

GUNTER SENFT

Darrell T. Tryon, editor: *Comparative Austronesian Dictionary. An Introduction to Austronesian Studies*, 4 parts, 5 vols. Trends in Linguistics. Documentation 10, edited by Werner Winter and Richard A. Rhodes. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1995. xvi + 4,649 pp. Cloth, DM 1,220.00.

With the publication of the *Comparative Austronesian Dictionary* (from here onward abbreviated as CAD) its editor Darrell Tryon has finally managed to overcome many impediments and to realize this long-announced and much-awaited mammoth project. He has done this with the help of his assistant editors Malcolm Ross, Charles Grimes, Adrian Clynes, and Alexander Adelaar and with additional support from eight area coordinators. This project, which is meant to start a series of comparative dictionaries planned to cover the major language families of the world, is proudly advertized by Mouton de Gruyter as "a basic reference tool in the study of Austronesian . . . languages (providing) truly comparable material in that all of the language data were collected in the field over the same three-year period (1986–1989)". The dictionary is based on the design of Carl Darling Buck's (1949) *Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages* and consists of an annotated dictionary of synonyms for some 1200 lexical items in 80 different Austronesian languages. The corpus is ordered according to Buck's 22 semantic domains (that cover, for example, "the physical world," "mankind," "animals," "body parts and bodily functions," etc.). This order and also Buck's system of numbering the domains and the lexical entries have been preserved to enable the comparison of the lexemes across volumes within the planned series of comparative dictionaries of the major language families. The dictionary allows for only one head word for each item; alternative or variant forms can be discussed in footnotes. Borrowings are indicated by the use of square brackets and their sources are listed. The lexicon is preceded by seven chapters that

constitute the first part of the CAD. This part consists of two fascicles. In what follows I will first review part 1 and then, on the basis of my own research (see e.g. Senft 1986) in one of the languages covered by the CAD, I will discuss the lexical entries offered for Kilivila, the language of the Trobriand Islanders, presented in three of the 22 semantic domains.

After the table of contents, the list of contributors, a list of abbreviations, a list of language abbreviations, a table of phonetic symbols, a list of maps, the acknowledgements, and maps of the Austronesian family, the non-Oceanic subgroups, and the Oceanic subgroups, the first fascicle of part 1 starts with the editor's introduction to the CAD (pp. 1-3). In this first chapter Tryon briefly outlines the project, summarizes the contents of the four parts of the dictionary, refers to the selection of languages and the linguistic material, and concludes with the aims of the project: the CAD "is designed to serve as a resource document which will hopefully stimulate interest and research in the Austronesian world and at the same time heighten cultural awareness of this region" (p. 3).

In chapter 2 (pp. 5-44) the editor first describes the membership and geographical distribution of the Austronesian language family. He then presents a population ranking of major Austronesian languages based on data from 1990. This ranking includes 25 languages that account for more than 240 million speakers (=87% of all Austronesian language speakers). After a brief history of research in Austronesian languages and a historical overview of various attempts to reconstruct the language ancestral to, and to classify, all these widespread languages, Tryon provides a broad sketch of the subgrouping of the Austronesian languages. The family-tree diagrams presented give an excellent orientation to the Austronesian family. Moreover, they also indicate the relevance and the position of the 80 languages that were selected for the CAD. A brief discussion of the origin and spread of Austronesian languages, an outline of the phonological and morphosyntactic characteristics, and a list with the 80 languages represented in the CAD finish this chapter. Before listing the languages together with their acronyms, their classification with respect to the major subgroup they belong to, and their location, Tryon mentions (in brackets) a separate "Language index card" included with the volume. Such a card would have been helpful, indeed, but unfortunately the publishers have not provided it (or the editor had to give up this very good idea).

In chapter 3 (pp. 45-120) Malcolm Ross discusses some current issues in Austronesian linguistics. Here the reader gets the strong impression that Ross understands Austronesian linguistics primarily as linguistics within the comparative-historical (or reconstructive) paradigm. Ross first discusses the subgrouping methodology and then reviews — from an

acknowledged subjective, personal, and sometimes even speculative point of view — the reconstruction of Proto-Austronesian phonology and morphosyntax and the internal and external genetic relationships of Austronesian languages. This chapter certainly justifies Ross's demand for more comparative-historical work in Austronesian linguistics, especially because the author admirably succeeds in indicating the strengths and weaknesses in our current knowledge. However, I would like to briefly comment on this claim from the descriptive Austronesianists' point of view: the fact that so many smaller languages within the family are endangered or dying and that Ross himself deplors our ignorance of many western Malayo-Polynesian languages and poor data bases for many other languages within the family somehow seems to weaken Ross's demand for more comparative historical work if this is confronted with the demand for more detailed descriptive studies in Austronesian linguistics. It goes without saying that linguists doing historical reconstruction themselves would benefit from better and more linguistic documentation, description, and analysis of languages within the family — however, I still have the general impression that research on reconstructing Proto forms of Austronesian languages is still out of all proportion if compared to general descriptive research on these languages.

