Chapter 2

Typology and Overview of the texts

This chapter presents a brief literature review of discourse analysis in relation to narrative discourse, and a synopsis of the texts used in this thesis.

2.1 Literature review

Traditionally the focus of linguistic analysis has been on the sentence level and below. A trend to study beyond this level has developed in the past few decades. Many linguists began to seek fuller answers to various syntactic problems. Robert E. Longacre, one of the pioneers in this field, states that "language is language only in context" (Longacre 1996:1). For instance, the anaphoric references to certain participants in some cases cannot be explained within the sentences themselves. Thus discourse analysis looks at the text as a whole and investigates the patterns and cohesive elements which unite the text as a single unit.

Longacre (1968, 1972, 1989, 1990, 1996) has studied written and spoken texts of various genres. This includes monologues and dialogues in various languages ancient and modern, standardized and minority. His major contributions to the field of discourse analysis include the studies of genre and typology, storyline materials and related salience schemes, and participant reference systems especially in narrative discourse.

There are various text types in a language, and each text type has unique textual properties used for a particular purpose. In this study I will use Longacre's broad categories to distinguish notional text types or etic discourse types.

According to Longacre (1996:8-9), all monologue discourses in any language can be classified by means of two characteristics: contingent temporal succession and agent orientation. Contingent succession "refers to a framework of temporal succession in which some (often most) of the events or doings are contingent on previous events or doings" (Longacre 1996:8). The following four etic discourse types are broadly classified by means of these two parameters as in Table 10.

		Agent Orientation	
		+	-
Contingent Succession	+	Narrative	Procedural
	–	Behavioral	Expository

Table 10: Etic discourse types (adapted from Longacre 1996:10)

Narrative discourse is *plus* in respect to both contingent succession and agent orientation. Procedural discourse is *plus* contingent succession and *minus* agent orientation. Behavioral is *minus* for contingent temporal succession and *plus* for agent orientation. Expository is *minus* in respect to both characteristics.

The other two parameters that Longacre (1996:9-10) proposed are: projection and tension. *Plus* projection "has to do with a situation or action which is contemplated, enjoined, or anticipated, but not realized" (Longacre 1996:9). Tension "has to do with whether a discourse reflects a struggle of some sort" (Longacre 1996:10). These parameters further subdivide the discourse types. Prophecy is *minus* projection, and narrative and stories have *plus* projection.

Narrative can be *plus* or *minus* tension. An episodic narrative has *minus* tension and climatic narrative has *plus* tension. Narrative discourse includes prophecy and story. Narrative discourses can teach, entertain, and inform the receptor.

The second part of this chapter will present a synopsis of the texts used in this thesis to serve as an introduction for the analysis and will classify the texts using the genre types proposed by Longacre.

2.2 Synopsis of the texts

There are three texts analyzed for this thesis. They are referred to as 'Wild Pig Hunting', 'Barking Deer Hunting', and 'Thief on Bus'. A synopsis of each of these texts is presented below. This synopsis is mostly the free translation of the texts, edited for easy and smooth reading. It does not attempt to present a formal macrostructure of those texts.

2.2.1 Wild Pig Hunting

This text is a wild pig hunting story. The narrator told this story to share the lesson he and his friend learned from this wild pig hunting experience. This story was told when I asked him to tell a hunting story of his that he could not forget.

> I and my friend Yongcuv went wild pig hunting during the time when the rice fields were ripe. Because it was the time wild pigs usually come out in the rice fields. I met the boar two times the first night, but I did not get it. But I was determined to get one somehow, only then to return home, and I stayed again the next night.
>
> The next night there were many wild pigs that came out in the field. I told my friend to stay back and I went near. There many small wild pigs came even in between my legs, but I did not find a big one. I climbed up

the stump and looked around. Then I found that a boar was standing near a banana tree. There I shot it. Then it ran away, knocking down the banana tree and bamboo. After that we slept for the night.

