

Classificatory Particles in the Language of Kiriwina

Bronislaw Malinowski

Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, University of London, Vol. 1, No. 4. (1920), pp. 33-78.

Stable URL:

http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=1356-1898%281920%291%3A4%3C33%3ACPITLO%3E2.0.CO%3B2-B

Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, University of London is currently published by School of Oriental and African Studies.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/journals/soas.html.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

The JSTOR Archive is a trusted digital repository providing for long-term preservation and access to leading academic journals and scholarly literature from around the world. The Archive is supported by libraries, scholarly societies, publishers, and foundations. It is an initiative of JSTOR, a not-for-profit organization with a mission to help the scholarly community take advantage of advances in technology. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CLASSIFICATORY PARTICLES IN THE LANGUAGE OF KIRIWINA¹

By BRONISLAW MALINOWSKI, Ph.D. (Cracow), D.Sc. (London)

CONTENTS

- I. Ethnographic Study of Language.
- II. Word Formation and Classification.
- III. General Definition of the Classificatory Formatives in the Language of Kiriwina.
- IV. Synoptic Table of the Particles and Commentary with regard to-
 - 1. Meaning.
 - 2. Degree of Obsoleteness.
 - 3. Grammatical Function.
- V. Grammatical Analysis of the Formed Expressions.
 - Numerals.
 - Demonstratives.
 - Adjectives.

Other Grammatical Formations.

VI. Semantic Reflections.

Ι

That language is an ethnographic document of fundamental importance is a plain truism. It also hardly needs stressing that the knowledge of all aspects of tribal life, without exception, is essential to a sound knowledge of any one aspect. To omit, for instance, the study of religion, or economics, or social organization when dealing with a native society, results not only in our ignorance of the subject omitted, but also lowers the value of all that has been recorded. All aspects of tribal life play into each other; to sunder a few of them from the rest results in a mutilation of the whole, and language is not an exception in this respect. The study of the linguistic aspect is indispensable, especially if we want to grasp the social psychology of a tribe, i.e. their manner of thinking, in so far as it is conditioned by the peculiarities of their culture. All this is clear and well known.

The nature, however, of the correlation between structure of language and social psychology, the manner in which language throws light upon native mentality, seem to be only partially understood. On the one hand, it is a well-known principle that in studying any aspect of native life the native terminology of this subject must be

VOL. I. PART IV.

¹ Some results of the Robert Mond Ethnographic Research among the Natives of the Trobriand Islands, British New Guinea.

recorded.¹ On the other hand, there are the general features of linguistic structure, rules of syntax, parts of speech, and word formation. Everybody agrees that in an ethnographic work these should be recorded, that all essential linguistic facts should be collected. But all collection of facts requires the guidance of definite theoretical principles, and, again, all linguistic features that have been recorded should be interpreted from the ethnological point of view. "How is the study of particular languages to be pursued successfully if it lacks the stimulus and inspiration which only the search for general principles can impart to any branch of science ? . . . There must be present a sense of wider issues involved, and such issues as may directly interest a student devoted to language for its own sake. The formal method of investigating language, in the meantime, can hardly supply the needed spur. . . . The philologist, then, if he is to help anthropology, must himself be an anthropologist . . . he must correlate words with thoughts, must treat language as a function of the social life."²

The principles of such linguistics—in a form accessible and useful for an ethnographer—have not yet been laid down. There is, of course, the vast literature dealing with comparative linguistics of Indo-European languages, with philological problems, with the history of modern European languages, with questions of teaching foreign languages, living or dead. There are also many theories framed on the basis of native ³ languages and aiming at the comparison of types of linguistic structure and at a reconstruction of general linguistic development.

Whatever their general theoretical value might be, almost all these theories are as good as useless for an ethnographer who needs guidance

¹ This principle has been, to my knowledge, first systematically adopted and thoroughly carried out by A. C. Haddon, W. H. Rivers, C. G. Seligman, and their collaborators in the research done amongst the Torres Straits Islanders. The extensive and excellent linguistic contribution of S. H. Ray (vol. iii of the Reports, Cambridge, 1907) marks this work also as the first practical recognition of the principle that a scientific study of language is essential to a full ethnographic description. There exist, however, other standard works of ethnology, where the linguistics are simply not given, although the authors claim a thorough acquaintance with the language.

² R. R. Marett, Anthropology, in "Home University Library", pp. 136-7. Every word of this, I am sure, will be endorsed by anyone, who has tried to do ethnolinguistic field-work.

³ I use the word "native" for want of a better one. By "native languages" I mean those spoken by uncivilized races. "Savage" or "primitive" are equivalent words, but they seem still clumsier and more equivocal than "native". in his linguistic field-work. For all of them are constructed from an oblique point of view; the student of Comparative Linguistics tries to build up the prehistoric Indo-European forms and to trace their further development in the various branches; the Classical Philologist deals with dead languages, embodied in inscriptions and literary documents, and his aim is, or should be, to bring them to life as far as possible; the Modern Linguist is busy with the historical development of German, French, English, Polish, etc., and with the normative shaping of his language. The Ethnographer, on the other hand, has the most direct scientific task : that of describing exhaustively, minutely, and precisely a living, full, organic phenomenon of a language hitherto not studied.

Even the works specially dealing with the broad survey of human languages, including such of native races, are of not much value to one who has to make first-hand linguistic observations. For they are interested in formalistic classification of the types of human speech and in broad outlines of evolution, rather than in defining and analysing fundamental grammatical concepts. These works, as well as studies on the psychology of language and general introductions to linguistic study, contain much valuable and suggestive material for a theory such as is here postulated. As they stand, however, they are of little direct help to an ethnographer who is not a specialist in linguistics, yet has to record a new type of language.

In saying this I am simply stating my own experience in this matter. It would require a volume to substantiate this statement. The reading of such works as Wundt's *Sprache*, Paul's *Principles*, Professor Tucker's and Professor Oertel's treatises has helped me immensely in my work it has, so to speak, allowed me to *see* linguistic facts.¹ All these works, however, are résumés of the present state of linguistics, and they reflect the insufficient attention hitherto given to Semantics. And it is only from the development of Semantics, as will be shown later on, that the ethnographer can look for real help.² The works dealing with native languages, such as W. von Humboldt's treatise on the Kawi language, F. Müller's *Outlines*, v. d. Gabelentz's monograph, contain much that

¹ W. Wundt, Volkerpsychologie, first two volumes; Die Sprache, Leipzig, 1900; H. Paul, Principles of the History of Language, English translation, London, 1888; T. G. Tucker, Introduction to the Natural History of Language, London, 1908; H. Oertel, Lectures on the Study of Language, New York, 1901.

² Breal's work *Semantics*, English translation, London, 1900, though interesting and stimulating, in my judgment does not face the real problems of the subject.

PAPERS CONTRIBUTED

is extremely valuable.¹ But, as far as I can judge, all the general linguistic views contained in these books, in order to be useful for our purpose, need to be recast and worked out systematically with the one aim in view, that of guiding linguistic research in connexion with ethnographic study. It must be remembered that Humboldt, F. Müller, v. d. Gabelentz, and the majority of specialized linguists had received their linguistic data at second hand. Whereas most of those, who made actual field observations on native languages troubled little about exhaustive linguistic theory.

Whereas the other branches of linguistics project their material on to a prehistoric phase or on to a historic development, or on to the ideal plane of what ought to be—and in all this they have a free hand for hypothesis and speculation—the ethnographer is limited to one phase, to one language, and to one task : that of scientifically recording it. On the other hand, his material, a living language, spoken by a native community, lacks all written documents and is made still more elusive by the considerable latitude allowed to individual variations and to tribally accepted equivalents, to say nothing of the fundamental difficulty of understanding well a language of so different a type from our own. The fuller and more elusive the subject to be recorded, the greater the need for a sound guiding theory. Such a theory—specially adapted for the ethnographer's need—can only be achieved by a frontal attack on Semantics, that is by a thorough study of the relation between linguistic Form and Meaning.

It is impossible in a short essay to give even an outlined argument for the justification of this last sentence, but the main theme of this article will give a concrete example of what is meant. It may also be pointed out that these views are not isolated. In some "Thoughts on the subject of Language", published in *Man*, 1919, No. 2, A. H. Gardiner shows very conclusively that unless we remodel our conception of the fundamental nature of speech, we cannot arrive at any satisfactory view about the elementary facts of syntax. He also recognizes clearly that any obscurity on such fundamental grammatical concepts as Parts of Speech, Subject, Predicate, etc., stands in the way of positive linguistic work.

"My own researches in Egyptian Grammar had brought me to grips with the fundamental and perplexing problems of 'subject',

¹ W. v. Humboldt, Ueber die Kawi Sprache auf der Insel Java, 3 vols., Berlin, 1836; esp. Einleitung, in vol. i. Friedrich Müller, Grandriss der Sprachwissenschaft, 3 vols., Wien, 1896. H. C. v. d. Gabelentz, "Die Melanesischen Sprachen": Abhandl. d. k. Sächs. Gesellschaft, viii.

' predicate', word-order, tense, and the like; it is a regrettable fact that Egyptologists have but the haziest notion as to what the term ' predicate ' means, or ought to be made to mean, and some excursions into Semitic and Indo-Germanic philology suggest that the students in these fields are in no better case." (Ibid.) Speaking from a much more limited experience, of course, I can only fervently endorse these words.

There can be no doubt that both the deeper knowledge of what language really is and a Semantic theory—explaining the nature of parts of speech and their modifications (case, tenses, etc.) of syntactic concepts, such as subject and predicate of word-formation and formative elements—are indispensable for Ethnographic linguistics.

Π

We shall deal in this article with a single linguistic phenomenon, namely, the *classificatory formatives* in the language of Kiriwina, Trobriand Islands, an archipelago lying due north of the eastern end of New Guinea.

Let us first define the expression "classificatory formatives". If we take the Latin word for "father" in its various cases and derivations—patris, patrem, patribus, patria, etc.—there are the variable endings -is, -em, -ibus, etc. (the inflectional suffixes or inflectional formatives), and the stable element, pater-. This, again, can be analysed into the root pa, and the word-formative -(t)er.¹ This syllable -(t)er appears also in other words as mater, frater, $\theta v \gamma \dot{a} \tau \eta \rho$ —words denoting relationship. This formative is characteristic of kinship terms, and it carries the meaning of this class of word. It is an example of what could be called a class-formative. Other examples of such class-formatives are numerous in Indo-European languages.²

Thus a class-formative is an affix or infix, common to a class of words, and distinguishable from the root and from inflectional endings or prefixes. In what follows we shall use formative, short for classformative.

¹ Compare Brugmann-Delbrück, *Grundriss*, 1906, vol. ii, pt. i, p. 4, pars. 3 sqq. In that work also endless examples of roots and formatives can be found. For kinship nouns see pp. 331 sqq., pars. 243-9; also p. 602, par. 474. I must add that I myself am not acquainted with the technicalities of Indo-European comparative linguistics. Of Brugmann-Delbrück's treatise I tried to understand only the main outlines and the general theoretical parts.

² See Brugmann-Delbrück, chapters on "Bedeutung der Nominalstämme (Bedeutungsgruppen)", pp. 582-681. For a few concise and clear examples: Oertel, op. cit., p. 160; Wundt, op. cit., vol. ii, pp. 15 sqq. Some formatives have no discoverable meaning. Others have a vague significance, in so far as they give expression in form to the general meaning, common to a class of cognate words, as -(t)er in the above example. In others, again, this meaning is distinctly and clearly felt, as in diminutives and pejoratives, for instance.

In all the examples so far given the formatives are characteristic of certain limited classes of words, but they do not entail a general principle of classification. In Indo-European languages the nearest approach to classificatory formatives are no doubt the suffixes denoting gender. All nouns in these languages are divided into three classes, masculine, feminine, and neuter, and these classes are marked either on the nouns themselves or on the concomitant adjectives or pronouns—by formatives, which can be called *classificatory*, because they distinguish a noun as a member of one of the three classes. But in Indo-European, though the classification itself is comprehensive, the classificatory nominal suffixes lack consistency, so that it is impossible to read the gender of a noun from its ending alone. Again, it is difficult or impossible to define the gender groups, with regard to their meaning.¹

In some native languages the classification of nouns into groups one may regard them as generalized genders—is carried out with further subdivision and greater consistency of form and meaning. The Bantu languages are a well-known example. "In the Bantu languages we find no genders based on sex, but instead other genders or classes of substantive, based principally . . . on the degree of unity and consistency of those things of which they are the names, as determined by their natural position and shape, their proper motion, effects, relative strength, etc."²

Again, in some languages of Eastern Asia and Indonesia there exist classificatory words used with numerals and denoting the class to which the objects numbered belong. Thus in Japanese there are

¹ Cf. Delbrück's conclusion: "Unsere Aufstellung hat also ergeben dass es bisher nicht gelungen ist, gewisse allgemeine Anschauungen oder Begriffe aufzufinden, von denen man annehmen könnte, dass sie die Sprechenden zu der Geschlechtsbezeichnung bei den Substantiven geführt hätten," op. cit., Band iii, p. 98. Compare the analysis of Indo-European gender in nouns, loc. cit., Kap. i, pp. 89–133.

