



THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato

Research Commons

<http://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/>

Research Commons at the University of Waikato

Copyright Statement:

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

The thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of the thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from the thesis.

**INTER-PROPOSITIONAL SEMANTIC RELATIONS AND
SEMANTIC RELATIONAL ENCODING IN WRITTEN DISCOURSE
IN MAORI: AN INVESTIGATION**

by

WALDO HOUIA

**A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Philosophy in Applied Linguistics at the University of
Waikato**

2001

INTER-PROPOSITIONAL SEMANTIC RELATIONS AND SEMANTIC RELATIONAL ENCODING IN WRITTEN DISCOURSE IN MAORI: AN INVESTIGATION

ABSTRACT

This thesis is an investigation of the various ways in which relationships of meaning between propositions (such as *reason-result* and *temporal overlap*) are encoded (as clauses, sentences and groups of sentences) and signalled in Maori.

In *Chapter 1*, the overall research topic and research questions are outlined.

Chapter 2 locates the research on inter-propositional semantic relations with reference to the concept of cohesion which is central to inter-propositional relational signalling and encoding. Here, reference is made to a number of relevant publications in the area.

Chapter 3 provides an introductory examination of the role of cohesion in the encoding and signalling of inter-propositional semantic relations in Maori.

Chapter 4 introduces a corpus of written texts and examines that corpus in terms of the ways in which inter-propositional semantic relations are encoded.

Chapter 5 examines a number of textbooks designed for learners of both English and Maori in terms of the extent to which they draw upon insights relating to the operation of inter-propositional semantic relations.

In *Chapter 6*, the research findings are summarised and their implications for aspects of the teaching and learning of Maori are discussed. In addition, suggestions are made in relation to future research possibilities.

Overall, the conclusion reached is that the study of semantic relational encoding and signalling in Maori texts reveals a number of aspects of language that appear not to be commonly taught and suggests the need for further studies of this type.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank my chief supervisor, Dr. Winifred Crombie, for all of the help she has given me in undertaking this research and, in particular, for the fact that she has willingly given up evenings and week-ends to assist me where necessary. I also wish to thank my second supervisor, Professor Tamati Reedy, whose detailed knowledge and understanding of Māori grammar has been of considerable assistance. Tēna rawa atu kōrua.

To Wiremu and Te Ohorere Kaa, I offer my sincere thanks for making available to me the disks of their edited versions of writings by Sir Apirana Ngata and Reweti Kohere. Tēna rawa atu kōrua.

I also offer my sincere thanks to Professor Wharehuia Milroy for his helpful suggestions and generous collegial support. Tēna rawa atu.

Thanks are also due to all of those others, including family members, who have given me encouragement and support, both personal and professional, while the work was in progress. Tēna koutou.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
CONTENTS	v
CHAPTER 1	1
INTER-PROPOSITIONAL RELATIONS IN ENGLISH AND MAORI: INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH	
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Research aims and research questions	2
1.3 Background to the research	3
1.4 Inter-propositional semantic relations and semantic relational encoding: introduction	4
1.5 Inter-propositional semantic relations and semantic relational encoding: relevance to the teaching of Maori as a second language	7
1.6 Cohesive devices	14
CHAPTER 2	19
COHESION: THE KEY TO THE ENCODING AND SIGNALLING OF INTER-PROPOSITIONAL SEMANTIC RELATIONS	
2.1 Introduction	19
2.2 Terminology	19
2.3 Inter-propositional semantic relations in the context of literature on coherence and cohesion	24
2.4 Linguistic universals and language specifics: semantic relations versus semantic relational encoding and signalling	25
2.5 Coherence and cohesion	26
2.6 Cohesive devices in English and Maori: an overview	27
2.6.1 Substitution	28
2.6.1.1 Nominal substitution in English and Maori	28
2.6.1.2 Verbal substitution	28
2.6.1.3 Clausal substitution in English and Maori	29
2.6.1.4 Verb plus object/manner substitution in English and Maori	29
2.6.2 Ellipsis (Ø) in English and ellipsis or substitution in Maori	30
2.6.2.1 Nominal ellipsis in English/ ellipsis and/or substitution in Maori	30

2.6.2.2	Lexical verb ellipsis in English/ ellipsis of subject in Maori	30
2.6.2.3	Clausal ellipsis in English and Maori	31
2.6.3	Conjunctions in English and Maori	33
2.6.3.1	Subordinating conjunctions in English and Maori	33
2.6.3.2	Coordinating conjunctions in English and Maori	33
2.6.3.3	Sentence conjuncts in English and conjunctions in Maori	34
2.6.4	Sequence signals in English and Maori	35
2.6.5	Temporal overlap signalling in English and Maori	36
2.6.6	Reason-result signalling in English and Maori	37
2.6.7	Signalling of exception in English and Maori	37
2.6.8	Concessive signalling in English and Maori	38
2.6.9	Conditional signalling in English and Maori	38
2.6.10	Contrastive signalling in English and Maori	40
2.6.11	Hypothetical conditional signalling in English and Maori	41
2.7	Analyses of the Maori language: the indirect nature of references to semantic relations and semantic relational encoding	41
2.8	Semantic Relations in Maori: a textual illustration	42
 CHAPTER 3		 48
INTER-PROPOSITIONAL SEMANTIC RELATIONS: AN INTRODUCTION TO THEIR ENCODING AND SIGNALLING IN MAORI		
3.1.	Introduction	48
3.2	Semantic Relational Framework	48
3.2.1	Causative type (involving cause/effect)	48
3.2.2	Matching process type (involving comparison and contrast)	48
3.2.3	Contiguity (in time and space) type	49
3.3	Definition and examples of causative type relations	50
3.3.1	Reason-Result	50
3.3.2	Means-Result	51
3.3.3	Grounds-Conclusion	51
3.3.4	Means-Purpose	52
3.3.5	Condition-Consequence	53
3.4	Definition and examples of matching process type relations	54
3.4.1	Simple Contrast	54
3.4.2	Statement-Exception	55
3.4.3	Statement-Denial	55

3.4.4 Denial-Correction	56
3.4.5 Concession-Contraexpectation	56
3.4.6 Contrastive Alternation	57
3.4.7 Simple Comparison	57
3.4.8 Statement-Exemplification	58
3.4.9 Statement-Affirmation	59
3.4.10 Paraphrase	60
3.4.11 Amplification	60
3.4.12 Supplementary Alternation	61
3.5 Definition and examples of contiguity process type relations (relations in time and space)	61
3.5.1 Chronological Sequence	61
3.5.2 Temporal Overlap	63
3.5.3 Bonding/Spatial Contiguity	63
CHAPTER 4	64
THE OCCURRENCE AND SIGNPOSTING OF SEMANTIC RELATIONS IN A CORPUS OF WRITTEN DISCOURSE IN MAORI	
4.1 Introduction	64
4.2 The corpus	65
4.3 Semantic relations and their realisation in the corpus	65
4.3.1 Reason-result	65
4.3.2 Means-purpose	83
4.3.3 Condition-consequence	88
4.3.4 Denial – correction	94
4.3.5 Concession – contraexpectation	94
4.3.6 Simple comparison	103
4.3.7 Chronological sequence	104
4.3.8 Temporal overlap	108
4.3.9 Supplementary alternation	109
4.3.10 Amplification	110
4.3.11 Bonding	113
4.3.12 Rhetorical coupling	114
4.13 Conclusions	115
CHAPTER 5	119
LANGUAGE TEACHING TEXTBOOKS: THE INFLUENCE OF DISCOURSE-BASED RESEARCH	
5. 1 Aims	119
5.2 Incorporating research on text and discourse construction into mainstream first language learning: the Australian	119

experience	
5.3 Incorporating research on text and discourse construction into intermediate/ advanced textbooks dealing with the learning of English as a second language	120
5.4 Reflection of text and discourse studies in textbooks designed for learners of Maori	123
5.5 Conclusion	128
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	130
6.1 Introduction	130
6.2 Preliminary findings of the research	131
6.3 Limitations of the study	131
6.4 Concluding remarks	132
REFERENCES	134

CHAPTER 1

INTER-PROPOSITIONAL SEMANTIC RELATIONS IN ENGLISH AND MAORI: INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH

1.1 Introduction

I have spent many years teaching Maori as a second language to children and adults. This experience has revealed to me that very 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. One approach to beginning to do so is to examine a corpus of writing from the past in order to determine the range of ways in which certain types of meaning are expressed and then to incorporate these into teaching programmes. In this thesis, a specific range of meanings of a particular type are examined. No attempt is made to provide a comprehensive analysis of the Maori language. That is not the purpose of this work. The project is fundamentally concerned with approaching written discourse in Maori from a new perspective, suggesting a methodology for future work in the area of Maori discourse analysis and providing a preliminary assessment of the potential value of this new approach for the teaching and learning of the language.

1.2 Research aims and research questions

The primary aim of this research is to examine inter-propositional¹ semantic relations² and semantic relational encoding in Maori in relation to a written corpus³. A secondary aim is to investigate the extent to which inter-propositional semantic relations and semantic relational encoding is accommodated in teaching learners of Maori.

The research questions are:

- How are inter-propositional semantic relations expressed in a corpus of written Maori?
- How can an understanding of the ways in which inter-propositional semantic relations are expressed in a corpus of written Maori assist in the teaching of Maori language?

In seeking to answer these questions, the following tasks were undertaken:

¹ 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).

² An explanation of the way in which the term 'inter-propositional semantic relations' is used here follows (see section 1.3)

³ So far as English is concerned, it is widely accepted by linguists (see, for example, (Halliday (1985)) that written and spoken language may differ in a number of respects and that in spoken language intonation plays an important role in meaning. The decision to work from a written corpus here was taken largely for practical reasons: the collection of a spoken corpus entails a number of representational problems (including problems associated with the way in which intonation is to be represented). Because the corpus used here is a written one, no assumptions are made in relation to the transferability of the conclusions to spoken Maori.

- selection of a corpus of written Maori;
- analysis of the corpus in terms of the signalling and encoding of inter-propositional semantic relationships⁴
- analysis of Maori language and English language teaching books in relation to the extent to which they take inter-propositional semantic relations into account.

Chapter 2 examines the concept of cohesion, which is central to the encoding and signalling of inter-propositional semantic relations. *Chapter 3* provides an introduction to the encoding in Maori of inter-propositional semantic relations. *Chapter 4* introduces a corpus of written texts and examines that corpus in terms of the ways in which inter-propositional semantic relations are encoded. *Chapter 5* reviews a number of language teaching series (for learners of Maori and other languages) in terms of the extent to which they take account of the types of relationship discussed here. In *Chapter 6*, the research findings are summarised and their implications for aspects of the teaching and learning of Maori are discussed. In addition, suggestions are made in relation to future research possibilities.

1.3 Background to the research

The teaching of Maori as a second language is one part of the strategy for the maintenance of the language and, as such, must be as effective as possible. Good teaching depends, to some extent at least, on genuine understanding of the language in all of its aspects. One dimension that has received comparatively little attention to date is the role that inter-propositional semantic relations play in textual coherence (whether the text makes sense in context to hearers/readers) and textual cohesion (the extent to which the text contains linguistic devices that function to relate its various parts to one another). An important

⁴ Encoding and signalling are discussed in detail at various points throughout this thesis. At this point, however, it should be noted simply that meanings are *encoded* when they are expressed linguistically (rather than, for example, pictorially). The *signalling* of semantic relations involves the use of language that indicates the nature of the relationship involved. So, for example, the subordinator 'because' in English acts as a signal that part of a discourse is to be interpreted as containing a reason as does the complex preposition 'because of'. Similarly, verbs such as 'cause' and nouns such as 'reason' and 'result' perform a signalling function. Signalling is not, therefore, confined to subordinating conjunctions.

aspect of textual coherence is the ways in which textual propositions are related to one another (inter-propositional semantic relations). An important aspect of textual cohesion is the way in which texts are held together linguistically (inter-propositional semantic relational signalling and encoding). These are aspects of language that learners should, directly or indirectly, come to terms with if they are to advance beyond the initial stages of language learning. Ideally, therefore, they could be included in Maori language teaching syllabuses and explored in relation to the teaching methodologies used. For this to happen, it is necessary first to explore inter-propositional semantic relations and semantic relational encoding in Maori so that teaching applications can be firmly based on research.

1.4 Inter-propopsitional semantic relations and semantic relational encoding: introduction

There are various types of relationship that can exist between propositions. These are referred to here as *inter-propositional semantic relations* (semantic relations)⁵ Inter-propositional semantic relations are relations between propositions where a proposition is treated as a grouping made up of a semantic predicator (e.g. *kai*, *koa*, *kei roto*), and one or more arguments (e.g. *Hēmi*, *āporo*; *kāpata*). Therefore, in (1) below, the semantic predicate is *kai* and it is related to the arguments (*te*) *tama* and *āporo*; in (2) below, the semantic predicate is *koa* and it is related to the argument *Hēmi*; in (3) following, the semantic predicate is *kei roto* and it is related to the arguments (a) *Hēmi* and *kāpata*.

(1) Kai āporo ai⁶ te tama.

(The boy eats apples)

(2) Kei te koa a Hēmi.

(Hēmi is happy)

⁵ A typology is introduced in *Chapter 3*.

⁶ 'Ai' can perform a number of functions, including indicating the presence of habitual aspect or anaphoric reference. In general, the role of such particles is not explicitly discussed here except in cases where it is fundamental to the specific inter-propositional relational meanings under consideration. Thus, it is not the intention here to provide a detailed description of all aspects of Maori language.

(3) Kei roto a Hēmi i te kāpata.

(Hēmi is in the cupboard)

Each proposition is commonly expressed in language as a single clause. However, a proposition may, in the case of nominalization, be expressed as part of a clause and so an inter-propositional relation may relate parts of a single clause (see (4) below) or separate clauses (see (5) below):

(4) Na te aruarutanga mai a Hēmi i riri ai ia.

(Hēmi's interruption caused his anger)

(5) I aruaru mai a Hēmi, ā ka riri hoki ia.

(Hēmi interrupted and s/he became angry)

In some cases, inter-propositional relations may link more than two clauses. Thus, one or both parts of an inter-propositional relation may be made up of several clauses or sentences (see (6) below):

(6) I āmai a Hēmi. I te wera rawa te whare. I te mau kākahu hōtoke taumaha ia, ā i

← result → ← reason →

te mate ia i te rewharewha.

← reason (continued) →

(Hēmi fainted. The house was too hot. He was wearing winter clothing and he was sick with influenza.)

Inter-propositional relations are essential to coherence. Their encoding is an essential aspect of cohesion. The encoding of inter-propositional semantic relations takes many different forms in different languages. The *reason* member of a *reason-result* relation in English may, for example, be encoded in a large number of ways. It may, be encoded as a subordinate clause introduced by *because* (see (7) below) or a non-finite clause introduced by a present participle (see (8) below). Equally, it may be encoded as a nominalization

following a complex preposition (see *because of* in (9) below⁷). A relation of *simple contrast* may also be expressed in a variety of different ways in different languages. In (10) below, it is encoded in English in terms of a combination of complementaries (e.g. he/she) and antonyms (e.g. good/bad)⁸.

(7) He left early *because* he felt ill.

(8) *Being* ill, he left early.

(9) He left *because of* the heat.

(10) *He's good; she's bad.*

In (7), (8), (9) and (10) above, the examples are coherent (make sense) and cohesive (involve linguistic devices such as 'because' that signal how the text should be interpreted). Inter-propositional semantic relations (semantic relations) and inter-propositional relational encoding therefore play an important role in coherence and cohesion. So far as English is concerned, inter-propositional relations and inter-propositional relational encoding have been the subject of detailed investigation (see, for example Beekman and Callow (1974), Winter (1977; 1982), Crombie 1985a & b) However, no single work has to date been devoted to an examination of inter-propositional relations and inter-propositional relational encoding in Maori. In *Chapter 4* here, the encoding of these relations in a written corpus of Maori is examined. This is the core of the research undertaken here. Another aspect of the research (see section 1.4 below) relates to the relevance for the teaching of Maori of an investigation of inter-propositional relations and inter-propositional relational encoding in Maori.

⁷ Whereas 'because' in English introduces a subordinate clause, 'because of' introduces a noun group and is referred to as a 'complex preposition' (a preposition involving more than one word).

⁸ Maori translations are not provided here because the focus at this point is on variety of encoding in English.

1.5 Inter-propositional semantic relations and semantic relational encoding: relevance to the teaching of Maori as a second language

The teaching of second languages changed significantly in many parts of the world throughout the latter part of the twentieth century. Currently, the emphasis within New Zealand appears to be on what is commonly referred to as 'communicative language teaching' (New Zealand Ministry of Education (1995a & b; 1998 a & b)). One aspect of communicative language teaching is the teaching of text in context and, therefore, inter-propositional semantic relations and semantic relational encoding are directly relevant to communicative language teaching. In this respect, communicative language teaching differs from earlier approaches to the teaching of language such as those discussed briefly below.

The grammar translation method of teaching that was popular in Europe until the 1940s (and beyond in many parts of the world) emphasized written language and translation (Larsen-Freeman 1986, pp. 9 & 10). Syntactic and stylistic explanations were provided in relation to aspects of the written texts as required. Following the grammar translation method was the direct method, a method that involved using the target language (rather than translation) as much of the time in the classroom as possible (Stern, 1983, p. 458). The direct method merged into the audio-lingual approach, an approach that was popular in the 1960s, one that was generally based on an explicit lexical and grammatical syllabus. It emphasized habit-formation (Celce-Murcia, 1991, p. 485) and involved "an interpretation of language learning in terms of stimulus and response, operant conditioning, and reinforcement, the emphasis being on successful, error-free learning in small well-prepared steps and stages" (Stern, 1983, p. 465). The audio-lingual approach made use of the language laboratory and often involved oral practice based on constructed dialogues (Stern, 1983, p.466), artificial texts that were constructed for the classroom on the basis of their usefulness in demonstrating specific grammatical points or particular vocabulary. In practice, these texts were rarely constructed to genuinely reflect the ways in which competent users of the language construct coherent texts.

Communicative language teaching has become popular in many countries including New Zealand in the last twenty years. It is based on the fact that language learning involves not only learning to use vocabulary and the rules of language systems correctly, but also on understanding how language and context interact in the construction and interpretation of coherent discourse. Central to communicative language teaching is the work of Hymes (1971) who defines 'communicative competence' as what the language user needs to know in order to use his or her language system for communicative purposes. This includes not only the rules of the language, but also how these rules are applied in different contexts of use in order to perform different functions. It therefore includes pragmatic as well as syntactic and semantic understanding⁹. Thus, for example, a sentence such as 'It's hot in here' may function in some contexts simply as an observation. In other contexts (such as, for example, a fireworks factory), it may function as a *warning*. Similarly, the same sentence may function as the *reason* member of a *reason-result* relation (see (11) below) or as the *concession* member of a *concession-contradiction* relation (see (12) below):

(11) Me tango kē au i taku koti. He wera a roto nei.
(I should take off my coat. It is hot in here)

(12) Kei te wera a roto nei. Heoi anō, ka mau tonu au i taku koti.
(It is hot in here. Nevertheless, I will keep my coat on)

On some occasions, these functional values (pragmatic values) may be recovered by hearers/readers by inferencing. On other occasions, they will be signposted. Thus, words such as 'because' and 'nevertheless' in English or 'no te mea' and 'heoi anō' in Maori not only have syntactic effects, they also have implications in relation to the ways in which relationships between clauses and sentences can be interpreted¹⁰. Some of these words are relatively straightforward in terms of this signalling of relational values (inter-propositional semantic relations); others are more complex. Thus, for example, 'no te mea' and 'because'

⁹ Pragmatic meaning is a term used here to refer to those values that are recovered on the basis of the interaction between text and context as indicated in what follows.

¹⁰ In other words, they perform a signalling function.

in (13) below occurs in the context of a *reason-result* (inverted) relationship, the reason being also, of course, a statement. In (14), however, the relationship is one of *statement-justification*, the statement no longer being a reason for the semantic content of the first encoded proposition.

(13) He momona ia no te mea he kaha rawa ia ki te kai.

◀ result → ← reason →

(He is fat because he eats too much)

(14) He momona ia - no te mea kātahi anō taku kiteatu I a ia.

◀ statement → ← justification →

(He's fat - because I just saw him)

The communicative movement led to proposals for new types of syllabuses. One of these was the 'notional syllabus' proposed by that Wilkins (1976). There were three parts to the notional syllabus: notions, functions and modality. Notions are meanings (such as, for example, *time*) that can be expressed lexico-grammatically. Many of them can be divided up in different ways in languages (e.g. *future time*, *past time*, *past in the past* etc.) which are expressed in Maori through verbal markers. Functions are meanings that result from the interaction of language and context (pragmatic meanings). Functions (e.g. *warnings* or *greetings* or *invitations*) can generally be expressed in a wide range of different ways. There are, however, exceptions such as, in most languages, *greetings* which are usually expressed as a fixed formula/formulaic expression. Because notional syllabuses tended to focus only on those functions that can be expressed formulaically (e.g. *greetings*), the notional syllabus has been criticized for paying too little attention to genuine discourse considerations, that is, to considerations that relate to the operation of text in context:

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 of English. In the notional syllabus, language content is defined in functional terms, as notions which are realized by formal items. In both cases, the essential design is an inventory of language units in isolation and abstraction. In the structural syllabus, the inventory is ordered with reference to grading criteria. In the notional syllabus it is not (Widdowson, 1979, p. 247).

In fact, it is not only the functional part of a notional syllabus that has been criticized. Some (e.g. Crombie, 1988, pp. 284 – 287) have argued that the notional part of a notional syllabus is little more than a different way of organizing what is really a structural syllabus¹¹. When criticisms of this type are taken into account, the notional syllabus can be seen not to have taken discourse considerations (including inter-propositional semantic relational meanings) fully into account.

