

ENTER AND EXIT IN KILIVILA

GUNTER SENFT

Max-Planck-Institute for Psycholinguistics, Netherlands

ABSTRACT

Based on film animation scenes and on an elicitation-task devised by members of the Cognitive Anthropology Research Group I elicited data on how the concepts ENTER and EXIT are expressed in Kilivila, the Austronesian language of the Trobriand Islanders. The paper presents the methodology used for data elicitation and the results for Kilivila. Kilivila can express ENTER and EXIT concepts either with specific lexicalized verbal expressions, or with constructions that use the motion verbs ‘come’ and/or ‘go’ together with a locative like ‘in, into’ or ‘out, outside’ (these constructions can be compared to Talmy’s “verb+satellite constructions”), or with serial verb constructions that minutely describe the ENTER/EXIT actions observed. Both the form and the semantics of these constructions are discussed.

1. Introduction¹

Miller and Johnson-Laird (1976: 527) characterized motion verbs as “the most characteristically verbal of all the verbs... that describe how people and things change their places and their orientation in space”. Movements “constitute some of the most basic human activities” (Heine et al. 1991: 35), and thus motion verbs definitely form a central semantic cluster in our languages. They are central and — in general — rather early acquired (see, for example, Macrae 1976; Clark and Garnica 1974; Gropen et al. 1991), and they generally play an important part in grammar and grammaticalization processes (see Heine et al. 1991), being prime candidates for development into auxiliaries, modals, and polyverbal chains (see Brown et al. 1993).²

Moreover, as Miller (1972: 338) rightly observes, “we have generalized [the concept of physical motion] freely into nonphysical contexts”, especially with respect to our (verbal) thinking (see Senft: in press). But how are “verbs of motion” to be defined?

As I have pointed out elsewhere (Senft: in press) there are a number of proposals in the linguistic literature to define motion verbs and, more generally, to define how motion events are linguistically coded (see, for example, Fefilov 1976: 287; Gerling, Orthen 1979: 99ff; Hilty 1965: 26f.; Maienborn 1990: 81, 106; Miller 1972: 339; Schröder 1983: 213; Di Meola 1994: 28f.; and especially Talmy 1975; 1985; n.d.), however, so far we do not have a general — notional — definition of motion verbs in linguistics. Moreover, Lucy (1994) points out that it is far from clear whether what we notionally call “motion verbs” corresponds to a formally defined verb class in a given language. I have discussed this problem in detail elsewhere (Senft: in press). For the purposes pursued here it should suffice to state that — despite this linguistic problem — speakers of any language talk about motion events — and that their languages offer them the verbal means to do so. Although Miller and Johnson-Laird (1976: 529) point out that we have (at least) to differentiate between “verbs of motion-in-place” and “verbs of locomotion” I assume the common sense argument that all the verbal expressions or verbs speakers use in their languages to refer to motion and locomotion events can be — at least pretheoretically and, of course, notionally — regarded as being motion verbs. Thus, if I speak of ‘motion verbs’ here I refer to verbal expressions speakers use to verbally refer to motion and locomotion events within the general framework of sensually perceivable and empirically given motion and locomotion events speakers experience in their environment.

If we accept this notional and, if you like, pretheoretical search domain for, and definition of, verbs that refer to motion and locomotion events, it is by no means difficult to collect data for these verbal expressions. Speakers of all languages use them in various contexts and text categories, and we can easily develop methods to elicit them.

In what follows I want to look at motion verbs that express the concepts of ENTER and EXIT in Kilivila, the Austronesian language of the Trobriand Islanders.³

This paper is the result of a joint interest with my colleagues within the “space project” at the Max-Planck-Institute for Psycholinguistics. We want to find out, among other things, “whether a language has a lexicalized ‘enter’ verb,

and if so, whether it requires or co-occurs with other path-markers (e.g., ‘inside’ pre- or postpositions or cases) and whether it has a true antonym meaning ‘exit’ or not. One may also ask whether there is more than one ‘enter’ verb, whether it may occur in a serial verb construction with say a manner verb of running, and so on” (Hendriks and McQueen 1996: 85; see also Wilkins et al. 1995: 14–16). In what follows I will first describe the methodology of data gathering and then present and discuss the ‘enter/exit’-subset of these Kilivila motion verbs.

2. Method of Data Elicitation

To research the semantics of verbal expressions for the concepts of ENTER and EXIT in various languages, Charles Hendriks realized Sotaro Kita’s (1995) design of computerized animation trick film clips with the help of a three dimensional animation program. The trick film consists of 13 movie clips which depict the following scenes:

- Three clips show a man walking into a house; each clip presents the same scene shot from a different camera angle, namely from the side (profile), from outside the house (going away), and from inside the house (coming towards). We refer to these clips as the “ENTER scenes”
- Three clips show a man walking out of a house; again, each clip presents the same scene shot from a different camera angle, namely from the side (profile), from inside the house (going away), and from outside the house (coming towards). We refer to these clips as the “EXIT scenes”.
- One clip shows a man as he is appearing and disappearing on the same spot. That is to say, the picture of the man slowly appears, remains for a while, and then slowly fades away again. We refer to this clip as the “APPEAR/DISAPPEAR scenes without motion and without change of place”.
- Three clips show a man disappearing from a location outside of a house and reappearing inside a house. The picture of the man standing outside of the house slowly fades away and “magically” reappears inside the house. We refer to this change-of-state/change-of-place with the expressions “TELEPORTING” or — paying our (ethnocentric) tribute to Captain Kirk, Scotty and the Starship Enterprise — “BEAMING IN/OUT”. Each clip presents the

same scene shot from a different camera angle, namely from the side (profile), from outside the house, and from inside the house. We refer to these scenes as the “BEAMING IN scenes” (this implies that the scenes are without (perceivable) motion but with a perceivable change of place).

