

論文の英文要旨

Predicate structure and valency changing processes of Vatulele Fijian Susumu Okamoto

This thesis described the predicate structure and valency changing processes of Vatulele Fijian and compared them to other Fijian languages such as Standard Fijian (SF). Although this was a descriptive work, several typological considerations were included to reveal uniqueness of the language. Examples given in the thesis were based on the author's fieldwork.

Chapters 1 to 4 constituted an introductory part of the thesis.

Chapter 1 provided a preliminary on Vatulele Fijian. This language is spoken in Vatulele Island in the Republic of Fiji. Genetically, Vatulele Fijian is an Oceanic, Eastern Malayo-Polynesian, Central-Eastern Malayo-Polynesian, Malayo-Polynesian, Austronesian language. Vatulele Fijian belongs to the Western Fijian group and shows some different characteristics from the Eastern group such as SF.

Chapter 2 provided an overview of Vatulele Fijian phonology, which serves as the foundation for subsequent discussion. Overall, it has a typical Oceanic phonological system, that is, a five-vowel system, an open-syllable structure, and a penultimate-stress rule.

Chapter 3 was a grammar sketch of the language written within Geraghty's (2002) framework. Some aspects discussed in this chapter were explored later.

Chapter 4 discussed what a “word” is in Vatulele Fijian. This is because a phonological boundary does not correspond to a grammatical boundary in Fijian languages. I concluded that Vatulele Fijian has two types of words: phonological words and grammatical words. A phonological unity does not trigger a grammatical one, and vice versa. For example, noun incorporation (NI) is a single grammatical word but consists of two (or more) phonological words (Chapter 8). In contrast, a prepositional verb constitutes a single phonological word but never functions as one grammatical word, that is, a transitive verb (Chapter 9). I also demonstrated that there are some mismatches between the two kinds of words.

Chapters 5 to 10 focused on the predicate structure and valency changing processes of Vatulele Fijian.

Some linguistic features are shared by Vatulele Fijian and other Fijian languages such as SF. Chapter 5 demonstrated the structure of the predicate. Because a predicate head is not limited to a verb, establishing word classes in Fijian languages is difficult. This study distinguished lexical classes (noun, verb, etc.) from syntactic functions (argument, predicate, etc.). Vatulele Fijian has a “weak” relationship between lexical classes and syntactic functions, where both a noun and a verb can function as an argument and as a predicate. A predicate includes bound pronouns that agree with core arguments in a clause. In addition to these bound pronouns, optional modifiers occur in a predicate. Vatulele Fijian can be considered a head-marking language based on these characteristics.

Chapters 6 revealed that Vatulele Fijian is dominantly a “transitivizing language,” which means that the language tends to derive a transitive verb from an intransitive one, not vice versa. This generalization seems to hold for other Fijian languages. Typical transitive verbs are formed by adding the transitive suffix. Verbal forms are slightly different from SF. When a verb has a high semantic transitivity such as *vāmate* ‘kill’ and *vāmudre* ‘burn,’ it functions transitively without the transitive suffix. This chapter analyzed the intransitive/transitive verb alternation within the framework of Nichols et al. (2004).

Chapter 7 dealt with ditransitive verbs, i.e., verbs that require three arguments: an agent argument, a recipient-like (R) argument, and a theme (T) argument. Typical ditransitive verbs like ‘give’ use the indirective alignment, where the T argument appears as an object, whereas the R argument is marked as peripheral. On the other hand, THROW verbs and causative verbs use the secundative alignment, that is, the R argument functions as an object, whereas the T argument is peripheral. The analysis of ditransitive verbs in this study calls into question Malchukov et al.’s (2010) typological model. To be precise, the position of THROW verbs in the semantic map

provided by them may need to be reconsidered. Utterance verbs such as ‘teach’ are peculiar because they use both alignments without any morphological processes.

Other linguistic aspects discussed in this thesis, on the other hand, are not described or reported in other Fijians. Chapter 8 discussed NI. As in SF, NI is formed by compounding an object noun and a verb to constitute an intransitive predicate. I pointed out that NI in Vatulele Fijian can be transitivized, having another object. Oceanic languages have never been identified as having this type of NI by typological studies. The fact that NI undergoes transitive derivation supports the idea that NI is intransitive in Vatulele Fijian. Although NI includes two or more phonological words, it is a single grammatical word. According to Mithun (1984), NI in Vatulele Fijian is now developing to the next stage of NI.

Another point peculiar to Vatulele Fijian is the prepositional verb construction. Chapter 9 explored this construction. In this construction, the preposition acts like a suffix to the preceding element, forming a diphthong. Previous research has not described this construction. Some syntactic operations support that a prepositional verb is not a grammatical word, although it constitutes a phonological word.

As previously stated, Vatulele Fijian is a transitivizing language, so possession would be expected to use the transitive construction. However, Chapter 10 demonstrated that it is not expressed by the transitive construction. Rather, the existential construction is used for possession. In addition to predicative possession, nominal possession was also described in this chapter.

I concluded that Vatulele Fijian is a language that strictly distinguishes between core and peripheral arguments. A core argument is an argument that is coreferential with a bound pronoun. On the other hand, a peripheral argument is one that is not coreferential with any bound pronouns and that cooccurs with a preposition. There are no examples of peripheral arguments acting like core arguments. An NP after a prepositional verb does not exhibit any morphosyntactic characteristics of an object. Similarly, even in the possessive construction, an argument with the preposition can never be a subject. In addition, Vatulele Fijian has no “double object” construction. In other words, because Vatulele Fijian takes only one object per clause, either the T or the R should be peripheral in the ditransitive construction.