In the context of the communicative movement in language teaching, there have been other proposals relating to syllabus design. One of these is the task-based approach (Prabhu, 1983) which involved constructing syllabuses made up of lists of tasks that were graded in terms of difficulty. The tasks rather than the language used in performing the tasks are the focus of attention in most task-based approaches to syllabus design although this is not always the case (see, for example, Skehan (1998)). There have been those who have claimed that task-based syllabuses involve 'hidden' syllabuses in that certain tasks require certain language. In introducing that language to learners, teachers were, in fact, presenting the 'real' syllabus (the language used to perform the tasks rather than the tasks themselves (Crombie, 1988, 287). The same thing has been said about syllabuses that focused on topics (e.g. *my iwi*) or situations (e.g. *at the marae*) or skills (e.g. *reading for gist*). In each case, it could be argued that the real syllabus is the language needed in order to discuss the topics, cope with the situations and put the skills to work. In each case, the 'hidden' language syllabus tends to be largely lexical and syntactic in nature. None of these approaches to syllabus design necessarily takes discourse considerations fully into account.

¹¹ Thus, it is argued that it makes little difference whether a syllabus lists different structures separately or groups structures in relation to their capacity to encode notions. In either case, what we have is a structural inventory.

Another syllabus proposal, one that is very different from those introduced above, was proposed by Krashen and Terrell (1983). They talked in terms of a 'natural syllabus', claiming that second language learners acquired the target language in a certain order whatever was taught. It was claimed that this order was a 'natural' one and that, therefore, second language learning (even in adulthood) and first language acquisition involved very similar processes. A consequence of this belief was that it was argued that all that was required was that learners should be surrounded by language that they understood (comprehensible input) or that was a little above their current level of competence. Claims such as this were said to be supported by experiments such as one conducted by Dulay and Burt (1974). However, this study, in common with a number of others that were said to support arguments in favour of a natural order of second language acquisition irrespective of teaching, was cross-sectional rather than longitudinal.

Dulay and Burt argued that their study of a group of Chinese-speaking children and a group of Spanish-speaking children gave "strong support for the existence of universal child language-learning strategies" (Dulay and Burt, 1974, p.37) and provided "a strong indication that universal cognitive mechanisms are the basis for the child's organisation of a target language" so that "it is the L2 system, rather than the L1 system that guides that acquisition process" (p. 53). This is a very strong claim to make in relation to an experiment that did not examine children's language development over time but focused on aspects of the language of two groups of children at one point in time. In addition, because Dulay and Burt combined all of the results together, it is impossible for readers of their work to determine precisely what language each different child was using. Consequently, Pienemann (1985, p. 47) has observed that the argument in favour of a natural order of second language acquisition "is not supported by any direct empirical evidence". Additionally, it is expressed so generally that "it cannot be operationalized or tested since the stages of acquisition to which it is related are left undefined in Krashen's work".

From the point of view of this thesis, the most important thing about all of these different syllabus design proposals is that they take relatively little account of discourse construction

and comprehension (including semantic relations). One applied linguist who does attempt to do this is Feez (1988) whose text-based approach to syllabus design is intended for adults studying English in Australia. Feez notes that "the objectives for a course based on a text-based syllabus [of the type she proposes] are always related to the use of whole texts in context" (p. 23). There are problems here. Although it makes sense to base language learning on whole texts some of the time, it is doubtful whether it does so all of the time. A unit of work from Feez (1988) is printed below:

Goal:

To enable learners to participate in a casual conversation in a workplace.

Objectives:

The learners will:

understand the purpose of casual conversation in Australian workplace culture

know which conversation topics are appropriate in Australian workplaces

recognise and use the key elements of a casual conversation i.e. greetings and closures, feedback, topic shifts

recognise and use conversation chunks such as comments, descriptions or recounts

take turns appropriately within simple exchanges i.e. question/ answer, statement/ agreement, statement/ disagreement

use language appropriate to casual conversation including politeness strategies, informal language, idiom

build pronunciation and paralinguistic skills and strategies, specifically in the areas of intonation and gesture (Feez 1998, 23).

Although this unit of work appears, at first sight, to be relatively straightforward, this is not the case. A syllabus component such as "use language appropriate to casual conversation including politeness strategies, informal language, idiom" is, in fact, very complex. The danger here is that the learners will simply memorise chunks of language. These language chunks might be useful in the workplace. Even so, in spite of the fact that memory does play an important part in language use (Skehan, 1998), learners also need to learn how to

construct new language in different contexts. Therefore, the type of syllabus proposed by Feez may be useful where the aim is simply to help learners cope in a very limited way with some of the language used in their workplace. It is unlikely to do much beyond that. In particular, it is unlikely to help learners to come to terms with the complex factors involved in the construction and comprehension of coherent discourses that they have not encountered before. In this respect, the syllabus design proposals outlined by Feez do not represent a significant advance on audio-lingual approaches. They do not seem to accommodate fully the principles of cognitive code learning (learning by understanding rather than simply imitating) that underpinned the beginning of the communicative movement in language teaching (Richards & Rogers, 1992, p. 59), and that eventually led to a recognition that “the learner must . . . be given opportunities to develop strategies for interpreting language in actual use” (Littlewood, 1981, p. 3) and “strategies for recognizing the communicative function of utterances in context” (Melrose, 1991, p. 19). These strategies must inevitably include strategies for constructing and interpreting coherent discourses of various types (one of which involves the understanding of semantic relations between propositions).

Students who want to reach a high level of competence in Maori, especially if they want to teach Maori or to teach subjects through the medium of Maori, need a great deal more than day to day spoken Maori. This is true even if they are native speakers of the language. Even native speakers need to learn how to use the spoken language effectively in different situations (such as, for example, formal presentations). They also need to learn how to create and interpret culturally authentic written texts of different kinds (e.g. formal letters and reports). For example, writing effective academic essays is not a skill that language users will necessarily have by virtue of the fact that they are native speakers of a language. The fact that each sentence in a text is well structured does not necessarily mean that the text will itself be well structured. A well structured text is one that is well organized and coherent and one that makes effective use of appropriate cohesive devices (Halliday and Hasan (1976)). Since the appropriate use of cohesive devices (e.g. lexical repetition, subordination) depends to a considerable extent on inter-propositional semantic relations,

an understanding of these relations is likely to help learners to deal more competently with text construction and comprehension.

1.6 Cohesive devices

Cohesive devices occur in spoken and written language and can take many different forms. Words such as 'because' in English and 'no te mea' in Maori are cohesive devices: they function to hold the pieces of a text together so that the text makes sense in terms of the relationships between text segments. In certain contexts, lexical repetition operates as a cohesive device as do ellipsis and substitution. All of these cohesive devices may occur in the context of the encoding of inter-propositional semantic relations and operate as signals of the presence of these relations. However, inter-propositional semantic relations are not always signalled explicitly by cohesive devices. Learners could benefit, therefore, from understanding the importance of being able to make inferences about the presence of these relationships. They could make these inferences on the basis of content and context as well as learning to make use (and respond to) the wide range of cohesive devices that operate as signals of the presence of these relationships.

The first example below (example 15) is coherent in that it makes sense to readers on the understanding that a certain type of relationship holds between the two sentences. The relationship (*result-reason*) is inferred on the basis of the linguistic content. The example does not, however, contain any cohesive devices that contribute to inter-propositional relational meaning.

(15) I hoki moata a Hone ki te kainga. I te mate ia i te rewharewha.

(John went home early. He was ill with a cold.)

In example (16), the relationship between the two clauses is explicit: the example contains a cohesive device (the subordinator 'no te mea') which signals the nature of the relationship between the content of the two clauses.

(16) I hoki a Hone ki te kainga no te mea i te mate ia i te rewharewha.

(John left for home because he was ill with a cold)

In both (15) and (16), readers are likely to interpret the relationship between the two parts as one of *reason-result*. There are, however, many different types of relationship. These relationships are semantic or semantico-pragmatic in nature¹². That is, they are relationships which rely on encoded meaning (semantic) or on meanings derived from a combination of encoded meaning and context (pragmatic). However, because many of them are commonly encoded in particular clause types (e.g. subordinate clause of reason), it is not always recognized that these clause types represent only one of a variety of ways in which these relational meanings may be signalled. In other words, a subordinator introducing a subordinate clause of reason is simply one of the many cohesive devices that may signal the presence of a relationship involving reason. Unless this is drawn to their attention, learners of a language are unlikely to appreciate the importance of the fact that the same relationship may be expressed in a wide range of different ways. If they are not exposed to these, they may fail to appreciate the linguistic and stylistic variety available to them and may also fail to appreciate the fact that very different structures may perform very similar relational functions. Thus, in the case of each of the following examples (examples 17 - 25), a *reason-result* relationship is present in spite of the fact that it is, in each case, signalled in different ways (as indicated by the bold type).

(17) **I te mea** i rongo rātou kua mate a Hone, ka tangi rātou.

(**Because** they had heard that John had died, they wept)

(18) I rongo rātou kua mate a Hone, **nā**, ka tangi hoki rātou.

(They had heard that John had died **so** they wept)

(19) **Na te mea** kāore ana moni, kāore i taea e ia te hoko mai te pukapuka rā.

(**As** he didn't have any money, he couldn't buy that book)

¹² That is, they can be encoded as part of the meaning of the text or inferred by readers/listeners on the basis of the interaction between text and context.

- (20) Kāore i tāea e ia te hoko mai taua pukapuka. Ko te **take**, kāore ana moni.
(He couldn't buy that book. The **reason** was that he didn't have any money)
- (21) Na te noho ko ia te rangatira, i huri ai ia ki te pōhiri i ngā manuhiri.
(**Being the chief**, he was obliged to welcome the guests)
- (22) I te rekareka ki tō rātou whakautu, ka mihia rātou e ia.
(**Relieved** at their reply, he complimented them)
- (23) I whakamihia mai ia mō te whakarongoā i te raruraru.
(He was praised **for solving** the problem)
- (24) Na te tirohanga ki te wāhi o te aitua i āta taraiwa ai ia.
(Looking at the scene of the accident **made** him drive more carefully)
- (25) Na te tino hē o tana taraiwa i aitua ai ngā motokā i te rori matua.
(His bad driving **caused** a pile up on the motorway)

These are just some of the ways that *reason-result* can be signalled in English and Maori. There are known to be many other ways of signalling this relationship in English (see, for example, Crombie 1985b, pp. 78 - 80). There are likely to be just as many possibilities in Maori (see *Chapter 4*).

If we examine any of the other inter-propositional semantic relations in terms of their encoding possibilities, we will also find that there is considerable variety as indicated in examples (26) - (32) below in which the relationship is that of *chronological sequence*.

- (26) I horoi ia i ngā pereti. **No muri**, i horoi ia i te te motoka.
(She washed the plates. **Afterwards**, she cleaned the car)

- (27) **I mua** i tana horoitanga i ngā pereti, i horoi ia i te motoka.
(**Before** she washed the plates, she cleaned the car)
- (28) I horoi ia i ngā pereti **a katahi** ia ka horoi i te motoka.
(He washed the plates **and then** s/he cleaned the car)
- (29) Ī oti katoa i a Hone āna mahi kāinga. **I te mutunga**, ka haere ia ki te moe.
(John did all his homework. **Finally**, he went to bed.)
- (30) **Nā**, kua mutu nei te mahi, e ahei ana koe ki te haere ki te taone.
(**Now that** the job is finished, you can go to town)
- (31) Katahi ano ia ka wehe atu **ka** tangi te waea.
(He had just left **when** the phone rang)
- (32) **I mua** i tana wehenga, ka whakapoko ia i ngā raiti.
(**Before** he left, he turned the lights off)

In the case of some inter-propositional semantic relationships, encoding is more likely to be marked by lexical than by grammatical means. Thus, for example, the combination of antonyms and complementaries in (33) below, even in the absence of a contrastive coordinator such as *but*, signals the presence of a contrastive relationship (in this case *simple contrast*).

- (33) I te koa te kōtiro. I te pouri te tama.
(The girl was happy. The boy was sad)

If learners of Maori are to be introduced to a range of different lexical and structural possibilities for encoding inter-propositional semantic relationships, it is necessary first to determine (a) what the relationships themselves are in terms of, for example, the work of Beekman and Callow (1974) and Winter (1977; 1982) (see *Chapter 2*), and (b) what the

range of encoding possibilities for each of these relationships is in Maori (see *Chapter 4*). This involves creating and examining a range of Maori corpora. In *Chapter 4*, one such written corpus is examined from this perspective and the results are recorded.

CHAPTER 2

COHESION: THE KEY TO THE ENCODING AND SIGNALLING OF INTER-PROPOSITIONAL SEMANTIC RELATIONS

2.1 Introduction

Although the relationships between propositions 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. 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 'otira' 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. For this reason, the focus of this chapter is cohesion. In *Chapter 3*, the inter-action between cohesion and the encoding and signalling of inter-propositional semantic relations in Maori is examined in greater detail.

2.2 Terminology

A number of the terms used here are defined below.

An *utterance* is any stretch of language by a single speaker or a single writer in a particular context. Therefore, a sentence such as "Haere mai ki konei ki te titiro ki tēnei ngārara, engari kia tūpato kei ngaua koe" ("Come here and look at this insect but be

careful lest it bites you") will be treated as a single utterance unless the same speaker has said other things at this point in the dialogue.

There are two aspects to *context*. First, there is *situational context* which includes aspects of the context of situation such as, for example, where something was said, (e.g. on a marae), who said it (e.g. a child) and to whom it was said to (e.g. older person). The other aspect of context is *co-text* which is the surrounding text. Therefore, the co-text of "Haere mai ki konei ki te titiro ki tēnei ngārara, engari kia tūpato kei ngaua koe" might be "He aha tērā?" ("What is that?").

Every utterance has both situational context and co-text. Utterances considered in isolation from their context may appear to be incoherent even if they are syntactically correct. This is because recovery of the full meaning of a discourse depends not only upon the utterances that occur, but also upon the context in which these utterances occur. So, for example, although the two sentences below may not necessarily appear to be related in the absence of context, a knowledge of who the speakers are (parent and child) and what the circumstances are (homework is generally done at seven o'clock) may lead hearers to interpret the relationship between the two sentences as that of *reason-result*.

(1) Kua iwa karaka. E tika ana kia kati te pouaka whakaata.

(It's nine o'clock. The television should be off)

Languages have many *cohesive devices* such as 'no te mea' (see *Chapter 1*) 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. 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 (part of co-text) play an important role in languages: they effectively reduce dependence on situational context.

The term 'text' is used here to refer only to what is said or written. The term 'discourse' is used to refer to texts considered in relation to context. Making sense of texts as coherent discourses depends, in part, on an ability to interpret the cohesive devices that occur. In the absence of cohesive devices that aid interpretation by signalling the types of relationship that exist among utterances, hearers/readers will rely more heavily on situational context.

Just as the difference between *text* and *discourse* is important, so too is the difference between *coherence* and *cohesion*. 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 (2) is coherent: it makes sense. There are, however, no cohesive devices present. Example (3) 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.

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

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

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

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

In this thesis, I will be examining (a) one aspect of coherence, that is the types of relationship that may occur between propositions, and (b) one aspect of cohesion, that is, how these relationships can be encoded and signalled in Maori.

The relationships which are examined in this thesis are *inter-propositional*, that is, they relate propositions (encoded as clauses, sentences, groups of sentences, or nominalizations within clauses) to one another. There are also *intra-propositional* relations (semantic relations *within* propositions) which are referred to as case roles (see, for example, Fillmore, 1968). These are relations between *semantic predicators* and their *argument* or *arguments* (see *Chapter 1*). In "I kai te tama" ("The boy ate"), there is an *intra-propositional* relationship between "te tama" (agent) and "i kai" (action). In "I hinga te rākau" ("The tree fell"), there is an *intra-propositional* relationship between 'te rākau' (object) and 'hinga' (event).

Intra-propositional relations (relations *between* propositions) have been labelled in a variety of different ways. Winter (1977), for example, refers to them as 'clause relations' (because they often link one clause to another). Crombie refers to them as 'semantic relations' in early work (Crombie, 1985a & b) and 'inter-propositional relations' or 'semantico-pragmatic' relations in later work (Crombie, 1987). The change in terminology is a reflection of the fact that the relations are often inferred from a combination of content and context, rather than being linguistically encoded. It is also a reflection of the fact that these relations may operate at different linguistic levels. In example (4) because "matenga" (death) is a nominalization, we find an *inter-propositional* semantic relationship *within* a single clause.

(4) Na tana matenga i whakakorea ai te hui.

(His death led to the meeting being abandoned)

In (4) above, there is a relationship of cause and effect. The death is the *cause* of the meeting being abandoned; the meeting being abandoned is the *effect* of the death. It does

not matter that there is only one clause. What matters is that there are two occurrences (the death and the abandoning the meeting), one of which is the cause of the other.

Relations are *binary* by definition; they have two parts. Sometimes this is evident from the fact that the labels applied to them (e.g. *reason-result*; *condition-consequence*) also have two parts. Sometimes, however, the labels applied to relations (e.g. *temporal overlap*; *bonding*) have only one part. So, the condition-consequence relation is a relation between a *condition* (for example, *ki te marangai* (if it rains)) and a consequence (for example, *ka māku koe* (you'll get wet)) The *chronological sequence* relation is a relationship between one event (for example, *I horoi a Hori i ngā kōhua* (Hēmi washed the pots)) and another event (for example, *kātahi ka horoi ia i te motoka* (Then he cleaned the car)). Similarly, however, the *simple contrast* relation involves contrasting two people or events (for example, *I mahi kaha a Hori, engari i mātakitaki pouaka whakaata noa iho a Timoti* (Hemi worked hard but Timoti just watched television)). From a pedagogic perspective, it may be better to create two-part labels for all relations in order that their binary nature should be immediately evident. This will be discussed more fully in *Chapter 5*.

Throughout the remainder of this thesis, the following abbreviations are used:

ADJ = Adjective; AFF = Affirmative; AGT = Agent Marker; ANA = Anaphoric particle; CAUS-V = Causative Verb; CONJ = Conjunction; CONT = Continuative; DEM = Demonstrative; DET = Determiner; DET-PL = Determiner – Plural; DIR = Directional; DN = Derived Noun; DISJ = DISJUNCT; FM = Focus marker; HAB = Habitual; INC = Inceptive; INT = Intensifier; INT-PASS = Intensifier Passive; IRRE = Irrealis; LOC = location; Mod = Modal; N = Noun; NEG = Negative; NPAST = Non-past; OBJ = Object Marker; PA = Personal article; PASS = Passive; PAST = Past tense; PRF = Perfective aspect; PERS = Personal article; POSS = Possessive; PP = Post-posed periphery; PR = Preposition; PRES = Present; PRO = Pronoun; PROG = Progressive Marker; PR-PRO = Preposition – Pronoun; REAL = Realis; TAM = Tense/aspect marker; TOP = Topic; V = Verb; VM = Verb Marker; V-PASS = Verb passive; Ø = ellipsis

2.3 Inter-propositional semantic relations in the context of literature on coherence and cohesion

Whether or not a text is perceived to be coherent (to make sense as a piece of discourse) depends on a range of factors: the relationships that exist between its encoded propositions (the topic of this thesis) is only one of these factors. Reference has already been made to another of these, that is, the relationships that exist within propositions (intra-propositional relations). Another type of relationship is the relationship between interactive acts. The first speaker in the first example below is telling someone to do something. In the second example below, the first speaker is asking someone for something. The first of these speech acts is a 'directive', the second is an 'elicitation' (see, for example, Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975). In the first example, the relationship between what the two speakers say is *directive-respond*. In the second example, the relationship is *elicitation-respond*. These relationships are concerned essentially with conversational functions:

(5) A: Mahia mai tēnei.

Do this one.

E: [Ka mahi]

[Does it]

(6) A: He aha tēna.

What's that?

E: He kiore.

A rat.

We have seen that the aspect of coherence that is central to this thesis (inter-propositional semantic relations) is only one of many factors relating to coherence. The same is true in the case of cohesion. Although cohesion plays an important role in the encoding and signalling of inter-propositional semantic relations, this is not the only role that cohesion can play in texts: "mere cohesion . . . does not suffice to make a text coherent" (Carrell,

1982, p. 481). So, for example, the anaphoric pronoun 'ia' in (7) below is cohesive in that it creates a referential link. It does not, however, play a role in this case in signalling the presence of a particular relationship between the propositions expressed.

(7) I whiua e Hēmi tana pēke ki raro. Ka tikina atu e ia he pukapuka, ā ka titiro ia ki nga pikitia.

(Hēmi tossed down his bag. He picked up a book and looked at the pictures)

It is important to remember that only one type of semantic relation is the focus here. Any complete account of semantic relations would need to accommodate intra-propositional relations and relationships between interactive acts. All of these are binary. Any complete account of textual coherence would need also to include a discussion of unitary values (that is, functional meanings or speech acts such as *threat*, *warning*, *insult* that do not involve two parts) (see, for example Austin, 1962 and Searle, 1969).

All of the aspects of coherence and cohesion discussed above are included in recent research by the Council of Europe, research that aims to present a *framework* for consideration by all of those involved in the teaching of languages (Council of Europe, 1996). Many of them are also discussed in works on discourse analysis, works that have had an important influence on the teaching and learning of many languages (see, for example, Halliday and Hasan (1976); Coulthard (1977); Brown and Yule (1983); Stubbs (1983); Cazden (1988). Their influence can also be found in works designed specifically for language teachers (see, for example, Garbutt and O'Sullivan (1991); Gonthier and Geoghegan (1998)).

2.4 Linguistic universals and language specifics: semantic relations versus semantic relational encoding and signalling

The focus here on semantic relations balances cognitive universals (semantic relational meanings) and language specifics (the encoding and signalling of these universal

meanings in specific languages). In this case, the primary concern is that way in which relations are encoded and signalled in Maori and the extent to which an understanding of this can contribute to the teaching and learning of the language.

2.5 Coherence and cohesion

In *Cohesion in English* (Halliday & Hasan, 1976), Halliday and Hasan make no real distinction between cohesion and coherence. The effect of this is that they focus on cohesive ties in English without making the link between these ties and the relational meanings that can be expressed in these ties. In a later work, *Language, Context, and Text* (1985), they do begin to make this important distinction, a distinction that is essential to an understanding of the link between cohesion and coherence. At no point, however, is the distinction as clearly articulated as it is in Coulthard (1977, p. 10):

Sentences combine to form texts and the relations between sentences are aspects of grammatical cohesion. Utterances combine to form discourse and the relations between them are aspects of coherence.