Chapter 4 (pp. 121-279) presents an alphabetical listing of Austronesian languages with information on higher-level classification, alternate names, dialects, location, and number of speakers of these languages. This list, compiled by Barbara Grimes, Joseph Grimes, Malcolm D. Ross, Charles Grimes, and Darrell Tryon, is based on the 1988 "Ethnologue" (Grimes 1988), and it is, indeed, an Austronesian excerpt from the eleventh Ethnologue edition (although presented in different fonts).

The "Introductions to individual languages" constitute chapter 5. These introductions consist of 80 language sketches that provide brief demographic and short linguistic — phonological and some basic morphosyntactic — information for each language. With each of these sketches comes an excellent and extremely useful locator map and a brief set of bibliographical references for the reader's further information. The introductions start with Austronesian languages spoken in Taiwan and then continue with Austronesian languages of the Philippines, Sabah, Madagascar, Indonesia, Papua New Guinea, the Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, New Caledonia, Kiribati, the Marshall Islands, the Federal States of Micronesia, Fiji, Tonga, Samoa, French Polynesia, and Easter Island. These introductions cover half of the first (pp. 283-665) and half of the second fascicle (pp. 667-964) of part 1. Before I comment on these introductions I will first list the 80 languages and provide the names of

the contributors of the respective introductions (intro) and wordlists (wl) in parentheses (if the introductions and the wordlists were written and compiled by different researchers, I note this by adding the abbreviations [intro] and [wl] to the researchers' names):

ATAYAL (P. Jen-kuei Li), TSOU (S. Tsuchida), RUKAI (P. Jen-kuei Li), PAIWAN (Dah-an Ho), YAMI (A. West), ISNAG (R. R. Barlaan), KALINGA/LINIMOS (H. Wiens), TAGALOG (R. D. Zorc), AKLANON (R. D. Zorc), PALAWAN (N. Revel), MOLBOG (R. D. Zorc [intro] and A. Thiessen [intro and wl]), KAGAYANEN (L. A. MacGregor), SARANGANI BLAAN (M. E. Rhea), BANGINI SAMA (E. Diment), TIMUGON MURUT (D. J. Prentice), MALAGASY (K. A. Adelaar [intro, wl] and P. Vérin [wl]), ACEHNESE (M. Durie [intro, wl] and A. Banta [wl]), TOBA BATAK (K. A. Adelaar [intro, wl] and P. W. J. Nababan [wl]), MINANGKABAU (K. A. Adelaar [intro, wl] and C. Anwar [wl]), INDONESIAN/MALAY (A. M. Moeliono and C. E. Grimes), SUNDANESE (A. Clynes [intro] and E. H. Sumantri [wl]), JAVANESE (A. Clynes [intro] and C. Rudyanto [wl]), MADURESE (A. Clynes [intro] and S. Djajengwasito and A. S. Ghozali [wl]), BALINESE (A. Clynes [intro, wl] and I. W. Bawa [wl]), SASAK (A. Clynes [intro] and S. R. Ali [wl]), GORONTALO (A. J. Little, Jr. [intro, wl] and H. Machmoed and A. D. Mustafa [wl]), DA'A (D. F. Barr [intro, wl] and G. Likenono [wl]), UMA (M. Martens [intro, wl] and H. Rigo [wl]), BUGIS (H. Abas [intro, wl] and C. E. Grimes [intro]), KONJO (T. Friberg), WOLIO (J. C. Anceaux [intro, wl], C. E. Grimes [intro], and R. van den Berg [wl]), MANGGARAI (J. A. J. Verheijen [intro, wl] and C. E. Grimes [intro]), NGADA (S. Djawanai [intro, wl] and C. E. Grimes [intro]), SIKA (E. D. Lewis [intro, wl] and C. E. Grimes [intro]), ROTI (J. J. Fox [intro, wl] and C. E. Grimes [intro]), BURU/MASARETE (C. E. Grimes [intro, wl], and W. M. Lesnussa [wl]), DOBEL/ARU ISLANDS (J. Hughes), IRARUTU (C. L. Voorhoeve), SAWAI (R. Whisler and J. Whisler), NYINDROU (B. Martin [intro] and T. Kundrake and C. Kowak [wl]), MANAM (B. P. Turner), TAKIA (M. D. Ross [intro, wl] and M. Kilil [wl]), DAMI (G. Elliott), MBULA (Salme E. Bugenhagen and R. D. Bugenhagen), YABEM (M. D. Ross [intro, wl] and J. F. Streicher [wl]), KAULONG (C. Throop [intro, wl] and M. D. Ross [wl]), TOLAI (U. Mosel), CENTRAL BUANG (B. A. Hooley); ADZERA (S. C. Holzknicht), KILIVILA (R. Lawton), TAWALA (B. Ezard and Y. Robert), MOTU (T. E. Dutton [intro] and A. Taylor [wl]), MEKEO (A. A. Jones), ROVIANA (D. T. Tryon [intro] and J. Wheatley [wl]), MARINGE/CHEKE HOLO (G. M. White), LAU (D. T. Tryon [intro] and E. Suri [wl]), KWAIO (R. Keesing), RAGA (D. S. Walsh),

