT 3sgS- die

Killing him they ate him. Upon them eating him, he died.

32) Hano esa engine okiurire.
hano e -sa engine o- kiu -ri -re
then 1pl.ex -GROUP engine(f) 3sgfO- die -CAUS -NF

ngoa fi leme hoin.
ngoa fi le- me hoi -n
stay 3sgnFOC 1pl.ex- HAB deep.sea -LOC

Then we stopped [lit. killed] the engine and floated in the deep sea.

huru 'go inside' vs. hururi 'put inside':

33) "Ngai ahurure" hide ore.
ngai a- huru -re hide o- re
1sg 1sgS- go.inside -FUT thus 3sgS- say

"I will go inside" he said.
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34) oehurule, ama foa
    o- e- huru -le a- ma foa
3sgfO- SBD- go.inside -POT 3sgmO- take go.down

amahururile, a- ma- huru -ri -le
3sgmO- 3plS- go.inside -CAUS -POT

...[it] can go inside, they can take [the poison], put it down inside,

fifi ‘sit’ vs. fifiri ‘sit something’:

35) Todou hona kini itaogen heaka fifire
       Todou hona kini itao  -n heaka fifi-re
    Todou(m) MOD.PROX.sgm ACT different.place -LOC there.DIST1 sit  -NF

But Todou was sitting over there in a different place,...

36) lake ga ekore ena eafifiri, 
    lake ga e- ko -re e- na e- a- fifi-ri
   fire(n) sgnArt 3sgnO- throw -NF 3sgnO- in 3sgnO- 1sgS- sit -CAUS

sosopen ga.

sosopen ga
pot(n) sgnArt

I make a fire and I sit it down on it, the pot.

The Causative suffix can also appear on some transitive verb stems. There is no change in the valency of such verbs when they have the Causative suffix. There are examples of only seven such stems in the data; this is certainly not a productive phenomenon. In fact, there are no obvious differences between the uses of such transitive verb stems when they have the Causative suffix and when they do not. Two of the seven stems, fei ‘scrape’ and foi ‘hold’, are always partially reduplicated when they appear with the Causative suffix.

The seven stems are:

fei ~ fefeiri ‘scrape’
foi ~ fofoiri ‘hold’
si ~ siri ‘cover’
kikia ~ kikiari ‘ask’
uma ~ numari ‘choose’
foa ~ foari ‘take down’
sisiafo ~ sisiafori ‘clean’

In fact, the appearance of the Causative suffix in these already transitive stems could be a lexical phenomenon; the Causative suffix has perhaps been partially lexicalised in some stems. Indirect support for this suggestion comes from the fact that many transitive verbs end in the sequence /ri/. For example: fusuri ‘buy’; hasisiri ‘sharpen’; hokiri ‘fold’; keuri ‘carry’; lagari ‘choose’; savuri ‘cover’; sisimiri ‘shift’. Presumably the Causative suffix has become fused onto the verb stem of some verbs, so that now stem
and erstwhile suffix are inseparable.

13.3.2 THE INTRANSITIVE SUFFIX -A

There is a suffix -a which appears on transitive verbs and intransitivises them. It can also appear on intransitive verbs to give them an iterative or intensified meaning. This suffix is quite rare; it occurs on only a handful of verbs in the corpus. It is not clear how productive it is.

When the Intransitiviser suffix is used on transitive verbs, there are two possibilities. Either the subject (A) of the transitive verb corresponds in semantic role to the sole argument of the intransitivised verb (S), or the object (O) argument does. Both of these situations occur, but not, it seems, on a single verb stem. Rather, some verb stems have an A/S correspondence pattern when they are transitivised, and some have an O/S pattern. There are so few examples that it is worthwhile showing them all here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERB STEM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>INTRANSITIVISED STEM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>ARGUMENT CORRESPONDENCE PATTERN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tuguri</td>
<td>exchange</td>
<td>tuguria</td>
<td>exchange</td>
<td>A/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lilihoiri</td>
<td>make a cross</td>
<td>lilihoiria &lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>make a cross</td>
<td>A/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limagoiri</td>
<td>pass</td>
<td>limagoiria</td>
<td>pass</td>
<td>A/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keuri</td>
<td>carry</td>
<td>keuria</td>
<td>be carried</td>
<td>O/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>savuri</td>
<td>cover</td>
<td>savuria</td>
<td>be covered</td>
<td>O/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visiri</td>
<td>prod</td>
<td>visiria</td>
<td>be prodded</td>
<td>O/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sisiafo</td>
<td>clean</td>
<td>sisiafoa</td>
<td>be cleaned</td>
<td>O/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koroi</td>
<td>chop</td>
<td>koroia</td>
<td>be chopped</td>
<td>O/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tairi</td>
<td>divide</td>
<td>tairia</td>
<td>be divided</td>
<td>O/S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are two examples of the suffix -a used on transitive verb stems with no change in the valency of those stems. Lugu 'think' is a very common verb, and in one example it is found as lugua, with no observable syntactic or semantic difference from lugu. Similarly kove 'look for' is found once as kovea, again with no observable syntactic or semantic difference from kove.

When the suffix -a is added to intransitive verb stems, it does not affect the valency of the verb, but it has certain semantic effects. For action verbs, it gives the verb an iterative meaning, indicating that the action of the verb is repeated over and over. For example compare, hului 'turn' with huluia 'go all round, turn round'; kelago 'go over' with kelagoa 'go from side to side'.

---

<sup>1</sup> Note there is also lilihoia 'make a cross', an intransitive verb.
Verbs referring to states undergo a slightly different semantic change when they suffix -a. The semantic effect is not iterativeness, but rather the meaning of the verb seems to be intensified. For example, compare mutate ‘be heavy’ with mutatea ‘be really heavy’; raravu ‘be red’ with raravua ‘be red all over’. One stative verb kele ‘be white’ becomes kelea ‘become white’, and kiu ‘die’ becomes kiua ‘fight’.

One further intransitive verb ririgoi ‘prepare’ has, as far as can be ascertained, the same meaning when it is suffixed with -a.

The suffix -a, although it has different uses on transitive versus intransitive verbs, seems to have a common functional core. On transitive verbs its function is to reduce the syntactic transitivity of the verb on which it appears. Its function with intransitive verbs, at least in its iterative use, is to reduce the semantic transitivity of the verb, in Hopper and Thompson’s (1980) terms. In its intensifying use however this seems not to be the case.

13.3.3 IMPERSONAL CONSTRUCTIONS

Impersonal constructions involve transitive verbs which have no object cross-referencing. They are in fact the only construction type in the language in which a transitive verb fails to receive object indexing; and it is by this feature that they can be distinguished from all other construction types. Impersonal constructions are a unique morphological pattern which is sufficient to demonstrate constructionhood. In particular, there are verbs which are otherwise solely transitive (i.e. not ambitransitive) which in this one function appear with a single argument. The patient, which one would expect to be the object, is expressed as a subject, and the agent, which one would expect to be the subject, is not expressed. The construction is used to avoid mentioning an agent of a verb. The agents of verbs in such constructions are almost always magical beings. There is no cultural or linguistic restriction on talking about magical beings, but often people prefer not to spell such things out in so many words. The Impersonal construction provides a mechanism for talking about such things without having to be explicit.

These Impersonal constructions are valency reducing constructions, in that a normally transitive verb is morphologically intransitive. One would not want to say that the verbs involved are ambitransitive, because there is always a strongly implied notion of an agent as well as a patient. There are ambitransitive verbs in the language, but these are not examples of them (see Section 3.2.3 for a discussion of ambitransitive verbs). Rather, one could think of these constructions as being pragmatically similar to passive constructions. They are not passives, because there is no overt morphology to signal the construction (cf. Dixon 1994: 146), and because if one was to include the agent in the construction, one would end up with a normal transitive clause; the Impersonal construction would cease to exist.

Importantly, these Impersonal constructions are used specifically to hint that there is an unstated agent involved in the action. A speaker could omit the overt NP and subject
indexing referring to the agent. This is common for when an agent is well-known or uninteresting. Recall that in many constructions in Lavukaleve it is only obligatory to index objects; subject indexing may be freely omitted, and very often is. But the pragmatic force of an Impersonal construction is different from simple omission; it flags the existence of the subject by its very absence. The following examples compare normal transitive and Impersonal uses of certain verbs.

Normal transitive use of \textit{vu} ‘dig’:

37) \textit{Namu ga mina feu vage tetelakom na avure.}

\textit{They go up to the garden and go dig one mound.}

Impersonal use of \textit{vu} ‘dig’. In this example, a magical whale is helping her two sons make a garden. The boys only have to do a little bit of digging, then, by magic, the whole garden has been dug:

38) \textit{Alovuge hano suni vure lo.}

\textit{They dig it, then all \{of the mounds\} are dug.}

Normal transitive \textit{si} ‘cover’:

39) \textit{Halere namu va vosire volori hi.}

\textit{It broke, it covered every place.}

Impersonal \textit{si} ‘cover’:

40) \textit{aka tome na si lome ga}

\textit{...but how the hole was shut we didn’t know.}

Transitive \textit{ala} ‘open’:

41) \textit{Oina kini koa ga ealare, ohuru.}

\textit{That one opened the door and went inside.}
Impersonal ala ‘open’:

42) efo’foira omalav e evole fi,
    1pl.exPOSS- work(f) 3sgPOSS- people(pl) 1pl.ex 1pl.ex- come -POT 3sgnFOC
    foiga minamina la suni ala lome.
    foiga Dup- mina la suni ala lo- me
    PN.MED.sgn REDUP- thing(f) sgfArt all open 3sgnF- HAB

...when we, our workers, came, everything would open.

Transitive ko ‘throw’:

43) Ta ana hola na akore lore.
    ta a- na hola na a- ko -re lo -re
    time(m) 3sgmO- in poison(m) sgfArt 3sgmO- throw -NF finish -NF
    (They would return.) When they have finished throwing the poison.

Impersonal ko ‘throw’:

44) Kiv va piru la ona fi kore malei.
    ki -v va piru la o- na fi ko -re ma- lei
    clothes -pl plArt cable(f) sgfArt 3sgfO- in 3sgnFOC throw -NF 3plS- exist
    The clothes are hung [lit. thrown] on the clothesline.

13.3.4 RECIPROCAL DERIVATIONS

Reciprocal derivations are detransitivised constructions involving a verbal suffix -ria, which, when suffixed to a transitive verb, reduces the surface valency of the verb to one, and indicates that the dual or plural agent and patient of the verb are acting on each other. Verbs suffixed with -ria are reduplicated, unless their stem is longer than two syllables, in which case reduplication is not obligatory for them. Principles of reduplication are discussed in Section 2.9.1.

For example, compare the reciprocal verb nunumaria ‘choose each other’ with transitive numa ‘choose’:

45) Felere, hano nunumariav laveaham.
    fele -re hano Dup- numa -ria -v lavea -ham
    return -NF then REDUP- choose -RECP -pl marriage -PURP
    They went back, then they [all] chose each other for marriage.

46) Anuma feo.
    a- numa -a feo
    1sgS- choose -sgf 3sgfFOC
    I choose it.
Similarly, compare the reciprocal verb totoiria ‘help each other’ with toi ‘help’:

47) Hano.Hano natu me ga ena
    hano hano natu me -∅ ga e-na
    then then old.ways(n) SPEC -sgn sgnArt 3sgnO- in

    akari fi, Lavukal hano totoiria mame.
    aka -ri fi Lavukale hano Dup- toi -ria ma- me
    then -PSNV 3sgnFOC Lavukals then REDUP- help -RECIP 3p1S- HAB

Before. Before, it was like that in the old ways, Lavukals would help each other.  

48) Lod etoi leon siama.
    Lod e- toi leon sia -ma
    Lord(m) 1pl.ex- help quickly do -DURIMP.sg

Lord help us quickly.

13.3.5 Reflexive Constructions: Not Valency Changing

It is worth mentioning here that unlike reciprocal constructions, reflexive constructions do not involve valency changing at all. Reflexive constructions are formed using the word muan ‘self’. Muan is described in Section 3.1.5, where it is explained that it forms its own word class. It is obligatorily prefixed with a Possessive prefix, and it can also be preceded by an NP referring to the same entity as the Possessive prefix. This NP controls verbal cross-referencing; muan is not a noun, so it does not function as an argument, and therefore does not control verbal cross-referencing.

This word muan ‘self’ is also used non-reflexively to emphasis a particular actor, or to stress that an actor did the event by themselves.

An example of muan ‘self’ used in a purely reflexive sense follows. Note the 1st singular subject and 1st singular object prefixes (on the Habitual Auxiliary and the main verb le ‘see’ respectively):

49) Nana ona ngamuan ngale fi lame.
    nana o- na nga- muan nga- le fi la- me
    shadow(f) 3sgfO- in 1sgPOSS- self 1sgO- see 3sgnFOC 1sg- HAB

I see myself in a mirror.

Reflexive constructions like this tend, however, to be avoided by speakers. Rather than having the same actor as both subject and object, constructions such as the following are generally preferred:

50) Ngai koroia uia ona.
    ngai koroi -a uia o- na
    1sg chop -INTR knife(f) 3sgfO- in

I cut [myself] on a knife.
13 - WORD-LEVEL DERIVATION

The same word *muan* ‘self’ is also used, more commonly than in reflexive uses, in senses such as the following. In the first example, it puts emphasis on the subject acting alone, by themselves:

51) **Lemuan** tuna ngoa memal foel.
le- muan tuna ngoa me -mal foel
1lduexPOSS- self be.really stay HAB -du.m 1lduexFOC

*We two (m) live completely alone.*

52) **Koi aram** omuan tave fi koi.
koi aram o- muan tave -Ø fi koi
also sand(n) 3sgPOSS- self be.not -sgn 3sgnFOC also

*Also, they didn’t use sand by itself. (They also used molio fruit and pumice stone.)*

13.4 POSSESSOR-SUBJECT CONSTRUCTIONS

There is an unproductive construction in Lavukaleve involving only four intransitive verbs *feu* ‘go up’; *hau* ‘go in, go shorewards’; *vau* ‘go out, go seawards’ and *vo* ‘come’. In this construction, the subjects of these verbs are indexed using prefixes from the Possessive prefix paradigm, not from the subject prefix paradigm. There is a stress shift rule which moves the stress of the verb from the verb stem to the Possessive prefix. The verbs also receive a special suffix -i--e. The verbs marked in this way function as normal simple predicates; the construction does not change the syntactic function of the verbs themselves. The construction is a stylistic variant of the regular forms. These verbs can, and normally do, also appear in their regular form, indexing their subjects with subject prefixes. Some examples of Possessor-subject constructions:

53) **Aesege,** urial
a- e- see -ge urial
3sgmO- SBD- be.full -ANT coconut.crabs

vomare
vo- ma -re nga- vau -i
3plO- take -NF 1sgPOSS- go.out -PSV

*It [the bag] is full, so taking the coconut crabs I go down.*

54) **lakokosorire** lamavel ovai.
la- kokosori -re la- ma -vel o- vau -i
3dumO- carry.on.head -NF 3dumO- take -COMPL 3sgPOSS- go.out -PSV

... carrying them, having taken them she goes out.

---

2 Note that all but one of the prefixes in the Possessive prefix paradigm are identical to the prefixes of the subject prefix paradigm. The only form which differs is the 1sg form. The 1sg subject prefix is a-, whereas the 1sg Possessive prefix is *nga*.
The suffix which the verbs in this construction receive is subject to a morphophonemic rule (this is mentioned in Section 2.9.3). For the verbs ending in /u/, the final /u/ is lost and a suffix -i is added. For the verb ending in /o/, a suffix -e is added. Thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>POSSESSOR-SUBJECT FORM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>feu ‘go up’</td>
<td>fei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hau ‘go ashore’</td>
<td>hai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vau ‘go out’</td>
<td>vai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vo ‘come’</td>
<td>voe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This suffix has strong formal parallels with the Nominaliser suffix -e--i. However the suffixes are clearly distinguishable. While it is true that the Nominaliser suffix takes the form -i after a high vowel (/u/ and /i/) and -e elsewhere, which this Possessor-subject construction suffix could also be analysed as doing, the Nominaliser suffix does not cause loss of a final /u/ of a verb stem. For example, compare the verb vau ‘go out’ in examples (53) and (54) above, with its form in the following example:

56) Orou lo, foiga, oma vaui hi.

Having smoked it, you take it out.

In the above example, vau takes the Nominaliser suffix, the form of which is -i. It does not lose its final /u/ vowel in the Possessor-subject construction.

There are other differences between the Nominaliser suffix and the Possessor-subject suffix. Nominalised verbs receive subject prefixes to mark their subjects, as was discussed in Section 13.1.1. Compare the next pair of examples: the first has two Possessor-subject verbs, levoe and ngavoe. The 1sg Possessor-subject form ngavoe (with a 1sg Possessive prefix) appears in the first example, and the 1sg nominalised verb avoe (with a 1sg subject prefix) in the second example:

57) Kini levoe foiga ngai aore,

We two come, okay, I go in, then picking fast [with my paddles], I come.
The further fundamental difference between verbs suffixed with the Nominaliser suffix and these Possessor-subject verbs is that the former function as arguments: even though they can take their own arguments, nominalised verbs function as the arguments of other verbs. However Possessor-subject verbs function as argument-taking predicates, and not as arguments of other verbs.

In the following example, the Possessor-subject verb is clearly the sole predicate of the clause, and takes as its subject argument the NP tulav va ‘the children’:

59) Tulav va mafei.
   tulav va ma- feu -i
   children(pl) plArt 3plPOSS- go.up -PSV

They go out.

In the next example, the verb is the main verb of a clause chaining construction, with a whole series of coordinate-dependent verbs preceding it:

60) Vaure laire laevauge ae
    vau -re lai -re la- e- vau -ge ae
    go.out -NF paddle -NF 3dumO- SBD- go.out -ANT go.up

lakokosorire lamare ovai.
    la- kokosori -re la- ma -re o- vau -i
    3dumO- carry.on.head -NF 3dumO- take -NF 3sgPOSS- go.out -PSV

They go out, paddle out, then [their mother] goes up and carries the two out.

Clearly the Possessor-subject construction is not a nominalising construction, even though the suffix used to mark it does have formal similarities with the Nominaliser suffix -e--i.

The Possessor-subject construction does not differ substantially in meaning from the normal construction which these verbs appear in. Compare the following regular examples with their Possessor-subject counterparts (57) and (59) respectively:

61) Lore, felere avo ngafela‘koen hoka.
    lo -re fele -re a- vo nga- fela’koe -n hoka
    finish -NF return -NF 1sgS- come 1sgPOSS- village -LOC here.PROX

Having finished, I came back here to my village.
There is however a strong stylistic connotation associated with the construction. It is very much a feature of the casual young people's conversational style. It is the kind of thing commonly heard yelled across the village: "Vulama!" "Ngavoe!" ("Come!" "I'm coming!"). The Possessor-subject construction is a stylistic variant, employed mainly by younger people.
CHAPTER FOURTEEN

Complex predicates

There are four kinds of complex predicates in Lavukaleve: serial verb constructions, verb compounds, verbal complexes using the Habitual Auxiliary, and predicates formed with verbal adjuncts. Serial verb constructions are common, although Lavukaleve is not such a heavily serialising language as many Papuan languages; or indeed many of the Austronesian languages of Oceania. If serial verb constructions are not a major feature of Lavukaleve syntax, verb compounds are even less so; there are only three verb compounds in the language. They probably represent lexicalised serial verb constructions. The Habitual Auxiliary is an aspectual auxiliary which forms what is here called a verbal complex: a predicate type that consists of a verbal head plus the Habitual Auxiliary. Complex predicates formed with verbal adjuncts consist of two parts; the adjunct expresses the lexical meaning of the predicate, and it occurs with a semantically rather empty verb, which may be either hai ‘do’ or sia ‘be, become, happen, do’.

14.1 SERIAL VERB CONSTRUCTIONS

14.1.1 INTRODUCTION

Serial verb constructions consist of two or, rarely, three verbs in juxtaposition, functioning as a single predicate, with no morphology to mark their relationship with each other. Each of the verbs receives its own stress, and thus is a separate phonological word, but the construction as a whole is expressed in one intonational unit. Verbs of a serial verb construction share their subjects and (if more than one member is transitive) objects. They also share adjuncts. They share all their morphology except object marking; all transitive verbs cross-reference their own objects. However, all other categories that can be marked on verbs (e.g. subject marking, TAM, polarity, valency changing, and other morphology) are marked only once on the predicate, and have
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scope over the whole predicate. See Section 15.4.6 for an account of the difference between serial verb constructions and clause chaining constructions.

The following examples illustrate some of the basic structural features of serial verb constructions in Lavukaleve:

1) "Oma vulama".
   o- ma vula -ma
   3sgfO- take come -DURIMP.sg
   "Bring it (f)." [i.e. you take it and come]

2) oina ae veom.
   oina ae veo -m
   other.MED.sgm go.up arrive -sgm
   ...he reached the top.

3) Efoure, aham hide ui oma ga
   e- fou -re a- ham hide ui o- ma o ga
   3sgnO- put.on -NF 3sgmO- for thus food(n) 3sgfO- take -sgn sgnArt
   vau ehoire, aka vau aore ove.
   vau e- hoi -re aka vau ao -re o- ve
   go.out 3sgnO- put.in -NF then go.out go.in -NF 3sgS- go
   Putting it in, he goes out [to the shore], and puts the food she took in [the canoe], and goes.

4) "Olagari oma kini veaiva"
   o- lagari o- ma kini vea -iva
   3sgfO- choose 3sgfO- take ACT emerge -PCTIMP.pl
   "Choose them, take them and come out"

In example (1) above, the first verb is transitive and the second intransitive; they share their subjects (although these subjects are not cross-referenced). Both verbs are covered by the scope of the Imperative suffix, which appears on the second verb. In example (2), both verbs are intransitive, and the subject of the serial verb construction is marked only once, on the second verb. In example (3) there are two serial verb constructions: vau ehoire consists of an intransitive verb followed by a transitive verb. They are together functioning as a coordinate dependent predicate, with Non-Finite suffix -re showing this; note that the Non-Finite suffix appears only once on the predicate, on the final verb. The transitive verb receives an object suffix. The second serial verb construction in this sentence is another coordinate dependent predicate, again with the Non-Finite suffix. Because these serial verb constructions are coordinate dependent predicates, they do not cross-reference their subjects; this is a feature of all such predicates (see Chapter 15). Example (4) shows a three-verb serial verb construction, with the first two verbs transitive, each cross-referenced for their object argument (though the object prefixes refer to the same entity). The Imperative suffix on the third verb has scope over all three verbs of the predicate.
14.1.2 SERIAL VERB CONSTRUCTIONS ARE SINGLE PREDICATES

The critical feature of serial verb constructions is that they consist of two or three verbs functioning together as a single predicate. This can be seen easily in Lavukaleve: serial verb constructions participate in all the same constructions which simple predicates do. Example (3) showed two serial verb constructions in the role of the coordinate-dependent predicates of a clause-chaining construction. Further examples of serial verb constructions serving as a single predicate in various complex constructions appear below.

In the following example, ma ve ‘take go’ is the complex lexical head of a complex predicate involving the Habitual Auxiliary (see Section 14.3 for a discussion of Habitual Auxiliary constructions). The entire predicate is in a focus construction as well.

5)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Olang ngai</th>
<th>kini</th>
<th>akari</th>
<th>amaa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>la</td>
<td>lsg</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>-PSNV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>then</td>
<td>1sgS-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finu</td>
<td>koi</td>
<td>ngoma</td>
<td>vela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>merem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sgFOC</td>
<td>also</td>
<td>2sg-</td>
<td>take</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>go-NEG</td>
<td>HAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-FUT</td>
<td>-sgm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1sgFOC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Because I took you (f) away, I (m) can’t take you back again.*

In the following example, iu kako ‘look up and out’ is marked with the Completive suffix -vel, and is the coordinate-dependent predicate of a clause chaining construction.

6)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>iu</th>
<th>kako</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>look.up</td>
<td>look.out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la</td>
<td>o-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-vel</td>
<td>-COMPL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3dumO-</td>
<td>3sgS-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*...having looked up and out he saw the two [boys].*

In the next example, feu houla la okoroige is a serial verb construction, functioning as a subordinate adverbial clause with main clause ovai.

7)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>feu</th>
<th>houla</th>
<th>la</th>
<th>okoroige,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>go.up</td>
<td>stick(f)</td>
<td>sgfArt</td>
<td>3sgfO-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3sgS-</td>
<td>chop</td>
<td>-ANT just</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la</td>
<td>lioi</td>
<td>-re</td>
<td>o-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgfArt</td>
<td>run</td>
<td>-NF</td>
<td>3sgPOSS-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3sgPOSS-</td>
<td>go.out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*He went up, chopped a stick, then the crocodile ran down [seaward].*
All members of serial verb constructions share their subject arguments. If more than one member is transitive, they also share their object arguments. Examples of all four transitivity combinations (transitive-intransitive, intransitive-intransitive, intransitive-transitive and transitive-transitive) were shown above (examples (1), (2), (3) and (4)).

As has been evident from some of the above examples, subjects and objects differ in the ways in which they are cross-referenced in serial verb constructions. A subject argument can only be cross-referenced once per predicate (although it does not have to be), on the last verb of the predicate, whereas an object argument must be cross-referenced on every transitive verb of the predicate. This is because of the principle of cross-referencing in Lavukaleve that every transitive verb must cross-reference its object argument (see Section 9.7). However, even though each transitive member of a serial verb construction must have its own object cross-reference, the cross-referencing material all refers to the same argument. It is not the case that each transitive verb of a serial verb construction chooses its own object argument, but rather there is a morphological constraint that each transitive verb must be indexed for an object argument. See below (Section 14.2 on verb compounds) where there is, unproductively, a lifting of this constraint.

The fact that only transitive verbs receive object cross-referencing in a serial verb construction shows that intransitive verbs do not share the object arguments of the transitive verbs. Rather, only transitive verbs share their object arguments in a serial verb construction, but all verbs share their subject arguments.

Unlike object cross-referencing, subject cross-referencing is not obligatory; and in some constructions its presence may be proscribed. The examples of coordinate-dependent constructions above illustrate this proscription. The next two examples show shared subjects cross-referenced once, on the final verb of the predicate. The cross-referencing may be of any kind allowed by simple predicates; that is either a prefix or the Agreement Suffix.

8) rongea ngoa voemege
    feu olavea.
    rongea ngoa vo- e- me -ge feu o- lavea
    play stay 3pLO- SBD-HAB -ANT go.up 3sgS- appear

...they were still playing and she went up and appeared [to them].

9) keker ena hau hoim.
    keker e- na hau hoi -m
    dry.place(n) 3sgnO- in go.ashore go.in -sgm

...he reaches the reef.

In the following example there is a three-verb serial verb construction, with object arguments cross-referenced on every transitive verb:
10) Oile nato ro ole okoroi oume.

\[ \text{oile nato ro o- le o- koroi o- u -me} \]
\[ 3sgfO-3sgS- do -POT sago.palm(f) one.sgF 3sgfO- see 3sgfO-chop 3sgfO-eat -HORT \]

Let’s go find and cut down a sago tree and eat it. [lit: if it does it, let’s find, cut down and eat a sago tree]

jn 058

All verbs of serial verb constructions share all of their adjuncts. Adjuncts may consist of postpositional phrases, locative-marked nouns, and other temporal and spatial words. The adjunct may precede the entire serial verb construction, or may appear between the verbs of the serial verb construction:

11) kini laham fo’sal

\[ \text{kini la- ham fo’sal} \]
\[ \text{ACT} \quad \text{3dumO- for fish(pl)} \]
\[ \text{vokuruv vo lana vonere} \]
\[ \text{vo- kuru -v vo la- na vo- ne -re} \]
\[ \text{3plo- hit -pl come 3dumO- in 3plo- give -NF} \]

...they would go and kill fish for them (m), and give it to them...

gm 078

12) Aka fela’koen vau siare,

\[ \text{aka fela’koe -n vau sia -re} \]
\[ \text{then village -LOC go.out do -NF} \]

Then we went out to the village,...

ef 030

13) katelea amare sagore vau tasin oerau.

\[ \text{katelea a- ma -re sago -re vau tasi-n o- erau} \]
\[ \text{crocodile(f) 3sgmO- take -NF jump -NF go.out sea-LOC 3sgS- jump/fall} \]

...the crocodile took it (m), jumped, and dived out into the sea.

vl 021

14.1.4 SHARING MORPHOLOGY

It has been shown above that subject cross-referencing is shared among members of a serial verb construction, while object cross-referencing is not shared, but must be marked on each transitive verb of a serial verb construction. The Causative suffix appears on an individual verb, and has scope only over that verb. This can be seen in example (20) below. All other verbal morphology, including TAM, negation, and subordinate adverbial clause-marking suffixes, is marked once only in the serial verb construction, on the final verb, and has scope over the whole predicate. Examples of the Non-Finite, Imperative and Completive suffixes only occurring on the last member of the serial verb construction have occurred above (see (1), (3), (4), (6)). Examples of other sorts of morphology follow:
Negation:

14) **Aka aram ena foa falela fongai.**

    aka aram e- na foa fale -la -a fongai
then ground(n) 3sgnO- in go.down stand -NEG -sgf 1sgFOC

\[ I (f) \text{ have never stepped down on the ground.} \]

Durative aspect:

15) **Vau keleanun.**

    vau kelea -nun
go.out walk -DUR

\[ [\text{He}] \text{ went on walking out.}\]

There is one exception to this generalisation that morphology appears on the final verb of a serial verb construction. The Negative suffix -la occurs on the first verb of a serial verb construction in which lei ‘exist’ is the last verb. Compare the position of the Negative suffix in the following sentences with (14) above.

16) **"Laila leimal final" hide mare.**

    lai -la lei -mal finala hide ma-re
paddle -NEG exist -du.m 3dumFOC thus 3plS- say

"They two (the two boys) were not paddling” they said.

17) **Fela’koe ofoton sula leiv fiv.**

    fela’koe o- foto -n su -la lei -v fiv
village 3sgPOSS- middle -LOC wash -NEG exist -pl 3plFOC

\[ \text{They did not wash in the middle of the village.}\]

18) **na’nug alugula leiv fiv**

    na’nug a- lugu -la lei -v fiv
thought(m) 3sgmO- think -NEG exist -pl 3plFOC

\[ ...\text{they would not think a thought...}\]

It is not clear whether the different position of the Negative suffix indicates that it has scope only over the first verb, not both, as in serial verb constructions with other verbs. In fact it is not completely clear what the scope of negation in such examples is. It depends on what the verb translated as ‘exist’ really means. If for example one thinks of (16) as meaning the two boys existed (that is, their existence was real) but they did not paddle, then the negation has scope only over paddling, not over existing. However perhaps one could think of the sentence as meaning that the existing refers to the paddling, in which case the existence of the paddling, and thus the whole serial verb construction, is negated.

The scope of morphology in serial verb constructions is not negotiable: in all serial verb constructions without lei ‘exist’, non-participant marking verbal morphology appears on the final verb and obligatorily has scope over the whole serial verb construction. It is only with serial verb constructions with lei as the second member that the Negative
suffix appears on the first not the last verb, and is not possible for the Negative suffix to appear on the last, lei verb. Note that the Negative suffix is the only non-participant verbal morphology found on serial verb constructions with lei in the corpus. It is not known whether other non-participant verbal morphology would appear on the first or last verb of serial verb constructions with lei.

