

**Looking at relationships between propositions in Maori language**

**Waldo Houia**

*Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato* (University of Waikato)

Private Bag 3105, Hamilton, New Zealand

[whoia@waikato.ac.nz]

**Abstract**

This paper reports on an investigation into the various ways in which relationships of meaning, such as *reason-result* and *temporal overlap*, are encoded as clauses, sentences and groups of sentences in Maori. It also provides an indication of the relevance of this type of research to teachers and learners of Maori.

**Introduction**

I have spent many years teaching Maori as a second language to children and adults. This experience has revealed to me that comparatively few learners of the language appear to progress to the stage where they are able to express themselves in a wide variety of different ways, making full use of the linguistic resources that are potentially available to them. In particular, I have noticed that second language learners tend to confine themselves to common ways of expressing certain types of meaning relationship between parts of a text. Thus, for example, reasons tend to be expressed by *notemea*, conditions by *mehemea* and purposes by *hei*. This is in spite of the fact that all of these meanings can be expressed in a range of different ways in Maori (as they can in other languages). If this situation continues, there is, I believe, a very real danger that many subtleties of expression in Maori will be lost to future generations who will, therefore, be unable to appreciate the ways in which the language was used in important works of the past. I believe that it is possible, and desirable, to attempt to reverse this trend. For this reason, I examined a corpus of writing from the past in order to determine the range of ways in which certain types of meaning are expressed with a view to incorporating these into teaching programmes.

**Semantic relationships between clauses and sentences**

Clauses, sentences and groups of sentences can be linked to one another in various different ways in coherent discourses. These relationships are referred to here as 'semantic relationships'. Each of these semantic relationships can be expressed linguistically in a variety of different ways.

The relationships examined here are of three main types:

- Causative relationships (involving cause and effect);
- Matching relationships (involving comparison and contrast);
- Contiguity relationships (involving relationships in time and space).

Under each of these headings, a number of different relationships are detectable. These relationships have been differently modelled and labelled in the literature on discourse analysis (see, for example, Beekman and Callow (1974), Winter (1977; 1982), Crombie (1985a). The model presented here is that outlined by Crombie (1985b). Examples are presented here in both English and Maori.

### Causative relationships

The causative relationships outlined here are:

- Reason-Result;
- Means-Result;
- Grounds-Conclusion;
- Means-Purpose;
- Condition-Consequence.

In the *Reason-Result* relationship, the *reason* member (which often follows the *result* member) gives the reason *why* a particular result came about or will come about.

- (1) He pai ki ahau te mea ra *notemea* he wera.  
(1a) I like it *because* it's hot.

In the *Means-Result* relationship, the *means* member states *how* a particular result was/will be or can be achieved.

- (2) I whakapuare ia i te tatau mā te whakatakawiri i te kakau.  
(2a) He opened the door *by* twisting the catch.

In the *Grounds-Conclusion* relationship, a *deduction* is drawn from an observation.

- (3) Ko te tino mate o te āhua o tērā kau, na reira ka kī au koira pea te mea i kī rā a Mere i te mate pupuhi te puku.  
(3a) That cow looks *so* ill *that* I conclude that she must be the one that Mary said had bloat.

In the *Means-Purpose* relation, the *purpose* member outlines the action that is/was/will be undertaken *with the intention of achieving* a particular result. The focus here is on the *intention* rather than the achievement.

- (4) I hoki moata au *kia* kore ai au e mahue i te pahi.  
(4a) I left early so that I wouldn't miss the bus.

In the *Condition-Consequence* relation, the *consequence* is dependent on a realizable or unrealizable *condition*.

- (5) *Ina* ka tae moata mai koe ka āhei koe ki te hianga.  
(5a) *Provided (that)* you get in early, you can play (realizable condition).  
(6) Kua mahia e au *me mea* i whai taima.  
(6a) I'd have done it *if* there had been time (unrealizable condition).

### Matching relationships

The matching relationships involving **contrast** outlined here are:

- Simple Contrast;
- Statement-Exception;
- Statement-Denial;
- Denial-Correction;
- Concession-Contraexpectation;
- Contrastive Alternation.

The matching relationships involving **comparison** outlined here are:

- Simple Comparison;
- Statement-Exemplification;
- Statement-Affirmation;
- Paraphrase;
- Equation;
- Amplification;
- Supplementary Alternation.

A *Simple Contrast* relation involves the comparison of two things, events, states, processes or abstractions in terms of some particular in respect of which they are different.

- (7) He Ngāpuhi ia; he Ngāi Tahu ia.  
(7a) He was Ngāpuhi; she was Ngāi Tahu.

*Statement-Exception* is very similar to simple contrast but it differs in that it is not simply a case of contrasting an area of difference, but of assuming similarity in areas other than the contrasted one/s.

- (8) Ko te katoa *i tua mai* i a Hine i wehe moata.  
(8a) Everyone *except* Hine left early.

