

# STUDIES IN PHILIPPINE LINGUISTICS

Volume 10 Number 1 1997

Takashi Fukuda; Fe T. Otones and Hazel Wrigglesworth, series eds.

V. Expository discourse genre in Eastern Bontoc 95



ISSN 0116-0516 ISBN 97-18-0314-3

© LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF THE PHILIPPINES and SUMMER INSTITUTE OF LINGUISTICS

Sample Citation Format

Ma. Lourdes S. Bautista. 1977. "The noun phrase in Tagalog—English code switching". *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 1:1, 1–16. Online. URL: <http://www.sil.org/asia/philippines/> [etc.] + access date.

## CHAPTER V

### EXPOSITORY DISCOURSE GENRE IN EASTERN BONTOC

Expository discourse shares one parameter value with behavioral discourse: *minus contingent temporal succession*. On the other hand, behavioral discourse is plus agent orientation and expository is not. Expository also shares one parameter value with procedural discourse: *minus agent orientation*. On the other hand, procedural discourse is plus contingent temporal succession and expository is not.

Expository discourse, as defined by Longacre (1983:3ff.), stands at the opposite extreme to narrative discourse: they share neither of the two major parameter values of discourse genre classification. Expository discourse is minus agent orientation and minus contingent temporal succession, whereas narrative discourse has a plus value for both parameters. Thus, in any language we would expect differences in participant reference, especially in pronominal usage, and in linkage between sentences and paragraphs. Although this chapter treats expository discourse, comments will be made on narrative discourse when applicable.

#### 5.1. The communication situation

Generally speaking, the main common feature assumed in the situation in which an expository discourse is given is a communicator who has more knowledge about a given subject than the addressee (cf. Walrod, 1979). Typical of expository discourse in Eastern Bontoc are the texts studied here, some of which are given to an outsider, who naturally knows little of local life, and some of which are given to young members of the society. In both cases, texts are given by relatively older people. The speaker does not have to be an old person but does have to be old enough to give an expository discourse. If one tries to get an expository discourse from a young person, he normally refuses by saying, 'I don't know.' What he really means is that even though he may know the material, he does not feel that he is in a position that Eastern Bontocs consider appropriate for giving such discourse. But an older person is supposed to know the things in the area, thus he feels he is in a position to do so. This is also true for the addressees; they feel comfortable when an older person gives an expository discourse but not when too young a person does so.

The intention of the communicator is to explain about the subject matter he knows well. Texts E1 and E2, given to an outsider, are intended to explain about harvesting in Eastern Bontoc. At the same time they are intended to entertain. They also convey the speaker's attitude toward the two harvesting times, one in the dry season and the other in the rainy season. In other words, these are not pure scientific explanations; rather the communicator communicates his intention with his emotions. In text E1 the communicator thinks the harvesting in the dry season is *ammay* 'good' (text E1, sentence 2), and in text E2 it is not so desirable to do harvesting in the rainy season, because we get caught in cold weather (*machinamoyta*, text E2). The main intention of the communicator in both cases, however, is to explain about harvesting. The main staple food in Eastern Bontoc area is rice. The people have been rice farmers on wet rice paddy terraces for many generations. Everyone knows when to plant and to harvest, for each of which there are two times in the yearly cycle. The communicator of texts E1 and E2 knows that the hearer, myself, knows their language and customs. What the communicator chooses to supply and to omit in background information reflects his assumption on how much the hearer already knows about harvesting in Eastern Bontoc.

Expository discourse is different from procedural discourse in that it is not meant to explain step by step how to make something, although sometimes both are explaining things on a chronological time line. It is considered successful communication if the hearer understands the subject matter or he understands the values which are communicated in the discourse. Text E1 does follow roughly a chronological time line, but events are not contingent on previous events. Rather, the communicator picks up the different activities to explain, e.g. bringing lunch, activities while planting, and cooking lunch.

Behavioral discourse intends to effect a change in the conduct of the hearer, whereas expository discourse does not. Thus expository discourse does not have a justification theme (see 4.3.1.). Narrative discourse is to entertain, and expository is to explain. Although they do not share any basic parameter values, they both communicate the value systems of the people.

