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Mundurukú Discourse

Margaret Sheffler

Abstract

Mundurukú discourse contains two major kinds of content, here labelled primary and secondary. Primary content must be distinguished from secondary in order to understand (1) reference, (2) the internal structure and length of the lexemic spans here labelled paragraphs, episodes, and chapters, and (3) the way in which lexemic organization differs from sememic organization.

Primary content consists of an event sequence that reports the progress of specific agents toward the attainment of their stated targets. Within this event, sequence change of targets is signalled at the beginning of each episode. The events themselves are in the foreground of the narrative. Their predication in primary content is itself a type of focus. Primary content has its own reference system that identifies participants, indicates target relationships, and links events. Secondary content consists of descriptions, explanations, conclusions, and summaries of primary events and the included participants. It provides the background against which the narrative is told.

Mundurukú discourse contains two major kinds of content, here labelled primary and secondary. Primary content must be distinguished from secondary in order to understand (1) reference, (2) the internal structure and length of the lexemic spans

---

1Mundurukú is classified by McQuown, and also by Rodrigues, as a Tupi language. It is spoken by about 1500 inhabitants of the upper Tapajós River and its tributaries of Das Tropas, Cabitutú, Cadiriri, Cururú, and São Manoel in the state of Pará, Brazil. An estimated 25 to 30 of these Mundurukú speak Portuguese. Another 350 or so Mundurukú live further north and on the Canumá River in the state of Amazonas. They speak Portuguese in their homes and only six or eight adults still speak the tribal language.

Field work was carried out between July 1964 and March 1969 under the auspices of the Summer Institute of Linguistics in accordance with a contract with the Museu Nacional do Rio de Janeiro. Brief periods were spent with the Canumá River group and with the Cururú River group. The bulk of the field work, however, was done in the savannah villages near the Cadiriri River, where the author has spent about two years in residence. This paper is based on texts from both the Cururú and the savannah areas. I am indebted to my colleague, Marjorie Crofts, who transcribed the tapes and made the transcriptions available to me. In the study, use was also made of a concordance of Mundurukú text materials made on the IBM 1410 computer at the University of Oklahoma by the Linguistic Information and the University of Oklahoma Research Institute, sponsored by Grant GS-270 of the National Science Foundation. The basic discourse analysis was done at a linguistic workshop at the Summer Institute of Linguistics conducted by Joseph E. Grimes at the University of Oklahoma in 1969.

I am also indebted to the Franciscan Mission of the Cururú River for hospitality extended to us when in their area, and to the Serviço de Proteção aos Indios for permission to live among the Indians. I am grateful to Joseph E. Grimes, David Bendor-Samuel, and Mr. and Mrs. Robert Meader, all colleagues in the Summer Institute of Linguistics, for their suggestions.

Mundurukú has 17 consonantal phonemes: voiceless stops p, t, c (alveopalatal), k, and 1 (glottal stop); voiced stops b, d, and j (alveopalatal); f, x (alveopalatal), and h (glottal); nasals m, n, and g (velar), which are simple nasals following nasal vowels and stop-nasal sequences following oral vowels; w, r, and y. The vowels occur orally and nasalized; i, u (high mid
here labelled paragraphs, episodes, and chapters, and (3) the way in which lexemic organization differs from sememic organization.

Paragraphs, episodes, and chapters are viewed in this paper as lexemic spans in the discourse, following Cromack (1968). A discourse consists of one or more chapters produced end to end in linear fashion. Each chapter, in turn, consists of several episodes, five being the smallest number found in a chapter to date. Each episode consists of one or more paragraphs. Different kinds of phenomena mark each kind of linear span.

A discourse topic may optionally be stated at the beginning of a discourse. In compound discourses, the beginning of each component discourse is signalled by stating a discourse topic, and under these conditions the stating of the discourse topic is obligatory.

Primary content reports the progress of specific agents toward stated targets or goals and the impeding or promoting of that progress by other participants. (The term target is used to avoid confusing the use of 'goal' for a grammatical object with the use of 'goal' for the end point of a trajectory in space. Mundurukù clause grammar distinguishes grammatical objects from end points (Crofts ms.), but Mundurukù discourse treats them alike.) Changes in setting, target, or plot structure that are specifically reported in primary content give the basis for determining the respective lexemic spans of paragraph, episode, and chapter.

The sememic organization of a narrative distinguishes orientation, complication, resolution, evaluation, and coda phases that are mapped on to only the final lexemic chapter of the discourse. Such a means of segmenting the discourse departs somewhat from Gleason’s (1968) suggestion that “the chain of events” forms “the backbone of a narrative and . . . controls its overall organization”. Attendant circumstances such as setting in time would not determine sememic spans, if I understand his position correctly, but I find it more congenial to treat such things as part of an orientation phase in Labov and Waletzky’s (1967) sense and to distinguish evaluation and coda information from the complication-resolution sequence, which is what corresponds in the main to Gleason’s chain of events.

The structure of the discourse in terms of lexemic spans based upon primary content does not necessarily correspond in a simple way to the sememic phases of the discourse. Event elements of the complication-resolution sequence, for example, are obligatorily realized in primary content. Change in the target towards which these event elements are directed, or in the setting in which these events occur, or in the underlying conflict from which they spring is reflected by the division of the narrative into the lexical spans mentioned earlier. On the other hand, identification and characterization information about participants that is essential to the compli-

unrounded), o (which phonetically ranges from u to o), e, and a. Each syllable occurs with high, mid, or low pitch, or with laryngealization. Neither pitch nor laryngealization is symbolized in the practical orthography, except that low pitch is written as ‘ı’ in inflected verb forms in the third person where it is essential for the differentiation of third from first person. Mundurukù phonology is described more fully by Ilse Braun and Marjorie Crofts: Mundurukù Phonology, Anthropological Linguistics 7:7.23–29 (1965).
cation and resolution of the narrative may be given in either primary or secondary content as far as the lexemic organization is concerned. Orientation, evaluation, and coda phases likewise may be given in either primary or secondary content.

Primary content, as already stated, consists of an event sequence that reports the progress of specific agents toward the attainment of their stated targets. Within this event sequence, change of targets is signalled at the beginning of each episode. The events themselves are in the foreground of the narrative. Their predication in primary content is itself a type of focus (Cromack 1968).

Primary content has its own reference system that identifies participants, indicates target relationships, and links events. This system is contrasted with the secondary reference system later in this paper. A fuller description of both systems and of Mundurukú discourse participants is planned for a forthcoming paper.

Secondary content consists of descriptions, explanations, conclusions, and summaries of primary events and the included participants. It provides the background against which the narrative is told. Elements that never enter into primary content may be included in secondary content for background purposes. Secondary content has a reference system different from the primary system. It refers to participants, targets, and events previously mentioned in primary content and references the other elements included in secondary content for background purposes.

The following lexemic episode exemplifies the occurrence of both primary and secondary content in the same span of discourse.

(1) ġebuje ikeyu o'jup. ka'wi o'jajat ip. wuynôm o'jajat ip. o'gupirâ ip. wuyjeyûm e'guğêge ip. ayacayûm o'e. tayxiyûm o'e. ġasup ta pên ace'e? ie iê'em. (Then they went-back. Earth got they. Mud got they. It-kneaded they. People were-making they. Women became. Wives became. Now what let's do? I-don't-know he-says.): 'They went back and got mud and kneaded it and made people. [These people] became women. They became their wives. 'Now what shall we do?' 'I don't know,' he said.' In (1) the episode introducer /ġebuje/ fills a time slot as far as the simple grammatical sentence (Crofts ms.) /ġebuje ikeyu o'jup/ then they went back is concerned, but it also introduces a new episode (and by implication a new paragraph) by indicating that the following action in the primary content /o'jup/ they went back will be directed by the actor of the episode /ikeyu/ they toward a new target /ka'wi/ earth.

