

Chapter 6

Macrostructure and Storyline

This chapter describes the construction of macrostructural summaries for the Solu Sherpa texts, and reports the types of clausal information employed in this construction. This is done to provide evidence for or against Robert E. Longacre's assertion that storyline material is the "main stuff" (i.e. primary type of clausal information) from which macrostructural summaries are made.

Chapter four identified the topic change markers and described the narrative superstructure of each text. This chapter continues the macroanalysis of the texts by describing the macrocues and applying the macrorules to the superstructural segments, resulting in two levels of macropropositions. This is exemplified with the SICK story in section 6.1, while the analysis of the other four texts is found in Appendix IV. In section 6.2, the second-level macropropositions for each text, which combine into a high level summary, are reported and compared to the superstructure of each text. In addition, the types and frequency of clausal information used in the construction the second-level macropropositions are described. A summary of the chapter is then given in section 6.3.

6.1 An Example of Macrostructure Construction

This section describes the process of macroanalysis applied to the five Sherpa texts that results in the construction of second-level macropropositions. The process is exemplified in detail with respect to the SICK story as shown in Tables 37 and 38. The first level of macrooperational output shown in Table 37 is

designated “M” followed by a number associated with the superstructural thematic paragraph that it summarizes. The macrorules are then once again applied to the set of first level macropropositions in Table 38 to yield a second level of complex macropropositions, which when combined form a high level summary of the story. This second level of macrooperational output is designated “2M” followed by a number.

In the first stage of the macroanalysis of SICK a series of 40 macrooperations (i.e. applications of the macrorules) have been applied to the 34 sentences, which form the seven thematic paragraphs of the SICK story world⁸⁴. At this first level of information reduction, the application of the Zero rule, Deletion rule, and Generalization rule can be observed. In addition, a number of macrocues (thematic expressions and syntactic macrocues) have been identified to support the macrooperational decisions.⁸⁵

The Zero rule and Deletion rule are applied to the first thematic paragraph, which is a single sentence made up of five clauses. Four clauses are retained to provide the basic setting information for the action of the story. The decision to retain this sort of setting material is supported by Longacre (1989a:418), who suggests that “...elements of setting are often somewhat important to the macrostructure of a story – they introduce participants and props and localize

⁸⁴ In SICK, as in the other four stories, the surface finis is excluded from the macroanalysis because it does not refer to the story world. Rather, it signals that the narrator is exiting the story world and redirecting the conversation to a new topic or discourse. The finis can therefore be analyzed as what Polanyi (1989:48) calls *exit talk*.

⁸⁵ The first clause in which a unit of information occurs is considered the origin of that unit. Subsequent instances of that unit are considered evidence of macrorelevance and examples of cohesion. Those cohesive units that repeat macrorelevant information are, methodologically speaking, not themselves considered macrorelevant, and not employed in the construction of macropropositions. This is because the information already appears in the macroproposition.

the text world in time and space". Van Dijk and Kintsch (1983:206) also discuss the relationship between setting and macrostructure:

If, indeed, the beginning of a story is schematically organized by a setting...we also know that the first macroproposition(s) may denote a state description, introducing participants, place and time specifications, and background motivations for the events or actions that follow.

Thus S1, because it conveys the main locational and temporal setting for the story, is important to maintain. However, the middle clause of the sentence, *hajden vilidz sir'up dasa'la* 'a place called Hidden Village (Lodge)', is deleted because the lodge is never again mentioned in the story, and is therefore judged to be without macrorelevance.

The application of the Zero and Deletion rules can also be seen with respect to thematic paragraph #3, the peak of SICK. Macrooperations 8, 10, 11, 13 and 16-18 exemplify the deletion of all of the sentences except for the second part of S7, the first part and third parts of S10 and S11. The second part of 7 retains the information that all of the trekkers ate potato pancakes. The first part of 10 retains the information that David is the main agent and experiencer of the action in the rest of the paragraph. This information is of crucial importance because the rest of the story is about David having diarrhea and ends when he stops having diarrhea. From 10 and the first part of 11, we maintain the information that David put various toppings on his potato pancakes, felt full, and then drank lots of tea. The detailed description of David's eating seems to be included here as the cause of David's sickness, and therefore macrorelevant.

Finally, the second part of 11 is a thematic expression introducing the topic of 'David having diarrhea', which is a theme that dominates the rest of the story.

In addition, a number of syntactic macrocues support the macrorelevance of 'eating' and 'starting to have diarrhea' in thematic paragraph #3. The verb 'eat' is repeated 8 times in the paragraph, the noun *rikiku*² 'potato pancake' is mentioned 6 times and the noun for 'diarrhea' appears 3 times. Furthermore, the evaluative comment in S12 refers back to the event of 'starting to have diarrhea', thus highlighting it.

The application of the Generalization rule can be observed with respect to thematic paragraph #4. Macrooperations 19-25 indicate that S16b, S17b, and S19b are generalized by M4, while the rest of the section is deleted. These three segments all indicate that David went to the toilet at least once. Together, they convey that David repeatedly went to the toilet, thus the macroproposition *devid t'hojletla banji gal'* 'David went to the toilet a lot (i.e. many times).'

TP #	Text Base	Translation	Macrooperations and Macroques	Macropropositions
1	<i>S1. qaj' k'artf'e trekiŋla qa²p -- t'ola ke² + jo' k'umdzuŋ lep sima' + ala² hajden vilidz sir'up dasa'la -- lozla ŋima' tfik² det' jin' na gomu' ji +</i>	1. A little while back while (David, Christy, Tshering, and I) were going trekking, after (we) arrived in that place, up in Khumjung village, all of us stayed one day at the Hidden Village Lodge, isn't that right, and one night.	1) S1abde ⁸⁶ - Zero 2) S1c - Deletion S1abde = M1	M1 <i>qaj' k'artf'e trekiŋla qa²p t'ola ke² jo' k'umdzuŋ lep sima' lozla ŋima' tfik² det' jin' na gomu' ji</i> 'A little while back, while (David, Christy, Tshering, and I)

⁸⁶ The letters that are sometimes written after a sentences number or macroproposition number specify a section of that numbered segments. They can refer to a few words, a phrase, or one or more clauses, e.g. 1a would refer to the first part of sentence one, roughly speaking.