– Three clips show a man disappearing from inside the house and reappearing at a location outside the house. Again, we refer to this change-of-state/change-of-place with the expressions “TELEPORTING” or “BEAMING IN/OUT”, and again each clip presents the same scene shot from a different camera angle, namely from the side (profile), from inside the house, and from outside the house. We refer to these scenes as the “BEAMING OUT scenes” (this implies that the scenes are without (perceivable) motion but with a perceivable change of place).

The clips were designed in this way for the following three reasons: First of all, they should elicit ENTER/EXIT motion verbs, of course. Second, they should elicit and provide information about the conditions under which in a particular language a person could be said to ‘enter’ or ‘exit’ an enclosure. And third, they should elicit and provide information about whether a language actually encodes “motion” in its ENTER/EXIT verbs or whether it only encodes a discrete change-of-state. We assumed that an ENTER verb might have the semantics ‘move across a boundary into a container’ or it might have the semantics ‘achieve a state of being inside a container, from a prior state of being outside’. We hypothesized that the “BEAMING IN/OUT” scenes should be described by languages which have a change-of-state semantics without a motion component in their ENTER/EXIT verbs, while verbs that encode motion might be more difficult to apply to this situation (see Hendriks and McQueen 1996:91).

We presented this film on Hi-8 video-tape to our consultants, using a Sony-Watchman as our monitor. Looking at all the 13 scenes takes 2 minutes and 30 seconds; however, we presented each clip separately, then the tape was stopped and the consultant (the speaker) was asked to describe what he or she had just seen to someone (the listener) who was with her or him but who could not see the video.⁴ Before we showed the “BEAMING IN/OUT” clips we explained to our consultants that the man in the film is said to have the special ability to appear and disappear as he wishes.⁵

In what follows I present and analyse the data that I elicited with this method with my consultants in Tauwema village on Kaile’una island. In 1995 I did a pilot study with 6 consultants as speakers (2 women and 4 men)

using a version of the video film that did not contain the clips showing the man entering and exiting the house from the side (profile) camera angle. In 1996 I elicited new data with the video that contained all the 13 movie clips described above. This time I elicited data with 3 male consultants as speakers — because first analyses of the 1995 data did not reveal any sex specific differences in the consultants' reactions.⁶ Most of the data presented here are based on these two corpora.

In addition to these data I will also refer occasionally to data I gathered with David Wilkins's (1995) "Moving IN(TO)/Moving OUT(OF)" elicitation kit. To gather comparative data on the expression of dynamic motion events that involve "motion in(to)" and "motion out (of)", Wilkins developed an elicitation task that uses a kit of various materials to elicit the linguistic description of 42 scenario types featuring various "moving in(to)" and "moving out(of)" scenes that vary on a number of parameters like, for example, (a) animacy, shape and/or consistency of the figure, (b) dimensionality, shape and/or consistency of a container (as ground), (c) manner of motion, (d) orientation in space, and so on. In 1995 I elicited with this tool a vast amount of data that ask for detailed analyses of their own and cannot all be presented in this paper. Thus, I will not describe Wilkins's elicitation task in detail here, but mention it because the "Enter/Exit Animation for linguistic elicitation" designed by Kita can be seen as a kind of supplement to Wilkins's kit for motion elicitation. To emphasize it once more, the data I gathered with Kita's "Enter/Exit Animation" device are in the focus of this paper; however, where necessary I will also refer to data I gathered with Wilkins's tool when they provide interesting and necessary additional information to the data elicited with the animation scenes I will present and discuss here.

3. ENTER and EXIT in Kilivila

With the exception of indicating the man's movement towards and away from the viewer/speaker by using the appropriate Kilivila COME and GO motion verbs and except for the production of a special verbal expression that allows the listener to infer the perspective of the camera (see example (6) below), the consultants' verbal reactions to the three ENTER and three EXIT scenes do not present special and relevant differences with respect to the three different camera angles or perspectives in which the clips depict

the scene. The descriptions of the “profile” scenes follow in general the descriptions of the “going away” scenes. Moreover, if we take the serial verb construction *elola ela (eva)/ema (emwa)* (he walks he goes (goes to)/comes (comes to)) as the most general construction that is unmarked with respect to manner (see examples (1), (2), (5) and (7) below) — keeping in mind that the verbal expression *-lola-* is just a reduplication of the verb *-la-* and can be glossed as ‘to go’ and as ‘to walk’ — then we do not find any manner verb that is realized in serial verb constructions to refer to the acts of entering and exiting presented in the film clips. Before we look at the data the speakers produced describing the ENTER scenes, I would first like to define the motion verbs expressing the concepts COME and GO that I just mentioned:⁷

The verbal expression *-la-* is used to refer to all kinds of motion events that are directed away from the speaker; this implies, of course, that the place of the speaker is not at the destination of the motion. The motion event itself can, but need not be deictically anchored in the speaker. Source, path, and destination of the motion may or may not be known. We can gloss this motion verb as ‘to go’. The expression *-lola-*, a reduplication of *-la-*, emphasizes and intensifies the motion referred to. This expression is also used to refer to the motion event that can be glossed as ‘to go’ as well as ‘to walk’.

The verbal expression *-ma-* is used by speakers to refer to motion towards the speaker. Source, path, and destination of the motion may or may not be known to the speaker. The speaker’s place may or may not be at the destination of the motion referred to. The expression can be glossed as ‘to come’.

The verbal expression *-va-* refers to motion away from the speaker. This expression is telic, it implies that the destination of the motion is known. The motion event the speaker refers to can, but need not be deictically anchored in the speaker. Information about the source and the path of the motion may or may not be known to the speaker. The expression can be glossed as ‘to go to’.

