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ABSTRACT

Storyline is a foregrounded main line of development in narrative discourse. Longacre’s textlinguistics storyline analysis distinguishes a storyline verb that is marked by the preterite tense from supporting materials coded with other tense-aspect-modality such as imperfect, progressive, modals, irrealis, etc. Among these he recognizes a cline of ranking from most dynamic to most static (1981, 1996, 2003a). In applying his theory to Iu-Mienh narrative discourse, two issues arise: 1) the advantage of a verb ranking/salience scheme approach which is compatible with prototype analysis from a Cognitive Linguistics perspective (Taylor 2003), as opposed to the binary approach of foreground-background (Hopper 1979), and 2) the problem of strong dependence on verb morphology which Iu-Mienh lacks totally as does Thai in identifying storyline (Somsonge 1990b, 1991a). What possible alternatives can Cognitive Linguistics suggest to such a situation?

Starting with a storyline analysis and salience scheme analysis based on seven Iu-Mienh narrative discourses within the framework of Longacre’s textlinguistics, this thesis shows first a prototype effect, or gradient relation, not only in the supportive materials but also inside each band. The storyline verb in Iu-Mienh is
unmarked, used 1) by itself, 2) with post verb aspectual verbs, or 3) in serial verb
constructions (SVCs) and topic chains. The pivotal storyline is recognized as a
band of grounding elements mi’aqv ‘resultative aspectual marker,’ aqv ‘perfective
aspectual marker’ and an adverb za’gengh ‘really, indeed, actually.’ Second,
following Somsonge’s (2002) non-verb-morphology dependent storyline analysis,
transitivity and sequentiality as the major factors of storyline are analyzed, using
Langacker’s billiard-ball model (1991b) and updating (i.e. increasing) Current
Discourse Space (CDS) model (2001). From a Cognitive Linguistics perspective,
storyline is foregrounded to the perception of the conceptualizer by two factors: 1)
as a result of the transitivity of energy and event in a clause or sentence composed
of SVCs and topic chains, and 2) as a result of sequentiality expressed by the
sequential marker ziouc ‘then, so, and,’ the conjunction cingx_daaih ‘therefore,’
the topic marker aeqv ‘as for,’ and adverbial clause containing liuz ‘after doing…’
or gau ‘after which.’

To identify storyline, Cognitive Linguistics analyzes conceptual structures of
transitivity and sequentiality, which result in foregroundedness to human
perception. Storyline is an epistemological outcome of transitivity and
sequentiality.
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บทคัดย่อ

เหตุการณ์ดำเนินเรื่องเป็นแกนหลักตอนเด่นในการดำเนินเรื่องเล่า ตองแสดงให้เห็นถึงลักษณะไวยากรณ์ของเหตุการณ์ดำเนินเรื่องเล่า ดังนี้ คือ คำแสดงรูปอดีตกาล เป็นตัวบ่งชี้กริยาเหตุการณ์สัมพันธ์ คำแสดงรูปการณ์-การณ์ลักษณะ-modality เช่น imperfect, progressive, modals, irrealis เป็นตัวแสดงรายละเอียดเสริมเหตุการณ์ นอกจากนี้ ตองแสดงให้เห็นเรื่องลักษณะความเห็นของข้อความส่วนที่เป็นการดำเนินเรื่องที่มีการเคลื่อนไหวที่สุดจนถึงส่วนที่

x
เป็นสภาพของดนตรีที่สุดของเรื่อง (2524, 2539, 2546) จากการประยุกต์ทฤษฎีของลองเอคเคอร์ กับเรื่องเล่าในภาษาอิ่มเจี๋ย พบว่ามีประเด็นที่น่าสนใจ 2 ประเด็น คือ 1) แนวคิดการเรียงลำดับความเห็นของข้อความนั้นตรงกับแนวคิดของ prototype analysis ตามมุมมองของภาษาศาสตร์ ปริชำ (เทลอร์ 2546) ซึ่งต่างจากวิธีของฮอบเปอร์ เพิ่ง ข้อความเป็น 2 ข้อ คือ ข้อความด้าน และ ข้อความรอง (ฮอบเปอร์ 2522) 2) วิธีการวิเคราะห์ของลองเอคเคอร์ ใช้ได้ดีในภาษาที่มีระบบภาษา-การณ์ modality แสดงในรูปว่าการิยา จึงทำให้เกิดปัญหาการวิเคราะห์ในภาษาอิ่มเจี๋ย ซึ่งไม่มีการเสนอที่การิยา เข้าต่อสุภากษาภาษาไทย (สมทรง 2533b 2534a) มีทางเลือกใดบ้างในการแก้ปัญหานี้ในมุมมองของภาษาศาสตร์เชิงปริชำ

วิทยานิพนธ์ฉบับนี้เริ่มจากการศึกษาหุตการ์ต้นนั้นเรื่องและการเรียงลำดับความเห็นของข้อความเรื่องในภาษาอิ่มเจี๋ยจำนวน 7 เรื่อง ตามแนวทางของลองเอคเคอร์ จากการศึกษาพบว่า prototype effect ไม่พบทั้งหมดในรายละเอียดเสริมเหตุการณ์ที่นั้น แต่อย่างน้อยในแต่ละข้อความดังนี้ คำร่วมแสดงการดำเนินเรื่องในภาษาอิ่มเจี๋ยจะไม่มีตัวบ่งชี้ทางภาษาการ์ที่ปรากฏว่าปรากฏแล้วปรากฏที่ 3 ลักษณะ คือ 1) อยู่โดยลำพัง 2) ปรากฏก่อนคำแสดงการณ์ modality และ 3) ปรากฏในโครงสร้างของกลุ่มอนุพากษ์ และ กลุ่มภาษาแสดงต่อเนื่องการดำเนินเรื่องที่มีตัวบ่งชี้เวลา (makhz mi'aqv) การณ์ที่แสดงการเสร็จสมบูรณ์ aqv และ คำบรรยายว่า grounding elements ซึ่งมีอยู่ 3 ชนิด คือ คำแสดงผลการณ์ (makhz za‘gengh‘) การณ์ที่แสดงการเสร็จสมบูรณ์ aqv และ คำบรรยายว่า grounding elements za‘gengh‘.

วิทยานิพนธ์ฉบับนี้วิเคราะห์ลักษณะไวยากรณ์ที่แสดงลำดับเวลา และการเคลื่อนไหว
ของเหตุการณ์ ตามแนวทางของสมทรงในการวิเคราะห์ภาษาที่ไม่มีการผันรูปกริยา (สมทรง 2545) โดยใช้ Billard-Ball Model (2534b) และ Current Discourse Space Model (2544) ของแลงเอคเคอร์ในการวิเคราะห์ จุดมุ่งของนักภาษาศาสตร์เชิงปริชาน เหตุการณ์ดำเนินเรื่องจะเป็นข้อความเต้นในในพื้นที่ของผู้อ่านหรือผู้ฟังได้ด้วยสมเหตุสติของประสบการคือ 1) การเคลื่อนไหวของอาการและเหตุการณ์ซึ่งพบในโครงสร้างของกลุ่มอนุพากย์และกลุ่มภาคแสดงต่อเนื่อง 2) ลำดับเหตุการณ์ในเวลาต่อเนื่องซึ่งมีตัวชี้เช่น 'ziouc' 'ตลาด แล้ว แล้วก็' และ 'คำเขื่อน cingx_daaih 'ด้วยกัน' สั่งข้อ 'aeqv' 'ส่วน' และ อนุประโยควิเศษณ์ที่มีคำว่า 'liuz' 'หลังจากที่' 'gau' 'หลังจากที่'。

ในการระบุเหตุการณ์ดำเนินเรื่อง นักภาษาศาสตร์เชิงปริชานใช้วิธีวิเคราะห์โครงสร้างเหตุการณ์ เพื่อนำถิ่นของอาการเคลื่อนไหวและลำดับเวลาที่มีผลให้เกิดในสภาพประจักษ์ชัด ดังนั้นเหตุการณ์ดำเนินเรื่องจึงเป็นผลของการอาการเคลื่อนไหวและลำดับเวลาในเชิงในทัศน์
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments............................................................................................................. v  
ABSTRACT.......................................................................................................................... viii  
List of figures ...................................................................................................................... xviii  
List of Tables ...................................................................................................................... xxi  
List of Abbreviations and Symbols.................................................................................... xxii  
Chapter 1 Introduction ..................................................................................................... 1  
1.0 Introduction ............................................................................................................... 1  
1.1 Overview of the Thesis ............................................................................................. 1  
1.2 Research Background .............................................................................................. 2  
1.3 Research Questions .................................................................................................. 3  
1.4 Why Cognitive Linguistics? ....................................................................................... 4  
1.5 Hypotheses ............................................................................................................... 6  
1.6 Ethnic, Historical and Cultural Background ............................................................ 7  
1.7 Linguistic Background ............................................................................................. 8  
1.8 Language Varieties .................................................................................................. 15  
1.9 Orthography ............................................................................................................ 16  
1.10 Methodology .......................................................................................................... 17  
1.10.1 Steps in Method .................................................................................................. 17  
1.10.2 Data Collection and Verification ...................................................................... 18  
1.10.3 Summaries of the Narrative Texts ...................................................................... 19  
1.10.4 “Cognitive Linguistics” as A Cover Term ......................................................... 22  
1.10.5 Analysis Procedure ............................................................................................. 23  
1.11 Scope and Limitations of the Study ....................................................................... 24  
Chapter 2 Literature Review ............................................................................................ 27  
2.0 Introduction ............................................................................................................... 27  
2.1 Theories of Discourse and Text Analysis in General .............................................. 27  
2.1.1 Discourse Analysis in Tagmemic Theory ............................................................. 27  
2.1.2 Meaning in Textlinguistics ............................................................................... 28  
2.1.3 Discourse Analysis in Generative Semantics ..................................................... 29
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3.3 Modality</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Topic Chains</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Summary of the Chapter</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 4 Textlinguistics Storyline Analysis</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Introduction</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Textlinguistics Storyline Analysis in Biblical Hebrew</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Definitions of Storyline: Two Approaches</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.1 Textlinguistic Definition of the Storyline</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2 Cognitive Linguistic Definition of the Storyline</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.3 Summary</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Textlinguistics Storyline Analysis in Iu-Mienh Narrative</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1 Profile Analysis</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.2 An Etic Salience Scheme Template</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.3 Iu-Mienh Salience Scheme Analysis</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.3.1 Band 8: Cohesive</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.3.2 Band 7: Evaluations</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.3.3 Band 6: Irrealis and Modals</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.3.4 Band 5: Settings</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.3.5 Band 4: Flashback</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.3.6 Band 3: Backgrounded Activities</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.3.7 Band 2: Backgrounded Action/Events</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.3.8 Band 1: Primary Storyline</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.3.9 Band 1′: Pivotal Storyline</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Finding Narrative Timeline through Temporal Movement</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.1 Methodological Consideration</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.2 Non-Verb-Morphology Dependent Method</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Summary of the Chapter</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 5 Cognitive Linguistics Storyline Analysis</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 Introduction</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Placing A Narrative in the Cognitive Linguistics Setting</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Salience Scheme as a Prototype Effect</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2.1 Primary Storyline Band .............................................................. 118
  5.2.1.1 Unmarked Verbs ................................................................. 118
  5.2.1.2 A Gradient within Band 1 .................................................. 119
5.2.2 Pivotal Storyline ....................................................................... 128
  5.2.2.1 Grounding of a Negated Construction ................................. 128
  5.2.2.2 Grounding and Interaction between Band 1 and others ........ 131
5.2.3 Setting Band ............................................................................ 134
5.2.4 Summary .................................................................................. 135
5.3 Foregroundedness through Transitivity ........................................ 135
  5.3.1 Energy Transitivity in the Billiard-Ball Model .......................... 135
  5.3.2 Energy Transition Rate in Action Chain ................................. 138
5.3.3 Summary .................................................................................. 141
5.4 Foregroundedness through Sequentiality ...................................... 141
  5.4.1 Sequential Markers .................................................................. 142
    5.4.1.1 Sequential Marker: Adverb or Conjunction? ................. 143
    5.4.1.2 Conjunction Cingx_daath .............................................. 146
    5.4.1.3 Summary of the Sequential Markers ............................. 148
  5.4.2 Role of Some Cohesive Band Materials for Sequentiality ......... 148
    5.4.2.1 Conceptual Structure of Adverbial Clauses .................... 149
    5.4.2.2 Topic Marker and Incrementation of CDS ..................... 157
    5.4.2.3 Adverbial Clauses and Incrementation of CDS .............. 159
    5.4.2.4 Summary ........................................................................ 161
5.5 Summary of the Chapter ............................................................... 161
Chapter 6 Conclusion ......................................................................... 164
6.0 Introduction .................................................................................. 164
6.1 Summary of Findings ................................................................... 164
6.2 Implications of the Findings to the Hypotheses ......................... 167
6.3 Suggested Areas of Further Study ............................................... 168
Appendix A ...................................................................................... 171
  1. Yao or Mien? .............................................................................. 171
  2. Linguistic Classification .............................................................. 172
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. The place of Hmong-Mien family posited by Benedict (1976:29) .................9
Figure 2. A place of Hmong-Mien family posited by Chinese scholars.......................9
Figure 3. The Hmong-Mien family..............................................................................10
Figure 4. The subgroups of Mienic languages.............................................................11
Figure 5. Four Mienic “dialects” in China.................................................................12
Figure 6. Provinces and major districts of Iu-Mienh settlement in the northern Vietnam............................................................................................................12
Figure 7. Areas of Iu-Mienh distribution in Vietnam and Lao PDR ......................13
Figure 8. Iu-Mienh settlements in Thailand and Laos................................................14
Figure 9. Illustrations to “Cicada Story” and “Faam-Bae’ and Aeng-Doi”.............21
Figure 10. A relationship of Cognitive Linguistics with other disciplines (Tsuji 2002:183).............................................................................................................23
Figure 11. A blueprint for the speaker ........................................................................43
Figure 12. Signifié-signifiant composit of a sign.........................................................50
Figure 13. The internal and syntagmatic relation of linguistic signs.........................51
Figure 14. Aspects of the usage event (Langacker 2001b:145)..............................53
Figure 15. Polysemous relation within the change-of-state aspectual particle aqv ....69
Figure 16. Composition of the resultative aspectual marker -mi’aqv..........................71
Figure 17. Basic Epistemic Model (Langacker 1991c:242).......................................73
Figure 18. The parameters for salience scheme for English narrative (Longacre 1996:26).................................................................................................................82
Figure 19. A profile of Story 1: A story of an old husband and bamboo shoots.......87
Figure 20. A profile of Story 2: A story of firefly and grasshopper.......................87
Figure 21. A profile of Story 3: A story of three piglets

Figure 22. A profile of Story 4: Why cicadas don’t have intestine

Figure 23. A profile of Story 5: A story of Faam-Bae’ and Aeng-Doi

Figure 24. A profile of Story 6: A story of Aahan

Figure 25. A profile of a story of big snake

Figure 26. An etic salience scheme for narrative (Longacre 1996:28)

Figure 27. An etic salience scheme for Iu-Mienh narrative

Figure 28. Salience scheme for Iu-Mienh narrative

Figure 29. A stage model

Figure 30. A narrative in the stage model

Figure 31. A gradient of transitivity of gorngv ‘speak’ in contrast to borqv ‘beat’

Figure 32. The figure-ground relation in the case of affirmative sentence

Figure 33. The figure-ground relation in the case of negative sentence

Figure 34. The static and moving objects

Figure 35. Action chain

Figure 36. The conceptual structure of action increase in SVCs and topic chains

Figure 37. Energy transitivity ratio

Figure 38. Scattered and condensed objects

Figure 39. Connectives

Figure 40. Prospective conjunction ziouc

Figure 41. Retrospective conjunction cingx_daaih

Figure 42. Functions of ziouc and cingx_daaih
Figure 43. Tail-head linkage as an adverbial clause ..........................................................150
Figure 44. Ground and Figure in paragraph linkage ..................................................152
Figure 45. Multi-layered topic-comment structure (Court 1986:36) ......................153
Figure 46. Multi-layered figure-ground relation .........................................................153
Figure 47. Rightward focus structure .........................................................................156
Figure 48. Topic Marker $aeqv$ .................................................................................158
Figure 49. CDS increment through adverbial clause ...............................................160
Figure A. Chinese tonal influence on Hmong-Mien ..............................................173
Figure B. Origine and Migration Route of the Proto-Mienic People ...................178
Figure C. The Crossing of the Sea .............................................................................179
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Distribution and Population of the Iu-Mienh in Ten Provinces of Thailand ................................................................. 15

Table 2. Sample lexical and phonological differences between regional varieties ................................................................. 16

Table 3. Titles and types of seven stories ............................................................................................................................. 19

Table 4. Temporal adverbs for narrative discourse ........................................................................................................ 64

Table 5. Aspectual auxiliary verbs ..................................................................................................................................... 66

Table 6. Transitivity parameters (Hopper and Thompson 1980:252) .................................................................................... 81

Table 7. A gradient relation within the equative constructions ........................................................................................... 134

Table 8. The definitions of ziouc ........................................................................................................................................ 144

Table A. Four Iu-Mienh groups migrated into Thailand ................................................................................................ 181

Table C1. Consonants phonemes and their corresponding orthography ........................................................................ 184

Table C2. Vowel phonemes and their corresponding orthography .................................................................................... 185

Table C3. Vowel glides and their corresponding orthography ............................................................................................ 185

Table C4. Tones and their corresponding orthography .................................................................................................. 185
## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>first person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>second person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>third person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1sg</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} person singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} person singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg</td>
<td>3\textsuperscript{rd} person singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pl</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} person plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pl</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} person plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pl</td>
<td>3\textsuperscript{rd} person plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adv</td>
<td>adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVBLZR</td>
<td>adverbializer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adv.loc</td>
<td>locative adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adv.tmp</td>
<td>temporal adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFM</td>
<td>affirmative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASST</td>
<td>assertive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS.COM</td>
<td>casual command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS</td>
<td>Current Discourse Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>Cognitive Grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>Cognitive Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>Clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLF</td>
<td>classifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cmpr</td>
<td>comparative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conj</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contr</td>
<td>contraction form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Cognitive Semantics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPCL</td>
<td>dependent clause marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>Direct Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL</td>
<td>goal or goal marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idntf</td>
<td>identifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idm</td>
<td>idiom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCHO</td>
<td>inchoative aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intj</td>
<td>interjection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIM</td>
<td>mimetic word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MST</td>
<td>Mental Space Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG.CMD</td>
<td>negative command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nominalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>noun phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.prp</td>
<td>proper noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONOMA</td>
<td>onomatopoeia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part</td>
<td>particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part.asp</td>
<td>aspectual particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part.f</td>
<td>sentence final particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part.mod</td>
<td>modality particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part.q</td>
<td>question particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part.voc</td>
<td>vocative particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>possessor/possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS.ST</td>
<td>present state aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRG</td>
<td>progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pn</td>
<td>pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pn.emph</td>
<td>emphatic pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pn.p</td>
<td>personal pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q</td>
<td>question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q.cont</td>
<td>content question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC.ACT</td>
<td>reciprocal action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPORT</td>
<td>reported speech marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELT</td>
<td>relative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSLT</td>
<td>resultative aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFT.CMD</td>
<td>soft command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SML.ACT</td>
<td>simultaneous action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOV</td>
<td>Subject Object Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St</td>
<td>sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSPD</td>
<td>suspend (i.e. holding a floor of speech or taking pause, serving as a dependent clause marker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVC</td>
<td>serial verb construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAM</td>
<td>tense, aspect, modality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOP</td>
<td>topic or topic marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.asp</td>
<td>aspectual verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.aux</td>
<td>auxiliary verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.cmp</td>
<td>compound verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.dr</td>
<td>directional verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi</td>
<td>intransitive verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.mod</td>
<td>modality verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
<td>verb phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.st</td>
<td>stative verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vt</td>
<td>transitive verb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

The present study focuses on the issue of foreground and background with reference to storyline, within the conceptual structures of storyline in Iu-Mienh\(^1\) narrative discourse. A semantic approach to narrative discourse, especially in storyline and salience scheme analysis, is pursued in this research.

In explaining the salience scheme of verbs and clauses in relation to the mainline, or storyline, of Thai narrative, Somsonge (1991a:113) affirms the validity of a psychological perspective in ranking them with the following example:

Reality is perceived through our cognitive experience or our approach to the world. For example, when we look into the field with nothing in it, the field itself is salient. However, if there is a herd of cows eating grass in the field, the cows are in focus and the field becomes a background. Suppose that a parachute is falling from a plane into the field. Now the parachute is salient and the cows are backgrounded. The field is further outranked.

This is probably an original insight applying Ronald W. Langacker’s concept of Cognitive Grammar (e.g. 1987a, 1991b, 1991c, 2000) to Robert E. Longacre’s theory of storyline (e.g. 1981, 1987, 1989a, 2003a) in discourse analysis.

1.1 Overview of the Thesis

Chapter 1 will set out research background, linguistic background, hypotheses, goal, methodology and scope of this study. Chapter 2 will survey relevant literature in the domain of discourse analysis and text linguistics in search of the approaches of various linguists to the semantics of discourse. Chapter 3 will describe some selected features of Iu-Mienh grammar limiting its scope to the minimum necessity for storyline analysis. Chapter 4 will present the textlinguistic storyline analysis of Iu-

\(^1\) The name of the people ‘Iu-Mienh’ [ʔiu\(^{31}\) mjen\(^{11}\)] is sometimes shortened to ‘Mienh’ (in their orthography) or ‘Mien’ (in Romanized transliteration) [mjen\(^{11}\]). In their own use, [mjen\(^{11}\)] refers to both the people and their language, but if the latter needs to be distinguished from the former, ‘Mienh waac’ [ʔmjen\(^{31}\) wa’\(^{11}\)] is used to refer to ‘Mien language.’ Henceforth the Iu-Mienh orthography is used to cite words. See section for the orthography (1.3) and IPA equivalent in Appendix C.
Mienh and the salience scheme analysis. The chapter will also compare the definition of the storyline with its associated concept of foreground from two perspectives; that is, textlinguistics and Cognitive Linguistics. Setting the subject matter of the present study, narrative discourse, on the cognitive linguistics basis, chapter 5 will investigate some selected linguistic constructions that are used in relation to the storyline in Iu-Mienh to identify their conceptual structures. This final chapter has three main sections. The first section will discuss (i) that the storyline verbs are unmarked, (ii) that some grounding elements (in CG term) are used in the pivotal storyline and (iii) also discuss a gradient of materials in the salience scheme. The second will pick up the serial verb constructions (SVCs) and topic chains (topic-subject) to investigate their conceptual structure from a CG perspective. The last section will explain some selected constructions both from the storyline and cohesive materials to investigate their conceptual structure in terms of CG. Chapter 5 as a whole argues that transitivity and sequentialty of events in the narrative are the major factors that make the storyline perceptively foregrounded in Iu-Mienh. In contrast to chapter 4, which is descriptive, chapter 5 is explanatory.

### 1.2 Research Background

Sitting around a fire at night or in the shade under trees during the day, the Iu-Mienh people enjoy listening to story after story. The storytellers have learned the stories from their grandparents, parents or friends and are likely to pass them on to the next generations. Details of the stories may vary from region to region or from narrator to narrator but their main lines, or storylines, tend to remain the same. The storyline seems to be remembered well in the minds of storytellers and listeners. What is actually going on in the minds of a storyteller and their audience?

While tools for analyzing narrative discourse, including identifying storylines as a field linguistic method with the emphasis on surface structure, are now abundantly available, an investigation into the meaning of storyline reflected in the conceptual structure has not been pursued. What kind of discourse analysis can be useful to reveal such an aspect? Does an investigation of the meaning in a speaker’s mind pose the danger that an investigator may become subjective, separated from the objective
surface structure of a discourse? After an empirical description of discourse features, could we not go on to the study of what they mean? This study is an investigation of such a bundle of questions against the background of the Iu-Mienh lovers of storytelling.

1.3 Research Questions

With this general background in mind, these inquiries are crystallized into three research questions.

Storyline is the mainline of narrative discourse (Longacre 1996:21). There is a difference between storyline and supportive materials, or non-storyline. In narrative discourse, the former is characterized by past tense (or preterite), the latter by aspect (e.g. imperfect, durative, descriptive) and modality (modal and irrealis). Hopper (1979) has proposed that the distinction is binary, referring to the former as “foreground” and the latter as “background.” This view is endorsed by Niccacci (1986, English translation 1990) in accordance with the theory of Vordergrund-Hintergrund (foreground-background) by W. Schneider (1974) and H. Weinrich (1964), who had developed it before American scholars began to use it. On the other hand, Longacre proposes a gradient of proximity to the storyline as exemplified in his metaphor of a “spectrum” (1981), which was later described as a “cluster concept” by Dry (1992:441). So the first research question is: (1) Is the relationship between storyline and supportive materials (i.e. non-storyline) binary (i.e. foreground vs. background) or a gradient?

Second, admitting that there is such a distinction between storyline and supportive materials, whether it is binary or a gradient, how do languages which do not have morphological inflection on verbs (e.g. past, perfect, imperfect) like Iu-Mienh identify the storyline? This question might be paraphrased to a wider one on the

---

2 Schneider’s Grammatik des biblischen Hebräisch (Munich: Claudius, 1974) is an application of Weinrich’s Tempus. Besprochene und erzählte Welt (Stuttgart, 1964), (which is translated, Tense: The world of discourse and the world of narrative) to Biblical Hebrew. Unfortunately, I do not have access to these works yet, hence they are not found in the bibliography of this thesis. A summary of the two authors is found in chapter 1 of Niccacci 1986. Talstra 1992 gives a detailed assessment of Schneider and Weinrich applying it to texts of 1 Kings 2 and Deutonomy 7.
assumption that the hypothesized answer to the first is that the relation between storyline and non-storyline is a gradient: (2) What linguistic expressions profile storyline (in Cognitive Linguistic terms)? On one hand, a simpler question in descriptive linguistic terms would be “What linguistic expressions carry a storyline in Iu-Mienh narrative discourse?” On the other hand, the question in Cognitive Linguistic terms, presupposes that a cline from the most dynamic material (viz. prototype) on the storyline to the most static supportive material (viz. extensions from prototype) can be better treated through a Cognitive Linguistic approach (e.g. Taylor 2003).

Thirdly, if the concept of the cline or gradient relationship between storyline and the supportive materials is valid, then the next question should be asked: (3) What are the conceptual structures of these linguistic expressions in the storyline? We assume that a sequentiality of events expressed mainly by cohesive clauses, retrospective and prospective conjunctions, and marginal clause particles on one hand and transitivity of events expressed mainly by unmarked verbs, aspectual auxiliaries, aspectual particles, adverbs, and the composite of serial verb constructions and topic chains on the other hand collaborate to indicate the storyline. In investigating the conceptual structures of storyline, these two areas have to be analyzed: sequentiality and transitivity of events. Following Langacker, who argues that meaning is equated with the conceptual structure (1991a:278), it is hoped that an attempt to answer these questions will identify the conceptual structure of storyline in Iu-Mienh narrative discourse.

1.4 Why Cognitive Linguistics?

With regard to the case for a use of Cognitive Linguistics (hereinafter CL) in this study, two basic reasons are employed: (1) because of the inseparability of form-and-meaning, and (2) because of continua across grammatical categories. Firstly, whilst the cautious attitude about subjectivity in the study of meaning has driven a generation of linguists to a formal study of language focusing on surface structure, semantics at the expense of form can safely be avoided as Langacker (1987a:46) asserts that “cognitive grammar claims that grammatical structure is almost entirely
overt.” He goes on to say, “Surface grammatical form does not conceal a ‘truer,’
deeper level of grammatical organization; rather, it itself embodies the conventional
means a language employs for the structuring and symbolization of semantic content”
(Langacker 1987a:46-7). Our position, therefore, is to believe that CL is a useful tool
for the investigation of meaning through surface grammatical form without divorcing
one from the other.

Secondly, even from among non-strict followers of leading cognitive linguists (e.g.
Langacker or Lakoff 1972, 1987), more and more linguists whose major concern is
description are beginning to recognize the fuzziness and continua that run across
linguistic categories, such as the continuum between verb and adjective (cf. Dixon
1977) or between verb and preposition (e.g. Yip and Rimmington 1997:114-9). With
respect to the latter case, Clark (1989:190) refers a verb that resembles a preposition
as a “locus verb,” citing an example of ‘to go’ which is grammaticalized to a locus
preposition ‘to’ in Khmer.

Further, one can observe a similar attitude among non-cognitive linguists. For
example, Somsonge’s metaphor of the descending parachute into a herd of cows
grazing in a static field cited at the outset of this chapter can well be analogous to a
continuum of a prototypical transitive verb (i.e. figure or trajector) on storyline, a
midway participle, and a setting described in a prototypical stative verb of existence
(i.e. ground or landmark) for her gestalt-like account of verb ranking (Somsonge
1991a:113). Dry (1992:441) also suggests a treatment of foreground as “the cluster
of features which mark transitivity.” This cluster concept enables characterizing the
foreground in terms of prototypical transitivity and its gradual deviations (i.e.
continuum) within the category. Furthermore, we should be reminded that the
terminology Longacre used as early as 1981 was, to begin with, “spectrum”, which is
an optic term implying a gradual change through various linguistic expressions in
relation to storyline. One of his Two hypotheses (1989b:414) contains a phrase
“progressive degrees of departure from the main line” (i.e. a continuum, again). The
last example is that the term “salience scheme” (Longacre 1996:27) suggests the
treatment of constructions placed between the storyline and the farthest band can be
“schematic”, which is a favorite term among cognitive linguists. All these notions in relation to the storyline as developed by Longacre have a good possibility of redefining them in terms of CL.

For these two reasons, we will attempt to analyze storyline from a CL perspective.

### 1.5 Hypotheses

Bearing these research questions in mind, this thesis will argue for the following two hypotheses (designated H1 and H2):

**H1:** The relationship between storyline and non-storyline in Iu-Mienh is a gradient.

**H2:** The storyline in Iu-Mienh is characterized both semantically by transitivity and sequentiality of events and syntactically also by various linguistic constructions.

Annotations on these two hypotheses may be needed. H1 is stimulated by an application of Longacre’s storyline theory to Thai by Somsonge (1990b, 1991a, 1992b:419-33) as cited in 1.0. In contrast to Longacre and Somsonge, one representative from those who have a binary understanding would be Givón (1984):

**Foreground vs. background:**

“In connected discourse, some aspects of the description—coded in some sentences/clauses—are considered the *gist, backbone, main line* of the episode/description/communication. They are the **foreground** of the discourse. Others are considered *satellites, side-trips, supportive* portions of the description/episode/communication. Those are the **background** portions of the discourse”. (Givón 1984:287-8) [Quotation marks, italics, and bold faces are as in the original.]

Concerning H2 related to the issues of languages without verbal inflection, Somsonge (1990b) writes:

The study of bipartite [viz. binary] structure of discourse information in Thai reveals that in language without verbal inflection as Thai, the bipartite structure is not expressed solely by the verb system as in English but by a conspiracy of non-systemic ways which include types of verbs, adverbs, time phrases, sequential signals, temporal clauses/phrases/words, auxiliaries, pre-serial verbs, and post-serial verbs. (Somsonge 1990b:76) [Underline added]

In a very similar way, Iu-Mienh exhibits both the difficulty of dependency on the verbs in finding the storyline and the benefit of utilizing other contextual linguistic
expressions. These constructions are categorized in two groups: sequentiality and transitivity of events.

For Thai narrative, proposing four categories of storyline verbs (i.e. cognitive experience, events proper, motion verbs, and action verbs), Somsonge cautions about an exclusive dependency on them in identification of the storyline and suggests that “[t]he most important criterion” is sequentiality (1991a:106). Following her, the present H2 presupposes that the storyline in Iu-Mienh is composed of two major factors: sequentiality of events and transitivity of events or, in simpler terms, continuation and movement of events. Sequentiality is profiled by materials such as cohesive adverbial phrases/clauses, lexical cohesion through tail-head linkage, retrospective/prospective connectives, and marginal clause particles. Transitivity is encoded by unmarked verbs, global grounding elements (aspectual sentence level particles), local grounding elements, other verbs marked by auxiliaries/adverbs, aspectual verbs, and serial verb constructions and topic chains. Each group has clusters of materials/constructions. It is as if an intertwined cable of the two groups composed of clusters of the materials creates a storyline, and not that a particular verb form is responsible for that storyline.

In summary, it is hypothesized that the storyline is characterized as a gradient with reference to verb and clause ranking as opposed to the binary concept of foreground vs. background. As such, a prototype analysis of gradual order from types of Iu-Mienh verbs, aspectual constructions, aspectual particles, five kinds of copulatives to marginal cohesive materials is hypothesized to identify a conceptual structure of storyline.

1.6 Ethnic, Historical and Cultural Background

This study has adopted the name Hmong-Mien, rather than formerly used “Miao-Yao” language family. Hence, the name of the people for this thesis is Iu-Mienh, not

---

3 Ratliff (1992a: 17) says “‘Hmong’ is better than ‘Miao,’” as it does not have any of the derogatory associations connected with the Southeast Asian form of “Miao,” “Meeo.” In a similar way, Iu-Mienh want themselves to be referred to as “Mienh” / mien / ‘human’, not “Yao” which, in Thai, sounds like “to tease/jest” as in [เจ้าบดก] (เยัาหยอก) or [ข้าดาเจ้อเจ้า] (กระเซาเยัาแหย). In fact “Iu-Mienh”, which is a proper name of the people in
Yao. See Appendix A on confusion concerning the names of the Iu-Mienh people and a recent consensus about linguistic classification among linguists outside China. Iu-Mienh historical and cultural aspects are found in Appendix B.

1.7 Linguistic Background

Iu-Mienh belongs to the Hmong-Mien language family. As to the wider affiliation of the Hmong-Mien language family, the debate concerning whether it belongs to Sino-Tibetan (mostly by Chinese scholars) or Benedict’s Austro-Thai stock (1975; 1976:1-36), or the Austro-Asian family assumed by Schliesinger (1998:130), or Haudricourt’s (1966:56) denial of the Miao-Yao’s contact with that family, has not been settled yet. The place of “Miao-Yao” (viz. Hmong-Mien) under Austro-Thai posited by Benedict is presented in Figure 1.

---

4 The term “Hmong-Mien” is now more popular than “Miao-Yao,” which seems to be obsolete at least among non-Chinese linguists. For example, Matisoff, at the special lecture held in Chulalongkorn University 10-26 January, 2005 in Bangkok, together with other Thai linguists who were present, never used “Miao-Yao” when talking about typology of South East Asian languages.

5 Haudricourt does so on the basis of Hmong-Mien’s late contact with Tai-Kadai languages, saying, “The Miao-Yao [Hmong-Mien] languages are not in contact with Austroasiatic languages, they are separated from them by the Tibeto-Burman languages, Thai and Kadai. The arrival of the Yao (Man) peoples in Vietnam dates only from the seventeenth century, and that of the Miao (Meo) from the nineteenth” (1966:56).
Chinese linguists and anthropologists in mainland China refer to Sino-Tibetan as the 
*Hàn-Zàng*\(^6\) phylum in which Hmong-Mien has been considered to be included, as shown in Matisoff’s summary of the Chinese version (1983:68) in Figure 2.

---

\*Hàn-Zàng yǔxi (The Sino-Tibetan)*

Chinese-Tai

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Tai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Tibeto-Burman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miao (Hmong)</th>
<th>Yao (Mien)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Miao-Yao (Hmong-Mien)

(Adapted from Matisoff 1983:68. Dotted lines indicate that the details of the group members are omitted for the sake of simplicity.)

---

Figure 2. A place of Hmong-Mien family posited by Chinese scholars

---

Here in Thailand, while the Tribal Research Institute (Mongkol and Thaworn (eds.) 1995:3, 25) in Chiang Mai and The Inter Mountain Peoples Education and Culture in Thailand Association (IMPECT Association 2002) adopt Benedict’s hypothesis (also Schliesinger 2003:272), others like Suriya (1988:4) of Mahidol University are more careful in their classification. Matisoff (1983:70-1) cautions against a rush

---

\(^6\) *Hàn-Zàng* (汉藏) is a compound of *hàn* (汉) ‘the dominant ethnic group in China’ and *zàng* in *Xīzàng* (西藏) ‘Tibet,’ hence, the Sino-Tibetan phylum is called *Hàn-Zàng yǔxi (汉藏语系).*
conclusion, and Clark (1989:175) summarizes, “Wider genetic relationships are undetermined.”

Figure 3 shows Matisoff’s presentation of the Hmong-Mien family (2001:299). What he calls “Chiengrai Yao” under “Iu Mien” in Figure 3 is the subject of the present study.

(Slightly altered from Matisoff 2001:299 without a content change)

Figure 3. The Hmong-Mien family
Subgroups of Mienic languages as suggested by Ratliff (1992a:19) are shown in Figure 4. The “Ho Nte” is an alternative name for Shē.

Matisoff’s classification is based on place names and pays more attention to the Hmongic side of the tree. Ratliff presents more detailed members under the Mienic side (besides her main discussion on the Hmong tones). Matisoff’s “Paipai” Yao or “ Bá Pái Yáo” (八排瑶) (Zee 1991:71-86) corresponds with Ratliff’s Dzao Min, also called Yau Min (邀敏) (Pan 1991:47). Other than four “dialects” studied by Mao (2004) (viz. Iu Mien (优勉), Kim Mun (金门), Biao Mon (标曼), and Dzau Min (藻敏)), Figure 4 also includes Biao Min (标敏) and Chao Kong Meng under the Min-Meng group.

The name of the people is ‘Iu-Mienh’ [ʔiu˧ mien˨˩] in their language, with a hyphen to indicate tone sandhi (a change from the original mid-level tone [ʔiu˧] to falling tone), and with the word-final h to indicate the falling tone. Though Iu-Mienh themselves distinguish the name of their ethnic group from the name of their language (Mienh waac [mien˨˩ waː˨˩] ‘Mienh language’), the term Iu-Mienh is used to refer to both in this study.
Iu-Mienh is spoken in Hunan, Guangtong, Guangxi, Guizhou, and Yunnan provinces of China (Figure 5), the northern provinces of Vietnam (Ha Giang, Cao Bang, Tuyen Quang, Lao Cai, Xiang Khoang, Luang Nam Tha, Bokeo, Yen Bai, Lai Chau, Lang

(Lemoine and Chiao 1991:46. Note that the Kim Mun are also on the island of Hainan though the map does not include it.)

Figure 5. Four Mienic “dialects” in China

Figure 6. Provinces and major districts of Iu-Mienh settlement in the northern Vietnam
Son, Thai Nguyen, Son La, Hoa Binh, Phu Tho, Bac Giang, Thanh Hoa) (Figure 6) and Lao PDR (in the provinces of Hua Phan, Luang Prabang, Phongsali, Sayaburi, and Vientiane) (Figure 7), and the North Thailand provinces (Figure 8). The distribution of the speakers of Iu-Mienh in Vietnam and Lao PDR is shown in Figure 7. It should be remembered that in many of these areas cohabitation with the Kim Mun is common (cf. Figure 5).

It is estimated that there are over 700,000 Iu-Mienh in China (Gordon 2005), 474,000 in Vietnam\(^7\) (Dang, Son, and Hung 2000:183, following Schliesinger 1998:130), and 20,250 (Gordon 2005) in Lao PDR (Figure 11). In Thailand, the Tribal Research Institute\(^8\) reported that 40,371 Iu-Mienh lived in eight provinces of Chiang Rai,

\(^7\) Khong (2002:172) lists 620,538 including Kim Mun but the sum of the detailed population by province is 448,047 (2002:52).

\(^8\) This Institute has recently been dissolved and research work is now conducted under the direction of the Research Institute of Sociology, Chiang Mai University and the Tribal Museum in Chiang Mai. The Institute’s first work on Iu-Mienh reports their migration to the city of Chiang Mai due to economic, social structure, and educational pressures, and cultural changes of their life, as argued by a Iu-Mienh researcher Mr. Yangyon and others (Prasit, Yangyon, Wisut 2004).

More recently (2002), the Department of Social and Welfare Development, Ministry of Social Development and Human Security of the Kingdom of Thailand has reported 45,571 in ten provinces having added two more provinces, Kanchanaburi and Phechabun (Table 1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>House-hold</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang Rai</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2,193</td>
<td>2,450</td>
<td>4,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nan</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1,429</td>
<td>1,907</td>
<td>3,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phayao</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1,326</td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td>3,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lampang</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>1,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamphaengphet</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>1,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang Mai</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sukhothai</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanchanaburi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phechabun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>6,758</td>
<td>8,022</td>
<td>15,260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 1. Distribution and Population of the Iu-Mienh in Ten Provinces of Thailand

The trend of migration from hills to plains and cities are reported in Jonsson (1996), Kimura (1997), and Prasit et al. (2004). About 23,000 Iu-Mienh speakers currently reside in immigrant communities on the west coast of the U.S.A. and also some 2,000 in France. The total population of Iu-Mienh speakers in all mentioned countries, estimated by Pourret (2002:12), is 1,600,000.

### 1.8 Language Varieties

Court (1991:149) observes, “the [Iu-]Mien[h] of Thailand speak a dialect virtually identical with the [Iu-]Mien[h] of Laos, and very close to the dialect of most of the same ethnic group in China and Vietnam.” As to the relationship between Thailand Iu-Mienh and Laotian Iu-Mienh, his observation may well be right since the migration route was from south China, through Vietnam and Laos, to Thailand (Chob 1997). Within Thailand the alleged difference between the Chiang Rai variety (spoken in Maechan district, Chiang Mai, Kamphaeng Phet, and Tak) and the Chiang Kham variety (Phayao, Nan, Lampang, Sukhothai) was discredited by Theeraphan (1988b, 1989) on the basis of the tone system analysis. They are essentially the same
as far as the tones are concerned. The native speakers, however, are conscious of some lexical differences as shown in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chiang Rai variety</th>
<th>Chiang Kham variety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pumpkin</td>
<td>fuqc nyomv</td>
<td>famh mbouh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cabbage</td>
<td>lai-dorgc</td>
<td>lai-jaixaix dorgc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jackfruit</td>
<td>da’ norc nih</td>
<td>ma’nun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to play</td>
<td>nyienx</td>
<td>jiuv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to water (plant)</td>
<td>fuqv wuom</td>
<td>pietv wuom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cicada</td>
<td>gaeng-waen</td>
<td>gaeng-waen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tomato</td>
<td>biouv-gomh</td>
<td>biouv-gomh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Sample lexical differences between regional varieties

1.9 Orthography

The orthography used in this study is the Unified Script (a pinyin-like Roman-based script, which is sometimes called the New Roman Script)\(^9\) ratified at the orthography conference held in Ruyuan County, Guangdong, with the Iu-Mienh delegates from China and the U. S. A., in 1984 (Purnell 1985).\(^10\) The tones are indicated by the letters suffixed to words except for the mid-level tone, which is unmarked.