## 5.2. The basic parameter values and subtypes of expository discourse

Expository discourse genre is minus agent orientation and minus contingent succession. It is subclassified by the parameter *projection*; *explanatory* is minus projection, while *orientation/budget* is plus projection (Longacre, 1983).

### 5.2.1. Minus agent orientation

One of the two basic parameter values which characterizes expository discourse is *minus agent orientation*. This means that the agent is not in focus; rather, the subject matter is (see 5.5.6.). In this regard it is similar to procedural discourse, in which again the agent does not play a vital role.

Minus agent orientation is realized by an indefinite agent being introduced by a pronoun or noun phrase and thereafter referred to by pronouns. As in procedural discourse, the pronouns refer to someone in the community, but the reference is not specific. In this regard it is different from behavioral discourse, which is addressed to and refers to a specific individual or group of people. Even in the orientation subtype, second person pronouns are indefinite in reference. Text E1 introduces an agent as *hen osa ay tako*, 'NM one lk person, one person,' which is the typical introduction of a nonspecific participant. It can be anyone in the community. Text E3 uses *cha* 'they' right from the first sentence. Text E4 introduces an agent as *hen om-asawahna*, 'NM one who gets married here, a person who gets married here,' and again it can be anyone. Text E5, which is of the orientation subtype, uses second person pronouns all the way through the text, but not referring to the addressee specifically. Text E6, which is another example of the orientation subtype, uses the first person inclusive pronoun *ta* 'I and you' to be polite, even though the person orientation is toward second person.

In order to achieve minus agent orientation, expository discourse depends on nominal and pronominal expressions capable of interpretation as indefinite reference. Narrative discourse is full of proper nouns, personal descriptions and titles, and kinship terms. Behavioral discourse uses pronouns, but as in narrative discourse they are definite in reference. In expository and procedural discourses pronouns cannot refer back to preceding expressions. For behavioral discourse the second person is closely linked with proper nouns or kinship terms. An example is from text B6, *chakayo Simon* 'you, Simon'. This phrase is addressed to Simon with a pronoun. Following this phrase the proper noun is not used but second person pronouns are. The reference of the pronouns is clear as the communication act aims at that second person which is referred to by the proper noun. When second person pronouns are used for procedural and expository discourses, it is clear that they are given to an addressee, who is referred to by the second person pronoun. But the addressee is not identified, at least not in the text. An addressee could be anyone who is in the same category as the one functioning as addressee in the communication situation. That is, if the actual addressee is an outsider, he represents any outsider. This is because the intention of expository discourse is to explain, not to effect a change on a particular individual or a group of people. In order to explain, one needs to be concerned about the subject matter in the communication act, although the communicator's assumption of how much an addressee knows of a particular subject affects how much background information he puts into his discourse.

### 5.2.2. Minus contingent temporal succession

The other basic parameter value for expository discourse is *minus contingent temporal succession*. It means that sentences and paragraphs are not temporally contingent on previous sentences and paragraphs; rather, they are logically linked. The subject matter develops logically. I illustrate this from text E2. In the introduction (sentences 1 and 2) it is established that this text is about harvesting the short variety of rice. And after sentences 3-10, a concluding remark is given as sentence 11. Roman numerals are for the notional grouping of expository explanation.

- I. { Sentence 3: Call neighbors.  
Sentence 4: If no one comes, your family works.

II.	{ Sentence 5: Even if they come, there is no need of meat for food.
	{ Sentence 6: Beans are the food.
III.	{ Sentence 7: Work in the rain.
	{ Sentence 8: Harvest is small.
IV.	{ Sentence 9: Some people come to get wages.
	{ Sentence 10: Others come to help.

Sentences 3 to 10 can be grouped two by two. Sentences 3 and 4 are about the workers (I). Sentences 5 and 6 are about lunch for the workers (II). Sentences 7 and 8 are about weather for the workers (III). Sentences 9 and 10 are about the workers (IV). (I) and (IV) are about the workers. (II) logically talks about lunch for the workers after the discussion of the workers in (I). (III) proceeds to the working conditions of the workers. If we take lunch as a working condition, (II) and (III) are similar. The notional organization of S3-S10 can be roughly formalized as:

a b b' a',

where a stands for the theme of workers and b stands for the working conditions of workers. It is now obvious that they are logically linked. a' and b' are similar to a and b respectively, but slightly changed; their order is b' a', forming a chiasmus. Also, a and b are logically related.