Targets are generally introduced in one of three ways. Here the target is a nominal in the first object slot following the episode introducer and preceding the primary event verb /o'jajat/ they got it.

The primary content in this episode is, They went back and got mud and kneaded it and made people. 'Now what shall we do?' 'I don't know,' he said. All these events are referred to by finite verb forms. The secondary content is /These people/ became women. They became their wives. This secondary content does not make use of finite verb forms, but uses the aspectual particle /o'e/ was, became instead.
Because there is no shift of setting within it, this episode consists of only one paragraph, which is divided grammatically into nine sentences as indicated by the periods in the transcription.\(^2\)

The chronological sequence cluster of events formed by /o'jup/ they went back /o'ja'kat/ they got it, /o'gupira/ they kneaded it, /o'gu'gegi/ they made them, is reflected in the free translation by the use of 'and'.

Sememic organization of information into phases, which Labov and Waletzky regard as underlying English narrative, is applicable to the underlying structure of Mundurukú narrative, but the phases are distributed differently. That is, English narrative evaluation phases come between the complication and the resolution, but Mundurukú evaluation phases follow the resolution. The Mundurukú evaluations thus offer no clue as to a division point between complication and resolution. For the major complication in the chapter, this point is set by the orientation phase in that the major complication has the same content as the abstract that is part of the orientation. Anything that follows the part that corresponds to the abstract is therefore part of the resolution, unless the major complication was negatively resolved. In such cases the resolution phase is omitted.

The lexemic stratum can be contrasted with the sememic in two ways: (1) by comparing the primary content in the lexemic units with the primary content in the sememic phases and (2) by comparing the secondary content in the lexemic units with the secondary content in sememic phases.

A lexemic introduction to a discourse, for example, is a complete episode. As such it closes just before the next episode opens. The episode introducers /gebujej/ then /gasu/ now /geyjom/ later mark this division, or it may be marked by the target marker /kay/ toward. The sememic orientation phase which corresponds to a lexemic introduction does not close until by definition it has given time and place information as well as the actor and target relationships. Time, however, is sometimes not given until after the second lexemic episode opens. When time is not given until the second episode, the orientation phase of the discourse and its lexemic introduction are not coterminous.

A lexemic chapter, likewise, closes just before the next chapter begins. An episode that contains an abstract begins the new chapter. The sememic evaluation phase begins in the last episode of any lexemic chapter. The lexemic closure of the chapter may, however, include summary remarks that are orientational, in addition to the evaluation. These lay the groundwork for the orientation of the audience to the lexemic chapter to follow. Lexemically, this chapter does not end until the episode that contains the summary has ended. The new chapter does not begin without the lexemic marking of a new episode by the identification of a new target. Sememically, the old chapter content ends with the evaluation statement, and the new chapter

---

\(^2\)Crofts considers the nine sentences together as a series sentence and cites intonational evidence for considering them as a unit. She says, "The series sentence has the structure +Cl +Cl +/- Cl\(^a\) + intonation, in which clauses (Cl) are a series of simple clauses linked together by rising intonation at the end of each nonfinal clause (raising to tone 1 or higher) and by falling intonation on the last clause."
content begins with summary remarks that foreshadow the next orientation phase. The evaluation phase of the earlier chapter and the lexemic closer of its last episode are not coterminous in such cases.

Lexemic episodes open with the marking of a new target and continue until a different target is designated. It is possible for a lexemic episode to begin after a complication phase has already started and to end, although the complication phase continues, indicating that lexemic episodes and sememic phases are not coterminous.

The sememic organization of the discourse into phases is thus not in one to one correlation with the lexemic span of chapters, episodes, and paragraphs. The sememic organization of the discourse information and the lexemic organization of the discourse units represent, instead, two organizations on two different strata (Gleason 1964, Lamb 1966).

Sememic phases, as they occur in discourse, present the following overall organization. An orientation phase orients the listener regarding the relationships of major participants to each other and regarding the narrative setting. It also contains an abstract of the major complication of the chapter it introduces. This complication is expanded on in the complication phase that follows the orientation phase. The complication phase reports the participants' attempts to resolve the conflict outlined earlier in the abstract. If it closes with an encouragement to some participant to carry out a plan or obey an order, it is to be followed by a resolution phase. If this closure is omitted, the complication phase is followed immediately by an evaluation phase, and no resolution phase is presented.

When it is present, the resolution phase follows the complication phase. In it a command is fulfilled, or an enemy conquered, or an order is carried out, and the conflict described in the complication phase is thereby overcome. If the conflict is not successfully resolved by the participants in the course of the chapter, the resolution phase is omitted.

An evaluation phase follows the resolution phase. This phase frequently begins with the summary introducer /imêneju/ because of all the foregoing when a recent experience is being reported. It may optionally close with the report of the return of the participants to their starting point, often the village where they reside.

A coda that relates the narrative back to the time of telling closes the discourse. Discourses that contain more than one chapter omit the coda from nonfinal chapters. Each new chapter follows the evaluation section of the preceding chapter.

The sequence of orientation, complication, resolution, and evaluation phases is repeated in each chapter except in case of negative resolution to the conflict (defeat). In such cases the resolution phase does not occur.

An abstract of the major complication of the chapter is always given in the orientation phase of a chapter. This abstract indicates the basic conflict around which the chapter events will be centered. When the basic conflict changes, a new abstract is given and a new chapter begins. Lexemically, a new chapter begins with an episode that contains such an abstract.
The following is an abstract in an account of a recent experience.

(2) wāsū wūy ojuy bima o’joa. wāsū wūy ojuy ma’aągu. (Bird to-arrow want when it-him-bit. Bird to-arrow want only did.) ‘When he wanted to kill a bird with an arrow, it [a snake] bit him, although he only wanted to kill a bird with an arrow.’ In (2) the basic conflict around which the chapter events center is the desire of the boy to kill a bird, on the one hand, /wāsū wūy ojuy ma’aągu/ he only wanted to kill a bird with an arrow, and the snake’s biting the boy, on the other, /o’joa/ it bit him.

PRIMARY CONTENT

Units of the primary content of the discourse are of two types, the event reports which make up the event sequence and the event relators. The event reports in the primary event sequence are lexemically realized as verbs and are here called the event line, following Gleanon (1968).

Some participants in events on the event line need to be treated as major; others are minor. Major participants are the ones introduced as actors of episodes or as the targets of those actors. All other participants in these events are minor participants. Major participants new to the discourse are introduced in primary content and not in secondary. Such participants are introduced by naming them according to the rules of the primary reference system. A participant thus named as actor of an episode when he is introduced may be the target in any later episode without further introduction, and a participant named as target may be the episode actor in any later episode without further introduction.

