

*Te Pua Wānanga ki te Ao*

The School of Māori and Pacific Development

He Puna Kōrero - Journal of Maori & Pacific Development



## Call for Papers

*He Puna Kōrero: Journal of Maori and Pacific Development (JMPD)* seeks manuscripts in all areas of Maori and Pacific Development, including manuscripts that report on research on the political, social, cultural, linguistic and educational development of Maori and Pacific peoples. In addition, we are interested in receiving short creative literary works, including songs and poems, as well as notification of conferences and meetings and book reviews. For more information, see 'Information for Contributors' at the end of this issue.

## Languages Accepted

Papers will be accepted in English, Maori or any Pacific language. We are, however, particularly keen to receive bilingual manuscripts (a Pacific language and English) because they have the additional value of being available to the majority of readers at the same time as promoting the use of Pacific languages for the purposes of scholarship.

## Copyright Notice

In the case of creative literary works, copyright is retained by individual authors unless explicitly stated otherwise. In all other cases, copyright is vested in *Te Pua Wānanga Ki Te Ao* (the School of Maori and Pacific Development), Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato (University of Waikato) in its role as publisher of *He Puna Kōrero: Journal of Maori and Pacific Development*. Authors whose works are published in *He Puna Kōrero: Journal of Maori and Pacific Development* and who, in accepting publication, cede copyright to the publishers of this journal must agree not to publish more than 20% of the material contained in the works published here in any other context without the express permission of the publishers of *He Puna Kōrero: Journal of Maori and Pacific Development*. Where the intention is to publish the material contained here in the context of a major work in which that material constitutes no more than 10% of the total content of that work, permission will normally be granted.

## Permission to Photocopy

Articles in *He Puna Kōrero: Journal of Maori and Pacific Development* may be photocopied freely for educational (noncommercial) purposes under the following conditions:

- Use of the photocopies must be for educational purposes exclusively, not for commercial publication or for any other commercial purposes of any type.
- Citation of the source of the publication must be provided in full on the first page of each photocopy as follows: the author(s), article title, journal, number and inclusive pages.
- In addition, the following statement should appear on the first page: Reprinted with the permission of the School of Maori and Pacific Development, The University of Waikato.

No creative works that appear in this Journal may be photocopied for any purpose without the express permission of the authors. All questions concerning copyright or photocopying should be directed to Dr. Winifred Crombie, *Te Pua Wānanga Ki Te Ao* (the School of Maori and Pacific Development), Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato (University of Waikato) School of Maori and Pacific Development, Private Bag 3105, Hamilton, New Zealand [crombie@waikato.ac.nz].

**He Puna Kōrero**  
**Journal of Maori and Pacific Development**  
**Volume 2, Number 2**  
**September, 2001**

ISSN 1175-3099

**A publication of:**

*Te Pua Wānanga Ki Te Ao*

**Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato**

---

General Editor:	Professor Tamati Reedy, Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato
Production Editor:	Associate Professor Winifred Crombie, Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato
Assistant Production Editor	Hēmi Whaanga
Editorial Board (Temporary):	Associate Professor Winifred <b>Crombie</b> , Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato Associate Professor Hirini <b>Melbourne</b> , Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato Professor Tamati <b>Reedy</b> , Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato Dr. Aroha <b>Yates-Smith</b> , Senior Lecturer/ Chairperson of Maori Department, Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato

**We welcome articles, reviews, and  
creative pieces from you.**

**For details about how to submit  
material to *He Puna Kōrero,*  
*Journal of Maori and Pacific*  
*Development,*  
see the back cover of this issue.**

**He Puna Kōrero**  
**Journal of Maori and Pacific Development**

**Vol. 2, No. 2, September 2001**

ISSN 1175-3099

**CONTENTS**

<b>EDITORIAL</b>	<b>1</b>
 <b>ARTICLES</b>	
<b>Maori syllabus and curriculum documents: a critical analysis. Part 1: <i>Tihē Mauri Ora</i></b>	<b>2</b>
Winifred Crombie, Diane Johnson and Hine Kahukura Te Kanawa	
<b>Approaching Māori Language through Meaning: The Predominance of Indo-European Models of Relationships within Propositions</b>	<b>17</b>
Hēmi Whaanga	
<b>Looking at Relationships between Propositions in Maori Language</b>	<b>39</b>
Waldo Houia	
<b>The Rhetorical Organisation of Discourse: Language Revitalisation and the Question of Authenticity</b>	<b>57</b>
Winifred Crombie and Ngaere Houia-Roberts	
 <b>INFORMATION FOR CONTRIBUTORS</b>	 <b>Back cover</b>

## TE PUĀWAITANGA O TE PUAWĀNANGA

### EDITORIAL

Tihē Mauriora!

Kua ara ake anō te reo o Te Pua Wānanga ki te Ao. Ko ngā kaupapa o tēnei putanga o *He Puna Kōrero* e pā ana ki te reo Māori. He whakatakoto nā ngā kaituhi i ō rātou whakaaro mo ētahi tirohanga ki te reo. E whā ēnei pepa ka tukuna atu hei huaki i ētahi kūwaha ki roto i te hōhonutanga o te reo. Māu e kōmiri ake ngā hua o ēnei tuhinga.

Once again the voice of the School of Māori and Pacific Development calls. The articles of this volume of *He Puna Kōrero* are solely about Māori language. The four papers explore various views and make in-depth analyses of aspects of te reo Māori. The fruits of these papers are presented for your discovery.

Professor Tamati Muturangi Reedy  
Te Amokapua  
*Dean/Pro Vice Chancellor (Māori)*  
Te Pua Wānanga Ki Te Ao  
*School of Maori and Pacific Development*  
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato  
*The University of Waikato*

**Maori syllabus and curriculum documents: a critical analysis**

**Part 1: *Tihē Mauri Ora***

**Winifred Crombie**

Te Pua Wānanga Ki Te Ao (School of Māori and Pacific Development)

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

**Diane Johnson**

Te Kura Kete Aronui (Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences)

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

**Hine Kahukura Te Kanawa**

Te Pua Wānanga Ki Te Ao (School of Māori and Pacific Development)

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

[crombie@waikato.ac.nz; dianej@waikato.ac.nz; mtekanawa@waikato.ac.nz]

**Abstract**

This paper presents, within the context of ongoing debates on syllabus design, a critical analysis of *Tihē Mauri Ora*, a syllabus document produced by the *New Zealand Ministry of Education* to support the teaching and learning of the Māori language in schools in New Zealand. It includes a number of suggestions in relation to any future documents prepared with similar intent.

**Introduction**

Within the general field of applied linguistics, a significant area of research focuses on the complex range of factors that influence the design and implementation of language syllabuses. A major debate in which researchers are engaged relates to the nature of the language syllabus itself. Of fundamental importance here are two central questions:

- How should a syllabus specify language learning objectives?
- Can, or should, a syllabus include graded grammatical specification?

It is largely in this context that *Tihē Mauri Ora* is discussed here.

***Tihē Mauri Ora!*: intended audience**

*Tihē Mauri Ora!* (Ministry of Education, 1990) is a New Zealand Ministry of Education syllabus document published in 1990 and intended for use with students in the New Zealand education system from Junior classes (age 5+) through to Form 2 (age 12+). The writers were presented, in preparing this document, with an extremely difficult task. First, there are no specific minimum requirements in relation to the teaching of Māori language and culture in mainstream schools in New Zealand. Secondly, the background of children in relation to knowledge and understanding of Māori language and culture differs considerably as does that of their teachers. Finally, the educational contexts in which children are introduced to Maori language and culture vary widely: from mainstream classes in which the predominant language is English, through bilingual (Māori and English) classes to, more recently, Māori immersion educational settings. In each of these settings, the cultural and linguistic

expectations are very different. Thus, the syllabus designers have had to produce starter packs for teachers whose knowledge and understanding of Māori language and culture are minimal as well as a range of materials appropriate for different educational settings. In spite of all of these difficulties, one overall aim is that “future programmes should be structured to move towards achieving the aims and objectives of [the] syllabus” (Ministry of Education, 1990, p. 11). In this context, it is not surprising that the aims, and the majority of the objectives, are expressed in very general terms.

### ***Tihē Mauri Ora!*: aims and objectives**

The overall aims in relation to the production of the syllabus are articulated in the Foreword by the then Secretary for Education. These are to provide:

- a coherent and consistent framework for the teaching of Māori language in primary schools;
- a basis for the inclusion of appropriate Māori language and culture in all studies and activities across the curriculum.

The aims of the syllabus itself are:

- to enable children to understand and acknowledge tikanga Māori;
- to enable children to grow in their ability to understand and speak Māori;
- to provide opportunities for children to read and write Māori where appropriate (p. 17).

Teachers are urged to encourage their pupils to apply their knowledge of Māori language by:

- communicating their needs, feelings, and ideas clearly and with confidence in spoken Māori;
- reading and understanding written Māori;
- writing in Māori for a variety of purposes (p. 17).

Within the context of national curriculum planning, it is the objectives or outcomes that are subject to assessment. There should be ways of determining whether, and to what extent, the stated objectives have been achieved. This has important implications for the ways in which objectives are articulated. However, in the absence of national agreement that achievement by the end of Form 2 (Year 8) should be within a certain, definable range, and in the absence of minimum competency standards for teachers in the area of Māori language and culture, the syllabus designers were faced with an impossible task in attempting to specify objectives. The result is the following list of objectives:

- apply the Māori language in their everyday language environment by:
  - understanding spoken Māori;
  - pronouncing people's names and place names correctly;
  - expressing simple greetings and farewells, and useful phrases;

- communicating their needs, feelings, and ideas clearly and with confidence in spoken Māori;
  - reading and understanding written Māori;
  - writing in Māori for a variety of purposes;
  - expressing themselves creatively in speech, writing, or performance.
- 
- feel comfortable with tikanga Māori as they participate in a variety of Māori functions and cultural activities;
  - understand and appreciate Māori values and attitudes;
  - understand and respect cultural differences in New Zealand;
  - understand Māori when it is used in bilingual schools as a medium of learning and instruction (p. 17).

Some of these objectives are specific and measurable (e.g. 'expressing simple greetings and farewells and useful phrases'); some are very general (e.g. 'communicating . . . needs, feelings, and ideas clearly and with confidence in spoken Maori'). Some of the objectives, most notably the final one, appear to be beyond the scope of the syllabus itself.

What this indicates is the need for national agreement on achievement standards in the area of Māori language and culture in different contexts (mainstream, bilingual and Māori immersion). This, in turn, suggests that at least three different curriculum statements for Māori language and culture are required, each of which is appropriate to a different setting. Such an agreement would have implications for teacher education. In its absence, however, those who are given the task of producing national guidelines (in the form of curriculum statements or syllabuses) are put in an impossible situation. It is this, above all, that appears to underlie some of the inconsistencies in *Tihē Māuri Ora!* However, in spite of these inconsistencies, *Tihē Mauri Ora!* has very considerable strengths, particularly in the area of Māori culture, strengths which reflect the determination and commitment of those who were involved in its production.

### ***Tihē Mauri Ora!* and the communicative movement in language teaching**

One section of *Tihē Mauri Ora!* is headed *A Communicative Approach* (p. 23). Here it is observed that "children learn best when they see a real point in what they are saying and doing – they need to communicate real information for authentic reasons" (p. 18). In this statement, the authors align themselves with the communicative movement in language teaching, a movement that has always, irrespective of the changing definitions and attitudes that have been associated with it over time, emphasised the fact that learners should be encouraged to engage in communication in the target language, communication that has a function over and above that of language learning itself. Once again, there are problems associated with the wide range of expertise of those who are expected to implement the syllabus. In the section headed *Individual Differences* (p. 28), the syllabus writers note that "although teachers should have a mastery of the language above the level at which it is being taught, teachers and students can learn successfully together". In fact, however, teachers who do not have a high level of proficiency in the target language, who lack an in-depth understanding of the culture and who have little, if any, training in language teaching pedagogy will have serious difficulties in attempting to create an appropriate context for

communicative language learning. As the syllabus writers themselves observe, “enthusiasm is very important, but it needs to be backed up by knowledge” (p. 28). Thus, *Appendix 6 of Tihē Mauri Ora!*, which provides a list of resources for the improvement of teachers' skills, valuable though it is, cannot be regarded as a substitute for the education and training that are required to deliver an effective programme of language and culture.

At the core of the communicative movement in language teaching is the concept of ‘communicative competence’ which, as originally defined by Hymes (1971), included four central areas: knowledge of rules (formal possibility), understanding of the constraints on the application of these rules in particular contexts (implementational feasibility), appreciation of contextual appropriacy, and understanding of the performative role of utterances (i.e. the functions that language performs in particular contexts). Thus, formal accuracy is one aspect only of communicative competence. However, although Hymes stresses that rules of grammar would be useless without what he referred to as ‘rules of use’, Carroll notes that “there are rules of grammar without which the rules of use would be inoperable” (Carroll, 1980, p. 8).

It is acknowledged within the communicative movement in language teaching that language learning involves much more than control of language systems. It involves control not only of rules, but also of strategies and procedures. It involves listening and speaking as well as reading and writing. Recognition of the range of factors involved entails recognition of the fact that it is unrealistic to expect error-free production at all times. Thus, what is emphasised is the use of language for genuine communicative purposes, an aim which must be reflected throughout the curriculum: in the syllabus, in the materials and in the methodologies employed.

Communicative approaches to language teaching are centrally concerned with teaching language in order to facilitate the use of real language for authentic purposes. In this respect, they are really no different in terms of overall aim from most other approaches to language teaching. There is, however, a difference, one that relates primarily to beliefs about how best to achieve this overall aim. The vast majority of language teachers accept that classroom-based language tuition will inevitably be artificial in some respects. However, those who subscribe to the ideals of communicative language teaching generally aim to keep such artificiality to a minimum and avoid language exercises that are out of context and essentially meaning-free. Neither this, nor recognition that the needs of individual learners must be taken into account, means that careful planning of the language learning environment is redundant. Nor does it mean that accuracy must be sacrificed in the name of fluency. Certainly, it is unwise to expect too much of young learners in tutored language learning contexts. Certainly, memory and formulaic language play an important role in tutored language learning, particularly in the early stages (Skehan, 1998). However, empirical research does not support the contention that there is no need for a focus on forms in the language classroom (Celce-Murcia, 1991, pp. 460 - 461). The problem is that in the early stages of the development of communicative approaches, a significant number of language teachers believed that it did. Furthermore, there were a few applied linguists who, notwithstanding the research evidence, were prepared to endorse this position. For this reason, the communicative movement in language teaching initially undermined confidence in established practices at the same time as appearing to promise a bright new future in

which students would progress rapidly and confidently towards high levels of proficiency without the need for form-focused instruction. The reality proved to be very different.

What went wrong? In part, what was really an evolutionary movement was interpreted by some as a revolutionary one. The communicative movement in language teaching offered opportunities. There were opportunities for applied linguists, for publishers and for those language teachers who were tired of the endless battle with the complexities of language. In spite of the cautionary note sounded by a number of prominent educationalists and applied linguists, communicative language teaching took on a life of its own and began to be associated with extravagant claims and counter-claims. In some extreme cases, communicative language teaching came to be associated with an outright rejection of the lessons of the past. Over time, however, the initial hype began to be replaced by caution.

In the context of the communicative movement, the problem so far as *Tihē Mauri Ora!* is concerned is that it was produced over a ten year period during which, partly as a result of much painstaking research and partly as a result of the experiences of teachers in the language classroom, the attitudes of many of those who advocated a communicative approach to language teaching changed considerably. It became increasingly clear that creating a learning environment that encouraged learners to attempt to use real language for authentic communicative purposes need not imply an outright rejection of form-focused instruction. Nor need it involve a rejection (implicit or explicit) of the staging of learning that is characteristic of national education planning. Thus, communicative orientation could be reconciled with clearly articulated language content. That the writers of *Tihē Mauri Ora!* had difficulty in reconciling the communicative movement with form-focused instruction and the staging of language learning is evident in a number of places.

### ***Tihē Mauri Ora!*: the language component, staging and form-focused instruction**

So far as the writers of *Tihē Mauri Ora!* are concerned, there can be no doubt that culture cannot be fully appreciated in the absence of language: “the key to successful work based on taha Māori is the centrality of te reo Māori” (p. 14). Thus, teachers should not regard the language component of the syllabus as an optional extra. Nevertheless, whereas themes, settings and suggested topics are presented at three levels (pp. 36 - 41), language is not.