As Lyons (1981, pp. 198-199) maintains:

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.

An understanding of coherence and cohesion can play a role in language teaching. However, there are many language teaching contexts in which neither are 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. . . .

Where there has been knowledge of cohesion in language teaching, there has sometimes been an implicit assumption that cohesive links must operate between sentences in the same way in the first and second language, in other words, through straightforward translation equivalents. Even now, when extensive research has been done on cohesion, there is still a reluctance to give it greater prominence in language pedagogy. Cohesion, between sentences is too easily seen as an aspect of language use to be developed after the ability to handle grammar and words with sentences.

Because cohesion is so central to the encoding and signalling of inter-propositional semantic relations, a discussion of cohesive devices in English and Maori is provided below.

2.6 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 that have been examined with reference to English: substitution, ellipsis and conjunction. An outline of these is provided below, together with an initial examination of all three in Maori.

2.6.1 Substitution

In English, there are different types of substitution: nominal, verbal and clausal. It is possible to have other types of substitution also (such as substitution of a verb plus an object, or of a prepositional phrase or a verb plus an adverbial). Examples of substitution in English and Maori are provided below.

2.6.1.1 Nominal substitution in English and Maori

(8) I like **the car**. It's a really nice **one**.

(8i) He pai ki a au te motoka. He mea pai rawa atu.
 DET ADJ PR PA PRO DET N DET N ADJ INT DIR
 A good to PERS me the car A thing good very

(9) I like **that pen**. It's a very good **one**.

(9i) He pai ki ahau tera pene. He mea tino pai rawa atu.
 DET ADJ PR PRO DET N DET N INT ADJ INT DIR
 A good to me that pen A thing very good

2.6.1.2 Verbal substitution

(10) A: I **fainted**.

B: I **did** too / So **did** I.

(10i) A: I **amai** au
 VM V PRO
 Past faint I

B: I **pērā** ano hoki au
 VM V PP PP PRO
 Past likewise also as well I / and I also as well

The Maori example above involves substitution. However, it is equally common in Maori to use ellipsis as in 'me (PR) au (PRO) ano (PP) hoki (PP)' ('and me also').

2.6.1.3 Clausal substitution in English and Maori

- (11) A: He said **that he was ill**.
 B: I said **so too**.

- (11i) A: I kī ia i te mate ia
 TAM V PRO PR DET V PRO
 PAST said he was the ill he
- Bi: I korero pērā atu ano hoki au
 TAM V V DIR PP PP PRO
 Past said likewise thither also as well I

2.6.1.4 Verb plus object/manner substitution in English and Maori

- (12) He **wrote a letter** and I **did too**

- (12i) I tuhi-a e ia he reta, a, i pērā
 TAM V-PASS PR PRO DET N CONJ TAM V
 Past write AGT he a letter and past likewise
- ano hoki au
 PP PP PRO
 also as well I

- (12ii) I tuhi reta ia, a, ka pērā ano hoki au
 TAM V N PRO CONJ VM V PP PP PRO
 Past write letter he and INC likewise also as well I

- (13) He **laughed happily** and I **did too**.

- (13i) I kata harikoa ia a, ka pērā ano hoki au.
 TAM V ADJ PRO CONJ VM V PP PP PRO
 Past laugh happy he and INC likewise also as well I

2.6.2 Ellipsis (Ø) in English and ellipsis or substitution in Maori

There are three main types of ellipsis in English, nominal, lexical verb and clausal. As the examples below show, both substitution and ellipsis occur in Maori.

2.1.2.1 Nominal ellipsis in English/ ellipsis and/or substitution in Maori

(14) A: Which **car** do you like?

B:: This Ø is the best.

(14i) A: Ko tēhea te **motoka** pai ki a koe
FM DET DET N ADJ PR PA PRO
TOP which the motorcar good to PERS you

Bi: Ko tēnei Ø
FM DET
TOP This (ellipsis)

Bii: Ko tenei te **mea** tino pai rawa atu.
FM DET DET N PP ADJ INT DIR
TOP this the thing very good (substitution)

2.6.2.2 Lexical verb ellipsis in English/ ellipsis of subject in Maori

(15) A: Has he **eaten**?

B: Yes he has Ø

(15i) A: **Kua kai** ia?
VM V PRO
PRF eat he

Bi: Ae Ø
AFF
Yes

In the example above, the Maori response has ellipsis of the entire clause.

Bii Ae. Kua kai kē
 AFF VM V INT
 Yes PRF eat already

In the Maori response above, the pronoun is subject to ellipsis.

2.6.2.3 Clausal ellipsis in English and Maori

(16) A: Does John read the newspaper?
 B: Yes Ø

(16i) A: Pānui ano ai a Hone i te niupepa?
 V PP PP PA N PR DET N
 Read also HAB PERS John OBJ the newspaper

B: Ae Ø
 AFF
 Yes

Cases where English typically uses substitution and Maori uses ellipsis are indicated below:

(17) A: John goes to University, does he?
 B: Yes (he does).

(17i) A: Haere ai a Hone ki te Whare Wananga ne ra?
 V PP PA N PR DET N N TAG
 Go HAB PERS John to the University TAG

Bi: Ae! Ø
 AFF
 Yes

Bii: Ae! Haere ai Ø
 AFF V PP
 Yes! Go HAB

In the example above, the Maori response omits the subject (Hone) and the prepositional phrase (ki te Whare Wananga).

Biii: Ae! Haere ai ia
 AFF V PP PRO
 Yes! Go HAB he

In the example above, the pronoun is included in the response but the prepositional phrase (ki te Whare Wananga) is omitted. Young learners of Maori sometimes use the verbal marker in isolation from the verb (e.g. 'Ae! Kua'). This particular construction represents an interlingual error which violates the rule that a verb marker cannot occur without an accompanying verb.

(18) A: Has he **eaten the food**?

B: Yes he has Ø

(18i) A: **Kua kainga e ia nga kai?**
 VM V -PASS PR PRO DET N
 PRF eat by him the food

Bi: Ae! Ø
 AFF
 Yes.

Bii: Ae! Kua kainga Ø
 AFF VM V -PASS
 Yes PRF eat

(19) A: Has he **finished his work**?

B: Yes, he has Ø.

(19i) A: **Kua mutu i a ia ana mahi?**
 VM V PR PA PRO POSS N
 PRF finish PERS he his work

Bi: Ae! Ø
 AFF
 Yes

Bii: Ae! Kua mutu Ø
 Aff VM V
 Yes PRF finish

2.6.3 Conjunctions in English and Maori

Another common type of cohesion is conjunction. English uses coordinating conjunctions (for example, *and*, *but*, *or*), subordinating conjunctions (for example, *although*, *if*, *because*), sentence conjuncts (for example, *furthermore*, *nevertheless*, *anyway*), and continuatives (for example, *now*, *of course*, *well*) as cohesive devices. Examples of each type are provided in English and Maori below.

2.1.3.1 Subordinating conjunctions in English and Maori

(20) I like him **although** he is mean.

(20i) Kaingakau ana au ki a ia **ahakoa** he toukiki ia
V VM PRO PR PA PRO CONJ DET ADJ PRO
Fond CONT I to PERS him although a mean he

(21) **Ahakoa** pirangi tonu au ki a ia he hākere
CONJ VB PP PRO PR PA PRO DET ADJ
Although like still I to PERS him a mean

(22) I like it **because** it's clean.

(22i) He pai ki ahau **nātemea** he ma
DET ADJ PR PRO CONJ DET ADJ
A good to I because a clean

2.6.3.2 Coordinating conjunctions in English and Maori

(23) I like the cat **but** the dog's horrible

(23i) He pai ki ahau te poti **engari** he weriweri
DET ADJ PR PRO DET N CONJ DET ADJ
A good to me the cat but a horrible

rawa atu te kuri
PP PP DET N
very the dog

(24) He came into the room and the cat meowed

(24i) I hou mai ia ki roto i te ruma a, ka tangi atu
VM V DIR PRO PR LOC PR DET N CONJ VM V DIR
PAST enter hither he at inside of the room and INC cry thither

te poti
DET N
the cat

(25) I don't want to leave but I have no choice.

(25i) Kāre au i te pirangi haere engari kāre hoki e tae-a
NEG PRO VM V V CONJ NEG PP VM V-PASS
Do not I want go but cannot of course can (avoid)

(25ii) Kāre au i te hiahia haere engari me aha kē atu hoki.
NEG PRO VM V V CONJ VM V PP DIR PP
Do not I want go but modal what else as well

(26) You can read a book or read a letter

(26i) Ka taea e koe te korero pukapuka, te tuhi reta ranei?
VM VPASS PR PRO DET V N DET V N CONJ
INC can by you the read book the write letter or

2.6.3.3 Sentence conjuncts in English and conjunctions in Maori

(27) I like it. Furthermore, it's healthy

(27i) He pai ki ahau. Rokohanga he ora
DET ADJ PR PRO CONJ DET AD
A good to me furthermore a well

(27ii) He pai ki au. Me te aha, he oranga kei roto.
DET ADJ PR PRO CONJ DET DN PR LOC
A good to me furthermore a healthy inside

(28) He washed the dishes, cleaned the car, scrubbed the floor, did the ironing. **After all**, he can't be that bad.

(28i) I horoia e ia nga rīhi, te motoka, te papa,
 TAM VPASS PR PRO DET PL N DET N DET N
 Past wash by he the dish the car the floor

 nga haenatanga. **Kāti ra**, ehara i te pērā rawa tona hē
 DET PL DN DISJ NEG - VM V PP POSS N
 the ironing after all not as like quite his bad-person

2.6.4 Sequence signals in English and Maori

(29) I'll teach the class **till** you finish your work.

(29i) Mā-ku e ako te karachi **kia** oti rānō o mahi.
 PR-PRO VM V DET N VM V INT POSS N
 I teach the class till finish your work

(30) I'll mind Hemi **until** you've finished washing the pots.

(30i) Mā-ku e tiaki a Hemi **kia** oti rānō i a koe
 PR-PRO VM V PA N VM V INT PR PA PRO
 I mind PERS Hemi until finish by PERS you

 te horoi nga kōhua
 DET VB DET(PL) N
 the wash the pot

(31) **After** he had eaten the cake, he ate the fish.

(31i) I **muri** i tana kaitanga i te keke, ka kai ia i te ika
 PR LOC PR POSS DN PR DET N VM V PRO PR DET N
 After his eat OBJ the cake, INC eat he OBJ the fish

(32) **Once** he leaves, I'll do the pots.

(32i) Wehe atu **ana** ia, ka mahi-a e au nga kōhua.
 V DIR VM PRO VM V-PASS PR PRO DET PL N
 Depart thither CONT he INC be done by I the pot

(33) Leave the room **directly/ as soon as** he asks you to.

(33i) Puta atu i te ruma i runga tonu i tāna i tono ai
 V DIR PR DET N PR LOC PP PR POSS TAM V PP
 leave thither the room immediately at his PAST say

(33ii) Wehe atu koe i te rūma ina tono ia i
 V DIR PRO PR DET N CONJ V PRO OBJ
 Leave you the room as soon as send he

a koe kia haere
 PA PRO VM V
 PERS you go

(34) The plane landed **whereupon** John fainted.

(34i) Ka tau te wakarererangi. I taua wā tonu amaia ana a Hone
 VM V DET N PR DET N PP V-PASS VM PA N
 INC land the plane thereupon faint CONT PERS John

(35) **Before** you leave, pass me the newspaper.

(35i) I mua i to haerenga, homai te niupepa ki a au.
 PR LOC PR POSS DN V DET PR PA PRO
 Before your going pass the newspaper to PERS me

(36) **Since** he left, I've been so sad.

(36i) Mai anō i tona wehenga atu, e tino hinapouri nei au.
 DIR PP PR POSS DN DIR VM INT V PP PRO
 Since his departure very sad here I

2.6.5 Temporal overlap signalling in English and Maori

(37) I'll cut the grass **while** the sun is shining

(37i) Mā-ku e tapahi te pātītī kei whiti ana te rā
 PR-PRO VM V DET N CONJ VB VM DET N
 I cut the grass while shine CONT the sun

2.6.6 Reason-result signalling English and Maori

(38) As the water is cold, I won't have a swim.

(38i) I te mea kei te makariri te wai, kua kore au e kaukau.
 CNJ VM V DET N VM NEG PRO VM V
 Because cold the water PRF won't I swim

(39) Because it's late, I won't do his work.

(39i) Na te mea he tōmuri, e kore au e mahi i āna mahi.
 CNJ DET ADJ VM NEG PRO VM V PR POSS N
 Because a late won't I do OBJ his work

(40) It's very interesting in that it's so complex.

(40i) He mea tino whakamere na te mea he tino pōwhiwhi
 DET N INT ADJ CONJ PRED INT ADJ
 A thing very admirable because a very complex

(41) Now that he's passed the exam, he can go on to college.

(41i) Ina kua puta ia i te whakamātau, kua āhei ia ki te haere
 CNJ VM V PRO PR DET N VM V PRO PR DET V
 Now PRF pass he the exam PRF able he to go

ki te kareti
 PR DET N
 to the college

2.6.7 Signalling of exception in English and Maori

(42) I would have done it **except that** he told me not to.

(42i) Kua mahi-a kē-tia e au heoi ano nā-na au
 VM V-PASS INT-PASS PP PRO CNJ PR-PRO PRO
 PRF do instead by I except he I

i whakahau kia kua
 TAM CAUS-V VM NEG
 PAST direct not

(43) I would have done it **save that** he told me not to.
 (43i) Kua oti kē i a au **engari ia** nāna
 VM V INT PR PA PRO CNJ PR-PRO
 complete by PERS me but he

i kī mai kia kauaka
 TAM V DIR VM NEG
 PAST say hither not

2.6.8 Concessive signalling in English and Maori

(44) **For all that** I care, you can leave.
 (44i) **Hei aha hoki** mā-ku. Haere atu koe
 CONJ PR-PRO V DIR PRO
 So what me go hither you

(45) **Although** it's cold, I haven't brought a coat.
 (45i) **Ahakoā** te mātao, kāre tonu au i mau koti mai.
 CNJ DET ADJ NEG INT PRO TAM V N DIR
 Although the cold not still I PAST bring coat hither

(46) **Given that** the weather is so hot, he did surprisingly well.
 (46i) **Ahakoā** te tino wera o te rangi, i tino kātuarehe ia
 CONJ DET INT N PR DET N TAM INT ADJ PRO
 Although the very hot of the sky PAST very well he

2.6.9 Conditional signalling in English and Maori

(47) I'd have done it **if** there had been time.
 (47i) Kua mahi-a e au **me mea** i whai wā.
 VM V-PASS PR PRO CNJ TAM V N
 PRF did by I if PAST possessed time

(48) **Assuming that** you leave on time, you should catch the plane.

(48i) **Ki te** wehe atu koe i te wa e tika ana, ka mau atu i a
CNJ V DIR PRO PR DET N VM ADJ VM VM V DIR PR PA
Assuming leave you at the time right CONT INC catch by PERS

koe te wakarererangi
PRO DET N
You the aeroplane

(49) **So long as** he's polite to you, you must be polite to him.

(49i) **Me mea** ka huatau ana ia ki a koe, me huatau anō koe
CNJ VM ADJ VM PRO PR PA PRO VM ADJ INT PRO
If INC polite he to PERS you polite also you

ki a ia
PR PA PRO
to PERS him

(50) I'd leave **sooner than** offend him.

(50i) Ka pai kē ake ki a au i te wehe moata i te whakariri
VM ADJ PP DIR PR PA PRO VM V ADJ CONJ CAUS-V
INC good instead to PERS me leave early than angering

i a ia
PR PA PRO
PERS him

(51) I'd leave **rather than** offend him.

(51i) Ka wehe kē atu au i te whakaārita i a ia
VM V INT DIR PRO PR DET CAUS-V PR PA PRO
INC leave instead I rather than offend PERS him

(52) **Provided (that)** you get in early, you can go.

(52i) **Ina** ka tae moata mai koe ka āhei koe ki te haere
CNJ VM V ADJ DIR PRO VM V PRO VM V
If and when INC arrive early hither you INC able you to go

(53) **Unless** you leave early, you won't get to Poneke on time.

(53i) Me e kore koe e wehe moata atu, e kore koe
CNJ VM NEG PRO VM V ADJ DIR VM NEG PRO
If not you leave early away NON-PAST won't you

e tae ki Poneke i te wa e tika ana.
VM V PR N PR DET N VM V VM
not PAST get to Poneke at the time NON-PAST correct CONT

(54) He goes to the bank **whenever** he runs out of money.

(54i) Haere ai ia ki te whare moni **ina** pau ana ana moni.
V PP PRO PR DET N VM V VM POSS N
Go HAB he to the bank when spend ever his money

(55) I'll find that cat **wherever** it is hiding.

(55i) Ka kitea e au te poti ra **ahakoa** kei hea
VM V-PASS PR PRO DET N PP CNJ PR LOC
INC find by I the cat there no matter where

e huna ana
VM V VM
hide CONT

2.6.10 Contrastive signalling in English and Maori

(56) I work very hard **whereas** Hone plays all day long.

(56i) He tino pukumahi au ki te mahi **kāti** a Hone
DET INT ADJ PRO PR DET V CNJ PA N
A very hard working I to the work whereas PERS Hone

hianga ai ia te katoa o te ra
V INT PRO DET ADJ PR DET N
plays always he the whole of the day

(57) He laughed **as if** I'd cracked a joke.

(57i) Ka kata mai ia **ano nei** i te kōrero whakangahau atu au
VM V DIR PRO CNJ VM V N DIR PRO
INC Laugh he as if was speak joke thither I

2.6.11 Hypothetical conditional signalling in English and Maori

(58) Turn off the fire **in case** the cat gets scorched.

(58i) Tinei-a te ahi kei hunuhunua te poti
V-PASS DET N VM V-PAS DET N
Extinguish the fire CNJ scorch the cat.

(59) He looked at me **as though** I'd committed a crime.

(59i) Tiro mai ia ki a au ano nei kua hara au
V DIR PRO PR PA PRO CNJ VM V PRO
Look hither he at PERS me as if PRF sin I

In *Chapters 3* and *4*, the examples provided here will be extended with reference to a written corpus of Maori language and linked to an overview of semantic relational types and categories established with reference to the relevant scholarly literature.

2.7 Analyses of the Maori language: the indirect nature of references to semantic relations and semantic relational encoding

There are now a considerable number of works dealing with the structure of Maori language. In the course of these works, semantic considerations are often taken into account. However, these works are generally organized in a way that primarily reflects the morphological and/or syntactic structure of the language, rather than semantico-pragmatic considerations. That is, the emphasis is on structural considerations such as, for example, phrase and sentence types, suffixation and reduplication. Descriptions such as these are, of course, extremely valuable in revealing the way in which the language is constructed (see, for example, Biggs, 1961 & 1969; Foster, 1997; Harlow, 1996; Head, 1989; Hohepa, 1967; Kārena-Holmes, 1995; Krupa, 1966; Ngata, 1960; Reedy, 1979; Wills, 1960). However, the structural emphasis may mask semantic similarities among structures that are very different. Thus, for example, although sections of these works may be devoted to concession clauses and, in particular, to the role of 'ahakoa' in these clauses (see, for example, Bauer 1997, pp. 606 – 607), what is absent is a discussion of *the range of ways* (including indirect ways) in which concessive meaning may be

expressed. Analysis of the corpus examined here (see *Chapter 4*) reveals, for example, that concessive meanings are often associated with the occurrence of ‘engari’ and ‘otira’, although neither of these is commonly linked directly in formal descriptions of Maori with concessive meaning, the emphasis generally being on the fact that ‘otira’ tends to function as a summative (conclusive) indicator. Similarly, the progressive aspect of ‘e . . . ana’ is frequently indicated in descriptions of Maori, as are the various functions of ‘ka’ (including its inceptive meaning (see, for example, Biggs 1969/1998, pp. 30 & 69). Nowhere, however, does it appear to be indicated that the co-occurrence in contiguous clauses of ‘e . . . ana’ and ‘ka’ may be indicative of temporal overlap as is indicated here (see *Chapter 4*).

2.8 Semantic Relations in Maori: a textual illustration

In this section, a short extract from the writings of Sir Apirana Ngata (1996, pp. 148 - 149) is analysed in relation to inter-propositional semantic relations and semantic relational encoding as a preliminary illustration of the nature of the task with which this thesis is concerned.

It is an important task
to fell the forest
including the burn off

Amplification: term specification

(‘Important task’ is amplified/ specified by what follows.)

He mahi nui
te tuanga i te ngahere
tae noa ki te tahunga

Amplification: term specification

(‘Mahi nui’ is amplified/specified by what follows.)

to fell the forest
including the burn off

Bonding: coupling

(‘Including’ signals addition to the initial general statement)



te tuanga i te ngahere
tae noa ki te tahunga



Bonding: coupling

(‘Tae noa’ signals addition to the initial general statement)

to fell the forest
including the burn off
to make the land clear
for the sowing of grass seed. | **Means**
↓
Purpose
(‘To make’ signals the Purpose member of the relation.)

te tuanga i te ngahere
tae noa ki te tahunga
kia wātea te whenua
hei ruinga ki nga purapura karaihe. | **Means**
↓
Purpose
(‘Kia wātea’ signals the Purpose member of the relation.)

to make the land clear
for the sowing of grass seed | **Means** 
Purpose 
(The Purpose member of the relation is signalled by ‘for’)



kia wātea te whenua
hei ruinga ki nga purapura karaihe | **Means** 
Purpose 
(The purpose member of the relation is signalled by ‘hei’)

The things that one has to careful about
are that the seeds are good
and that the whole land is fully sown. | **Amplification: term specification**
(‘Things that one has to be careful about’
is amplified by what follows.)

Ko te mea tūpato ia
kia pai nga purapura,
a, kia kapi te whenua te rui. | **Amplification: term specification**
(‘Ko te mea tūpato ia’ is amplified by
what follows.)

that the seeds are good
and that the whole land is fully sown. | **Bonding: coupling**
(The relationship is signalled by ‘and’)

kia pai nga purapura,
a, kia kapi te whenua te rui. | **Bonding: coupling**
(The relationship is signalled by ‘ā’.)