(3) poy oajem jakare kay. wetuyda kakam pima oajem poy . . . ğebuje o’guóm i’pi be io’e. (Turtle arrived alligator toward. Beans cracking when he-arrived turtle . . . Then he-caused-him-to enter the ground into it-is-said.) ‘A turtle approached an alligator. He arrived while [the alligator] was shelling beans . . . Then [the alligator] caused [the turtle] to enter into the ground, it is said.’ In (3) /poy/ turtle is introduced as the actor of the first episode of a narrative by being named in the subject slot preceding the predicate /cajem/ he arrived. /yakare/ alligator is then introduced as the target of the turtle’s activity by being named in a locative slot that carries the locative relator /kay/ toward. No other participants are introduced during this episode, so the remainder of it is omitted from the example. It keeps the same target throughout. ğebuje/ then introduces the next episode by indicating a change in target with the following event so that o’guóm/ he caused him to enter will as an activity be directed toward a new target. Since the action o’guóm/ he caused him to enter can no longer be directed toward /yakare/ alligator, who has been the target up to this point, and since no new participants have been introduced in the narrative, the change of target has the effect of making /poy/ turtle the target and therefore the one who is made to enter. Again, since no new participants have been introduced in the narrative, /yakare/ alligator by default becomes the actor of this new episode and the one who causes the turtle to enter. The actor of the first episode without further introduction has thus become the target of the second episode and vice versa.

The event line extends throughout the discourse. In compound discourses, in which the beginning of a new discourse is signalled by stating a discourse topic, the
new reference system makes it preferable to say that each component discourse has its own event line. Such compound discourses are rare in the data available.

Time relationships between adjacent events on the event line can be indicated with or without morpheme markers. Sequential time is indicated without morpheme markers if adjacent events are arranged in such an order that, given the first event, the next would chronologically follow the first in the real world, for example, ‘chew and swallow’, ‘go and get and make’, ‘lie down and sleep and awaken’. Such clustered actions are here called a chronological sequence cluster. They are never intermingled with secondary content and can be recognized from this lack of intermixture and from the type of chronological action they represent, in which each action grows out of the preceding one.

(4) ixe itaybitat o'jewún. o'akóm. o'jeu. o'jedau. (That smart-one fell-in; he-submerged-in-the-water. he-came-up [and out]: he-ran.): ‘The trickster fell in, he went into the water, he surfaced and came out, he ran.’ In (4) the chronological sequence cluster is /o'jewún/ he fell in, /o'akóm/ he submerged in the water, /o'jeu/ he surfaced [and came out], /o'jedau/ he ran.

Two events are asserted to be simultaneous in a coterminous manner if an event is related between two other verbs that refer to a single event. The verb that is repeated serves as a center to which additional discourse information of actor or place is peripherally attached. The two events may have the same initiator or different initiators.

(5) o'guóm. o'guwun wuh parak'ti. i'pi be o'guóm. (He-caused-him-to-enter. He-pushed-him. Ideophone: pushing someone. Ideophone: entering into the ground. Ground into he-caused-him-to-enter.): ‘He caused him to enter, pushing him so that he entered into the ground.’ In (5) /o'guwun/ he pushed him is coterminous with /o'guóm/ he caused him to enter because /o'guwun/ is the event that is reported between the /o'guóm/ at the beginning of the example and the second /o'guóm/ at the example’s end. This final /o'guóm/ and the /o'guóm/ at the beginning of the example refer to the same event in the real world. The additional discourse information /i'pi be/ into the ground is peripherally attached to the final /o'guóm/.

Event line relators which are morphemically marked are the second type of primary content. They connect temporal, logical, and summative details directly to the event line where such details come into marginal focus and thus avoid the defocusing that occurs when details are given in secondary content. Full discussion of these relators and their connection with discourse focus will not be attempted in this paper.

Temporal connections connect two primary actions in either a sequential or simultaneous time relationship. Logical connections, however, connect added information (the reason for or cause of the primary action) directly to the event line and to a single primary action. Summative connections add primary elements to subjects, objects, and locations of verbs on the event line, the primary action itself serving as the center to which these elements are peripherally attached.
Specific temporal connections with morpheme markers are either sequential or simultaneous. /gebuj/ then indicates that the following action is sequential to the preceding episode. It connects events sequentially across episode boundaries and also indicates that target change occurs with the following action.

(6) etabut'üm yakare i0'e. gebuj ixo o'jo'o'o i0'e. (You-it-believed-not, alligator, he-said. Then he it-was-eating it-is-said.): “You didn’t believe in me, alligator,” he said. Then he ate him, it is said.’ In (6) /gebuj/ then connects /o'jo'o'o/ he ate him sequentially to /i0'e/ he said of the preceding episode.

/puje/² when indicates that the action of the puje clause was completed before the following action began. It connects dependent clauses with independent ones within a grammatical sentence. It cannot connect events across episode boundaries. In addition to this, /gebuj/ places in full focus both of the events it connects, whereas /puje/ defocuses the event in the dependent clause and leaves the event in the independent clause focused upon.

/ixe dak/ and he indicates that the action of the clause is simultaneous at an indefinite point on the time continuum with the most recently mentioned primary event. It coordinates events within an episode and indicates that the same participant initiated both actions.

/pima/ when, while indicates that the action of the pima clause is simultaneous with the following event, but began before it and continues after its completion. /pima/ connects dependent clauses with independent ones.

Logical connections are causative, counterfactual, and reversed. The causative connects cause to a primary action. The counterfactual connectors emphasize that because one event did not or will not occur, another event also did not or will not occur. The reversed connection indicates the reverse motion of an action that has already occurred.

The causative connector /puye/ because indicates the cause of, or the reason for, a primary action. It connects dependent clauses with independent ones. It joins the cause to the event line as a part of primary content and brings it into sharper focus than it would be if it were expressed in secondary content.

(7) o'ju gú ipa'i buye (He-went not someone’s:fever because.): ‘He did not go because someone had fever.’

The counterfactual connectors /...kajuk... pima/... would have... if indicates that the second statement is contrary to fact (past). It connects an independent apodosis to a dependent conditional protasis as contrary to fact.

(8) ixe bit kajuk acetobuxik mubaat'üm pima bit. (Him contrastively would-have we-found rain-not if contrastively): ‘We would have found him if it had not rained.’ In (8) /mubaat'üm pima bit/ if it had not rained is the dependent condition which is

²The form /puje/ follows consonants, but /buje/ follows vowels. So also pima/bima while and puye/buye because. tio jot puj, o'timog ip baseya'a be. (Water bring when, liquid-place they basin in.): ‘When they brought water, they put it in a basin.’ seis xet kap puj, ip o'jem. (Six sleep pass when, they left.): ‘When six days had passed, they left.’
connected to /ixe bit kajuk acetobuxik/ we would have found him. Because the primary action /acetobuxik/ we found is already completed, the conditional here emphasizes that an opposite event from we found has occurred, namely that we did not find him.

The counterfactual connecters /kuka . . . pima . . . would . . . if indicates that the statement is contrary to future expectations of the speaker. It connects a dependent protasis to an independent apodosis as contrary to future expectations of the speaker.

The suffix /-p/ indicates the reverse of an action (stated or assumed) which has already occurred in the narrative. It acts as a participant coordinator because it indicates that both the original action and its reverse action are performed by the same person.

(9) ixeyū o'jup (they went-back the way they had come.) ‘They went back as they had come.’ In (9) the /-p/ on /o'jup/ they went back indicates that /ixeyū/ they had arrived and were now reversing their steps to their starting point.

Summative connections are additives, oppositionals, or appositives.

/dak/ and adds subjects, objects, or locations to those already named in the sentence. It names associates, but does not indicate whether or not the participants named will henceforth be acting as a group in the narrative. That a group is formed is signalled by the use of the pluralizer /ip/ in the continuing narrative. /eju dak/ also with adds the names of other associates to an associate already named. /be dak/ also in or to adds locations to one already named.