Some diacritics are also used in the Iu-Mienh orthography. The hyphen is used for an indication of tone sandhi (e.g. *Iu-Mienh*), and syllable breaks of some proper names

---

\(^9\) As opposed to the New Roman Script, there is also the Old Roman Script devised by Cox and Smalley in the 1950s, which is more phonetic than phonemic. See Purnell 1985. On the Thai-based Mienh orthography, see Callaway and Callaway 1976.

\(^10\) This orthography is used in Mao’s dictionary (1992), Panh’s dictionary (1995), Aumann and Bienh’s dictionary (2002), Jennings’ literacy lessons (1998), and other literature. Court 1986 and Pán and Shū 1988 also use this orthography but differ slightly in that the former uses a few different vowel letters, the latter some different diacritics.
(e.g. longer than two syllables) are shown by “^” as in A^me^li^ka “America.” Every syllable is written separately reflecting the monosyllabic tendency of this language. Within this study, however, the following interlinearization will make use of an underscore “_” to connect syllables which form one lexical item; e.g. gamh_nziex “fear” or ninh_mbuo = 3rd person-pronoun_plurale marker, “they.”

A summary of Iu-Mienh phonology\(^\text{11}\) (Purnell 1965) is given in Appendix C concerning 33 consonants, 9 vowels, 12 glides, and 6 tones, with the corresponding Roman-based orthography (viz. the Unified Script).

1.10 Methodology

1.10.1 Steps in Method

A breakdown of the method into steps is as follows:

(1) Identify verbal and clause structures of Iu-Mienh, based on seven recorded, transcribed, and interlinearized texts verified through monolingual field interviews with language helpers/consultants.


(3) Define the storyline in relation to “verb ranking,” “salience scheme,” “foregrounding vs. backgrounding,” and “tense-aspect” as a perceptual metaphor of foregroundedness that is made salient through the transitivity of events (including time movement) and sequentiality of events exhibiting a prototype effect from the prototypical dynamic verbs on-the-line to the prototypical static materials far-off-the-line, with support from DeLancey\


(4) Remove off-the-line materials first, then identify the storyline; that is, following Somsonge’s insights in Thai (1991:76, 1992b:410-33) and Longacre’s “peeling off” method (1996:27), an analysis will be done from margin to nucleus: namely, from cohesion, evaluation, irrealis, setting, flashback, cognitive state, background activities, then to storyline.

(5) Apply the “billiard-ball model” of Langacker (1991b:282-329) in order to analyze the transitivity of serial verb constructions and topic chains on-the-line to reveal their conceptual structures.

(6) Apply Langacker’s “augmentation and grounding” model to an analysis of retrospective conjunctions and prospective conjunctions (2001b:151) in the framework of Current Discourse Space (CDS) to analyze the meaning of sequentiality in storyline.

1.10.2 Data Collection and Verification

Seven narrative texts for this study were tape-recorded and transcribed by Ms. V. Ann Burgess, who has served as a missionary nurse-midwife and as one of the senior research associates of the Mien dictionary (Purnell, Zanh G-F, Burgess, forthcoming) in Doi Luang, Maechan district, Chiang Rai province since the 1970s.

Data verification was done through monolingual interviews and discussions (cf. Everett 2001:167) with Mr. Bienh Wuonh Mengh (นายพิชญ์พิเชษฐ์ พันธุ์พิสุทธิชน) (mid 20’s), a Chiang Rai variety speaker, and Mrs. Dangc Meix Daqv (นางเหมยติะ ตั้งกิตติกุล) (mid 50’s) from Chiang Khong, Chiang Rai.\(^\text{12}\) Though coming from Chiang Rai province, her variety is closer to that of Chiang Kham, Phayao province, probably due to a geographical proximity. Jennings (personal communication 2006) has pointed out that Meix Daqv often uses different words than Chiang Kham, while she has identified herself as a Chiang Kham variety speaker to me.

\(^{12}\) Though coming from Chiang Rai province, her variety is closer to that of Chiang Kham, Phayao province, probably due to a geographical proximity. Jennings (personal communication 2006) has pointed out that Meix Daqv often uses different words than Chiang Kham, while she has identified herself as a Chiang Kham variety speaker to me.
different areas, both now live in Chiang Mai, hence, providing the present researcher with the opportunity to learn from them. Mr. Zanh Gueix-Fongc also helped the author in double-checking of the data.

### 1.10.3 Summaries of the Narrative Texts

The names, types and number of sentences of the texts are listed in Table 3. These sentences include quotations of direct speech (DS). Though sometimes DS includes multiple sentences, these are not counted as a separate sentence but are included under the heading number. When DS is uttered without a quote marker, it is numbered as a separate sentence but not analyzed as storyline material.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Title</th>
<th>Mieneh Title</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Story-teller</th>
<th>Number of Sentences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Story 1</strong> A Story of an Old Husband and Bamboo shoots</td>
<td>Nqox-Gox Caux Mbiaic Nyei Gouv</td>
<td>Wisdom story</td>
<td>Yauz-Guangv</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Story 2</strong> A Story of Firefly and Grasshopper</td>
<td>Gaeng-Kiev caux Caah_Laaah_Pornge Nyei Gouv</td>
<td>Animal folk tale (A why story)</td>
<td>Yauz-Guangv</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Story 3</strong> A Story of Three Piglets</td>
<td>Buo Dauh Dungz-Dorn</td>
<td>Western nursery or children’s story</td>
<td>Yauz-Guangv</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Story 4</strong> Why Cicadas don’t Have Intestines</td>
<td>Gaeng-Waen Maiv Maah Jaangh Nyei Gouv</td>
<td>Animal folk tale (A why story)</td>
<td>Yauz-Guangv</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Story 5</strong> A Story of Faam-Baeqv and Aengh Doih</td>
<td>Faam-Baeqv Aengh Doih Nyei Gouv</td>
<td>Love story</td>
<td>Yauz-Guangv</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Story 6</strong> A Story of Aahan</td>
<td>Aa’han Gouv</td>
<td>Hero story</td>
<td>Yunh Zoih</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Story 7</strong> A Story of Big Snake</td>
<td>Domh Naang Gouv</td>
<td>Mysterious tragedy</td>
<td>?Yauz-Guangv</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sentences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Titles and types of seven stories

A summary of Story 1 (OH): “A Story of an Old Husband and Bamboo Shoots” is as follows:

There was a man who had a daughter. He wanted her to marry a very old man because of his riches. “Once you marry him, you will like him” was his persuasion.
But she didn’t want to, so she got an idea to persuade her father to stop thinking about it. She collected old and hard bamboo shoots for a meal. Trying to eat it, her father complained to her that they were too hard to eat. Her reply was, “Once you bite it, you will gradually like it.”

A summary of Story 2 (FG): “A Story of Firefly and Grasshopper” is as follows:

A firefly and a grasshopper took turns working for each other until it got dark. On the way back home they raced to each one’s home. The grasshopper was confident of winning because he had long legs. But the firefly reached home first because he had a light and wings. On the other hand, the grasshopper asked a sparrow to let him sleep in his house. While sleeping, a dead tree snapped and fell down to frighten the grasshopper. He forgot to keep his legs bent and kicked the sparrow hard. He excused himself blaming the dead tree. The dead tree blamed termites. The termites blamed a worm. In the court case the worm was sentenced as guilty and got a punishment of strangling. This is why worms have a ring around their necks today.

Story 3 (3PG) “A Story of Three Piglets” is a Western nursery tale retold by a Iu-Mienh storyteller Yauz-Guangv, who also narrated four or five other stories. Therefore, it is completely Mienized having typical Iu-Mienh narrative features. It goes like this:

Three brother piglets built each one’s house. The first one built his house with stalks of rice. The second one built his house with rods and sticks, and the third one with bricks. A wolf came, blew the first house down, and ate the first piglet. Then he blew down the second house and made it collapse, and then ate the second piglet. The third house was strong. The wolf and the third piglet competed in their cleverness several times. Finally, the piglet won and the wolf died…in what way? The story will tell you.

Story 4 (CI): “Why Cicadas don’t Have Intestines?” is another “Just-so story” (cf. Story 2), which can be summarized as follows:

It explains why cicadas appear hollow, owls have such big eyes, and yellow squirrels’ backs are yellow. All these have reasons, starting from a barking deer that misunderstood the owl’s words. This was the first link of the chain, which caused the barking deer to step on an ash pumpkin’s vine. Cut off, it rolled down to bump a sesame seedpod, which went into a wild chicken’s eyes. Out of agony, the wild chicken scratched black ants, which stung a snake, which in turn went into a nest of a yellow squirrel. Driven out of his nest, the yellow squirrel bit an oil fruit, and then it dropped off a tree to hit a grandfather’s opium lamp, which spilled everything out. A punishment had to be given to each one. Who was most wrong?

---

13 A Lao Iu-Mienh version of this story can be found in Beard et al. (eds.) (1995:11-19), narrated by Ta Fou Saechao, under the title “The Owl’s Words” Norqc Giv Long nyei Gouv, in the Unified Script and English translation.
Story 5 (FA): “A Story of Faam-Bae’ and Aeng-Doi”\(^{14}\) is, in fact, of Chinese origin, well integrated into Iu-Mienh culture. It can be summarized like this:

Aeng-Doi was a girl who desired to study in school in the days when girls never did. She disguised herself to be a boy, and went to a school far from home. She had a classmate boy, Faam-Bae’, who believed Aeng-Doi was a boy. They got along well with each other, did all things together, sharing school books, pencils, and a bedroom too. But a teacher was suspicious about Aeng-Doi, so he tested her twice to uncover her secret. Escaping from these tests, she went home alone. By the time Faam-Bae’ searched and found his old friend, she had become a beautiful young woman. After considerable confusion in his heart, he decided to marry her. But he was too late because Aeng-Doi’s marriage with another man had already been arranged by her parents. Yet, she knew that she was to be united with Faam-Bae’ even after death. So she told him to die first and wait for her. He did. On the day of her wedding to the unwanted man, she called Faam-Bae’s grave to open; she ran into the open grave, then the two ascended to the sky.

\(^{14}\) An English translation of a Lao Iu-Mienh version of this story can be found in Beard et al. (eds.) (1995:75-96); unfortunately the original Iu-Mienh version was not included.

---

Story 6 (AS): “A Story of Aahan” is a hero story full of action, adventure and humor. Unlike Story 4 (CI), Story 5 (FA), and the next one, Story 7 (BS), which are found among the Iu-Mienh in Laos as well, it is unique to the Thailand Iu-Mienh in that it shows a sociolinguistic contact with the Northern Thai people, such as the use of some Northern Thai words with “Iu-Mienh accent,” and interactions with Thai officials. “Aahan” means “brave,” and this is how he goes about:

Illustrations of Story 4 (CI) and Story 5 (FA), drawn by Kao Fong Saelee in Beard (1995:13, 89)

Figure 9. Illustrations to “Cicada Story” and “Faam-Bae’ and Aeng-Doi”
A poor Iu-Mienh couple, whose occupation was a vendor going through Northern Thai villages, suddenly became famous because of their brave actions. The husband was called “Aahan the brave.” First, the wife killed a bear accidentally, and then the husband killed a crocodile that attacked a passenger boat. He further saved a whole community by getting rid of a gigantic snake that had fallen into a village water source, and he killed a tiger too. Each time he solved a problem, he was rewarded with a special title by a Northern Thai governor. Finally, when he drove back a group of enemy soldiers, he and his wife were given a fortified city.

A summary of Story 7 (BS): “A Story of Big Snake”\textsuperscript{15} is as follows:

A man had three daughters. When he worked in a forest, he got a help from a big snake. So he gave it the third daughter as a wife. At the snake’s house, she gave birth to a baby boy. When she went her father’s home to pay respect after the wedding, her elder sisters deceived her by taking her out to a forest. They let her fall down from a high tree into a pond and killed her. The first daughter went back to the snake’s house to be his wife. They found a strange bird in the forest and kept it at home, but he noticed that it was his first wife from the way it related with their baby. The elder sister killed it. The husband picked it up and dressed its meat to eat, but his second wife spat it out on the ground, which became mustard green. They ate it, she spat it out again, and it became a big bamboo. A grandmother found that this bamboo had magical power to keep a fire alive in a cooking place, which came from the first wife living in it. The grandmother took the wife home and kept her. The husband noticed again that this woman from the bamboo was his first wife and took her back home. The elder sister realized that her younger sister reincarnated to be a beautiful woman. She wanted her younger sister’s beauty and followed her instructions. Following it, she was boiled to death.

1.10.4 “Cognitive Linguistics” as A Cover Term

In this study the term “Cognitive Linguistics” is used in a hypernymous sense embracing Langacker’s CG, Fauconnier’s Mental Space Theory (MST) (1994), and Talmy’s Cognitive Semantics (CS) (2000a, 2000b) as its hyponyms. Primarily, CG is used for the analysis of the conceptual structure of narrative discourse in regard to the storyline. Only secondarily, some notions from MST and CS are used. CL’s overlapping relationships with other disciplines in a broad perspective of cognitive

\textsuperscript{15} A Lao Iu-Mienh version of this story can be found in Beard et al. (eds.) (1993:62-70), narrated by Muang Yoon Saechao with the title “Old Black Snake” Naang-Jiev Gouv in the Unified Script and English translation.
science presented by Tsuji (2002:183)\textsuperscript{16} is reproduced with an emphasis on CG, CS, and MST in Figure 10.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure10.png}
\caption{A relationship of Cognitive Linguistics with other disciplines (Tsuji 2002:183)}
\end{figure}

\subsubsection{1.10.5 Analysis Procedure}

The data was interlinearized and glossed through monolingual interviews with the Iu-Mienh language consultants with supplements from two dictionaries, Lombard and Purnell (1968) and Panh (1995). Occasionally, the forthcoming revision of the former dictionary (Purnell, et al.) was consulted. The text corpus was divided into two kinds: one is the direct speech (DS) in the narratives, the other the narrative materials. The sentences in the latter, numbered up to 715, will be analyzed with respect to the storyline parameters such as punctiliar, sequential, dynamic, realis,

\textsuperscript{16} Though this diagram appears to be comprehensive, one should be also reminded of CG's significant contribution to historical-comparative linguistics, such as an account for diachronic semantic change in a process of grammaticalization studied by Geeraerts (1997) and Sweetser (1990).
narrative, substantive, following Longacre (1996). The corpus in the former kind, the materials in DS, was separated from the latter because they do not carry the storyline. Three kinds of analysis were conducted. First, a storyline was analyzed using Longacre’s “peeling off” method, Langacker’s grounding theory and Tayler’s twelve transitivity parameters (a cognitive linguistically modified version of Hopper and Thompson 1980 by Tayler 2003). This resulted in the salience scheme of the storyline verbs and the supportive materials. The second was an analysis of the transitivity of the storyline verbs/clause using Langacker’s billiard-ball model with respect to the action chain in the constructions. The third was an analysis of the sequentiality of some key constructions in relation to the storyline applying Langacker’s current discourse space (CDS) model, particularly, the theory of incrementing CDS.

1.11 Scope and Limitations of the Study

The major limitations of this study are threefold. First, this study is within the category of narrative discourse. Longacre’s typological classification of discourse (1968, 1972a:167-85, 1996:10) includes narrative, procedural, behavioral, and expository discourses. Of these four, narrative discourse is characterized by such features as [+Contingent Succession] and [+Agent-Orientation]. Besides these two features, if the narrative category has the feature [–Projection], viz. “minus projection,” this is a story; that is, the events “are represented as having already taken place” (Longacre 1996:9). It is through this narrative genre among the oceans of discourse study that we will attempt to wade, narrated by Iu-Mienh storytellers in seven pieces.

Concerning the term “discourse” analysis, it was used in the early works of Longacre (i.e. till mid-80s) in the sense of a text unit larger than the sentence, and has been replaced by “textlinguistics” later (e.g. 1989a, 2003a, 2003b, Longacre and Shin Ja Hwang 1994). This change is helpful to distinguish the text analysis (cf. chapter 4)
from the kind of “discourse analysis” which has a functional or social aspect. For example, Schffrin (1994) gives three different definitions of discourse, i.e. “discourse as language above the sentence,” “discourse as language use” and “discourse as utterances” (viz. from a perspective of the interaction between structure and function) (1994:23-41). Typically, Longacre’s textlinguistics falls into Schffrin’s first definition: discourse as language above the sentence. Thus, following Longacre, the term “narrative discourse analysis” under the present study is used in a textlinguistic sense rather than the “discourse analysis” in the sociolinguistic, functional or pragmatic sense.

Second, the scope of this study is storyline, which is foregrounded in a narrative discourse. In his succinct account for what discourse analysis is to aim at, Payne (1997:343, 351-6), summarizing Givón (1983:1-41), points out the study of continuity (cohesion) includes three areas: topic continuity, action continuity and thematic continuity. In this sense, the present study concentrates on the action continuity as it seeks to investigate foregroundedness through sequentiality and transitivity in storyline.

Therefore, admitting that there is rich information in the “off-the-line” materials as well as topic continuity and thematic continuity, this study is limited to the primary task of investigating the sequentiality and transitivity in the sense of action continuity in a narrative discourse analysis. By way of explanation, the term sequentiality is a narrowly defined word; it is a hyponym of continuity. Thus, the examination of

---

17 The distinction between “text” and “discourse” is necessary from a social/functional perspective. From this perspective, describing a text of a narrative belongs to textlinguistics; while describing how the genre narrative is used in a social context with all additional components (e.g. symbolic or cultural meaning) is discourse analysis, a text in use. On the other hand, a borderline between the two approaches may be blurred: e.g. Longacre’s approach (2003a) incorporates sociolinguistic analysis, speech acts and dialogue analysis into textlinguistics. In addition, other scholars approach both aspects simultaneously, for example, as in works by Halliday and Hasan (1989) form Systemic Functional Linguistics, viewing language as a social-semiotic phenomena; Brown (1995) from cognitive/pragmatic approach; or Smith (2003) from the discourse modes perspective.

18 Payne (1997:353) writes, “‘Foreground’ information is not the same as the ‘most important’ information in a text. It may be more accurate to say that the foregrounded material is the framework on which the important information is hung. […] The real significance of a narrative, as well as any other kind of text, often is carried in the ‘background’ clauses.”
discourse cohesion is demarcated to the minimum extent as needed for the sequentiality in storyline only.

Third, this research will be confined to a semantic investigation of storyline in terms of the conceptual structure in Langacker’s sense. This means that we do not enter an area of hermeneutics of texts, such as a sense of Johnstone’s heuristic approach to discourse analysis (2002:230-1). She claims to “consider meaning from all of these perspectives,” (i.e. what the speaker means, what the text itself means, and its meaning to its audiences); rather, we limit ourselves to a linguistic study of the meaning of narrative texts. Halliday and Hasan (1976:327) contend “[t]he linguistic analysis of a text is not an interpretation of that text; it is an explanation;” thus, we will try to explore how the linguistic constructions are interconnected to encode meaning in the storyline reflected in the conceptual structures.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

In contrast to the academic scene five decades ago when Harris blazed a trail in the analysis of discourse with the distributionalist’s emphasis (Harris 1952a, 1952b), discourse study is now so popular that there is even a high school level introductory textbook (Chimombo and Roseberry 1998), as well as standard and general university-level introductions (cf. Brown and Yule 1983, Georgakopoulou and Goutsos 1997, Jaworski and Coupland eds. 1999, Johnstone 2002, Schiffrin 1994, Schiffrin, Tannen, and Hamilton eds. 2001). Furthermore, the discipline is now highly interdisciplinary as exemplified in the works of Hatim 1997, Schäffner and Kelly-Holmes eds. 1996, Scollon and Scollon 1995, van Dijk ed. 1985, etc. In this chapter the literature on discourse and text analysis in the period of the 1960s to the 1990s will be reviewed with reference to their attention to the study of meaning in discourse and texts.

2.1 Theories of Discourse and Text Analysis in General

Subsections 2.1.1 to 2.1.12 survey the treatment of meaning in discourse in various linguistic theories.

2.1.1 Discourse Analysis in Tagmemic Theory

After Harris, Pike was one of the earliest linguists in the American structuralist tradition who advocated the study of discourse. In Pike’s tagmemics (Pike 1967, 1982; Pike and Pike 1982), the study of meaning is treated in the referential hierarchy in his triple-hierarchy: phonological, grammatical, and referential. While his early discourse study (Pike 1964) was concerned with the identification of tagmemes as composites of situational roles and grammatical roles in matrix (viz. barely above the sentence level), a later work with his wife Evelyn Pike was done in a top-down way (i.e. discourse to morphemes) in the referential hierarchy.
E. Pike 1983 is subtitled as “systematic exegesis;”¹⁹ that is, leading or drawing meaning out of a text systematically. The meaning of a text is analyzed through presentations of grammatical constituents and referential constituents, echoing Pike’s fundamental view of “form-and-meaning composite” (1982:111-7), in the tree/branch diagrams and the formulas with the four-cell tagmemes (Pike 1981:47-64, Evelyn Pike 1983:12-6; 1988). With a similar theoretical background of tagmemics, the issue of form and meaning in relation to participant identification in discourse was studied by Wise 1971 [1968]. Among a host of writers on discourse analysis in the tagmemic and structuralist milieux, E. Pike 1983 seems to be the only work which addresses the issue of referential meaning in an explicit term “exegesis.”²⁰ As will be seen in 2.2.1, this type of meaning in discourse can be viewed in terms of “a conduit metaphor of discourse,” that is, meaning is contained in a text.²¹

### 2.1.2 Meaning in Textlinguistics

While the term “discourse analysis” is generally used in the American structuralist tradition, “textlinguistics” is “a prominent area of linguistics in Europe” (Fasold 1990:65). A difference between the two continents may be approximated by saying that while discourse analysts are more engaged in the description and documentation of texts of less-known or never-written languages, the textlinguists are interested in the processing and interpreting of written texts in well-known languages. Beaugrande and Dressler (1981), in discussing seven standards of textuality (i.e. cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, informativity, situationality, and intertextuality), freely use the notions of cognitive psychology and procedural semantics, such as activation, strength of linkage, decomposition, decomposition,

---

¹⁹ ‘Exegesis’ comes from Greek ξηγέσων έxēgēnoma (a compound verb of a prefix ex- ‘out’ and ἁγό ‘to lead’), which means ‘to draw (meaning) out from’, i.e. ‘tell, relate, explain, report, make known, reveal’ and a related noun is ξηγήσις exégēsis ‘narrative, description’ and ‘explanation, interpretation’.

²⁰ There is a brief mention in Longacre (2003b:179) that “the role of discourse analysis in general […] is exegetical rather than predictive.”

²¹ It should be remembered that the text-internal meaning is only one kind of several types of meaning in discourse. Other types involve social and functional meanings.
spreading activation, episodic vs. semantic memory, economy, global patterns, inheritance, plan, script, schema, mental imagery, and so forth (1981:92, 93). Their view of meaning is characterized as the distinction between virtual meaning (i.e. the potential of expression or sign for representing and conveying knowledge) and sense (i.e. the knowledge actually conveyed by expressions occurring in a text) (1981:84). A continuity of senses gives text coherence, which is mutually (i.e. between a sender and a receiver of the text) accessible and relevant within a configuration of concepts and relations. The receiver’s selecting and verifying of conceptual schemata “contributes to comprehension” (1981:198) of the situation or text. Of the seven standards of textuality mentioned above, the study of intentionality may also reveal meaning by the author of a text.

2.1.3 Discourse Analysis in Generative Semantics

In the U.S.A. in the late 1960s and early 1970s, Generative Semantics was widely disseminated over the country, while the opposing interpretive semanticists, namely, those following Chomsky within Extended Standard Theory were concentrated at MIT. Though the name Generative Semantics may have a nostalgic connotation to some people22 by now, Grimes’ discourse analysis in that framework is of importance in that it provided later discourse analysts, as well as his contemporaries, with tools for capturing different kinds of information in discourse (Grimes 1971).23 Such notions as a distinction of information between events and participants (his chapter 3) and non-events (his chapter 4) (e.g. setting, background, evaluations, and collateral) are developed in Longacre’s profile and storyline analysis to supplement the semantic side of his discourse study.

22 To some others, such sarcastic comments of Newmeyer’s as “The public lectures given by Lakoff, Ross, McCawley, Postal, and others resembled political rallies as much as academic seminars” (1980:152) or “The Fall of Generative Semantics” (1980:133) may be recalled.

23 Grimes’ theoretical assumption is that: “[W]e can say the most about language by factoring out two different things: the decisions a speaker can make regarding what and what not to say, and the mechanisms and patterns that are available to him for implementing the results of those decisions in a way that communicates with another person. The decisions that the speaker makes, and the relations among them, are referred to as the underlying formational structure, […] or the semantic structure” (1975:30, 31).
Working in close association with tagmemeists, yet identifying himself as a generative semanticist, Grimes sought “a more revealing theory” (1975:30) than the kind of discourse analysis that Pike and Longacre were developing, albeit his recognition that the latter gradually showed “the direction of including semantics” (Grimes 1975:23). In other words, semantics in discourse analysis in his day was not yet a majority concern, at least in American structuralism.

### 2.1.4 Discourse Analysis in Functional-Typological Linguistics

In a broad range of theoretical similarity shared by structuralism and functionalism, the following sections will touch on four theories that have been labeled “functional” in one way or another.

Functional-Typological Linguistics “seeks to account for linguistic phenomena, based on cross-linguistic data, in relation to human communicative/feeling states through an on-going interactive discourse between the speaker and the hearer” (Horie and Sato 2001:1). For example, Givón and others base their investigations in topic continuity in discourse on the data from Amharic, Biblical Hebrew, Chamorro, English, Hausa, Japanese, and Spoken Latin-American Spanish (Givón 1983). His theoretical assumption is “that language and its notional/functional and structural organization is intimately bound up with and motivated by the structure of human cognition, perception and neuro-psychology” (Givón 1984:11), as applied to interclausal coherence. For him, “the grammar of referential coherence is not primarily about reference. Rather it is about indentifying and activating the locations (‘files’, ‘nodes’) where verbally-coded text is stored in episodic memory. The nominal referents-topics serve as ‘file labels’; they are used to access (‘activate’) the storage locations where incoming information is to be ‘filed’” (Givón 1990:894).

Bybee and others discuss modality in discourse (Bybee 1995, Myhill and Smith 1995, Silva-Corvalán 1995). Myhill’s approach seeks a language-universal framework to explain why the speakers of a language choose a particular construction from alternatives (e.g. NP types, tense and aspect, voice alternation,
and word order) with objective contextual evidences in discourse by the use of quantitative analysis of such parameters as humanness, recency of mention of referent, specificity, controlled vs. uncontrolled future actions, affectedness of patient, and temporal sequencing (Myhill 1992, 2001). Hopper (1979) and Thompson (1997) should also be considered to be important linguists, active in this theoretical tradition, whose works will be reviewed in relation to foreground-background in narrative discourse in chapter 4 (cf. Hopper 1979, 1982, 1995, 1998; Hopper and Thompson 1980).

As will be mentioned in subsection 2.2.4 below, those linguists who are working with the Functional-Typological methodology have much in common with Cognitive Linguistics concerning the approach to meaning. (cf. Chafe 1994, 1996, Croft 1991, 1999, Givón 1990, 1994, 1995)

2.1.5 Discourse Analysis in the Prague School

Sharing the common view that communicative function is important in the system of language with Functional-Typological Linguistics, the approach of the Prague School may be referred to as structural-functional linguistics. As opposed to the descriptive emphasis of the former, however, in the latter, “semantics has always been understood as belonging to the core of the system of language” (Sgall 1994:277). Prague School linguists take discourse as language use in communication; that is, discourse as a sequence of utterances, rather than a sequence of sentences. In this sense, the semantics24 of the Prague Linguistic Circle can be considered as semantico-pragmatics at discourse level, whereas at the lexical level it endorses “the Saussurean notion of meaning (as linguistic form of cognitive content)” (Sgall 1994:294). Meaning in discourse is analyzed in terms of the topic/focus articulation (TFA) of the sentence (Hajičová 1994, Peregrin 1996:236-7, Sgall 1987) and of the hierarchy of communicative dynamism; meaning of the sentence, in turn, is distinguished into contextually

---

24 A historical account of how the Prague School has been studying meaning (e.g. Jakobsen and Mathesius) can be found in Leška 1996.
bound and non-bound. Despite the high interest in meaning from its early period and concern with pragmatic discourse (utterance), the School’s analysis is more focused on sentences than lengthy pieces of text.  

2.1.6 Discourse Analysis in Systemic-Functional Linguistics

Those who discuss more directly the matter of “discourse-semantics” (Eggings 1994:82-4) than those who are mentioned in the previous subsection are scholars of Systemic-Functional Linguistics, exemplified in the works by Halliday and his followers (cf. Berry 1981; Coulthard 1987; Coulthard ed. 1994; Eggings 1994; Enkvist 1987; Fries 1992, 1995, 2002; Halliday 1994; Halliday and Hasan 1976, 1989; Hasan, Cloran, and Butt eds. 1996; Lemke 1988; and G. Thompson 1996). Eggings, for example, explains that three kinds of meaning (i.e. experiential, interpersonal and textual meanings) run through a text (1994:83); thus, they are analyzed, following Halliday and Hasan 1989, in the following ways. The experiential meaning (i.e. what the discourse is talking about) is investigated by analyzing the transitivity structure of the clauses. The interpersonal meaning (i.e. who is taking part) is accounted for by the analyses of mood, modality, and persons. In order to identify textual meaning (i.e. role assigned to language), lexico-grammatical organization needs to be described by analyzing the content words (e.g. verbs, nouns, and circumstances such as prepositional phrases and adverbs) of transitivity structure of the clauses (Eggings 1994:83) with reference to theme, information (Fries 1995, Cloran 1995) and cohesion (Aziz 1988).

In sum, Halliday and Hasan have written that “the concept of cohesion accounts for the essential semantic relations whereby any passage of speech or writing is enabled to function as text” (Halliday and Hasan 1976:13). It may be safe to say that the study of textual meaning for Systemic-Functional linguists is closely

---

25 In this connection, a more extended understanding about topic (or “theme”) as characterized at the paragraph and discourse level has been presented by Jones (1977) from the Pikean tagmemics perspective.
concerned with the analysis of cohesion\textsuperscript{26} while the experiential and interpersonal meanings are also in the scope of the theory.

\textbf{2.1.7 Discourse Analysis in Functional Grammar (FG)}

In the Netherlands, Simon C. Dik and his followers around the world have been developing Functional Grammar (FG), also with an emphasis on semantics and pragmatics. The theory has the term “functional” in that the primary function of language is “a symbolic instrument used for communicative purposes” (Dik 1980:46). As to the relationship among areas of linguistic studies, Dik goes on to say, “Syntax is subservient to semantics, and semantics is subservient to pragmatics” (1980:46). FG aims to have four-fold adequacy: typological adequacy, descriptive adequacy, psychological adequacy and pragmatic adequacy. Three distinct functions that FG highlights are semantic functions (e.g. Agent, Goal, Recipient, Beneficiary), syntactic functions (Subject and Object), and pragmatic functions (Theme and Tail, Topic and Focus).

Though discourse study in FG, or functional grammar of discourse, is not fully developed yet, Dik has set out an outline (1997:409-41). According to Dik, discourse is approached from three perspectives: global decision (similar to Longacre’s discourse typology or genre), global structure (e.g. hierarchy, units, relations), and coherence.

Integrating FG with textlinguistics, however, Buth (1995:77-100) has analyzed Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic discourse with an emphasis on the distinction between Topic and Focus. Topic, in FG, “is a constituent of a clause that has received special marking […] in order to signal the intended perspective for relating the clause to the larger context” (Buth 1995:84). It is also termed as “contextualizing constituent” (or C.C.). “Focus, on the other hand, is a way of specially marking the salient, important information of a sentence” (ibid.). Topic

\textsuperscript{26} A cohesion analysis, from the standpoint of stratificational grammar, is found in Gutwinski (1976), where he applies it to Henry James and Ernest Hemingway’s literature pieces.
provides a discourse with continuity, focus enhances foreground. Relating the concept of topic (C.C.) and focus with foreground and background, Buth redefines the foreground as “sequential-foregrounding” structure that has a more author-oriented pragmatic function, than a traditional understanding that “[t]he foreground of a narrative is usually defined to be the sequential chain of completed events” (1995:86). On this ground, Hebrew’s peculiar word order XSV (where X is any NP or other non-Subject and non-V element), as opposed to the default VSO, is analyzed as a mark of discontinuity. A significant implication of his continuity-discontinuity analysis in place of the traditional type of foreground-background to storyline analysis will be discussed in chapter 6.

### 2.1.8 Discourse Analysis in Relevance Theory (RT)

Relevance Theory (hereafter RT) is inherently semantic in that it digs out “the hidden implications” (Morgan 1994:148), being “a theory of cognition which offers a model of how the mind works” (id. 1994:127). Originally developed by Sperber and Wilson (1986), RT operates on the principle of relevance:

*Principle of relevance*

Every act of ostensive communication communicates the presumption of its own optimal relevance. (Sperber and Wilson 1986:158)

In other words, because “[h]umans tend to pay attention to what is relevant to them,” […] “relevance, and the maximization of relevance, is the key to human cognition” (Blass 1990:43) and communication. A good communication is achieved when it is contextually relevant; that is, in RT’s term, communication has a *contextual effect*, or “the link-up between an utterance and its context” (Gutt 1992:21). The term “context” in RT is “the cognitive environment of the hearer” (Gutt 1992:22), which includes perception memory, inference, general knowledge about science, people’s beliefs, and culture and so forth. The *contextual effects* that make communication relevant have three kinds: (i) derivation of a contextual implication, (ii) strengthening of a contextual assumption, and (iii) elimination of a contextual assumption through contradiction (Gutt 1992:22-3).
Applying RT to discourse analysis, Blass claims that it “provides a better theoretical foundation for comprehension and textuality than coherence models” (1990:43). She argues that discourse analysis in RT has more strength in understanding a text’s meaning than a mere classification of discourse types. She summarizes: “coherence- and topic-based approaches look at purely textual connectivity: relevance theory is based on the relation between information content and context. Moreover, discourse analysis within relevance theory is not a purely formal matter, but involves a consideration of how texts are understood, how they are processed and what effects are achieved” (Blass 1990:80).

Following Blass (1990) within RT, Follingstad (1994:151-88) analyzes storyline in Tyap narrative discourse. Identifying two sets of particles (one has two preverbal particles, and the other includes three conjunctions), he argues that the first set has the contextual effects and that the latter has a. thematic prominence, b. focus prominence in relation to the foreground of the narrative, and c. emphatic prominence “with respect to the speaker-hearer axis of communication” (1994:188). Follingstad’s insight into the nature of the latter is of great importance for the present study of storyline in Iu-Mienh narrative; one of the second set, i.e. si, “a coordinating conjunction which tends to imply temporal succession” (1994:169), “tends to correlate with […] prominent foreground events” (id. 1994:169, 171, 188). Attention should be drawn to his statement that it is “conjunction,” as opposed to verbs or narrative tense that marks, in the particular case of Tyap, the temporal succession and foreground events (e.g. H2 in

---

27 A discourse marker, or an illocutionary adverb bekidur ‘in short’ in Modern Hebrew within the framework of RT was studied by Shloush (1998), who agrees with Blass 1990 in saying, “I tend to accept the idea that texts do not occur with fixed coherence relations and that coherence is derivative from the establishment of relevance. Nevertheless, this does not mean that a text does not exhibit distinct hierarchical structures, from which coherence may follow” (Shloush 1998:78).

28 Blass’s illustration goes like this: “just setting up these types [narrative, conversation, procedural, hortatory] does not say anything about the function of these discourses nor why they have the particular structures they do. This approach is like comparing different games such as football, cricket and polo just by their outward appearances and forgetting that players are actively involved in achieving particular goals, the goals being different in each case” (1990:80).

29 Tyap (also “Kataf”) is a member of the Niger-Congo family, spoken in southern Kaduna State in Nigeria. An application of RT to discourse analysis of another African language, Lobala, a Bantu language of Northwest Zaïre, has been carried out by Morgan (1994:125-49).
1.1.2). This importance will be discussed in chapters 4 and 5 as Iu-Mienh exhibits a similar phenomenon.

By way of reference, it is noteworthy that Follingstad has moved from RT to Mental Space Theory (MST), perhaps through a common emphasis on a cognitively-oriented approach to language, applying to Biblical Hebrew discourse analysis with a particular focus on \( ki \) ‘because’ (2001).

Due to RT’s deep concern with relevant interpersonal communication, together with the wider sense designated by the term “context” of interpersonal communication than a context of texts, it is natural that it extends its scope to the study of discourse markers. Such examples include Shloush (1998) and Ziv (1998) in the semantic and pragmatic study of Modern Hebrew: the former on \( bekicur \) ‘in short,’ the latter \( kaze \) ‘like this’: both identifying the conceptual and procedural meanings of these discourse markers within the framework of RT.

2.1.9 Discourse Markers and Sociolinguistic Discourse Analysis

Congenial to the study of discourse markers within RT, others have done similar research with no particular theoretical brand name. They include studies on \( oh \), \( well \), \( and \), \( but \), \( or \), \( so \), \( because \), \( now \), \( then \), \( y’know \), \( I \) mean (Schiffrin 1987), and \( yeah \) and \( like \) (Jucker and Smith 1998) in English, on \( rotsë \) lishmoa kéta? ‘wanna hear something weird/funny’ (Maschler 1998) in Modern Hebrew, on \( X nante \), \( X nanka \), \( X nado \), \( X dano \), \( X toka \), and \( X tari \), pejorative expressions of ‘the likes of X’ (Suzuki 1998) in Japanese, on \( k\omega \) ‘then, also, consequently’ (Yajai 1985), \( na^5 \), \( la^5 \), \( si^5 \), and \( th\omega^2 \) (Paensiri 1998, Cooke 1979) in Thai, and on \( amen \) and \( hallelujah \) in African American sermons by Wharry 2003 to name a few.

As is obvious from these, the study of discourse markers resides at the intersection of the sociolinguistic study of discourse (Fasold 1990:65-75, Gee 1999, Stubbs 1983), conversation analysis (Coulthard ed. 1992, Fox 1987:6-76\(^{30}\)), pragmatics

\(^{30}\) After the treatment of anaphora in conversational analysis in English, the latter half (pp. 77-136) of Fox’s study focuses on the anaphora in monologue expository written texts.
(e.g. Clark and Haviland 1977), and the study of discourse markers and reported speech in written texts (e.g. Larson 1978). Furthermore, a sociolinguistic discourse analysis which incorporates Halliday’s social-semiotics (Halliday and Hasan 1989) provides the discourse marker study with a wider and more adequate perspective. Some of this research may be interesting; however, they are of limited relevance to the present study (except for Thai $k\alpha$, cf. 2.1.12, infra).

2.1.10 Narratology

*Quid est enim tempus?* (“What, then, is time?”) was the question Augustine asked in his *Confession*, which lead Paul Ricoeur (1984 [in French 1983], 1985 [1984], 1988 [1985]) to argue for temporality of narrative. On the other hand, however, he also approves an “emplotm ent” (1984:31-51) of narrative, following Aristotle, the culturally polar end of Augustine. According to Ricoeur, Augustine analyzed time in terms of a threefold present, 31 whereas Aristotle argued that time is something passing from the past through the present to the future in a plot of *mimesis/muthos* (viz. narrative). Ricoeur’s analysis is illuminating in suggesting that the aspectual nature of the Iu-Mienh language, as opposed to tense-oriented Indo-European languages, is akin to Augustine’s theory of time in narrative, while the underlying philosophy of the plot/profile analysis in narrative discourse theorized by Longacre (1996:33-50) is from an Aristotelian understanding of plot. 32 Rather than separating them, though, Ricoeur puts forth the correlation between “the activity of narrating a story [with plot therein] and the temporal character of human experience” in the following way: “time becomes human to the extent that it is articulated through a narrative mode, and narrative attains its

---

31 Meaning, “By saying that there is not a future time, a past time, and a present time, but a threefold present, a present of future things, a present of past things, and a present of present things, Augustine set us on the path of an investigation into the most primitive temporal structure of action in terms of this threefold present. The present of the future? *Henceforth*, that is, from now on, I commit myself to doing that tomorrow. The present of the past? *Now* I intend to do that because I *just* realized that… The present of the present? *Now* I am doing it, because *now* I can do it. The actual present of doing something bears witness to the potential present of the capacity to do something and is constituted as the present of the present” (Ricoeur 1984:60).

32 It is noteworthy that Ricoeur (1985:7) points out that, “[t]he Aristotelian theory of plot was conceived during an age when only tragedy, comedy, and epic were recognized as ‘genres’ worthy of philosophical reflection.”
full meaning when it becomes a condition of temporal existence” (1984:52) (italicized by Ricoeur).

In addition to Ricoeur’s philosophical narratology, there is also: a. structural/functional narratology (Prince 1982), b. sociolinguistic narratology (Toolan 2001), c. literary narratology (Abbott 2002), and d. exegetical/theological narratology (Coats 1985). An interesting common feature among them is their acute consciousness of the distinction between the narrative time and the real-world time. For example, Toolan (2001:42) states that, “there is something unreal and heavily convention-laden about so-called story time and text time. In neither case are we referring to actual temporal progression, but the linear verbal representation of temporality” (emphasis by Toolan). Furthermore, “[g]iven a narrative recounting a chrono-logical sequence, where sequence is taken to be a group of non-simultaneous topic-comment structures the last one of which constitutes a modification of the first, events can be distinguished in terms of their relevance to that sequence” (Prince 1982:68).

In other words, change/transition/movement of events is inherently bound with the time passage in narrative. It is this inseparability of event sequentiality and event transitivity along the time-line that makes the narrative time more complex than the real-world time. This is also a fundamental nature of a prototypical narrative, since “[t]his dependence of time with regard to change (movement) is a sort of primitive fact […]” (Ricoeur 1988:15, 1985). This significant nature of...

---

33 Prince (1982:163) summarizes the goals of narratology as “to discover, describe and explain the mechanics of narrative, the elements responsible for its form and function.” He goes on to say, “narratology gives us an insight into the principles governing systems of signs and signifying practices as well as our interpretation of them” (idem 164).

34 Coats (1985:15) categorizes Hebrew Old Testament narratives into Saga, Legend, Tale, Novella, and Fable, asserting that recognition of different narrative forms affects exegesis: “interpretation advances under the careful control of genre definition.”

35 Nevertheless, in contrast to the distinction, it is also necessary to note that Abbott (2002) tends to integrate narrative time and real-world time. He says, “In narrative […] , though it is the incidents that give shape and that dominate our sense of time, the regularity of abstract time, which is also an integral part of all our lives, unavoidably adds its own counterpoint to the time structured by incidents. […] We have always been aware of the recurring cycles of the sun, moon, and seasons, and at the same time we have always been shaping and reshaping time as a succession of events, that is, as narrative” (2002:5).
inseparability between the sequentia lity of events and the transitivity of events in relation to the storyline (e.g. H2 in 1.1.2) will be discussed in chapter 5.