The verbal expression *-mwa-* refers to motion towards the speaker. The expression is telic, the destination of the motion event is known to the speaker, though the speaker need not be at the destination point of this motion event. The source and the path of the motion may or may not be known to the speaker. The expression can be glossed as ‘to come to (a place which is in the direction of, but different from, the speaker’s place)’.

The expressions *-va-* and *-mwa-* are most probably forms that originate in grammaticalization processes that combined the expressions *-la-* and *-ma-*

with the directional *va* to express the telicity in the GO and COME expressions.

Given these definitions we will now look at the data my consultants produced describing the ENTER scenes

3.1 ENTER in Kilivila

There are basically three verbal means that are used to refer to the ENTER concepts in the ENTER scenes:

First, consultants use simple expressions like ‘to go (or: to come) + Directional or Locative + Goal’ like, for example:

<i>Ela va bwala</i>	<i>Ela o la bwala</i>
<i>e-la va bwala</i>	<i>e-la o la bwala</i>
3-go DIR house	3-go LOC 3.POSSPRO house
‘he goes (in)to the house’	‘he goes into his house’
(here the act of entering is only implied)	

and ‘to go (or: to come) + Locative: inside⁸+ Goal’ like, for example:

<i>ela olopola bwala</i>	<i>ela olumolela bwala</i>
<i>e-la olopola bwala</i>	<i>e-la olumolela bwala</i>
3-go inside house	3-go inside house
‘he goes inside the house’	‘he goes inside the house’

These expressions can be found in constructions like the following:

- (1) *Tetala tau... tetala tau esunapula, elola ela o la bwala.*
te-tala tau te-tala tau e-sunapula e-lola e-la
 CP.male-one man CP.male-one man 3-exit 3-walk 3-go
o la bwala
 LOC 3.POSSPRO house
 ‘One man... one man, he gets out he walks he goes into his house.’
 (speaker: Moagawa 1996, scene 1.1).
- (2) *Bogwa etoli elola ela va bwala.*
bogwa e-toli e-lola e-la va bwala
 already 3-stand 3-walk 3-go DIR house
 ‘He is standing (there) already he walks he goes (in)to the house.’
 (speaker: Bwetagava 1995).

Note that in this example the actual act of entering the house is simply implied, the phrase only refers explicitly to the fact that the man is moving towards the house.

- (3) *Elola va doa elola olopola valu ela itoli.*
e-lola va doa e-lola olopola valu e-la i-toli
 3-walk DIR door 3-walk inside place 3-go 3-stand
 ‘He walks to the door, he walks inside the place he goes and stands (there).’
 (speaker: Taidyeli 1995).

In this phrase the speaker mentions the border that has to be transgressed, the door, and then explicitly refers to the following act of entering.

Second, consultants use the verbal expression *-suvi-* which may actually be glossed as ‘to enter’ in phrases like:

- (4) a. *Mtona tomwota esuvi va bwala etoli.*
m-to-na tomwota e-suvi va bwala e-toli
 DEM-CP.male-DEM person 3-enter DIR house 3-stand
 ‘This man enters the house (and) stands (there).’
 (speaker: Meabwau 1995).

However, I want to mention here that in the actual elicitation session the speaker in his full description of the “entering”-scene added the following sentence:

- (4) b. *E besatuta okaukweda etota e bilola bila va bwala ela va bwala etoli.*
e besatuta okaukweda e-tota e
 and now outside (of the house) 3-stand and
bi-lola bi-la va bwala e-la va bwala e-toli
 3.FUT-walk 3.FUT-go DIR house 3-go DIR house 3-stand
 ‘And now at the outside (of the house) he stands and he will walk he will go (in)to the house he goes (in)to the house he stands).’

This sentence is similar to the sentences presented in examples (1)–(3).

Third, consultants most often use the verbal expression *-suvi-* together with other motion verbs — preferably in serial verb constructions — that describe the man’s action of entering the house more explicitly. This is illustrated with the following examples:

- (5) *Bisuvi va doa e bogwa elola ela olopolo bwala.*
bi-suvi va doa e bogwa e-lola e-la olopolo bwala
 3.FUT-enter DIR door and already 3-walk 3-go inside house
 ‘He enters through the door and already he walks he goes inside
 the house’ (speaker: Namnabai 1995).
- (6) *Kasivia, mtona tau va doa etobwadi esuvi ela olopolo bwala elola*
eva wala itoli olopolo bwala.
Kasivia m-to-na tau va doa e-tobwadi
 Kasivia DEM-CP.male-DEM man DIR door 3-block sight
e-suvi e-la olopolo bwala e-lola e-va wala
 3-enter 3-go inside house 3-walk 3-go to only
i-toli olopolo bwala
 3-stand inside house
 ‘Kasivia, this man is blocking sight in the direction of a door he
 enters he goes inside the house he walks he goes there only he
 stands inside the house.’ (speaker: Kwelava 1996, scene 1.2).

Note that with the verbal expression *-tobwadi-* the speaker refers to the camera angle that depicts the man’s entering action from outside the house; the verb refers to the fact that the viewer sees the man’s back.

- (7) *Etota va doa e bisuvi bila va bwala e biloki tebeli manakwa etota.*
e-tota va doa e bi-suvi bi-la va bwala
 3-stand DIR door and 3.FUT-enter 3.FUT-go DIR house
e bi-loki tebeli ma-na-kwa e-tota
 and 3.FUT-walk arrive table DEM-DEM-CP.general 3-stand
 ‘He stands in the direction of the door and he will enter he will
 go into the house and he will walk and he will arrive at this
 table and he stands (there).’ (speaker: Kasilasila 1995)

The verbal expression *-loki-* used in this sentence can be defined as follows: *-loki-* refers to motion away from the speaker. The focus of this expression is on the completion of the motion, or the arrival of the object or person moving away from the speaker. It implies that the action of the motion away from the speaker is completed and that the destination of the motion is known. The motion event the speaker refers to can, but need not be deictically anchored in the speaker. Information about the source and the path of the motion may or may not be known to the speaker. The expression can be glossed as “to go/walk and arrive (at a known destination)”.