² Torrend, A Comparative Grammar of the South African Bantu Languages, p. 63, par. 313; quoted after Oertel, op. cit., p. 158. For a fuller and a most illuminating description of the Bantu classifiers the reader is referred to Miss A. Werner's *Introductory Sketch of the Bantu Languages*, London, 1919. Unfortunately I was able to consult this excellent book only after this article had been written. "certain names which, joined to a numeral, express the object, which to be counted is present as a unit of so many times as the numeral denotes . . . The number of such-like auxiliary names in Japanese is greater than is really necessary. Considering objects in respect of their outward appearance they are counted according to one or another noticeable characteristic. . . . Hence has arisen a distribution of articles into classes."¹ A similar feature exists in Malay, "a set of specific and technical terms called by the grammarians numeral affixes, some one or other of which is always used as a coefficient to the numeral, the term being selected according to the class under which the object falls."²

Thus, for example, orang (person) is used for human beings; ekur (tail) for animals, birds, insects; batang (trunk) for trees, poles, spears, teeth, and other long objects; buah (fruit) for fruits, houses, ships, countries, towns, islands; biji (seed) for grains and small, round objects; kěping (flatness) for blocks of timber, sheets of metal, hunches of bread, and flat, thin objects; hělai for hair, feathers, and leaves; patah (verb: to break) for words, items of information; bidang (adj.: broad) for mats, sails, awnings, rice-fields.³

Mr. C. O. Blagden kindly supplied me with the following information about the grammatical use of the classifiers : "The Malay classifiers are used with numerals and with a very few indefinites and interrogatives, involving the idea of number, such as *běběrapa*, some, ever so many; *běrapa*, how many? But they are not used with *banyak*, many or much.

"The classifiers are used when concrete things are numbered, but there are no classifiers corresponding to abstract concepts, except *patah*, the classifier corresponding to the class: 'words, themes of information.' When the thing numbered is not merely concrete, but has also life, then it is an almost invariable rule in idiomatic Malay, as spoken among the natives themselves, that classifiers are used. Speaking of an inanimate object, on the other hand, a native may frequently use a numeral without a classifier. Thus, words for animals and trees would hardly ever be used without a classifier ; chairs, houses, etc., might or might not be supplied with a classifier ; divisions of time, space, values, etc., would never be used with a classifier ;

¹ J. J. Hoffman, Japanese Grammar, Leiden, 1868.

² Colonel Yule, J.A.I., 1880.

³ For these examples I am indebted to Mr. C. O. Blagden, Reader in Malay at the Oriental School of London. In the *Malay Grammar* of R. O. Winstedt, 1913, § 80, pp. 129 sqq., there is an (incomplete) list of classifiers, which can be looked up in R. J. Wilkinson's *Malay-English Dictionary*, 1901, 1902, for further identification.

in fact, there is none corresponding to this class of nouns. The word jam, for instance, is used to denote 'hour' and 'watch', and it can take the classifier biji (seed) in the latter sense, but is never classified in its first meaning.

"In Siamese, Burmese, Chinese, and other languages of this type, there exist also classifiers more akin to those of Malay than to the Kiriwinian ones." $^1\,$

In some Micronesian languages there are four classes of numerals, referring respectively to living beings, lifeless objects, measures of length, and measures for days and moons; 2 or two classes for living and lifeless objects.³

In the Melanesian Islands, studied linguistically by Codrington, only faint traces of numeral non-classificatory formatives are to be found. "There are not in any Melanesian language, so far as I know, any 'numeral coefficients' or 'numeral classifiers' such as are employed with numerals in the Indo-Chinese languages and in Malay. ... There is, nevertheless, an idiom in giving a number in which a word precedes the numeral carrying with it the image which the things enumerated seem to present to the mind. Thus in Fiji four canoes in motion are *a waqa saqai va*, from *qai*, to run. In Mota two canoes sailing together are called *aka peperua*, butterfly two canoes, from the look of the two sails." The author adduces a few more such examples which show that the principle of classifying words, so pronounced in Malay, is very rudimentary in the Melanesian Islands.⁴

The best example in Oceanic languages of numerical classifiers is afforded by the language of Kiriwina Trobriand Islands. This language has been already previously recorded by the Rev. S. B. Fellowes in "Kiriwina Grammar and Vocabulary" (Annual Report on British New Guinea, 1900–1). Mr. Sidney H. Ray makes the following résumé of the information on numerical classifiers contained in that Grammar: "In Kiriwina many of these descriptive prefixes are given. *Tai*-, persons; *na*-, animals; *kai*- or *qai*-, things; *ia*-, thin things; *kala*-, days. Examples with the numeral *ta* or *tala*, one, are: *tai-ta tau*, one man; *tai-ta vivila*, one woman; *na-ta mauna*, one

¹ Personal communication from Mr. Blagden, who also kindly read the MS. of this paper and improved it by many valuable suggestions.

² P. Callistus, O. Capuc., Chamorro Wörterbuch, Hong-Kong, 1910. Spoken in the Marianne Islands.

³ Gilbert Islands, *Vocabulaire Arorai*, by P. A. C., Paris, 1888. For more Micronesian examples see Ray, op. cit., p. 475, footnote.

⁴ R. H. Codrington, *Melanesian Languages*, 1885, p. 242. For the Fijian Language compare *Fijian Dictionary and Grammar*, by D. Hazelwood, 1872, p. 18 of Grammar and Table of Numerals; also v. d. Gabelentz, op. cit., p. 25.

animal; *ia-tala*, one thin (article); *kai-tala*, one thing. Similar words appearing in the vocabulary are *tai-ua*, two baskets; *kili-tala*, one bunch of fruit; *kasa-tala*, one row; *uvai-tala*, one of the rows. There are also words denoting bundles of various articles, such as *umo-tala*, one bundle of *taro*; *vili-tala*, one bundle of sugar-cane."¹

This statement shows clearly that the use of numerals in the Kiriwinian language implies some sort of classification of nouns. But the scanty and scattered information of the *Kiriwina Grammar* does not even answer these essential questions; is the numerical classification in Kiriwina comprehensive or is it not? That is, must numerals be used with classifiers always, or is this use sporadic only? If so, what are the rules of this sporadic use? Does the classification embrace all nouns or only a few isolated groups? How many classifying formatives do there exist? Are the examples given exhaustive, or nearly so, or only a small fraction of the full list?

To any of these questions no answer could be found in the existing record of the Kiriwinian language. In fact, the above quoted summary by the most competent Oceanic linguist presents the information better than is done by Fellowes, the original data being scattered all over the Grammar and Vocabulary.

But even as far as it goes the information is not correct either in details or in essentials; thus it would appear to anyone who reads the Grammar that classifying formatives enter into the formation of numerals only. This, as we shall see, is not the case.²

Ш

Let us now give the full statement of the linguistic data, referring to the Classificatory Formatives in the Kiriwinian language.

In that language the Demonstratives and Adjectives as well as the Numerals do not exist in a self-contained form, conveying an abstract meaning. There are no single words to express such conceptions as "this", "big", "long", "one", etc., in abstract. Thus, for example, there is no equivalent of the word "one", or of any other numeral. Whenever the number of any objects is indicated the nature of these objects must also be included in the word. Thus :—

> (1) One man = TAYtala ta'uOne woman = NAtana vivilaOne stone = KWAYtala dakunaOne canoe = KAYtala wagaetc.

¹ S. H. Ray, op. cit., p. 475. ² See below in par. VI.

PAPERS CONTRIBUTED

(2) Two men = $TAYyu tau'a'u^{1}$ Two women = NAYyu vivilaTwo stones = KWAYyu dakunaTwo canoes = KAYyu waga.

Comparing the numerals in this table, TAYtala, NAtana, etc., it can be seen at a glance that each of these consists of two elements; one of them remains unaltered in all the numerals, corresponding to "one" and "two" respectively; it is the suffix *-tala*, one, *-yu*, two, etc.; the other part, the prefixed one, TAY-, NA-, KWAY-, KAY-, etc., corresponds evidently to the objects or persons numbered.

The same holds good with regard to other numerals, as well as to demonstratives and adjectives. Each of these words consists of a fixed form or mould, which carries the meaning of the numeral, demonstrative, or adjective, and of an interchangeable particle which denotes the class of object to which the numeral, demonstrative, or adjective is being applied. We shall call the former element the fixed part or root, and the latter one the classificatory particle or formative.

As we saw in the above example, the numerals are formed by suffixing the fixed part, which carries the meaning of the number to the classificatory particle, which carries the meaning of the object numbered.

Prefix denoting	Stable element or root denoting	
Object numbered	Number	
by means of the	by means of the	
Classificatory Particle	Fixed numeric part	
TAY-	-TALA	
human	one	
TAY is the classificatory particle denoting that human beings are numbered.	TALA is the numeric root denoting that the number is one.	

This may be represented diagrammatically :---

The demonstratives are formed by infixing the classificatory particle into a fixed frame. This latter consists of the two syllables ma-, na, which carry the meaning of pointing to or referring to.

Root Frame	Infix	Root Frame
MA-	-TAU-	-NA
The fixed which conveys of direct		frame the signification reference.
TH-	human	-18

¹ Tau'a'u, men, plural to ta'u, man. It is one of the very few plurals extant in Kiriwinian.

Prefix denoting	Stable element of root denoting
Object qualified	Quality
by means of	by means of
Classificatory Particle	Fixed adjectival part
<i>TO-</i>	-VIYAKA
human	big
TO- is the classificatory particle denoting that human beings are qualified.	<i>VIYAKA</i> is the adjectival root denoting that the object is big.

Finally, adjectives are formed in the same manner as numerals, i.e. by suffixing the adjectival part to the classificatory particle.

Thus we see that the three classes of words, demonstratives, numerals, and adjectives, cannot be used *in abstracto* without carrying in them the expression of the objects to which they refer. This reference, however, is made only in a general manner; the particle does not mention directly the thing to which it applies, but it indicates only the class of object numbered, pointed at, or qualified. This is why we have called them *classificatory* particles.

This is a general outline of the nature and grammatical extent of the classificatory particles in Kiriwina. It is, however, necessary for the reader, in order to follow with interest the technicalities given further on, to familiarize himself with this linguistic phenomenon, to get it well in hand. A good way to achieve this—to make them a living fact of speech—is to imagine how such an arrangement would appear in English. This is not meant, of course, as a strict definition, only as a first approach, or, rather, as a short cut into the heart of the subject.

Let us transpose this peculiarity of Kiriwinian into English, following the native prototype very closely, and imagine that no adjective, no numeral, no demonstrative may be used without a particle denoting the nature of the object referred to. All names of human beings would take the prefix "human". Instead of saying "one soldier" we would have to say "human-one soldier walks in the street". Instead of "how many passengers were in the accident?" "how human-many passengers were in the accident?" Answer, "human-seventeen."

Or, again, in reply to "are the Smiths *human*-nice people?" we would say, "no, they are *human*-dull!" Again, nouns denoting persons belonging to the female sex would be numbered, pointed at, and qualified with the aid of the prefix "female"; wooden objects with the particle "wooden"; flat or thin things with the particle "leafy", following in all this the precedent of Kiriwina.

Thus, pointing at a table, we would say, "look at wooden-this"; describing a landscape, "leafy-brown leaves on the wooden-large trees"; speaking of a book, "leafy-hundred pages in it"; "the women of Spain are female-beautiful," "human-this boy is very naughty, but female-this girl is good," and so on, in this Ollendorfian strain.

These examples will no doubt familiarize anyone better and more quickly with the general character of the classifiers than many long definitions could possibly do. They show that, when qualifying a noun, we are made to realize to which of the several classes it belongs, into which all the nouns are divided. Each of these classes—turning to genuine Kiriwinian again—embraces a number of words, capable of a general definition.

IV

Let us now pass to a survey of the Classificatory Particles in Kiriwinian. Following the principle that, in all phenomena of language of any importance, it is directly wrong to give examples only, and that a full enumeration must be given, I tried to record all the particles. Most likely a few of the very obsolete ones escaped my attention, but the list here given can be considered with this reservation as a complete enumeration, and not as an exemplification only. The particles, forty-one in number, have been arranged in a synoptic table. Against each of them there is a short definition of the class of noun with which the particle is used. Such a short definition, however, is not sufficient, since the classes are not equivalent in several respects, and we must comment on them, taking the three following aspects in successive order.

