

XAVANTE MORPHOLOGY AND RESPECT/INTIMACY RELATIONSHIPS

ALEC J. HARRISON

0. Introduction

In most, if not all societies, social variables such as relative status and degree of intimacy are expressed in speech by means of "honorific" and "endearment" terms (e.g. "your honor" and "daddy" in English, respectively). Less common are languages like Koya (Tyler 1965), Japanese (Prideaux 1970), and other Southeast Asian languages in which honorific/endearment forms are woven into the core of the grammar. Various social relationships are distinguished by specific forms in the morphology. Although social distinctions such as degree of political power and status in a community are reflected in the grammar of these languages, it is within the domain of kinship that this phenomenon is most fully developed.

In Xavante,¹ in addition to the use of endearment terms, certain respect/intimacy relationships are reflected in the morphology by means of existing features (such as the third person and generic grammatical forms for direct address), and by unique morphemes not otherwise utilized in the morphology. These relationships include not only those within the realm of kinship, but of individuals with unique roles in the society as well.

This phenomenon, in which honorific or respect relationships are reflected in the grammar of a language, has scarcely been documented among Amazonian languages. The Bakairí people of central Brazil utilize a pluralizing morpheme when indirectly addressing certain in-laws.² In a study of letters written by the Mbyá Guarani of southern Brazil, Dooley 1983 shows that terms of spatial deixis are used differently than they are in normal conversation. The sender, if he so chooses to operate in a deferential mode with respect to the addressee (due to age difference or other factors), takes the addressee's position as spatial base. The Asuriní of the Tocantins river use forms which appear to have some honorific flavor. The prefix *mi-* and a suffix *-ke* occur with terms for relatives of the ascending generation (father, mother, grandfather, grandmother).³ Yet none of these or other documented accounts of honorific reference among Amazonian languages appear to compare in complexity to the Xavante system.

The purpose of this paper is to discuss how patterns of social behavior correlate with features of Xavante morphology. After a brief discussion of background data regarding social patterns of behavior, general features of Xavante morphology relevant to the topic will be outlined, followed by a description of the respect/intimacy forms as reflected in the morphology. Finally, it will be shown that there is a direct correlation between the degree of respect and the kind of forms utilized.

1. Patterns of Social Behavior

Of all the possible combinations of relationships, societies tend to choose a limited number of those relationships as being more central or crucial. In Xavante society, the relationships viewed to be of fundamental importance are precisely the ones expressed in the morphology.⁴

1.1 Child–Parent

The relationship of a child to his/her parents⁵ is one of intimacy as an infant, becoming one of respect as the child matures. An obedient son seeks his father's counsel and respects his opinion. A boy will begin using the respect/intimacy grammatical forms in his speech to his parents at the time his ears are pierced (as part of the initiation rites), and a girl when she has her first child. These grammatical forms will continue to be used during their entire adult life. If an individual purposely wants to show disrespect to his parents, he simply does not use the respect/intimacy forms. Traditionally this was considered very disgraceful behavior.⁶ Parents would scold and shame their children if they didn't use the appropriate forms while addressing them.

1.2 Grandchild–Grandparent

Grandparents and grandchildren have a relationship of extreme intimacy. They can be seen together constantly, especially once a child is old enough to not need his mother's constant care. According to Maybury-Lewis (1967:222), "... the relationship is thought of as one of affectionate indulgence on the part of the grandparent and privileged familiarity on the part of the grandchild." Children can frequently be seen walking across the village at dusk to spend the night close to their grandparents. When the grandparents become too old to go to the fields, often the grandchild will stay with them while the child's parents go off to work. Before a grandchild is even born, the grandmother will begin asking questions about the baby using the respect/intimacy forms. As with the child—parent relationship, the child will begin using the forms only after having had his ears pierced (if a boy), and after the first child is born (if a girl). Grandchildren are also expected to respect and listen to the advice of their grandparents.