14.1.5 What can intervene between verbs of a serial verb construction

Both core NPs and adjuncts can intervene between verbs of a serial verb construction. Example (11) above shows a postpositional phrase between the two verbs of a serial verb construction. Example (4) above shows the particle kini intervening between the verbs of a serial verb construction. In the following example, the NP ngai, referring to the object of the second verb, directly precedes its verb and thus intervenes between the two verbs of the serial verb construction:

19) Kini foa ngai emare
    kini foa ngaui ui e ma re
    ACT go.down 1sgPOSS food(n) 3sgnO take -NF
    lore, -re aunio ohourenun, hou -re -nun
    finish -NF evening(f) 3sgfO wait.for -NF -DUR
    aunion -n felere ae. a ae
    evening -LOC return -NF 1sgS go.up

*I went down and ate my food, I waited for the evening, then in the evening I went back up.*

14.1.6 Semantic types of serialising verbs

The overwhelming majority of serial verb constructions with an intransitive verb involve one of the following motion verbs:

foa ‘go down’
feu ‘go up, go inland’
ae ‘go up, climb’
hau ‘go ashore’
vau ‘go seawards, go out’
ve ‘go’
vo ‘come’

Also occurring less commonly are other motion verbs sou ‘rise’, oio ‘surround’, fongo ‘reach’, huru ‘go inside’; aspectual verbs lei ‘exist’, lo ‘finish’, and also lai ‘paddle’, i ‘do’ and sia ‘be, become, happen, do’. These verbs provide directional, aspectual or manner specification for the other verb in the serial verb construction.
The transitive verbs which take part in serial verb constructions are much more diverse semantically, even though actual occurrence of transitive verbs in serial verb constructions is far less frequent. Some of the more commonly occurring transitive verbs include the following:

- ma ‘take’
- ke ‘drop’
- li ‘build’
- fei ‘scrape’
- fou ‘make’
- lufu ‘leave’
- tuguri ‘change’
- vala ‘pull’
- sive ‘follow’
- ko ‘throw’

The verbs which may occur in serial verb constructions are not restricted, and can be any verb of the language.

With respect to the order of different verb types in serial verb constructions, a motion verb usually, but not always, precedes the other verb; which may be another motion verb, or may be a verb of a different semantic type. The verbs lei ‘exist’, lo ‘finish’, i ‘do’ and sia ‘be, become, happen, do’ are always the second verb of the serial verb construction in which they occur. Note however the following example, in which lo occurs both as the first and second verb of a serial verb construction:

20)  
(I finish cutting the canoe.)

Aka alori lo fi, han fiv,
aka a- lo -ri lo fi ha -n fiv
then 3sgmO- finish -CAUS finish 3sgnFOC rib.of.canoe-PL, 3pIFOC

vona gigil vomane asiare.
vo- na gigil vo- ma -ne a- sia -re
3plO- in measurements(pl) 3plO- take -IMPF 1sgS- do -FUT

Having finished finishing it, I will take the measurements for the ribs.  

14.1.7 LAVUKALEVE’S SERIAL VERB CONSTRUCTIONS IN TYPOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

Compared to many grammatical topics, there is a vast literature on the typology of serial verb constructions. Durie’s (1997) account of serialising languages divides languages into four types, under two parameters. The parameters are whether the verbs of the verb sequence are contiguous, and whether they are incorporating: that is, whether the components form a single morphological word. This account clarifies the relationship between serial verb constructions and verb compounds. In Lavukaleve, serial verb constructions are non-contiguous (see above, where it was shown that NPs and adjuncts can intervene between verbs of a serial verb construction) and non-incorporating (the
verbs do not form a single phonological or morphological word). Lavukaleve’s verb compounds (to be discussed below, Section 14.2) are, however, both contiguous and incorporating; the verbs involved do form a single morphological and phonological word.

Foley and Van Valin (1984), Foley and Olson (1985) and Crowley (1987), among others, consider the distinction between core and nuclear layer serialisation. In Crowley’s terms “the two kinds of serialisation differ basically in that while core layer serialisation allows some degree of independence to the two verbs in the choice of nominal arguments associated with each, this is not the case with nuclear layer serialisation” (1987: 58); and further, “[in core layer serialisation] each verb independently chooses its own noun phrase arguments” (1987: 41).

In Lavukaleve, all verbs of a serial verb construction must share their subject arguments as well as all adjuncts and all morphological categories, and transitive verbs must share their object arguments. They cannot independently choose their arguments. For this reason, Lavukaleve’s serial verb constructions can be classified as nuclear layer serialisation. Note that there is a tendency pointed out by Crowley (1987: 42) that SOV languages (of which Lavukaleve is one) “tend to prefer nuclear juncture between verbs when they have serial constructions, and for SVO languages to prefer core juncture”. Lavukaleve, then, accords with this general tendency.

14.2 VERB COMPOUNDS

There are only three verb compounds in Lavukaleve; they are probably lexicalised serial verb constructions. A verb compound consists of two phonological words but only one grammatical word.

On the surface, verb compounds differ from serial verb constructions only in their participant marking system, but this difference points to very different fundamental structures. Verb compounds consist of two lexical verbs, but, whereas in serial verb constructions the subject is marked only once, on the final member of the serial verb construction, and the object is cross-referenced separately on each transitive verb, verb compounds display the participant marking which would be expected on a simple predicate. That is, subject and object are marked once only across the predicate, and subjects can be cross-referenced either by a prefix (thus on the first verb of the predicate) or by a suffix (thus on the second verb). They cannot be marked by a suffix on the first verb or a prefix on the second verb. The verb roots must be contiguous.

The three verb compounds in Lavukaleve are ke vau-ri ‘push sth out’ [push put out], ke feu-ri ‘push sth up [push put up]’, and sou fale-ri ‘stand sth up’ [rise stand sth up]. The first two are the most common way of talking about maneuvering canoes onto and off beaches. They involve the transitive verb ke ‘push’, followed by a causativised intransitive verb; vau ‘go out seawards’ and feu ‘go up inland’. The third, sou faleri, is
not as frequently used as the first two. An example:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
21) & \text{kiiu} & \text{mev} & \text{felere} & \text{vosoufaleri} \\
& \text{kiiu} & \text{me} & -v & \text{fele} & -re \text{vo- sou fale} & -ri \\
& \text{die} & \text{SPEC} & -pl & \text{return} & -\text{NF} & 3\text{plO- rise stand -CAUS} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[\text{[We] help the sick to stand up again [lit: stand the dying back up].}\]

This compound consists of two verbs, intransitive \text{sou} 'rise, go up' and derived transitive \text{fale} 'stand up'. The two verbs, as always in verb compounds, have their own stress, and thus are two phonological words. There is no subject cross-reference in this example. The Causative suffix appears at the end of the verb sequence, but the obligatory object indexing which appears with all transitive verbs, whether they are causativised intransitives or base transitives, appears on the first verb, not on the verb with the Causative suffix. In all other sequences of transitive verbs in Lavukaleve, each one must be indexed for its object. The fact that this derived transitive verb is not shows that it is crucially different from serial verb constructions, and indeed from all other verbs. The explanation is simple, however; verb compounds treat both verbs as one, and they cross-reference their arguments accordingly. Further examples follow.

In the next example, both verbs are transitive (\text{ke} is base transitive, \text{vau} is derived transitive), and both subject and object are cross-referenced at the beginning of the predicate:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
22) & \text{aunio} & \text{nun} & \text{vau} & \text{mola} & \text{ga} \\
& \text{aunio} & -\text{n} & \text{nun} & \text{vau} & \text{mola} & \text{ga} \\
& \text{evening} & -\text{LOC from} & \text{go.out} & \text{canoe(n)} & \text{sgnArt} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[\text{...in the evening they pushed out their canoe. The war canoe.}\]

In the following example, the subject is cross-referenced at the beginning of the predicate, and the object at the end. Thus, even though both verbs are transitive, object cross-referencing occurs only once:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
23) & \text{malav} & \text{va} & \text{ta} & \text{hano molev} & \text{va okevauriv} \\
& \text{malav} & \text{va} & \text{hano molev} & \text{va o- ke vau} & -ri -v \\
& \text{people(pl) plArt just then canoe(sp) plArt} & \text{3sgS- push off go.out -CAUS -pl} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[\text{...it [the sea during a cyclone] pushes the canoe and the people out.}\]

Thus, it is clear that the verb sequences discussed in this section are not the same as serial verb constructions, because of the participant marking system.

Note that \text{sou} and \text{fale} can also occur intransitively, without any Causative suffix:
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24)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sou</td>
<td>fale</td>
<td>oki’kile</td>
<td>omane</td>
<td>Sou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rise</td>
<td>stand</td>
<td>-NF</td>
<td>3sgPOSS-</td>
<td>3sgfO-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o-</td>
<td>o-</td>
<td>ki’kile</td>
<td>o-</td>
<td>ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-re</td>
<td>-re</td>
<td>headhunting.axe(f)</td>
<td>3sgfO-</td>
<td>-ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o-</td>
<td>o-</td>
<td>-re</td>
<td>3sgfO-</td>
<td>velavel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o-</td>
<td>o-</td>
<td>kokosori</td>
<td>-re</td>
<td>go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sgPOSS-</td>
<td>vultur</td>
<td>-re</td>
<td>vela</td>
<td>-COMPL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-re</td>
<td>vela</td>
<td>velv</td>
<td>3sgnFOC</td>
<td>-re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sgfO-carry.on.head -NF</td>
<td>3sgfO-take -NF</td>
<td>go</td>
<td>-COMPL 3sgnFOC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He stood up and carried his axe and his shield; he took them and went...

In such cases, it is impossible to tell if the sequence of verbs is a verb compound, or if it is a serial verb construction. The criterial difference between the two is in the participant marking, particularly the object marking. If both members of the sequence are intransitive, there is nothing on which a decision can be based. Put differently, in such cases there is no distinction between serial verb constructions and verb compounds. In this description, unless the sequence is definitely a verb compound, the two verbs are always written separately.

It is probable that verb compounds represent a lexicalisation of serial verb constructions. However unlike verb compounds in many languages, these compounds have predictable semantics; their meanings are readily derivable from their individual components. There are only three of these verb compounds, and two of these occur relatively commonly. From that alone a claim for lexicalisation could be justified.

14.3 THE HABITUAL AUXILIARY

The Habitual Auxiliary, which forms another kind of complex predicate, is extremely frequent in Lavukaleve discourse. It is used to express events which are habitual, characteristic or typical. It is also used for events which take some time to carry out. The Habitual Auxiliary is very frequently used in narratives about what the ancestors used to do, and also in procedural texts explaining how people make or do things.

The Habitual Auxiliary is the sole member of its word class, and indeed is the only auxiliary in the language. There is also an intransitive verb me ‘continue’; it is discussed below, Section 14.3.3, by way of comparison with the formally identical Habitual Auxiliary. The Habitual Auxiliary always occurs in construction with and following another verb; the verb + auxiliary constituent is called a verbal complex. The Habitual Auxiliary me never occurs without a verb, and it does not have valency, but, with its verb, takes arguments according to that verb’s valency. It does however take certain verbal morphology, including the subordinate adverbial suffixes Anterior -ge, Potential -le, the Admonitive -n, the Future -re (in certain constrained circumstances) and the Agreement Suffix.

The members of the verbal complex share their arguments, and participant marking is shared between them, in a very particular way. The Habitual Auxiliary can only ever cross-reference the subject (S/A), never the object argument (with one exception,
outlined below). The verb can only cross-reference the object if it is transitive, never the subject. The Habitual Auxiliary can use either a special subject prefix, or else the Agreement Suffix, to cross-reference the subject. Unlike with verbs, the subject cross-reference on the Habitual Auxiliary is obligatory.

First consider some examples of these verbal complexes:

25)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ei</th>
<th>leme</th>
<th>veva.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e-</td>
<td>le-</td>
<td>me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sgnO-</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>1pl.ex-HAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>veva</td>
<td>in.that.way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_We would do it in that way._

26)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homelav</th>
<th>koi</th>
<th>daeva</th>
<th>sia</th>
<th>mev</th>
<th>fiv,</th>
<th>koi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>homela-</td>
<td>koi</td>
<td>daeva</td>
<td>sia</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>-v</td>
<td>fiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woman -pl</td>
<td>also</td>
<td>diving</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>HAB</td>
<td>-pl</td>
<td>3plFOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fo'sal</td>
<td>vokuru</td>
<td>mev</td>
<td>fiv.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fo'sal</td>
<td>vo-</td>
<td>kuru</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>-v</td>
<td>fiv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fish(pl)</td>
<td>3plO-</td>
<td>hit</td>
<td>HAB</td>
<td>-pl</td>
<td>3plFOC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Women also usually go diving, and catching fish._

27)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oia</th>
<th>vau</th>
<th>mo'sil</th>
<th>savun</th>
<th>fale</th>
<th>mea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>oia</td>
<td>vau</td>
<td>mo'sil</td>
<td>savu -n</td>
<td>fale</td>
<td>me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other.MED.sgf</td>
<td>go.out</td>
<td>high.tide</td>
<td>edge -LOC stand</td>
<td>HAB</td>
<td>-sgf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>oina</td>
<td>kini</td>
<td>hau</td>
<td>eraum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>oina</td>
<td>kini</td>
<td>hau</td>
<td>erau -m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and other.MED.sgm</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>go.asshore</td>
<td>fall -sgm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_She goes out to the sea shore, she is standing up for a long time, and he [the husband] comes ashore._

In each of the above examples, the Habitual Auxiliary _me_ immediately follows a verb, and, together with that verb, forms the predicate of the clause. The verbal complex takes a subject argument, cross-referenced as a prefix or suffix on _me_, and, if the verbal complex is transitive, also takes an object argument, cross-referenced as a prefix on the verb. Verbal complexes take their valency from the verb of the complex; _me_ is not a verb and has no inherent valency.

The only thing that can intervene between a verb and a Habitual Auxiliary in a verbal complex is the focus marker; and this can only occur if the Habitual Auxiliary is cross-referenced for its subject by a prefix, not if it is cross-referenced for its subject by the Agreement Suffix. The focus marker (see Section 11.3.3) can be used to mark focus on the lexical part of the verbal complex. Apart from this, no other non-obligatory elements can be a part of the verbal complex. An example of a focus marker in a verbal complex can be seen at (36) below.

It was stated above that the Habitual Auxiliary must always cross-reference the subject argument of the verbal complex in which it appears. Like verbs, it can use either a
prefix or the Agreement Suffix to cross-reference this subject (though the prefix paradigm used is slightly different to that of verbs). And also as with verbs, there are important semantic differences between a verbal complex with the Habitual Auxiliary when it receives prefixes to cross-reference its subject versus one when it uses the Agreement Suffix for this purpose, as is discussed in detail in Chapter 10. The same kinds of semantic distinctions are apparent when the Agreement Suffix is used on a verbal complex involving a Habitual Auxiliary. The following section discusses the prefixing of the Habitual Auxiliary. The section after that discusses the semantic and syntactic differences of the Habitual Auxiliary when it cross-references its subject using the Agreement Suffix.

Prefixed forms and suffixed forms of the Habitual Auxiliary are discussed separately here simply for the purposes of exposition, because the prefixed forms are morphologically a little complex and take some space to explain. But the reader should bear in mind that the major semantic and syntactic differences between prefixed forms and forms marked with the Agreement Suffix are the same as the differences between verbs when prefixed and verbs when appearing with the Agreement Suffix; the differences follow on from the fundamental distinction in Lavukaleve between cross-referencing with prefixes versus cross-referencing with the Agreement Suffix; and as such, these differences are not unique to the Habitual Auxiliary at all, but rather are just another reflection of a fundamental feature of Lavukaleve morpho-syntax.

14.3.1 THE HABITUAL AUXILIARY'S SUBJECT PREFIXES

The Habitual Auxiliary has its own unique set of subject prefixes with which it cross-references the subject of the verbal complex in which it appears. The paradigm is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>DU</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1EXCL</td>
<td>la-</td>
<td></td>
<td>le-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1INCL</td>
<td></td>
<td>me-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ngo-</td>
<td></td>
<td>mele-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>lo-</td>
<td></td>
<td>ma-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(In subordinate adverbial constructions the Habitual Auxiliary, like intransitive verbs, takes object prefixes to cross-reference its subject in the third person and adds a special subordinate e- prefix in the normal subject prefix slot; see Section 16.1).

The Habitual Auxiliary subject prefixes are based on the subject prefixes used on verbs, with the addition of initial /l/ in all those forms which are vowel-initial in the verbal
subject prefixes\(^1\). Some examples of this system of subject prefixing:

28) Hamusin fo’foira oeivele.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Argument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hamus</td>
<td>-LOC</td>
<td>work(f)</td>
<td>3sgfO-SBD- do -Succ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evening</td>
<td>-LOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laran</td>
<td>-LOC</td>
<td>iru</td>
<td>lame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lar</td>
<td>-LOC</td>
<td>iru</td>
<td>la- me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daylight</td>
<td>-LOC</td>
<td>3sgnFOC</td>
<td>sleep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After I had worked at night, I'd sleep in the day.

29) "Vaia siare lako ngome?"  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How</th>
<th>Do</th>
<th>Lako</th>
<th>Ngome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vala</td>
<td>sia-re</td>
<td>lako</td>
<td>ngo- me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how</td>
<td>do-NF</td>
<td>cry</td>
<td>2sg- HAB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Why are you crying?"

30) le eveale koi vela lomel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day(n)</th>
<th>3sgnO-SBD-</th>
<th>SBD-</th>
<th>POT</th>
<th>3duS- HAB-du</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>le</td>
<td>e-vea-e-le</td>
<td>koi</td>
<td>vela</td>
<td>lo- me-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...when day came the two [boys] went again.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last example shows a further morphological point: that Habitual Auxiliaries with third person dual subjects frequently suffix a dual suffix -l to their form. This is not obligatory, but it is nevertheless quite common. Note that this dual suffix does not occur with 1st and 2nd person dual subjects. Dual marking is pervasive in Lavukaleve, and its most common manifestation is /l/, or some form containing /l/. Note that this dual suffix is not the Agreement Suffix. The Agreement Suffix dual forms are marked for gender:

\(-mal\) (masculine); \(-aol\) (feminine) and \(-gel\) (neuter).

Occasionally when a Habitual Auxiliary with a subject prefix occurs in a Sentence-Final focus construction, the argument of the verbal complex which the focus marker agrees with is cross-referenced by the Agreement Suffix on the Habitual Auxiliary, and the Habitual Auxiliary also retains its subject prefixing. This leads to the anomalous situation of an argument being cross-referenced twice within the same predicate. The following are examples of this situation. Note that ‘stern of a boat’ is plural in Lavukaleve. The object argument ‘stern’ is cross-referenced by the prefix on the verb **ma** ‘take’, and also by the Agreement Suffix on the Habitual Auxiliary and the focus marker; thus it is cross-referenced twice within one predicate.

---

\(^1\) This addition of /l/ to vowel-initial forms is not a general phonological rule of the language; there is no restriction on vowel-initial words in Lavukaleve. Rather, it is simply a feature peculiar to the Habitual Auxiliary subject prefix paradigm.
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31) Oisia va vonelele tasi
   3sgPOSS- stern(pl) plArt 3plO- 2sgS- see-POT sea(n)
   voma lomev
   vo- ma lo- me -v (fiv)
   3plO- take 3sgS-HAB -pl 3plFOC

*If you look at the sterns [of the boat], the sea was reaching them.*

32) Atigiri lamem hona Lavukaleve fi.
   a- tigiri la- me -m hona Lavukaleve fi
   3sgmO- say 1sg- HAB -sgm MOD.PROX.sgm Lavukaleve 3sgnFOC

*I said this (m) in Lavukaleve*.2

This anomalous situation presents a clash between two competing principles in Lavukaleve. The first principle is that all transitive verbs must be cross-referenced for their objects. The second principle is that all sentence-final focus constructions like this one require an argument to be cross-referenced by the Agreement Suffix on the verbal element before the focus marker (see Chapter 11). Normally these principles do not collide, because normally in single-word predicates either subject or object can be marked at either end of the verb, by either prefix or suffix. So it is possible always to choose to mark the one required by the focus construction by the Agreement Suffix, and to mark the other one by a prefix. However, in verbal complexes, marking of subject and object occurs in a fixed position. The object must be marked on the verb, and subject must be marked on the Habitual Auxiliary. Now, because the focus construction requires the object to be cross-referenced by the Agreement Suffix, a morphological dilemma arises. The language must either violate its rule of marking object on the verb and subject on the auxiliary, or violate its rule of only marking each argument once per predicate. The latter alternative is apparently preferable. In only this circumstance can it mark the same argument more than once within the one predicate (although note that there is somewhat of a similar situation in certain types of relative clauses: see Section 16.3).

The same anomaly also comes about when a speaker wants to use a prefix to cross-reference the subject on the auxiliary, but also wants to use a focus construction requiring cross-referencing of that subject: the result is that the subject gets cross-referenced twice on the auxiliary:

33) Haufa lomem hoinariom fin.
   haufa lo- me -m hoina -ri -om fin
   go.off 3sgS-HAB -sgm MOD.MED.sgm -PSNV -m/n 3sgmFOC

*That one (m) went off now.*

2 This example uses a demonstrative instead of a focus marker for the focus construction. This occasionally happens: see Section 11.4.2 for discussion.
There are semantic reasons why a speaker might choose to use the subject prefix, not just abandon it and use the Agreement Suffix to cross-reference the subject. It has been explained elsewhere at length (Chapter 10) that there are semantic differences in the choice between cross-referencing arguments with prefixes versus with the Agreement Suffix. In single-word verb predicates if one wants to use a focus construction requiring one argument to be cross-referenced by the Agreement Suffix, one has no choice but to abandon all other cross-referencing of that argument elsewhere in the predicate. With the Habitual Auxiliary, however, one can choose to retain subject prefixing on the auxiliary, and one must retain object prefixing on the verb, if it is present; and thus these anomalous situations arise.

Predicates formed by verbal complexes have similar morpho-syntactic possibilities to single-verb predicates. They can be nominalised:

A serial verb construction can function as part of a verbal complex, where it is itself a complex predicate, acting as one constituent within a larger complex predicate. In the following example, huru fufu is a serial verb construction, forming the lexical head of the verbal complex involving lome (with the focus marker intervening between lexical head and auxiliary):

Verbal complexes can function as the final predicate of a clause chaining construction (see Chapter 1.5):
Verbal complexes using the Habitual Auxiliary can occur in subordinate adverbial clauses just as simple predicates can. A full discussion of this construction type appears in Section 16.1.

14.3.2 THE HABITUAL AUXILIARY WITH THE AGREEMENT SUFFIX

The Agreement Suffix is discussed fully in Chapter 10. Briefly, it is a paradigm of suffixes added to verbs and nominal modifiers to agree with a (usually core) participant for various syntactic and pragmatic functions. When added to intransitive predicates, it gives a stative/resultative meaning. It is also used in relative clauses and Sentence-Final focus constructions. In verbal complexes with the Habitual Auxiliary it is suffixed to the Habitual Auxiliary. This combination of habitual, characteristic meanings from the Habitual Auxiliary, and stative/resultative meanings from the suffix, often indicates that the entity cross-referenced by the Agreement Suffix is a habitual agent.

Semantically, verbs in this construction have subjects who habitually carry out the action (examples (26), (38), (39) or to actions which involve a process continuing over some extent of time (examples (27) and (29). In example (27), for instance, the woman who is the subject of the habitual-agent construction is waiting for her husband for hours by the shore, listening for the sound of his canoe. Some further examples:

38) Malav sasavaliv fo’foira hori olugu mev.
   malav sasavali -v fo’foira ho -ri o- lugu me -v
   people(pl) be.willing -pl work(f) MOD.PROX.sgF -PSNV 3sgF-O- think HAB-pl
   (The Mother’s Unions requires a certain type of people.) Willing people who take this work seriously.

39) vovao mev, lafa ona
   vo- vao me -v lafa o- na
   3plO- feed HAB -pl part(f) 3sgF-O- in
   mangoarea ole mev hiv
   ma- ngoa -re -a o- le me -v hiv
   3plS- stay -NF -sgF 3sgF-O- see HAB -pl 3plEFOC
   kavu ena hi lame ga.
   kavu e- na hi la- me -Ø ga
   group(n) 3sgF-O- in do/say 1sg- HAB -sgn sgnArt
   ...they always feed them, and also they always look after the area they live in.

emk 022 emk 024
No words, not even the focus marker, can intervene between the verb and me with the Agreement Suffix. There are good reasons however why one would not want to say that the me word is suffixed to the verb. The element is phonologically an independent word; it can be said in isolation.

It is a different morphological word too. One observation in this regard relies on parallelism with the prefixed forms of the Habitual Auxiliary. One would not want to say that the me which is prefixed for its subject is different in its fundamental syntactic nature from the me which receives the Agreement Suffix. All verbs are capable of receiving either prefixes or the Agreement Suffix for participant marking, and the Habitual Auxiliary, although it is not a verb, is no different in this respect. The me which receives a prefix for subject is definitely a separate word from the verb which it follows; and thus, the simplest analysis, without evidence to the contrary, is that the me which receives the Agreement Suffix is too.

There is a further reason for saying that me with the Agreement Suffix is a separate word from the verb, to do with participant marking. In these constructions, regardless of the transitivity of the verb, the suffix on me agrees with the subject (S/A). If the verb is transitive, it takes an object prefix. It is ungrammatical for an intransitive verb to take the subject prefix and me to be unmarked; or for the transitive verb to take subject marking and me to take object marking. If the verb and me were morphologically one word, one would expect, judging from all other participant marking rules in the language, that participant marking would be flexible in this respect; one would expect subject or object to be marked at either end of the word, as it can be in any verb. The fact that there is no flexibility here suggests that this is not one morphological word. Rather, the rule is that the verb, if transitive, must mark its object. This is in fact a fixed rule throughout the language; see Section 9.7 for discussion. For these reasons, me is regarded as a separate word, both on the phonological and morphological levels, in these (as indeed in all other) constructions.

The word me, suffixed with the Future Tense marker -re, plus the Agreement Suffix, is used with negated verbs to express negative habitual-state meanings\(^3\). The resulting construction differs from the construction discussed above only in that the auxiliary me is always suffixed with the Future Tense marker -re in these constructions, and the

\(^3\) There are also four positive examples of this construction in a corpus of around 5000 sentences.
verbs in question have the Negative suffix -la.

41) "O! Tamu. Omala mere " foe.
   o tamu o- ma -la me -re foe
   oh no 3sgO- take -NEG HAB -FUT 1pl.exFOC

"Oh! No. We won’t take her."

42) Etokaire koi evalare leta faite ga evala
   e- tokai-re koi e- vala -re leta faite -o ga e- vala
   3sgnO- poke-NF also 3sgnO- pull -NF but be.hard -sgn sgnArt 3sgnO- pull

elufula merem finu.
   e- lufu -la me -re -m finu
   3sgnO- leave -NEG HAB -FUT-sgm 2sgFOC

He poked it, then he tried to pull it, but it was hard to pull it out, you (m) can’t do it.

43) Mina laita roru ngona
   mina laita -a ro -ru ngo na
   thing(f) secret/sacred -sgf one.sgf -none 2sg in

ngiola merea feo.
   ngiu -la me -re -a feo
   hide -NEG HAB -FUT -sgf 3sgFOC

Nothing secret can hide from you.

44) Uia tamu oemele nei ga
   uia tamu o- e- me -le nei ga
   knife(f) no 3sgO- SBD- continue-POT coconut(n) sgnArt

ekoroila merem finu.
   e- koroi -la me -re -m finu
   3sgnO- chop -NEG HAB -FUT -sgm 2sgFOC

If you don’t have a knife you (m) can’t cut a coconut.

45) "Tamu. Ngai vela merea fongai.
   tamu ngai ve -la me -re -a fongai
   no 1sg go -NEG HAB -FUT -sgf 1sgFOC

"No. I (f) can’t go."

In such cases the meaning of the verbal complex construction as a whole is that the entity referred to by the Agreement Suffix on the Habitual Auxiliary cannot, does not, or will not carry out the action referred to by the verb. Many of these constructions are negative generic statements referring to impossibility.

Note that even though the Future Tense marker -re is obligatorily used in such constructions, these constructions do not necessarily have future time reference. Its appearance might be due to an irrealis reading of the Future tense marker. See Section 12.2.1 for discussion of other uses of suffix -re which may be relevant here. Note also

4 The Agreement Suffix has been omitted here, as occasionally happens (see Section 10.3.1).
that such constructions are also mostly focus-marked; as are most negative sentences in Lavukaleve (see Chapter 11 and Section 17.2).

14.3.3 THE INTRANSITIVE VERB ME ‘CONTINUE’

It was mentioned above that there is an intransitive verb formally identical to the Habitual Auxiliary. The intransitive verb me ‘continue’ does not form a complex predicate; however, it is worth noting its main features here for the sake of comparison with the formally identical Habitual Auxiliary. This section aims to briefly show that this intransitive verb me ‘continue’ is easy to formally distinguish from the Habitual Auxiliary.

The intransitive verb me ‘continue’ is no different from other intransitive verbs in the language. Whereas the Habitual Auxiliary has its own special set of S/A prefixes, the intransitive verb just uses the regular S/A prefixes common to all intransitive verbs. Compare the prefixes used in the following sentences with those shown in Section 14.3.1 above. The 3sg subject prefix for the Habitual Auxiliary is lo-, and o- for the verb (examples (46) and (48)). Similarly, the 1st plural exclusive subject prefix is le- for the Habitual Auxiliary, and e- for the verb (47). In addition, like all intransitive verbs, me ‘continue’ can function as the sole predicate of a clause:

46) "Le urio ta ome!", hide are ke.
   le urio ta o- me hide a- re ke
   see coconut.crab(f) just 3sgS- continue thus 1sgS- say EMPH
   "But it’s just a coconut crab” I say.

47) E emenan.
   e e- me -nen
   1pl.ex 1pl.ex- continue -ABIL.
   We would be able to do it.

48) Daine fi omere.
   raine fi o- me re
   tomorrow 3sgnFOC 3sgS- continue -FUT
   It will go on tomorrow.

The two words, me Habitual Auxiliary and me ‘continue’, are obviously semantically very closely related; indeed there is often no semantic distinction between them. Presumably they are also historically related. However there are these crucial morpho-syntactic differences which force them to be recognised as different morpho-syntactic entities. When me appears with verbal subject prefixes, as sole member of a predicate, it is the verb ‘continue’. When it occurs with the special set of Habitual Auxiliary prefixes, immediately following a verb, it is the Habitual Auxiliary. Of course, rather than considering them separate words, one could consider the difference between them as simply arising out of different constructions in which they occur. The analysis here,
of one as a verb and one as an auxiliary, is intended to highlight the combinatorial possibilities of each, and their syntactic functions.

Me 'continue' can of course also occur in other complex constructions which are open to verbs. In the following example, me is the main verb of its clause; ngosiveham is a purposive adverbial clause subordinate to the me clause. The me clause is focus-marked.

The following two examples show me 'continue' as the verb of a subordinate adverbial clause, marked with Anterior suffix and the correct split-ergative participant-marking system appropriate to subordinate adverbial constructions (see Section 16.1 for a discussion of these constructions):

Note that there is yet another word me; it is an adjective, with a rather complex set of meanings to do with specifying the nominal head as one with which speakers are all familiar. This adjective me (cited throughout this thesis in its feminine singular form mea) is discussed in Section 4.1.2.

14.4 VERBAL ADJUNCT CONSTRUCTIONS

Verbal adjunct constructions involve a non-predicating element expressing the lexical
meaning of the construction, in conjunction with a semantically fairly empty verb, which enables the element to function as a predicate by providing the necessary morphology.

There are only two verbs in Lavukaleve which take part in such constructions: hai ‘do’ and sia ‘be, become, happen, do’. The lexical elements involved are of a number of types, different for each verb. Both verbs can also act as simple predicates; they do not always occur in these verbal adjunct constructions.

Verbal adjunct constructions are extremely common in Papuan languages, particularly those of the highlands of mainland PNG (Foley 1986: 119). Lavukaleve differs from many of these languages in that, while it does have verbal adjunct constructions, they are not a pervasive feature of Lavukaleve grammar; and in fact there are only two verbs, and very few adjuncts, that take part in the constructions.