Expository discourse can be developed roughly on a chronological time line, yet it is not characterized by contingent temporal succession. Text E1 is an example. Like text E2, text E1 gives the theme of the text, the harvesting of the long variety of rice, in its *introduction*. The communicator just gives a long time span as a frame of reference, and describes what kinds of activities are performed in that time span. These activities are not chronologically ordered. In the case of narrative discourse, repeating a previous event is the common device for chronological linkage: 'When it was ready, they went to the field. When they went to the field, they began harvesting.' Sentence 8 of text E1 states several activities: Some people get in lines, still others give riddles, others tell stories, and others sing songs. These activities do not take place at the same time, but one after another; yet none is contingent on its temporal antecedents. This text explains what the owner of the field is supposed to do and what other people who come to help harvesting are supposed to do.

### 5.2.3. Subtypes of expository discourse genre

The minor classificatory parameter value is *projection*. Plus projection is used to explain a subject matter which is to take place. This is an *orientation* subtype. Minus projection is the usual concept of expository, *explanatory*, in which the discourse refers to no particular time.

The orientation subtype gives information on how to behave, or how to prepare for something, but not how to make a certain thing. The communicator of an orientation discourse considers the addressee as the presupposed agent of the discourse. This presupposition is realized by using pronouns *ka* 'you' or *ta* 'I and you.'

Explanatory discourse explains any subject to a less knowledgeable person. An agent in this discourse is referred to by third person pronouns and noun phrases, such as 'one who gets married' or 'one man.'

## 5.3. The notional structure

### 5.3.1. The notional script

The notional *script* of expository discourse is made up of a number of sets, each of which is in turn made up of three constituents: *condition*, *expository element*, and *reason* (Fukuda, 1980). This schema can be compared to the three-way division into *projected circumstance*, *command element*, and *support by argument* of behavioral discourse (4.3.1.); expository discourse has no constituent corresponding to

justification theme. (Procedural discourse likewise has three constituents: *condition*, *step*, and *evaluation*.) In all three of these discourse genres, the first sort of constituent creates a hypothetical situation, which is the background information. The central part advances the main line of the discourse, and is the *foregrounded* part. The third part supports the central part by giving additional background information.

For expository discourse, the *condition* is the starting point of the explanation, or the condition for the following explanation. It serves to develop the explanation. There can be several *expository elements* to one *condition*. A set of constituents expresses the subthemes of an expository discourse.

Expository element is the main body of the notional script. It carries the main expository theme. Reason gives background information, and strengthens the communicator's explanation (cf. example 330).

Like behavioral discourse, expository discourse can have an *introduction* and a *finis*. An introduction begins the discourse, states its thesis, and orients the addressee to the direction of the communicator's intention. A *finis* gives concluding remarks, summarizing what has been explained. An introduction and a *finis* are optional. For example, when a communicator is asked by an addressee to give an explanation on some subject, he does not necessarily state what he wants to explicate, as it is clear from the communication situation. Text E1 gives us an example of an introduction:

(330) *hen kasibtak ahen tinyorkiw ad Kachakran, at monlapo ahen anongos*  
 NM harvest OM long rice OM Kadaclan IM begin OM end

*hen Mayo inkana Julio.*

GM May until July

'The harvesting time of long rice in Kadaclan begins at the end of May and goes till July.'

A *finis* is exemplified in (331) from the same text.

(331) *hiyachi hen aton hen kasibtak ahen tinyorkiw ad Kachakran.*  
 that NM way GM harvest OM long rice OM Kadaclan  
 'That is the way of harvesting long rice in Kadaclan.'

Expository discourse does not have the justification theme found in behavioral discourse (4.3.1.). The justification theme sets the proper relationship between the communicator and the addressee. Expository discourse does not need to set a social relationship between the communicator and the addressee because in order to explain, one does not need to establish himself in the position of advisor, although the relationship between communicator and addressee is important.