Early next morning we went tracking it. We found that it slept at eight places, and the last one was still very warm. After we tracked a little further, we came to a bush between two bamboo clumps and found signs that the boar had entered into it. So we climbed up on the fallen bamboo stalks and shook them again and again to make it come out. When it did not come out, I thought that it might go away by the other side of the bamboo clump; so I went around to that side. When I got there, I shouted back to my friend to make sure that was the right place. Immediately the boar jumped out of the bush and came toward me. I had a dangerous escape from it. My friend thought I was already dead. After that, I thought of giving it up, but my friend insisted. So we continued to track it. When my friend went to track it, I went to close off the way. But before I got to the place the boar met me. Then I tried to shoot it, but it ran away. When it met me for the second time, I shot it at its forehead, and it fell down right there. Then my friend also came up and shot it again on the neck and it died.

After it was killed we found that all the bullets I shot last night, hit deadly spots. If it was a normal one or other animals like deer or barking deer, it would have died after two steps. Also we found that it had had a severe fight with a tiger one or two years ago and its wounds at the back healed very deep. So it became very wild and stubborn. It did not shed its blood because it was very fat, and the fat stopped the blood from coming out. So it is good for hunters to be aware of this kind of animal.

In the Wild Pig Hunting story there are clear temporal markers such as *atiti vu ra* 'the first night', *asëri* 'the next night', *asëcë* 'early next morning', etc. which show the chronological succession of the events. The events are also contingent on the previous events. Therefore this story has *plus* contingent succession. The narrator, his friend and the wild pig are the agents of those events, proving that it has *plus* agent orientation. Moreover the story has the value of *minus*

projection and *plus* tension. The narrator struggles to escape from the danger of the animal, and tries to shoot it. These textual properties of the story are typical of a narrative discourse.

2.2.2 Barking Deer Hunting

This text is about the first experience of the narrator to kill a barking deer. It was told when the narrator was asked to tell about an unforgettable experience in his life.

> One day my friend and I decided to go track birds and so off we went.
> On the way we saw a gooseberry tree, and saw that there was a fresh foot
> print of a barking deer. So I decided to build a blind there while my
> friend went further. Then I sat in that blind and waited for an animal.
> As the sun set, a pheasant came, but before I could shoot it, it went away.
> When a barking deer actually came, I was shaking out of fear, because it
> was my first experience. But I was able to shoot it. I got ready to shoot
> it again, if the animal happened to get up, but it did not. So I climbed
> down from the blind and was very happy to see the dead barking deer
> lying on the ground.
>
> At that time I heard my friend fire a shot. I called him to see what he
> shot. Then my friend came up, and said that he had gotten a pheasant.
> After that we came back to the village happily carrying those animals we
> killed. My friend carried the one I killed and I carried our guns and the
> pheasant that my friend killed. On the way back we rested again and
> again because the road was long.
>
> When we arrived home, we did not know how to butcher the animal. My
> father was not at home to help us; he was away on a journey in those
> days. So we two had to butcher it ourselves in order to divide it. After
> that my mother and sisters cooked it and we all ate happily. Then I also
> gave a gift of some meat to all the villagers. There I had a conversation
> with the chief about how I killed it. Also I told him that there was a baby
> inside its belly when we had butchered it.

I was so happy that I kept talking about it to my friends for more than a week. Also I told the whole story to my father when he came back from the journey. My mother and sisters saved some dry meat for him to eat.

Agent orientation and chronological succession are seen in this story; the narrator and his friend went hunting, and the narrator built a blind. He shot a barking deer. Then they brought it home, and butchered it and divided it between them. These are the events which had already taken place in the past. This story is also a climatic narrative. The narrator's struggle to shoot an animal is the climax of the story.

2.2.3 Thief on Bus

In this text the narrator tells about his unforgettable experience when he got help from a teacher named Cuvpi, because the teacher met trouble by helping him.