In sentences (5)–(7) the speakers describe the man’s action of entering the house in ways that get more and more explicit. We also observe in sentences (2)–(4), (6) and (7) and in many other illustrative sentences below that speakers often describe the scenes in beginning or ending with verbal expressions that can be glossed as “to stand”; these verbs express a state, of course. Thus, verbs of motion are often accompanied by verbal expressions that express the initial and/or final state of the action.

In the examples 2–7 speakers produce the directional *va*. This directional is used if a speaker refers to an unspecified place at the destination of the movement to be described, e.g.:

Ela va bagula.
e-la va bagula
 3-go DIR garden (general term for all gardenland)
 ‘He goes to the garden.’

O is a locative that is used if a speaker refers to a specified place at the destination of the movement to be described, e.g.:

Ela o buyagu.
e-la o buyagu
 3-go LOC garden (personal garden plot)
 ‘He goes to (his) garden.’

or:

Ela o la bagula.
e-la o la bagula
 3-go LOC 3.POSS.PRO III garden
 ‘He goes to his garden.’

In this example the possessive pronoun (abbreviated as POSS.PRO III) expresses a degree of possession that is intermediate between distant and intimate, inalienable possession; its use indicates that the speaker knows at which specific place the movement he describes will end.

If the destination of the movement to be described has a proper name, than the speaker produces this name immediately after the motion verb (without any locative), e.g.:

Eva Kaduwaga.

e-va Kaduwaga

3-go to Kaduwaga (village name)

'He goes to Kaduwaga.'

Example (4) illustrates that speakers can refer to the act of entering by simply using the verbal expression *-suvi-* together with the directional *va* referring to the goal of the entering action. However, speakers may also use the verb *-suvi-* in isolation to refer to the act of entering something. In my elicitation sessions with Wilkins's "Moving IN(TO)/Moving OUT(OF)" elicitation kit, speakers used constructions like *turaki/boli/vela esuvi mana-kwa bwala* (= the truck/ball/roo enters this house)". However, none of my consultants did come up with this possible variant in the animation tests. Thus, *-suvi-* can probably best be described as the verbal expression that marks the crossing of a border or a boundary (usually) implying the act of crossing this border or boundary and entering something to a certain point or to its centre — and it can, but need not, be accompanied by an additional motion verb or additional motion verbs — in serial verb constructions — that explicitly express the act of entering something to a certain point, e.g., to the object's centre.

To sum up, we see that Kilivila has both an 'enter' as well as a 'go in/come in' expression. The 'enter' expression is *-suvi-*. The 'go in/come in' expression is realized by the verbal expressions for 'go', *-la-* (or *-lola-* (to go, to walk)) or for 'come', *-ma-* (or *-mwa-* (to come to)) together with the directional *-va-* (to go to)⁹ or with a locative like, for example, *o* (into), *olopola*, *olumolela* (inside), and the mentioning of the goal. However, speakers obviously prefer realizing both the 'enter' and the 'go in/come in' expressions within the same utterance, most often in serial verb constructions. This fact makes it plausible to hypothesize that the 'enter' verb *-suvi-* does not properly encode motion, but simply expresses a change of state or place.

To test this hypothesis we will now briefly look at the consultants' reactions to the "BEAMING IN scenes". As mentioned above (see Section 2), we hypothesized that these scenes "should be readily described by languages which have a Change of State semantics without a Motion component in their 'enter/exit' verbs, while verbs that encode motion might be more difficult to apply to this situation" (Hendricks, McQueen 1996: 91). Do speakers of Kilivila now use the "enter" verb *-suvi-* without a motion

verb to describe the “BEAMING IN scenes”? My consultants referred to these scenes with simple phrases like:

- (8) *Ema/Ela olopola bwala etoli/etota.*
e-ma/ e-la olopola bwala e-toli/ e-tota
 3-come/ 3-go inside house 3-stand/ 3-stand
 ‘He comes/goes inside the house he stands (there).’
 (speaker: Taidyeli 1995).

However, in general they produce more complex phrases to describe these scenes like, for example, the following ones:

- (9) *Etamwau e besatuta olopola bwala etota.*
e-tamwau e besatuta olopola bwala e-tota
 3-disappear and now inside house 3-stand
 ‘He disappears and now inside (the) house he stands.’
 (speaker: Meabwau 1995).
- (10) *E etota okepapala doa, etamwau e esuvi bila va bwala.*
e e-tota okepapala doa e-tamwau e e-suvi
 and 3-stand close to door 3-disappear and 3-enter
bi-la va bwala
 3.FUT-go DIR house
 ‘He stands close to the door he disappears and he enters he will go into (the) house.’
 (speaker: Kasilasila 1995).
- (11) *E esunapula mtona tau itota ivokwa ivalova isuvivau va bwala.*
e e-sunapula m-to-na tau i-tota i-vokwa
 and 3-exit DEM-CP.male-DEM man 3-stand 3-be over
i-valova i-suvi-vau va bwala
 3-start going 3-enter-again DIR house
 ‘And he has exited he stands this man it is over he starts going he enters the house again.’
 (speaker: Moagawa 1996, scene 4.2).

The verbal expression *-valova-* produced in this sentence is used to refer to motion away from speaker. The focus of this expression is on the start of the motion event. The source is known to the speaker. The motion event the speaker refers to can, but need not be deictically anchored in the speaker. Information about the path and the destination of the motion may or may not be known to the speaker. The expression can be glossed as ‘to start going/walking’.