By means of the grass growing, of course,
the animals fare well, | **Means** 
Result 
(The Means member of the relation is
signalled by ‘by means of’.)

Ma te tupu hoki o te karaihe
e ora ai nga kararehe,

Means 
Result 

(The Means member of the relation is signalled by 'ma'.)

By way of the grass growing, of course,
the animals fare well,
so that money spent on felling trees is regained
and the suffering expended when clearing
the land is recompensed.

Reason



Result

(The result member of the relation is By 'so that'.)

Ma te tupu hoki o te karaihe
e ora ai nga kararehe,
e hoki ai nga moni i pau i te tuanga,
e ea ai rānei te māuiui o te hunga nāna
te waerenga.

Reason



Result

(The result member of the relation is signalled by 'e . . . ai'.)

so that money spent on felling trees is regained
and the suffering expended when clearing the
land is recompensed.

Bonding: coupling

(The additive nature of this relation is signalled by 'and'.)

e hoki ai nga moni i pau i te tuanga,
e ea ai rānei te māuiui o te hunga nāna
te waerenga.

Bonding: coupling

(The additive nature of this relation is implicit.)

It is a important task to fell the forest
including the burn off to make the land clear
for the sowing of grass seed.

The things that one has to careful about
are that the seeds are good and that the whole
land is fully sown. By way of the grass growing,
of course, the animals fare well,
so that money spent on felling trees
is regained and the suffering expended
when clearing the land is recompensed.

Therefore one should persist in saving good
Grass including clover to get the maximum
Benefit lest the clearing for cultivation is wasted.

Grounds



Conclusion

(The Conclusion member of the relation is signalled by 'therefore')

He mahi nui te tuanga i te ngahere
tae noa ki te tahunga kia wātea te whenua
hei ruinga ki nga purapura karaihe.

Ko te mea tūpato ia kia pai nga purapura,
a, kia kapi te whenua te rui. Ma te tupu hoki
o te karaihe e ora ai nga kararehe, e hoki ai
nga moni i pau i te tuanga, e ea ai rānei te māuiui
o te hunga nāna te waerenga.

Na reira me whakamomori he purapura karaihe
pai, me nga koroa hei whakarānui kei mōumou te
waerenga.

Grounds



Conclusion

(The Conclusion member of
the relation is signalled by
'na reira'.)

one should persist in saving good grass
including clover

Bonding: coupling

(The additive nature of the relation is
signalled by 'including'.)

me whakamomori he purapura karaihe pai,
me nga koroa

Bonding: coupling

(The additive nature of the relation is
signalled by 'me'.)

one should persist in saving good grass
including clover
to get the maximum benefit

Means



Purpose

(The Purpose member of the relation is
signalled by 'to get'.)

me whakamomori he purapura karaihe pai,
me nga koroa
hei whakarānui

Means



Purpose

(The Purpose member of the relation is
signalled by 'hei'.)

Therefore one should persist in saving
good grass including clover
to get the maximum benefit
lest the clearing
for cultivation is wasted.

Consequence



Condition (negative)

(Here, the Condition member of the relation
is signalled by 'lest'.)

Na reira me whakamomori he purapura
karaihe pai, me nga koroa hei whakarānui
kei moumou te waerenga.

Consequence



Condition

(Here, the Condition member of the relation
is signalled by 'kei'.)

The grass which maintains the well-being
of the animals is the Alpha and Omega of
the task of rearing animals.

Reason



Statement

(Here, there is a Statement-Reason
relation (inverted) which is inferred from
the semantic content.)

The Creator did not intend the land to lie
fallow . . .

Reason

(Here, the Reason member of the relation
is signalled by 'for'.)

for if man does not to sow it;
it will be filled rapidly with bad weeds.

Ko te karaihe me ora ai nga kararehe te
Arepa me te Omeka o te mahi whakatupu
kararehe.

Reason



Statement

(Here, there is a Statement-Reason
relation (inverted) which is inferred from
the semantic content.)

E kore te whenua e waiho kia takoto noa
e te Kaihanga

Reason

(Here, the Reason member of the relation
is signalled by 'ina'.)

ina kore e ruia e te tangata:
ka hohoro tonu te kī i nga taru kikino.

if man does not to sow it;
it will be filled rapidly with bad weeds.

Condition

Consequence



(Here, the Condition (negative) member
of the relation is signalled by 'if . . . not'.)

ina kore e ruia e te tangata:
ka hohoro tonu te kī i nga taru kikino.

Condition

Consequence



(Here, the Condition (negative) member
of the relation is signalled by 'ina kore'.)

if man does not to sow it;
it will be filled rapidly with bad weeds.

Furthermore,
if you sow it lightly,
the roots of the seeds will grow sparsely
leaving weeds of no value for the animals.

ina kore e ruia e te tangata:
ka hohoro tonu te kī i nga taru kikino.

Waihoki
ki te māmā te rui
ka takitahi te tupu a nga pūtake karaihe,
ka wātea ētahi wāhi o te whenua mo
nga taru kore tikanga ki te kararehe,
if you sow it lightly,
the roots of the seeds will grow sparsely

ki te māmā te rui
ka takitahi te tupu a nga pūtake karaihe

the roots of the seeds will grow sparsely
leaving weeds of no value for the animals.

ka wātea ētahi wāhi o te whenua
mo nga taru kore tikanga ki te kararehe.

Bonding: coupling

(Here, the additive nature of the relation
is signalled by 'furthermore'.)

Bonding: coupling

(Here, the additive nature of the relation
is signalled by 'waihoki'.)

Condition

Consequence

(Here, the Condition member of the
relation is signalled by 'if'.)



Condition

Consequence

(Here, the Condition member of the
relation is signalled by 'ki te'.)



Reason

Result

(Here, the Result member of the
relation is signalled by the presence
of the present participle: 'leaving').



Reason

Result

(Here, the presence of the Result
member of the relation is signalled
indirectly: 'mo' (which can be
literally translated as 'for' – 'left . . .
for the weeds . . .') indicates that the
growth of the weeds is a result of
the sparse growth of the seeds.)



CHAPTER 3

INTER-PROPOSITIONAL SEMANTIC RELATIONS: AN INTRODUCTION TO THEIR ENCODING AND SIGNALLING IN MAORI

3.1. Introduction

In this Chapter, a framework for semantic relations is set up and it is used later in *Chapter 4* where semantic relations in Maori are looked at in terms of the ways they are expressed and signalled. This framework here is adapted from Crombie (1985b). In the outline below, each relation is defined.

3.2 Semantic Relational Framework

The semantic relations are outlined below.

3.2.1 Causative type (involving cause/effect)

Inter-propositional relations:

- (i) Reason-Result;
- (ii) Means-Result;
- (iii) Grounds-Conclusion;
- (iv) Means-Purpose;
- (v) Condition-Consequence

In the *Grounds-Conclusion* relation the Conclusion member of the relation may involve a Statement (an acknowledged/existing state) or an injunction (order/suggestion).

3.2.2 Matching process type (involving comparison and contrast)

Inter-propositional relations:

Contrastive

- (i) Simple Contrast;
- (ii) Statement-Exception;
- (iii) Statement-Denial;
- (iv) Denial-Correction;
- (v) Concession-Contraexpectation;
- (vi) Contrastive Alternation

Statements can be compared/contrasted as well as events (like doing things) and processes (like things that happen just like butter melts but doesn't do anything to melt).

Comparative

- (vii) Simple Comparison;
- (viii) Statement-Exemplification;
- (viii) Statement-Affirmation;
- (x) Paraphrase;
- (xi) Equation;
- (xii) Amplification;
- (xiii) Supplementary Alternation

3.2.3 Contiguity (in time and space) type

Inter-propositional relations:

- (xiv) Chronological Sequence;
- (xv) Temporal Overlap;
- (xvi) Bonding

3.3 Definition and examples of causative type relations

The examples here are, in many cases, those included in *Chapter 2*. These examples are not in context and so they should be treated as possible (rather than definite) encodings of the relations.

3.3.1 Reason-Result

Here, the reason member (which often follows the result member) gives the reason why a particular result came about or will come about.

(1) I like it because it's hot.

(1i) He pai ki ahau te mea ra notemea he wera.
DET ADJ PR PRO DET N DET CONJ DET ADJ
A good to I the thing there because a hot

(2) As the water is warm, I won't have a drink.

(2i) Na te mea, he mahana te wai, kāore au e inu.
CNJ DET ADJ DET N NEG PRO VM V
Because a warm the water won't I drink

(3) Because it's late, I won't wash the car.

(3i) I te mea he tomuri, kāore au e horo i te motoka.
CNJ DET ADJ NEG PRO VM V DET N
As a late won't I wash the car

(4) It's very interesting in that it's so small.

(4i) He mea miharo i te mea he tino iti
DET N ADJ CONJ DET INT ADJ
A thing admirable because a very small

(5) Now that he's passed the test, he can drive

(5i) Ina kua pāhi ia i te whakamātau, ka ahei ia ki te taraiwa

CNJ VM V PRO PR DET N VM V PRO VM V

Now PRF pass he the exam INC able he drive

(6) Unless you leave now, you won't get home.

(6i) Ma to wehe inaianei tonu, e kore koe e tae ki te kainga.

CNJ POSS V ADJ INT VM NEG PRO VM V PP DET N

By your leaving now won't you get home

(7) Turn off the light in case the children growl.

(7i) Whakapokongia te raiti kei kōhete nga tamariki.

V-PASS DET N CNJ V DET N

Put out the light in case growl the children.

3.3.2 Means-Result

Here, the **means** member states **how** a particular result was/will be or can be achieved.

(8) He opened the door by twisting the catch.

(8i) I whakapuare ia i te tatau mā te whakatakawiri

TAM CAUS-V PRO PAST-LOCPREP DET N PP DET CAUS-

PAST Open he the door by the twisting

i te kakau.

PR DET N

the handle

3.3.3 Grounds-Conclusion

Here, a deduction is drawn on the basis of some observation.

(9) That cow looks so ill so/therefore I conclude that she must be the one that Mary said had flu.

(9i) Ko te tino mate o te āhua o tērā kau, na reira ka kī au
 FM DET INT V PP DET N PP DET N CONJ VM V PRO
 TOP the very ill of the look of that cow therefore INC say I

koira pea te mea i kī rā a Mere i te mate pupuhi
 V INT DET N TAM V ANA PA N VM DET N ADJ
 that is perhaps the one PAST state PERS Mary sick swelling

te puku.
 DET N
 the stomach

3.3.4 Means-Purpose

In this relation, the **purpose** member outlines the action that is/was/will be undertaken **with the intention of achieving** a particular result. The focus is on the intention rather than the achievement (**P is the means by which Q becomes achievable**).

(10) I left early so that I wouldn't miss the bus.

(10i) I hoki moata au kia kore ai au e mahue e te pahi
 TAM V ADJ PRO CNJ NEG PP PRO VM V AGT DET N
 PAST return early I so wouldn't HAB I NPAST leave behind by the bus

(11) He decided to leave her in order to move in with his girlfriend.

(11i) I whakarite ia ki te wehe i a ia, kia noho ai ia
 TAM CAUS-V PRO VM V PR PA PRO VM V PP PRO
 PAST decide he FUT leave AGT PERS her stay him

i tana tau.
 PR POSS N
 his girlfriend

3.3.5 Condition-Consequence

In this relation, the consequence is dependent on a realizable or unrealizable condition.

(12) I'd have done it if there had been time (unrealizable condition).

(12i) Kua mahi -a e au me mea i whai taima.
 VM V-PASS PR PRO CNJ VM V N
 PRF Done by I if TAM possessed time

(13) Assuming that you leave on time, you should meet your uncle (realizable condition).

(13i) Ki te tupono ra ka wehe koe i te wa tika, ka tūtaki koe
 CNJ PP VM V PRO PR DET N ADJ VM V PRO
 On the chance that INC leave you at the time right INC meet you

i tō matua kēkē
 PR POSS N
 your uncle

(14) So long as he's good to her, we must behave likewise (realizable condition).

(14i) Mena kei te pai ia ki a ia, me pai anō tātou.
 CNJ VM V PRO PR PA PRO VM ADJ INT PRO
 If good he PERS her, should good also we

(15) Provided (that) you get in early, you can play (realizable condition).

(15i) Ina ka tae moata mai koe ka ahei koe ki te hianga
 CNJ VM V ADJ PP PRO VM V PRO PRE DET V
 Now that INC arrive early hither you INC able you to play

(16) Unless you leave now, you won't catch the bus (realizable condition).

(16i) Ma to wehe inaianei tonu, e kore koe e hopu te pahi
CNJ POSS V ADJ ADV VM NEG PRON VM V DET N
By your leave now only won't you catch the bus

(17) Take the map in case you get lost.

(17i) Mau-ria te mapi kei ngaro koe
V-PASS DET N CONJ V PRO
Take the map in case lost you

3.4 Definition and examples of matching process type relations

3.4.1 Simple Contrast

A relation involving two things, events, states, processes, abstractions in terms of some particular in respect of which they are different.

(18) He was Ngāpuhi; she was Ngai Tahu.

(18i) He Ngāpuhi ia; he Ngai Tahu ia.
DET N PRO DET N PRO
A Ngāpuhi he; a Ngai Tahu she

(19) He wrote quickly; she wrote slowly.

(19i) I tuhi tere ia; i tuhi pōturi ia.
TAM V ADJ PRO; TAM V ADJ PRO
PAST write quick he; PAST write slowly she

3.4.2 Statement-Exception

This 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.

(20) Everyone except Hine left early.

(20i) Ko te katoa i tua mai i a Hine i wehe moata.
FM DET N CONJ PR PA N VM V ADJ
TOP the all except PERS Hine PAST left early

3.4.3 Statement-Denial

In this relation, the truth or validity of a proposition is denied.

(21) A: He should go tomorrow.

B: No. he shouldn't.

(21i) A: Rā ke ia te haere āpōpō

MOD PRO VM V N

Should he go tomorrow

(22) A: Tom fainted.

B: No he didn't.

(22i) A: I āmai a Tame

TAM V PA N

PAST Faint PERS Tom

B: Kāo. Kaore ia i āmai.

NEG NEG PRO TAM V

No. Didn't he PAST faint

3.4.4 Denial-Correction

In this relation, 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.

(23) He isn't a teacher; he's a politician.

(23i) Ehara ia i te māhita; he minita pāremata ia.
NEG PRO PR DET N DET N N PRO
Is not he the teacher; a minister parliament he

3.4.5 Concession-Contraexpectation

Here, the truth of a possible inference is directly or indirectly denied.

(24) I like apples *although* they are expensive.

(24i) He pai ki a au te āporo, ahakoa te nui o te utu.
DET ADJ PR PA PRO DET N, CONJ DET ADJ PR DET N
A good to PERS me the apple, although the great of the cost

(25) I like the meat *but* the wine's awful.

(25i) He pai ki a au te mīti engari ko te waina he weriweri
DET ADJ PR PA PRO DET N CONJ FM DET N DET ADJ
A good to PERS me the meat but TOP the wine a awful

(26) For all it matters to me, he can stay at home.

(26i) Ahakoa ōkū ake whakaaro, me noho ia ki te kainga
CONJ POSS INT N VM V PRO PR DET N
Despite my personal thoughts stay he at the home

(27) Although it's raining, I haven't brought an umbrella.

(27i) Ahako te ua, kaare tonu au i mau hamarara mai.

CNJ DET N NEG PP PRO TAM V N DIR

Although the rain not still I PAST bring umbrella hither

3.4.6 Contrastive Alternation

This relation involves a choice between two terms which are treated as being antithetical.

(28) Either stay or leave.

(28i) E noho rānei e wehe atu rānei.

VM V CONJ VM V DIR CONJ

Past stay either leave thither or

(29) It's either good or bad.

(29i) He pai rānei he kino rānei.

DET ADJ CONJ DET ADJ CONJ

A good either a bad or

3.4.7 Simple Comparison

This relation involves the comparison of two terms in relation to some aspect of similarity.

(30) I was afraid and so was Tom.

(30i) I te matakū ahau ā i te pēra anō a Tame.

TAM DET V PRO CONJ TAM DET V PP PA N

PAST afraid I and PAST likewise as well PERS Tom

(31) A: He said that he was drunk.

B: I said so too.

(31i) A: I korero mai ia i te haurangi ia
TAM V DIR PRO VM V PRO
Past said hither he past drunk he

Bi: I korero pera atu ano au
TAM V V DIR PP PRO
Past said likewise thither also I

Bii: Ko au ano i korero pera atu
FM PRO INT VM V V DIR
TOP I also past said likewise thither

(32) He found an insect and I did too

(32i) I kitea e ia he ngārara, a, i pera ano au
TAM V-PASS PR PRO DET N CONJ TAM V INT PRO
PAST find he an insect and PAST likewise also I

(33) Hine smiled shyly and Tama did too.

(33i) I kata whakamā a Hine, ā i pērā anō a Tama
TAM V ADJ PA N CONJ TAM V PP PA N
PAST laugh shyly PERS Hine and PAST likewise also PERS Tama

3.4.8 Statement-Exemplification

One member provides a generalization and the other provides an exemplification of that generalization.

(34) Everyone spent up large. Kararaina, for example,

(34i) I whakapau moni te katoa. ina koa a Kararaina i hoko mai i
VM CAUS-V N DET N CONJ PA N VM V DIR PR
Past spend money the everyone For example Kararaina past buy hither

bought fifteen dresses.
te tekau mā rima kaka
DET ADJ N
Fifteen dresses

3.4.9 Statement-Affirmation

Here, the truth or validity of an encoded, fleshed out proposition is affirmed.

(35) A: He should visit his mother tomorrow.

B: I agree.

(35i) A: Me toro atu ia ki tōna māmā āpōpō.
VM V DIR PRO PR POSS N N
Should visit hither he to his mother tomorrow

B: Kei te whakaae atu au.
VM DET CAUS-V DIR PRO
PRES the agree thither I

(36) He said that Mary should have stuck to soft drinks and I agree.

(36i) I ki ia rā kē a Mere te noho i runga waireka, ā,
TAM V PRO MOD PA N DET V PR LOC N CONJ
PAST said he should PERS Mary the stay on soft drinks, and,

e whakaae ana au.
VM CAUS-V VM PRO
NPAST agree PROG I

3.4.10 Paraphrase

Here the same expanded propositional content is expressed in different encodings.

(37) He began to climb; he commenced the ascent.

(37i) I timata ia ki te piki; i tīmata ia i te pikingā.
TAM V PRO PR DET V; TAM V PRO PR DET NOM
Past begin he to climb; past commence he at the ascent.

(38) He's not bad; he's good.

(38i) Ehara ia i te kino; he pai ia.
NEG PRO PR DET ADJ DET ADJ PRO
Not he the bad a good him

3.4.11 Amplification

In this relation, one of the encoded, fleshed out propositions repeats the content of the other but with a non-contrastive additive specification. In the first example below 'knew' is replaced by 'that he was lying' and 'mōhio' is replaced by 'i te rūpahu a Hone'.

(39) He knew that John was lying.

(39i) I mōhio ia i te rūpahu a Hone.
TAM V PRO VM V PA N
PAST know he lie PERS John

(40) He said that I shouldn't have gone.

(40i) I kī ia rā kē au i te kore haere.
TAM V PRO MOD PRO PR DET NEG V
Past say he should I the not go

(41) A: Someone left early

B: It was Hine.

(41i) A: I wehe moata tētahi.

TAM V ADJ N
PAST depart early someone

B: Ko Hine

FM N
TOP Hine

3.4.12 Supplementary Alternation

This relation involves two or more non-antithetical choices.

(42) You can read a book or wash the car.

(42i) Ka tae-a e koe te korero pukapuka, te horoi i te ka ranei?

VM V-PASS PR PRO DET V N DET V PR DET N CONJ
INC Can by you the read book the wash the car or

3.5 Definition and examples of contiguity process type relations (relations in time and space)

3.5.1 Chronological Sequence

This relation provides 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.

(43) I'll watch the baby till you finish your work.

(43i) Mā-ku e mātaki te pepi tae noa atu ki te mutunga o o mahi

PR-PRO VM V DET N CNJ PR DET DN PR POSS N
I watch the baby till the finish of your work

(44) I'll mind Hemi until you've finished your work.

(44i) Ka tiaki au i a Hemi kia mutu rawa i a koe o mahi
VM V PRO PR PA N CNJ V CNJ PR PA PRO POSS N
INC mind I PERS Hemi till finish by PERS you your work

(45) After he had eaten the fish, he drank the water.

(45i) No muri i tana kaitanga i te ika, ka inu ia i te wai
CNJ PR POSS DN PR DET N VM V PRO PR DET N
After his eat of the fish, INC drink he of the water

(46) Once he leaves, I'll read the newspaper.

(46i) Wehe ana ia, ka pānui-tia e au te niupepa.
V VM PRO VM V-PASS PR PRO DET N
Depart CONT he INC read by me the newspaper

(47) Go into the room as soon as possible

(47i) Hou atu ki te rūma i runga tonu i tāu e tae-a ai
V DIR PR DET N CNJ PR POSS VM V-PASS PP
Enter thither the room upon immediately as you can

(48) The car crashed whereupon Hine screamed.

(48i) Ka aitua te motoka. I taua wā tonu ka umere a Hine
VM V DET N DISJ VM V PA N
INC crash the car immediately INC screamed PERS Hine

(49) Before you leave, feed the dog.

(49i) I mua i to haerenga, whāngai-a te kuri
CNJ PR POSS DN V-PASS DET N
Before your going feed the dog

3.5.2 Temporal Overlap

This relation links two events which overlap wholly or partly in time.

(50) I'll cut the wood while the dinner is cooking.

(50i) Mā-ku e tapahi ngā peka kei maoa ana ngā kai
AGT-EMP VM V DET N CONJ VB VM DET N
I will cut the wood while cooking CONT the food

3.5.3 Bonding/Spatial Contiguity

This is a the most basic form of relationship: it is a non-elective (not involving either/or choice), non-sequential relation between two conjoined, fleshed out propositions which generally involves spatial contiguity/relationship/juxtaposition.

(51) He wore a coat and carried an umbrella.