/bit/ but instead, but rather contrasts the primary element it follows with other elements of the same kind. The element it follows is signalled as the actual participant, location, or time, instead of some other participant, location or time that has been mentioned earlier in the discourse. It thus contrasts participants with participants, locations with locations, time with time. Such contrasts may be within or across grammatical sentence boundaries.

Those grammatical phrases analyzed by Crofts as filling the expansion slot of subtype three detail expansion sentences (Crofts ms.) are used appositionally in Mundurukú discourse to give information about previously mentioned locations, objects, participants, and activities without defocusing this information as would be the result if it were put into secondary content. Such phrases may, for example, narrow the actors of an episode from a group of people to a single individual.

(10) oceexexa mubaat ocemukajiguig puye. oju ba'ore ma oce. (All we-arrived-home rain us-made-cold because. I-went impossible emphatically I): ‘We all arrived home because the rain chilled us. It was difficult for me to go.’ In (10) /suat/ all refers to all the members of the hunting party who as a group were the actors of the episode up to this point. /oce/ I narrows the actor of the episode to the narrator alone

---

4Grimes and Glock label such phenomena collateral information and cite William Labov's use of comparator for the same thing.
at this point. If the pronoun /oce/ did not appear here in the expansion tagmeme, the actors of the episode would continue to be the entire hunting party.

Previously introduced participants may be referred to in specifying phrases of the type just illustrated, specifying either the actor of the episode or his target in more detail. Participants are never introduced for the first time in a specifier slot. Place is sometimes specified more fully after a general change in direction has been indicated. The general change indicates a new paragraph, if it is initial in the sentence. Specifying slots are never initial in a sentence and therefore never indicate a new paragraph.

(11) deimwi . . . oceju koapat ibut tağ ma. (From-downstream we-went the-first-one his-footprints along.): ‘From downstream we followed closely the tracks of the first [tapir].’ In (11) /deimwi/ from downstream indicates a general change in direction. /koapat ibut tağ ma/ right along the first one’s tracks specifies the change of direction more fully. This makes it possible for the place setting to change (from downstream to upstream) while the target, the tapir’s trail, remains unchanged for the actors of the episode (the hunting party). This also allows the direction conscious Mundurukú to indicate that the tracks are going in a new direction at this point in the narrative.

Minor participants can be described more fully in such phrases also.

SECONDARY CONTENT

Secondary content is related only to what has already been mentioned in primary content. It describes the states of objects or gives explanations, conclusions, or summaries of events mentioned earlier in primary content.

There are four types of secondary content here called comments, parentheses, flashbacks, and summaries.

Comments describe the overall physical condition, position, existence, or emotional state of participants named in primary content. They frequently serve as paragraph closers. They contain a special form /ağu/ or /osunuy/ was, /o'e/ was or became, or /oeku/ went around as the only filler in the predicate slot of the sentence, causing them to differ in internal composition from other types of secondary content.

(12) iboce bit ağu ip. (There contrastively were they.): ‘There, however, they were.’

(13) tap ade o'e. (Feather lots there-were.): ‘There were lots of feathers.’

(14) iğuycuğ oeku. (Sadly he-went-around.): ‘He went around sadly.’

Comments differ from all other types of secondary content in that they have neither a distinctive introduction nor a closure. They occur more frequently and are less restricted in their distribution in the total discourse than any other type. They are shorter than most types of secondary content.

Parentheses give details on the manner in which a primary action is carried out, the setting in which this action occurred, the results of the action. Descriptions are not of objects or participants in general, but of targets and of actors of episodes in
particular. Parentheses are of three types, which contrast with each other in their grammatical form. They also contrast with each other in either their distribution within chapters, episodes, and paragraphs, or in their semantic function, or both. Formal differences that exist between parenthesis types are summarized in Table 1.

The noun contrastive parenthesis is usually two or three sentences in length. A noun or pronoun followed by /bit/ contrastive particle signals the beginning of the parenthesis. The first sentence may optionally contain a time word followed by a locative relator. The parenthesis may close with a comment or with a summary statement introduced by /imën̪pit/ but, however. This parenthesis indicates the beginning of chapter closure or reviews the discourse topic at the close of an episode when the topic has been stated in the discourse introduction. If it reviews the discourse topic, it closes the episode of which it is a part, but it does not then close the chapter.

(15) jay. ajug daje in. juku i'e̊em. juku. daje ġu bit. ġebuje bit dajecko ma dajecko ixe acà dajem cexe ip dajecko acà. imën̪pit ġuyjom ixeyo ma dajem o'jëwexat. (He-arrived. Aunt, wild-pig some of. Here, she-says, here. Wild-pig not contrastively it was. Instead caititu contrastively [it was]. Caititu it rather wild-pig-became according to-them rather. However later they wild-pigs turned-into:.) 'He arrived. "Aunt, I want some wild pig meat." "Here it is," she said, "Here." It was not wild pig. Instead it was actually caititu. Rather it was caititu. Only according to them this caititu was wild pig. However, later they themselves turned into wild pigs.' In (15) the noun phrase /daje ġu/ not wild pig is followed by the contrastive particle /bit/, thus signaling the beginning of the parenthesis. The sentence contains neither a time word nor a locative relator.3 This parenthesis closes with a summary statement which is also a review of the discourse topic. /imën̪pit ġuyjom ixeyo ma dajem o'jëwexat/ however, later they themselves turned into wild pigs is the summary statement. The topic, given as the first sentence in the discourse, is /Karuskaybu daje o'guju tacup ip puybit puye/ Karuskaybu turned them into pigs because they were selfish with food.

The descriptive detail parenthesis enlarges paragraph introductions by giving details related to some event mentioned in the introduction. Some parentheses of this kind contain several time words (such as /kât/ afternoon. about dusk or /kuyâj/ the next day) or tense-aspect forms. All descriptive detail parentheses close with either the formal marker /hop/ that's how it was or with /pit/ markers that indicate that the

3/ġebuje bit/ means instead in secondary content. It is illustrative of the need to recognize both primary and secondary content in Mundurukû discourse. In secondary content, no new episodes or new targets are signalled because secondary content contains no episodes. If /ġebuje bit/ were understood as an episode introducer, the primary reference system would suggest that a target change occurs with the primary verb which follows /ġebuje/, but there is no primary verb in the sentence and no way to ascertain a new target, because that target would need to be signalled by the object of a transitive verb following /ġebuje/ or an intransitive verb with a noun in the locative slot marked by /kay/ or by a subject oriented verb with the /je/ marker. In secondary content, however, /ġebuje bit/ does not act as an episode introducer or target changer because the primary reference system bypasses secondary content and operates independently of it. There is therefore no problem about knowing where discourse episodes begin and end or what each new target is throughout that discourse.
following sentence in the discourse will be a return to primary content. This parenthesis type occurs noninitially in paragraph introductions.

(16) o'jewexat dajem. dajem kuy ya'o. bekkitk kuy dajem. kuy aya aya aya. hop. *(He-changed-them-into wild-pigs. Wild-pigs-became already their-voices. Children already wild-pigs-became. Already oink, oink, oink. That's-how-it-was.)*: 'He changed them into wild pigs. Their voices were already becoming like wild pigs' voices. Their children were already becoming wild pigs. Already "Oink! Oink! Oink!" they cried. That's how it was.' In (16) the introductory sentence of the paragraph is /o'jewexat dajem/ He turned them into wild pigs. The descriptive detail parenthesis (16) gives details related to the change spoken of in the introductory sentence quoted here. /kuy/, an aspect marker translated already, occurs in the three sentences of the parenthesis and is the tense-aspect cluster /dajem kuy ya'o. bekkitk kuy dajem. kuy aya aya aya./ Parenthesis (16) closes with the formal marker /hop/ that's how it was.