- (12) *Kasivia mtona tau va doa etota etota etamwau eluvapela ela olopola bwala etota.*

Kasivia m-to-na tau va doa e-tota e-tamwau
 Kasivia DEM-CP.male-DEM man DIR door 3-stand 3-disappear
e-luvapela e-la olopola bwala e-tota
 3-go to other place 3-go inside house 3-stand

‘Kasivia, this man stands in the direction of the door he disappears he goes to another place he goes inside the house he stands’.
 (speaker: Kwelava 1996, scene 4.2.).

- (13) *Unisi mtona tau okaukweda itota itota wala itamwau emwamvai iga iyounapula olopola bwala itota.*

Unisi m-to-na tau okaukweda i-tota i-tota wala
 Unisi DEM-CP.male-DEM man outside 3-stand 3-stand only
i-tamwau e-mwamvai iga i-younapula olopola bwala
 3-disappear 3-take a while then 3-appear inside house
i-tota

3-stand

‘Unisi, this man stands outside he stands only he disappears it takes a while then he appears (and) inside the house he stands (there).’
 (speaker: Gayoboda 1996, scene 4.2.).

With these sentences we observe the following: In example 9 the speaker neither realizes the ‘enter’ specification (-*suvi*-) nor the ‘go into’ specifications for describing the “BEAMING IN scenes”; he uses the verbal expression to refer to the act of disappearing (-*tamwau*-) and then refers to the fact that the man’s place has changed.

In the examples 8 and 12 we only find ‘go into’ specifications for describing the “BEAMING IN scenes” together with the verbal expression to refer to the act of disappearing (-*tamwau*-).

In example 13 the speaker neither realizes the ‘enter’ specification (-*suvi*-) nor the ‘go into’ specifications for describing the “BEAMING IN scenes” but produces the lexicalized verbal expressions to refer to the acts of appearing (-*younapula*-) and disappearing (-*tamwau*-) — the consultants also use these expressions to describe the “APPEAR/DISAPPEAR scenes without motion and without change of place”.

It is only with the examples 10 and 11 that the speakers realize the ‘enter’ specification (-*suvi*-); however, this verbal expression either precedes

the ‘go into’ specification (in example (10)) or it follows the motion verb *-valova-* (in example (11)) in a serial verb construction.

In all the descriptions of the “BEAMING IN scenes” the Kilivila ‘enter’ specification *-suvi-* is either not produced at all or only produced in connection with a COME/GO-motion verb; or, to phrase it differently, the verbal expression *-suvi-* is never used without a COME/GO-motion verb. This runs completely against our hypothesis. However, we may explain this finding as follows: We can assume that the Kilivila ‘enter’ verb *-suvi-* is just a boundary-crossing verb. In my 1992 Kilivila data on topological functional relations between objects in space I find the verb realized for describing pictures like, for example, ‘a thread in a needle’. In this study I asked my consultants, for example, ‘where is the thread?’ — and I got answers like ‘the thread *esuvi* the needle’. I elicited exactly the same verb with a number of other stimuli like, for example, ‘a needle in a piece of paper, a spear in an apple, a hand in a glove, a cork in a bottle’, and so on. Thus we may assume that the sense of motion properly inside is not carried by the semantics of this verbal expression — although the verb may refer to the result(s) of a motion action. In the “BEAMING IN scenes” the speakers do not perceive a boundary crossing — therefore, the consultants most natural reaction is to produce the verbal expressions that refer to the concepts of ‘appearing’ and ‘disappearing’. However, if they want to refer to these scenes with expressions that also encode acts of motion (although this motion is not perceived), it is probably more plausible for them to produce ‘go into’ specifications (and these then again in combination with the ‘enter’-verb), than to use the ‘enter’-verb alone.

Thus, we can summarize our findings so far as follows:

- In Kilivila we find a lexicalized ‘enter’ verb *-suvi-*; however, this verbal expression is probably most adequately analysed as being basically a boundary-crossing verb (where a boundary is crossed in order to enter something).
- To express the concept ENTER we also — and more often — find ‘go/come into’ specifications or ‘go/come inside’ forms that may occur in serial verb constructions. In general, the lexicalized ‘enter’ verb *-suvi-* also cooccurs with these ‘go/come into/inside’ forms, and again we find these verbs most often in serial verb constructions.

– The Kilivila ‘go/come into/inside’ specifications consist of a motion verb that expresses movement towards or away from the speaker and a locative or a local adverb that expresses the ‘into’ part of the specification. However, the motion verb can also combine with a directional that expresses ‘direction towards (the goal)’; although this combination only expresses this latter concept explicitly, the ‘go/come into/inside’ aspect of the action is implied.

– In the descriptions I elicited with Kita’s computerized animation trick film clips, I find the verbal expression *-suvi-* always together with a noun-phrase (NP) that specifies the goal of the ‘entering’ action. However, my 1992 Kilivila data on topological functional relations between objects in space and the data I gathered with David Wilkins’s (1995) “Moving IN-(TO)/Moving OUT(OF)” elicitation kit reveal that *-suvi-* does not obligatorily require the specification of the goal (realized with a NP).¹⁰ I will give just one typical example: To describe a scenario where a toy bush kangaroo enters a fence enclosure through an open gate or an arch, Gayoboda produced the following utterance:

- (14) *Vela esuvi ela ekanobusi.*
vela e-suvi e-la e-kanobusi
 roo 3-enter 3-go 3-come/get out/exit
 ‘The bush kangaroo enters it goes (through) it gets out (of the arch).’

With these observations I will finish my presentation and analyses of how the concept ENTER is realized in Kilivila. In what follows we will look at how the concept EXIT is expressed in this Austronesian language.