(51i) I mau pōtae ia me te hari hāmarara
TAM V N PRO CONJ DET V N
PAST wear hat he and the carry umbrella

CHAPTER 4

THE OCCURRENCE AND SIGNPOSTING OF SEMANTIC RELATIONS IN A CORPUS OF WRITTEN DISCOURSE IN MAORI

4.1. Introduction

The overall aim of this chapter is to examine a corpus of written Maori in relation to the occurrence, and encoding, of semantic relations between propositions and groups of propositions. The relations examined here are:

Cause-Effect relations: reason-result; means-purpose, condition-consequence;

Contrastive relations: denial-correction; concession-contradiction;

Comparative relations: simple comparison;

Temporal relations: chronological sequence; temporal overlap;

Elective relations: supplementary alternation;

Additive relations: amplification; bonding; rhetorical coupling.

Because almost all the texts dealing with te reo Maori generally approach the language from a structural point of view rather than a semantico-pragmatic one, some encodings 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 intensified 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.

4.2. The corpus

In order to identify examples of the various binary relationships outlined above, I have used the following two Maori texts:

Kaa, Te Ohorere raua ko Wiremu Kaa. 1994. *Nga Kōrero a Reweti Kohere Ma.* Victoria University Press, Victoria University of Wellington.

Kaa, Te Ohorere raua ko Wiremu Kaa. 1996. *Apirana T Ngata.* Victoria University Press, Victoria University of Wellington.

4.3. Semantic relations and their realisation in the corpus

Each section below will provide examples of different semantic relations from the corpus (indicating the location of their occurrence) and will discuss some of these in relation to the ways in which they are presented in Bauer (1997).

Each example below will indicate which corpora mentioned above they came from as follows:

(A.N.p.26:L.2) = Apirana Ngata, page 26: Line 2.

(R.K.p.25:L.11) = Reweti kōhere, page 25: L.11.

4.3.1 Reason-result

Bauer (1997, 376) observes that result clauses do not occur before the matrix clause. From a semantico-pragmatic perspective, it is, however, possible, in a reason-result relation, for a result clause to function as the matrix clause as is demonstrated the examples below in which **the result member of the relation is in bold**:

(1) Ka whakaputa ia i tōna pāmamae mō runga i ngā mahi āhuareka a Ngāti Porou e rangirangi ana a rātou waiata i ngā rangatira o waho. (A.N.p.26:L.2)

(He expressed his resentment (result), as a consequence of the entertainment in which Ngāti Porou songs denigrated the chiefs from outside the area (reason)).

(Note that example (1) here also appears as example (50) where it is discussed under a different heading.)

(2) E tika ana hei a Ngāti Porou anake ka rawe ana āhuareka me ana rangirangi me ana tāwai, kāore hoki e hōhonu te hekenga o te kupu. (A.N.p.26:L.13)

(It is perfectly acceptable for Ngāti Porou to enjoy its own entertainment along with the slandering and taunts (result/ conclusion), because the words are lighthearted (reason/ justification)).

(Note that example (2) here also appears as example (51) where it is discussed under a different heading.)

(3) E takahi ana i te tekiona 15 notemea torutoru o aua tangata i hokohoko e whiwhi ana i te whenua i kō atu. (A.N.p.33:L.30)

(Section 15 is unacceptable (result/ conclusion) because very few of those people who have sold, possess any lands beyond these (reason/ justification)).

(4) . . . i whakamomori mō te haerenga o tana wahine ki te hī; nā te waiata hoki a Rakaruahine. (R.K. p.23:L.7)

(He was displeased with his wife (result) for going fishing and also also because of Rakaruahine's song (reason)).

(5) Ka mīharo te ngākau ki te pokanoa o tērā kōhatu rahi (R.K. p.25:L.11)

(He was delighted (result) because of his random choice of that large stone (reason)).

(6) Ka huri nga ope, ka waiho iho i nga mihi ki a Te Arawa, mo te Iwi Maori katoa, ka whiwhi tahi ērā atu waka i te ingoa pai. (R.K.p.31:L.1)

(The tribes agreed that the welcome should be left to Te Arawa to represent all the Maori tribes (result), and all the canoes [thereby] share due acknowledgment (reason))

(Note that example (6) here also appears as example (32) where it is discussed under a different heading.)

(7) Tēnā pea ia kei te tahuri whakamuri mai, me kore koe i te whai atu. (R.K.p. 26:L.4)

(Perhaps he is in actual fact looking back this way (result) in the hope that you are following (reason)).

(8) Kāore ngā tungāne i whakaae he kore no te wahine e rawe ki te haere ki te moana, kei kitea mai hoki e te tāne. (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)).

(9) I tuhia ngā poroporoaki i te mea kua oti kē te tuhituhi (R.K.p.113:L.30)

(The farewells were recorded (result) because it had already been done elsewhere (reason)).

(Note that example (9) here also appears as example (42) where it is discussed under a different heading.)

(10) . . . kāhore he poroporoaki, he kore tonu hoki; kāore i tuhituhia. (R.K.p.113:L.32)

(. . . there were no words of farewell (result) simply because they had not been recorded (reason)).

(11) . . . ka tangi ia he kore no Whangaparaoa e kitea atu e te tangata. (R.K.p.118:L.27)

(. . . and she wept (result) because Whangaparaoa would not be seen by people (reason)).

(12) He nui te ruihi ou iwi mou kua kore nei e puta tinana atu ki a tātou marae maha. (R.K.p.121:L.24)

(Your people regret your loss (result) because you no longer appear physically at our many marae (reason)).

(13) I kinongia ai tāua e ētahi tāngata heoi anō nā to rātou ngākau hae.(R.K.p.128:L.15)

(In that, we two were maligned by some people (result) because of their jealous nature (reason)).

(14) I nui taku kata i o kōrero. (R.K.p.27:L.31)

(I was greatly amused (result) because of your words (reason)).

(Note that example (14) here also appears as example (39) where it is discussed under a different heading.)

(15) Kei te āhua pouri au i te nui o a mātou raruraru (A.N.p.33:L.3)

(I am rather distressed (result) because of the enormity of our problems (reason)).

(Note that example (15) here also appears as example (63) where it is discussed under a different heading.)

(16) 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.13)

(Ngāti Porou was placed in an adverse situation last year (result) because of government land sales (reason)).

(Note that example (16) here also appears as example (40) where it is discussed under a different heading.)

(17) I mōhio a Pomare kei roto o Te Whetumatarau a Te Rangipaiia, he wahine rongonui hoki. (R.K.p.16:L.3)

(Pomare knew that Te Rangipaiia was in Te Whetumatarau (result), because she was a woman of renown (reason)).

(18) . . . moe mai hoki koe i ta tāua wahine i tenei pō, āpōpō hoki hei au.(R.K.p.16:L.7)

(. . . bed our woman tonight (result/ injunction) for tomorrow she will be mine (reason)).

(19) Kaati me tono e tātau kia whakapaia tō tātau rori notemea ko ngā whenua i te taha kei te utu reiti inaianei kua nui haere ngā mahi o tēnei takiwā e mate ana . . .(A.N.p.34:L.23)

(Now then, we must request that our road be upgraded (result / conclusion) because the lands on either side are now paying rates and there is much work in this area in trouble . . . (reason)).

(20) No te putanga o te uruhanga tonga ka totohu i te kī rawa i te witi.
(R.K.p.27:21)

(When the storm appeared **it sank (result)** due to being overloaded with wheat (reason)).

(21) Ko Huripuku te kaitiaki o ngā kaupuke i tau ki Awatere, he hōhonu hoki a Awatere i ēra ra. (R.K.p.28:L.14)

(Huripuku was the guardian of the boats when they berthed at Awatere (result) because Awatere was very deep in those times (reason)).

(22) Te hāngaitanga ki waho o te Kawakawa, ka mānu mai te waka he marino hoki. (R.K.p. 29:L.23)

(As they were directly out from Kawakawa, the boat berthed (result) because it was calm (reason)).

Bauer (1997, 379), observes that *ai* follows the verb in the matrix clause when the reason clause precedes it. In the following examples, however, the reason clause (which may not necessarily be encoded with a marker of reason), occurs before the matrix clause, but the main verb of the matrix is not followed by *ai*. In these examples, **the reason member of the reason-result relation is in bold.**

(23) 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)).

(Note that example (23) here also appears as example (52) where it is discussed under a different heading.)

(24) Kāti i te mea ka whānau tamaiti tuatahi a Te Whatuapiti rāua ko Te Huhuti, a te Wawahanga ka tonoa a Te Rangitaumaha ki te tūātanga o tōna mokopuna. (R.K.p.18:L.18)

(Now, because Te Whatuāpiti and Te Huhuti gave birth to their first child called Wawahanga (reason), Te Rangitaumaha was sent to the naming ceremony of his grandson (result)).

(25) I tōna ātaahua ka whāia a Te Aoputaputa e nga taitama. (R.K.p.19:L.6)

(Because of her beauty (reason), Te Aoputaputa was the focus of attention of the young lads (result)).

(Note that example (25) here also appears as example (60) where it is discussed under a different heading.)

(26) I te nui o tōna aroha ki tōna hoa tāpui, ki a Nihomakuru i mahue atu rā i a ia, kihai ia i rongō ki te māuiui, kihai i hiakai, anō kei runga ia i nga parirau o te hau e rere ana. (R.K.p.20:L.2)

(Because of her everlasting longing for her intimate companion, Nihomakuru, whom she had abandoned (reason), she felt no weariness, and no hunger, as if she were being whisked along on the wings of the wind (result)).

(27) I te nui o te parariki ki te moana, kaore e mate te kai; . (R.K.p.20:L.28)

(Because of the abundance of sea drift (reason), food will proliferate (result)).

(Note that example (27) here also appears as example (61) where it is discussed under a different heading.)

(28) I taku kore kīnaki ka mauria mai e tētahi wahine he koura māku. (R.K.p.22:L.24)

(As I had no embellishments (reason), a woman brought me a crayfish (result)).

(29) . . . i te mea kāhore he mahi ma nga kaipuke, ka tū i roto o Awatere hereherea ai ki te pohutukawa. (R.K.p.28:L12)

(Because there was no work for the boats (reason), they were berthed at Awatere, tied to the pohutukawa.(result)).

(30) . . . i te mea kua tīmata te raureka a te Pākehā ki te whenu, ka tae o tātou mātua ki te pāremata. (R.K.p.33:L.8)

(. . . because the Pākehā had started to act deceitfully over Maori land (reason), our parents went to parliament (result)).

(31) . . . ki te mea he Maori taua tangata ka āhei ia ki te whakatapu i ōna pānga ki roto i tana rīhi ara ka riro i a ia taua whenua. (R.K.p.33:30)

(. . . because that that person is Maori (reason), he could claim his interests within the lease, and indeed, that portion of the land becomes his (result)).

(32) Ka huri ngā ope, ka waiho iho i ngā mihi ki a Te Arawa, mo te Iwi Maori katoa, ka whiwhi tahi ērā atu waka i te ingoa pai. (R.K.p.31:L.1)

(The tribes agreed that the welcome should be left to Te Arawa to represent all the Maori tribes (result), and all the canoes [thereby] share due acknowledgment (reason))

(Note that example (32) here also appears as example (6) where it is discussed under a different heading.)

(33) Ka eke te whakamā ki a Te Huhuti, kātahi ka karanga atu ki te pāpā, 'Ka kore anō ki konei'. (R.K.p.18:L.28)

(Te Huhuti was overcome with embarrassment (reason), and she called out to her father, “There is nothing else here”. (result))

(Note that example (33) here also appears as example (64) where it is discussed under a different heading.)

(34) I te mea ka whānau a Raupare, ka mahara a Taraia akuanei ka tupu hei wahine ka riro te mana o Heretaunga i te tangata kē. (R.K.p.23:L.6)

(Because Raupare was born a girl (reason), Taraia thought that when she attained womanhood, the autonomy of Heretaunga would be inherited by an outsider(result)).

(35) . . . **ka hōhā ia**, ka whaoria e ia te ngaruru ki roto i tana kete.
(R.K.p.19:L.28)

(. . . she became vexed (reason), and put the shell in her kit (result))

(36) . . . **ka whatia e te tangata nei te tāhurihuri o te ika māna, ka maoa te whatuaro**, nāwai rā ka pā te whakamā ki a Rakaruahine (R.K.p.21:L.8)

(. . . he secured the finest part of the fish and boil the fatty parts for himself (reason) and eventually, Rakaruahine felt humiliated (result)).

Bauer (1997, 380) observes that when *reason phrases* are introduced by *mā* and *nā* and are fronted, the *ai* is required if the *TAM* is *e* or *i*. In the following example, however, the reason phrase is fronted and introduced by *nā* and the *TAM* is *i*, but *ai* does not occur.

(37) **Na te whakapono** i hiki te wahine kia tū rangatira, (R.K.p.22: L20)

(It was faith (reason) that raised women to establish themselves as leaders (result)).

(Note that example (37) here also appears as example (62) where it is discussed under a different heading.)

Bauer (1997:384) states if *result clauses* have *i* or no *TAM*, then *ai* is required. This was the case in many of the examples in the corpus (see the first two examples below). However, the third and fourth examples below have *i* and *TAM* without *ai*, the fifth example below has *i* as *TAM* without *ai* in the passive, and the sixth and seventh examples below have *i* as *TAM* without *ai* in the context of *negation* (*kihai* and *kahore*). **The result clauses are in bold in the examples below.**

(38) ... nāku ake nei anō, ngā patu o te pakanga, i a, ki tahaki i ora ai koutou (A.N.p.24:L.15)

(It was also I who parried aside the weapons of war (reason) so that you survived (result)).

(Note that example (38) here also appears as example (48) where it is discussed under a different heading.)

(39) I nui te kata i o kōrero. (R.K.p.27:31)

(I was greatly amused (result) because of your words (reason)).

(Note that example (39) here also appears as example (14) where it is discussed under a different heading.)

(40) 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)).

(Note that example (40) here also appears as example (16) where it is discussed under a different heading.)

(41) 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)).

(42) 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)).

(Note that example (42) here also appears as example (9) where it is discussed under a different heading.)

(43) Kāore ngā tungāne i whakaae he kore no te wahine e rawe ki te haere ki te moana, kei kitea mai hoki e te tāne. (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)).

(Note that example (43) here also appears as example (57) where it is discussed under a different heading.)

(44) I te nui o tōna aroha ki tōna hoa tāpui, ki a Nihomakuru i mahue atu rā i a ia, kihai ia i rongō ki te māuiui, kihai i hiakai, anō kei runga ia i nga parirau o te hau e rere ana. (R.K.p.20:L.2)

(Because of her deep love for her intimate companion, Nihomakuru, whom she had abandoned (reason), she felt no weariness, and no hunger. It was as if she were being transported on the wings of the wind (result)).

Bauer (1997, 605-606) observes that clauses expressing *result* are introduced by *nā reira*, *no reira* or *nā wai* and have *ka* as *TAM* marker. She also states that if they have *i*, then *ai* is inserted postverbally. There are, however, according to Bauer, occasions when *nā reira*, *no reira* and *nā wai* do not occur. On such occasions, *a* (and) is said to occur followed by a clause without a *TAM* marker, but with *tonu* (indeed) after the verb. The first three examples below have *nā reira* and *ka*. The fourth to the twelfth examples

below are, however, counterexamples to Bauer's statement. In example (54) below the 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). In each case, the result member of the relation is in bold:

(45) Hei tēnei hui pea mōhiotia ai i runga i ngā haka, i ngā waiata, me ngā āhuareka . . . ko tēhea te mana nui. Nā reira ka kaha te akoako haka, waiata a Māui, a, Te Koroni me Kahukura. (A.N.25:L.18)

(It will perhaps be known at this gathering who will be the most prestigious (result) as a consequence of the performance of the haka, the songs, and the entertainment (reason). On account of this, Māui, Te Koroni and Kahukura have put a lot of effort into learning their haka and songs (result)).

(46) Ka whai kete kai, nā reira ka tae mai ki ngā rohe o Ngāti Porou kōrero ai i ngā mahi a te pāremata i Pōneke. (A.N.p.26:L7)

(I possess a basket of knowledge (reason), hence I come to the area of Ngāti Porou to discuss what the parliament has achieved in Wellington (result)).

(47) E hiahia ana ahau ki te tono moni mā tātau i te kāwanatanga o Ingarangi hei whakamahi pāmu. Nā reira ka tono au kia whakatūria ngā komiti. (A.N.p.36:L3)

(I wish to request money for us from the government of England to establish funds to establish farms (reason). Therefore I will request that the committees be formed (result)).

(48) . . . nāku ake nei anō, ngā patu o te pakanga, i a, ki tahaki i ora ai koutou (A.N.p.24:L.15)

(It was also I who parried aside the weapons of war (reason) so that you survived (result)).

(Note that example (48) here also appears as example (38) where it is discussed under a different heading.)

(49) I te mea ka tae katoa mai ngā manuhiri ka kawaia a Hine Tāpora. (A.N.p.25:L.28)

(Because all the guests had arrived (reason), Hine Tāpora was formally opened (result)).

(50) Ka whakaputa ia i tōna pāmamae mō runga i ngā mahi āhuareka a Ngāti Porou e rangirangi ana a rātou waiata i ngā rangatira o waho. (A.N.p.26:L.2).

(He expressed his resentment (result), as a consequence of the entertainment in which Ngāti Porou songs denigrated the chiefs from outside the area (reason)).

(Note that example (50) here also appears as example (1) where it is discussed under a different heading.)

(51) E tika ana hei a Ngāti Porou anake ka rawe ana āhuareka me ana rangirangi me ana tāwai, kāore hoki e hōhonu te hekenga o te kupu. (A.N.26:L.14)

(It is perfectly acceptable for Ngāti Porou alone to enjoy its own entertainment along with the slandering and taunts (result/ conclusion) because the words are lighthearted (reason)) (also see example (2) here).

(Note that example (51) here also appears as example (2) where it is discussed under a different heading.)

(52) 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)).

(Note that example (52) here also appears as example (23) where it is discussed under a different heading.)

(53) Ko te tino take o te kino a Ngāpuhi ki a Ngāti Porou mō te patunga me te kainga a Ngāti Porou i te tuahine o Te Morenga. (R.K.p.15:L.12).

(The real reason for Ngāpuhi's anger with Ngāti Porou (result) was the cannibalising of Te Morengā's sister by Ngāti Porou (reason)).

(Note that example (53) here also appears as example (55) where it is discussed under a different heading.)

(54) Moumou te whenua mo te Maori o naitanei 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)).

Examples from the corpus that are likely to be of particular interest in relation to the teaching and learning of te reo Maori are the following:

- Those in which *take* is used in the result member of the relation to signal the later occurrence of the reason member:

(55) 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 Morengā's sister by Ngāti Porou (reason)).

(Note that example (55) here also appears as example (53) where it is discussed under a different heading.)

- those in which a negative conditional introduced by 'kei' (lest) occurs as the reason member of the relation, or a negative condition signalled by 'he kore' occurs as the result member:

(56) . . . 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)).

(57) 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)).

(Note that example (57) here also appears as example (43) where it is discussed under a different heading.)

- those in which the reason member of the relation occurs first and 'na kore' signals the anaphoric nature of the following result member:

(58) Ka maha ngā tau i noho tahi ai, i kitekite ai, i whakawhitiwhiti ai ngā mahara, i tūhonohono ai ngā ngākau (reason) na konei hoki ki te tomo tētahi mea rā waenganui, he momotu kē. (result) (R.K.p.127:L.12)

(Because we lived there together for many years (reason), we understood and communicated our thoughts and become one mind (result)/ (reason) and as a result if one thing was raised that came between us, we found it divisive (result)).

- those in which the reason member of the relation is embedded in an interrogative (33):

(59) 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))

- those in which the reason member of the relation occurs as a verbless construction:

(60) 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)).

(Note that example (60) here also appears as example (25) where it is discussed under a different heading.)

(61) I te nui o te parariki ki te moana (reason) kaore e mate te kai (result);
(R.K.p.20:L.28)

(Because of the abundance of sea drift (reason), food will proliferate (result)).

(Note that example (61) here also appears as example (27) where it is discussed under a different heading.)

(62) Na te whakapono (reason). i hiki te wahine kia tū rangatira (result) . .
. (R.K.p.22:L.20)

(It was faith (reason) that raised women to establish themselves as leaders (result)).

(Note that example (62) here also appears as example (37) where it is discussed under a different heading.)

(63) Kei te āhua pouri au (result) i te nui o a mātou raruraru (reason)
(A.N.p.33:L.63)

(I am rather distressed (result) because of the enormity of our problems (reason)).

(Note that example (63) here also appears as example (15) where it is discussed under a different heading.)

4.3.2 Means-purpose

Williams (1988, 161) notes that *mā* signals 'by means of'. However, as is indicated in 2.1 (above), *mā* often occurs in the context of the reason rather than purpose as in the example below:

(64) Ka eke te whakamā ki a Te Huhuti, kātahi ka karanga atu ki te pāpā,
'Ka kore anō ki konei'. (R.K.p.18:L.26)

(Te Huhuti was overcome with embarrassment (reason), and she called out to her father, "There is nothing else here". (result))

(Note that example (64) here also appears as example (33) where it is discussed under a different heading.)

What does appear to be the case is that, as Bauer (1997, 383) indicates, purpose clauses are generally introduced by *kia* (the subjunctive marker), normally *kia ... ai*.

(65) Haramai *kia* kite koutou i a au (A.N.p.24:L.41).

(Come (means) in order to see me (purpose)).

Bauer further notes (1997, 379) that, with *experience verbs, passives or intransitives*, there may be no particle but that when clauses expressing purpose occur before the matrix clause, the matrix clause is followed by *ai* (1997, 379). In particular, she observes that the particle never occurs where the verb is *kite*.

In the first example below, *kite* occurs without *ai*. In fact, however, there are examples of *kite* with *ai* in the corpus (see 69 - 71 following):

(66) Utaina atu aku kōrero ki runga i o parirau, **kia kite** mai ōku hoa o te motu (R.K.p.117:L.23).

(Carry my words on your wings (means) so that my friends of the land can see them (purpose)).