2.1.11 Discourse Study by Thai authors

It has been mentioned three times thus far in this section (by Buth (1995) in 2.1.8; Follingstad (1994) in 2.1.9; and Riccoeur (1984, 1985, 1988) in 2.1.11) that the central issue of inseparability between change/movement/transitivity of events and sequentia lity of events along the time-line is crucial to the storyline. In a similar vein, a fourth author, who is from Thailand, Somsonge has also stated that the sequentia lity marked by a group of certain conjunctions and serial clauses is “the most important criterion” (1991:105-6) in determining whether clauses and verbs in question are really on the storyline. She has also stated that these markers often co-occur with temporal adverbs. For instance, she says, “kɔɔ̂ signals that the following event is sequential to the previous one” (Somsonge 1990:71). Further, Yajai (1985:2) claims that, among other functions of kɔɔ̂, it has the function of “addition, temporal sequence, sequence of events,” “discourse cohesion” (id. 6), and “prominence marker” (id. 9). In addition, Somsonge (1992a: 48-9) has found a similar function with the Sgaw Karen particle sweʔ as highlighting “an important chronological juncture”, “a backreference” (id. 50-1) which indicates “the crucial backbone event” and “progression from the preceding backbone event” (id. 50), “a connectivity of successive events” (id. 51).

Finally, her recent study on Hlai (Li) discourse (Somsonge 2002) has integrated the above-mentioned findings in her own version of “storyline” theory, “narrative timeline.” “The narrative timeline is defined as the main line of development, i.e. the line of sequential, punctiliar happenings (Longacre 1996)” (Somsonge 2002:142). Incorporating Dry’s point that “for a structure to move time, it must present new information” (1983:33), Somsonge summarizes that the narrative timeline must have two major components: sequentia lity and presentation of new information. Her statement (ibid.) is presented visually as follows:
The clauses refer to (i) sequenced points on timeline and (ii) present new information constitute the foreground of a narrative.

Hence, H2 of the present study has been hypothesized for Iu-Mienh, which also has a conjunction ziouc [z'ouJ] meaning approximately ‘and then, so, after which’ similar to Thai kx3 ‘then’ and caik2nan4 ‘after that’. A distant brother of the Iu-Mienh in the Hmong-Mien family, the White Hmong, has been reported by Clark (1988) to have a similar conjunction los [lo1] “with the approximate meaning ‘(and) then/so, thus, therefore, yet, and it happens, and it turns out, with the result’” (1988:93). Her naming of it as “an inchoative conjunction” suggests that it has a sort of force of aspectual/verbal element to contribute to movement in a discourse. Clark’s later investigation (1992) has added data of the Vietnamese conjunction thì and the Black Tai conjunction kò “all seem to have meanings something like ‘well, (and) then, (and) so, and it happens that, and it turns out that’”(1991:87), adding one more function, that of topicalizer.

Therefore, insights from these Thai authors and other Southeast Asian languages can be summarized as follows: (1) it is not only verbs but particles (i.e. conjunction-like particles) that mark the storyline in these languages that do not have tense-aspect marking on verbs, (2) these conjunctions mark sequentiality, which is the most important criterion for the identification of storyline, and (3) the sequentiality is indicated in corroboration not only with conjunctions but also serial clauses and temporal adverbs.

For other Thai discourse studies, see Person’s (1993:6-7) lucid summary. There are two narrative-related MA theses of Chulalongkorn University, which studied the Iu-Mienh. Uthai’s (1982) sociological and pedagogical study of Iu-Mienh folktales includes 35 narratives from Ban Huai Mae Sai village, Chiang Rai province, which is the same variety as the subject of the present study. Kasamaporn (1990) investigated the participant reference in five narratives loosely following Longacre’s discourse analysis.
2.1.12 Discourse Semantics

Sharing the same term “discourse semantics” with Eggings (1994:82) mentioned in 2.1.6, Seuren (1985) has more polemic characteristics. Seuren’s book is primarily a departure from “surface semantics,” “truth conditional semantics,” “calculus semantics,” and an “autonomous” view of components of language. He criticizes them with numerous citations of insufficiency of propositional analysis and entailment analysis, terms that come from a logical point of view. He claims that his semantics is a “discourse-dependent linguistic interpretation” (1985:1), holding the view that discourse is a “psychological reality.” He even asserts, “that logic is psychologically real in so far as humans carry out logical operations as part of their cognitive behaviour” (1985:211).

Yet, despite the same dissatisfaction with autonomously disconnecting grammar from semantics as cognitive semanticists and linguists have been lamenting, Seuren’s theory is not CL. Discourse semantics from a more cognitive oriented perspective has been outlined by Tomlin, Forrest, Pu, and Kim 1997. Tomlin et al. (1997:104-5) discuss “the central issues and concepts of discourse semantics” in two main problems as follows:

The first is the problem of knowledge integration: how the individual propositions in a text and discourse are integrated to reflect well the speaker’s conceptual representation and to optimize the creation of an appropriate conceptual representation in the listener. The second is the problem of information management: how information is organized and distributed as the speaker and listener interact during the blueprint creation process.

In the next section (2.2), cognitive approaches to discourse analysis will be reviewed following the basic outline by Tomlin et al. (1997): the knowledge integration and information management.

2.1.13 Summary

To summarize this section on the treatment of semantics in discourse analysis in various theories, one can observe that the study of meaning in discourse was not a major concern in structuralism. Functionalists are confined to sentence level
study or studying meaning in the pragmatic domain. Some theories have the psychological and cognitive range to capture the meaning beyond the sentence level. One such example is the discourse semantics from the cognitive linguistic perspective. Concerning the study of storyline in narrative discourse, some linguists who pay attention to semantics have found that certain conjunctions exhibit both the sequencing function and the developing function along the timeline of narrative.

2.2 Cognitive Approaches to Discourse Analysis

In this section, following Tomlin et al. (1997) mentioned in 2.1.12, an overall picture of cognitive discourse semantics will be reviewed. Therein, works that have been done within various cognitive theories and cognitive oriented approaches will be integrated. Such theories include CL (CG, CS, MST), cognitive-minded functionalists (e.g. Chafe and Givón), an application of cognitive psychology to linguistics (e.g. van Dijk and Kintsch), and linguists of other theoretical schools who approach their subject matter in a highly cognitive way without reference to CL. Subsequently, views of meaning by Longacre and Langacker will be compared concerning the matter of the inseparability of the form-and-meaning composite or surface-and-deep structure. Finally, the section will propose a model of a CG approach to discourse.

2.2.1 An Overall Picture of Cognitive Discourse Semantics

There are two basic ways of looking at discourse metaphorically speaking: a conduit metaphor of discourse and a blueprint metaphor of discourse. Cognitive discourse semantics views discourse and texts utilizing a blueprint metaphor. The conduit metaphor represents discourse and text as things that contain meaning, where an act of text comprehension can be reduced to “exegesis” or drawing meaning out of the text. In contrast, in the blueprint view of discourse, “the speaker holds a conceptual representation of events or ideas which he intends should be replicated in the mind of the listener” (Tomlin et al. 1997:64). In this view, creation and comprehension of discourse have two major areas: knowledge
integration and information management as shown in Tomlin et al. (1997:71), who use Levelt’s (1989) concept of blueprint for the pre-verbal message (Figure 11).

Starting from the left end of the Figure 11, the knowledge integration stage involves the formation of the conceptual representation as “the fundamental ‘meaning’ the speaker works with in constructing a discourse” (Tomlin et al. 1997:68). That is, the conceptual representation is formed by receiving raw materials from remembering, perceiving and creating activities. The conceptual representation in turn is processed through four kinds of information management, namely, rhetorical management, thematic management, referential management and focus management. Thus in this model, cognitive discourse semantics deals with knowledge integration and information management leaving the utterance formulator to cognitive morphology and cognitive phonology (cf. Figure 10).

2.2.2 Knowledge Integration

In order to build and interpret discourse or text successfully, the semantic information provided in each utterance or sentence has to be integrated into a coherent whole (Tomlin et al. 1997:65). This integration involves three areas: (i) morpho-syntactic coding, (ii) implicatures, and (iii) planning and inference. MST
can be placed in the morpho-syntactic coding of the model inasmuch as Fauconnier organizes his model by saying “[t]he spaces set up by a discourse in this way [a new mental space is set up relative to an existing space that is in focus] are organized into a partially ordered lattice. At any given stage of the discourse, one of the spaces is a base for the system, and one of the spaces […] is in focus. […] As “the discourse participants move through the space lattice; their view point and their focus shift as they go from one space to the next” (1997:38-9).

Implicatures and inference are not purely morpho-syntactic but important in producing and understanding discourse. In this sense, Langacker’s domain-based meaning and encyclopedic semantics in CG (1987a:62-3; 154-66) has more power to explain implicatures and inference than formal semantics.

2.2.3 Information Management

This section includes four areas of discourse management: rhetorical management, thematic management, referential management and focus management.

2.2.3.1 The Rhetorical Management of Discourse

The process of producing discourse (spoken and written) involves the information component and the action component,\(^{36}\) both guided by the speaker’s/writer’s goal. The information component includes study areas like propositional content and pragmatic matters (e.g. emphasis, importance, presupposition). From a decoder’s point of view, all of them guide how the semantic content should be interpreted. From an encoder’s viewpoint, a selection process is at work. In regard to the information management component, Langacker has investigated the selective nature of linguistic coding, exploiting CG notions of focal adjustment of selection (1987a:116-20), construed (1991b:294-8), and action chain (1991b:213-7). With respect to the pragmatic side of discourse, the study of discourse markers

---

\(^{36}\) The sentence final particles that have illocutionary force in Asian languages (e.g. -oc [o:]), ‘POLITE PARTICLE,’ –aes [e:\] ‘I-REALLY-MEAN-IT,’ –madh [ma:]\(\) ‘COMMAND,’ nii [ni:y] (with an emphatic rising intonation) ‘I-AM-TELLING-YOU’ in Iu-Mienh) should also be studied in the cognitive discourse semantics under the area of the rhetorical management.
in RT (though dismissed as irrelevant if they are only from a classifying approach, cf. 2.1.10) Andersen (1998), Ariel (1998), Jucker and Smith (1998), Shloush (1998), Ziv (1998), among others, should belong here due to their attention to the cognitive status of the discourse markers.

2.2.3.2 The Thematic Management of Discourse

In the thematic management of discourse, at least three major problems are recognized: (1) theme or topic at clause level, (2) discourse theme, and (3) foreground and background proposition, i.e. the problem of propositional centrality. Commonly understood definitions of ‘theme’ include: (i) theme as aboutness (i.e. it is that which the predicate talks about), (ii) theme as a starting point or what Lambrecht (1994) terms “a point of departure for the clause,” and (iii) theme as a center of attention. As will be seen in chapter 6, the thematic marker or topic marker –nor ‘talking about,’ -aeqv ‘as for’ in Iu-Mienh come under the term “theme as aboutness” and they will be analyzed in relation to the conceptual structure of sequentiality (cf. 2.1.12).

From the perspective of cognitive psychology, Van Dijk and Kintsch (1978, 1983) studied “cognitive information processing,” which they defined as “understanding discourse” using the notion “macro-structure”. They state, “The global meaning of a discourse is represented by semantic macro-structures” (1978:68). In other words, it is “an abstract semantic description of the global content, and hence of the global coherence of discourse” (Van Dijk and Kintsch 1983:189). Originally taken from Generative Semantics, in the conviction that there must be “THE DEEP STRUCTURE OF A TEXT” (van Dijk 1972:130), van Dijk’s notion of macro-structure of texts (1977:130-63; 1981:195-214) (except for its cognitive psychological emphasis) was incorporated into Longacre’s discourse analysis (1979a, 1985a) to reinforce the semantic part of his theory (cf. 2.1.3).³⁷

³⁷ Note the cross-academic cooperation among the American Generative Semantics, European Textlinguistics, and American discourse analysis.
Rong (1992) identifies English logical connectors express foreground-backgrounding in discourse. The background connectors include *though, despite, in spite of, regardless, notwithstanding, even though, since, as due to, for example, that is, in other words, by the way and in passing*. The foregrounding connectors are *but, however, nevertheless, yet, so, therefore, also, moreover, besides, to sum up, overall, anyhow, to resume, etc.* It should be noted, as has been pointed out in 2.1.9 and 2.1.12, that conjunctions can express foreground-background when they are analyzed from a CL perspective.

The present study of storyline, which can be broken down to be an analysis of foreground and background, receives its due position under the thematic management of discourse in a broader perspective of cognitive discourse semantics: specifically, in the issue of propositional centrality.

**2.2.3.3 The Referential Management of Discourse**

Under the term referential management, information structure such as given, or old, and new information in the traditional investigations receive a more cognitively oriented treatment. Though belonging to no particular theoretical group, Chafe (1973, 1974) researched them in a new light of “psychosemantics” as “active memory” (given information), “semi-active memory,” and “inactive memory” (new information) in the flow of discourse (1979, 1987, 1994:53-191). Givón’s (1983) referential distance model is devised to measure the gap between a previous occurrence of the referent/topic and its current occurrence by counting numbers of clauses between them. He also claims that coherence is a mental entity rather than being found in texts (1995). For Givón “text comprehension is synonymous with the construction of a structured mental representation of the text” (1995:64) on the assumption that coherence is grounding (i.e. the more grounded the clause in a discourse is, the more mentally-accessible it is). In a similar vein with Chafe (1974) and Givón (1983), Epstein (1999, 2002) investigated the accessibility of the English definite article in discourse within the MST framework.
Research into anaphora can be located under the term referential management of discourse. Van Hoek (1997) has researched the conceptual-semantic relationship of anaphora within a CG perspective resulting in the establishment of the “reference point model.” Conceptual connectivity is argued to be a continuum ranging from the most strongly interconnected structures to more weakly connected structure, and to the weakest, that is, discourse unit boundaries. Her area of research is reinforced by Langacker (1996) in that “restrictions on the location of a pronoun vis-à-vis its antecedent are best described in terms of conceptual configurations” (Langacker 1996:333). Liang’s (1996) work has revealed that zero anaphora in Chinese discourse is an “emergent reference” using a cognitive strategy term.

2.2.3.4 The Focus Management of Discourse

The focus management segment is a counterpart of the theme or topic at clause level under the thematic management of discourse when it is interpreted in Prague School terms: namely, the theme-rheme pair. In cognitive discourse semantics, however, the term focus management has broader perspective encompassing the focus as prominence, focus as pragmatic function (Dik 1980, Buth 1995:84, cf. 2.1.8), and Lambrecht’s (1994) predicate focus, argument focus and sentence focus. Following Lambrecht, Heimerdinger (1999) analyzed topic, focus and foreground in Biblical Hebrew with some cognitive psychological concerns. Holmqvist and Holšánová (1997) have investigated empirically the focus movement of a text during a time of telling and listening to a spoken discourse. They found that a visualization of language is taking place in the mind of the listener.

38 Heimerdinger’s work is different from Johnstone’s heuristic approach to discourse analysis (2002:230-1, cf. 1.11 supra.). With regard to the focus structure in a third person narrative clause, Heimerdinger analyzes predicate-focus structures, argument-focus structure and sentence-focus structure in both wayyiqtol (the preterite verb or Longacre’s foregrounded material) clause and NP + qatal (perfective verb) clause. He concludes from them that the latter construction, which Longacre claims to be the background material, indicates “a change of information structure in the sentence” and sometimes indicates “foregrounded rather than backgrounded material” (1999:219). See 4.1 concerning its implication to Longacre’s theory of storyline.
Subsections 2.2.1 to 2.2.3 have reviewed literature related to cognitive linguistics approaches in a scaffold-like framework of broad cognitive discourse semantics outlined by Tomlin et al. (1997).

2.2.4 Cognitive Functional Linguistics

As has been noted above, there are number of linguists who are cognitive-minded or cognitive-psychology-concerned with regard to the semantic issue of discourse. These approaches were recently summarized by the Japanese cognitive linguists (Horie and Sato 2001) under a new term “Cognitive-Functional Linguistics.”

The last item in this chapter of literature review, Dooley and Levinsohn (2001), (written independently from the aforementioned Horie and Sato (2001) in the same year with the same interest from different backgrounds), possibly fall into this category of cognitive-functional discourse analysis. Though intending to provide linguistic field workers with an introductory manual for discourse analysis, it contains “a functional and cognitive approach” (2001:vii) such as the notion of “mental representation” (2001:21-5, 49-60) as a conceptual framework within the traditional method of Longacre’s genre analysis and text charting techniques. In fact, Levinsohn co-authored with Longacre the “field analysis of discourse” twenty-three years ago (Longacre and Levinsohn 1978:103-22). It seems to be natural for Levinsohn to have increased his concern about semantics of discourse as an exegete of Biblical languages; Hebrew (Levinsohn 2000) and Greek (1992a, 1992b, 1992c).

2.3 Views on Meaning

In the last subsection 2.2.4, it was suggested that field linguistics could legitimately proceed to the interpretation of meaning of texts after an initial stage of description. A comparison of two field linguistics manuals, i.e. Dooley and Levinsohn (2001) and Longacre (1964), shows that both have a serious concern with the issue of meaning. However, at the same time the comparison may suggest that their approach to the study of meaning has changed in the period of nearly forty years. In this section, two views on meaning will be compared.
2.3.1 Longacre’s view on meaning

In Longacre’s field manual (1964) for linguists who work in a structural and tagmemics framework, his view on meaning can be seen:

Obviously, meaning lurks in the background everywhere. The background of meaning would seem to be essential to the analysis. […] We assume with Pike that the units we handle are form-meaning composites. Nevertheless, it seems necessary to insist that it is the formal side of the composite which is amenable to initial systemic analysis. (1964:23) [underline added]

While both formal and semantic sides are recognized as important, it should be noted that a major interest in an “initial systemic analysis” necessitates a concentration on the former (or the surface structure) rather than the latter, which is reasonable within the context of the discovery procedure and descriptive field linguistics.

Furthermore, in the process of development from descriptive linguistics at morpheme-to-sentence levels (1964) to a full-fledged discourse analysis, Longacre (1972b) accentuates the inseparability of form and meaning as follows:

Here [i.e. in questions of universality], I accept without further cavil the point eloquently made by post-structuralist linguistics that deep or semantic structures are relatively universal, while surface structures are relatively restricted and language specific. I reject, however, any implication that ‘surface’ is to be regarded as superficial, or ‘deep’ as more relevant. While this implication is a hazard built into the very terms themselves, the contention here is that both deep and surface structure are prime concerns of the student of language and that meaning is found in both. (1972b:xi)39 [underline added]

This contention that meaning is found in both surface and deep structures based on the conviction of inseparability between them urges us to revisit de Saussure’s signifié-signifiant composite (de Saussure 1910-11:93 in Komatsu and Harris 1993; English translation by Baskin 1959:67) as a transitional link to Langacker’s

---

39 Longacre goes on to say “[s]urface structures are of obvious importance, in that all that is said, or ever will be said, in a given language must be expressed in its surface structures. Tagmemics (of which I am a practitioner) need not be apologetic for its many years of preoccupation with the discovery procedures for, and the taxonomy of, surface structures” (1972:xi).
concept of grammar as symbolic units comprising semantic and phonological poles (Langacker 1987a:76-86).

### 2.3.2 Langacker’s view on meaning

De Saussure’s axiomatic diagrams are in Figure 12 as follows:

![Figure 12. Signifié-signifiant composit of a sign](image)

(The left diagram is from Emile Constantin’s notebook VII of the 2nd of May, 1911, in Komatsu and Harris 1993:75. The two diagrams on the right are from Baskin’s translation of Saussure [1911] 1959:67)

The diagrams in Figure 12 show that the linguistic sign is composed of concept and acoustic image, namely, *signifié* and *signifiant* (signified and signifier). Further, Saussure says that “the linguistic sign is based on an association made by the mind between two very different things, but which are both mental and in the subject: an acoustic image is associated with a concept” (1910-11; Komatsu and Harris 1993:74a).  

From the above, it is clear that both the symbolic (sign) and mental nature of linguistic expressions have been carried into Langacker’s CG.

It is this symbolic nature or the oneness of the signified-and-signifier composite of the linguistic sign in the mental domain that keeps investigators from becoming subjective in the analysis of meaning. This symbolic understanding demands consistency in grammatical analysis as well, which will be shown in section 2.4.

---

40 “[L]e signe linguistique repose sur une association faite par l’esprit entre deux choses très différentes, mais qui sont toutes deux psychiques et dans le sujet: une image acoustique est associée à un concept” (Constantin’s notebook VII, 2nd of May 1911 in Komatsu and Harris 1993:74)
Before that, however, attention should be drawn to one more statement about the “surface structure” that is closely associated with an objectivity of linguistic analysis. As has been observed above (2.3.1), Longacre (1964) said, “that it is [in] the formal side of the composite…” and “in both” (1972b:xi) of the composite that meaning should be found. In 1976, he refined his position by saying, “that the surface structure patterns in themselves have meanings which are imposed over the deep structure patterns” (Longacre 1976:10). Even though he inclines toward the formal side of the composite as a place of meaning’s existence,41 a balance between the form and meaning can be secured as expressed in Saussure’s following metaphor:

[T]aking up [an] example of the sheet of paper that is cut in two, it is clear that the observable relation between the different pieces A, B, C, D, etc. is distinct from the relation between the front and back of the same piece as in A/A’, B/B’, etc. (Saussure 1959:115 [1910-11]).

Here Saussure talks about the following diagrams in Figure 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>acoustic</th>
<th>image</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Term A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Saussure from Constantin’s notebook VIII, 12 May 1911 in Komatsu and Harris 1993:89a)

Figure 13. The internal and syntagmatic relation of linguistic signs

41 Indeed, Longacre elsewhere writes, “I think we must insist that surface constructions have meaning which is imposed over and sometimes in tension with deep structure meaning” (1976:256).
The internal relationship between the “concept” and “acoustic image” is likened to the front and back of a piece of paper. Therefore, what is needed is a model that deals with both sides simultaneously. For this purpose, Saussure’s diagram is utilized to provide CG with the symbolic assumption of language (Langacker 1987a:11-13).

The notion of the “sign” composed of the “concept” and the “acoustic image” are incarnated in Langacker’s modern characterization that linguistic “expressions” associate “a semantic representation of some kind” with “a phonological representation” (1987a:11). Not only that, the two ovals connected by an arrow in Figure 15 suggest that a syntagm (i.e. a sequenced linguistic form of more than two items) also has the same semantic value in itself. This is the basis for Langacker’s claim that grammar is symbolic: “Grammar is simply the structuring and symbolization of semantic content” (1987a:12).

Having looked at the comparison in subsections 2.3.1 and 2.3.2, one should be reminded of the fact that Longacre’s apparent rejection of the “deep structure” or reluctance to delve into the semantic side of the form-meaning composite and Langacker’s deep concern about the meaning in grammar are not in conflict. Rather, their standpoints actually stem from a common dissatisfaction with an abstract treatment of syntax detached from the reality of language.

2.4 Discourse Analysis in Cognitive Grammar

Developing the Saussurean diagram (Figure 13) into a discourse compatible device, Langacker (2001b:145) presents the following syntagmatic windows (Figure 14):
Parallel to Saussure’s diagram, the upper frames represent the conceptualization pole, and the lower the vocalization pole. The usage event consists of the speaker (S) and the hearer (H) (or the “interlocutors” collectively) interacting with each other or paying attention to each other as indicated by the dotted two-hand arrow between them. The upward arrows indicate that both the speaker and hearer are actively focusing on the conceptualization. That the upward arrows cross the upper and lower frames means that “each has to deal with both a conceptualization and a vocalization” (Langacker 2001b:144). A discourse occurs in a usage event, which is “carried out by the speaker and hearer.” A meaningful communication can only be actualized when both the speaker and the hearer are grounded (G), that is, “the interlocutors’ apprehension of their interactive circumstances,” as the inner frame has the label “Ground,” which is in turn situated in the context. This context is referred to as the context of speech, “interpreted broadly as including the physical, mental, social, and cultural circumstances” (2001b:145) (cf. Halliday’s ‘context of situation’ in Halliday and Hasan 1989:3-14), thus it is surrounded by the “Shared Knowledge” (cf. Halliday’s ‘context of culture’ in Halliday and Hasan 1989:46-7). As pointed out
in subsection 2.2.2, shared knowledge is a part of the encyclopedic knowledge of the language users, which has to be taken into consideration in the cognitive analysis of discourse.

The “Viewing Frame” represents a limit or amount that the mind can conceptualize at one moment. In the viewing frame, the interlocutors’ attention is drawn to a selected entity that is focused. The bold-lined circle represents the focus of attention or profiling.

The whole window containing the above-mentioned relations and configuration within is termed the current discourse space (CDS). “The CDS is defined as the mental space comprising those elements and relations construed as being shared by the speaker and hearer as a basis for communication at a given moment of the flow of discourse” (2001b:144). This flow is indicated by “> >” in the passage of “Time” along the penetrating arrow. An occurrence of a discourse is thus conceptualized in the usage event, “i.e. actual instance of language use” (2001b:144). All the necessary elements involving the usage event of a discourse are schematized as a representation of conceptual structures in the CDS in Figure 14.

Arrows, circles, and boxes in CG diagrams, various profiling, relations and conceptual configurations can be expressed in this schematic representation of CDS by the technique of highlighting lines. This is a tool to capture the meanings of linguistic expressions without disconnecting them from grammar. In other words, this device is an entry into the conceptual structure through the surface structure, with the conviction that “Cognitive grammar equates meaning with conceptualization…[…] Linguistic semantics must therefore attempt the analysis and explicit description of conceptual structures” (Langacker 1991a:278). Langacker also states, “[l]inguistic meaning is largely a matter of construal, and dimensions of construal reasonably described as matters of prominence are critical to both semantics and grammar” (2001b:158). In chapter five, this will be utilized to analyze an increment of discourse spaces and a conceptualization of some conjunctions.
2.5 Summary of the Chapter

Chapter 2 has surveyed how various linguists from different theoretical backgrounds approach the semantic issues manifest in discourses and texts. Four approaches to this issue and one specific area of Iu-Mienh will be summarized below.

Broadly speaking, there are four basic approaches to the meaning of language at the discourse level. The first is the formal approach. In this approach, the field-based discovery and descriptive procedure, the texts documentation, and the structural-functional methodologies are employed from a holistic perspective (i.e. discourse to clause and lower) or a build-up perspective (i.e. sentence syntax applied to a larger unit) to explain how a text is organized as a coherent whole. The study of meaning is conducted in relation to the wholeness of text, thus encompassing the study of cohesion and information structure at the sentence level. A rigorous semantic study at the discourse level from this approach is difficult to find. However, their concentration on empirical field-based description of surface structure and the analysis of a text corpus have provided later generations with a solid foundation of data and methodology toward a deeper investigation into the semantic domain of discourse.

The second approach is mental. The meaning of texts are approached from cognitive psychology, psycholinguistics, and neuro-psychology, by both linguists who are psychology-minded and psychologists who are linguistic-minded, providing an interdisciplinary environment internationally. These researchers approach texts in such a way as to “process” and “interpret” them. In this approach, the process of the interpretation of texts is the central area of study, rather than the texts themselves.

Third approach is a sociolinguistic study of discourse. Here the meaning of discourse can be found in the middle ground between the sender and receiver of a message in a relevant context. Therefore, the study of meaning in this type of discourse analysis is perceived as a subject of communicative, pragmatic, and
social-semiotic research. In Halliday’s term, the interpersonal meaning of discourse is treated in this area (sociolinguistics), while the ideational meaning belongs to the second group (mental) mentioned above.

The fourth approach is symbolic, reconciling the formal and mental sides. Language and grammar are construed as a symbol comprising the semantic content and its phonological representation. In this view, grammar and semantics are inherently one, and this oneness strives to answer the concern about ignoring the surface structure in the study of discourse as held by the majority in the first group. Discourse, whether written or interpersonal, is also taken as a symbol, that is, a conceptual entity. As such, the study of discourse cannot be exempt from the analysis of its meaning in this approach of CG.

One specific issue with regard to Iu-Mienh, suggested through several cases of other languages (i.e. from Africa and Asia), is the multifunction of some conjunctions in relation to the storyline. This group of conjunctions seems to have both a connecting function and a foregrounding function (as opposed to a traditional understanding that it is a verb with special tense and aspect that foregrounds the storyline). This issue will be discussed in chapter 6 from the CL perspective.
CHAPTER 3

SOME GRAMMATICAL FEATURES OF IU-MIENH

3.0 Introduction

Chapter 3 lays a grammatical foundation for chapters 4 and 5. Court (1986) describes Iu-Mienh syntax from noun phrases to simple clauses, as well as including a basic phonology, based on Purnell (1965). Building upon the foundation laid by Court, this chapter will recapitulate basic clause types, serial verb constructions, tense-aspect-modality and topic chains.

As opposed to languages that have morphosyntactic coding with respect to tense and aspect, Iu-Mienh does not depend on such features to identify the storyline since it does not have any morphological marking on verbs. The main purpose of this chapter is not an exhaustive description, but a presentation of verb and clause types sufficient for identifying a distinction between storyline and non-storyline materials.

3.1 Basic Clause Types

The basic word order in Iu-Mienh is SVO. The verb in (1) is intransitive and the subject is an Agent.

(1)  
Mbopv tiux
squirrel run
‘A squirrel ran.’

The prototypical transitive clause has the subject as an Agent and the object as a Patient as in (2).

(2)  (CI .034)
Mbopv ngaatc yie
Squirrel bite 1sg
‘A squirrel bit me.’

An adverbiał clause often precedes the main clause as in (3).
Adverbial clauses are often marked with the topic marker aeqv ‘as for’ (sometimes nor aeqv), an independent clause marker gau ‘after which,’ ‘as,’ or ‘while’ or an aspectual verb liuz ‘after finishing.’ The aeqv stands at the end of the adverbial clause (4); gau and liuz come immediately after the verb in the clause as in (5).

An adverbial clause marked by hnangv ‘like, as’ often comes after the main clause as in (6).

---

42 neiz is a contraction of ninh nyei ‘his/her’ (3sg + POSS).
3.2 Serial Verb Constructions (SVC)

Iu-Mienh uses serial verb constructions and multiclausal constructions extensively, and sentences are often juxtaposed without conjunctions, resulting in a long string of verbs. In such a situation, it is important to identify which component in an SVC encodes an event and an action that are on the storyline and which do not.

A serial verb construction (SVC) is defined by Aikhenvald as follows:

A serial verb construction is a sequence of verbs which act together as a single predicate, without any overt marker of coordination, subordination or syntactic dependency of any other sort. Serial verbs describe what can be conceptualized as a single event. They are monoclausal; their intonational properties are those of a monoverbal clause, and they have just one tense, aspect and polarity value. Serial verbs may also share arguments and obliques. (Aikhenvald 2005)\(^43\)

Thus, six defining factors of SVC are 1) serial verb as a single predicate, 2) monoclausality, 3) no intonation breaking between components, 4) shared tense, aspect, mood, modality and polarity value, 5) serial verb as one event, 6) prototypical serial verb sharing at least one argument.

As such, each SVC is expected to be on the storyline. However, some SVCs exhibit a complex internal structure; hence, the following examples should be of help in recognizing the head of the construction.

Starting from a simple SVC, gorngv mbuox ‘speak tell,’ gorngv heuc ‘speak call/order,’ gorngv naaic ‘speak ask’ are frequently used both in a conversation and narrative discourse. The relationship between two verbs in all of these SVCs seem to be that \(V_1\) provides a general meaning followed by \(V_2\) with specific information about how the general meaning of speaking is performed. (7) is from a narrative.

\(^{43}\text{The citation of Aikhenvald 2005 is from the pre-publication draft.}\)
Switch-subject SVCs (Aikhenvald 2005) are exemplified in (8), where the object of *haeqv* ‘frighten’ *hieh_juv* ‘black wolf’ is the subject of the verb *gamh_nziex* ‘fear.’

(8) (3PG.056)

\[
\text{Haeqv} \text{ nc dauh hieh_juv_jieqv gamh_nziex haic}
\]

frighten that CLF wolf_black fear very

‘(A piglet) frightened the black wolf into being very afraid.’

An example of a switch-subject cause-effect SVCs, where \( V_1 \) causes an effect on the object, which in turn becomes a subject of \( V_2 \) expressing the effect, is shown below in (9):

(9) (3PG.069)

\[
douz-sioux congx zuqc ninh m'zing sui
\]

smoke zap GOAL 3sg eye sour

‘Smoke zapped his eyes making them sore.’

In (10) \( Cl_2 \) which is a monoclausal SVC is embedded in \( Cl_1 \). This is explained by Aikhenvald (2005) as the switch-subject SVC used for complement clause serialization. The complement clause is in brackets.

(10) (3PG.067)

\[
\text{Dungz-dom buatc} [\text{hieh_juv_jieqv nyomg jien} v jiaux]
\]

Piglet see wolf_black creep SML.ACT ascend

‘The piglet saw the black wolf creeping up.’

The next four SVCs include adverbial information. The location adverbial SVC is shown in (11), where the adverbial component precedes the head of the construction.
An associative adverbial SVC uses *caux* ‘accompany’ or ‘to be with’ as in (12):

(12)  (BS.167)  
\[ Njang\_hnoi\ meih\ caux\ yie\ mingh \]
\[ \text{tomorrow 2sg be_with 1sg go} \]

‘Tomorrow, you will go with me.’

Manner adverbial SVCs have two different constructions. One type has the same constituent order as (11) and (12); the other uses *duqv* ‘get, acquire, attain.’ The former type is illustrated in (13), the latter in (14).

(13)  (3PG.033)  
\[ Dauh\ dungz\_dom\ njiec\ qaqv\ jatv\ ninh \]
\[ \text{CLF piglet let_go_down strength laugh 3sg} \]

‘That piglet laughed at him very hard.’

(14)  (Lombard and Purnell 1968:72)  
\[ Meih\ domgx\ jauv\ duqv\ haic\ ni\ aa! \]
\[ \text{2sg do_wrong road attain far very part.f} \]

‘Goodness! You missed the trail a long way back!’ (Translation by Lombard and Purnell) (or ‘You’re WAY off the path!’)

This usage of *duqv* in (14) is referred to as “attainment aspect marker” by Li (1991:32). Though he does not consider this kind of sentence as an SVC, his analysis of Hmong examples are labeled “simplex sentences,” thus, fitting the definition of SVCs by Aikhenvald.

Temporal adverbial SVCs also use *duqv* ‘get, acquire, attain’ as in (15).

(15)  (FA.044)  
\[ Yie\ njiaux\ mh^{45}\_mbuo\ duqv\ i\ buo\ hnyangx\ aqv \]
\[ \text{1sg teach 2.PL attain two three year PFT} \]

‘I have been teaching you for two or three years already.’

---

44 *Doqc_sou* literally means ‘read book’ (at school). That gives the gloss ‘study.’ See (25) below for ‘read.’

45 The second person *mh* is a contraction form of *meih.*
In directional SVCs, the construction ends with mingh ‘go,’ daaih ‘come,’ faaux ‘ascend,’ and njiec ‘descend.’ They indicate movement of a participant. In (16) mingh is a directional verb describing the action taking place.

(16) (BS.190)

\[ \text{Ninh auv zorqv pietv guangc mingh} \]

‘His wife took (the meat) and threw (it) away.’

Lastly in this section, a brief mention on a quasi-serial verb construction should be made. In this, a verb follows a head noun or NP to modify it, as in English ‘food to eat’. A similar translation for the noun phrase which contains a verb in (17) is possible, i.e. ‘wings to fly with.’

(17) (FG.011)

\[ \text{gaeng-kiev maaih douz yaac maaih ndaatv ndaix} \]

‘The fire fly had a light and wings to fly with.’

In the identification of a storyline clause, any verb that modifies a head noun should be demoted to a lower band.

### 3.3 Tense, Aspect and Modality

A strong connection between the verbal morphology and the narrative storyline can be seen in Longacre’s statement: “each surface structure type has characteristic tense/aspect/voice features in the verbs that occur on its mainline in discourse in a particular language” (1996:12). The crux of the matter seems to be that it is the verbal tense/aspect/voice that indicates whether a particular verb is or is not a storyline verb. However, this does not work in Iu-Mienh since its system for tense-aspect-modality (TAM) has more complex features.

#### 3.3.1 Tense

Tense is defined as “the grammaticalisation of location in time” (Comrie 1985:1). A comment such as “Chinese [is] an example of a language which lacks tense entirely” (Trask 1993:276) is possible when one adopts a definition as follows:
Tense

Fundamental grammatical (morphological) category of the verb which expresses the temporal relation between a speech act (S) and the state of affairs or event (E) described in the utterance, i.e. which places the event spoken of in relation to the temporal perspective of the speaker. (Bussmann 1996:478)

Though Iu-Mienh does not have a “morphological category of the verbs to express the temporal relation,” it has tense and a way to express it. Whaley discusses different strategies in different languages which have “no special tense morphology” (1997:206-9). He cites an example of Burmese, in which “time adverbials are used in conjunction with modal affixes” (Whaley 1997:206) to express tense.

Iu-Mienh also uses temporal adverbs to indicate time reference. For example, am’hnoi ‘yesterday,’ wuov norm leiz-baaix ‘last week,’ wuov zanc ‘then, that time’ etc. for past; ih zanc ‘now,’ ih hnoi ‘today,’ jangc jangc ‘just now’ etc. for present; and aav hitv deix ‘in a minute,’ njang hnoi ‘tomorrow,’ dieh norm leiz-baaix ‘next week’ etc. for future. The word order is: Adv.tmp + SV as in (18).

(18) (FA.005)

Wuov_zanc hnoi m’sieqv_dom mv haih doqc_sou
that_time day girl NEG be_possible study_book

‘In those days, women could not study.’

In narrative discourse the following temporal adverbs used to refer to past tense are listed in Table 4.

46 These are found in the narrative corpus for this study. Other temporal adverbs in conversations or other situations include: hitv deix dangh ‘in a minute,’ a’hitv deix ‘later,’ aav deix dangh ‘shortly,’ dieh hnoi (dih hnoi) ‘some other day,’ zinh ndaangc ‘in the past, previously,’ nqa’haav ‘later, in the future,’ nqa’haav hingv ‘in the future,’ V + jiex ‘have experienced V,’ jiex daaih wuov norm leiz-baaix ‘last week,’ jiex daaih buo hnyangx ‘in the past three years,’ zanc-zanc ‘always,’ manc-manc ‘gradually,’ etc.
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Table 4. Temporal adverbs for narrative discourse

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>loz-hnoi</td>
<td>in the old days, once upon a time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>wuov hnoi</td>
<td>that day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>wuov zanc</td>
<td>that time, then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>wuov zanc hnoi</td>
<td>in those days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>da’nyeic hnoi</td>
<td>the following day (lit. the second day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>da’faam hnoi</td>
<td>another day (lit. the third day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>da’nyeic ndorm</td>
<td>the following morning (lit. the second morning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>njang ndorm</td>
<td>the following morning (lit. tomorrow morning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>njang hnoi</td>
<td>the following day (lit. tomorrow)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>wuov nzunc hnoi</td>
<td>this\textsuperscript{47} time, another occasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>wuov nzunc hnoi aeqv</td>
<td>as for this time, another occasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>mv nzunc hnoi aeqv</td>
<td>as for this time, another occasion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The items (k) and (l) employ a topic marker \textit{aeqv} ‘as for’ forming a full length construction; the whole phrase meaning ‘talking about this time,’ or ‘as for this time of event’.

The expressions (h) \textit{njang ndorm} ‘tomorrow morning’ and (i) \textit{njang hnoi} ‘tomorrow’ refer to the future in a direct speech or an actual conversation. However, in a narrative discourse, they refer to the future from the perspective of discourse participant, which is the past from the perspective of audience. Therefore, in (19) the verb \textit{mingh} ‘go’ refers to past time reference even though \textit{njang hnoi} ‘tomorrow’ is used. By the inherent narrative perspective of telling a story about something that happened in the past, or an initial temporal setting indicator that provides the past setting, \textit{njang hnoi} ‘tomorrow’ means ‘the next day.’

\textsuperscript{47} Direct translation of \textit{wuov} is ‘that’ and ‘that time’ in English refers to what had already happened prior to the time of narration. However, in narrative discourse, the construction \textit{wuov nzunc hnoi} means ‘another occasion’ referring to an event that takes place after a previous one. Therefore, the translation for j and k are ‘this time’ and ‘as for this time.’
Some Iu-Mienh native speakers refer to njiang_hnoi ‘tomorrow’ of this situation “tomorrow of the past day,” as opposed to “tomorrow of now.” This is a kind of relative future tense in Comrie’s sense (1985:56, 124).

3.3.2 Aspect

Comrie offers following definition: “aspects are different ways of viewing the internal temporal constituency of a situation” (1976:3). In Iu-Mienh aspects are expressed by serial verb constructions and sentence final particles.

Similar to the directional serial verb constructions discussed in 3.2, perfective aspects can be expressed by mingh ‘go’ and daaih ‘come.’ In (20) mingh is not involved in a locomotion in space but indicates that the action has just taken place. This is different from mingh in (19) which indicates movement in space.

In both (20) and (21) mingh and daaih can be replaced with ziangx ‘finish.’ In addition, one cannot answer such questions as Ninh mbuo mingh haaix? ‘Where did they go?’ concerning (20); Ninh yiem haaix daaih? ‘Where did she come from?’ with respect to (21).

The following five examples contain posthead aspectual verbs: (22) V + ziangx ‘finish V-ing,’ (23) V + liuz ‘finish/done V-ing,’ (24) V + baac ‘finish V-ing,’
(25) V + dorn ‘completed a process of V-ing,’ (26) V + nzengc ‘consume V-ing, completely V-ed.’

(22) (BS.226)
\[
\text{Mbenc ziangx kuv lai kuv hnaangx}
\]
\[\text{prepare finish delicious vegetable delicious rice}\]
‘(the old woman) finished preparing delicious vegetables and delicious rice.’ (i.e. finished preparing a delicious meal or a feast).

(23) (CI.061)
\[
\text{Laapc liuz cingx_daaih ih_zanc ngaiv ngaiv wuov nor aex}
\]
\[\text{put finish therefore now big-eyed big-eyed that as I\_mean\_it}\]
‘(They) finished pouring (ginger juice into the owl’s eyes); therefore, now the eyes of owls are as big as saucers; I mean it.’

(24) (Lombard and Purnell 1968:22)
\[
doct\ baac sou
\]
\[\text{read finish book}\]
‘to have finished reading the book; to have finished studying’

(25)
\[
\text{Ninh doqc dorn sou}
\]
\[3sg read complete\_a\_process book\]
‘He has graduated (from school).’

(26) (FA.054)
\[
\text{Yiem wuov haaix\_nyungc waac yaac gomgv nzengc}
\]
\[\text{be\_in there what word TOP speak consumed}\]
‘There (they) talked about all kinds of thing.’ (in a sense that “what ever words were consumed”)’

The constructions are summarized in Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Semantic value</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 V-liuz</td>
<td>Past TR marker: ‘finished V-ing’: Simple past</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 V-baac</td>
<td>Past TR marker: ‘finished V-ing’: Simple past, similar to liuz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 V-ziangx</td>
<td>Perfective Aspectual Verb ‘completed V-ing’: the perfective sense is stronger than the simple past liuz and baac.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 V-nzengc</td>
<td>Completive Aspectual Verb ‘have V-ed all’: Expresses consumption, an exhaustive or universal plural, some emphasis or surprise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 V-dorn</td>
<td>Completed Aspectual Verb ‘have completed V-ing throughout’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Aspectual auxiliary verbs
V-liuz and V-baac are almost interchangeable in most contexts. As will be seen in chapter 4 (and example (23)), they are often used in an adverbial clause preceding a main or independent clause: ‘after finishing V-ing, S + main Cl.’ When used in an independent clause, they require the aspectual sentence final particles ąqv or mi’ąqv to ground the whole clause in a usage event as in (27):

(27) (BS.104)

\[ \text{Ninh} \ \text{nziez} \ \text{ziuc} \ \text{maeqv} \ \text{zoi} \ \text{njiec} \ \text{bun} \ \text{liuz} \ \text{ąqv} \]

3sg younger_sister then peel throw descend give finish PFT

‘Her younger sister then finished taking off (the bracelet and silver neckpiece and) throwing down (and) finished giving (them).