1.3 In-laws

Perhaps the most central and crucial relationship in Xavante society is that of son-in-law—parents-in-law, especially that of son-in-law—father-in-law. When a young man marries, he moves into his in-laws' house. At this point he must accept his father-in-law as head of the household, and treat him with utmost respect. He is obliged to work for him in his fields and in general is subservient to him. During this potentially volatile transitional phase, the son-in-law avoids making eye contact with or speaking to either of his parents-in-law unless absolutely necessary, and usually communicates by using his wife or, less commonly, someone else as a liaison. At those times when he must speak to them, he employs the respect forms. Curiously, the father-in-law rarely speaks directly to his son-in-law as well, despite the fact that he is in a position of authority over him. Again, when

direct communication is necessary, he also utilizes the respect forms.⁷ Perhaps this serves to emphasize the extreme volatility of the relationship. Avoiding direct address at all costs enables those involved to avoid direct confrontation and the possibility of the severing of the relationship. As the relationship is stabilized and the son-in-law matures, the speech taboo is utilized less and less as a form of avoidance behavior. Nevertheless, the honorific grammatical forms continue to be used by the in-laws to call attention to and encode their relationship.

For girls, the above phenomenon involving men which so strongly characterizes Xavante culture is rarely exhibited. A young married girl has little direct contact with her father-in-law, and although she may frequently visit her mother-in-law, the relationship is usually anything but tense.⁸ Nevertheless, a mother or father-in-law will use the honorific forms to address a son's wife.

1.4 *Dasiwasini*

Xavante marriages are traditionally arranged years in advance by the parents. Once two sets of parents agree on a match-up, they enter into a special kind of relationship of mutual respect and concern. They become *dasiwasini* to each other, and begin using respect forms when speaking to each other.

1.5 *A'ama*

A very limited number of Xavante men called *a'ama* fulfill a special role in the community. These men learn an alternate set of vocabulary for hundreds of words (mostly nouns), all of which are modified forms of the original word, and all beginning with /ai-/. When a young man wants to become an *a'ama*, an older *a'ama* trains him for several months, teaching him the new vocabulary. When he is finished, the young man has acquired special knowledge, thus taking on a new status. From this point forward, male members of his clan speak to him using a unique set of morphological forms not otherwise employed in normal conversation.

1.6 *Sõ'rebzu'wa*

A Xavante uncle enjoys a special kind of relationship with his sister's children, especially her daughters. When a girl is still quite young, any uncle (mother's brother) can decide he wants to become his niece's *sõ'rebzu'wa*. At that point the girl goes to her uncle's house, where he paints her body with red *urucú* and places a special cotton cord around her neck. This symbolizes their close ties of affection, and serves as a constant reminder of the bond between them, and of his responsibility to guide and counsel her throughout her entire life. At the occasion of her marriage ceremony, he again places the cotton neck-collar on her body, thus reaffirming their special relationship. After the girl's first child, she will start calling her *sõ'rebzu'wa* as *ĩmama* 'my father', and not surprisingly, will begin using the corresponding honorific forms. Curiously, the girl's husband follows suit by using the same honorific forms with his wife's *sõ'rezu'wa* as a man does with his parents-in-law.

1.7 Classification of Social Relationships

In Table I we see that all of these relationships can be classified according to the kind of behavior and the direction of the behavior (as shown by the arrows). Later it will be shown that the grammatical forms used to express these key social relationships correspond with these four categories.

Table I. Classification of Behavior Types with Relationships

<u>Behavior</u>	<u>Relationship</u>		
A. Intimacy	Grandchild	<=> Grandparent	Kin
	Child	<=> Parent	"
	Niece	<=> Uncle (MB)	"
Respect	Grandchild	=> Grandparent	"
	Child	=> Parent	"
B. Respect (to higher status)	Son-in-law	=> Parents-in-law	Affine
	Husband	=> Wife's <i>sõ'rebzu'wa</i>	"
C. Respect (to lower or equal status)	Son-in-law	<= Parents-in-law	"
	Parents of husband-to-be	<=> Parents of wife-to-be (<i>dasiwasini</i>)	"
D. Respect	Clan member	=> <i>A'ama</i>	Clan/Kin

2. General Features of Xavante Morphology

In this section, only features of the morphology relevant to the topic will be reviewed. As was previously mentioned, several standard grammatical forms are utilized as respect/intimacy forms, namely that of third person reference and generic reference.