TP #	Text Base	Translation	Macrooperations and Macro cues	Macro-propositions
				were going trekking,, after (we) arrived up in Khumjung, we stayed one day and one night at a lodge.'
2	<i>S2. te'kine -- devid taŋ² kʰristila -- te¹ + jula juk¹ dɑ²p tʃʰela dalza¹ ai², tʰeŋnok ke² + S3. ai² miŋma² si²wi + S4. tama¹ ai² miŋma² ti¹ jo¹, katagnok + S5 ŋiraŋ² ti¹ jo¹ gal¹u dza¹ gomu¹ + S6. aaaa, ti¹ki sala¹ ti¹ ŋiraŋ² ti¹ jalem, aaaa, lozla det¹up kja¹ni gal¹u dza¹ +</i>	2. After that, on that day David and Christy went up to visit the village and they met a friend-sister. 3. The sister is called Mingma. 4. And then sister Mingma invited everyone to come up to her lodge. 5. Everyone went up to visit that night. 6. The next day we went up to stay at (Mingma's) lodge.	3) S2 – Deletion 4) S3 – Deletion 5) S4 – Deletion 6) S5 – Deletion 7) S6 – Zero S6 = M2	M2 <i>ti¹ki sala¹ ti¹ ŋiraŋ² ti¹ jalem lozla det¹up kja¹ni gal¹u dza¹</i> 'The next day we went up to stay at a different lodge.'
3	<i>S7. tama¹ + ŋima¹ tiŋ¹la ti¹, sama¹ maso¹ kja¹ni ŋira² didi rikikur² zo zo si¹ni -- ŋiraŋ² + devid kʰristi tsʰeriŋ ŋiraŋ² teri²ki -- rikikur² so¹wu dza¹ + S8. ŋje¹ rikikur² ŋi² so¹in + + TTT AAA S9 gomu¹la ti¹ riki¹ tso² so¹, tama¹ ti¹ tiŋ¹la rikikur² so¹ + tama¹, ŋje¹ ŋi², devidki ŋi², kʰristi ŋi² + + TTT kʰristi ŋi² tsʰeriŋ ŋi² kja¹ni rikikur² ŋi² ŋi² so¹wu dza¹ + S10. tama¹,</i>	7. And then after that, we had not eaten yet. Then our older sister Mingma said she made potato pancakes. We, David, Christy, Tshering, and I, all of us ate some. 8. I ate two... [interaction with audience]. 9. So that night we cooked and ate potatoes. And then after that we ate potato pancakes. I ate two, David ate two, Christy ate two, and Tshering ate two, we each ate two potato pancakes. 10. And David, [teller	8) S7a – Deletion 9) S7b – Zero 10) S8 – Deletion 11) S9 – Deletion 12) S10a – Zero 13) S10b – Deletion 14) S10c – Zero 15) S11 – Zero 16) S12 – Deletion 17) S13 – Deletion 18) S14 – Deletion S7b, 10a, 10c, 11 = M3 Macro cues: - S11: the last clause is a thematic expression introducing the topic of diarrhea that dominates the rest of the story. - The verb stem <i>so¹</i> 'eat' is used	M3 <i>devid kʰristi tsʰeriŋ ŋiraŋ² teri²ki rikikur² so¹wu dza¹ tama¹ devidki rikikur²la mar¹ ku pinat batʰar ku martsi² ku tama¹ numdʒi ti¹ ʃakpa¹ gal¹ tama¹ sotʃja kʰafjen tʰu¹ tama¹ gomu¹ ŋeʒu ma¹ kʃakpa² fel¹ mar¹ am mo mo mo mo</i>

TP #	Text Base	Translation	Macrooperations and Macroques	Macropropositions
	<p><i>TXXX devidki lakla + rikikur²la + mar¹ ku + mar¹ ku pinat bat^har, ku -- ti¹ k^ha loŋ XXX -- martsⁱ ku so¹ + + tama¹ -- tama¹, rikikur² so¹ sima¹ + aaaa, numdži ti¹ ɭakpa¹ gal¹, S11. ti¹ k^ha loŋ, soŋfja k^haŋjen² t^hu¹ + tama¹, gomu¹ ŋežu, ma¹ -- kjak.pa² felu mar¹, am mo mo mo + S12 kutuk¹ ke² jin¹ S13. tama¹ + kjak.pa² fel¹up ti¹ fel¹dok -- if, n, be -- kjakpa² fel¹up ti¹ fel¹dok kja¹n -- tor¹up mator¹ + S14. men so¹ sinaj mator¹ +</i></p>	<p>laughing] spread butter, peanut butter and then chilli pepper sauce on his potato pancakes in his hand and then ate them. And then after David ate potato pancakes, he felt full. 11. And then he also drank lots of tea. And then starting that night, David had diarrhea [exclamation sounds] 12. Oh, it was so terrible when this happened! 13. He continued to have diarrhea and did not feel well. 14. He took medicine, but he still didn't feel well.</p>	<p>8 times in this paragraph. - The noun <i>rikikur²</i> 'potato pancake' is used 6 times in this paragraph. - Participants Christy and Tshering are mentioned twice. - David is mentioned 3 times. - First person plural pronoun mentioned three times. - First person singular pronoun mentioned twice. - The noun <i>kjakpa²</i> 'diarrhea' is mentioned 3 times and its first use it highlighted by the emphatic particle <i>mar¹</i>. - The evaluative summary in 12 acts as a macrocue highlighting the event of starting to have diarrhea. -The verb <i>tor¹</i> 'well' is used 5 times in the text, 2 times here in paragraph 3, 1 time in paragraph 6, and 2 times in paragraph 7.</p>	<p>'We, David, Christy, Tshering, and I, all of us ate some potato pancakes. David spread butter, peanut butter, and chili pepper sauce on his potato pancakes and then he felt full. Then David drank lots of tea and starting that night (he) had diarrhea.'</p>
4	<p><i>S15 te¹wa jaŋ² + goŋa laŋni + tama¹, devid jeji -- jar -- koufi k^ha¹la wot¹up dza¹ ŋiraŋ² ti ŋilok²upla + S16. tama¹, t^hojlet, p^ho gjak t^hendejla -- paŋ¹la + te¹wa + devidki -- t^hojletla</i></p>	<p>15. After that we were laughing. And then David was up on the top floor and we were up there to sleep. 16. And then David went outside to the toilet [slight teller laughing]. 17. We couldn't go to the toilet because he was going every ten minutes. 18. Up there [teller</p>	<p>19) S15 – Deletion 20) S16a – Deletion 21) S17a – Deletion 22) S18 – Deletion 23) S19a – Deletion 24) S16b, 17b and S19b – Generalization 25) S20 – Deletion S16b, 17b and 19b = M4</p>	<p><i>M4</i> <i>devid t^hojletla baŋi gal¹</i> 'David went to the toilet a lot (i.e. many times).'</p>