I illustrate the *condition* constituent of the sets of script from E4 (see Figure 10). The first constituent of *condition* is *hen omqasawahna fiabroy tako* 'the one who gets married here in our village.' Note that the condition is set up, not by a conditional sentence (3.4.2.7.), but by a noun phrase that presupposes the condition. This text is about inheritance. The highest, most inclusive theme is whether a person gets married or not, so the first constituent of the condition takes this up on the positive side of getting married. Later in the text (S7ff.) the other side of not getting married will be considered. The next two constituents of the condition deal with the case of children who come of marriageable age. The first of these is *at mo pangoro* 'if he/she is the eldest child' (S2). It is customary in Eastern Bontoc society that the children get married starting with the eldest, so this condition is about the case of the eldest son or daughter. The second of these is *kon pay hen enaqochi mo omqasawa* 'when the youngest gets married' (S3). Usually people in Eastern Bontoc have many children. It is assumed that the inheritance practice for the second child and following is not as complicated as for the eldest; they merely inherit some pond fields. The fourth constituent is *ya konpay hen asawa ay maqid anak cha* 'and those people who do not have children' (S4). The previous constituents presuppose a couple without children. The fifth constituent is *at wacha hen mangintokchon chicha* 'and there is a person who takes care of them' (S5). The sixth is *mo maqid mangintokchon chicha kaya wachan matoy kan chicha ay hen asawa* 'and if there is no one who takes care of them and one of them dies' (S6). The seventh is *hen achi omqasawa* 'the one who does not get married' (S7). This corresponds to the first constituent of the condition. Here I list all these constituents of the condition.

1. the one who gets married here in our village

2. if he/she is the eldest child
3. when the youngest gets married
4. and those couples who do not have children
5. and there is a person who takes care of them
6. and if there is no one who takes care of them and one of them dies
7. the one who does not get married

In this text the condition is closely associated with the overall intent of the communicator. This is because the expository discourse explains a given subject, and in order to do that, one must develop his explanation according to a logical scheme of presentation.

The *expository element* mainly serves to state the consequence of a *condition*. I illustrate this again from text E4. Since the first constituent of the condition is covering the second and third constituents of the condition, it does not have an expository element. The expository element for condition 2 is *hiya hen manginfortan ahen chamchamona ay payyew ya hen fosi mo wachay fosi, poryok ya hen kangsa* 'he is the one to inherit many pond fields, the clay pot, if there is one, the big cooking pan, and the gong.' The expository element for the third constituent of condition is *hiya hen manginkowah nan fiaroy ya hiya hen mangintokchoh nan chiyoy enana ya ama na* 'he is to get the house and takes care of his mother and father.' The house he gets is the one in which the parents have been living. Regardless of sex, the youngest one gets the house and takes care of the parents. The fourth constituent of the condition is one level above the fifth and sixth, and does not have an expository element. The expository element for the fifth constituent of condition is *hiya hen chiyoy hen manginkowah nan chiyoy kokowan nan chiyoy asawa ay maqid anak cha* 'he is the one to get the property of that couple who does not have children.' The expository element for the sixth constituent of condition is *hen chiyoy ibqa na kodkodwaqon cha hen oycha payyew ay kinako cha* 'their relatives divide the property, the pond field of that couple.' The expository element for the seventh constituent of condition is *maketokchoh nan chiyoy ena na ya ama na, angkayya hen chiyoy oy nafortan kon cha amqammaqan amqin, maramamong hen oyna chanakchakor ay aqammaqan cha* 'he takes care of his or her mother and father, and they work together so that all that is earned is his. They live together to work.'

*Reason* supports the expository element by giving additional information. In text E4, after the third condition and expository element, additional information is given: *kon pay hen chiyoy pangoro kon cha esafiatan he fiaroyna* 'the eldest child builds his own house.' This additional information is given here because in the previous condition and expository element the youngest child is mentioned as receiving the house of the parents. After the sixth condition and expository element additional information is also given: *mo maqanqanisqo hen kastos cha ofos mo tempon hen matayan* 'if at the time of burial both sides of relatives spend equally.' It is the usual practice that both sides, the families of the dead spouse and of the surviving spouse, spend equally, so that they can get the property equally. This information is given as background information for an outsider. From these examples it can be said that the *reason* constituent of the script gives material supportive to the expository element.