Some teachers may approach the themes, settings and suggested topics largely through the medium of English. If they do, an important aspect of the syllabus - the integration of language and culture - will have been lost. Others may seek to approach these themes and topics more gradually, building up language competence as they progress. If they do, they will need to make decisions in relation to language content. This will not be a straightforward matter. Certainly, the themes, settings and suggested topics have certain lexical and conceptual implications. However, apart from some vocabulary and some stereotypical, formulaic expressions (such as, for example, certain types of greeting), it will be difficult to decide what language should be introduced when, where and how. Looking at the list entitled *Grammar as Function* in *Appendix 3* (pp. 44 - 49) will help to some extent. However, apart from some question and answer forms, what we really have here is a decontextualized list

of phrases and sentences (see extract from 'Grammar as Function' in *Appendix 1* here).

Since communicative language teaching (using real language for authentic purposes) is not consistent with the imitation and repetition of sample sentences, teachers will need to find ways of providing students with access to the language code. Even if all of the teachers were fluent speakers of the language and had no other educational goals to achieve, a range of language planning decisions would have to be made. The fact that this syllabus provides little assistance in this respect suggests that the syllabus writers were influenced, to some extent at least, by the work of Krashen who has argued that, so long as the attitude and atmosphere are appropriate, language can be 'acquired' in classroom contexts by the simple device of talking meaningfully in the target language, making sure to challenge the students by using language that is a little in advance of their current level of competence (see, for example, Krashen (1981)). Exactly how this is to be achieved has never been explained. Nor has the binary divide between 'acquisition' and 'learning' ever been justified. In any case, Krashen's claims, and the research upon which they were supposedly based, have been repeatedly discredited. Thus, for example, McLaughlin (1978, p. 56) notes that "Krashen's theory fails at every juncture" and Gregg (1984, p.94) observes that "each of Krashen's hypotheses is marked by serious flaws: undefinable or ill-defined terms, unmotivated constructs, lack of empirical content and thus of falsifiability, lack of explanatory power". However, most of the painstaking work that has gone into rebutting claims of this sort has taken place since *Tihē Mauri Ora!* was initially planned and much of it has actually appeared since *Tihē Mauri Ora!* was produced. Furthermore, Krashen's approach has continued to have considerable appeal partly, no doubt, because it has come to be associated with his advocacy of minority languages, and partly because it is reassuring for those teachers who lack a secure background in language teaching pedagogy. Bearing in mind that *Tihē Mauri Ora!* was prepared throughout the 1980s, and bearing in mind that there is little point in designing a syllabus that teachers will not accept, this appeal may have been something that the writers of *Tihē Mauri Ora!* felt that they could not afford to ignore. Even so, there is evidence that they were sceptical of the more extravagant claims that had been made by Krashen and those with similar views. Thus, for example, they note that:

At school the target language *may* have to be learned, not acquired [emphasis added] (p.18).

Furthermore, they include extensive reference to language functions as well as lists of vocabulary and grammatical information. In spite of this, there remains some resistance to the idea that a staged introduction to language can be helpful:

.....as the language used for learning mirrors the child's interests and development, a fixed sequence in teaching is neither desirable nor possible - a cyclic approach which reruns language experiences with increasing confidence, fluency, and accuracy is best (p. 23).

There appears here to be a careful avoidance here of any reference to language systems. What is to be rerun is 'language experiences'. Certainly, particularly in the case of young learners, it is absolutely necessary to accommodate teaching to needs and interests. Furthermore, planning needs to be constantly revised in the light of

experience. In this respect, it is true to say that ‘a fixed sequence in teaching is neither desirable nor possible’. However, this should not be taken to mean, as some teachers may have thought, that there is no place for planning and sequencing in tutored language learning.

All good teaching involves revision as well as extension. From this perspective, it may be better talk in terms of a spiral rather than a cycle, thus emphasising the desirability of demonstrable progression. In fact, this is clearly what the syllabus writers had in mind when they observed that “teachers should revisit what has gone before, then move on to some yet unexplored aspect until, at least, the whole is complete” (p.12).

A syllabus that relates to both language and culture needs to include both in any levels framework that is produced. However, whereas *Tihē Mauri Ora!* introduces themes and settings in relation to three levels of achievement, it does not treat language in the same way (see extract from section dealing with themes, settings and suggested topics for level two in *Appendix 2* here). To have done so need not have implied that the levels needed to be treated as hard and fast (any more than is the case in relation to themes and settings). Indeed, the writers themselves observe that:

The programme for children is presented in three taumata (levels of learning and achievement). . . . These levels are not hard and fast. Teachers and children will move through them at the rate their competence allows (p. 34).

The fact that language content as such is essentially unstructured in *Tihē Mauri Ora!* seems to run counter to some of the observations that are included in the syllabus itself:

Future programmes should be *structured* to move towards achieving the aims and objectives of this syllabus [emphasis ours] (p. 11).

At school . . . language grows in *a more deliberate and organised way* [emphasis ours] (p. 18).

The writers observe that:

Teachers need to be aware . . . that *a gap may develop between what children want to talk about and their ability to express themselves. Teachers should be ready to modify their teaching approaches to take this into account* [emphasis ours] (p. 34)

In fact, in the area of language learning, the existence of a gap between desire and ability is inevitable rather than possible. The problem is, however, that that gap is unlikely to narrow significantly unless attempts to reduce it are systematic.

The lack of any suggested systematic approach to language content in *Tihē Mauri Ora!* may relate not only to the influence of Krashen and his associates, but also to the fact that the syllabus was designed to be all things to all people. Clearly, different types of learner in different educational settings need different types of syllabus. Introducing a real sense of progression into a syllabus that is designed for very

different learners in very different educational settings taught by teachers from very different backgrounds would have been extremely difficult. However, if the New Zealand Ministry of Education should ever commission a range of curriculum documents for different educational settings, there would be a real opportunity to revisit the issue of how best to deal with the need for staged, progressive and cumulative language learning. As we will indicate in a future article, a Māori curriculum statement designed largely for students in Māori-immersion contexts has now been produced. However, that curriculum statement does not fully address the issue of the need for staged, progressive and cumulative language learning. This may be because it is designed to be very similar to the English curriculum statement, a curriculum statement that was designed primarily for native speakers of English.

### ***Tihē Mauri Ora!*: syllabus design and language content**

Central to debates on communicative competence has been the question of how best to deal, in the context of language programmes, with the complex nature of communication. Vocabulary and structure had traditionally been treated as central aspects of language learning, and syllabuses that introduced structures progressively (structural syllabuses) had become the norm. However, other areas of communicative competence clearly needed to be taken into account and methodologies that treated structure in mechanistic ways needed to be replaced.

It was in this context that educationalists began to focus on different ways of organizing language syllabuses. Among these were proposals relating to task-based syllabuses, skills-based syllabuses, situational syllabuses and topic-based syllabuses. For a discussion of these, and others, see Yalden (1987). When each of these approaches to syllabus design was first introduced, it tended to be associated with an abandonment of structural progression as a central aspect of syllabus planning. Over time, however, the more extreme versions of these syllabus design proposals have been replaced by less extreme versions which acknowledge the importance of attending in meaningful ways to all aspects of language, including structure.

In *Tihē Mauri Ora!* there is evidence of the integration of a range of different approaches to syllabus design. One of the most significant of these is the notional syllabus. However, although one important aspect of the notional syllabus (the functional component) plays a significant role in *Tihē Mauri Ora!*, another (the notional component) receives much less attention. This is unfortunate because, in neglecting the notional component, the syllabus designers effectively downgraded the significance of structure in the context of the communicative agenda.

The notional syllabus proposal grew out of research on language education conducted under the auspices of the *Council of Europe* in the 1970s. It presented a challenge to a purely structural approach to the concept of syllabus. Wilkins (1973; 1974 a & b; 1976) proposed that a notional syllabus should have three main strands: *functions* (illocutionary forces of speech acts, such as ‘apology’ and ‘complaint’) *notions* (meanings that are encoded in the lexico-grammatical systems of languages such as, for example, habitual aspect encoded in the present simple in English) and modal meanings (such as, for example, *possibility* and *certainty*). The concept of a notional syllabus revolutionised language teaching in many parts of the world. However, in common with other aspects of the communicative movement more generally, it also

destabilised the language teaching profession, reducing confidence in existing approaches at the same time as introducing a raft of new problems relating to theory and practice: see, for example, Widdowson (1979), Crombie (1988), McNamara (1996). In particular, it was often implemented in an uneven way, the functional component having greater appeal than the notional and modal components for those who were in search of something fundamentally different.

One of the most significant problems relating to the notional syllabus was that of determining to what extent the notional component of the syllabus differed from structural syllabuses (syllabuses which introduced different grammatical structures gradually in addition, of course, to other aspects of language, including vocabulary). Widdowson (1979), for example, argued that although there was a fundamental difference between a structural syllabus and the notional component of a notional syllabus, that difference related primarily to organization rather than to content. Whereas a structural syllabus might list, at a specific point, a single structure associated with a single meaning (e.g. present simple in English for habitual actions or for future arrangements), the notional component of a notional syllabus might include, at a particular point, one or more ways of expressing concepts such as habitual action, *or future arrangements*, concepts that could be associated with a range of different structures. In other words, structural syllabuses tended to approach meaning through structure, whereas notional syllabuses tended to approach structure through meaning. As Widdowson observed:

Notional syllabuses are represented by their proponents as an alternative to, and an improvement on, structural syllabuses. . . . The two types of syllabus differ most obviously in the manner in which the linguistic content is defined. In the structural syllabus it is defined in formal terms, as lexical items and grammatical patterns manifesting the system. . . . In the notional syllabus, language content is defined . . . as notions which are realised by formal items (Widdowson, 1979, p. 247).

Thus, the notional component of a notional syllabus is in many ways very similar to aspects of a structural syllabus, something that has not always been clearly understood. This very fact, however, means that a syllabus which involves notions, modal meanings and functions (as well as other aspects of language) can be useful. What is likely to be less useful, however, is a syllabus that prioritises functions over other aspects of language. This is particularly so given that the functional component of a notional syllabus has limited applicability. It can be very useful where functions, such as, for example, greetings are expressed idiomatically or semi-idiomatically. It is, however, less useful and can even be even misleading where this is not the case. As Crombie (1988, p. 285) observes:

Almost any utterance can have almost any illocutionary force [function] depending on the context in which it is used. So an utterance such as 'It's hot in here' may function as a request (to open a door or a window), as a complaint, as a warning (in a paint factory, for example) etc.

Associating a particular example with a particular function can lead students to believe that it will always, irrespective of context, be associated with that function.

As a result, students may, instead of coming to terms with the economical, generative systems of language, associate particular examples with particular functions in a way that is characteristic of phrasebook learning. This is not to say that functions do not have an important part to play in language syllabuses. In fact, recent proposals relating to the role of exemplars and memory in second language contexts (Skehan, 1997) support the view that this can be the case. Indeed, the formulaic or semi-formulaic character of the functional component of many early attempts to implement the notional syllabus concept may provide a partial explanation for the initial enthusiasm of many teachers for this type of approach: formulaic language is as an effective aid to memorisation, particularly in the early stages of language learning. Nevertheless, most of the problems that can be associated with introducing language in terms of functions remain. In particular, there is a tendency to focus on those functions (such as, for example, *greetings*) which are essentially formulaic in nature at the same time as ignoring the vast lexical and syntactic variety that can be associated with others (such as, for example, *compliments*). Thus, the extremely important role that an appreciation of syntactic regularity can play in facilitating language learning may be sacrificed in favour of encouraging students to memorise sentences which are said to exemplify certain functions, even though many of these sentences can just as readily exemplify different functions in different contexts.

In *Appendix 3* (pp. 44 - 49), *Tihē Mauri Ora!* has a list headed *Grammar as Function*. This terminology is curious in that it is notions rather than functions that can be directly related to grammar. As has already been indicated, functions are contextually derived. Thus, with the exception of formulaic expressions such as greetings, it is impossible to determine what function an utterance has if it is out of context.

The section of *Tihē Mauri Ora!* headed *Grammar as Function* is made up of lists of phrases and sentences. Among these we find, for example, 'Tata tonu au te ngaro' / 'I nearly got lost' as an example of 'possibility, ability'. Apart from the fact that possibility and ability are modal in character, this particular sentence could, in different contexts (like nearly all of the others) realise a whole range of different functions. It is not, for example, difficult to imagine contexts in which this sentence might function as a complaint or as a warning. Out of context, however, it does not have any function: function (except in the case of formulaic language use) is the product of the interaction between language and context. Another example of this is the sentence 'Māku e whakaweto te pouaka whakaata!' / 'I'll turn the TV off!'. This sentence is listed under the heading of 'threat'. Certainly, in an appropriate context, this sentence could function as a threat. However, it could equally function as an inducement, an offer or some other function or combination of functions.

Why, then, do the examples listed in *Appendix 3* of *Tihē Mauri Ora!* appear to realise the functional headings under which they are listed?

First, a significant number of the sample phrases and sentences are formulaic and, in such cases, form and function coalesce. Thus, 'Tēnā koe!' can be listed out of context under the functional heading 'greeting' precisely because it is always used as a greeting.

Secondly, a number of the headings in this section relate to aspects of the core lexical or grammatical meanings of the phrases and sentences listed. Thus, for example,

under the heading of ‘like, dislike and preference’, we find the sentence ‘He pai ki a au te heihei’/‘I like chicken’. Thus, readers will have little difficulty in associating this sentence with ‘likes’. However, this is because ‘like’ is a translation of part of the core meaning of the sentence. It is not because ‘like’ is a function. In terms of function, this sentence, depending on context, could function, for example, as a suggestion or a complaint. Thus, for example, as a response to a question about what would be good for dinner, a sentence such as this would be likely to be interpreted as a suggestion. In summary, the link between some of the headings and the phrases and sentences listed under these headings relates to core meaning rather than function.

Overall, the section headed ‘Grammar as Function’ in *Tihē Mauri Ora!* is a list of decontextualized phrases and sentences grouped under headings of various types. The next section, headed *Grammar as Structure* (pp. 50 - 65) is a list made up largely of parts of speech, phrase types and sentence types. Although some of the listed sample sentences in this section indicate the importance of, for example, aspectual meaning, there is no explicit interaction between grammatical form and grammatically encoded meanings as there typically would be in structural syllabus or in the notional component of notional syllabuses.

### **Conclusion**

So far as the culture component is concerned, *Tihē Mauri Ora!* presents a very helpful framework for learning. However, the language component of the syllabus is largely made up of lists of vocabulary and decontextualized examples that are not explicitly related to the levels framework or to the other aspects of the syllabus (the themes, settings and suggested topics). The reasons for this appear to relate less to theoretical issues than to the complexity of attempting to accommodate students and teachers from vastly different backgrounds. In fact, however, a curriculum statement based on, for example, eight levels of attainment, could be designed to meet the needs of a wide range of different types of student so long as it was accepted that there would inevitably be different expectations in relation to different educational settings. Thus, whereas the early levels would be appropriate for all students, the middle levels would be appropriate for students in bilingual settings and the higher levels would be appropriate for students in Māori-immersion education settings. Of course, this would not mean that issues of teacher education could be avoided. Nor would it be preferable to having a range of different curriculum statements and syllabuses for different settings. However, it would go some way towards resolving the problems faced by the writers of *Tihē Mauri Ora!* On the assumption that this would be possible, we believe that the following guidelines might be helpful:

- an eight levels structure in which different levels of achievement were appropriate to different educational settings could be considered;
- the framework outlined by the Council of Europe (1996), a framework designed with minority as well as majority languages in mind, could be used as a guide to coverage in the area of linguistic skills and knowledge;
- objectives could be linked directly to levels and the cultural and language learning objectives could be integrated (as indicated in *Appendix 3* here which provides an example of one way in which this could be achieved).

