IDENTIFICATION OF PARTICIPANTS IN DISCOURSE: A STUDY OF ASPECTS OF FORM AND MEANING IN NOMATSIGUENGA

SUMMER INSTITUTE OF LINGUISTICS PUBLICATIONS

IN

LINGUISTICS AND RELATED FIELDS

PUBLICATION NUMBER 28

EDITOR

Irvine Davis

ASSISTANT EDITORS

Alan C. Wares Iris M. Wares

CONSULTING EDITORS

Doris Bartholomew Eugene Loos

Robert E. Longacre William R. Merrifield

Kenneth L. Pike

PUBLISHER

Benjamin F. Elson

IDENTIFICATION OF PARTICIPANTS IN DISCOURSE: A STUDY OF ASPECTS OF FORM AND MEANING IN NOMATSIGUENGA

by

Mary Ruth Wise

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Linguistics
The University of Michigan
1968

A Publication of the
SUMMER INSTITUTE OF LINGUISTICS
of the
University of Oklahoma
Norman

1971

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Charts	ix
List of Diagrams	x
List of Abbreviations and Symbols	xi
Preface	xiii
1. INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEMS	1
1.1. Aspects of Form and Aspects of Meaning Illustrated	3
1.2. Structures Beyond the Sentence and Related Concepts: Basic Hypotheses	6
2. VIEWS OF FORM AND MEANING IN DISCOURSE	11
2.1. Current Models in Relation to Basic Hypotheses of This Thesis	12
2.1.1. Stratificational Grammar	12
2.1.2. Transformational Grammar	16
2.1.3. Scale-and-category Grammar	19
2.1.4. Tagmemic Grammar	21
2.1.4.1. Original Formulation	21
2.1.4.2. Some Modifications	22
2.1.4.3. Some Relevant Tagmemic Studies	26
2.2. Some Further Relevant Studies	28
2.2.1. Some Further Linguistic Contributions	28
2.2.2. Some Contributions from Stylistic and Literary Studies	33
2.2.3. Some Contributions from Folklore Studies	35
2.3. Summary of Similarities and Differences in Views of Form and Meaning	37
3. PARTICIPANT IDENTIFICATION IN RELATION TO THE GRAMMATICAL HIERARCHY (SURFACE STRUCTURE)	39
3.1. The G-clause Level	39
3.1.1. Verbal Active Clause Types	42
3.1.2. Subject and Complement Units in G-clauses	47
3.1.3. G-clause Classes Other Than Verbal Active	50
3.2. The G-phrase Level	58
3.3. The G-word Level	62
3.4. The Morpheme Level	66
3.5. The G-sentence Level	68
3.5.1. Contrastive G-sentence Types	69
3.5.2. Distributional Variants of G-sentences	74
3.6. The G-paragraph Level	75
3.7. The G-discourse Level	88
3.8. Summary of the Grammatical Hierarchy	92

4. PARTICIPANT IDENTIFICATION IN RELATION TO THE LEXEMIC HIERARCHY (DEEP STRUCTURE) 95

4.1. The L-clause Level 96
4.1.1. Basic L-clauses 98
4.1.2. Clauses Marked for Initiator or Focus 99
4.1.3. Units in L-clauses Which Characterize Participants by Their Roles 106
4.1.3.1. Agent and Other Units Which Co-occur With Particular Kinds of Events 107
4.1.3.2. Optional Units Which Occur in the Basic L-clauses 109
4.1.3.3. Additional Units Which Occur in Clauses Marked for Initiator or Focus 113
4.1.3.4. Control by Aspects of Meaning 116
4.1.4. Variants of L-clauses 117
4.1.5. Some Differences Between L-clauses and G-clauses 119
4.2. The L-phrase Level 120
4.3. The L-word Level 122
4.4. The Lexeme Level 123
4.5. The L-sentence Level 128
4.5.1. Contrastive L-sentence Types 129
4.5.2. Distributional Variants of L-sentences 136
4.5.3. Some Differences Between L-sentences and G-sentences 137
4.6. The L-paragraph Level 139
4.7. The L-chapter Level 149
4.8. The L-discourse Level 153
4.9. Summary of the Lexemic Hierarchy 157

5. IDENTIFICATION OF PARTICIPANTS IN SPECIFIC DISCOURSES 161

5.1. A Biographical Narrative 161
5.1.1. Grammatical Structure and Lexemic Structure of the Story 164
5.1.2. Selection of Nouns and Pronouns 177
5.2. Correlation Between Social Roles and Plot Roles in the Mabireri Myth 179
5.2.1. Free and Literal Translation of the Myth and Partial Analysis ... 180
5.2.2. Grammatical Structure and Lexemic Structure of the Myth as a Whole 200
5.2.3. Identification of Participants and Forms for Referring to Them in Myth 202
5.3. Informant Reaction in Relation to Paragraph Boundaries 203