The verb plus adjunct is treated here as a complex predicate because the adjunct of these constructions is tightly bound to the verb: while the verb is the predicating element, in that it controls number of arguments and takes the morphology, the adjunct is closely bound to the verb, and the two elements function as a single constituent. It is not however an argument of the verb, and is never cross-referenced on the verb.

14.4.1 Hai ‘do’

Hai ‘do’ is an ambi-transitive verb, which, in its intransitive function, can act as the verb of a verbal adjunct construction. The lexical elements it can occur with in this construction are very few, and consist only of the class of verbal adjuncts: fo’for ‘fly, ‘prepare’; va’var ‘talking’; so’sor ‘fast’ and ko’kor ‘tight’. These words are presumably old reduplications, although there is no evidence in the language today of *for, *var, *sor or *kor.

See Section 3.16 for criteria distinguishing verb adjuncts from other word classes. Some examples:

52) Kini lake ga emare ove koi fo’for hai-re.  
   kini lake ga e- ma re o- ve koi fo’for hai -re  
   ACT fire(n) sgnArt 3sgO- take -NF 3sgS- go also fly do -NF

   *He takes the fire, then flies away.*

53) Oraore oraore kini gouna na  
   o- rao re o- rao -re kini gouna na  
   3sgfO- surround -NF 3sgfO- surround -NF ACT turtle(m) sgmArt

   omi ga oloen ko’kor hai ke.  
   o- mi ga o- lo e -n ko’kor hai ke  
   3sgPOSS- special.thing(n) sgnArt 3sgS-finish -NOMZR -LOC tight do EMPH

   *It went round and round, the turtle’s thing went completely tight at the end.*
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54) ta kusukui na so'sor haire lolo kini
just rat(m) sgmArt fast do -NF straight ACT
mitakeu oho'vul ana hurum.
dog(m) 3sgPOSS- ear(m) 3sgmO- in go.inside -sgm

...the rat goes quickly, and goes inside the dog's ear.

55) Aevole fi vau ana va'var
a- e- vo-le fi vau a- na va'var
3sgmO- SBD- come-POT 3sgmFOC go.out 3sgmO- in talking
haivele fi, akuru anekiurire.
hai -vele fi a- kuru a- ne- kiu -ri -re
do -Succ 3sgmFOC 3sgmO- hit 3sgmO- 2sgS- die -CAUS -FUT

When he comes, you go down and when you talk to him, then you kill him.

56) Fo'for lehai feleham.
fo'for le- hau -i fele -ham
ready 1duePOSS- go.asore -PSV return -PURP

We got ready to go back.

It is interesting that fo'for has two separate meanings; ‘fly’ (as in example (52) above), and ‘get ready’ (as in example (56) above). It is difficult to see a semantic connection between them.

A word of the same form as the verb adjunct va'var also exists in Lavukaleve; there is a word va'var ‘talking’, which is a neuter noun. These are clearly two different syntactic possibilities of va'var. Compare the following two examples with (55) above:

57) Aka foiga Hoikari
aka foiga hoika -ri
then PN.MED.sgn there.MED -PSNV

ngava'var olou siav
nga- va'var o- lou sia -v
1sgPOSS- talking(n) 3sgPOSS- edge(pl) do -pl

mola ehoae ova'var ena.
mola e- hoa -e o- va'var e- na
cano(n) 3sgmO- poke.through -NOMZR 3sgPOSS- talking(n) 3sgmO- in

Okay, there now, my talking is at its end, my talking about canoe-making. [i.e. my story about canoe making does its edges]

58) Redio ova'var ga lagariaia fi.
redio o- va'var ga lagariaia -Ø fi
radio(f) 3sgPOSS- talking(n) sgmArt unclear -sgm 3sgmFOC

The radio talking is unclear.

In the first of the above pair, va'var appears as the head of an NP ‘canoe-cutting-talk’
(talk about canoe-making), which is the object of the postposition na `in'. In the second example, va’var is again the head of the NP, with a neuter definite article. These are clearly very different syntactic environments than those seen above for verb adjuncts. The simplest analysis is that there are two words va’var; one is a verb adjunct, the other a neuter noun. They have a very similar meaning.

Hai ‘do’ also takes part in some common collocational expressions. The normal way to express marrying (or having sex with) a woman is to say vovo hai (lit. ‘girl do’); beheading is expressed as sooso hai ‘neck do’; coughing is hovir hai ‘cough do’; snoring is ngoro hai ‘snore do’; shouting is haikio hai ‘shout do’; fishing is siriae hai ‘fishing do’ and so on. For example:

59) Vo’vou hovir echainu.
vo’vou hovir e- hai -nu
boy(m) cough(n) 3sgnO- do -PRES.sg

The boy is coughing. [lit: the boy is doing a cough]

All of these expressions involve the verb hai, with a noun as object. cross-referenced on hai. They are not verbal adjunct constructions.

14.4.2 SIA ‘DO, BE, BECOME, HAPPEN’

The verb sia ‘be, become, happen, do’ can function as a simple predicate, and it can also function as the second part of a predicate in a verbal adjunct construction. It is used in complex predicates involving particles and borrowed words. When it occurs as the sole predicate of a clause it usually means ‘be’, ‘become’ or ‘happen’. When it occurs as part of a complex predicate in a verbal adjunct construction it usually means something more like ‘do’.

When a verb from another language is borrowed into Lavukaleve, it cannot usually be used as a predicate by itself, but rather must be used as the lexical element of a verbal adjunct construction, using sia as the verb. In the corpus sia has been found with the following words. Some of these words are clearly borrowed; others may be borrowed, but a possible source has not been found:

gohed sia ‘go ahead, embark on (a project)’ (from Solomon Pijin)
stat sia ‘start’ (from Solomon Pijin)
stop sia ‘stop’ (from Solomon Pijin)
vin sia ‘win’ (from Solomon Pijin)
draeva sia ‘drive’ (from Solomon Pijin)
daeva sia ‘dive for shellfish’ (from Solomon Pijin)
let sia ‘be late’ (from Solomon Pijin)
plen sia ‘plane wood’ (from Solomon Pijin)
nok sia ‘knock’ (from Solomon Pijin)
popiulet sia ‘populate’ (from English)
baere sia ‘chat, tell a story’ (cf. baere ‘friend, mate’ in Roviana (Austronesian, Western Province) (Waterhouse 1949); also mbaire, referring to a bond of friendship in languages of the Western Province (Hocart nd).
ta’rai sia ‘pray’ (cf. tarai ‘pray’ in Cheke Holo (Austronesian, Santa Ysabel) (White 1988))
saporau sia ‘grow (as of new grass)’
sabo sia ‘clear garden for planting’
maia sia ‘show out, appear’
ngiungiu sia ‘be secret’

Some examples:

60) Aka hamus o lar vona fi draeva asia.
aka hamus o lar vo- na fi draeva a- sia
then evening(n) and daylight(n) 3plO- in 3sgnFOC drive 1sgS- do

Night and day I drove.  

61) Veore, mina nok aesiage, hano.
veo -re mina nok a- e- sia-ge hano
arrive -NF um knock 3sgmO- SBD- do-ANT then

Arriving, he knocked. 

62) Aka oleen plen siae ga fi.
aka o- lo -e -n plen sia-e ga fi
then 3sgS- finish -NOMZR -LOC plane do -NOMZR sgArt 3sgnFOC

So planing is the last thing [in canoe-making].

63) vona ta’rai siaham o vosuri foia
vo- ma ta’rai sia -ham o vo- su -ri foia
3plO- take prayer do -PURP and 3plO- wash -CAUS PN.MED.sgF
mafo’foira heo.
ma- fo’foira heo
3plPOSS- work(f) 3sgFEOC

... to take them to church, and wash them, that’s their work.

Note that the word ta’rai is also cross-classified as a feminine noun. It is used in the above example as a verbal adjunct, but in its noun use it functions as an argument of a predicate:

64) Ta’rai oma mem
tra’ai o- ma me -m
prayer(f) 3sgF-take SPEC -sgm

He takes the prayer [service]

The verb sia is also used very commonly for making predicates with indigenous
particles, especially temporal and spatial particles. For example the normal way of
telling time is to say, for example, **12 kilok sia** ‘it is twelve o’clock’; or numbers
**lamukas enga sia** ‘there are three thousand’ (thousand three do). A euphemistic way of
expressing dying is to say **tamu sia** ‘not do’, i.e., ‘become not’. It is also used in other
constructions, as the sole member of a single predicate.

Some examples of **sia** as sole predicate, with some of its other meanings:

**be:**

65) Ona **vovo la sia feo.**  
    o-na vovo la sia -a feo  
    3sgFO- in girl(f) sgfArt do -sgf 3sgFOC  

*The girl was [born] from it [a coconut].*  

**happen:**

66) **Hamus sia.**  
    hamus sia -Ø  
    evening(n) do -sgn  

*Night came.*

**be/do:**

67) **Vala siare olei?**  
    vala sia -re o-lei  
    how do -NF 3sgS- exist  

*How is she?*

**be/reach:**

68) **Kini kulukulumal vokinun vokinun**  
    kini kulukulu -mal vo-ki -nun  
    ACT pigeon -pl 3plO- shoot -DUR 3plO- shoot -DUR  
    vokila kini oka osia.  
    vo-ki -la kini koka o- sia  
    3plO- shoot -EXT ACT far 3sgS- do  

*He went shooting pigeons, on and on, and reached far away.*

Even though **sia** does have different meanings in different contexts, it is glossed
consistently as ‘do’. 
CHAPTER FIFTEEN

Clause chaining

15.1 INTRODUCTION

Clause chaining constructions consist of a string of coordinate-dependent clauses followed by a final independent clause. This chapter describes in detail the morphology and syntax of coordinate-dependent clauses, and shows that they can be clearly distinguished from subordinate clauses and independent coordinate clauses. Clause chaining constructions in other Papuan languages are examined briefly to see how Lavukaleve’s constructions compare with those already known in the literature.

15.2 INDEPENDENT, SUBORDINATE-DEPENDENT AND COORDINATE-DEPENDENT CLAUSES REVISITED

It was explained in Section 9.5 that there are two main types of clauses in Lavukaleve: independent (main) clauses and dependent clauses. There are, in turn, two types of dependent clauses: subordinate-dependent and coordinate-dependent clauses. This terminology is used by Foley (1986) in describing typical clause structures of Papuan languages. It is particularly revealing for Lavukaleve: in Lavukaleve there are clear morpho-syntactic distinctions between each of these clause types, and it is descriptively useful to consider them each separately. Main (independent) clauses were described in Chapter 9. Subordinate-dependent clauses are described in Chapter 16. This chapter is devoted to the description of the other major clause type: coordinate-dependent clauses.

Coordinate-dependent clauses are, as their name suggests, dependent on a main (independent) predicate. They share this property with subordinate clauses, but the kind of dependence which they display is very different in the two cases. It was explained in
Section 9.5 that main clauses are syntactically and morphologically independent; they can occur as single utterances on their own, and do not depend on any other clause for the expression of TAM and participant marking. The words ‘main’ and ‘independent’ are used interchangeably to name this kind of clause. Dependent clauses, on the other hand, cannot occur on their own, but rather occur in construction with another clause. They rely on this other clause for the expression of certain TAM and participant marking properties.

Subordinate-dependent clauses cross-reference their own arguments, but they can only specify their TAM properties in a very restricted way; essentially, they are only marked for their semantic relationship to their main predicate. Subordinate-dependent clauses are embedded within a main clause; they function as modifiers of particular parts of the main clause (i.e. they are relative clauses, adverbial clauses and purposive clauses); as Foley (1986) points out, they have a part-whole relationship with the main clause. Crucially, they allow subject cross-referencing, whereas coordinate-dependent clauses do not. A discussion of the difference between subordinate-dependent and coordinate-dependent clauses (and serial verb constructions) appears later on in this chapter.

Coordinate-dependent clauses are syntactically and semantically dependent on a main clause, but are not syntactically or semantically a part of that clause. Instead, they are linked to the main clause “in a linear string, much like beads on a necklace” (Foley 1986: 177). In Lavukaleve they cannot cross-reference their subject arguments. Also, they cannot mark their own TAM; they rely on the main clause for this. However they do carry morphology specifying their temporal relationship with the main clause. In fact, the only morphology (apart from the Causative suffix) available to a coordinate-dependent predicate is an object prefix, if the predicate is transitive, and a suffix marking the temporal relationship of the coordinate-dependent clause with the next clause.

Note that because coordinate-dependent clauses are marked by verbal morphology, it is not possible to have non-verbal predicates entering into clause chaining constructions. Coordinate-dependent clauses are always verbal.

15.3 OVERVIEW

As a starting point for the discussion, consider the following excerpt from a text. The story is a procedural text explaining how the speaker gathers and cooks taalea, a kind of shellfish. It consists of a sequence of sentences, each one involving a clause chaining construction. Coordinate-dependent predicates are italicised; the independent final predicates of the chain are underlined.
1) a. gaikoko na ana aige oke foare, aerau.

...dropping the anchor from the canoe, I jump out.

di 008

b. Ngadaeva ga efoure, ga efoare, ga fou -re

 Putting on my goggles, taking a string [basket] that I will put the taalea in, I go down.

di 009-010

c. Kini daeva siare taalea la

 I go down and see the taalea and collect it. [lit: Going diving, seeing the taalea, I collect it.]

di 011

d. Ote lamege ote

 I keep on getting them, then when I have a lot, I get back in [the canoe], and paddle home. [lit: With me keeping on getting them, when they are many, then going back in, returning by paddling around, I come back.]

di 012 - 013

e. Vore, aka ngagaikoko akefeurire,

Coming back, then pushing my canoe up [on the beach], I go up.

di 014 - 015

Sentence a. above has one coordinate-dependent predicate, consisting of the serial verb construction ke foa 'drop down' followed by the independent predicate aerau.
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'fall/jump'. Sentence b. consists of two coordinate-dependent clauses followed by an independent clause afoa (the sequence kemus ena taalea oahore ga is a relative clause). Sentence c. is similar, consisting of two coordinate-dependent predicates followed by an independent predicate. Sentence d. interrupts the sequence of clause chaining constructions by introducing three subordinate clauses ote lamege, ote lamege and oeovutiaje. These subordinate clauses mark their subject arguments (albeit with the special subordinate adverbial system which, among other things, marks third person intransitive subjects as objects; see Section 16.1), and explicitly show their relationship to the independent verb avo, by the Anterior suffix -ge. The sentence continues, however, with a clause chaining construction with coordinate-dependent predicates aore, felere and felere, ending with independent clause avo. Sentence e. shows another clause chaining construction, with coordinate-dependent predicates vore and akefeurire (a verb compound), and independent predicate afeu.

Clause chaining constructions are the most common method of joining predicates in a sequence of events in a narrative in Lavukaleve. They are used to bring the action of the story forward, for what Hopper and Thompson (1980) call foregrounding; foregrounded clauses are those clauses which express action sequences which move the storyline along from event to event. As such, clause chains are not used to set a scene; this means that the fact that they cannot mark TAM does not matter. When a clause chain is used, TAM would normally already be understood. Alternatively, it can be marked with an intervening subordinate clause, as is shown above, or later after the end of the chain. TAM marking in Lavukaleve is not obligatory, and indeed is relatively infrequent; usually once a time frame has been established, speakers do not repeat the morphology which established it.

15.4 DEFINING FEATURES OF COORDINATE-DEPENDENT CLAUSES

Structurally, clause chaining constructions consist of one or more coordinate-dependent clauses, each one with its own coordinate-dependent predicate, followed by an independent (main) predicate. This order of clauses is obligatory; the coordinate-dependent clauses always precede the independent clause (though see below for an environment when a coordinate-dependent clause can follow its main clause). The independent predicate has all the structural possibilities of any independent predicate in the language. Coordinate-dependent predicates however have a number of special properties particular to them.

15.4.1 MORPHOLOGY

Coordinate-dependent predicate forms are very restricted as to the morphology which they can take. Transitive coordinate-dependent predicates must take an object prefix; but no coordinate-dependent predicate can cross-reference its subject. The Causative suffix can occur on coordinate-dependent predicates. In addition, all coordinate-
dependent predicates are obligatorily marked with one of three suffixes indicating the temporal relationship of the coordinate-dependent clause to the next clause. These suffixes are -re (glossed NF ‘Non-Finite’ for reasons explained below), -vel (COMPLEtive) and -vele (SUCCessive). These three suffixes only occur on coordinate-dependent verbs. Apart from these affixes, no other morphology is available to coordinate-dependent predicates.

15.4.2 Clause chains with completive -vel

The Completive suffix -vel refers to a fulfilled condition. It marks a clause as having been finished completely before the action of the next clause. The verb on which it is suffixed forms a coordinate-dependent predicate, with the meaning ‘Having completed X, [then Y]’. The implication is that the action or event has only just been completed; and that upon its completion, then something else was enabled to happen. Note that clause chains are not used to express events far distant from each other in time, so a sentence like ‘having planted the yams last year, we harvested them today’, would not be expressed with a clause chain.

2) hivel okalem na
   hi -vel o- kalem na
   do/say -COMPL 3sgPOSS- father(m) sgmArt

akurure aokiuiri.
   a- kuru -re a- o- kiu -ri
   3sgmO- hit -NF 3sgmO- 3sgS- die -CAUS

...having said that, then hitting his father he killed him. gm 109

3) Kini vau suni vomavel ofei.
   kini vau suni vo- ma -vel o- feu -i
   ACT go.out all 3plO- take -COMPL 3sgPOSS- go.up -PSV

He came down and, having taken everyone, he went up [to the bush]. jn 007

4) Hano lonaumal na asifirire ana
   hano lo- naumal na a- fifi -ri -re a- na
   then 3duPOSS- god(m) sgmArt 3sgmO- sit -CAUS -NF 3sgmO- in

va’var haire lore fi aka alafuvel lovo.
   va’var hai -re lo -re fi aka a- lufu -vel lo- vo
   talking do -NF finish -NF 3sgnFOC then 3sgmO- leave -COMPL 3duS- come

Then the two sacrificing to their god [lit: sitting their god], and having finished talking to him, then having left him they went. ja 341

5) Hivel lalafuvel ofoa ke umu.
   hi -vel la- lufu -vel o- foa ke umu
   do/say -COMPL 3duumO- leave -COMPL 3sgS- go.down EMPH under

She said it and left them and went down [to the bottom of the sea]. [lit: Having said (that), having left them she goes way down] ja 039
The Completive suffix is often used with hi ‘do/say’, as a way of linking speech with resulting action:

6) Le ga eveage "Ngoamela" hivel loyau.
   le ga e- vea -ge ngoa-mela hi -vel lo- vau
day(n) sgnArt 3sgnO- SBD- emerge -ANT stay -DURIMP.du do/say-COMPL 3duS-go.out

Upon day coming, "You two stay"; her having said that they go out.

15.4.3 CLAUSE CHAINS WITH SUCCESSIVE -VELE

The Successive suffix -vele is used to mark a clause as being in temporal sequence to another clause. As with the Completive suffix, the clauses are ordered iconically; the first, -vele clause precedes the main clause. The Successive clause means 'After X has happened, [then Y]'. It can also mean 'whenever'. Note that its meaning is very similar to that of the Completive. Some examples:

7) "Vala afouham ngovo" hivel
   vala a- fou -ham ngo- vo hi -vele
how 3sgnO- put.on -PURP 2sg- come do/say -SUCC

fi akuru anekiuriire.
fi a- kuru a- ne- kiu -ri -re
3sgnFOC 3sgnO- hit 3sgnO- 2sgS- die -CAUS -FUT

After you say "Why did you come?", then you will kill him.

8) Efoure, foiga "Emavele velama!"
   e- fou -re foiga e- ma -vele vela -ma
3sgnO- put.on -NF PN.MED.sgn 3sgnO- take -SUCC go -DURIMP.sg

Putting it inside, okay, "Once you've taken the coconut, go!"

9) Ena felevele kini efela'koen elavea.
   e- na fele -vele kini e- fela'koe -n e- lavea
3sgnO- in return -SUCC ACT 1pl.exPOSS- village -LOC 1pl.ex- appear

We will go back on it to our village. [lit: having returned we will arrive at our village]

10) Aka gali ga ali ele elikivele Adina
    aka gali ga ali e- le -e e- liki -vele Adina
then stone.canoe(n) sgnArt man(m) 3sgnO- see-NOMZR 3sgnO- want -SUCC Yandina

fi oare.
fi o- ae -re
3sgnFOC 3sgS- go.up -FUT

And if anyone wants to see the stone canoe he must go up to Yandina. [lit: once a man wants to see it, he will go up...]

Verbs with the Successive suffix often seem semantically subordinate to the following clause, but syntactically such clauses pattern far more closely with Completive and Non-Finite clauses rather than with subordinate-dependent clauses.
15.4.4 Clause Chains with Non-Finite -re

The Non-Finite suffix is overwhelmingly more frequent than the other two, and it is semantically less marked. It indicates that the action of the verb on which it appears forms a temporal sequence with the following clause(s), but without the emphasis on completion or causal succession which the other two chaining suffixes have. The frequency of coordinate-dependent clauses with the Non-Finite suffix, as opposed to either of the other two suffixes, is reflected in the proportions of examples of each in this chapter.

11) Aka sia -re ngai nageare -re a- kiu
    then do -NF 1sg fear -NF 1sgS- die

    That's why I was scared to death. [Lit: so doing, me fearing, I died]  w2 028

12) Alere, amare -re a- ma -re kini tasi -n o- vau
    3sgmO- see -NF 3sgmO- take -NF ACT sea -LOC 3sgS- go.out

    He saw it (m) and took it to the sea. [Lit: seeing it, taking it, he went out to sea]  v1 009

13) Vokuire vo fe fere re -re aka
    vo- kui -re vo- Dup fei -ri -re aka
    3plO- burn -NF 3plO- REDUP- scrape -CAUS -re then

    maka na aigure, maka na a- igu -re
    nut.pudding(m) sgmArt 3sgmO- take.out -NF

    hauvil nun va, vofou.
    hau -vil nun va vo- o- fou
    pana -pl four plArt 3plO- 3sgS- put.on

    [She] cooked them and grated them, took the maki and put out the four pana. [lit: Cooking them, grating them, taking the maki, she fixed the four pana.]  co 191

The Non-Finite suffix -re needs some discussion. In Section 12.2.1 it was shown that a formally identical suffix -re is a Future Tense marker, which is used in clauses with reference to future time.

Even though the Non-Finite suffix -re and the Future Tense suffix -re do not co-occur, it can be shown clearly that there are in fact two suffixes of the form -re. Rather than being a tense marker, when it appears on coordinate-dependent predicates, it is serving as a linker indicating that the predicate is non-finite and is taking part in a clause chaining construction in which the events appear in a sequence.

In coordinate-dependent constructions the Non-Finite suffix -re makes no reference to a time frame. It can be used with clauses which have reference to past, present or future time. On main (independent) predicates it always expresses future tense, and can be
used only in clauses which have future time reference. Most of the previous examples have past time reference, as can be seen from the translations.

Future Tense -re is used in full, completely independent, clauses. There are many examples, of which the following is representative, which show -re marking fully independent single verbs:

14) "Ngai lafa ona voasu ka foiga
   ngai lafa o- na vo- a- su ka foiga
   1sg part(f) 3sgfO- in 3plO- 1sgS- tie LOCEMPH PN.MED.sgn

   "I tied them up in some place - I'll go there" he said.  

Furthermore, there are morpho-syntactic differences between -re the Non-Finite marker and -re the Future Tense marker. When Non-Finite -re occurs on a coordinate-dependent predicate, that predicate cannot mark its subject, as was explained above. However when Future Tense -re appears on independent predicates, this restriction does not hold; independent predicates can freely cross-reference their subjects. See the above example, and the following:

15) le'usa tatavari mea la lain onekaere.
   le'usa tatavari me -a la lai -n o- ne- kae -re
   betel.tree(f) split SPEC-sgf sgfArt top-LOC 3sgfO- 2sgS- put.up -FUT

   [When making a house] you will put up the split betel nut on top.  

16)  ohoul va voegu
   o- houl va vo- igu lo
   3sgPOSS- trees(plt) plArt 3plO- take.out lo

   gagamu la oalaure.
   gagamu la o- a- lau -re
   debris(f) sgfArt 3sgfO- 1sgS- sweep -FUT

   ...having removed the sticks, I will sweep the debris.  

So the Non-Finite suffix -re is clearly distinguishable from the Future Tense suffix -re, in terms of semantic and morphological criteria. In clause chain constructions, it serves as a linker, to mark each coordinate-dependent clauses as belonging to one of a series, linked to a following independent predicate. Coordinate-dependent predicates, marked with this suffix, cannot express TAM distinctions or cross-reference their subjects. These are typical features of non-finite predicates, which indeed coordinate-dependent
predicates are).

15.4.5 Syntax

Coordinate-dependent clauses may contain, as well as the coordinate-dependent predicate, NPs referring to the object and subject of that predicate, plus any number of adjuncts. Note that, even though coordinate-dependent predicates cannot cross-reference their subjects, coordinate-dependent clauses can contain an NP referring to this subject. See for example sentence (11) above. Note also the following:

17) Airuge vo'vou na felere kini feum.
    a-e-iru-ge vo'vou na fele re kini feu
    3sgmO- SBD- sleep -ANT boy(m) sgmArt return -NF ACT go.up -sgm

    *He [the giant] slept and the boy went back up. [lit: Him sleeping, the boy returning, he went back up.]*

18) Hoikari fi malav va kini
    hoika -ri fi malav va kini
    there.MED -PSNV 3sgnFOC people(pl) plArt ACT

    haure ane mangoa.
    hau -re a-ne ma-ngoa
    go.ashore -NF 3sgmO- with 3plS- stay

    *So then people all came and lived (on the mainland) with him. [lit: coming ashore, they lived with him]*

It is not necessary that clause chaining constructions share any of their arguments, although usually they tend to. Unlike in many of the languages which have constructions of this type, in Lavukaleve there is no grammatical device to show whether a coordinate-dependent predicate has the same subject as the independent predicate of the construction. The following set of examples illustrate this. To make exposition simpler, they have all been taken from the same story, about a magical mother whale and her two sons.

In the following sentence, the subject of the first coordinate-dependent clause ekurure `hit it’ is not stated but is known to be ‘the whale (f)’, from the previous sentence. The next coordinate-dependent clause of the sequence, oinala sou falere `they two (m) got up’, introduces a new subject with the demonstrative pronoun oinala. The third coordinate-dependent clause of the sequence, roge foiga soire `one of them ran’, has a new subject again: expressed by the NP roge with ellipsed head and resumptive pronoun foiga. This clause is basically repeated for clarity; the canoe referred to is the

---

1 Perhaps the name ‘non-finite’ is not ideal for this suffix, because coordinate-dependent verbs are all non-finite, so all three coordinate-dependent clause markers, -vele, -vel and -re, are markers of non-finite clauses. However the name was chosen to highlight the fact that -re is semantically and distributionally by far the least marked of the three, and thus the most general gloss is perhaps appropriate.
second canoe, of which the first was previously mentioned some time ago in the story. So the fourth clause, leleta ga soire ‘the second one ran’, has the same real-world referent as the third clause, although the NP subject used to refer to it is actually different. The independent verb ohai has the same subject leleta ga ‘the second [canoe (n)]’ as the fourth coordinate-dependent clause.

19) Ekurure aka oinala sou falere roge
e- kuru -re aka oinala sou fale -re roge
3sgnO- hit -NF then other.MED.mdu rise stand -NF one.sgn

foiga soire leleta ga soire ohai.
foiga soi -re leleta -ø ga soi -re o- hau -i
PN.MED.sgn run.away -NF second-sgn sgnArt run.away -NF 3sgPOSS-go.ashore -PSV

[She] hit it [the canoe], the two boys stood up, then one of the [canoes] ran away, the second escaped to shore. [lit: [Her] killing it, then the two boys standing up, then one of the [canoes] runs away, the second ran to shore.] ja 041-042

In the next sequence, ‘two boys’ are the (unstated) subject of the first verb. A full NP introduces ‘their mother’ as the subject of the second verb. It is not clear who is the subject of the third verb; it could be the two boys, or the two boys with their mother. The independent verb has all three as its subject (shown by the plural, not dual, subject prefix), thus suggesting on semantic grounds (although not proving conclusively) that all three were the subject of the previous, coordinate-dependent, verb.

20) Vomare aka lokala la
vo- ma -re aka lo- kala la
3plO- take -NF then 3duPOSS- mother(f) sgnfArt

lamare aka felere mahau.
lamare ma -re aka fele -re ma- hau
3dumO- take -NF then return -NF 3plS- go.ashore

They took them, then their mother took the two boys, then they all went back to shore. [lit: [Them] taking them [the people], then their mother taking the two boys, then they all went back to shore.] ja 045

In the next example, the (unstated) subject of the first coordinate-dependent verb haure ‘go ashore’ is malav va ‘the people’; the second coordinate-dependent clause aka oinala malav va vokurure ‘then the two (m) killed the people’ has two full NPs, but only the object is cross-referenced, as it is a coordinate-dependent verb. The third verb lore ‘finishing’ is the same, (its subject is still ‘those two’); the independent verb has a change of subject introduced by the full NP malav va ‘the people’.
21) **Haure** aka **oinala** **malav** va **vokurure**

haure - NF then oinala malav va vo- kuru - NF

go.ashore - NF other.MED.mdu people(pl) plArt 3plO- kill - NF

lore, foiga aka malav va mi **nageay**.
lo - NF foiga aka malav va mi nagea - v

finish - NF PN.MED.sgn then people(pl) plArt um fear - pl

*They all went ashore, the two boys had killed all the people and the people were afraid.* [lit: [Them all] going ashore, then the two boys having finished killing the people, the people were afraid.]

In all the previous examples, different subjects have been marked by overt NPs. However if all protagonists are understood, subject reference can change with no signaling of new actors. In the next example, **paral nala** ‘the two larrikins’ is the subject of the first, second, third and fourth coordinate-dependent verbs. In the fifth coordinate-dependent clause **ae lakokosorire** ‘lifting the two (m) up’ ‘the whale’ is understood to be the subject (from previous discourse); and in the independent clause again ‘the whale’ is understood as the subject. Thus, even though during this clause chain the subjects are changed, there is no overt signaling of this. It is not obligatory to mark a changed subject if the identity of the participant is clear from the discourse.

22) **Paral** **nala** lokilekilevil **vomare**

para -1 nala lo- kilekile -vil vo- ma - re
larrikin(m) - du mduArt 3duPOSS- axe - pl 3plO- take - NF

vau vohoire laire laeauage
vau vo- hoi - re lai - re la- e- vau - ge
go.out 3plO- put.in - NF paddle - NF 3dumO- SBD- go.out - ANT

ae lakokosorire lamavel ovai.
ae la- kokosori - re la- ma - vel o- vau - i
go.up 3dumO- carry.on.head - NF 3dumO- take - COMPL 3sgPOSS- go.out - PSV

*The two larrikins took their axes, put them in the canoes, paddled out, then the whale lifted them up.* [lit: The two larrikins taking their axes and putting them inside [their canoe], paddling out, she [i.e. the whale] lifted the two up onto her head, and having taken them goes out.]

While there is no overt syntactic signalling of a new subject, the dual object marking of the last two coordinate-dependent verbs shows the hearer that the boys are now the object, which might lead to a guess that the whale is now the subject.

It was said above that coordinate-dependent clauses precede the main clause, but there are occasional examples where one of the coordinate-dependent clause in a chain actually follows the main clause. The instances in which this happen are clearly examples of afterthoughts; the coordinate-dependent clause is added after the rest of the chain as a just-remembered addition, or in order to clarify a part of the event. In each of the following examples, note the pauses (marked by slashes) after the main clause,

2 An account of how it was that the people were able to be afraid after they had all been killed is beyond the scope of this thesis.
before the added coordinate-dependent clause at the end:

23) Vere, ta / ove ofela'koen / otua
ve -re ta / o- ve o- fela'koe -n / o- tua
la  olufure.
la  o- lufu -re
sgfArt  3sgfO- leave -NF

Going, he went to his village, leaving his wife.  