## References

- Carroll, B. J. (1980). *Testing communicative performance*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (1991). Grammar pedagogy in second and foreign language teaching, *TESOL Quarterly*, 25 (3).
- Council of Europe. (1996). *Draft common European framework for modern languages*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Crombie, W. H. (1988). Syllabus and method: system or licence?, *System* 16 (3), 281-298.
- Gregg, K. (1984). Krashen's monitor and Occam's razor, *Applied Linguistics*, 5 (2), 79-100.
- Hymes, D. (1971). *On communicative competence*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press
- Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- McLaughlin, B. (1978). The monitor model: some methodological considerations, *Language Learning* 28, 309 - 332.
- McNamara, T. (1996) *Measuring second language performance*. London and New York: Longman.
- Ministry of Education (1990) *Tihē Mauri Ora*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.
- Skehan, P. (1997) Task-based instruction, *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 17, 38-62.
- Widdowson, H. (1979). Notional syllabuses. In Widdowson, H. G. (Ed.), (1979). *Explorations in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wilkins, D. (1973). The linguistic and situational content of the common core in a unit/credit system. In *Systems development in adult language learning*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Wilkins, D. (1974a). Grammatical, situational and notional syllabuses. In A. Verdoort (Ed.). (1974). *Proceedings of the third international congress of applied linguistics* 2. Heidelberg: Julius Groos.
- Wilkins, D. (1974b). Notional syllabuses and the concept of a minimum adequate grammar. In Corder, S. P. & Poulet, E. (Eds.). (1974). *Linguistic insights in applied linguistics*. Brussels: AIMAV; Paris: Didier.
- Wilkins, D. (1976). *Notional syllabuses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yalden, J. (1987). *Principles of course design for language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Appendix 1: Extract from 'grammar as function' in *Tihē Mauri Ora!***

<p><b>Thanks</b>  <b>Kia ora!</b> <i>Thanks!</i>  <b>Kia ora koe!</b> <i>Thank you!</i>  <b>Aroha ana!</b> <i>Thank you!</i></p> <p><b>Apology</b>  E aroha ana au mō tērā.  <i>I'm sorry for what happened.</i></p> <p><b>Weather</b>  Te makariri hoki o te rangi! <i>Is it ever cold!</i>  Tino pai te rangi, nē rā? <i>Lovely day, isn't it?</i></p> <p><b>Invitation</b>  Me haere tāua ki te mātakitaki. <i>Let's go and watch.</i>  Me kai tātou. <i>Let's eat.</i></p> <p><b>Permission</b>  Me māu koe i tōku paihikara. <i>You can take my bike.</i></p> <p><b>Belief</b>  <b>Ki a au,</b> kei te haere mai ia āpōpō.  <i>I think he's coming tomorrow.</i>  <b>Ki taku mōhio,</b> kei te haere mai ia āpōpō.  <i>As far as I know, he's coming tomorrow.</i>  <b>Ki tā</b> Eruera, kei te haere mai ia āpōpō.  <i>According to Eruera, he's coming tomorrow.</i>  <b>Te āhua nei</b> kei te haere mai ia āpōpō.  <i>He seems to be coming tomorrow.</i></p>	<p><b>Like, dislike, preference</b>  He pai ki a au te heihei. <i>I like chicken.</i>  Kāore au e pai ana ki te ika. <i>I don't like fish.</i>  <b>Ki a au nei,</b> he pai ake te heihei i te poaka. <i>I prefer chicken to pork.</i></p> <p><b>Desire</b>  Ko tōku hiahia kia haere mai a Hōne. <i>I want Hone to come.</i></p> <p><b>Hope</b>  Ko te tūmanako ōna e tuwhera ana ngā kūaha. <i>He hopes the doors are open.</i></p> <p><b>Anticipation</b>  Kei te rikarika atu rātou ki te kōnohete. <i>They are looking forward to the concert.</i></p> <p><b>Disappointment</b>  <b>Ka aroha kē</b> te pikitia. <i>A pity about the film.</i></p> <p><b>Approval, disapproval</b>  Ka pai! <i>It's great!</i>  He aha māu i mahi pēnā ai? <i>Why did you do that?.</i></p> <p><b>Concern</b>  Kei hea kē ō kākahu kaukau? <i>Where could your togs be?</i></p>
--	--

**Appendix 2: Extract from themes, settings and suggested topics at level 2 in *Tihē Mauri Ora!***

<b>Taumata Tuarua (level two)</b>				
<b>ĀHUATANGA (settings)</b>				
	<b>Kāinga (home)</b>	<b>Kura (school)</b>	<b>Papa Kāinga Māori (Māori settings)</b>	<b>Ētahi atu wāhi (other places)</b>
<b>KAUPAPA (themes)</b>	<b>TAKE (topics)</b>			
<b>Kai (food)</b>	. special food at home  example: Ngā Whakarite mō te Harakoa (getting ready for a party)	. making food at school  example: Te Mahi Hanawiti (making sandwiches)	. traditional food on the marae  example: Kei te Whakareri mō te Hākari (getting ready for the hākari)	. food outside  example: Kai Tunutunu i Waho (a barbecue)
<b>Mea kaingākautia (things one likes)</b>	. doing things with friends at home  example: Te Mātakitaki Pouaka Whakaata (watching television)	. doing things with friends at school  example: Te Mahi Manu Aute (making kites)	. meeting friends at the marae  example: Te Kōrerorero i te Marae (chatting at the marae)	. doing things outside  example: Te Kohikohi Kaimoana (gathering seafood)
<b>Ētahi huihui (getting together)</b>	. family reunions  example: Kia Hoki mai taku Tipuna (a grandparent comes home)	. sports events at school  example: Whakareri mō te Rā Tākaro (preparing for sports day)	. gatherings at the marae  example: I te Hui (at the Hui)	. special days in our community  example: Te Rā Mātakitaki (show day)

**Appendix 3: Suggestions for incorporating language learning objectives into a levels framework**

**Context: Food      Topic: Breakfast at home (1)**

**Language focus**

Structure	Function	Suggested Vocabulary	Suggested sound focus
<p>1. Imperative form eg <i>Pass me ....</i></p> <p><i>Homai..... maku.</i> <i>Homai koa.....</i></p> <p>2. Indefinite articles eg <i>a / he</i></p> <p><b>Examples:</b> <i>Homai he pereti maku.</i> <i>Homai koa he pereti.</i></p>	<p>Requests eg <i>Please, pass me a ...</i></p> <p><b>Examples:</b> <i>Homai he pereti maku.</i>  <i>Homai koa he pereti.</i></p>	<p>plate            <i>pereti</i> cup             <i>kapu</i> saucer         <i>hoeha</i> bowl            <i>kumete</i> knife            <i>naihi</i> spoon          <i>pune</i> fork             <i>paoka</i></p> <p>(Other regional or dialectal variants should also be used where appropriate)</p>	<p>Vowel sounds. Intonation pattern of imperatives and declaratives.</p>

**Skills development**

Listening	Speaking	Reading	Writing
<p>For vocabulary and verb form recognition.</p> <p>Learners should be able to listen to a short text and recognise the vocabulary they have learned. They should be able to identify and respond to the verb forms they have been taught.</p>	<p>Word and utterance stress (ie equal stress on each syllable)</p> <p>Learners should be able to use the vocabulary they have learned and the verb forms being focused on in authentic situations, imitating appropriate word and sentence stress.</p>	<p>For recognition of target vocabulary.</p> <p>Learners should be able to read short dialogues containing the target vocabulary and demonstrate their comprehension of what they have read.</p>	<p>For accurate writing of vocabulary items.</p> <p>Learners should be able to write the vocabulary items they have learned.</p>

**Recycling**

Recycling
Ways of expressing thanks and acknowledgment.

**Approaching Māori Language through Meaning: The Predominance of Indo-European Models of Relationships within Propositions**

**Hēmi Whaanga**

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

Private Bag 3105, Hamilton, New Zealand

[jpwl@waikato.ac.nz]

**Abstract**

In every language, there are relationships between predicators (such as, for example, 'go'/'haere') and arguments (such as, for example, 'James'/'Hēmi'). One such relationship that has been proposed is that of agency. Thus, in 'James goes'/'E haere ana a Hēmi'), 'James'/'Hēmi' can be said to be the agent of the action 'go'/'haere'. Much of the international literature on relationships of this type is based on research on English and it has been claimed that the relationships that have been identified are universals. However, there may be differences among languages, differences that are attributable to the fact that different languages encode different ways of perceiving divisions in perceptual space. My aim here is to demonstrate, with reference to a number of different models of predicator/ argument relations, that most of them are based on assumptions that derive from the structure of Indo-European languages, English in particular. In *Part 2* of this paper (to appear in a subsequent issue of this Journal), the implications of this discussion will be examined with reference to an analysis of Māori in terms of relationships within propositions.

**Introduction: laying the foundations**

An early article by Fillmore (1968) is regarded as one of the major benchmarks in the presentation of a universal set of case relations in language (Cook, 1989; Grimes, 1975; Nilsen, 1972). In this article, Fillmore develops an alternative model to the transformational models proposed earlier (e.g. Chomsky (1957) and Chomsky (1965)), questioning the “deep structure validity of the traditional divisions between subject and predicate, a division which is assumed by some to underlie the basic form of all sentences in all languages” (1968, p. 17). Central to Fillmore's argument (p. 5) is the following claim:

There are many semantically relevant syntactic relationships involving nouns and the structures that contain them. . . . These relationships . . . are in large part covert but are nevertheless empirically discoverable. . . . [They] form a specific finite set, and . . . observations made about them will turn out to have considerable cross-linguistic validity.

Fillmore refers to these relationships as ‘case relations’. He proposes a ‘conceptual framework’ in which these relations are interpreted, making a clear distinction between deep and surface structure. A proposition is defined as “a tenseless set of relationships involving verbs and nouns (and embedded sentences, if there are any)” (p. 23), the basic structure of a sentence being treated as a verb and one or more noun phrases associated with the verb in a particular case relationship. The propositional constituent of a sentence is separated from modalities on the sentence as a whole which include “tense, mood, and aspect” (p. 23). Each proposition has a verb and one

or more nominal components which have relationships of various types (case relations) with the verb. Fillmore initially lists six case roles (*Agentive, Instrumental, Dative, Factitive, Locative, and Objective*), adding a further three (*Benefactive, Time, Comitative*) in the course of the discussion. These are outlined in *Table 1* below alongside examples drawn from English. In each case, the noun that enters into the relationship in question is in bold.

**Table 1: Case roles (intra-propositional relations) according to Fillmore (1968)**

Case Role	Description	Specific Features	Examples
<b>Agentive</b>	Instigator of the action identified by the verb.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>chosen as the subject in a simple sentence.</li> <li>'typically animate' (perceived).</li> <li>marked with the preposition <i>by</i> in English.</li> </ul>	<p><b>John</b> ran.</p> <p><b>John</b> opened the door.</p> <p>The house was built by <b>John</b>.</p>
<b>Instrumental</b>	Inanimate force or object used in the action or state identified by the verb.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>marked with the preposition <i>by</i> when there is no agentive.</li> <li>otherwise it takes the preposition <i>with</i> when there is an agentive present.</li> <li>includes natural forces.</li> </ul>	<p>He was knocked over by a <b>truck</b>.</p> <p>He broke it with a <b>hammer</b>.</p> <p>The <b>wind</b> knocked over the tree.</p> <p>The <b>wind</b> opened the door.</p>
<b>Dative</b>	Animate being affected by the state or action identified by the verb.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>may appear as subject, direct object or indirect object of non-action verbs.</li> <li>may also occur as the indirect object of state or action verbs.</li> <li>typically marked by the preposition '<i>to</i>'.</li> </ul>	<p>I kicked <b>John</b>.</p> <p>I gave the letter to <b>John</b>.</p> <p><b>He</b> heard the scream.</p>
<b>Factitive</b>	Object or being resulting from an action or state identified by the verb, or understood as a part of the meaning of the verb.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>distinguishes the effected object from the affected object.</li> <li>can never occur as the subject.</li> </ul>	<p>Nick built the <b>house</b>.</p>

**Table 1 (continued): Case roles (intra-propositional relations) according to Fillmore (1968)**

Case role	Description	Specific Features	Examples
<b>Locative</b>	Identifies the location or spatial orientation of the state or action identified by the verb.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>may occur as a subject or object but more often as a preposition.</li> </ul>	<b>Wellington</b> is windy.
<b>Objective</b>	Limited to things which are affected by the action or state identified by the verb	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>not to be confused with direct object or with accusative case in surface structure.</li> <li>may occur as subject or object of a non-action verb or direct object of an action verb.</li> </ul>	John enjoyed the <b>movie</b> .  He opened the <b>door</b> .
<b>Benefactive</b>	Not defined by Fillmore.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>marked by the preposition '<i>for</i>' (for the sake of).</li> </ul>	He washed the car for <b>Tina</b> .
<b>Time</b>	Not defined by Fillmore.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>no surface marker.</li> <li>prepositions of time.</li> </ul>	He left on <b>Monday</b> .
<b>Comitative</b>	Not clearly defined by Fillmore: involves co-ordination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>signalled by the preposition <i>with</i>.</li> <li>parallel to the conjunctive '<i>and</i>'.</li> </ul>	He is leaving with <b>Peter</b> .

It is immediately apparent that this framework is biased towards Indo-European languages. In fact, Fillmore himself observes that this proposal is language-specific to the extent that it prioritises the role of verbs and nouns rather than the conceptual content that may be expressed in some languages nominally and verbally. This means that the way in which the term 'proposition' is defined needs to be revised. Here, a proposition is redefined as a predicator (often encoded as a verb) together with one or more arguments (often encoded as nouns or pronouns) that are related to that predicator. The relationships between arguments and the predicators are case relations. Thus, case relations are intra-propositional relations, that is, they are relationships that exist *within* the proposition rather than *between* propositions.

Thus, a proposition is redefined here as a combination of a predicator and one or more arguments that are related to that predicator. With this definition in place, it becomes clear that a proposition need not be encoded as a clause. In examples (1) and (2) below, from Māori and English respectively, a single clause encodes a single proposition. However, in example (3) below, there is propositional embedding: a

proposition is embedded as a nominalization inside a clause. Thus, in example (3), the proposition 'James interrupted' (where 'James' is in an agentive role in relation to 'interrupt') is embedded as a noun group. In this example, there are two encoded propositions: 'James interrupted' and 'he became angry'. In fact, these two propositions are linked in an *inter*-propositional (not *intra*-propositional) relationship of reason-result. Thus, the first proposition acts as a reason in relation to the result in the second proposition:

- (1) She washed the plates
- (2) I horoi ia i ngā pereti.
- (3) James' interruption caused his anger.

Thus, a single clause can encode more than one proposition. From this perspective, it may be that there is no need for the case relationship that Fillmore (1968) refers to as 'Benefactive'. In example (4) below, there appear to be two propositions encoded within a single clause:

- (4) John washed the car for Mary.

Here, the first proposition ('John washed the car') is encoded directly. However, the second proposition needs to be recovered and can be expressed as something like 'Mary benefited'.

As in the case of example (3), there appears in example (4) to be an *inter*-propositional relationship (a relationship *between* the two propositions). This time, the *inter*-propositional relationship appears to be that of means-purpose. Thus, the purpose (benefiting Mary) is achieved by means of washing the car. What this suggests is that two different types of relationship (*inter*-propositional and *intra*-propositional) are being confused. *Intra*-propositional relationships (case relations or case roles) are relationships *within* propositions; *inter*-propositional relationships are relationships *between* propositions.

We have already seen that an entire proposition can be encoded as a noun group. We have also already seen that predicators can be encoded as verbs and arguments can be encoded as nouns and pronouns. In fact, however, predicators need not, even in English, be encoded as nouns or pronouns. In example (5) below, what is predicated of James is not 'isness' but 'inness':

- (5) James is in the cupboard.

Thus, in example (5) above, the encoded predicator is 'is in' and the arguments are 'James' and 'cupboard'. The verb ('is') is, in effect, simply a place-filler that can carry tense. The fact that this is the case (the fact that 'inness' is the predicator) becomes clearer when we consider an example from Māori. This is because Māori does not have any equivalent of the verb 'to be' in English. In example (6) below, the two arguments 'Hēmi' and 'kāpata' relate to the predicator which is 'kei roto':

- (6) Kei roto a Hēmi i te kāpata.

In examples (5) and (6), 'the cupboard' and 'te kāpata' are *Locative* in relation to the encoded predicator 'in'/'kei roto'. In example (7), 'cupboard' is *Locative* in relation to the encoded predicator 'is under':

(7) James is under the cupboard.

In terms of this analysis, examples (8) and (9) would have a predicator which is encoded as a verb plus a preposition ('lives in' and 'hides under') with 'compost' being the argument that has the case role *Locative*:

(8) The hedgehog lives in the compost.

(9) The hedgehog hides under the compost.

In the case of a clause involving two prepositional phrases which operate together, one of the arguments is made up of a group containing an embedded proposition:

(10) Jane is in the cupboard under the stairs.

Thus, in example (10) above, what is predicated of the first argument ('Jane') is 'inness' and the encoded predicator is 'is in'. The second argument (occupying the *Locative* role) is 'the cupboard under the stairs'. Thus, the second argument contains an embedded proposition ('The cupboard is under the stairs').

Some clauses can contain two prepositional phrases that are not semantically linked as in example (11) below:

(11) The box is under the stairs, beside the coat.