The *Statement-Denial* relationship involves the denial of the truth or validity of a proposition.

- (9) A: I āmai a Tame.  
B: Kāo. Kāore ia i āmai.  
(9a) A: Tom fainted.  
B: No he didn't.

In the *Denial-Correction* relationship, one member is a denial involving a negated word or expression; the other is a contrary assertion containing a corrective, non-antonymic (not opposites) substitute for the negated word or expression:

- (10) Ehara ia i te māhita; he minita pāremata ia.  
(10a) He isn't a teacher; he's a politician.

In the relationship of *Concession-Contraexpectation*, the truth of a possible inference is directly or indirectly denied:

- (11) *Ahako* te ua, kāre tonu au i mau hāmarara mai.  
(11a) *Although* it's raining, I haven't brought an umbrella.

The *Contrastive Alternation* relation involves a choice between two terms which are treated as being antithetical.

- (12) E noho *rānei* e wehe atu *rānei*.  
(12a) *Either* stay or leave.

The *Simple Comparison* relation involves the comparison of two terms in relation to some aspect of similarity.

- (13) I te mataku ahau *ā* i te pēra anō a Tame.  
(13a) I was afraid *and* so was Tom.

In *Statement-Exemplification*, one member of the relation provides a generalization and the other provides an exemplification of that generalization.

- (14) I whakapau moni te katoa. *Ina koa* a Kararaina i hoko mai i te tekau mā rima kaka.  
(14a) Everyone spent up large. Kararaina, *for example*, bought fifteen dresses.

In the *Statement-Affirmation* relation, the truth or validity of a statement is affirmed.

- (15) I ki ia, rā kē a Mere te noho i runga waireka, *ā*, e *whakaae ana* au.  
(15a) He said that Mary should have stuck to soft drinks and I *agree*.

In the *Paraphrase* relation, the same propositional content is expressed in different ways.

- (16) I tīmata ia ki te piki; i tīmata ia i te pikinga.  
(16a) He began to climb; he commenced the ascent.

In the *Amplification* relation, a general term is replaced by a specific expression. Thus, in the first example below 'knew' is replaced by 'that he was lying' and 'mōhio' is replaced by 'i te rūpahu a Hone'.

- (17) I *mōhio* ia i te rūpahu a Hone.  
(17a) He *knew that* John was lying.

*Supplementary Alternation* involves two or more non-antithetical choices.

- (18) Ka taea e koe te korero pukapuka, te horoi i te ka *rānei*?  
(18a) Can you read a book or wash the car?

### **Contiguity relationships**

The contiguity relationships outlined here are:

- Chronological Sequence;
- Temporal Overlap;
- Bonding/Spatial Contiguity.

The relationship of *Chronological Sequence* involves a sequential link between event propositions one of which follows the other in time. The events may be long or short and need not be in the past.

- (19) *I muri* i tana kaitanga i te keke, ka kai ia i te ika.  
(19a) *After* he had eaten the cake, he ate the fish.

The *Temporal Overlap* relationship relation links two events which overlap wholly or partly in time.

- (20) Māku e tapahi ngā peka *kei* maoa *ana* ngā kai.  
(20a) I'll cut the wood *while* the dinner is cooking.

The *Bonding/Spatial Contiguity* relationship is the most basic form of relationship: it is a non-elective (not involving either/or choice), non-sequential relation between two clauses and involves spatial or temporal relationship or juxtaposition.

- (21) I mau pōtae ia *me* te hari hāmarara.  
(21a) He wore a coat *and* carried an umbrella.

### **The encoding and signalling of semantic relationships**

Although the relationships between propositions<sup>1</sup> expressed in texts may be inferred by readers and listeners from content and context, these relationships may also be encoded in languages in ways that signal the relational meanings involved. That is, aspects of the encoding of these relations may act as signposts or indicators of the type of relationship involved. These signals may be syntactic or lexical or they may involve both syntax and lexis (see Halliday and Hasan 1976/1985). They may be unambiguous (as in the case of certain types of subordination) or they may, as in the case of the contrastive co-ordinator 'engari' signal the presence of a certain general type of relationship (e.g. a relationship of contrast) rather than the specific relationship of that type that is involved. They may operate at clausal or sentential level (as in the case of subordinators), or they may operate at a higher level (as in the case of certain adjuncts such as 'otirā' which may, for example, link the content of an entire paragraph to the content of the preceding text. Where relational meanings are specifically encoded and signalled in languages, the concept of textual cohesion (expressed as devices that hold texts together) is central as indicated by Lyons (1981, pp. 198 - 199):

The text as a whole must exhibit the related, but distinguishable, properties of 'cohesion' and 'coherence' . . .

Roughly speaking, it [the distinction between coherence and cohesion] has to do with the difference between form and content . . . Ellipsis and the use of pronouns as well as the use of particular connecting particles and conjunctions

('therefore', 'so' etc.) commonly serve to create and sustain the kind of connectedness to which the term 'cohesion' is applied. Languages differ considerably with respect to the degree to which they permit or oblige their users to connect text units in sequence by means of explicit indications of cohesion.