24) Aka kini ngaigure ta / meo voetegige,
aka kini nga- igu -re ta / meo vo- e- tegi -ge
then ACT 1sgO- take.out -NF just / tuna(pl) 3plO- SBD- fish.feeding -ANT
vokulaham  vere ta / ove ofela'koen.
vo- kula -ham ve -re ta / o- ve o- fela'koe -n
3plO- run.after-PURP go -NF just / 3sgS- go 3sgPOSS- village -LOC

Then he left me, bonito were feeding, he went to catch them, then he went back to his village.

While clause chaining constructions have a fairly limited structure themselves, they do allow other sorts of clauses to intervene between elements of the clause chain. In particular, aspect-marked verbs, and subordinate clauses marking various types of TAM can intervene between elements of a clause chain. The following examples illustrate clauses intervening in chaining constructions. The first of these shows a whole clause of quoted speech intervening between coordinate-dependent and independent verbs in a chaining construction:

25) Houla fokoa mea ro ona
houla foko -a me -a ro o- na
stick(f) leaning -sgf SPEC -sgf one.sgf 3sgfO- in

vaure, vau volere
vau -re vau vo- le -re

Going out on a tree that was leaning over, going out and seeing them ...

"O hobea fi. Mafoton fi
o hobea fi ma- foto -n fi
oh good 3sgnFOC 3plPOSS- middle -LOC 3sgnFOC

aeraure" hide ore.
a- erau -re hide o- re
1sgS- fall -FUT thus 3sgS- say

"Oh, good. I'll jump between them" he said.

The next example shows a relative clause (in square brackets) intervening between
CLAUSE CHAINING

coordinate-dependent verbs and the independent verb:

26) Aka foiga vosure lore

aka foiga vo- su -re lo 
then PN.MED.sgn 3plO- tie -NF finish -NF

feiere [kini lafa onam ngoa
fele -re kini lafa o- nam ngoa
return -NF ACT part(f) 3sgfO- to stay

lemea me [la] onam esa kini ngoay.
lele [p e] na fele -ham hide koi le-
second -sgn 3sgnO- in return-PURP thus also 1duex- 3sgS- tell

This example shows a series of aspect-marked verbs and a purposive subordinate verb intervening between coordinate-dependent and final independent verbs:

27) Felere aka ngoanun ngoanun tonga

fele -re aka ngoa -nun ngoa -nun tonga
return -NF then stay -DUR stay -DUR change(n)

leleta ena feleham hide koi leolai.
leleta -o e- na fele -ham hide koi le- o- lai
second -sgn 3sgnO- in return-PURP thus also 1duex- 3sgS- tell

Coming back [we] stayed and stayed, then he told us to go back for a second time. 

15.4.6 CLAUSE CHAINING CONSTRUCTIONS VERSUS INDEPENDENT COORDINATED CLAUSES, SERIAL VERB CONSTRUCTIONS AND SUBORDINATE CLAUSES

Clause chaining constructions were described in the previous sections as being a particular construction type involving one or more coordinate-dependent clauses, each containing a predicate marked with particular morphology, followed by an independent predicate, which finishes the sentence. This clause chaining construction type is only one of many ways in Lavukaleve in which to join verbs and clauses; it is worthwhile to look briefly at each of the other ways in turn, to show that each one is structurally easily distinguishable from clause chaining constructions.

INDEPENDENT COORDINATE CONSTRUCTIONS

Two or more independent clauses can be joined by the use of a conjunction. There is a small number of conjunctions in Lavukaleve, including aka ‘then, so’; hano ‘then, after, finished’; leta ‘but’; olang ‘because’. These conjunctions are listed in Section 3.10. Of concern here is the structural differences between clauses joined using such conjunctions, and clause chains. The major difference is that all the clauses joined using conjunctions are independent; that is, they can freely stand on their own as complete utterances. In addition, they can take the full range of TAM and participant marking morphology normally available to independent predicates (and, for the most part, not
available to coordinate-dependent predicates). For example note the conjunction aka ‘then’ joining the two sentences in square brackets (each one a clause chaining construction):

28) [Eigure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e-</th>
<th>igu</th>
<th>-re</th>
<th>koi</th>
<th>mina</th>
<th>fofo</th>
<th>la</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3sgmO-</td>
<td>take.out</td>
<td>-NF</td>
<td>also</td>
<td>thing(f)</td>
<td>fofo</td>
<td>la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ona</td>
<td>koi</td>
<td>maki</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>aoigu],</td>
<td>aka</td>
<td>then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o-</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>maki</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>a-</td>
<td>o-</td>
<td>igu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sgfO-</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>also</td>
<td>nut.pudding(m)</td>
<td>3sgmO-</td>
<td>3sgS-</td>
<td>take.out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[sumavil</td>
<td>enga</td>
<td>va</td>
<td>koi</td>
<td>vomare,</td>
<td>teteka</td>
<td>la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suma</td>
<td>-vil</td>
<td>enga</td>
<td>va</td>
<td>koi</td>
<td>vo-</td>
<td>ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taro</td>
<td>-pl</td>
<td>three</td>
<td>plArt</td>
<td>also</td>
<td>3plO-</td>
<td>take</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ona</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>voho</td>
<td>o-</td>
<td>ho</td>
<td>vo-</td>
<td>ho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sgfO-</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>3plO-</td>
<td>3sgS-</td>
<td>put.inside</td>
<td>3plO-</td>
<td>put.inside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ana</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>ui</td>
<td>e-</td>
<td>o-</td>
<td>ne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sgmO-</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>food(ν)</td>
<td>sgnArt</td>
<td>3sgnO-</td>
<td>3sgS-</td>
<td>give</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

She took it out, put it in a basin, and took out the maki, then, she took three taros, put them in a basket, and putting them in, gave him the food. [lit: taking it out and in a basin, she took out the maki, then taking three taros, she put them in a basket, putting them in, she gave him the food.]

Independent coordinate constructions are not common in Lavukaleve. It is certainly not the preferred way of joining clauses. Instead, speakers prefer to join clauses using clause chaining constructions or subordinate constructions.

SERIAL VERB CONSTRUCTIONS

Clause chaining constructions are structurally very different to serial verb constructions. Serial verb constructions are a type of predicate; clause chaining constructions are a type of sentence. Clause chaining constructions consist of one or more coordinate-dependent clauses, which are dependent on a following independent clause. Serial verb constructions, however, do not have this relationship of dependence; each verb of a serial verb construction is structurally equivalent to each of the other verbs in the construction.

Serial verb constructions (discussed in Section 14.1) consist of a sequence of verbs which occupy a single predicate slot. Like in clause chaining constructions, each of the verbs must cross-reference its own object, but, unlike in clause chaining constructions, the verbs do not take any morphology to show what relationship they have to each other. A serial verb construction can mark subject arguments and TAM distinctions, but only once across the whole predicate. Coordinate-dependent verbs cannot mark subject arguments or TAM distinctions at all. Serial verb constructions can in fact act as a coordinate-dependent predicate as part of a clause chaining construction, as the
following example shows (see also many previous examples in this chapter, including (1), (22) and (25)):

29) Foe na afufurire, oina
    foa na a- fufu -ri -re oina
    pig(m) sgmArt 3sgmO- lie -CAUS -NF other.MED.sgm

koi foa fufu -re hano iru -m
also go.down lie -NF then sleep -sgm

Laying the pig down, he lay down too, and slept.

SUBORDINATE CLAUSES

Subordinate clauses are easily distinguishable from clause chaining constructions. Firstly, subordinate clauses are embedded within their main (independent) clauses, and function either as an argument or a modification of their main clause. Subordinate relative and purposive clauses bear little structural relationship to coordinate-dependent clauses, and are not considered further here.

Subordinate adverbial clauses have predicates which are specifically marked with special morphology which shows their semantic and syntactic relationship to the independent clause, by using one of the Anterior suffix -ge; the Potential suffix -le or the Surprise suffix -meon (see Section 16.1). They differ morphologically from coordinate-dependent clauses in that coordinate-dependent clauses can never under any circumstances cross-reference their subjects, whereas subordinate adverbial clauses can. Subordinate adverbial clauses, if intransitive, have their own system of participant marking, whereby third person subjects are cross-referenced as objects, in a split-ergative marking system, and a special prefix e- holds the place of the normal subject prefix.

Subordinate adverbial clauses can in fact be used to modify coordinate-dependent clauses in clause chaining constructions. For example consider the following:

30) Ngoanun foa fufure ngoanun
    ngoa -nun foa fufu -re ngoa -nun
    stay -DUR go.down lie -NF stay -DUR

    otin elaketeige, sou falere, ...
    o- tina e- e- laketei -ge sou fale -re
    3sgPOSS- body(n) 3sgO- SBD- live -ANT rise stand -NF

He stayed lying down, then, as his body became stronger, he stood up, (picked up his pig, went on and on, put down the pig, saying "Hey! This pig is really heavy!")

[lit: He was staying lying down, as his body started to get strong, then standing up, ... ] hr1 014

In this sentence fragment (the end of the sentence wasn’t included because it is very long, and not to the point) the subordinate clause otin elaketeige ‘upon his body
re recuperating’ modifies the coordinate-dependent clause sou falere ‘standing up’; it describes what the anterior conditions for the completion of the sou falere clause were. Note that the first and second coordinate-dependent predicates in this fragment, foa fufure ‘lying down’ and sou falere ‘standing up’, are serial verb constructions.

15.5 CLAUSE CHAINING IN OTHER PAPUAN LANGUAGES

One might not expect necessarily to find structural similarities between Lavukaleve and other Papuan languages; the term Papuan, after all, simply means that the language in question is from a certain region of the world and is not Austronesian. Nevertheless, constructions very similar to the one described in this chapter are very characteristic of mainland Papuan languages, and it is worthwhile to look at how Lavukaleve’s clause chaining constructions compare with clause chaining constructions in other languages. Such constructions are not at all characteristic of the Oceanic languages surrounding Lavukaleve.

Lavukaleve’s clause chaining constructions are similar in most respects to the well-known examples in other Papuan languages, for instance Hua (Haiman 1980) and Tauya (MacDonald 1990). Foley (1986) in his discussion of clause chaining constructions mentions the following features as typical of such constructions in Papuan languages.

Typically coordinate-dependent verbs in Papuan languages have no tense marking (Foley 1986: 196), and in fact their inflections are normally stripped down, often including only a linking morpheme to show that they are in a clause chaining construction (1986: 180). Typically, the temporal relation between the coordinate-dependent and final independent verbs is marked; thus coordinate-dependent verbs often mark whether their action is simultaneous with or sequential to the independent (final) verb (1986: 180). Often Papuan languages with clause chaining constructions have a switch-reference system, or some other tracking mechanism to show whether the actor of a coordinate-dependent verb is the same as or different to the actors of other verbs in the sequence. Final independent verbs are fully inflected verbs which contain all information regarding TAM and person marking.

In Lavukaleve the situation is quite similar. Coordinate-dependent predicates carry object marking if transitive, and carry a suffix to show their temporal relationship with the next clause. Independent predicates in Lavukaleve carry full participant marking. One place in which Lavukaleve differs from many Papuan languages is that in Lavukaleve there is no obligation for the predicates of clause chains to share their subjects, or to mark whether or not the subjects are shared, so there is no need for a switch-reference system or some other mechanism to do this. In this respect, Lavukaleve is similar to Yimas, which does not have a switch-reference system, and does not require clause chains to have the same subjects (Foley 1991: 446). Also, Lavukaleve does not have the simultaneous/sequential distinction which many languages with clause chains make.
CHAPTER SIXTEEN
Subordinate clauses

It was shown in Section 9.5 that there is a major division in clause types in Lavukaleve, between independent (main) and dependent clauses. Dependent clauses themselves are of two types: coordinate-dependent and subordinate-dependent. Coordinate-dependent clauses are discussed in the previous chapter, Chapter 15. Subordinate-dependent clauses, henceforth to be called simply subordinate clauses, are discussed in this chapter.

Lavukaleve has three types of subordinate clauses: adverbial clauses, purposive clauses and relative clauses. There are three different types of adverbial clauses, all marked by verbal suffixation, and by changes in participant marking of the predicate, involving a split-ergative system with 3rd person subjects following an ergative/absolutive marking pattern and 1st and 2nd person subjects following a nominative/accusative marking pattern. Purposive clauses too are marked by verbal suffixation, but do not have a split-ergative marking system. Lavukaleve has internal relative clauses. That is, the argument shared between the relative clause and the main clause is syntactically a part of the relative clause, not the main clause. The following table summarises the basic morphosyntactic information to be covered in this chapter:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBORDINATE CLAUSE TYPE</th>
<th>SUBTYPE</th>
<th>CROSS-REFERENCING SYSTEM</th>
<th>OVERT MARKER OF CLAUSE TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adverbial</td>
<td>Anterior</td>
<td>split-ergative</td>
<td>-ge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>split-ergative</td>
<td>-le</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>split-ergative</td>
<td>-meon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purposive</td>
<td></td>
<td>as for main clauses</td>
<td>-ham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relative</td>
<td></td>
<td>as for main clauses with Agreement Suffix</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are no complement clauses in Lavukaleve; nominalised clauses cover most of the functional domains of complementation in other languages (see Section 13.1 for a discussion of nominalisation).

The three major subordinate clause types, while they are all subordinate clauses, differ markedly in their morpho-syntactic characteristics, and in the semantic functions which they serve to express. This chapter, then, falls into three separate parts: a discussion of adverbial clauses is followed by a description of purposive clauses then relative clauses.

16.1 ADVERBIAL CLAUSES

Adverbial clauses are subordinate clauses which add temporal, spatial, and other types of meanings to the main clause. There are three kinds in Lavukaleve: Potential clauses, Anterior clauses, and Surprise clauses. Adverbial clauses are marked by two means: firstly, there is a suffix on the predicate of the subordinate clause. The suffix, as well as showing that the predicate is subordinate, indicates the semantic relationship of the adverbial clause to the main clause. Secondly, these clauses are marked by a very special sort of participant marking. In this participant marking system, the surface marking of grammatical relations within the subordinate clause is altered such that in intransitive clauses the logical intransitive subject is cross-referenced using an object prefix, and an invariant prefix e- holds the second prefix position, the position normally reserved for cross-referencing to the subject of a transitive verb. This pattern only applies to third-person subjects; first and second person subjects are marked as in main clauses. It also only applies to intransitive predicates; transitive predicates use normal main-clause participant marking strategies.

The system of participant marking in these clause types is described in the first sections; firstly for verbs, then for the Habitual Auxiliary. This is a rather complicated area of the language, and takes quite some explanation. The actual clause types, Anterior, Potential and Surprise, are discussed only after this preliminary material has been dealt with. It is necessary to explain the participant marking first in order for the reader to be able to understand the examples of these adverbial clauses, which is the main descriptive task of this section.

As with coordinate-dependent clauses, subordinate clauses are marked by verbal morphology. This means that there are no non-verbal subordinate predicates.

16.1.1 PARTICIPANT MARKING WITH THIRD PERSON SUBJECTS IN SIMPLE VERBAL PREDICATES

Participant marking in subordinate adverbial clauses with simple verbal predicates which have third person subjects is as follows. If the subordinate verb is transitive, participant marking is normal: both subject and object are cross-referenced with the
usual prefixes (the Agreement Suffix does not co-occur with verbs of subordinate adverbiacl clause). Unlike in main predicates, subject cross-referencing is obligatory in subordinate predicates.

If the subordinate verb is intransitive, the logical subject of the verb is cross-referenced with a prefix from the object prefix paradigm, not with a prefix from the subject prefix paradigm. In addition, a prefix e- (glossed SuborDinate) intervenes between this object prefix and the verb stem, in what is normally the subject prefix position. The paradigms for subject and object prefixes were given in Section 9.7. Note that 1st person dual and plural, 2nd person and 3rd person feminine dual and plural prefixes are identical for subject and object, so it is only the other forms that show that intransitive subjects are marked as objects in subordinate adverbiacl clauses.

Note also that the subordinate e- prefix is formally identical to the 1st plural exclusive subject and object (and Possessive) prefix. It is not clear whether this formal identity is coincidental or not.

The following examples illustrate the subordinate participant marking pattern:

1) Nikol mem na aerege fi aka vuli
   nikol me -m na a- e- re -ge fi aka vuli
   SPEC-sgm sgmA 3sgmO- SBD- say-ANT 3sgnFOC then behind
   mem na "Ba ke!" hide ore.
   me -m na ba ke hide o- re
   SPEC-sgm sgmA go!sg EMPH thus 3sgS- say

   The older one saying [that], then the younger one said "Let’s go!". co 004

2) meo voetegige, vokulaham
tuna(pl) 3plO- SBD- fish.feeding-ANT 3plO- run.after -PURP
   vere ta ove ofela’koen.
   ve -re ta o- ve o- fela’koe -n
   go -NF just 3sgS-go 3sgPOSS- village -LOC

   when the bonito started feeding, he went to catch them, then he went back to his village. gm 032

3) Aka le eveage lalamuon ta
   aka le e- e- vea -ge lalamu -n ta
   then day(n) 3sgnO- SBD- emerge -ANT morning -LOC just
   hano stat siam.
   hano stat sia -m
   then begin do -sgm

   But then day coming, in the morning, then it started. ef 012

The prefix e- serves to signal that the verb is of this subordinate adverbiacl clause type, and that the prefix preceding the e- refers to the logical subject, not the object as its form would suggest. Compare the following transitive verbs in subordinate adverbiacl
clauses. They prefix their subject and object arguments as normal, except that in subordinate clauses the subject must be prefixed, unlike in main clauses:

4)  nalo ga eigure elolorige kivi.
    nalo ga e- igu -re e- lo- lo -ri -ge kivi -ø
    intestines(n) sgnArt 3sgnO- take.out -NF 3sgnO- 3duS- finish -CAUS -ANT be.smelly-sgn
    taking it (the intestine) out (of the ground), when they had finished, the intestine really smelt.

5)  Kemus ga elofoage kini ofoa.
    kemus ga e- lo- fou -ge kini o- foa
    rope(n) sgnArt 3sgnO- 3duS- put -ANT ACT 3sgS- go.down
    The two boys put down the rope.

6)  Kini malav va matulav manapikal
    kini malav va ma- tulav ma- napi -kal
    ACT people(pl) plArt 3plPOSS- children(pl) 3plPOSS- nappy -pl
    vomakoge ta, taragau na kini
    vo- ma- ko -ge ta taragau na kini
    3plO- 3plS- throw -ANT just sea.eagle(m) sgmArt ACT
    votogore omav
    vo- togo -re o- ma -v
    3plO- take.out -NF 3sgS- take -pl
    So when the people put out their children's nappies, the sea eagle took them

16.1.2 NON-THIRD PERSON SUBJECTS

If the logical (intransitive) subject of an intransitive verb of a subordinate adverbial clause is first or second person singular, normal main clause prefixing applies. That is, the e- prefix seen with 3rd person subjects of subordinate clauses does not occur. In addition, for the first person, a prefix from the subject prefix paradigm, not from the object prefix paradigm is used (2nd person singular first-position prefixes are identical for subject and object).

For example, the following intransitive subordinate verbs show normal main-clause first or second person prefixing, and no subordinate e-:

7)  Ahauge
    a- hau -ge fi, aka ngai
    1sgS- go.ashore -ANT 3sgnFOC then 1sg
    ngatoire
    nga- toi -re ngai ngagaikoko na ngai
    1sg- help -NF 1sg 1sgPOSS- canoe(m) sgmArt 1sg
    Mima alekefeuri.
    Mima a- le- ke feu -ri
    Mima 3sgmO- 1duex- push.off go.up -CAUS
    When I go ashore, then he helps me. Me and Mima push my canoe up.
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8) Vau aiguge, ngasivel ngali roa.
   vau a- igu -ge nga- sivel ngali roa
   go.out 1sgS- go -ANT 1sgO- follow friend(m) one.sgm

When I went out, one friend followed me.

9) avege ta urio la ngaosokai ke.
   a- ve -ge ta unio la nga- o- sokai ke
   1sgS- go -ANT just coconut.crab(f) sgfArt 1sgO- 3sgS- poke EMPH

...upon me going, the coconut crab poked me!

10) Huluire akakoge "Ta man rio feo tam!"
    hului -re a- kako -ge ta man urio feo tam
    go.round -NF 1sgS- look.out-ANT just what(m) coconut.crab(f) 3sgfFOC man(m)

I turn, and looking back, "What? It's the coconut crab! Man!"

11) Huru ngovele fl, hano koi koa ga si.
    huru ngo- ve -le fl hano koi koa ga si -ø
    go.inside 2sg- go -POT 3sgnFOC then also door(n) sgArt cover -sgn

If you went inside, the door would shut.

It is impossible to know if this also happens with non-singular first or second person subjects. This is because of the forms of the 1st and 2nd dual inclusive and exclusive, and 1st and 2nd plural inclusive and exclusive prefixes. Firstly, they do not change for subject and object; their form is invariant. Thus the phenomenon of logical subject being marked as object is not pertinent to them. Secondly, they all end in the vowel /e/. This means that one cannot tell if they have the prefix e-, because of the morphophonemic rule which deletes one of two identical vowels at morpheme boundaries (see Section 2.9.3). So in practice one cannot tell if first and second person non-singular subjects pattern with first and second person singular or if they pattern with third person forms. A subordinate e- prefix is never put into the gloss of 1st and 2nd person non-singular forms.

Recall too that this participant marking system only occurs with intransitive verbs. With transitive verbs, normal participant marking prevails at all times, with 1st/2nd singular and all other person/number combinations.

In summary, then, participant marking in subordinate adverbial clauses, compared with normal participant marking, is as follows:

---

1 I do however put a subordinate e- prefix into glosses after 3rd person subjects of subordinate intransitive verbs where the object prefixes end in /e/ (i.e. 3rd singular and dual neuter), under the assumption that they follow the pattern of the rest of the third person forms.
Participant marking prefixes in main verbs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSITIVE</th>
<th>O-</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTR</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participant marking prefixes with verbs of subordinate adverbial clauses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSITIVE</th>
<th>O-</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTR (3rd person)</td>
<td>O(marking S)-</td>
<td>e-</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTR (1st/2nd person)</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that this participant marking system in subordinate clauses is a split-ergative system, with the split based on a combination of two factors: the main vs. subordinate adverbial status of the clause; and the 1st/2nd vs. 3rd person status of the subject. In main clauses the participant marking prefixes operate on a nominative/accusative basis, distinguishing A/S from O. In subordinate clauses however, the participant marking prefixes operate on the basis of a split between first/second person and third person. First and second person subordinate prefixes operate on a nominative/accusative system (distinguishing O from A/S), and third person prefixes operate on an ergative/absolutive system, distinguishing A from O/S.

This is exactly the direction of split noted by Silverstein (1976) (see also Dixon (1994: 84)), who suggests that if there is a split in a marking systems based on the nature of different types of NPs, 1st and 2nd person pronouns are more likely to be marked by a nominative/accusative system than 3rd person pronouns, which in turn are more likely to be marked by an ergative/absolutive system. Silverstein’s (and Dixon’s) discussion is actually about case-marking systems, but presumably the same principles hold for pronominal prefixing systems.

Dixon also makes certain predictions about the direction of split in the main vs. subordinate parameter. However it is more difficult to tell if Lavukaleve follows the kinds of typological generalisations made by Dixon or not. He points out that in languages with a split based on main vs. subordinate clauses, which one is more likely to be marked with a nominative/accusative system and which with an ergative/absolutive system depends on the type of subordinate clause involved, and he does not discuss the semantic types which Lavukaleve’s adverbial subordinate clauses express. However one possibly relevant parallel is Tsimshian, which has a nominative/accusative system for main clauses and an ergative/absolutive system for subordinate clauses including examples like “‘His mother was glad when she saw him’” (Dixon 1994: 103). The direction of this split is the same as in Lavukaleve.
16.1.3 THE HABITUAL AUXILIARY ME

The Habitual Auxiliary me has a couple of idiosyncrasies in subordinate adverbial constructions. It was shown in Section 14.3 that the Habitual Auxiliary, in construction with a lexical verb, forms what is termed a verbal complex. The Habitual Auxiliary cross-references the subject, with its own special set of subject prefixes, and the verb, if transitive, carries the object prefix.

In subordinate adverbial clauses, me follows the split-ergative system that verbs follow. It carries the relevant adverbial suffix (for which, see below), and its prefixes follow the same pattern as a verb would in these subordinate adverbial clause types with normal verbs, except that all those forms which would be vowel-initial for regular verbs, here start with /l/. So in these clauses, the Habitual Auxiliary cross-references its logical 3rd person subject using prefixes from the object prefix paradigm, its 1st and 2nd person subject with prefixes from the subject paradigm, but all those vowel-initial prefixes begin with /l/ when they are used with the Habitual Auxiliary. In addition, the e- prefix occurs in the second prefix position, with all 3rd person forms.

12) kini vau laemege hano
    kini vau la- e- me -ge hano
    ACT go.out 3dumO- SBD- HAB -ANT then

lana le vea.
la- na le vea
3dumO- in day(n) emerge

...upon those two going out, then it was daylight for them.

13) Malav va sabo sia voemege
    Malav va sabo sia vo- e- me -ge
    people(pl) plArt clear.garden do 3plO- SBD- HAB -ANT

    ta taman taragau na ove lake emaham.
    ta taman taragau na o- ve lake e- ma -ham
    just but sea.eagle(m) sgmArt 3sgS- go fire(n) 3sgnO- take -PURP

The people clearing their gardens, then the sea eagle goes to take some fire.

14) Hano. Vala Rugi eu laemege eu
    Hano. Vala rugi e- u la- e- me -ge e- u
    then belly(n) big.sgn 3sgnO- eat 3sgmO- SBD- HAB -ANT 3sgnO- eat

    laemege eu
    la- e- me -ge e- u la- e- me -ge
    3dumO- SBD-HAB -ANT 3sgnO- eat 3sgmO- SBD-HAB -ANT

    kavukal enga va hano lov.
    kavu -kal enga va hano lo -v
    group -PL three plArt then finish -pl

Okay. Big Belly ate and ate and ate, until the three heaps of food were finished.
Examples (12) and (15) show that even though 3sgm object prefix a- and 1sg subject a- are formally identical, they act differently with respect to this participant marking. A subordinate adverbial verb with a 3rd person logical subject cross-referenced by the 3sgm object prefix also prefixes e- in the second position, but a subordinate adverbial verb with a 1st person singular logical subject cross-referenced by the 1sg subject prefix does not. Both have the initial /l/ as Habitual Auxiliary prefixes.

16.1.4 SERIAL VERB CONSTRUCTIONS IN SUBORDINATE CLAUSES

Participant marking patterns in simple predicates and in Habitual Auxiliary complexes have been described above. The other main type of complex predicate, serial verb constructions, can also occur in subordinate clauses. Participant marking patterns are as follows. The subordinate morphology occurs on the second verb of the construction. The subject is marked once, on the second verb, and the object is marked on every transitive verb present. These morphological principles are as outlined in Section 14.1. The only difference is that the split-ergative marking pattern, and subordinate e- prefix obtains, as always in subordinate adverbial constructions. This then is exactly the participant marking one would expect.

Intransitive - transitive subordinate serial verb construction:

17) **Feu** houla la okoroige, ta hano katelea

He went up and chopped a stick, then the crocodile ran down [seaward].

hr2 025
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Intransitive - intransitive subordinate serial verb construction:

18) Gaikoko na holou aefoage,
   gaikoko na holou a- e- foa -ge
   canoe(m) sgmArt sink 3sgmO- SBD- go.down -ANT

   voesongige ta kokovan hano lolo foam.
   vo- e- songi -ge ta kokovan hano loolo foa -m
   3plO- SBD- swim -ANT just hermit.crab(m) then straight go.down -sgm

   When the canoe sinks down, they swim, but the hermit crab goes straight down. s2 050

Transitive - intransitive subordinate serial verb construction:

19) Mema efeule eleila.
   me- ma e- feu -le e- le -ila
   2pl- take 1plex- go.up -POT 3sgnO- see -PCTIMP.du

   If we take you two up you must see it. ja 464

Transitive - transitive subordinate serial verb construction:

20) ama aokoge aerauge,
   a- ma a- o- ko -ge a- e- erau -ge
   3sgmO- take 3sgmO- 3sgS- throw -ANT 3sgmO- SBD- fall -ANT

   ... taking and throwing him, him falling,

   kini vatu ga ehaire.
   kini vatu ga e- hai -re
   ACT head(n) sgnArt 3sgnO- take.off -NF

   he cut off his head. kg2 037-038

Participant marking in other subordinate complex predicates, namely verb compounds and verb adjunct constructions, also presents no surprises; participant marking principles remain the same except that there is a split-ergative system, and there is an e-prefix in place of the subject prefix.

The next three sections describe the three types of subordinate adverbial clauses: Anterior clauses, Potential clauses and Surprise clauses.

16.1.5 ANTERIOR CLAUSES

Anterior clauses are adverbial clauses which can be translated into English as “On Ving, (Y happened)”. That is, this subordinate clause type provides a temporal starting-point for the action of the main clause. This clause structure is extremely common; it is one of the main ways (along with clause chaining constructions) of connecting events in a narrative. The verb of the subordinate clause is suffixed by -ge (glossed ANTERior), and the split-ergative marking pattern appears. The only other morphology available to an Anterior verb is the Causative suffix. The subordinate clause precedes the main clause. Some examples:
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21) Aka le eveage, motokavil
aka le e- e- vea -ge motoka -vil
then day(n) 3sgnO- SBD- emerge -ANT car -pl

ena hide kine mae emaham.
e- na hide kine ma- ae e- ma -ham
1pl.ex- in thus ACT 3p1S- go.up 1pl.ex- take -PURP

Then upon day coming, trucks came to us, to take us.

22) Aka e suni kine motokavil vona
aka e suni kine motoka -vil vo- na
then 1pl.ex all ACT car -PL 3p1O-in

eago, emere mafoa Honiara.
e- ao -ge e- ma -re ma- foa Honiara
1pl.ex-go.in -ANT 1pl.ex- take -NF 3p1S- go.down Honiara

Then us all getting into the trucks, taking us, they went down to Honiara.

23) Otigirire olurire,
o- tigiri -re o- luri -re
3sgfO- say -NF 3sgfO- sort.out -NF

hobea fi aerege,
hobea fi a- e- re -ge
3sgmFOC 3sgmO- SBD- say -ANT

kine foa Losiolen hoka foar amata.
kine foa Losiole n hoka foar a- ma- ta
ACT go.down Losiolen -LOC here.PROX clear.path 3sgmO- 3p1S- clear

They talked about it, straightened it, upon him saying okay, they went down to Losiolen here and cleared a passage.

24) Amalevalorige, hano, lai ga ooom ke.
a- ma- levalo-ri -ge hano lai ga oeo -m ke
3sgmO- 3p1S- wake-CAUS -ANT then rain(n) sgnArt go.all.around -sgm EMPH

Upon them waking him, then the rain soaked him.

25) Aosavurige hano malav va
a- o- savuri -ge hano malav va
3sgmO- 3sgS- cover -ANT then people(pl) plArt

ana sosokore.
a- na Dup- soko -re
3sgmO- in REDUP- laugh -NF

Upon it soaking him the people laughed at him.

This construction is often used as a discourse device to indicate that things went on in the same way for some time. For example, emege ‘it continued on, [then...]’ is extremely common at the start of sentences in texts. Note that agreement here is with a dummy 3sgn subject.
26) Emege,
1905 ana, ta'rai
e- e- me -ge 1905 a- na ta'rai
3sgnO- SBD- continue -ANT 1905(m)3sgmO- in prayer(n)
tail ga emavolori ke.
tail ga e- ma- volori ke
house(n) sgnArt 3sgnO- 3plS- make EMPH

[Things] continuing, in 1905, they built a church.

