STUDIES IN PHILIPPINE LINGUISTICS

Volume 2 Number 1 1978

Hartmut Wiens. "Focus shift and tense shift: Highlighting and conflict in Limos Kalinga narrative discourse"
103–114

FOCUS SHIFT AND TENSE SHIFT: HIGHLIGHTING AND CONFLICT
IN LIMOS KALINGA NARRATIVE DISCOURSE

Hartmut Wiens
Summer Institute of Linguistics
Philippine Branch

0. INTRODUCTION

Kathleen Callow in her book, Discourse considerations in translating the Word of God, identifies four aspects of naturalness in the study of discourse structure, namely, grouping, cohesion, information structure, and prominence. The primary concern of this paper is with the aspect of prominence, and, more specifically, with the devices employed in Limos Kalinga narratives to lend prominence to particular events and relationships.[1]

Callow distinguishes among three kinds of prominence in discourse: Prominence with thematic value, Prominence with focus value, and Prominence with emphatic value. The latter is probably the easiest type to identify in discourse since it generally employs such devices as semantic particles, word order, and repetition. This value of prominence would make an interesting topic for study in itself and will not receive further comment in this paper. It should be noted here, however, that all three of the devices mentioned above are common in Limos Kalinga narrative discourse. Like other Philippine languages, Kalinga has numerous semantic particles which are used for emphasis. Word order is also used for emphasis, the front-shifting of clause constituents being especially noteworthy in this respect. Repetition is quite common as well, reduplication being a prime example.

Prominence with thematic value will likewise receive relatively little attention in this paper. The unmarked thematic signals of tense and focus do function to provide prominence with thematic value but they will be introduced only by way of contrast with the marked use of tense and focus which achieves prominence with focus value.

Callow describes prominence with focus value as "a spotlight, playing on the thematic material to bring some of it especially to the attention" (1974:60). This rather semantic usage of the term, focus, is clearly quite distinct from the morphologically based usage that has become familiar in the description of Philippine languages. Focus in the latter sense refers to a relationship that exists between the verb and a particular nounphrase within a clause. Typically the nounphrase will be morphologically marked as the focused item and will be cross referenced by affixation on the verb which identifies the relationship that exists between the focused item and the verb. It is focus in this syntactic sense that is involved in the phrase, focus shift. Focus shift in this grammatical sense, however, serves as an important device for conferring what Callow refers to as prominence with focus value upon

a particular event in the backbone of a narrative. Thus, though the two senses of the term, focus, must be distinguished, they are not at all unrelated in Limos Kalinga.

1. General Observations on Discourse in Related Languages.
This paper is by no means the first study of discourse in Kalinga related languages. Before discussing focus shift and tense shift in Limos Kalinga it is useful to discuss as background certain findings on discourse from related languages upon which this paper builds.

The most closely related dialect for which discourse studies have been published is Guininaang Kalinga. Many of the observations that Gieser makes for Guininaang Kalinga also hold true for Limos Kalinga.

Concerning person orientation, Gieser states that "Kalinga narrative discourse is either first or third person oriented." (1972:17). This is also true of narrative discourse in Limos Kalinga. In procedural discourse, however, instances of second person orientation have been found in Limos Kalinga in contrast to Guininaang for which Gieser has found only first or third person orientation (1972:17).

Concerning narrator's viewpoint, Gieser observes that in factual accounts of current events narrators may take the viewpoint of either a first person participant or that of a third person but that in legends the narrator generally assumes the viewpoint of an omniscient author, entering at will the mind of any participant and viewing events, states and participants either as a neutral narrator or subjectively through the eyes of an involved participant. Gieser's account of Guininaang seems to hold quite well for Limos in this respect.

With respect to narrative setting, however, there appears to be at least one subsystem for which Limos requires a slightly different description. Gieser states, "The narrator may reveal where he was when he related the narrative by the way he employs deictic forms, names of actual places, and certain motion verbs." (1972:17) It appears, then, that in Guininaang a narrator may optionally position himself in relation to specific places mentioned in his story.

In contrast to this, a narrator in Limos Kalinga has no choice but to position himself in relation to the specific places he refers to. This is accomplished by the use of the noun phrase marking particles or determiners which in Limos Kalinga have a deictic quality similar to that of the demonstrative pronouns.