PAAMESE (T. Crowley), LEWO (R. Early), PORT SANDWICH (J.-M. Charpentier), NORTH TANNA (J. Blaymires), KWAMERA (L. Lindstrom), NEMI (F. Ozanne-Rivierre), CEMUHI (J.-C. Rivierre), A'JIE (D. T. Tryon [intro] and S. Aramiou and J. Euritein [wl]), XARACUU (C. Moysse-Faurie), NENGONE (D. T. Tryon), KIRIBATI (S. P. Harrison), MARSHALLESE (S. P. Harrison), PONAPEAN (S. P. Harrison), WOLEAIAN (S. P. Harrison), EASTERN FIJIAN/BAUAN (P. Geraghty), WESTERN FIJIAN/NADROGA (P. Geraghty), ROTUMAN (P. Geraghty [intro, wl] and H. Schmidt [wl]), TONGAN (P. Geraghty), SAMOAN (U. Mosel), MELE-FILA (R. Clark), TAHITIAN (Y. Lemaitre), RAPA NUI (R. L. Weber and N. L. Weber).

With this chapter the CAD departs from Buck's (1949) dictionary. The introductions to the languages were included into the CAD and "devised with the aim of rendering the comparative lexical material as intelligible as possible, especially for languages where complex morphology and multiple verb forms are derivable" (p. 2). However, many of the introductions do not come up to this high expectation. The brief sketches not only vary in length (the average length of a description covers eight pages; however, the sketches actually range from four pages [TSOU, MANAM, DAMI, TOLAI, LEWO, CEMUHI, XARACUU, MELE-FILA] to 20 pages [YABEM]) but unfortunately also differ in quality. Some sketches set out examples well, providing very good and useful morpheme-interlinear translations (see e.g. pp. 761ff., 827, 847), others give no, or at best rather incomplete and poor, morpheme-interlinearizations (see e.g. pp. 842, 682ff.), and others do not provide illustrations at all for interesting observations mentioned (e.g. p. 598: no examples for how NGADA marks aspect and mood on verbs; p. 663: the longest word in SAWAI is said to consist of five syllables, but such a word is not mentioned in the text). In general, these differences in quality do not very much affect the phonological information given — however, more often than not the morphosyntactic information provided in these introductions is very poor. This may partly be due to the fact that many contributors only present those morphophonemic features that they consider "important for interpreting the wordlist" (p. 743). However, the decision of what is important and what is not is sometimes difficult to understand. Thus, unfortunately the realizations of the great idea of providing brief grammatical sketches of the languages represented in the CAD quite often do not come up to the reader's expectations regarding the usefulness of the individual entries for research that goes beyond comparative Austronesian phonology. And those entries that do mention highly interesting morphosyntactic phenomena more often than not frustrate the reader by footnotes or parentheses that state that a

discussion of these facts "lies beyond the scope of this introduction" (p. 683; see also e.g. pp. 712, 717) — and these frustrations cannot always be reconciled by referring the reader to further literature.

In what follows I will briefly critique the entry for KILIVILA, a language in which I have been doing research since 1982. I assume that judging the grammatical sketch given for one language will give an impression of what kind of problems users of the CAD have to take into account.

The author of the introduction to KILIVILA, the Reverend Ralph Lawton, lived from 1961 to 1973 as a missionary of the Methodist Church of South Australia in the village of Oyabia on Kiriwina, the largest of the Trobriand Islands. His translation of the Bible into Kiriwina (this is another name for the language, which Lawton prefers to use elsewhere) is in print at the moment, and an edited version of his MA thesis and other work on Kilivila was published in 1993. Although in writing my Kilivila grammar and dictionary I profited from meeting Lawton on the Trobriands (and later in Canberra), discussing with him some aspects of Kilivila, and reading his MA thesis and some selected chapters of a manuscript titled "Some aspects of the language of Kiriwina" (see Senft 1986: 3), there are a number of places where I disagree with Lawton's language sketch.

Lawton mentions that on Kiriwina Island there are five different dialects of Kilivila, but he does not list the dialects spoken on the other islands that belong to the Trobriands, nor does he make any reference either to the indigenous Kilivila names for dialects or to other varieties the speakers themselves differentiate in the Kilivila metalinguistic vocabulary (see Senft 1986: 6–10). To my mind, this is an important shortcoming, especially with respect to understanding the material provided in the wordlist of the CAD. Lawton bases his language sketch and his wordlists on the Kavataria dialect. Kavataria is the neighboring village of Oyabia, and the inhabitants of both villages speak the same dialect. When in 1894 the United Church commenced work on the Trobriand Islands, they had their headquarters in Oyabia and Kavataria. Other Trobriand Islanders refer to the Kavataria variety as *biga galagoki* or *biga galagola* and always emphasize that this variety is similar to (what I call) the "situational-intentional variety" (Senft 1991a) they refer to as *biga tapwaroro* (= [the] language [of the] church'). This variety is heavily influenced by the Dobu language, resulting in a number of loans (Dobu, another Austronesian language, was the language the missionaries working in the area of what is now the Milne Bay Province of Papua New Guinea used as a kind of lingua franca); moreover, the *biga tapwaroro* shows many traces of archaic varieties of Kilivila (Senft 1986: 126). Thus,