3.2 EXIT in Kilivila

With the EXIT clips of Kita’s “Enter/Exit Animation” film I elicited the following reactions in my consultants. As with the ENTER scenes, there are basically three verbal means speakers use to describe the EXIT scenes:

First, two consultants (Namnabai and Vasopi) simply commented on the EXIT scene I showed them in 1995 with the serial verb construction *elola ema etoli*, as documented in the following example:

- (15) *Olopola bwala etoli elola ema, elola ema etoli.*
olopola bwala e-toli e-lola e-ma
 inside house 3-stand 3-walks 3-come
e-lola e-ma e-toli
 3-walk 3-come 3-stand
 ‘Inside the house he stands he walks he comes he stands (there).’
 (speaker: Namnabai 1995).

The speakers most probably assumed that after their description of the ‘enter’-scene their partners would have no difficulties to infer that they now refer to the ‘exit’-scene; thus in this contextualized interaction the speakers minimally marked their report of the ‘exit’-action with the verbal expression *-ma-* (to come) which was appropriate with respect to describing the action presented in the stimulus.

Second, consultants simply use expressions like “to go/come + locative/goal¹¹”, like, for example, *imwa pilayuvela* or *ema okaukweda* as documented in the following examples:

- (16) *Tetala tau olumolela bwala ilola imwa pilayuvela itoli va kai.*
te-tala tau olumolela bwala i-lola
 CP.male-one man inside house 3-walk
i-mwa pilayuvela i-toli va kai
 3-come to other side 3-stand DIR tree
 ‘One man inside the house he walks he comes to the other side
 he stands at the tree’
 (speaker: Moagawa 1996, scene 2.1).
- (17) *Elola ema okaukweda ema etoli.*
e-lola e-ma okaukweda e-ma e-toli
 3-walk 3-come outside 3-come 3-stand
 ‘He walks he comes outside he comes he stands (there).’
 (speaker: Meabwau 1995).

Note that with this sentence the speaker does not give any source specification for the ‘come out’ action!

Third, consultants most often produce the expression *-kanobusi-* which may actually be glossed as ‘to exit’ or as ‘to come/go/get out, to appear, to emerge’,¹² together with a motion verb and the goal of the action. This is illustrated in the following example:

- (18) *Kasivia mtona tau olopola bwala, ekanobusi ela okaukweda itota.*
Kasivia m-to-na tau olopola bwala
 Kasivia DEM-CP.male-DEM man inside house
e-kanobusi e-la okaukweda i-tota
 3-exit 3-go outside 3-stand
 ‘Kasivia, this man inside the house he goes out (exits) he goes
 outside he stands (there)’.

(speaker: Kwelava 1996, scene 2.2).

In the data corpus I gathered with Wilkins’s “Moving IN(TO)/Moving OUT(OF)” elicitation kit in 1995, all my consultants also realize the verbal expression *-sunapula-* which may also be glossed as ‘exit’ or as ‘to come/go/get out, to appear, to emerge’ (see also examples (2), (11), and (14) above) — one speaker realizes them together within one and the same utterance; and when I transcribed the data he claimed that there is no difference of meaning between the two verbal expressions *-sunapula-* and *-kanobusi-*. In general, speakers combine these expressions with COME/GO-motion verbs, and it seems — as indicated in the glosses above — that these two ‘exit’ verbs embrace the semantics of ‘appear’ and ‘emerge’. If we look at the “BEAMING OUT scenes”, we realize that in the 1995 elicitation speakers preferred the ‘come outside’ expression (*ema okaukweda* — he comes outside) if they wanted to describe any aspect at all of motion in these scenes (in general these informants just mentioned that the man disappeared at one place and reappeared at another place); none of the six consultants I worked with in 1995 produced the verbs *-sunapula-* and *-kanobusi-*. In my 1996 corpus, however, two of the three informants prefer to realize the verb *-kanobusi-* in a serial verb construction with a COME or GO motion verb; and only one informant (Kwelava) realizes the ‘come/go outside’ expression and does not at all produce the ‘exit’ verbs. On the basis of these data I can infer — with all necessary caution — that the notion of these ‘exit’ verbs is broader than the notion of the ‘enter’ verb. This assumption would agree with first findings of our group that “in a number of languages the ‘exit’ verb in fact embraces the semantics ‘appear’, ‘emerge’, ‘come on-stage’, while the ‘enter’-form does not cover the corresponding ‘disappear’ notions” (Hendriks and McQueen 1996: 97). Moreover, it also seems plausible to assume that (— like the ‘enter’ verb —) the two ‘exit’ verbs *-sunapula-* and *-kanobusi-* are more adequately described as boundary-crossing verbs that do not properly encode motion (outside), but simply

express a change of state. Given the fact that the Kilivila ‘exit’ verbs embrace the semantics of appear, this would also agree with another general finding of our group: “‘Appear’ semantics are transparently ‘change-of-state’ rather than ...motion-encoding” (Hendriks and McQueen 1996: 97). Finally I would like to mention that the description of an ‘exit’ event does not necessarily require a specification of the source of this action. With this observation I would like to finish my analyses of how the concept of EXIT is expressed in Kilivila.