There is a narrative form of the determiner which is simply the form of the remote reference demonstrative, di, with the narrative linker, -t. This determiner predominates in the noun phrases of a narrative except in the cases of reported speech. However, if this narrative determiner is used with locative noun phrases it indicates that the place mentioned is either fictional or no longer exists.

When referring to real and specific places, then, a narrator must switch to one of the forms of the non-narrative determiner. The most common forms are the proximate reference demonstrative, tu, with non-narrative linker, -n, to indicate that the narrator is in or near the place mentioned or the remote reference demonstrative, di, with non-narrative linker, -n, to indicate that he is not at the place referred to. This latter form, din, occurs in apparently free allomorphic variation with the forms, ud, and ∅, when used with place names.

The positioning of the narrator with respect to the places to which he refers in the narrative is not absolute. Rather, it is relative to the locations of other places referred to in the context. Thus the narrator can refer to the Saltan river as tun Saltan at one point in his story as long as the geographic location of the narrator is relatively close to the Saltan by comparison with other rivers referred to up to that point in the story. Just as soon as the events of the narrative move to a new geographic setting which includes reference to another river or stream closer to the place of narration than the Salten, the closer stream is marked with tun (for example, tun sulung Babattuwan) and from that point the Salten is referred to as sidin Saltan.

The organization of Limos Kalinga discourse, like that of Guininaang, has also been found to include orientation, coda, and body, of which only the latter is nuclear. It is also in the body of the discourse that the prominence features discussed below are most clearly seen.

Possibly the greatest contrast found between Guininaang and Linimos narrative discourse is the one which constitutes one of the chief concerns of this paper, namely, the discourse significance of the tense or aspect inflection of the verb. This is also an area of divergeance between Limos Kalinga and Bontoc. Gieser reports Reid's finding for Bontoc that "past tense forms tend to be used 'heavily in the early sentences' of the discourse, and then, after the orientation to past time has been established, nonpast forms are used in the body of the discourse. At the end of the discourse there is a reversion to past tense." (Gieser, from Longacre 1963:1.3) He then states that "In contrast to the distribution of past and nonpast forms in Bontoc narratives, however, completed and incompleted aspect forms in Kalinga narratives are interspersed throughout the discourse rather than being clustered in particular portions of it."

2. Tense and Focus in Limos Kalinga.

The system in Linimos contrasts with both of these and is virtually the reverse of that found in Bontoc. Setting and background information which is typically found in the orientation is usually in nonpast tense. Similarly, the summary information that is found in the coda is usually also in nonpast tense. The orientation and the coda are thus characterized by the heavy use of nonpast tense.

By contrast with this, events, which make up the body of the narrative, are generally reported in past tense. The use of nonpast tense in

reporting events in a narrative is therefore unexpected. Callow points out that "Sometimes a construction which normally signals theme can be used in an unexpected way so as to bring certain information into focus." (1974:63) The use of nonpast tense in the narration of events in Linimos has been found to correlate rather closely with conflict passages and points of peak tension in the plot. It seems then that its function is precisely what Callow has referred to as a device to achieve prominence with focus value.[2]

It should be noted here that Limos Kalinga is similar to Guininaang Kalinga in having certain grammatical constructions which automatically determine the tense of the verb without regard for higher level discourse functions. In Linimos, for instance, speech verbs in quotation formulae are automatically nonpast. At one time this may have been an optional choice which served to lend prominence to the quoted material that followed the quotative verb. At present, however, the choice of nonpast tense in this situation is the norm and in Callow's terms (1974:68) may lend only unmarked prominence to the construction. The choice of nonpast tense is also fairly automatic with the particle, man, which marks specific time, and with the particle, kad, which marks temporal conditions. If any prominence is achieved by the choice of nonpast in these cases, it would be considerably less than that achieved by the unexpected choice of nonpast in other narrative contexts.

Another grammatical device for achieving prominence and one which is often used in conjunction with tense shift is that of a shifting focus pattern. As has been observed by Clay Johnston (ms.), the focus relationship that obtains between an affixed verb form and a certain noun-phrase complement appears to be a thematic device in discourse. In fulfilling its thematic function it is quite normal for focus to remain primarily on one participant or participant group throughout a paragraph or section. Of course there are also lower level constraints that tend to determine the focus of the verb automatically without regard for higher level thematic considerations and in these cases the prominence value of focus choice is considerably reduced. These constraints have yet to be studied in detail for Limos Kalinga. Even if these low level constraints are ignored, however, there is a high degree of correlation between shifting focus patterns and points of tension in the plot for the narratives that have been investigated thus far.