27) Leta emege
teta e- e- me -ge koi mina faitia -a feo koi.
but 3sgnO- SBD- continue-A NT also thing(f) be.difficult -sgf 3sgFOC also

But, [things] continuing, the thing was really hard.

An Anterior clause is also frequently used in a clause involving the conjunction olang 'because'. Olang appears clause-initially. The clause has a verb suffixed with -ge, and has a causal meaning. This clause type can be thought of as causally anterior to the main clause, rather than temporally anterior as in the kinds of Anterior clauses discussed above.

28) Ta hona mina ole lame ga,
ta hona mina o- le la- me -Ø ga
time(m) MOD.PROX.sgm thing(f) 3sgF0- see 1sg- HAB -sgn sgnArt
olang koi kiu otailaverav
olang koi kiu -i o- tail -verav
because also die -NOMZR 3sgPOS- house -pl
voesiage, mina hoiari me
vo- e- sia -ge mina hoia -ri me -Ø
3plO- SBD- do -ANT thing(f) MOD.MED.sgf-PSNV SPEC -sgn
ta hona omila fome.
ta hona o- mi -la fome
time(m) MOD.PROX.sgm 3sgF0- make -NEG 1pl.inFOC

Now, as I see it, because of there being hospitals, we don't do that way now.

29) Ta hoinariom
ana olang
ta hoina -ri -om a- na olang
time(m) MOD.MED.sgm -PSNV -m/n 3sgmO- in because
faus hamus ve esiage,
faus hamus ve e- e- sia -ge hano
low.tide(n) evening(n) go 3sgnO- SBD- do -ANT then
lafavil va kekeare lov.
lafa -vil va kekea -re lo -v
part -pl plArt dry -NF finish -pl

At that time, because of it being low tide that night, everywhere was dry.
### 16.1.6 Potential Clauses

Potential clauses with verbal suffix -le (glossed POTential) cover a number of related functions. They include hypothetical (what might be), counterfactual (what might have been), predictive, concessive conditional (even if), or hortative (let's) clauses. As well as if-clauses, they are also when-clauses; that is, temporal adverbial clauses (using the terminology of Thompson and Longacre 1985: 193). These different meanings are apparent from the context in which the clauses are uttered.

The Potential marker -le is a suffix added to a verb stem, forming an adverbial clause, and it requires the special subordinate subject-marking system on the verb to which it is attached, as described above. The only other morphology available to a Potential verb is the Causative suffix. Potential clauses precede their main clause. Examples of each of the related functions of this type of adverbial clause follow:

#### Hypothetical:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>31)</th>
<th>Aka</th>
<th>daine</th>
<th>kini</th>
<th>aefeule,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aka</td>
<td>raine</td>
<td>kini</td>
<td>a-</td>
<td>efeu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>then</td>
<td>tomorrow</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>3sgmO-</td>
<td>SBD-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go.up</td>
<td>-POT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>31)</th>
<th>foiga</th>
<th>anelaire.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>foiga</td>
<td>a-</td>
<td>ne-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN.MED.sgn</td>
<td>3sgmO-</td>
<td>2sgS-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tell</td>
<td>-FUT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Then tomorrow if he comes, okay, you should tell him.*  

---
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Counterfactual:

32) Aka kini tataveuarea la oesiale,
aka kini tataveua -re -a la o- e- sia -le
then ACT be.missing -NF -sgf sgfArt 3sgfO-SBD- do -POT
ovea mame.
o- vea ma- me
3sgfO- know 3plS- HAB

If [anything] was missing, they would have known it (but it never was).

Concessive conditional:

33) kini koa ga ekelei siala
kini koa ga e- kelei sia -la
ACT door(n) sgnArt 3sgnO- near do -EXT
ngomele fi koa ga oalare.
ngo- me -le fi koa ga o- ala -re
2sg- HAB -POT 3sgnFOC door(n) sgnArt 3sgS- open -FUT

...even if you were not close to the door yet, the door would open².

Predictive:

34) Ngolevalale fi, kini ngoaere.
ngo- le- vala -le fi kini ngo- ae -re
2sg- 1duex- pull -POT 3sgnFOC ACT 2sg- go.up -FUT

If we two pull you, then you will come up.

Hortative clauses are slightly unusual in Lavukaleve; there is a fixed form oile `3sgfO-3sgS- do-POT’ ‘let’s do it’, which is different from normal Potential clauses in that the 3sg feminine prefix is fixed; no other person/number/gender prefix form can occur in this slot. The verb i is ambitransitive, but the fact that there is no e- prefix in this form suggests that this is a transitive use of i, and thus that the subject prefix is o-, the 3rd singular subject prefix. This appears to be a fixed idiomatic expression in the language, literally meaning something like ‘if it does it’:

35) "Oile mina ro omemi."
o- o- i -le mina ro o- me- mi
3sgfO- 3sgS- do -POT thing(f) one.sg 3sgfO- 1pl.in- make

"Hey, let’s do something."

Because the form of this expression is fixed, and because the verb cannot take any NP arguments, this expression is considered not a clause but a particle-like adjunct to a main clause.

If-clauses and when-clauses are formally identical. The following sentence is ambiguous, as indeed it would be in many languages:

² This example is anomalous in having verbal morphology (in the form of Extended -la) on the verb of a Habitual Auxiliary verbal complex siala ngomele. This is the only such example in the corpus.
36) **Okove**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ena</th>
<th>feu</th>
<th>oakoroile</th>
<th>vau</th>
<th>oeraure.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e-</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>o-</td>
<td>a-</td>
<td>koroi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kovelofin</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>roge</td>
<td>o-</td>
<td>erau-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sgf0-</td>
<td></td>
<td>3sgnFOC</td>
<td>3sgnFOC</td>
<td>one.sgn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having found it (a particular type of tree), one day I go up and if/when I chop it, it falls down.

The following is an example of both an if-clause and a when-clause, showing their identical form:

37) **Merele**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>me-</th>
<th>re</th>
<th>-le iire</th>
<th>a-</th>
<th>e-</th>
<th>-le foiga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2pl-</td>
<td>say</td>
<td>-POT yes</td>
<td>3sgmO-</td>
<td>SBD-</td>
<td>say-POT PN.MED.sgn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When you say [this], then if he says "Yes", okay.

16.1.7 **SURPRISE CLAUSES**

The verbal suffix **-meon** SURPrise is extremely rare. It occurs on verbs of subordinate adverbial clauses, so it utilises the special subordinate participant marking system, as Potential and Anterior subordinate verbs do. No other morphology, apart from these participant marking morphemes, occurs on verbs suffixed with **-meon** (although it is likely that the Causative suffix is possible).

The suffix has a meaning related to expressing a surprising and exciting event, and is often used at the crux of a story. The suffixed verb itself does not indicate the surprise, but rather, it indicates a lead-up to the surprising event in the following clause. It tells the hearer that something surprising is about to happen. It is something like the function of the English phrase ‘would you believe it’. So the first example below could be more freely translated as something like ‘He threw the knife, and would you believe it, it split his mouth in two!’:

38) **Uia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>uia</th>
<th>la</th>
<th>ookomeon,</th>
<th>ta</th>
<th>hokari</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>knife(f)</td>
<td>sgfArt</td>
<td>3sgfO-</td>
<td>3sgS-</td>
<td>-meon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atourire</td>
<td>o-</td>
<td>-re</td>
<td>o-</td>
<td>leu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sgmO-</td>
<td>split</td>
<td>-NF</td>
<td>3sgPOSS-</td>
<td>mouth(n)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He threw the knife, and it split his mouth in two.
39) **Aehurumeon huru safelen ka**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a-</th>
<th>-e-</th>
<th>huru</th>
<th>-meon</th>
<th>huru</th>
<th>safe</th>
<th>-n</th>
<th>ka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3sgmO-</td>
<td>SBD-</td>
<td>go.inside</td>
<td>-SURP</td>
<td>go.inside</td>
<td>shelf</td>
<td>-LOC</td>
<td>LOCEMPH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**aekakomeon**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a-</th>
<th>-e-</th>
<th>kako</th>
<th>-meon</th>
<th>ta</th>
<th>tagio</th>
<th>ru</th>
<th>feo.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3sgmO-</td>
<td>SBD-</td>
<td>look.out</td>
<td>-SURP</td>
<td>just</td>
<td>snake(f)</td>
<td>big.sgf</td>
<td>3sgfFOC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*He went inside to the shelf, and looked around, and there was a big snake.*  
*cp 098*

40) **Kini hau laerauge, aevaumeon ta vovo**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>kini</th>
<th>hau</th>
<th>la-</th>
<th>e-</th>
<th>erau</th>
<th>-ge</th>
<th>a-</th>
<th>e-</th>
<th>vau</th>
<th>-meon</th>
<th>ta</th>
<th>vovo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>go.ashore</td>
<td>3dumO-</td>
<td>SBD-</td>
<td>fall</td>
<td>-ANT</td>
<td>3sgmO-</td>
<td>SBD-</td>
<td>go.out</td>
<td>-SURP</td>
<td>just</td>
<td>girl(f)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Just as the two came ashore, he sees the girl.*  
*co 146*

41) **Aelaveare oful ga eokomeon**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>aelaveare</th>
<th>-re</th>
<th>oful</th>
<th>ga</th>
<th>e-</th>
<th>o-</th>
<th>ko</th>
<th>-meon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>go.up</td>
<td>appear</td>
<td>-NF</td>
<td>3sg POSS</td>
<td>tail(n)</td>
<td>sgnArt</td>
<td>3sgnO-</td>
<td>3sgS-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ta aka mola lelagel gala kiu -gel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ta</th>
<th>aka</th>
<th>mola</th>
<th>lelagel</th>
<th>gala</th>
<th>kiu</th>
<th>-gel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>just then</td>
<td>canoe(n)</td>
<td>two.n</td>
<td>du.nArt</td>
<td>die</td>
<td>-du.n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*She comes up, then she thrashes her tail, and two canoes are wrecked [lit. die].*  
*ja 074*

In accordance with its meaning of setting up for a surprising event, the **-meon** verb is almost invariably followed by the particle **ta** or **taman** which, broadly speaking, means ‘just’, ‘but’ and so on. The combination means something like ‘just as X was happening, then Y!’.

### 16.2 Purposive Clauses

Purposive subordinate clauses are marked by the verbal suffix **-ham**. They differ from adverbial subordinate clauses in that they do not receive the split-ergative participant marking system. Instead they mark their participants in the same way as independent clauses, but using only subject and object prefixes, not the Agreement Suffix, which is incompatible with the Purposive verbal suffix. Note, however, that subject prefixes are rare with Purposive verbs.

A transitive verb suffixed by **-ham** must however take an object prefix, as all transitive verbs in Lavukaleve must be cross-referenced for their object. The subject of the Purposive verb is almost always the same as the subject of the main verb. There is only one example of a Purposive clause with a different subject to the main clause.

The Purposive suffix **-ham** expresses the aim or purpose of an action. Bybee et al. (1994: 179) refer to this as “intention”, an agent-oriented modality.
Purposive subordinate clauses usually belong in their own intonation unit, within the sentential intonation unit. The Purposive clause usually precedes its main clause, but not always. When the Purposive clause follows, it is always as an afterthought to the main clause, separated from the main clause by a pause. This is shown in examples (45) to (47) (pauses on level pitch are indicated in this set of examples by slashes).

42) Aka avalaham / hide / lake fi koi /
aku a- vala -ham / hide / lake fi koi /
then 3sgmO- pull -PURP / thus / road(n) 3sgnFOC also /
atare hi.
a- ta -re -Ø hi
1sgS- clear -FUT -sgn 3sgnEFOC

So to pull it in this way, I make a path.

43) Kini eraure / mi fo'foira oiham
kini erau -re / mi fo'foira o- i -ham
ACT fall -NF / um work(f) 3sgfO- do -PURP

mavo ke.
ma- vo ke
3plS- come EMPH

[The Company] arrived, and they came to work.

44) Kiuham hide fi / avo.
kiu -ham hide fi / a- vo
die -PURP thus 3sgnFOC / 1sgS- come

I have come like this to die.

45) Elole fl koi, akomorire /
e- e- lo -le fi koi a- komori -re /
3sgnO- SBD- finish -POT 3sgnFOC also 3sgmO- turn.upsidedown -FUT /

okatel amaham.
o- katel a- ma -ham
3sgPOSS- keel(m) 3sgmO- take -PURP

Having finished that too, I will turn it upside down - to make the keel.

46) Hano taragau na ove koi / kiv
hano taragau na o- ve koi / ki -v
then sea.eagle(m) sgmArt 3sgS- go also / clothes -pl

vomaham.
vo- ma -ham
3plO- take -PURP

So the sea eagle went again - to take the clothes.

47) Makalem na hano vem. Siriaham.
ma- kalem na hano ve -m sira -ham
3plPOSS- father(m) sgmArt then go -sgm catch.fish -PURP

Their father [the giant] had gone. To catch fish.
There is one example in the corpus of a different-subject Purposive clause. In this example, the subject of the Purposive clause is coreferential with the object of the independent clause:

48) Felere aka ngoanun ngoanun tonga leleta ena
   fele -re aka ngoa -nun ngoa -nun tonga leleta -v e- na
   return -NF then stay -DUR stay -DUR chance(n) second -sgn 3sgnO- in

feleham hide koi leolai.
fele -ham hide koi le- o- lai
return -PURP thus also 1duex- 3sgS- tell

We came back and stayed and stayed then he told us again to go back for a second time. mt 033

This is a problematic example because it involves a verb of speech, which are often anomalous in the world’s languages. With this verb lai ‘tell’ the message told is usually expressed as direct speech functioning syntactically as a paratactic adjunct to the lai clause (see Section 9.3.2).

There is a postposition ham, an independent word meaning ‘for’ in a benefactive sense which is formally identical to the Purposive suffix (see Section 7.1 for examples). Presumably there is a historical relationship between these two semantically close morphemes ham ‘for’ and -ham Purposive.

16.3 RELATIVE CLAUSES

Relative clauses are clauses which modify an NP, the head. All relative clauses in Lavukaleve are restrictive; that is, they function to restrict the reference of the head from any number of possible referents to only those described in the relative clause.

Lavukaleve’s relative clauses are internal relative clauses. Keenan (1985: 163) notes that internal relative clauses are ill-attested in the languages of the world, but that all the languages in which they are known to occur have a basic constituent order of SOV. Lavukaleve certainly fits this generalisation.

In internal relative clauses the head noun, that is, the noun referring to the common argument shared by the main clause and the relative clause, functions syntactically as part of the relative clause, not as part of the main clause. In Lavukaleve, as in many languages with internal relativisation (Keenan 1985: 163), there is no overt marker of relativisation.

As there is no overt marker of relativisation, the only feature by which relative clauses can be recognised in Lavukaleve is that they consist of a clause inside an NP. Consider the following examples:
In the first example, the whole relative clause consists of meham sevo osum ‘a promise he made to us’. The head noun sevo occurs after the postpositional phrase and before the relative verb. The relative clause functions as a noun, and is followed by the definite article. The NP thus formed functions as the object of the main verb olugurem ‘he will respect it’.

In the second example, the italicised relative clause ali ngafo’sal aum ‘the man who ate my fish’ is followed by the definite article, and functions as the object of the main clause. This NP is the argument shared by the main clause and the relative clause.

Structurally, such examples follow the structure of NPs in Lavukaleve: there is a head noun, followed by a modifier marked with the Agreement Suffix, followed by a definite article. Relative clauses appear in the position in which adjectives appear in NPs in Lavukaleve; and note also that both relative clauses and adjectives show agreement with their head noun using the Agreement Suffix.

The predicates of relative clauses are always marked with the Agreement Suffix. The agreement suffix agrees with the head, which helps to show which argument is the head of the relative clause.

The head may be ellipsed. It is always retrievable, and in any case it is cross-referenced on the relative predicate and the definite article, and often also on the main predicate.

The following example shows a relative clause with an ellipsed head:

If anything went missing, they would have known it.
present, is presumably *mina* ‘thing’, which is feminine, and thus controls the feminine agreement.

The head is usually a noun, but it can be a demonstrative pronoun from the *oia* paradigm (see Section 8.7). It cannot be any other type of pronoun or demonstrative. Example (56) below shows a relative clause with the *oia* demonstrative pronoun as head.

The head of the relative clause may have any syntactic role in the relative clause, and also may be in any syntactic role with respect to its function in the main clause, although it is questionable whether it is possible to relativise on possessors (see below). That is, the head can function as S, A, O, or postpositional object in either clause.

The predicate of a relative clause must be suffixed with the Agreement Suffix, but otherwise has the full range of morphological possibilities of any predicate suffixed with the Agreement Suffix (see Chapter 10 for a discussion of the functions and morpho-syntax of the Agreement Suffix). It may also be a complex predicate; examples (56) and (60) contain respectively a verbal complex with the Habitual Auxiliary and a serial verb construction as predicates of relative clauses. Examples (62) and (63) are interesting in that the relative clauses each contain two predicates, one an independent Imperfective-marked verb, followed by another independent verb marked with the Agreement Suffix. In fact relative clauses can consist of strings of independent clauses like these, or indeed complex structures with subordinate clauses, or clause chains as in the example below:

(56) *Mina nikol ona va'var hai elikire*  
= *thing first in talking do want*  
= "The first thing 1 want to talk about, is mother's work. [lit: in the first thing I am wanting to talk about, [it's] mother's work]"  

In the above example, the relative clause consists of a clause chaining construction (see Chapter 15). The clause *elikire* ‘wanting it’ has a nominalised object *va'var hai* ‘to talk’, which is a coordinate-dependent clause in a clause chain, of which the independent predicate is *alei* ‘I am’. In complex relative clause structures like this, the principle is that the complex structure appears as it would elsewhere, but, in addition to whatever other participant marking is called for by the construction (see Section 9.7), the final verb of the clause receives the Agreement Suffix cross-referencing the head.

The main clause contains any elements which any main clause would normally contain.

Thus, there are two main features that distinguish relative clauses from other
construction types in Lavukaleve. Firstly, the relative clause appears inside an NP. Secondly, the predicate of the relative clause always has the Agreement Suffix; and it can be followed immediately by the definite article. In all other construction types, if a predicate is followed by the definite article, the predicate must appear with the Nominaliser suffix (described in Section 13.1); only in relative clauses can a non-nominalised predicate be followed immediately by the definite article. Note that the definite article is not an obligatory part of the relative clause construction; it belongs to the NP which is an argument of the verb of the relative clause. The definite article is in its normal function as in any NP (see Section 4.1.2 for a discussion of the definite article).

However if there was no definite article, there would be no means of recognising a relative clause structurally as any different from an independent clause followed by another independent clause. Consider the following example:

53) **Bongihehev vone, malav mima evealav,***
   
   heathens(pl) 3plO- with people(pl) way.of.life(n) 3sgnO- know -NEG -pl

   **vone fi, kini fo’foira oine angoa.***
   
   3plO- with 3sgnFOC ACT work(f) 3sgfO- do -IMPF 1sgS- stay

   *I stayed doing work with heathens, with people who do not know the church. [lit: with people who didn’t know the church I stayed doing work]*

In this example, the italicised part, **malav mima evealav**, could be seen as functionally a relative clause, with shared argument **malav** functioning as subject of the relative clause and postpositional object of the main clause. However there is no syntactic evidence that it is a relative clause: the sentence could translate as ‘with the heathens, the people who don’t know the church, with them, I stayed working’; thus, as a string of independent clauses. The only structures recognised in this description as syntactically relative clauses are those which do involve a definite article immediately following a verb.

Note that it is perhaps possible to analyse these structures as independent clauses, with the definite article functioning not as a definite article but rather as a kind of resumptive determiner; thus, example (50) could be paraphrased as ‘the man ate my fish: him, I saw’. However there are a few arguments against this analysis. Firstly, resumptive pronouns do occur in Lavukaleve, but they are demonstrative pronouns from the foia paradigm (see Section 8.4). This is only a minor problem. Secondly, and more importantly, it is never possible to put a definite article anywhere after the head noun, apart from directly after the relative verb, which is at the end of the NP under the analysis presented here. It is certainly not possible to add another definite article after the head noun, for example (again using 50):
This suggests that the definite article is indeed functioning in its normal definite article function, rather than as a resumptive determiner. This in turn suggests that the analysis here, that these structures are indeed relative clauses, is correct.

It was stated above that the head of the relative clause, that is, the argument shared between the relative clause and the main clause, can be in any grammatical function with respect to both the main clause and the relative clause, including any combination of S, A, O or postpositional object. It is generally not, however, possible to relativise on possessors. As a matter of fact, there is one example in the corpus of a relative clause with a possessor as head. The example is:

55) Hogariom ena fela’koe enuvev / va.
    hoga -ri -om e- na fela’koe e- nuve-v / va
    MOD.PROX.sgn -PSNV-m/n 3sgnO- in village(n) 3sgnO- own -pl / plArt
    Malosiv voluae eham ta mavere / hamusin.
    ma- losiv -v vo- lua e- -ham ta ma- ve-re / hamus -n
    3plPOSS- basket -pl 3plO- steal -NOMZR 3sgnO-for just 3plS-go-FUT / evening -LOC

At this [time], they will go in the evening to steal the food baskets of [the people] who own the village.

The head is ‘they (the owners of the village and baskets)’, which is ellipsed, expressed only in the Possessive prefix on losiv ‘their baskets’.

However the example is problematic for two reasons. Most importantly, as the punctuation shows, the relative clause is in its own intonation unit, followed by a sentence-final drop in pitch (indicated by the full stop). The intonation is hesitant (slashes indicate pauses on level pitch), suggesting that the sentence is perhaps not a complete or fluent example. Secondly, this is the only example of relativising on a possessor. If this is a possibility in Lavukaleve, it is a possibility rarely utilised by speakers. The area needs to be thoroughly checked with Lavukaleve speakers before any conclusions can be drawn.

The following examples show all possible combinations of the syntactic roles of shared arguments. Unlike the above construction, these relative clauses are quite frequent and well-attested as an important part of Lavukaleve grammar.

S (main clause) - A (relative clause) (note this example, as some others below, contains a focus construction; for the purposes of the relative clause, this is immaterial):
16 - Subordinate Clauses

56) Oina nato okoroi mem na fin
oina nato o- kroroi me -m na fin
other.MED.sgm sago.palm(f) 3sgfO- chop HAB -sgm sgmArt 3sgmFOC

felere soire vem hin.
fele -re soi -re ve -m hin
return -NF run.away -NF go -sgm 3sgmEFOC

The boy who chopped the tree runs away.

S (main clause) - O (relative clause)

57) Foe otutuk alufu ga lake
foe o- tutuku a- lufu -ø ga lake
pig(m) 3sgPOSS- middle.of.body(n) 1sgS- leave -sgn sgnArt road(n)
sil heaka fi esavurire ealufu.
si -I heaka fi e- savuri -re e- a- lufu
cover -LOCZR there.DIST1 3sgnFOC 3sgnO- cover -NF 3sgnO- 1sgS- leave

The half of the pig that I left is over there in the middle of the road; I covered it and left it.

S (main clause) - S (relative clause)

58) Ngamio hoka voa la vasia?
nga- mio hoka vo-a la vasia -a
1sgPOSS- special.thing(f) here.PROX come -sgf sgfArt be.where -sgf

Where is my thing (arrow) that came there?

S (main clause) - Postpositional object (relative clause)

59) Nikol lafa ona fofoira
nikol lafa o- na fofoira
first part(f) 3sgfO- in work(f)
oaia la feo Honiara taon.
o- a- i -a la feo Honiara taon
3sgfO- 1sgS- do -sgf sgfArt 3sgfFOC Honiara town(f)

The first place I did work in was Honiara town.

A (main clause) - A (relative clause)

60) "Vau olufule foiga, ami hin
vau o- o- lufu -le foiga ami hin
go.out 3sgfO- 3sgS- leave -POT PN.MED.sgn who(m) 3sgmEFOC
vau olerem na sulum
vau o- le -re -m na sulum
go.out 3sgfO- see -FUT -sgm sgmArt chief(m)
oovoo ohaire".
o- vovo o- hai -re
3sgPOSS- daughter(f) 3sgfO- do -FUT

"If he goes out and leave it, and who[ever] finds it, will marry the chief's daughter."
A (main clause) - O (relative clause):

61) *Foe akulam* na ngatail
foe a- kula -m na ngat- tail
pig(m) 1sgS- run.after -sgm sgmArt 1sgPOSS-house(n)

*ota'vul* ahari ta o-
o- ta'vul a- hari ta o- i
3sgPOSS- house.post(m) 3sgmO- break just 3sgS- do

*The pig that I chased broke my house post.*

---

A (main clause) - S (relative clause):

62) *Ali lakone ngoam* na
ali lako -ne ngoa -m na
man(m) cry -IMPF stay -sgm sgmArt

*ane mem akuru* ta o-
a- ne me -m a- kuru ta o- i
3sgmO- with SPEC-sgm 3sgmO- hit just 3sgS- do

*The man who was crying had killed his brother.*

---

A (main clause) - Postpositional object (relative clause):

63) *Ali ana sosokone angoam* na
ali a- na Dup- soko -ne a- ngoa -m na
man(m) 3sgmO- in REDUP- laugh -IMPF 1sgS- stay -sgm sgmArt

*ofoe na olufum.*
o- foe na o- lufu -m
3sgPOSS- pig(m) sgmArt 3sgS- leave -sgm

*The man who I laughed at had lost his pig.*

---

O (main clause) - A (relative clause):

64) *Ami ngagaikoko asikarirem* na
ami nga- gaikoko a- sikari -re -m na
who(m) 1sgPOSS- canoe(m) 3sgmO- destroy -NF -sgm sgmArt

*akururem fin.*
a- kuru -re -m fin
1sgS- hit -FUT -sgm 3sgmFOC

*I will kill whoever might break my canoe.*

---

O (main clause) - O (relative clause)

65) *Foiga.* Alesive *min* na
foiga a- le- sive mina
PN.MED.sgn 3sgmO- 1due- follow thing(f)

*otigiria* la olesive.
o- tigiri -a la o- le- sive
3sgS- say -sgf sgfArt 3sgfO- 1due- follow

*Okay, We follow him, we follow what he said.*
O (main clause) - S (relative clause)

66) Mina tutula tapalav mamina
mina Dup- tula -a tapalav ma- mina
thing(f) REDUP- small -sgf white.people(pl) 3plPOSS- thing(f)

hau ta la omare.
hau ta -a la o- ma -re
go.ashore arrive -sgf sgfArt 3sgfO- take -FUT

They will take every little thing belonging to the white men that had come ashore.

O (main clause) - Postpositional object (relative clause)

67) lire. Hano meo maveko ho namu
iire hano meo ma- beko ho namu
yes then tuna(pl) 3plPOSS- stone(f) MOD.PROX sgf place(n)
enanunovogaenalavfome.
e- na nun o- -o ga e- vea -la -v fome
3sgnO- in from 3sgS- come -sgn sgnArt 3sgnO- know -NEG -pl 1pl.inFOC

Yes. We didn't know the place where this stone tuna came from.

Postpositional object (main clause) - A (relative clause)

68) Aira one va'var haine angoa la
aira one va'var hai -ne a- angoa -a la
woman(f) 3sgfO- with talking do -IMPF 1sgS- stay -sgf sgfArt
nganemem fin ohaim hin.
nga- neme -m fin o- hai -m hin
1sgO- sibling -sgm 3sgmFOC 3sgS-do -sgm 3sgmEFOC

The girl who I talked to married my brother.

Postpositional object (main clause) - O (relative clause)

69) Irure, le ga eveage,
iru -re le ga e- e- vea -ge
sleep -NF day(n) sgnArt 3sgnO- SBD- emerge -ANT
tail loliki ga ena fain fi malei.
tail lo- liki -o ga e- na fain fi ma- lei
house(n) 3duS- want -sgn sgnArt 3sgnO- in inside 3sgnFOC 3plS- exist

They sleep, then, day coming, they are all in the house the two wanted.

Postpositional object (main clause) - S (relative clause)

70) Fela'koen man man sia mem
fela'koen -n man man sia me -m
village -LOC what(m) what(m) do HAB -sgm sgArt
ana koi vone sangine fofoirana
a- na koi vo- ne sangine fo'foira
3sgmO- in also 3plO- with together work(f)
oine angoa.
o- i -ne a- ngoa
3sgfO- do -IMPF 1sgS- stay

Anything that happened in the village, I involved myself in.
Postpositional object (main clause) - Postpositional object (relative clause)

71)  

feunun  | lafa  | ona  | foe  | na  | ali  | na  
feu     | -nun  | lafa | o-   | na  | foe  | na  | ali  | na  
got.up  | -DUR  | part(f) | 3sgfO- | in | pig(m) | sgmArt | man(m) | sgmArt 

aosea   | la    | onam | siare.  
3sgmO-  | 3sgS- | gut  | -sgf | sgmArt | 3sgfO- | to | do | -NF  

...they went up to the place where the man had gutted the pig.

This last example is particularly interesting in that the predicate of the relative clause, a-o-sea-a, is indexed for three participants: object and subject are indexed by prefixes; and the head of the relative clause, a postpositional object, is indexed with the Agreement Suffix. This is one of the few constructions in which a predicate can be cross-referenced for three arguments.

In other construction types, the Agreement Suffix only indexes subjects or objects. In relative clauses, however, it always indexes the head, and as the head may be in the syntactic roles of subject, object or postpositional object, the Agreement Suffix in relative clauses may in fact index arguments in the syntactic role of object of postposition. The functions of the Agreement Suffix are discussed in detail in Chapter 10.
CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

Questions and negation

This chapter takes as its starting point the semantic fields of questions and negation and looks at the kinds of constructions used to express them. The expression of questions and negation in Lavukaleve involves some use of focus constructions, as well as other syntactic strategies not involving morphologically-marked focus.

Questions are expressed in one of two main ways: either by using a specific question-word, or by just using a focus construction. Even those clauses using specific question words are frequently expressed using focus constructions.

There are various ways to negate different kinds of constituents: including the Negative verbal suffix -la, the particle tamu 'no'; the intransitive verb tave 'be not'; the negative imperative expressed by the Admonitive suffix; and other negative lexical items. Frequently, negative predications are expressed using a focus construction. The use of focus constructions in the areas of questions and negation is a very characteristic feature of Lavukaleve, and indeed of other languages which have grammaticalised focus structures.

The first part of this chapter discusses the syntactic structures used to express questions, and also all the interrogative lexical items in the language. It also discusses how positive and negative polar questions are answered. The second part of the chapter presents a discussion of all aspects of negation, including the role of the focus markers in negative clauses. The morphological, syntactic and pragmatic features of focus constructions are discussed in Chapter 11.

17.1 Questions

In Lavukaleve, questions are very often phrased using a focus construction. There are
also a number of question words which may be used, either in a focus construction or not. All questions are marked, not only by syntactic and lexical means, but also by a distinctive rising intonation. Questions can be divided into two functional and syntactic types: polar questions and content questions.

As was shown in Section 11.7, there are three focus markers in Lavukaleve: feo, the default focus marker; meo, the focus marker used in polar questions; and heo, the focus marker used, among other things, in content questions. See the above-mentioned chapter for a full discussion of the focus markers and their syntactic and semantic functions.

The sole use of the meo focus marker, then, is in marking focus in polar questions. Content questions usually use a question word, usually with a focus marker. If the focus marker is present, it is heo, and it agrees with the questioned item. The following sections discuss in turn polar questions and then content questions.

17.1.1 POLAR QUESTIONS

Polar questions are framed using a focus construction involving the meo focus marker, with the focus marker agreeing with the questioned element. Since questioned elements are focussed, by definition, one would expect questions to be expressed using morpho-syntactically marked focus in a language in which this is available, and this is indeed what happens in Lavukaleve. Some examples (there are many more in Section 11.7):

**Questioning an NP:**

1) Vo'vou honalari  minal? 
vou vo -ri honala -ri minala 
bou PROC.dum PROX.dum MOD.PROX.dum 3dumQFOC 3dumQFOC

*Is it these two boys?*

**Questioning an adjunct:**

2) Hokariom mi ngoae elikire melei? 
here.PROX mi ngoa e liki re me lei 3sgO- stay -NOMZR 3sgO- want -NF 2pl exist

*Is it here you want to stay?*

**Questioning a single-verb clause:**

3) "Tuna mi?"
	 hide aerege.
tuna -ø mi hide a e re -ge
be.really -sgn 3sgQFOC thus 3sgmO- SBD- say -ANT

"Is it really true?" he said.