Thus, languages have many *cohesive devices* such as 'no te mea' that signal the actual nature of the relationship involved and that therefore reduce dependence on context. In the absence of these, there is greater reliance on context. So if a speaker said, "Mutu ai tana mahi i te toru karaka" ("He finishes work at three o'clock"), hearers should, in terms of Grice's co-operative principles (Grice 1981) interpret this as a *reason* if they know that the preceding utterance (co-text) was the following question: "He aha hoki i tae ai ia ki te kainga i te whā karaka?" ("Why does he get home at four every day?"). An utterance or a text is said to be *coherent* if you can make sense of it; it is said to be *cohesive* if it involves lexical or syntactic devices that hold its different propositions together as a unit.

Knowing the context of utterances is an important aspect of understanding the relationships between them and, therefore, of interpreting them as being *coherent* (making sense of them). The greater the reliance on context, the greater the processing effort involved. For this reason, cohesive devices play an important role in languages: they effectively reduce dependence on situational context.

Thus, cohesion is a property of texts. 'No te mea' is a cohesive device. If it is used appropriately, it is likely that the text in which it occurs will be interpreted as being coherent at that point. A text can, however, be coherent (make sense) even if there are no cohesive devices. Example (22) is coherent: it makes sense. There are, however, no cohesive devices present. Example (23) is both coherent and cohesive: it contains the word 'take' which instructs readers to interpret the content of the second clause as a *reason* for the content of the first.

(22) Kāore au i te pīrangī ki te wehe i tēnei wā tonu. Kāore anō rātou kia haka noa.

(22a) I don't want to leave right at this time. They have not yet performed their haka.

(23) Kāore au i te pīrangī ki te wehe i tēnei wā tonu. Ko te *take* kāore anō rātou kia haka noa.

(23a) I don't want to leave at this time. The *reason* is that they have not performed the haka.

### **Cohesive devices in English and Maori: an overview**

A text is coherent if it makes sense as a piece of discourse. A text is cohesive if it involves one or more devices that hold it together as a unit. These devices can be lexical or syntactic. There are three main types of syntactic cohesion: substitution, ellipsis and conjunction.

There are different types of substitution. The main ones are nominal substitution, verbal substitution and clausal substitution. It is possible to have other types of substitution also. Examples of substitution in Maori and English are provided below.

*Nominal substitution*

- (24) He pai ki a au *te motokā*. He *mea* pai rawa atu.  
(24a) I like *the car*. It's a really nice *one*.

*Verbal substitution*

- (25) A: I *āmai* au.  
B: I *pērā* anō hoki au.  
(25a) A: I *fainted*.  
B: I *did* too / So *did* I.

*Clausal substitution*

- (26) A: I kī ia i *te mate ia*.  
B: I kōrero *pērā* atu anō hoki au.  
(26a) A: He said *that he was ill*.  
B: I said *so* too.

*Verb plus object substitution*

- (27) I *tuhia e ia he reta*, a, i *pērā* anō hoki au.  
(27a) He *wrote a letter* and I *did too*.

Ellipsis is essentially substitution by zero (Ø). There are two main types of ellipsis in Maori: nominal and clausal.

*Nominal ellipsis*

- (28) A: Ko *tēhea te motoka* pai ki a koe.  
B: Ko *tēnei* Ø  
(28a) A: Which *car* do you like?  
B: This Ø is the best.

Note that Maori can, in this context, also use substitution ('Ko *tēnei te mea* tino pai rawa atu').

*Clausal ellipsis*

- (29) A: *Kua kai* ia?  
B: Ae Ø

An alternative in Maori is ellipsis of the subject only ('Ae. *Kua kai kē*'). Notice that in English, it is possible also to have ellipsis of the main lexical verb only in this context ('Yes he has').

A number of typical learner errors may be attributable to inter-lingual interference in cases where Maori typically uses a type of ellipsis that is not available in English<sup>2</sup>. Both Maori and English may have clausal ellipsis (see 30) and (30a) below. However, English does not have the option of ellipsis of the subject and retention of the verb (see 31) below.

- (30) A: *Haere ai a Hone ki te Whare Wananga ne ra?*  
B: Ae! Ø
- (30a) A: John goes to university, does he?  
B: Yes. Ø
- (31) *Haere ai a Hone ki te Whare Wananga ne ra?*  
(31a) Ae! Haere ai a Hone. Ø

Another common type of cohesion involves the use of conjunctions of various types. The following examples demonstrate subordinating conjunctions, coordinating conjunctions and sentence conjuncts acting as cohesive devices in the context of a range of semantic relationships.

