C.H. Beaumont. <u>The Tigak Language of New Ireland.</u>
Pacific Linguistics B58, 1979. Pp xii + 163.

Malcolm Ross
University of Papua New Guinea

Clive Beaumont's description of Tigak is a very welcome addition
to the published accounts of Austronesian languages in the New Guinea
region. It is the first published grammar of a northern New Ireland
language, and the first in English of any of the languages of New
Ireland[1].

The work begins with an introduction to Beaumont's tagmemic
approach, which is followed by an account of Tigak phonology. Four
subsequent chapters describe the grammatical structure at sentence,
clause, phrase and word levels respectively. An account of Tigak
dialect variation and two Tigak texts with morpheme-by-morpheme
glosses, free translation and commentary make up the two final
chapters. The book is also furnished with a Tigak-English wordlist of
some 700 items, an English-Tigak index to this, an index to the
grammar, and two maps showing the languages of New Ireland and the
dialects of Tigak. The excellent use of various type-faces
contributes much to the book's clarity.

The amount of information contained in Beaumont's analysis and
additionally available in his numerous sentence-examples and texts make
this a useful reference work for the descriptive linguist, and the
chapter on dialect variation is an extra bonus for the comparativist.

Certain aspects of the analysis, however, leave something to
be desired. The flexibility and language-centred nature of tagmemic
analysis to which Beaumont refers on page 4 have not been as
thoroughly applied as they might have been, with the result that
several significant generalizations implied in the data are missing.
The division of the analysis into sentence, clause, phrase and word
levels, and the superimposition at each level of semantic categories
(e.g. time, manner, genitive, dative) which do not always reflect

184

Tigak structure mean that related uses of the same morpheme are scattered throughout the book. For example, the relator morpheme te ~ ta- is mentioned in sections 4.1.5.5 and 4.1.5.7 in connection with the time and manner peripheries to clause bases; 4.7 and 4.8 with time and manner clauses; 5.1.3.1 with possessive noun phrases; 5.3.1, 5.3.6, and 5.3.8 with genitive, time and manner phrases; and in 6.4.1.5 as a constituent of genitive/possessive pronouns. A more 'traditional' presentation in terms of morphology and syntax and less use of predetermined semantic categories might well have captured useful intermediate levels of structure and generalizations both within and across grammatical levels which are absent from the analysis. An account of the paradigmatic relations between units and of their distribution would have balanced Beaumont's syntagmatic account.

I should like to complement Beaumont's work by offering a reanalysis of the area of what Beaumont calls relators, i.e., more traditionally, prepositions. I have additionally used data from Omo village (see Map 2), also in Beaumont's Central dialect area but nearer to Kavieng than his data from Kaselok, from which Omo differs marginally. It may well be that features present at Omo are absent at Kaselok, and Omo examples are accordingly marked (O). Omo replaces the Kaselok common article a (p.60) with the indefinite article ta.

Tigak prepositions can be divided on morphological grounds into four categories:

1. i   inalienable possession, attribution, purpose
   ka   alienable possession, beneficiary
   ta   alienable possession, and uses considered below
   pa   instrument, accompaniment
   su   location, direction
1a. kuli location ('on top of')

185

2. lo   location, direction
   e   location, direction
3. an-   reference.

The prepositions su, lo and e are glossed identically, as they are in complementary distribution, as will be shown below.

Category 1 is characterized by its differing forms in three environments:

a) the preposition stands unsuffixed before a personal noun phrase, but preposition-final a becomes e:

   (1) na   tiga-na   i Gamsa (p.60)
       the brother-his of Gamsa   'Gamsa's brother'

   (2) suk   kariu ke Lapan (0)
       bring bamboo for Lapan

   (3) gi etok malan te tama-k (p.71)
       he talk as   of father-my   'He talks like my father'

   (4) rig-a pising-i   pe Taugui (p.69)
       they-past say-him with Taugui 'They called him Taugui'

   (5) ga   sang su Tamasigai (p.59)
       he.past come to Tamasigai   'He came to Tamasigai'
                                    (person's name)

b) the preposition has the morpheme -na suffixed to it before a common noun phrase:

   (6) suk   kariu ima i-na lui (0)
       bring bamboo come for house   'Bring bamboo for the
                                                        house'

   (7) ta kariu   ang ka-na tang anu iang (0)
       a bamboo this for   the man this
       'This bamboo is for this man'

   (8) ta kariu   ang ta-na tang anu iang (0)
       a bamboo this of   the man this
       'This bamboo is this man's'

186

(9) gi vis-i tang piu pa-na iai (p.42)
    he hit-it the dog with stick
    'He hit the dog with a stick'

(10) ga   lisan-i su-na tang ulina (p.43)
     he.past bring-it to   the   woman
     'He brought it to the woman'

c) the preposition has a possessive pronoun suffixed to it and
   may undergo certain morphological changes, well described by
   Beaumont (pp.99-103):

   ka-ri   'their, for them'
   tata-ri 'their'
   papa-ri 'with them'
   su-ri   'to them'
   (the preposition i has no corresponding forms).