3. Examples of Tense and Focus Shifts from Limos Texts.
A good illustration of the use of tense shift to lend prominence in a conflict passage can be found in the first five sentences of the story of the monkey and the turtle. The text is presented below in two columns, one for events and the other for nonevents. The free translation appears in a third column in which the verbs which translate past tense events are underlined with a single line and those which translate nonpast tense events are underlined with a double line.

<div align="center">

<u>Allalim</u> da <u>Abbak</u> kan <u>Dogga</u>
story   of monkey and turtle

</div>

NONEVENTS	EVENTS	
1. Da dogga kan abbak plural turtle and monkey napiya dan mambulbulun good they companion		1. The monkey and the turtle were good friends.
2. Osan algaw one day	ummoy da nan-ay-ayaw <u>went</u> they visiting sidit sulung. at the stream	2. One day they <u>went</u> visiting at the river.
3.	Indasan da dit <u>found</u> they the suplang di balat. shoot of banana	3. They <u>found</u> a certain sprout of banana.
4.	Mampulpulsan da un <u>fight</u> they link duwa. two	4. The two of them <u>quarrelled</u> over it.
5. Yoong gaputa but because		5. But because they were friends they <u>carefully</u> <u>divided</u> it.

mambulbulun da   inam-ammaan dan pintod.
companion   they   <u>carefully</u>   they <u>divided</u>

    As the story continues there are three other events or groups of
events which are related in nonpast tense. All of these occur at points
of tension in the plot, although the degree of tension is not entirely
uniform. Since this is a stylistic device it will be employed with
varying degrees of skill by different narrators and it may be that four
uses of the same device in one narrative is excessive even for a fairly
lengthy story such as the monkey and the turtle. One to three occur-
rences of tense shift was the range covered by other texts studied. It
may also be the case that there are other factors in narrative discourse
which call for a switch to nonpast tense and which have not yet been
identified.

    Perhaps one of the most skillful uses of this device is found in
the story about the origin of rice as told by Mr. Modisto Wagsingan, a

noted raconteur in the Limos Kalinga area. In this case, tense shift is employed in conjunction with focus shift.

The complete text of this story is given below, followed by a chart of tense and focus shifts employed in the body of the discourse.

The following abbreviations are used as glosses for words in the following text:

Foc	focused determiner	Obl	oblique determiner
Gen	genitive determiner	OF	object focus
LF	locative focus	Pl	plural
Lk	link	RF	referent focus
Loc	locative determiner	SF	subject focus
NFoc	nonfocused determiner	Top	topic determiner or demonstrative

```
        Sat laplapun  dit pagoy ilumtaw uttun pita   The beginning
        Top beginning Gen rice  appear  Loc   earth  of the appearance
                                                      of rice on this
                 by Modisto Wagsingan                 earth
```

1. Sasadit damdamu un tagu, maid kanu   ud
   Top,Pl first   Lk people none it is said Foc

immula   da si pagoy. 2. Si Kabuniyan kanu,
plant,past,OF they Obl rice   Top Kabuniyan it is

   siyad   ida   mangal-an   sit   pagoy.
said he,Foc go,they get,nonpast,LF Obl, specific rice

3. Amina tagu kanu,   utdit   osan algaw ummoy
   all   people it is said Loc,past one day   go,past,SF

da   kanu   alan   dit kanon da   kan
they it is said get,nonpast,OF Foc food their Obl

Kabuniyan. 4. Sat   osan algaw kanu,   abus
Kabuniyan   Loc,past one day   it is said only

kanul   lawa dit kupsit dit pagoy. 5. Maid kanu
it is said only Foc skin   Gen rice   none it is

    ud lusbak na. 6. Nu umoy   kanu,
said Foc husk   its   when go,nonpast,SF it is said

dadit tagu, paamin   kanun
Foc,Pl people cause all,nonpast it is said,NFoc

1. The first people, it is said, did not plant rice.
2. Kabuniyan was the one from whom they went to get rice.
3. All people in former times went and got their rice from Kabuniyan.
4. Long ago there was only skin on the rice.
5. It had no husk.
6. When the people went, Kabuniyan had them remove all the skin of the rice and it did not grow.
7. And when the