the Kavataria dialect is not only spoken by the inhabitants of only two villages on the Trobriand Islands, it is also — even from the emic point of view, that is, within the language of the Trobriand Islanders — marked as a variety with many special and some unique features. The statement that the Kavataria dialect has acquired status in Kiriwina may reflect the pride of the Bible translator who used this variety for his translation of the New Testament (Lawton 1984), but it does not weaken this criticism. Moreover, many missionaries these days change the written script so that their reading of the texts comes closer to the *biga besagala* variety, which is spoken in most other villages on Kiriwina Island — and this does not support Lawton's claim that the Kavataria dialect is the "medium for any literary work in Kilivila." The only literary works in Kilivila I know besides the Bible translations and English poems, plays, and stories by Trobriand Islanders are John Kasaipwalova's (1978) publication of Kilivila songs and mythical poems and the *Buki Tapwaroru* published in 1990 by the Catholic Church on the Trobriand Islands — and they represent the *biga besagala* variety of Kilivila.

Lawton's description of the phoneme inventory (pp. 748ff.) does not list the glottal stop (Senft 1986: 11f., 19) and the voiced labiodental fricative /v/; however, he describes the bilabial fricative /β/ — which might have been used in the Kavataria variety at the time when Lawton was living on the Trobriand Islands, but which I have never yet heard on the Trobriands. It is interesting to note, though, that on page 703 in part 3 of the CAD we find the entry *-veka* (= *-veaka* in my orthography) side by side with the form *-to-βeka* (= *toveaka* in my orthography). On page 708 in part 3, however, we find *βeka* again. Moreover, Lawton mentions only two allophonic forms of the phoneme /k/, the voiceless backed velar stop and the voiceless velar stop; he does not mention the other two allophonic forms of this consonant, namely the voiceless backed velar fricative and the voiceless velar fricative (Senft 1986: 12).

Lawton's summary of the syllable patterns of Kilivila is basically correct; however, he does not mention that the place for the vowel in the pattern where the vowel is followed by a consonantal /m/ can only be taken by the vowels /a/, /u/, and the diphthong /ai/. Moreover, Lawton does not mark in his formula for the syllable pattern that the /m/ that represents an entire syllable is syllabic.

In his example on page 751 Lawton presents the adverb *-mlili* (= 'clearly'). My consultants on the Trobriand Islands, with whom I checked all the Kilivila data I refer to in this review during my 1995 period of field research, gave me only the form *gisimlili* and did not know of Lawton's form (which could be the result of a typo, of course).

Like his discussion of syllable patterns, Lawton's discussion of stress in Kilivila (see Senft 1986: 25–27) is somewhat inaccurate, inelegantly formulated, and incomplete (he does not discuss, e.g., emphatic and secondary stress). The same is true for what Lawton has to say on Kilivila classifiers or "classificatory particles" and the role they play in Kilivila word formation (see e.g. Senft 1991b, 1996). I do not want to go into more detail here, but I must close this section of my review with a few remarks on Lawton's comments on the "verb word" (p. 755) in Kilivila.

Lawton rightly states that the verbal expression is "morphologically very complex." However, this comment does not refer to the extremely complex marking of aspect and/or tense and/or mood in the Kilivila verbal expression (see Senft 1993), although some of his glosses of Kilivila examples indicate that Lawton interprets reduplication of verb forms — usually a means for expressing intensification and emphasis in Kilivila — as an aspect-marking device. Lawton postulates the existence of three verb classes in Kilivila. According to his analyses there is an intransitive and a transitive verb class and a verb class in which verbs "have an obligatory marking either for verb focus or for object focus." In my own analyses of the Kilivila verbal expression I have always avoided the technical terms "transitive" and "intransitive," because — like Mosel and Hovdhaugen (1992: 720ff) in their description of Samoan — I take them basically as inadequate for describing the verbal expression and the argument structure in Kilivila. To oversimplify a bit, one could say that speakers can do almost everything with a verbal expression in Kilivila with respect to its argument structure. In summer 1995, I checked this and Lawton's examples for verbal expressions that have what he calls "verb focus" and "object focus" with my consultants both on Kaile'una and on Kiriwina Island. Their reaction to these forms was that they are just variants of one and the same verbal expression; however, they referred to one of the alternatives given as representing the language of the old people ("*Biga Tommwaya*"). Thus, Lawton may have correctly documented an archaic morphological distinction that was once valid in Kilivila; however, speakers of Kilivila these days do not make this distinction any more. This may be important for the purposes of lexicographic comparison. Lawton states that he made this distinction "for numerous forms quoted in the word list" (p. 756). However, this distinction is void if the lexicographic material really refers to material that is said to have been collected and documented for all 80 Austronesian languages in the field over the same three-year period, namely from 1986 to 1989 (see above) — especially if we keep in mind that the lists are explicitly "intended to represent a synchronic snapshot of current usage" (p. 444f.) of these languages. Finally, the reader looks in vain for at least a few



remarks with respect to the orthography on which the data presented in the wordlists are based. These critical comments should suffice as a look at just one of the introductions to the languages represented in chapter 5 of the CAD.