In this example, there are two propositions: 'The box is under the stairs' and 'The box is beside the old coat'. The encoded predicator of the first proposition is 'is under'; the encoded predicator of the second proposition is 'is beside'. The *Locative* case role is occupied by 'stairs' in the first proposition and by 'coat' in the second.

This approach would help us also to analyse clauses containing predicative adjectives. In the sentence below, for example, what is predicated of 'Jane' is 'prettiness'. Thus, 'is pretty' is the encoding of the predicator:

(12) Jane is pretty.

However, where the adjective is in attributive position, as in the example below, an entire proposition ('The girl is pretty') is embedded within the initial noun group:

(13) The pretty girl laughed.

Thus, an entire proposition (embedded) operates as the argument of the predicator 'laughed' in example (13).

Thus, predicators may be encoded as more than one part of speech. In the following example, what is predicated of Mary is 'running quickly'. Thus, 'runs quickly' is the encoded predicator:

(14) Mary ran quickly.

In example (15), the encoded predicator is 'ran quickly towards' and the arguments are 'Mary' and 'Tom':

(15) Mary ran quickly towards Tom.

Approaching the proposition in terms of arguments and predicators in the way suggested above removes a number of problems that are associated with Fillmore's proposal (Fillmore, 1968), problems that would make it difficult to apply his model to languages which are structured in ways that are very different from English. It would, furthermore, provide a coherent way of dealing with propositional embedding and with those adjectives, adverbs and prepositions in English which created difficulties in relation to the original model.

It has already been suggested that there may be no need for a *Benefactive* role. Equally, what Fillmore (1968) refers to as the 'Comitative' role appears to be unnecessary. In terms of propositional content, there is no difference between 'John and Mary' and 'John . . . with Mary': the difference is a matter of surface emphasis. Thus, in both 'John and Mary are leaving' and 'John is leaving with Mary', the argument is 'John and Mary'. Redefining the term 'proposition' and recognizing the fact that there are relationships *between* propositions as well as *within* them allows for the reduction of case roles within Fillmore's initial model to seven: *Agentive*, *Instrumental*, *Dative*, *Factitive*, *Objective*, *Locative* and *Time*. Replacing references to verbs in the descriptions by references to predicators and acknowledging that predicators need not be encoded as verbs would have the effect of making the model more likely to apply to a wide range of languages. Finally, consideration needs to be given to the use of the words 'animate' and 'inanimate' in the definitions of two of the remaining case roles (*Instrumental* and *Dative*). Because Māori culture (in common with a range of other cultures) recognises that all things are imbued with *wairua* (life spirit), it may be inappropriate to differentiate between 'animate' and 'inanimate' in defining case roles. This is a matter that can be finally resolved only when specific examples from Māori are examined in the context of a set of possible case frames.

### **Beyond the initial framework: a critical examination of international literature on case roles**

The case roles proposed by Fillmore in 1968 underwent radical revision during a seminar devoted to syntax held in the summer of 1970 at Ohio State University. The revisions are reflected in an article published in 1971. In this article, Fillmore notes that the intention was "not [to provide] a proposal to eliminate deep structures altogether, but . . . to find a level of syntactic structure which was deeper than that offered by the then standard theory" (Fillmore, 1971, p. 245). In the revised theory, the propositional core consists of "a predicator (a verb, adjective or noun) in construction with one or more entities, each of these related to the predicator in one of the semantic functions known as (deep structure) cases" (pp. 246-47). These cases or

relations identify the roles that the entities serve in the predication, “including that of the instigator of an action, that of the experiencer of a psychological event, that of an object which undergoes a change or movement, that of the location of an event, and so on” (p. 247).

Once again, the predicator is tied to syntactic realisations although these no longer consist of the verb only. The model also remains tied to clause structure: although he acknowledges clause embedding, Fillmore argues that only one case role of any particular type may occur in a single clause. In fact, it would be better to acknowledge that **(a)** a single clause may encode more than one proposition, and **(b)** only one case role of any particular type may occur in a single encoded proposition.

In this model, a distinction is made between *Actor* and *Experiencer* and between both of these and *Location*. The cases are hierarchically organised in relation to subject selection in the case of ‘unmarked’ sentences, the hierarchical order being: *Agent*, *Experiencer*, *Instrument*, *Object*, *Source*, *Goal*, *Location*, *Time*, and *Benefactive*. Once again, at least one aspect of the model (the hierarchical ordering in the case of ‘unmarked sentences’) is clearly language-specific and there is no recognition of the existence of *inter-propositional* relationships.

The *Dative* case relation is replaced by three relations: *Experiencer*, *Objective* and *Goal*. The *Locative* case relation is also replaced by three case relations: *Location*, *Source* and *Goal* (subsuming *Factitive*). Note that there are, in fact, five case roles here (*Goal* appears in each set). Although the *Comitative* relation has been removed, *Benefactive* remains. However, there is considerable uncertainty about inclusion of a *Benefactive* relation: it is noted that “sentences with *Benefactives* in them really come from more complicated constructions in which . . . somebody offers some deed to somebody else” which in turn constitutes “an abstract verb of giving” (p. 261). The five case roles (case relations/ intra-propositional relations) that replace *Dative* and *Locative* are outlined in *Table 2* below along with the redefined *Time* role:

**Table 2: Case roles replacing Dative and Locative in Fillmore (1971)**

Case Role	Description	Specific Features	Examples
<b>Experiencer</b>	Animate being affected by the action.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• experiencer of a psychological event or mental state.</li> <li>• excludes non-psychological change of state verbs (i.e. <i>grow</i>).</li> <li>▪ does not include transfer of property verbs (i.e. <i>give</i>).</li> </ul>	<p><b>I</b> am in love with her.</p> <p><b>John</b> is cold.</p> <p><b>She</b> heard the song.</p> <p><b>He</b> is fond of food.</p>

**Table 2 (continued): Case roles replacing Dative and Locative in Fillmore (1971)**

Case Role	Description	Specific Features	Examples
<b>Objective</b>	Semantically the most neutral relation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>entity which moves or undergoes change.</li> <li>occurs in the direct object position in the context psychological predicators relating to experience.</li> </ul>	<p>John opened the <b>door</b>.</p> <p>John built a <b>house</b>.</p> <p>John broke the <b>plate</b>.</p> <p>The wind opened the <b>door</b>.</p>
<b>Location</b>	Place where an object or event is located.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>used in conjunction with <i>Source</i> and <i>Goal</i>.</li> </ul>	Nick <b>lives in Wales</b> .
<b>Source</b>	The origin or starting point of a motion.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>refers to the place from which the motion begins.</li> <li>earlier location with motion verbs.</li> <li>earlier states with change of state verbs.</li> <li>earlier time with time verbs.</li> </ul>	<p>He went from the <b>hill</b> to the river)</p> <p>He grew from a <b>weakling</b> to a giant.</p> <p>The meeting lasted from <b>Saturday night</b> to Sunday morning.</p>
<b>Goal</b>	End point of a motion.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>place towards which a motion tends.</li> <li>final location with motion verbs.</li> <li>final state with change of state verbs.</li> <li>final time with time verbs.</li> </ul>	<p>He went from the hill to the <b>river</b>.</p> <p>He grew from a weakling to a <b>giant</b>.</p> <p>The meeting lasted from Saturday night to <b>Sunday morning</b>.</p>
<b>Time</b>	The time at which an object or event is located.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>there may be multiple time expressions.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Summer</b> is warm.</p> <p>The meeting took place on <b>Saturday night</b>.</p>

The distinction between *Agent* and *Experiencer* makes immediate sense in relation to the semantic classification of predicator types. Distinguishing these two case roles from the role referred to as 'Objective' captures a perceptual distinction between the direct involvement with a predicator (*Agent* and *Experiencer*) and indirect involvement (*Objective*). The *Source* and *Goal* roles capture a distinction that appears to be fundamental in the case of movement.

Thus, removing *Dative* and *Locative* (which are replaced) and *Comitative* and *Benefactive*, we have the following case roles: *Agentive*, *Instrumental*, *Experiencer*, *Object*, *Location*, *Source*, *Goal*, *Objective* and *Time*.

Chafe (1970) presents a model based on two major conceptual spaces. He refers to these as **(a)** the area of the verb, embracing states (conditions and qualities) and events, and **(b)** the area of the noun, embracing 'things' ((both physical objects and reified abstractions) (p. 96). In fact, the two areas of conceptual space are clearly occupied by arguments and predicators and there is no need to make direct reference to nouns and verbs (which may be involved in encoding but are not directly relevant to propositions as abstract meanings). An important aspect of Chafe's proposal is the observation that some clauses do not encode propositions. These 'ambient' clauses are said not to have arguments (see examples (16) - (18) below):

(16) It's raining.

(17) It's hot.

(18) It's late.

In fact, however, it could be argued that all of these examples do include an argument. When example (16) is reworded as 'Rain is falling', it becomes clear that the verb 'to rain' encodes both an argument (rain) and a predicator (fall). In the case of example (17), heat can be said to be predicated of the environment (for which 'it' stands). Similarly, in example (18) lateness can be said to be predicated of time.

Chafe distinguishes between intrinsic and derived verbs, intrinsic verbs being transformed into derived verbs by means of derivational processes (pp. 119-143). The system of derivation includes categories such as inchoative, resultative, causative, deactivative, and deprocessive.

Inchoative is a derivational process that converts an intrinsic state verb into a derived process verb. Chafe notes that in the surface structure of English, the presence of the inchoative "is sometimes reflected by the suffix *en*, sometimes in a different way (as *heat* from *hot*), sometimes not at all (as with *open*), and occasionally, as with *tired* and *tire*, there may be a perverse postsemantic development" (p. 123). Thus, for example, in (19) (20) and (21), we have derived process verbs:

(19) The street widened.

(20) The fire heated the room.

(21) John tires.

Resultative converts an intrinsic process verb into a derived state verb. This derivational process is the opposite of inchoative: here a state is derived from a process (see examples (22) and (23) below):

(22) The dish is broken.

(23) The dish broke.

Causative converts an intrinsic or derived process verb into a derived action-process verb. The causative derivational process is similar to the inchoative. Here, however, a verb root which is a process (either intrinsically or as a result of a prior derivation) is converted into one that is derivatively both a process and an action” (p. 129). Chafe notes that “such a derived verb will then require the accompaniment not only of a patient but also of an agent” (p. 129). Thus, in example (24), we have an action-process verb:

(24) John broke the dish.

Deactivative converts an intrinsic action-process verb into a derived process verb. This process is the opposite of the causative and applies only “under limited circumstances” (p. 131). Thus, in example (25) below, there is an intrinsic action-process verb; in example (26), there is a derived process verb, the agent having been removed during the derivational process:

(25) John is cutting paper.

(26) The paper cuts easily.

An examination of examples (19) - (26) above demonstrates the way in which the operation of derivational processes can contribute towards surface structure clauses in which arguments and predicators may be expressed in a range of different ways. Thus, in example (27) below, the predicator is encoded as a verb ('widened'), whereas in example (28), it is encoded as a verb plus an adjective. Similarly, in example (29), the predicator is encoded as a verb ('tires'), whereas in example (30), it is encoded as a verb plus an adjective.

(27) The street widened.

(28) The street became wider.

(29) John tires.

(30) John becomes tired.

In example (31), on the other hand, there are two propositions linked by the causative *inter*-propositional relation of reason-result. The first proposition is an existential one ('There was a fire'/ 'A fire existed'); the second is a process one ('The room heated').

(31) The fire heated the room.

Chafe lists seven case relations (which he refers to as noun-verb relations). These are *Patient*, *Agent*, *Experiencer*, *Beneficiary*, *Instrument*, *Complement*, and *Location* (1970, p.163). An examination of two of these reveals that they are so closely tied to English as to be non-generalizable (see *Table 3* below).

**Table 3: Two noun-verb relations according to Chafe (1970)**

Noun-Verb relation	Description	Specific Features	Examples
<b>Patient</b>	Required by a state or process verb, provided that the verb is also not classified as ambient.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• with state verbs, the <i>Patient</i> specifies what actually is in that state.</li> <li>• for process verbs, the <i>Patient</i> specifies a change in its state or condition.</li> </ul>	<p><b>The plate</b> is broken.</p> <p><b>The dish</b> broke.</p> <p>Jane broke <b>the dish</b>.</p> <p>John dried <b>the wood</b>.</p> <p>Tom knew <b>the answer</b>.</p> <p>John saw <b>the bird</b>.</p>
<b>Agent</b>	Required by action verbs (provided that the verb is not ambient).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• specifies something or someone that performs the action.</li> <li>• occurs in both action and action-process sentences.</li> <li>• chosen as the subject when the verb is used in the active voice.</li> <li>• the thing that has the ability or power to do something (it has a force of its own, it is self-motivated).</li> </ul>	<p><b>James</b> sang.</p> <p><b>James</b> ran.</p> <p><b>Mary</b> opened the door.</p> <p>The <b>wind</b> opened the door.</p> <p><b>Jane</b> built the fence.</p> <p><b>Simon</b> gave the gift to James.</p> <p><b>John</b> broke the plate.</p>

In summary, the overall approach adopted by Chafe has something important to offer in that it contributes towards an understanding of why it is that predicators can be encoded in a range of different ways. However, the fact that the analysis is tied so closely to English is unhelpful in the search for a model that will be of value in the analysis of Māori.

Anderson (1971) argues in favour of a more abstract view of case than is found in Fillmore (1968), defining case relations as "grammatical relations contracted by nouns which express the nature of their 'participation' in the 'process' or 'state' represented in the sentence (or noun phrase)" (p. 10). He notes that these relations can be "represented superficially in various fashions, including inflexionally and by pre- and postpositions" (pp. 10-11). He believes that languages differ "with respect to how they divide up minimal semantic fields [i.e. these intra-propositional relations] . . . [and] in the particular transformational operations performed on these underlying representations" (p. 15). Although this last observation is one that could prove significant in relation to the analysis of Māori, there continues to be no recognition of the fact that a single clause in which there is propositional embedding may be marked by *inter*-propositional relations. Furthermore, a number the important distinctions recognised by Fillmore (1971) are absent.

A number of other models of case relationships have been forwarded. Thus, for example, Platt (1971) situates his model within the framework of tagmemic analysis. However, the actual relations listed are little different from those listed by Fillmore (1971). One framework that is different in some respects is that of Grimes (1975) who distinguishes between orientation roles (orientation to motion or position), process roles (dynamic aspect of change of state and static aspect of stable states) and agentive roles (causative) (see *Table 4* below):

**Table 4: Orientation, process, and agentive roles according to Grimes (1975)**

Orientation roles	Description	Specific Features	Examples
<b>Object</b>	The thing that is moving in the dynamic case, or the thing that is in a particular position in the static case.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the thing whose orientation to its physical environment is given by the predicate.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Water</b> flows downhill.</p> <p><b>A statue</b> sits on the pedestal.</p> <p><b>The letter</b> fell from her hand.</p>
<b>Source</b>	Identifies the location of the object at the beginning of the motion, the initial boundary of the event.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>applies to motions but not positions.</li> <li>motion implies that when event ended the object is elsewhere.</li> </ul>	<p>The letter fell from <b>her hand</b>.</p> <p>This idea came to me from <b>James</b>.</p>

**Table 4 (continued): Orientation, process, and agentive roles according to Grimes (1975)**

Orientation roles	Description	Specific Features	Examples
<b>Goal</b>	Identifies the location of the object at the end of the motion, the terminal boundary of the event.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• applies to motion but not positions.</li> <li>• at end of the motion object is in a position identified by <i>Goal</i> relation.</li> </ul>	<p>The letter fell to the <b>floor</b>.</p> <p>This idea came to <b>me</b> from James.</p>
<b>Range</b>	Location of a static entity or the path or area traversed by a moving entity. It can specify meteorological (ambient) predicates.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• with expressions of motion <i>Range</i> indicates the path or area traversed.</li> <li>• with position <i>Range</i> indicates static location.</li> <li>• associated with ambient predicates.</li> <li>• labelled by others as locative etc.</li> </ul>	<p>The ball rolled down the <b>hill</b>.</p> <p><b>Scotland</b> is cold.</p> <p>A breeze came to him from the <b>sea</b>.</p>
<b>Vehicle</b>	Something that conveys the object and moves along with it.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Vehicle</i> and <i>Range</i> may be difficult to distinguish.</li> </ul>	<p>The letter came by <b>plane</b>.</p> <p>The <b>tide</b> floated the oil slick in to the harbour.</p>
Process roles	Description	Specific Features	Examples
<b>Material</b>	The entity that undergoes a process of becoming.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• occur with <i>Result</i> relations.</li> <li>• either the <i>Material</i> or <i>Result</i> relation must combine with <i>Patient</i>.</li> </ul>	<p>She makes dresses from <b>flour sacks</b>.</p>
<b>Result</b>	The entity that results from a process of becoming.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• occur with <i>Material</i> relations.</li> <li>• either the <i>Result</i> or material relation must combine with <i>Patient</i>.</li> </ul>	<p>She makes flour sacks into <b>dresses</b>.</p>