TP #	Text Base	Translation	Macrooperations and Macroques	Macro-propositions
	<p><i>gal' + TXXX</i> <i>S17. t^hojlet ŋira²,</i> <i>t^hojlet metup wo¹ni</i> <i>+ t^handa² raŋ²</i> <i>t^handa² raŋ², das</i> <i>minit, das minitla,</i> <i>t^hojlet gal' + S18 jo</i> <i>+ TXXX t^hojlet +</i> <i>t^hojlet qa²p bela¹,</i> <i>t^hojlet naŋla¹ kaŋ¹</i> <i>kja²suŋ sisiŋ +</i> <i>ŋilok² wot¹u ke² jin¹</i> <i>na, S19 ŋi² gal¹up,</i> <i>bela¹ + kja²pa² jaŋ²</i> <i>de¹ mo¹ surwal</i> <i>naŋla¹ raŋ² buk</i> <i>furnok + + TXXX!</i> <i>S20 te¹wa, de¹ma</i> <i>t^huldumi -- () di¹ŋ</i> <i>+ + XXX! AAA</i></p>	<p>laughing] while David went to the toilet, what he did inside was that he was sleeping, isn't that right? 19. While he slept, he defecated and it exploded into his pants [intense teller laughter]. 20. After that he was wet [inaudible section] [intense laughing, audience comment].</p>	<p>Macroques: The word for 'toilet' is used 8 times and the term for 'diarrhea' <i>kja²pa²</i> is used just once.</p>	
5	<p><i>S21 ŋiraŋ² ŋi² mo¹ --</i> <i>ŋiraŋ² ŋi² mo¹, kifin</i> <i>naŋla¹ wot¹ dza¹ +</i> <i>+ S22 duk¹i ŋi²</i> <i>gal¹up t^hola, kja²pa²</i> <i>ti¹, hokt^hen + k^hok</i> <i>la¹ sima¹ nok¹ -- duŋ</i> <i>duŋ duŋ duŋ duŋ +</i> <i>+ XXX S23. t^hojletla</i> <i>gal¹ S24. kja²pa² fel¹</i> <i>taŋ² fel¹ni mik² ŋaŋ²</i> <i>duk¹ kja¹ni -- miŋma²</i> <i>tj¹ ki¹nok + TXXX</i> <i>ar ju ok^he XXX --</i> <i>S25 ja ajm ok^he + +</i> <i>XXX S26 tama¹ ti¹</i> <i>k^halaŋ + jelon²</i> <i>miŋma² tj¹ ki¹ +</i> <i>miŋma² sama¹ tso²,</i> <i>te¹ zindak tj¹ ki¹ +</i></p>	<p>21. We were all together in the kitchen. 22. At the time when he was sleeping, the feces came out. After waking up, he was running and made a noise like "doong, doong, doong, doong" [laughter]. 23. And he went down the stairs to the toilet. 24. He continued to have diarrhea and his eyes looked this way [teller looks around in a certain way]. Mingma asked [teller laughing], "Are you ok?" [laughter]. 25. And David responded, "yes, I'm ok." 26. At that time</p>	<p>26) S21 – Deletion 27) S22 – Deletion 28) S24c – Deletion 29) S25 – Deletion 30) S26 – Deletion 31) 23, 24ab – Generalization 23 and 24ab = M5 Macroques: The noun 'toilet' is mentioned 1 time while 'diarrhea' is used 2 times.</p>	<p><i>M5. kja²pa²</i> <i>fel¹ taŋ² fel¹ni</i> <i>t^hojletla gal¹</i> 'He (David) continued to have diarrhea and went to the toilet.'</p>

TP #	Text Base	Translation	Macrooperations and Macroques	Macropropositions
	"ej k ^h arte + sama ¹ jemba ¹ sa ² p meŋziwi, ej, ɖaŋ ¹ rikikur ² te ¹ baŋi ¹ so ¹ wu -- ŋiŋdʒe atʃu ¹ " + + TXXX	Mingma again asked...She cooked some food. Mingma, the owner said, "Hey, I will not allow you to eat another meal. Beloved brother, yesterday you ate so many potato pancakes" [teller laughing].		
6	S27 goɖa forni te ¹ + te ¹ wa devid ita -- di ¹ sala ¹ saŋ ² + + sala ¹ saŋ ² mator ¹ S28 te ¹ jo ¹ -- topla ² lama ² ki ti wa ¹ ni + lama ² ki ti ¹ wa ¹ ni topla ² XXX -- k ^h risti ŋira ² kot ^h ala -- "lama ² , ti ¹ gi ¹ wi" si ¹ nok S29 "kaŋ ¹ ki ¹ wi" si ¹ nok -- S30 ŋa ¹ dakpu ¹ mop ^h or kir ¹ up si ¹ kja ¹ si ¹ ni mop ^h orin +	27. We were laughing and then the next day, David was still not better. 28. In the morning a lama (Tibetan Buddhist village priest) came (to pray for David). Then Christy came to our room and said, "A lama is coming." 29. "What should we do?" she said. 30. "We all should pray," I said. And so we prayed.	32) S27 – Deletion 33) S28b – Deletion 34) S29 – Deletion 35) S30a – Deletion 36) S28a and 30b – Generalization S28a and 30b = M6 Macroques: - 'lama' is mentioned 3 times in this paragraph but does not appear anywhere else.	M6. topla ² lama ² ki ti ¹ wa ¹ ni mop ^h orin 'The next morning a lama came (to pray for David) (and then) we (also) prayed.'
7	S31 ti ¹ ts ^h ermu ¹ ti ¹ te ¹ raŋ ² de ¹ ni ti ¹ sala ¹ -- ti ¹ la menk ^h aŋla gal ¹ dza ¹ + S32 te ¹ wa tikaj + S33 mator ¹ S34 tama ¹ menk ^h aŋla gal ¹ sima ¹ , tor ¹ AXXX	31. We stayed there that day and the next day David went to the hospital. 32. After that, he was better. 33. He was not feeling well. 34. And then after he went to the hospital he felt better.	37) S31a -- Deletion 38) S33 – Deletion 39) S34 – Deletion 40) S31b and 32 – Generalization S31b and 32 = M7 Macroques: - S33 and 34 together repeat the main content of S31 and 32 and acts as a partial summary of the text as a whole.	M7. ti ¹ sala ¹ ti ¹ la menk ^h aŋla gal ¹ dza ¹ te ¹ wa tikaj 'The next day (David) went to the hospital (and) after that he was better.'

Table 37: Application of Macrorules and Macroques for the Text Base of SICK

As Table 38 shows, the Zero rule, Deletion rule, and Generalization rule are also applied at the second level of macroanalysis. With respect to M1 and M2, the

Deletion rule and Generalization are utilized. M1b, ‘after arriving...all of us stayed one day and at a lodge, isn’t that right, and one night’, and M2a, ‘the next day’, are deleted because at the global level, the first day and night staying at the first lodge are not relevant. Rather, what is macrorelevant is that the group stayed some place in the village of Khumjung and that is where David had diarrhea. The Generalization rule is then applied to combine M1a, ‘a little while back while trekking...up in Khumjung (village)’, and M2b, ‘we went up to stay at a lodge’. This information specifies the macrorelevant aspects of setting that contextualize the peak/inciting moment segment that follows. The combination of the M1 and M2 is also supported on a superstructural level in that both macropropositions summarize thematic paragraphs that are labeled as stage/exposition within the narrative superstructure.