TABLE OF CONTENTS

6. SIMULTANEITY OF ASPECTS OF FORM AND ASPECTS OF MEANING .. 207

6.1. Narrative Discourse Types Distinguished by Simultaneous Lexemic and Grammatical Contrasts 207

6.2. On Simultaneous Relations of Lexemic, Grammatical, and Phonological Structures..... 212

6.3. Participants Identified by Simultaneous Aspects of Form and Participant Reference Controlled by Simultaneous Aspects of Meaning 217

APPENDIX A. Phonemic Sketch and Some Morphophonemic Rules..... 221

APPENDIX B. Inventory of Affixes 225

APPENDIX C. Notes on Linguistic Classification of Nomatsiguenga and Tribal History 231

BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 233

LIST OF CHARTS

Chart		Page
1.	Schematization of the relation between aspects of form and aspects of meaning	7
2.	System of G-clauses with contrastive features of form of each clause class listed in the cells	41
3.	Formulas showing the contrastive forms of verbal active G-clauses	44
4.	Examples of verbal active G-clauses	46
5.	Examples of verbal active G-clauses with added complements	50
6.	Summary of contrastive forms of G-clause classes	51
7.	Examples of verbal passive G-clauses	52
8.	Examples of verbal stative G-clauses	53
9.	Examples of nominal active G-clauses	54
10.	Examples of nominal passive G-clauses	55
11.	Examples of relative G-clauses	57
12.	Contrastive forms of noun phrases shown by formulas in conjunction with additional features	59
13.	Examples of noun phrases, with constituent units identified in parentheses	60
14.	System of noun stem classes with each class illustrated in the cells	63
15.	Contrastive features of form of G-word classes other than noun	64
16.	Pronominal morphemes	67
17.	Contrastive forms of G-sentences	71
18.	Contrastive forms of G-paragraphs	78
19.	Contrastive grammatical forms of biography and myth	91
20.	System of L-clauses	97
21.	Contrastive forms of basic L-clauses	100
22.	Examples of basic L-clauses	102
23.	Summary of contrastive forms of L-clause classes	103
24.	Examples of causative L-clauses	104
25.	Examples of referential L-clauses	105
26.	Examples of accompaniment L-clauses	107
27.	System of kinship lexemes	124
28.	System of kinship lexemes illustrated in L-phrases	125
29.	System of L-narrative sentences	129
30.	Contrastive forms of L-sentences	131
31.	System of L-paragraphs	140
32.	Contrastive forms of L-paragraphs	142
33.	Constrastive forms of L-chapters	152
34.	Contrastive lexemic forms of biography and myth	154

Chart Page

35. Summary of the sequence of roles of participants in each L-paragraph of the fishing story 162
36. Participant roles in L-chapters in the Mabireri myth 179
37. Correlations between plot roles and social kinship roles 181
38. System of narrative discourse types 209
39. Contrastive forms of narrative discourse types 211
40. Directions of interaction between hierarchies 217

LIST OF DIAGRAMS

Diagram Page

1. Partial Analysis of Fishing Story 166-175
2. Partial Analysis of Mabireri 184-193

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

Act active
ag agent
Anim animate
App apposition
ben beneficiary
Bitran bitransitive
Ch chapter
Cl clause
co-ag co-agent
Comp complement
Cpd compound
Cx complex
D or Demon demonstrative
Develop developmental
F focus
Fac factitive
g goal
G- or G grammatical, e.g., G-sentence for grammatical sentence
G^0 ego's generation
G^2 second generation from ego
G^{+1} first ascending generation
G^{-1} first descending generation
H head
i g indirect goal
Inam inanimate
Ind independent
init initiator
Inter interrogative
inst instrument
Intran intransitive
L- or L lexemic, e.g., L-sentence for lexemic sentence
Lk linked sentence variant
M modifier
masc masculine
Mot motion
n unit can be repeated with no apparent structural limit
Neu neutral
non-masc non-masculine
O opening sentence variant
Obs observer
Para paragraph
partic participant
Pf prefix
Ph phrase
Poss'd possessed
Poss'r possessor
Pred predicate
Pro pronoun
pu purpose
Qtn quotation
Qtv quotative
Redun redundant sentence variant
ref referent
S successive sentence variant
Sen sentence
Sf suffix
Soc social setting
Sub subject
Subor subordinate
T terminative sentence variant
Tran transitive
U unmarked sentence variant
V verb
Vbl verbal
Voc vocative
¶ paragraph
- in examples separates morphemes considered pertinent to the discussion; in formulas indicates deletion or that the unit cannot occur

