Central Bontoc:

Sentence, Paragraph and Discourse

SUMMER INSTITUTE OF LINGUISTICS PUBLICATIONS
IN
LINGUISTICS AND RELATED FIELDS
PUBLICATIONS NUMBER 27

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

Central Bontoc:

Sentence, Paragraph and Discourse

Lawrence A. Reid

Central Bontoc: Sentence, Paragraph and Discourse
1970   5.5C

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SYMBOLS

Act	Action		Form	Formula
Adv	Adversative		GS	Grammatical Sentence
AjP	Adjectival Phrase		H	Head
Alt	Alternate		HortS	Hortatory Sentence
AltS	Alternative Sentence		Hort	Hortatory
An	Antithesis		Id	Identificational Clause
AntiS	Antithetical Sentence		IndC	Independent Clause
Aux	Auxiliary		Intro	Introduction
Bu	Build–Up		IQ	Indirect Quote
C	Clause		IQu	Indirect Question
CauM	Cause Margin		IQF	Indirect Quote Formula
ChS	Chance Condition Sentence		IQuF	Indirect Question Formula
Circ	Circumstance		IQS	Indirect Quote Sentence
CircM	Circumstance Margin		IQuesS	Indirect Question Sentence
CoLink	Co-ordinate Link			
Compx	Complex Dialogue		Lk	Link
Dia Para	Paragraph		Loc	Locative
Concl	Conclusion		LogGS	Logical Goal Sentence
ConcM	Concessive Margin		M	Morpheme
ConM	Conditional Margin		MS	Merged Sentence
ConcS	Concessive Sentence		N	Noun Phrase
Coor	Co-ordinate		Narr	Narrative
CoorS	Co-ordinate Sentence		Neg	Negative
C–RS	Circumstance–Result Sentence		Nu	Nucleus
			Obj	Object
DesC	Descriptive Clause		¶, PARA	Paragraph
DivS	Diverse Sentence		P	Phrase
DQ	Direct Quote		Para	Paraphrase
DQF	Direct Quote Formula		ParaS	Paraphrase Sentence
DQS	Direct Quote Sentence		Peri	Periphery
Emph	Emphasis		Pred	Predicate
EP	Episode		Proc	Procedure
EqC	Equational Clause		Proj	Project
EquQS	Equational Quote Sentence		PROP	Proposal
			PROP̄	Counter Proposal
Excl	Exclamation		Prop	Proposition
ExcS	Exclusive Condition Sentence		PS	Phonological Sentence
			PurM	Purpose Margin
Exhor	Exhortation		PurS	Purpose Sentence
ExiC	Existential Clause		(Q̄)	Counter Question
Expl	Explanatory		QS	Quote Signal
Expo	Exposition		QuS	Indirect Question Signal
ExS	Extent Sentence		RAcS	Recurrent Action Sentence
ExtP	Extent Phrase			

CENTRAL BONTOC

R-AS	Relator-Axis Sentence	ThQF	Thought Quote Formula
Reas	Reason	TM	Time Margin
ReaS	Reason Sentence	VC	Verbal Clause
Reinf	Reinforcement	Voc	Vocative
Rel	Relator	W	Word
(REM)	Remark	WhC	'Wh' Question Clause
(REM̄)	Counter Remark	Y-NC	Yes-No Question Clause
Res	Result	af	associative focus
ResM	Result Margin	app	apparent
Resp	Response	att	attributive
RheS	Rhetorical Question Sentence	card	cardinal
		cau	causative
RQ	Referential Quote	ch	chance condition
RQF	Referential Quote Formula	con	condition
		conc	concessive
RQS	Referential Quote Sentence	dep	dependent
		exc	exclusive condition
S	Sentence	eq	equational
Sb	Subject	ext	extent
SCon	Sentence Conjunction	fut	future
Sec	Section	hort	hortatory
Sēc	Counter Section	lg	logical goal
SeqS	Sequence Sentence	neg	negative
Sim	Simultaneous	of	objective focus
SIntro	Sentence Introducer	ord	ordinal
Sp	Speech	prop	proper
SpS	Speech Sentence	pur	purpose
SS	Simple Sentence	rac	recurrent action
SenS	Sensate Sentence	rea	reason
ST	Step	rel	relator
St	Sentence Topic	rf	referential focus
Sta	Statement	rhe	rhetorical question
SubS	Subjunctive Sentence	sen	sensate
T	Topic	seq	sequence
T̄	Non-Topic Clause Tagmeme	sf	subjective focus
		s̄f	non-subjective focus
TagQ	Tag Question	sp	speech
Tem	Temporal	st	stative
Term	Terminus	sto	sentence topic
Th	Thesis	sub	subjunctive
ThoS	Thought Sentence	tem	temporal
ThQ	Thought Quote	y-n	yes-no question