Chapter 6 (pp. 965–1103) presents a “Select Austronesian bibliography” by Lois Carrington and Charles E. Grimes that gives 2,218 references of publications from 1817 (John Martin’s “Account of the natives of the Tongan Islands, in the South Pacific Ocean, with an original grammar and vocabulary of their language”) to 1992. This bibliography is certainly interesting; however, the reader misses an introduction or at least a statement that clarifies on what basis and by which criteria the titles presented were selected. A — one hopes more exhaustive — bibliography of current and old Austronesian titles — which will also include Lois Carrington’s long version of the (obviously abbreviated) CAD bibliography — is being prepared by Jeff Marck at the Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies at the Australian National University in Canberra. There are plans to make this new bibliography accessible via the Austronesian Languages and Linguistics List (for detailed information contact Jeff Marck via e-mail: [jeff.marck@anu.edu.au](mailto:jeff.marck@anu.edu.au)).

Chapter 7 (pp. 1105–1197), David Zorc’s extremely useful “Glossary of Austronesian reconstructions,” which contains “some 1650 reconstructions for high-order Austronesian proto languages . . . and an English finder list to the reconstructions” (p. 1105) finishes the first part of the CAD.

The comparative lexicon (a 1200-item list [p. 652]) together with an index of English glosses (at the end of each part) starts with part 2 of the CAD. In 749 pages, part 2 presents lexical items for the following five semantic domains:

1. The physical world.
2. Mankind: sex, age, family relationships.
3. Animals.
4. Body parts, bodily functions, bodily conditions.
5. Food and drink, cooking utensils.

Part 3 (in 739 pages) continues the presentation of lexical items for domain five and lists entries for the following domains:

6. Clothing, personal adornment, personal care.
7. Dwelling, house, furnishings.
8. Agriculture, vegetation.
9. Miscellaneous physical acts, specialized crafts, implements, materials, products.
10. Motion: locomotion, transportation, navigation.

11. Possession, property, commerce.
12. Spatial relations: place, form, size.

Part 4, finally, continues the presentation of lexical items for domain 12 and lists (in 767 pages) lexical items for the following ten semantic domains:

13. Quantity and number.
14. Time.
15. Sense perception.
16. Emotion: temperamental, moral, aesthetic notions.
17. Mind, thought.
18. Speech, reading, writing.
19. Social relations: territorial, social, and political divisions.
20. Warfare.
21. Law.
22. Religion and superstition.

Before I look at the entries given for Kilivila in three of these 22 semantic domains, I want to make the following three remarks:

The critical reader and user of the CAD misses a chapter on the methodological guidelines the editor, his assistant editors, and the area coordinators gave the contributors as instructions for compiling the wordlists. There must have been a theoretical basis for the decision that the CAD allows for only one head word for each item; there must have been at least some guidelines with respect to what kind of additional lexicographic, semantic, and other grammatical information could be mentioned in the notes to each entry; there must have been a decision on what kind of ethnographic information should be presented in these notes; etc. I take the fact that no such information whatsoever is given in the four parts of the CAD as a severe shortcoming of this project.

Although it is certainly a great and ambitious idea — as well as a great challenge for a publisher — to have a series of comparative dictionaries published that cover the major language families of the world, it is somehow difficult to understand why the CAD followed the style of Buck's (1949) dictionary to such an extent that it also preserves the wordlists designed to meet the aims of a dictionary for the "principal Indo-European languages." These wordlists inevitably imply a strong Eurocentric orientation and thus an ethnocentric bias when they are used to elicit and document lexical material in other language families of the world. (The suspicion that there may be an Indo-European bias in some of the materials presented is certainly not dissipated if we read sentences like "The classification does not follow a strictly logical dichotomy as it might be seen through western cultural eyes . . ."; (p. 734) in part 1 of

the CAD). Comparing the CAD with Buck reveals, however, that the CAD presents some entries that are not to be found in Buck, but are culturally important for speakers of Austronesian languages (such as 'banana tree', 'banyan', 'coconut', etc. — but not 'betel', e.g.) and marks entries that are not found in the Austronesian language area (e.g. 'oak', 'beech', 'birch', etc). But the reader looks in vain for comments on where the CAD departs from the entries found in Buck, for a summary of which entries were added to Buck's wordlists, and on what theoretical or cultural bases these additions were made. Moreover, I have to note that — unlike Buck — the CAD does not provide general comments on (e.g. the history, interrelationship, grammatical and semantic features of) its lexical entries.