Category 1a, kuli 'on top of' (Beaumont has kula) differs from
Category 1 only in that its (b)-form is not the predicted *kuli-na,
but kula:

(11) tang anu kula lui (0)
     the man on   house
     'The man is on top of the house'

Otherwise kuli behaves like Category 1 prepositions (e.g. kuli Lapan
'on top of Lapan'; kuli-ri 'on top of them').

The members of Category 2, the locative prepositions lo and e
remain unsuffixed and unchanged:

(12) tang anu lo lui (0)
     the man in house   'The man is in the house'

(13) nak inang e Kaplaman (p.69)
     I   go   to Kaplaman 'I am going to Kaplaman'

Category 3, an- (which Beaumont has as a simple relator ani) is
a prepositional verb. It behaves like a transitive verb and takes
object pronoun suffixes (whereas prepositions proper take possessive
pronoun suffixes):

187

(14) <u>ga</u>   <u>aigot-i</u>   <u>pok</u> <u>an-iri</u> (p.43)
     he.past prepare-it food for-them

     'She prepared food for them'

(15) <u>ga</u>   <u>etok</u> <u>an-i</u>   <u>a</u> <u>mamana</u> <u>ot</u>   <u>akurul</u> (p.68)
     he.past talk about-it a plural thing many

     'He talked about many things'

It also seems reasonable to treat Beaumont's transitive suffix <u>-ani-</u>
as the same morpheme, the more so as the 'suffix' is separable from
the verb:

(16) <u>ga</u>   <u>giak</u> <u>epatok</u> <u>an-iri</u> (p.76)
     he.past send   away   ∅-them

     'He sent them away'

The forms assumed by <u>i</u>, <u>ta</u>, <u>pa</u> and <u>kuli</u> before common noun
phrases also introduce clauses of purpose (p.54), time and manner
(pp.54-5), reported speech (pp.29-31) and reason (p.53) respectively.
Although Beaumont mentions this correspondence (p.107), he has not
organized his data so as to show the paradigmatic relations described
above, as the scattered page references of the examples indicate.

Reference to the complementary distribution of the three
locative prepositions <u>su</u>, <u>lo</u> and <u>e</u> is also missing. Their co-
occurrence relations are:

   <u>su</u> +   personal noun phrase[2], common noun phrase denoting
            person(s); examples (5) and (10) above

   <u>lo</u> +   locative noun phrase; example (12) above

   <u>e</u>   +   locative pronoun, place name; example (13) above.
These relations require the definition of the additional categories
locative noun phrase and locative pronoun.

A locative noun phrase is a subcategory of Beaumont's common
noun phrase (pp.60-1) which has as its head a locative noun, i.e.,
a common noun denoting location or time which occurs after <u>lo</u> with
no intervening article. Locative nouns may belong either to
Beaumont's alienable category (p.89), e.g. <u>lo lui</u> 'in the house'

(p.61), lo kono 'on the beach' (0), lo matang 'in the garden' (0), lo ge 'in the afternoon' (p.44), or to his part-noun category (p.88). Although the book contains few examples of these, locative noun phrases with a part-noun as head play an important role in denoting locations in Tigak. But for the lack of an article, their structure is the same as that of a possessive common noun phrase with a part-noun as head. For example:

common noun phrase.

   (17) tang lingi-na i Gamsa (p.62)

       the voice-his of Gamsa   'Gamsa's voice'

locative noun phrase:

   (18) (lo) no-na   i Lapan (0)

       (at) front-his of Lapan   'in front of Lapan'

Further examples of locative noun phrases with lo and a part-noun are:

   (19) lo la-na   lui (p.62)

       at inside-its house   'inside the house'

   (20) lo paka-k   (0)

       at underneath-my   'underneath me'

   (21) lo tua-na   ta dum (0)

       at side-its the river   'beside the river'

   (22) lo mugi-m   (0)

       at back-your(sg)   'behind you(sg)'

   The category locative pronoun results from a reanalysis of some of Beaumont's locative adverbs, from which the preposition has not been segmented[3]:

   evang   'there' (p.104)   =   e vang

   egeng   'here' (p.104)   =   e geng

   epakal   'above' (p.104)   =   e pakal(cf.pakpakal 'shoulder')

   eve   'where?' (p.46)   =   e ve

Omo has e tang 'there', e keng 'here', e kul 'up there', e laman 'down there (at the beach)' and e ve 'where?'

   Four quite simple distributional statements can be made about prepositional phrases.

Firstly, phrases formed with all prepositions except ta are found as adverbial phrases in clause peripheries. Beaumont gives examples including pa (example (9) above), su (example (10)), kuli and lo (p.44), e (example (13)), an- (examples (14) and (15)), but has not found i or ke in this environment. Examples (6) and (2) above respectively fill this gap.