   The segmental phonemes of Bontoc are as follows (symbols in parentheses indicate orthographic conventions): a, e, o, i, p, t, k, b, d, g, m, n, ŋ (ng), l, s, w, y, and ʔ (- between a consonant and following vowel, zero word initially and between vowels. Hyphen also represents geminate glottal stop between vowels, and is used to separate the symbols n and g when they represent a sequence of those phonemes and not the velar nasal.) Stress is phonemic but is not symbolized. For further information see Reid 1963.

FOREWORD

Does grammatical structure in any significant sense of the word exist for units larger than the sentence? Or do we restrict grammar to lower levels of hierarchical structure (stem, word, phrase, clause, and sentence) and exit to lexical or content analysis when we consider the structure of larger units? While such questions as these were partially answered before beginning the Philippine project (cf. Totonac: from Clause to Discourse by Reid, Button, Bishop, and Longacre, Summer Institute of Linguistics, Norman, Oklahoma, 1968), it was during the Philippine project that significant insights were gained that put the whole matter of the grammatical structure of paragraph and discourse on a firmer basis.

Tagmemics has been defended enough by its proponents and ex-coriated enough by its critics that the name, if not the tenets, of this school of grammar is well known. It is taxonomic and pattern-sensitive. It postulates a unit of grammar (the tagmeme) which involves a correlation between a function and a set whose members expound the function. It defines grammatical construction in a holistic way as a contrastive string with obligatory and optional parts (almost but not quite correlating with a further distinction: nucleus versus periphery) and embracing a variety of readings, permutations, and exponential combinations. The construction (syntagmeme) is summarized and presented in a tagmemic apparatus which consists of a formula plus rules. Tagmemic grammars are hierarchically oriented from morpheme (level of zero internal grammatical structure) to discourse (level of maximal structure) with intermediate levels: stem, word, phrase, clause, sentence, and paragraph.

In approaching the problem of the grammatical structure of paragraph and discourse a practitioner of tagmemics first looks for functional slots and set members that expound such slots on these two putative levels of structure. Actually, this is not in itself difficult. It is no news that discourses contain some sort of aperture and closure with intermediate chunks such as episodes and dénouement in narrative, and points in essays and sermons. In reference to paragraphs students of rhetoric and composition are taught to develop a paragraph from a topic sentence so as to secure proper flow of exposition or movement of narrative. What then does a tagmemic analysis of discourse and paragraph have to offer that can legitimately be claimed to be new?

Here the stubborn taxonomic bent of tagmemics comes to the fore with the suggestion that discourses and paragraphs should be classified into a finite number of genre (broad classification) and types (specific structurally contrastive string= syntagmeme) and that a given discourse or paragraph is classifiable as a given genre and type. But--in view of the undoubted variety and complexity of both discourses and paragraphs--

is not such a claim patently absurd? Yes, patently and irrevocable absurd--unless we admit recursion on both levels. Once we admit that discourse may embed within discourse and paragraph within paragraph then it becomes both rational and useful to set up an inventory of discourse and paragraph types. Conversely, we can have a finite number of such types if and only if we posit such recursion.

Thus, a narrative discourse may embed within it extensive expository, procedural, and hortatory sections. When each such section embraces several paragraphs then each such chain of paragraphs is structurally an embedded discourse. This is a necessary assumption in tagmemics which does not accept unstructured and hierarchically unoriented strings of anything, be they words, clauses, sentences, or paragraphs. It is, furthermore, a useful assumption in that we find that a string of paragraphs that cluster together within a discourse do themselves have the structural features of a discourse. What then of the whole discourse which contains these sections? It is not a careless or amorphous mixture of narrative, expository, procedural, and hortatory elements. It is rather a coherently structured unit whose first and most comprehensive structure is a narrative, but which contains embedded discourses of other varieties. The embedded discourses expound functional slots of the main discourse, such as aperture, episode, dénouement, and closure. The discourse is then classifiable as to type and the various discrete parts of it are classifiable as well. Our assumption that discourses may be taxonomically classified, far from impeding our analysis, has then actually expedited it.