Kabuniyan un pakaan   dit kupsit dit
Kabuniyan Lk cause remove,nonpast Foc skin   Gen

pagoy, ot adi na kanu   tumubu.   7. Ot
rice   and not it it is said grow,nonpast,SF   and

nu   manalan   kanu   dat tagu, aminona
when leave,nonpast,SF it is said Foc people all,nonpast,

    kanun   ilan   dit susulsulan
OF,he it is said, Lk look at,nonpast, OF Foc betel nut

    dadit   tagu.
masher Gen,Pl people

people left, he
searched the
betel nut
crushers of the
people.

8. Inggaw   sin algawan inggaw   pay osan tagu
   there is one day   there is also one   person

un anduandu kanu   dit kuku na. 9. Insukip
Lk long   it is said Foc nail his   insert,past,OF

na kanu   dit simbolas un pagoy sidit kuku na.
he it is said Foc one grain Lk rice   Loc   nail his

10. Adin kanun   Kabuniyan ud naila
    not it is said,NFoc Kabuniyan Lk see,past,OF

dit nailsukip   sit   kukun didit lalaki.
Foc insert,past,OF Loc,specific nail Gen   man

11. Dumatong   kanu   man   dit
    arrive, nonpast,SF it is said specific time Foc

lalaki sidit boloy da,   immula   na dit pagoy
man   Loc   house their plant,past,OF he Foc rice

un simbolas. 12. Tummubu   kanu   man
Lk one grain   grew,past,SF it is said specific time

diya   immula   na, namunga   ot liman
that,Foc plant,past,OF he fruit,past,SF and five

lugoy   kanu.   13. Imbos   na kanu
panicle it is said   repeat,past,OF he it is said

uman immula   ot umadu   kanuwon
again plant,past,OF and increase,nonpast,SF it is said

    dit pagoy. 14. Naiwalas   kanu
already Foc rice   distribute,past,stative it is

8. One day there
was a man with
long nails.
9. He inserted
one grain of rice
under his nail.
10. Kabuniyan
did not see the
hidden grain
under the man's
nail.
11. When the man
got to their
house, he planted
the one grain of
rice.
12. When what he
planted grew, it
bore fruit and
had five heads.
13. He planted
again and the
rice multiplied.
14. The rice was
distributed
little by little.
15. The rice
multiplied.
16. Kabuniyan
was surprised
because no one
came to get rice
from him.
17. But the rice
they planted had
husks even though

```
    dit pagoy un sin akikit.        15. Ummadu
said Foc rice  Lk one little by little increase,past,
```

it had not had
husks before--
perhaps it was
because he put
it under his
nail.

```
   kanuwon            dit pagoy.  16. Masdaaw
SF it is said already Foc rice          surprised,
```

```
              kanu        ut Kabuniyan ta
nonpast,stative it is said Foc Kabuniyan reason
```

```
maid imangala            ud si  pagoy kan siya.  17. Yoong
none go get,nonpast,SF Lk Obl rice  Obl him               but
```

```
sat pagoy un immula        da   nalusbakan
Top rice  Lk plant,past,OF they have husks,past,stative
```

```
dit pagoy, un maid lusbak na  kanu        yoong maipanggop
Foc rice   Lk none husk   its it is said but   because
```

```
nin   ta     inigga        na utdit kuku ha.
maybe reason place,past,OF he Loc   nail his
```

```
    18. Ilan            kanu       man
        see,nonpast,OF it is said specific time
```

18. When Kabuniyan
looked down upon
the earth, he saw
that there was
already much rice.

```
Kabuniyan utdit    isdungana              tun labaw
Kabuniyan Loc,past look down,nonpast,RF Foc top
```

```
ditun pita, adu  un pagoyon.  19. Nan-akaw       da
Gen   earth much Lk rice              stole,past,SF they
```

19. "So those
people stole some
rice!" he said.
20. Because
Kabuniyan was
angry, he threw
down a pair of
rats to eat the
rice.

```
gayam    dadin  kataguwan sidin pagoy, kanana
surprise Foc,Pl people    Obl   rice   say,nonpast,he
```

```
kanu.    20. Gapu    ta      nabegut            si
it is said   because reason angry,past,stative Foc
```