Finally, the application of the Zero rule at the second level of abstraction is observed in macrooperation 47. Here, all of M7 is retained and left uncombined with any other segment to form 2M4. This macrooperation serves to summarize the denouement and conclusion of the story and must be retained to provide a resolution to the conflict.

First Level Macropropositions	Translation	Macrooperation	Second-Level Macropropositions
M1 <i>qay' k'art'he</i> <i>trekiŋla qa'p t'ola ke²</i> <i>jo' k'umdzuy lep</i> <i>sima' lozla ŋima' t'jik²</i> <i>det' jin'na gomu' ji</i>	1. A little while back while (David, Christy, Tshering, and I) were going trekking, after (we) arrived in that place, up in Khumjung village, all of us stayed one day at a lodge, isn't that	41) M1b – Deletion 42) M2a – Deletion 43) M1a and M2b – Generalization M1a and M2b = 2M1	2M1 <i>qay' k'art'he</i> <i>trekiŋla qa'p t'ola ke² jo'</i> <i>k'umdzuyŋla ŋiraŋ² ti'</i> <i>jalem lozla det'up kja'ni</i> <i>gal'u dza'</i> 'A little while back while (David, Christy, Tshering, and I) were going trekking up in Khumjung (town) we went up to stay at a lodge.'

First Level Macro-propositions	Translation	Macrooperation	Second-Level Macro-propositions
	right, and one night.		
<i>M2. ti'ki sala' ti' njiraŋ² ti' jalem lozla det'up kja'ni gal'u dza'</i>	'The next day we went up to stay at a lodge.'	(see above)	
<i>M3. devid k^hristi ts^herij njiraŋ² teri²ki rikikur² so'wu dza' tama' devidki rikikur²la mar' ku pinat bat^har ku martsⁱ² ku tama' numdži ti' jakpa' gal' tama' sotfja k^hafjen t^hu' tama' gom^u' nezu ma' kjakpa² fel' mar' am mo mo mo mo</i>	'We, David, Christy, Tshering, and I, all of us ate some potato pancakes. David spread butter, peanut butter, and chili pepper sauce on his potato pancakes and then he felt full. Then David drank lots of tea and starting that night (he) had diarrhea.'	44) M3a – Zero 45) M3b, M4, and M5 – Generalization M3b, M4, and M5 = 2M2	<i>2M2 devid k^hristi ts^herij njiraŋ² teri²ki rikikur² so'wu dza' tama' devidki rikikur²la mar' ku pinat bat^har ku martsⁱ² ku tama' numdži ti' jakpa' gal' tama' sotfja k^hafjen t^hu' tama' devid kjakpa² baŋi sel'u mar'</i> 'We, David, Christy, Tshering, and I, all of us ate some potato pancakes. David spread butter, peanut butter, and chili pepper sauce on his potato pancakes and then he felt full. Then David drank lots of tea and he had lots of diarrhea.'
<i>M4. devid baŋi t^hojletla gal'</i>	'David went to the toilet alot (i.e. many times).'	(see above)	
<i>M5. kjakpa² fel' taŋ² fel'ni t^hojletla gal'</i>	'He (David) continued to have diarrhea and went to the toilet.'	(see above)	
<i>M6. topla² lama²ki ti' wa'ni mop^horin</i>	'The next morning a lama came (to pray for David) (and then) we (also) prayed.'	46) M6 – Zero M6 = 2M3	<i>2M3 topla² lama²ki ti' wa'ni mop^horin</i> 'The next morning a lama came (to pray for David) (and then) we (also) prayed.'
<i>M7. ti' sala' ti'la menk^hanla gal' dza' te'wa tikaj</i> 'The next day (David) went to the hospital	'(David) went to the hospital (and) after that he was better.'	47) M7 – Zero M7 = 2M4	<i>2M4 ti' sala' ti'la menk^hanla gal' dza' te'wa tikaj</i> 'The next day (David) went to the hospital (and)

First Level Macro-propositions	Translation	Macrooperation	Second-Level Macro-propositions
(and) after that he was better.’			after that he was better.’

Table 38: Construction of Second-Level Macropropositions in SICK

6.2 Comparing Macrostructure and Storyline

In this section we describe the clausal information types employed in the construction of the second-level macropropositions. Sub-sections 6.2.1 to 6.2.5 present: 1. The second-level macropropositions of each text, 2. the relationship between these propositions and the text's narrative superstructure, and 3. the information type of each clause/information unit⁸⁷ from the original text employed to construct the macropropositions.

It seems that Longacre (1989a:415, 444) is claiming that the macrostructure of a narrative can be built primarily from the storyline.⁸⁸ However, the present analysis shows that although the storyline is the most used information type for constructing second-level macropropositions of the Sherpa texts, supportive material is employed more often than storyline material. These results argue for a broader approach to the macroanalysis of Solu Sherpa stories of personal experience that includes the analysis of supportive material as well as storyline clauses.

⁸⁷ The term *information unit* is utilized because the semantic units used in the construction of macropropositions often are syntactic units smaller than a clause. However, only one information can be extracted from each clause to be integrated into a macroproposition.

⁸⁸ Longacre (1989a:444) states that “There is a relationship between the etic [salience] scheme formulated here and macrostructure theory, including such formulations as van Dijk's rules for reducing a text to its macrostructure, that is, obtaining an abstract of the text (van Dijk 1977b:143ff). Storyline forms are the main stuff from which abstracts are made. But abstracts can be posited on various descending levels of generality as we add further elements to the storyline.” Based on this context, the present study interprets the statement, “Storyline forms are the main stuff from which abstracts are made” to mean that Longacre is asserting that a general abstract constructed using van Dijk's macrorules would normally be composed mostly from information that appears in the storyline clauses of the original text (i.e. over 50% of the clauses from which information is taken to construct the general abstract should be storyline clauses).

6.2.1 SICK

The four second-level macropropositions in SICK are constructed with 19 information units, as seen in Table 39. Ten of these units originate with storyline clauses. The other nine units come from flashback, background action, background activity, irrealis material, and a cohesive clause.

A summary of the relationship between the second-level macropropositions and the narrative superstructure of SICK is also illustrated in Table 39. The second-level macropropositions closely correspond to the major divisions of the notional structure. Macroproposition 2M1 summarizes the exposition of the story (thematic paragraphs 1 and 2). Macroproposition 2M2 summarizes the developing conflict of the story, including the moment that initiates the conflict (thematic paragraphs 3, 4, and 5). Macroproposition 2M3 summarizes the climax of the conflict (thematic paragraph 6). Finally, macroproposition 2M4 summarizes the denouement and conclusion (thematic paragraph 7). Thus the second-level macropropositions seems to correspond with the most extreme shifts in the level tension in the story.