V-ziangx indicates completion of a process or action. Its difference from liuz and baac is in line with Bybee’s definition of perfective aspect:

Perfective also designates a temporal notion, but not one that is reckoned deictically in relation to the moment of speech, but rather one that is determined by the viewpoint taken on the situation. That is, perfective presents the situation described by the clause as having temporal boundaries, as being a single, unified, discrete situation. (Bybee et al. 1994:83)

The completive nzengc originally comes from a sense that a quantity of something is consumed. Bybee’s elaboration of completive into three semantic nuances fits nzengc well:

1. The object of the action is totally affected, consumed, or destroyed by the action. To repeat, ‘to end up’ is a good example.
2. The action involves a plural subject of intransitive verbs or object of transitive verbs, especially an exhaustive or universal plural, such as ‘everyone died’ or ‘he took all the stones’.
3. The action is reported with some emphasis or surprise value. (1994:57)

Durative aspect and simultaneous action are expressed by an extended use of the stative verb jienv ‘to be stable, firm.’⁴⁸ Example (28) is in a construction V + jienv ‘keep in a state of V,’ and (29) in V₁ + jienv + V₂ ‘V₂ while/at the same time V₁-ing.’

---

⁴⁸ Another meaning is ‘to be important, urgent, pressing’ (Lombard and Purnell 1968:95), but it is not known yet if the two different meanings are polysemous or they are homophonous.
The following seven examples discuss aspect as expressed by the sentence final particle *aqv* ‘change-of-state.’ Though *aqv* is often used in a perfective sense, there are other situations where the perfective meaning does not fit, such as a case of referring to a future time reference. The interpretation of *aqv* depends on context largely.

Court analyzes the sentence final particle *aqv* as a “change-of-state particle” (CH-O-ST) (1986:248). A contrast between (30a) and (30b) shows that the “change-of-state” has a perfective sense.

(30a) (Court 1986:24)

\[
\text{Yie mv mingh} \quad \text{1sg not go}
\]

‘I will not go.’

(30b) (Court 1986:25)

\[
\text{Yie mv mingh aqv} \quad \text{1sg not go CH-O-ST}
\]

‘I am not going any more.’ < ‘I have changed my mind from going farther.’

“Change-of-state” as being a generic meaning of the particle *aqv* can be interpreted in two ways: 1) perfective aspect and 2) inchoative aspect. (30b) shows that the change of the speaker’s mind is from the past (i.e. ‘I was thinking of going before.’) to the present (i.e. ‘Now I have changed my mind not to go’ or ‘I’ve made up my mind, and I’m not going to go,’ or ‘I’ve decided not to go.’)

49 If the speaker means ‘I did not go,’ *yie maiv duqv mingh* is usually used.
Another example of this perfective sense is (31), in which the change can be interpreted as from the fruit’s growth in the past to the present state of ripeness.

(31) (CI.008)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Maqv_gorky_biov zuoqc aqv} \\
\text{olive_fruit ripe PPT}
\end{array}
\]

‘The olives are ripe.’

On the other hand, the extension of the generic meaning “change-of-state” to the inchoative aspect is indicated in the right-hand tree of Figure 15.

In the inchoative sense, there are three possibilities as in (32)-(35). They are all used in the present and future time references. Since the subjects are all animate and can have volition, they correlate with modality. When a speaker is in the first person, it means, “I have changed my mind from what I have been doing” or a resolution (32) in a sense that “I have decided to do a new thing.”

(32) (AS.022)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Aa, yie m\text{\textbackslash'}sieqv_dorn, yie maiv nongc mengh aqv} \\
\text{Ah 1sg woman 1sg NEG want fame I_am\_sure}
\end{array}
\]

‘Ah, I am a woman; I’m sure I don’t want an honor.’

When used to address the second person, it means, “You should change your present situation,” that is COMMAND but casual (33).
In the second person but in a inclusive sense, it means INVITATION, “Let’s do…” (34).

(34) (OH.011)

(Mbuox ninh nyei die, "Nyanc hnaangx aqv.")
tell 3sg POSS father eat rice CAS.CMD

‘(She) said to her father, “Come eat!”’ [If she were speaking to her peers/friends, it would be ‘Let’s eat!’]

When the subject is in the third person, it means “he is about to…,” or “he is on the verge of doing…” (35).

(35) (BS.173)

(Ninh daix yie aqv)
3sg kill 1sg INCHOAT

‘Otherwise, he is about to kill me.’

Thus, glossing of aqv varies depending on its context, whether the sentence occurs in the past (i.e. realis) modality or in the future (i.e. irrealis) modality.

Resultative aspect is “a state that was brought about by some action in the past” (Bybee et al. 1994:63), and this is expressed by mi’aqv. In the previous paragraph, it was mentioned that the second person with inclusive sense under the inchoative usage of the CH-O-ST aspectual marker aqv has the meaning of casual command or invitation. This is exemplified in Panh (1995:250) where mi’aqv is given a translation “let’s go” with his note that the expression is a “contraction of mingh aqv.” Compare this with (36).

(36) (Panh 1995:255)

(mingh mi’aqv)
go go-CH-O-ST

‘gone already’
The seeming duplication of “go + go” is not a problem in a native speaker’s mind due to a well-entrenched contraction of \textit{mi’aqv} as an inseparable unit.\footnote{Some incidents of elicitation turned out that most native speakers of Iu-Mienh cannot identify the etymological break down of \textit{mi’aqv}; some can guess this might have come from the two words \textit{mingh + aqv}. Panh (1995) is a native Iu-Mienh.} It means that \textit{mi’aqv} is an independent construction by itself.

Formed in this way \textit{mi’aqv} is a resultative aspectual marker. This concurs with Bybee’s comment that “resultative constructions may be lexically restricted, or a more generally used construction may have a resultative use only with change-of-state verbs” (Bybee et al. 1994:65-6). The combination of the aspectual verb and the aspectual particle is shown in Figure 16.

![Figure 16. Composition of the resultative aspectual marker \textit{mi’aqv}](image)

In contrast to the subtle modal senses of \textit{aqv}, the listener/hearer of a narrative can be sure that an event is over and there is a definite result of it whenever \textit{mi’aqv} is uttered (except when addressed to the second person).

### 3.3.3 Modality

Modals include \textit{oix} ‘want, like, will’ (37) and \textit{oix zuqc} ‘must’ (lit. want + passive or want + forced) (38). The latter construction sometimes varies to \textit{aqv zuqc} in a rapid speech. Both \textit{oix zuqc} and \textit{aqv zuqc} are commands when addressed to the second person.
(37) (3PG.009)

\begin{align*}
\text{Yie oix bieqc melh nyei biauv} \\
1sg & \quad \text{want} & \text{enter} & \text{2sg} & \text{POSS} & \text{house}
\end{align*}

‘I want to come into your house.’

(38) (FA.011)

\begin{align*}
\text{Mingh aeqv, aqv_zuqc faix_fim} \\
go & \quad \text{TOP} & \text{must} & \text{careful}
\end{align*}

‘When you go, you must take care.’

Not all modal uses of oix are desiderative, while a non-desiderative use has an irrealis sense. An inanimate subject can take this modal verb as in (39).\footnote{Purnell (2006, personal communication) mentions that “oix can be treated as a future time marker”. Also Burgess (personal communication).}

(39)

\begin{align*}
\text{Biauv oix mbaang} \\
\text{house will collapse}
\end{align*}

‘The house is about to collapse.’

Example (40) is a consecutive speech consisting of two sentences, where the first oix is non-desiderative (i.e. near future without volition) while the second is desiderative.

(40)

\begin{align*}
\text{Ninh se gox oix daic haic niaa} \\
3sg & \quad \text{TOP} & \text{old} & \text{is about to die} & \text{very} & \text{I wonder}
\end{align*}

‘He is so old that he is about to die.

\begin{align*}
\text{Aengx oix mauv haaix_nhunc camv?} \\
further & \quad \text{want} & \text{desire} & \text{what} & \text{much}
\end{align*}

What else (what other things) does he want/desire?’

The non-desiderative use of oix correlates with futurity as a derivation from a modal use. That is, it only refers to the future in a secondary sense after the primary sense that an Agent wants to do something, which means that the thing to be done lies ahead time-wise. This correlation between the future time reference and the modality of the verb oix is represented in Langacker’s “basic epistemic model” (1991c:242-44) (Figure 17).
What is wanted/willed has not come true yet; it is irrealsis, and thus, naturally belongs to a domain yet to come to the conceptualizer, i.e. future time reference.

Another case of cross-category interaction is the relationship between the aspectual use and modal use of mingh ‘go’ and daaih ‘come.’ Court contends:

The verbs mingh and daaih [are] used as aspectual/evaluative/diectics components. These indicate a change of state, and by the choice of mingh one can indicate that the change is not desirable, or neutral, while daaih marks it as desirable. (Court 1986:248).

Since these senses of “desirable” and “not desirable” are determined in relation to a conceptualizer or the speaker, it is suggested to refer to them as modal verbs. A context of (41) is at the occasion of the arrival of a newborn child, hence daaih is used with a desirable sense.

(41) (BS.091)

Marry DUR three years, bear get CLF son come daaih.

‘Having been married for three years, (she) has given birth and got (happily) a baby son.’

In contrast to the “desirable” sense of ‘come,’ (42a) shows an undesirable situation with the aspectual verb mingh ‘go.’
(42a) (Court 1986:248)\textsuperscript{52}
\begin{align*}
\text{Duqv} & \quad \text{mi(ngh)} \quad \text{aqv} \\
\text{Get} & \quad \text{go} \quad \text{FFT}
\end{align*}
‘He’s (gone and) taken it off (when he shouldn’t have)’ (translation by Court)

The contrastive sense will become clearer when compared with (42b):

(42b) (Court 1986:248)
\begin{align*}
\text{Duqv} & \quad \text{daac} \quad \text{aqv} \\
\text{get} & \quad \text{come} \quad \text{FFT}
\end{align*}
‘He’s taken it off (as he hoped he would)’ (translation by Court)

Another form with a range of meaning is \textit{duqv} ‘to get, acquire, attain, be able to, can.’ That is, its lexical meaning has extended to an aspectual use. Clark reported on \textit{tau} ‘get/acquire’ in Hmong, in which she recognizes a perfective aspect (1989:217). Furthermore, Li (1991) advanced the argument that \textit{tau} is an “attainment aspect marker.”\textsuperscript{53} \textit{Duqv} in Iu-Mienh has a similar aspect shown in (43a-b).

(43a) (AS.138)
\begin{align*}
\text{Za'gengh!} & \quad \text{ninh} \quad \text{yaac} \quad \text{duqv} \quad \text{zoux} \quad \text{hlo} \\
\text{Really} & \quad \text{3sg} \quad \text{also} \quad \text{get} \quad \text{be} \quad \text{big}
\end{align*}
‘Really he also has become big.’ (i.e. ‘He reached/gained an important position.’)

That is, he attained the event of becoming an important person. Besides the original sense of ‘to get,’ the perfective meaning in the sense of accomplishment and achievement after some period is evident.

The verb \textit{duqv} in (43b) does not take a verb as its complement but a noun phrase, and yet still has a perfective sense.

(43b) (FA.043)
\begin{align*}
\text{Yie} & \quad \text{njaaux} \quad \text{mh} \quad \text{mbuo} \quad \text{duqv} \quad \text{i} \quad \text{buo} \quad \text{hnyangx} \quad \text{aqv} \\
\text{1sg} & \quad \text{teach} \quad \text{2} \quad \text{PL} \quad \text{attain} \quad \text{two three years} \quad \text{FFT}
\end{align*}
‘I have been teaching you both for two or three years.’

\textsuperscript{52} Though Court’s example lacks the context, I assume that he has drawn his conclusion from sufficient examples.

\textsuperscript{53} Recently, Enfield (2001) has referred to this kind of polyfunctional construction as AQUIRE, “a marker of complex descriptive complement constructions such as resultative, adverbial, and potential expressions” (Enfield 2001:268).
The object of attainment by the verb *duqv* is the event of “two or three years.” The result of attaining the event is naturally interpreted with the perfective aspectual sense. It seems to be more suitable to adopt Li’s “attainment aspect” to designate the Iu-Mienh equivalent *duqv*.

### 3.4 Topic Chains

Topic chains are “chains of clauses which share a common topical participant” (Van Valin 2005:103). The primary topical participant in a clause is also termed “topic subject” (Somsonge 2002:142). Once a topic subject is established in the first clause, it will be realized by a pronoun or zero anaphora (Van Valin 2005:104). Since zero anaphora can be used frequently in topic chains in discourse, the chains appear to be juxtaposed clauses, and it is sometimes difficult to distinguish them from sequenced serial verb constructions. Aikhenvald (2005:42), referring to such constructions as “sequence of actions,” distinguishes them as follows: 1) In a sequence of actions, “A pause or an intonation break indicating a clause boundary can appear between the verbs” (vs. SVCs cannot), 2) a topic chain or a sequence of actions is compositional (vs. SVC as a single predicate), 3) a topic chain encodes “several events in sequence which may be conceptualized as connected to each other” (vs. SVC as one event), 4) it is “chains of clauses” (Van Valin 2005) (vs. SVC as monoclausal).

In (44) the subject topic is in bold face; established by a pronoun in clause 1, then carried over by zero anaphora in clauses 2 and 3 (the subject being a piglet running away from a wolf in the story).
(44) (3PG.046)

Cl₁

**Ninh youc bangc wuov norm zanc**

3sg also depend_on that CLF period

Cl₂

Ø nqongh deix njiec daaih

it hurry some descend come

Cl₃

Ø biaux nzuong mingh

it flee return go

‘As for (the piglet), it used that occasion, came down quickly (from a tree), fled (and) went home.’ (i.e. ‘...it took the opportunity to quickly come down and run off/away home.’)

Each component may have its composite internal construction. Cl₂ in (44) is an adverbial SVC with a directional verb (i.e. [[nqongh deix]ₜₜₜₜₜₜ [njiec]ₜₜₜₜₜₜₜ] daaihₜₜₜₜₜₜ), and Cl₃ is a directional SVC.

An even more complex structure can be found in (45). The serial verb components within the clauses are in brackets. The topic subject of this sentence is *caah laauh pornc* ‘grasshopper’ established in the preceding sentence (FG.018), hence, (45) begins with the zero anaphora. The whole thing is a multiclauusal construction, consisting of topic chains. However the internal structure is as follows: Cl₁ is an adverbial clause marked by *aeqv* the topic marker and an intonation break. Cl₁ is dependent on Cl₂. Cl₂ is a switch-subject cause-effect SVC followed by a short pause. Cl₃ is another adverbial clause marked by a topic marker and a pause, and is dependent on Cl₄. Cl₄ cannot be broken by a pause; thus it is a switch-subject SVC.
An overall structure of this topic chain is that a sentence comprising Cl₁ and Cl₂ provides a setting for the succeeding sentence comprising Cl₃ and Cl₄. Thus Cl₂ and Cl₄ carry the story forward.

3.5 Summary of the Chapter

In chapter 3 we have surveyed the basic clause types, serial verb constructions, tense-aspect-modality (TAM) and topic chains. A semantic extension is obvious in a certain class of verbs (e.g. mingh ‘go,’ daaih ‘come,’ faaux ‘ascend,’ njiec ‘descend,’ duqv ‘get, attain, aquire, can,’ oix ‘like, want, will’ or ‘be about to,’ liuz ‘finish,’ baac ‘finish,’ ziangx ‘finish,’ nzengc ‘be consumed,’ jienv ‘be stable’). They extend their original meanings to adverbs of direction and TAM. All these verbs can be strung together into SVCs, multicausal constructions and topic chains. The sentence final particles, aqv (change of state) and mi’aqv (resultative) provide additional aspectual and modal meanings. Thus the interaction between TAM through verbs is frequent with no morphological inflection, implying a need for a non-TAM based storyline theory. The SVCs and main clauses in topic chains advance the narrative forward.
CHAPTER 4
TEXTLINGUISTICS STORYLINE ANALYSIS

4.0 Introduction

Starting with a brief review of Longacre’s principle behind the storyline and verb ranking analysis, this chapter will first present definitions of storyline from two different perspectives, i.e. textlinguistics and cognitive linguistics. Secondly, the chapter will discuss textlinguistic storyline and salience scheme analysis of Iu-Mienh narratives, preceded by their profile analysis. In the course of doing so, some rudimentary insights into cognitive-linguistic aspects of storyline analysis will be pointed out. Thus, chapter 4 is a transitional chapter moving from a textlinguistics storyline analysis to a cognitive linguistics storyline analysis.

4.1 Textlinguistics Storyline Analysis in Biblical Hebrew

The second edition of Joseph (2003a), a culmination of rigorous empirical research, analytical techniques, comprehensive methodology and the holistic theory of Longacre’s version of discourse analysis, stands on the basis of nearly fifty years[^54] of his study of Biblical Hebrew among some eighty languages.[^55]

Obviously Biblical Hebrew[^56] is one of the important languages for him, largely

[^54]: The earliest mention, perhaps, of the Biblical Hebrew among his publications may be Longacre 1960, where he illustrates hypertagmemic analysis of the clause types, predicate tagmemes and object tagmemes. He testifies that it was in 1944 at seminary that he first encountered so-called waw-consecutive as a "special narrative tense", which sounded strange to him, through the Gesenius-Kautzsch-Cowley Hebrew grammar (1910) (Longacre 2003a:64).


[^56]: But again why Hebrew? It was perfectly legitimate for Longacre to choose Biblical Hebrew to be one of many soils on which the study of narrative discourse should be cultivated. It is appropriate because of two-fold richness. First, it is because it provides abundant corpus: 484 chapters out of 912 chapters of the whole Hebrew Bible are entirely narratives (other 417 chapters are entirely poems or narratives that contain poetic forms and 11 chapters are written in Aramaic). Second, it is because no other narrative corpus in the world has undergone such an acute scrutiny of literary, linguistic, semantic studies, and textual criticism over two millennia as these texts. Thus, Hebrew of the Bible offers a laboratory where various methodologies can be tested.
through which, if not exclusively, he constructed the theory of storyline and salience scheme.

The first half of this section summarizes Longacre’s ten works on storyline analysis in Biblical Hebrew (1961, 1979a, 1981, 1982b, 1985a, 1987, 1989a, 1994a, 1995, 2003a). These works have been compared with five recent authors, and a summary of the comparison will be presented in the second half.

First, having reviewed these ten works, three premises concerning Hebrew narrative discourse can be summarized as follows:

1. The preterite (i.e. “wāw plus prefixal verb”) is the special narrative tense for the back-bone of a story (viz. a storyline tense/verb). It is this tense of a verb that pushes the story forward.

2. A distinction between the foregrounded event-line (i.e. storyline) and supportive material is binary. An implication of this premise is that once the storyline tense is identified, all the other supportive materials will be (almost automatically) eliminated as “off-the-line” materials into a background from the “on-the-line” material.

3. On the other hand, there is a “spectrum” (i.e. “ranking” or “cline”) across the supportive materials.

Concerning the third point, Longacre states:

Possibly Biblical Hebrew narrative is one of the clearest places to posit with confidence a spectrum which involves considerable diversity of verb and clause structure (1981:341) [underline added]


1. The prototypical function of the preterite (wayyiqtōl form) verb is to keep sequentiality in recounting past events in a narrative.

---

57 One should be reminded, however, of the fact that Hebrew is not the only language Longacre’s theory is built on.

58 For details see Arisawa 2006.

59 By assigning the term “preterite,” which is non-aspect, Longacre set a right course for the future analysis of Hebrew verb in discourse. See Blau who argues “that in Biblical prose the Hebrew verbal system denotes tenses, rather than aspect” (1998b:208-10).
(2) The sequential function of the preterite can be extended to some non-sequential functions off the storyline pragmatically by the author’s intention.

(3) The storyline emerges as a foreground phenomenon because of the sequentiality expressed by the sequential verb *wayyiqtōl*, not that this particular form is the storyline verb/tense or foregrounding verb/tense.

(4) A mechanical application of storyline verb form as a measuring stick to all cases of occurrence in order to single out the storyline may either lump subtle semantic differences within a category into a rough grouping or put an exegetical process of texts into a peril of eisegesis.\(^60\)

A difference between Longacre and the others is as follows: Longacre emphasizes the importance of dependence on the preterite verb form in identifying the storyline, while others see the preterite’s primary function as the sequential verb; thus the foregrounded storyline is an outcome of the verb’s sequentiality.

### 4.2 Definitions of Storyline: Two Approaches

In this section the definitions of storyline from different authors are summarized into two groups: one is from a textlinguistics perspective, another is from a cognitively oriented approach.

#### 4.2.1 Textlinguistic Definition of the Storyline

Summarizing Hopper’s analysis of foreground and background (1979), his version of storyline can be defined as follows in the present author’s words:

**A definition of storyline (1)**

The story line is foregrounded events that are succeeding “one another in the narrative in the same order as their succession in the real world,”\(^61\) and that are

---

\(^60\) Waltke and O’Connor say in a footnote, “In reality, a discovery procedure is usually an inductive extension of a definition. Any linguistic analysis results from much more than mechanical application of fully specifiable technique; discovery-procedure linguistics tends to be a form of empiricist extremism” (Waltke and O’Connor 1990:56).

\(^61\) Hopper (1979:214).
denoted by verbs with preterite tense or perfective aspect. The foregrounded story line is in a binary opposition to the background events, which are concurrent with the foregrounded events, and are marked by imperfective aspect of the verbs.

Hopper and Thompson (1980) hypothesized that there is a correlation between the high transitivity of the foreground, and the low transitivity of the background. Their ten transitivity parameters are displayed in Table 16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>LOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 or more participants, A and O</td>
<td>1 participant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. KINESIS</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>LOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>non-action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. ASPECT</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>LOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telic</td>
<td>atelic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. PUNCTUALITY</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>LOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Punctual</td>
<td>non-punctual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. VOLITIONALITY</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>LOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volitional</td>
<td>non-volitional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F. AFFIRMATION</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>LOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G. MODE</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>LOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Realis</td>
<td>irrealis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H. AGENCY</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>LOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A high in potency</td>
<td>A low in potency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. AFFECTEDNESS OF O</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>LOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O totally affected</td>
<td>O not affected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J. INDIVIDUATION OF O</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>LOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O highly individuated</td>
<td>O non-individuated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(A = Agent, O = Object)

Table 6. Transitivity parameters (Hopper and Thompson 1980:252)

Longacre, however, questions if transitivity is the only parameter to identify the foreground, that is, the storyline. For him sequentiality is also important. He states, “I have often thought it somewhat curious that, although their [Hopper and Thompson 1980] parameters apply primarily to narrative, a further parameter, sequentiality (sequenced vs. nonsequenced) was not included” (Longacre 1996:24). Furthermore, he asserts, “Sequentiality must in fact be taken as [a] prime characteristic of the storyline, i.e., of foregrounding in narrative” (1996:25). **63**

**62** They characterize the foreground (i.e. storyline) with two points. “First, the foregrounded portions together comprise the backbone of the text, forming its basic structure; the backgrounded clauses put flesh on the skeleton, but are extraneous to its structural coherence. […] Second, the foregrounded clauses […] are ordered in a temporal sequence; a change in the order of any two of them signals a change in the order of real-world events. Backgrounded clauses, however, are not ordered with respect to each other, and may even be movable with respect to the foregrounded portions” (Hopper and Thompson 1980:281).

**63** These two passages seem to be the only places where Longacre emphatically states the importance of sequentiality. Interestingly, he does not relate this importance of sequentiality with wayyiqtol in Hebrew, though it has been pointed out elsewhere by other researchers (e.g. Bath 1995, Endo 1996, 2003, Myhill...
Thus he has included sequentiality as an important semantic value of the storyline in the salience scheme for English narrative (1995c:7, 1996:26) shown in Figure 18 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Substantive</th>
<th>B. Narrative</th>
<th>C. Realis</th>
<th>D. Dynamic</th>
<th>E. Sequential</th>
<th>F. Punctiliar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 18. The parameters for salience scheme for English narrative (Longacre 1996:26)

Collected from various publications by Longacre (e.g. 1995c:6-8;1996:18, 27, passim), his version of storyline, particularly in the framework of textlinguistics, is defined as follows:

**A definition of storyline (2)**

The storyline is the most foregrounded main line of narrative discourse whose semantic values are substantive, narrative, realis, dynamic, sequential and punctiliar, and whose morpho-syntactic marking is the preterite or completive verb form.\(^{64}\)

As observable from the above summaries, while both Hopper and Longacre developed the storyline/foreground theory with its correlation to transitivity, one difference is that Longacre acknowledges the importance of sequentiality as a property of storyline.

This point has been recognized by some Asian scholars and some who have studied languages of Africa (Follingstad 1994, cf. 2.1.8) or Semitic languages

---

\(^{64}\)This statement is constructed by the present author from several definitions of storyline by Longacre.
(Endo 1996). For example, Somsonge (2002) defines the foreground of a narrative (viz. storyline) as follows:

**A definition of storyline (3)**

The clauses which refer to sequenced points on a timeline and present new information, rather than referring anaphorically to happenings that have already occurred, constitute the foreground of a narrative. The foregrounded clauses are thus defined as clauses in which the action of the narrative takes up and time begins to move forward. (Somsonge 2002:142)

In this statement the important thing is that she points out that sequentiality is an essential part of the storyline. Moreover, the presentation of new information is also captured as a component of it. To repeat this, two important components, namely, the sequentiality on a timeline and the increment of new information, constitute the foreground of a narrative, that is, a storyline.

While the textlinguistic storyline analysis in Iu-Mienh in 4.3 is based on the definition (2), Somsonge’s definition will be incorporated into a re-definition of storyline in terms of CL in 4.2.2.

**4.2.2 Cognitive Linguistic Definition of the Storyline**

Dry (1992) has reviewed various authors’ different understandings about storyline and the foreground-background issue, and categorized them into two large groups of elements that characterize the foreground. One group views the foreground from importance (i.e. thematic, human, causal, formal (or timeline eventline)); and the other group views foreground from salience (i.e. from unexpectedness, figural properties and cognitive accessibility). It is the latter type of foreground that provides the present study with the definition of storyline from a CL perspective. Together with Dry’s reminder that the very notion of foreground is originally from “gestalt theories of perception” (1992:436), two more concepts should be recognized as important: the cluster concept (1992:441) and the continuum concept (1992:445, Hopper and Thompson 1980).

Dry has developed the concept that foreground markings are best described as a cluster concept, proposing it based on Longacre’s idea of the “bag of tricks”, i.e.
many different items that are available to mark discourse peak (Dry 1992:441). In a similar vein, foreground (i.e. storyline) can be marked by a variety of markers, forming a cluster of markers. Furthermore, different marking features in the cluster are in the continuum relation. This understanding is feasible and plausible when the foreground (i.e. storyline) is perceived as a cognitive phenomenon. The foreground (storyline) in this view is consistent with Buth’s and Endo’s understanding of the sequentiality factor. For instance, Endo states, “The distinction between ‘foreground’ vs. ‘background’ as a result of observation rather seems to be a phenomenon triggered by the ‘sequentiality’ of verbs” (Endo 2003:88). That is, the foreground is the perceptive outcome of a phenomenon that events expressed by verbs are strung in a sequence: not that it exists ontologically and should be detected by identification of its marks.\(^{65}\) When recognized in this way, the problem of missing the reality of language by limiting analysis to morpho-syntactic markings, cautioned by Waltke and O’Connor (1990), will be safely avoided. This point is summarized by Dry also as follows:

Many of the markers identified have aspectual meaning as well as pragmatic function, and this may bolster the identification of foreground with temporally successive clauses, while the identification of specific markers may lead away from conceptualizing foreground as relative” (Dry 1992:448).

In other words, the identification of foreground or storyline is not absolute nor mechanical but relative. A definition of storyline from the CL perspective, therefore, is proposed as follows:

A storyline is a perceptually foregrounded line of a narrative discourse. The line is foregrounded by two major causes: the sequence of events and the movement of events along a timeline toward its goal or conclusion, which is pragmatically planned by the narrator. The former is referred to as sequentiality of events, the latter transitivity of events. Thus, storyline consists of sequentiality and transitivity of events.

\(^{65}\) As it may be noticeable, sequentiality comes first in CL perspective, and then the foreground is identified subsequently. Once this order is recognized, such an opinion seen as follows may be eased to some extent: “Endo’s attempt to take sequentiality as basic rather than foregrounding initially impressed me as a mere terminological squabble. After all, foregrounded clauses in narrative are sequential. Foregrounding is a general term which is extendible to other discourse types (e.g. expository or descriptive) where sequentiality is not a concern” (Longacre 1998:217).
Note the expansion of the meaning of the term “transitivity” used in the above definition. Traditionally, as in works in Halliday (1967-8, 1970:146-55, 1994:106-75) or Hopper and Thompson (1980), Hopper and Thompson eds. (1982), transitivity means a transition of energy from an Agent to a Patient/Object within a clause. However, in the above proposal in the present study, the term is used to capture the energy transition both in and across clauses, hence an event transition at the inter-sentence level as well. Thus, the definition is expanded from the standard use so it will be fitted to an analysis of strings of the serial verb constructions (SVCs) and topic chains in 5.3.

4.2.3 Summary

Various understandings from different disciplines on the nature of storyline can be summarized into two fundamental attitudes. One is an ontological approach to the storyline. In this approach, the storyline is assumed to exist first, and the linguist’s responsibility is to discover it through an identification of the most foregrounded line of development, particularly, an identification of a marking on a verb for preterite tense or perfective aspect, and an application of such a verb to text corpus to confirm or check the initial identification. This spiral procedure of finding the storyline will continue until the non-storyline linguistic constructions are ranked in the order of the most dynamic to the most static in a salience scheme.

Another approach to the storyline is epistemological. In this view, the storyline, which is foregrounded, is a result of perceiving the sequenced events and dynamically moving events along the timeline. Just as grouped dots arranged in sequence emerge to form a line, so the sequenced events in a narrative also cognitively stand out to the observer’s perception as a foreground, rather than disconnected items. Moving events or a transitional relation from clause to clause, sentence to sentence, has more vividness to the perception of an observer of a narrative. Thus, once the narrative is set on a theater stage as a cognitive entity,
the storyline is explained as a foregrounded line of narrative facilitated by the transitivity of events and sequentiality of events.

This subsection is summarized by comparing two different opinions of one linguist in his change with regard to this issue. Compare the Givón’s opinion in 1984 quoted in 1.1.3 with the revised one quoted below:

Like all discrete, binary distinctions we have constructed in the past, the foreground/background distinction is both useful and dangerous. It is useful in carrying us the first step toward a function-based definition of an important strand in the thematic coherence of discourse. It is dangerous if we wed ourselves to it rigidly and do not eventually trade it in for more elaborate, more specific, less circular and empirically better grounded notions (Givón 1987:185).

4.3 Textlinguistics Storyline Analysis in Iu-Mienh Narrative

In this section, a profile analysis of the seven stories and a salience scheme of Iu-Mienh narrative will be discussed.

4.3.1. Profile Analysis

A profile of narrative discourse is analysed in terms of its surface and notional structures. The notional structure is “etic and heuristic devices to uncover emic structures in given languages” and “a schema on which climactic narrative discourses are built” (Longacre 1996:34). The notional structure is manifested in the surface structure, expressed by various linguistic devices.

A profile of Story 1 (OH) is as follows:
Figure 19. A profile of Story 1: A story of an old husband and bamboo shoots

Usually the Aperture is a formulaic phrase, which appears only on the surface structure (Longacre 1996:36). However, in this short story, the Aperture is only a title of the story.

Story 2 (FG) exhibits a profile as follows:

![Table]

Figure 20. A profile of Story 2: A story of firefly and grasshopper
Story 3 (3PG) has the following surface structure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface Structure</th>
<th>Sent. No.</th>
<th>Sentence at the boundary</th>
<th>Notional Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aperture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1) Now I am going to tell a story of a wolf and piglets.</td>
<td>Surface features only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2) In the old days, a female pig gave birth to three piglets.</td>
<td>Exposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ep 1</td>
<td>3-16</td>
<td>(3) After bringing them up to big enough, she told them, “Each of you must go and find your own place to live.”</td>
<td>Inciting moment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ep 2</td>
<td>17-25</td>
<td>(17) The wolf took the first piglet and ate it; and again he went to the second piglet's house and told him again like that, “You, open the door to let me in.”</td>
<td>Developing conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ep 3</td>
<td>26-33</td>
<td>(26) (The wolf) further went to the third piglet's house, (and) called the third piglet to open the door to let him come in.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ep 4</td>
<td>34-38</td>
<td>(34) He again planned to deceive the piglet, enticed to say, “Let's go and dig potatoes tomorrow.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ep 5</td>
<td>39-47</td>
<td>(39) He again planned to deceive the piglet, (saying) “Let's go and collect some fruits, tomorrow; collect apples.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ep 6</td>
<td>48-58</td>
<td>(48) He again planned to entice the piglet, (saying) “Let's go and see the fair tomorrow.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ep 7</td>
<td>59-64</td>
<td>(59) And then the black wolf returned following the piglet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak episode</td>
<td>65-70</td>
<td>(65) The roof of the piglet's house has a hole; a hole that they made to let smoke go out.</td>
<td>Climax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>(71) There, that the piglet’s plan really tortured that wolf to death.</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finis</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>Surface features only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 21. A profile of Story 3: A story of three piglets

The prepeak episodes consist of two cycles. One is a cycle of the wolf’s eating of two piglets and a failure to eat the third piglet (Ep 1-3). The second is from Ep 4 to 6 where the wolf tried to deceive the third piglet and failed. The second cycle is appended with a conversation between the two and the wolf’s failure is emphasized (Ep 7), which suspends the story and prepares for the peak.66

---

66 Concerning the Western- (and Thai-) loaned folk tales, Jennings has pointed out that “the pattern of ‘three little animals’ is a Western discourse feature. The Lao-Thai loans would not be found in Mienh stories in China and Vietnam” (personal communication 2006). A higher level plot scheme which is unique to the Iu-Mienh is an interesting topic of study, whilst a difficulty of excluding elements of language contact remains. With regard to the pattern of three, Purnell points out that “three daughters as primary actors is also found in the Big Snake story” (personal communication).
A profile of Story 4 (CI) is presented as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface Structure</th>
<th>Sent. No.</th>
<th>Sentence at the boundary</th>
<th>Notional Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>(1) I am going to tell you a story.</td>
<td>Surface features only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(8) In the old days, an owl told a barking-deer; &quot;Olive fruits are ripe, Olive fruits are ripe,&quot; deceiving the barking-deer to eat some.</td>
<td>Exposition and inciting moment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepeak Episode</td>
<td>Ep 1 9-16</td>
<td>(9) The barking-deer came there to eat those olive fruits.</td>
<td>Developing conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ep 2 17-26</td>
<td>(17) This time, a wild-chicken scratched the ground carelessly and hit ants accidentally making them to come out.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ep 3 27-59</td>
<td>(27) Talking about that squirrel, he got very angry criticizing that the snake took his place to live.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak episode</td>
<td>60-63</td>
<td>(60) This old man, therefore, has come to the conclusion there, found out the root (of the problem)...</td>
<td>Climax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postpeak episode</td>
<td>64-</td>
<td>(64) Talking about the cicada,</td>
<td>Denouement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>65-72</td>
<td>This story is like (I) have told, and...</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finis</td>
<td>73-78</td>
<td>(73) Now, one person has one story, isn't that right?</td>
<td>Surface features only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 22. A profile of Story 4: Why cicadas don’t have intestine

This story is an unedited one; it has a long Aperture and Finis. They are outside the narrative text, though socially or interpersonally they may have some more meanings.
Story 5 (FA) is profiled as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface Structure</th>
<th>Sent. No.</th>
<th>Sentence at the boundary</th>
<th>Notional Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
<td>A story of Faam-Bae’ and Aeng-Doi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aperture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1) I am going to tell a story of Faam-Bae’ and Aeng-Doi.</td>
<td>Surface features only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>(2) In the old days, there was a man whose name was Faam-Bae’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Prepeak Episode   | Ep 1      | 6-11                     | (6) She couldn't do anything, but she made a plan. | |
|                   | Ep 2      | 12-25                    | (12) She didn't know that Faam-Bae’ was going (to study). | |
|                   | Ep 3      | 26-34                    | (26) They indeed arrived at the Meisen school. | |
|                   | Ep 4      | 35-43                    | (35) After studying for three years, her parents at home felt that their daughter had gone very long and she had never returned home. | |
|                   | Ep 5      | 44-60                    | (44) The next day, her teacher said, | |
|                   | Ep 6      | 61-80                    | (61) When Aeng-Doi returned home, she took off men's clothes and put on women's clothes, as a beautiful lady. | |
|                   | Ep 7      | 81-89                    | (81) (When he) returned home, his heart was sad and only wept without eating (anything). | |
|                   | Ep 8      | 90-99                    | (90) The next day, his mother and others really went to look for; as they arrived they found that Maajaa had arranged for a marriage with her first. | |

| Peak episode      | 100-113   | (100) And then when it was a day of wedding, Maaja and the relatives were taking Aeng-Doi back home (as a bride). | Climax |

| Postpeak episode  | 114-118   | (114) That is, in the past, from the beginning Aeng-Doi had known that she was destined to marry Faam-Bae’ but she did not tell him anything. | Denouement |

| Closure           | 119-120   | (119) Later, (they) really married. | Conclusion |
| Finis             | none      | | |

Figure 23. A profile of Story 5: A story of Faam-Bae’ and Aeng-Doi
A profile of Story 6 (AS) is presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface Structure</th>
<th>Sent. No.</th>
<th>Sentence at the boundary</th>
<th>Notional Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aperture/Title</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yun Zoi narrated</td>
<td>Surface features only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>(1) There was a couple who were very poor.</td>
<td>Exposition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Prepeak Episode   | Ep 1      | 4-15                      | (4) As they went, it became dark. | Inciting moment |
|                   | Ep 2      | 16-28                     | (16) Then the couple discussed.  |
|                   | Ep 3      | 29-46                     | (29) Then another day, like the river down there where we ride a boat, there was a kind of crocodile, which was big. | Developing conflict |
|                   | Ep 4      | 47-64                     | (47) Then another day, there was a gigantic snake, which fell into a city water source for all the residents. |
|                   | Ep 5      | 65-89                     | (65) And then another day, there was a disturbing tiger. |

| Peak episode      | 90-130    | (90) Later, the country became unsettled again, like people here have a war nowadays. | Climax |
| Postpeak episode  | 131       | (131) The officer further let people go to get guns and so forth back. | Denouement |
| Closure           | 132-134   | (132) Then this time, (the officer) assigned one corner of a region with one capital city for him to make a living. | Conclusion |
| Finis             | 135       | (135) I have told you. | Surface features only |

Figure 24. A profile of Story 6: A story of Aahan

It seems that the tape-recorded data used to have a longer aperture than this.
Finally, a profile of Story 7 (BS) is shown in Figure 26:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface Structure</th>
<th>Sent. No.</th>
<th>Sentence at the boundary</th>
<th>Notional Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aperture</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>Surface features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>(1) In the old days, there was an old man who had seven daughters and he raised them up.</td>
<td>Exposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepeak episode</td>
<td>Ep 1</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>(3) Because their father saw that they were lazy, he then went to look a piece of land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ep 2</td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>(6) The following day, then, his daughters went.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ep 3</td>
<td>8-58</td>
<td>(8) The following morning, after having a breakfast, their father sharpened his axe; carrying it on his shoulder to chop a tree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ep 4</td>
<td>59-90</td>
<td>(59) The following forming, after eating breakfast, then, their father told the First daughter, saying &quot;Wrap your blanket, and follow the big snake to be his wife.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ep 5</td>
<td>91-120</td>
<td>(91) Having married for three years, (she) bore and got a baby son.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ep 6</td>
<td>121-139</td>
<td>(121) At night when they went to bed, her husband then asked her,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ep 7</td>
<td>140-178</td>
<td>(140) This time, he has got a permanent servant for the house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ep 8</td>
<td>179-198</td>
<td>(178) The following morning, his wife get up carrying the baby; before she washes his face, the baby cried.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ep 9</td>
<td>199-210</td>
<td>(199) Later when this bamboo grew tall, its middle part became swollen up; so he did not cut it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ep 10</td>
<td>211-243</td>
<td>(211) Later a son of the shop owner went that old woman's house for a visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postpeak episode</td>
<td>224-255</td>
<td>(224) He then told that old woman to kill a pig to have a birthday feast.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>256-258</td>
<td>(256) As for her elder sister, she was boilt to death; she didn't become anything.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finis</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>(259) The story of the Big Snake has finished.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 25. A profile of a story of big snake

### 4.3.2 An Etic Salience Scheme Template

As a working tool for doing a storyline analysis, an “etic salience scheme” is proposed by Longacre. He explains that “[h]is etic salience scheme can serve as a beginning frame of reference for analyzing verb/clause functions in narrative, and so served for a number of languages in various parts of the world” (1996:26-7), shown in Figure 25.
Two modifications are needed for Iu-Mienh: first, concerning “flashback”, second, “Routine.” Longacre explains “flashback” in this salience scheme for narrative “as an ill-defined category, it [flashback] can group with [Band] (2) or (4); as a well-defined morphosyntactic category it can be added after (5)” (1996:28). Iu-Mienh flashback is not clearly defined if one follows Longacre’s explanation. However, a judgment from the context leads to the conclusion that the flashback band in Iu-Mienh has its own position between (5) and (6).