I here give the display of expository text E4 with columns for condition, expository element, and reason. Numbers after sentence numbers are for numbering the conditions.

	Condition	Expository element	Reason
S1	1. The one who gets married here in our village,		
	2. if he/she is the eldest child,	he is the one to inherit many pond fields, clay pot, if there is one, big cooking pan, and gong.	

S2	3. When the youngest gets married,	he is to get the house and takes care of his parents.	S3 The eldest child builds his own house.
S4	4. Those couples who do not have children,		
	5. and there is a person who takes care of them,	he is the one to get the property of that couple.	
S5	6. And if there is no one who takes care of them and one of them dies,	their relatives divide the property, the pond field of that couple,	if at the time of burial both sides of relatives spend equally.
S6	7. The one who does not get married,	he takes care of his parents. S7 They work together so that all that is earned is his. S8 They live together to work.	

FIGURE 10. SCRIPT OF EXPOSITORY TEXT E4

### 5.3.2. The macrostructure

The macrostructure of a discourse is the communicator's overall conception of the message of a text (4.3.2.). The macrostructure of expository discourse is harder to discover than that of behavioral discourse. Most behavioral discourses of Eastern Bontoc deal with one hortatory point; thus the intention of the communicator forces him to make his hortatory point clear. For expository discourse, when a communicator explains a subject, he makes his point clear by logical linkage. I illustrate the macrostructure for expository discourse from text E4.

The main intention of the communicator is to explain about inheritance. The main interest of explanation is who gets what. The communicator picks out individuals as candidates to inherit following a logical scheme of presentation. The macrostructure is apparently very extensive for this text:

The rule of the inheritance is:

0. If the couple has children
  1. and one gets married
  2. and if he is the eldest child, he/she gets many fields and many valuable objects,
  3. and if he is the youngest child, he/she takes care of the parents and inherits the house,
  7. and if the child does not get married, he/she takes care of the parents and inherits what they have earned together.
4. If the couple does not have children,
  5. and if there is someone who takes care of them, he/she inherits the property,
  6. and if there is no one who takes care of them, the relatives of both divide the property.

### 5.4. Transitivity

The transitivity scale, mentioned in 4.4., serves as a scheme for comparing different discourse genres. We expect the transitivity value for expository discourse to be toward the opposite extreme from procedural and narrative discourse.

For expository discourse the expository element constituent of the script is the highest constituent on the transitivity scale, but not as high as the highest constituents in narrative and procedural discourses. One of the transitivity features is *kinesis* (Hopper and Thompson, 1980), which means action is higher on transitivity scale than nonaction. Only 16 out of 45 clauses (36%) in the consequence part of the six expository texts are transitive verbal clauses. This proportion is significantly low compared to the *step* constituent of procedural discourse, where all the clauses are transitive verbal clauses. In condition and reason, there are 9

and 3 instances of transitive verbal clauses out of 49 and 18 clauses, or 18% and 17%, respectively. These proportions are lower than the one in expository element. In expository element, the identificational clause (see 3.3.1.) is typical for expository discourse and has 14 instances (50%). There are four existential clauses, six adverbial expanded clauses, and four stative verb clauses. Of all the clauses in the six expository texts, 25% are transitive verbal clauses, compared with 62% for behavioral discourse (4.4.). This percentage of transitive clauses in expository discourse is the expected result.

The condition is most often filled by a conditional clause (332a). It can also be filled by an identificational clause (332b).

- (332) a. *konpay mo omcha hen orkiw ay monfiatk-ana, (S4, E1)*  
 when if come NM day lk harvest time-his  
 'When his day of harvesting arrives, . . .'
- b. *hen kay fiatak at anakqakettoy.*  
 NM harvest IM little  
 'The harvest is little.'

The reason is filled by an identificational clause or a verbal clause (333).

- (333) *konpay hen chiyoy pangoro, kon cha esafiatan he fiaroy na. (S3, E4)*  
 and NM that eldest only they build OM house his  
 'The eldest child builds his own house.'