1. It is clear at a glance that the classes are not equivalent and that the definition of some of them has been made in this table on a principle different from that of other classes. Thus, first of all we shall have to say some more about the meaning of the various classes.

2. Again, some of the particles are very often used, and are of great importance in the language, whereas others are almost obsolete.

3. Finally the grammatical use of the particles is not the same in the different groups, and this point must also be made quite clear.

1. Meaning

In order to make it visible at a glance that the particles are not of the same type throughout, the list has been subdivided into eight groups. Within each group the particles and the classes of nouns governed by them are more or less of the same type.

TABLE OF KIRIWINIAN CLASSIFICATORY PARTICLES

GROUP I

1. TAY, TO, TAU. Human beings; males.

N.B. — TAY — used with numerals; TO—with adjectives; TAU—with demonstratives.

- 2. NA. Persons of female sex; animals.
- 3. KAY. Trees and plants; wooden things; long objects.
- 4. KWAY. Round, bulky objects; stones; abstract nouns.
- 5. YA. Leaves; fibres; objects made of leaf or fibre; flat and thin objects.
- 6. SISI. Boughs.
- 7. LILA. Forked branches; forked sticks.
- 8. KAVI. Stone blades.
- 9. KWOYA. Human and animal extremities (legs, arms); fingers of a hand.
- 10. LUVA. Wooden dishes.
- 11. KWOYLA. Clay pots.
- 12. KADA. Roads.
- 13. KADUYO. Rivers, creeks, seapassages
- 14. VILO. Villages.

GROUP II

- 15. KILA. Clusters ("hands") of bananas.
- 16. SA. Bunches of betel-nut.
- 17. BUKWA. Bunches of coco-nut.

GROUP III

- 18. PILA. Parts of a whole ; divisions ; directions.
- 19. VILI. Parts twisted off.
- 20. BUBWA Parts cut off by transversal cutting.
- 21. UTU. Parts cut off; small particles.
- 22. SI. Small bits.

GROUP IV

- 23. KABULO. Protuberances; ends of an object.
- 24. NUTU. Corners of a garden.
- 25. NIKU. Compartments of a canoe. 26. KABISI. Compartments of a vam-
- house.
- 27. NINA. Parts of a song; of a magical formula.
- 28. MAYLA. Parts of a song; of a magical formula.
- 29. KUBILA. Large land-plots (ownership divisions).
- 30. SIWA. Sea portions (ownership divisions with reference to fishing rights).
- 31. KALA. Davs.
- 32. SIVA. Times.

GROUP V

- 33. KAPWA. Bundles (wrapped up).
- 34. OYLA. Batch of fish.
- 35. UM'MWA. Bundles of taro.
- 36. KUDU. Bundles of lashing creeper.
- 37. YURAY. Bundles of four coconuts, four eggs, four waterbottles.

GROUP VI

- 38. KASA. Rows.
- 39. GILI. Rows of spondylus-shell discs on a belt.
- 40. GULA. Heaps.

GROUP VII

 41. ——. Numerals without a prefix are used to count baskets of yams.

GROUP VIII

42. UWA. Lengths, the span of two extended arms, from tip to tip.

N.B.—In order to appreciate correctly the nature of the particles contained in this table, it is necessary to peruse the Commentary, which forms the contents of this (the fourth) Chapter. More especially, it must be stressed that the particles differ very much in their grammatical character and function. Ranging them into a coordinate table might give them an undue appearance of equivalence and uniformity, against which the reader must be cautioned at the outset. (Compare § 3 of this chapter on the grammatical function of the particles.) The particles of Group 1 (Nos. 1–14) refer directly to the nature of things, which they express, and this group contains in itself a comprehensive classification of things. Particles 1 and 2 refer to human beings and animals, and the rest embrace the world of inanimate things; 3 indicates plants; 4 stones and bulky objects. Things made by human hand are first classed according to material; those manufactured of leaf, fibre, bark, into Class 5, implements made of stone into Class 8. Two classes of manufactured objects, however, adopt special prefixes: wooden dishes (10) and clay pots (11). Classes 6 and 7 are a subdivision of the plant class, they refer to special parts of trees or plants; 12, 13, 14 refer to features of settlement and communication, villages, roads, and waterways.

This group, as said above, is based mainly on the direct classification of things. That is, it implies a system of distinction between humans and animals, between plants and stones, between objects made of wood and those made of stone and those made of fibre. But it must be realized clearly that even within this group the principles of classification are inconsistent and at cross-purposes with one another; again, several of the classes are not properly exclusive, and the same noun may be used once with TAY-, and then again with NA-. or with KAY- and LUVA-, etc. This will come out more clearly if we go over the list and make the necessary remarks about each particle and its class of nouns in succession. The principle of distinction between Class 1 and Class 2 is really double; thus, 1 comprises all human beings, but more especially men; Class 2, as against 1, comprises all nouns denoting female beings. This would be a distinction of sex, the same as that expressed by Indo-European gender, when this is used with animate beings. But the second principle of distinction between Classes 1 and 2 is that between human beings and animals. In actual usage this means that, although you must use all nouns of male persons-such as chief, fisherman, magician, etc.-with the formative 1, and also you must use formative 2 with animals; yet human female nouns-such as woman, sorceress, girl, etc.-may be used with TAY- or NA- ad libitum. Etymologically, particle 1 is obviously derived from the word ta'u (man). Whether NA- is correlated to ina (mother), and vivila (woman), and what is its connexion to the words denoting animal (mauna), is a problem.¹

¹ I cannot, for reasons of space, trace the etymological connexions of these words through other Oceanic languages. With the help of Tregear's comparative data in his dictionary of the Maori language (*The Maori-Polynesian Comparative Dictionary*, Wellington, New Zealand, 1891) and of Codrington's and Ray's *Comparative Melanesian Vocabularies* (op. cit.), it would be easy to follow the etymologies.

Passing to particle 3, KAY, it embraces a class of objects defined (a) by their nature—trees and plants in general; (b) by the material of which they are made, irrespective of whether they are wooden canoes or wooden spears or chips of wood; (c) by their form : long objects, irrespective of nature and material, may be used with the formative KAY- as certain anatomical expressions, for example, tongue. Etymologically the particle KAY- is undoubtedly connected with the word KA'I, tree, wood—a word to be traced in cognate forms through many Melanesian and Polynesian languages.

KWAY-, perhaps the most important and most extensively used of all Kiriwinian particles, refers in its primary use to the shape of objects: round, bulky objects; stones, rocks, and hillocks, and all other features of the landscape, except when they are strikingly elongated. KWAY- receives its greatest importance, however, from the fact that it is used in all those cases where no other particle can be fitted in. This has been indicated in our table by mentioning "abstract nouns" in this class (4), states of the weather: calm, wind; cold, heat; states of the body: sleep, disease, exhaustion, hunger, thirst, states of mind, etc., etc. All such nouns which cannot be placed in any of the other classes—all of which are defined concretely—are used with KWAY-. I cannot, with any degree of certainty, approach the word *koya*, hill, mountain, to the prefix KWAY-. This is, however, the only etymological hypothesis I can think of.

Class 5, governed by the formative YA-, is the last of the more comprehensive ones of Group I. It comprises leaves, fibres, all objects made of these materials, and all objects shaped like leaves and fibres, i.e. all flat, thin, and thread-like objects. Etymologically YA- is connected with the words *yawesi*, *yagavana*, both meaning leaves.

Of the following particles, Nos. 5, 6, 9, 12, 13, 14 refer again directly to the nature of objects, and so do Nos. 10 and 11, although these latter classes comprise man-made objects. Prefix 8, KAVI-, is used when counting, qualifying or pointing at stone blades, now, by extension, also steel blades. I am unable to tell whether in the old usage this class comprised objects with reference to their material which was a special stone of volcanic origin, imported from Woodlark Island—or whether the reference was rather to the cutting quality and to the special shape of the implements. The recent use of the particle with European implements is of no value in deciding this question. I have circumstantial reasons, too long to set down here, to believe that KAVI- was rather a reference to the material than to the shape. Etymologically the formatives KAVI-, KWOYA-, LUVA- cannot be connected to any words of the Kiriwinian language. The remaining ones, on the other hand, are obviously correlated by form and meaning to the generic nouns denoting the class of objects : 6, SISI-: sisila, bough; 7, LILA-: lalari, a forked branch; 11, KWOYLA-: kuria, a clay pot; 13, KADUYO-: keda, road, and kari-keda, a sea-passage; 14, VILO-: valu, village, place.

Summarizing the remarks about Group 1 we may see that there are the following principles underlying the classification of the group: (1) direct reference to the nature of the objects, taken in their entirety as forming a genus; (2) reference to the material of which an object is made; (3) reference to its shape; (4) the abstract sense of KWAY, which does not fall under any of the foregoing headings. That this direct classification could stand no logical test is clear. It can also be safely said that it does not embody any metaphysical *Weltanschauung*, even of the most rudimentary description. To jump, however, from this to the other extreme conclusion that the system of classification embodied in this table is worthless in throwing any light upon the native psychology, would be equally rash.

Passing to the following groups, we may first remark that they contain classes of a much more restricted description ; in each group we find emphasized one special point of view-usually very concrete and sometimes very narrow in connotation. Thus Group II comprises three classes of fruit bunches. In Group III we find several types of subdivision of a whole into parts, more especially with regard to the mechanism of the subdivision-whether a whole is divided by cutting, by cutting transversally, by twisting off, or whether it is subdivided in thought only, so to speak. Group IV, again, embraces various systems of subdivision, but here the principle of classifying according to mechanical severance is not heeded. Instead we have very concrete and special kinds of component parts of definite objects. Group V comprises various kinds of bundles. Group VI formations-rows and heaps. Groups VII and VIII consist each of a single class, one of them at least extremely remarkable, as it is the only class of object used in Kiriwinian without classificatory formatives.

Let us say a few words in detail on each of the groups.

Group II. Here we have particles, used when counting and qualifying bunches of fruit. KILAtala, one (partial bunch of bananas), is used when numbering the partial clusters or, as they are technically called, "hands," of bananas (usi). Etymologically the formative KILA- is not allied to any Kiriwinian word. SA- is the particle used with reference to betel-nut (bu'a), and again its etymology is unknown to me. BUKWA- is the formative — etymologically obscure — of whole bunches of coco-nuts (luya or nuya, according to dialect). There is no doubt that bunches of fruit must be an important class of objects to a tribe, where gardening is one of the main economic pursuits, and one in which the natives take an extreme interest and pride. But, speaking more specially of the expression for betel-nut bunches, fruit clusters are also important from another point of view. Gifts and payments and tributes are a very prominent feature of the social organization and public life in Kiriwina. Family obligations, relations to chief and headman, magico-religious and mortuary ceremonies, all are connected with gifts and moreover with a ceremonial display of gifts. In these, undivided bunches of betel-nut play a specially prominent part, although coco-nut and banana bunches are also important. The displayer has both the pride of having grown them and of giving them away, and this latter pride is shared by the man who receives the present. In Kiriwina display of quantity as well as of quality is a feature of generosity, and generosity, although a universal phenomenon, is never taken for granted or hidden under a bushel. The importance of the main objects normally used as gifts is therefore clear.

Group III. All these formatives serve to denote parts of a divided whole. Three of them, VILI-, BUBWA-, and UTU-, denote, moreover, directly the mechanism by which the severance of the parts has been accomplished. These three formatives are also etymologically connected with verbs denoting such mechanical acts of division. The verbal root vila means to turn or twist; buabu, to cut transversally; utu (connected with ta'i), to cut in the general sense of the word. The three formatives follow exactly the meanings of the three verbal roots; VILItala, meaning a piece twisted off (a whole); BUBWAtala, a piece cut off transversally; UTUtana, a piece cut off, a parcel.¹ Thus, when I used to distribute tobacco, the natives would ask for their portions with different words, according as to whether I would twist off the "stick" with my fingers and tear off pieces, or cut off portions with a knife. In the first case they would count the pieces with the prefix VILI-, in the second with the prefix BUBWA-. To disregard this linguistic usage would be as incorrect as to misuse the gender in an Indo-European language, and the natives might laugh, as rude people, uncorrupted by good manners, do laugh when their language is mutilated by a foreigner.