Another modification of the etic salience scheme is the “Routine.” This was posited by Longacre to make the etic template operative to capture such materials of Halbi, and often Indo-European language (1996:27-8). However, it is not relevant to Iu-Mienh. As a result, a modified etic salience scheme for Iu-Mienh is presented in Figure 26 as follows:

1’.  Pivotal storyline (augmentation of 1)
   1.  Primary storyline (S/Agent > S/Experiencer > S/Patient)
   2.  Secondary storyline
      3.  Routine (script-predictable action sequences)
      4.  Backgrounded actions/events
      5.  Backgrounded activity (durative)
      6.  Setting (exposition)
      7.  Irrealis (negatives and modals)
      8.  Evaluations (author intrusions)
      9.  Cohesive and thematic

Figure 26. An etic salience scheme for narrative
(Longacre 1996:28)
4.3.3 Iu-Mienh Salience Scheme Analysis

A Iu-Mienh salience scheme is obtained by applying the etic salience scheme posited in 4.3.2 (Figure 27) to the seven stories; it is presented in Figure 28. Following Longacre’s “peeling off” method, the analysis begins with the most remote band, viz. the cohesive band, going up to the storyline band.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band 1.</th>
<th>Pivotal storyline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Unmarked action (dynamic) verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>aengx+V (Developmental adverb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>S + ziouc + V (Sequential marker ‘and then’, ‘after which’, ‘then soon’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Serial Verb Constructions (SVC) including: Aspectual SVCs (V+daaih ‘come,’ V+mingh ‘go,’ V+ziangx ‘finished V-ing,’ V+rzengc ‘completely V or ‘be consumed’) Directional SVCs (V+daaih ‘come,’ V+mingh ‘go,’ V+faaux ‘ascend,’ V+njiec ‘descend’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>za’gengh +V (Realis adverb ‘really, indeed, actually’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band 2.</th>
<th>Backgrounded actions/events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V+jienv (in the construction V₁+jienv+V₂, where V₁+jienv- indicates prolonged, repetitive, ongoing, simultaneous action to modify V₂)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band 3.</th>
<th>Backgrounded activity (durative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>V+V+V (repetitive), V+neyi+V (repetitive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>V+jienv (Durative aspect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Mimesis/Onomatopoeia + neyi+V (descriptive),</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band 4.</th>
<th>Flashback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Unmarked verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>wuov_zanc ‘that time,’ loz-knoi ‘old days’ or ‘in the past,’ m’daaih ‘from the beginning’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band 5.</th>
<th>Setting (exposition)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>maaih+Subject (Presentational)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Static verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Vst+neyi (present state aspect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.1 (Eq1) A benx B ‘be’ or ‘become’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.2 (Eq2) A zoux B ‘be’ or ‘make’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.3 (Eq3) A zeiz B ‘be_correct’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.4 (Eq4) A dongh B ‘the same as’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.5 (Eq5) A se B ‘that_is’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Neg+Vst (Negation of antonym in a synonymous parallel to a positive stative verb)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band 6.</th>
<th>Irrealis (negatives and modal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Neg + dynamic/action verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Negative idiom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Modal. oix+V ‘want to do’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Unmarked verb in a complemental VP of a causative verb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band 7.</th>
<th>Evaluations (author intrusions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1st person pronouns yie ‘I’, mbuo ‘we’ (inclusive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Empathy with participants/audience by an interjection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Marginal clause hnangv…nor ‘like, as’ taking an illustration from audience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band 8.</th>
<th>Cohesive and thematic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Cl+saepp (Topic marker) ‘as for’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>Cl+nor (Topic marker) ‘talking about’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>V+gau (Indpt. Cl marker ‘and then’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>V+liuz ‘after finishing V’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Tail-head link</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 28. Salience scheme for Iu-Mienh narrative

**4.3.3.1 Band 8: Cohesive**

The most obvious band that does not move the story forward is the cohesive band. The materials in this band repeat what is stated previously. There are two groups
here: one is marked, the other not. In the first group, the adverbial clauses are marked by one of four particles. Two particles are clause final, forming the structure as in (46) and (47). Both can function as a topicalizer. When the clause is topicalized, its meaning can be interpreted as the temporal setting, reason, cause, and condition. The adverbial clause in (46) indicates the temporal setting, and Cl₂ in (47) the reason.

(46) **(OH.010)**

Cl-adverbial

\[
\text{zouv} \quad \text{ziangx} \quad \text{aeqv} \\
\text{cook} \quad \text{finish} \quad \text{TOP}
\]

‘(After) finished cooking,

Cl-main

\[
\text{mbenc} \quad \text{daaih} \quad \text{bun} \quad \text{ninh} \quad \text{nyei} \quad \text{die} \quad \text{nyanc}
\]

prepare come give 3sg POSS father eat

(she) prepared (food) for her father to eat.’

One more construction of this kind is Cl + nor ‘talking about’ or ‘as/when/since’ as in (47).

(47) **(BS.078)**

\[
\text{Mingh} \quad \text{gau} \quad \text{taux} \quad \text{diuh} \quad \text{ndoqv} \quad \text{nor},
\]

‘When (they) went, as (they) reached a stream,

\[
\text{ninh} \quad \text{gorgv} \quad \text{mbuox} \quad \text{ninh} \quad \text{nyei} \quad \text{auv}
\]

3sg speak tell 3sg POSS wife

it (the snake) spoke (and) told its wife

\[
\text{yiem} \quad \text{wuov} \quad \text{ndoqv-hlen} \quad \text{zuov} \quad \text{ninh}
\]

be_there there stream-side wait_for 3sg

(that she should) stay there at the side of the stream (and) wait for him.’

The other kind of clauses have a post verb markers, forming the construction V + gau ‘having done V and then’ or ‘when/as S V-ed...’ and V + liuz ‘after finishing V’. All these four constructions precede the main clause providing the main clause with the old information from the previous sentence. A surface structural difference between the first two constructions and the latter two is that aeqv and
nor are clause final while gau and liuz are clause internal, placed immediately after the verb.

Example (48) shows gau functioning as a dependent clause marker (DPCL):

(48) (FG.003)

Buic  gau  gong  
exchange  DPCL  work

wuov_hnoi  ninh_mbuo  gomgv  taux  ninh_mbuo  ganh  nyei  za'eix
that_day  3_PL  speak  reach  3_PL  self  POSS  plan

‘When/as (they) took turns working for each other, that day they talked about each other’s plan.’

Example (49) shows that the aspectual verb liuz occupies the same position as gau forming an adverbial clause, which precedes the main clause.

(49) (BS.049)

Adverbial Clause
Nyanc  liuz  hnaangx
eat  finish  rice

Main Clause
ninh  die  aengx  heuc  Guh_Meix  dimc  domgx
3sg  father  again  order  the_first_daughter  overlay  place
bun  domh  naang  bueix
give  big  snake  sleep

‘After they finished having a meal, their father told again the first daughter (to) lay out [a bed or mattress on] the place [for the snake to sleep on] (to) let the big snake (to) sleep.’

One more structure, which has no identifying particle, is ‘tail-head’ linkage. It repeats the last word or phrase of the previous sentence before the main clause as in (50).
Aengx maaih dungz-dorn nyei za'eix longc hui-zun gomv blauv
and_then have piglet POSS plan use brick build house

‘Another piglet’s plan was (that he) built a house with bricks.’

Gomv jienv mv nangc lauh
build DUR NEG very long

maaih dauh hieh_juv_jieqv daaih nduov ninh_mbuo nyanc
have CLF wolf_black come deceive 3.PL eat

‘Building (it) not very long, there was a black wolf (and it) came (to) deceive them (to) eat.’ (i.e. ‘They had not been building it for very long when a black wolf came (and tried to) trick (them) so he could eat them.’)

4.3.3.2 Band 7: Evaluations

The evaluation band includes author intrusions by using the first person pronouns yie ‘1sg’ and mbuo ‘1pl’ (‘we’ inclusive). Besides the ordinary use of the first person plural yie_mbuo ‘1.PL’ which has exclusive meaning, mbuo sometimes has inclusive meaning. When the inclusive ‘we’ uttered by a narrator is directed to the audience, the narrator’s intention is to involve the audience in a story (50). Such an involvement or non-forcing invitation may be called a narrator-audience tie. This tie is sometimes expressed by an interjection of empathy ov ‘oh!’, aah ‘ah!’ This interjection is directed from the mouth of a participant in the narrative toward the audience; and sometimes it is addressed to the audience directly from the narrator. The marginal clause preposition hnangv ‘like’ or ‘as’ is used to draw an illustration from the audience’s world or experience and incorporate it in the narrative (51).

(51) (AS.029)

1 Da'nyeic hnoi hnangv wuov ndiev ndaaih naaic, mbuo geh jakv
second day like that under river there 1pl ride boat

2 maaih douh_taanh yietc nyungc, hlo nyei
have big_lizard one kind big PRS.ST

‘Then another day, like (in) the river down there (where) we ride a boat, there was a kind of crocodile, (which) was big.’
These rapport-building techniques are highly pragmatic. Though they are far down from the primary storyline, they certainly contribute to the vividness of the narrative and help the audience to be drawn to continue to listen.

### 4.3.3.3 Band 6: Irrealis and Modals

Negatives and modals belong to this band. Negatives include a simple negation of dynamic/action verbs and idioms which contain the negator maiv ‘not’ (or its shortened form mv) as in maiv_haih_funge_zoux ‘there is nothing one can do about it.’ The idiom that contains a negative marker is used more frequently when the story comes near the peak, in the process of accumulating tension.

The modals oix ‘want’ and haih ‘can’ or ‘be possible’ do not push the story forward. These modals refer to possibility but not actual happenings, i.e. irrealis. Another use of verbs which do not carry the storyline ahead should be mentioned. The regular verbs in a complementation of the main verb do not realize the action described in them. In (52) a complement is in brackets. After the actual happening of heuc ‘call’ or ‘order’, all the following verbs buov ‘burn’, hnyutv ‘boil’, bun ‘let’ and nzaaux ‘wash’ are not realized yet.

\[(52) \ (BS.032)\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\text{Aengx} & \text{heuc} & \text{[Guh_Meix} & \text{buov} & \text{douz} & \text{hnyutv} & \text{wuom} \\
& & \text{further order the_first_daughter burn fire boil water} \\
\text{bun} & \text{domh-naang-gorx} & \text{nzaaux} & \text{sin.} \\
& \text{let big-snake-elder_brother wash body} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘(Father) further ordered the first daughter (to) make a fire (i.e. make a fire) (and) boil water (to) let the big snake elder brother take a bath.’

### 4.3.3.4 Band 5: Settings

In this band, there are four kinds of expressions. The first is a presentational construction using an existential verb maaih ‘to have, to be, there was…’ This verb, in the SVO order, means ‘to have’ or ‘to possess.’ However, at the beginning of a story, or at the episode boundary inside a story, it “serves to introduce a new participants into the discourse. The subject NP appears in the
postverbal position normally reserved for objects, the unmarked focus constituent in a predicate focus construction” (Van Valin 2005:71). See (53).

(53)  (FA.002)

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{Loz-hnoi} & \text{maaih} & \text{dauh} & m\text{'jangc_dorn} & \text{heuc} & \text{Faam-Bae} \\
\text{in_the_old_days} & \text{there_is} & \text{CLF} & \text{man} & \text{call} & \text{Faam-Bae'}
\end{array}
\]

‘In the old days, there was a man (whose) name was Faam-Bae’.

Similar to the function of laying a story out in the presentational construction, temporal adverbs also provide the setting.

The second kind of setting expressions is stative verbs describing the nature and characteristics of the subject. These stative verbs are often accompanied by \textit{nyei} ‘present state affirmative’ (PRS.ST.AFM.) at the end of the clause. \textit{Nyei} does not occur with negative as in a contrast between (54a) and (54b).

(54a)  (BS.187)

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{Ninh} & \text{nqox} & \text{nyanc} & \text{aeqv}, & \text{kuv} & \text{nyei} \\
3\text{sg} & \text{husband} & \text{eat} & \text{TOP} & \text{delicious} & \text{PRS.ST.AFM}
\end{array}
\]

‘When her husband ate (it), (it) tasted delicious.’

(54b)  (BS.188)

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{Ninh} & \text{auv} & \text{nyanc} & \text{aeqv}, & \text{maiv} & \text{kuv} \\
3\text{sg} & \text{wife} & \text{eat} & \text{TOP} & \text{NEG} & \text{delicious}
\end{array}
\]

‘When his wife ate (it), (it) was not delicious.’

The third kind of setting expression has a wide variety, all of which are copulatives or constructions in equative sentences. The construction ‘A \textit{benx} B’ means ‘A is B’ describing A’s internal characteristic (almost permanent), e.g. \textit{Aengh Doi benx m’sieqv dorn} ‘Aeng-Doi was a girl.’ The ‘A \textit{zoux} B’ means ‘A is B’ in a sense of role, occupation, or social position as in (55abc) (these three examples are all from Lombard and Purnell 1968:158).

(55a)  (Lombard and Purnell 1968:158)

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{zoux} & \text{auq} & \text{be} \\
\text{be} & \text{wife}
\end{array}
\]

‘to be a wife’
In contrast to the previous two constructions in this subset, ‘A zeiz B’ is associated with evaluation; that is, right or wrong as in (56).

(56) (FA.077)
\[
\text{Ninh\_mbuo gengh i dauh zorqv ninh\_mbuo nyei sou doix} \\
\text{3\_PL really two CLF take 3\_PL POSS book match}
\]
\[
\text{za\’gengh zeiz nyei} \\
\text{really right PRS.ST}
\]

‘They two indeed took out their books (and) compared; really (they) were right [i.e. they really did match].’

Zeiz is often used in the negative, e.g. Aengh Doi maiv zeiz m’jangc dorn ‘Aeng-Doin is not a boy’ (<lit. Aeng-Doin is not correct a boy). Another example is (57).

(57) (BS.042)
\[
\text{Mangc buatc maiv zeiz naang} \\
\text{look see NEG right snake}
\]

‘(She) looked (and) saw (that) it was not a snake.’

Furthermore, zeiz can negate a proposition (58).

(58) (FG.023)
\[
\text{Ndjiangx-kou youc gomgv mv zeiz ninh ganh oix nauv} \\
\text{dead\_tree also speak NEG right 3sg self want snap}
\]

‘The dead tree also said (that) it was not that he himself wanted to snap.’

Among this group, se is the loosest connector. ‘A se B’ means ‘A, that is B.’ After presenting A as a topic, the description or explanation follows after se. Example (59) is a repetition of (57) with a full ending.
The fifth setting expression is *dongh*, originally meaning ‘the same.’ Thus, ‘A *dongh B*’ means ‘A is identical with B’ or ‘A is identified as B.’ See (60):

(60) (FA.074)

\[
\text{Zinh}_{ndaangc} \quad \text{mbuo} \quad \text{juangc} \quad \text{horqc} \quad \text{domgh} \quad \text{doqc_sou} \quad \text{wuov}
\]

\[
\text{previously} \quad \text{lpl} \quad \text{share} \quad \text{school} \quad \text{place} \quad \text{study_book} \quad \text{that}
\]

\[
\text{dongh} \quad \text{yie}
\]

\[
\text{that_is} \quad \text{1sg}
\]

‘The one (who) we studied in the same school before; that’s me.’

The last kind of expression in this band is the negation of a stative verb which is used in a synonymous parallel affirmative expression. An example is *maiv kuv*, *im nyei* ‘not delicious, bitter’, where the first phrase is in the negative, which is coupled with a synonymous paraphrase in the affirmative stative verb. The whole phrase as a unit functions as a descriptive expression as in (61).

(61) (BS.192)

\[
\text{Ninh} \quad \text{auv} \quad \text{nyanc} \quad \text{yaac} \quad \text{maiv} \quad \text{kuv}, \quad \text{im} \quad \text{nyei}
\]

\[
\text{3sg} \quad \text{wife} \quad \text{eat} \quad \text{and_yet} \quad \text{NEG} \quad \text{delicious} \quad \text{bitter} \quad \text{PRS.ST}
\]

‘His wife ate but (it was) not delicious, (it was) bitter.’

Note that a negation of dynamic/action verbs is not used in this construction. Such a negation belongs to the irrealis band.

### 4.3.3.5 Band 4: Flashback

Basically, flashbacks are expressed with unmarked verbs; there is no specific marking on the verb for this band. The context has clues to indicate that certain clauses are pointing to a deeper past time reference than the time of narration. In (62) (sentences 1-3), (St₁) is on the storyline with the verb *gornv* ‘speak’ followed by an indirect speech *maiv zeiz ninh dornge* ‘it was not that he was wrong.’ This
indirect speech is carried on in (St2) and (St3), which report an event that happened previous to the narrative storyline. Verbs in boldface are all flashbacks.

(62) (FG.025)

\[\text{St1} \]
\[
\text{Nziouv-mbiauh}_\text{loc} \text{gorgv maiv zeiz ninh domgc}
\]
termites speak NEG right 3sg wrong

(FG.026)

\[\text{St2} \]
\[
\text{Naang-nzung} \text{ganh zun ninh nyei biauv}
\]
earthworm self cement 3sg POSS house

(FG.027)

\[\text{St3} \]
\[
\text{Ninh mv maaih domgx yiem}
\]
3sg NEG have place live

\[
\text{cingx}_\text{daaih cuotv naaic daaih ngaatc ndiangx-nzungh dangx}
\]
therefore come_out there come bite tree_root break_off

"The termite said (that) he was not wrong. The earthworm himself was cementing his (termite’s) house. He (termite) had had no place to live, therefore (he) had come out from there, (and) bit the tree roots (and the roots) broke off."

Other than interpreting from the flow of context, flashbacks are marked by such time phrases as \textit{wuov}_\textit{zanc} ‘that time’, \textit{loz-hnoi} ‘in the old days’ or ‘in the past’ and \textit{m’daaih} ‘from the beginning.’

4.3.3.6 Band 3: Backgrounded Activities

The materials in this band do not advance events in the narrative, but they describe how the actions are carried out. They are repetitive, habitual, progressive and durative. The examples are (63) \(V_1 + V_1 + V_1 + \ldots\) (repetitive), (64) \(V + \text{nyei} + V\) (repetitive), (65) \(V + \text{jienv} ‘keeping in the state of V’ (durative aspect), and (66) Mimesis/onomatopoeia + \(\text{nyei} + V\) (manner).

(63) (AS.110) Repetitive

\[\text{Sin zinx za’gengh nyanh nyanh nyanh nyanh nyanh nyanh nyanh}
\]
body tremble really jerk jerk jerk jerk jerk jerk jerk jerk

\[
\text{nyanh nyanh deix}
\]
jerk jerk some

‘(His) body really trembled continuously so much.’
Another repetitive construction involves *nyei* ‘adverbializer’ between *V*₁ and *V*₂, where *V*₁+*nyei* modifies *V*₂ (64).

(64) (AS.084) Repetitive

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Baqv} & \quad \text{nyei} & \quad \text{baqv,} & \quad \text{baqv} & \quad \text{daic} & \quad \text{mingh} \\
\text{pierce} & \quad \text{ADVBLZR} & \quad \text{pierce} & \quad \text{pierce} & \quad \text{die} & \quad \text{go}
\end{align*}
\]

‘(They) pierced and pierced (the tiger), (they) pierced (it) dead.’ (They stabbed the tiger repeatedly and stabbed until it died.)

(65) (FA.063) Durative

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ninh} & \quad \text{za'gengh} & \quad \text{hnyouv} & \quad \text{nzauh} & \quad \text{yiem} & \quad \text{jienv} \\
3sg & \quad \text{really} & \quad \text{heart} & \quad \text{sad} & \quad \text{exist} & \quad \text{DUR}
\end{align*}
\]

‘He was in a really sad situation.’

Similar to (64) the next example has mimetic words (sometimes onomatopoeia) adverbialized by *nyei*, and as a whole phrase it modifies the main verb *taux* ‘reach’ as in (66).

(66) (AS.075) Descriptive

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ndamaauh} & \quad \text{suoh} & \quad \text{suoh} & \quad \text{nyei} & \quad \text{taux} & \quad \text{wuov} \\
\text{tiger} & \quad \text{MIM} & \quad \text{MIM} & \quad \text{ADVBLZR} & \quad \text{reach} & \quad \text{there}
\end{align*}
\]

‘The tiger arrived there slinking along.’

### 4.3.3.7 Band 2: Backgrounded Action/Events

The background action and events expressed by the use of *jienv* ‘be stable’ is syntactically in close connecton with the verbs in Band 1. The verb phrase *nyiemv jienv mingh* ‘cry-ing-go’ can be translated as ‘go while crying’, ‘go in a state of crying,’ ‘go at the same time crying’ or ‘went away crying.’ That is, in ‘*V*₁ + *jienv* + *V*₂’, where *V*₂ is the main verb, the phrase ‘*V*₁ + *jienv*’ modifies/explains *V*₂. The *V*₁ expresses a simultaneous action with the main verb *V*₂, thus it is *V*₂ that carries the storyline (67). Hence, *V*₁ in this construction belongs to Band 2. Semantically, besides the simultaneous action, *V*₁ indicates prolonged, repetitive, on-going action. Example (67) consists of sequenced clauses (Cl₁ and Cl₂), where Cl₂ contains an expansion of ‘*V*₁ + *jienv* + *V*₂’, namely ‘*V*₁ + *jienv* NP + *V*₂.’
(67) (AS.079)

\[
\begin{align*}
C_1 & \quad Wuov_{deix} \quad huei, \quad huei \quad nyei \quad zunc \quad jienv \quad daaih \\
\text{those_people} & \quad \text{MIM} \quad \text{MIM} \quad \text{ADVBLSR} \quad \text{chase} \quad \text{SML.ACT} \quad \text{come} \\
C_2 & \quad bungx \quad jienv \quad congx \quad daaih \\
\text{release} & \quad \text{SML.ACT} \quad \text{gun} \quad \text{come}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Those people came chasing (the tiger) with a loud noise; (they) came shooting guns.’ (or ‘shooting as they came’)

Another construction expressing a simultaneous action without using jienv is yietc binc + V₁, yietc binc + V₂ ‘V₁-ing and V₂-ing’ (lit. one time V₁, one time V₂).

However, this will be described in the section of primary storyline (4.3.3.8) for the reason given therein.

4.3.3.8 Band 1: Primary Storyline

Once a narrative is introduced by the presentational expression maaih ‘there was..’, and/or the setting expression loz-hnoi ‘in the old days’ or ‘once upon a time’, the events following are all in the past in the narrative; hence there is no need to mark the tense as a narrative past. In fact, Iu-Mienh does not have such a coding for this band. Thus, this band employs the unmarked verbs as a default storyline verb. However, they are distinguished from the verbs used in Band 6, which are presentational, stative and equative. As in Somsonge’s analysis for Thai storyline (1992:113-4), Iu-Mienh also uses verbs of cognitive experience (e.g. hiuv_{duqv} ‘know’, buate ‘see’), event proper, action and motion in the storyline.

These unmarked verbs are also used in other grammatical constructions such as repetition (for emphatic expression and repetitive action), serial verb constructions, multiclause constructions and topic chains. They are also used with the directional verbs daaih ‘come,’ mingh ‘go,’ faaux ‘ascend’ and njiec ‘descend.’ Among them daaih and mingh have aspectual meaning when a transportation in space is not involved. They all have the properties of Band 1 that Longacre has listed in Figure 18. The repetition of unmarked verbs signals the dynamics and punctiliar parameters; SVCs and topic chains provide the narrative with clear and
rapid transitivity of actions, and aspectual verbs express the completive and realis aspects of actions.

One more important parameter for the storyline is “sequentiality” as has been discussed previously (in the subsections 2.1.7, 2.1.8, 2.1.10, 2.1.11). In Iu-Mienh sequentiality is overtly marked by the sequential marker ziouc, whose approximate translation would be ‘and then,’ ‘then soon’ and ‘after which.’ This conjunction can be used with all the other verbs and constructions listed above in this subsection. An example of the way this sequential marker ziouc is used can be found in (68).

(68) (BS.116)

\[ \begin{align*}
Ninh & \text{ nziez ziouc nyorm gjenv mingh} \\
3sg & \text{ younger_sister then creep SML.ACT go}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
taux & \text{ ndiangx-nquaah dueiv-mueiz mi'aqv} \\
\text{reach} & \text{ branch end_of_tail RSLT}
\end{align*} \]

(68) (BS.117)

\[ \begin{align*}
Ninh & \text{ dorc ziouc goix ndiangx-gorn, ndiangx ziouc nauv} \\
3sg & \text{ elder_sister then cut_down tree-root tree then snap}
\end{align*} \]

(68) (BS.118)

\[ \begin{align*}
Ninh & \text{ nziez ziouc zong njiec wuom-njaangh mi'aqv} \\
3sg & \text{ younger_sister then strike descend water-pond RSLT}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
ziouc & \text{ daic wuov njaangh mi'aqv} \\
\text{then die there pond RSLT}
\end{align*} \]

(68) (BS.119)

\[ \begin{align*}
Ninh & \text{ dorc ziouc zorqv ninh nziez nyei lui-houx} \\
3sg & \text{ elder_sister then take 3sg younger_sister POSS clothes}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
siou-setv & \text{ daaih zomg gjenv} \\
a_set_of_woman's_dress & \text{ come dress DUR}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
ziouc & \text{ nriex gjenv guh_nguaaz nzuonx taux biauv} \\
\text{then carry_on_back DUR baby return reach house}
\end{align*} \]

‘116 Her younger sister then went creeping (and) reached the end of the branch. 117 Her elder sister then cut down a tree base; then the tree fell down. 118 Her younger sister then struck down into the pond, then died there in the pond. 119 Then her elder sister took her younger sister’s clothes and the whole set of dress (and) put them on; (she) then went home carrying the baby.’

The development adverb *aengx* ‘again’ should receive some mention. Lombard and Purnell (1968:4) give the definition ‘again, still, also.’ Panh (1995:4) defines it as ‘and, again, another, also, either.’ However, longer narrative texts show that it often introduces a new development of the story, rather than just a repeat of the previous happening. Hence another meaning is ‘further, furthermore, moreover’ as an extension of ‘still’ and ‘also’ by the two dictionaries above-mentioned. In (69) a cicada speaking is not a repetition of its previous action but the first mention of the new participant. In the preceding sentence CI.001, an owl talked to a deer (CI.008), a squirrel talked to the deer (CI.010), then comes (69).

(69) (CI.011)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Gaeng-waen} & \quad \text{aengx} & \quad \text{gorngv} \\
\text{cicada} & \quad \text{further/also} & \quad \text{speak}
\end{align*}
\]

‘A cicada also spoke up.’ [in addition to the owl and the squirrel having spoken]

Example (70) shows that *aengx* functions as a developer of the story. It recounts the sequence of events which led to the injury or damage. This kind of discourse level grammatical device is termed a “development marker” by Levinsohn (1992b:32-37).

(70) (CI.014)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Sopc} & \quad \text{luangh} & \quad \text{dangx} & \quad \text{mingh} & \quad \text{youc} & \quad \text{aengx} & \quad \text{sopc} & \quad \text{njangx} \\
\text{ash_pumpkin vine break_off go} & \quad \text{also further ash_pumpkin roll}
\end{align*}
\]

(71)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Sopc} & \quad \text{njangx} & \quad \text{jienv} & \quad \text{njiec} \\
\text{ash_pumpkin roll SML.ACT descend}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{youc} & \quad \text{aengx} & \quad \text{mborqv} & \quad \text{zuoqc} & \quad \text{saqv-ndongh} & \quad \text{kung} \\
\text{also further hit GOAL sesame-container spill_out}
\end{align*}
\]

(72)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Mborqv} & \quad \text{zuoqc} & \quad \text{saqv-ndongh} & \quad \text{kung} \\
\text{hit GOAL sesame-container spill_out}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{youc} & \quad \text{aengx} & \quad \text{kung} & \quad \text{bieqc} & \quad \text{norqc_jai} & \quad \text{m’zing} & \quad \text{mingh} \\
\text{also further spill_out enter wild_chicken eye go}
\end{align*}
\]

‘The ash pumpkin vine broke and a pumpkin rolled away. The ash pumpkin rolled down and smashed into a sesame pod spilling out the contents. (The pod) being smashed open, (the seeds) flew out and got into a wild fowl’s eye.’

There is a construction which expresses a simultaneous action similar to that of the Band 2-backgrounded actions/events band. However, the sentence containing
this construction is on the storyline. In contrast to (67) in 4.3.3.7 (i.e. \( V_1 + jienv + V_2 \)), (71) uses \( yietc\ binc + V_1,\ yietc\ binc + V_2 \) ‘\( V_1\)-ing and \( V_2\)-ing’ (lit. one time \( V_1 \), one time \( V_2 \)):

\[
(71)\quad (BS.010) \quad Ninh\ ziouc\ yietc\ binc\ nyiemv\ yietc\ binc\ heuc\ lungh_ndiev
\]

\[
3sg\ then\ one\ time\ weep\ one\ time\ call\ world
\]

‘He then one time cried, one time called (to) the world.’ (i.e. ‘So then he was weeping and calling on Heaven and Earth [as witnesses] all at the same time.’)

In this construction, both \( V_{P1} \) and \( V_{P2} \) are in equal status (i.e. crying and calling), as opposed to the modifier-modified relationship between \( V_1 + jienv \) and \( V_2 \) in (67). Nonetheless, as will be seen in Figures 50-52 in 5.4.2.1 (Court 1986:36), \( V_{P2} \) seems to receive more attention by a hearer than \( V_{P1} \) due to a fundamental nature of putting more focus on a rightward element in a sentence in Iu-Mienh. However, the two VPs describe one event, hence the whole sentence (71) is on the storyline (note that the sentence has the sequential marker \( ziouc \)). In regard to the isolated VP \( yietc\ binc + V_1 \) itself, it encodes a background action.

**4.3.3.9 Band 1’: Pivotal Storyline**

Though unmarked verbs serve as default verbs for the storyline, there are three more items that are used in a special way to augment or supplement the storyline. They include sentence final aspectual markers \( aqv \) ‘perfective aspect,’ \( mi’aqv \) ‘resultative aspect’ and an adverb \( za’gengh \) ‘really.’ They all belong to the pivotal storyline. Here, \( mi’aqv \) and \( za’gengh \) are discussed, leaving \( aqv \) for 5.2.2.

The pivotal storyline is an augmentation of the primary storyline. Longacre (1996) categorizes it into two groups: “(i) happenings which are marked as pivotal constitute a rough abstract of the story, and (ii) happenings which are marked as pivotal, although they are for some reason weighted, when taken together do not constitute such an abstract” (Longacre 1996:28-9). It is the second group that \( aqv, mi’aqv \) and \( za’gengh \) ‘really’ belong to.

The construction ‘Sentence + \( mi’aqv \)’ (resultative aspect) expresses a strong punctiliarity and a complete passage of an event. For example, \( ninh\ mingh \)
mi’aqv ‘he is gone’ has a sense that ‘he is not here any more’ besides its explicit meaning. (72) shows that an event of Faam-Bae’s death is conclusive, definite and punctiliar. This additional information is indicated by the resultative aspectual particle mi’aqv, though the unmarked verb daic ‘die’ is enough for indicating the storyline.

(72) (FA.098)

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
Nqaengx & jaang & sim & baqv & daic & mi’aqv \\
\text{choke on throat needle pierce die RSLT}
\end{array}
\]

‘(A needle) choked on the throat, the needle pierced (his throat), (and he) died.’

The construction often marks a discrete point of ending at the closure of one paragraph as in (73):

(73) (AS.130)

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
Buonv & baaic & mi’aqv, & ninh_mbuo & biaux & nzengc & mi’aqv \\
\text{shoot defeat RSLT 3_FL flee consumed RSLT}
\end{array}
\]

‘(He) shot (and) defeated (them) all; they all completely ran away.’

(73) is the last sentence at the end of the peak episode (cf. Figure 24). Similarly, the sentence containing mi’aqv in (FA.113) in Story 5 and (BS.255) in Story 7 marks the end of the peak episode in both stories (cf. Figure 23 and Figure 25).

The adverb za’gengh ‘really, indeed, actually, surely,’ has two basic usages: 1) as a manner adverb as in ‘za’gengh + Stative Verb,’ and 2) as an adverb emphasizing an actual occurrence of the action, ‘za’gengh + Action/dynamic Verb.’ It is the second kind of usage that is on the pivotal storyline, while the first is used in the setting band ((74a) is in DS.). The first kind of usage is exemplified in (74a) and the second in (74b):

(74a) (AS.026)

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
"U... & Meih & za’gengh & henv \, haic."
\end{array}
\]

‘Wow! 2sg really strong very’

(74b) (FA.097)

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
Ninh & za’gengh & nyanc & nc & zeiv & fiexn. \\
3sg & really & eat & that & paper & letter
\end{array}
\]

‘He actually ate the letter.’
An implication of (74b) is “Believe it or not, he actually ate the letter!” emphasizing the actual happening of the action it modifies. Borrowing a term from Whaley (1997), this adverb can be referred to as a “realis adverb.” A realis adverb means that it “asserts that an event actually occurs” (cf. Whaley 1997:206).

A contrast between (75a) and (75b) may solidify the definition.

(75a) (AS.101)

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Baeng} & \text{za'gengh} & \text{daaih} \\
\text{soldier} & \text{really} & \text{come}
\end{array}
\]

‘The soldiers really came.’

(75b)

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Baeng} & \text{mv gaengh} & \text{daaih} \\
\text{soldier} & \text{NEG-yet} & \text{come}
\end{array}
\]

‘The soldiers haven’t come yet.’

Za’gengh in (75a) indicates realis; hence on the storyline, whereas mv gaengh ‘not yet’ in (75b) indicates irrealis.

The realis adverb za’gengh ‘really,’ ‘indeed,’ ‘actually’ is used immediately after direct speech, flashback, the participant’s internal thinking and author intrusions in order to bring the audience back onto the storyline. This usage will be discussed in 5.2.2.2.

In contrast to punctiliar adverbs like \( \text{t}^\text{han} \text{daj} \text{nan} \) ‘suddenly’ in Thai, the Iu-Mienh equivalent liemh zeih ‘suddenly’ does not appear often in Iu-Mienh narratives. Instead, za’gengh ‘really’ is very frequently used for the furtherance of a story, not only in the environment just mentioned above but also in other places which are clearly on the storyline and its augmentation.

---

68 In describing Burmese past tense which is marked by “a realis affix,” Whaley defines it: “roughly, this affix is used to assert that an event actually occurs” (1997:206). Thus, for za’gengh in Iu-Mienh I have adopted the term “realis adverb,” as opposed to a manner adverb, which emphasizes the stative verb.

69 The component gengh itself means ‘really’ (as in CI.003, FA.077, FA.094, FA.106, passim). Thus, za’ by itself probably comes from zien gengh (‘true + really’) or zengh gengh, with the first part undergoing the common neutralization to za’ (Purnell, 2006: personal communication). Za’gengh and gengh mean ‘really’; mv gaenh means ‘not yet.’
In summary, two things should be emphasized. First, the pivotal storyline in Iu-Mienh is the second kind which Longacre (1996:28-9) describes as a non-abstract-constituting pivotal storyline, as opposed to an abstract-constituting pivotal storyline. Hence, one should be reminded of the primary function of an unmarked verb is as a storyline verb. Second, belonging to the non-abstract-constituting pivotal storyline band, aqv, mi’aqv and za’gengh occur to supplement the primary storyline. That is, other constructions in the primary storyline band and the three constructions in the pivotal storyline band are not mutually exclusive; the latter reinforces the effect of the former.

4.4 Finding Narrative Timeline through Temporal Movement

Somsonge, mainly working within the framework of Longacre, seems to have been aware of the need for a method to identify the storyline in languages without verbal morphological inflections such as Thai (1991a:76). She states:

Even though these four categories of on-the-line verbs [i.e. verbs of cognitive experience, event proper, motion and action] are recognized as being on the storyline, one should not expect that whenever they are present, they are always on the storyline. (Somsonge 1991a:99)

The following subsections will recapitulate an observation of the Iu-Mienh salience scheme in the similar vein with Somsonge’s caution, and will mention briefly that her proposed alternative is in concordance with the identification of storyline in Iu-Mienh.

4.4.1 Methodological Consideration

From the observation of verbs and clauses in arranging the salience scheme in Iu-Mienh, the same construction is used in different bands. First of all, the fact that the verbs on the storyline are unmarked is a complication for a morpho-syntactic based methodology of identifying the storyline. For example, the forms in the flashback band are the same as those in the storyline. There is no morphological distinction between irrealis verbs in complementation in Band 6 and storyline verbs in Band 1. Other examples include the verb mingh as a regular verb ‘go’
and the directional verbs in different bands, and fieni in different bands, zoux as a regular verb ‘do’ or ‘make’ and a copular ‘be’. In the Iu-Mienh case, it is difficult to identify the storyline by searching for a particular verb form. This situation is due to the fact that many aspectual particles and auxiliaries were originally regular verbs and the same forms are still used.70

A similar phenomenon has been recognized in other genetically unrelated languages such as Greek (Tehan 2000:8-10). He acknowledges that 1) different verb forms can be on a storyline band without excluding each other, 2) therefore, an exclusion of either form will lose significant information from the macrostructure (viz. semantics).71

4.4.2 Non-Verb-Morphology Dependent Method

As a proposal of a non-verb-morphology dependent method of identifying the storyline, taking the contextual and semantic information into consideration, Somsonge argues for two parameters: time-movement in sequence and presentation of new information in sequence (2002:142). They are inseparable. According to her, these parameters are found in four types of grammatical constructions in Hlai (Li) narrative discourse: 1) a sequential indicator fan53 ‘then,’ 2) topic subject, i.e. “the noun phrase designating the topic of the discourse used as the subject of a clause” (2002:148-9), 3) temporal connectives and 4) anaphoric temporal clauses. Likewise, four corresponding groups of constructions are evident in Iu-Mienh.

First, in Iu-Mienh narratives, the sequential marker ziouc belongs to Band 1. In discussing the sequential marker in Hlai, Somsonge also mentions an adverb lom11 ‘again,’ whose equivalent in Iu-Mienh is the development adverb aengx ‘again,’

---

70 A similar situation in Thai is discussed in Kingkarn (1986:245): “…lexical verbs are used to perform what a speaker of other languages might expect to be performed by two types of elements: lexical and grammatical. In fact, lexical verbs in Thai still retain their semantic properties in every case.”

71 The exclusion of present indicative, as opposed to aorist which appears to be a storyline verb, would lead an exegete to a deficiency because such a mechanical application of alleged storyline criterion will eliminate substantive information. See Tehan 2000:9.
‘further,’ ‘moreover.’ Belonging to the primary band, both *ziouc* and *aengx* carry the storyline forward: the former by keeping the sequentiality, the latter by developing an event and presenting a new happening (discussed in 4.3.3.8 and 5.4.1).

Second, what Somsonge refers to as the “topic subject” is discussed as “topic chains” within Band 1 in 4.3.3.8. This construction is also a significant device to keep sequentiality while presenting new events at the same time.

Third, the temporal connectives in Iu-Mienh are assigned to Band 5: settings.

Fourth, the anaphoric temporal clauses in Iu-Mienh belong to Band 8: cohesive band. Particularly, the two expressions, *V + gau* (independent clause marker) ‘after *V,*’ ‘*V and then,*’ and *V + liuz* (aspectual verb) ‘after finishing *V*’ have both a connecting function with the previous sentence and a presenting function of a new development.

The third and fourth groups are not main-verb-related constructions; they even belong to “supportive materials” bands. However, they play a significant role in advancing the storyline forward.

### 4.5 Summary of the Chapter

In this chapter the storyline analysis theorized by Longacre has been reviewed with particular focus on the storyline verb or the preterite. In doing so, the importance of sequentiality was pointed out as a common characteristic of the foregrounded storyline studied by many scholars. Subsequently two types of definition as to storyline were compared: one being ontological and the other epistemological. Belonging to the latter, the cognitive approach sees the foregroundedness as a result of the sequentiality phenomenon. At the end of the chapter, a salience scheme for Iu-Mienh narrative discourse was presented according to the textlinguistics storyline analysis. Finally, it was observed that the same verb form is used across different bands and that different constructions are used in one band. This phenomenon has suggested that a “spectrum” can be recognized not only across the supportive materials but even within a band, e.g.
inside the storyline band. In dealing with this phenomenon Somsonge’s four categories of constructions were considered: the sequential and development markers, topic-subject (i.e. topic chains), temporal connectives and anaphoric temporal clauses.
CHAPTER 5

A COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS STORYLINE ANALYSIS

5.0 Introduction

In 4.2.2 a definition of storyline from a CL perspective was proposed. In 2.2 and 2.4, the CL framework for discourse analysis was presented. This chapter affirms further that the conceptual structure of storyline can be analyzed in such a way that reveals its meaning if the narrative discourse is taken as a cognitive system, following Langacker (1991c, 2001b) and Talmy (2000b). In Talmy’s “cognitive framework for narrative structure” (2000b:423-7), he sets forth two factors of prototypical narrative: the degree of progression and the degree of coherence and significance. These two factors are also confirmed by Somsonge (2002:142) as major parameters of the main line of narrative development, when she says, “The clauses which refer to sequenced points on a timeline [viz. Talmy’s “coherence”] and present new information [viz. Talmy’s “progression”] […] constitute the foreground of a narrative.” For the analytical feasibility of sequenced SVCs and topic chains in Iu-Mienh, the latter can be summarize as event transitivity (i.e. “progression” or “presentation of new information”) and the former as event sequentiality (i.e. “coherence” or “sequenced points on a timeline”), which are the crucial components in a prototypical narrative storyline. First, in this chapter, a notion of narrative discourse will be situated on a stage as if we were viewing a storyline in a theater; then, the conceptual structure of transitivity of events, as a contributor to foregroundedness in the storyline, will be explained. Finally, the conceptual structure of sequentiality will be discussed at the end of this chapter. Describing and analyzing the storyline and salience scheme in chapter 4, this chapter explains what they mean in terms of conceptual structure of some selected linguistic constructions in Iu-Mienh.
5.1 Placing A Narrative in the Cognitive Linguistics Setting

“Inside or outside?” is the issue in this section. Does a narrative discourse exist outside of a mind or inside? As has been shown thus far in chapter 4 (except for 4.2.2), textlinguistics places a narrative discourse outside of a mind, often as a written text. By contrast, CL views it as a thing taking place in a mental domain (with an attention to interpersonal meaning too, though the present study does not include such an aspect). A fundamental assumption in approaching narrative in Talmy’s cognitive semantics (2000b:417-8) is “the existence of a mind that has produced the narrative as well as of a mind that is cognizing the narrative.” This cognition of the narrative is carried out perceptually. One of the six tenets of cognitive semantics suggested by Gärdenfors (1999:21) is that “[c]ognitive models are mainly perceptually determined (meaning is not independent of perception).” The perception of a clause (an archetypal/prototypical transitivity in this case) by a viewer (V) is schematised as the “stage model” by Langacker (1991a:211) in Figure 29 and its extention to a discourse level is shown in Figure 30, which is a modification of Figure 14 in 2.4.

---

72 For an argument for the social and cultural component of discourse in cognitive semantics, see Langacker 1997. He writes, “I would claim, then, that despite its mental focus, cognitive linguistics can also be described as social, cultural, and contextual linguistics” (Langacker 1997:240).

73 The other five are quoted as follows: “1) Meaning is conceptualisation in a cognitive model (not truth conditions in possible worlds). 2) [quoted above]. 3) Semantic elements are based on spatial or topological objects (not symbols that can be composed according to some system of rules). 4) Cognitive models are primarily image-schematic (not propositional). Image-schemas are transformed by metaphoric and metonymic operations (which are treated as exceptional features in the traditional view). 5) Semantics is primary to syntax and partly determines it (syntax cannot be described independently of semantics). 6) Concepts show prototype effects (instead of following the Aristotelian paradigm based on necessary and sufficient conditions [end quote]” (Gärdenfors 1999:21-5).
The clause level viewer (V) in Figure 29 is divided into a discourse level speaker (S) and hearer (H) in Figure 30 (See 2.4 for explanations on the parts of the diagram). In Figure 30, the two upward broken arrows indicate that S and H are mentally viewing a narrative.

Thus, a narrative discourse is viewed as a cognitive entity in a CL perspective.
5.2 Salience Scheme as a Prototype Effect

This section is concerned with the phenomenon that there is a gradient both in the storyline material and in the supportive materials. That is, a primary task here is in reference to hypothesis one (H1) in 1.1.3.