The verbal insert type of parentheses give details related to a primary content event. It must repeat a verb used in the preceding paragraph and may contain more than one repetition of that verb. All such repeated verbs refer to a single identical event in the real world. The verbal repetition may be expanded within the parenthesis to give the setting of the action or the manner in which the action was carried out. The close of the parenthesis is marked by a repetition of the same verb, but with no expansion beyond details given earlier in primary content. /i/o'el it is said or /i/o'e ip/ they say may optionally be included in this closure at its termination point. Such inserts may be lengthy, containing quoted material or summary statements, and may even be divided into paragraphs which will be made up entirely of secondary content. Divisions are made between quotations and at the occurrence of /imèvejuy/ because of all this.

(17) tapmuymuy. ceteg Ꙁ tapmuymuy. wuywuywuy ma buğun ma ku. inaka o'tapmiwedip tapmuymuy. *(feather-placing. It-near not feather-placing. Very distant contrastively. Just this far. Besides this he-feathers-caused-to-draw-together feather-placing.)*: 'He was placing the feathers. Not very near it (the shelter) he was placing them, very distant actually. Just this far. [Gesture by speaker to indicate distance.] In spite of this he caused the feathers to draw together. (Thus) he was placing them.' In (17) /tapmuymuy/ he was placing the feathers, the first word in the example, is a verb in primary content. /ceteg Ꙁ tapmuymuy/ not very near it he was placing them repeats /tapmuymuy/ feather placing and thus signals the beginning of the parenthesis. The last word of the parenthesis /tapmuymuy/ he was placing the feathers closes the parenthesis by repeating the verb for the last time. The details given in the parenthesis regarding the placing of the feathers have to do with the location of their placement in relation to the temporary shelter in which some participants lived and also their placement in relation to each other. They were placed rather distant from the shelter and yet close enough to one another to allow the hero to draw them together to magically prevent the escape of those participants from their shelter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Discourse Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noun contrastive</td>
<td>noun or pronoun plus /bit/ <em>contrastive</em> as opener of parenthesis; close of parenthesis signalled by summary introducer /iménpit/ <em>but</em>, however, by a comment, or by a finite verb indicating a return to primary content</td>
<td>to include further details regarding an actor of an episode or his target</td>
<td>occurs with chapter closure when reference to stated discourse topic is absent; with episode closure when reference to stated discourse topic is made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive detail</td>
<td>enlarges upon introductory sentences of paragraphs; clusters of time words or tense aspect forms; /hoph/ <em>that’s how it was</em> or /pit/ mark close of parenthesis</td>
<td>to include details not mentioned earlier regarding the result of an action</td>
<td>occurs only with paragraph introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal insert</td>
<td>must contain verbal repetition; verbal repetition without expansion closes parenthesis</td>
<td>to include details not mentioned earlier in the discourse regarding an action's setting or the manner in which an action was done</td>
<td>may occur with introductions, closures, or intermediary materials in chapters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 1**

Differences Among Parenthesis Types
Flashbacks explain the chapter to which they are appended. The events of the chapter are explained from the viewpoint of a participant other than the main actor of the discourse. They are introduced into the discourse by a rhetorical question from the narrator. In such questions, the marker /jit/ is placed immediately after the question word which begins the question. This marker indicates the question is rhetorical. The flashback ends when the answer to the question has been given by the narrator. Flashbacks occur in chapter closures.

(18) ao jìt mo sue? imunaponpon ip. xìjap taëg kapkam ip. a’ò. (What rhetorical-question-maker is that? It-cause-fleeing they. Temporary shelter throughout passing they. There he goes!): ‘What in the world is that? It was causing them to flee. They were attempting to leave the temporary shelter. There he goes!’ In (18) /ajo/ what is the question word and /jit/ is the rhetorical question marker. /a’ò/ there he goes is an exclamation by which the narrator answers the question, indicating the participant was seen and recognized by the people in shelter.

Summaries optionally close chapters, episodes, or paragraphs in a causal or a contrastive closure. The causal closure gives the effect of primary action. Such effects do not contribute to reaching the target of the episode actor and are thus defocused and put in secondary content. Causal closures may be limited or extensive in influence, depending upon the summary introducer used. /iménéjul/ because of all the foregoing relates the entire preceding chapter of discourse to the summary statements causally. /imënpuye/ because of this relates only the immediately preceding sentence to the summary causally. /iménéjul/ because of all the foregoing is a paragraph marker connecting sentences across paragraph boundaries and introducing the chapter closure paragraph. /imënpuye/ because of this connects sentences across sentence boundaries within a paragraph.

(19) puybu wuyagûgn. imënpuje ocejepit. (Snake us-bite-could. Because-of-this we returned.): ‘A snake might bite us. Because of this we returned.’ In (19) /imënpuje/ because of this connects the effect /ocejepit/ we returned to the cause /puybu wuyagûgn/ a snake might bite us.

(20) soat oceexexe muba’at ocemukajuğjuğ puye. oju ba’ore ma. oce kajuk cicà. obu dak obupi oce. imeneju odobu’u oce tip taëg. (All we-arrived home rain us-made-cold because. I-went unable-to contrastively. I cold very. My-finger also finger-pain I. Because-of-all-the-foregoing my-leg bone-unwilling I underbrush through.): ‘All of us arrived home because the rain made us cold. I was very cold and unable to go. My finger pained me too. Because of all this I did not wish to walk through the underbrush.’ In (20) /iménéjul/ because of all this relates the entire preceding chapter to the summary statement causally. All that precedes /iménéjul/ in the primary content contributes to the effect stated in the summary.

Contrastive summaries give contrastive information regarding the incident that precedes them. /imënpit/ but, however connects the preceding events with a following event or opinion across sentence boundaries. It indicates that contrary to the normal or expected outcome of the first clause, the second clause actually happened.
(21) ibocewi ma āgu ixe imu'um ojuy iem ajojoyū'um'ūm. ġa'a ajojo ma kadi beku daje. imēnpi iem ixe ma āgu o'gu'um pi in ibocewi ma. *(There-from contrastively aspect he them-cause-to-end wanted it-say grandfathers-deceased. Let's we-them-see contrastively aspect that wild-pig. But it-saying he contrastively aspect he-them-cause to-end wanted there-from contrastively.)*: 'From then on he wanted to kill them, the deceasedgrandfathers say. 'Let's go visit those pigs.' But saying this, he rather than anyone else wanted to kill them from then on.' In (21) the incident that precedes the summary introducer /imēnpi/ but, however is the quotation ġa'a ajojo ma kadi beku daje/ Let's go visit those pigs. The contrastive information given in the summary is that the actor's real reason for going was not to pay a friendly visit, but to destroy those he was going to visit.

Summaries differ in content from comments by being causal or contrastive rather than descriptive. They differ in form from comments in that they require one of the three introducers /imēnju/, /imēnpuye/, or /imēnpi/, while comments contain no introducer. Comments contain specialized verb forms not found in summaries.

Summaries also differ from comments in their place within the total discourse. Summaries always indicate some type of closure and are found at the close of chapters, episodes, or paragraphs. The location of comments, however, is not limited to closures. Such comments are intermixed with primary content throughout the discourse.

**REFERENCE SYSTEMS**

Two reference systems operate simultaneously in the same discourse to connect the units of content just discussed. The primary reference system identifies and connects only primary content.