I asked the teacher to help me in using email. He agreed to help me. Then we went by bus to an internet cafe downtown. That day was a Buddhist festival day. So there were drunkards and many people dancing and singing on the streets. At one of the bus stops, a woman got on the bus carrying a lot of money in a plastic bag.

Then as the teacher looked off toward the dancing, accidentally he saw a man trying to steal that money from the woman's plastic bag. The thief was not pleased to find him taking notice of his action. Then without saying anything he passed by me and hit the teacher and he was not allowed to say anything. Again three or four of them (thief's friends) surrounded him and hit him. I and everyone on the bus were so shocked, and we could not say anything while the teacher was being beaten so badly.

After that I asked the teacher why that happened. He was not sure why he was beaten. Just then he realized that it was the thief who tried to steal the money but he could not steal it because of him. At the next bus

stop the thieves got off and challenged the teacher to get off as well and fight with them. But he did not do so because he was a Christian minister.

Then we went to the internet cafe, and while we were there the teacher's face became swollen. I felt guilty about it, so I tried to help him by buying some medicine. But the teacher did not allow me to do that. Then we came back home. After arriving home I visited the teacher at his house again, and I found that his students had already taken care of him. But the swelling on his face took some time to heal. That was an unforgettable experience.

This story has agent orientation and contingent succession. The events were already realized. There is also *plus* tension when the thief hit the teacher because he saw him trying to steal the money, the fourth criterion of climatic narrative.

2.3 Summary

In this chapter a brief overview of discourse analysis in relation to narrative discourse and a synopsis of the texts to be analyzed are presented. It was observed that the texts for this analysis fall into the narrative discourse type, having the basic narrative text properties.

The three narratives presented above are stories of personal experience and an eye-witness account. They are factual narratives. However, there are differences among these narratives. Even though the former two stories are first person narratives, the latter one is mixed with first person and third person narrative types.

In his unpublished manuscript 'The fabric of discourse', Thomas M. Tehan (2008:36) summarizes the list of the generic features that Richard A. Burridge

(2004:107-122) used for analyzing Graeco-Roman Biography, which Greninger

(2009:97-99) also applied in analyzing Sherpa narratives. The similarities and

differences of the three Makuri narratives can be summarized using some

features from this list as shown in Table 11. It is divided in to four categories:

opening features, external features, internal features and sub-genre features.

Features	Wild Pig	Barking Deer	Thief on Bus
Opening features			
1. Title	None	in aperture	None
2. Aperture*	Stage	Stage	Stage
3. Content, Theme	Hunting	Hunting	Riding on a bus
External features			
1. Mode of representation	Oral prose, narrator's point of view from memory	Oral prose, narrator's point of view from memory	Oral prose, narrator's point of view from memory
2. Size/ length	8m , 59 sentences	10m 18s, 51 sentences	5m 35s, 50 sentences
3. Structure/ sequence	continuous time which follows one event	continuous time which follows one event	continuous time which follows one event
4. Scale/ scope	3 days	1 day	1 days
5. Literary units	Narrative, some dialogue	Narrative, some dialogue	Narrative, some dialogue
6. Sources	Narrator's memory of experience	Narrator's memory of experience	Narrator's memory of experience
7. Methods of characterization	Action with some dialogue	Action with some dialogue	Action with some dialogue
Internal features			
1. Setting/ location	Country side	Country side	City
2. Motif	Hunting down the wounded wild pig	Overcoming fear at the first experience of shooting a barking deer	Getting into trouble on a bus
3. Style	Popular	Popular	Popular
4. Atmosphere	Serious	Serious, later jovial	Serious
5. Author's intention	a. Information b. Teach the hunters how to be careful with the wounded wild pigs	Information	Information
Sub-genre features			
1. Author	Known	Known	Known

* Aperture is formulaic phrase or sentence, e.g., 'once upon a time'

Table 11: Generic features in the three Makuri narratives

Literature reviews on boundary marking, salience scheme, and participant

reference will be presented in each of the following chapters.