5.2.1 Primary Storyline Band

In the primary storyline Band, the unmarked verbs and the gradient relationship within the band are considered.

5.2.1.1 Unmarked Verbs

As has been analyzed in 4.3.3.8, Band 1, primary storyline verbs are unmarked. See example (76), where the boundary between the aperture (CI.001-007) and the first sentence of the actual narrative (CI.008) is clear (e.g. Figure 22).

\[(76) \text{(CI.008)}\]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Cl}_1 \\
\text{Loz-hnoi} \quad \text{norqc_guv_long} \quad \text{gornqv} \quad \text{mbuox} \quad \text{jung} \\
\text{in_the_old_days} \quad \text{owl} \quad \text{spoke} \quad \text{tell} \quad \text{barking_deer} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘In the old days, an owl told a barking-deer;’

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Cl}_2 \\
"\text{Maqv_gorkv_biov} \quad \text{zuoqc} \quad \text{aqv}, \quad \text{Maqv_gorkv_biov} \quad \text{zuoqc} \quad \text{aqv}\" \\
\text{olive_fruit} \quad \text{ripe} \quad \text{PFT} \quad \text{olive_fruit} \quad \text{ripe} \quad \text{PFT} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Olive fruits are ripe! Olive fruits are ripe!’

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Cl}_3 \\
\text{nduov} \quad \text{jung} \quad \text{daaih} \quad \text{nyanc} \\
deceive \quad \text{barking_deer} \quad \text{come} \quad \text{eat} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘(and he) deceived the barking-deer to eat some’

In Cl1, the temporal adverb \textit{loz-hnoi} ‘in the old days’ sets the scene; and immediately after that, the clause \textit{norqc_guv_long gornqv mbuox jung} begins the storyline. The verbs \textit{gornqv mbuox} ‘spoke & told’ and \textit{nduov} ‘deceived’ are all unmarked; and both Cl1 and Cl4 are on the storyline. The whole sentence and what follows to the end is understood as a narrative and in the past tense once the presentational phrase \textit{loz-hnoi} ‘in the old days’ opens the narrative.
In Fauconnier’s term, this presentational phrase is “A space builder [...] a grammatical expression that either opens a new space or shifts focus to an existing space. Space builders take on a variety of grammatical forms, such as prepositional phrases, adverbials, subject-verb complexes, conjunctions + clauses…” (1997:39-40). Besides loz-hnoi ‘in the old days’ (FG.002), other space builders include maaih ‘there was…’ (< ‘to have’) (OH.001, AS.001), and the two expressions combined loz-hnoi maaih ‘in the old days there was…’ (BS.001, 3PG.002, FA.002). They all can be referred to as narrative space builders.

As soon as the narrative space is opened by one of these space builders, both the narrator (S in Figure 30) and the audience (H in Figure 30) are grounded to understand that what is going to be told belongs to a Past TR; hence, there is no need to encode the verbs as such. This can be supported by the comment by Dooley and Levinsohn: “Typically, the body of a text is UNMARKED for prominence. Thus, the storyline or foreground events of a narrative do not normally carry a marker” (2001:84). This situation goes with all the constructions in Band 1: S + ziouc + V ‘and then V,’ repetition of verbs, SVCs, topic chains, V + directional verbs (daaih ‘come’ and mingh ‘go’), and V + aspectual verbs.

5.2.1.2 A Gradient within Band 1

A selective approach is taken to suggest that there is a gradient within a band. The discussion in this subsection is limited to a gradient within Band 1. Another specimen of a gradient is recognized in Band 5-setting band, which will be briefly mentioned in 5.2.3.

As Dooley and Levinsohn (2001:84) state that the unmarked materials are (proto) typical body text of a narrative, it is possible to recognize that the unmarked verbs in Iu-Mienh are the prototypical storyline verbs. Moreover, it seems to be feasible to posit a graduated cline of salience among the constructions mentioned above.

---

74 Also Levinsohn (1992b) and (1994).
For example, the verb *gorngv* ‘speak, say, talk’ can have various transitivity depending on how it is used:

(i) *gorngv* ‘speak, talk, say’ (FG.028, IC.011, both on the storyline; passim)

(ii) *gorngv* ‘have a marriage arranged’ (FA.090, FA.120, both in flashback.)

(iii) *gorngv_ziangh* ‘engage’ (FA.091 in DS)

(iv) *gorngv waac* ‘say words’ or ‘speak a language’ (FA.054, FA.068, both on the storyline)

(v) *gorngv + DS* ‘say’ (OH.007, FG.006, both on the storyline; passim)

(vi) *gorngv_mbuox + person* ‘say & tell + person’ (3PG.037, CI.008, both on the storyline; passim)

(vii) *gorngv-baeqc* ‘lie’ (BS.103 on the storyline)

(viii) *gorngv_taux* ‘talk about’ (FG.003, FG.004, both on the storyline)

All of these but (ii) and (iii) are unmarked verbs and used on the storyline. Though (ii) and (iii) are not found in the corpus for this study, they also may well be used on the storyline.

Furthermore, *taux* ‘reach’ in (viii) is used in the following expressions: (ix) *taux biauv* ‘arrived home,’ (x) *mingh taux biauv* ‘went as far as a house.’ A comparison of (ix) and (x) with (xi) *nzuonx biauv* ‘go home’ seems to show an expansion of grammatical constructions in the same semantic domain.

Developing upon Hopper and Thompson’s ten transitivity parameters (1980) (e.g. Table 16 in 4.2.1), Taylor (2003:232-3) has presented twelve parameters or semantic properties from a more cognitively oriented approach to analyse the prototype transitive category. They are listed below:

(a) The construction describes events involving two, and only two participants, encoded by the subject and direct object NPs respectively;
(b) The identity of the two participants can be determined, that is to say, the subject and direct object nominals have specific reference;

(c) The two participants are highly individuated, distinct from each other and from the background environment;

(d) The event is initiated by the referent of the subject NP, i.e. by the agent. Responsibility for the event thus lies exclusively with the agent. Furthermore, the subject NP is the sentence topic; the subject is what the sentence is about;

(e) The agent acts consciously and volitionally, and thus controls the event. Since consciousness and volition are typically human attributes, it follows that the agent is typically a human being;

(f) As a consequence of the agent’s action, something happens to the patient, i.e. the referent of the object nominal. The effect on the patient is intended by the agent. Typically, though by no means necessarily, the patient is inanimate;

(g) After the occurrence of the event, the patient is in a different state from before the event. Usually, the difference is one which would be highly perceptible to an onlooking observer;

(h) The event is construed as punctual. Even though the event necessarily has temporal extension, the internal structure of the event, and the intermediate states between its inception and termination, are not in focus;

(i) The agent’s action on the patient usually involves direct physical contact, and the effect on the patient is immediate;

(j) The event has a causative component, i.e. the agent’s action causes the patient to undergo a change;

(k) Typically, agent and patient are not only clearly differentiated entities, often they also stand in an adversative relationship;

(l) The event reported by the construction is real, not imaginary, hypothetical, or counterfactual. Central instantiations of the construction are reals.

These twelve parameters will be applied to the constructions (i) – (viii) mentioned above. They are applied categorically to all of them, even though some examples are not found on the storyline due to the limitation of corpus. Nevertheless, it is possible to know their degree of transitivity as independent constructions, while there is a high possibility that all of them occur as storyline verbs.

This set of parameters is intended to identify a prototypical transitive verb. A deviation from a prototypical transitive verb will be identified if the conditions of the construction under investigation do not meet all the descriptions in the
parameters. For instance, a participant reference indicated by zero as regard to (a), (b) and (c) suggests a less typical transitive verb. As Taylor (2003:232-3) emphasizes above, “(two participants) encoded by the subject and direct object NPs” (of a), “specific reference” (of b), “[t]he two participants are highly individuated” (of c), they should be on the surface structure in search for a prototypical transitive verb. This means that one and the same construction can have a different degree of transitivity depending on context. Comparing the different constructions which contain the same element will certainly show a variety of degree.

The expressions (i) – (viii) are exemplified in (77a-h):

(77a)  (CI.011)

\[
\text{Gaeng-waen aengx gorngv}
\]

\[
cicada \quad \text{also} \quad \text{speak}
\]

‘A cicada also spoke up.’ (i.e. entered the conversation)

Here the verb gorngv does not have an object, describing a situation in which a cicada simply made a sound or said something. Thus it is very low in transitivity: parameters are: (a)-0, (b)-0, (c)-0, (d)-0 since the narrator explains that “the cicada just called without purpose” in CI.012. The adverb aengx ‘also,’ ‘furthermore’ or ‘again’ introduces a new participant, cicada, after mentioning an owl (CI.008) and a squirrel (CI.010) said something. Transitivity of this sentence is 16.7%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>h</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>j</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Transitivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of gorngv</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(77b)  (FA.119)

\[
\text{Cl}_1
\]

\[
\text{lh_zanc ninh_mbuo longc jienv nyei}
\]

\[
\text{now} \quad 3_{-}\text{PL} \quad \text{marry} \quad \text{DUR} \quad \text{PRS.ST}
\]

Now they are married.

\[
\text{Cl}_2 \quad \text{Cl}_1
\]

\[
\text{Maaz Jaa gorngv gau hnangv, m'daaih mv duqv longc}
\]

\[
\text{Maajaa speak as only of-course NEG can marry}
\]

‘Maajaa just completed the arrangements (of his marriage with Aeng-Doi); (but) of ourse (he) didn’t get to marry her.’
Though Cl₂, where the verb gorngv ‘have a marriage arranged’ occurs, is an adverbial clause, the twelve parameters are applied to see how transitive this construction is because it is perfectly possible to have this construction on the storyline. Even though it may be on the storyline, an event of arranging a marriage involves many steps in a process; thus, the parameter (h = punctiliarity) is null. However, zero punctiliarity does not necessarily mean that this verb cannot occur on the storyline. The transitivity of this sentence is 25%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>h</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>j</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Transitivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of gorngv</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example (77c) is a typical usage of this speech verb gorngv waac ‘speak words.’

(77c) (FA.053)

Obj-Topicalized

Yiem wuov haax nyungc waac yaac gorngv nzengc
be_in there what word TOP speak consumed

‘There (they) talked about anything altogether.’ (i.e. ‘There, whatever there was to talk about, they covered everything.’)

The Object is marked by yaac TOPICALIZER. Even though the verb seems to be more transitive, the whole sentence does not have an explicit Subject-Agent as is often case in Iu-Mienh, thus it computes to a lower level of transitivity. The transitivity of this construction is 25%, the same degree as (77b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>h</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>j</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Transitivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of gorngv waac</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example (77d) is an idiomatic compound gorngv-baeqc ‘lie.’ It is a part of a long sentence, where the verb is followed by nduov ‘deceive;’ thus, the transitivity of the verb by itself and the clause as a whole differ.

(77d) (BS.103)

Ninh dorc ziouc gorngv-baeqc nduov ninh nziez 3sg elder_sister then lie deceive 3sg younger_sister

‘Her elder sister lied and deceived her younger sister.’
The parameters applied only to the verb itself are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>h</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>j</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Transitivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of <strong>gorngv-baeqc</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The transitivity of the verb itself is 25%. For the sake of a comparison, however, if the parameters are applied to the serial verb construction *gorngv-baeqc nduov* ‘lied and deceived,’ its transitivity is 66.7%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>h</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>j</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Transitivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of <strong>gorngv-baeqc nduov</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example (77e) is from a DS in FA.090.

(77e) (FA.090)

*Ih zanc Maaz Jaa gorngv ziangh mi’aqv*

`now Maajaa engage RSLT`

‘Now Maajaa has already become engaged to me.’

The transitivity of this sentence is 41.7%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>h</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>j</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Transitivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of <strong>gorngv ziangh</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The verb *gorngv ziangh* ‘become engaged, complete the engagement process’ inherently implies that two participants are involved even though Iu-Mienh surface structure often omits the Patient. On this basis of the semantic structure, rather than the surface, the parameter (f) is valued positive. The parameter (g) is positive because of the resultative aspectual particle *mi’aqv*.

In example (77f) the verb *gorngv* has DS as its object, which results in a greater degree of transitivity.

(77f) (OH.007)

*Ninh die gorngv “Longc maah”*

`3sg father speak marry SFT.CMD`

‘Her father said, “Marry (him)!”’
The transitivity of this verb is 50%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>h</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>j</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Transitivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gorngv+DS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example (77g) is a compound verb gorngv mbuox ‘speak tell’ taking an addressee as a Patient. The complement of the speech can be either DS or an embedded indirect speech. Here (77g) is the latter case.

(77g) (FA.095)

\[
\begin{align*}
Aengh^Doih & & gorngv & & mbuox & & ninh & & aqv_zuqc & & nyanc \\
Aeng-Doi & & speak & & tell & & 3sg & & must & & eat
\end{align*}
\]

‘Aeng-Doi told him that he must eat (it = her letter).’

The transitivity of this construction is 50%, the same degree of transitivity as (77g).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>h</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>j</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Transitivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gorngv mbuox</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last example (77h) is also an idiomatic compound comprising V+V, gorngv taux ‘talk about’ (literally, ‘talk reach’).

(77h) (FG.004)

\[
\begin{align*}
ninh & & mbu ox & & gorngv & & taux & & hmuangx & & nyei & & jauv \\
3_{PL} & & speak & & reach & & dark & & POSS & & NOM
\end{align*}
\]

‘They talked about the darkness’ (i.e. talked about that it became dark)

The parameters applied to this expression are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>h</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>j</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Transitivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gorngv taux</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The transitivity of this expression is 50%.

Since the verb gorngv is a cognitive experience verb, it is not surprising to have a relatively low transitivity (the highest is 50% among the eight expressions here).

For a heuristic purpose, a typical transitive verb mborqv ‘hit’ or ‘beat’ is drawn from BS.185 as (78):
Then she just beat the bird to death.

The parameters of this verb are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>h</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>j</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Transitivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The transitivity of this verb is 100%. This is the only fully transitive verb in these examples.

Though the numerical indications have some significance in understanding the transitivity of the verb, they should be at best interpreted as a tendency of these semantic properties as a cluster. There are intricate combinations of factors that may influence the transitivity of the whole sentence. For example, when gornvg-\(bae\)gc in (71d = 25% transitivity) is considered as a part of an SVC, its transitivity increases to 66.7%. Some transitive verbs inherently have an Object as a semantic component; e.g. ziaaux means to call animals (back to a cage), which can be perfectly understood with or without saeng-kuv ‘animal’ as an Object (BS.113-115). Furthermore, the verbs which have a preposition-like function can alter the transitivity of the main verb. For example, gornvg taux +NP ‘talk reach/about NP’ in (77h) has an explicit and specific object (hence, a relatively higher transitivity), while gornvg waac ‘say words’ is too general. In the expression gornvg + preposition-like verb, the verb taux ‘reach’ has lost its concrete force of reaching a physical goal. Indeed, the force of transitivity may not be numerically measured as the sum of the value of gornvg and the value of taux.

At this point, one should be reminded of Taylor’s description of these twelve semantic properties: “many of the following properties are understood relative to a prior understanding of the gestalt,” the gestalt does not emerge from the

---

75 *Gestalt* (literally meaning ‘shape, form, configuration’ in German) is an organized whole which is seen as more than the mere sum of its elements. Gestalt psychologists argue “that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts, that the configuration of the whole has properties of its own, over and above the properties of the individual objects that constitute it” (Miller and Johnson-Laird 1976:49).
summation of independently conceptualized attributes” (2003:232). From a gestalt psychological perspective, which argues for “the primacy of perceptual whole over sensory atoms” (Miller and Johnson-Laird 1976), these various transitivity degrees are not more than a tool for getting the feel of a tendency of different verbs. The “summation” of “atoms” of computed transitivity parameters does not exactly reflect what the conceptualizer or listener of a narrative perceives when listening to a story.

However, to summarize, one clear point is that there is a cline or gradient among the verbs and constructions of the primary storyline band from prototypical transitivity to marginal (low) transitivity. A specimen of this gradient relation within a category is shown in Figure 31.

![Figure 31. A gradient of transitivity of gorngv ‘speak’ in contrast to borqv ‘beat’](image-url)
5.2.2 Pivotal Storyline

In 4.3.3.9, it was pointed out that the pivotal storyline in Iu-Mienh is the kind that is non-abstract-constituting, as defined by Longacre: “happenings which are marked as pivotal, although they are for some reason weighted, when taken together do not constitute such an abstract” (1996:28-9). Then, for what reasons are they “weighted”? This section will propose an interpretation of the pivotal storyline in Iu-Mienh from a CG perspective. That is, that pivotal storyline materials function as grounding elements.

5.2.2.1 Grounding of a Negated Construction

The CG term ‘grounding’ here must be clearly distinguished from the discourse/textlinguistics term ‘foreground vs. background’ used among linguists like Hopper and Thompson (1980). As a specific technical term in CG, it is defined by Brisard (2002) as follows:

> Grounding is proposed as a technical term in Cognitive Grammar to characterize grammatical predications that indicate the relationship of a designated entity to the ground or situation of speech, including the speech event itself, its participants, and their respective spheres of knowledge. By definition, grounding predications are obligatory grammatical elements needed to turn nouns into full *nominals*, and verbs into *finite clauses*. (Brisard 2002:xi).

In short, it can be described as “the epistemic footing of deixis and reference” as the subtitle of Brisard’s book indicates. This fits well with the use of *aqv* ‘perfective aspectual particle’ and *mi’aqv* ‘resultative aspectual marker’ in Iu-Mienh, though their behavior is not as strictly regulated as “obligatory grammatical elements” as defined above. Compare (79a) and (79b).

---

76 Langacker’s glossary defines them as follows: “ground; The speech event, its participants, and its immediate circumstances” (Langacker 1991c:548), and “grounding; A semantic function that constitutes the final step in the formation of a nominal or a finite clause. With respect to fundamental ‘epistemic’ notions (e.g. definiteness for nominals, tense/modality for clauses), it establishes the location vis-à-vis the ground of the thing or process serving as the nominal or clausal profile” (1991c:549).
Iu-Mienh speakers are uncomfortable with (79a) since the sentence is not finished yet; they would wait for something more to be said from the speaker. By contrast, (79b) is situated in a usage event such as an actual situation at a meal table or as a response to a question like “Have you eaten yet?” thus, it is grounded.

As a clausal grounding element in Iu-Mienh, aqv ‘perfective aspectual particle’ and mi’aqv ‘resultative aspectual marker,’ among others, are tentatively proposed. Their grounding function in the pivotal storyline can be seen in (80):

(80) (AS.048)

\[ Za'gengh \quad mv \quad duqv \quad wuom \quad nyanc \quad aqv \]

\[ \text{really} \quad \text{NEG} \quad \text{get} \quad \text{water} \quad \text{eat} \quad \text{PFT} \]

‘Indeed, the water became undrinkable.’

The context is that a gigantic snake fell into a city water source for all the residents (AS.047). Then comes (80). If the sentence is \( mv \ duqv \ wuom \ nyanc \) ‘did not get the drinking water,’ it belongs to Band 7-irrealis. However, the whole sentence, lead by the realis adverb \( za'gengh \) ‘really’ or ‘indeed,’ is grounded by aqv, whose original meaning is ‘change-of-state aspect’ as discussed in 3.3.2. The water situation has changed from the previous drinkable state to the undrinkable state as a reality. From a figure-ground perspective, against the usual (expected) ground of the drinkable state, the negative situation of undrinkable state

---

77 Dangc Wuonh Mengh, one of my Iu-Mienh language helpers, has described other (quasi/pseudo) sentences like (74a) without aqv or mi’aqv as naaiv joux waac maiv maah gorn-baengx, meaning, “this sentence has no foundation.” His description of the situation and the term gorn-baengx ‘foundation,’ ‘root’ or ‘base’ seem to be a good explanation that aqv and mi’aqv are the clausal grounding elements in Iu-Mienh. The nominal grounding elements in Iu-Mienh include classifiers, the demonstrative pronouns naaiv ‘this,’ naaic ‘that,’ wuov ‘that,’ etc.
(unexpected) has become the figure. This analysis can be supported by Takahashi and Kingkarn (1997:273-82), though their focus is on Thai serial verb negation.

The event is informative saliently only if the background of inertia or non-eventness of the universe is more frequent, normal, and routine. When negative sentences occur, there must be a reversal of the figure-ground relation, so that the corresponding affirmative somehow becomes the expected, unsurprising background. Against such a background, the negative sentence then becomes salient or informative as illustrated in Figure 1 and 2 [reproduced as Figure 32 and 33] (Takahashi and Kingkarn 1997:277).

Such a reversal of negation into a figure by the grounding element *aqv* can be found in (81a-b), where the particle *aqv* is glossed as the ‘change-of-state’ aspect, reflecting its prototypical semantic property (cf. Court 1986:248). The examples (81a-b) are the part of a story where the participant’s attitude changed78 from (81a) to (81b). That is, the participant (a young man) has been visiting an old woman’s house but he would go home when the time came (up to the point of (81a)), but in (81b) his attitude changed and he would not go home. Thus, *maiv nzuonx* ‘not return’ is marked by the perfective aspectual particle *aqv* which reflects the original meaning “change-of-state.”

---

‘But though he visited her repeatedly, he still would go home.’

Later, he wouldn’t go home.

The CHG-O-ST aspectual particle in (81b) is in contrast to the present state aspectual particle nyei, which is often used with the affirmative, in (81a). This contrast in the flow of the discourse shows the contrast between the previous expected state (i.e. he would go home) and the changed situation (i.e. he would not go home), and the negative sentence (81b) is grounded as an event that pushes the story forward by the particle aqv. A similar example can be found in (82).

‘(They) went to the place where he stayed every day, (but) the bird wouldn’t make its call.’

Before (82), or BS.169 in the story, the bird always made its cry when the participant went to his workplace. When he took his employer to the place to let him listen to the bird, it would not cry as expressed by maiv heuc aqv. That is, the expression is negative, and yet propels the story forward.

The resultative aspectual marker mi’aqv has a similar function, since it is composed of mingh ‘go away from the speaker with adversative effect’ and aqv (e.g. Figure 16).

5.2.2.2 Grounding and Interaction between Band 1 and others

As described in 4.3.3.9, the realis adverb za’gengh ‘really, indeed, actually’ often occurs immediately after a DS, flashback, the participant’s internal thinking and the author’s intrusions. Here a focus is given to the realis adverb za’gengh.
'really’ as a grounding element, rather than its ordinary meaning of emphasis (e.g. *za’gengh jomc* ‘really poor’ in AS.001, *za’gengh henv* ‘really strong’ in AS.026, *za’gengh ceng ninh haic* ‘really praised him much’ in AS.057, etc.).

Example (83) occurs immediately after a DS. The context is that the piglet jeered at the wolf, which is in the DS (3PG.029); then comes the narration which contains *za’gengh* in (83), i.e. 3PG.030.

(83) (3PG.030)

```
Ninh qiex_jiez hai, ninh za’gengh biomv aqv
3sg get_angry very 3sg really blow PFT
```

‘He got angry, so he really blew away (at the house).’

After the storyline is put on hold for a while by the DS, *za’gengh* retrieves it. This usage is found in BS.176, FA.025, FA.089, FA.105, passim.

Example (84) is a case where *za’gengh* occurs immediately after a flashback. Here, AS.008 reports the hero and his wife went into a granary, then AS.009 explains, as an author’s intrusion, that a bear had given birth in that granary, i.e. flashback.

(84) (AS.008)

```
Nyorng bieqc lamz mingh
creep enter granary go
```

‘(They) crept into the granary.’

(AS.009)

```
Jiepv njiec domin
bear give_birth_to cub
```

‘A bear had given birth to a cub there.’

(AS.010)

```
Jiepv za’gengh tiux cuotv oix ngaatc
bear really run go_out want bite
```

‘The bear really ran out and wanted to bite the couple.

The realis adverb *za’gengh*, thus, brings the audience back to the storyline. (Another example of this kind is found in FA.118 after a flashback of FA.113-117 in Appendix D.)
The last example is the case of za’gengh occurring immediately after a participant’s internal thinking. In (85a-d), the sentences (85a)-(85c) are the narrator’s empathetic representation of the participant’s thought. Then (85d) narrates what really happened in the story.

(85a) (AS.031)

Janx aengx mv haih fungc zoux
non_Iu-Mienh again NEG be_able_to how-come do
‘There was nothing the northern Thai people could do about it again.’

(85b) (AS.032)

Aav mv noic duqv aqv
Ah NEG manage can FFT
Ah, (we) can’t manage to do anything.

(85c) (AS.033)

Aqv_zuqc mingh lorz naaic dauh Aa^Han_ Mix daaih zorqv hnangv
must go look_for that CLF Bear_the_Brave come take only
‘(We) must go find that Bear Aahan and bring him here to let him catch (the crocodile).’

(85d) (AS.034)

Za’gengh mingh lorz
really go look_for
‘(They) really went to look for (him).’

It should be noted that all (85a)-(85c) are irrealis, two negatives and a modal: mv haih ‘not able to’ in (85a), mv noic ‘not manage’ in (85b), and aqv_zuqc ‘must’ in (85c). After them, za’gengh in (85d) resumes the realis of the story.

To summarize the observations concerning (83)-(85), the adverb za’gengh brings the audience’s attention back to the storyline after the narrator establishes rapport, explains a background through flashback or intrudes to address the audience. Therefore, za’gengh is another grounding element in the sense that the narrator pragmatically restores the audience to the common ground of perceiving the narrative event (cf. S and H sharing a ground in Figure 30 in 5.1). Thus, the materials in Band 4-flashback, Band 6-irrealis and Band 7-author intrusion are interacting with Band 1-Primary storyline through the pivotal storyline material.
5.2.3 Setting Band

A similar situation to the gradient in transitivity category analyzed in 5.2.1.2 can be posited in the Band 6-setting, with regard to equative clause construction. Space does not allow for a detailed discussion, and yet a general cline of strength in connecting A and B in an equative sentence can be proposed as follows in Table 17.79

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cline</th>
<th>Constructions</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Examples and description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular verb</td>
<td>A <em>benx</em> B</td>
<td>‘A is B’ profiles a genetic relation, inner character, instinct.</td>
<td><em>Aeng-Doi benx m’ieq dorn</em> ‘Aeng-Doi is a girl.’ The equation between A and B is considered permanent. Negation of <em>benx</em> means ‘no good,’ ‘bad in terms of a moral or ethical issue,’ or ‘not rich.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived verb</td>
<td>A <em>zoux</em> B</td>
<td>‘A is B’ or ‘A as B’ profiles a temporal equation, a social role, occupation.</td>
<td><em>Ninh zoux baeng</em> ‘He is a soldier’ or ‘He serves as a soldier.’ Zoux originally means ‘do’ and ‘make.’ The equation between A and B can be temporary as in <em>Ninh zoux jieq baeng</em> ‘he has ever (jieq) served as/been a soldier.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted verb</td>
<td>A <em>zeiz</em> B</td>
<td>‘A be_correct B’</td>
<td><em>Ninh maiv zeiz baeng</em> ‘He is not a soldier.’ This is also used for the negation of a situation expressed by A <em>benx</em> B. Zeiz can be negated, showing that it is a verb. But the usage is restricted to <em>zeiz nyei</em> ‘it is right’ and <em>maiv zeiz</em> ‘it is not right/correct.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particle</td>
<td>A <em>dough</em> B</td>
<td>‘A same as B’ or ‘A identical B’ profiles identification.</td>
<td><em>Aa’han Nguv dough yie aqv!</em> ‘The Dragon Aahan, that’s me myself!’ <em>Dough</em> cannot be negated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A <em>se</em> B</td>
<td>‘A, that is B’ or ‘A, in other words B’ profiles presentation of a topic and its explanation.</td>
<td><em>Naiv se baatv</em> ‘This is a pen.’ A before <em>se</em> can be a whole sentence or a situation, not only an NP. B after <em>se</em> often explains, elaborates, or paraphrases A. <em>Se</em> cannot be negated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. A gradient relation within equative constructions

On the upper side of the scale, the constructions A _benx_ B, A _zoux_ B, A _zeiz_ B are all regular verbs, allowing negation and utilizing the present affirmative aspectual particle _nyei_. Among them, _zoux_ originally means ‘do’ or ‘make,’ and its derived

---

79 Examples in the table are from interviews with Iu-Mienh language consultants.
meaning is similar to “is” in English, linking A and B in an equal status. On the lower side of the scale, the constructions A dongh B and A se B use particles, neither allowing negation nor the aspectual marker. While dongh indicates an identifying relationship between A and B, se signifies an explanatory function of B to A. Thus, the strength of connecting the two elements in the first construction is stronger than that of the second. From the light of the above observation, it is possible to recognize a gradient relationship in the setting band from the verbs to the particles. The gradient can be interpreted as a bundle of different characteristics which are spread across the cline from the prototypical-to-deviation relationship.

5.2.4 Summary

The analyses in this section have been selective. Nonetheless, they show that a gradient relationship can be continued both inside the storyline and in other supportive materials, exemplified by the transitivity cline and in the category of equative constructions. The pivotal storyline is approached as the band of grounding elements in the sense that the narrator pragmatically employs them to restore the audience back to the storyline.

5.3 Foregroundedness through Transitivity

This section is concerned with one part of H2: The storyline in Iu-Mienh is characterized semantically by transitivity of events.

In this and the following sections, the storyline is construed as being foregrounded in that it perceptually emerges into the conceptualizer’s perception through energy and action transitivity (5.3) and through sequentiality (5.4).

5.3.1 Energy Transitivity in the Billiard-Ball Model

A moving object is more conspicuous than a static one in the perception of the viewer as schematized in Figure 34.
In 3.2, it was mentioned that serial verb constructions (SVC) can be strung together to form a multiclausal construction, and topic chains\(^{80}\) express a sequence of actions. Aikhenvald (2005) states, “The order of components [in a sequence of actions] is iconic (that is, it follows the temporal sequence of the subevents).” Somsonge also states that one of the storyline materials that secure sequentiality (sequentiality being the most important criterion that marks the storyline in Thai according to her) is “a series of clauses” (1992:106). Therefore, SVCs, a multiclause composed of SVCs, and topic chains are analyzed here with regard to their conceptual structure of transitivity. For this purpose, Langacker’s billiard-ball model, which is more suitable for grammatical analysis than the schema in Figure 29 in 5.1, is utilized. Langacker’s model (1991b:283) expresses an action chain as in Figure 35.

\[^{80}\text{Note that Van Valin’s “topic chain” (2005) (originally labeled by Dixon), Aikhenvald’s “a sequence of actions” (2005), and Somsonge’s sequence of “topic subject” (2002) are almost equivalent.}\]

---

Figure 34. The static and moving objects

Figure 35. Action chain
Figure 35 can be applied to example (86a-b). (86a) has a complex composition. An intonation break shows that it is composed of two sentences, but connected tightly describing one event comprising subevents. Cl₁ and Cl₂ are SVCs presenting a setting for Cl₃. There is no intonation break between Cl₄-Cl₆, which comprise the three-member switch-subject SVCs. Cl₅-Cl₆ is a topic chain.

(86a) (AS.030)

```
St₁ [Cl₁] [Cl₂] [Cl₃] [Cl₄] [Cl₅] [Cl₆][Pause]
Mienh geh jakv jiex, nzaeng nzangv jiex, ninh cuotv daaih
person ride boat pass paddle boat pass 3sg come_out come
```

```
St₂ [Cl₄] [Cl₅] [Cl₆]
ngatv          nzangv mbienv ndortv duqv mienh nyanc
press_down_on_hard boat overturn fall get person eat
```

Cl₁ People rode a motorboat, passed (river), Cl₂ paddled, passed, Cl₃ it [the crocodile] came out; Cl₄ pressed down on the boat, Cl₅ (the boat) turned over (and people) fell off, Cl₆ (crocodile) got people (to) eat.

Impressionistically, the audience would feel that this sentence is dynamic in its movement and speed. Analytically, the billiard-ball model makes the dynamism explicit. In (86b) below, the action chain schema in Figure 40 is superimposed.

(86b) (AS.030)

The participants are circled, and the actions are labeled by the arrows. Each time the verb is uttered by the narrator, an action occurs. This increase of new information, particularly the information concerning action in the case of SVCs and topic chain, is conceptualized as follows in Figure 36, where the action increase is profiled with the black arrows.
Axis Y indicates the action incrementation in the sentence spoken by the narrator. Each time the narrator adds another verb, energy is transferred to the following participant and the action/event goes forward. Axis X indicates the perceptual movement of the actions from the viewpoint of the audience. As the audience hears the sentence, they mentally visualize the movement of action. Particularly in the case of SVC and topic chains, the density of verbs is high; thus, the perceptual movement becomes evident; that is, it is foregrounded in the mind of the hearer. From the CG point of view, the foregroundedness of the storyline is thus conceptualized as a result of this energy/action transitivity capturing the hearer’s attention. This is probably because the “order of components” or “temporal sequence of the subevents” is “iconic” (Aikhenvald 2005:42).\(^8\)

5.3.2 Energy Transition Rate in Action Chain

A faster object is more conspicuous than a slow-moving one in the perception of a conceptualizer. From a CL perspective, a sentence composed of SVCs and sequential serial verbs expressing action chains seem to have a sense of speed in regard to presentation of information.

---

\(^8\) The page number of Aikhenvald 2005 is from the pre-publication draft.
In example (86) used in 5.3.1, the sentences contain sixteen elements, of which six are participants and ten are actions. The rate of action is $10/16 = 62.5\%$. A paraphrase of (86) with explicit participants is given below as (87). The added participants are indicated in bold.

(87)  (modification of AS.030)

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Mienh} \quad \text{geh} \quad \text{jakv} \quad \text{jiex}, \quad \text{mienh} \quad \text{nzaeng} \quad \text{nzangv} \quad \text{jiex} \\
&\text{people} \quad \text{ride} \quad \text{boat} \quad \text{pass} \quad \text{people} \quad \text{paddle} \quad \text{boat} \quad \text{pass} \\
&Mienh \quad \text{nzaeng} \quad \text{nzangv} \quad \text{jiex} \\
&\text{people} \quad \text{pass} \quad \text{people} \quad \text{paddle} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘People rode a boat to pass (river), people paddled a boat to pass,’

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{ninh} \quad \text{cuotv} \quad \text{daaih} \quad \text{ninh} \quad \text{ngav} \quad \text{nzangv} \\
&\text{3sg(crocodile)} \quad \text{come_out} \quad \text{come} \quad \text{it} \quad \text{press_down_on} \quad \text{boat} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘It (crocodile) came out and it pressed down on the boat,’

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{nzangv} \quad \text{mbienv} \quad \text{mienh} \quad \text{ndortv} \quad \text{ninh} \quad \text{duqv} \quad \text{mienh} \quad \text{nyanc} \\
&\text{boat} \quad \text{overturn} \quad \text{people} \quad \text{fall} \quad \text{crocodile} \quad \text{get} \quad \text{people} \quad \text{eat} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘the boat turned over, the people fell off, the crocodile got people to eat.

The energy transitivity of this artificial sentence is schematized in a modified billiard-ball model in Figure 37.

The upper row indicates the total number of elements in these sentences, and this is interpreted as the distance through which the action is transmitted. The middle row indicates the action chain composed of the participants and actions, starting from the head terminating at the tail. The bottom row, with the circled numbers, indicates the total number of energy transitions. Thus the rate of energy transition of the sentence is gained by the following calculation:

\[
\frac{\text{Energy Transition}}{\text{Distance}} = \text{Energy Transition Rate}
\]
The energy transition rate of the sentence (87) is 47.6% (= 10/21). Compare this with 62.5% of sentence (86a-b). This difference is reflected in the response from the Iu-Mienh speakers, who describe (87) as “too long,” “boring,” “unnatural,” or “We don’t speak like that.”\(^{82}\) The energy transition rate can be interpreted to contribute to the sense of speed of the sentence. Metaphorically, it takes many short steps to walk through the sentence like (87), whereas a sentence like (86a-b) can be walked through in fewer steps.

The Iu-Mienh SVC, sequential serial verbs and topic chains create sentences as exemplified in (86), (88) and (89), which are far above the 47.6% information rate of the artificial dull sentence (87).\(^{83}\)

\[(88) \quad \text{(AS.015)}\]

\[
\text{Nzopv} \quad \text{jiepv, nzopv gau nzopvl nzopv nzuzi gau} \\
pierce \text{bear} \quad \text{pierce DPCL pierce pierce shove DPCL}
\]

‘(She) stabbed and stabbed and shoved (the pole) and then

\[
\text{jiepv} \quad \text{nyei nzuih baengx, daic mi\'aqv} \\
bear \quad \text{POSS mouth die RSLT}
\]

(into) the bear's mouth (and) the bear died.’ (or ‘She jabbed and jabbed the bear, shoving the pole into its mouth, until the bear died.’)

The energy transition rate of this sentence is 75%.

\[(89) \quad \text{(AS.131)}\]

\[
\text{Guien} \quad \text{aengx bun mienh mingh zorqv congx lo haaix} \\
\text{Officer further let person go take gun and\_so\_forth}
\]

\[
\text{nzuo} \quad \text{daaih} \\
\text{return come}
\]

‘The officer then let the people go get (their) guns and other things and come back.’

The energy transition rate of (89) is 62.5%.

\(^{82}\) Although example (87) is not ungrammatical, it is just unnatural.

\(^{83}\) “(87) is dull because all the implicit elements are made explicit, overloading the communicative task. But the elements are there in the underlying structure because they can be correctly recovered. So the deletions do not undermine the coherence despite the lack of explicit lexical cohesion. In terms of storytelling, the deletions are obligatory if naturalness and hearer interest are to be maintained” (Purnell 2006, personal communication).
This sense of speed in SVCs and topic chains is an important factor for foregroundedness in the storyline as much as these constructions are frequently used throughout the narrative. The faster the energy moves forward in a sentence, the more foregrounded the storyline becomes. This is an interpretation of what it means to have SVCs, sequenced SVCs in multiclausal constructions and topic chains on Band 1-Primary storyline from the CL perspective.

### 5.3.3 Summary

In this section, the conceptual structure of foregroundedness through transitivity has been investigated using the modified billiard-ball model, originally posited by Langacker (1991c). In terms of the perception, a moving object, as opposed to a static one, and faster movement, as opposed to slower one, are more perceptive to the conceptualizer. The SVC and topic chains being the important and common storyline materials, it is evident that their transitivity, both its energy movement and the sense of speed and dynamism indicated by the information stride, has a significant part to make the sentence stand out to the viewer of the narrative.

### 5.4 Foregroundedness through Sequentiality

This section is concerned with one more part of H2: *The storyline in Iu-Mienh is characterized semantically by sequentiality of events.*

A condensed cluster of objects in a linear order is more conspicuous to the perception of the viewer than scattered objects with no connection between them as schematized in Figure 38. This is in accordance with two of the gestalt principles of organization:84 “the principle of proximity” and “the principle of good continuation” (Anderson, J. R. 1995:45).

---

84 They are: (1) the principle of proximity: “elements close together tend to organize into units,” (2) the principle of similarity: “objects that look alike tend to be grouped together,” (3) the principle of good continuation: a good continuation or well-shaped line tends to be recognized easily as opposed disrupted or a sharp bent, (4) the principle of closure and good form. (Anderson, J. R. 1995:44-47)
The proposal in this section is that two groups of discourse markers (i.e., sequential markers and topic markers) connect events in a sequence in the storyline. The sequenced events, in turn, stand out as foregrounded, as depicted in the right hand diagram in Figure 38.

The first group of discourse markers includes ziouc ‘then, and then, then soon, consequently, so’ and cingx_daaih ‘therefore.’ The second group involves nor_aeqv ‘as for,’ aeqv ‘talking about,’ nor ‘in case of, if,’ V + gau ‘V and then, while,’ V + liuz ‘after finishing…’ and V + baac ‘after finishing….’ As has been described in 4.3.3.8, the sequential marker ziouc identifies storyline material (cf. Figure 28), in a similar vein to cumj ‘consequently’ in Thai analyzed by Somsonge (1992b:197). By contrast, the materials in the second group all belong to Band 8-cohesive as in 4.3.3.1 (cf. Figure 28). One of the aims in this section is to show how these “off-the-storyline” materials contribute to sequentiality in relationship to the foregroundedness of the storyline.

5.4.1 Sequential Markers

Strictly speaking, the conjunction cingx_daaih ‘therefore’ is not a sequential marker per se. It may be correct to define it as a pure conjunction. It is, however, grouped together with the sequential marker ziouc due to a common syntactic
behavior; (i.e. both occur in the second position after the Subject and before the Verb in a sentence) and a few semantic similarities, as will be seen.

5.4.1.1 Sequential Marker: Adverb or Conjunction?

Concerning the nature of ziouc, first, a seeming problem has to be pointed out. Then, it will be shown that that very problem plays an important role in the storyline. See example (90):

(90) (BS.117)

\begin{verbatim}
Cl₁
Ninh dorc ziouc goix ndiangx-gom
3sg elder_sister then cut_down tree-root

‘Her elder sister then cut down the tree at its base;’

Cl₂
ndiangx ziouc nauv
tree then snap

‘then the tree fell down.’
\end{verbatim}

(BS.118)

\begin{verbatim}
Cl₁
Ninh nziez ziouc zong njiec wuom-njaangh mi’aqv
3sg younger_sister then strike go_down water-pond RSLT

‘Her younger sister then crashed down into the pond,

Cl₂
ziouc daic wuov njaangh mi’aqv
then die there pond RSLT

then (she) died there in the pond.’
\end{verbatim}

Several points can be observed from these examples. (i) Syntactically, the basic word order of this construction is S + ziouc + V as in BS.117 and Cl₁ of BS.118, while S can sometimes be omitted as in Cl₂ of BS.118. (ii) It is a sequential marker at the discourse level, occurring in every clause in this example. (iii) Semantically, it is difficult to separate the sequential function of ziouc from the immediacy of a consequent event, especially in Cl₂ of BS.117, Cl₁ and Cl₂ of BS.118.
Compare the dictionary definition of *ziouc*; one by Panh, a Iu-Mienh lexicographer, another by Lombard-Purnell, both western linguists in Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>ziouc</em></td>
<td>forthwith, right away, immediately</td>
<td>so, then, after which</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>joc</em>; <em>jouc</em></td>
<td>immediately (1995:180)</td>
<td>Ø86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. The definitions of *ziouc*

The problem is this: Is *ziouc* an adverb (Panh) or a conjunction (Lombard and Purnell)? To this question, a broad description of “connectives” by Bussmann (1996) may be illuminating in that he includes “conjunctions” and “conjunctive adverbs.” He defines the “conjunctive adverbs” as follows:

**Adverb** which occurs as an independent constituent before the finite verb and which has a co-ordinating function, e.g. *so* in *It was raining, so we stayed at home*. Conjunctive adverbs can have other semantic and syntactic functions besides co-ordination, such as **particles** or **adverbials** (Bussmann 1996:95).

A summary of his description is diagrammed in Figure 39.

Furthermore, Clark (1988) has reported that the White Hmong has what she defines “an inchoative conjunction,” meaning “an indication of the

---

85 Purnell et al. (forthcoming) puts the usage for *ziouc*, “Expresses a sequence of events happening without delay, the second of which marks a result or consequence of the previous action or state. In some cases, it is used as a marker of future time.”