2.1 Person Proclitics

The core of the Xavante clause is a predicate complex beginning with person proclitics (Burgess 1986:28), followed by the verb, and ending with various person-number, aspect and modal morphemes, and other modifiers.⁹

The person proclitics relevant to the current discussion are *te* 'non first person', *te-te* 'transitive third person (low-transitivity)', and *da-te* 'transitive generic reference (low-transitivity)',¹⁰ illustrated in the following examples:

- (1) *Buru u te ø-mo.*
 fields to N1 3-go.SG
 He is going to the fields.
- (2) *Awẽpsi te za ai-pawaptob za'ra.*
 tomorrow N1 FUT 2 -help PL
 Tomorrow they will help you.
- (3) *Te-te¹¹ rom-huri za'ra ð di.*
 3-LTR earth-eat(work) PL NEG STAT
 They aren't/weren't working.
- (4) *Uzâ te oto da-te 're pré za'ra.*
 fire N1 now GEN-LTR IMPERF make.fire PL
 Now people (habitually) make fires.

Da-te denotes an unspecified group of people, or mankind in general, as in (4). The low-transitivity proclitics occur with transitive verbs only, whereas *te* occurs with both transitive and intransitive verbs, as in (1) and (2).

2.2 Person Prefixes

The third person prefixes *ø* (zero morpheme) and *da-* 'generic' "double" as respect-intimacy forms. The normal usage is illustrated in the first clause of (5) and (6) respectively.

- (5) *øMorĩ wamhã, te tã-ma rowasu'u.*
 3-go when N1 3 -to talk
 When he went, he talked to him.
- (6) *Da-saihuri wamhã, da-ma rowẽ di.*
 GEN-eat when GEN-to good STAT
 When people eat, they're happy.
- (7) *Te-te da-zabu da, te mo, ã-dub'rada hã.*
 3-LTR GEN-see PURP N1 go 3-o.brother FOC
 His older brother went to see the people.

Person prefixes also occur with postpositionals (*tã-* 'third person' in (5), and *da-* 'generic' in the second clause of (6)), function as possessives (*ã-* 'third person' in (7)), and when prefixed to a transitive verb agree with the object (*da-* 'generic' in (7)).¹² Notice that the three 'third person' prefixes in (5) and (7) are all different forms: *ø* *tã*, and *ã*; the choice of prefix being conditioned by grammatical role ('intransitive subject' (absolutive), 'indirect object', and 'possessive' respectively).

2.3 ‘Nonreferential Subject’ Postverbal Morpheme

The ‘nonreferential subject’ postverbal morpheme *ni* occurs in both transitive and intransitive clauses. With transitive clauses, semantically it functions similarly to a non-AGENTIVE passive (Xavante has no true passive), in which the speaker does not have a specific performer of the action in mind, as in (8).

- (8) *Ma ø-wĩrĩ ni.*
N1.PST 3-kill NREF.S
Someone (unknown/unidentified) killed him.

The person prefix *da-* ‘generic’ (see section 2.2) is commonly used in conjunction with *ni* ‘nonreferential subject’ in both transitive (9) and intransitive (10) clauses.

- (9) *Ma tō da-siwi ø-azâri ni.*
N1.PST CERT GEN-COLL 3-hit NREF.S
People (unspecified group) collectively beat him up.

- (10) *Da-'ahâ na, te ta¹³-ry'ry ni.*
GEN-a.lot REF N1 GEN-mourn NREF.S
Lots of people are mourning.

If the speaker wishes to make reference to a specific group of people, *da-* and *ni* would simply be omitted from (9) and (10), as follows:

- (11) *Ma tō ø-siwi ø-azâ.*
N1.PST CERT 3-COLL 3-hit
They beat him up.

- (12) *Ahâ na te ti-ry'ry.*
a.lot REF N1 3.CLM-mourn
There are a lot of them (specific) mourning.