¹ -tana is an archaic form of -tala, see below. VOL. I. PART IV. Again, the word BUBWAtala, meaning in its broader sense "one bit cut off transversally", has also the narrower meaning of "one half". UTUtana, again, usually means "a little", "a bit". The word SItana possesses the same meaning, and it does not refer to any special mode of division. These two formatives UTU- and SI- have become specialized in their use. They are hardly ever used in any other form but in association with the numeral "one", UTUtana and SItana meaning "one bit", or "a little". They may be used also to count, especially in ordinal forms : UTUy'wela, SIywela (second bit), UTUtolula, SIto!ula ("third bit"), but their adverbial use (see below under 2 and 3) is by far the most preponderant. Characteristic is the archaic form of the numeral "one" with the N instead of the L, which no doubt bears witness to the fact that the prefix and the numeral "one" have coalesced at a very distant epoch.

The formative *PILA*-, like *SI*- has no reference to any mechanical process of severance. But it implies a definite character of subdivision, namely, that the part of a whole is rather a natural component part and not a part definitely severed. Thus it is used when describing parts of a village, parts of any district, directions, points of the compass (which in Kiriwinian are named after prevailing winds), portions of an animal to be divided, etc. Etymologically it is connected with the verb *pilasi*, to assist, to help in work (to share in work), and with an important general formative *PILA* or *PIYA*, signifying manner of pitch, intensity, etc.

Group IV. In contradistinction to the foregoing group, here all the formatives have a concrete, and except for the first one (No. 23), a highly specialized meaning. The particle KABULO-, with a clear etymological pedigree from *kabulula*, nose (his), is used to count, demonstrate, or qualify any nose-shaped parts of a whole : ends, prominences, or protuberances. Thus, ends of a stick, prominences of a rock, promontories, corners of houses, or boats, etc., etc., all the parts that stick out, detach themselves from a whole, form ends or corners, are used with this particle. Thus KABULO- possesses a broad sphere of application, and its meaning is both concrete and metaphorical.

All the other formatives of this group possess an extremely special meaning and a very narrow sphere of application; NUTU- (etymology unknown) refers only to corners of a garden enclosure; KABISI-(etymology unknown) to the compartment of a yam-house, and NIKU- to the spaces in a canoe, between two outrigger poles. The etymology of this last word is dubious to me; liku (L and N being in

this language interchangeable) means "beam", and also the main part of a yam-house, and the three meanings may be connected. In these three formatives (*NUTU-*, *KABISI-*, *NIKU-*), we have to do with subdivisions of a whole, when both the nature of this whole is definitely stated (garden, canoe, yam-house), and the nature of subdivisions or parts is strictly indicated.

The two following classes refer to divisions—verses or strophes in a traditional text or song or formula. To my knowledge they are interchangeable, and etymology seems to be the only key for making a distinction; thus, *MAYLA*- is probably connected with *maye*-, tongue, speech; *NINA*- with *nano*-, mind.

The two next particles, KUBILA- and SIWA-, are used in demonstrating, qualifying, or counting subdivisions of land and sea, made for purposes of ownership. All garden-lands in Kiriwina are subdivided into large blocks called *kwabila*, and with this word the classifier KUBILA- (obviously the two words are cognate) is used. These large plots are owned by a whole community, each individual owning one or more of the small subdivisions, called *baleko*. This last word is used with the formative KWAY-. The sea on the lagoon is divided roughly into portions, *sewa*, using the formative SIWA-, which have individual names each, and a number of *sewa* are regarded by a community as their fishing-grounds.

KALA- and SIVA- are formatives of time division. KALArepresents periods of twenty-four hours—a day and a night—SIVArepresents how many times anything happened. Here may be added that they have a characteristic way of counting the following days : to-morrow is represented by the word *nabwoye*; the day after tomorrow by *bogiyyu*, literally "night-two", and the following days : onward by compounding the formative BOGI- (night) with numerals : three *tolu*; four, *vasi*, etc. As this is a very special use of the prefix BOGI-, I have not included it in our list.

Thus within this last group (IV), the following subdivisions can be further distinguished: (a) KABULO- a particle of general meaning, referring to the shape of constituent parts of a whole. (b) Artificial parts of human-made wholes (garden enclosures, yam-houses, canoes). (c) Subdivisions of traditional formulæ. (d) Economic subdivisions of garden-land and fishing-grounds. (e) Time divisions.

Group V. The classes of the two preceding groups are subdivisions of things; in this group we have to deal with conglomerations. The particle KAPWA----etymologically connected with the verbal stem kapwali, to wrap up----is a general formative for all wrappings. Natives often use leaves to wrap up small parcels of food or to carry some substance of value, such as precious shells, red ochre, or small ornaments. Again, in magic as a rule, the spell is said over some stuff, placed on a leaf, and then the stuff and the magical virtue imparted to it by the spell are carefully wrapped up to prevent evaporation. All such bundles—which may be named in various ways according to their contents—are used with the formative KAPWA-, which has thus a fairly general meaning and a broad extent of application.

The other formatives of this group are very highly specialized and of restricted application. Thus OYLA- is used as classifying particle when batches of fish are counted. Fish is tied up into batches on occasions of wasi-, the regulated, ceremonial exchange of fish for vams. The inland villagers, who have good gardens and plenty of yams, but no access to the rich fisheries of the lagoon, have a traditional standing partnership with the coastal men. Each man has one partner or more on the coast. When fish is needed—especially for a ceremonial, festive distribution of food in which usually a whole community partakes-each member of the inland villages will carry some vam-food to the coast and offer it to his partner. The best vams only are used on such occasions, and they are put into baskets or wooden structures in a decorative manner. Selected *taro* is bound into big, carefully arranged bunches. The men carry the food in a body, and they enter the coastal village with loud ceremonial screams and place their gifts at the doorways of their respective partners. This constitutes a binding obligation to the fishermen to go out fishing as soon as the weather allows it, and to repay the yams and *taro* according A batch of fish, OLYAtala, is the measure of such to fixed rates. repayments, the general rule being two oyla for each basket of yams or of taro. No haggling or quarrelling takes place on such transactions ; when the fishermen's yield is good they are generous; when their endeavours have been rather barren the fish bundles are small, and the inlanders take it philosophically. An oyla is certainly not an exact measure of weight, but it would never sink below a certain minimum -I should say about 5 lb. in weight-and when the yield is very abundant the surplus would be given to the inlanders, not as payment for the yams given, but as payment for some more food, to be received at a later date.

This somewhat lengthy description of the *wasi* (fish and yam exchange) has been given to show how narrow and definite is the application of the formative OYLA-, and also to show how necessary it is to give some ethnographic information if grammatical relations are to be fully understood.

The next formative, UM'MWA-, has also been defined by the foregoing description; it is used when counting and qualifying the bundles of *taro* as prepared for the *wasi* and the ceremonial gifts or payments. Etymologically this formative is connected with the verbal root *mwam*', to bind together.

KUDU-, of unknown etymology, is used with reference to coils of a lashing creeper, called *wayugo*, extremely important for the natives, as it is the only material reliable for use in their big sea-going canoes. To obtain genuine and fresh *wayugo* may be a matter of life and death for a party embarking on a long expedition. It grows in certain, places only, on marshy soil, and it is traded from there to the coast. YURAY-, etymology unknown, is a formative used with groups of four round objects, four coco-nuts, eggs, lime-pots, water-bottles, etc. These are counted by fours, as we count certain objects by the dozen.

Group VI. In this group two formatives, KASA-, row, and GULA-, heap, are of rather wide application. KASA- is used for all sorts of row formations—rows of people in a dance, of houses in a village, of trees in a plantation. Its etymology is unknown to me. GULA-(from gugula, heap) is used to count heaps of yams, heaps of shell, and all other heaps of objects.

GILI- (etymology ?) is used in a very narrow sense, to count the rows of red shell discs in a belt. The red shell discs, made of a variety of spondylus shell, rare and difficult to fish, are used in making ornaments, long necklaces, belts, ear-rings, pendants, etc., all of which are very highly valued and used as ornaments, as signs of rank and as tokens of value, and also as articles of exchange in a very complicated and traditionally defined system of trading.

Group VII. This group consists of one class only, and no classifying particle. Basketfuls of yams are counted by using the numeral affixes only, bare of any classifying addition. And this is the one case only where abstract numerals can be used in Kiriwinian. It must be realized, however, that the counting of basketfuls of yams in Kiriwina is counting *par excellence*. The whole social life of the native is bound up with systems of mutual payments, in which yam payments stand first and foremost. Family ties are connected with regular yam gifts. Every man has to work the gardens for his mother first and, after his sisters have grown up, for them. When his sisters marry their husbands and their families have to be provided for. Thus we have a remarkable system, in which everyone is working for his female relations, and again is himself provided for by his wife's family. The chief receives regular annual gifts of yams at harvest time. Obligations arising from the performance of garden magic, fishing magic, sorcery; from service in war, in sailing, in canoe and house-building; from communal work in the gardens-all such obligations are squared by payments in food, as a rule given and measured in basketfuls. Public life and ceremonial, whether in mourning and mortuary feasts or during dancing periods and tribal festivities, are accompanied by distributions of food. In all these cases, the element of display being very much to the fore, the amount of gifts given is measured, counted, and boasted about in basketfuls. Moreover, basketfuls of yams are the nearest approach to a common measure of value. The term "money" has often been applied to the native objects of high value, like stoneblades, necklaces of spondylus discs, and armshells. It can be said without reservation that such a use of the term "money" is incorrect. and as it cannot be applied to any but in a loose metaphorical sense it does more harm than good. But it may be said that, as one of the functions of money is to supply a common measure of value, and as the baskets of yams fulfil this function in Kiriwina, this is the nearest approach to money from this point of view.

All this makes it quite clear that the counting of baskets of yams is undoubtedly the most important occasion on which numbers have to be recorded in Kiriwina. The natives can count easily above the thousand, and on occasions of great annual harvest gifts to a chief, the figures of baskets given come well into five figures. Thus in August, 1918, in Omarakana, there were more than 10,000 basketfuls given to the chief. Each community provided him with a big heap, stacked around his yam-house. As the yams were being brought to the heaps a man was counting them, and for each basket he plucked off a leaflet on a big cycas leaf. Several such leaves, giving the total tally, were then planted on top of the heap. Thus high figures in counting can be recorded exactly and fixed with some degree of permanence. The natives, who vie with one another, remember the figures well, and for a long time.

Group VIII. Here the formative UWA- (etymology ?) is used to count measures of length, the span of two open arms from the tips of one hand to the tips of the other. They use this measure to compare lengths of canoes, houses, etc. Exact measures, for technological purposes, are obtained by using a rope as a tally.

2. Degree of Obsoleteness

Turning now to the second of the three points mentioned above, we have to say a few words about the degree of linguistic vitality or aliveness of the various particles. It is clear that two words or two grammatical formations may be equally general, important, and of equally extended sphere of application, yet they may vary in usage; one of them may be just starting to become obsolete or be well on the way towards complete obsoleteness. Thus "thou" and "you" in English are symmetrical in all other respects, but "thou" is on the road to becoming completely antiquated.

When recording a native language it is by no means easy to deal with this side of the question, yet it is extremely important to do so. Of course, we have no historical records to follow the gradual lapsing of some form or other. But there is no doubt that this difference in vitality exists and can be observed. Certain forms are in constant use and they impress themselves even on the foreign beginner. Other forms are used only by old people, particularly such ones as excel in fine command over their language; or they are found in magical texts and formulæ and songs or traditional narratives. Again there are words which are evidently on the wane, since they can be replaced by others without reciprocity. It is extremely astonishing that, although this is the only way of gaining an insight into the historical changes of a native language, and although historic change and evolution have been the main orientation of linguistics, yet, to my knowledge, very little attention has been paid to the degree of obsoleteness of words and grammatical forms.

Starting with Group I, the first four formatives, TO-, NA-, KAY-, KWAY-, are all equally vital, and they cannot be replaced or shifted, nor do they show any tendency to encroach on each other; the double boundary between TO- and NA- cannot mean that one of these particles is on the wane, although it may mean that there is a process of shifting. In which direction this process goes on I see no data to look for an answer. The fifth particle, YA-, has its own well-established sphere of application. It is, however, remarkable that certain objects made of leaves—the most prominent would be mats—are used with the formatives KWAY-, and not with YA-. This is what I would call a clear case of expansion of one form at the expense of another.

SISI- and LILA- are vigorous in their limited sphere of application, but they are not capable of any extension. As a matter of fact, LILA-, which is used with regard to forked branches, may be replaced by KAY- if branches are counted without special reference to their being forked. KAVI-, KWOYA-, and KEDA- cannot be replaced in their own narrow sphere. The two particles referring to vessels, KWOYLAand LUVA-, present an interesting case; they are quite symmetrical in their restricted area of meaning, each being applied to similar objects. Yet one of them, LUVA-, is as a rule replaced by KAY- with reference to the material (wood), whereas clay-pots must be counted with the prefix KWOYLA. The particles VILO- and KADUYO- are rare, and as a rule replaced by the abstract KWAY-. Especially I hardly ever heard the formative VILO- in use, though in direct answers to questions my informants would insist on its being the correct particle for " village".