*Subordinating conjunctions*

- (32) Kaingākau ana au ki a ia *ahako* he toukiki ia.  
(32a) I like him *although* he is mean.
- (33) He pai ki ahau *nātemea* he mā.  
(33a) I like it *because* it's clean.

*Coordinating conjunctions*

- (34) He pai ki ahau te poti *engari* he weriweri rawa atu te kuri.  
(34a) I like the cat *but* the dog's horrible
- (35) Ka taea e koe te korero pukapuka, te tuhi reta *ranei*?  
(35a) You can read a book *or* read a letter.

*Sentence conjuncts*

- (36) He pai ki au. *Me te aha*, he oranga kei roto.  
(36a) I like it. *Furthermore*, it's healthy
- (37) I horoia e ia ngā rīhi, te motokā, te papa, ngā haenatanga. *Kāti ra*, ehara rawa i te pērā rawa tona hē.  
(37a) He washed the dishes, cleaned the car, scrubbed the floor, did the ironing. *After all*, he can't be that bad.

**Semantic relations exhibited in a Moari corpus: examples of the *reason-result* relation and the *concession-contraxpectation* relation**

Because almost texts dealing with Maori generally approach the language from a structural point of view rather than a semantico-pragmatic one, some types of

encoding of relationships may be overlooked. The result of this can be that learners of the language are presented with models that are, in various ways, incomplete. If, however, structural descriptions are accompanied by semantico-pragmatic ones, a more complete picture can be created and learners will have a greater opportunity to appreciate the indirect, as well as direct, ways in which particular types of relationship between propositions and groups of propositions can be expressed. For this reason, a corpus of works by Apirana Ngata and Reweti Kōhere was established (Kaa, 1994; 1996) and examined from the point of view of the occurrence of each of the semantic relations outlined earlier. In the examples from the corpus that follow, A.N. = Apirana Ngata and R.K = Reweti Kōhere. The page and line references refer to Kaa, 1994 and Kaa, 1996. In this paper, examples of only two semantic relations (reason-result and concession-contradiction) are provided. For a more detailed review of the research, see Houia, 2001.

Some examples of the reason-result relationship that may be of particular interest in relation to the teaching and learning of Maori are included here. In example (38), *take* is used in the result member of the relation to signal the later occurrence of the reason member.

- (38) Ko te tino *take* o te kino a Ngāpuhi ki a Ngāti Porou (result) mō te patunga me te kainga a Ngati Porou i te tuahine o Te Morenga (reason).  
(R.K.p.15, l.12)  
(The real reason for Ngāpuhi's anger with Ngāti Porou (result) was the cannibalising of Te Morenga's sister by Ngāti Porou (reason)).

In example (39), a negative conditional introduced by 'kei' (lest) occurs as the reason member of the relation; in example (40), a negative condition signalled by 'he kore' occurs as the result member.

- (39) . . . kia hohoro tonu tana haere ka hoki me ana wai (result) *kei* rokohanga ia e te awatea (reason).  
(R.K.p.25, l.24)  
(She must travel swiftly and return with the water (result/ conclusion) lest she be overtaken by the appearance of the daylight (reason)).
- (40) Kāore ngā tungāne i whakaae (result) *he kore* no te wahine e rawe ki te haere ki te moana, kei kitea mai hoki e te tāne (reason).  
(R.K.p.21, l.13)  
(The brothers would not consent (result), because she was not a seafarer, and in addition, lest she be seen by her husband (reason)).

In example (41), the reason member of the relation is embedded in an interrogative.

- (41) He aha tōku hara (reason) i kore ai he whakaatu o te kuini nei o Heni Materoa ki a au, ki a Tūhoe? (result)  
(R.K.p.126, l.15)  
(What sin have I committed (reason) that you did not let us Tūhoe know about this queen, Heni Materoa? (result))

In example (42), the reason member of the relation occurs as a verbless construction.

- (42) I tōna ātaahua (reason) ka whāia a Te Aoputaputa e nga taitama (result).  
(R.K.p.19:L.6)  
(Because of her beauty (reason), Te Aoputaputa was the focus of attention of the young lads (result)).

Bauer (1997, p. 379), observes that *ai* follows the verb in the matrix clause when a reason clause precedes it. In the following examples, however, the reason clause occurs before the matrix clause, but the main verb of the matrix is not accompanied by *ai*.

- (43) Nā runga i tēnei mea a te hoko ka tae mai au ki konei.  
(A.N.p.35:L.37)  
(Because of the matter pertaining to sales (reason), I have come here (result)).
- (44) I tōna ātaahua ka whāia a Te Aoputaputa e ngā taitama.  
(R.K.p.19:L.6)  
(Because of her beauty (reason), Te Aoputaputa was the focus of attention of the young lads (result)).

It has been noted (Bauer, 1997, p. 384) that if *result clauses* have *i* or no *TAM*, then *ai* is required. This was the case in many of the examples in the corpus. However, examples (45), (46) and (47) appear not to conform to this.