The secondary reference system places events, participants, targets, and locations with reference to their earlier mention in primary content and connects the secondary content to these.

Contrasts between primary and secondary systems are as follows. Rules of the primary reference systems apply to discourse participants when they take part in event sequence actions and thus are in the foreground of the narrative. Rules of the secondary reference system apply to the same participants whenever they are mentioned in secondary content and thus enter into the background of the narrative. In the primary system, targets are introduced or reintroduced in relation to the primary content; in the secondary system, targets are never introduced, but are merely indicated on the basis of their prior appearance in primary content. Since by definition only the primary system participants initiate event line actions, and in the secondary system event line action is not initiated, the secondary reference system connects secondary content as background to primary content. Such connections are one means of defocusing narrative content. The connections made by the primary reference system, on the other hand, are a means of focusing narrative content.
SEMEMIC ORGANIZATION

Sememic organization in Mundurukú discourse information follows the orientation, complication, evaluation, resolution, and coda pattern mentioned earlier in this paper. Some narratives repeat this pattern (except for the coda) five or more times before the discourse closes.

The orientation phase of a chapter, as has been stated, orients the listener regarding the relationships of major participants to each other and to the primary action of the chapter. Most of the orientation phase, including the identification of participants and their roles and the abstract, is contained in the first episode or introduction of the chapter. Some orientation content, notably temporal information connected with the narrative setting, may appear in the second episode or in the first. This is the basis for distinguishing the sememic phase of orientation from the introduction, which is a lexicem span, the first episode of the chapter.

Abstracts are brief in accounts of recent experience. Legend abstracts, on the other hand, may be brief or long. In legends the lexicem form of the abstract is often a conversation between participants.

The following is an abstract in a legend:

(22) tapulu, ieuem jekpot pe, boyukayku wuyxan ejat eyey kay daje in. hm hm. cucum. jay. ajug, daje in. juku. iumum ip pug in, ieuem ajoyoju'um'um.

(Son! it-saying his-son to, there-plural-toward-location marker our-food you-get your-aunt toward pig some. O. K. Going, he-arrived. Aunt, some pig. Here. It-giving they one some, it-saying grandfathers-deceased."

"Son!" he says to his son, "you get food for us from your aunts—some pig meat." "O. K." He arrived. "Aunt! Give me some pig meat." "Here you are." They gave him just a little bit, the deceased grandfathers say.' In (22) the basic conflict around which the chapter events will be centered is the desire of the man and his son for meat on the one hand, /tapulu/. . . boyukayku wuyxan ejat eyey kay daje in/ 'Son! . . . you get food for us from your aunts—some pig meat,' and the aunts' unwillingness to give the meat, on the other, /iumum ip pug in/ they gave him just a little bit.

A specific time word or a time phrase is included in the orientation for relating a recent experience. The time orientation for legends is simply /io'e/ it is said, /ie'em ip/ they say, or /ie'em ajoyoju'um'um/ the deceased grandfathers say.

Orientation information may link the final evaluation of the preceding chapter to the orientation of the chapter that follows by including evidence that a suggestion made in that evaluation was carried out in the orientation phase that followed.

(23) gebeje taweyu o'jenapow io'e. ijoce eya'io io'e. waretya'ya 'o'om kobi. jay. wida oajem io'e tiot kay. (Then monkeys they-fled, it-is-said. Here you-round thing-eat, they said. Naja fruit-round-thing eating. Ideophone: eating. Arrived. Jaguar arrived, it-is-said, him-underneath toward.):

'Then the monkeys ran away, it is said. "You eat fruit right here," they had said [to the turtle]. He was eating naja fruit at the time the jaguar arrived beneath him, it-is-said.' In (23) /gebeje taweyu o'jenapow io'e. ijoce eye'io, io'e./ Then the monkeys ran away, it is said. "You eat fruit right
here.' They had said [to the turtle] is the final episode of the chapter, in which You eat fruit right here is the monkeys' parting command to the turtle. The narrator evaluates the chapter events by picturing the monkeys running off as victors after matching wits with the turtle. /joce eya'o, io'e/ You eat fruit right here, they said is fulfilled in the first sentence of the next episode /waretay'a 'o'om kobil He was eating naja fruit, which is simultaneous with /vida oajem io'e tiot kay/ A jaguar arrived beneath him, it is said. The simultaneity is indicated by the verb form /io'om/ eating and the ideophone /kobil eat, which emphasizes continuation of the act of eating through the next event on the event line, the arrival of the jaguar. The new episode is signalled by the locative target marker /kay/. The orientation phase begins, then, by referring to the quoted command, known to have been spoken by the monkeys to the turtle. Since no new participant is named as eating the fruit, the one who was commanded to eat it is doing so and was known to be up high when last see. /tiot kay/ beneath him is, then, beneath the turtle. The major participants, turtle and jaguar, thus have been introduced in the orientation—jaguar as the episode actor and turtle as his target, even though the turtle has not been specifically named, but has been identified through a network of implications.

The orientation phase optionally opens with a stated discourse topic, if it is the first orientation in the discourse. It closes with time and sometimes with location, if these have not been given earlier. If time and location have been given earlier, the orientation phase closes just before the first primary event following the abstract.

Complication information includes the participant's action in response to the complication or a solution to be tested in the light of the complication or both.

Information regarding the participants' reaction may be detailed or sketchy. One account of a food quest gives the participants' reaction to each minor complication as it arises during the quest. The solution to be tested is usually stated briefly. If the testing of the solution is described, this may include descriptions of preparations made for the testing as well as the test itself.

Complication information may optionally describe quiescent periods in which the passage of narrative time is noted (Cromack 1968).

(24) xet. xet. xet. ade xet ma jejujum. (Sleep. Sleep. Sleep. Many sleeps passed.): 'Three days passed. Many more days passed.' This example of a description of a quiescent period gives the amount of time that elapsed between the last primary event, /ya'ãpi iru ip, ie'em poy/ Go fly a kite, said the turtle, and the return of the alligator to taunt the turtle /jay/ he arrived.

Action taken in preparation for testing a solution may also be included in complication information.

(25) ãgebuje o'jup ixibu bikm io'e. jebureyũ dakoy ma ãuto ixe dak o'ju. yağûryûykarey poy io'e. ãgebuje poy jebureyũ kay. jaboli aka boku itabut'ûmat aqatubun bitku io'e. itabut'ûma boku wuykay. ha'a o'e io'e. ixibu o'subu'uk xiburirtpu io'e. pere. (Then he-went jungle-vine to-get it-is-said. His-companions to invite actually again he also went. His-thoughts-were-in a turmoil the turtle's it-is-said. Then he-arrived his-friends towards turtles only there. He's-an-unbelieving-one,
he-said. Let's-cause-him-to-believe thus, he-said. He-doesn't-believe that-one us-in. Let's go, he-said, it-is-said. Jungle-vine he-it-took, jungle-vine-white-very it-is-said. Finished.): 'Then he went back to get jungle vine, it is said. At the same time he was going to invite his friends. The turtle's thoughts were whirling, it is said. Then, retracing his steps, he approached his friends in a place where only turtles were located. He's an unbelieving one, he said. But we'll cause him to believe. That one doesn't believe in us. Let's go, he said, it is said. They collected very white jungle vine and finished that process.' In (25) the collection of a type of jungle vine is narrated. The vine was collected in preparation for binding a large snake so that he could be pulled out of a water hole where he had made his home.