**Questioning a larger clause:**
Example (4) shows that the meo focus marker can be used with a negative clause. Section 17.1.2 explains how the answers to these and other questions are phrased.

Note that the focus marker does not move to the initial position in questions; rather, it remains in the position in which it would be if the sentence were not a question. There are a couple of examples in which the focus marker appears in initial position. For instance:

5) Mínu ngakala ona neano aem na
   min nga- kala o- na neano ae -m na
   2sgQFOC 1sgPOSS mother(f) 3sgfO- in disparagement(m) go.up -sgm sgmA rt
   hin oigure olufure vem na hin?
   hin o- igu -re o- lufu -re ve -m na hin
   3sgmEFOC 3sgfO- take.out -NF 3sgfO-leave -NF go -sgmsgmA rt 3sgmEFOC

Was it you (m) who was cruel to my mother, putting her there and leaving her and going?

This is not an example of movement of the focus marker, as there is no other place in the sentence where the focus marker would be expected to be. Rather, it is an example of ellipsis of the argument with which the focus marker is in construction; inu 'you (2sg)'. This, and another sentence structurally almost identical to it from the same story, is the only example of such ellipsis in the corpus. It is not clear whether the possibility is to do with the fact that the sentence is a question.

Incidentally, this is also one of the rare examples of a focus-echo construction using the meo focus marker. Note that the second (and third, in fact) focus markers agree in gender and number but not person with the first. See Section 11.5.1 for an explanation of focus-echo constructions.

17.1.2 Answers to Polar Questions

Polar questions can be phrased both positively and negatively, as the examples above have shown. Positive answers to positive polar questions are expressed by íire 'yes'. Negative answers to positive questions are expressed by tamu 'no'. The particle comes first, in its own sentence intonation unit, then a longer sentential answer may follow. For example the answer to the question in (2) Is it here you want to stay? is as follows:
Questions phrased positively are neutral as to whether they expect a positive or negative answer. However questions phrased negatively expect a positive answer. For example the question in (4) above *The giant here didn’t eat you?* was asked when a boy reappeared in his village after a long absence. The village people had assumed he had been eaten by the giant, but seeing him they realised he must not have been, and thus asked the question knowing that it would receive a positive answer: the giant had not eaten him. The boy’s answer is as follows:

"No. He didn’t eat me."

As the example shows, positive answers to negative questions are expressed with the negative particle. There are no examples in the corpus of negative answers to negative questions; that is, answers which contradict the speaker’s anticipation of a positive answer. It is unclear whether these are possible or not, and, if possible, how they would be phrased.

**17.1.3 CONTENT QUESTIONS USING THE HEO FOCUS MARKER**

Content questions are those which expect a content word or words as an answer. It was shown in Section 11.7 that if a content question employs a focus construction, the focus marker used will be the *heo* focus marker. The *heo* focus marker in questions works as in focus constructions, but the element it is questioning is the element it expresses focus on, using the agreement system outlined in Chapter 11.

**Argument focus (questioning a coordinate-dependent clause):**

8) "**E**ta  
 *kali!*  
 *Vala*  
 *siare*  
 *hi*  
 *ngatum*  
 *na*  
 **eta**  
 **kali**  
 **vala**  
 **sia**  
 **-re**  
 **hi**  
 **nga**  
 **tum**  
 **na**  
 *Wow! my.goodness! how do -NF 3sgnEFOC 1sgPOS- husband(m) sgmArt*  
 *vola*  
 *tuna*  
 *olei?*"  
 *vo*  
 *la*  
 *tuna*  
 *o-*  
 *lei*  
 *come*  
 *NEG really*  
 *3sgS- exist*  

"Hey! Why isn’t my husband coming?"

**Predicate focus (questioning a predicate):**

9) **mina**  
 **mamirea**  
 **heo.**  
 **mina**  
 ma-  
 **mi**  
 re  
 a  
 **heo**  
 **thing(f) 3plS- make -FUT -sgf**  
 **3sgfEFOC**  

... what will they do?

"Heo"
Sentence focus (questioning a sentence):

10) "Salá! Amí ta ui ga eum hin?"

Sala! who(m) just food(n) 3sgmO-eat 3sgmEFOC
Hey! who(m) just food(n) sgnArt 3sgmO-eat -sgm 3sgmEFOC

"Hey! Just who ate our food?"

Example (11) below shows a focus-echo construction using heo as both the first and the second focus markers. These constructions are discussed in Section 11.5.1.

17.1.4 CONTENT QUESTIONS USING INTERROGATIVE LEXICAL ITEMS

Content questions are often phrased in focus constructions using specific interrogative lexical items. These interrogative words belong to various word classes, and thus have different syntactic properties. The full list is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORD</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>WORD CLASS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ami</td>
<td>'who?'</td>
<td>noun (masculine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man</td>
<td>'what?'</td>
<td>noun (masculine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elahave</td>
<td>'how much?'</td>
<td>noun (masculine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elav</td>
<td>'how many?'</td>
<td>noun (plural)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vasia</td>
<td>'be where?'</td>
<td>intransitive verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roi-doí</td>
<td>'which?'</td>
<td>own word class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vala-valai</td>
<td>'how?'</td>
<td>particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ninam</td>
<td>'when?'</td>
<td>particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ria-día</td>
<td>'where?'</td>
<td>particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>riahí-díahi</td>
<td>'where to?'</td>
<td>particle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Content questions generally appear as the first word of the clause, although they can appear elsewhere in the clause. In particular the intransitive verb vasia 'be where' frequently appears clause-finally, as other verbs do. The following sections exemplify each of these question words.

WHO, WHAT AND HOW MUCH

The question words ami 'who', man 'what' and elahave 'how much' are all masculine nouns. They function as the heads of NP, and as arguments of verbs, and take masculine agreement. They cannot however be modified.

11) "Amí hin leim hin?"

Amí who(m) 3sgmEFOC exist -sgm 3sgmEFOC
Who(m) 3sgmEFOC exist -sgm 3sgmEFOC

"Who is it?"
12) "Le ami ta elorirem?"
le ami ta e- lo -ri -re -m
but who(m) just 3sgnO- finish -CAUS -FUT -sgm
"But who will finish it?"

13) "Le man hin alevele ngoelere?"
le man hin a- le -vele ngo-e- le -re
but what(m) 3sgmEFOC 3sgmO- see -SUCC 2sg-1pl.ex- see -FUT

When they went out "But what is it? Once we’ve seen it, will we see you?"

14) Elahave hin ovum?
elahave hin o- vu -m
how.much(m) 3sgmEFOC 3sgS- dig -sgm

How many "earth" did he dig?

HOW MANY

Elav ‘how many’ is a plural noun. Some examples:

15) Sa elav hiv aurev?
sa elav hiv a- u -re -v
banana(pl) how.many(pl) 3plEFOC 1sgS- eat -FUT -pl

How many bananas will I eat?

16) Elav siav?
elav sia -v
how.many(pl) do -pl

How many is that?

BE WHERE

The word vasia ‘be where?’ is an intransitive verb. It appears either as the first word of a clause, like other interrogative words, or the last, like other verbs. It has a few differences from other intransitive verbs apart from this ability to appear as the first word of a clause. For instance, it cannot form a complex predicate with the Habitual Auxiliary, and it does not take verbal morphology apart from the Agreement Suffix.

Because it is stative in meaning, it always marks its subject with the Agreement Suffix, not with a verbal prefix (see Section 10.5). Some examples:

17) "Mekalem vasiam?"
me- kalem vasia -m
2pl- father(m) be.where -sgm

"Where is your (pl) father?"
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18) "Le mola hoiga omalav vaslav?" hini
le mola hoiga omalav vaslia 3sgPOSS- people(pl) be.where -pl INT
but canoe(n) MOD.MED.sgn 3sgPOSS- people(pl) be.where -pl INT

"Where are the people from that canoe?" they say.

19) Vasiam oina ruima la?
vasia oina ruima la
be.where other.MED.sgm old.man(f) sgfArt

Where is the old man?

Which

The word roi-do `which?' (the forms vary freely: see Section 2.10) belongs in its own word class. It functions as the head of an NP, taking the definite article, but there are two reasons for not calling it a noun. Firstly, it does not have its own gender, but takes its gender from the noun whose identity it is questioning. Secondly, it can appear with a noun immediately following it, in apposition to it, in the same NP, to mean `which X?'. It is not possible for two nouns to be juxtaposed in this way; normally, two nouns within an NP must bear a head-dependent relationship to each other, using the possessive construction (see Section 4.2). For these reasons, although it clearly has a close relationship with nouns, roi is considered a word of its own word class.

Roi-do inflects according to its own paradigm, marking number and gender of the referent which it is questioning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>singular</th>
<th>dual</th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>masc</td>
<td>roin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fem</td>
<td>roi</td>
<td>roil</td>
<td>roi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a bizarre agreement system in terms of the typical patterns of the language. Firstly, feminine and neuter singular are not distinguished; secondly, a masculine marker -n is unknown elsewhere in the language; thirdly, gender is not distinguished in the dual (although the pervasive dual /l/ is present); and fourthly, the pervasive plural /v/ is not present.

Roi-do is always the first word of its clause. Some examples:

20) "Roi va malav va?" koleav.
roi va malav va kalea -v
which plArt people(pl) plArt wonder -pl

"Which ones are the people?" they wonder.
17 - Questions and Negation

21) Roil heol inu ngovovol heol?
roil heol inu ngo-vovo -l heol
which.du 3duEFOC 2sg 2sg- girl -du 3duEFOC

Which are your two daughters?

22) Roin ta aku hi Iuminao Honiara
roin ta a- ku hi Iuminao Honiara
which.sgm time(m) 3sgmO- like 3sgnEFOC ship.name Honiara Honiara

vela lome? vela lo- me
go 3sgS- HAB

About what time [lit: like which time] does the Iuminao go to Honiara?

How, when, where, where to

The words vala-valai ‘how?’, ninam ‘when?’, ria-dia ‘where?’, and riahi-diahi 'where to?' are all uninflecting particles. They usually appear at the beginning of their clause.

The particle vala-valai (the two forms are in free variation) is the most general question indicator, and can mean ‘how?’, ‘why?’, and so on. It is also a common greeting on its own, meaning something like ‘what’s up?’. In combination with siare (sia ‘be, become, happen, do’ plus -re Non-Finite), it means ‘why?’: In combination with afouham ‘3sgmO-make-PURP’, it means ‘for what?’:

23) Olang beko ovo’vou vala ta overe?
olang beko o- vo’vou vala ta o- ve -re
because stone(n) 3sgPOSS- boy(m) how just 3sgS- go -NF

Because how could a baby stone move?

24) Vala hi lome?
vala hi lo- me
how do/say 3sgS- HAB

What [lit: how] did he say?

25) "Ta ruia! Vala? Vala siare hoka ngoa ngome?"
ta ruia vala vala sia -re hoka ngoa ngo- me
hey old.woman(f) how how do -NF here.PROX stay 2sg- HAB

"Hey old woman! What's up? Why are you here?"

26) "Etale! Vala afouham mina hea
etale vala a- fou -ham mina hea
wow! how 3sgmO- make -PURP thing(f) MOD.DIST1.sgF

ruta la omare vela lome?"
ruta la o- ma -re vela lo- me
lamp(f) sgFArt 3sgfO- take -NF go 3sgS- HAB

"Hey! What is this thing taking the light away for?"
**Ninam** 'when':

27) "Ninam koi kini ngofeure?"

ninam koi kini ngo-feu -re

when also ACT 2sg- go.up -FUT

"When will you come back up?"

28) ("We two want to open the new house.")

"Hobea fi Ninam?"

hobea fi ninam

good 3sgnFOC when

"All right. When?"

**Ria-dia** 'where' and **riahi-diahi** 'where to' (the forms vary freely: see Section 2.10) have some formal and functional overlap. It is tempting to consider that **riahi** in fact consists of **ria** 'where' with **hi** '3sgnEFOC', but speakers explicitly deny this interpretation. Even if this is not a good synchronic analysis of **riahi**, it is a possible diachronic analysis. Note that it is not possible to say *riahi hi*. Note also that even if **riahi** is a separate word, it is indistinguishable from the two-word sequence of **ria** **hi** 'where 3sgnEFOC’, which also occurs.

However while their meanings are similar, they are not identical: **ria-dia** refers to static location, whereas **riahi-diahi** refers to motion towards something.

29) "Le inu **ria** ngoa mem inu?" lore.

le inu ria ngoa me -m inu lo- re

but 2sg where stay HAB -sgm 2sg 3duS- say

"But where do you live?" the two say.

30) "**Riahi** ve elikire melei?" hide ore.

diahi ve -e e- liki -re me- lei hide o- re

whither go -NOMZR 3sgnO- want -NF 2pl- exist thus 3sgS- say

"Where do you want to go to?" he said

**17.2 Negation**

There are a number of means by which a word or a clause can be negated. Verbs can be negated using the verbal suffix -la, which usually, but not necessarily, involves a focus construction. NPs can be negated using the adjective **ro** 'one', with its negative suffix -ru to mean 'not one'. Adjectives and whole propositions can be negated using the intransitive verb **tave** 'be not'. An entire proposition or an NP can be negated using the particle **tamu** 'not'. A negative command can be given, using the Admonitive verbal suffix -n. In addition there are various lexical items which have a negative meaning. The syntax and semantics of these methods of negation will be discussed. The method of expressing not wanting, while not actually a syntactically negative construction, nonetheless belongs in this semantic area, and is also discussed below.
17.2.1 The verbal suffix \(-la\)

The verbal suffix \(-la\) (glossed NEG) is used to negate a verb. It co-occurs with little other verbal morphology: only an object prefix if the verb is transitive, the Causative suffix (which precedes it) and the Agreement Suffix (which follows it). Negative expressions involving the negative suffix \(-la\) are almost always expressed in focus constructions. This is a stylistic rather than obligatory syntactic matter, but nevertheless it is unusual to see a negated verb not in a focus construction.

It was explained in Chapter 11 that all verbal predications, negated or otherwise, may appear in a focus construction, with the type of focus being shown by means of which core participant is indexed with the Agreement Suffix and the focus marker. In all transitive non-negative predication types in which there is a focus marker immediately following the verb, the speaker may choose whether the Agreement Suffix and focus marker will agree with the subject or object of the verb; the choice depends on what type of focus the speaker wishes to express; either sentence focus or predicate focus. In negated clauses, however, there is no choice: the Agreement Suffix and focus marker must obligatorily agree with the subject of the verb (in positive sentences this agreement system would mark sentence focus).

Some examples will illustrate these points. The examples show a negated verb, with the Agreement Suffix, followed by a focus marker, both agreeing with the subject of the clause.

31)  
\[
\begin{array}{lll}
ui & eulam & o \\
& u & -la & -m \\
& sia & -la & -m \\
& fin \\
\end{array}
\]
food(n) 3sgnO- eat -NEG -sgm and do -NEG -sgm 3sgmFOC

... he didn't eat or do anything.

32)  
\[
\begin{array}{lll}
Avealam & fin & kusukui \\
& a- & vea & -la & -m \\
& fin & kusukui & mitakeu \\
& 3sgmO- & know & -NEG -sgm & 3sgmFOC & rat(m) \\
& olei & ga. \\
o- & lei & -o & ga \\
& 3sgS- exist & -sgn & sgnArt
\end{array}
\]

He [the dog] doesn't know the rat is inside the dog's ear.

33)  
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
Aka & lokalala & la & otailamal \\
& aka & lo- & kala & o- & tai & -la & -mal \\
then & 3duPOSS- & mother(f) & sgfArt & 3sgfO- & show & -NEG & -du.m \\
& then & 3duPOSS- & mother(f) & sgfArt & 3sgfO- & show & -NEG & -du.m & 3dumFOC
\end{array}
\]
The two boys didn't show their mother (to the people). (i.e. they kept her hidden)
NEGATION OF VARIOUS CONSTRUCTION TYPES

The negative suffix cannot co-occur with any TAM suffixes, or with verbal morphology marking subordinate clauses, the Non-Finite, Completive or Successive suffixes on clause chaining verbs, the Nominalisers, the Locativiser, the Extended or the Reciprocal suffixes (these are discussed in Chapters 12, 13, 15 and 16).

These restrictions mean that the verbs of many construction types cannot be negated directly. Instead, multi-verb constructions are used, such that verbal morphology appears on a different verb from that which the Negative suffix appears on. Alternatively, other kinds of negation apart from the Negative suffix can be used.

For example, the following construction type is commonly used for future negation. The lexical verb carries the Negative suffix, and the Habitual Auxiliary carries the Future Tense suffix:

36) Ane mea la olevele
    a- ne me -a la o- le -vele
    3sgmO- with SPEC -sgf sgfArt 3sgfO- see -SUCC
    ofemilav hulila merem fin.
    o- femi -la -v hului -la me -re -m fin
    3sgfO- face -NEG -pl go.round -NEG HAB -FUT -sgm 3sgmFOC

If they see their sister, they won’t turn in front of her!

Instead of aspectual suffixes on the verb with the Negative suffix, a phrasal construction using two verbs can be used. In the following example, the first verb carries the negative suffix and the second creates Present tense meaning:

37) Kini minamina okovelam olei?
    kini Dup- mina o- kove -la -m o- lei
    ACT REDLP- thing(f) 3sgfO- look.for -NEG -sgm 3sgS- exist

Isn’t he going looking for something?

1 The speaker switches from plural to masculine singular agreement through this sentence: literally, it is ‘If they see his sister, he won’t turn in front of her’.
The intransitive verb *tave* means ‘be not’, and is used to create a negative proposition. A *tave* construction may be used to negate a clause.

A *tave* construction may be used to negate a clause.

If the clause to be negated is non-verbal, as in the above example, *tave* is the sole verb of the negative construction. However if *tave* is used to negate a verbal clause, an unusual situation occurs, in which the verb *tave* immediately follows the verb of the clause to be negated:

This construction type only occurs with two intransitive verbs, *tuna* ‘be really’ and *tave* ‘be not’, and was discussed in Section 3.2.3. It is not a serial verb construction, because the subject of a serial verb construction can be marked only once across the whole predicate, not once on each verb as here. For the same reason it cannot be any other type of complex predicate. Syntactically such sequences of verbs are considered to be two independent clauses in succession. Such constructions only occur with verbs *tave* and *tuna*; in all other cases, clauses in sequence must be overtly marked for their relationship with each other, either as subordinate-dependent or coordinate-dependent or coordinated independent clauses.

The suffix *-ru* only appears on the adjective *ro* (cited here in its feminine singular form). *Ro* means ‘one’; *ro-ru* means ‘not one’. The suffixed *ro* word is used to negate a noun. It very frequently negates *mina* ‘thing’; thus *mina roru* ‘nothing’. A clause containing an NP negated with *ro-ru* must appear with a further clausal negator. Thus, if the clause is verbal, the verb must be negated using verbal suffix *-la*. If the clause is non-verbal, it must be negated with the negative particle *tamu* ‘not’.

\[17 - \text{QUESTIONS AND NEGATION}\]

\[17.2.2 \ \text{THE VERB TAVE 'BE NOT'}\]

\[38\] Vusalu \ tave \ fi \ okor \ ga.
  vusalu \ tave \ -\ø \ fi \ o- \ kora \ ga
  weak \ be.not \ -sgn \ 3sgnFOC \ 3sgnPOSS- \ end(n) \ sgnArt

*It's not weak, its end.*

\[39\] Vutiv \ tavev \ fiv \ aka \ laketei \ ga \ hoka \ fi \ olei
  vutiv \ tavev \ -v \ fiv \ aka \ laketei \ ga \ hoka \ fi \ o- \ lei
  be.many \ -pl \ be.not-pl \ 3plFOC \ then \ life(n) \ sgnArt \ here.PROX \ 3sgnFOC \ 3sgS- \ exist

*There aren't many [people], but the life is still here.*

\[40\] (One boy was really tired.)

Olang \ tokam \ tavem.
  olang \ tokam \ -m \ tave \ -m
  because \ be.strong \ -sgm \ be.not \ -sgm

*Because he wasn't strong.*

\[41\] Ro-ru ‘not one’
41) Malav rovoru sigun ka vela leiv friv.
people(pl) one.pl -none birth.hut(m) LOCEMP go -NEG exist -pl 3plFOC
No-one can go into the birth hut.

42) Leta mina ro ru ana namurila.
but thing(f) one.sgf -none 3sgmO- in shake -NEG
But nothing shook in it [the boat (m)].

43) Aka koi lafa ro ru ona mima ga tamu.
then also part(f) one.sgf -none 3sgfO- in way.of.life(n) sgnArt no
And also the church was in no other place.

44) Aka kola tamu.
then empty.space(m) no
There was no empty space.

The adjective ro is discussed in detail in Section 4.1.2.

17.2.4 Tamu 'not'

The particle tamu negates an entire clause or an NP. It appears postposed to a positive clause and negates the proposition of that clause, or, as discussed above, it provides an answer to a negative question. The difference between using a tamu construction and using the verbal suffix -la or tave 'be not', which have the same propositional effect, appears to be a stylistic one; in texts, particular speakers tend to favour one or the other.

45) Ui eu tamu.
food(n) 3sgnO- eat no
We didn't eat.

46) Olang ta hoinariom ana
because time(m) MOD.MED.sgm -PSNV -m/n 3sgmO- in
bangakaual tamu ke
...because at that time there were no banks there

47) Aka siare, neuriae tamu, lalasir o neano tamu.
then do -NF argue -NOMZR no cruelty and disparagement no
Because of that, there wasn't any argument, or cruelty or treating each other badly.
17 - Questions and Negation

48) Honiae ga esiage
    honia -e ga e- e- sia -ge
    know -NOMZR sgnArt 3sgnO- SBD- do -ANT

luguo la tamu, ta hona.
    lugu -io la tamu ta hona
    think -NOMZ.f sgfArt no time(m) MOD.PROX.sgm

Education happens, and there is no respect now.

Tamu is also used as a negative answer to a polar question. In this case, it can provide the entire answer, or it can form part of an answer:

49) Kini foa Kiolen hain siavel vokikiari "Valai
    kini foa Kiolen hai -n sia -vel vo- kikia -ri vala
    ACT go.down Kiolen point -LOC do -COMPL 3plO- ask -CAUS how

hokariom?" hide aerege.
    hoka -ri -om hide a- e- re -ge
    here.PROX -PSNV -m/n thus 3sgmO- SBD- say -ANT

They went down and when they reached Kiolen Point, he asked them "How about here?" he said.

"Tamu. Furigen ta fi".
    tamu furinge-n ta fi
    no west -LOC must 3sgnFOC

"No. It has to be west."

17.25 The Negative Imperative

The Admonitive verbal suffix -n (discussed Section 12.4.1) can be used to give a negative command; that is, to tell the hearer not to do something:

50) Malegen leia la le'laol ona lounagen
    malegen lei -a la le'laol o- na loun -n
    left exist -sgf sgfArt two.f 3sgfO- in right.side -LOC

leia la oneman.
    lei -a la o- ne- ma -n
    exist -sgf sgfArt 3sgfO- 2sgS- take -ADMON

One [old coconut (f)] is on the left - of the two - this one on the right, between two, don't take it.

51) Sevo ema enekole eraun.
    sevo e- ma e- ne- ko le erau -n
    tabu/holy 3sgnO- take 3sgnO- 2sgS- throw -POT fall -ADMON

Don't! When you take it, don't let it fall down.

17.26 Other Negative Lexical Items

There are a few other negative lexical items, including the particles vutuna 'nothing' and vuhu 'nothing'. These two particles seem to have the same distribution, and the semantic difference between them is unclear.
52) Kalem ne kala! Vutuna ta melei.

kalem ne kala vutuna ta me- lei
father(m) with mother(f) nothing just 2pl- exist

Mother and father! [exclamation meaning Wowee!] You lot are nothing [i.e. worthless]. kg2 047

53) Aka Savutum ogao ga vu hu oloolo
aka Savutum o- gao ga vu hu o- loolo
then Savutum(m) 3sgPOSS- war.canoe(n) sgnArt nothing 3sgPOSS- straight

And Savutum’s canoe had absolutely nothing [i.e. was empty] kg2 050

54) Ngokalem ana vu hu fi ane ngome.
ngo-kalem a- na vu hu fi a- ne ngo- me
2sg- father(m) 3sgmO- in nothing 3sgnFOC 3sgmO- give 2sg- HAB

You would give it free [i.e. for nothing] to your father. ch 034

17.2.7 NOT WANTING

Not wanting is usually expressed using an idiomatic expression involving the noun laku ‘hate’. This noun always occurs with the Locative suffix, and with a Possessive prefix marking the experiencer of the not-wanting. The experiencer can also be expressed with an overt NP before laku, as in (55).

If the thing which is not wanted is expressed by a nominal, it follows the noun laku:

55) Ngai ngalakun sa.
ngai nga- laku -n sa
1sg 1sgPOSS- hate -LOC banana

I don’t want bananas. [lit: in my hate are bananas] e1 048f

If the thing not wanted is expressed by a clause, it again follows laku, and the verb is always marked with the Imperfective suffix -ne (see Section 12.3.1):

56) Ngalakun lafa hoiariom otigir ine.
nga- laku -n lafa hoia -ri -om o- tigiri -ne
1sgPOSS- hate -LOC part(f) MOD.MED.sgf -PSNV -m/n 3sgfO-tell -IMPF

I don’t want to say that bit. [lit: in my hate is telling that part] jn 078

57) Olakun tuna aune.
o- laku -n tuna a- u -ne
3sgPOSS- hate -LOC really 3sgmO- eat -IMPF

He really didn’t want to eat it. co 174
CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

Discourse organisation

Most of the previous chapters have dealt with the structures and functions of sentences and their component parts. This chapter aims to show some aspects of how these sentences, once built, are actually used in Lavukaleve. The chapter is in two separate parts. The first part examines how sentences are joined together in discourse, looking at typical Lavukaleve ways of structuring discourse in narratives for textual cohesion. The kinds of methods to be discussed are not grammaticalised structures, but rather, common and idiomatic ways of choosing to structure a discourse, and as such are an important part of how the language works. The second part discusses reference tracking. Other parts of the description have shown what linguistic material is available in Lavukaleve to introduce and track referents in narratives. This section shows how these different types of linguistic material interact, and how they are used across a narrative, rather than just across a sentence. It also shows that very often participant tracking is not a priority, and instead there frequently exists a high degree of ambiguity about the identity of referents.

18.1 Ways of joining sentences into larger units

There are three main ways by which sentences are joined into larger discourse units in Lavukaleve. Very commonly, head/tail linkage is used, in which the final verb of one sentence is repeated as the first verb of the next sentence (Section 18.1.1). Also very common is the use of 'discourse-linkage verbs', a strategy in which generic verbs such as 'do' are used to link a sentence to the previous one (Section 18.1.2). Thirdly, conjunctions can be used to link sentences together in a temporal or causal sequence (Section 18.1.3).
18.1.1 HEAD/TAIL LINKAGE

Head/tail linkage is a ubiquitous feature of Papuan languages, as a way of connecting sentences in a discourse. It involves repeating the final element of a sentence, usually a verb, or verb plus object, as the first element of the next sentence, as the following examples show:

1) a. Akari fi matairia veva aka
   aka -ri fi ma- tairi -a veva aka
   then -PSNV 3sgnFOC 3p1S- divide -INTR in.that.way then
   oina ofeu.
oina o- feu
other.MED.sgm 3sgS- go.up

   They divided themselves in that way, and the other boy went up [to the bush].

b. Feu karuverav sevi fiv vokurure vomare kini ovau.
   feu karu -verav sevi fiv vo- kuru-re vo- ma -re kini o- vau
   go.up possum -pl eight 3plFOC 3plO- hit -NF 3plO- take -NF ACT 3sgS-go.out

   He went up, and killed eight possums and took them and went out [of the bush].

c. Kini vau vokoroire oina kini
   kini vau vo- kori -re oina kini
   ACT go.out 3plO- kill -NF other.MED.sgm ACT
   haulam tunam fin.
   hau -la -m tuna -m fin
   go.ashore -NEG -sgm be.really -sgm 3sgmFOC

   He went out and killed them, then the one who went fishing, he didn't come back.

d. Oina haulam tunam fin vau piru
   oina haul -la -m tuna -m fin vau piru
   other.MED.sgm go.ashore -NEG -sgm be.really -sgm 3sgmFOC go.out cable(f)
   la okone fi ngoa lome roaru
   la o- ko -ne fi nga -me roa -ru
   sgfArt 3sgfO- throw -IMPF 3sgnFOC stay 3sgS- HAB one.sgm none
   hoalam fin.
   hoa -la -m fin
   poke.through -NEG -sgm 3sgmFOC

   He didn't come back, he stayed line-fishing, but he didn't catch any. 
2) a. Velanun velanun velanun kini foe na
vela -nun vela -nun vela -nun kini foe na
go -DUR go -DUR go -DUR ACT pig(m) sgmArt
alere, akulare, hano lofoim.
a-le -re a-kula -re hano lo- foi -m
3sgmO- see -NF 3sgmO- run.after -NF then 3duS- hold -sgm

They went on and on and on, then seeing the pig, chasing him, then they caught him.

b. Afoire, asure amare kini
a- foi -re a- su-re a- ma -re kini
3sgmO- hold -NF 3sgmO- tie -NF 3sgmO- take -NF ACT
nganga oraravan alofou.
nganga o- rarava -n a- lo- fou
river(m) 3sgPOSS- side -LOC 3sgmO- 3duS- put.on

Catching him, they tied him up and took him to a river bank.

c. Afoure, hano kui na foam.
a- fou -re hano kui na foa -m
3sgmO- put.on -NF then sun(m) sgmArt go.down -sgm

Putting him there, okay. The sun went down.

d. Aefoage, koleamal.
a- e- foa -ge kolea -mal
3sgmO- SBD- go.down -ANT wonder -du.m

Upon it going down, the two weren't sure [what to do].

3) a. Feiere veiere otum aham kakone.
fele -re vau o- turn a- ham kakok -ne
return -NF go.out 3sgPOSS- husband(m) 3sgmO- for look.out -IMPF

Returning, she went out to watch for her husband.

b. Kakonun aka felere kini ofeu.
  kako -nun aka fele -re kini o- feu
  look.out -DUR then return -NF ACT 3sgS- go.up

She watched for him then she returned back up [to the village].

c. Felere kini feu ofufu.
fele -re kini feu o- fufu
return -NF ACT go.up 3sgS- lie.down

She went back up and lay down.

d. Veal ka oefufuge oina
vea -l ka o- e- fufu -ge oina
emerge -LOCZR LOCEMPH 3sgfO- SBD- lie.down -ANT other.MED.sgm
ika ngoanun ngoanun ngoanun.
ika ngoa-nun ngoa -nun ngoa -nun
there stay -DUR stay -DUR stay -DUR

She lay down outside, the other boy was still there.