- (45) I pā he mate ki a Ngāti Porou i tēnei tau ka taha atu nei i runga i ngā hoko whenua a te kāwanatanga.  
(A.N.p.33:L.14)  
(Ngāti Porou was placed in an adverse situation last year (result) because of government land sales (reason)).
- (46) He take anō i hohoro tonu ai taku tuhituhi arā, he kupu mai na ngā tamariki mātau o Pōneke.  
(R.K.p.113:L.15)  
(Another reason that I respond immediately in writing (result) is that the learned students [request it] from Wellington (reason)).
- (47) I tuhia ngā poroporoaki i te mea kua oti kē te tuhituhi.  
(R.K p.113:L.15)  
(The farewells were recorded (result) because it had already been previously done elsewhere (reason)).

In example (48), a result is expressed negatively ('a waste of time') and the reason takes the form of (*hei .....kē*). This is reasonably common expression in Maori, but one that is seldom associated directly with *reason – result*.

- (48) Moumou te whenua mo te Maori o naianei hei hoatu kē mō ētahi hei rīhi.

(R.K.p.32:L.11)

(There is no gain for Maori of today in possessing land (result/conclusion)

because they will only lease it out to others (reason)).

The following examples of the *concession-contrarexpectation* relation were found in the corpus. In examples (49) – (55), *ahakoa* occurs:

- (49) Ko te takoto o ngā kōrero i whakatōputia ki roto ki te kākati e āhua rite ana tōna kaupapa. Ēngari *ahakoa* i pēneitia, ka taea tonu te whakauru ētahi o ngā kōrero nei ki tētahi atu o ngā kākati kōrero.

(A.N.p.8:L.32).

(The tenor of these writings that have been compiled within the gazette are similar in nature (concession), but despite this format, we can still enter some of our concerns in one of the other gazettes (contrarexpectation)).

- (50) Tēnā koe mo to tono rangatira, mīharo ana te ngākau. *Ahakoa* noa rā e kāore e taea e au.

(A.N.p.18:L.2).

(Thank you for your thoughtful request. I am delighted (concession). Despite this however, I regret I cannot attend (contrarexpectation)).

- (51) Ko te Ture Taiapa hou me mahi *ahakoa* te taumaha o ētahi wāhi me mahi. (A.N.p.37:L.11).

(The new fencing law must be abided by. Despite the severity of some parts (concession), we must comply (contrarexpectation)).

- (52) . . . kātahi ka kiia kia mutu te hoko i o mātou whenua, arā i ngā mea e tūria ana e o mātou kāinga, me a mātou mahinga kai. No te tau 1895 ka kitea *ahakoa* pēhea te kaha o ngā kupu o ngā rangatira kia mau ki ngā whenua, tēnei anō ētahi tāngata kāore e rongō, arā me whakakaeke he here ki runga he here i ngā hoko katoa, *ahakoa* na te kāwanatanga, na te Pākehā noa iho rānei.

(A.N.p.39:L.7).

(Then it was stated that the sale of our lands must cease, especially where our homes and our cultivations are. In 1895, we discovered that no matter how well we explained the need to retain our lands (concession), there were still some people who would not listen (contrarexpectation), and therefore we must impose some conditions to prevent all purchases, whether by the government or an individual Pākehā).

- (53) *Ahakoa* he maha nga wāwāhanga ririki o roto i runga i te āhua o nga karakia, he iwi tēnei e kotahi rawa ana te whakaaro mo runga i nga mate me nga huarahi ora. (A.N.p.47:L.33).

(Although there are many small divisions within the forms of their church services (concession), these people are of one mind in their thinking in respect of their failures and positive progress (contrarexpectation)).

- (54) Na reira i tangatanga ai taku haere, me taku kōrero i roto i a Ngāti Awa puta noa ōna rohe *ahakoa* he iwi tauhou rawa tērā ki au. (A.N.p.49:L.13).  
(That is why my trip went so smoothly, including my addresses within Ngāti Awa and its territories (contraexpectation) despite the fact that they are a tribe with which I am particularly unacquainted (concession)).
- (55) Kua whakaaetia ia kia uru ki Te Aute *ahakoa* i te kī te kura, a, hei te marama o Hūrae nei ia tae ai ki reira. (A.N.p.51:L.24)  
(Approval has been given for him to attend Te Aute (concession). Despite the school's full roll, he is due to arrive there in July (contraexpectation)).

As examples (56) – (124) illustrate, *engari* also occurs in the context of concessive relations.