Given the fact that since Buck's pioneering dictionary project, computer technology is widely used in the publication of, and for getting access to, lexical material, one wonders why Mouton de Gruyter did not publish the CAD in two volumes that cover (most of) part one of the CAD with a CD-ROM attached containing the lexical material (together with David Zorc's list of reconstructions). The accessibility of the material via computer would also allow for lexical search procedures that use certain filters for getting specific information only. It is quite difficult and very time-consuming to wade through the material presented in parts 2, 3, and 4 of the CAD, keeping in mind all the abbreviations for the 80 languages, if one is interested in the comparison of a few specific lexical items that represent only a small subdomain within one of the 22 semantic domains represented.

In what follows I will briefly comment on the Kilivila entries given for the first semantic domain (the physical world), the tenth semantic domain (motion: locomotion, transportation, navigation), and the twelfth semantic domain (spatial relations: place, form, size); the choice of these three domains is purely random. Again I do this assuming that examining entries that are provided for one language in the CAD will give an impression of what kind of problems users of the CAD have to take into account for their research.

*The physical world.* In 01.222 Lawton proposes *dibodebula* for CLIFF, PRECIPICE. *Dibodebula* actually refers only to 'the bottom part of a cliff where the waves are breaking against the rocks'. Lawton does not provide any comment on this entry. The term *sakala* offered for 01.240 VALLEY is only known to my consultants in its meaning 'any water that is pouring down' (see below); instead, they use the Kilivila term *itayatila* to refer to 'valley'. The term *lumata* for 01.270 SHORE is — according to my consultants on Kaile'una Island — only used on

Kiriwina. My consultants use the noun *kwadeva*. In a note to the entry 01.320 SEA, Lawton gives as a variant to *bolita* (in my Kilivila variety and in my orthography [Senft 1986: 14ff.] *bwalita*) the noun *milaβeta*; my consultants use *milaveta* only in referring to 'the deep sea'. With entry 01.330, LAKE, Lawton once more presents *milaβeta*; my consultants on both Kaile'una and Kiriwina use the noun *daula*. In the note accompanying this entry Lawton also gives *katuwotu* as an alternative for LAKE. My consultants use the (variant) noun *utuwotu* only to refer to 'a water hole that can be seen if one hits groundwater'. Lawton offers the term *talia* for TIDE (01.352) in general and differentiates LOWTIDE (01.353) and HIGHTIDE (01.354) in presenting the phrases *i-busi talia* and *i-pola talia*. These entries are correct; however, these days these phrases are rather rarely used; *talia* refers both to 'tide' in general and to 'high tide' in particular, while *mamala* is used to refer to 'low tide'. It may well be that the questionnaire on the basis of which the data had to be compiled urged contributors to be more specific than native speakers in their current language usage generally are. Lawton does not offer any entry for WATERFALL (01.390). Here it is possible to present the noun *sakala*, which refers in general to 'any water that is pouring down'. In 01.590 I read *lubaikaidoga* for RAINBOW. This noun is only used to refer to 'two rainbows that can be seen at one and the same time'. The Trobriand Islanders use *kalipedoga* to refer to only 'one — though big — rainbow', which in turn they differentiate from 'a small rainbow' — *lubakusa*. For LIGHT (01.610) we find *lumalama*; this noun refers to 'moonlight' only. I could neither find nor elicit an indigenous Kilivila noun for 'light', but many of my consultants were already using the loan word *laitila* when I started my research on the Trobriands in 1982. In the note to 01.630 SHADE, SHADOW Lawton correctly refers to *kai-kobu-la*, which he glosses as 'his shadow'; however, he does not mention that the suffix *-la* is the possession-indicating suffix for third person singular within the series of possessive pronouns that indicates intimate inalienable degree of possession (Kilivila has four series of possessive pronouns). We do not find any Kilivila entry for AIR (01.710). My consultants offered the noun *yo'ula* to refer to this concept. In 01.760 Lawton offers the loan word *sinou* for SNOW. Referring to snow on pictures depicting mountainous parts of Germany in winter, my consultants used the phrase *budubadu numla* (= 'much dew'). In 01.780 Lawton gives *kalu* for WEATHER. According to my informants *kalu* refers to 'the course of the sun' (*lilu la keda* 'sun its road'). They only offered the noun *valu* for weather and climate in general (a noun that has a broad semantic scope indeed) and differentiate between 'good weather' and 'bad weather' using the phrases *valu bwena* and *valu gaga*. For the entry

FLAME (01.820) my informants offered the noun *mailakova* as an alternative to Lawton's phrase *koβa i-lululu*. These remarks and comments should suffice for this semantic domain.