In Lavukaleve, the repeated verb is very often expressed as an Anterior subordinate verb,
meaning something like 'upon X having happened, ...'. This occurs in sentence (3d). Consider also the following:

4) a. Sia loemege fi aka le ga ovea.
   sia lo- e- me -ge fi aka le ga o- vea
do 3sgfO- SBD- HAB -ANT 3sgnFOC then day(n) sgnArt 3sgS- emerge

   *She did like that, then next day came.*

b. Le ga eveage lalamuon lalamuon.
   le ga e- e- vea -ge lalamu -n lalamu -n
day(n) sgnArt 3sgnO- SBD- emerge -ANT morning -LOC morning -LOC

   *Upon the next day coming, then [it was] very early in the morning, really early.* co 388-389

5) a. "Kini foa voemen matua ve manman man
   kini foa vo- e- me -n matua ve man man man
   ACT go.down 3plO- SBD- HAB -ADMON old.coconut(f) or what what what(m)
na foa laemen."
   na foa la- e- me -n hide o- re
   sgmArt go.down 3sgmO- SBD- HAB -ADMON thus 3sgS- say

   "Bring it down, whatever it is, no matter if it's a dry old coconut!" he said.

b. Hide lain mem na aerege,
   hide lai -n me -m na a- e- re -ge
   thus top -LOC SPEC -sgm sgmArt 3sgmO- SBD- say -ANT
omakelagurige ofoa.
   o- ma- kelago -ri -ge o- foa
   3sgfO- 3plS- go.over -CAUS -ANT 3sgS- go.down

   *Upon the man in the line saying that, then they sent [the message] down*

c Oefoage ta oina "Ho'bea fi" ore.
   o- e- foa -ge ta oina ho'bea fi o- re
   3sgfO- SBD- go.down -ANT just other.MED.sgm good 3sgnFOC 3sgS- say

   *Upon it going down, the other man said "It's all right!".* jm 139-141

In the above example, sentence a. ends with verb ore ‘he said’. Sentence b. begins with this same verb, this time in a subordinate Anterior clause, with subject laen mem na ‘the one in line’. Sentence b. ends with ofoa ‘it went down’, which is the first verb of sentence c., in Anterior form. These examples show that the repeated verb need not necessarily be the first word of the following sentence, but rather it is the verb of the first clause.

18.1.2 DISCOURSE-LINKAGE VERBS

A second strategy for joining sentences is by means of discourse-linkage verbs. The term (which I have taken from van Enk and de Vries 1997) refers to generic verbs which can be used to recapitulate a previous event, in order to link it to the next event. In Lavukaleve, verbs such as sia ‘be, become, happen, do’ (glossed ‘do’), ngoa ‘stay’ and lo ‘finish’ are very frequently used for this purpose. The verb sia is used in this way in
the next example:

6) a. Mairu irunun irunun fi aka oia ma - iru iru - nun iru - nun fi aka oia
3pIS- sleep sleep -DUR sleep -DUR 3sgnFOC then other.MED.sgf

totum anam vore, kini ane o- tum a- nam vo - re kini a- ne
3sgPOSS- husband(m) 3sgmO- to come -NF ACT 3sgmO- with

ngoaone. irune.
ngo a - ne iru - ne
stay - IMPF sleep - IMPF

They slept, it went on, then she came to her husband, and stayed with him. Sleeping.

b. Sia loemege fi aka le ga ovea.
sia lo- e- me - ge fi aka le ga o- vea
do 3sgfO- SBD- HAB - ANT 3sgnFOC then day(n) sgn 3sgS- emerge

She did like that, then next day came.

In the next example, note the use of lo ‘finish’ to move the narrative line from one event to the next, in this story about how canoes are made:

7) a. Doi rara hi, okol siarem, o roi rara hi o- koli sia - re - m o
which.sg/pl side(n) 3sgnEFOC 3sgPOSS- interior(m) do - FUT - sgm and

roi rara hi oum me siare.
roi rara hi o- umu me - o sia - re
which.sg/pl side(n) 3sgnEFOC 3sgPOSS- under SPEC - sgn do - FUT

Where one side is, will be its inside, and the other side is its underside.

b. Aka aluri lo ta, okol na aka a- luri lo ta o- koli na
then 3sgmO- sort.out finish just 3sgPOSS- interior(m) sgmArt

ana kokova oaire
a- na kokova o- a- i - re
3sgmO- in sth.written(f) 3sgfO- 1sgS- do - FUT

ovala la otaham.
o- vala la o- ta - ham
3sgPOSS- belly(f) sgfArt 3sgfO- pound - PURP

So having sorted it out, I draw markings for cutting its belly.

c. Ota lo fi, oereav ne o- ta lo fi o- erea - v ne
3sgfO- pound finish 3sgnFOC 3sgPOSS- front - pl with

oesiav va mahou voatare.
o- esia - v va ma- hou vo- a- ta - re
3sgPOSS- back.of canoe - pl plArt 3plPOSS- cheeks(pl) 3plO- 1sgS- pound - FUT

Having cut it, I will cut the cheeks (the front and back curved bits).
d. Hoikari lo ta okol na
  hoika -ri lo ta o- koli na
  there.MED -PSNV finish just 3sgPOSS- interior(m) sgmArt

  aigure himara ona.
  a- igu -re himara o- na
  3sgmO- take.out -FUT axe(f) 3sgfO- in

That one finished, I take out the inside with an axe.

e. Lo ta katil amavele, okol na,
  lo ta katil a- ma -vele o- koli na
  finish just adze(m) 3sgmO- take -SUCC 3sgPOSS- interior(m) sgmArt

  asisiaforire.
  a- sisiafo -ri -re
  3sgmO- clean -CAUS -FUT

That finished, having taken an adze, I will clean the inside.

f. Asisiafori lo fi, ohan va fiv
  a- sisiafo -ri lo fi o- ha -n va fiv
  3sgmO- clean -CAUS finish 3sgnFOC 3sgPOSS- rib.of.canoe -pl plArt 3plFOC

  voalagarire.
  vo- a- lagari -re
  3plO- 1sgS- choose -FUT

Having cleaned it, I will choose the ribs. cp 010-015

This use of lo ‘finish’ is a particularly common device to link events in procedural texts.

In the next example, ngoa ‘stay’ is used to indicate that the events of sentence a. continued on, through to the time of the events of sentence b. Ngoa is very frequently used in narratives in this function.

8) a. Ali otalai ali otalai akariom
  ali o- talai ali o- talai aka -ri -orn
  man(m) 3sgPOSS- equal.share man(m) 3sgPOSS- equal.share then -PSNV -m/n

  meariare.
  mearia -re
  count -NF

(They divided the fish between them.) They counted out each man’s share. [lit: one man’s share, one man’s share, then they counted]

b. Ngoane ngoa voemege akari sia ne
  ngoa -ne ngoa vo- e- me -ge aka -ri sia -ne
  stay -IMPF stay 3plO- SBD- HAB -ANT then -PSNV do -IMPF

  voemege hano lalamu la faua.
  vo- e- me -ge hano lalamu la fau -a
  3plO- SBD- continue -ANT then morning(f) sgfArt happen -sgf

Things went on, it went on like that, then morning came. jn 104-105
18.1.3 Conjunctions

Conjunctions can also be used to link sentences in a narrative. There are two very frequently used conjunctions, aka ‘then, next, so, and, etc.’ and hano ‘then’. If hano is used to join two sentences, it is the last element of the first sentence. However, if aka is used to join two sentences, it is the first element of the second sentence. Some examples illustrate the use of these two conjunctions in sentence combining.

Note that hano always occurs with a sentence-final drop in pitch, but many of the units which hano joins are actually not full sentences but coordinate-dependent or subordinate clauses, followed, after hano, by an independent clause.

9) a. Avalare amare, kini veare, hano.
   a- vala -re a- ma -re kini vea -re hano
   3sgmO- pull -NF 3sgmO- take -NF ACT emerge -NF then
   Pulling him out, he emerged, then...

b. Ikaika afo'foirinun hano.
   ikaika a- fo'foiri -nun hano
   each 3sgmO- pummell -DUR then
   They hauled him all about, then...

c. Akurure maum.
   a- kuru -re ma- u -m
   3sgmO- hit -NF 3plS- eat -sgm
   Killing him they ate him.

10) a. Ohuluirige ta (kalem ne kala!) nato la
   o- hului -ri -ge ta kalem ne kala nato la
   3sgfO- go. round -CAUS -ANT just father with mother sago.palm(f) sgfArt
   erau oiga mafoton erau oiga ta hano.
   erau oiga ma- foto -n erau oiga ta hano
   fall other.MED.sgn 3plPOSS- middle -LOC fall other.MED.sgn just then
   Turning it around, oh my goodness!, the sago tree falls down in the middle of them all, then...

b. Vokuruge kiure lov.
   vo- o- kuru -ge kiu -re lo -v
   3plO- 3sgS- hit -ANT die -NF finish -pl
   It hitting them they all die.
11) a. Feu koi "Nam lake, tutum" aerege hano.
go.up also give.it! fire(n) grandparent -sgm SBD- say -ANT then

He went up again. "Give me some fire, old man" he said, then...

b. Olakun enene koi!
o- laku -n e- ne -ne koi
3sgPOSS- hate -LOC 3sgnO- give -IMPF also

He didn’t want to give it again!

In the following examples, aka occurs as the first element of the second sentence:

12) a. Oae foiga.
o- 3sgS- go.up PN.MED.sgn

He climbed up [the tree].

b. Aka aolai "Ae ngomele ae
aka a- o- lai ae ngomele -le ae
then 3sgmO- 3sgS- tell go.up 2sg- HAB -POT go.up

ngomele ae mina rara hoga ehamail
ngomele -le ae mina rara hoga ehamail
2sg- HAB -POT go.up um side(n) MOD.PROX.sgn facing.side

mina matua feo ke.
mina matua feo ke
um old.coconut(f) 3sgfFOC EMPH

Then she told him: "You go up, up up up , on this side, is a dry coconut." co 204-205

aka kini houl vo- koroi -iva hide ma- re ke
then ACT trees(pl) 3plO- chop -PCTIMP.pl thus 3plS- say EMPH

"(This is the tree we need!) So go and cut sticks!" they said.

b. Aka oiva airal lelemal houla airal lelemal houla
aka oiva airal lelemal houla airal lelemal houla
then other.MED.pl men.du(m) two(m) tree(f) men.du(m) two(m) tree(f)

airal lelemal houla oina okoroi mem na
airal lelemal houla oina o- koroi me -m na
men.du(m) two(m) tree(f) other.MED.sgm 3sgfO- chop HAB-sgm sgfArt

okoroi fi ngoa lome nato la.
o- koroi -ne fi ngoa lo- me nato la
3sgfO- chop -IMPF 3sgnFOC stay 3sgS- HAB sago.palm(f) sgfArt

So, they were two men to a tree, two men to a tree, two men to a tree, one man was chopping away at the sago tree.

c. Aka kini hano falev.
aka kini hano fale -v
then ACT then stand -pl

Then they all stood up.
18.2 Reference Tracking

There is an array of morphological material available for marking referents in a discourse: overt NPs can be used, and there are various types of verbal participant-marking affixes depending on the predicate type. There is also the gender system, by means of which participants can be differentiated by agreement on verbs and nominal modifiers. Also important are the demonstrative pronouns, one of which is used to refer to activated referents, and the other to refer to semi-activated referents, that is, referents which have been mentioned before but are not the last referent to have been mentioned. In addition, the focus marking system as a method of making reference to a participant, and at the same time marking its role in the information structure of the sentence, is pervasive. These phenomena have all been described at length in previous chapters. The purpose of this section is to show how the interaction of all this linguistic material operates in texts to refer to and, if necessary, disambiguate participants. It also aims to show that, even though this material does exist and can be used for this purpose, very often disambiguation of participants is not a priority, and in fact, in many cases, identity of participants is understood through extra-linguistic rather than linguistic means.

18.2.1 INTRODUCING PARTICIPANTS WITH OVERT NPs

In general, participants are introduced by overt NPs, and tracked by verbal agreement affixes.

The following excerpt is taken from the beginning of a story about a boy and a married couple of giants. These two participants, the boy and the couple, are the main protagonists throughout the story. They are introduced first, in a., just by overt NPs, as the title of the story. The first real sentence of the story, sentence b., restates the NP referring to the giant couple, as the subject. The only verbs of this sentence are Durative-marked, which means it is not possible to also cross-reference their subject with verbal morphology. The next sentence, c., reintroduces the boy with an overt NP, and verbal prefixing. The boy is the subject of the following sentence, d., beginning with feure 'going up', and he is tracked by verbal prefixing alone. There is a change of subject with the last verb of this sentence, shown by the dual subject marker on the verb lore 'they two say'. From the dual number it is to be inferred that it is the giant couple who spoke. The next sentence, e., returns to singular subject marking, by which the referent can be inferred to be the boy. In the following sentence, f., there is an overt NP reintroducing the giant, bagatum na, as an actor, thus avoiding the ambiguity which would have otherwise arisen. He remains as the actor throughout this and the next sentence, g., but in the last sentence the subject changes to his wife, who is reintroduced with an overt NP. We only know that the NP otua la 'his wife' refers to the subject here, and not the object, because of gender agreement. Subject prefixes do not show gender agreement, but object prefixes do. The object prefix is masculine, while the overt NP is feminine, so the NP cannot refer to the object, therefore, by elimination, it must refer to the subject.
18 - DISCOURSE ORGANISATION

14) a. Bagatum ne ko’mua o vo’vou roa.

Bagatum ne ko’mua o vo’vou roa
male.giant(m) with female.giant(f) and boy(m) one.sgm

A male giant, his wife and one boy.

b. Bagatum ne ko’mua la ngoanun ngoanun

Bagatum ne ko’mua la ngoa-nun ngoa-nun
male.giant(m) with female.giant(f) sgArt stay -DUR stay -DUR

ngoa-nun lea o-rolo -n ngoa-nun
stay -DUR cave(m) 3sgPOSS inside -LOC stay -DUR

A man giant and a woman giant were living in a cave.

c. Ta vo’vou roa fo’sal vokila kini ofeu lanam.

Ta vo’vou roa fo’sal vo-ki -la kini o-feu la-nam
just boy(m) one.sgm fish(pl) 3p10-throw -EXT ACT 3sgS go.up 3dumO to

Then one boy was spearing fish all about, and went up to the two.

d. Feure, feu lanam aesiage,

Feure, feu lanam aesiage,
3sgmO go.up -NF go.up 3dumO to 3sgmO SBD do -ANT

alere "O, vulama! vulama!" lore.

a-le re o vula -ma vula -ma lo-re
3sgmO see -NF oh come -DURIMP.sg come -DURIMP.sg 3duS say

He went up to them, they saw him, "Oh! Come! Come!" they said.

e. Lanam vere, lekal enga vona

Lanam vere, lekal enga vona
3dumO to go -NF day -pl three 3plO in

lanam ireure lore, felere ovau.

lanam ireure lo-re fele -re o-vau
3dumO to sleep -NF finish -NF return -NF 3sgS go.out

He went to them, and having slept three days with them, he went back out.

f. Aevauge, bagatum na felere vore,

Aevauge, bagatum na felere vore,
3sgmO SBD go.out -ANT male.giant(m) sgmArt return -NF come -NF

fo’sal va voole.

fo’sal va vo o-le
fish(pl) plArt 3plO 3sgS see

Him going back, the man giant saw the fishes (sc. which the boy had caught).

g. Volere, "Ami okiv hova?" aerege

Volere, "Ami okiv hova?" aerege
vo-le re ami o-ki -v hova a-e-re ge
3plO see -NF who(m) 3sgS shoot -pl MOD.PROX pl 3sgmO SBD say -ANT

Seeing them, "Who killed these?" he asked.

h. Otua la aolai.

Otua la aolai.
3sgPOSS wife(f) sgfArt 3sgmO 3sgS tell

His wife told him ("it was a boy who brought them up").
18.2.2 OVERT NPS AS AFTERTHOUGHT ADDITIONS

The pattern above, of referents introduced by overt NPs and then tracked primarily by verbal prefixing, is the typical way of structuring reference tracking throughout a narrative. Overt NPs are also used as last-minute additions, when the speaker suspects the audience might not understand which referent was intended. Such afterthoughts usually occur after a pause. The last NP of the following excerpt, *otum na*, is an example of an afterthought NP (the pause is shown by slashes):

15) Oia vau mo'sil savun fale mea o
  oia vau mo'sil savu -n fale me -a o
  other.MED.sgf go.out high.tide edge -LOC stand HAB -sgf and
  oina kini hau eraum / oitum na.
oina kini hau erau -m / o- tum na
  other.MED.sgm ACT go.ashore fall -sgm / 3sgPOSS-husband sgmArt

She goes out to the sea shore, she is standing up, and he [the husband] comes ashore.  _co 340_

In fact, overt NPs in texts are not very common, and it is particularly rare for a transitive verb to have overt NPs for both its subject and its object. There is a strict word order rule in Lavukaleve that if two NPs, subject and object, both occur in a clause, the subject NP must precede the object NP. A transitive verb with two overt NPs does occur often in elicitation, but in texts it is very rare indeed. This is probably because the discourse role of NPs is mainly, as has been seen, to introduce or reintroduce participants. Speakers do not usually introduce two participants in one clause. Therefore a subject and object NP do not usually co-occur in one clause.

18.2.3 TRACKING REFERENTS WITH THE DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUN OIA ‘THE OTHER’

Another method of tracking referents involves the use of the demonstrative pronoun *oia* ‘other’, which switches attention between two referents in a discourse (see discussion in Section 8.7). Consider the following. The excerpt is about two participants: two boys, and a group of people in a canoe. The two boys cut off the heads off some of the people in the canoe, then go ashore. The remaining other people also go ashore. The demonstrative pronoun *oia* (in its forms *oinala* (3rd dual masculine) and *oiva* (3rd plural)) is used for overlapping reference to each participant:
18.2.4 Tracking referents with gender

Often referents can easily be tracked just by the gender system. In the next example, the participants are tracked by gendered verbal cross-referencing affixes, gendered demonstrative pronouns, and gendered focus markers. Note that 1st and 2nd person personal pronouns are not gender-marked, but demonstrative pronouns, which are used for 3rd person reference, are. Note also that verbal prefixes cross-referencing subjects are not marked for gender, but those marking objects are, and furthermore that the split-ergative system used in subordinate adverbial clauses means that intransitive verbs of these clauses use object prefixes to cross-reference their third person subjects and add a special e- prefix in the subject slot (e.g. oerege, laemege below; see Section 16.1 for discussion), thus intransitive verbs of subordinate adverbial clauses do have gender marking for their logical subjects, in the third person at least:

Actually, the information about which participant is doing what is also contained in the gender and number of the verbal cross-referencing prefixes. The oia pronouns are redundant as simple markers of disambiguating participants; their true role is more in terms of monitoring activation states.

16) a. Soire - ehauge oinala oarenun
soi -re e- hau -ge oinala oarenun
run.away -NF 3sgnO- go ashore -ANT other.MED.mdu not.worry -NF -DUR
kini malav va mavatuva vohaire
kini malav va ma- vatu -v vohaire re
ACT people(pl) plArt 3plPOSS-head -pl 3plO- take.off -NF
lomol okolin vohaire lohai.
lomol o- koli -n vohaire lo- hau -i
3duPOSS-canoe(n) 3sgPOSS-interior-LOC 3plO- put.in -NF 3duPOSS-go.in -PSV

It (the canoe) runs away to shore, then [the two boys] just go straight and cut off the people’s heads, no worries at all, then [they] put them inside their canoe and go ashore.

b. Haune hano oiva hau maveo.
ha -ne hano oiva hau maveo
Go ashore -IMPF then other.MED.pl go ashore 3plS- arrive

They go ashore, they [the other people] reach the shore.
17) a. Oerege aka oina "Tamu ke.
o- e- re -ge aka oina tamu ke
3sgfO- SBD- say-ANT then other.MED.sgm no EMPH

Her saying this, then the other one (m) [said] "No way.

b. Olang ngai kini akari amaa finu koi
olang ngai kini aka -ri a- ma -a finu koi
because 1sg ACT then -PSNV 1sgS- take -sgf 2sgFOC also

Because I took you (f) away, so I (m) can't take you back".

c. Hide aerege aka iru laemege
hide a- e- re -ge aka iru la- e- me -ge
thus 3sgmO- SBD- say -ANT then sleep 3dumO- SBD- HAB -ANT

kui na aeril osia.
kui na æ -ril o- sia
sun(m) sgmArt go.up -MORE 3sgS- do

Him saying this, then they slept, and the sun went up a little bit.

18.2.5 DISAMBIGUATION OF PARTICIPANTS

Reference tracking is easily done by verbal agreement affixes, gender agreement and the oia pronoun when there are participants of different person/gender/number status. In (14) above, there was a boy; and a couple consisting of a man and woman who usually acted together. The person values are the same for both (3rd person) and both referents are masculine gender (in Lavukaleve, masculine gender is used for mixed-gender referents, if at least one is masculine). So number is the only value different, and it is number alone that distinguishes the participants in the fourth and fifth sentences of this extract.

What, then, happens when two participants have the same person/gender/number status? In the next extract from the same story, the two main participants are the male giant and the boy, both of whom have the same person/gender/number values. The speaker uses overt NPs to refer to them each time one becomes an actor:

18) a. Bagatum na otin ga elauge,
bagatum na o- tina ga e- e- lau -ge
male.giant(m) sgmArt 3sgPOSS-body(n) sgmArt 3sgmO- SBD- be.sore -ANT

ika irum.
ika iru -m
there sleep -sgm

The giant's body was sore, there he slept.

b. Airuge vo'vou na felere kini feum.
a- e- iru -ge vo'vou na fele -re kini feu -m
3sgmO- SBD- sleep-ANT boy(m) sgmArt return -NF ACT go.up -sgm

Him sleeping, the boy went back up.
The oia pronoun can be used in this context, to show which referent was meant, either the most recently mentioned one or the previously mentioned one. However this does not always completely clarify matters, as the following extract shows. In this sentence from a story about two brothers, the speaker struggles to keep separate the two brothers, and tries to make it clear which one he is talking about each time. He does this by means of the oia pronoun, with the additional help of added NPs:

18.2.6 CHOOSING NOT TO DISAMBIGUATE PARTICIPANTS

Lavukaleve offers many morpho-syntactic mechanisms for the disambiguation of participants. However, in telling stories it is often the case that speakers do not avail themselves of these. Often there is no need for overt disambiguation, because people tend already to know who did what. In traditional stories particularly, everyone knows what happened. However, even when such things are not known, there is a noticeable tendency still not to be explicit unless pressed.

As an example, the story from which the following excerpt was taken from was told to me by a friend, after she found out I had never heard the story of how her relative had been killed. When she told the story, she told it specifically to me, no other people were present, and she knew I didn’t know the story, or any of the people in it. She introduces the background, that there was a man called Tagoila, and that he had a friend:
20) a. **Oinari**

Tagoila na fin

Kiolen heaka

oina -ri

Tagoila(m) sgmArt 3sgmFOC

Kiolen -n heaka

other.MED.sgm -PSNV

Tagoila(m) sgmArt 3sgmFOC

Kiolen -LOC there.DIST1

**fi**

**oali roa ome.**

3sgnFOC 3sgPOSS-

man(m) one.sgm 3sgS- continue

That one, he was Tagoila, over at Kiolen, and he had one particular friend.

b. **Foina**

anam iruraine haure hi lome.

foina a- nam iruraine hau -re hi lo-

PN.MED.sgm 3sgmO- to everyday go.ashore -NF do/say 3sgS- HAB

He visited him every day (to take market goods to another island).

There are no syntactic rules to tell the audience who, in the previous sentence, visited who every day, and there is little in the story so far to help us. The story continues:

c. **Aka**

velanun velanun le roge ena

aka vela -nun vela -nun le roge e- na

then go -DUR go -DUR day(n) one.sgm 3sgnO- in

aham talu oone aolai.

a- ham talu o- o- ne a- o- lai

3sgmO- for word(f) 3sgfO- 3sgS- give 3sgmO- 3sgS- tell

So it went on and on, then one day he told him: ("One day, on a certain day, you come ashore.")

d. **Aka**

aunione fi kini ngohaure."

aka aunio -ne fi kinit go- hau -re

then evening -PERL 3sgnFOC ACT 2sg- go.ashore -FUT

ore. "Sarere fi."

o- re Sarere fi

3sgS- say Saturday 3sgnFOC

So in the evening you come ashore" he said. "On Saturday".

Again here there was nothing to tell us who told whom to come ashore on Saturday. We find out in the next sentence that it is the friend who told Tagoila to come ashore, and we find out later that this is because he was planning an ambush, but at this stage the audience has no means of knowing this. The story goes on:

e. **Otam malan na aerege, ohau.**

otam malan na a- e- re -ge o- hau

companion(m) sgmArt 3sgmO- SBD- say -ANT 3sgS- go.ashore

His friend saying that, he went ashore.

Here the friend is explicitly mentioned, by an overt NP, and we could guess that he is not only the subject of the clause in which he appears, but also the subject of the next clause, **ohau.** In this, we would be wrong. The friend tells Tagoila to go ashore, and then Tagoila goes ashore. Tagoila remains the subject of much of the next long sequence, in which he is tracked just by verbal prefixes:
f. Aham leo o kegu o mina la
aham leo o kegu o mina la
3sgmO- for betel.nut(n) and leaf.for.betel.nut(f) and thing(f) sgArt

oririgoirire, lelenga o fo'sal vomare ohau.
oririgo -ri -re lelenga o fo'sal vo- ma -re o- hau
3sgfO- prepare -CAUS -NF pudding(f) and fish(pl) 3plO-take -NF 3sgS- go.ashore

He prepared betel nut, leaf and everything for him, pudding and fish, and took them ashore.

g. Haure fi, ana mina oone.
haure -re fi a- na mina o- o- ne
go.ashore -NF 3sgnFOC 3sgmO- in thing(f) 3sgfO- 3sgS- give

Coming ashore, he gave the stuff to him.

h. Ana mina oonege, ane ngoa
ana mina o- o- ne -ge a- ne ngoa
3sgmO- in thing(f) 3sgfO- 3sgS- give -ANT 3sgmO- with stay

laemege ngoa laemege ngoa
la- e- me -ge ngoa la- e- me -ge ngoa
3sgmO- SBD- HAB -ANT stay 3sgmO- SBD- HAB -ANT stay

laemege hano kini koro ga fau.
la- e- me -ge hano kini koro ga fau
3sgmO- SBD- HAB -ANT then ACT darkness(n) sgnArt happen

Him giving the stuff to him, he stayed on and on and on, then dark came.

i. Koro ga efauge, aunio lalamu
koro ga e- e- fau -ge aunio lalamu
darkness(n) sgnArt 3sgmO- SBD- happen -ANT evening(f) early

ona kini ovaau.
ona kini o- vau
3sgfO- in ACT 3sgS- go.out

Darkness coming, in the early evening he went out (seawards).

j. Felere "Ba! Koi ta fi" hivel.
felle -re ba koi ta fi hi -vel
return -NF go!sg also must 3sgnFOC do/say -COMPL

Returning, "Let's go! It's time now!" [he] said.

The actor changes during the last sequence, but we do not know exactly when. We can guess that the friend is speaking in the last sentence, but it is also possible the friend was the actor in the third last and second last as well. There is nothing to tell us.

A similar situation occurs in the next sequence, about a rat and a giant, both of whom are grammatically 3rd person singular masculine:
21) Eonege emare ovai.

He gave it, then he took it and went down.

"Vau akui fi, ngahourene melengoare" hide ore.

"Once you've cooked it, you two will wait for me" he said.

"Ho'bea fi" hivel.

"Okay" he said.

In this sequence, it is perhaps easier to tell who is doing what, just from the context, and from the fact that they take it in turns to talk. Another translation, this time with the participants made overt, is as follows:

He (the giant) gave it (the fire), then he (the rat) took it and went down. "Once you've cooked it (the pig), you two wait for me" he (the giant) said. "Okay" he (the rat) said.

These sequences highlight the fact that although there are plentiful means of disambiguating participants, often speakers choose not to avail themselves of them. Often this does not matter, as hearers often already know, or can guess, the intended referents. However often it does lead to confusion. In the story about Tagoila (excerpt 20 above), the consultant who helped me transcribe it had not heard this version of this story. Although he did know the major participants, and the conclusion of the story, he was as confused as I was about what was happening in each sentence. It was only after hearing the whole story that he could go back and say who must have been referred to in each sentence. In this, he relied not on linguistic means of disambiguating participants, but instead on his knowledge of the broad outline of the story, and his knowledge of the real-world context in which the events happened.
APPENDIX: text

Monggo Mako'mua - The Monggo people

This story was told by James Nepolo, of Ale Village.

Punctuation conventions are as follows. A numbered chunk of text is an intonation group plus extra-prosodic afterthoughts which are syntactically and/or semantically linked. Full-stops indicate sentence-final intonation. Commas represent a pause after a rise in pitch. Slashes represent a pause after level pitch. Exclamation marks indicate prosodically prominent elements inserted into the intonation contour. Question marks indicate question intonation. Double quotes indicate direct speech, which may be pronounced in a different voice than the rest of the text.

jn 001
Aka malav hovariom / ka'sov fiv.
aka malav hova -ri -om / ka'so -v fiv
then people MOD.PROX.pl -PSNV -m/n / not.know -pl 3plFOC
So these people were stupid!

jn 002
Mina roru ovealav fiv.
mia ro -ru o- vea -la -v fiv
thing one.sgF -none 3sgFOG know -NEG -pl 3plFOC
They didn't know anything.

jn 003
Mitakeumal voku mavatuv mame fiv.
mitakeu -mal vo- ku ma- vatu -v ma- me fiv
dog -pl 3plO- like 3plPOSS head -pl 3plS- continue 3plFOC
Their heads were like dogs.

jn 004
Aka foiga mangoae foiga.
aka foiga ma- ngoa -e foiga
then PN.MED.sgn 3plS- stay -NOMZR PN.MED.sgn
So their lives were like this.
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jn 005

Ngoanun ngoanun ngoanun / ngoanun ngoanun
ngoa -nun ngoa -nun ngoa -nun / ngoa -nun ngoa -nun
stay -DUR stay -DUR stay -DUR / stay -DUR stay -DUR
ngoanun / ta fi aka sulum na / hide
ngoa -nun / ta fi aka sulum na / hide
stay -DUR / just 3sgnFOC then chief sgmArt / thus
aerege / "Ririgoiha!
a- e- re -ge / ririgoi -a -ba
3sgmO- SBD- say -ANT / prepare -INTR -DURIMP.pl

Things were going on and on, then one time the chief said "Prepare!"

jn 006

Raine mate emeko” / ore.
raine mate e- me- ko / o- re
tomorrow war 3sgnO- 1pl.in- throw / 3sgS- say

Tomorrow we’ll fight a war,” he said.

jn 007

Hide malav va voolaige "O / ho’bea fi” /
hide malav va vo- o- lai -ge o / ho’bea fi /
thus people plArt 3plO- 3sgS- tell -ANT oh / good 3sgnFOC /
mare ke.
ma- re ke
3plS- say EMPP

Upon him telling people thus, “Oh, okay” they said.

jn 008

"Raine. Raine fi mevere”.
raine raine fi me- ve -re
tomorrow tomorrow 3sgnFOC 1pl.in- go -FUT

"Tomorrow. Tomorrow we’ll go”.

jn 009

Le ga eveage malav va
le ga e- e- vea -ge malav va
day sgnArt 3sgnO- SBD- emerge -ANT people plArt
makikilevil o mavulitavil
ma- ki’kile -vil o ma- vulita -vil
3plPOSS- headhunting.axe -pl and 3plPOSS- shield -pl
ohasirisire / voririgoirire lore,
o- hasisiri -re / vo- ririgoi -ri -re lo -re
3sgfO- sharpen -NF / 3plO- prepare -CAUS -NF finish -NF
aunion nun vau / mola ga emake
aunio -n nun vau / mola ga e- ma- ke
evening -LOC from go.out / canoe sgnArt 3sgnO- 3plS- push.off
vauri. Binabina la.
vau -ri ø binabina la
go.out -CAUS sgn war.canoe sgfArt

The next day, the people sharpened their axes and their shields, and having prepared, then in the evening pushed out their canoe. The war canoe.
**APPENDIX: TEXT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>jn 010</th>
<th>Vaurire,</th>
<th>ngoane</th>
<th>ngoa voemege,</th>
<th>sulum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vau</td>
<td>-ri</td>
<td>ngoa</td>
<td>-ne</td>
<td>ngoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go.out</td>
<td>-CAUS</td>
<td>stay</td>
<td>-IMPF</td>
<td>stay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na</td>
<td>kini</td>
<td>vau</td>
<td>/ laveam.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Going out, they waited, then the chief arrived.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>jn 011</th>
<th>Hano</th>
<th>vau</th>
<th>aom.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hano</td>
<td>vau</td>
<td>ao</td>
<td>-m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Okay. He went [to the shore] and got in [the canoe].*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>jn 012</th>
<th>Mave</th>
<th>foiga.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ma-</td>
<td>ve</td>
<td>foiga</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*They went.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>jn 013</th>
<th>Aka</th>
<th>velav</th>
<th>va.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aka</td>
<td>ve</td>
<td>-la</td>
<td>-v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*But they didn't go!*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>jn 014</th>
<th>Aige</th>
<th>la</th>
<th>foia.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aige</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>foi</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The anchor was still holding.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>jn 015</th>
<th>Rurukanarene</th>
<th>ngoa</th>
<th>mea.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dup-</td>
<td>rukana</td>
<td>-re</td>
<td>-ne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*It was still tied.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>jn 016</th>
<th>Lai</th>
<th>voemege</th>
<th>lai</th>
<th>voemege</th>
<th>lai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lai</td>
<td>vo-</td>
<td>e-</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>-ge</td>
<td>lai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paddle</td>
<td>3plO-</td>
<td>SBD-</td>
<td>HAB</td>
<td>-ANT</td>
<td>paddle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*They paddled on and on and on and on, they continued.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>jn 017</th>
<th>Lai</th>
<th>voemege</th>
<th>lai</th>
<th>voemege</th>
<th>lai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lai</td>
<td>vo-</td>
<td>e-</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>-ge</td>
<td>lai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paddle</td>
<td>3plO-</td>
<td>SBD-</td>
<td>HAB</td>
<td>-ANT</td>
<td>paddle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*They paddled and paddled and paddled, then - where? - Sokopiu.*

---

441
Hoikari mala'gulev kilikil / na olako.
hoika -ri mala'gulev kilikil / na o- lako

There some birds - a kilikil bird - cried.