- (56) E mōhiotia ana e te katoa he titotito noa. *Engari* hei ngā iwi o waho kāore e rawe ka pāmamae, ka mahara mai he mahi tōtika he kupu whai tikanga. (A.N.p.26:L16)  
(It is well known by all that these are fabrications, (concession) but people from out of the area will find them unpleasant and be hurt by them, thinking they are true (contraexpectation)).
- 57) I taku tau tuatahi kāore he mahi i oti. *Engari* i tēnei tau. (A.N.p.36:L.6)  
(During my first year no work was completed (concession). However, this year [it has been completed] (contraexpectation)).
- (58) Ka ora a Raupare *engari* ka hunia i te pāpā, i a Taraia. (R.K.p.23:L.27)  
(Although Raupare survived, (concession), she was hidden from Taraia, her father (contraexpectation)).
- (59) Nōna hoki ngā reo e rua, te reo Maori me te reo Pākehā. *Engari* ia ko ngā tuhinga o tēnei pukapuka ko ērā kei roto anake i te reo Maori. (A.N.p.5:L.10)  
(Although he was bilingual in Maori and English (concession), the writings of this book are only in Maori (contraexpectation)).
- (60) Ko ia i tu ki te kei o te waka i te rōpu whakamaori hou i te paipera *engari* ko ana tuhinga i te wa o taua kaupapa kāore i kitea e māua. (A.N.p.6:L.11)  
(Although it was he who spearheaded the group who translated the bible (concession), we could not find his writings at that time (contraexpectation)).

- (61) Ko ngā kōrero kei ngā pukapuka o te whare paremata kei roto katoa i te reo Pakeha. *Engari* i whakaaro tonu māua tērā anō pea ētahi o āna tuhinga mo te Ope Hoia Maori kei whea rānei e takoto ana (A.N.p.13:L27).  
(The books contained in the parliamentary books are all in English (concession) but we both thought perhaps there would have been some writings about the Maori soldiers located somewhere (contraexpectation)).
- (62) Hei tieki i te rangimarie, me te noho pai, me ngā mahi e puta ake ai he pai ki o rātou hapū i roto i o rātou rohe ake. *Engari* kua a rātou tikanga, me ngā whakahaere, e takahi i ngā tikanga o ngā ture o te Koroni, o ngā kaute kaunihera rānei. (A.N.p.32:L.11).  
(To keep the peace, and to sustain those activities giving benefit to their own hapu in their respective districts, is good (concession) But their traditions and endeavours must not undermine the principles of the Colonial laws or even of the County Councils (contraexpectation)).
- (63) I te tau 1895 ka puta mai e £4,000 i runga i taku tono. *Engari* i pau noa mo ngā rori pakupaku a te Kaunihera. (A.N.p.36:L.39).  
(Although in 1895 4000 pounds was granted at my request (concession), they were used on the small council roads (contraexpectation)).
- (64) Ka mutu ngā kōrero a Wi, ka tu a Wiremu Tamehana, a Hohepa Karapaena, me Te Hata Hokopaura ki te whakatakoto i ta rātau pitihana ki tōna aroaro. *Engari* i te āhua rīriri, ka kī mai a Wi Pere me āta waiho kia tino oti i a rātau. (A.N.p.37:L.18).  
(When Wi finished speaking, Wiremu Tāmehana stood, followed by Hohepa Karapaena, and Te Hata Hokopaura. Although they stood to present their petition before him (concession), they were squabbling (contraexpectation) and Wi Pere said that they should set it aside till they finished it properly).

In examples (65) – (72) *otirā* occurs. *Otira* also occurs in the context of the chronological sequence relation and so the context is critical for interpretation. However, where it occurs in a contrastive rather than a sequential context, *otirā* appears to be specifically concessive in meaning, whereas *engari* is more generally contrastive, with the concessive aspect being more context dependent. *Otirā* and *ahakoa* appear to convey similar meanings except that *ahakoa* appears to carry the additional sense of summation or conclusion.

- (65) I āhua pakaru i reira te āhua o te whakaaro o te tangata. *Otirā* no te hui ki Mataahu i te tau 1892, ka whakakotahitia anō te whakaaro o te tangata. (A.N.p.35:L.3)

(Although the opinions at this point became somewhat divided, (concession) *however it was not till the meeting of 1892 that they were once again united* (contraexpectation)).