Such quiescent (24) or preparatory (25) periods in the narrative divide the complication information into two parts. The part preceding such periods either states the reaction to the complication or suggests a solution to that complication; or both a reaction and a solution may be given. The part of the complication that follows the quiescent or preparatory period describes the testing of the solution (but without giving the results of the test, which is in another phase). Borders of lexemic episodes do not coincide with sememic divisions marked by periods of quiescence or preparation. For example, in (25) /gebuje/ then marks the beginning of an episode. However /gebujep jey jebureyu kay/ then, retracing his steps, he approached his friends marks the beginning of a second episode within the preparatory period and this second episode continues through the remainder of the text given in the example. The preparatory period ends with the process closer /pere/ finished; but the episode does not end at this point. In complication information, as in orientation, the sememic phase does not correspond precisely to the lexemic span of the episode or paragraph.

Resolution information gives the solution to the complication. If the solution is adequate, the resolution phase is followed immediately by the evaluation phase.

(26) gebuje ibureyu oyaoka ip puybu. gebuje oexe iboce, je'a buje io'e. (Then his-friends killed they the snake. Then he-arrived-home here bitten it-is-said.): 'Then his friends killed the snake. Then he arrived here at home bitten, they said.' In (26) the solution is /ibureyu oyaoka ip puybu/ his friends killed the snake. The evaluation is /oexe iboce, je'a buje io'e/ he arrived here at home bitten, they said and it sums up the entire experience.

If no adequate solution is found to the complication the resolution phase is absent, and the complication phase ends just before the summary introducer /imeneju/ because of all this, /imepiti/ but, however, or /imepuye/ because of this introduces the evaluation phase.

Such phases often begin with an evaluation of loss.

(27) imeneju ma wuyju jekon umun ajo acejo'o? (Because-of-all-this actually we will-eat nothing. What let-us-it-eat?): 'Because of all this we will really have nothing to eat. What shall we eat?' The evaluation phase closes the chapter if it occurs in a nonfinal one. If the chapter is the last in the discourse, a coda follows the evaluation phase and closes the discourse.
(28) imēnpuye ojexen ma. (Because-of-this I-slept just.): ‘Because of this I have just [in contrast to walking through the underbrush looking for game] slept.’ In (28) /imēnpuye ojexen ma/ gives the negative solution, sleeping, and includes in an evaluative way the narrator’s dissatisfaction with the way his entire hunting trip came out. The evaluation is given by /ma/ just [in contrast to walking through the underbrush looking for game].

A single episode may give both resolution and evaluation information, with the result that the resolution phase does not always correspond to a complete lexemic episode.

In Mundurukú discourse the evaluation phase gives the result of the resolution. This evaluation is in reference to the events of the entire chapter. The evaluation may be a stated conclusion, or it may take the lexemic form of presenting a major participant as victor over the complicating situation. Evaluation phases in legends frequently include both kinds of information. They sometimes give the exit of the victor here also. Evaluations in accounts of every-day experiences state a conclusion. This conclusion in short narrations is a simple statement of an existing result which at the same time acts as a coda to return to the time of the telling of the incident. In (26) the evaluation /oexe iboce, je'na buje ioe'le/ he arrived here bitten, they said not only sums up the entire experience but at the same time acts as a coda to return to the time of the telling of the incident. This is clear only when it is known that the discourse was given in answer to the question, ‘What happened to your grandson?’ Sememic and lexemic borders do not always coincide as the evaluation information is given.

Cudas are used only at discourse closure. They connect the narrative to the time of telling by mentioning time, place, or a present attitude or condition of the narrator. In (28), for example, /imēnpuye ojexen ma/ because of this I have just [in contrast to walking through the underbrush looking for game] slept closed a narrative given in response to the suggestion that the speaker tell what he had been doing that day. Cudas are brief. They end the discourse. In some cudas, closure is made with /ibūrū ma/ that is all.

(29) kuyaye osodot ip ijoce. oexexe ip. kuy oexexe ip ijoce. ġaxepxep ma o'yadu-juxe yopitma. ibūrū ma. (Yesterday came they here. Arrived they. Already arrived they here. A few only they-round-things-carrying-arrived--small-very.): ‘Yesterday they came here. They arrived home. They have already arrived home here. They arrived carrying only a small number of very small fruits. That is all I have to say.’ In (29) /kuyaye osodot ip/ yesterday they came is the beginning of the coda and connects the narrative to the time of telling. Where they arrived, /ijoce/ here . . . at home gives the place connection as also the place where the narrator is located at the time of telling the story. Iibūrū ma/ that is all I have to say, the optional discourse closer, is used by the narrator in this example.

LEXEMIC ORGANIZATION

Lexemic organization of the discourse is by chapters, episodes, paragraphs, and sentences. The lexemic discourse introduction is the first episode of the discourse. It
optionally contains a stated discourse topic, but a primary introduction is essential. In it the major participant is introduced and some reference is made to setting. A favorite first sentence for the introduction consists of a subject, a verb, and a locative given in that order.

If the discourse is a legend, the verb /ilo/ it is said appears in the introduction directly following one or more of the verb forms used to introduce the major participant. When everyday experiences are related, however, /ilo/ is omitted from the introduction. Introductions generally close in one of three ways: with quoted material that indicates a problem to be dealt with later in the discourse, with an ideophone marking closure, or with some type of secondary content.

In example (22) the quoted material indicates in brief the problem to be dealt with later in the discourse.

Example (30) gives the closing section of an introduction in which the ideophone /pere/ finished closes the discourse introduction.

(30) ibocewi o'ju ip. xijap muggem ip. pere. (From-there went they shelter in order to make they. Ideophone: finished.): 'They left in order to make a temporary shelter and finished the building process.' In (30) the ideophone /pere/ finished closes the lexemic introduction. It indicates in particular that the building of the temporary shelter was completed.

Example (31) gives the closing section of an introduction in which a comment, a type of secondary content, closes the discourse introduction.

(31) ijocewi ip ebidase o'xet. ebidase o'xet ip. ijap mognog ip jexet am. jekonkon gu o'xet ip. ka'umma ma. ka'umguy puybit. (From-here they trail-in-the-middle-of slept. Trail-in-the-middle-of slept they. Exist-hot-actually emphatic. Exit-not-not meat.): 'Being away from here, they slept on the trail. They built a temporary shelter to sleep in. They went to bed without eating. There was nothing at all to eat. There wasn't any meat.' In (31) the comment /ka'umma ma. ka'umguy puybit./ There was nothing at all. There wasn't any meat, is the secondary content that closes the lexemic introduction.

The body of the discourse begins with the second episode, which is the first change of target, and continues until the last change of target has been made in the discourse.

(32) gbeuje puybu o'gucak. o'subumucak. gbeuje o'joa. gbeuje ibureyu oyaoka ip puybu. (Then target changer snake he-it-stepped on. He-it-stepped on. Then it-him-bit. Then his-friends killed they snake.): 'Then he stepped on a snake. It bit him. Then his friends killed it.' In (32) the body of a very short narrative is given. /gbeuje puybu o'gucak/ Then (target change) he stepped on a snake is the first change of target in the discourse. /gbeuje ibureyu oyaoka ip puybu Then his friends killed the snake, directly precedes the final change of target in the discourse and so is at the close of the body of this discourse.
The lexemic body of a Mundurukú discourse may end with an explanation in secondary content, with a conclusion, or with a primary event. There appear to be no lexemic forms that are especially common at this point in a discourse.