**Table 4 (continued): Orientation, process, and agentive roles according to Grimes (1975)**

Process roles	Description	Specific Features	Examples
<b>Patient</b>	The relation between a thing that gets changed and the process that changes it, or in the static sense, between a thing that is in some state and the state that it is in.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>labelled by others as patient, objective, neutral, affected, theme, and undergoer.</li> <li>can be a gradual process.</li> <li>or abrupt.</li> <li>processes end, leaving the things that undergo them in some terminal state.</li> <li>psychological processes such as perception and feelings employ <i>Patient</i> relation to identify who perceives or feels.</li> </ul>	<p><b>The snow</b> melted.</p> <p><b>The foundation</b> cracked.</p> <p>The chef melted the <b>butter</b>.</p> <p><b>I</b> hear.</p> <p><b>I</b> am dizzy.</p>
<b>Referent</b>	The limitation of a process to a certain field or object from the actual application of a process to a patient.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>limits the process to a field.</li> <li>limits an object from the application of a process to a patient.</li> </ul>	<p>We talked about <b>politics</b>.</p> <p>This book costs <b>three dollars</b>.</p>
Agentive roles	Description	Specific Features	Examples
<b>Agent</b>	Identifies who is responsible for an action.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>occur with process and orientation roles.</li> <li>does not necessarily imply animateness.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Simon</b> made a cake.</p> <p><b>George</b> threw the ball.</p> <p><b>Fred</b> fixed the engine.</p>
<b>Instrument</b>	Entity by means of which an action is carried out.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>if a person or part of that person is used in the instrument role, their body part is the object referred to, not the person acting independently.</li> <li>may arise through proposition consolidation.</li> </ul>	<p>He cut the rope with an <b>axe</b>.</p>

**Table 4 (continued): Orientation, process, and agentive roles according to Grimes (1975)**

Agentive roles	Description	Specific Features	Examples
<b>Force</b>	Non-instigative cause.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• asserts a causal relation devoid of responsibility.</li> <li>• incompatible with both agent and instrument.</li> <li>• may take the prepositions <i>of</i>, <i>from</i>, <i>on</i>, or <i>in</i>.</li> </ul>	<b>Malaria</b> killed the girl.
<b>Benefactive</b>	Someone or something on whom an action has a secondary effect, good or ill.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a supernumerary role that can be attached to almost anything.</li> <li>• it has an agent, a referent, and a patient.</li> <li>• double benefactives are the result of unrestricted consolidation.</li> </ul>	We chased the cats out of the attic for <b>her</b> .  The milk turned sour on <b>me</b> .

This framework is an interesting one in terms of potential applicability to languages other than English and other Indo-European ones in that it is motivated largely by considerations of meaning rather than structure. There are, however, some issues that need to be resolved. For example, it would seem, from a semantic perspective, important to distinguish between two types of meaning relation, both of which are listed as *Patient* (see examples (32) and (33) below):

(32) The **butter** melted.

(33) **John** heard the music.

In the first case, a physical process is involved. In the second case, the predicator is a psychological process. In Crombie (1985), the first type is referred to as *Mutant*, the second as *Experiencer*. Furthermore, it is not clear how, in terms of case role, 'the meal' would be classified in the following example (where 'thirty dollars' is the *Referent*):

(34) The meal cost thirty dollars.

Once again, a *Benefactive* role appears although, as indicated above, this is a role that is difficult to motivate in intra-propositional terms.

Whereas Grimes outlines three role types (orientation, process and agentive (causative)), Crombie (1985) outlines five role types: causative roles, participation roles, orientation-transition roles, relational roles and the abaxiant role (see *Table 5*):

**Table 5: The five role (intra-propositional relation) types according to Crombie (1985)**

<b>CAUSATIVE ROLES:</b> concerned with causative relations.			
<b>Intra-propositional relations</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Specific Features</b>	<b>Examples</b>
<b>Agent</b>	Sentient entity carrying out an action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>always sentient.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alan</b> signed the contract.</p> <p><b>The dog</b> ate the rat.</p>
<b>Instrument</b>	The entity by means of which an action is carried out.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>rarely sentient</li> <li>non-volitional.</li> </ul>	Alan broke the window with a <b>hammer</b> .
<b>Force</b>	Non-sentient causative.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>precludes the explicit or implicit involvement of an agent.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Typhus</b> killed the man.</p> <p><b>Curiosity</b> killed the cat.</p>
<b>PARTICIPATION ROLES:</b> concerned with the non-causal involvement of an entity or abstraction in an activity or with a process or state.			
<b>Intra-propositional relations</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Specific Features</b>	<b>Examples</b>
<b>Patient</b>	The entity or abstraction involved non-causally in an activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>an <i>Activity-participation Role</i>.</li> <li>occur with dynamic predicate types: general activity, momentary action, and mental activity.</li> </ul>	<p>He kicked the <b>dog</b>.</p> <p>He chose a <b>shirt</b>.</p> <p>He awarded a <b>medal</b>.</p> <p>He rejected the <b>idea</b>.</p>
<b>Assignee</b>	The sentient entity (or collection of sentient entities) to whom/which the patient of an activity predicate is assigned.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>an <i>Activity-participation Role</i>.</li> <li>occur with dynamic predicate types: general activity, momentary action, and mental activity.</li> </ul>	He awarded a goal to the <b>team</b> .

**Table 5 (continued): The five role (intra-propositional relation) types according to Crombie (1985)**

<b>PARTICIPATION ROLES:</b> concerned with the non-causal involvement of an entity or abstraction in an activity or with a process or state.			
<b>Intra-propositional relations</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Specific Features</b>	<b>Examples</b>
<b>Material</b>	The entity that undergoes a process of becoming.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• occur with factitive predicates.</li> <li>• occurs with <i>Result</i> relations.</li> </ul>	<p>She creates puppets from <b>gloves</b>.</p> <p>She makes <b>clay</b> into bowls.</p>
<b>Result</b>	The entity that results from a process of becoming.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a Factitive role.</li> <li>• occur with factitive predicates.</li> <li>• occur with <i>Material</i> relations</li> </ul>	<p>She creates <b>puppets</b> from gloves.</p> <p>He knitted a <b>sweater</b>.</p>
<b>Mutant</b>	The entity that is changed by a process:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ± sentient.</li> <li>• a <i>Process-participation</i> role.</li> <li>• occur with process predicates.</li> </ul>	<p>The <b>butter</b> melted.</p> <p>The <b>plant</b> grew.</p> <p>The <b>boy</b> grew tired.</p>
<b>Durant</b>	The entity that is an identified state.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ± sentient</li> <li>• a <i>State-participation</i> role.</li> <li>• occur with stative predicates.</li> </ul>	<p>The door is green.</p> <p>The <b>toy</b> is broken.</p>
<b>Experiencer</b>	The entity directly involved in an experiential state	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• sentient</li> <li>• a <i>State-participation</i> role.</li> <li>• occur with stative predicates.</li> </ul>	<p><b>He</b> heard the music.</p> <p><b>He</b> feels hungry.</p> <p><b>He</b> likes music.</p>
<b>Appertainant</b>	The entity or abstraction experienced in a particular way by a sentient entity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ± sentient.</li> <li>• a <i>State-participation</i> role.</li> <li>• occur with stative predicates.</li> </ul>	<p>He heard the <b>music</b>.</p> <p>He likes <b>John</b>.</p>

**Table 5 (continued): The five role (intra-propositional relation) types according to Crombie (1985)**

<b>PARTICIPATION ROLES:</b> concerned with the non-causal involvement of an entity or abstraction in an activity or with a process or state.			
<b>Intra-propositional relations</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Specific Features</b>	<b>Examples</b>
<b>ORIENTATION-TRANSITION ROLES:</b> considered with movement or static location.			
<b>Object</b>	The entity described as being in a particular location or as being involved in a transitional event	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <math>\pm</math> sentient.</li> <li>• or, metaphorically, the abstraction.</li> </ul>	The <b>coin</b> rolled down the hill.
<b>Source</b>	The location of an entity at the beginning of a movement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• occur with a <i>Goal</i> relation.</li> <li>• Physical movement may not be involved: it may be metaphorical.</li> </ul>	The book fell from the <b>table</b> to the chair.  The book was passed from <b>Mary</b> to John.
<b>Goal</b>	The location of the entity at the end of a movement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• occur with a <i>Source</i> relation.</li> <li>• physical movement may not be involved: it may be metaphorical.</li> </ul>	The book fell from the table to the <b>chair</b> .  The house passed from father to <b>son</b> .
<b>Range</b>	The location of a static entity or the path or area traversed by a moving entity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Range</i> is associated with meteorological (ambient) predicates.</li> </ul>	The cat is on the <b>bed</b> .  The egg rolled down the <b>hill</b> .
<b>RELATIONAL ROLES:</b> considered with relational predicators.			
<b>Referee</b>	The entity to which a relational predicate is linked.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• + sentient</li> </ul>	It concerns <b>him</b> .  <b>He</b> deserves a prize.
<b>Referent</b>	The entity to which a Referee is linked through a relational predicate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <math>\pm</math> sentient.</li> </ul>	<b>It</b> concerns him.  He deserves a <b>prize</b> .

**Table 5 (continued): The five role (intra-propositional relation) types according to Crombie (1985)**

<b>RELATIONAL ROLES:</b> considered with relational predicators.			
<b>Intra-propositional relations</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Specific Features</b>	<b>Examples</b>
<b>Quantant</b>	The expression of extent to which an entity is linked by a relational predicate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>occur with either a Referent or Referee relation.</li> </ul>	<p>The book cost <b>eighty pence</b>.</p> <p>He weighs <b>one hundred and eighty pounds</b>.</p>
<b>THE ABAXIANT ROLE:</b>			
<b>Abaxiant</b>	Entity affected by an action or process but not directly involved in action/process or in its outcome.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ sentient.</li> </ul>	<p>She washed the car for <b>me</b>.</p> <p>He welcomed the guests on <b>my</b> behalf.</p> <p>The milk turned sour on <b>me</b>.</p>

If the *Abaxiant* relation is removed (for the same reason as it was suggested above that *Benefactive* be removed), we are left with a four-way distinction: causative roles participation roles, orientation-transition roles and relational roles.

When this framework is compared with that of Longacre (1996), a number of fundamental differences can be detected. In particular, the role *Experiencer* in Longacre's system includes what is referred to as *Patient* in Crombie (1985). Thus, 'Bill' in example (35) below would belong to the *Experiencer* role which is defined by Longacre as an animate entity whose registering nervous system is relevant to the predication, particularly as the predicator is the same in each case and there appears to be no area of grammar that reflects this distinction.

(35) John kicked Bill.

In fact, however, it is difficult to see why Bill in example (35) above should be different, in terms of perceptual space, from 'the table' in (36) below. In other words, it is difficult to see why a registering nervous system should be relevant in this instance.

(36) John kicked the table.

For Longacre, intentionality is fundamental to agency, an *Agent* being an animate entity which intentionally instigates a process or action. Thus, in the absence of an adverb such as 'intentionally' or 'accidentally', it is unclear whether 'Jean' in example (37) below should be assigned to the *Agent* role:

(37) Jean dropped the hammer.

There are other difficulties in relation to Longacre's framework. Thus, for example, *Range* is the role assigned to either the product of the activity of a predicate or any surface structure nominal or adjectival that completes or specifies the predicate. This means that all of the bolded sections in examples (38) - (40) below would be assigned to *Range*:

(38) Anthony sang a **song**.

(39) The soup tastes **salty**.

(40) They made a **table**.

The problem here is that the specification appears to be largely syntactically rather than semantically motivated. However, in the case of the *Instrument* role as defined by Longacre, the definition appears to be neither syntactically motivated nor semantically motivated in that both 'tornado' in example (41) below and 'knife' in example (42) below would come within the definition of *Instrument* which includes both entities that trigger change (non-intentionally) and that which is used by an agent to accomplish an action or instigate a process:

(41) A **tornado** wrecked the house.

(42) He cut the rope with a **knife**.

A rather different problem is encountered in relation to Longacre's definition of *Source* which, in making reference to both place of origin and the entity from which a physical sensation emanates, allows both 'chair' in example (43) below and 'concert' in (44) below to be classified as *Source*:

(43) He watched the **concert**.

(44) He fell from the **chair**.

Thus, a semantic distinction which is, in fact, directly reflected both in the syntactic structure of English (and Māori) is not reflected in the classification framework. Problems of this type become even more apparent where Longacre discusses causatives which "cover several problems which relate to case or role and case frame analysis" (p. 211). Here, he concludes that examples such as (45) below can be accommodated within the *intra*-propositional framework although he acknowledges that "more frequently than not the actual surface structure of a language . . . involves two clauses with two separate verbs" (p. 213). The dual propositional nature of example (45) below (in which the first predicator is unstated) becomes clearer when an example such as (46) below is taken into account. Thus, there is, in both examples, a causative relationship between propositions (an *inter*-propositional relationship):

(45) John cheered Mary up.

(46) John cheered Mary up by playing the piano.

Recognising the importance of the fact that there are relations both within and between propositions, Fillmore (1977a) notes that his earlier concern was "with the inner structure of clauses rather than with the semantics of interclausal connections through the devices of coordination and subordination" (p. 60). Thus, "the grammatical functions of the nominals that represent the entities that are put into perspective are determined in part by something like a DEEP CASE HIERARCHY", whereas "other parts of the associated scene can be introduced with prepositional phrases, with adverbials of various kinds, and with subordinate clauses". So, "the 'circumstantial' constituents of a sentence need not be aspects of scenes that are specifically required by a particular type of situation" (p. 74):

Since any event takes place in time, any event sentence can contain a time adverbial; since many kinds of events take place in specific locations, sentences representing such events can contain locative adverbials; and so on (p. 74).

Drawing upon the research of Berlin and Kay (1969) and Rosch (1973) on prototypes, Fillmore (1977b) notes that word frames may refer to "any system of linguistic choices of grammatical rules or grammatical categories — that can get associated with prototypical instances of scenes" (p. 63). Thus, the explicit linguistic choices made by the speaker "activate certain scenes in the interpreter's repertory of scenes, and as the linguistic data continue to be produced and processed, these original scenes get linked to larger scenes [and] their 'blanks' get filled in" (p. 74). Societies (and languages) will, therefore, differ in respect of the options available in relation to a particular perspective on complex scenes.

### **Conclusion**

What Fillmore's observation (Fillmore, 1977b) about the reflection of prototypical instances of scenes suggests is that different societies will have different priorities in relation to the division of perceptual space. Thus, there are likely to be cultural differences in terms of which areas of perceptual space are seen as sharing fundamental similarities and which are seen as being fundamentally different. For example, some cultures may treat animacy as a fundamental aspect of the division of perceptual space (thus clearly differentiating between animate and inanimate sources of change) whereas others may not. We might, therefore, anticipate that the semantic and syntactic systems of different languages will reflect these differences, differences which will have implications for the classification of intra-propositional and inter-propositional relationships. In *Part 2* of this paper (to appear in a later issue of this Journal), an existing intra-propositional analysis of Māori (Bauer, 1981) will be examined in the context of the division of perceptual space as indicated in the semantic and syntactic structure of Māori.

## References

- Anderson, J. M. (1971). *The grammar of case: towards a localistic theory*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Bauer, W. (1981). *Aspects of the grammar of Māori*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Edinburgh.
- Berlin, B., & Kay, P. (1969). *Basic color terms: Their universality and evolution*. Berkley; Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Chafe, W. L. (1970). *Meaning and structure of language*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic structures*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Cook, W. A. (1989). *Case grammar theory*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Crombie, W. (1985). *Process and relational discourse and language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fillmore, C. J. (1968). The case for case. In E. Bach & R. T. Harms (Eds.), *Universals in linguistic theory* (pp. 1-88). London: Holt, Rhinehart, and Winston.
- Fillmore, C. J. (1971). Some problems for case grammar. *Ohio State University Working Papers in Linguistics*, 10, 245-265.
- Fillmore, C. J. (1977a). The case for case reopened. In P. Cole & J. M. Sadock (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics: Grammatical relations*. (Vol. 8, pp. 59-81). New York, San Francisco, London: Academic Press.
- Fillmore, C. J. (1977b). Scenes-and -frames semantics. In A. Zampolli (Ed.), *Linguistic structure processing: Fundamental studies in Computer Science* (Vol. 5, pp. 55-81.). Amsterdam, New York, Oxford: North-Holland.
- Grimes, J. E. (1975). *The thread of discourse*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Longacre, R. E. (1996). *The grammar of discourse*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Nilsen, D. L. F. (1972). *Toward a semantic specification of deep case*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Platt, J. T. (1971). *Grammatical form and grammatical meaning; a tagmemic view of Fillmore's Deep structure case concepts*. Amsterdam,: North-Holland Pub. Co.
- Rosch, E. (1973). Natural categories. *Cognitive Psychology*, 4, 328-350.