- (66) Nā ngā ture o te whare me ngā mahi tūāhaehae a ngā mema i patu. *Otirā*, i uru ngā tekiona o taua pire ki roto i te ture Komiti Poraka. (A.N.p.35:L.33)  
(It was the law of Parliament together with the spite of its members that defeated it. (concession) However, sections of the bill were included in the Committee Block Act. (contraexpectation)).
- (67) E patua ana a Taotaoriri e Ngāti Porou, he tangata toa *engari* na nga rangatira i aruaru. (R. K.p.16:L.17)  
(Taotaoriri, a warrior, was to be slain by Ngati Porou, (concession) but the chiefs intervened (contraexpectation)).
- (68) Whakaae ana taua tangata. *Otira* i kī mai anō ia, ki te kore ia e wātea tērā e tonoa mai e ia a Te Makenehi Minita mo ngā whenua. (A.N.p.25:L.11)  
(That man agreed (concession). Nevertheless he also said that if he were not free, that perhaps he would send McKenzie, the Minister of Lands (contraexpectation)).
- (69) Na ngā ture o te whare me ngā mahi tūāhaehae a ngā mema i patu. *Otira* i uru ngā tekiona o taua pire ki roto i te Ture Komiti Poraka i hangaia e te Pāremata nei. (A.N.p.35:L.33)  
(It was the laws of the house and the petty jealousies of the members that defeated it. (concession). However, sections of that Bill were included in the T.K.P Bill that was enacted by this parliament (contraexpectation)).
- (70) Mehemea i patu noa ake a Paratene i te waea kua kore e moumou te moni pāhi. *Otira* pai rawa tōna taenga ake. Ko ia hoki e mōhio ana ki ēnei whenua. (A.N.p.36:L.33)  
If Paratene had only used the phone, the money for his fare would not have been wasted. (concession). On the other hand, his arrival was very useful. He is of course the one who knows this land (contraexpectation)).
- (71) Ko te tekau mā rua tēnei o ngā tau e takoto ana taua rori. Ko ētahi wāhi e whakapaingia ana e te Kaute Kaunihera. *Otira* ko te wāhi e tino takahia ana e mātou arā ko te wāhi i Kaiinanga haere atu ki Waiomatatini (A.N.p.42:L.25)  
(This is the twelfth year that this road has been in existence. Some places have been improved by the County Council (concession). However, the one that is in regular use by us is that of Kaiinanga to Waiomatatini (contraexpectation)).

- (72) Me mutu i konei ngā kupu nei. *Otira* me āpiti atu tēnei . . .  
(A.N.p.51:L.16)  
(I should foreclose my speech here (concession). However I must add this . . . (contraexpectation)).

In examples (73) and (74), *kāore* (*kāhore*) appears in the context of concessive meaning. In (74), it is accompanied by *otira*. Thus, in (73), concession is implied by a negative-positive contrast and context; in (74), it is conveyed by a combination of negative-positive contrast and a contrastive signal (*otira*).

- (73) I roa te whakapaenga a Ngāpuhi i te pā, *kāhore* i taea, kātahi ka māmingatia e Pomare.  
(R. K.p.15:L.30)  
(Although Ngāpuhi attacked their pā for some time, (concession) they were unsuccessful (contraexpectation). Then Pomare deceived them by a stratagem).
- (74) . . . ka rongo a Taraia kei te ora tana tamaiti ka tipu tōna riri, *otirā kāore* ia i mōhio kei hea a Raupare e huna ana.  
(R.K. p.23: L. 28)  
(Well thereafter, Taraia heard that his daughter was still alive and his anger grew, (concession), though he did not know where Raupare was (contraexpectation)).

In examples (75) – (78) *hāunga* occurs in the context of a specific type of Concession – Contraexpectation in which the second member of the relation makes reference to a concession that is exclusive in nature.

- (75) Ma ia iwi, hapū rānei, e whakarite nga rāhui mo tōna takiwā, me uru mai ki roto ngā whenua e rīhi ana *hāunga* nga hea kua hokoa.  
(A.N.p.183:L.14).  
(Each tribe, or clan, can decide the reserves for their own interests including lands being leased out (concession) disregarding the shares that have been sold (contraexpectation)).
- (76) Me tahuri ia tangata e noho ana i runga i te whenua i roto i te rohe o taua kāinga ki te huna i ngā taru kikino, *hāunga* ia ngā taru e whakatupuria ana hei taiepa . . .  
(A.N.p.63:L.14).  
(Each person living on land in the region of our homes must in turn to destroy the noxious weeds, (concession), not including, of course, these weeds being used as fences (contraexpectation)).
- (77) E tae atu ana tēnei karanga ki a Ngāti Awa, ki a Tūhoe ki a Te Whakatōhea, *hāunga* Ngaitai, Te Whānau ā Apanui me Ngāti Porou, ko rātau te tangata whenua.  
(A.N.p.64:L.32).

(This call is extended to Ngāti Awa, to Tūhoe, to Whakatōhea (concession) obviously not Ngaitai, Te Whānau ā Apanui or Ngāti Porou, as they are the home folk (contraexpectation)).

- (78) Nā reira au ka whakaaro me whakakaupapa poto e au ētahi kupu hei whakaea i a koutou tonu. *Hāunga* ia ngā mea o koutou e kōrero ana i ngā nūpepa Pākehā, (A.N.p.86:L.4).  
(This is why I have thought to submit some short ideas to fulfill your invitations. (concession) although this does not include those of you who read the English newspapers (contraexpectation)).

In example (79) below, concessive meaning is recovered from a combination of content and context. Here, the whole-part relation plays a role in that recovery of concessive meaning.

- (79) He ture pai taua ture. He kino tētahi wāhi.  
(A.N.p.35:L.35)  
(The law was overall a good one (concession) although one part was discriminatory (contraexpectation)).