Aelakoge / "O! Meukeav.
a- e- lako -ge / o me- ukea -v
3sgmO- SBD- cry -ANT / oh 1pl.in- come.close -pl

Him crying, "Oh! We're close.

Laiba!" mare.
lai -ba ma- re
paddle -DURIMP.pl 3plS- say

Paddle!" they said.

Lai voemege lai voemege lai
lai vo- e- me -ge lai vo- e- me -ge lai
paddle 3plO- SBD- HAB -ANT paddle 3plO- SBD- HAB -ANT paddle
voemege / kilimar na lakom.
vo- e- me -ge / kilimar na lako -m
3plO- SBD- HAB -ANT / flock.of.white.seagulls sgmArt cry -sgm

They paddled and paddled and paddled, then the flock of seagulls cried.

"E! Laiba! Ukeare lore fi melei".
e! lai -ba ukea -re lo -re fi
hey! paddle -DURIMP.pl come.close -NF finish -NF 3sgnFOC
melei".
1pl.in- exist
"Hey! Paddle! We're close now!"

Malav ne kalem ne kala!
malav ne kalem ne kala
people with father with mother

My goodness, those people!

Lai voemege lai voemege lai
lai vo- e- me -ge lai vo- e- me -ge lai
paddle 3plO- SBD- HAB -ANT paddle 3plO- SBD- HAB -ANT paddle
voemege lar ga foiga / haure
vo- e- me -ge lar ga foiga / hau -re
3plO- SBD- HAB -ANT daylight sgmArt PN.MED.sgn / go.ashore -NF
vula me.
vula me -ø
come HAB -sgn

They paddled and paddled and paddled, then day broke, okay, they came ashore.
The kilikil bird and the seagull cried.

Them crying, they (the people) looked around, and it was daylight.

They looked up and saw a vogo tree.

They went up [to the bush].

Having left the canoe.

They went up, like that.

Things went on, then, hey!
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jn 033
Volu voire voula leiv fiv!
volu vo- i -te vo- u -la lei -v fiv
garden 3plO- do -NF 3plO- eat -NEG exist -pl 3plFOC
They don’t work in gardens!

jn 034
Noka vuhu ta ngoa mame.
noka vuhu ta ngoa ma- me
just nothing just stay 3plS- HAB
They just do nothing.

jn 035
Aka foiga.
aka foiga
then PN.MED.sgn
So okay.

jn 036
Ae! Hogariom
æ hoga -ri -om e- na / fela’koe
hey! MOD.PROX.sgn -PSNV -m/n 3sgnO- in / village
enuvev / va.
e- nuve -v / va
3sgnO- own -pl / plArt
Gee! This time, those people who own the village, ...

jn 037
Malosiv voluae eham ta
ma- losi -v vo- lua -e e- ham ta
3plPOSS- basket -pl 3plO- steal -NOMZR 3sgnO- for just
mavere / hamusin.
ma- ve -te / hamus -n
3plS- go -FUT / evening -LOC
They [the Monggo] would go to steal their food. At night.

jn 038
Mave ga koro ga efauge
ma- ve -ø ga koro ga e- e- fau -ge bae
3plS- go -NOMZR sgnArt darkness sgnArt 3sgnO- SBD- happen -ANT let’s go
They went when night came, “Let’s go!

jn 039
Vai!” Mave foiga / fela’koe ga enam.
bae ma- ve foiga / fela’koe ga e- nam
let’s.go 3plS- go PN.MED.sgn / village sgnArt 3sgnO- to
Let’s go!” They went to the village.

jn 040
Ve mai ga ena / kini ali roa tail
ve ma- i -i ga e- na / kini ali roa tail
go 3plS- do -NOMZR sgnArt 3sgnO- in / ACT man one.sgm house
roge ena ali roa tail roge ena /
roge e- na ali roa tail roge e- na /
one.sgn 3sgnO- in man one.sgm house one.sgn 3sgnO- in /
The way they went, one man to one house, one man to one house, then having taken took the food (left) in the losi baskets they went. To their village.

"Hey! Who ate our food?"

It was like that, they lived by stealing.

"Hey, let’s do something."

The other way they went, one man to one house, one man to one house, then having taken took the food (left) in the losi baskets they went. To their village.
A whale, and the crab and the coconut crab and whatever people eat, they took.

They slept and slept and slept, then the others said "Let's go!"

They went to steal.
One man went to the house, put his hand in a basket, and when something bit him. "Ow!", then when he said it, [the house owner] stood up and killed him.

The whole lot of them were killed.

When they hit them.

That's why none returned.

That's their way.

So it went on, then, "Hey!"
Aka / kini houl vokoroiva!
hide / mare
aka / kini houl vo- koroi -iva
then / ACT trees 3plO- chop -PCTIMP.pl
ke.
ke
EMPH
So go and cut sticks!" they said.

Then they all stand up.

Standing, they hold up their branches.

Two men, one at each end, they stand.

Then he says "So what's up? Are you lot ready?

He turns it around [and cuts from the other side].
Turning it around, oh my goodness!, the sago tree falls down in the middle of them all.

Upon it hitting them, they all die.

The branches squashing them.

The man who chopped the tree runs away.

That's their way.

Things go on and on, then the chief says "Hey!"
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jn 075
Mate fi veva."
mate fi veva
war 3sgnFOC in.that.way
It's war!"

jn 076
Hide aerege, maririgoia
hide a- e- re -ge ma- ririgoi -a
thus 3sgmO- SBD- say -ANT 3plS- prepare -INTR
ririgoiare ngoanun / hano.
ririgoi -a re ngoa -nun / hano
prepare -INTR -NF stay -DUR / then
Him saying this, then they all get ready.

jn 077
Oiva vauv / binabina la oke
oiva vau -v / binabina la o- ke
other.MED.pl go.out -pl / war.canoe sgfArt 3sgfO- push.off
vaurire, houio la oirene
vau -ri -re hou -io la o- i -re -ne
go.out -CAUS -NF wait.for -NOMZR.f sgfArt 3sgfO- do -NF -IMPF
ngoa voemege / sulum na
ngoa vo- e- me -ge / sulum na
stay 3plO- SBD- HAB -ANT / chief sgmArt
ahourene ngoa voemege kini /
a- hou -re -ne ngoa vo- e- me -ge kini /
3sgmO- wait.for -NF -IMPF stay 3plO- SBD- HAB -ANT ACT
ovau.
o- vau
3sgS- go.out
They go out [to shore], push out the war canoe, and wait and wait for the chief. They wait and wait, and he comes out.

jn 078
Ngalakun lafa hoiariom
nga- lafa hoia -ri -om
1sgPOSS- hate -LOC part MOD.MED.sgF -PSNV -m/n
otigirine.
o- tigiri -ne
3sgfO- tell -IMPF
I don't want to say that bit.

jn 079
Mina onal mina ngiungiu oesiage.
mina o- nal mina ngiungiu o- e- sia -ge
thing 3sgfO- because thing secret 3sgfO- SBD- do -ANT
Because of it being a secret.

jn 080
Vaure, mao.
vau -re ma- ao
go.out -NF 3plS- go.in
Going out [seawards] they got in [the canoe].
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jn 081
Aore  velanun  velanun  velanun  velanun  ta
ao  -re  vela -nun  vela -nun  vela -nun  vela -nun  ta
go.in  -NF  go  -DUR  go  -DUR  go  -DUR  go  -DUR  just
"Ei!
ei
hey!
They went on and on, then "Hey!"

jn 082
Naumal na  tamu siam.
aumal na  tamu sia  -m
god  sgmArt  no  do  -sgm
There is no magic strength.

jn 083
Bai  feleme!"
hide  ore.
bai  fele  -me  hide  o-  re
let's go  return  -HORT  thus  3sgS-  say
Let's go back!"  he said.

jn 084
Aerege  mafele.
a-  e-  re  -ge  ma-  fele
3sgMO-  SBD-  say  -ANT  3plS-  return
Him saying this, they returned.

jn 085
Felere  vore,  kini  maerau  eraure,  sulum  na
fele  -re  vo  -re  kini  ma-  erau  erau  -re  sulum  na
return  -NF  come  -NF  ACT  3plS-  fall  fall  -NF  chief  sgmArt

jn 086
Feuna  feuna  feuna  feu  otua  otail
feu  -na  feu  -na  feu  -na  feu  o-  tua  o-  tail
go.up  -DUR  go.up  -DUR  go.up  -DUR  go.up  3sgPOSS-  wife  3sgPOSS-  house
okoan  ka  /  kilekile  la
o-  koa  -n  ka  /  kilekile  la
3sgPOSS-  door  -LOC  LOCEMPTH  /  axe  sgmArt
okoge  lain  heaka
o-  o-  ko  -ge  lai  -n  heaka
3sgPOSS-  3sgS-  throw  -ANT  top  -LOC  there.DIST1
oeaenge  haikio  la  oehaige
o-  e-  æ-  ge  haikio  la  o-  e-  hai  -ge  /
3sgFO-  SBD-  go.up  -ANT  shout  sgmArt  3sgFO-  SBD-  do  -ANT  /
oeaenge  haikio  la  ohaire
o-  e-  æ-  ge  haikio  la  o-  hai  -re  kilekile
3sgFO-  SBD-  go.up  -ANT  shout  sgmArt  3sgFO-  do  -NF  axe
la  ini  foae  oiga  ena /
la  ini  foa  -e  oiga  e-  na /
sgmArt  ACT  go.down  -NOMZR  other.MED.sgn  sgmO-  in /
He went up and up and up, he goes to the door of his wife's house, and throwing his axe up into the air, and shouting, shouting, the axe comes down on it, it breaks the soft part on the top of the head, he lays stiff. In the door.

jn 087
Okiu.
o- kiu
3sgS- die
He dies.

jn 088
Aka otua la "Ta! aka o-tua la ta
Then his wife says "Hey!

jn 089
Le ngomae fin haikio la ohaim
but 2sg- take -NOMZR 3sgmFOC shout sgfArt 3sgfO- do -sgm
hin / aka ria ta vere / 'koa ealava'
hin / aka ria ta ve -re / koa e-ala -va
3sgmEFOC / then where just go -NF / door 3sgnO- open -PCTIMP.sg
hilam olei" / ore.
do -NEG -sgm 3sgS- exist / 3sgS- say
But my husband shouted. Where did he go, he hasn't said 'Open the door'?" she said.

jn 090
Kekimare ngoanun ngoanun koa ga
kekima -re ngoa -nun ngoa -nun koa ga
listen -NF stay -DUR stay -DUR door sgfArt
ealare, oekakomeon ta foina
e-ala -re o- e-kako -meon ta foina
3sgnO- open -NF 3sgfO- SBD- look.out -SURP just PN.MED.sgm
hoina loveare leim. Koan.
hoina lovea -re lei -m koa -n
MOD.MED.sgm be.stiff -NF exist -sgm door -LOC
Listening, she opened the door and looked around, and he was stiff. In the doorway.

jn 091
Ikari ta hano.
ika -ri ta hano
there -PSNV just then
There it was.
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jn 092
Laegaelaveage.
laega\hspace{1em}cry\hspace{1em}appear\hspace{1em}ANT
With the crying. (agreement mistake: should be elaveage (AHT))

jn 093
Aka\hspace{1em}ikari\hspace{1em}ta\hspace{1em}hano\hspace{1em}malav\hspace{1em}va\hspace{1em}hauhaua\hspace{1em}ikari\hspace{1em}ta
aka\hspace{1em}ri\hspace{1em}ta\hspace{1em}hano\hspace{1em}malav\hspace{1em}va\hspace{1em}hauhaua\hspace{1em}v\hspace{1em}ika\hspace{1em}ri\hspace{1em}ta
then\hspace{1em}PSNV\hspace{1em}just\hspace{1em}then\hspace{1em}people\hspace{1em}worry\hspace{1em}pl\hspace{1em}PSNV\hspace{1em}just
Kini\hspace{1em}amare\hspace{1em}amangiu.
kini\hspace{1em}ma\hspace{1em}ma\hspace{1em}ngiu
ACT\hspace{1em}take\hspace{1em}3plS\hspace{1em}bury
Then the people all worried around, then they took him and buried him.

jn 094
Mangoae foiga.
ma\hspace{1em}ngo\hspace{1em}foiga
3plS\hspace{1em}stay\hspace{1em}NOMZR\hspace{1em}MED.sgn
That’s their way.

jn 095
Ngoanun\hspace{1em}ngoanun\hspace{1em}ngoanun\hspace{1em}ngoanun\hspace{1em}ta\hspace{1em}fi.
ngo\hspace{1em}nun\hspace{1em}ngo\hspace{1em}nun\hspace{1em}ngo\hspace{1em}nun\hspace{1em}ta\hspace{1em}fi
stay\hspace{1em}DUR\hspace{1em}stay\hspace{1em}DUR\hspace{1em}stay\hspace{1em}DUR\hspace{1em}stay\hspace{1em}DUR\hspace{1em}just\hspace{1em}3sgnFOC
Things went on and on.

jn 096
"Ila. Bai vau ila emeva" hide mare.
ila\hspace{1em}bae\hspace{1em}vau\hspace{1em}ila\hspace{1em}me\hspace{1em}va\hspace{1em}hide\hspace{1em}ma\hspace{1em}re
net\hspace{1em}let’s.go\hspace{1em}go.out\hspace{1em}net\hspace{1em}1pl.in\hspace{1em}pull\hspace{1em}thus\hspace{1em}3plS\hspace{1em}say
“A net. Let’s go out and take a net” they said.

jn 097
Ngoanun\hspace{1em}le\hspace{1em}ga\hspace{1em}eveage,\hspace{1em}vau
ngo\hspace{1em}nun\hspace{1em}le\hspace{1em}ga\hspace{1em}e\hspace{1em}vea\hspace{1em}vau
stay\hspace{1em}DUR\hspace{1em}day\hspace{1em}SDN\hspace{1em}emerge\hspace{1em}ANT\hspace{1em}go.out
koku\hspace{1em}lelemal\hspace{1em}nala\hspace{1em}lamafale.
koku\hspace{1em}two.m\hspace{1em}mduArt\hspace{1em}3dumS\hspace{1em}stand.sth.up
It went on, then next day, they went out and built two diving platforms.

jn 098
Laega\hspace{1em}emare\hspace{1em}vau\hspace{1em}evelare
ila\hspace{1em}e\hspace{1em}ma\hspace{1em}vau\hspace{1em}e\hspace{1em}vela
net\hspace{1em}take\hspace{1em}go.out\hspace{1em}press.down
airal\hspace{1em}lelemal\hspace{1em}nala\hspace{1em}koku\hspace{1em}roa
airal\hspace{1em}lelemal\hspace{1em}men.du\hspace{1em}mduArt\hspace{1em}standing\hspace{1em}two.m\hspace{1em}one.sgm
koku\hspace{1em}roa.
koku\hspace{1em}roa
They took the net, pressed it down, two men, one on each diving platform.
They stayed waiting for a school of little fish.

Then some of the others waited here at the shore.

Things went on, the school of little fish came in, they put them all in the net.

Putting them in, the others (who stayed ashore) came out and took the fish out of the net.

Having tipped out the school of fish, they divided them.

They counted out each man's share.
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jn 105

Ngoane ngoa voemege / akari siane

Ngoa -ne ngoa vo- e- me -ge / aka -ri sia -ne
stay -IMPF stay 3pLO- SBD- HAB -ANT / then -PSNV do -IMPF
voemege / hano lalamu la faua.

Things went on, it went on like that, then morning came.

jn 106

Oefauge, aka hide ore "Tam!
o- e- fau -ge aka hide o- re tam
3sgfO- SBD- happen -ANT then thus 3sgS- say man
It came, then [one man] said "Man!

jn 107

Oile hagi amefou.
o- i -le hagi a- me- fou
3sgfO- do -POT dry.coconut.leaf 3sgmO- 1pl.in- put.on
Let's light a dry coconut leaf.

jn 108

Ana feume" / hide mare.
a- na feu -me / hide ma- re
3sgmO- in go.up -HORT / thus 3pLS- say
Let's go up [to the bush] with it" they said.

jn 109

Hide voerege aka ali sulakat ali sulakat /
hide vo- e- re -ge aka ali sulakat ali sulakat /
thus 3pLO- SBD- say -ANT then man torch man torch /
akari fi / aka feure voeloge ta
aka -ri fi / aka feu -re vo- e- lo -ge ta
then -PSNV 3sgnFOC / then go.up -NF 3pLO- SBD- finish -ANT just
aka / ngalakun lafa hoiairom
aka / nga- laku -n lafa hoia -ri -om
then 1sgPOS- hate -LOC part MOD.MED.sgf -PSNV -m/n
otigirine.
o- -tigiri -ne
3sgfO- tell -IMPF

So each man had one torch, like that they went up. But I don't want to say that bit.

jn 110

Mina onal mina ngiungiu oesiage.
mina o- nal mina ngiungiu o- e- sia -ge
thing 3sgfO- because thing secret 3sgfO- SBD- do -ANT
Because of it being a secret.

jn 111

Hoikariom / masulakatev vofure /
hoika -ri -om / ma- sulakatev vo- fu -re /
there.MED -PSNV -m/n / 3pLOPOS- torches.pl 3pLO- light -NF /
aka foiga.
aka foiga
then PN.MED.sgn
So they all lit their torches, okay.
They went up [to the bush].

One man was sitting wondering.

The others all went far away.

They went, and cooking their little fishes, they eat them.

The other man stood up and went, but he took the wrong path. He walked and walked and walked, and then his little fish got smelly [went rotten].

They went rotten, then next day coming, he went straight home.
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jn 118
Mangoae - foiga.
ma- ngoa -e foiga
3p1S- stay -NOMZR PN.MED.sgn
That's their way.

jn 119
Ngoanun / ngoanun ngoanun / "Ei!
ngoa -nun / ngoa -nun ngoa -nun / ei
stay -DUR / stay -DUR stay -DUR / hey!
Things went on and on, then "Hey!

jn 120
Raine / vau / kua roge elevele
raine / vau / kua roge e- le -vele
tomorrow / go.out / coconut.tree one.sgn 3sgnO- see -SUC
eku "meu" / mare.
e- kua e- me- u / ma- re
3sgnO- coconut.tree 3sgnO- 1pl.in- eat / 3p1S- say
Tomorrow let's go out and find a coconut tree and eat its fruit." they said.

jn 121
Aka kua / ena maere ga lokosu
aka kua / e- na ma- ae -re ga lokosu
then coconut.tree / 3sgnO- in 3p1S- go.up -NF sgnArt headless
fi.
fi
sgnFOC
So the one they climbed had no top (ie. it was dead).

jn 122
Aunio la oefauge, mavaux.
aunio la o- e- faux -ge ma- vau
evening sgfArt 3sgO- SBD- happen -ANT 3p1S- go.out
Evening came, and they went out [of the bush].

jn 123
Vauve, sulum na hide ore "Foga
vau -re sulum na hide o- re foga
go.out -NF chief sgmArt thus 3sgS- say PN.PROX.sgn
hogariom".
hoga -ri -om
MOD.PROX.sgn -PSNV -m/n
Going out, the chief said "This one".

jn 124
Sagiolen fi maere.
sagio -n fi ma- ae -re
line -LOC 3sgnFOC 3p1S- go.up -NF
They climbed up in a line.

jn 125
Sagiolen aenun aenun aenun / oina
sagio -n ae -nun ae -nun ae -nun / oina
line -LOC go.up -DUR go.up -DUR go.up -DUR / other.MED.sgm
They climbed up in a line, then one man reached the top.

Him reaching the top, then the line followed him, and he said:

"Hey! This coconut tree has no top!" he said.

Him saying this, they passed [the words] over [the line] in a whisper.

Sending it over, it went down the line, and reached the man at the bottom.

"Hey! It's okay!"
No matter if it's dead or alive, small or young, or ready for eating, bring it down" he said.

Him saying that, he sent his word up slowly and it reached the man at the top.

Then the other man said:

"Hey! There is nothing there!"

This one is headless! It has no fruit." he said.

They sent down his word.
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jn 138
Foana  foana  foa  anam
foa -na  foa -na  foa a-   nam
go.down -DUR  go.down -DUR  go.down 3sgmO- to
oeveoge  "Ho'bea fi ke!".
o-   veo -ge  ho'bea fi  ke
3sgfO-  SBD- arrive -ANT  good  3sgnFOC  EMPH
It went down and down and down, and reached the bottom. "Okay!

jn 139
Kini  foa  voemen  matua  ve  man  man  man
kini  foa  vo- e- me -n  matua  ve  man  man  man
ACT  go.down  3plO-  SBD-  HAB -ADMON  old.coconut  or  what what what
na / foa laemen".
na / foa la- e- me -n  hide o- re
sgmArt / go.down  3sgmO- SBD-  HAB -ADMON  thus  3sgS- say
Bring it down, whatever it is, no matter if it's dry!” he said.

jn 140
Hide  lain  mem  na  aerege,
hide  lai -n  me -m  na  a- e- re -ge
thus  top -LOC  SPEC -sgm  sgmArt  3sgmO- SBD- say -ANT
omakelagurige  ofoa.
o- ma- kelago -ri -ge  o- foa
3sgfO-  3plS-  go.over  -CAUS -ANT  3sgS- go.down
Then the man on the top sent his word down.

jn 141
Oefoage  ta  oina / "Ho'bea fi" /
o-   foa -ge  ta  oina / ho'bea fi /
3sgfO-  SBD-  go.down -ANT  just  other.MED.sgm / good  3sgnFOC /
ore.
o- re
3sgS-  say
It going down, the bottom man said "It's all right!".

jn 142
Okelagurige  leta  aka / oina  feiriare /
o- kelago -ri -ge  leta  aka / oina  feiria -re /
3sgfO-  go.over  -CAUS -ANT  but then / other.MED.sgm  be.tired -NF /
haikio  la  ohai.
haikio  la  o- hai
shout  sgmArt  3sgS- do
The talk went back up, then that man on top got sick of it and shouted.

jn 143
"Lokusu foga!"  hide  ore.
lokusu  foga  hide o- re
headless  PN.PROX.sgm  thus  3sgS- say
"This one is headless!” he said.

jn 144
Aerege,  hano / mate ga  vo.
a- e- re -ge  hano / mate ga  vo -∅
3sgmO-  SBD- say -ANT  then / war  sgmArt  come -sgn
Him saying this, then there was a fight [with the owners of the tree].
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jn 145
Kini evoge oiva soi va / kini e- e- vo -ge oiva soi -v va / ACT 3sgnO- SBD- come -ANT other.MED.pl run.away -pl plArt / hoika tam enga ve. hoika tam enga ve -e there.MED man three go -NOMZR

It coming, then only three men [managed to] run away.

jn 146
Elav hova tam? elav hova tam how many MOD.PROX.pl man [aside:] How many men?

jn 147
Foiva hano soi hiv / oiva roa kini foiva hano soi -v hiv / oiva roa kini PN.MED.pl then run.away -pl 3plIEFOC / other.MED.pl one.sgm ACT aefoale akurure, roa kini a- e- foa -le a- kuru -re roa kini 3sgmO- SBD- go.down -POT 3sgmO- hit -NF one.sgm ACT aefoale akurure / a- e- foa -le a- kuru -re / 3sgmO- SBD- go.down -POT 3sgmO- hit -NF / vokurure vomalori / akari vo- kuru -re vo- ma- lo -ri / aka -ri 3plO- hit -NF 3plO- 3plS- finish -CAUS / then -PSNV siare mangoae foiga. sia -re ma- ngoa -e foiga do -NF 3plS- stay -NOMZR PN.MED.sgn

Those ones who ran away, any of them who came down, other people killed every one of them.

jn 148
Ngoanun / ngoanun ngoanun ngoanun ta fi / ngoa -nun / ngoa -nun ngoa -nun ngoa -nun ta fi / stay -DUR / stay -DUR stay -DUR stay -DUR just 3sgnFOC / "Ei! ei hey! Things went on, then "Hey!"

jn 149
Lefalefaul votaeva! / hide koi mare. lefalef -aul vo- tae -iva / hide koi ma- re basket -pl 3plO- make -PCTIMP.pl / thus also 3plS- say You make some big baskets!" they said.

jn 150
"Ali lefalef / ali lefalef / aka hoikari fi ali lefalef / ali lefalef / aka hoika -ri fi man basket / man basket / then there.MED -PSNV 3sgnFOC
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mevere" / hide mare.
me- ve -re / hide ma- re
1pl.in- go -FUT / thus 3plS- say

"Each man should make a basket, then we'll go." they said.

jn 151
Lefalefaul va volukarire matongan.
lefalef -aul va vo- lukari -re ma- tonga -n
basket -pl plArt 3plO- gather -FUT 3plPOSS- chance -LOC

They gather the baskets, one each.

jn 152
Vofoure ngoane ngoa voemege
vo- fou -re ngoa -ne ngoa vo- e- me -ge /
3plO- put.on -NF stay -IMPF stay 3plO- SBD- HAB -ANT /
kor o ga fa u.
koro ga fau -o
darkness sgnArt happen -sgn

They get them, thing go on, dark comes.

jn 153
Koro ga efauge, foiva.
koro ga e- e- fau -ge foiva
darkness sgnArt 3sgnO- SBD- happen -ANT PN.MED.pl

Dark coming, those people.

jn 154
Mava u.
ma- vau
3plS- go.out

They went out.

jn 155
Vau mabinabina la okeva u r ire,
vau ma- binabina la o- ke vau -ri -re
3plPOSS- war.canoe sgnArt 3sgfO- push.off go.out -CAUS -NF
vau mao.
vau ma- ao
go.out 3plS- go.in

They went out and pushed out their war canoe, and got in.

jn 156
Vau aore / hoine talav!
vau ao -re / hoi -ne tala -v
go.out go.in -NF / deep.sea -PERL go.far -pl

They got in, then they went far away in the deep sea.

jn 157
Gurugurur tamu.
gurugurur tamu
canoe.noise no

Making no noises.
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jn 158
Mafoae  foiga.
ma-  foa -e  foiga
3p1POSS-  go.down -NOMZR PN.MED.sgn
That was how they went down.

jn 159
Foana  foana  foana  foana  foana
foa  -na  foa  -na  foa  -na  foa  -na  foa  -na
go.down  -DUR  go.down  -DUR  go.down  -DUR  go.down  -DUR
foa  Nagu  me  efataran  ka
foa  Nagu  me  -ø  e-  fatara  -n  ka
go.down  place.name  SPEC  -sgn  3sgnO-  across.from  -LOC  LOCEMPH
siavel  hokari  ta  fi.
sia  -vel  hoka  -ri  ta  fi
do  -COMPL  here.PROX  -PSNV  just  3sgnFOC
They went down and down and down and down, then across from Nagu they went ashore.

jn 160
Hau  maerau.
hau  ma-  erau
go.ashore  3p1S-  fall
They went ashore.

jn 161
Hau  eraure,  mabinabina  la  ona  aige
hau  erau  -re  ma-  binabina  la  o-  na  aige
go.ashore  fall  -NF  3p1POSS-  war.canoe  sgfArt  3sgfO-  in  anchor
okefoare,  mafeu.  Lalamu  la
okefoare,  mafeu.  Lalamu  la
o-  ke  foa  -re  ma-  feu  lalamu  la
3sgfO-  push.off  go.down  -NF  3p1POSS-  go.up  darkness  sgfArt
ona.
ona.
3sgfO-  in
Going ashore, they anchored the canoe and went up [to the bush]. In the dark.

jn 162
Feu  lugauline  gala  keleanun  keleanun  keleanun
feu  lugauli  -ne  gala  kelea  -nun  kelea  -nun  kelea  -nun
go.up  bush  -PERL  there  walk  -DUR  walk  -DUR  walk  -DUR
volu  ika  tamu.
volu  ika  tamu
jet  garden  there  no
They go up through the bush, there are no gardens there.

jn 163
Vuvurane  igala  keleanun  keleanun  keleanun  /  dani  ga
vuvura  -ne  igala  kelea  -nun  kelea  -nun  kelea  -nun  /  dani  ga
go.all.about  -IMPF  there  walk  -DUR  walk  -DUR  walk  -DUR  /  dawn  sgnArt
ekige,  elere,  malav  va  mafan
ekige,  elere,  malav  va  mafan
ø-  ø-  ki  -ge  ø-  le  -re  malav  va  ma-  fan
3sgnO-  SBD-  dawn  -ANT  3sgnO-  see  -NF  people  plArt  3p1POSS-some
ika  volufure  o'asene  gala  kini  vau  mao.
ika  vo-  lufu  -re  o'as  -ne  gala  kini  vau  ma-  ao
there  3p1O-  leave  -NF  bush  -PERL  there  ACT  go.out  3p1S-  go.in
They went all about, went on and on, then dawn came, they saw day coming, they left some people there,
the rest went with the canoe.

jn 164
Felere, soire mae.
fele -re soi -re ma- æ
return -NF run.away -NF 3plS- go.up

Returning, they ran up.

jn 165
Ae mangoæ foiga.
ae ma- ngoæ -e foiga
go.up 3plS- stay -NOMZR PN.MED.sgn

They stayed up there.

jn 166
Ngoanun / hoikari fi kini / ngoæ
ngoæ -nun / hoika -ri fi kini / ngoæ -e
stay -DUR / there.MED -PSNV 3sgnFOC ACT / stay -NOMZR
mae ga ena hano aka suni / kiure
ma- æ ga e- na hano aka suni / kiu -re
3plS- go.up sgnArt 3sgnO- in then then all / die -NF
lov.
lo -v
finish -pl

Things went on, then they all died.

jn 167
Monggomil va.
Monggo -mil va
stupid.Isabel.people -FOLK plArt
The Monggo people.

jn 168
Rovoru tamu ta hona. Loa.
rovo -ru tamu ta hona lo -a
one.pl -none no time MOD.PROX.sgm finish -sgf
There are none left now. The end.
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