21. But he also
thought to pity
the people and
threw down a pair
of cats to eat
the rats.

```
Kabuniyan, inotdag           na kanu      dadit
Kabuniyan  throw down,past,OF he it is said Foc,Pl
```

```
man-asawa          un utut ta    dalapun mangkan
marry,nonpast,SF Lk rat  reason so that eat,nonpast,SF
```

22. He also threw
down a pair of
wild pigs to eat
the rice.

```
da   utdid pagoy.  21. Yoong nagasmok           na
they Obl   rice        but   think,past,stative he
```

23. Kabuniyan
thought to pity
the people and
threw down a pair
of dogs to eat
the wild pigs.

```
kanu       dit mangaasi          utd,dit kataguwan,
it is said Foc pity,nonpast,SF Obl,Pl  people
```

```
inotdag              na kanu      pay dadit man-asawa
threw down,past,OF he it is said also Foc,Pl marry,non-
```

```
         un kusa ta      dalapnu      kanon              24. Then those
past,SF Lk cat   reason in order that eat,nonpast,OF      are the animals
                                                          Kabuniyan gave
da    dadit utut.  22. Inotdag            na kanu         to the people
they  Foc,Pl rat       threw down,past,OF he it is said   on this earth.

pay dadit man-asawa          un laman    ta      dalapnu
also Foc,Pl marry,nonpast,SF Lk wild pig reason in order

     mangen          da    utdit pagcy.   23. Nasomsomok
that eat,nonpast,SF they Obl   rice            think,past,

        kanun            Kabuniyan dit mangaasi
stative it is said,NFoc Kabuniyan Foc pity,nonpast,SF

utdadit kataguwan, inotdag            na kanu          dadit
Obl, Pl people      throw down,past,OF he it is said Foc,Pl

man-asawa          un asu ta      dalapnu          mangan
marry,nonpast,SF Lk dog reason in order that     eat,nonpast,SF

da    utdadit babuy.  24. Kadon   siya       dadin
they Obl,Pl  wild pig     so then those,Top Foc,Pl,non narrative

kakkayap un intod      Kabuniyan utdadit kataguwan situn
animals  Lk give,past,OF Kabuniyan Obl,Pl  people     Loc

labaw ditun pita.
top   Gen   earth
```

```
25. Mansidiyon                      utdit     osan algaw     25. So then long
    specific time,then,already  Loc,past one   day           ago the people
                                                             already knew
tigammu         dat       kataguwan dit koon                 what to do.
know,nonpast,OF NFoc,Pl people     Foc do,nonpast,OF         26. They raised
                                                             cats to drive
daon.        26. Mantalkon        da   pay ud si             away the rats.
they,already     raise,nonpast,SF they also Lk Obl           27. They also
                                                             raised dogs to
kusa ta      man-addag            si  utut.                  drive away wild
cat   purpose drive away,nonpast,SF Obl rat                  pigs who ate
                                                             their plants.
27. Mantalakon        da   pay si asu ta      man-addag
    raise,nonpast,SF they also Obl dog purpose drive

         si laman    un mangan          sidadit
away,nonpast,SF Obl wild pig Lk eat,nonpast,SF Obl,Pl

mula  da.
plant their
```

Sentence Number	Focused Item				Tense
	Ancestors	Kabuniyan	Rice	Animals	
8					nonpast(orientation)
9			x		past
10			x		past
11			x		past
12			x		past
13			x		past
14			x		past
15			x		past
16		x			nonpast
17			x		past
18	x		x		nonpast
19	x				nonpast (quote)
20		x		x	past
21				x	past
22				x	past
23				x	past
24				x	past

Figure 1.   Chart showing tense and focus shifts in 'The beginning of the appearance of rice on this earth'.

One of the features of Limos Kalinga narrative discourse that is immediately apparent from Figure 1 is the past tense orientation of the body of the narrative. Equally obvious from an inspection of the text itself would be the nonpast orientation of the introduction and coda.