*Motion: locomotion, transportation, navigation.* Lawton offers (a suffix?) *-m* for the entry MOVE (10.110). My consultants did not know to what form Lawton wants to refer here. My Kilivila dictionary presents a rather broad variety of verbal expressions that refer to a number of 'MOVE' concepts (see Senft 1986: 527). In 10.210 Lawton offers *-mwena* for RISE. The verbal expression that I note down as *-mwena-* is to be glossed as 'to climb (up)'. The verbal expression *-tokeya-* is used if a speaker wants to refer to 'a person rising/standing up', and the verbal expression *-pela-* is used in the phrase *lilu ipela* '(the) sun it rises'. Lawton offers the entry *-busi* for DRIP (10.240). The verbal expression *-busi-* has to be glossed as 'to climb down'. The variant Lawton offers in the notes to this entry, *-bwiki-*, is used to refer to 'water that is dripping down' and seems to be more appropriate here than *-busi-*. In 10.451 Lawton offers the expression *-pem-* for LIMP. However, it is unclear whether the dictionary refers here to an adjective or to a verb. *-pem* is an adjective (*tau topem = tau to-pem = man classifier/male-limp = 'a lame man'*); the verbal expression that refers to the act of limping is *-ketukwa-*. Lawton's entry for GO (10.470) needs some more detailed comments: he offers *-wa (= -va-)* for GO. This verbal expression refers to motion away from the speaker. It is telic, it implies that the destination of the motion is known, and it is not necessarily deictically anchored. Thus, the verbal expression *-va-* has to be glossed as 'to go to'. In his notes to this entry Lawton seems to be somehow aware of this fact (see his further gloss for what he writes as *-wa-*); however, in these notes we find a number of further inaccurate glosses: Lawton's gloss 'go from here' for *-la (= -la-)* implies that this verbal expression referring to all kind of motion events that are directed away from the speaker indicates a deictic anchoring; however, *-la-* is not necessarily deictically anchored. The most appropriate gloss for this verbal expression is 'to go'. The verbal expression *-loki-* (Lawton's *-lo-ki*) is glossed together with the verbal expression *-lokeya-* (Lawton's *-lo-kaia*) as 'go-to (him, that place, away from here)'. The motion verb *-loki-* refers to motion away from the speaker; however, 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 expression can be glossed as 'to go/walk and arrive (at a known destination)'. The verbal expression *-lokeya-* can be glossed as 'to go/walk to a place known to the speaker'. In his note

to 10.550 Lawton mentions a verbal expression *-lo-busi* and glosses it as 'to arrive at journey's destination'; my consultants did not know of such a form (for most of these motion verbs see Senft 1995). In 10.780 Lawton offers the noun *kaitakewa* to refer to YOKE; my consultants use the noun *ketakeva* only to refer to 'a carrying stick'. In his notes to the entry 10.890 ANCHOR Lawton offers as a variant for the verbal expression *-lola-* the verbal expression *-kota-*. However, this verbal expression does not mean 'to anchor'; it has to be glossed as 'to arrive'. These remarks and comments should suffice for this semantic domain.

*Spatial relations: place, form, size.* In 12.011 Lawton gives the locative *o-tuboulo-la* to refer to BEHIND—glossing it in the notes to this entry as 'at-back-his' (though the Kilivila form is gender-neutral). It is here that one wonders why Lawton did not refer to other forms that express this concept, such as *okopo'ula* (= 'behind, back, behind him/her'), *ome-waga* (= 'behind, in the back of [the canoe]'), *osusuna* (= 'behind the house, near the small trees'). In 12.060 Lawton gives *o-koukweda* (= 'okaukweda') for OUTSIDE. This form is more accurately glossed as 'outside of the house'; the locative *omakava* refers to the concept 'outside' in general. In 12.260 COVER we find the verbal expression *-katu-bodi*. However, the expression *-katubodi-* and its variant *-katubwadi-* have to be glossed as 'to close'. The verbal expression *-kapwali-* means 'to cover, to wrap'. In 12.410 Lawton offers the prepositional phrase *o-lakakata* for the concept RIGHT (side). In the notes he glosses the phrase as 'at his right' — however, he does not parse the entry correctly. The phrase consists of the preposition *o*, the form *la* — which marks third person singular within the series of possessive pronouns that expresses an intermediate degree of possession (intermediate between intimate and more distant possession), and the form *kakata*, which is simply glossed as 'right'. I would like to note that the possessive pronoun *la* mentioned here should not be confused with the previously mentioned suffix *-la*. We find the same incorrect glossing in the next entry, 12.420 LEFT (side). Here Lawton again presents a prepositional phrase *o-lakikiwama* instead of the simple form *kikivama*. In the entries that refer to EAST (12.450), WEST (12.460), NORTH (12.470), and SOUTH (12.480), Lawton does not note that the forms offered are all names of winds. In 12.570 we find the form *-wonaku* for LONG. The form *vanaku* refers to 'long' in its spatial sense; the concept 'long' in its temporal meaning is expressed with the form *kaduana*. In general it is unclear to which concept of "long" the CAD entries given here refer. Lawton does not offer entries for the concepts SQUARE (12.780), ROUND (12.810), and CIRCLE (12.820). The adjective *kwebobuta* (consisting of the general classifier *-kwe-* prefixed