Some of the findings relating to the reason-result and concession-contraexpectation relation are summarized below:

*Reason-result*

- result clauses may function as matrix clauses;
- where the reason clause precedes the matrix clause, the main verb of the matrix clause need not be followed by *ai*;
- where a reason phrase is fronted and introduced by *nā* and the TAM is *i*, *ai* need not occur;
- where result clauses have *i* or no TAM, *ai* need not necessarily occur (true of active (positive and negative) and passive (positive and negative));
- result clauses that do not have *nā reira*, *no reira* or *nā wai* may not be followed by a TAM marker plus *tonu* following the verb;
- *take* may signal that a following clause should be read as containing a reason;
- the reason member of a reason-result relation may contain a negative conditional signalled by *kei* (lest) or *ke kore*;
- the reason member of a reason-result relation may contain a negative condition signalled by *kei* (lest) or *he kore*;
- where the reason member of a reason-result relation occurs before the result member, *na kore* may signal the anaphoric nature of the following result member;
- the reason member of a reason-result relation may occur in a verbless construction;
- *hei . . . kē* may occur in the context of the reason member of a reason-result relation.

### **Concession-Contraexpectation**

- may include *ahakoa*, *engari* or *otirā*, the last of these normally being associated, in other contexts, with chronological sequence;
- may include *otirā* appears to be more specifically concessive in meaning than *engari* (which is more generally contrastive);
- *ahakoa* appears, in the context of concession, to carry the additional sense of summary or conclusion;
- *hāunga* may occur in the context of a specific type of concession-contraexpectation relation in which the second member of the relation makes reference to a concession that is exclusive in nature.

### **Semantic relationships and language teaching**

An understanding of semantic relationships, and of coherence and cohesion generally, can play a role in language teaching. However, there are many language teaching contexts in which neither is given prominence. As Cook (1989, p. 127) observes:

Cohesion has often been neglected in language teaching, where sentences have been created, manipulated, and assessed in isolation. It has been assumed that student difficulties arise primarily from lack of vocabulary or the complexity of grammatical structure at sentence level, whereas difficulties can easily arise from problems with cohesion. . . .

Even where language teachers and language course designers are aware of the importance of coherence and cohesion, there has sometimes been an implicit assumption that cohesive links must operate between clauses and sentences in much the same way in a target language as they do in whatever language or languages learners are wholly familiar with. This is not the case.

Teaching Maori language presents significant challenges, particularly where learners require a very high level of competence. A significant dimension of high-level language competence is the ability to understand and create complex discourses of a range of different kinds (Bachman & Palmer, 1996; McNamara, 1996). What I have been concerned with here is just one aspect of this complex ability.

### **Endnotes**

<sup>1</sup> The term 'proposition' is commonly used in linguistics and philosophy to indicate the essential cognitive content of propositional signs (sentences and clauses):

The precise formulation varies, but a proposition, or propositional content, is customarily defined in modern logic as 'what is asserted' when a sentence (an indicative, or declarative, sentence) is used to say something true or false, or as 'what is expressed by' such a sentence. The term is also applied to what is expressed by the subordinate clauses of complex sentence, to forms of words which, if separated from the complex sentences of which they are a part, can stand alone as indicative sentences in their own right. Accordingly, such sentences and clauses are often called 'propositional signs' (Honderich, 1995, p. 724).

Detailed expositions of propositional theory are provided by Prior (1976) and Copi (1982).

<sup>2</sup> In addition, young learners of Maori sometimes use the verbal marker in isolation from the verb (e.g. 'Ae! Kua'). This particular construction may relate to the fact that English may have ellipsis of the main verb with retention of the auxiliary verb ('Has he eaten his dinner?'/ 'Yes he has'.)

## References

- Bachman, L. & A. Palmer. (1996). *Language testing in practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bauer, W. (1997). *The Reed reference grammar of Maori*. New Zealand: Reed.
- Beekman, J. (1974) *Translating the word of God*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Pub. House.
- Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crombie, W. H. (1985a). *Discourse and language learning: a relational approach to syllabus design*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crombie, W. H. (1985b). *Process and relation in discourse and language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Grice, H.P. (1981). Presupposition and conversational implicature. In Cole, P. (Ed.). *Radical pragmatics*. New York: Academic Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan, R. (1976/1985) *Cohesion in English*. London : Longman.
- Kaa, W. & Te O. (1994). *Ngā kōrero a Reweti Kohere mā*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Kaa, W. & Te O. (1996). *Apirana T. Ngata: Āna tuhinga i te reo Maori*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Lyons, J. (1981). *Language, meaning, and context*. London: Fontana.
- McNamara, T. (1996). *Measuring second language performance*. USA: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Winter, E. (1977). A clause relational approach to English texts: a study of some predictive lexical items in written discourse, *Instructional Science* 6, 1, 491-514.
- Winter, E. (1982). *Towards a contextual grammar of English: the clause and its place in the definition of sentence*. London ; Boston : Allen & Unwin.