(67) Ko te tino pūtake kē o tēnei tukunga tuhituhi he hora i te reo Maori tūturu anake o Aotearoa, **kia kite** mai ai te katoa i te hōhonutanga o te reo; **kia mōhio** ai te katoa ka taea tonutia e te reo Maori nei te whakaputa me te whakamārama i nga āhuatanga katoa o te ao whānui. (Ā.N. p.5:L.15)

(The real purpose of releasing these writing (means) is to display the indigenous Maori language of Aotearoa (purpose) in order that everybody may see the depth of Maori language (purpose) that all may know that the Maori language has the capacity (purpose) to express and explain anything in the world (purpose)).

(68) Tangohia he kape o Te Toa Takitini o Hanuere ma koutou, **kia kite ai** koutou i nga kōrero a te Poari whakahaere i nga take tawhito a nga iwi Maori o nga moutere katoa (Ā.N. p.124:L.34)

(Obtain an edition of the Te Toa Takitini for yourselves (means) in order that you may see the reports of the controlling Board administering long-standing issues of all Maori people everywhere (purpose)).

(69) Ina tonu au e tu atu nei i te taha o nga mahi; ahakoa kaore i te pupuri i te kakau o te hoe, kei runga tonu i te waka, **kia kitea** mai ai te kanohi e nga kaihoe (A.N. p.356:35)

(Here I still am, standing amidst all this work; although I do not have a directing role, I still retain an association (means), so that my presence is seen by others committed to the cause (purpose)).

In the following examples, *kia* occurs without *ai* in the context of passives (as Bauer indicates it commonly does):

(70) Ā, ka tono anō **kia** whakakorea ngā hoko (A.N.p.34:L.4).

(And they requested again (means) in order that the sales be stopped.(purpose)).

(71) Kātahi ka puta te whakaaro **kia** huniaia e ia tana tamaiti, ara **kia** patua. (R.K.p.23:L.7).

(The thought arose that he concealed his child (means) that he might kill him (purpose)).

(72) Te taenga ki reira ka tū te komiti a Te Wiremu Karuwihā, a Te Wiremu Parata, me to rātou hui katoa **kia** whakahokia mai ki Waiapu, hei mau mai i te Rongopai. (R.K.p.29:L.6)

(When they arrived there Bishop Williams and William Parata formed a committee and all of them agreed that they might be returned to Waiapu (means) to preach the gospel (purpose)).

(73) Ka kiia e Te Wiremu **kia** heke nga tāngata ki roto o te kaipuke, **kia** āta tirohia atu nga tāngata o te waka (R.K.p.29:L.26).

(Te Wiremu ordered the people to go below deck (means) so that they might see clearly the people of the canoes (purpose)).

(74) Kaati me tono e tātau **kia** rāhuitia aua whenua, **kia** whakaurua mai nga whenua karauna i reira ki roto i te rāhui a, **kia** whakamutua te mahi a te Pākehā e ngaki nei i nga ngahere i reira (A.N.p.34:L.23).

(Now we must seek to have these lands be reserved (means), that the crown lands there be included under this reserve (purpose), and so that the Pakeha stop felling the forests there (purpose)).

(Note that example (74) here also appears as example (77) where it is discussed under a different heading.)

(75) . . . kia hunaia e ia tana tamaiti, ara **kia** patua (R.K.p.23:L.8).

(. . . he would conceal his child (means) with the intent of slaying her (purpose)).

In the following examples, *kia* occurs without *ai* in the context of intransitives (also as Bauer indicates it commonly does):

(76) E (6 pounds) i whakapaua e te Pāriha o Te Horo ara e Kahukura hei hāmene i ngā Pāriha o Tokomaru haere atu ki Wairarapa **kia** tae mai ki te kawanga o Rakaitemania ki Te Horo a te 26 o Maehe, 1896 (A.N.p.31:L.21).

(The parish of Te Horo that is Kahukura, spent 6 pounds (means) to summons the parishes of Tokomaru through to Wairarapa (purpose) that they arrive to the opening of Rakaitemania at Te horo on the 26 March 1896 (purpose)).

(77) Kaati me tonu e tātau **kia** rāhuitia ana whenua **kia** whakauru mai ngā whenua karauna i reira ki roto i te rāhui, a, **kia** whakamutua te mahi a te Pākeha e ngaki nei i ngā ngahere i reira (A.N.p.34:L.23).

(Now we must request that these lands be reserved (means) in order that the crown lands in that area be encompassed into the reserved (purpose) and in order that the Europeans who are cutting down the forests there be stopped purpose)).

(Note that example (77) here also appears as example (74) where it is discussed under a different heading.)

(78) Me hanga mai e te Pāremata he ture kia rite ngā kupu ki ngā rūri o a tātau nei komiti (A.N.p.34:L.31).

(The government should enact a law (means) so that the words encapsulate the rules of our own committee (purpose)).

(79) Ka tae mai a Raena kia haere māua, ko au hei arataki i a ia (R.K.p.32:L6).

(Raena arrived (means) so that we two might go (purpose) and I was quick to guide him).

(80) . . . tātou ka karakia kia tere te awatea (R.K.p.33:L19)

(. . . let us pray (means) so that the morning may appear quickly (purpose)).

In the following example, *kia* occurs without *ai* although the sentence (a) does not contain an experience verb, (b) is not passive, and (c) is not intransitive:

(81) Aramia atu to tama, a Te Makarini, **kia** mau atu i a koe ki te huarahi (R.K.p.126:L.3).

(Pursue your son Te Makarini (means) so that you may catch him along the pathway (purpose)).

4.3.3 Condition-consequence

The most common signals in the case of condition are *mehemea* (positive) and *ki te kore* (negative). Bauer (1997, 472) notes that if the conjunction *ki te* or *ki te mea* occurs, then *kahore* or *kore* are possible.

In the examples below, condition is signalled by *mehemea*:

(82) Mehemea i whakahaerea i raro i te Ture Hoko Whakawhiwhi Whenua 1893, e takahi ana aua hoko i taua ture (A.N.p.33:L.29).

(If it was administered under the provisions of the Ture Hoko Whakawhiwhi Whenua of 1893 (condition), then those sales were contrary to that legislation (consequence)).

(83) Mehemea ka riro te whenua ki te komiti ka kati te hoko (A.N.p.35:L.39)

(If the committee becomes responsible for these lands (condition), then the sales will cease (consequence)).

(Note that example (83) here also appears as example (86) where it is discussed under a different heading.)

(84) Mehemea ana he kāinga hahore a Puatai, e kore e pēnei rawa te maha o ngā taunga ika, (R.K.p.20:L.34)

(If Puatai were a barren place (condition), then there would not be as many fishing grounds here (consequence)).

(85) E kī ana mātau mehemea i whakahaerea i raro i te Ture Hoko whakawhiwhi whenua 1893, e takahi ana aua hoko i taua ture. (A.N.p.33:L.28)

(We are stating that if it is conducted under the Sales Acquisition Land Law 1893m (condition), that those sales are undermining those laws (consequence)).

(86) Mehemea ka riro te whenua ki te komiti ka kati te hoko. (A.N.p.35:L.39)

(If the committee becomes responsible for these lands (condition), then the sales will cease (consequence)).

(Note that example (86) here also appears as example (83) where it is discussed under a different heading.)

(87) Mehemea ka tonoa ki te kāwanatanga kia rāhuitia, tērā e ngawari noa atu (A.N.p.36:L.1)

(If the government is asked to reserve the land (condition) perhaps it would be much easier (consequence)).

(88) Mehemea ka uru te tangata haurangi ki roto i te whare rūnanga ka whiua (A.N.p.36:L.12).

(If an intoxicated person enters the Council Rooms (condition), [he] will be fined (consequence)).

(89) Mehemea ka riro katoa nga whenua Maori i te hoko ka mate ko tēnei kāwanatanga i te Kuini mo te takahi i tana atawhai. (A.N.p.36:L.28)

(If all the Maori lands are sold (condition) this government will be reprimanded by the Queen for acting contrary to the principle of ‘caring’ (consequence)).

(90) Mehemea i patu noa ake a Paratene i te wāea kua kore e moumou te moni pāhihi (A.N.p.36:L.33).

(If Paratene had only telephoned (condition), it would not have wasted a passenger's fare (consequence)).

(91) He mea pai **mehemea** ka oti te Ture mo Tūhoe (A.N.p.37:L.5)

(It would be great (consequence) if the Tūhoe Law is completed (condition)).

(92) Mehemea ka hiahia ki te tuku i aua whenua ki raro i te Ture Komiti Poraka i te Ture Rāhui rānei, me kooti. **Ki te kore**, me tuku kia uru ki raro i te ture o Tūhoe (A.N.p.38:L.27).

(If it is decided to bring those lands under the jurisdiction of the Blocks Committee Act or the Reserves Act, [we] must take it to court. If not (condition), [it] should come under the Tūhoe Act (consequence)).

(93) Mehemea nāna katoa ēnei mea i kōrero nei a ia i mahi, ka nui tōna kaha (A.N.27.p.38:L.2).

(If he is responsible for all these things that he says he did (condition), then he has displayed much energy (consequence)).

In the following examples, *ki te kore* occurs:

(94) Ki te kore me utu ngā moni i pau mō aua hoko kia hoki mai ai anō ki te āhua o mua. (A.N.p.34:L.5).

(If not (condition), we should pay back the money spent on those sales so that we may return to how it was before (consequence)).

(95) Otirā **ki te kore** māua e tae atu, māu e whakaatu a tātau kōrero i konei ki te iwi nui (A.N.p.33:L.6).

(However, if we do not attend (condition), you may present our views from here to the whole tribe (consequence)).

(96) . . . ma tāua tonu ma te Maori e waihanga he kaupapa mo te reo Maori. **Ki te kore** hoki, ka pē to tātou reo (A.N.p.21:L.4).

(We, the Maori, must establish our own platform for the Maori language. If not (condition), our language will be subsumed (consequence)).

(97) Otira i kī mai anō ia, **ki te kore** ia e wātea tērā e tonoa mai e ia a Te Makenehi Minita mo nga whenua (A.N.p.25:L.11).

(Furthermore, he has stated that if he is not available (condition), perhaps he will send McKenzie the Minister of Lands (consequence)).

(98) A, ka tonoa anō kia whakakorea nga hoko. **Ki te kore** me utu nga moni i pau mo aua hoko kia hoki mai ai anō ki te āhua o mua (A.N.p.34:L.4).

(And, we will request once again that purchases be stopped. If not (condition), that that money spent on those sales be repaid so we may revert to the approach of the past (consequence)).

(99) I runga i ēnei take me te kaha o to mātou hiahia kia hoki mai o mātou whenua ki te āhua o mua, ka tonu mātau ki te kāwanatanga kia whakakorea atu te mana o aua hoko. **Ki te kore** e taea e te kāwanatanga tēnā me whakaaro mai tēnei tono a mātou arā. . . (A.N.p.40:L.37).

(Based on these facts and the courage of our convictions that our lands be returned in the state they once were, we will request of government to rescind the authority of those sales. If the government cannot achieve that (condition), then they should consider this request from us (consequence), namely...).

(100) **Ki te kore** e ngāwari mai te kāwanatanga ki tēnā tono. Kaati me whakaneke ake nga moni hei utunga atu ma mātou mo te hea (A.N.p.41:L.4).

(If government will not comply with that request (condition), then they must increase the money for us to pay for shares (consequence)).

In the first two examples below, the condition-consequence relation is accompanied by *mena*; in the second example below, it is accompanied by *engari mena*.

(101) Ko te kī a ēnei kupu, **mena** kāre te pakanga o te Poa, e kore e kitea te hōhonutanga o te āhua o te Ingarihi (A.N.p.273:L.14).

(These words are saying, if it were not for the outbreak of the Boer War (condition), we would not have seen the depth of quality of the English (consequence)).

(102) **Engari mena** ka āta tirongia te huarahi mai o tōna whanautanga mai ki te ao, ka tere te whakaae o te hinengaro, ae (A.N.p.15:L.21).

(But if we look carefully at his progress since his birth into this world (condition), the mind will quickly agree , yes (consequence)).

A universal condition occurs in the context of *ki hea* in the first example following. In the second example following, a negative condition occurs in the context of *kei*:

(103) *Haere* a Te Aoputaputa **ki hea** kei reira anō ia (R.K.p.19:L.9).

(Wherever Te Aoputaputa went (universal (indirect) condition), he was there as well (consequence)).

(104) . . . **kei** te ruku tonu a Te Ao, **kia** whiwhi koura ia kei hoki tahanga tana kete (R.K.p.19:L.26).

(Te Ao was still diving, so that she may find some crayfish (consequence) to avoid returning with an empty kit (negative condition)).

In the final two examples below, the condition-consequence relation occurs in the context of *ki te*:

(105) Otira **ki te** kite iho o rātou kanohi i ēnei kupu, ka mōhio iho rātou kei te mau tonu atu nga whakaaro (A.N.p.54:L.8).

(Nevertheless if they read these words (condition), they will know that we are determined to uphold our thoughts (consequence)).

(106) **Ki te** whakananua e koe te whero me te kōwhai ka puta mai he tuhi paraparū, tā oneone noa iho (A.N.p.56:L.21).

(If you mix red with yellow (condition), a dirty colour is the result (consequence), only useful for marking soil.

4.3.4 Denial – correction

There are only two examples of *denial-correction* in the corpus. In the first, correction is signalled by *i te* (see below); in the second, it is indicated by *heoi anō* (see below):

(107) . . . kia rāhuitia o rātou toenga whenua i te hoko kāwanatanga i ētahi atu hoko rānei. (A.N.p.33:L.24)

(that their remaining lands be reserved (correction) rather than be purchased by government, or by any other forms of purchase (denial).

(108) . . . kāhore e kōrero, kāhore e katakata, heoi anō ka whakapoururu tonu (A.N.p.19:L.13)

(He did not speak, he did not laugh, (denial) but continued to be gloomy (correction)).

4.3.5 Concession – contraexpectation

In the following examples ((113) – (119)) of concessive relations from the corpus, *ahakoa* occurs:

(109) Ko te takoto o nga 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 nga kōrero nei ki tētahi atu o nga 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 (contraexpectation)).

(110) Tēnā koe mo to tono rangatira, mīharo ana te ngākau. *Ahako*a 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 (contraexpectation)).

(111) Ko te Ture Taiapa hou me mahi *ahako*a 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 (contraexpectation)).

(112) . . . kātahi ka kiia kia mutu te hoko i o mātou whenua, arā i nga mea e tūria ana e o mātou kāinga, me a mātou mahinga kai. No te tau 1895 ka kitea *ahako*a pēhea te kaha o nga kupu o nga rangatira kia mau ki nga whenua, tēnei anō ētahi tāngata kaore e rongō, arā me whakakaeke he here ki runga he here i nga hoko katoa, *ahako*a na te kāwanatanga, na te Pākeha 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 (contraexpectation), and therefore we must impose some conditions to prevent all purchases, whether by the government or an individual Pākeha).

(113) *Ahako*a 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 (contraexpectation)).

(114) 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)).

(115) Kua whakaetia 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.51:24).

(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 (116) – (124) illustrate, *engari* also occurs in the context of concessive relations

(116) 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)).

(117) I taku tau tuatahi kāore he mahi i oti. *Engari* i tēnei tau. (A.N.p.36:L.6)
(contraexpectation)

(During my first year no work was completed (concession). However, this year [it has been completed] (contraexpectation)).

(118) 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)).

(119) Nōna hoki nga reo e rua, te reo Maori me te reo Pākeha. *Engari* ia ko nga 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)).

(120) 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 kaore i kitea e maua. (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)).

(121) Ko nga kōrero kei nga pukapuka o te whare paremata kei roto katoa i te reo Pakeha. *Engari* i whakaaro tonu maua tērā ano pea ētahi o āna tuhinga mo te Ope Hoia Maori kei whea rānei e takoto ana (A.N.p.13:L.27).

(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)).

(122) Hei tieki i te rangimarie, me te noho pai, me nga mahi e puta ake ai he pai ki o rātou hapū i roto i o rātou rohe ake. *Engari* kaua a rātou tikanga, me nga whakahaere, e takahi i nga tikanga o nga ture o te Koroni, o nga 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)).

(123) I te tau 1895 ka puta mai e £4,000 i runga i taku tono. *Engari* i pau noa mo nga 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)).

(124) Ka mutu nga 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 (125) – (132) *otira* 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, *otira* appears to be specifically concessive in meaning, whereas *engari* is more generally contrastive, with the concessive aspect being more context dependent. *Otira* and *ahakoa* appear to convey

similar meanings except that *ahakoa* appears to carry the additional sense of summation or conclusion.

(125) 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)).

(126) 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)).

(127) 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)).

(128) 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 nga 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)).

(129) Na nga ture o te whare me nga mahi tūāhachae a nga mema i patu. *Otira* i uru nga 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)).

(130) Mehemea i patu noa ake a Paratene i te wāea kua kore e moumou te moni pāhihi. *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)).

(131) Ko te tekau mā rua tēnei o nga 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)).

(132) Me mutu i konei nga 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 (133) and (134), *kāore* (*kāhore*) appears in the context of concessive meaning. In (134), it is accompanied by *otira*. Thus, in (133), concession is implied by a

negative-positive contrast and context; in (134), it is conveyed by a combination of negative-positive contrast and a contrastive signal (*otira*).

(133) 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).

(134) . . . ka rongō a Taraia kei te ora tana tamaiti ka tipu tōna riri, *otira 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 (135) – (148) *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.

(135) Ma ia iwi, hapu rānei, e whakarite nga rāhui mo tōna takiwa, me uru mai ki roto nga whenua e riihi 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 landa being leased out (concession) disregarding the shares that have been sold (contraexpectation)).

(136) Me tahuri ia tangata e noho ana i runga i te whenua i roto i te rohe o taua kāinga ki te huna i nga taru kikino, *hāunga* ia nga 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)).

(137) 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)).

(138) Na reira au ka whakaaro me whakakaupapa poto e au ētahi kupu hei whakaea i a koutou tonu. *Hāunga* ia nga mea o koutou e kōrero ana i nga nūpepa Pākeha, (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 (139) 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.

(139) 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)).

4.3.6 Simple comparison

Bauer (1997, 417 - 418) observes that equal degree sentences in Maori: may include the state intransitive verb *rite* or the *pē* forms (*pēnei/ pēnā/pērā*). With the *pē* forms, the equative preposition is often *me*, rather than *i* or *ki* as indicated in example (140) below.

(140) “Tū noa ana ngā tūranga i Kaitu ka ngaro a Ririhiupe nui a tau.” *Pēnei* anō hoki *me* koe ka ngaro nei. (R.K.p.121:L.19)

(When the confrontation occurs at Kaitu, then Ririhiupe disappears. This is like you who have departed).

Where two different properties involving two distinct entities are equated, the covert equative structure appears to be the norm as indicated in (141) – (143) below.

(141) “He pupū anō to roto, he pupū anō to waho, whakaruru, whakawawe, ko koe anō ko ahau, a te miriniuma 2 .” (R.K.p.121:L.20)

(Stirrings take place within you; stirrings take place without. One is sheltered, the other as a result of haste. Nevertheless, we will be present at the next millenium).

(142) Ka hinga a Te Kawa ki Tamaki, ka hinga a Runga te Rangi ki Mokau. (R.K.125:L.5)

(Just as Te Kawa falls at Tamaki, so Runga te Rangi falls at Mokau).

(143) Waihoki whakamori kau ana ngā tai o Hokianga ka ngaro a Papahia. Whakamori kau ana nga tai o Wharo, ka ngaro a Toakai.Ó (R.K.p.121:L.17)

(In like manner, when the tide goes out at Hokianga, Papahia disappears, and when the tide goes out at Wharo, Toakai disappears).

4.3.7 Chronological sequence

Bauer (1997, 129) notes that *mutu* signals completion of one event or situation prior to another. This is exemplified in examples (144) – (146).

(144) *Ka mutu* ngā karanga *ka* haere ngā kupu whakahoki. (A.N.p.25:L.39)

(When the calls of welcome were over, the speeches of reply followed).

(145) *Mutu* katoa ngā whakatau *ka* tū mai ko Wipere. (A.N.p.26:L.1)

(When all the formal speeches were concluded, Wipere stood).

(146) *Ka mutu* ngā kōrero *ka* tukua te takiwā katoa o te pō mō ngā mahi āhuareka a te Koroni a Māui, me Kahukura. (A.N.p.26:L.21)

(When formal speeches were concluded, the whole evening was set aside for the entertainment by Koroni, Māui and Kahukura).

In the following example, we find the same realization of chronological sequence except for the occurrence of the passive form of *mutu*.

(147) Te *mutunga* o te koho *ka* whakahaerea ngā take kōrero o te hui.
(A.N.p.31:L.27)

(When the donations were all received, the issues of the meeting took place).

In examples (148) and (149) below, the existence of chronological sequence is signalled by the fact that two events are included, the first event being marked as completed with the occurrence of *oti/ otira*. The relationship is, therefore, inferential.

(148) Kia *oti* ēnei mā koutou e āpiti mai ērā atu tino take mārama, a, hei muri ka whakatakoto ai ki te aroaro o te kāwanatanga. (A.N.p.32:L.25)

(When these are finished, you may add other clear statements, and following that, you may present it before government).

(149) I āhua pakaru i reira te āhua o te whakaaro o te tangata. *Otirā* nā te hui ki Mataahu i te tau 1892 ka whakakotahingia anō te whakaaro o te tangata. (A.N.p.35:L.3)

(It was there that the people became somewhat divided. However, it was not till the meeting at Mataahu in 1892 that they reconciled their differences).

In examples (150) – (152), the existence of chronological sequence seems to be signalled by the multi-functional *ā*, operating in this context as a marker of delayed time.

(150) *Kaati ka* tonoa ki te kāwanatanga kia rāhuitia o tātau whenua i roto i te rārangi i raro nei. *A, ka* tonoa kia whakakorea ngā hoko. (A.N.p.34:L.3)

(In conclusion, it was forwarded to the government that our lands listed below be reserved. And then it was also requested that sales be forbidden).

(151) Mā tātau e tuku ki te kāwanatanga, *a*, mā o tātau mema e mahi atu i te whare. (A.N.p.35:L.17)

(Let us forward to the government and then let our members present in the house deal with it).