## 5.5. Constituency structure<sup>25</sup>

### 5.5.1. Lexical cohesion

Lexical cohesion is realized by using lexical items in the same semantic domain (cf. chapter 6 of Halliday and Hasan, 1976). Text E1 is about harvesting, so it is natural that the word *fiatak* 'harvest' is used in different forms, i.e. verbal and nominal, in almost every sentence. Text E1 is presented here in simplified form for each sentence with the translation of the root *fiatak* italicized.

- S 1 about the *harvesting* of long rice  
 S 2 this *harvest* . . . to *harvest*  
 S 3 his rice is ready to *be-harvested*  
 S 4 the day of *harvesting* . . . let us go *harvesting*  
 S 5 those who come to *harvest-together* . . . to be *harvested*  
 S 6 the rice *harvested*  
 S 7 those who *harvest* . . . *harvest*  
 S 8  
 S 9  
 S 10 *harvest*  
 S 11 how we do *harvesting*

Text E1 explains about harvesting in the dry season. There are two seasons in the Eastern Bontoc area, the dry season and the rainy season. Harvesting in the dry season is characterized by the participation of many people and their happily eating together out in the field. So words which imply many people, such as 'each one', 'divided two by two', 'neighbors', and 'relatives' are used.

<sup>25</sup>The notion of peak is not found helpful for expository discourse; thus the section of peak is not included in this constituency structure.

- S 1
- S 2 *people*
- S 3
- S 4 *neighbors, relatives* come
- S 5 those *people* who harvest
- S 6 *each one*
- S 7 *divided-two-by-two*
- S 8 line up . . . *some* ask riddles, *some* do story telling, *some* do singing
- S 9
- S 10 *each one*
- S 11

It is not only the presence of many people that makes people happy, but also what they eat. Usually people eat rice and vegetables. Animals are butchered for such occasions as weddings, funerals of old people, visits of important visitors, and harvesting in the dry season. In other words special food is for special occasions and is mentioned in several sentences.

- S 3 meat, food, rice wine
- S 5 people do not bring lunch
- S 9 cook their food, eat

In text E1, the value ‘good’ is explicitly mentioned in sentence 2. It is the dry season, so one does not get wet in harvesting. Lots of people help each other in harvesting, thus making it an enjoyable time, and lots of food, especially meat, is provided. All of these contribute to a good happy harvesting. Thus lexical items help to achieve the cohesion of the text and development of the topic.

5.5.2. Pronouns and participant reference

In text E1, a person whose rice is ready to be harvested is introduced by a common noun phrase, *osa ay tako* ‘one person’, and those who come to help him are introduced by *tatako* ‘people’. Since everyone has fields and harvesting time comes for each one of them, and there is no one who does harvesting by himself; each person calls for helpers. *Osa ay tako* ‘one person’ can be anyone in the community. *Tatako* ‘people’ can be any kind of group. I illustrate this from text E1.

A Host	Helpers
S 1	
S 2	people
S 3 one person . . . <i>his</i> rice. <i>he</i>	
S 4 <i>his</i> . . . <i>he</i> . . . <i>his</i> neighbors. <i>his</i> neighbors	<i>his neighbors</i> . . . <i>his neighbors</i>
S 5 that <i>owner</i> of the field	<i>these people</i>
S 6	<i>each one</i> . . . <i>his</i> . . . <i>his</i> . . . <i>his</i> . . . <i>his</i> . . .
S 7	<i>these people</i> who harvest together . . . <i>they</i>
S 8	<i>they</i> . . . <i>they</i> . . . <i>some others</i>
S 9 this <i>owner</i> of field	<i>their</i> . . . <i>their</i>
S 10	<i>they</i> . . . <i>they</i> . . . <i>each one</i>
S 11	

After the initial common nouns or noun phrases, pronouns are used to refer to the participants: *na* ‘he, his’ or *cha* ‘they, their.’ After a few occurrences of pronouns, participants are referred to again by a common noun phrase or by a nominalized verb: *makibtak* ‘the ones who harvest together’ (S7) or *nengpayyew* ‘the one who owns the field’ (S9). This is done when a speaker wants to shift his reference point to another entity. This is different from what happens in procedural discourse, where pronouns are used from the first sentence without prior reference and these referents are never referred to by a noun phrase. But for both discourses, expository and procedural, agent orientation is minus. This means that specific participants do not have roles in the text. In behavioral discourse, the agent is specifically referred to by the communicator. As we saw in

text E1, participants in expository discourse are introduced as one person, or people, without specific mention of who they are.