4. Conclusion

To sum up, we can state the following:

- Kilivila has a lexicalized ‘enter’ verb, namely *-suvi-*, and two lexicalized ‘exit’ verbs, namely *-sunapula-* and *-kanobusi-*. These lexicalized forms are probably most adequately described as boundary-crossing verbs.
- The Kilivila ‘exit’ verbs are most probably only functional antonyms to the ‘enter’ verb because the semantics of these ‘exit’ verbs is broader than the semantics of the ‘enter’ verb.
- To express the concepts ENTER and EXIT, Kilivila — like many other languages — also provides motion verbs expressing the concepts COME and GO; they are produced together with a directional or a locative and — facultatively — with expressions that specify the source and/or the goal of the action of ‘entering’ and/or ‘exiting’. These phrasal ‘come/go in/into/out/outside’ constructions can be compared to Talmy’s ‘verb+satellite constructions’ (Talmy 1987; 1985; n.d.).
- In general speakers of Kilivila refer to the concepts of ENTER and EXIT with serial verb constructions that consist of both the lexicalized verbs for ‘enter/exit’ and these ‘verb+satellite constructions’.
- Speakers of Kilivila may, but need not, include a manner verb in such serial verb constructions if they want to combine MANNER information with their reference to the ENTER/EXIT action — and thus with the PATH information that is encoded in the ‘enter/exit’ verbs.

Author's address:

Gunter Senft
 Cognitive Anthropology Research Group
 Max-Planck-Institute for Psycholinguistics
 PB 310
 NL-6500 AH Nijmegen
 The Netherlands
 e-mail: gunter@mpi.nl

NOTES

1. This paper is based on 29 months of field research on the Trobriand Islands in 1982/83, 1989, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, and 1997. I want to thank the German Research Society and the Max-Planck-Society for their support in realizing my field research. I also want to thank the National and Provincial Governments in Papua New Guinea and the National Research Institute (formerly: IPNGS) for their assistance with, and permission for, my research projects. I express my great gratitude to the people of the Trobriand Islands, especially to the inhabitants of Tauwema; I thank them for their hospitality, friendship, and patient cooperation over all the years. I presented a first version of this paper at the Third International Conference on Oceanic Linguistics, at the University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand, in January 1997. I would like to thank the conference participants and two anonymous referees for their helpful comments.
2. For bibliographical information on motion verbs see, for example, König-Hartmann, Schweizer 1983; Schreuder et al. 1992; Slobin 1995.
3. Kilivila, the language of the Trobriand Islanders, is one of 40 Austronesian languages spoken in the Milne Bay Province of PNG. It is an agglutinative language and its general word order pattern is VOS (Senft 1986).

The Trobriand Islanders belong to the ethnic group called "Northern Massim". They are gardeners, doing slash and burn cultivation of the bush. Their most important crop is yams. Moreover, they are also famous for being excellent canoe builders, carvers, and navigators, especially in connection with the ritualized "Kula" trade, an exchange of shell valuables that covers a wide area of the Melanesian part of the Pacific. The society is matrilineal but virilocal. The Trobriand Islanders have become famous, even outside of anthropology, because of the ethnographic masterpieces on their culture published by the famous anthropologist Bronislaw Kaspar Malinowski, who did field research there between 1916 and 1920.

4. I told my consultants in Kilivila:

Magigu kulivala avaka kugisi avaka tau evagi

magi-gu ku-livala avaka ku-gisi avaka tau e-vagi

wish-my 2-say what 2-see what man 3-do

'I want you to say ((to the listener)) what you see, what the man is doing.'

5. Given the strong belief of the Trobriand Islanders in “flying witches”, the *munukwausa* (Malinowski 1922: 76, 237–244; Senft 1995: 222), to explain this was not too difficult for me.
6. In June 1995 I collected data with the following consultants (speaker/listener): Taidyeli — Subisubi (males, both Malasi-clan), Meabwau (male, Malasi-clan) — Sulumada (male, Lukwasisiga-clan), Kasilasila — Mokemwena (males, both Malasi-clan), Namnabai — Inawila (females, both Malasi-clan), Bwetagava (female, Malasi-clan) — Isaya (male-Lukuba-clan), Vasopi (male, Malasi-clan) — Imde’isi (female, Malasi-clan).
 In May 1996 I collected data with the following consultants (speaker-listener): Moagawa (male, Lukwasisiga-clan) — Kilagola (male, Lukulabuta-clan), Gayoboda (male, Malasi-clan) — Unisi (female, Lukuba-clan), Kwelava — Kasivia (both male, both Lukwasisiga-clan). I checked the arguments I am presenting in this paper with my consultants in June 1997.
7. The definitions of verbs expressing the concepts COME and GO are based on Senft (in press).
8. Note that the two locatives produced here are grammaticalized forms that consist of the preposition (or: locative) *o*, the noun *lopo-* (belly) or *lumole-* (inside) and the suffix for the 3.Person Possessive Pronoun indicating inalienable possession, *-la* (see Senft: 1994). Note also that the phrases are not ambiguous (as are the English glosses, by the way). To refer to the act of going that is done or happening inside of a house, Kilivila speakers would use the verb *-ta’ina-*.
9. See example (7) above; as already mentioned with example (2) above, the use of the verbal expression for ‘go’ together with the directional *va* just implies the actual act of entering something.
10. In this corpus I also find verbal expressions like, for example *-sakaula-* (to run) that express the manner of the enter- or exit-action. To give just one example:
Manawena vela esakaula esuvi olopolo kali ela olopolo bagula itova.
ma-na-we-na vela e-sakaula
 DEM-CP.animal-that-DEM bush-kangaroo 3-run
e-suvi olopolo kali e-la olopolo bagula i-tova
 3-enter inside fence 3-go inside garden 3-stand
 ‘That bush-kangaroo runs and gets inside the fence it goes into the garden and stands there’.
11. I want to note here that expressions like *okaukweda* in Kilivila are ambiguous. We can either analyse *okaukweda* as a grammaticalized locative (or as an adverb of place) and gloss it as ‘outside (of the house), in front of the door’, or we analyse it as consisting of the locative (or preposition) *o* and the noun *kaukweda* that indicates the goal of the action, and gloss the adverbial phrase as ‘to the veranda/place before the house’.
12. The expression *-kanobusi-* is generally used to describe actions like stepping down from a house to the ground outside the house (- thus appearing or emerging from inside of the house); the expression *-tobusi-* is used to describe actions like standing up and stepping out of a canoe down to the shore or the reef (and thus arriving at a certain place or destination). The verbal expression *-sunapula-* is more specifically used in the sense of ‘emerging’, but it is also used to refer to the concept “EXIT”.