Ultimately, a discourse will be found to be composed of constituent paragraphs--even though we may not get down to the paragraphs until we have passed through several layers of embedded discourses. Paragraphs also need to be classified into genre and type with recursion of paragraph within paragraph. The failure to recognize such recursion is one of the main reasons that it has proven difficult through the years to analyze paragraphs. Few paragraphs are simple enough in structure to be analyzed as a simple string of functional slots each filled with one and only one grammatical sentence. With much greater frequency paragraphs display an immediate constituent structure in which certain sentences group together as a bloque and may in turn combine with another such bloque before entering directly into the structure of the main paragraph. It is claimed here that all such groups of sentences within a paragraph constitute an embedded paragraph and that each paragraph, whether main or embedded, may be classified according to a finite number of paragraph types.

The above claims are qualified in two respects: (1) This classification is carried out most surely within the bounds of a single language; and (2) as much (but no more) ambiguity as to structural type is found here as is found on lower levels of structure. The first qualification is necessary simply because languages and the cultures that they reflect reserve the right to differ. Nevertheless, it is possible that we may find within the foreseeable future that structures on the higher levels are more stereotyped and universal than those on the lower levels. The second qualification is necessary in that on any level distinct structures

may generate ambiguous exponents. Thus, the old chestnut 'Flying planes can be dangerous' leaves us in doubt as to whether flying is a modifier of plane or whether flying is a verbal with plane as its object. But this does not in the least invalidate the structural distinction between the two structures as seen, e.g., in their differing expansions. Similarly, we may find a paragraph which could be construed as narrative or exposition without invalidating the distinction between the two paragraph types.

The claim is therefore made that tagmemics offers new and fresh insight into the structure of discourses and paragraphs in the course of classifying them into genres and types. The second part of this volume by Reid is exemplary in this respect. He shows, for example, that matters of tense and person orientation within individual sentences are best understood by reference to larger units of specified genre--as are also such matters as anaphora and deletion. Reid's analysis of native Bontoc texts also shows the necessity and usefulness of a theory of recursive exponence in both discourse and paragraph structure.

A slot-class analysis of discourse and paragraph is not in itself of great significance to the understanding of such higher level units unless we can in some fashion guard against imposing such structures on the data without sufficient justification in the data themselves. Conceivably, more than one outline can be imposed on a narrative, essay, or sermon. How do we know that any such outline reflects anything more than the ingenuity of the analyst? Faced with such doubts we are driven back to the data to look for formal features of contextual connection. In the Philippine data papers in general, and here in Reid's monograph in particular, such a theory of contextual connection is proposed. It is proposed that the sentences which compose the nucleus of a paragraph of a given type are linked to each other in stateable and formally observable ways. It is further proposed that the paragraphs which form the nucleus of a discourse are likewise linked in stateable and observable ways. It emerges, in fact, that the manner in which sentences and paragraphs link on each level is more diagnostic of paragraph and discourse types than the nature of the constituents themselves. Thus, while both narrative discourses and narrative paragraphs exist, it by no means follows that a narrative discourse must have even a majority of its constituent paragraphs as narrative paragraphs. What is diagnostic is that a narrative links its paragraphs together in the manner that is characteristic of its genre. Granted this, the constituent paragraphs may be, for example, dialogue and explanatory paragraphs with or without a sprinkling of actual narrative paragraphs. I will not say more here; the volume of which this is the foreword speaks well on this and other scores.

Granted all the above, however, the question may well persist: But is this grammar? In answering this question it is necessary to remember first of all that while tagmemics posits linguistic structure in three modes--phonology, grammar, and lexicon--it does not insulate structure in any one mode from structure in the other two modes. Just as years ago Pike wrote on 'grammatical prerequisites for phonemic analysis,' we now note phonological and lexical prerequisites for