In Group II SA- is by far the most important and vital particle. KILA is not used very often—instead of counting by "hands" they count by single fruit with the prefix KAY-, referring to their shape. BUKWA- I never heard in actual use, coco-nuts being counted by fours (particle 37), or by ones with the prefix KWAY-.

None of the particles of Group III can be styled as obsolete. But, on the other hand, PILA- possesses a range of application far beyond any of the others, and on the other UTU- and SI- are becoming consolidated into one definite expression, each with a special meaning. Again, VILI-, BUBWA-, and UTU- have the original concrete meaning. BUBWA-, however, is used much more often in its restricted sense of half than in the original one.

Of Group IV, the formative with the broadest sense and connotation, *KABULO*-, is the most vital, *ipso facto*. The very special expressions, *NUTU*-, *NIKU*-, and *KABISI*-, are by no means obsolete, and I do not think any of them could be replaced in its proper place by a particle of more general meaning. The formatives *NINA*- and *MAYLA*-, on the other hand, are distinctly obsolete, the general formative *PILA*-, signifying "part of ", being often used with reference to parts of a song or formula. *KUBILA*- is an important formative in its very restricted sense and not at all obsolete, whereas both the noun, *seva* (sea division), and the particle, *SIWA*-, are certainly passing out of use; indeed, they are not understood by junior members of the community. *SIVA*- and *KALA*-, the two time-divisions, are perfectly vital.

In Group V there is none which could be styled obsolete from any point of view, and this refers to two at least of the formatives of Group VI, KASA- and GULA-.

It is needless to add that neither the bare abstract numeral form used for counting basketfuls of yams, nor the prefix UWA-, used for measuring lengths, are in the slightest degree obsolete. In all this it must be stressed that my conclusions cannot be anything but tentative, as such observations must be the result of the general linguistic feeling rather than detailed analysis of tangible data. Again, dealing with a native community in contact with the white man and under his decomposing influence, one has to take into account the possibility that linguistic change and decay are the result of the new artificial conditions and not a natural one. But even then these indications would not be quite worthless, because they would serve as measures of the relative strength of various linguistic features. In this case, however, I am sure that the influence of white man is negligible, less than two per cent of the natives in Kiriwina being acquainted with a few words of Pidgin English.

We may sum up our results thus :----

(1) The formatives KAY- and KWAY- show a tendency to expand beyond their narrower sphere of application over the area of inanimate things, squeezing out such formatives as YA-, LILA-, LUVA-, KADUYO-, VILA-.

(2) Certain special prefixes, *PILA-*, *KABULO-*, *KAPWA-*, are, side by side with being more general, more vital than cognate particles, and may be used in an extended manner.

(3) Certain formatives are strictly limited to their fixed use, and in this they cannot be replaced: SISI-, KAVI-, KWOYLA-, SA-, VILI-, BUBWA-, NUTU-, NILU-, KABISI-, KUBILA-, KALA-, SIVA-, OYLA-, UM'MWA-, KUDU-, YURAY-, KASA-, GULA-, UWA-.

3. GRAMMATICAL FUNCTION

There remain to be mentioned certain grammatical peculiarities of the formatives. They are mainly dependent upon the meaning of the formatives, and in discussing this above we had to mention certain grammatical facts, as, for instance, the crystallization of UTUtana and *SItana* into nominal expressions often used also adverbially. Again, it is clear that this point touches also the previous one (2), and that the broader the grammatical application of a particle (whatever the width of its meaning) the less chances it has of becoming obsolete.

In the initial definition of the particles and in their transposition into English, they were shown to be classificatory word-formatives, serving with the help of fixed roots to build up the Kiriwinian numerals, demonstratives, and adjectives. As with all linguistic gene alizations, this statement needs some qualification on its grammatical side as well as in its semantic aspect.

Let us start with Group I again, bearing in mind what has been sa d about it above under "1. Meaning" with reference to the width and homogeneity of the various classes. It requires no effort to see that the meaning of a classifying particle is inseparable from its grammatical The meaning of a particle is nothing else but the generic function. description of its class, just as in Indo-European the meaning of a genderformative conveys the general description of the word classes, male, female, and neuter. Thus the meaning of TO-tau is "human being", and if I say maTAUna it means "this human being", implying the human nature to the object pointed at, whatever his nearer description may be. The primary grammatical function of the classifiers is to serve for the formation of certain grammatical instruments-demonstratives, numerals, adjectives-each of a general application, and each of them both qualifying the noun with which it is used, and stamping it with the mark of a definite class.

But if we have a formative of a very narrow application and definite meaning, like KADA- or SISI-, the resultant word will not possess any power to stamp the noun as belonging to any class, because it simply repeats the noun and adds nothing to its meaning. Thus, if I say $maKADAna \ keda$, "roady-this road," or SISItala sisila, "boughy-one bough," I qualify "road" with "this" and "bough" with "one", but I do not classify them, since I simply repeat them in a modified form. One can, of course, say that I put them in a class by themselves, but that is another way of repeating the present contention. Such classifiers as SISI- and KADA- are simply the repetition of the nominal root—of the noun they are used to qualify—and if all the Kiriwinian formatives were like this we would have an extremely interesting phenomenon, but one which could not by any stretch of the term be called classification.

Thus we may say that where both phonetically and semantically the formatives and the nominal root coincide, there we have a naming formative but not a classificatory one.

In Group I we have the real classifiers: TO-, NA-, KAY-, KWAY-, YA-, LILA-, LUVA-, KWOYA-, KADUYO-; and the root-repeating formatives: SISI- (noun sisila), KWOYLA- (noun kuria), KADA-(noun keda), VILO- (noun valu).

Passing now to Group II we find there three classifiers with a very narrow meaning, restricted to one object only: KILA-, to clusters of bananas; SA-, to betel-nut branches; BUKWA-, to coco-nuts. In so far they resemble the "naming" formatives of Group I. But grammatically their position is slightly different. To understand this,

let us realize that a formative with a numeral or with a demonstrative may be used alone without the corresponding noun. Thus. pointing to a boy I may say : "maTAUna," "human-this," as well as "maTAUna qwadi," "human-this boy," or speaking of sailing I may say, "boge ikewasi KAYyu," "already they sailed wooden-two," instead of "boge ikewasi KAYyu waga," " already they sailed woodentwo canoes." This usage may be well brought home to our linguistic feeling by comparing the English elliptic way of saying "I saw two yesterday" in a conversation where definite objects were discussed; although we can see that in Kiriwinian the prefixed or infixed classifier gives a more definitely nominal character to the numeral or demonstrative; compare "I saw two yesterday" with "I saw humans-two yesterday". In this last sentence the expression " humans-two " is more than a mere qualifying adjunct with the noun added to it in thought. It is a nominal expression allied, no doubt, to English ones such as "The Great ONE", "The Almighty", etc. Only it is more nominal, in some cases at least, since the classifying formatives stand for not one quality only but for all the attributes proper to the class, "human-being," "female-being," "animal," "plant," "road," "earthenware pot," "wooden dish," "bough," etc., etc.

Where the formative has a very restricted sphere of application, like *KADA*-, "road-like," or *SISI*-, "boughy," then its meaning is very complex, and it stands for all the many attributes pertaining to the concept of "road". And the compound qualifiers, *KADAtala*, "road-like one," *maKADAna*, "road-like this," etc., etc., if standing alone, are obviously equivalent to nouns, in that they describe an individual thing.

Now if there be a difference in usage between two classes of formatives, one being used as a rule with the corresponding noun and the other independently, it is clear that the latter will have a different grammatical nature; it will belong to the division of nouns rather than to that of attribute words. I think that this difference exists between the "naming" formatives of Group I (SISI-, KWOYLA-, KADA-, VILO-) and the formatives of Group II (KILA-, SA-, BUKWA-), and that the latter are as a rule used without the corresponding nouns, and that they therefore possess a pronounced nominal character. In fact, SAtala can be said to be the name for a bunch of betel-nut. The other two formatives, as said above, are rarely used, and therefore I can speak with less confidence about their grammatical character.

There is another interesting problem with regard to the relation

between classifier and noun. The expression SAtala, "betel-bunchy one," is undoubtedly a noun when used alone, as it definitely names an object and points its individuality—in other words, it is a word standing for a thing. It may be used with the noun bu'a, the general symbol for betel-nut, (areca) palm, denoting tree-leaves, fruit generically. *Bu'a SAtala* might be transposed into English "betelpalm betel-bunchy-one". Now, which in these two is the real substantive and which the attributive word ? *SAtala* is the individualized, differentiated thing, whereas bu'a is the generic expression and is no doubt used adjectivally or adverbially. Thus in this case the grammatical relations between classificatory word and naming word seem to be reversed.

Nevertheless, such considerations can hardly be looked upon at present as anything but linguistic curios, as long as we are not in possession of a system of consistent definitions of parts of speech. Then, no doubt, we could easily either show up such a view as a quibble, or else be able to answer it definitely and gauge its theoretical importance.

Group III. Let us start from the meaning of these formatives, and see to what grammatical considerations we are led. These formatives indicate subdivisions of a whole, and also indicate the manner of the subdivision. They mean "portions obtained by cutting off", "portions obtained by transversally cutting off", respectively. They are genuine classifiers in so far as they classify portions according to the manner they were obtained from the whole. But each class contains only one type of object, and this object is sufficiently defined by the formative; that is, if the nature of the whole is known. If not, this must be added as a generic, adjectival qualifying word. Thus, BUBWAtala usi, "cut off transversally one portion of banana."

The classificatory expression here again is a substantive, since it means an independently existing thing and defines it sufficiently, the added noun functioning as a qualifying word. The conditions are analogous to those obtaining in the previous group. As a matter of fact all these expressions of Group III are almost exclusively used with the suffix *-tala*, one, in the sense of "a bit", "a bit cut off", etc. We noticed above already two of them have consolidated with an archaic form of one, *tana* into fixed forms *UTUtana* and *SItana*. The nominal character of these two expressions, as well as of the others, is marked by the frequent use with suffixes of nearest possession : *-gu*, *-m*, *-da*, etc. *UTUtagu*, "my little cut-off portion"; *SItagu*, "my little bit"; *SItyuwegu*, "my second little bit"; *VILItagu*, "my twisted

off little bit," etc. This is the form in which the natives beg for tobacco and other bounties, asking "give me my part".

Again, these expressions of Group III may be used adverbially in the sense of "a little", "a little bit", in such phrases as *SItana kunanakwa*, "hasten a little"; *UTUtana kubiya*, "pull a little," etc. In other phrases as *bakam SItana*, "I might eat a bit," it is difficult to judge whether *SItana* is used adverbially or as a noun in the objective case.

But it must be stressed: the particles of Group III can be used also as genuine formatives in numerals, demonstratives, and adjectives: *PILAvasi*, "four parts"; *BUBWAlima*, "five parts transversally cut off"; *VILIviyaka*, "a big portion twisted off"; *UTUkekita*, "a small portion"; *maPILAna*, "this part," etc., etc. *SI* is an exception in so far as I never heard it used in demonstratives or adjectives.

Group IV. Some of these formatives possess a very definite meaning, and denote one type of object only. What is more, they, unlike the formatives of Group II, do not possess any complementary noun. Thus, to KILAtala (one banana-bunch) we can always add usi (general word for banana-plant); but there are no nouns to be added to NUTU-, NIKU-, KABIS-, and SIVA-, and the word yam' (day) is never used with KALAtala. Thus the independent nominal character of the formatives, NUTUtala, etc., is still more prominent than was the case with the previously discussed ones. The remaining particles of this group, KABULO-, NINA-, MAYLA-, KUBILA-, and SIWA-, may, of course, be used independently of any noun, but there are nouns to be used with them, nouns signifying ends, promontories, protuberances, with KABULO; the nouns wosi (song), vinavina (ditty, chanty), meava (magic), yopa (spell), can be used with NINAand MAYLA-, indiscriminately; the noun kwabila (garden-land plot) and sewa (lagoon-portion) are used, as said above, with KUBILA- and SIWA-.

All the formatives of this group can be used in all the three main combinations : demonstratives, numerals, and adjectives.

Group V. All the formatives have a well-defined, special meaning, and they all are as a rule used in the form of nominal expressions. But each has a number of nouns, which may be used with it : with OYLA- all specific names for fish kinds ; with UMMWA- all the many names for two varieties, etc. They all form adjectives, numerals, and demonstratives.