(152) . . . *ka* tae ki te Rotoātara, *ka* kauria e ia, *ā*, tae ki te moutere, nōna nei te ingoa. (R.K.p.18:L.5)

(...she arrived at Rotoātara, and swam across and arrived at the island named after him).

The following examples (153) – (162) suggest that *ka . . . ka* may signal chronological sequence rather than inceptive aspect.

(153) . . . *ka* tae ki te Rotoātara, *ka* kauria e ia, *ā*, tae ki te moutere, nōna nei te ingoa (R.K.p.18:L.5)

(. . . she arrived at Rotoātara, and swam across and arrived at the island named after him)

(154) *Ka* eke te whakamā ki a Te Huhuti, *kātahi ka* karanga atu ki te pāpā, “*Ka* kore anō ki konei. (R.K.p.18:L.28)

(Te Huhuti was overcome with embarrassment, and then she called out to her father, “There is nothing else here”.)

(155) *Kātahi ka* puta te whakaaro kia hunia e ia tana tamaiti, ara kia patua. *Ka* mea ia kia hangā he whare me nga whakaaro i roto i a ia. (R.K.p.23:L.7)

(Then the thought arose that he concealed his child that he might kill him. Then he ordered that a house be built with all its appropriate history within it).

(156) . . . *ka* whakatata atu ki te rua o te poutokomanawa, *ka* karanga atu a Hinepare ki a Tuwhakawhiurangi . . . (R.K.p.23:L.18)

(As he was getting close to the hole of the heartpole, Hinepare called out to Tuwhakawhiurangi.)

(157) ko te rerenga atu ki te kākahu e iri ana *ka* takaia mai he pōhatu ki roto, *ka* haere atu ki a Taraia, *kātahi ka* tonono atu kia takaia e ia te tamaiti ki roto i te kākahu. (R.K.p.23:L.22)

(. . . he ran to her clothing hanging up, wrapped a rock in it, approached Taraia, and requested that he wrap the child in the clothing).

(158) *Ka* tonono atu kia hōmai he wai mōna, *ka* mauria atu te tahā, *ka* wāhia. e ia. (R.K.p.18:L.8)

(She asked for some water, the container was delivered to her, whereupon she took hold of the calabash and smashed it.)

(159) *Ka* tomo nga waka i te ika, *ka* hoe ki uta . . . (R.K.p.22:L.1)

(The canoes were loaded with fish, and rowed ashore.)

(160) *Ka* kī ana tahā *ka* hoki ia. (R.K.p.25:L.27)

(When her calabashes were filled with water, she returned.)

(161) I te taenga mai ki waho o Tikirau *ka* puta te hau kino, *ka* pakaru nga hēra, *ka* hoki te kaupuke ki Paihia rā anō. (R.K.p.29:L.13)

(On the arrival outside of Tikirau a sudden wind storm arose, and the sails were torn, and the boat returned all the way to Paihia.)

(162) *Ka* riro rā a Te Rangipaiia i a Pomare *ka* noho rāua ki Taumarere. . . *Ka* taka te wā, *ka* huri a Pomare ki te whakapono. . . (R.K.p.16:L.9)

(Te Rangipaiia was taken by Pōmare and they lived at Taumarere. After a period of time, Pomare turned to Christianity . . .).

Chronological sequence occurs in the context of *hei muri rawa* in example (163).

(163) I mea au me matua whakahaere he mahi paamu i te tuatahi. *Hei muri rawa* taake ai. (A.N.p.36:L.8)

I stated as a matter of priority we must undertake farming first . Then much later, implement taxes).

In example (164), *ka* plus nominalization occurs in the context of chronological sequence.

(164) Te homaitanga *ka* hoake e ia ki te kōkā. (R.K.p.23:L.24)

(On being given [the child], he passed her to its mother.)

4.3.8 Temporal overlap

There are very few examples of the temporal overlap relation in the corpus. In example (165) below, temporal overlap appears to be signalled by the fact that the first event is marked as ongoing by the occurrence of the *e . . . ana* and the second event is marked by *ka* used as the inceptive marker.

(165) *E* ahu *ana* āna kōrero mo runga i āna mahi i te Pāremata *ka* aruarutia, . . . (A.N.p.26:L.8)

(He was talking about his performance in parliament when he was interrupted. . .)

In example (166), temporal overlap is marked by the occurrence of *i te tima ...ka*.

(166) *I te tima ka rere ka mate tētahi o ngā heramana, ka rukea atu ki te moana.*
(R.K.p.125:L.6)

(When the steamer was at sea, one of the sailors died and he was cast into the sea.)

In examples (167) – (169), temporal overlap occurs in the context of *i . . . ka*.

(167) *I a ia ka whakatata atu ki te rua o te poutokomanawa, ka karanga atu a Hinepare ki a Tuwhakawhiurangi, i ko tata atu e tū mai ana, . . . (R.K.p.23:L.18)*

(As he was getting close to the hole of the heartpole, Hinepare called Tuwhakawhiurangi who was standing close by to her, . . .)

(168) *I a ia e haere ana ka rongoa ia kua māmā tētahi (R.K.p.25:L.27)*
(As she was walking along, she felt that one was getting lighter . . .)

(169) *I a rātou e kōrero ana, ka rokohia e te po (R.K.p. 24:L.29)*
(As they were speaking, they were overcome by the darkness.)

4.3.9 Supplementary alternation

The relation involving non-antithetical choices, that is, Supplementary Alternation, occurs only twice in the corpus. On both occasions, it is signalled by *rānei*. This is consistent with Bauer's account of coordinating alternatives (Bauer 1997, 556) which are

said generally to occur in the final conjunct, following the predicative constituent, or in any preceding conjunct (s) in the corresponding sentence position.

(170) . . . i te hoko kāwanatanga i ētahi atu hoko *rānei*. (A.N.p.33:L.24)

(. . . be purchased by government, or by any other means of buying.)

(171) 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.12)

(However, do not let their rules and conduct undermine the laws of the colony or of the council accounts either.)

4.3.10 Amplification

Bauer (1997, 310) states that apposition is particularly common with a proper name and a description (occurring in either order). Where the specific term precedes the general one, amplification is generally expressed appositionally (see examples (172) and (173) below). Where the general term precedes the specific one, apposition appears to be less common in Maori. In example (174), we find general followed by particular. Here ‘kupu’ is amplified by the remainder of the sentence and the ‘māngai o Ngāti Porou’ is amplified by ‘Paratene Ngata’.

(172) . . . e tāweka mai rā i roto i tāku kupenga i te Ikakoraparua, te kāinga, i whakatauki ai taku tipuna a Tapu. (A.N.p.24:L.29)

(. . . that are ensnared in my fishing net at Ikakoraparua, the place that was proverbialised by my ancestor, Tapu.)

(173) Otira me whakahaere nga kōrero i te aroaro o to tātau mema o Wi Pere māna e mau atu ki Pōneke. (A.N.p.33:L.12)

(However, the discussions must take place in the presence of our member, (general) Wi Pere (specific), who will take it to Wellington.)

(174) Tētahi kupu kāore i konei te māngai o Ngāti Porou a Paratene Ngata. (A.N.p.33:L.11)

Another word, the spokesman of Ngāti Porou, Paratene Ngata is not here.)

In the following examples, the specific term is signalled by *o*.

(175) I tu tēnei hui ki Mangahānea, wāhi o Tūparoa, i te takiwā o Waiapu,(A.N.p.23:L.16)

(This meeting was held at Mangahānea in the area of Tūparoa in the district of Waiapu.)

(176) . . . ka whakatakotoria ēnei take ki te aroaro o Wi Pere mema o te Tairāwhiti. (A.N.p.38:L.31)

(These facts were set before Wi Pere member of Te Tairāwhiti.)

(177) Tēnei anō nga karakia o tēnei mea o te manu. (A.N.p.41:L.30)

(There were special chants for these creatures the birds.)

(178) Ka whakaae mai a Te Hurinui Apanui, te tangata o tērā iwi o Ngāti Awa. (A.N.p.49:L.20)

(Te Hurinui Apanui, the spokesman of the Ngāti Awa tribe, agreed.)

(179) I takoto ta rātou tonu moni i au ki te aroaro o nga komiti o Ngāti Porou.

(A.N.p.53:L.24)

(Their request for money was presented by me before the committee of Ngāti Porou.)

(180) Te pūtaketanga mai o tēnei ingoa o Raupare .. (R.K.p.23:L.2)

(The derivation of this name, Raupare . . .)

(181) Ko Mokena Kōhere tonu te kāpene o tōna kaipuke o Mereana

(R.K.p.27:L.23)

(Mokena Kōhere was the captain of the ship, Mereana . . .)

(182) Na Hori Mahue te kōrero i te taunga o te Kaipuke o Mokena Kōhere ki Waiheke. (R.K. p.28:L.9)

(It was Hori Te Mahue who related the arrival of the ship of Mōkena Kōhere at Waiheke.)

(183) Kia haere ia ki Toka a Kuku ki te ngaki i te mate o tōna pāpā o Pākura.

(p.35:L.14)

(That he goes to Toka a Kuku to avenge the death of his father, Pākura.)

4.3.11 Bonding

Conjoining which does not involve cause-effect, choice or temporal sequence (Bonding) generally occurs with the most ambiguous of the connectives, that is, *ā*, as indicated in the examples below.

(184) Kaati me tonu e tātau kia rāhuitia aua whenua kia whakaurua mai ngā whenua karauna i reira ki roto i te rāhui, *a* kia whakamutua te mahi a te Pākeha e ngaki nei i ngā ngahere i reira. (A.N.p.34:L.12)

(Now we must request that those lands and the lands of the crown be reserved, and that those Europeans who are felling the forests there be stopped.)

(185) E ki anā te Pirimia he take nui tēnei e pā ana ki te koroni katoa, *a*, ka tino whakaarohia e te kāwanatanga. (A.N.p.34:L.15)

(The Prime Minister has stated that this is an important issue for the whole of the country and that this will be seriously taken into consideration by government.)

(186) No te 3 o Hūrae o te tau 1874 ka whānau a Apirana, *a*, no te tau 1876 ka whānau mai hoki te taina a Renata. (A.N.p.16:L.12)

(It was on the 3 July 1874, when Apirana was born, and in the year 1876 Renata his younger brother was born.)

(187) Na te Tohunga tonu i kī ki a Paratene kia riro mā Mohi Turei e irirri, *a*, ko ngā mātua atua ko Reverend Wi Paraire . . . (A.N.p.16:L.13)

(It was the priest who said to Paratene that Mohi Turei baptise him, and that the godparents be Reverend Wi Paraire . . .)

(188) Kei te mōhio whānuitia hoki āna mahi mo Nga Mōteatea, *a*, he iti nei ta māua whai atu ki tēnei. (A.N.p.20:L.34)

(His Nga Mōteatea works are well known, and were only peripherally involved in that activity)

(189) 4. Na Māui rāua ko Te Koroni i pōhiri, *a*, na rātau tokotoru i pōhiri Te Whānau ā Rua ki Tokomaru. (A.N.p. 25:L.24)

(It was Māui and Te Koroni who conducted the welcome, and it was the three of them who welcomed T. W. a Rua of Tokomaru.)

(190) . . . kia piripono tonu, ki te mana o te kuini me ōna ture, me te Kāwanatanga o Niu Tīreni mo aianeī, *a*, ake tonu atu. (A.N.p.33:L.16)

(Let us continue to embrace the authority of the Queen and her laws, including the Government of N.Z. from now on, and forever more.)

(191) Kātahi ka haere a Paratene Ngata ki Pōneke ki te kawē i te pitihana a Ngāti Porou kia āraia te hoko i o rātau toenga whenua, *a*, kia rāhuitia aua whenua. (A.N.p.33:L.16)

(Then Paratene Ngata went to Wellington to present the Ngāti Porou petition to prevent the sale of their remaining lands, and to reserve them.)

4.3.12 Rhetorical coupling

In the case of Rhetorical Coupling, the relationship between the related states or events is emphasized. In the two examples in the corpus, this emphasis appears to be communicated by the inclusion of *hoki*.

(192) Ka ngaro koe i ngā marae o te Werengitana Hōtēra, e tū ai koe i roto i o iwi maha, hautū ai, ka ngaro ana *hoki* koe i roto o te whare wānanga.
(R.K.p.123:L.26)

(You are now lost in the premises of the Wellington Hotel where you stood within your many tribes speaking eloquently, and you are also lost within the University.)

(193) Ko tōnā ingoa e mōhiotia ai ko te Whanauarua Nama 2 me Kahukura *hoki* ki roto o Uawa . . . (A.N.)

(The name it is known by is Whanauarua number 2, and of course Kahukura within Uawa.)

4.13 Conclusions

In many cases, the analysis of the corpus supports what is recorded in Bauer (1997). However, in several places it either (a) leads to additional information, or (b) appears to contradict existing accounts.

Analysis of examples of the reason-result relation reveals that:

- 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.

So far as the means-purpose relation is concerned:

- *mā* may be associated with reason rather than purpose;
- *kite* and *ai* may co-occur;
- *kia* may occur without *ai* in clauses that do not contain an experience verb and are neither passive nor intransitive.

In the case of the condition-consequence relation:

- *mena* and *engari mena* sometimes occur with condition-consequence;
- universal conditions may occur in the context of *ki hea*;
- negative conditions may occur in the context of *kei*.

Concessive relations may:

- include *ahakoa*, *engari* or *otira*, the last of these normally being associated, in other contexts, with chronological sequence;
- *otira* 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-contradiction relation in which the second member of the relation makes reference to a concession that is exclusive in nature.

Examples of the chronological sequence relation reveal that:

- *ka . . . ka* may sometimes signal chronological sequence rather than inceptive;
- chronological sequence may occur in the context of *hei muri rawa*.

The temporal overlap relation may be signalled by:

- the occurrence of *e . . . ana* in the first member of the relation and *ka* (as inceptive) in the second member;
- the occurrence of *i te tīma . . . ka* or *i . . . ka* marks temporal overlap.

In the case of the amplification relation:

- apposition appears to be less common where the general term precedes the particular one;
- the specific term may be signalled by the occurrence of *o*.

In the case of rhetorical coupling:

- the emphasis on the relationship between states or events appears to be signalled by the inclusion of *hoki*.

A larger corpus would reveal many more aspects of semantic relational encoding in Maori. However, there is sufficient evidence here to suggest that detailed corpus-based studies are needed to supplement the analyses currently found in grammars of Maori.

CHAPTER 5

LANGUAGE TEACHING TEXTBOOKS: THE INFLUENCE OF DISCOURSE-BASED RESEARCH

5.1 Aims

The aim here is to examine the extent to which a selection of language teaching texts (English and Maori) already accommodate the types of insight that can be gained from an examination of texts in terms of inter-propositional semantic relations.

5.2 Incorporating research on text and discourse construction into mainstream first language learning: the Australian experience

In mainstream classes in Australia, teachers make use of research on text and discourse construction in the exploration and development of the English language of primary school children. One example of a textbook that is based on this type of research is *Exploring How Texts Work* by Derewianka (1990) which encourages primary school students to examine the ways in which recounts, instructions, narratives, information reports, explanations and arguments can be constructed. In each case, the students are introduced to aspects of inter-propositional semantic relational coherence and cohesion. So, for example, the sections dealing with *recount*, *instructions* and *narratives* draw attention to the use of linking words and expressions that relate to temporal overlap and temporal sequence (pp. 15, 29, & 42); the section dealing with *information reporting* draws attention to relations involving comparison and contrast (pp. 52 & 53) and the sections dealing with *explanations* and *arguments* focus on sequential and causative relations (pp. 62 & 78). In each case, teachers are encouraged to follow a curriculum cycle that involves preparation, modelling, joint construction and independent construction of texts. Classroom-based material of this kind “has generally focused on the highest level of textual organization” (Paltridge, 1994, p. 69). Nevertheless, they do

generally (as in this case) examine the semantic relationships that characterize different sections of overall text design to some extent, and therefore provide some guidance in this area.

5.3 Incorporating research on text and discourse construction into intermediate/ advanced textbooks dealing with the learning of English as a second language

Particularly at the higher levels (intermediate/ advanced) of language learning, students need to be able to construct coherent texts of a number of different kinds (such as, for example, reports and narratives). They can be helped to achieve this in a number of different ways, some of these relating directly or indirectly to the exploitation of research on inter-propositional semantic relations. A number of textbooks designed for intermediate/advanced learners of English make use of research on the construction and comprehension of coherent discourses of different types, some of these works drawing heavily on what is known about the encoding and signalling of inter-propositional semantic relations in English. One example of this is the series *Reading and Thinking in English*, a four volume series designed for second language learners who aim to study through the medium of English. The last three volumes in the series are *Exploring Functions* (The British Council, 1979), *Discovering Discourse* (The British Council, 1979) and *Discourse in Action* (The British Council, 1980). In the first of these, a range of sequential and comparative and contrastive relations are explored in the context of the reading process (pp. 1 - 21), the emphasis being on abstracting information in relation to both gist and detail. A section dealing with following instructions (pp. 22 - 35) emphasises the importance of recognizing different ways of expressing purpose and of sequencing actions. A section dealing with the description of how things work (pp. 35 - 49), focuses on the relations of *general-particular*, *means-purpose* and *chronological sequence* and their encoding in English. *Chronological sequence* and its encoding in English are prioritized in a section dealing with logical presentation of ideas (pp. 50 -64). Two sections are devoted exclusively to the *general-particular* relation (pp. 73 - 88) and the relations of *comparison* and *contrast* (pp. 89 - 106).

The next book in the series (*Discovering Discourse*) places even greater emphasis on inter-propositional semantic relations, making direct reference to *contrast*, *cause-consequence*, *general-specific*, *method-purpose* and *equivalence* in the initial section (pp. 7 - 18). *Statement-exemplification* and *chronological sequence* feature in relation to reading strategies and summarization (p. 30) and description is presented, in part, in terms of *comparison*, *contrast*, *statement-exemplification*, *reason-result*, *means-purpose* and *chronological sequence* (pp. 35, 37, 39, 40, 41, 47 & 48). Definitions are related to *means-purpose*, *comparison*, *means-result*, *general-particular* and *amplification* (pp. 53, 54 & 67). The discussion of classification (pp. 69 - 87) centres on the *general-particular* relation as well as the relation of *reason-result*. *Statement-reason*, *reason-result* and *grounds-conclusion* as well as *general-particular* and *alternation* feature in the section dealing with the statement of hypotheses (pp. 88 - 108).

An earlier work that made use of text and discourse studies was *A Course in Basic Scientific English* (Ewer and Latorre 1969). These textbooks are for students who want to go on to academic study, particularly studying science. However, there are other textbooks for more general learners of English that also rely on text and discourse studies. They include *Upper Intermediate Matters* (Bell and Gower, 1992).

In *Upper Intermediate Matters*, there is, for example, in *Unit 4* a writing section which the writers examine narrative from the point of view of linking words and expressions associated with *time*, *addition*, *contrast*, *reason* and *result*. There are other relationships such as *condition-consequence* and *means-purpose* that could usefully have been included here. Even so, this is a useful starting point. Among the exercises suggested is one - headed *Time* - that includes a list of expressions beginning with adverbs that perform specific relational functions. Students are requested to complete the sentences in terms of their own lives. Examples are:

Until I met . . .

Before I began . . .

While I was living . . .

Since I started learning English . . .

Following this exercise, there is another - headed *Addition, contrast, reason and result* - in which students are asked to select connecting words such as *since, therefore, too, however, so, as well as* and *although* to include in sentences as appropriate. Although this exercise is, in itself, a mechanical one, it can be used to lead into more context-centred work that develops understanding of the role of semantic relations in linguistic selection.

The third exercise in *Unit 4* of *Upper Intermediate Matters* does involve the construction of meaningful discourse. Here, students work in pairs beginning with sentences such as the one in italics below and using a series of relational cues (as indicated below) in the construction of coherent texts.

I screamed at my boss and walked out . . .

- 17 I also threw . . .
- 18 Nevertheless . . .
- 19 As a result . . .
- 20 That's why . . .
- 21 Because . . .

These are some of the ways in which the writers of textbooks designed for learners of English have attempted to take account of text and discourse studies. How far writers of some textbooks designed for learners of Maori have attempted to do so is examined in the following section.

5.4 Reflection of text and discourse studies in textbooks designed for learners of Maori

In this section, only three textbooks, each from the same series, a series designed by John Moorfield, are examined. However, the type of observations that are made in relation to these books could also be made in relation to other Maori language teaching texts such as *He Whakamārama* (Foster, 1987) and *Te Mātāpuna* (Cormack & Cormack, 1995) in spite of the fact that the methodological approaches are rather different in each case.

The second volume in the series by John Moorfield treats aspects of text and discourse construction and comprehension largely from a grammatical perspective. Thus, for example, in *Te Pihanga* (Moorfield, 1989), there is a section (*Section 3, p 48*) in which grammatical markers of *condition* are introduced. The discussion is confined to a distinction between conditional (*mehemea*) and future conditional (*ki te and ki te kore*). In the same section (*p. 50*), *ka . . . ai* is introduced as a way of expressing 'and then'. There is no further discussion of *Chronological Sequence*. In *Section 5* (*p. 94*), *ahakoa* is introduced as the equivalent of 'although' without any further discussion of concession. In all cases, the examples included are decontextualized. In *Section 6* (*p. 104*), students are introduced to what is referred to as 'another way of saying when' (*no . . . ka*). In fact, however, *no . . . ka* can express wither reason or temporal sequence as the following example (from Moorfield, 1989, p. 104) indicates:

1 Nō te timatanga ki te ua, ka hoki rātou ki roto.

1(a) (When/Because . . .) it began to rain, they went back inside.

Also in *Section 6* (*p.104*), there is an introduction to *ina* which is said to translate as 'when' or 'if + when' and to be used only with reference to future time. In fact, in the example below, the relationship is a complex one involving temporal overlap:

2 Ina haere koe apopo, me hari tō koti.

2 (a) When you go tomorrow, you should take your coat.

Section 6 also includes an introduction to a type of amplification involving inference:

3 Me te mea nei, na Hēmi i kai nga pea.

3(a) (It looks as if James ate the pears)

Finally, in *Section 6* there is an introduction to temporal expressions (e.g. *taro ake* (after a while), *au ake i te ata* (next day), *nawai* (after a time), *ka . . . ka* (then) and *i te + nominalization* (when)). The important feature of each of these temporal expressions is that they can signal Chronological Sequence. However, to demonstrate this fully, further context would be necessary.