In SICK, all four macropropositions are constructed with at least one storyline clause. Therefore, for this story, it may be possible to use the storyline alone as input to formulate an acceptable macrostructural summary with all high level notional segments accounted for.

2M#	Second-Level Macropropositions	Surface / Notional Function	Originating Sentences	Types of Information
2M1 S1-6 TP1-2	<p><i>ɖaŋ¹ k^hartf^he trekiŋla ɖa²p t^hola ke²jo¹ k^humdzuŋla ŋiraŋ² ti¹ jalem lozla det¹up kja¹ni gal¹u dza¹</i></p> <p>‘A little while back while (David, Christy, Tshering, and I) were going trekking up in Khumjung (town) we went up to stay at a lodge.’</p>	<p><u>Surface:</u> - Stage 1 - Stage 2</p> <p><u>Notional:</u> - Exposition 1 - Exposition 2</p>	S1 Sub ⁸⁹	Cohesive
			S6 Sub	Irrealis
			S6 Main	Storyline
2M2 S7-26 TP3-5	<p>2M2 <i>devid k^hristi ts^heriŋ ŋiraŋ² teri²ki rikikur² so¹wu dza¹ tama¹ devidki rikikur²la mar¹ ku pinat bat^har ku marts² ku tama¹ numd³zi ti¹ ʃakpa¹ gal¹ tama¹ sotʃja k^hafjen t^hu¹ tama¹ devid kjakpa² baŋi sel¹u mar¹</i></p> <p>‘We, David, Christy, Tshering, and I, all of us ate some potato pancakes. David spread butter, peanut butter, and chili pepper sauce on his potato pancakes and then he felt full. Then David drank lots of tea and David had lots of diarrhea.’</p>	<p><u>Surface:</u> - Peak - Postpeak 1 - Postpeak 2</p> <p><u>Notional:</u> - Inciting moment - Developing conflict 1 - Developing conflict 2</p>	S7 Main	Storyline
			S10 Med(1)	Flashback
			S10 Med(2)	Flashback
			S10 Med(3)	Flashback
			S10 Main	Storyline
			S11 Med	Background action
			S11 Main	Storyline
			S16 Main	Storyline
			S17 Main	Background activity
			S19 Main	Storyline
S23 Main	Storyline			
S24 Med	Background activity			
2M3 S27-30 TP6	<p><i>topla² lama²ki ti¹ wa¹ni mop^horin</i></p> <p>‘The next morning a lama came (to pray for David) (and then) we (also) prayed.’</p>	<p><u>Surface:</u> - Postpeak 3</p> <p><u>Notional:</u> - Climax</p>	S28 Med	Background action
			S30 Main	Storyline
2M4 S31-34a TP7	<p><i>ti¹ sala¹ ti¹la menk^hanla gal¹ dza¹ te¹wa tikaj</i></p> <p>‘The next day (David) went to the hospital (and) after that he was better.’ the hospital (and) after that (he) was better.’</p>	<p><u>Surface:</u> - Closure</p> <p><u>Notional:</u> - Denouement - Conclusion</p>	S31 Main	Storyline
			S32 Main	Storyline

Table 39: Information Types in Second-Level Macropropositions of SICK

⁸⁹ The abbreviation ‘Sub’ indicates that the information came from a subordinate clause, ‘Med’ means the information came from a medial clause, and ‘Main’ signals that the information came from a main clause in the original text.

6.2.2 RAT

The five second-level macropropositions in RAT are constructed with 10 information units, as seen in Table 40. Only three of these units originate with storyline clauses. The other seven units come from background action, flashback A material, setting, irrealis material, and evaluation.

2M#	Second-Level Macropropositions	Surface / Notional Function	Originating Sentences	Types of Information
2M1 S1 TP1	<i>nje' ani²la pje' tamnje² pje' pe² tfik²</i> <i>setupno</i> 'I will share a rat story with my aunti.'	<u>Surface:</u> - Title - Aperture	S1 Main	Evaluation
2M2 S2- 11 TP2	<i>k^hartf^he nje' hot^hella lemba pje'</i> <i>funok</i> 'A little while ago in my tea shop a rat entered a trap.'	<u>Surface:</u> - Stage <u>Notional:</u> - Exposition	S2 Main S9 Main	Temporal phrase, from Setting clause <i>Storyline</i>
2M3 S12- 38 TP 3-4	<i>me' tf^har dapni tama' pitar^h tonju</i> <i>dza' ni</i> 'I set fire (to the rat) like "char", then I let the rat free outside.'	<u>Surface:</u> - Prepeak 1 <u>Notional:</u> - Inciting moment	S23 Med S28 Main	Background action <i>Storyline</i>
2M4 S39- 47 TP5	<i>tama' kjeri par'la fun gal'nok</i> <i>t^hendup raj² matf^hu^hni</i> 'And then the rat went in between some banana trees and he could not escape.'	<u>Surface:</u> ⁹⁰ - Postpeak 1 <u>Notional:</u> - Climax	S42 Main S46 Med	<i>Storyline</i> Irrealis
2M5 S48- 53 TP6	<i>tama' te'mi sala' topla² pje' jan² ġil</i> <i>dumba ġili subd³aj tf^hindaj gal'</i> 'And then the next morning the rat had become all burned up like a hard oval or a piece of bread.'	<u>Surface:</u> - Closure <u>Notional:</u> - Denouement - Conclusion	S50 Sub S51 Main S52 Main	Temporal phrase, from Setting Flashback A Flashback A

Table 40: Information Types in Second-Level Macropropositions of RAT

The relationship between the second-level macropropositions and the notional structure in RAT is similar to that found in SICK. That is, the second-level macropropositions correspond closely with the major notional level functions, as

⁹⁰ The macroproposition that summarizes peak/developing conflict of RAT has been deleted because it is not textually macrorelevant. It simply serves to elaborate on and give macrorelevance to macroproposition 2M3. See Appendix IV.

seen in Table 40. One possible departure from this pattern is the deletion of the peak/developing conflict segment in RAT. It seems that the peak/developing conflict segment (thematic paragraph 4) is simply an elaboration of the action in 2M3 and not a macrorelevant sequence for moving the plot from the inciting moment to the climax, even though it has peak marking. However, it seems that the notional function of the developing conflict in the summary is fulfilled by the inciting moment under the broader concept of 'change in the level of tension'.