86 The absence of *joc* in Lombad and Purnell may be due to a regional difference. They researched mainly in Chiang Rai province in Thailand, whereas Panh is a speaker of the Lao Iu-Mienh variety, and migrated to the U.S.A. Zan Gueix-Fong, a Chiang Rai variety speaker and Burgess have reported that *joc* is an old form of *ziouc* (personal communication 2005).
commencement of actual or perceptual change, including such concepts as realization and consequence” (1988:93). The Hmong los means “(and) then/so, thus, therefore, yet, and it happens, and it turns out, with the result” (1988:93). Whereas these meanings are closer to Lombard and Purnell’s conjunction-like definition of ziovuc in Iu-Mienh, Clark’s insight that the conjunction has the inchoative (i.e. adverb-like or even aspectual) semantic value seems to be a parallel situation to that of Iu-Mienh. Moreover, Zanh Gueix-Fong has explained, from a native speaker’s point of view, that ziovuc indicates “future.”

Therefore, it should be safe to accept both properties in one entity ziovuc: it connects clauses and sentences into a discourse, and at the same time it pushes a story forward with an adverb-like function.

Secondly, having recognized this “double function” in ziovuc, its conceptual structure can be elucidated. According to Langacker, a “particular linguistic element can be retrospective, in the sense of making a specification concerning the prior discourse, and/or prospective, by virtue of evoking the subsequent discourse” (2001b:151). Figure 40 depicts the conception that ziovuc as a prospective conjunction “evokes” the subsequent event.

Three viewing frames in the CDS are labeled from the left hand as “minus frame,” “zero frame” and “plus frame.” The presently focused event (E₁) in the zero

---

87 Personal communication 2005. Also Burgess.
frame (also called the “focus frame”) exists as a result of the previous event (E) in the minus frame. While *ziouc* in the zero frame profiles the E₁, it simultaneously evokes E₂ in the immediate prospect of the plus frame. The rightward projected frame based on the zero frame represents the incrementation of CDS by *ziouc*. Thus, the conceptual structure of *ziouc* is to profile two relations simultaneously: the expectation of a prospective event and the conjoining of the present event with the prospective event. Grammatically, the evoking of E₂ and the incrementation of CDS by *ziouc* is obligatory, in that a narrator is compelled to speak something once he/she utter the word *ziouc*.

This analysis concurs with the aforementioned observation of similar kinds of conjunctions in other languages, e.g. Thai by Somsonge, White Hmong by Clark. Another example can also be cited from an African language (Tyap) as referenced in 2.1.9, which is by Follingstad: “In the context of chronologically arranged material such as narratives and procedures, *si* is a coordinating conjunction which tends to imply temporal succession. As such, it tends to correlate with, but not exclusively mark, prominent foreground events” (1994:169).

In sum, *ziouc* is a prospective conjunction. This is the reason (not the problem of conflicting definitions, cf. Table 8) why *ziouc* indicates clauses on the storyline: being a conjunction it keeps the sequentiality; being a prospective element, it increments the discourse space.

### 5.4.1.2 Conjunction *Cingx_daaih*

In contrast to the prospective conjunction *ziouc*, *cingx_daaih* ‘therefore’ is a retrospective conjunction. See Figure 41.
Langacker’s analysis of *therefore* in English is quoted here due to its parallelism to *cingx_daaih*: “*therefore* [and *cingx_daaih*] introduces and profiles a relationship in which one proposition, labelled P₂, follows from another, P₁. Moreover, P₁ is identified as the proposition expressed in the previous usage event, just earlier in the flow of discourse” (2001:149). Two differences between *cingx_daaih* and *ziouc* are that (i) P₁ is associated with the proposition in the minus frame, as opposed to E₁ which is projecting E₂ expecting the plus frame (cf. Figure 45); (ii) *cingx_daaih* profiles a logical relation between two propositions, as opposed to *ziouc* which profiles the temporal sequence along the storyline. The relation of the two conjunctions is diagrammed in Figure 42.

![Figure 41. Retrospective conjunction *cingx_daaih*](image)

![Figure 42. Functions of *ziouc* and *cingx_daaih*](image)
5.4.1.3 Summary of the Sequential Markers

Both ziouc and cingx_daaih are conjunctions. They function to indicate the sequence in a narrative. They differ, however, in that the former is a prospective conjunction; the latter, a retrospective. Defining ziouc corresponds with Clark’s (1988) analysis of a similar conjunction in Hmong as being the “inchoative conjunction,” Bussmann’s (1996) definition of “conjunctive adverb” and the Lu-Mienh native speakers’ intuition that it has the “future” sense. While cingx_daaih sustains the sequentiality, ziouc introduces it. In this way, the progressive sequentiality of ziouc makes the storyline proactive/transitive and tightly cohesive. This causes the storyline to be foregrounded in the perception of the audience. Thus, ziouc has more qualification than cingx_daaih to be on the storyline.  

5.4.2 Role of Some Cohesive Band Materials for Sequentiality

It has been explained that the materials in the cohesive band are placed far from the storyline band in the salience scheme. They are used to repeat a part of the previous sentence/discourse or thematic materials to secure cohesion. Thus, they are assumed to be non-story-pushing elements.

The materials under investigation in this subsection are mostly clauses with topic markers and adverbial clauses, including the “tail-head” linkage. These topic markers are: aeqv ‘as for,’ nor ‘as, like,’ nor_aeqv ‘talking about’ and naaic ‘concerning.’ They follow immediately after the NP which they topicalize, and the thus-formed topic clause stands before the main clause. The adverbial clauses are constructed with gau ‘while doing…’ and ‘after doing…,’ liuz ‘after finishing …,’ and baac ‘after finishing…’ They come immediately after a V followed by an Object NP if the verb is transitive. Formed in this way, adverbial clauses are followed by the main clause.  

---

88 Purnell et al. (forthcoming) defines cingx_daaih as ‘and so, and then, after which, as a result of which,’ and it ‘Expresses a sequence of events, though there may be some time between them. In some cases, it is used as a marker of future time’.
Aeqv for the topicalized constituents and liuz for the adverbial clauses are selected for the present investigation. It will be shown that the topic marker and adverbial clauses also have a function of discourse incrementation; that is, pushing a story forward along the timeline, when analyzed from the CG perspective.

5.4.2.1 Conceptual Structure of Adverbial Clauses

Here it will be shown that Iu-Mienh prefers to use topic-comment structure and that a conceptual structure of this nature is important in understanding an aspect of information structure in a sentence.

In Figure 43, the sentences of AS.001-009 are charted to show the tail-head linkage, where the tail of the previous word/phrase is repeated in the first position of a succeeding sentence. The repeated constituent functions as an adverbial phrase/clause for the coming main clause. The left hand column is the adverbial clause; the second, the topic or subject; the third, the VO or the predicate; and the right hand column shows the grounding elements. The second, third and fourth elements are for the nucleus of the matrix clause. The grounding of the last column is described in the sense of the epistemic footing (i.e. in this case, the clausal grounding through the aspectual markers), in 5.2.2.1. The storyline verbs are in boldface, and they are repeated in the adverbial clause.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S#</th>
<th>Adverbial Cl.</th>
<th>Topic/Subject</th>
<th>V + O</th>
<th>Grd./Asp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Maaih i_gox miinth have-couple-person</td>
<td>za’gengh really poor</td>
<td>nyei. PRS.ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2a)</td>
<td>Jomc nighth poor PRS.ST</td>
<td>ninh 3sg</td>
<td>mingh maaic gong go sell work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2b)</td>
<td>lorz hnaangx nyanjc. look_for rice eat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3a)</td>
<td>I_gox married couple</td>
<td>ndaam jenjv ndaamx carry SML.ACT carrying_pole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3b)</td>
<td>Jangx Jangx-KorNorrmx nor like Northern Thai as hnaang dangle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3c)</td>
<td>hnaang hnaang mingh. dangle-dangle dangle go</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>Mingh go gau DPCL</td>
<td>hmuangx dark aqv CHG-O-ST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5a)</td>
<td>Hmuangx aqv. dark CHG-O-ST</td>
<td>taux wuov ndaamx-jauv, reach there half-way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5b)</td>
<td>Jangxye nynelamz nor like 1sg poss granary as zoux daaih lauh make come long-period very aqv CHG-O-ST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>Taux wuov reach there</td>
<td>hmuangx dark aqv CHG-O-ST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>Aav. Ah mingh haax yae jiepv bear go. TOP</td>
<td>mv mingh taux beicq lamz bueix no go reach enter granary sleep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>[they] Nyong beicq lamz njeq creep enter granary dom mingh give birth to cub</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 43. Tail-head linkage as an adverbial clause

Semi-literal translation:

(1) There was a couple, who were poor. (2a) Being poor, they would go for selling their labor, (2b) earning their living. (3a) The couple would carry a pole (on their shoulders for hanging goods on both ends), (3b) just as the Northern Thai would do, (3c) went swinging, swinging and swinging. (4) As they went, it started to get dark. (5a) It was getting dark; (while they were still) on the way, (5b) (and there was an old granary) just like my granary, (which) had been used for a long time. (6) (By the time they) reached there, it was dark. (7) Ah! Wherever they went, they had never gone as far as this—having to sleep in a granary. (8) Anyway (they) crept into the granary. (9) A bear had given birth to a cub (there).

Sentence (1) is a presentational structure marked by *maaih* ‘there was’ or ‘have,’ a stative verb and the present state aspectual particle *nyei*. After this (2a) starts pushing the story with *mingh* ‘go’ in the main clause. (2a)-(2b) consist of a two component-SVC. (3a) has a construction V₁ + *jenjv* + V₂ ‘simultaneous action’ material from Band 2, followed by (3b) an author’s explanation with *hnangv…nor ‘like…as’. Thus (3a) and (3b) provide a setting for (3c). Two verbs of *mingh* in (2a) and (3c) are repeated as an adverbial clause in (4). Though the verb in (4) is
A stative *hmuangx* ‘dark,’ it is grounded as a storyline verb by the change-of-state aspectual particle *aqv,* that is ‘it became dark’ or ‘it started to get dark’ indicating the early stages of getting dark, rather than ‘it was dark.’ This event of *hmuangx* *aqv* is repeated as an adverbial clause providing a setting for the further event *taux* ‘reached’ in (5a). (5b) is another author intrusion marked by *hnangv* ‘as’ introducing an illustration from his situation outside the story. After the author intrusion, the audience has to be brought back to the story; thus the event *taux* ‘reached’ of (5a) is repeated as an adverbial clause, and the event of *hmuangx aqv* ‘it became dark’ or ‘it had become dark (by then)’ is also repeated as a main clause marked by *aqv,* which has the effect of restoring the storyline in (6). (7) is irrealis. (8) with zero anaphora topic subject is a directional SVC, advancing the storyline forward. (9) is a flashback.

In (2a), (4), (5a) and (6) of this example, their matrix clauses, of which the adverbial clause is a repeat, are on the storyline. Though (6) does not present a new event, it restores the narrator-audience rapport back to the storyline after the flashback. An adverbial clause in the tail-head construction is in Band 8, and is used to indicate “anaphoric temporal clauses” (Somsonge 2002). These three examples (2a, 4, 5a) accord with Somsonge’s statement: “the main clause preceded by the anaphoric temporal clause is sequenced with the previous time-moving clause and thus triggers the perception of temporal movement” (2002:146).

In terms of Thompson and Longacre (1985:210-1), the adverbial clause column of Figure 43 is called “ground” or margin, and the columns ranging from the topic/subject to the grounding aspectual markers “figure” or nucleus. In analyzing interparagraph linkages in Philippine languages by identifying many devices, Longacre (1968:1-222) globally uses a concept of ground and figure. His example of one paragraph from the “Bakid” story in Itneg is shown in Figure 44 (1968:57):

---

89 E.g. Longacre discusses tail-head linkage, linkage through summary, consecutive time horizon linkage, linkage through particles, lexical linkage, head-head linkage, etc. (1968:1-222)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ground</th>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>BU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He went.</td>
<td>he chopped the trees.</td>
<td>BU1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When he arrived in the forest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When he had chopped them</td>
<td>he shaped them.</td>
<td>BU2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When he had shaped them</td>
<td>he went home again.</td>
<td>BU1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 44. Ground and Figure in paragraph linkage

It can be observed immediately that the clauses in the ground column represent old (given) information and the figure new. This simple chart has considerable potential for analyzing the conceptual structure of information in sequentiality. Such is the case in Iu-Mienh, which uses topic-comment structure extensively. Figure 43 shows that within the figure column there is a distinction between the topic subject carrying the old (given) information while the VO column carries the new. An exception is lamz ‘granary’ in (5b), which was drawn from a shared world between the narrator and the audience outside the story marked by hnangv...nor ‘like/as.’ This multi-layered topic-comment structure is analyzed by Court (1986:36) as shown in Figure 45.
‘Even if today we are alive, we still do not know whether or not we will be dead tomorrow.’

Figure 45. Multi-layered topic-comment structure

(Court 1986:36)

This multi-layered topic-comment structure can be expressed in accordance with the ground-figure schema as in Figure 46.

This can be referred to as a multi-layered figure-ground structure of a sentence.

In Iu-Mienh the outermost layer is coded by the adverbial clause with or without the topic marker. Almost anything can serve in this position. It can be filled with
NPs, VPs, clauses, sentences with or without the perfective marker *aqv* and summaries of what has been told already in the narrative. They can be marked by the topic marker *aeqv* or not. The innermost layer receives the highest focus by its end position. In other words, the more rightward the constituent goes, the more it is focused.

This underlying multi-layered figure-ground structure allows the Lu-Mienh speaker to keep sequencing adverbial clauses before the main clause. Especially, it is possible to do so when he/she utilizes the topic marker *aeqv*. This is the reason why this particle is defined in two seemingly different ways: as (i) a “topicalizing particle” by Court (1986:52) and (ii) a “[p]article marking the end of an introductory conditional clause” by Lombard and Purnell (1968:4). Then, when should the speaker stop adding clauses? The speaker can add conditional clauses (*six_gorngv…nor ‘if’*), reason clauses (*weic_zuqc ‘because,’ *laaix ‘due to’*), descriptive clause, until he/she grounds the sentence with the clausal grounding elements: the perfective aspectual particle *aqv* and the resultative aspectual marker *mi’aqv*. Example (91) ends with another grounding element, an illocutionary particle *na’maah ‘I am telling you’ or ‘you should understand me.’

---

90 Purnell et al. (forthcoming) gives a fuller definition, ‘particle used to indicate the end of an introductory conditional clause or a topic clause’.
(91) (CI.60)

$Cl_1$

\textit{Dauh ong cingx\textunderscore daaih zimh jomc nc norm domgx}

CLF old man therefore investigate end that CLF place

‘This old man, therefore, has brought the investigation to a close there’

$Cl_2$

\textit{zimh cuotv gom daaih aeqv}

investigate go\textunderscore out root come TOP

‘discovering the root (of the problem); namely…’

$Cl_3$

\textit{norqc\textunderscore guv\_long nduov jung mingh nyanc biouv}

owl deceive barking\textunderscore deer go eat fruit

‘The owl enticed the barking deer to go and eat the fruit’

$Cl_4$

\textit{ninh\_mbuo zorqv sung mborqv mborqv daaih}

3\textunderscore PL take ginger pound pound come

‘they crushed a ginger’

$Cl_5$

\textit{nanv ninh nyei wuom cuotv daaih aeqv}

squeeze 3sg POSS water go\textunderscore out come TOP

‘they squeezed the juice out of it, and so,’

$Cl_6$

\textit{dorh sung\_wuom mingh laapc norqc\_guv\_long m\textacute{'}zing na\textacute{'}maah}

take ginger\_juice go put owl eye I\_am\_telling\_you

‘they took the ginger juice to pour into the owl’s eyes, you see.’

By the use of the topic marker \textit{aeqv}, the narrator can suspend the progression of the storyline for the audience and is able to prepare them for the next clause. Each time a clause with new information is spoken, it immediately becomes a ground for the next clause. The suspended audience will be settled when the whole sentence is grounded by the grounding element, usually \textit{aqv} or \textit{mi\textacute{'}aqv}. Though they can be used in an adverbial clause, when the sense of change-of-state aspect in the particle \textit{aqv} and the sense of resultative aspect in \textit{mi\textacute{'}aqv} are pragmatically used by the speaker, they serve to indicate an ending point of suspension. The ending of (91) is rhetorical. Unlike the expected \textit{aqv} or \textit{mi\textacute{'}aqv}, the narrator used an illocutionary particle, directly addressing the audience; thus, $Cl_1$ to right before the particle in $Cl_7$, the audience are listening to the narrative objectively or with
less emotional engagement. Suddenly, at the end, that is, at the focus position of Iu-Mienh sentence structure, the audience is caught by the narration with greater empathy. Figure 47 shows that the more rightward a constituent goes in a string of multiclauses, the more it is focused.

![Figure 47. Rightward focus structure](image)

This explains several phenomena. First, it can explain a difference between (92a) and (92b). While Court (1986:252) analyzes (92a) and (92b) as having the same meaning, an alternative analysis from the perspective of the rightward focus structure will show a difference in profile.

(92a) (Court 1986:252)

```
Yie zoux gong yiem biauv
1sg do work be_in house
```

‘I work at home.’ (translation by Court)

(92b) (Court 1986:252)

```
Yie yiem biauv zoux gong
1sg be_in house do work
```

‘I work at home.’ (translation by Court)

In (92a) yiem biauv is profiled, whereas in (92b) what is profiled is zoux gong. This difference should be reflected in the translation, e.g. “In the house I work” or “I work in the home” (92a) vs. “I work at home” (92b).

From the perspective of the rightward focus structure, which iconically corresponds with the “from-general-to-specific” order of the topic-focus structure in Iu-Mienh, (92b) seems to be less marked. That is, it is more natural than (92a).
The pattern of (92a) has been increasing during the past ten to twenty years in Thailand, as well as in the U.S.A. as in Court’s analysis above (92a-b) (c.f. his informants were in California). This is probably due to language contact. See the same word order with Thai (93a) and with English (93b).

(93a) (Thai)

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
p^h\text{om} & t^h\text{am} & g\text{a}:n & t^h\text{i} & b\text{a}:n \\
1\text{sg} & \text{do} & \text{work} & \text{at} & \text{home} \\
\end{array}
\]

Yie zoux gong yiem biauv
1sg do work be_in house

‘I work at home.’

(93b) (English)

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{I} & \text{work} & \text{at} \\
\end{array}
\]

Yie zoux gong yiem biauv
1sg do work be_in house

It seems that the younger generation of Iu-Mienh speakers feel as if the word yiem in this pattern is a preposition rather than a verb.

Second, the topicalized constituents and adverbial clauses share the same conceptual structure in that they set the ground in which the succeeding clause gets the attention of the hearer/audience. This function of setting the ground for the upcoming figure is similar to the discourse expectation of the prospective conjunction discussed in 5.4.1.1. As such, the adverbial clauses and the topic marker, though ranked in Band 8-cohesive, have an effect of foreshadowing an upcoming story in the mind of audience before the story is told. This is a significant contribution of Band 8 to Band 1.

5.4.2.2 Topic Marker and Incrementation of CDS

How can a narrator continue holding the floor of narration by the use of aeqv?

Levinsohn (1994:7) proposes that the topicalization’s main function is to indicate discontinuities while maintaining “the overall unity and continuity”. He states:
“This is because topicalized constituents have a bidirectional function: (a) they serve as a point of departure for what follows and (b) they indicate the primary basis for linking what follows to its context.

The conceptual structure of this bi-directional function of the topic marker is discussed by Langacker (2001b), which is applicable to aeqv in Iu-Mienh. See Figure 48.

Figure 48. Topic Marker aeqv

Langacker’s explanation is as follows:

A topic marker refers schematically to the thing profiled by the noun phrase with which it combines; the nominal referent is represented as a circle in the focus frame. Such marker is prospective by virtue of signaling that the profiled entity will function as a conceptual reference point for purposes of interpreting a subsequent proposition, as shown in the plus frame. But it is also retrospective, in the sense that the topic needs to be an entity already accessible in the prior discourse. Thus the profile is shown as corresponding to a thing present in the minus frame. (Langacker 2001b:152)

This bi-directional or retro-prospective function of the topic marker can be observed in (94), where the sentence starts with this topic marker. Here nor aeqv is a variant of aeqv.

(94) (FG.020)  
Nor aeqv, norq.meix ziouc hnyouv mv nqai aqv  
So then sparrow then be-dissatisfied CHG-O-ST  
‘So, the sparrow then became unhappy.’

The preceding sentence (FG.019) recounts as this:

After going to bed, a dead tree snapped down to frighten to wake the grasshopper up; without remembering keeping his legs bent, he stretched out his legs and kicked the sparrow’s goiter hard turning up the nape of its neck.
Then comes (94), viz. (FG.021), followed by a DS of the sparrow, saying:

“From the beginning I told you I wouldn't give you my house to sleep in. No matter how you said that you would keep your legs bent, this time (you) kicked my goiter up to the nape!”

### 5.4.2.3 Adverbial Clauses and Incrementation of CDS

As opposed to the bi-directional topic markers discussed in 5.4.2.4, *liuz* ‘after finishing…,’ *baac* ‘after finishing…’ and *gau* ‘while doing…’ or ‘after doing…’, are more monodirectional. They are prospective. Compare (95a-d).

\[(95a) \]
\[
*nyanc liuz hnaangx
\]
\[
eat \ finish \ rice
\]
\[(unnatural)\]

\[(95b) \]
\[
yanc liuz hnaangx \ aqv
\]
\[
eat \ finish \ rice \ PFT
\]
‘I have finished having a meal.’

\[(95c) \]
\[
yanc liuz nhaangx, (yie) cingx_daaih daaih
\]
\[
eat \ finish \ rice \ (1sg) \ therefore \ come
\]
I have finished having a meal, so I came.

\[(95d) \]
\[
yanc liuz nhaangx, (yie) ziouc daaih
\]
\[
eat \ finish \ rice \ (1sg) \ consequently \ come
\]
‘Having finished a meal, I came right away.’

All but (95a) are used in actual situations. The Iu-Mienh speakers’ response to (95a) would be “So then what?” or “and then what happened?” This means the clause *nyanc liuz hnaangx* is a fragment until either it is grounded by an aspectual marker or followed by a main clause. The former likely occurs in a conversation or DS in a discourse; the latter tends to be found in the storyline of a narrative. An example of the latter is (96).
Both the narrator and hearer cannot stop after the *liuz* clause. This adverbial clause inevitably evokes in the hearer’s mind an expected comment or focus. Utilizing Langacker’s CDS incrementing model (2000:265), the conceptual structure of the *liuz* clause can be explained as in Figure 49. Diagram (a) specifically depicts *liuz* while (b) gives the general idea of the increment.

![Figure 49. CDS increment through adverbial clause](image)

In the construction V + *liuz*, the V carries the old information (a). The whole construction’s primary function is to profile the space for new information. In general (b), this kind of adverbial clause (using *liuz*, *baac* and *gau*) takes an anchor in the CDS and increments a new CDS. This conceptual structure differs from *aeqv* in that while *aeqv* is both a retrospective and a prospective element (e.g. Figure 48), this adverbial clause is prospective. The effect on the audience in hearing the adverbial clause that contains *liuz*, *baac* and *gau* is to cause an expectation or a whetting of the appetite to listen for more. Naturally, it has an impact on the sequentiality, which is created in the narrative mental space of the audience.
5.4.2.4 Summary

In this subsection, a role for both adverbial clauses and topic markers has been identified as having some contribution to the storyline by their double functions. That is, they are conceptually retrospective and prospective in relation to the proceeding and succeeding discourses. Based on the rightward focus characteristic of Iu-Mienh, where the leftward constituents provide ground and the right-most constituent profiles focus, both the topic markers and adverbial clauses take the left-most position in a sentence. While the leftward elements retain a relation with the preceding discourse, the topic marker *aeqv* and adverbial clauses *V + liuz* (additionally, *V + gau* and *V + baac*) increment or update the CDS with new information; thus, they are prospective. A subtle difference between the topic marker *aeqv* and the adverbial clause *V + liuz* is this: the former is bi-directional (i.e. both retrospective and prospective), the latter more prospective. The conceptual function of these linguistic constructions, the members of Band 9-cohesive, is to keep an overall cohesiveness of the narrative while at the same time evoking an expectation of new information. The kind of sequentiality caused by them is implicit but existing in the mind of the narrative audience.

5.5 Summary of the Chapter

At the outset of this chapter, a narrative was established as a cognitive entity on the stage, mentally viewed by the conceptualizer. The chapter has investigated three areas: a gradient relation in the salience scheme, the conceptual structure of event/action transitivity and the conceptual structure of event sequentiality. First, a prototypical transitive verb *mborqv* ‘hit/beat’ and a less dynamic verb *gorngv* ‘say/speak’ were analyzed in terms of the twelve transitivity parameters (Taylor 2003) to show how the other constructions that use *gorngv* are distributed on a scale of a dynamic-static nature. This prototype analysis of transitivity category has suggested that there is a gradient within verbs and constructions of the storyline not just in the spectrum or in gradual degree of more dynamic and more static constructions across off-the-line materials. This gradient is caused by two
factors, although at first glance it appears disordered due to the same forms being used in different bands and different forms in one band. That is, (i) some lexical verbs in Iu-Mienh have a variety of grammatical functions, such as aspectual markers and directional verbs functioning similar to English prepositions and adverbs; and (ii) the aspectual markers and illocutionary sentence final particles function pragmatically and epistemically as grounding elements, relating some materials in lower bands with the storyline and the pivotal storyline.

Secondly, the conceptual structure of action/event transitivity manifested in some specimens of SVCs, a series of action chains and topic chains have been analyzed using a modified billiard-ball model, originally developed by Langacker (1991c). It has shown that the Iu-Mienh SVCs together with topic chains are one category of constructions that give the audience of a narrative a sense of movement and speed due to the iconic relation between constituents and subevents with regard to time-movement. Such an analysis assumes the existence of human cognitive ability to perceive a fast moving object as more salient than a static or slow-moving one.

Thirdly, the conceptual structure of sequentiality has been analyzed through the investigation of two groups of constructions: the sequential markers and cohesive materials. Group one includes ziouc and cingx_daaih. Using Langacker’s notion of “retrospective” and “prospective” linguistic elements, ziouc has been analyzed as having a prospective profiling semantic feature, while cingx_daaih profiles a retrospective referent. This explains why this kind of conjunction in other languages is sometimes called “inchoative conjunction” or “adverbial conjunction.” From the CG perspective, ziouc is a prospective conjunction; cingx_daaih is a retrospective conjunction. The former naturally pushes the storyline forward even though it is not a verb. Group two involves two kinds of cohesive materials: the topic marker aeqv and the adverbial clause V + liuz (as a representative of the group including baac and gau). The former profiles bidirectional cohesion; and the latter profiles prospective reference point in a new mental space. Though ranked in the cohesive band, adverbial clauses have a
prospective semantic property in the narrative, contributing to a formation of sequentiality. The underlying principle of these analyses is this: a cluster of tightly sequenced objects in line is more salient to the human mind than disconnected and scattered ones. This sequentiality is marked primarily by the prospective conjunction \textit{z ions} and adverbial clauses, and secondarily by the topic marker \textit{aeqv}. It influences the viewers (listeners) of narrative to see the storyline emerge as perceptually foregrounded.

Recapitulating the main idea of this chapter, three words are the keys: gradient, movement and sequence.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

6.0 Introduction

In the beginning, was the storyline verb, and the verb was with tense/aspect/voice, and the verb was preterite. The preterite was a narrative tense. It was in the beginning on the storyline. “Find the narrative tense and the storyline will be given unto you,” said a textlinguist. There came a cognitive linguist sent from a narrative space, whose name was Foregroundedness. And he said, “Let transitivity and sequentiality serve the storyline;” and the storyline became foregrounded perceptually in a canonical narrative space. Tense was a relation between the textlinguist and the cognitive linguist. Then, a voice of an author intrusion was heard from another space, “A new aspect I give unto you. That is, go hand in hand.”

6.1 Summary of Findings

A semantic investigation into the storyline in Iu-Mienh has taken us through the preceding four chapters. Our original goal was to account for the meaning of storyline in discourse without separating grammar and semantics.

For that goal, in chapter 2, we surveyed twelve different linguistic theories and schools or approaches and have categorized them into four basic attitudes with regard to the semantic study of discourse and text. These are formal (or descriptive), mental, sociolinguistic and symbolic approaches. While the second approach provides a framework of discourse semantics from a broad cognitively oriented perspective, the fourth approach, represented by Langacker’s Cognitive Grammar, has been chosen as appropriate to achieve our goal of analyzing the conceptual structure of storyline. This is because of its principal claim that a linguistic unit, including a discourse, is a symbolic entity comprising a phonological representation of concept and its semantic content, viz. the form and meaning are inseparable within a linguistic and social context.
In chapter 3, we have described some selected grammatical features of Iu-Mienh. Some important characteristics of Iu-Mienh grammar that are relevant to the investigation of storyline involve the following aspects:

(i) the extensive use of lexical verbs together with their derived grammatical functional verbs, e.g. directional, aspectual and modal verbs,

(ii) the frequent use of the Serial Verb Constructions, sequenced SVCs in multiclause constructions and topic chains,

(iii) all these verbs have the same form, and

(iv) the pragmatic use of aspectual and sentence final particles.

Chapter 4 has taken us back to the inception of Longacre’s storyline theory with his particular adherence to the preterite verb in Biblical Hebrew (wayyiqtol) as a guiding principle in the development of his theory. The chapter has also compared two different definitions of storyline: from a textlinguistics perspective;

the storyline is the most foregrounded main line of narrative discourse whose semantic values are substantive, narrative, realis, dynamic, sequential and punctiliar, and whose morpho-syntactic marking is the preterite tense or completive aspectual verb form.

From a CL perspective:

the storyline is a perceptually foregrounded line of a narrative discourse. The line is foregrounded by two major causes: the sequence of events and the movement of events along a timeline toward its goal or conclusion, which is pragmatically planned by the narrator. The former is referred to as sequentiality of events, the latter transitvity of events. Thus, the storyline consists of sequentiality and transitvity of events.

Subsequently, the fourth chapter has presented the profile/plot analysis of seven Iu-Mienh narratives, has analyzed the storyline, and has proposed the salience scheme based on 715 sentences in this corpus. The chief characteristics found there are:

(i) the storyline verbs are unmarked by default,
(ii) clauses containing SVCs, topic chains, directional SVCs with directional verbs (*mingh* and *daaih*), aspectual SVCs with aspectual verbs (*mingh* and *daaih*) are on-the-line,

(iii) clauses containing not only verbal constructions but also the conjunction *ziouc* and the development marker *aengx* are on the storyline, and

(iv) the pivotal storyline band has (a) the aspectual markers, *aqv* ‘perfective’ and *mi’aqv* ‘resultative,’ and (b) the realis adverb *za’gengh*.

In chapter 5, we discussed three areas: a prototype analysis of salience scheme, the conceptual structure analysis of action/event transitivity and the conceptual structure analysis of sequentiality. First, the prototype effect of transitivity has been found in reference to the prototypical transitivity of the verb *mborv* ‘beat/hit’ on a continuum with varying constructions to the verb *gorngv* ‘say/speak.’ We have also found a small example of the gradient relation among five equation/copulative particles in Band 5-setting: *benx*, *zoux*, *zeiz*, *se* and *dongh*.

The materials in the pivotal storyline have been analyzed as grounding elements; viz. the narrator pragmatically and epistemically establishes rapport with the audience by bringing their attention back to an anchor into the storyline (particularly after an author intrusion and empathy, a long direct speech, a participant’s internal monologue).

Second, we have analyzed the conceptual structure of action/event transitivity, and how it is related to the foregroundedness of storyline. For that, we have utilized Langacker’s billiard-ball model with a few modifications, and applied it to some selected SVCs and topic chains. It was shown that a construction of this kind profiles “movement” and “speed”; viz. high transitivity and a high rate of action movement. These two conceptual factors have a foregrounding effect in the perception of storyline by the conceptualizer (hearer). Underneath this perceptual foregroundedness lies the principle of human cognitive ability that perceives a fast moving object as more salient than a static or slow-moving one.
Third, we investigated the conceptual structure of event sequentiaity and its relation to the foregroundedness of storyline. Here the constructions analyzed fall into two major groups. Group one contains the conjunction/sequential marker ziouc and the conjunction cingx_daih. Langacker’s notion of “retrospective” and “prospective” linguistic elements proved to be useful in analyzing the conceptual structure of these entities. While the conjunction cingx_daih profiles a retrospective referent, ziouc profiles a prospective referent. Thus, the latter has a function of incrementing the current discourse space (CDS), which, in turn, creates the sequentiality resulting in making the storyline foregrounded perceptually. Group two includes the topic marker aeqv and the adverbial clause V + liuz. Though both are materials of Band 8-cohesive, they have some qualities that move the storyline forward. Whereas aeqv profiles the bi-directional reference in CDS, V + liuz profiles a prospective reference point in the newly built mental space. This CDS incrementing function of the V + liuz is enhanced by the characteristic rightward focus structure of Iu-Mienh. That is, V + liuz occupying the left most position in a sentence with its prospective reference function (i.e. pointing toward the right), the expectation and focus of attention by the hearer is strongly directed to the right-most position of the sentence. This mechanism creates sequentiality in the perception of narrative and evokes expectation for an upcoming discourse space. The bottom line is that the tightly sequenced objects in a line are more conspicuous to our cognitive perception than scattered and unrelated ones. This perception of salience helps us mentally see the storyline standing out or foregrounded.

6.2 Implications of the Findings to the Hypotheses

We started with the following hypotheses.

H1: The relationship between storyline and non-storyline in Iu-Mienh is a gradient.
H2: The storyline in Iu-Mienh is characterized both semantically by transitivity and sequentiality of events and syntactically also by various linguistic constructions.

Based on the findings in the present study, some conclusions are summarized below:

1. The relationship between storyline and non-storyline in Iu-Mienh is a gradient. Not only that, the gradient relation can be found inside the storyline itself and the off-the-line bands as well. The nature of the gradient relation is that the cluster of different features are lined up from a prototypical feature of a construction to the deviations of it. Moreover, it is recognized that there is a pragmatic interaction between Bands 1 and 7-9, through the grounding function of the pivotal storyline. Thus, the relationship between storyline and non-storyline in Iu-Mienh is not a binary distinction of foreground vs. background.

2. The storyline in Iu-Mienh is characterized both semantically and syntactically. It is not characterized exclusively by syntactic codings.

3. The storyline in Iu-Mienh is characterized by various kinds of linguistic constructions and configurations. It is difficult to identify the storyline exclusively depending on a particular coding of verbs.

4. Semantically, the storyline is identified by perceptive foregroundedness resulting from transitivity and sequentiality of events in narrative.

### 6.3 Suggested Areas of Further Study

The present study has been of a selective nature, and there are many other items awaiting further investigation. First, from the category of ziouc, other similar conjunctions should be studied further: joc (jouc) ‘immediately,’ yaac ‘and/also/even/besides/still,’ youc (yoc) ‘again/and/also.’ It seems that ziouc and joc (jouc) can be grouped together whereas yaac and youc form another group. Clark (1991) seems to lump these two different groups, which correspond with the Iu-Mienh items of these kinds, in other languages in one discussion of
conjunction-cum-topicalizer. It seems that there is a distinction between ziouc and yaac, which probably corresponds with *cuųŋ*¹ and *koξ*² in Thai respectively.

Second, another conjunction *weic_naaiv* ‘for this reason’ has to be studied with regard to its similarity and difference to *cingx_daaih*.

Third, on the pivotal storyline, where *za’gengh* has received some investigation, there is one more important entity, viz. *aengx* ‘again/furthermore/and_then.’ This can be termed as a development marker, which obviously works for the furtherance of the storyline. It has some similarity with *de* (ðê) and *kai* (και) in Koine Greek discussed in Levinsohn (1992b:31-7).

Fourth, the construction V + *liuz* has two more members, *baac* and *gau* in this group within adverbial clauses. The distinction between *liuz* and *gau* is that the former is clearly prospective whereas the latter sometimes profiles a temporally overlapping relation between the event of the preceding sentence and the event of the succeeding main clause. As to *baac* it is difficult to find its difference from *liuz* as far as our corpus of seven stories and discussion with the native speakers are concerned. A speculation is that *baac* is an Iu-Mienh original word and *liuz* is a loan from Chinese (Τ), functioning in the same way. If this is the case, a topic of historical background of synonyms and how loan words are integrated into Iu-Mienh until their origins are completely forgotten is an interesting area of study.

Fifth, the issue of grammaticalization in Iu-Mienh should be studied more. Court may well be right in saying, “My impression is that the coverbs are not as ‘deverbalized’ as in Mandarin: for instance, they may take aspectual markers freely” (1986:249). Kingkarn also states “lexical verbs in Thai still retain their semantic properties in every case” (1986:245). If so, a kind of storyline theory that depends on a particular verb form as a criterion for its identification has to be revised, at least for Iu-Mienh (and possibly Thai).

Sixth, since some insights from common areal features in other authors’ studies have been helpful to describe some aspects of Iu-Mienh grammar, further studies
in other cognate languages will be needed and rewarding; viz. Kim Mun, Biao Mon, and Dzau Min, as well as other non-related languages of the area.

Seventh, the development of metalanguage in Iu-Mienh will be an enterprise but may be possible. In the course of elicitation and discussion with the Iu-Mienh, one comment was interesting: *naaiv joux waac maiv maaih gorn-baengx* ‘this sentence has no foundation.’ This explanation exactly fitted Langacker’s concept of grounding. More tools of this kind, as well as encouragement, will be needed for the Iu-Mienh to think and talk about their language in their language.
APPENDIX A

A NAME OF THE PEOPLE AND LINGUISTIC CLASSIFICATION

1. Yao or Mien?

There is confusion concerning the names of the Iu-Mienh people. A source of the confusion concerning the various names of the people primarily comes from a discrepancy between the name in their own language and names given by outsiders in the national languages of China and Vietnam, which are often based on characteristics of their traditional attires or names of place they inhabit. In China the “Yao” is the name given to one of the fifty-five ethnic minority peoples of the country, called Yao-zú, the “Yao nationality.” Within the “nationality,” some member groups are genetically related, and others are unrelated to each other. This fact increases the confusion of language names. As research in linguistics and anthropology has revealed this name confusion, Chinese scholars have become more aware of the medley nature of the “Yao nationality.” For example, Shū (1992:1), after mentioning that the Yao includes Mien, Bunu, and Lakkia, clearly states, “the reality, however, is that they do not belong to the same linguistic family: the Mien belongs to the Yao branch of Miao-Yao language family; Bunu to Miao branch of the Miao-Yao; and Lakkia to the Dong Shui [viz. Kam-Sui] branch of Zhuang Dong [viz. Tai] family.” In a recent study of Mao’s Mien dialectology (2004:7), Bunu and Lakkia are not included; instead, four separate but closely related “dialects” under the pure Mienic group are discussed in terms of detailed lexical comparison. Their names in their own languages are Mien [mjen$^{31}$] (勉), Iu Mien [ju$^{31}$ mjen$^{31}$] (优勉), Kim Mun [kim$^{33}$ mun$^{33}$] (金门), Biao Mon [bjau$^{31}$ mon$^{31}$] (标曼), and Dzau Min [dzau$^{53}$ min$^{53}$] (藻敏).
The Iu-Mienh people in the north of Thailand under the present study speak an almost identical language with Mao’s [mjen₃¹] or [ju₃¹ mjen₃¹] ⁹¹ above. Although the Thailand Iu-Mienh (or Mien) are also called as “Yao” by the Thai, there is no other group under this term; the Yao in Thailand are equated to the Iu-Mienh. Thus, when we talk about the Iu-Mienh, we mean the only “Yao” by Thai definition in Thailand. In some contexts, particularly in reference materials written in Chinese, “Yao” refers to the Iu-Mienh, the Kim Mun, the Biao Mon, and the Dzau Min but excludes the Bunu and the Lakkia as is seen in Mao (2004). Strictly speaking, however, a preferable terminology referring to these four languages of Mao’s study is the “Mienic languages” following Aumann and Sidwell (2001).

2. Linguistic Classification

A recent approach to the Hmong-Mienh language family in its own right, not subsuming it in other groups, is from two directions. One is a practical and pedagogical approach. For example, Suriya (1988) recommends the Hmong-Mien language family should be separated from Sino-Tibetan and not be classified in Austro-Thai so that it will get more attention by more scholars for further research (1988:165-6).

Another direction is from an investigation on the reasons for the apparent similarities between the Hmong-Mien languages and Chinese. For instance, LaPolla (2001) has implied that further scrutiny of Hmong-Mien and languages which share similar words, tone system, and classifiers may well reveal that Hmong-Mien should be separated from the Sino-Tibetan phylum. This disconnection hypothesis, he claims, parallels “the case of Vietnamese, which at one time was also thought to be related to Chinese, due to its many Chinese-like

---

⁹¹ “Iu-Mienh” in Thailand is pronounced as [ʔiu₃¹ mjen₃¹], in contrast to Mao’s [ju₃¹ mjen₃¹] in China.
features and words, but is now thought to be a Mon-Khmer language heavily influenced by Chinese” (LaPolla 2001:227).  

Concerning the tonal and lexical similarities between Chinese and Hmong-Mien which have been used for the claim that they are genetically related, Matisoff (1983, 1991, 2001) has suggested an alternative solution; namely, an areal diffusion explanation based on his theory of tonogenesis (Matisoff 1973:71-95) by tentatively adopting Benedict’s Austro-Tai hypothesis (e.g. Figure 1, supura). Matisoff writes, “these branches [Tai and Hmong-Mien] of the originally atonal and disyllabic Austro-Tai stock became monosyllabic and tonal under Chinese influence, diverging from Austronesian, which remained atonal and disyllabic” (2001:317). This hypothesis is presented in Figure A, adapted from Matisoff (1983:75, 1991:488, 2001:316) leaving the Chinese tone influence to Vietnamese under Austroasiatic out from the original chart.

Furthermore, in agreement with the recent theory of punctuated equilibrium hypothesized by Dixon (1997), Aikhenvald and Dixon (2001:1-23), Matisoff has

---

92 LaPolla has stated this in the following context: “Many scholars in China argue that the languages [Chinese, Tai, and Hmong-Mien] are related, but most linguists outside China feel the shared words are very old loans, and the other features, such as the similarities in the tone systems, the use of the classifier for definite marking, etc. spread areally” (2001:227). Concerning the language contact in relation to the Hmong, similar points are stated by Li, “The socio-historical background of the area in which the Hmongs have been residing suggests that (i) the superstratum languages in that area have been Thai and Chinese, and (ii) all of the languages in the area have been subject to intense contact with each other. Thus, contact is probably the major factor for an array of areal features, such as mono-syllabicity, lexical tones, and an analytic (isolating) type of grammatical structures. Contact is also the reason for the indeterminate status of the genetic classification of many of the languages in the area” (Li 1991).
suggested that the Mongol invasions in Eurasia in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries might have caused that vast range of diffusion.\textsuperscript{93} Thus, Matisoff (2001:295) asserts, “Every one recognizes the validity of these basic macro-groupings:” i.e. Austroasiatic, Sino-Tibetan, Tai-Kadai, Hmong-Mien and Austronesian. That is, he does not subsume the Hmong-Mien under other phylum. It seems that an increasing number of linguists outside China have adopted the theory that Hmong-Mien should not be placed under other stocks.