Group VI. These formatives have a general meaning, since they signify formations and they require the addition of a noun more urgently than the particles of the foregoing group; it is more necessary to use a noun when you say "one heap" than when you say "one fish bundle". The numeral use of these formatives is perhaps the most prominent, but demonstratives and adjectives can be formed of them.

Group VII. Here there is no formative, the purely qualifying character of the numerals is prominent. "This basketful of yams" is expressed by using the root or frame of demonstration with the particle TA infixed, MA-TA-na. Whether -TA- is an abbreviated form of TALA, "one," or the second syllable of PETA, I cannot say.

The particle of Group VIII, referring to a definite measure, has, of course, a numeric use only.

Let us now summarize the results of the grammatical analysis of the formative particles. The fourteen particles of the first group possess in the most pronounced degree both the classificatory meaning and the grammatical function of a real word-formative. They serve to form adjunct words to neuns, and they mark a noun as belonging to a certain class, besides the noun being qualified by the numeric, adjectival, or demonstratival root.

The formatives of this group, however, and those of other groups in a higher degree, may function as independent nominal expressions wherein the formative stands for the thing (naming or classifying it), and the root gives it an attribute. In certain expre sions (Group IV) this nominal role is the only one in which we find them. The bulk of such expressions are found with the suffix *tala* (or the archaic form *tana*), which in this connexion plays a part similar to the indefinite article *un* (in French), *ein* (in German), and *a* (in English).

Finally we must remember that all grammatical terms and distinctions have been used as cautiously as possible, but with the reservations stated at the beginning, and touched upon again and again, namely that sound semantic definitions valid for a wide range of linguistic types are needed before any grammatical analysis of native languages is possible.

V

In the last division we discussed the grammatical nature of the particles and the grammatical use of the expressions formed by them. We mainly had to qualify the statement that these particles are "classificatory formatives" of attributive expressions. Here we must give some more information about the nature of these attributive expressions, i.e. of the numerals, demonstratives, and adjectives formed by means of classifiers.

Numerals

Following the distinctions introduced by Codrington and adopted by Ray, we may say that the Kiriwinians have an *imperfect decimal* system of notation.¹

They have independent words for 1 to 5, whereas their numeration from 6 to 10 is neither entirely independent, since 6–9 are formed by adding the word 1, etc., to the word for 5, nor is it a simple repetition, since there is a new and independent word for 10.

The following table will make it still clearer. In the first column are given the pure numeral roots as they are used for counting basketfuls of yams; in column II numerals with prefixes *PILA*- are given to show the manner of compounding—which is indeed simplicity itself.

Kiriwinian Numerals

1. Numeral Roots.

1. Tala Yuwa 2.1 to 5 progressive series 3. Tolu of independent words. Vasi 4. 5. Lima 6. Lima tala) 6 to 9 obtained by 7. Lima yuwa adding words for 1, 2, etc., to the word 8. Lima tolu 9. Lima vasi for 5. 10. Luvatala. New word. 20. Luvayyu Same formation as 10. 30. Luvatolu Etc. 50. Luvalima. 60. Luvalima luvatolu. 87. Luvalima luvatolu lima yuwa.

100. Lakatutala.

II. Numerals used for counting portions of a subdivided whole.

- of a subdivided whole. 1. Pilatala. 2. Pilayyu. 3. Pilatolu. 4. Pilavasi. 5. Pilalima. 6. Pilalima pilatala. 7. Pilalima pilayyu. 8. Pilalima pilayyu. 9. Pilalima pilavasi. 10. Piluvatala. 20. Piluvayyu. 30. Piluvatolu. 50. Piluvalima. 60. Piluvalima piluvatolu. 87. Piluvalima piluvatolu pilalima
- pilayyu. 100. Lapilatutala (hardly ever used).

This table shows well the extremely cumbersome manner in which higher and more complicated numbers have to be computed. As noticed against the word for 100, such high numbers are never in practice used with anything except yam-baskets, men (*latatutala*), and trees (*lakatutala*). But even the number for 87 is a mouthful to pronounce in a hurry, especially when it has to be used with a prefix. As shown, the prefix has to be uttered with each component word. None the less, the natives speak and even compute them quite glibly, and when I recorded the figures of a big harvest tribute given in 1918 to the chief in Omarakana, my native informants were far ahead of

¹ Codrington, op. cit., Chapter on Numeration and Numerals, pp. 220-51; Ray, op. cit., "Numeration and Numerals in the Melanesian Languages of British New Guinea," pp. 463-78. N.B.—Following the information of the Rev. S. B. Fellows, Mr. Ray presents the Kiriwinian data about numeration in an incorrect manner.

me in handling the figures, reckoning out how the individual tributes compared, finding out totals, etc.

The prefixing of the classifiers presents no difficulties; the numeral root is simply added to them and there are no contractions of phonetic modifications, except the l in tala (one) and tolu (three) is changed into n with the prefix NA-: NAtana (one female, one animal) and NAtonu (three females). Again, the ending -wa in the root for two, yuwa, is always dropped in the prefixed forms; thus, TAYyu, NATyu, etc.

It may be stated explicitly once more that all numerals on all occasions must be used with one classificatory prefix or other, except when counting basketfuls of yams. Also all the classifiers can be used with numerals (though some cannot be used with demonstratives), as has been stated in detail above (under IV, 3). The ordinal numerals are formed by adding the ending -la to the cardinals, with the exception of first, which is used in its cardinal form. Thus :---

1st man,	TAYtala tau.
$2 \mathrm{nd}$,	TA Yyuwe-la tau.
3rd ,,	TAYtolu-la tau.
4th ,,	TA Yvasi-la tau.
5th ,,	TA Ylima-la tau.
6th ,,	TA Ylima-la TA Ytala tau.
7th ,,	TA Ylima-la TA Yyuwe-la tau
Etc.	U U
10th	TA Yluvatala tau.

If it were necessary to emphasize the ordinal nature of first or tenth, they would say. maTAUna TAYtala, maTAUna TAYluvatala, "human-this human-one," "human-this human-tenth," respectively.

A few combined numeric pronouns are formed with the classificatory particles. The expressions for "alone", "once", "only", are : alone, *TAYtanidesi*; one thing only, *KWAYtanidesi*, *KAYtanidesi*, *YAtanidesi*, etc., etc. These are composed of the numeral part *TAYta*, etc., and the special suffix *-nidesi*, expressing the exclusive meaning.

Again, there are pronominal expressions: kamaTAYyu, kadaTAYyu, "we two together" (exclusive and inclusive respectively), kamiTAYyu, "you two together," kasiTAYyu, "they two together"; similar ones for "three", kamaTAYtolu, "we (exclusive) three together," kadaTAYtolu, "we (inclusive) three together," etc.

Demonstratives

There are two kinds of demonstratives in Kiriwinian, the simple demonstrative, *bayse*, or the equivalent form *bayne*, which simply points, and requires a direct indication, with a finger, nod, or gesture, and the group of compound demonstratives formed by particles.

The forms bayse and bayne are completely equivalent phonetic variations of the same word, and in Kiriwinian there is no distinction between nearer and further demonstration, corresponding to English "this", "that", French "celui-ci" and "celui-là", etc., though such distinction exists in many Melanesian languages.¹ This distinction, however, exists in the compound demonstratives; by the addition of the infix -we- the demonstrative is put into an opposition to the simple form, and it receives the "further" meaning. Thus, maTAUna, "this human," can be opposed by maTAwena, "the human there"; the first demonstrative, when thus coupled with an opposing one, means "this human here". Similarly, maKAYna waga aikota, maKAYwena aikeulo, "this-here wooden canoe anchored, this-there wooden sailed."

Some of the more obsolete particles, like VILO-, LUVA-, KADUYO-, might be used with numerals, but would probably not be used with demonstratives. The demonstrative maKWAYna, formed with the abstract particle, would be used with them. I advance this statement with caution, as it rests mainly on my own Kiriwinian "linguistic feeling". Those who have made observations on native languages will understand how difficult it is to generalize with regard to subtle differences, and that direct questioning of the natives is almost useless. It must be noted that the compound demonstratives in Kiriwina are certainly not pure "pointing" words. They might be called *nominal*, or *naming demonstratives*, as they inform us about the nature of the objects pointed at, besides performing the function of pointing.

It will be noted that the demonstratives can be used in the plural. In this case the plural pronominal particle si, "they," is infixed between the classifier and the ending na. Thus maTAUna, "this human," forms maTAU-si-na, "these humans"; maKAYna, "this wooden thing," forms maKAY-si-na, "these wooden objects," etc. Correspondingly, in the "further" demonstratives, we would h ve maTAU-si-wena, "these there humans," and maKAY-si-wena, "these there wooden things."²

¹ Compare Ray, op. cit., p. 426.

² It is interesting to compare these facts with the previous information of Kiriwinian demonstratives. Mr. Ray gives in his work on Papuan languages (op. cit.) an excellent digest of all the information available about the Melanesian languages of New Guinea, in which the Kiriwinian is included. There he summarizes the information given by the Rev. S. B. Fellowes by enumerating Kiriwinian demonstratives thus: "1. ma, baise, sina. 2. ma, baise, siwena" (loc. cit., p. 426). No. 1 refers to what we call nearer, No. 2 to the further demonstratives.

It is easy to see, in the light of the above data, that this information is quite VOL. I. PART IV. 5

Adjectives

Here the grammatical relations are much more complicated. Whereas in the numerals all words without exception were shown to be constructed with classifiers, and in the demonstratives a definite class is thus formed, here, in the adjectives, some adjectival words are formed with formatives and others dispense with them. We stand thus before a dilemma : shall we consider both these classes as adjectives, and thus assume that there are two classes of adjectives, showing a fundamental difference of formation, or shall we regard the simple (non-classified) words as adverbs and thus gain a clear formal boundary between adjective and adverb? No doubt it might be urged that these questions are idle, but then there would remain the onus probandi that it is so. At first sight it is clear that an attempt at giving the Kiriwinian language some sort of fromal consistency is one of the grammarian's tasks. And this formal consistency seems to be entirely lost if on the one hand the classificatory word formation throws together three different "parts of speech", and, moreover, tears asunder one of them.

This dilemma is one of the several points, where need for a good semantic theory is made evident to anyone who reading this paper has grasped the problems. Any definitions based on purely formal criteria must break down, where, as here, we have to solve problems of form without the help of meaning. We might say, here we have a new part of speech, as there is a new formal mark, and we might speak of Kiriwinian "classifiers" as a part of speech equivalent to noun, verb, and adverb. But this would lead us no further. If parts of speech and other grammatical distinctions possess any deeper significance, correspond to real distinctions in human thinking and human Weltanschauung, then let us once and for ever find this out. And then, whenever we find new linguistic forms and groupings we shall be able to say what they mean in relation to human social psychology and the special psychology of the given nation.

incorrect: ma, sina, siwena are debris of words and not complete words. Moreover, the dual arrangement is incorrect, in so far as it is made to embrace baise. But what must strike us most forcibly in this connexion is the omission on the part of Fellowes to make any mention of the role played by the classifiers in the formation of demonstratives. What has happened is obviously this: he identified the first part of the root ma with the "demonstrative", treated the suffix na as "of no account" (except in the plural endings sina, siwena), and neglected the classificatory infixes as "having been spoken about elsewhere". In fact, reading his grammar, it is easy to see that it is so, though it would be too cumbersome to prove it point for point. I preferred to quote Ray rather than Fellowes, as it is more telling to show directly that even the most competent expert cannot help being misled by information badly presented, in fact misrepresented.

For the present, however, we must leave our dilemma unanswered, and say that whereas some adjectives are used with classificatory prefixes, another class of adjectives—or words closely allied in function and general meaning—is used without classification. Thus viyaka is the adjectival root for "big", gaga for "bad". The first word can never be used without a prefix; "a big man" is ta'u TOviyaka, "a big canoe" is waga KAYviyaka; the second word is used unprefixed, as ta'u gaga, "a bad man"; kaulo gaga, "bad yam-food," etc. And if it is formed with prefixes it must adopt another infix formative, which also modifies its meaning: "a bad-minded man," ta'u TOmitugaga; "a bad-looking man," ta'u TOmigaga.

I cannot find any simple rule, formal or semantic or combined, for the distinction between the one class of adjectives and the other. A few remarks must suffice.

Thus certain words, as *viyaka*, big, *vana'u*, long, *dadodige*, crooked, *bubovatu*, rounded up, cannot be used without prefixed formatives.