In RAT, the three macropropositions in the middle of the story are all constructed with at least one storyline clause. However, the initial macroproposition which summarizes the surface aperture and the final macroproposition which concludes the story are both formulated solely from supportive clauses. A macrostructural summary based on the storyline as input would therefore be unlikely to be acceptable to mother-tongue speakers of Sherpa. Of course, this hypothesis needs to be tested.

6.2.3 MRKT

The seven second-level macropropositions in MRKT are constructed with 14 information units, as seen in Table 41. Only five of these units originate with storyline clauses. The other 9 units come from flashback A, flashback B, setting, and evaluation.

Table 41 also displays the second-level macropropositions of MRKT and their relationship to the narrative superstructure. The macrostructure of MRKT is similar to that of SICK in that the two stage/expositions segments can be reduced

to a single macroproposition. One difference is that while the climax in SICK and RAT is represented by its own macroproposition, the climax and denouement in MRKT are jointly summarized by a macroproposition. Another notable characteristic of this macrostructure is the asymmetry between the developing conflict and final suspense. While each thematic paragraph of the developing conflict (including the inciting moment) is summarized by a different macroproposition, the three segments with the notional function of final suspense are deleted.

In this story, storyline clauses are employed in the formulation of the first five macropropositions with high level notional functions. However, the last macroproposition is constructed completely from supportive clauses. A macrostructure of MRKT based on the storyline would therefore result in a summary that deletes the ending of the story.

2M#	Second-Level Macropropositions	Surface / Notional Function	Originating Sentences	Types of Information
2M1 S1-13 TP 1-2	<i>tama¹ ti baksila bazarla mi² mi²ra tin² karminla gal¹u dzo¹</i> 'And in Baksila Bazar seven men went to do construction.'	<u>Surface:</u> - Stage 1 <u>Notional:</u> - Exposition 1	S1 Main	Storyline
2M2 S14-16 TP3	<i>zelsaki petu ji me¹ ti¹ t^hat^ha t^hut^ha se²n dzak tikpe¹ p^herwa ji lunok</i> 'A helper boy from Chelsa village put the fire out very quickly and left a small piece of fire remaining.'	<u>Surface:</u> ⁹¹ -Prepeak 1 <u>Notional:</u> - Inciting moment	S14 Main S16 Main	Subject, from Setting clause Storyline
2M3 S17-26 TP4	<i>me¹ ti¹ doŋbu¹ taŋ² tfoŋda gal¹</i> 'The fire became as high as a tree.'	<u>Surface:</u> - Prepeak 2 <u>Notional:</u> - Developing conflict 1	S25 Main	Storyline
2M4	<i>k^haŋba¹ k^haŋba¹ne ts^he ts^he ts^he jaŋ²</i>	<u>Surface:</u>	S33 Main	Storyline

⁹¹ The macroproposition that summarizes the stage 2/exposition 2 of MRKT has been deleted because it is not textually macrorelevant. It acts as a foreshadowing elaboration about the fire introduced in 3M2. See Appendix IV.

2M#	Second-Level Macropropositions	Surface / Notional Function	Originating Sentences	Types of Information
S27-34 TP5	<i>lali tʰu² kʰur²ni lesuŋ</i> 'Some people from every house brought a little bit of water'	- Prepeak 3 <u>Notional:</u> - Developing conflict 2		
2M5 S35-53 TP6-9	<i>jo¹ ŋa¹ra maʒa tuwa¹ tʰenin sama</i> <i>baji tak¹ tsʰik¹nok</i> 'I grabbed my own clothes from up there (but) many things were completely burned up/damaged.'	<u>Surface:</u> - Peak - Postpeak 1 <u>Notional:</u> - Climax - Denouement	S35 Main	Storyline
			S38 Med	Flashback B
			S43 Main	Subject, from Setting clause
			S44 Main	Flashback A
			S45 Med	Flashback B
			S45 Main	Flashback A
			S46 Med	Flashback B
S47 Main	Flashback A			
2M6 S54-60a TP 10-11	<i>tama¹ ti¹ki loalaŋ dakp¹i</i> <i>amotʰowuki</i> 'And with this (story shows that) we are not able to do anything against the fire'	<u>Surface:</u> ⁹² - Closure <u>Notional:</u> - Conclusion	S60 Main	Evaluation

Table 41: Information Types in Second-Level Macropropositions of MRKT

6.2.4 BATTLE

The six second-level macropropositions in BATTLE are constructed with 23 information units, as seen in Table 42. Only five of these units originate with storyline clauses. The other 18 units come from background action, background activity, flashback A, flashback B, setting, irrealis material, and evaluation.

The relationship between the second-level macropropositions and the narrative superstructure in BATTLE is also displayed in Table 42. This story has a number of unique characteristics. First, the main action of the plot (i.e. the inciting moment, climax and denouement) is summarized by a single macroproposition.

Secondly, BATTLE is the only story with two expositions that has a separate

⁹² The macropropositions that summarize the postpeak 2/final suspense 1 and postpeak 3/final suspense 2 of MRKT have been deleted because they include descriptive material that is not macrorelevant. The postpeak 4/final suspense 3 is a hypothetical example expressing the same attitude as the macroproposition summarizing TP11. Since M10 is not a presupposition of M11, M10 can be deleted. See Appendix IV.

macroproposition summarizing each one. Third, BATTLE is unique in that both final suspense segments of the superstructure are represented by a separate macroproposition.

In BATTLE, four out of six macropropositions with high level notional functions are constructed with at least one storyline clause. However, 2M1 (stage 1/ exposition 1) is constructed only from setting material and 2M5 (postpeak 3/ final suspense 2) is made up of the flashback A Band and background activity. For this story, macroanalysis based on the storyline alone would result in a summary that would be missing two important notional segments.

2M#	Second-Level Macropropositions	Surface / Notional Function	Originating Sentences	Types of Information
2M1 S1-3 TP1	<i>ŋa' tɪkpe' bela' ŋa' lo' tɪkɲi²</i> <i>lewu bela' p^haplu sir'up dasa'la</i> <i>te' ti' de'kiwi</i> 'When I (was) small, when I was 12, I was staying at a place (town) called Phaplu.'	<u>Surface:</u> - Stage 1 <u>Notional:</u> - Exposition 1	S1 Sub	Setting
			S1 Sub2	Setting
			S3 Sub	Setting
			S3 Main	Setting
2M2 S4-5 TP2	<i>ŋa' ti' dalza' jiki dalza' ti'</i> <i>k^haqba' ti' k^haqba' gal'ni de'in</i> 'I went and stayed at my friend's house'	<u>Surface:</u> - Stage 2 <u>Notional:</u> - Exposition 2	S4 Med	Background action
			S4 Main	Storyline
2M3 S6-37 TP 3-5	<i>te' p^haplu ti' mo' saleri san²</i> <i>nup'ki mi² ŋima' ŋi²la k^hafjen² ta'</i> <i>mak² gjeɟsun</i> 'There in Phaplu and also down in Salleri for two days the Maoists did alot of fighting.'	<u>Surface:</u> - Peak 1 - Peak 2 - Postpeak 1 <u>Notional:</u> - Inciting moment - Climax - Denouement	S10 Sub	Subject, from Irrealis clause
			S21 Main	Storyline
			S23 Sub	Background activity
			S27 Sub	Temporal, from Irrealis clause
			S28 Main	Background activity
			S37 Main	Storyline
2M4 S38-42 TP6	<i>te'wa tiŋ'la sala' topla² te' tiŋ'la</i> <i>te'wa ma² tindup maŋmi² tuwa'la</i> <i>dalza' go'kinok si'ni tama' ŋiraŋ²</i>	<u>Surface:</u> - Postpeak 2 <u>Notional:</u> - Final suspense 1	S38 Med	Temporal, from background action clause
			S40 Med	Flashback B