to the form *bobuta*) can be glossed as 'thing-round' and is used by my consultants to refer to the concepts 'round' and 'circle'. My consultants use the numeral *kabuluvasi*, which consists of the classifier *-kabulu-* (= 'point, corner') and the numeral *-vasi* (= 'four') and which can be glossed as 'point/corner-four', to refer to a square. In the entries 17.220 (FOOLISH, STUPID) and 17.230 (INSANE, CRAZY) Lawton does not mention that the entries he offers (*nagowa* in both cases) have to have a classifier prefixed to the adjective. I could comment further on the notations for many entries that do not give any grammatical information with respect to which form belongs to which word class. However, I think these remarks should suffice for the purposes pursued in this review.

One might think that all these points of criticism sound somehow carping — especially if one takes into account that the points made above affect only a few of all the entries within the three semantic domains reviewed in detail here. However, I think this criticism is necessary in order to get a better idea of the degree of the general reliability of lexical entries presented in the CAD.

From the more formal point of view, the CAD is — in general — extremely well edited. Besides a few shortcomings already mentioned above, I could only find two (obvious) typos in part I (p. 43, read "Wien" for "Wein"; p. 676 read "Haus der Völker und Kulturen" for "Haus Völker und Kulturen"), one wrong line break (p. 625, between the second and third paragraphs), and a somewhat faulty right alignment on page 723. Some contributors use abbreviations that are somewhat idiosyncratic and are not listed in the attached list of abbreviations (see e.g. pp. 64ff., p. 864), and there is a nice kind of "Freudian slip" in Table 6 (p. 87) of Malcolm Ross's chapter on current issues in Austronesian linguistics, where he gives a column "POC" (=Proto Oceanic) and a column "Grace" that was probably intended to read "POC Ross 1988" and "POC Grace 1969". Moreover, a few references were not brought up to date (see e.g. p. 103, Adelaar 1985), and the reference for Comrie (1985) on page 650 does not list the pages of Comrie's contribution to Shopen's volume.

To sum up, despite all the critical remarks made above, the CAD will certainly be one of the basic reference tools for Austronesianists working within the paradigm of the comparative method. Unfortunately, I assume that the dictionary will prove its general usefulness only slowly: very few researchers can afford to have these books on their desk or on their bookshelves — the price of this long-awaited reference tool dooms it to await its users only in a few libraries. However, Darrel Tryon's generous

decision to forgo his royalties has meant that Mouton de Gruyter could provide all contributors with the complete set of the CAD.

Received 31 August 1995

Revised version received

22 February 1996

Max Planck Institute  
for Psycholinguistics,  
Nijmegen

## Note

1. Correspondence address: Cognitive Anthropology Research Group, Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, P.O. Box 310, 6500 AH Nijmegen, The Netherlands. E-mail: gunter@mpi.nl.

## References

- Buck, Carl Darling (1949). *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages. A Contribution to the History of Ideas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Grimes, Barbara F. (ed.) (1988). *Ethnologue --- Languages of the World*, 11th ed. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Kasaipwalova, John (1978). *Yaulabuta, Kolupa deli Lekolekwa. Pilatolu Kilivila Wosimwaya*. Port Moresby: Institute of Papua New Guinea Studies.
- Lawton, Ralph (1984). *Bulogala Bwaina — Kabutuvuu*. Port Moresby: Bible Society of Papua New Guinea.
- (1993). *Topics in the Description of Kiriwina*, Malcolm Ross and Janet Ezard (eds.). Pacific Linguistics D-84. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Mosel, Ulrike; and Hovdhaugen, Even (eds.) (1992). *Samoan Reference Grammar*. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press.
- Senft, Gunter (1986). *Kilivila — The Language of the Trobriand Islanders*. Mouton Grammar Library 3. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- (1991a). Prolegomena to the pragmatics of "situational-intentional" varieties in Kilivila language. In *Levels of Linguistic Adaptation. Selected Papers from the 1987 International Pragmatics Conference*, vol. 2, Jef Verschueren (ed.), 235–248. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- (1991b). Network models to describe the Kilivila classifier system. *Oceanic Linguistics* 30, 131–155.
- (1993). These "procrustean feelings" . . . some of my problems in describing Kilivila. In *Topics in Descriptive Austronesian Linguistics*, Ger Reesink (ed.), 86–105. Semaian 11. Leiden: Vakgroep Talen en Culturen van Zuidoost-Azie en Oceanie, Rijksuniversiteit Leiden.
- (1995). Kilivila motion verbs. Paper presented at the Second International Conference on Oceanic Linguistics, University of the South Pacific, Suva, Fiji, July 3–7.
- (1996). *Classificatory Particles in Kilivila*. Oxford Studies in Anthropological Linguistics. New York: Oxford University Press.



Copyright of Linguistics is the property of Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.