Secondly, phrases formed with all prepositions except pa and an- are found as the complement of a verbless sentence. (This is predictable for an- as it is a prepositional verb.) Examples are, for ka, (7); for ta, (8); for kuli, (11); for lo (12); and for i, su and e, these below:

(23) ta kariu   ang i-na lui (0)
     a bamboo   this for house   'This bamboo is for the
                                                    house'

(24) Lapan su Taia (0)
     Lapan at Taia   '(the man) Lapan is with (the woman)
                                                    Taia'

(25) Lapan e Omo (0)
     Lapan at Omo   'Lapan is at Omo(village)'

Beaumont does not note prepositional phrases in this environment, and consequently his formula for verbless sentences (p.41) requires expansion to include them.

Thirdly, phrases formed with the prepositions i, ka and ta mark the possessor in various kinds of possessive noun phrase, as is shown on pp.61-2 and 67-8.

Fourthly, phrases formed with ta, pa, su, lo, and e all occur in what I will call expanded prepositional phrases, i.e. phrases consisting of a relator plus a prepositional phrase. These relators fall into a non-verbal and a verbal subclass. The most common member of the non-verbal subclass is ul 'from', which precedes any of the three complementary locative prepositions su, lo and e:

(26) nag-a ima ul   su Lapan (0)
     I-past come from at Lapan
     'I have come from (the man) Lapan'

190

     (27) <u>nag-a</u> <u>ima</u> <u>ul</u> <u>lo</u> <u>paka-na</u>   <u>lui</u> (0)
          I-past come from at underneath-its house
          'I have come from underneath the house'

     (28) <u>nag-a</u> <u>ima</u> <u>ul</u> <u>e</u> <u>kul</u> (0)
          I-past come from at up.there
          'I have come from up there'

Since only the last of these combinations is noted in the book, where
it is treated as a unitary preposition <u>ule</u> (p.69), it is possible that
<u>ul</u> is not a separate morpheme in the Kaselok communalect. Two other
non-verbal relators are found in Beaumont's examples, namely <u>malan</u> 'as'
(+ <u>ta</u>) and <u>kuvul</u> or <u>kum</u> 'together' (+ <u>pa</u>):

     (29) <u>gi</u> <u>etok</u> <u>malan</u> <u>te</u> <u>tama-k</u> (p.71)
          he talk as   of father-my
          'He talks like my father'

     (30) <u>ga</u>   <u>minang</u> <u>kum</u>   <u>papa-nik</u> (p.70)
          he.past stay   together with-me
          'He stayed with me'

    Three verbal relators <u>inang</u> '(go) to', <u>isua</u> '(go) down to', and
<u>isa</u> '(go) up to' are the semantic opposites of <u>ul</u> 'from', and denote
motion towards somewhere. The first, <u>inang</u>, occurs frequently in the
examples as an independent verb 'go', but always preceding a
prepositional phrase (cf. example (13) above). However, all three
function not only as independent verbs but as relators before <u>su</u>, <u>lo</u>
and <u>e</u>:

     (31) <u>na</u> <u>Lapan</u> <u>ga</u>   <u>suk</u> <u>bua</u>   <u>inang</u> <u>su</u> <u>Taia</u> (0)
          the Lapan he.past take betelnut go.to at Taia
          'Lapan took betelnut to Taia'

     (32) <u>na</u> <u>Lapan</u> <u>ga</u>   <u>puka</u> <u>isua</u>   <u>lo</u> <u>la-na</u>   <u>mata</u> (0)
          the Lapan he.past fall go.down.to at inside-its ditch
          'Lapan fell into the ditch'

Beaumont's relator <u>tuk</u> 'until', homophonous with the verb <u>tuk</u> 'stand',
is similarly reanalysable as a verbal relator (with preposition <u>ta</u>):

(33) <u>ga</u>   <u>aisok</u> <u>tuk</u>   <u>ta-na</u> <u>gan</u> <u>tap</u> (p.70)
      he.past work stand of   day holy
      'He worked until Sunday'

All the expanded prepositional phrases described above occur as adverbial phrases in clause peripheries.

Although the reanalysis presented here implies certain shortcomings in Beaumont's analysis, no reader can overlook the immense labour which has gone into the collection of data not only at Kaselok, but also for other communalects on which the account of dialect variation is based. Nor can he do other than admire the detailed analysis, of which only a small part has been touched on here. Few such detailed accounts of Austronesian languages in Papua New Guinea are available, and this one earns our gratitude.

NOTES

1. Three grammars of New Ireland languages have appeared in German; two, of Tangga and Lihir, have appeared as microfilms (H. Maurer, <u>Grammatik der Tanga-Sprache</u>, Micro-Bibliotheca Anthropos 39; K. Neuhaus, <u>Grammatik der Lir-Sprache</u>, MBA 20), whilst an early account deals with Patpatar (S. Peekel, <u>Grammatik der neu-mecklenburgischen Sprache, speziell der Pala-Sprache</u>, volume 9 of the <u>Archiv für das Studium deutscher Kolonialsprachen</u>, 1908).

2. I have collapsed Beaumont's proper noun phrase, kinship noun phrase, and personal pronoun into the single category of personal noun phrase for the purposes of this reanalysis.

3. The locative adverb <u>losiliak</u> 'close' (p.104) is analysable as a prepositional phrase <u>lo siliak</u> 'at (the) side', as demonstrated by the Omo example <u>lo silik i Lapan</u> 'at Lapan's side'.