Others like the names of colours—*pupwaka'u*, white, *bwabwa'u*, black, *bwebwerya*, red, *digadagile*, describing all other colours, like brown, yellow, and green—may be used with or without formatives. Other words, like *bwoyna*, good, *gaga*, bad, *nanakwa*, quick, can be used only without formatives, except in compounds, where an added formative alters their meaning as well.

Now these remarks are only exemplifying and giving a faint outline of facts, a methodical proceeding vehemently condemned in this paper. This has to be admitted, but at present I am unable to make this point more substantial. I hope that the analysis of a copious material, which I possess in the form of texts, taken down verbatim from native utterances, will yield better results when this is republished as a chapter of Kiriwinian Grammar.

Other Grammatical Uses of Classificatory Formatives

In the general definition given at the outset we stated that Kiriwinian classifiers enter into the formation of demonstratives, numerals, and adjectives. This is correct in so far as in these three parts of speech, the formatives play a very characteristic and important part. But it is obvious at once that in two more directions this use must extend beyond these strict limits, into nominal formations on the one hand, and into pronominal on the other. It has been stated clearly already and in detail that many of the classificatory numerals standing alone must be considered as independent nouns.

This nominal role, however, extends even beyond that. TO-, with

adjectival and nominal roots, forms nouns denoting an agent; NAis used with female and animal nouns; KAY- has the formative meaning of "instrument".¹

TO. ToKWAY-wosi, a dancer; composed of formative infix KWAY- and wosi, dance. To-KABI-kuriga, steersman; composed of infix KABI- and kuriga, steering. To-KABI-yalumila, the man at the bailer; yalumila, bailer. To-BWagau, sorcerer; from bwagau, sorcery. Especially important is the compound prefix TOLI-, meaning owner, maker.

NA. NA-valulu, the woman in child-birth; valulu, child-birth. NA-susuma, pregnant woman; from suma, pregnancy. NA-mwala, male animal; from mwala, male. NA-vivila, female animal; from vivila, female.

KAY. KAY-tutu, hammer; from tutu, to hammer. KAY-mili, the mortar; from mili, to crush. The formative meaning of KAY- as "instrument", however, is in many words not clear.

There are also nominal formatives with YA-, which often, though not always, stands for "leafy", with KWAY- and with PILA-. In some cases these formatives give a definite meaning to the word, in others they do not. A special and exhaustive study of the subject would lead us to a comprehensive treatment of Kiriwinian wordformation, which again must be postponed to another occasion.

With regard to the pronominal formation, the most important thing to be said about it is that the demonstrative of the form maTAUna is the only form of the 3rd person personal pronoun in Kiriwinian.

Thus in enumeration, "I, thou, he," a Kiriwinian has to say yaygu, yoku, maTAUna. Also in the objective form, "me, thee, him," maTAUna has to be used for the latter. "Thou givest me," kusakaygu, but "I give him", asayki maTAUna. Only in the pronouns, which are used with verbal forms to indicate the person, there exists a pronominal form of the 3rd person. a-, 1st person; ku-, 2nd person; i-, 3rd person. The possessive pronouns have the 3rd person in their three degrees of possession; nearest, suffixed -gu, -m, -la; nearer (agu, kam, kala), and remote (ulo, um', la). I think that the Kiriwinian language stands alone among all Melanesian tongues in this respect, that it does not possess the 3rd person of the personal pronoun, except when used in the verbal form.

Some interrogative pronouns are also formed by suffixing significative particles. Thus "who " and " which " may be expressed in a general

¹ This has been clearly recognized and stated by the Rev. S. B. Fellowes.

manner by *avayla*, "who," and *avaka*, "what," and with special reference to the object inquired after by *avay-tau*, "which male"; *avay-vivila*, "which female"; *avay-mauna*, "which (flying) animal"; *avay-ka'i*, "which tree." But here, obviously, the formatives possess a much more definite meaning and cannot be identified with the classifiers.

Indefinite pronouns, "someone," "something," are expressed by classified numeral forms; "one human being" is used for "some human being", the difference being recognizable from the context. *TAYtala*, "some human being," in *ilukwaygu TAYtala*, "one man told me"; *PILAtala*, "one of the heaps," "any heap," in *kuyousi PILAtala*, "get hold of one heap," etc. The compound demonstratives are also used as relative pronouns and conjunctions. In order to express such a phrase as "the man who sits in the middle takes the oar," the Kiriwinian says, *biyousi kuriga maTAUna isisu oluwalela*; literally, "he takes oar, that man he sits in middle." This rudimentary expression of relativity seems to be a universal feature of demonstratives in many native languages.

VI

The main theme of this paper, the Classificatory Formatives of the Kiriwinian language, has been primarily presented here as a linguistic fact. But also it is to serve us as an example of a general proposition, namely, that there is an urgent need for an Ethno-linguistic theory, a theory for the guidance of linguistic research to be done among natives and in connexion with ethnographic study.

It was stressed above, in the introductory paragraph, that as there can be no sound theory which is not based on an extensive study of facts, so there can be no successful observation of facts without the guidance of a sound theory. A theory which, moreover, aims, not at hypothethical constructions—" origins," "historical developments," " cultural transferences," and similar speculations—but a theory concerned with the intrinsic relation of facts. A theory which in linguistics would show us what is essential in language and what therefore must remain the same throughout the whole range of linguistic varieties; how linguistic forms are influenced by physiological, mental, social, and other cultural elements; what is the real nature of Meaning and Form, and how they correspond; a theory which, in fine, would give us a set of well-founded plastic definitions of grammatical concepts.

By the presentation of the Kiriwinian classificatory formatives, this general contention has been *prima facie* justified, in so far as we were able to see how a very characteristic and theoretically important phenomenon has fared badly, when treated on the foundation of insufficient theory. If we again look into the résumé of Fellowes' previous information about Kiriwinian classifiers—quoted at the end of Part II—we see that it is not only incorrect in detail but also distorted in its main outline. The errors in detail will be clear to anyone who reads the above quoted statement.¹

But the information criticized is distinctly misleading in essentials, in so far as it reveals only certain features of the classifiers, and leaves others quite obscure, although they are of fundamental importance, and it must be here emphatically stated that information which is incomplete in essentials is false information.

The data contained in the previous Kiriwina Grammar are incomplete in several points. They forcibly lead the reader to the conclusion that classifiers in Kiriwina are used with numerals only. Thus, S H. Ray in his digest presents Kiriwinian demonstratives and adjectives as if they were simple forms, having nothing to do with the classificatory formatives.²

The previous information is furthermore insufficient even within its own limitations; thus, as already indicated above, it never tells us whether the classificatory formation is used always with numerals and under all conditions, or whether it is of an occasional use. It is needless to expatiate on this point, as any one who reads this article will see for himself what I am aiming at.

The case in question can be taken as a fair example of the linguistic insufficiency of extant Grammars, as the *Kiriwina Grammar* is beyond question one of the best minor grammars (I exclude, of course, Codrington's and Ray's works), and probably it is the best one as far as the Melanesian languages of British New Guinea are concerned. The Rev. S. B. Fellowes knew the language perfectly well, he was a shrewd and judicious observer, and his knowledge of linguistic theory was undoubtedly above the average found in similar works. As his follower in the study of the Kiriwinian language and custom, I may be allowed to express my admiration and indebtedness to his work.

What is the reason, therefore, that this author has so signally

¹ Thus: NA- refers not only to animals. KAI- or QAI-(?) cannot be possibly defined as representing "things"; TAIua(?) does not mean "two baskets"; the expression UVAI-tala was unknown to my informants. All these details are, more-over, very important ones.

² Compare above in V, where Ray's summary on demonstratives is quoted. And op. cit., p. 458, § 20, "Adjectives."

failed in recording this striking and theoretically important linguistic First, it must be remembered that the popular prejudice fact? against neglect in treating seriously "the manners and customs of low, degraded races" has survived more tenaciously with regard to linguistics than to any other branch of ethnology. An irregularity in some obscure Greek inscription will draw forth volumes of erudite garrulousness, but for a unique record of an entirely new type of language we have to rely as a rule on some sketchy account of a wellintentioned but linguistically untrained amateur, missionary, or traveller. It is only quite recently, within the last few decades, that a few pioneers have done really scientific work on savage languages, often under great difficulties and always with a great deal of disinterested enthusiasm. For there is neither material endowment nor general prestige attached to these studies, and they receive as little encouragement from the universities as from the general public. What is most disappointing, however, is that philologists and linguists as a body do not show half as much interest in this type of work as they should. For there can be no doubt that for the real science of linguistics the living monuments of very primitive language as they still exist in the native-speaking communities possess an infinitely higher value than shattered débris of a dead language, because the former are full, living specimens, because they are of a type widely different from our own languages, and therefore more indispensable in a comprehensive comparison, and last but not least because these living monuments are disappearing fast and for ever, whereas granite, marble, parchment, and brass will survive the remains of prehistoric humanity.

Many linguists, no doubt, realize the importance of studying language on living rather than dead specimens, and everyone would probably admit that the study of native languages is of paramount importance. Thus it is characteristic that H. Paul, in his *Principles* (quoted above), develops and exemplifies the bulk of his statements on living modern languages. Perhaps this is one of the reasons why this work is so sound and inspiring. Even Delbruck, whose interest and life-work lay in the study of prehistoric forms on the basis of dead languages mainly, remarks several times in this *Grundriss* that a finer analysis of given linguistic phenomena could be achieved on living languages only.¹

¹ Op. cit., vol. v (3rd vol. of the *Syntax*), pp. 1-22: "Wir werden über diese Dinge erst sicherer urtheilen können, wenn vollständigere Sammlungen aus lebenden Sprachen vorliegen werden." p. 135: "Die feinere psychologische Analyse dieser Verhältnisse lässt sich aber nur an dem Material aus lebenden Sprachen vornehmen." And *passim* in other places. Compare also F. Max Müller, Lectures on the Science of

This refers to modern languages only, but it applies a fortiori to those of native communities. It is probably the special difficulty of bringing theoretical knowledge and opportunities of direct observation together that has not allowed ethno-linguistics to assume its proper place among other ethnographic pursuits. With several notable exceptions the effort spent on recording native languages in a strictly scientific manner is inadequate.¹

Let us now return to the *Kiriwina Grammar*. Besides the general one, there were more definite reasons no doubt, why it was difficult for Fellowes to present the classificatory formatives in the proper light, without the guidance of theoretical analysis. If one approaches a new language, which has to be recorded, with fixed and rigid grammatical views and definitions, it is easy to tear asunder the natural grouping of facts and squeeze them into an artificial scheme. If we imagine someone approaching Kiriwinian with the definite idea that demonstratives, adjectives, and numerals are separate "parts of speech ", and that they must be kept strictly asunder; further, with the knowledge that numeric classifiers exist, and that such phenomena are to be looked for in numerals but not elsewhere, then we can easily imagine what the result would be: the natural grouping, that is the identical formal principle underlying the word-formation in adjectives, numerals, and demonstratives, is ignored and misrepresented; numerals are endowed with classifiers, and a casual enumeration of them is considered. Moreover, in order to save space and time, no trouble is taken to make it absolutely correct. This is what in reality has happened in the Kiriwina Grammar.

So much on the score of criticism, which negatively shows us how lack of theoretical guidance and of realizing the theoretical importance of linguistic phenomena must lead, and does lead, to blurred vision of facts. But on the positive side it must be shown also, how we should construct the working of such "theoretical guidance"—see its operation in the manner in which the classifiers have been here recorded ?

Language, 8th ed., 1875, p. 268, where a good exposition is given of the reasons why modern languages are bound to give us better insight into linguistic phenomena than dead ones.

¹ Besides the older works previously quoted of Humboldt, F. Müller, and others, there may be mentioned the two periodicals, Z. f. Volkerpsychologie u. Sprachwissenschaft and the Z. f. Kolonialsprachen, the latter specially devoted to the study of native languages. C. Meinhof, Introduction into the Study of African Languages (English translation, London, 1915), gives a summary of the work done in the field. There has been much, and as it seems excellent, work recently done on the American native languages, but with that I am completely unacquainted.

It must be remembered first that a scientific theory gives us, besides a body of rules, also definite mental habits. A theory bent on "Origins", for instance, will lead anyone to see "survivals", "primitive forms", "innovations", and such like, in every ethnographic phenomenon studied. A sound linguistic theory, the aim of which is not to project the facts on to any extraneous plane, but to understand them in their nature, will in the first place engender the habits of mind which lead towards scientific perspective and completeness, that is, towards subordinating the less important to the essential, grouping it properly and lucidly, and trying to exhaust the data and not to exemplify them merely. In other words, instead of giving the *disjecta membra* of a linguistic phenomenon, there would be a tendency to construct an adequate picture of it.