As will be demonstrated in the next section, the features of Xavante morphology discussed above play an important part in distinguishing respect/intimacy relationships.

3. Respect/Intimacy Forms

From Table I we observe that the respect/intimacy relationships can be categorized into four groups; those that are characterized by mutual intimacy but unidirectional respect (Category A), those that are distinguished by respect to one of higher status (Category B), those that are characterized by respect for someone of equal or lower status (Category C), and finally those which are characterized by respect for someone who plays a unique role in the society at large (Category D).

In Table II we see that there is a direct correlation between the categorization of these relationships and the grammatical forms used. For example, a granddaughter and a daughter (Category A) will use the same grammatical forms to refer to their grandmother and mother, respectively. Notice also that there is one case of overlap, in which Categories A and B both make use of the generic reference in signaling respect/intimacy relationships.

Table II. Correlation between respect-intimacy categories and grammatical forms used.

RELATIONSHIP REF	TRANSITIVE DEP	CLAUSES INDEP	INTRANS. DEP	CLAUSES INDEP	GRAM. FORM
A. DA ¹⁴	a-te VERB	VERB-ni	a- VERB	a- VERB ni	unique
RF ¹⁵ B. DA RF	da-te VERB	VERB ni	da- VERB	ta- VERB ni	generic
C. DA	te-te VERB	te VERB	ø VERB		3 rd p.
D. DA	ã-te VERB	ã-te VERB	ã- VERB		unique

3.1 Relationships of Intimacy and Respect

In Category A relationships (which are based on a mutual feeling of intimacy with a certain degree of respect from an individual to his/her parents or grandparents) second person reference (direct address) represents only a slight deviation from the standard second person prefix (*ai-* to *a-*). In the grandparent-grandchild relationship, the use of these forms in relating to each other is extremely important. In the following example, a grandmother calls for her grandson:

- (13) *Bâdi*,¹⁶ *we* *a-watobro*, *te* *a -'õno* *da*.
 gr.son.ENDR toward 2.RES-exit.SG 1SG.LTR 2.RES-delouse PURP
 My grandson, come out here so I can delouse you.

In (14) a grandfather, sensing that his grandson is unhappy, asks:

- (14) *Bâdi*, *e* *ma* *tô* *a-wa'a* *ni*.
 gr.son.ENDR QW N1.PST CERT 2.RES-lazy/tired INDEF.S
 My grandson, have you become tired (of being here)?

The following example illustrates the use of both direct and referential address as a boy asks a favor of his grandfather for the benefit of his grandmother:

(15) *ĩ* -'radare, *ãhã, òme a-te*
 1SG-gr.father.ENDR here there 2.RES-LTR

sãrĩ -re na, apâsi da-te 'rêne da.
 put.down-DIM IMP later GEN-LTR eat PURP
 Grandfather, here, put this over there for (grandmother) to eat later.

The examples (13)-(15) above illustrate that the relationship grandparent—grandchild is indeed characterized by a mutual feeling of intimacy, as both the grandchild and the grandparent use the respect/intimacy forms when speaking to or referring to the other.

Such is not the case with the child—parent relationship, as in example (16).. Although there is a mutual feeling of intimacy, only the child utilizes the respect/intimacy forms in reference to his parents. The parent will use the standard grammatical forms when addressing or referring to his or her child. Perhaps this distinction serves to emphasize that, although similar, the relationship is not exactly the same as that of grandparent—grandchild. As in Western societies, the grandparent role tends to be much less of an authority role than that of the parent.

In the following example, in telling of a hunting trip, a man describes how he met up with his father on the trail:

(16a) *Tame ma tô ã-mama hã ã-'uzusire ni.*
 there N1.PST CERT 1SG-father FOC 1SG-meet NREF.S
 And there my father (nonreferential subject) met up with me.

(16b) *Abahi zô te da-nhihudu norĩ da-te simro.*
 fruit for N1 GEN-grandchild group GEN-LTR take/lead
 He (my father) was taking his grandchildren to get some *abahi* fruit.
 (The normal translation of this sentence would be "The (group of unspecified) people took their grandchildren to get some *abahi* fruit.")