grammatical analysis. One thing at least is evident: this theory of discourse and paragraph structure takes seriously as a structural unit the grammatical sentence. The theory of paragraph structure is formed to answer the question: 'How do grammatical sentences combine to form paragraphs?' In answering this question we find that grammatically identifiable parts of sentences, e.g., the initial conjunctions and the sentence margins (for details see the first half of the Reid volume) are the stuff which serves to relate sentence to sentence within the paragraph. Presumably, since we are fitting grammatical sentences into paragraph-level slots by virtue of links which are grammatically identifiable parts of those sentences, then what we come out with is grammatical paragraphs. These are then in turn fitted into slots within what is--as the highest level of structure--necessarily not only a grammatical discourse but a phonological and lexical discourse as well. Were we doing a lexical analysis of the paragraph our procedure would be quite different and our analytical results distinct as well. We would then disregard boundaries of grammatical sentences and simply analyze the content structure. We would group as a lexical string--perhaps a lexical 'sentence'--what belonged together lexically, even if this led to cutting one grammatical sentence into several lexical parts and joining one part of one grammatical sentence to another part of another such sentence. In narrative paragraphs we would trace the even line of a paragraph even if it gave us, e.g., seven discrete events encoded in only three grammatical sentences. Such a lexical analysis is not simply programmatic and visionary; a beginning in this direction is made in a joint paper with Myra Lou Barnard and printed in the last section of volume one of the report on the Philippine project. In Barnard's study of Dibabawon text it became evident that not only are grammatical and lexical sentences not necessarily coterminous, but that similar skewing may hold between grammatical and lexical paragraphs as well.

All of this brings us down to a consideration of the first half of this volume, viz. the section on Bontoc sentence structure. Reid has written his own introduction to this half of the volume and I need not duplicate what he says there. I would call to the reader's attention, however, Reid's set of five rules for mapping the grammatical sentence onto the phonological sentence at the end of his introduction (with more formal development in an appendix). These rules are without doubt applicable to other languages than Bontoc and therefore worthy of consideration as a possible linguistic universal.

The most noteworthy feature of Reid's description of Bontoc sentences is the care with which he has assembled his tagmemic apparatuses for each sentence type (and often for sub-types). A lot of detail is included here--detail concerning the role of conjunctions and particles, the structural restrictions of component clauses, and the relevant semantic classes of verbs that may expound predicates in component clauses. Defining sentence as a level of clause combination, we must then consider that Reid's work is the most comprehensive and detailed description of sentence ever yet produced by practitioners of tagmemics. As a careful and detailed piece of work it should, furthermore, commend itself to those of other persuasions. A careful piece

FOREWORD

of description should be able to survive the mortality of the theoretical framework with which it is associated.

The reader should note, among other things, Reid's system of sentence structure in three parameters. This is an unusual sort of sentence system in that most systems are apparently oriented in but two parameters. Balangao, which is closely related to Bontoc, has a similar system (Joanne Shetler, unpublished data paper).

Also interesting is Reid's postulation of backlooping of paragraph structures into the Sequence and Paraphrase sentences. Quite interesting here is the fact that Reid not only postulates that certain paragraph types may be backlooping exponents of sentence bases in these sentence types, but also that there are good a priori reasons for considering that other paragraph types may never occur in these situations as backlooping exponents.

Finally, of considerable interest is the manner in which Reid finds it necessary to refer to the paragraph and discourse while describing the sentence, and to the sentence while describing paragraph and discourse. The two halves of the description are mutually dependent. Sentence is analyzed in a way to fit the needs of paragraph and discourse and vice versa. Indeed, so striking is the mutual dependence of the three levels that it might well be wondered if sentence belongs not rather to the upper ranges of hierarchical structure (along with paragraph and discourse) than to the mid ranges (clause and phrase) that are the domain of what is usually called 'syntax'--in distinction to the lower ranges (word and stem) that have been termed morphological. At any rate, Reid's volume here is an important contribution to the understanding of these three upper levels of grammatical structure.

Robert E. Longacre

PREFACE

The Bontoc language is spoken mainly in Bontoc municipality, Mountain Province, Luzon, Philippines. The particular dialect upon which this analysis is based is that spoken by the 1,500 residents of Guinaang barrio.

The basis of this analysis is a corpus of texts, of various discourse types. About half of these texts (some 10,000 words) formed the input of an IBM Concordance extensively used during the analysis. The concordance was made on the IBM 1410 computor at the University of Oklahoma by the Linguistic Information Retrieval Project of the Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Oklahoma Research Institute, and sponsored by Grant GS-934 of the National Science Foundation.

This presentation was written during a three and one half month workshop conducted at the Philippine Headquarters of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, January – April 1968, as part of a project sponsored by contract 0-8-062838-0391 of the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Appreciation is here expressed to Robert E. Longacre, principal investigator of the project for providing the theoretical base, and much helpful guidance and counsel during the analysis and writing.

PART I
TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART II
TABLE OF CONTENTS