Thus it was necessary first clearly to state the range of the classificatory particles, their main function and meaning. As soon as such a striking phenomenon was observed in the numerals, the theoretical interest and the impulse towards completeness would make their discovery inevitable in the demonstratives and adjectives as well. Again, the constructive desire for completeness imposes the principle to search for all the classifiers and to present them in an exhaustive list. Once tabulated, the differences in their nature-their meaning. their grammatical function, and their degree of obsoleteness-became patent. Immediately a series of problems presents itself, the finer shades of meaning, details in grammatical definition, the vitality of these forms have to be specially observed, noted, and inquired into. Further research is thus stimulated, and this leads to the discovery of new facts. And so on; theoretical analysis compels us to see gaps in the facts and to formulate problems-this elucidates new facts. which must be submitted to theoretical analysis again, and so on, until the limit is reached, where further details would be too vague and too insignificant for observation.

I must insist that in stating this I am not expressing a *pium* desiderium or using figurative speech, but laying down a definite postulate of ethnographic field-work; whilst making observations it is necessary constantly to group, construct, and organize the evidence, and this leads to further research. But in order to do that it is necessary to be in possession of a sound theory. I am in position to stress this point from my own experience; during my first stay in Kiriwina, 1915 to 1916, I had no linguistic preparation, and though I picked up the language easily enough I entirely failed in an attempt to write up a grammar. I made this attempt on my return to Melbourne in 1916 and its miscarriage led me to a good deal of linguistic reading and reflection during my eighteen months stay within reach of the excellent Melbourne library. On my next visit to the Trobriands I saw linguistic facts where there had previously been nothing but confusion, and I am now able to write on linguistics, whereas I absolutely failed in this before.

So far, so good, and the point will perhaps be conceded that theoretical interest and guidance have helped us in the survey of the Classificatory Formatives. But this is not all. All the grammatical conclusions and the remarks that have been made above were done under protest and with reservations. Thus, for instance, in stressing the nominal or adverbial character of certain expressions, in distinguishing between the formative as strictly classifying and naming, using conceptions such as head-word and adjunct-word or attribute, we admittedly only make provisional linguistics. I may say at once that I have a semantic theory of my own, and that it was only owing to this theory that I felt capable of imparting a certain amount of consistency to my grammatical conclusions. But, of course, such an implicitly held theory or creed, though necessary to the author, cannot carry conviction to the reader. In the present state of affairs, however, when there is no universally acknowledged set of definitions and no consistent body of views about the various linguistic categories, everyone is compelled to use his own discretion and to coin his own terminology.¹

Broadly speaking, in this article, we adhere to simple semantic criteria in using the terms "noun" and "nominal" to denote words which stand for an individually considered and fully defined thing, the term "adjective" for words denoting attributes ascribed to a thing, and so on. Yet, even in the fundamental question as to whether one is justified in deducing parts of speech from real categories, there

¹ When I wrote this and the following paragraphs, I had not seen Sir Richard Temple's most interesting attempts at a semantic theory adapted to the study of primitive languages. His outlines of a Universal Grammar and their application, although very condensed and carried out only in very broad outlines, seem to me of extreme importance: the problems are set forth in an excellent manner, and the solutions offered are undoubtedly correct in all essentials. Any future attempt at a semantic theory, based on ethnology, will have to proceed on the lines indicated by Sir Richard Temple. Cf. "A brief exposition of a Theory of Universal Grammar", privately printed 1683; "The Skeleton of a Theory of Universal Grammar," JRAS., 1899, pp. 597-604; "A Theory of Universal Grammar, as applied to a Group of Savage Languages," in *The Indian Antiquary*, vol. xxviii, 1899, pp. 197, 225; "A Plan for a Uniform Scientific Record of Languages of Savages, applied to the Languages of the Andamanese and Nicobarese," in *The Indian Antiquary*, vol. xxxvi, 1907, pp. 181, 217, 317, 353. is no agreement whatever. Thus Wundt in his monumental work on language assumes without further analysis that "noun", "adjective", "verb", and "particle" correspond to concepts of classes : "Things," "Quality," "State," and "Relation", whereas Oertel directly denies that the linguistic divisions into parts of speech have anything to do with what he calls "logical categories".¹ Yet these two authors are among the very best and most competent authorities; a great psychologist who has gone deeply into the study of language, and a good linguist, whose work is founded on extensive psychological knowledge.

Again, dealing with Kiriwinian demonstratives, we pointed out that they are not demonstratives pure and simple, but "naming demonstratives". But how much does such a distinction mean, or how little? It would be idle to speculate, without a safe basis of theory. We could multiply the examples from this paper, but it may be better to give an example or two from other works, else this one example might appear to claim too much of our attention, and one might be also under the impression that it forms a class of its own.

As we were speaking of the parts of speech, let us remain within this grammatical area. It is safe to say that so far we possess correct—or, at least, sufficient—definitions of the terms verb, noun, adjective, etc., only within the reach of Indo-European languages. Can we apply these terms to, say, Oceanic languages? One of the greatest authorities on this subject, Edward Tregear, author of the *Maori-Polynesian Dictionary*, answers this question in the negative : "I have carefully avoided the use of letters to mark the native words as substantive, adjective, verb, etc. It is an unwise, if not a mischievous effort to make, if we endeavour to force the rules of grammar which fit (more or less) the modern stage of the English tongue upon a language belonging to the utterly unequal grammar-period in which the Polynesian speech is now found."² I doubt very much

² Op. cit., Introduction, p. xiii.

¹ "In den meisten Sprachen haben sich auf diese Weise vier . . . deutlich unterschiedene Wortformen entwickelt, die jenen Begriffskategorien genau entsprechen : den Gegenstandsbegriffen das *Substantivum*, den Eigenschaftsbegriffen das *Adjectivum*, den Zustandsbegriffen das *Verbum*, endlich den Beziehungsbegriffen die *Partikel*" (*Die Sprache*, ii, p. 7 and *passim* through the 6th chapter on Parts of Speech, ii. pp. 1-207).

[&]quot;The logical category of each name is definitely fixed; it stands either for a thing or for a quality, or for an action, or for a state, and these categories have no inherent connection with the grammatical or syntactical categories of 'substantive', 'adjective', or 'verb'"... (op. cit., p. 284). It is needless to add that my point of view is much nearer to that of Wundt than to that of Oertel.

whether he is correct in compiling a vocabulary where each word is defined in an apriorically insufficient manner, because meaning is only half the definition of a word. And perhaps Tregear would have done better to have followed the usual routine of wholesale application of European categories rather than clung to full scientific strictness at the cost of giving an entirely one-sided work. None the less, he is right in stressing the point of strictness, and there is the incontestable fact that his great work would not have been presented in a mutilated form but for the absence of a satisfactory linguistic theory which would allow him grammatically to define Polynesian words without pressing them into the "net of English grammar".

Another Oceanic linguist of great merit, Codrington, on the other hand, has no scruples in using freely undefined grammatical concepts. Speaking of a Melanesian part of speech, he says : "These are here called 'Possessives' for want of a better term, and are not called Possessive Pronouns because Pronouns they are not."¹ We are neither told why the author thinks so dogmatically and affirms so boldly that "Pronouns they are not", we have to take it on his word-nor does he even trouble to tell us what he understands by pronoun. Presumably we are to accept the word in its current sense. But taking it thus, it is difficult to agree with Codrington, since all possessives "stand for a noun", and are thus pronouns according to the broad definition of this term. Codrington's distinction must therefore rest on some subtlety, which he has in his mind, but which he never explicitly states. Either he should have given us his reasons or abstained from applying rigorous criteria, which must remain completely meaningless. As it stands we have a typical example of such linguistic views, where no trouble is taken to state the problem clearly and to define terms, yet where a very definite and somewhat pretentious use is made of these terms.

On the same page, again, we find it written about a Melanesian particle: "It may be called a Possessive Particle, or a Possessive Preposition, or a Possessive Sign. But it is in fact a Noun "—and that is all! Again, it is difficult for anyone, uninitiated to that author's unexpressed thoughts to see how a Formative Particle can be a Noun. A noun has to be a word independent in form and meaning, and the particle in question is a formative only, a mere portion of a word, without independent sense or linguistic existence. Yet no attempt is made² to justify the quoted phrase, to indicate on what it rests—

¹ Op. cit , p. 129.

² What the author probably had in his mind was that the Formative Particle in question originally *must have been* a noun. The non-linguistic reader must be cautioned

what are the criteria by which the author would distinguish between a noun and non-noun. Nor is evidently the need for such criteria felt. This shows clearly how this author, to whose linguistic genius and industry we owe so much in Melanesian ethnography, must have felt the need of making clear-cut and definite linguistic distinctions, though he had not realized that they must be based on sound theoretical foundations.

Examples of not sufficiently justified grammatical reshuffling are to be found even in the scholarly work of Mr. S. H. Ray. Thus, he says: "It is somewhat difficult to ascertain whether *true adjectives* exist in the Melanesian languages of New Guinea... the word usually appears with a pronominal suffix [-na] which indicates it to be a noun." After comparing adjectival expressions with nouns and showing similarity of form (in the suffixes), he concludes: "It is evident that the attributive adjective is used in the same way [as a noun is] and must therefore be constructed as a noun."¹

This appears to me highly inconclusive. First, what is exactly a "true adjective", and have we to understand that there are "untrue adjectives"? What are they? Then, to conclude, from mere formal similarity that the grammatical nature of the words is the same without entering into any analysis of this formal common feature seems to me quite inadmissible.

As a matter of fact I am certain that in this case Mr. Ray is not correct, in that he confuses two different meanings of the suffix -na, the possessive and the emphatic. The suffix used with adjectives is emphatic. "Ira namona is said to have a definite emphatic meaning as if the particular hatchet was singled out; this is a good ira."² In Kiriwinian, when a noun is repeated emphatically it will be used with the suffix -la (-na). And this has nothing whatever to do with the possessive. Thus, for example, in the dark I might stumble against something, and ask, Avaka bayse? ("what is this?"). A native against whose leg I stumbled will answer, Kaykegula, which, with a strong accent, has a very emphatic meaning, "my leg, you fool!" Here, obviously, the suffix -la has nothing to do with the 3rd person singular possessive pronoun, since it comes on top of the -gu, the 1st person possessive suffix. It is simply emphatic.

² Loc. cit.

against a confusion of ideas. Discussing the grammatical function of Kiriwinian Formatives above (in IV, 3) we asserted that certain *expressions formed* with these Particles are nouns. But it must be realized that a *Formative Particle itself* can never be anything but the part of a word, and can thus never be ranged under any of the independent parts of speech.

¹ Op. cit., p. 458, § 20, "Adjectives." The italics are mine.

Let us point out one more methodological feature before we finally restate our conclusions : in all our grammatical distinctions we have always led back to meaning. Thus, in dealing with the grammatical character of the various formatives, we had to keep their meaning constantly before us. In trying to prove that an expression should be rather classed as a noun or adverb or adjective or a "nominal demonstrative", we use semantic and not formal definitions. But the analysis of meaning again led us often to ethnographic descriptions. When defining the meaning and function of several of the formatives, we had to make excursions into ethnography, describe customs, and state social conditions. Thus linguistics without ethnography would fare as badly as ethnography would without the light thrown on it by language. And it is the right and the duty of ethnographers to ask for an efficient assistance in the linguistic work on the part of the students of language.

Now let us summarize our results :---

We saw that rigid grammatical concepts, borrowed from current grammars of Indo-European linguistics, are a bar to linguistic observation—they lead to wrong distinctions, to tearing asunder of natural grouping, to false perspective.

Again, an amateurish, extemporized use of grammatical terms—as we had to do it in this paper, and as has been done by others—carries no conviction, and simply opens up problems, the proper solution of which would only again lead to the construction of a semantic theory.

To give up all grammatical definitions, as is possible in a vocabulary, but quite impossible in a grammar, is incorrect. We need a Theory, devised for the purpose of observation of linguistic fact. This theory would give a recast of grammatical definitions, based on an analysis of meaning. It would analyse the nature of syntax, parts of speech, and formation of words, and besides giving adequate and plastic definitions would open up vistas of problems and thus guide research. Such a theory would also serve as an interpretation of linguistic facts in their bearing upon social psychology.

Phonetic note.—The sounds of the Kiriwinian language will be described more completely in a future publication. The spelling in this paper follows the general rule that all vowels are to be pronounced as in Italian, and all consonants as in English. The consonantic i sound has been rendered by the letter y. Thus in the Kiriwinian word guya'u the y is to be pronounced like the j in Italian Ajaccio. The accent ' is used to separate two vowels which do not form a diphthong, but must be pronounced with a break between them, as separate syllables.