REFERENCES

- Brown, Penelope; Levinson, Stephen; and Senft, Gunter. 1993. *Change of state project: Motion and locomotion*. Mimeo: Nijmegen.
- Clark, Eve; and Garnica, Olga. 1974. "Is he coming or going? On the acquisition of deictic verbs". *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 13: 559-572.
- Di Meola, Claudio. 1994. *Kommen und gehen*. Eine kognitiv-linguistische Untersuchung der Polysemie deiktischer Bewegungsverben. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Filifov, Alexander. 1976. "Über einige Grundprinzipien der konfrontativen Untersuchung der deutschen und russischen Fortbewegungsverben". *Deutsch als Fremdsprache* 13: 285-289.
- Gerling, Martin and Orthen, Norbert. 1979. *Deutsche Zustands- und Bewegungsverben. Eine Untersuchung zu ihrer semantischen Struktur und Valenz*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Gropen, Jess; Pinker, Steven; Hollander, Michelle; and Goldberg, Richard. 1991. "Syntax and semantics in the acquisition of locative verbs". *Journal of Child Language* 18: 115-151.
- Heine, Bernd; Claudi, Ulrike; and Hünemeyer, Friederike. 1991. *Grammaticalization - a conceptual framework*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hendricks, Henriette; and McQueen, James (eds). 1996. *Max-Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics Annual Report 1995*. Nijmegen: MPI for Psycholinguistics.
- Hilty, Gerold. 1965. "Strukturunterschiede zwischen französischem und deutschem Bewegungsausdruck". *Moderne Sprachen* 9: 25-35.
- Kita, Sotaro 1995. "Enter/Exit animation for linguistic elicitation". In: Wilkins, David (ed.). *Extensions of space and beyond: "Manual" for field elicitation for the 1995 field season*. 13. MPI for Psycholinguistics, Nijmegen: Mimeo.
- König-Hartmann, Daniela; and Schweizer, Harro. 1983. "Kommentierte Bibliographie zu psychologischen und linguistischen Arbeiten über die kognitive und sprachliche Verarbeitung räumlicher Beziehungen (Laufende Thematische Bibliographie, Stand Oktober 1982) Teile I-III". *Linguistische Berichte* 85: 102-118; 86: 107- 126; 87: 99-120.

- Lucy, John. 1994. "The role of semantic value in lexical comparison: Motion and position roots in Yucatec Maya". *Linguistics* 32: 623–656.
- Macrae, Alison J. 1976. "Movement and location in the acquisition of deictic verbs". *Journal of Child Language* 3, 191–204.
- Maienborn, Claudia. 1990. *Position und Bewegung: zur Semantik lokaler Verben*. IBM Germany Science Center, Institute for Knowledge Based Systems. IWBS Report 138.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw. 1922. *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul (=1978).
- Miller, George A. 1972. "English verbs of motion: A case study in semantics and lexical memory". In: Melton, Arthur W. and Martin, Edwin (eds). *Coding processes in human memory*, 335–372. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Miller, George A. and Philip N. Johnson-Laird. 1976. *Language and perception*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press.
- Schreuder-Peters, Misja, Milko van Gool, and Messing, Ester. 1992. *A bibliography on space, deixis, and related topics, with index*. Working paper No. 15. Nijmegen: Cognitive Anthropology Research Group, MPI for Psycholinguistics.
- Senft, Gunter. 1986. *Kilivila — The language of the Trobriand Islanders*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Senft, Gunter. 1994. "Grammaticalization of body-part terms in Kilivila." *Language and Linguistics in Melanesia* 25: 98–99.
- Senft, Gunter. 1995. "Ain't misbehavin'? Trobriand pragmatics and the field researcher's opportunity to put his (or her) foot in it". *Oceanic Linguistics* 34: 211–226.
- Senft, Gunter. In press. "COME and GO in Kilivila". In Geraghty, Paul; and Palmer, Bill (eds). *Papers on Oceanic linguistics. Selected papers from the second international conference on Oceanic linguistics in Suva, Fiji*. Pacific Linguistics Series, ANU: Canberra.
- Slobin, Dan I. 1995. *Motion verbs — A bibliography*. Berkeley: Mimeo.
- Talmy, Leonard. 1975. "Semantics and syntax of motion". In Kimball, J. (ed). *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol. 4, 181–238. New York: Academic Press.
- Talmy, Leonard. 1985. Lexicalization patterns: Semantic structure in lexical forms. In Shopen, Timothy (ed.). *Language typology and syntactic description*, 57–149. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Talmy, Leonard. (n.d.). *Path to realization: a typology of event conflation*. Mimeo: Berkeley. 40 pp.
- Wilkins, David. 1995. "Motion elicitation: "Moving 'IN(TO)'" and "moving 'OUT(OFF)'"". In Wilkins, David (ed.), *Extensions of space and beyond: "Manual" for field elicitation for the 1995 field season*. 4–12. MPI for Psycholinguistics, Nijmegen: Mimeo.
- Wilkins, David; Pederson, Eric; and Levinson, Stephen. 1995. "Background questions for the "Enter"/"Exit" research". In Wilkins, David (ed.), *Extensions of space and beyond: "manual" for field elicitation for the 1995 Field Season*. 14–16. MPI for Psycholinguistics, Nijmegen: Mimeo.