The example (16b) illustrates the fact that an utterance can be ambiguous as to its person reference. If in (16a) the teller of the story had left out the word *ãmama*, then the two sentences could have been interpreted as referring to a large group of people. For this reason a Xavante will often start out a conversation by including the appropriate endearment term in order to clue the listener.

3.2 Relationship of Respect to a Higher Status

As has been stated, the relationship of son-in-law to his in-laws (Category B) is the most critical, and hence, most strained relationship in Xavante society. Much effort is made to maintain the proper level of extreme respect, the result of which is a very distant, reserved relationship. Perhaps this explains why only a son-in-law will utilize the 'generic' grammatical forms with his in-laws in both direct **and** referential address. This is, in essence, the most remote or indirect way one could speak to or about someone using

a standard grammatical form, the linguistic equivalent to the diverted gaze or some other kind of avoidance behavior. The following is an excerpt from a letter written by a man to his mother-in-law, urging her to come see him and the family:

- (17a) *We da-morĩ zei wamhã, te za we*
 towards GEN-go sweet if N1 FUT towards
ta-morĩ ni, da-'ra da-te 'madâ'â da.
 GEN-go NREF.S GEN-child GEN-LTR see PURP
 If one would like to come here, then surely one will, in order to see
 one's daughter.
- (17b) *Tawamhã te za wa-pawaptom ni, misi a'amo na.*
 then N1 FUT 1NSG-help NREF.S one month REF
 Then the person(s) can help us out for one month.

The fact that a husband will also employ these same honorific forms in relation to his wife's *sô'rebzu'wa* (see 1.6) supports the premise that what triggers the use of these forms is the necessity to encode verbally the direction and the degree of respect involved in a relationship, not the kinship relationship per se (a man's mother-in-law's brother is not his real father-in-law).

3.3 Relationship of Respect to Lower or Equal Status

Category C (where the relationship is one of respect to a person of lower or equal status) is perhaps the simplest to analyze in that second person (direct address) is signaled by the standard third person forms, instead of the second person forms. This is, in essence, a form of indirect speech, a way of speaking to someone without addressing him directly (as is 3.2 above). This device was used in Biblical times in what Jewett (1993:6) calls 'deference to royalty'. In Esther 5:4, in a direct response to the king's question, Esther says **to him**, "If it pleases the king...let the king, together with Haman, come today to a banquet I have prepared **for him**" [NIV]. In the Xavante context, a typical conversation between a man and his son-in-law (although infrequent) might go something like this:

- (18a) *ĩ-za'õmo, e momo te ø-mo.*
 1SG-son-in-law QW where N1 3-go.SG
 My son-in-law, where is he going?
- (18b) *Õwa wa mo, wede te 'ma-tari da.*
 there 1 go.SG wood 1SG.LTR INDEF-cut PURP
 I'm going over there to cut some wood.
- (18c) *E niwa te za we ø-wi.*
 QW when N1 FUT towards 3-arrive.SG
 When is he going to return?

- (18d) *Ã bâta na wa za we wi, apâ.*
 this day on 1 FUT towards arrive.SG return
 I will return today.

This kind of relationship (of parents-in-law to son-in-law and *dasiwasini* to each other) is more formal than those of Category A, yet not so strained as those of Category B.

3.4 Relationships of Respect to One with a Unique Role

The special respect relationship of men to an *a'ama* of the same clan (Category D) is expressed by a unique (non-standard) grammatical form (*ã-*) in direct address:

- (19) *E õwa ã-morĩ õ di za.*
 QW there 2.RES-go.SG NEG STAT FUT
 Are you (a'ama) not going there?

- (20) *A'amo norĩ, ã-te ã-ma sõmri.*
 a'ama. ENDR 2.RES-LTR 1SG-to give
A'amo norĩ, please give it to me.

3.5 "Less Constrained vs. More Constrained" Continuum

By observing the characteristics of these prominent relationships in Xavante society, we can propose a correlation between the degree of "strain" or "obligation" in a relationship, and the kind of morphological forms used to signal these relationships. The less strained a relationship, the more unique the forms. The more strained a relationship, the more the tendency to use vague forms.