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

**Waldo Houia**

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

Private Bag 3105, Hamilton, New Zealand

[whoiua@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 matakū 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 Maori corpus: examples of the *reason-result* relation and the *concession-contradiction* 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 tonono 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 hunaia 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.

**The Rhetorical Organisation of Discourse:  
Language Revitalisation and the Question of Authenticity**

**Winifred Crombie and Ngaere Houia-Roberts**

*Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato* (University of Waikato)  
[crombie@waikato.ac.nz; nroberts@waikato.ac.nz]

**Abstract**

We propose here one approach to unravelling some aspects of authentic discourse construction in a way that may prove useful to teachers and learners of Maori. The approach is illustrated in relation to one text which realises the *argument genre* in Māori. In terms of *text-type*, the example provided is an *open letter of advice/warning*. The approach illustrated here, and the hypotheses emerging from it, are currently being further tested by one of the authors with reference to a corpus of written texts.

**An Approach to the Analysis of Discourses in Māori**

Morphological, syntactic and phonological systems underlie the operation of languages and these systems play an important role in the realisation of meanings. However, there is much more to using languages effectively than the control of such systems and the appropriate use of vocabulary. Much of the meaning of discourses is conveyed pragmatically, through the interaction of text and context. Thus, for example, when it occurs as part of a discourse, a sentence such as "It's hot in here" has both meaning (semantic) and value (pragmatic). There is nothing in the sentence itself to indicate that it may be intended to function as, for example, a warning or a compliment or an inducement to open a window. However, in certain contexts, it may be intended to have any of these functions, or, indeed, one or more of a wide range of other functions. Functions such as this are often referred to as micro-functions (see, for example, the Council of Europe draft Framework for modern languages (Council of Europe, 1996). There is a wide range of other types of function that are critical to the creation and interpretation of coherent discourses. To understand these, it is important to look at morphology, syntax and phonology. It is, however, also important to look beyond these systems in order to gain a more complete understanding of the ways in which discourse segments function in relation to discourses as a whole. In doing this, we need to take into account the fact that social and cultural understanding play an important role in discourse construction and interpretation. It is this that is critical to the research with which we are concerned here.

As Pilegaard and Frandsen (1995, p. 1) note, linguists have struggled for some time with the problem of distinguishing among different types of text:

The past two decades have seen several studies which have struggled to establish a distinction between various kinds of texts on the basis of structural (linguistic) and/or functional (communicative) criteria. The shared ambition

of these studies has been dual: i) to develop an overall typology of texts, and ii) to provide a theoretical and empirical foundation for comparative discourse research. These efforts have been closely connected with the rising interest in text linguistics and discourse analysis especially since the beginning of the 1970s.

Both *genre* and *text-type* assignment represent two important, and related, aspects of distinguishing among texts. However, these two terms (*genre* and *text type*) are used in different ways by different analysts and so it is important to specify how they are used here. In the discussion that follows, the term ***text-type*** is used with reference to the ways in which societies (or groups within societies) group texts in relation to a range of criteria relating to **(a)** overall form and/or appearance (including, for example, the presence of certain types of salutation such as *Dear X*), and/or **(b)** their overall function such as, for example, to welcome visitors. In this sense, letters and *whaikōrero* (speeches of welcome) each represent different text-types. Our primary interest here is in *genre* rather than *text-type*. However, we shall say a little here about text-type before moving to genre.

Many ***text-types*** have different sub-types which may be associated with different contexts and levels of formality (business letters versus personal letters, for example). It is, therefore, not a simple matter to establish a typology of text-types. Thus, **(a)** although some text-types are likely to be recognised by most members of a society, others may not be, and **(b)** as society and culture changes, so do text-types. In general, therefore, the number of text-types (and the variety within each of these) that is identified in any typology will relate to the overall purpose of the typology. If, therefore, the reason for establishing a typology of text-types is to initiate young learners of a language at intermediate level into the use of these text-types, the number of different types recognised, and the distinctions made within each of these types, will be different from those recognised in the context of the teaching of advanced learners who need to use the language for a range of academic purposes.

Each ***text-type*** (eg novels, letters) is likely to be typically associated with a particular genre or a particular range and/or sequence of ***genres***, a genre being essentially a discourse style or discourse orientation. Thus, for example, a *car manual* (text-type) is likely to be written largely in the *instructional genre*, whereas a *newspaper editorial* (text-type) will often exhibit the *argumentative genre*. Of course, a text that represents a particular text-type may, and generally will, involve a range of different genres. Thus, a text that realises the text-type 'novel' may combine a variety of genres such as narrative genre, instructional genre, argumentative genre etc.

<b>Text-type</b>	<b>Genre</b>
Car manual	Instructional
Newspaper Editorial	Argumentative
Novel	Narrative, Instructional, Argumentative etc.

In the same way as different text-types may be sub-divided into a range of different categories (personal letters, business letters etc.), so too may genres. Thus, for example, the *argumentative genre* may be subdivided into a range of different categories depending on the degree of delicacy considered necessary in terms of the overall purpose of the taxonomy.

In general, *genre typologies* relate primarily to the general cognitive operation involved (eg describing, informing, arguing). However, different analysts have proposed different genre typologies in relation not only to general cognitive operations, but also in relation to different communicative functions (such as giving directions) and different typical combinations of linguistic realisations (such as the combination of particular types of participant and process (see, for example, Derewianka, (1990)). Thus, although Biber (1989) recognizes eight main genres, Werlich (1983) recognizes only five: *description, narration, exposition, argumentation, instruction*. In common with Derewianka in *Exploring How Texts Work* (Derewianka, 1990), a textbook designed for teaching English to primary school students in Australia, we prioritise here six different genres. These are: *recount, narrative, instruction, information report, explanation* and *argument*.. Essentially, each of these genres can be characterized in terms of its overall (or primary) purpose which, in turn, relates to the primary type of cognitive operation involved. Thus:

The *recount* genre relates what took place;

The *narrative* genre relates events, and feelings (and reactions associated with these) in order to teach and/or engage sympathy or imagination;

The *instruction* genre outlines the sequence of actions involved in achieving or accomplishing a goal;

The *information report* genre describes and classifies phenomena;

The *explanation* genre outlines the way/s in which things function or operate and/or provides reasons for events or phenomena;

The *argument* genre provides justification/s for one or more positions adopted in relation to events or circumstances that are open to different opinions or interpretations.

If this work were to be of practical use, it was necessary to begin by analysing the *tasks* required of students learning a range of curriculum areas through the medium of Māori in order to determine the different *genres* and *text-types* generally required of them. Thus, for example, presenting the arguments for and against home schooling would involve using, primarily, the *argument genre* in the context of a *text-type* that could broadly be described as *academic essay*, a text-type that has a number of different varieties depending on the nature of the academic subject and the specific task involved. In general, the text-type 'academic essay' as realised in English is associated, at higher levels of study, with a range of *structural features* including *title, general statement about the content of the sections to be included, main section* (including references, footnotes and/or endnotes), *concluding section, bibliography or list of references*. Figures and diagrams need to be appropriately labelled and, in general, need to be accompanied by particular types of discussion and highlighting. At lower levels of study, references may not be included in the main section and there may be no final list of references. The main section of the essay will be structured differently, depending on the nature of the task and, therefore, on the genre or genres that are drawn upon. So far as academic essays written in Māori are concerned, there will be a range of differences associated with both (a) characteristic features of that text-type in Māori, and (b) characteristic features of the genres involved as realised in Māori.

If students are familiarised with characteristic features of different genres in Māori texts, they can then make use of these in the context of different text-types, adding to their understanding of genre an understanding of the characteristic features of the different text-types they will be required to draw upon. Thus, students who have become familiar with the *argument genre* can then make use of this understanding wherever argument is required in particular sections of a text (whatever the text-type involved).

An analysis of the writing tasks required of students working in the medium of Māori at School Certificate, Bursary and first year university level in a range of different subjects revealed that certain text-types appeared frequently. These included letters (business letters and personal letters) and academic essays of various types. It also revealed that the six main genres outlined above occurred frequently. Thus, for example, in writing business letters, students would often need to outline a series of events (*recount genre*), explain a problem that had arisen in relation to that series of events (*explanation genre*) and then make a complaint based on an argument (*argument genre*). In order to perform this task adequately, they would need to be able to make use of **(a)** the characteristic features of the *recount, explanation and argument genres* in Māori discourse, and **(b)** the characteristic features of business letters written in Māori. First, however, it was necessary to discover what these characteristic features were.

Although looking at particular texts in terms of their discourse characteristics involves an integrated approach to genre and text-type, we confine the discussion here to genre and, in particular, to one type of genre, that is, the argument genre.

In looking first at *genre*, samples of texts written by Māori scholars (past and present) which conformed as closely as possible to a single genre were selected. Six texts representing each of the six genres outlined above were selected - a total of 36 texts. Each group of six texts was then analysed from a number of different perspectives in an effort to determine whether there were properties that each group of texts shared that were different from those properties shared by the texts representing each of the other genres. At this stage, the search was for characteristic features of each of the six genres as represented by Māori texts written by educated native speakers recognised for the high quality of their discourse production. This part of the research is still in progress. At this stage, therefore, the features proposed as being characteristic of the *argument genre* in Māori discourses should be regarded as tentative.

When this section of the research has been completed, students can be introduced to characteristic features of each of the six genres and can practice creating their own texts in line with exemplars exhibiting these features. Initially, they would be encouraged to create texts representing a single genre. Later, they would be encouraged to combine different genres in different ways to create more complex, multi-faceted texts. At each stage, an approach such as that recommended by Derewianka (1990, pp. 6 - 9) based on a curriculum cycle involving *preparation, modelling, joint construction* and *independent construction* of texts could be followed.

Thus, texts written by highly proficient users of the language were analysed in relation to genre characteristics. Although an attempt was made to select texts that conformed as closely as possible to a single genre, some of the texts proved to be

were multi-generic, that is, they exhibited different genres at different stages. This did not create any major problems. Indeed, it provided an opportunity. Thus, one section of a text might exhibit the *argument genre*, another section might exhibit the *recount genre*. When these same texts were examined in relation to *text-type* rather than *genre*, the fact that certain text-types were typically associated with certain multi-generic characteristics began to emerge. This is central to the research as a whole although it is not the focus of attention here.

### The Analytical Categories

Analysis of the six texts belonging to the argument genre was conducted in relation to the following categories:

- the different overall functions (eg *position statement*) associated with different parts of the text: **functioning segments**.
- the semantic relations (eg *reason-result*; *denial-correction*) that *typically* occur in each of these text-type functional segments, *the typical grouping* of these semantic relations and the *typical interactions* among them (both within and between segments) within the genre being examined: **relational structure**.
- the specific language in which these semantic relations are *typically* encoded/realised within the genre being examined: **relational encoding characteristics**.
- other features of language that appear to *typify* the genre under investigation: **language features**.

On the basis of the types of analysis outlined above, the following hypotheses in relation to typical aspects the *argument genre* in Māori are proposed. These hypotheses can be tested in relation to a range of further texts belonging to the argument genre. Thus, texts belonging to the argument genre are, it is hypothesised, generally characterised by the features that are outlined below.

### Hypothesis concerning typical functioning segments of the argument genre in Māori texts

Frequently, the following functioning segments, in the order indicated, occur in examples of the argument genre in Māori:

- **General statement** (situational and/or attitudinal context);
- **Specific issue** (current position);
- **Thesis Statement 1** (statement of one possible perspective on specific issue, generally *not* that adopted by the writer);
- **Thesis Statement 2: Problem/Issue** (statement of another possible perspective on specific issue, generally that adopted by the writer);
- **Probable Resolution (general)** (expressed metaphorically as *whakatauāki* (saying));
- **Problem/Issue: further details** (often involving personal statement);
- **Summing up of Situation** (general);
- **Problem/Issue: specific effects** (often involves listing of points);
- **Return to Specific Issue:**
  - (a) **further detail (point 1 ff.)**

**(b) general summing up;**

- **Specific practical details** (optional);
- **Specific practical issue** (optional);
- **Conclusion** (often in the form of an injunction);
- **Restatement of Probable Resolution** (general) (expressed metaphorically as whakatauaiki (saying));
- **Concluding Remarks** (optional, involving positive outcome statement)

**Illustration of functioning segments with reference to a text by Timoti Kāretu, former Māori Language Commissioner**

**General statement** (situational and/or attitudinal context):

I ēnei rā o te tino kore nei te mōhio ka pēhea ra ngā nekeneke me ngā hiahia o te Kāwanatanga e tika ana kia noho tūtakarerewa, kia noho matawhiwhiu ki ngā whakatau, ki ngā āhuatanga hou ka puta.

*In these times of uncertainty about the movements and the wishes of Government, it is understandable that there are feelings of apprehension and the need to be alert to the decisions, to the reorganisation which will take place.*

**Specific issue** (current position):

Kua puta te kōrero a te Minita Māori ki te ao whānui mo tōna hiahia kia whakakotahitia ngā whakahaere katoa e whai pānga ana ki te reo. Nā, hei whakatutuki i tērā whakaaro ōna ko te whai kia kotahi a Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori me te Māngai Pāho nā te mea ko ēnei whakahaere e rua i takea mai i te reo me tōna ora, tōna mau haere ake nei.

*A public announcement has been made by the minister of Māori Affairs of his wish to amalgamate all organisations associated with Māori language. Now, to accomplish his idea, the aim will be to amalgamate Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori and Te Māngai Pāho because both organisations are associated with the Māori language, its revival and its survival in the future.*

**Thesis Statement 1** (statement of one possible perspective on specific issue, generally *not* that adopted by the writer):

Ā hinengaro nei mārakerake ana te kitea atu o te whāinga o tērā whakaaro ināhoki ki te whakakotahitia te taha whakahaere inā kē noa atu te pūtea ka toe mai hei whakapeto ki ētahi atu mahi e ora ai, e pakari ake ai te reo.

*Thinking about this, the aims behind this idea are obvious, for if the management of these two organisations were amalgamated, there would be a considerable amount of funding left over to distribute to other factions involved in the revitalisation, the strengthening of the language.*

**Thesis Statement 2: Problem/Issue** (statement of another possible perspective on specific issue, generally that adopted by the writer):

Engari hāunga ia tēnā, ko te raruraru kē hoki ko te āhua o te noho tahi he minita kē noa atu hoki nōna te mana ki Te Māngai Pāho, ā he minita kē noa atu anō hoki nōna te mana ki Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori.

*But that aside, a problem is posed by the fact that two ministers, one in charge of Te Māngai Pāho, and another whose responsibility is to Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori will both be directly involved. It is imperative that these two concur. If there is dissension, the proposal will not be completed, it will remain unresolved.*

**Probable Resolution (general) (expressed metaphorically as whakatauāki (saying)):**

Mate atu he tētēkura, ara mai he tētēkura  
*As a chief dies, so another arises*

**Problem/Issue: further details** (often involving personal statement):

Waihoki, ko mātou ko āku nā kaimahi e noho maunawenawe nei i te korenga e puta wawe o tētahi kōrero kia tau ai ō rātou mauri kia kore ai hoki e noho i runga i te tītakataka, i te māharahara.

*Furthermore, there is the uncertainty for me and for my staff because definite notification, needed to help settle their emotions, so that they do not wallow in their anxieties has been slow to emerge. Nevertheless, they continue to function and to move this organisation forward although the future direction is uncertain.*

**Summing up of Situation (general):**

***Ahakoā pēhea ka rere kē te āhua o te Taura Whiri me āna mahi ka mahi.***

*Whatever happens, the organisation and the role of Te Taura Whiri will be different.*

**Problem/Issue: specific effects** (often involves listing of points):

Inā eke tā te Minita Māori e whai nei kua kore te Taura Whiri e whakatū e whakahaere rānei i ngā kura kua roa nei e haere ana engari ka hokona mai i tētahi atu whakahaere i tērā mōhio o te whakatū kura.