### 5.5.3. Particles

One of the particles which characterize expository discourse is *kay*. It can be roughly glossed 'then in that connection', but that does not convey its exact meaning. There is another adverb, *ofos/os*, which can be glossed 'too'.

(334) *omoy-ak ofos.*  
 go-I        too  
 'I go, too.'

This clause presupposes that someone other than the speaker goes. But *kay* advances the explanation, sometimes by giving examples, or by contrasting the statement with *kay* with the previous statement. I illustrate this from text E1.

Sentence        7    Those who harvest, they group themselves two by two.

Sentence        8    There are *kay* those who line up, and still others give riddles . . .

Sentence        9    The owner *kay* of that field, he cooks in preparing their food for lunch.

Sentence 8 is a further elaboration of sentence 7; i.e. sentence 7 describes the harvesters as working in groups of two people each, and sentence 8 gives more details of the explanation of harvesting. Sentence 8 builds on sentence 7. The reference point is shifted to individual groups. Sentence 9 shifts the reference point to the owner of the field. What he does is contrasted with what other people do. *Kay* advances the subject of an expository discourse.

### 5.5.4. Sentence

Expository discourse utilizes simple sentences (3.4.1.), complex sentences (3.4.2.), quotation sentences (3.4.2.11.), and negative sentences (3.1.7.3.). By contrast behavioral discourse has question sentences (3.4.1.1.), especially rhetorical questions. Procedural discourse does not have question sentences. Unlike procedural and behavioral discourses, where imperative sentences (3.4.1.2.) are the main sentence type for the command element of the script, expository discourse does not have instances of imperative sentences except in quotes. For a *finis*, expository discourse has identificational clauses, which start with *hiyachi hen* . . . 'that is . . .' (this occurs in four instances out of six expository texts).

(335) *hiya-chi hen aton hen kasibtak ahen tinyorkiw ad Kachakran.*  
 it-that NM way GM harvest time OM long rice OM Kadaclan  
 'This is the way we do at the harvest time of long rice in Kadaclan.'

But behavioral discourse has a *finis* with *angkay chi* 'that is . . .'

(336) *angkay chi-h ifiaka-k. (S17, B3)*  
 that that-NM say-I  
 'That is all I want to say.'

For an *introduction*, expository discourse has the following examples of identificational clauses, but they are inverted, with noun phrases which are the topic of the text fronted.

(337) a. *hen kasibtak ahen tinyorkiw ad Kachakran at monlapo ahen*  
 NM harvest time OM long rice OM Kadaclan IM begin OM

*anongos hen Mayo inkana Julio.*  
end GM May until July

'The harvesting time of long rice in Kadaclan begins at the end of May until July.' (S1, E1)

b. *hen kanan cha ngon sidsicha, at hiyan...* (E3)

NM word they QP ceremony IM that

'What they say 'sidsicha', that is ...'

But for behavioral discourse, although simple sentences are employed, they often include an additional nominal constituent, functioning as a vocative, usually sentence initial.

(338) *ah chakayo ay anak ko, naqoy nan maqifiaka-k kan chakayo...* (S1, B3)

OM you lk child my this NM advice-my OM you

'You who are my children, this is my advice to you ...'

For *condition* and *reason*, the sentences which are used are similar to the *projected circumstance* and *support by argument* of behavioral discourse. The sentence types are conditional (3.4.2.7.), concessive (3.4.2.12.), contingent (3.4.2.5.), and quotation sentence (3.4.2.11.). The conditional sentence sets up the new situation for the *expository element*.

(339) *mo maqid omali, kon kayo angkay ay hen fiaroy.* (E2)

if none come only you only lk one house

'If none comes, your family will be the only ones.'

The concessive sentence is another way of setting up a new situation for the *expository element*.

(340) *oray mo wacha hen omali ay osa wenno chowa,...* (E2)

even if exist NM come lk one or two

'Even if one or two persons come, ...'