Of the four sentences in the body of the narrative in which nonpast tense is employed, two instances involve constructions that normally dictate the choice of nonpast. For such constructions nonpast tense is the norm and cannot be viewed as a marked or highlighting choice. Thus, Sentence 8 introduces the body of the narrative with the existential inggaw, a verb that only very rarely occurs in past tense and Sentence 19 introduces a direct quotation with a quote formula which is equally rare as a past tense construction.

This leaves Sentences 16 and 18 as constructions which in and of themselves could just as well be past as nonpast, and which in this environment are expected to appear in past tense. The shift to nonpast for these sentences represents an unexpected or marked choice, one that is used to lend special prominence to the events referred to. The fact that these sentences coincide with the onset of peak tension in the plot adds weight to this claim. The prominence afforded by nonpast

tense in Sentence 16 highlights a participant reaction which motivates the event in Sentence 18. The event in Sentence 18 precipitates the reaction from Kabuniyan that motivates much of the rest of the narrative. Both occur at points that foreshadow pivotal plot-related events.

Strictly speaking, Sentence 16 is portrayal of a participant reaction rather than an event. That such participant reactions would be past tense in narrative if not highlighted is born out by a study of a wider range of Kalinga narratives. Thus highlighting of this sort is not restricted to events in narrative alone.

Also apparent from Figure 1 is the fact that tense shifting for prominence coincides with the onset of focus shift. The expected or non marked choice of focused item in a narrative relating to rice is the one consistently made in Sentence 8 through 15. The focus choices made in Sentences 16 and 18 appear to reinforce the highlighting effect of choosing nonpast forms, and they certainly coincide nicely with the elevation of Kabuniyan and the Ancestors into climactic prominence within the events that follow. Departure from the unmarked choice of focused item coincides with the onset of overt conflict. It is as if the narrator were using his choice of focus and tense forms to tell the audience, "Watch out for what comes next."

4. Conclusion
    The expected norm for tense orientation in the body of the Limos Kalinga narrative is past tense and the expected norm for focus patterning is that the focus should remain constant on one participant grouping throughout a paragraph. As Callow states, "When the expected norm in fact occurs, the degree of prominence is small. However, if some unexpected element is given thematic position, then the intensity of prominence is much greater." (1974:51) There is a surprising degree of correlation in the Linimos narrative between the use of the unexpected choices in tense and focus on the one hand and the points of peak tension in the plot on the other, and it would appear that such choices constitute some of the principal devices available for achieving prominence. It appears, then, that an intelligent use of these devices could greatly enhance the communicative value of translated materials.

REFERENCES

Callow, Kathleen. 1974. Discourse considerations in translating the Word of God. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House.

Gieser, C.R. 1972. Kalinga sequential discourse, Philippine Journal of Linguistics, 3:1.15-33.

Johnston, E. Clay. ms. (1976) Cotabato Manobo first person narratives: major features of discourse and paragraph.

Levinsohn, Stephen. 1977. Preliminary observations on the use of the historic present in Mark, Notes on Translation No. 65, pp. 13-28.

Longacre, Robert E. 1968. Discourse, paragraph, and sentence structure in selected Philippine languages. 3 vols. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Final Report, Contract No. 0-8-062838-0391. ERIC Document No. ED 030 883, 4, 5. Also published as Philippine languages: discourse, paragraph, and sentence structure. Summer Institute of Linguistics Publications in Linguistics and Related Fields, No. 21. Santa Ana, California: S.I.L.

FOOTNOTES

[1]The dialect of Kalinga referred to in this paper as Linimos or Limos Kalinga is spoken by approximately 5,300 people living in eight barrios along the lower Saltan river in the municipality of Pinokpok and is one of several dialects of Kalinga spoken in the province of Kalinga-Apayao in northern Luzon. The author wishes to acknowledge with thanks the comments and suggestions of Austin Hale.

[2]The idea that tense shift is related to highlighting has been noted earlier by Hazel Wrigglesworth in her work on Ilianen Manobo folktales. This phenomenon might have gone unnoticed were it not for her insights into the working of that Philippine language. After this paper was written it came to our attention that Levinsohn (1977) reported a related phenomenon in Koiné Greek. He states:
> "The present article seeks to show that, when an event is described in the present tense, it establishes the direction and gives prominence to the following action(s), which in turn "build upon" that event in some way (Section 1). In Mark's Gospel, this has the effect of highlighting certain episodes and themes, in what is basically a narrative presentation (Section 2)." (1977:13)