Relationship	Less Constrained -----> More Constrained			
Gram. forms	Unique		Vague	
Relation	Kin		Affine	
Category	D	A	C	B

Of the 4 categories of relationships discussed in this paper, a man's relationship to an *a'ama* (Category D) of the same clan is definitely the least strained, in that there is little social obligation involved, other than to esteem one's *a'ama* for his extra knowledge. This relationship is verbalized by using a **totally** unique (non-standard) grammatical form (*ã-/ã-te*). The use of this totally unique form, always an attention getter when heard in the village, serves to emphasize the uninhibited nature of this unique relationship in Xavante society.

The relationship of grandchild—grandparent and child—parent (Category A) is slightly more strained in that the child has certain obligations to his relatives of ascending generation, mainly to respect them and listen to their advice. In this case, the forms used to grammaticalize these relationships for direct address (second person) are unique, but only slightly so, in that (*a-*) represents only a minor deviation from the standard second person prefix form (*ai-*).

More strained than any of the above kin relationships are those relating to one's affine (Categories B and C). But once again, a man's relationship to his son-in-law is certainly less strained than the son-in-law's to him, as he has less of a social obligation to behave in a specific manner. The heaviest "burden" of social obligation and accountability falls on the son-in-law. This distinction between levels of strain in affine relationships is also preserved by the usage of different morphemes. The use of standard third person forms to signal second person (direct address) is fairly common in languages as a means of indirectly addressing someone. This deviation from second to third person is certainly more vague than the slight modification of the standard second person form (*ai-* to *a-*) in Category A relationships. But the utilization of the 'generic' forms by a son-in-law with his in-laws (Category B) in *both* direct *and* referential address can certainly be considered even more vague than standard third person, which again serves to emphasize the saliency of this relationship.

4. Conclusion

As in all societies, Xavante society identifies certain relationships as more prominent than others in terms of function in the community. If the community is to function as it should, the expected behavior for each one of these relationships must be preserved. The use of respect/intimacy forms in the morphology (along with endearment terms) helps to reinforce and sustain these relationships. By employing the respect/intimacy forms, the Xavante recognize and accept their social responsibility. This constitutes but one more interesting additional distinction found in language.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Xavante is classified by Irvine Davis (1966:45) as belonging to the Ge linguistic family, and is spoken by approximately 8500 people living on six indigenous reservations in the state of Mato Grosso, Brazil. All research for this paper was done in the Culuene dialect area. Alternate English spellings for Xavante include **Chavante** and **Shavante**. I wish to thank the following people for helpful comments on this paper: Des Derbyshire, Bob Dooley, Cheryl Jensen, Isabel Murphy, and Fran Popovich.

² Data from Betty Camp.

³ Data from Carl Harrison.

⁴ Respect forms are known to be used in a number of other social contexts, but for the sake of brevity will not be included in this discussion.

⁵ 'Parent' is defined as one's father, mother, and paternal uncles and aunts. In Maybury-Lewis 1967:214, Xavante is stated as having a Dakota-type kinship system.

⁶ I say *traditionally* because the use of the respect/intimacy forms seems to be dying out, especially as concerns the child-parent relationship.

⁷ The grammatical forms used by the father-in-law are different from those used by the son-in-law (Sect. 3.2).

⁸ See Graham 1995:73 for a more detailed analysis of this social relationship.

⁹ See McLeod 1980 for a more complete analysis of Xavante morphology, and McLeod 1974:56-69 for a detailed discussion of Xavante person proclitics.

¹⁰ Proclitics glossed **LTR** 'low transitivity' are found in dependent, negative, and imperative clauses, relative clauses, and clauses with imperfective aspect. All of the above constructions express a lower level of transitivity (the effectiveness with which the action takes place) than independent indicative clauses. See Hopper 1980 for a detailed treatment of the concept of varying degrees of transitivity.

¹¹ All Xavante text is in the current orthography, with the exception of the proclitics *te te* and *da te*, which, for the sake of clarity in the current discussion, are being written as *te-te* and *da-te*.