The contingent sentence is for condition, adding background information.

(341) *hen kay fiatak at anakqakettoy, ta agqagkay narango, tay amchan chi*  
NM also harvest IM small so quick dry since much that

*oragna ay pakoy.* (E2)

fall lk rice

'This harvest is small, and it is quick to get dried, since there is much rice which falls.'

The quotation sentence adds vividness to the explanation.

(342) *konpay mo omcha hen orkiw ay monfiatka-na, oy-na iyayag ahen*  
when if come NM day lk harvest-his go-he call OM

*sasaggo-na ya ibqa na ay mangali ngon, in tako ta oy takon*  
neighbor-his and relatives his lk say QP go we so go we

*fiatak he payyew-mi-d-qowan wenno ah wakas.* (S4, E1)

harvest OM field-our-prep-now or prep tomorrow

'When the day of his harvesting comes, he goes to call his neighbors and relatives, saying "Let's go to harvest at our field today or tomorrow."'

### 5.5.5. Sentence inversion

Jones (1977) mentions two Philippine languages, Mamanwa and Tagalog, which show the characteristic feature of the nominative case markers, *ya* and *ang*, respectively, for the sentential theme. The use of these case markers beyond the sentence is described as follows:

Theme at higher hierarchical levels in Tagalog may be grammatically marked in various ways. One common way is to front a thematic NP in the sentence. Since Tagalog sentences are generally verb-first, an NP before the verb receives strong prominence (Jones, 1977:175).

The above statement can be applied to Eastern Bontoc. The nominative case marker, *hen* for a common noun, *he* for a singular proper noun, and *cha* for a plural proper noun, is equivalent to *ya* and *ang* of Mamanwa and Tagalog. The fronting of a thematic NP in the sentence signals the higher level theme also for Eastern Bontoc. When a NP is fronted, an inversion marker *at* is placed after the NP, separating it from the rest of the sentence (cf. 3.4.1.3.).

I illustrate the above statement from text E1. In sentences 1 and 2 *kasibtak* 'harvesting' is fronted and thus gains high level thematicity.

Sentence 1:

*hen kasibtak ahen tinyorkiw ad Kachakran, at monlapo ahen anongos*  
 NM harvest OM long rice OM Kadaclan IM begin OM end

*hen Mayo inkana Julio.*

GM May until July

'The harvesting of long rice in Kadaclan begins at the end of May and goes till July.'

Sentence 2:

*hetona ay kasibtak, at ammay...*

this lk harvest IM good

'This harvesting, it is good...'

Sentences 3 to 10 go on to explain about harvesting since that is established as the main theme of the text. There are two groups of people, those who invite their neighbors and relatives to harvest and those who come to help in harvesting. They are not specific persons since any person may be part of either group. Sentence 3 talks about the one inviting others. Sentence 5 changes the topic to those who come to help. Sentence 9 comes back to the one inviting. I note for sentence 5 *at* is not after *makibtak*, which is the normal position, but before the case marker, and for sentence 9 *at* is omitted, although the noun phrase is fronted.

Sentence 3:

*mo hen osa ay tako at kayod mabtak chi pakoy na...*

if NM one lk man IM near harvest that rice his

'When one person's rice is ready to be harvested...'

Sentence 5:

*at hen chiyoy cha oy makibtak, achi cha manngat.*

IM NM this they go harvest not they take lunch

'These people who come to harvest together, they do not bring their lunch.'

Sentence 9:

*hen kay chiyoy nengpayyew, monsorqat ay...*  
 NM also that owner of field cook lk  
 'The owner of the field, he cooks ...'

#### 5.5.6. Focus system

In the *expository element* constituent of expository discourse, out of 45 clauses of six texts, there are only 5 instances (11%) of subject focus verbs. In the condition and reason, there are 3 instances each of subject focus verbs out of 49 and 18 clauses, or 6% and 16%, respectively. Thus only 11 out of 112, or 10% of the clauses, have subject focus verbs. This low proportion reflects the fact that the expository discourse is minus agent orientation. Behavioral discourse, by comparison, has 39% subject focus verbs (see 4.5.5.).