With the final change of target, the final episode and thus the close of the discourse begins. Discourse closure may be anticipated by a series of summary statements. The discourse closer, /iburuma/ that is all is optionally added.

Chapters, as mentioned earlier, consist of a number of episodes, usually more than five. When the chapter is the only chapter in the discourse, the discourse introduction serves also as the chapter introduction, and the discourse closure serves also as the chapter closure. Such chapters tend to anticipate closure by a series of summary statements.

When a chapter is the first chapter of several in the discourse, the discourse introduction serves also as the introduction to the first chapter. Closing features of such a chapter, or of any chapter nonfinal in the discourse, are the same as the closing features of discourse introductions: quoted material, ideophone marking closure, or some type of secondary content.

When a chapter is a middle chapter whose opening and closure are not coterminous with the opening or closure of the total discourse, chapter introductions introduce new participants who will act as targets later in the chapter.

When a chapter is the closing chapter of the discourse, the chapter introduction names new participants who will act as targets later in the chapter. The discourse closure serves also as the chapter closure.

The inner arrangement of chapters is flexible rather than rigid. Secondary content varies as to point of possible occurrence within chapters. Comments may occur at any point in the chapter. On the other hand, descriptive detail inserts, which are parenthetical, occur only in chapter, episode, and paragraph introductions. Verbal insert parentheses occur following verbs that are in the primary content of the chapter. Flashbacks occur only in chapter closures. Noun contrastive parentheses occur in chapter closures; but when such parentheses refer directly to the stated discourse topic they may occur at the close of any episode in the discourse.

In legends, narrative links with the distant past are optionally made by the use of /ho'le ajojo'um'umayu/ the deceased grandfathers say when a participant is newly introduced into the discourse, at episode openings, and at chapter closure. They may also occur at discourse closure.

A discourse episode, as indicated earlier, is that unit within the discourse which lies between two points of target change or between the target's introduction and the first point of target change. It is possible to mark such points of significant change by one of a small set of forms which, when used in primary content, serve as target changers. These signal that action will now be directed toward a new target, as was briefly illustrated under primary content. They are /gebuje/ then, /gasu/ now, /geyjom/ later. They function as episode introducers when they occur in the initial slot of the first sentence of the episode.
New targets may be introduced without /既可以/, /经常/, or /因/ , but in this case they are always marked by the locative relator /向/ toward, which marks new targets whenever they occur in the locative slot of sentences in primary content. See example (34).

Each episode centers around one participant, here labelled the actor of the episode, who in turn has one overall objective—his target. The target may be another participant, a location, or an inanimate object; or it may be the episode actor’s doing or performing an action itself, such as: ‘running away’, in which case the actor’s target is flight; ‘conversing’, in which case the actor’s target is getting across to another participant whatever he has to say; ‘eating’ (intransitive), in which case the actor’s target is to satisfy his hunger by taking food. The episodes are usually short when the target is the actor’s doing or performing an action itself.

Targets are generally introduced in one of three ways: First, as a nominal in the first object slot preceding a single event verb form and following one of the target changers just listed.

(33) /既可以/ wita'a o'lyamuy timudip (then rock he-placed it-cause-close): ‘Then he placed a rock to close it.’

Second, targets are introduced as a nominal in the locative slot followed by the target marker /向/ toward.

(34) poy oajem jakare kay (turtle arrived alligator toward): ‘The turtle came to the alligator.’

Third, targets are introduced as a verb following an episode introducer to indicate that the actor’s target is the doing or performing of the action itself. In this case the target is marked by the morpheme -je- appearing within the verb itself and indicates that the verb is a member of a class of subject oriented verbs. In describing these verbs, Crofts states that “the morpheme -je- occurs in all forms of the verb” and that it has the allomorphs /ce/ with first singular, second plural, and first plural inclusive subjects; /je/ with second plural subjects; and /je/ with third singular and plural and first plural exclusive subjects. She suggests that its purpose is to focus attention on the actor. This seems to be true. When, however, these verbs occur at the point of target change in a discourse, /je/ focuses attention on the actor as involved in an action as an end in itself rather than as involved in an action as a means to some other end.

(35) /既可以/ apat o'jenapön (then alligator fled): ‘Then the alligator fled.’

Other rare ways of introducing targets into the discourse exist, but these await fuller study. They appear to be modifications of the ways presented here. Changes of time or place may occur within the episode. If these changes are mentioned in the initial slot of the sentence, a paragraph break within the episode is indicated. Introducers for such paragraphs are /from/ from there; /return/ return, and slot-initial time phrases such as /at night/ at night, /in the afternoon/ in the afternoon, /tomorrow/ tomorrow. Expansion, explanation, or summary of the episode events can be given in the secondary content in the episode.
Paragraphs are of three types, those with primary content only, those with both primary and secondary content, and those with secondary content only.

Paragraphs with primary content are of two types, paragraphs which are episode-initial and in which targets therefore are introduced, and paragraphs in which the target is simply retained from a preceding paragraph. Episode-initial paragraphs may contain an episode introducer or a target marker or both. Such paragraphs begin with /ğebuje/ then, /ğasů/ now, or /ğeyjom/ later, if an episode introducer is used. Paragraphs with retained targets are introduced by /ibocewi/ from there, /aripito/ return, or a slot initial time phrase such as /ixima be/ at night, /katpuje/ in the afternoon, /kuyaje/ tomorrow.

Paragraphs with both primary and secondary content contain comments or summaries or both. Comments occur within the body of such paragraphs or act as paragraph closers. Summaries introduced by /iměnpi/ but, however, or by /iměnpuje/ because of this act as closers.

Paragraphs with secondary content only neither introduce new targets nor retain targets from the preceding paragraph as the target of the actor of the episode in which they happen to occur. They may, however, refer by name to any target previously introduced in primary content. They may be subdivided according to the manner in which the paragraph is introduced in primary content; that is, as summary or flashback. The summary introducer is /iměheju/ because of all the foregoing. The introducer for flashback is a rhetorical question. Paragraphs with secondary content only are not introductory.

Simple and quotative sentences of Crofts' grammar and the interrogative clauses related to independent clause types can be lexically realized in Mundurukú discourse to distinguish discourse participants.

Question words followed by the marker /jit/ indicate the question is rhetorical and will be answered by the narrator elsewhere in the discourse. Any events placed in the discourse between the rhetorical question and its answer are a review of the events of the chapter in which the question occurs. This review is given from the viewpoint of the participant named as the target in the discourse topic, regardless of who is the target in the current episode. The question, its answer, and the reviewed events are part of the secondary content in the discourse. The three items are considered together as flashback in this paper. If the actor is unnamed in the flashback, the actor is the participant who was named as the target in the discourse topic. If there is no stated discourse topic, flashbacks of this sort cannot be used.

In quotative sentences, exhortations or commands in quotations recommend actions to discourse participants. If these actions are carried out and the actor is not named, the actor is the participant commanded to so act.


In quotative sentences, response particles occurring in quotations indicate change of speaker and vocatives indicate who is addressed without the participants being
otherwise named at that point in the discourse. In (36) the vocative /papai/ indicates the son is speaking, and the response particle /ka/ indicates the father is replying. Quotative sentences are in the primary content of the discourse except when included in a parenthesis.

In the primary content of the discourse, the slot order of simple sentences indicates new or previously introduced participants, depending upon which order is used. It is also a means of focusing on a participant.

(37) poy oajem jakare kay (turtle-new-participant arrived alligator toward): ‘The turtle came to an alligator.’

(38) oajem poy (he-arrived turtle-previously-introduced-participant): The turtle arrived.'