2M#	Second-Level Macropropositions	Surface / Notional Function	Originating Sentences	Types of Information
	<i>ti¹ mamu¹ la²p taŋ² kja¹ni mamu¹ gal¹in</i> 'And after, the next morning some people said to us "down there the army men are injured and need some help". And then we went down to look.'		S42 Sub2 S42 Med S42 Sub3 S42 Main	Irrealis Background action Irrealis <i>Storyline</i>
2M5 S43-48 TP7	<i>mi² tuwa¹ k^hafjen² se²nok tama¹ te¹wa ŋa¹ŋ tama¹ te¹wa maŋmi²la k^hur²upla dalza¹ kit¹up</i> 'Many people had died and I was helping the army carry injured people.'	<u>Surface:</u> - Postpeak 3 <u>Notional:</u> - Final suspense 2	S43 Main S47 Main S48 Main	Flashback A Flashback A Background activity
2M6 S49aa nd b TP8	<i>te¹ raŋ² kot^ha kot^hala wa¹ni de¹in</i> 'We came back to the room and stayed'	<u>Surface:</u> - Closure <u>Notional:</u> - Conclusion	S49 Med S49 Main	Background action <i>Storyline</i>

Table 42: Information Types in Second-Level Macropropositions of BATTLE

6.2.5 BEAR

The six second-level macropropositions in BEAR are constructed with 28 information units, as seen in Table 43. Almost half of these units, 13, originate with storyline clauses. The other 15 units come from background action, background activity, flashback A, setting, irrealis material, and cohesive material.

The relationship between the second-level macropropositions and the narrative superstructure of BEAR is seen in Table 43. The exposition function, represented by two thematic paragraphs, is summarized by a single macroproposition, as in SICK and MRKT. The climax, denouement, and conclusion are each summarized by a separate macroproposition. However, the inciting moment is separated from

the rest of the developing conflict. Prepeak 1, with the notional function of inciting moment, is summarized by one macroproposition, while prepeak episodes 3 and 4, which have the notional function of developing conflict, combine under a single more generalized macroproposition.

In this story, there is at least one storyline clause employed to construct each second-level macroproposition. Although some information would be lost, a macrostructure of BEAR based on the storyline alone may result in an adequate summary that includes elements of all high level notional segments.

2M#	Second-Level Macropropositions	Surface / Notional Function	Originating Sentences	Types of Information
2M1 S1-7 TP 1-2	<i>ɲa¹, tɪkpe¹ bela¹ jin¹ tsʰermu¹ ji ɲiraŋ² ti¹ te¹ jo¹ te¹wa ti¹ tɕuŋma tɕik² ʈala¹ gjeɲnok tɕʰala ʈa² gal¹in</i> 'When I was small, one day we went up to look near where a cow had fallen down.'	<u>Surface:</u> - Stage - Stage 2 <u>Notional:</u> - Exposition - Exposition 2	S01 Main	Setting
			S04 Main	Temporal phrase, from Background action
			S05 Sub	Irrealis
			S06 Main	Storyline
2M2 S8-16 TP3	<i>ti¹ tɕuŋma ʈala¹ gjeɲwu tɕʰala ti¹ tuko¹ tum¹ ji wa¹ni de¹nok</i> 'A bear came and stayed where the cow had fallen.'	<u>Surface:</u> - Prepeak 1 <u>Notional:</u> - Inciting moment	S08 Main	Storyline
2M3 S17-30 TP 4-6	<i>2M3 ti¹ tɕuŋma ti¹ ta¹ pʰo ɕepni maɕe tama¹ ti¹ ɲiraŋ² mi²ra din laktɕa kʰun²ni tama¹ ɲiraŋ² taŋ² ki² ɲi² ti¹ tum¹ ti¹ foru gal¹in</i> 'At that time, the cow was not dead and so we seven people took weapons and went with the two dogs to chase the bear.'	<u>Surface:</u> ⁹³ - Prepeak 3 - Prepeak 4 <u>Notional:</u> - Developing conflict 2 - Developing conflict 3	S21 Sub	Irrealis
			S21 Med	Background action
			S21 Sub	Irrealis
			S21 Main	Storyline
			S26 Med	Subject, from Cohesive
2M4 S31-54 TP7	<i>2M4 ki² ɲi²kar taŋ² mi² tuwa¹ tum¹ taŋ² mula¹ tʰapni tum¹ ti¹ te¹wa tiŋ¹la ti¹ tsur ti¹ loŋn mawa¹wu</i> 'The two dogs and the people fought with the bear and the bear did not return.'	<u>Surface:</u> - Peak <u>Notional:</u> - Climax	S33 Sub	Irrealis
			S33 Main	Storyline
			S42 Main	Storyline
			S45 Main	Storyline
			S48 Main	Storyline
			S50 Main	Storyline
S52 Med	Background			

⁹³ Prepeak episode 2/Developing conflict 1 has been deleted. The information in this section can be assumed based on later information and does not need to be stated explicitly in the second-level macrostructure.

2M#	Second-Level Macropropositions	Surface / Notional Function	Originating Sentences	Types of Information
				action
			S52 Main	<i>Storyline</i>
			S53 Main	Irrealis
			S54 Med	Background activity
			S54 Main	<i>Storyline</i>
2M5 S55- 61 TP8	<i>te'wa tij'la tfujma ti' gjaŋ fenok ŋira² bela' ts ti' tfujma ti' ti²ni mo' tsaŋb'i naŋla' kjurin tum' ti' gi'nok tfujma ti' dar ti²in gal'</i> 'And then after, (we saw that) the cow had already died, and we took the cow down and threw it in the river, and the bear came and went away dragging the cow.'	<u>Surface:</u> - Postpeak <u>Notional:</u> - Denouement	S55 Main	Flashback A
			S56 Med	Background action
			S56 Main	<i>Storyline</i>
			S57 Main	Background activity
			S61 Main	<i>Storyline</i>
2M6 S62a TP9	<i>te'wa ŋiraŋ² ti' k'angba' wa'ni de'in</i> 'And we came home and stayed'	<u>Surface:</u> - Closure <u>Notional:</u> - Conclusion	S62 Med	Background action
			S62 Main	<i>Storyline</i>

Table 43: Information Types in Second-Level Macropropositions of BEAR

6.3 Chapter Conclusion

In this chapter, the process of macroanalysis was exemplified, the second-level macropropositions were presented and compared to the narrative superstructure, and the types of clausal information employed in the construction of the second-level macropropositions were described.