*When the objectives set down by the Minister for Māori Affairs are fulfilled, the Taura Whiri will no longer establish or organise the schools which have been running for some time now but instead, some other organisation with the necessary expertise, will contract for, and will run these schools.*

Kua noho te Taura Whiri hei kaihoko ratonga, kua kore i riro mai māna ake te ratonga e whakawhiwhi ki te hunga tonu.

*The Taura Whiri will become a purchaser of services and will no longer have the role of providing Māori language services to applicants.*

Tērā pea ko ngā mahi ka mau tonu ko 'He Muka' me 'Ko te Whānau' engari atu i ērā ka hokona katoatia mai ngā ratonga e hiahiatia ana.

*It is possible that the work for 'He Muka' and 'Ko te Whānau' may possibly continue, but beyond these, all services required will be purchased.*

**Return to Specific Issue:**

**(a) further detail (point 1 ff.)**

Ko te whai kē hoki kia hāngai atu ngā mahi a Te Taura Whiri ki te Mahere Rautaki Reo kua whakatakototia nei e te Kāwanatanga hei whāinga mā te motu arā,  
*The aim is also to align the working of Te Taura Whiri with the Māori Language Strategy which the government has set down for the nation that is,*

- (1) kia tokomaha ake te hunga mōhio ki te reo Māori mā runga anō i te maha o ngā āheinga o te tangata ki te ako me ngā wāhi ka taea te reo te ako  
(1) *to increase the numbers of those who know te reo Māori as a result of an increase of the abilities of those who teach together with an increase in the number of contexts where te reo can be taught*
- (2) kia pai ake te kōrero me te tuhi i te reo Māori, kia kaha ake anō hoki te mārama atu ki te reo Māori mā runga anō i te āta whakarongo me te pānui i te reo Māori  
(2) *to improve speaking and writing in te reo Māori, to heighten the understanding of te reo Māori through careful listening and reading in te reo Māori*
- (3) kia nui ake ngā wā me ngā wāhi e āhei ana te tangata ki te kōrero Māori  
(3) *to increase the times and places where people may speak Māori*
- (4) kia tere ake te whakawhānuitia ake me te whakapakiritia ake o te reo Māori  
(4) *to hasten the spread and to increase the strength of te reo Māori*
- (5) kia aro pai mai te Māori me te Pākehā ki te reo Māori me te whakapono anō hoki he tino hua kei roto i te āhei o te tangata ki te kōrero i ngā reo e rua, he painga anō hoki kei roto i tērā mō Aotearoa whānui.  
(5) *so that both Māori and Pākehā are favourably disposed toward te reo Māori, and believe that not only are there advantages for those who are bilingual, but that bilingualism could also benefit New Zealand as a whole.*

**(b) general summing up**

Kāti, koinei rā ngā take e whāia nei me kore e tutuki ā, e tutuki ai me whakarere kē ko te āhua o te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori.  
*So then, these are the issues which may or may not be resolved and will mean changes to te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori.*

**Specific practical details (optional):**

Nā reira koia noa nei te whakamōhio atu ko ngā kura kua whakaritea kia tū i roto i tēnei tau pūtea, arā atu i te 30 o Pipiri ka tū tonu, ā, ko aua kura ko tō ngā akonga taipakeke o ngā Kura Kaupapa Māori ka tū ki Waititi ā te 30 o Haratua - 3 o Pipiri me tō ngā pakeke ki Ngahutoitōi ā te 27 o Pipiri – 2 o Hongongoi,

*This, therefore, is merely clarification that those schools which were established under this year's funding, to the 30 June, will continue and those schools are the senior Kura Kaupapa Māori classes to be held at Waititi Marae from the 30 May to 3 June and the adult classes at Ngahutoitoi Marae on 27 June to 2 July,*

**Specific practical issue (optional):**

engari ko o tua atu i taua rā kāore i te mōhiotia ka aha i ngā āhuatanga hou nei.  
*but beyond that it is unclear what will evolve from the new system.*

**Conclusion** (often in the form of an injunction):

Koirā au e kī nei, he whakaōhiti, he whakatūpato tēnei kia noho mataara, kia noho mōhio mai ai koutou he aha te aha.  
*It is for that reason that I say that this is a word of warning, a note of caution, so that you be watchful, so that you be aware of the developments.*

**Restatement of Probable Resolution (general) (expressed metaphorically as whakatauāki (saying))**

Waiho ki tā rātou i kī rā ‘ Mate atu he tētēkura, mai he tētēkura’  
*Let it be, as stated (by our ancestors): 'As a chief dies, so another arises'*

**Concluding Remarks (optional, involving positive outcome statement):**

Otirā koirā te wawata nui o te ngākau e tātou mā, mo te whakahaere nei, mō Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori.  
*Indeed, that is the deepest desire, held by us all, for this organisation, for Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori.*

**Hypothesis concerning typical interaction of functioning segments and semantic relations in Māori texts exhibiting the argument genre (illustrated with reference to a text by Timoti Kāretu, former Māori Language Commissioner)**

**The textual (semantic) relationships outlined here are as follows:**

Reason-Result;  
Outcome-Reason;  
Grounds-Conclusion;  
Means-Purpose;  
Statement-Purpose;  
Statement-Summary;  
Condition-Consequence;  
Statement-Amplification;  
Concession-Outcome;  
Denial-Correction.

With the exception of Statement-Amplification and Statement-Summary, the parts of these relationships may appear in any order (eg Reason-Result; Result-Reason).

These relationships are not defined here. However, the examples should be sufficient to indicate the general sense in which the terms are used.

**General statement (situational and/or attitudinal context) - Reason-Result (or Result-Reason) (often stated indirectly):**

I ēnei rā o te tino kore nei te mōhio ka pēhea ra ngā nekeneke me ngā hiahia o te Kāwanatanga (REASON)

e tika ana kia noho tūtakarerewa, kia noho matawhiwhiu ki ngā whakatau, ki ngā āhuatanga hou ka puta. (RESULT)

*In these times of uncertainty about the movements and the wishes of Government, (REASON)*

*it is understandable that there are feelings of apprehension and the need to be alert to the decisions, to the reorganisation which will take place. (RESULT)*

**Specific issue (current position) - Statement - Amplification with embedded Purpose-Means (or Means-Purpose) and/or Reason-Result:**

Kua puta te kōrero a te Minita Māori ki te ao whānui mō tōna hiahia kia whakakotahitia ngā whakahaere katoa e whai pānga ana ki te reo. (STATEMENT)

Nā, hei whakatutuki i tērā whakaaro ōna ko te whai kia kotahi a Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori me te Māngai Pāho nā te mea ko ēnei whakahaere e rua i takea mai i te reo me tōna ora, tōna mau haere ake nei. (AMPLIFICATION)

*A public announcement has been made by the minister of Māori Affairs of his wish to amalgamate all organisations associated with Māori language. (STATEMENT)*

*Now, to accomplish his idea, the aim will be to amalgamate Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori and Te Māngai Pāho because both organisations are associated with the Māori language, its revival and its survival in the future. (AMPLIFICATION)*

Nā, hei whakatutuki i tērā whakaaro ōna (PURPOSE)

ko te whai kia kotahi a Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori me te Māngai Pāho nā te mea ko ēnei whakahaere e rua i takea mai i te reo me tōna ora, tōna mau haere ake nei. (MEANS)

*Now, to accomplish his idea, (PURPOSE)*

*the aim will be to amalgamate Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori and Te Māngai Pāho because both organisations are associated with the Māori language, its revival and its survival in the future. (MEANS)*

**Thesis Statement 1 (statement of one possible perspective on specific issue, generally *not* that adopted by the writer) - Conclusion-Grounds (or Grounds-Conclusion), often with embedded Condition-Consequence:**

Ā hinengaro nei mārakerake ana te kitea atu o te whāinga o tērā whakaaro. (CONCLUSION)

inahoki ki te whakakotahitia te taha whakahaere inā kē noa atu te pūtea ka toe mai hei whakapeto ki ētahi atu mahi e ora ai, e pakari ake ai te reo. (GROUNDS)

*Thinking about this, the aims behind this idea are obvious, (CONCLUSION)*

*for if the management of these two organisations were amalgamated, there would be a considerable amount of funding left over to distribute to other factions involved in the revitalisation, the strengthening of the language. (GROUNDS)*

ināhoki ki te whakakotahitia te taha whakahaere (CONDITION)  
inā kē noa atu te pūtea ka toe mai hei whakapeto ki ētahi atu mahi e ora ai, e pakari ake ai te reo. (CONSEQUENCE)  
*if the management of these two organisations were amalgamated, (CONDITION)  
there would be a considerable amount of funding left over to distribute to other factions involved in the revitalisation, the strengthening of the language. (CONSEQUENCE)*

**Thesis Statement 2: Problem/Issue (statement of another possible perspective on specific issue, generally that adopted by the writer) - Reason-Result (or Result-Reason), Grounds-Conclusion (or Conclusion-Grounds), often with embedded Condition-Consequence:**

Engari hāunga ia tēnā, ko te raruraru kē hoki (RESULT)  
ko te āhua o te noho tahi he minita kē noa atu hoki nōna te mana ki Te Māngai Pāho, ā he minita kē noa atu anō hoki nōna te mana ki Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori. (REASON)  
*But that aside, a problem is posed (RESULT)  
by the fact that two ministers, one in charge of Te Māngai Pāho, and another whose responsibility is to Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori will both be directly involved. (REASON)*

Ko te mahi nui kia whakaae ēnei minita tokorua nei ki te whakaaro. (CONCLUSION)  
Ki te whakatenetene tētahi kua kore te kaupapa i tutuki, kua noho tārewa noa iho i konā tārewa mai ai. (GROUNDS)  
It is imperative that these two concur. (CONCLUSION)  
*If there is dissension, the proposal will not be completed, it will remain unresolved. (GROUNDS)*

Ki te whakatenetene tētahi (CONDITION)  
kua kore te kaupapa i tutuki, kua noho tārewa noa iho i konā tārewa mai ai. (CONSEQUENCE)  
*If there is dissension, (CONDITION)  
the proposal will not be completed, it will remain unresolved. (CONSEQUENCE)*

**Problem/Issue: further details (often involving personal statement) - Result-Reason, often with embedded Statement-Purpose and/or Means-Purpose and/or Concession-Outcome:**

Waihoki, ko mātou ko āku nā kaimahi (RESULT)  
e noho maunawenawe nei i te korenga e puta wawe o tētahi kōrero kia tau ai ō rātou mauri kia kore ai hoki e noho i runga i te tītakataka, i te māharahara. (REASON)  
*Furthermore, there is the uncertainty for me and for my staff (RESULT)  
because definite notification, needed to help settle their emotions, so that they do not wallow in their anxieties has been slow to emerge. (REASON)*

kia tau ai (STATEMENT)  
ō rātou mauri (PURPOSE)  
*needed (STATEMENT)*

*to help settle their emotions, (PURPOSE)*

kia tau ai ō rātou mauri (PURPOSE)

kia kore ai hoki e noho i runga i te tītakataka, i te māharahara (MEANS)

*to help settle their emotions, (PURPOSE)*

*so that they do not wallow in their anxieties has been slow to emerge. (MEANS)*

Waihoki, ko mātou ko āku nā kaimahi e noho maunawenawe nei i te korenga e puta wawe o tētahi kōrero kia tau ai ō rātou mauri kia kore ai hoki e noho i runga i te tītakataka, i te māharahara. (CONCESSION)

Aua atu e mau tonu ana rātou ki te kakau o te hoe me te hoe mārama ka whakakukū ki hea. (OUTCOME)

*Furthermore, there is the uncertainty for me and for my staff because definite notification, needed to help settle their emotions, so that they do not wallow in their anxieties has been slow to emerge. (CONCESSION)*

*Nevertheless, they continue to function and to move this organisation forward although the future direction is uncertain. (OUTCOME)*

**Summing up of Problem/ Issue (general) - Conclusion (based on Grounds in preceding text):**

Ahakoā pēhea ka rere kē te āhua o te Taura Whiri me āna mahi ka mahi. (CONCLUSION)

*Whatever happens, the organisation and the role of Te Taura Whiri will be different. (CONCLUSION)*

**Problem/Issue: specific effects (often involves listing of points) - Denial-Correction, Statement-Summary, often with Concession-Outcome:**

Inā eke tā te Minita Māori e whai nei kua kore te Taura Whiri e whakatū, ē whakahaere rānei i ngā kura kua roa nei e haere ana (DENIAL)

engari ka hokona mai i tētahi atu whakahaere i tērā mōhio o te whakahaere kura. (CORRECTION)

*When the objectives set down by the Minister for Māori Affairs are fulfilled, the Taura Whiri will no longer establish or organise the schools which have been running for some time now (DENIAL)*

*but instead, some other organisation with the necessary expertise, will contract for, and will run these schools. (CORRECTION)*

Inā eke tā te Minita Māori e whai nei kua kore te Taura Whiri e whakatū, ē whakahaere rānei i ngā kura kua roa nei e haere ana engari ka hokona mai e tētahi atu whakahaere i tērā mōhio o te whakahaere kura. (STATEMENT)

Kua noho te Taura Whiri hei kaihoko ratonga, kua kore i riro mai māna ake te ratonga e whakawhiwhi ki te hunga tonu. (SUMMARY)

*When the objectives set down by the Minister for Māori Affairs are fulfilled, the Taura Whiri will no longer establish or organise the schools which have been running for some time now but instead, some other organisation with the necessary expertise, will contract for, and will run these schools (STATEMENT)*

*The Taura Whiri will become a purchaser of services and will no longer have the role of providing Māori language services to applicants. (SUMMARY)*

Tērā pea ko ngā mahi ka mau tonu ko 'He Muka' me 'Ko te Whānau' (CONCESSION)

engari atu i ērā ka hokona katoatia mai ngā ratonga e hiahiatia ana. (OUTCOME)

*It is possible that the work for 'He Muka' and 'Ko te Whānau' may possibly continue (CONCESSION)*

*but beyond these, all services required will be purchased. (OUTCOME)*

**Return to Specific Issue:**

**(1) further detail (point 1 ff.)**

**Purpose-Means (or Means-Purpose) and/or Reason-Result (or Result-Reason) and/or Outcome-Reason (or Reason-Outcome):**

Ko te whai kē hoki kia hāngai atu ngā mahi a Te Taura Whiri ki te Mahere Rautaki Reo kua whakatakototia nei e te Kāwanatanga hei whāinga mā te motu (PURPOSE)

arā,

- (1) kia tokomaha ake te hunga mōhio ki te reo Māori mā runga anō i te maha o ngā āheinga o te tangata ki te ako me ngā wāhi ka taea te reo te ako
- (2) kia pai ake te kōrero me te tuhi i te reo Māori, kia kaha ake anō hoki te mārama atu ki te reo Māori mā runga anō i te āta whakarongo me te pānui i te reo Māori
- (3) kia nui ake ngā wā me ngā wāhi e āhei ana te tangata ki te kōrero Māori
- (4) kia tere ake te whakawhānuitia ake me te whakapakiritia ake o te reo Māori
- (5) kia aro pai mai te Māori me te Pākehā ki te reo Māori me te whakapono anō hoki he tino hua kei roto i te āhei o te tangata ki te kōrero i ngā reo e rua, he painga anō hoki kei roto i tērā mō Aotearoa whānui. (MEANS)

*The aim is in fact to align the working of Te Taura Whiri with the Māori Language Strategy which the government has set down for the nation (PURPOSE)*

*that is,*

- (1) *to increase the numbers of those who know te reo Māori as a result of an increase of the abilities of those who teach together with an increase in the number of contexts where te reo can be taught*
- (2) *to improve speaking and writing in te reo Māori, to heighten the understanding of te reo Māori through careful listening and reading in te reo Māori*
- (3) *to increase the times and places where people may speak Māori*
- (4) *to hasten the spread and to increase the strength of te reo Māori*
- (5) *so that both Māori and Pākehā are favourably disposed toward te reo Māori, and believe that not only are there advantages for those who are bilingual, but that bilingualism could also benefit New Zealand as a whole. (MEANS)*

- (1) kia tokomaha ake te hunga mōhio ki te reo Māori (PURPOSE)