¹² The verbal person prefixes exhibit the characteristics of an ergative system; that is, the same person prefixes are used for the subject of intransitive verbs and the object of transitive verbs.

¹³ *ta-* is an allomorph of *da-*.

¹⁴ DA - Direct Address (second person).

¹⁵ RF - Reference, talking to someone about someone else (third person).

¹⁶ The Xavante have endearment terms for each one of the relationships in Categories A-D.

XAVANTE GLOSS ABBREVIATIONS

1	FIRST PERSON
2	SECOND PERSON
3	THIRD PERSON
CERT	CERTAIN (commonly express "completed action")
CLM	CLASS MARKER
COLL	COLLECTIVE
DIM	DIMINUTIVE
DO	DIRECT OBJECT
DU	DUAL
EMPH	EMPHASIS
ENDR	ENDEARMENT TERM
FUT	FUTURE
GEN	GENERIC "people, mankind"
GRP	GROUP
IMFUT	IMMEDIATE FUTURE
IMP	IMPERATIVE
IMPERF	IMPERFECTIVE (most commonly habitual, also continuative)
INDEF	INDEFINITE
INTR	INTRANSITIVE
LOC	LOCATION
LTR	LOW TRANSITIVITY
MAL	MALEFACTIVE
N1	NON-FIRST PERSON "second or third person"
NEG	NEGATIVE
NREF	NON-REFERENCIAL
NSG	NON-SINGULAR "dual or plural"
O	OBJECT
PCL	PROCLITIC (always begins transitive verb phrase)
PL	PLURAL
POSS	POSSESSION
PRO	PRONOUN
PST	PAST
PURP	PURPOSE
QW	QUESTION WORD (begins every question)
REF	REFERENCE "in reference to, about, concerning, on"
REFL	REFLEXIVE/RECIPROCAL
REL	RELATIVE
REPET	REPETITIVE
RES	RESPECT/INTIMACY FORM
S	SUBJECT
SG	SINGULAR
STAT	STATIVE
TR	TRANSITIVE

REFERENCES

- Burgess, Eunice. 1986. 'Focus and Topic in Xavante.' in Joseph E. Grimes (ed.), *Sentence Initial Devices*, 27-41. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics and University of Texas at Arlington.
- Davis, Irvine. 1968. 'Some Macro-Jê Relationships.' *International Journal of American Linguistics* Vol.34, No.1. 43-47.
- Dooley, Robert. 'Spatial deixis in Guarani.' in *Ciência e Cultura*, 35(9):1243-1250, September, 1983. SBPC, São Paulo, Brazil.
- Edwards, A.D. 1981. *Language in Culture and Class: The Sociology of Language and Education*. London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd..
- Fishman, Joshua A. (ed.). 1971. *Advances in the Sociology of Language - I. Basic Concepts, Theories and Problems: Alternative Approaches*. Mouton & Co., The Hague.
- Hopper, Paul J. and Sandra A. Thompson. 1980. 'Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse.' *Language* 56.2:251-299.
- Graham, Laura R. 1995. *Performing Dreams: Discourses of Immortality among the Xavante of Central Brazil*. University of Texas Press, Austin.
- Hymes, Dell. 1974. *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Jewett, Dwight. 1993. 'Letters to the editor.' *Notes on Linguistics* 62:05-09. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Lyons, John. 1968. *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maybury-Lewis, David. 1967. *Akwẽ-Shavante Society*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- McLeod, Ruth. 1974. 'Paragraph, Aspect and Participant in Xavante.' *Linguistics* 132. 51-74.
- McLeod, Ruth and Valerie Mitchell. 1980. *Aspectos da língua Xavante*. Brasília: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Prideaux, Gary Dean. 1970. *The Syntax of Japanese Honorifics*. The Hague: Mouton.

Siegel, James T. 1986. *Solo in the New Order: Language and Hierarchy in an Indonesian City*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Tyler, Stephen A. 1965. 'Koya Language Morphology and Patterns of Kinship Behavior.' *American Anthropologist* 67. 1428-1440.