The comparison between macropropositions and narrative superstructure has shown that thematic paragraphs with a superstructural function are often subsumed under a single macroproposition based on their general role in relation to the tension in the story. When exposition paragraphs combine, they combine with other exposition paragraphs. When paragraphs that increase tension (inciting moment and developing conflict) combine, they tend to combine with other paragraphs that increase tension. When paragraphs that

decrease tension (denouement, final suspense, conclusion) combine, they tend to combine with other paragraphs that decrease tension. Two exceptions to these tendencies were observed, in which paragraphs that increase tension were combined with paragraphs that decrease tension. In the BATTLE story, the inciting moment, climax, and denouement are subsumed under a single macroproposition. Then the climax and denouement are combined in MRKT. It is possible to posit another high level notional category called 'height of tension' to cover these exceptions.

These high level notional functions were often filled by segments of text that included a combination of storyline and supportive material. Of the 27 second-level macropropositions, 17 (63%) were constructed with a mixture of storyline and supportive material. In addition, 5 (19%) second-level macropropositions were constructed with only supportive material and 5 (19%) were constructed with only storyline material. It seems that supportive material was interpreted as macrorelevant (and thus used to construct second-level macropropositions) when it was needed to adequately fill superstructural categories which would not be filled by storyline clauses alone. It seems that storyline material did not sufficiently perform a superstructural function in 22 of 27 second-level macropropositions (81%), thus resulting in the large number of supportive clauses employed in the construction of the second-level propositions.

As seen in Table 44, the analysis of Sherpa texts described in this chapter has demonstrated that the storyline Band was certainly the most used single Band, being the origin of 38% of the information units. But the supportive information

types as a group were employed more than storyline material in the construction of the second-level macropropositions (62% to 38%). Of the supportive Bands, background action accounted for 13% of the information units, irrealis clauses produced 12%, setting 10%, flashback A 9%, and flashback B and background activity 7% each. The two least used types were evaluation and cohesive, each accounting for 2% of the information units.

Story	Info Units in 2 nd Level Macropropositions	Storyline Units	%	Other Important Units	#	%
SICK	19	10	53	Flashback B	3	16
				Background activity	2	11
				Background action	2	11
RAT	10	3	30	Flashback A	2	20
				Setting	2	20
MRKT	14	5	36	Flashback A	3	21
				Flashback B	3	21
BATTLE	23	5	22	Setting	4	17
				Background action	4	17
				Irrealis	4	17
BEAR	28	13	46	Background action	5	18
				Irrealis	5	18
Total – All Stories	94	36	38	Background action	12	13
				Irrealis	11	12
				Setting	9	10
				Flashback A	8	9
				Flashback B	7	7
				Background activity	7	7
				Change of state (+ punc)	63	67
Change of state (+/-punc)	70	74				

Table 44: Summary of the Types of Information Units Used in the Macropropositions of Each Text

In all five stories, storyline material was the most used information type.

However, if flashback Bands A and B are considered as one type, than flashback material, which is characterized by happenings that are out-of-sequence from the storyline, was employed more often than storyline clauses in MRKT.

SICK was the only story in which storyline accounted for over half of the information units. The BEAR story employed storyline material in just under half the information units. These two stories were the only ones in which every macroproposition with a high level notional function was constructed with at least one storyline clause. Therefore, for these two stories, it may be possible to formulate a full macrostructural summary with all the superstructural elements based solely on the storyline input for the macroanalysis. Nonetheless, some important information would most likely be lost.

In the other three stories, RAT, MRKT, and BATTLE, storyline material accounts for less than 37% of the information units used to construct the second-level macropropositions. In addition, in each of these stories there are second-level macropropositions with high level notional functions that are constructed solely with supportive material. For this reason, a macrostructural summary of these stories using the storyline alone is likely to be considered inadequate by mother-tongue speakers of Sherpa.

Future studies are needed to determine the acceptability of different kinds of summaries for mother-tongue speakers of Sherpa. One possible investigation might involve having mother-tongue speakers listen to various types of summaries of the stories analyzed in this thesis. These summaries could include the macrostructural summary based on the entire text reported in this study, a macrostructural summary based the storyline, and one or more oral summaries constructed by other mother-tongue speakers. Mother-tongue speaker would then be asked to rank the summaries from best to worst and give a brief intuitive

explanation about why they rated the summaries the way they did. This type of investigation would not only test the results of this thesis, but also test the argument of van Dijk and Kintsch (1983:206, 237, 240, 252-253) and van Dijk (1976:554-557 and 1985:126) that an acceptable summary of a story normally requires information from all of the categories of the narrative superstructure.

In addition, the global thematic importance of storyline clauses in SICK and BEAR can be correlated with the overall density of storyline clauses in these stories. SICK has the highest storyline clause density (.18) and the highest use of storyline clauses in macrostructure formation (53%). The BEAR story has the second highest level in both categories (.17 and 46% respectively). The other three stories all have a storyline clause density of less than .14 and less than 37% of the information units employed in the construction of their second-level macropropositions originate in storyline clauses.

However, the data can be viewed in another way. Rather than simply looking at the distribution of storyline versus supportive material, the information Bands can be divided into eventive clauses which indicate a new change of state (Bands 1-5) and non-eventive clauses where no new change of state is communicated (Bands 6-9). If the data is viewed in this way, one observes that the majority of information units, 74%, originate in eventive clauses.

Furthermore, the importance of punctiliar eventive clauses (Bands 1-4 only), which account for 67% of the information units, can also be observed. This result seems to support van Dijk's (1977b:147) assertion that event and action

descriptions are more important than state descriptions in the macrostructure of a narrative.

Longacre (1989a:444) states that the storyline is the “main stuff from which abstracts are made”. It seems that Longacre is claiming that the macrostructure of a narrative can be built primarily from the storyline. However, this study indicates that although the storyline is the most utilized information type for constructing second-level macropropositions of the Sherpa texts, supportive material is employed more often than storyline material. Therefore, this study seems to indicate that there are some narrative genres in some languages in which supportive information has at least as much global thematic prominence as storyline information, even while the storyline continues to represent the structural thematic prominence.