- mā runga anō i te maha o ngā āheinga o te tangata ki te ako me ngā wāhi ka taea te reo te ako (MEANS)
- (1) *to increase the numbers of those who know te reo Māori (PURPOSE) as a result of an increase of the abilities of those who teach together with an increase in the number of contexts where te reo can be taught (MEANS)*
- (2) *kia pai ake te kōrero me te tuhi i te reo Māori, kia kaha ake anō hoki te mārama atu ki te reo Māori (PURPOSE)*  
*mā runga anō i te āta whakarongo me te pānui i te reo Māori (MEANS)*
- (2) *to improve speaking and writing in te reo Māori, to heighten the understanding of te reo Māori (PURPOSE)*  
*through careful listening and reading in te reo Māori (MEANS)*
- (3) *kia nui ake ngā wā me ngā wāhi e āhei ana te tangata ki te kōrero Māori (MEANS)*
- (3) *to increase the times and places where people may speak Māori (MEANS)*
- (4) *kia tere ake te whakawhānuitia ake me te whakapakiritia ake o te reo Māori (MEANS)*
- (4) *to hasten the spread and to increase the strength of te reo Māori (MEANS)*
- (5) *kia aro pai mai te Māori me te Pākehā ki te reo Māori me te whakapono anō hoki he tino hua kei roto i te āhei o te tangata ki te kōrero i ngā reo e rua, he painga anō hoki kei roto i tērā mo Aotearoa whānui. (PURPOSE)*
- (5) *so that both Māori and Pākehā are favourably disposed toward te reo Māori, and believe that not only are there advantages for those who are bilingual, but that bilingualism could also benefit New Zealand as a whole. (PURPOSE)*

**(2) summary statement - Conclusion (based on Grounds in preceding text)**

Kāti, koinei rā ngā take e whāia nei me kore e tutuki ā, e tutuki ai me whakarere kē ko te āhua o te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori. (CONCLUSION)

*So then, these are the issues which may or may not be resolved and will mean changes to te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori. (CONCLUSION)*

**Specific practical details (optional) and Specific practical problem (optional) - linked by Concession-Outcome:**

**Specific practical details (optional)**

Nō reira koia noa nei te whakamōhio atu ko ngā kura kua whakaritea kia tū i roto i tēnei tau pūtea, arā atu i te 30 o Pipiri ka tū tonu, ā, ko aua kura ko tō ngā akonga taipakeke o ngā Kura Kaupapa Māori ka tū ki Waititi ā te 30 o Haratua - 3 o Pipiri me tō ngā pakeke ki Ngahutoitoi ā te 27 o Pipiri – 2 o Hongongoi, (CONCESSION)

*This, therefore, is merely clarification that those schools which were established under this year's funding, to the 30 June, will continue and those schools are the*

*senior Kura Kaupapa Māori classes to be held at Waititi Marae from the 30 May to 3 June and the adult classes at Ngahutoitoi Marae on 27 June to 2 July, (CONCESSION)*

**Specific practical problem (optional)**

engari ko o tua atu i taua rā kāore i te mōhiotia ka aha i ngā āhuatanga hou nei. (OUTCOME)

*but beyond that it is unclear what will evolve from the new system. (OUTCOME)*

**Conclusion (often in the form of an injunction) - Result (based on Reason in preceding text), and/or Statement-Purpose:**

Koirā (REASON)

au e kī nei, he whakaōhiti, he whakatūpatō tēnei kia noho mataara, kia noho mōhio mai ai koutou he aha te aha. (RESULT)

*It is for **that** reason (REASON - a reason provided earlier in the text)*

*that I say that this is a word of warning, a note of caution, so that you be watchful, so that you be aware of the developments. (RESULT)*

he whakaōhiti, he whakatūpatō tēnei (STATEMENT)

kia noho mataara, kia noho mōhio mai ai koutou he aha te aha. (PURPOSE)

*this is a word of warning, a note of caution, (STATEMENT)*

*so that you be watchful, so that you be aware of the developments. (PURPOSE)*

**Metaphoric Restatement of conclusion - Conclusion (based on Grounds in preceding text)**

Waiho ki tā rātou i kī rā ‘Mate atu he tētēkura, ara mai he tētēkura’ (CONCLUSION)

*Let it be, as stated (by our ancestors) ‘Mate atu he tētēkura, ara mai he tētēkura’ (CONCLUSION)*

**Hypothesis concerning some typical features of the language associated with the semantic relations occurring in the functional segments in the case of Māori texts exhibiting the argument genre (illustrated with reference to a text by Timoti Kāretu, former Māori Language Commissioner)**

*Reason-Result* is generally expressed indirectly. For example:

I ēnei rā o te tino kore nei te mōhio ka pēhea ra ngā nekeneke me ngā hiahia o te Kāwanatanga e tika ana kia noho tūtakarerewa, kia noho . . .

In these times of uncertainty about the movements and the wishes of Government, it is understandable that there are feelings of apprehension . . .

However, on some occasions, the reason member of the relation is signalled by *na te mea* (and its equivalents) in the context of positive reasons and *i te korenga* in the context of negative reasons:

Nā, hei whakatutuki i tēra whakaaro ōna ko te whai kia kotahi a Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori me te Māngai Pāho nā te mea . . .

Waihoki, ko mātou ko āku nā kaimahi e noho maunawenawe nei i te korenga e puta . . .

*Condition-consequence* is generally expressed directly and signalled by *ki te*:

Ki te whakatenetene . . .

*Concession-Contraexpectation* generally occurs in the context of the non-specific contrastive signal *engari* (which may be glossed as 'but'), but may also be signalled by the idiomatic expression *ahu atu* (which may be glossed as 'even so'), or by *ahakoa* (roughly equivalent to 'although' in English):

...engari ko o tua atu i taua rā . . .

Aua atu e mau tonu ana . . .

Ahakoa pēhea . . .

The Purpose member of a *Means-Purpose* relation is generally signalled by *kia* or *hei*, with both Means and Result generally being signalled by *mā runga anō*:

Nā hei whakatutuki . . .

...arā, kia tokomaha ake . . . mā runga anō i te maha ake . . .

### **Hypothesis concerning some typical additional features of the language associated with Māori texts exhibiting the argument genre (illustrated with reference to a text by Timoti Kāretu, former Māori Language Commissioner)**

In argument texts in Māori, a number of words signalling problem (including *te raruraru*) are common, as are expressions such as *engari hāunga ia tēnā* which function to signal a change of topic. Also common are universal expressions such as *ahakoa pēhea* which often function in this context to dismiss an argument or set of related arguments in favour of a summary statement of a critical issue.

Another feature that is typical of the argument genre in Māori is the occurrence of what we shall refer to here as *rhetorical coupling*, that is emphatic addition, often expressed by the repetition of *anō hoki* in two parallel constructions:

Kia aro pai mai te Māori me te Pākehā ki te reo Māori me te whakapono anō hoki he tino hua kei roto i te āhei o te tangata ki te kōrero i ngā reo e rua, hei painga anō hoki kei roto i tērā mo Aotearoa whānui.

Finally, repetition with variation in the context of contrastive meanings or the juxtaposition of opposites occurs frequently:

he minita kē noa atu hoki nōna te mana ki . . .

he minita kē noa atu anō hoki nōna te mana ki . . .

### Conclusion

Some tentative conclusions have been reported here concerning typical features of the argument genre in Māori. Much more remains to be done. However, one of the authors of this paper is currently researching the interaction between genre and text-type and between both of these and the types of writing task required of students who are operating in academic contexts through the medium of Māori. It is hoped that that research will lead to more detailed, and more specific conclusions, conclusions which may then inform the teaching of students who need to come to terms with the structure of Māori discourses of various types.

### References

- Biber, D. (1989). A typology of English texts. *Linguistics*, 27: 23 - 43.
- Council of Europe. (1996). *Draft common European framework for modern languages*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Derewianka, B. (1990). *Exploring How Texts Work*. Victoria, Australia: Primary English Teaching Association.
- Pilegaard, M. and Frandsen, F. (1995). Text Type. In Verschueren, J., Östman, J. O. and Blommaert, J. *Handbook of Pragmatics*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.
- Werlich, (1983). *A text grammar of English*. Heidelberg: Quelle and Meyer.

# TE WHARE WĀNANGA O WAIKATO

## *Te Pua Wānanga Ki Te Ao*



---

### THE UNIVERSITY OF WAIKATO THE SCHOOL OF MAORI AND PACIFIC DEVELOPMENT

**Professor Tamati Reedy  
Dean**

**Private Bag 3105 - Hamilton - New Zealand - Phone #: 64 - 7 - 838 4737 - Fax #: 64 - 7 - 838 4742  
E-mail: [smpd@waikato.ac.nz](mailto:smpd@waikato.ac.nz) - Website: <http://www.waikato.ac.nz/smpd>**

Dean's Welcome

Nau mai haere mai

Te Pua Wānanga Ki Te Ao (The School of Māori and Pacific Development) aims to lead the way for the new millennium as an educator and research institute in Māori and Indigenous Studies. In achieving this we strive to be a world centre of excellence in teaching and research. Underpinning our School activities is the commitment to the advancement of Māori through the teachings of Te Reo, Tikanga, and indigenous development. With our quest for knowledge, Te Pua Wānanga Ki Te Ao is committed to building long term relationships. Our School aims to provide life long learning opportunities and to prepare our students for successful careers. We welcome all to join our whānau at Te Pua Wānanga Ki Te Ao.

Professor Tamati Reedy  
Te Pua Wānanga Ki Te Ao

The School consists of several departments that contribute to our vision of uplifting the people:

- Te Tari Māori
- Development Studies
- Te Tīmatanga Hou
- Te Whakapiki i te Reo
- Centre for Māori and Pacific Development Research
- Centre for Māori and Pacific Development Research
- MSAAC

### **Te Tari Māori**

Our School was founded on the strong teachings of Te Reo (Māori Language) and Tikanga (Māori Protocol or Traditions). It is through the teachings of language and traditions that the School aims to maintain and develop the cultural identity of Māori as indigenous peoples of New Zealand.

Staff at our School are involved in a wide range of activities outside of their teaching duties. Staff are involved in activities such as iwi/hapū management and treaty negotiations, kapa haka and other Māori performing arts, which all contribute to the teachings and learning within Te Tari Māori and our School.

By maintaining and developing Māori cultural identity, the School plays an important role in indigenous nation building in New Zealand.

### **Development Studies**

Our Development Studies department offers the opportunity for incorporating the international dimensions of development issues for our School. Alongside the Māori development issues, the department offers learning about other indigenous peoples and the challenges they face in nation building. The department provides a multidisciplinary approach to learning by offering courses from a wide range of fields that relate to issues of development.

### **Te Tīmatanga Hou**

Te Tīmatanga Hou is a foundation programme designed for Māori students in mind. The programme is taught under a kaupapa Māori philosophy where tikanga, and te reo are incorporated where possible. The programme targets in particular Māori who do not have any previous tertiary education study experience and require preparation for entering the tertiary education environment. This is a commitment by the University and the School for providing accessibility to tertiary education for Māori through providing sufficient academic preparation in a culturally sensitive environment.

### **Te Whakapiki i Te Reo**

Te Whakapiki i te Reo offers practicing teachers the opportunity to enhance and develop their language proficiency and competency. The course further seeks to develop language skills for the delivery of Māori as a second language. This service helps the School to achieve the promotion and development of Te Reo outside and beyond the tertiary level of education.

### **Centre for Māori and Pacific Development Research**

Given our School's relative youth, we have been successful in securing and undertaking research contracts. There are currently three major areas of research which different research teams, from the School and University, are undertaking:

- 1) Māori Sustainable Development in Te Puku o Te Ika
- 2) He Rangahau Tikanga Māori - Traditional Fisheries Research Project
- 3) Māori Language Proficiency Tests for Year 5 and Year 8

The School will be opening a new Centre for Māori and Pacific Development Research, which will help to manage the research activities within the School.

### **Māori Student Academic Advisory Centre (MSAAC)**

To support Māori students studying at the University of Waikato, a centre was established to provide advice and a friendly environment for Māori students. MSAAC services provide academic advice and support Māori students to ensure there is a high retention rate of Māori students at the tertiary level. Students who approach MSAAC will find an environment that encourages academic learning with a particular focus on tikanga Māori, supporting both the cultural and academic development.

**We welcome articles, reviews, and  
creative pieces from you.**

**For details about how to submit  
material to *He Puna Kōrero,  
Journal of Maori and Pacific  
Development*,  
see the back cover of this issue.**

# Guidelines for Final Submission of Article for JMPD

## General

Manuscripts should be in Times 12 cpi with 1.5 spacing and fully justified. There should be the equivalent of one line left between paragraphs within sections and new paragraphs should not be indented. Articles that are 20 pages in length or shorter are preferred. The manuscript should **NOT** have numbered pages but should have a footer on each page with the first three words of the title.

## Title

The title should be in Times 12 cpi boldface and should be centred on the page. The title should indicate as clearly as possible the nature of the content of the manuscript. All content words of the title are to have an initial capital letter.

## Abstract

Each article must include an abstract of not more than 200 words. The heading Abstract should be in Times 12 cpi boldface, and centered.

## Headings

*Level 1* headings should be capitalized in the same way as the main title, and centered. The font used is Times 12 boldface. The format for *level 2* headings is the same as for *level 1* headings except that the font is Times 11, and the heading is justified to the left of the column. There should be the equivalent of a one line space between level 1 and level 2 headings and the following text. The format for *level 3* headings is the same as for level 2 headings, except that the font is Times 10, and there should be no space left between the heading and the text.

## References within the text

All references within the text should be placed in parentheses containing the author's surname followed by a comma and a space before the date of publication (Jones, 1999). If the sentence already includes the author's name, then it is necessary only to put the date in parentheses: Jones (1999). When several works are cited, each entry should be separated by a semicolon: (Jones, 1999; Peters, 1995; Simon, 1993). When a reference has more than three authors, cite only the name of the first author followed by *et al* in every subsequent reference to the same work. When including page references, separate them from the date by a comma and a space (Jones, 1999, 7 – 14). Page numbers should be indicated as follows: Peters (1999, p. 1), Jones (1998, pp. 4 - 7).

## Endnotes

Endnotes are indicated within the text by a number<sup>1</sup> in superscript. They should be in Times 9, and appear together at the end of the article and before the reference list.

## Tables and Figures

All tables and figures should be centered in the manuscript. Tables and figures should be numbered in the text, and should be preceded by a caption in Times 12 cpi italic. The equivalent of one line space should be left between captions and the tables or figures to which they refer. Captions and the tables or figures to which they refer should always appear together on the same page.

## References

References should be listed in alphabetical order at the end of the article. The title of the section, 'References', should be a *level 1 heading*. The first line of each bibliographical reference must be justified to the left of the column, and the rest of the entry should be indented five spaces. The following examples (of fictitious references) illustrate the format required for conference proceedings, books, journals, articles, Ph.D. theses, and chapters of books respectively:

- Jones, L.E. (1999). Marae Protocol. In *Proceedings of the First Annual Conference of the Society for Māori Language Revitalisation* (pp. 71 -- 133). Wellington, NZ: Te Rapa Books.
- Peters, S.O. (1997). *Words and Meanings*. London: Groves and Parker.
- Stephens, E. & Jones, A.E. (1987). An Experimental Approach to Case, *Journal of Case Studies*, 2 (3), 12 - 17.
- Houia, A. (1992). Common Syntactic Errors in Young Learners of Greek. Doctoral Thesis. University of Te Rapa, Auckland.
- Edmonds, A.B. (1991). Scaffolding Second Language Learning. In T. A. Stone, A.T. Bread & V. Matthews (Eds.), *Scaffolding in Education* (pp. 12-48). Wellington, NZ: Learning Media.

## Policy regarding use of the macron

The editors will respect the decisions made by authors in relation to their use of the macron in text written in English and/or Maori. Where Maori words are included by the editors themselves in text written in English, the macron will not be used in cases where a particular word (such as, for example, the word *Maori* itself) is deemed by the editors to have been fully integrated into New Zealand English. Thus, the macron is not used in the title of the Journal.

## Submission

Each manuscript should be submitted on white A4 paper (3 copies) and sent to the Production Editor (Dr. Winifred Crombie) at *Pua Wānanga Ki Te Ao* (the School of Māori and Pacific Development), Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato (University of Waikato), Private Bag 3105, Hamilton, New Zealand.

The manuscript should be accompanied by a Word Disk and/or also sent by email attachment to <crombie@waikato.ac.nz>. Author's names should **NOT** be included in the manuscript but should be indicated in an accompanying letter in which institutional affiliations, institutional addresses, email addresses and phone and fax numbers are also included. The accompanying letter should indicate clearly whether the content of the manuscript has, in the same or similar form, either (a) been delivered as a conference paper and, if so, where and when, or (b) been produced or published in any other context and, if so, where and when.

## Acknowledgments

Place all acknowledgements (including those concerning research grants and funding) in a separate section at the end of the article.

---