In the third book in the series, *Te Mahuri*, (Moorfield, 1992), there is, once again, very little that relates directly to the teaching of text and discourse construction and comprehension with the exception of several references to grammatical features of sentences that could be related to semantic relational meanings. So, for example, in *Section 1* (pp. 27 - 28), students are introduced to 'haere' with and without *e . . . ana* (continuative) in the context of an 'action done while moving'. In fact, some of the examples (see the first two below) can be seen in terms of Chronological sequence and others (see the second two examples below) relate to Temporal Overlap.

4 Hawhe haora te pahi e rūruru haere ana, ka tae ki te ngutu awa.

4(a) (The bus bumped along for half an hour before reaching the river mouth)

5 Ka patua haerētia mai tēra iwi, a tae noa mai ki Mahurangi.

5(a) (The tribe was slaughtered as they came right to Mahurangi)

6. Ka kite ratou i te tohora e pupuha haere ana

6(a) (They saw the southern white whale spouting as it went.)

7 Kei te tangi haere mai nga kuia ki runga te marae.

7(a) (The elderly ladies are crying as they come onto the marae)

In *Section 1* also (p. 31) *kia . . . ai* and *kia kore ai* are introduced in the context of purpose. However, there is no reference at this point to the fact that they can (as indicated indirectly earlier in the series) also be used in the context of Chronological Sequence. Also at this point, alternative ways of expressing condition (*pēnei* and *pēna* rather than *mehemea*) are introduced.:

8 Penei ki, te piko te rāti, he whakatikatika tana mahi.

8(a) (If the harpoon is bent, it is his job to straighten it)

In *Section 2* (p. 42 ff.), there is an introduction to 'another way of asking and saying why something happened/ didn't happen'. In fact, the focus here is on *he aha* and *nā te aha* in the question form and *nō* and *nua te* in the reason member of the relation.

9 A: He aha tō pāpā i riri ai?

B: He whakahihī nō taku tungāne.

9(a) (A: Why was your father angry?

B: Because my brother was showing off.)

10 Na te kitenga mai o tō ratou whare i hoki mai ai ratou.

10(a) (They returned because their house had been burnt down)

11 A: Na te aha koutou i kore ai e toa?

B: Na te māngere o tō matou tīma.

11(a) (A: Why didn't you win?

B: Because our team is lazy)

In the same section (p. 44), students learn to ask "why something will be done". Once again, *he aha* is used to in the question form so that what is really the focus of attention is future time reference.

It would be useful, for example, to bring together the different ways of expressing reason in the context of different markers of time. It would also be useful to include a section dealing with different relational meanings of the same markers (e.g. *kia . . . ai* for sequence and purpose). So, for example, although *ana* with *ki te* and *ka* for sequence are treated together (p.60), there is no reference at that point to other ways of marking sequence. Similarly, the use of *ā* to mark manner or means is indicated (p. 61) without reference to other uses of *ā*.

There is very little in Te Māhuri that appears to relate directly to furthering students' understanding of textual cohesion. There is a reference to *i te/ o te/ no te* as a signal of reason (p. 63) but, again, the examples are decontextualized:

12 I te/ o te kaha mamae o ōna waewae, kā kanga ia.

12(a) (Because her feet were so painful, she sat down).

13 He kaha/no te riri no te autaiā rā, ka kanga ia.

13(a) (Because the bloke was so angry, she swore)

Once again (p. 109), students learn that *ana* can be used to signal 'when' and, once again, no reference is made to its function as a signal of Chronological Sequence.

14 Tawhito ana ōku hū, hokona ana he mea hou e au.

14(a) (When my shoes are old, I buy new ones)

15 Tae atu ana ki reira, moe ana.

15(a) (When she arrived there, she went to bed).

It is some time later (p. 164) before students are introduced to another signal of Chronological sequence (*no . . . kua/ ka*). At this point, no reference is made to *ana*.

16 No te mutunga o te tangi o te pere , kua mea a Kingi māna mātou e karakia.
16(a) (When the bell was rung, Kingi said that he would conduct the prayers)

22 No te tūtakitanga o Ngātororangi rāua ko Tia ki a rāua rākau, ka tautohetohe.
17(a) (When Ngātororangi and Tia met in their forests, they argued)

At this same point, *i te* and *na te* are introduced as a translation of 'when' although they are very clearly signalling reason in the examples provided (see below):

18 I te whakatakariri o te tumuaki , ka whiua te taitama.
18(a) (Because the principal was so angry, the youth was punished)

19 Na te haerenga mai o Paki, ka oti ngā mahi
19(a) (It was because Paki came that the job was completed).

The fourth book in the series, *Te Kohure*, (Moorfield, 1996) is written to “lift the level of proficiency of learners who are near proficient”. Whereas, however, in *Te Kakano*, *Te Pihinga* and *Te Mahuri* (the first three books in the series), there is a focus on vocabulary, syntax and idioms, *Te Kohure – Te Whakanake 4* focuses attention on vocabulary and idiomatic expressions. Each section of the book seems to be based on a theme or topic (a notable person, a historical event etc.) and there are texts from different areas. Students are required to listen to fairly long texts (between 10 and 24 pages) and then discuss them, write about them and answer comprehension questions. There are no exercises dealing specifically with aspects of textual cohesion. One of the few occasions when reference is made to a specific feature of textual meaning is a section dealing with different ways of translating 'while'. Apart from this, the only reference to cohesion appears to relate to the use of *ka . . . ai* , *kia . . . ka . . . ai* and *kei . . . ana* . As the

examples below demonstrate, *kei . . . ana* is used in the context of Temporal Overlap rather than Chronological Sequence although this difference is not clearly indicated in the textbook. In addition, the fact that *ka . . . ai* can signal reason is not drawn attention to in spite of the fact that it actually acts in this way in one of the examples given (see the third example below):

20 Heoi anō, ka mea atu a Hoani rāua ko Huriana me whāngai ai ki a au, kia puta rā au i taku Kura Minita whiwhi pāriha, ka mārena ai.

20(a) (Well, John said Juliana would wait for me until I finished my training for the ministry and had a parish and then she and I could wed).

21 Me haere tātou kei whiti ana te rā.

21(a) (Let's go while the sun is shining)

22 Ko te pānga kei runga au e noho ana, nōna, arā nā rātou ko ōna taina. Ka tūtata atu ai ki te wāhi e taki mai nei ia.

22(a) (The section where I was living belonged to her and her younger sisters. Consequently, I was close to the place where she lay.)

In summary , *Te Kohure – Te Whakanake 4* includes a number of listening and reading texts along with some ideas for speaking and writing activities. It would be possible to design a series at this level that made more direct use of what is known about coherence and cohesion in Maori and, in this way, draw the attention of the students to specific ways in which they could improve their overall proficiency.

5.5 Conclusion

As indicated above, writers of textbooks designed for learners of English have begun to take account of text and discourse studies in their content and methodology. Conducting research on aspects of text and discourse, such as the research reported here, should

provide the writers of textbooks designed for learners of Maori with an opportunity to develop and extend their works in a similar way, thus providing learners with greater opportunity to appreciate the factors involved in creating coherent discourses in Maori. If we look again at the textual illustration at the end of *Chapter 2* (see p. 42 ff.) in the context of the discussion here, we can see a range of possibilities in terms of pedagogic developments in the second language classroom. For example, a text such as this could be introduced following some vocabulary development and extension (perhaps with a focus on concrete versus abstract nouns). Each member of a group of students could then be given a different parts of the text with instructions that the group should work together to reassemble the text in an acceptable order. In doing this, the students would make use of textual cues such as 'hei', textual cues which could be reinforced when the group responses is discussed in class. As an alternative to this type of 'jigsaw reading', students could be given the first clauses of complex sentences occurring in the text along with a request that they should select appropriate sentence completions from a list of possibilities. Once again, the significance of relational cues could be discussed during the next phase of the lesson. Yet another possibility, in terms of making students more aware of the significance of textual clues to relational meanings, would be an exercise in which students were provided with jumbled sentences which, when correctly reordered, would yield the original text. Reordering the sentences would, once again, depend on a range of textual clues. Exercises of this type could be followed by joint construction of a new text on the basis of (a) research on a topic of interest, and (b) a series of textual clues which were intended to guide the text production. Finally, students could be encouraged, using the same, or similar, cues, to produce a new text on their own.

CHAPTER 6:

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Introduction

The last two decades in New Zealand have seen an important increase in momentum within the process of Maori language revitalisation. However, many Maori are urbanised and thus separated from traditional marae settings where the intergenerational tranference of language (Fishmann, 1989, 1991) would commonly occur. This has resulted in an increased demand for the provision of Maori language education programmes in primary and secondary schools and in community education contexts. Much of the teaching and learning of te reo Maori now takes place in classrooms, for short periods of time in much the same way as car maintenance, mathematics or Spanish.

The notion of second language learning of the Maori language presents significant challenges for Maori language educators and applied linguists who now must seek ways of helping those for whom Maori is not a first language to fully understand and use a range of different discourses with the same level of skill as a first language speaker. This involves not simply an understanding of syntactic structure but equal control of all of those elements needed to ensure a high level of communicative competence (Celce-Murcia, 1997). A significant dimension of communicative competence is knowledge about how discourses are created. (Bachman & Palmer, 1996; McNamara, 1996).

An overview of recent trends in applied linguistics indicates a focus on a wide range of issues, all of which contribute to an increasing understanding of the ways in which discourses operate (Halliday, 1985; Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Crombie 1985a, 1985b). In relation to the teaching and learning of English, researchers are currently examining how to apply this knowledge about discourse to second language teaching methodology (Celce-Murcia, 1997) and to the creation of textbooks which take discourse issues into account (Widdowson, 1979, 1989). The flow-on effects that resultant changes in methodology and resources will have on the testing and evaluation of students'

communicative competence is also a key issue (Bachman & Palmer, 1996; Hughes, 1989; McNamara, 1996).

6.2 Preliminary findings of the research

To date, little work has been done in the area of discourse analysis in relation to the Maori language. This research project, therefore, has been concerned with an initial attempt to approach written discourse in Maori from a new perspective, to suggest a methodology for future work in the area and to provide a preliminary assessment of the potential value of this new approach for the teaching and learning of the language.

Central to the work is an examination of the ways in which coherence is established in Maori texts (see *Chapter 2*), a suggested model of the encoding of inter-propositional semantic relations in Maori (see *Chapter 3*) and an application of this model to a small corpus of written texts (see *Chapter 4*). The model adopted for this work, and its application, is suggested by the paradigm of inter-propositional semantic relations in English outlined by Crombie (1985a, 1985b). Preliminary indications are that discourse signals in Maori are perhaps more complex than can be revealed simply through syntactic analysis of the language. It seems clear that future work in the area of understanding both spoken and written Maori must include semantic and pragmatic considerations alongside the current knowledge of syntax.

The analysis of the two Maori language teaching series presented in *Chapter 5* confirms the need for current methodological approaches (as reflected in popular textbooks) to reach beyond the production of clauses and sentences and enable students to produce a range of sophisticated discourses. Syntactic knowledge alone does not provide learners with sufficient understanding of the ways in which language operates to create discourse. Semantic and pragmatic features must also be taught and understood.

6.3 Limitations of the study

There are a number of factors which have placed limitations on this research project. The most significant of these from a research perspective is the fact that this particular

approach has not been adopted in relation to Maori before. This has meant that it was difficult to seek the views of Maori academics who, before being able to comment, would have been obliged to undertake considerable preliminary work in the area of discourse analysis without the benefit of a large bank of Maori-related literature to support the work. Notwithstanding, the project has also indicated that research in Maori language can draw considerable benefits when Maori researchers examine work being done in international language research and apply them to the local context.

There are further factors which have placed limitations on the study. In the main section of the thesis (*Chapter 3*), reference to existing research is confined to one author – Winifred Bauer – who is taken as typical in terms of analytic approach. However, for comparative and contrastive purposes, it would have been valuable, had there been time and had the study been a more extensive one, to include reference to a wider range authors. Further research in this area would need to address this issue.

Furthermore, the corpus examined in *Chapter 4* of the project, is a small, written corpus representing a single tribal area (Ngati Porou) and a limited number of text types. This is an inevitable consequence of the limitations of the scope of this kind of study, contributed to by constraints of time and availability of material. If real conclusions are to be drawn about the nature of inter-propositional relations in Maori, studies based on a larger corpus and a more extensive range of text types are needed.

6.4 Concluding remarks

Overall, this research project has indicated a way forward for future research in the area of Maori discourse analysis and Maori language and while, in a limited way, the study has provided a summary of some of the central aspects of study in this area, it is clear that a great deal more work needs to be done, and in more depth. A number of key issues have emerged.

It is clear that there is a pressing need for there to be more research in the area of Maori discourse analysis in order that Maori language be better understood. The current rule-

driven focus in both grammar books and language teaching textbooks enables learners to produce simple clauses and sentences but does not encourage the use of whole texts or a variety of complex discourses.

A greater understanding of Maori discourse could enable the production of a truly pedagogic grammar for the Maori language. This grammar would take into account not only the syntactic rules of the past but would also consider meaning in context, and conventions of language use. The production of a grammar of this kind would need to be undertaken by experienced discourse analysts with contributions from grammarians and and in collaboration with first language speakers representative of a wide range of tribal areas. This grammar would then underpin a number of other areas critical to the revitalisation and development of the Maori language.

A pedagogic grammar would make textbook writers, in particular, more aware of the need to accommodate discourse-centred studies. It would provide teachers of te reo Maori with a tool to help them become experts in pedagogic language analysis. It would provide them with a resource, in combination with newly designed textbooks, to support vibrant teaching programmes less concerned with the production of repetitive day to day, vehicular language than with the mastery of complex and sophisticated discourses.

REFERENCES

- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words: the William James lecture delivered at Harvard University in 1955*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 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.
- Bell, J. & R. Gower.(1992). *Upper intermediate matters*. England: Longman.
- Biggs, B. (1961). The structure of New Zealand Maaori. Offprinted from *Anthropological Linguistics* 3, 8.
- Biggs, B. (1969). *Let's learn Maori*. New Zealand: Auckland University Press.
- British Council. (1979). *Exploring functions*. U.K.: British Council.
- British Council. (1979) *Discovering discourse*. U.K.: British Council.
- British Council. (1980). *Discourse in action*. U.K.: British Council.
- Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Callow, K. (1974). *Discourse considerations in translating the word of God*. Grand Rapids : Zondervan Pub. House.
- Carrell, P. (1982). *Cohesion is not coherence*. Los Angeles Second Language Research Forum, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA.
- Cazden, C. (1988). *Classroom discourse : the language of teaching and learning*. Portsmouth, NH : Heinemann.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (1991). Language and communication: a time for equilibrium and integration. In Alatis, J.E. (Ed.). (1991). *Georgetown University roundtable on language and linguistics*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Celce-Murcia, M., Z. Dornyei, & S. Thurrell. (1997). Direct approaches in L2 instruction: a turning point in communicative language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly* 31, 1. 141-152.

- Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Copi, I.M. (1982). *Introduction to logic. (6th edition)*. New York: Macmillan; London: Collier Macmillan.
- Cormack, I. & S. Cormack. (1995). *Te Matapuna 1*. New Zealand: New House Publishers.
- Coulthard, M. (1977). *An introduction to discourse analysis*. London : Longman.
- 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.
- Crombie, W.H. (1987). *Free verse and prose style*. London ; New York : Croom Helm,.
- Crombie, W. H. (1988). Syllabus and method: system or licence?. *System* 16 (3), 281-298.
- Derewianka, B. (1990). *Exploring how texts work*. New South Wales: Primary English Teaching Association.
- Dulay, H. & M. Burt. (1974). Errors and strategies in child second language acquisition *TESOL Quarterly* 8. 129-136.
- Dulay, H. & M. Burt. (1974). Natural sequences in child second language acquisition *Language Learning* 24. 37-53.
- Ewer, J. & G. Latorre. (1969). *A course in basic scientific English*. U.K. : Longmans.
- Feez, S. (1988). *Text-based syllabus design*. Sydney : National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, 1998.
- Fillmore, C. (1968) The case for case. In Bach, E, & Harms, R. (Eds). (1968). *Universals of linguistic theory*. New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston.
- Fischmann, J. (1989). *Language and ethnicity in minority sociolinguistic perspective*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Fischmann, J. (1991). *Reversing language shift*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Foster, J. (1987). *He whakamarama. A new course in Maori*. New Zealand: Reed.
- Foster, J. (1997). *Nga kupu whakamarama. Maori grammar*. New Zealand: Reed.

- Fotos, S. (1994). Integrating grammar instruction and communicative language use through grammar consciousness-raising tasks. *TESOL Quarterly* 28. 323-351.
- Garbutt, M. & K. O'Sullivan. (1996). *IELTS practice tests*. Sydney : National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarie University.
- Gonthier, J. & C. Geoghegan. (1996). *Voici!: the new course in French for adult beginners*. London : Hodder & Stoughton.
- Grice, H.P. (1981). Presupposition and conversational implicature. In Cole, P. (Ed.). *Radical pragmatics*. New York: Academic Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1985). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London ; Baltimore, Md., USA : E. Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A.K. & Hasan, R. (1976/1985) *Cohesion in English*. London : Longman.
- Harawira, K.T. (1950). *Teach yourself Maori*. New Zealand: A.H. & A.W. Reed.
- Harlow, R. (1996) *Maori*. München : LINCOM EUROPA.
- Head, L. (1989). *Making Maori sentences*. New Zealand: Longman Paul.
- Hohepa, P.W. (1967). A profile generative grammar of Maori. Baltimore, USA: Waverly Press Indiana University.
- Honderich, T. (Ed.). (1995). *The Oxford companion to philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hughes, A. (1989). *Testing for language teachers*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hymes, D. (1971). *On communicative competence*. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press.
- Kaa, W. & Te O. (1996). *Apirana T. Ngata: āna huinga i te te reo Maori*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Kaa, W. & Te O. (1994). *Nga kōrero a Reweti Kohere mā*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Karena-Holmes, D. (1995). *Maori language. Understanding the grammar*. New Zealand: Otago University Press.

- Krashen, S. & Tyrell, T. (1983). *The natural approach to language acquisition in the classroom*. Oxford/San Francisco: Pergamon/Alemanya.
- Krupa, K. (1966). *Morpheme and word in Maori*. The Hague: Mouton and Co.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (1992). Macrostrategies for the second/foreign language teacher. *Modern Language Journal* 76. 41-49.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lyons, J. (1981). *Language, meaning, and context*. London: Fontana.
- Lyons, J. (1981) *Language and linguistics : an introduction*. Cambridge; New York : Cambridge University Press.
- McNamara, T. (1996). *Measuring second language performance*. USA: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Melrose, R. (1991). *The communicative syllabus : a systemic-functional approach to language teaching*. London ; New York : Pinter Publishers.
- Ministry of Education. (1995a). *Spanish in the New Zealand curriculum*. Wellington, N.Z.: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (1995b). *Chinese in the New Zealand curriculum*. Wellington, NZ: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (1998a). *Japanese in the New Zealand curriculum*. Wellington, N.Z.: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (1998b). *Korean in the New Zealand curriculum*. Wellington, N.Z.: Learning Media.
- Moorfield, J. (1989) *Te pihanga*. New Zealand: University of Waikato.
- Moorfield, J. (1996). *Te kohure*. New Zealand: University of Waikato.
- Ngata, A.T. (Ed.). (1901). *New and complete manual of Maori conversation*. New Zealand: Lyon and Blair.
- Ngata, A.T. (Ed.). (1926). *Complete manual of Maori grammar and conversation with vocabulary*. New Zealand: Whitcombe and Tombs.
- Paltridge, B. (1994) Genre analysis and the language learning classroom : a relational perspective. *Working papers in language education*. 65-73.

- Pienemann, M. (1989). Is language teachable? *Applied Linguistics* 10. 52-79.
- Pienemann, M. & K. Hyltenstam. (Eds.). (1985). *Modelling and assessing second language acquisition*. Clevedon . Multilingual Matters.
- Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second language pedagogy: a perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Prior, A. N. (1976). Propositions and sentences. In *The doctrine of propositional terms*. London:
- Reedy, T. (1979). *Complex sentence formation in Maori*. USA: Ann Arbor : University Microfilms International.
- Richards, J. C. (1990). *The language teaching matrix*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. & T. Rogers. (1982) Method: approach, design and procedure. *TESOL Quarterly* 16, 153-168.
- Ryan, P.M. (1978). *Modern Maori book 1*. New Zealand: Heinemann Publishers (NZ) Ltd.
- Savignon, S.J. (1990). Communicative language teaching: definitions and directions. In Alatis, J.E. (Ed.). (1991). *Georgetown University roundtable on language and linguistics*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Searle, J. (1969). *Speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sinclair, J. & M. Coulthard. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse : the English used by teachers and pupils*. London : Oxford University Press.
- Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford ; New York : Oxford University Press.
- Stern, H. (1983). *Fundamental concepts in second language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse analysis: the sociolinguistic analysis of natural language*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Maori (1999). *He kohinga kiwaha*. New Zealand: Reed.
- Waititi, H. (1962) *Te tangatahi 1*. New Zealand: Government Printer.

- Waititi, H. (1964) *Te rangatahi 2*. New Zealand: Government Printer.
- Waititi, H. (1978) *Te rangatahi 3*. New Zealand: Government Printer.
- Williams, W.L. (1923). *First lessons in Maori*. New Zealand: Whitcombe and Tombs.
- Williamson, C. (1968). Propositions and abstract propositions. In Rescher, N. (Ed.). *Studies in Logical Theory*. Oxford: O.U.P.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1978). *Teaching language as communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Widdowson, H.G. (Ed). (1979). *Discovering discourse: reading and thinking in English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1989). Knowledge of language and ability for use. *Applied Linguistics 10*. 128-137.
- Widdowson, H.G. (1990). *Aspects of language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wills, W.H. (1950) *Lessons in the Maori language*. New Zealand, New Plymouth: Thomas Avery and Sons Ltd..
- Wilkins, D. (1976). *Notional syllabuses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 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.