_ in glosses joins two or more English words translating single vernacular unit

... in glosses where translation of a morpheme is not considered pertinent to the discussion

\+ obligatory occurrence of a unit

: used in some formulas and examples to separate function from manifesting unit

= contrastive form of unit named at left equals formula to right

~ phonologically conditioned alternate

∞ grammatically conditioned alternate

∅ zero allomorph

‿ joins units manifested simultaneously by a single form, e.g., referent‿focus

(+x ±y) y can optionally occur if x occurs

[ ] encloses agreement rules and other features of constructions

( ) joins complex manifestations of a single unit

{ } one of the enclose units is to be selected

/ __x occurs in the environment of following x

/s__ occurs in the environment of preceding x

> becomes

1st first person

2nd second person

3rd third person

[αpartic] [αpartic] the two units must refer to the same participant

[αpartic] [-αpartic] the two units must refer to different participants

α1, α2, α3, etc., identifies participants when more than two are involved

± optional occurrence of a unit

PREFACE

This study was undertaken with a two-fold goal in view. The first was to show the factors which must be accounted for in any language in order to identify pronominal antecedents, i.e., to identify participants, in discourse. Or, conversely, it was to show the factors which control the occurrence of nouns, free pronouns, and pronominal affixes referring to participants. Since lexemic, grammatical, and phonological structures are each relevant factors, it has been necessary to delineate the nature of lexemic structures more fully than has been done in previous tagmemic studies.

The second goal was to provide a partial description of Nomatsiguenga for which no previous descriptions are available. Nomatsiguenga is representative of the Campa languages in which pronominal affixes occur far more frequently than nouns or free pronouns in narrative discourse. Since the problem of pronominal reference is accentuated in Nomatsiguenga, the data have provided the stimulus for the theoretical developments made in attempting to meet the first goal. The accentuation of the problem also provides one rationale for studying little known languages: In more widely known languages there are similar problems of referrence, but, in general, they do not appear to be so acute that one is driven to seek a more comprehensive model of language than most of those currently available to the linguist.

The language name "Nomatsiguenga" is spelled in Spanish orthography and means 'my (no-) people (matsiguenga)'. It is a Campa language of the Pre-Andine group of Arawakan languages and is spoken by approximately 1,000 persons living on the eastern slopes of the Andes in Peru.

Data for this study were gathered from September, 1966 through June, 1967 and are supplemented by data gathered by Mr. and Mrs. Harold Shaver working under the auspices of the Summer Institute of Linguistics. I am deeply indebted to Mr. and Mrs. Shaver for their hospitality during my own field work among the Nomatsiguenga and for the free access which they granted to their field notes. Much of the clause analysis presented here is based on data painstakingly gathered by Mr. Shaver.

The data include approximately 500 pages of narratives--including myths, explanations of beliefs, and accounts of events relevant to the lives of the narrators--and conversations transcribed from magnetic recordings. About 75 pages of the corpus were transcribed by Mr. Shaver, and the remainder were transcribed by Alberto Chimanca Mabanca, Raul Casancho Charíti, and Alfredo Casancho Legia. The narrators included Julio Mishicuri, Roberto Casancho, Ricardo Casancho, Sra. Rosa de Mishicuri, Pablo Chimanca Mabanca, Julian Chimanca Mabanca, and Andres Chompati. Julian Chimanca Mabanca and Pablo Chimanca Mabanca were the principal informants for analytical stages of the study.

IDENTIFICATION OF PARTICIPANTS

An IBM concordance of approximately 150 pages of Nomatsiguenga text has been useful in the analysis. The concordance was done under the sponsorship of National Science Foundation grant GS-1605. The field work was sponsored in part by a Doctoral Dissertation Research Grant GS-1137 from the National Science Foundation. A Horace H. Rackham Dissertation Fellowship from the University of Michigan made the completion of this dissertation possible.

My gratitude to Kenneth L. Pike for his counsel and encouragement cannot be adequately expressed. I am also grateful to the other members of my doctoral committee and to A. L. Becker for many helpful suggestions. I have profited from discussions with Charles Elliott, David Fox, Albert Wakeman, and Patricia Townsend.

I wish to acknowledge also the competent help of Ann Niemeyer, Beverly Cook, and Grady Hope in typing this dissertation and of Arlene Gusman in typing the manuscript for the concordance project.