\textsuperscript{93} Matisoff writes: “It is remarkable fact that a tremendous spate of tonogenetic and registrogenic activity occurred all over the South-East Asian linguistic area in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, triggered by the devoicing of the previously *voiced series of obstruents in many Middle Chinese and Hmong-Mien dialects, in Siamese and other Tai languages, in Karenic, in Burmese and many Loloish languages, and in Vietnamese, Khmer, and other Mon-Khmer languages” (Matisoff 2001:323).
APPENDIX B

A HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL BACKGROUND

1. A Historical Background

According to Zhèn (1993:1), at the beginning of the Qin (221-206 B.C.) dynasty, there was a mention in a Chronology about “three Miaos” or Sānmíáo (三苗), which includes Miáo (苗), Shē (畬), and Yáo (瑶), a mixed group of the Proto-Miao-Yao (i.e. Proto-Hmong-Mien) people. The Proto-Yao people lived in Jiānghàn plain (江汉平原), a vast region extending from its west end Yīchāng (宜昌) in Húběi province (湖北省) to the east end at around Wǔhàn (武汉) along the Hánshuǐ river (汉水) and the Chángjiāng river (长江) with its south end at the lake Dōngtíng or Dŏngtínghú (洞庭湖) in Húnán province (湖南省). They also lived in a region east of Wǔhàn, west of the lake Poyang or Póyānghú (鄱阳湖). They gradually crossed the Chángjiāng river southward and lived in the region south of the lake Dōngtíng due to pressure from the feudal Hán people who moved southward (cf. Figure B, infra). Their names given by the Hán people were after the places of their habitation, such as Wǔlíng mán (武陵蛮), Chángshā mán (长沙蛮), Wǔxī mán (五溪蛮) (Zhèn 1993:7). Collectively they were called as Mán zú (蛮族), namely “undeveloped people” or “barbarians” whose internal ethnic/linguistic composition was unknown to the dominant people who came from the north.

Anthropologically, in the Wèi (魏) (A.D. 220-265), the Jìn (晋) (265-316) dynasties, and the Nánběicháo (南北朝) (or South-North dynasty) (316-589) period, those who associated themselves around a legend of Pán Hù (盘瓠), a dragon dog (Lombard (n.d. 1st ed) mentions an importance of dog as an alleged progenitor of the tribe; dog is one of several possible meanings of the word “Pan Hu.” Also the Yao’s abstain from eating dogs. However, not

---

94 Wǔlíng (武陵) is present day Chángdè (常德), a city on the west coast of the lake Dōngtíng.
95 They are also called the “Bang Ku community.”
96 Lombard (n.d. 1st ed) mentions an importance of dog as an alleged progenitor of the tribe; dog is one of several possible meanings of the word “Pan Hu.” Also the Yao’s abstain from eating dogs. However, not
that has a human body riding on a deer, gradually became a distinct ethnic group, the Yao, separating themselves from other ethnic groups (Zhen 1993:13-4). Linguistically speaking, Nishida (1989:174) explains that the speakers of Hmong-Mien (i.e. Miao-Yao) languages diverged to the west and north becoming the Miao (i.e. Hmong) and the Bunu speakers, and to the east and south becoming the Mien-Kimmun (i.e. Zhen’s Yao) speakers and the She speakers.

The aforementioned Pan Hu or Bang Ku community was originally referenced in some Han Chinese historical books in the periods of the Song (宋) (420-479) and the Liang (梁) (502-557) in Southern dynasties, as Mo Yao (莫徭), meaning “not subject to compulsory service” (Fei 1991:18). Later, in the Sui (隋) (581-618) and the Tang (唐) (618-907) dynasties their name was shortened to Yao (徭). It was in the Song dynasty that they migrated to Guangxi (广西) and Guangdong (广东), after which the two provinces have been the major residence area of the Yao where they inhabit half of both provinces (Zhen 1993:16). Further down in history in the Qing (清) dynasty (1632-1911), they moved into Guizhou (贵州) and Yunnan (云南) provinces.

The Chinese character that designated the name Yao during the Sui and Tang dynasties up to the liberation was 徭, which means “used for compulsory labor works.” After 1949, it has been changed to 瑶 meaning “gem,” the two characters being homophonous. Thus, the people have been given different names beginning with “barbarian” (for over 400 years), “those who are exempt from compulsory labor works” (360 years), next, “those who are used for compulsory labor works” (370 years), then “gem people” (50 years) and finally to the recent academically recognized name Mien, that is, “human.”
2. The Emperor’s Charter

An important Yao document written in Chinese came to the light of anthropological and historical research in the 1970s, that is, a Charter or passport (劵牒) for the Yao people issued by Emperor (King) Ping or Ping Huáng (评皇).

Huáng’s study (1989) on this Charter includes 101 documents collected from five provinces of southern China. Huang (1991:108) assumes that “King Ping’s Charter was produced in the Zhen Guan era of the Tang dynasty.” Zhèn (1993:72-92) emphasizes the importance of Pan Hu mythology found in this document in understanding the Yao cosmology and the importance of its social function.

The existence of this document became known to academics through extensive research on various kinds of Yao documents in Thailand lead by Shiratori (1974), followed by the publication of Yao Documents in Japan. In Thailand, Theraphan (1991) translated a manuscript into Thai and English of the Charter or Jiex sen borng (in Iu-Mienh), bought from Mr. Woun Fei Sae Pan (Bienh Wuonh-Fei) of Khun Haeng village, Ngau district, Lampang province in 1974. In Singapore, Tan (1986) has translated one of the hand-written copies of the Charter into English, several of which were found in Khun Haeng, the same village in which Theraphan obtained her manuscript. Its first part tells of a legendary origin for the Iu-Mienh people, while the latter part tells of the protection and privileges of the Iu-Mienh people in crossing the mountain areas under the Emperor’s jurisdiction.

Comparing several scrolls of this Charter, Tan summarizes four common themes found in them:

1. The Yao [Iu-Mienh] ancestor was a dog having the surname Pieun [Bienh]. He was popularly called Pieun Hu [Bienh Hungh].
2. This dog crossed a sea or seas to take the head of an enemy of a monarch, the latter most probably a Chinese emperor.
3. The dog married a human being. She belonged to the monarch’s court and was given in marriage to the dog as his reward for his killing the enemy.
4. The offspring of this dog-human union were the ancestors of the twelve Yao [Iu-Mienh] clans (Tan 1986:58-9).
However, there is an intervarsity Iu-Mienh Students Club consisting of students from Chiang Mai University, Maejo University, Rachaphat University, doing ethnographic and historical research concerning point #1 above, disagreeing with the idea that their ancestor was a dog.

3. The Enigma of the Migration Routes

The legends or myths which are included in many different manuscripts found in various places bewilder researchers with an enigma of two possible migration routes. From the description at the outset above, the first route can be postulated as shown in Figure B.

(Base map downloaded from Google Earth)

Figure B. Origine and Migration Route of the Proto-Mienic People
On the other hand, the second route starts from Nanjing. Setting out to the sea, they sailed through the Formosa strait offshore of Fujian and landed in Guangdong. This is presented as a hypothesis in McKinnon and Bhruksasri (1983:194) (Figure C) and endorsed by the Tribal Museum, Chiang Mai. Somkiat (2005: personal communication) explains that the crossing of the sea by the Yao preceded their arrival at Hunan province. Compare the second route in Figure B with Figure A.

The second theory is based on a sea odyssey recorded in the Charter and ethnographic interviews with the Iu-Mienh storytellers. Chob (1997) summarizes them as follows:

According to the songs and stories of the Yao living in Thailand, they lived for some times on mountains, cultivated the ground. They then migrated until they finally established their abode at Nanking, which is near the sea. Later, during the years of the Tiger and Rabbit, the soil was devastated by drought, so that they could no longer cultivate it. Many of the people died. The twelve Yao clans fled, crossing the big sea by boats for seven days and nights until finally, with the help of the Great spirits, [the] Three Pures Ones, they were able to land at Le Chang district in Lao Chiao province of
Guangdong, where they dispersed to establish themselves on the mountains. These Yao groups were called Pan Yao [viz. Iu-Mienh].

One of the reasons for this discrepancy between the two migration routes is an Iu-Mienh word’s polysemy *koriv* [kʰoiʔ], which can mean both “sea” and “lake” as pointed out by Zhèn (1993:15). He implies “the sea” that the Yao are said to have crossed in the Charter must have been the lake Dongting (e.g. Figure B). In order to reach a convincing conclusion with regard to the actual course of their southward journey, it will be necessary to investigate geographical feasibility, careful differentiation between legends and historical facts in the Charter, textual criticism of numerous manuscripts found across the international borders, the successive migration’s psychological effects on the people’s epistemology formed throughout the history, historical-comparative study between the four “dialects” of the Mienics, and dating of loaned Cantonese lexical items in Iu-Mienh.

4. A Historical Background to the Religion

Nonetheless, it is clear from both these documents and “the songs and stories of the Yao living in Thailand” that their religion took its present form only after “the crossing of the sea/lake.” The religious side of their life is summarized, by Somkiat (2005: personal communication), as an amalgamation of the following three: (i) “Three Pures Ones” (三清) (Chob 1997:5, supra) or *Faam Cing* with a Daoistic flavored complex sacrifice system (which Tán refers to as *guīshén chóngbài* “worshipping demons and gods” (鬼神崇拜) (1993:629-32 [1982]), (ii)

---


99 Robert S. Bauer, at the Asia Lexicography Conference, 24-26 May 2004, Payap University, Chiang Mai, pointed out to me that comparative studies between Cantonese and Iu-Mienh would be extremely revealing because of a considerable percentage of loan words of the former into the latter. Ramsey (1987:286) briefly explains the phonological similarity between “Yao” (Iu-Mienh) and Cantonese. Matisoff (1991:489) mentions, “More than 50% of the lexicon in some Mien dialects are Chinese loanwords,” without reference to whether the loanwords are Mandarin or Cantonese. Purnell points out, “In the literary language and among many loanwords, the tone correspondences are very regular with a type of Mandarin. The ritual language would have more correspondences with Cantonese” (personal communication).

100 It is also possible that they took both routes.
ancestor worship, and (iii) animistic belief. Iu-Mienh “cultures and mode of living run parallel with deep-rooted beliefs in ancestor worship, animism and spirit worship, sometimes interplaced [i.e. replaced] as a result of missionary work with a little Buddhism or Christianity. These practices govern every aspect of their sexual, marital, family and economic life” (Preecha 1987:9).

5. Migration to Thailand

Migration from southern China to Thailand through Laos took place in the middle of 19th century, estimated to be about 1880 by such scholars as Tsunemi (1980) and others. A detailed study by Chob (1997:7-8) shows that one of the first Iu-Mienh clans who migrated from China was that of Tang Jan Kuan (Dangc Zanh Kuon (?) in the Unified Script) arriving at Laos in 1877, and eventually came into Nan province of Thailand in 1896. Chob claims that there are four groups which migrated into Thailand in large numbers at different stages, which can be summarized as follows in Table A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Lead by</th>
<th>Clan</th>
<th>Woman’s turban</th>
<th>Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Chiang Rai – Nan group</td>
<td>Tang Jan Kuan (Phaya Kirisrisombat)</td>
<td>Tang, Pian</td>
<td>m’ngorgy-beu ping (rolled turban)</td>
<td>Laos→ Doi Ji, Doi Nam Mong, Doi Pha Chang Noi, Doi Pha Ji, Doi Pha Lom, Nam Lao (Nan), Chinag Khong, Thoeng (Chiang Rai)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Doi Ang Khang group</td>
<td>Tang Yao Foey</td>
<td>Pian, Zhao, Tang</td>
<td>m’ngorgy-beu paanx (criss-cross turban)</td>
<td>Laos→ Thoeng (Chiang Rai) → Doi Ang Khang (north of Chiang Mai) → Myanmar→ Doi Ang Khang→ Mae Ngon Luang (south of Fang district) → Huai Chmphu, Doi Phalang (Chiang Rai), Fang and Mae Ai districts (Chiang Mai), Nong Waen (Mae Chan district, Chiang Rai)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Upper Chiang Rai group</td>
<td>Zhao Wang Seng and later by Bianh Lao Lu</td>
<td>Li, Zhao, Pian, Fong, Wang, Tang</td>
<td>m’ngorgy-beu paanx (criss-cross turban)</td>
<td>Nam Khuyeung of Laos→ Nam Kham and Huai Kwang (Chiang Saen district, Chiang Rai), Doi Luang (Chiang Khong district), Lao Sip, Lao Shi Kuai, Phalae (Mae Chan district) → Wang Nua district (Lampang), Khlong Lan district (Kamphaeng Phet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Evacuee group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m’ngorgy-beu paanx (criss-cross turban)</td>
<td>Khun Mac Bong (Mae Chan district, Chiang Rai)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A. Four Iu-Mienh groups migrated into Thailand
6. A Cultural Background

As is listed in the fourth column in Table A, a group identity is best expressed in women’s attire, an important semiological code of the people, though different dress does not mean different dialect. A study of elegant and intricate geometric patterns of embroidery with color photographs of Laos can be found in Goldman (1995), of Thailand in Lewis and Lewis (1984:138-49), the garments, head gears, poems and songs of China Yao in Chen and Li (1995), and silver ornaments used by the Iu-Mienh and the Kim Mun of China, Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand in Pourret (2002:142-73).

“[S]widden (slash-and-burn) agriculture” and “opium cultivation” mentioned in Kunstadter (1967:585) has gradually been discarded. The protection of the forest through the Royal project began in 1931 and was reinforced by the National Policy on the hill tribes in 1989, and the drug control began in 1952 with the successful result of leaving about 200 rai of opium growing fields in 2002. Instead, a tension between maintenance of village life on the mountains and a shift to urban life, pursuit of university education and international communication through the internet and the use of the Unified Script (a Roman based orthography; c.f. Appendix C) are the present state of affairs. The unchanging aspect, however, is that Iu-Mienh “exhibit a spirited, congenial and independent nature, […] initial shyness when confronted by strangers, […] hard-working, […] gracious and honest manner” (Schrock et al. 1970:689). The Iu-Mienh are “the industrious, thrifty, wise and kind” people, inheriting these characteristics from their “brave and persevering forerunners” (Huang 1991:122).

To summarize, the fostering of the aforesaid noble characteristics of the Iu-Mienh in the face of the harsh nature of mountain life and the hardship of generations of migration due to feudal rulers’ pressure and wars, and their progressive nature of adjustment to bigger ethnic groups or host countries observable in their adoption

101 The Technical Service Club at The Tribla Musium, Chiang Mai (2004:71-9) lists the hill tribal policy concerning these facts.
of various religious practices and acceptance of contact languages are still in process.\textsuperscript{102}

\textsuperscript{102} Besides these positive characteristics, there are also problems. Cf. The Technical Service Club at The Tribla Musium, Chiang Mai (2004:64-6).
## APPENDIX C

### IU-MIENH PHONOLOGY AND ORTHOGRAPHY

#### Consonants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bilabial</th>
<th>Labio-Dental</th>
<th>Alveolar</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
<th>Glottal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plosives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless</td>
<td>Aspirated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>/p/</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>/t/</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>/k/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/pʰ/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/tʰ/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/kʰ/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaspirated</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>/p/</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>/d/</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>/c/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/p/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/t/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/c/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>Mb</td>
<td>/b/</td>
<td>Nd</td>
<td>/d/</td>
<td>Nj</td>
<td>/j/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mb</td>
<td></td>
<td>/d/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/j/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affricates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless</td>
<td>Aspirated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>/tʃ/</td>
<td>/tsʰ/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaspirated</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>/tʃ/</td>
<td>/ts/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>Nz</td>
<td>/dʒ/</td>
<td>/dʒ/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voiceless Fricatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hu</td>
<td>/h/</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>/f/</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>/s/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/h/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/f/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/s/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hi</td>
<td>/ç/</td>
<td>/ç/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>/h/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nasals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless</td>
<td>Hm</td>
<td>/m̥/</td>
<td>Hn</td>
<td>/n̥/</td>
<td>Hny</td>
<td>/ŋ̥/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m̥/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/n̥/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/ŋ̥/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>/m/</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>/n/</td>
<td>Ny</td>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
<td>/n/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lateral</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless</td>
<td>Hl</td>
<td>/l̊/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/l̊/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approximant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>/w/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/ẘ/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>/j/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/j̊/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This voiced nasal is preglottalized. The voiced nasals are preglottalized on three tones: unmarked, -v, and –x, and not preglottalized on the other three tones. Purnell 1965*

Table C1. Consonants phonemes and their corresponding orthography
Vowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Front</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Back</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
<td>I /i/</td>
<td></td>
<td>U /u/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close-mid</td>
<td>E /e/</td>
<td></td>
<td>O /o/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>er</td>
<td>/œ/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-mid</td>
<td>A /e/</td>
<td></td>
<td>Or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>A /a/</td>
<td>Aa aa</td>
<td>/a/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C2. Vowel phonemes and their corresponding orthography

Vowel glides

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iu  /iu/</td>
<td>Ui  /ui/</td>
<td>Ei  /ei/</td>
<td>Ou  /ou/</td>
<td>Ie  /iœ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eu  /eu/</td>
<td>Oi  /œi/</td>
<td>Ai  /ai/</td>
<td>Au  /au/</td>
<td>Aai /a œi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C3. Vowel glides and their corresponding orthography

Tones

The tone marks by the Unified Script are in < > shown in the Table C4.

1. Mid-high level: <Unmarked> / ˧ / 3. High rise falling: <˧> / ˥˥ / 5. Mid-low rising: <˧> / ˩ / 7. checked syllable: <ˀ ICMP> or <ˀ ICMP> [ itemCount ]

C = consonant, <ˀ ICMP> = glottal stop. (adapted from Downer 1963:136 and Purnell 1991:374)

Table C4. Tones and their corresponding orthography
APPENDIX D

THE TEXTS OF SEVEN STORIES

Notes on the translation: The “free translation” presented as follows is not actually “free” in a sense that it is natural and flowing English. It reflects the boundaries between clauses, and sometimes between components of serial verb constructions in a clause, as indicated by subnumbers (e.g. 1.1) under the sentence number (e.g. OH.001). The clause sometimes omits the verb, thus some clauses appear to be a noun phrase.

Direct speeches are rendered more freely or dynamically since they do not affect the analysis of the storyline. DSs are indented and are not numbered except for long multi-sentence monologues. In the latter cases, the sentences are numbered instead of clauses.

When words which do not exist in the original language are needed to be expressed in English, they are in parentheses. Cultural information that needs to be supplemented to understand the sentence is in brackets.
Story 1 (OH): “A Story of an Old Husband and Bamboo Shoots”

Old Husband

A story of an old husband and bamboo shoot

OH.001
1.1
Maaih dauh lov nor,
have CLF man TOP

vt clf n top

1.2
aapv ninh nyei sieqv 1.3
force 3sg POSS daughter marry that CLF old-husband
vt pn.p poss n vt pn.dem clf n

1.1
There was a man; 1.2 he (tried to) force his daughter 1.3 (to) marry that old husband.

OH.002
Ninh sieqv mv oix longc.
3sg daughter NEG want_to marry

pn.p n neg v.mod vt

His daughter didn't want to.

OH.003
3.1
Ninh ndongc_haaix yaac
3sg no-matter-how and_yet

pn.p adv conj

3.2
aapv ninh sieqv 3.3
force 3sg daughter marry CLF that rich
v.mod vt pn.p n vt clf pn.dem adj

3.1
No matter what, 1.2 he wanted (to) force his daughter 1.3 (to) marry that man, (who was) rich.

OH.004
"Longc jienv aqv, maiv_zuqc kouv, maaih zinh_nyaanh longc."
marry DUR CAS.CMD no_need_to tired have wealth use

vt asp part. mod adv v.st vt

n vt

"Just marry him, it shouldn't be bad. He is wealthy."

OH.005
5.1
Ninh sieqv aeqv 5.2
3sg daughter TOP hnamv GOAL rich

pt nth adj part v.st asp

5.4
my_baac gox hainc ba_laqc mv puix.
but old very too_much NEG appropriate
conj v.st adv adv neg v.st

5.1 As for her, 5.2 (she) thought about the wealth, 5.3 it was right, 5.4 but (he) was so old 5.5 (it) was not appropriate.
She did not want to marry.

Her father said, “Marry him! You go ahead and marry him. It’s just now that you don’t like him, you see. Though he is old, once you marry, you will gradually love him.”

Like that, (he) said to his daughter.

Do (like this) then, later, his daughter planned a plan; (she) cooked a pot of old bamboo shoots, (which people) cannot chew—such a kind.

She finished cooking; (she) prepared (food) (she) let her father eat.
She said to her father, "We're going to have a meal."

Her father spoke, (he) asked her, “Today, what did you cook?”

His daughter answered her father, (she) said, “(I have) cooked bamboo shoots.”

She deceived her father, he took (it) toward (him) and then, he chewed (it) and then, (he) could not swallow (it).
15.1 Her father spoke, (he) asked his daughter, “Why did you cook such old bamboo shoots as this? How can I eat?”

15.2 Father, you can’t chew it now, but if you gradually chew for some period, it will be delicious.

I don’t want to marry an old man. But father, you force me to marry (him).

You told me that I would gradually love him; that’s exactly the same with the old bamboo shoots.
If you, father, chew (old bamboo shoots) and feel it’s delicious, and if you can swallow it, I can marry the old man too.

If you don’t feel it’s delicious, and no matter how you chew well if you can’t swallow it, then I also will not marry.

---

17.1 His daughter planned a plan, and then; 17.2 (she) talked (about) her father’s way; 17.3 (her father’s way) came to an end; 17.4 therefore, (she) did not have to marry that old man.
Story 2 (FG): “A Story of Firefly and Grasshopper”

A story of Firefly and Grasshopper

In the old days, a firefly and a grasshopper exchanged works [i.e. offer labor reciprocally or ‘you
work for me and I work for you in return’].

(They) exchanged works and then, that day they talked about each other’s plan.

(They) did works and then, (it almost) became dark, they talked about (that it was becoming) dark.

The firefly called saying, “Go home! You don’t have a light, you must go now. It’s going to be so
dark soon so that you can’t see.”
The grasshopper said, "What are you worrying about?  Don't you know that my legs are long. Don't you see it won't take that many leaps to get home."

The firefly said, “I just feel sorry for you. I have a light, you see.”

The grasshopper said, “You don't have to worry about me. I have long legs, I can run strongly. It's you I feel sorry for. You have a light, but you are small. It's too difficult for you to get home. If I run for a while I can get home.”
He teased the firefly (and he) got angry.

After (they) did works, it got dark, then they competed going home.

(They) started to set out, the firefly had a light and wing to fly too.

He could light up his own road himself (and) walked back (and) reached home.

Grasshopper returned (but) did not reach house, when (he) went half way, (he) went (and) borrow [i.e. asked for a room to stay] the sparrow’s house to sleep in.

The sparrow said, “You, your legs are too long. Soon (you) will stamp on me, I’m sure.”

The grasshopper said, “Don’t worry. I will bend (my legs), I won’t stretch my legs.”
The sparrow said, “You are sure you won’t, aren’t you? I see your legs are really long. You will soon stamp on me. My house is narrow.”

The grasshopper said, “You can’t help it. I will really remember (that) I should bend (my legs), I will not stretch my legs.”

There was nothing the sparrow could do about it, (he) let the grasshopper sleep.

After (they) had been asleep for awhile, a dead tree snapped down (and) frightened (and) woke the grasshopper up; because he did not remember (to keep his legs bent), (he) stretched out his legs (and) kicked the sparrow's goiter hard (it) turned up to his nape.

So, the sparrow then became unhappy.
From the beginning I told you I wouldn't give you my house to sleep in. No matter how you said you would keep your legs bent, this time (you) took my goiter (and) kicked it up to the nape.

This time the grasshopper also said (that is) because the dead tree snapped, the dead tree was wrong.

The dead tree also said (that) it was not that he himself wanted to snap.

Termite himself bit him, his roots broke off altogether, (he) was not able to be stable.

The termite said (that) he was not wrong.

It was an earthworm that cemented his house.
He had no place to live, therefore (he) came out from there, (and) bit the tree roots (and the roots) broke off.

This time, they drew a law (and) discussed.

The earthworm failed (he) got a Nyut-Daai god bound around his neck (and it) became round-ringed.

Now (if) you don’t believe, look at the neck of an earthworm.

The grasshopper also was wrong a little, (so) they took the grasshopper’s legs (and) bent them.

And look at a grasshopper’s legs.
(They are) really bent and bent.
Now I am going to tell a story of a wolf and piglets.

In the old days, there was a female pig (and she) gave birth to three piglets.

(She) brought up three cubs (to) big enough, she told them, “Each of you must go and find your own place to live.”

So these piglets went out (and) looked for a place (to) live.

One piglet’s method was (that he) looked for (and) got rice stalks (and) built a house.

And the another piglet’s method was (that he) looked for rods (and) built a house.
Another piglet’s plan was (that he) built a house with bricks.

(When they were) building not very long, there was a black wolf (and it) came (to) deceive them (to) eat (them).

(When he) arrived at the fist piglet's house, (the wolf) told him, “You must open the door to let me come in. I want to come into your house.”

And the piglet was fearful, he did not open the door (to) let him come in.

No matter what (he) would not open.

“Don’t you really open it? If you really won’t open it, I will really blow your house down.”
There was nothing the piglet could do about it, (if the house) collapsed (he) can’t do anything.

He was so afraid (that he) didn’t open.

The black wolf indeed blew; (he) blew for a while and touched softly his house, (his house) was blown down (and) collapsed.

He could not flee to anywhere, so the black wolf ate it.

(He) has taken the first piglet and ate it; and again (he) went to the second piglet’s house and told him again like this, “You, open the door (to) let me in.”
The second piglet also was fearful (that) the black wolf (would) enter (to) eat him,  
so he would not open.

He told the piglet again, “If you won't open the door, then I will really blow down your house”

There was nothing he could do about it either.

(If the house) collapses, (he) would not be able to do anything.

(He) was fearful (so he) would not open the door (to) let the black wolf come in.

Then the black wolf really blew; (he) blew a short while,  
(further) he touched his house (and it) collapsed.

He (the second piglet) had no place to hide,  
then the wolf ate (him) also.
The black wolf ate two piglets, (he) felt (they) were really delicious.

(The wolf) further went to the third piglet's house, (and) called the third piglet (to) open the door (to) let him come in.

The third piglet was also fearfull (and he) did not open.

He said, “Do you really not open? If you really don’t open, I will really blow your house down.”

There in the house the piglet laughed at him, saying “My house is so good that you can't blow it to collapse.”

He got angry, (so) he really blew away (at the house).
(He) blew and blew.

No matter how he blew, (the house) could not collapse.

That piglet laughed at him very hard.

He again made a plan (and) deceived the piglet, (he) enticed the piglet, "Let's go to dig potatoes tomorrow."

Then the piglet promised (that) he would go (to) dig potatoes with him, but the following morning the piglet got up early went first (and) dug potatoes (then) came back.

The black wolf came (and) told him, “Let’s go! Let’s go dig potatoes!”
He said to the black wolf, “I’ve been back from digging. If you want to go, go by yourself.”

(He) deceived the black wolf, 38.2 the black wolf got very angry, 38.3 he could not get the piglet (to) eat (him).

He again made a plan (to) deceive the piglet, “Let’s go and collect some fruits, tomorrow; collect apples.”

The following morning the piglet got up early again, 40.2 then he went first again.

(When he) reached a fruit tree, 41.2 (he) climbed up the tree.

As soon as (he) went up above, 42.3 the black wolf just arrived.
He was afraid (that) the wolf was about to eat him.

Again the piglet made a plan (he) picked an apple (and) threw (it) away over there.

(It) fell there in quite a far place, (he) deceived the black wolf (and the wolf) went (to) pick the fruit.

He then used that time came down quickly fled (and) went home.

So the black wolf could not manage (to) eat (him) again (he) hurried to home.

He again planned to entice the piglet, (saying) “Let’s go and see the fair tomorrow.”
The following morning, the piglet got up early again (and) went first, (he) went (and) reached there (and) was buying (things).

There was… there was a kind of container; they make a can for powdered milk, (they) make a big powdered milk’s bucket.

(He) returned half way, as there was a place where the slope went up a bit, he reached the foot of the hill.

Then there was nothing he could do about it but (he) could see the wolf was ready to eat him.

So then he crept into the powdered milk container.
The powder milk container rolled, and went down directed straight toward the black wolf.

(It) frightened the black wolf (the wolf) was very fearful then ran away.

The black wolf ran away, then he [piglet] depend on that competition again (and) went home again.

(He) came back home.

And then the black wolf returned following the piglet.
"This morning I went to the fair but I didn’t see you. As I went half way there was a thing that scared me very much and made me tired. I was very fearfull. (That thing) scared me so much that I was almost dead."

The piglet laughed, “That was me. I made you frightened.”

(He) deceived him (to) make (him) angry very much.

The piglet’s method was so well planned that (the wolf) could not manage to eat (him).
So the black wolf planned again (and he) crept up the chimney hole, along the hole went in (to) eat the piglet.

The piglet saw the black wolf was creeping up, the piglet made a plan again, (he) took a big bucket (and) filled water (in it), boiled on the fire place tricked the black wolf go up, (he) went up (to the top of) the chimney (and) indeed went in.

(He) followed the chimney hole (and) entered.

(wolf) came in, as soon as (he) came in to the inner part of the house, a smoke shot at his eyes got sore, got dizzy, could not see anywhere.
He fell down, therefore (he) fell in to the boiling water in the bucket, therefore (he) the water scalded (him) (he) died.

There, that the piglet's plan really tortured that wolf (and he) died.
Story 4 (CI): “Why Cicadas don’t Have Intestines?”

Cicada

A story of Why cicadas don’t have intestines

C1.001
Yie gorngv diuh gouv bun meih muangx oc.
1sg speak CLF story let 2sg listen PLT
pn.p v clf n vt pn.p vt part

I am going to tell a story (and) let you listen (to it).

C1.002
Oix muangx nyei?
want_to listen q
v.mod v part

Do you want to listen?

C1.003
Gengh oix muangx?
really want_to listen
adv v.mod vt

Do you really want?

C1.004
Oix muangx haai nyungc gouv?
want_to listen what_kind story
v.mod vt q n

Which story do you want to listen to?

C1.005
5.1
Gaeng-waen ga’sie mv maaih jaangh nyei gouv
5.2
n n neg vt n relt n pn.p vt aux part

5.1 The story that there is no intestine in a cicada’s stomach, 5.2 have you ever heard?

C1.006
Mv hai z jiex?
NEG hear experienced
neg vt aux

You haven't, have you?

C1.007
7.1
Mv hai z jiex yie gorngv bun meih muangx.
NEG hear experienced 1sg speak let 2sg listen
neg vt aux pn.p v vt pn.p vt

7.1 If you haven't, 7.2 I will tell you.
In the old days, an owl told a barking-deer; “The olives are ripe, The olives are ripe,” deceived the barking-deer (to) eat (some).

The barking-deer came there (and) ate…uh… those olive fruits.

A yellow-squirrel also told the barking-deer, “You must be caught, must be caught.”

You see, the cicada just cried without any intention, but the barking deer himself thought (that) he was fearful, I guess.
The barking deer said (that he) heard the cicada saying, “I will catch you, I will catch you, I will catch you,” (the words) frightened the barking deer (and let him) run away, (he) stepped on an ash-pumpkin, (and) its vine broke off.

A vine of the ash pumpkin broke off and further the ash pumpkin rolled down.

The ash pumpkin was rolling down and down, and further (it) hit a sesame container (and it) spilled out.

(It) hit the sesame container (and it) spilled out, and further (the sesame) spilled (and) went into a wild chicken's eyes.
This time, a wild chicken scratched (the ground) carelessly (and) scratched (and) hit an ant accidentally (the ant) came out.

Oh, he was not just an ordinary ant (but) a black ant.

The wild chicken carelessly clawed the ground (and) hit the black ant, (the black ant) came out, (they) stung a snake.

Then the snake went away aimlessly.

When (it) went, (it) crawled into a squirrel's nest.

(The snake) went (and) crawled into the squirrel's nest, the squirrel also did not have place to stay.

Because the squirrel did not have place to live, therefore (he) just came out aimlessly.
He (squirrel) bit a kind of cucumber.

The oil fruit also did not fall without a specific goal.

(The oil fruit) aimed straight at that old man’s opium lamp (and) went down (and) bumped (it).

As for that squirrel, (and) he got very angry (and) criticized (that) the snake took his place to live.

As he lost his place to live, because (he) really bit the oil fruit, (it) dangled and dropped down there with a thud…and…
That old man got very angry, “I was smoking opium in this forest and you just came randomly (and) destroyed my opium lamp, why?”

That cucumber asked him back.

The cucumber said, “Not me! Not that I myself wanted to fall. How can I fall without someone damaging me?”

That old man asked saying, “What damaged you? Can you tell me what damaged you to fall?”
The cucumber said, “Oh, a squirrel himself bit me, how can I be connected to the stem tightly?

The squirrel bit me, I couldn't get connected tightly, that's why I fell, don't you know? Please forgive my mistake.”

That old man said (that) he would charge the squirrel; the squirrel himself must have bitten.

“You just carelessly bite the old fruit without thinking anything, letting it hit my opium lamp, why?”
The squirrel also said to him, “The snake himself came into my house. I was scared of the snake so I came out, and was very angry. I just aimlessly bit, that’s why I accidentally bit it and it fell. This, I don’t consider that I offended you. I didn’t do wrong to you. Please, overlook my wrong.”

(The squirrel) tricked the old man (the old man) further went (to) ask the snake.

(The old man) asked the snake, “Seems like you are not thinking anything. You should have stayed in your place but came out restlessly and just carelessly went into the squirrel’s house. Why?”
"Oh, it’s the black ant that stung me. When I just fled, I felt it’s comfortable to be here. So I came in here. It’s not my fault, it’s the black ant’s fault. You go and punish the black ant.”

The old man further went (to) ask the black ant.

(The old man) went, went to the black ant’s place without thinking anything you stung the snake carelessly, why? You stung the snake, because it ran away, it committed a crime, won’t you see?”
not that I myself wanted to sting. ld chicken himself clawed me out. y house to enter I got angry; it was because I faced something (problem). It’s not that I stung without a reason, you see. themselves came to bother me and drove me out? you want to punish, go and punish the wild chicken. the wild chicken who clawed the black ant out.

The black ant also said, “It’s not that I myself wanted to sting. The wild chicken himself clawed me out. Because I could not find my house to enter I got angry; it was because I faced something (problem). It’s not that I stung without a reason, you see. Don’t you see that they themselves came to bother me and drove me out? If you want to punish, go and punish the wild chicken. It was the wild chicken who clawed the black ant out.”

(The black ant) deceived the old man there was nothing (the old man) could do about it, (he) further went (and) asked the wild chicken.
The wild chicken also said, "The sesame seeds got into my eyes, I couldn’t see anything. It’s not because I clawed carelessly. I didn’t carelessly claw and make the ant come out. If I could see well, even I could have avoided ants and clawed different places, you see?"

(The wild chicken deceived the old man, there was nothing (the old man) could do about it, (he) further went (and) asked the sesame, “Like you without thinking anything went carelessly and entered the wild chicken’s eyes, why?”)
The sesame also said, “Not that I myself wanted to enter, you see. The ash pumpkin itself hit me; that’s why I could not stay there, fell down and went into the wild chicken’s eyes.”

(The sesame) deceived the old man, there was nothing (the old man) could do about it, (he) went (to) ask the ash pumpkin, (he) asked the ash pumpkin, “Like you, without thinking anything you went carelessly and hit the sesame to come out and entered the wild chicken’s eyes, why? They have done wrong, you see. I want to punish you.”
(The ash pumpkin) spoke (and) deceived (the old man), 49.2 there was nothing (the old man) could do about it again, 49.3 (the ash pumpkin) also said, 49.4 "I myself didn’t want to roll. 49.5 The barking deer himself stepped on me (and) the vine broke off; no way for me to keep staying there, that’s why I had to roll down. 49.6 Rolling down then I couldn’t avoid and then hit the sesame’s bottom. 49.7 You go and ask the barking deer. 49.8 Ask him why he came and stepped on me."

(The ash pumpkin) deceived him, 50.2 (the old man) again went (and) asked the barking deer.
The barking deer said, “Because those two or three things said (something and) frightened me, then I ran away. If they hadn’t frightened me, I myself wouldn’t have done wrong.”

(The old man) asked, “What did they say? How did they frighten you?”

The barking deer said, “Oh, the owl himself deceived (and) he said that olive fruits are ripe, olive fruits are ripe.”

(The owl) enticed him (to) go (and) eat the olive fruits.

(I) ate (it and it) felt delicious, (I) ate there.
56.1 When he ate,
56.2 (he) heard a yellow squirrel say, 
56.3 Seize quickly, seize quickly, seize quickly!

57.1 Soon, a cicada also cried (and) said
57.2 Catch quickly, catch quickly, catch quickly!

58.1 Oh, of course I thought like that, that two of them discussed like that. 
58.2 Don’t you think it’s possible that they would really catch me soon? 
58.3 Don’t you think I could die? 
58.4 If so, I couldn’t be unafraid. 
58.5 I couldn’t help running away. 
58.6 If I would not run away, they would catch me, you see.”
59.1 (The barking deer) accused the squirrel (of) bite(ing) the oil fruit (and) hit (it) drop, 59.2 (and) hit his opium smoking lamp, that’s what he [deer] said.

60.1 This old man, therefore, has come to the conclusion there, 60.2 found out the root (of the problem); 60.3 (that is,) the owl enticed the barking deer (to) go (and) eat the fruit; 60.4 (so) they took ginger 60.5 (and) crushed (it) 60.6 (and) squeezed out the juice of it, and so, 60.7 (they) took the ginger juice (and) poured (it) into the owl’s eyes, you see.

61.1 (After they) finished pouring (ginger juice in his eyes); 61.2 therefore, now the eyes of owls are so big and round like that, I mean it.

62.1 As for the yellow squirrel, 62.2 because they were very angry, 62.3 (they) took (him) away (and) singed (him), that’s what they say, I mean it.
63.1 (They) singed his back, 63.2 therefore, nowadays, (its back) is totally yellow.

64.1 Moreover, talking about the cicada… 64.2 (he was) too small, 64.3 whatever (they tried to) do 64.4 (they) could not do (it) and so, 64.5 they, therefore, took his intestine 64.6 dug (it) out, 64.7 replaced that old man’s opium smoking lamp (with it), that’s what they say, listen to me!

64.1 This story, they tell like this, and...

64.1 For this reason, the cicada himself, even the cicada doesn’t consider (that) he deceived, you see.
The barking deer himself was stupid; he himself thought he was frightened.

The yellow squirrel also lost in court.

Therefore they punished them like that.

Now, one person has one story, isn’t that right?

Can you remember?

If you can’t remember, I will tell it to you again sometimes.

If you can remember, someday you tell it (and) let me listen.
Can’t memorize it, I wonder.

If you really remember it, it’s good, you see.
Story 5 (FA): “A Story of Faam-Bae’ and Aeng-Doi”

Faam Baeqv Aengh Doih

I am going to tell a story of Faam-Bae’ and Aeng-Doi.

In the old days, there was a man (whose) name was Faam-Bae’.

There was (also) a girl (whose) name was Aeng-Doi

She wanted (to) go to Meisen school (to) study.

There was nothing he could do about it, (but) she made a plan.

She took off girl’s clothes undressed all, (and) put on man’s clothes dressed up as a man.
When she (was about to) go, \( ^8.2 \) she took a bowl (and) dipped water, \( ^8.3 \) and took another (and) turned (it) over above the other as a cover, \( ^8.4 \) told her mother and others (who) were at home, “Please don’t open this bowl.”

As (she) dressed up as a boy, \( ^9.2 \) (she) was ready to go.

Her mother and others sent her off \( ^10.3 \) (she) set out.

(Mother) told her everything, “When you go, you must take care.”

She didn't know (that) Faam-Bae' was going (to study too).

Faam-Bae’ didn’t know (that) she was going either.
(Aeng-Doi) went halfway, (she) ran into Faam-Bae’ (and he) asked Aeng-Doi, “Where are you going?”

Aeng-Doi said to Faam-Bae’, “Oh, I am going to Meisen school.

Aeng-Doi also asked Faam-Bae’, “Where are you going?!”

Faam-Bae’ also told Aeng-Doi, “I am going to Meisen school too.”

They be(ing) there compared (to) see who was older.
As (they) compared, \textsuperscript{21.2}Faam-Bae’ was two years older; \textsuperscript{21.3}but Faam-Bae’ only thought (that) Aeng-Doi was a boy.

At that time, he could not think (that) Aeng-Doi was a girl.

They made boy friends together \textsuperscript{23.2}went to study only.

Wherever they went (they) liked (each other), \textsuperscript{24.2}wherever (they) were (they) liked (each other).

Aeng-Doi said to Faam-Bae’, “We have finished comparing (our) birthdays; finished comparing (out) ages. Let’s go. You are two years older (so) you go in front of me. I am two years younger, I will carry your school bag behind you.”
They indeed arrived at the Meisen school.

Wherever (they) might be, (they) could have friends to play with.

Aeng-Doi knew (that) Faam-Bae’ was a boy.

Faam-Bae’ didn’t know (that) Aeng-Doi was a girl.

Sleeping at night, (they) would share a bed (to) sleep.

In regard to studying in the day time, (they) shared a desk and shared one chair.

As for write(ing) characters, (they) shared a pencil.
As for studying, (they) shared books.

After studying for three years, her mother and others at home felt (that) their daughter had been gone very long as for their daughter (she) had never returned home.

Her daughter at Meisen school, then could not hide her breasts (from growing), her teacher knew (that) Aeng-Doi was not a boy, (but actually) a girl.
Her teacher, because he was quite clever, he knew somehow (that) she might perhaps be a girl; so her teacher was going to try her.

Her teacher came (and) being with them (he) slept.

Aeng-Doi, on the other hand, made a plan again: (she) took a bowl (and) filled (it) with water, placed (it) between the two (men), (that is) put it on the blanket.

No one could move.
Just speaking 42.1 would move that bowl, 42.2 then the water would spill over the blanket; 42.3 (they) could not sleep.

(She) tricked her teacher: 43.1 though (he) slept with her (i.e. them) for a night, 43.2 (he) could not find out (anything); 43.3 (he) was afraid of moving.

The following day their teacher said again, “I have been teaching you for two or three years already. Today let’s try and see who can spurt urine farthest.”
She went (and) chopped a small bamboo, inserted in her genital part, (and) competed (to) release urine.

Even her teacher did not spurt as far as she (did).

Her teacher tried two kinds (of tests).

She felt she really could not stay there.

She really wanted to go home.

So Aeng-Doi bought (some) paper, transcribed her part of the textbook (to) take home.
Neither of them could manage to go.

There (they) talked about anything altogether.

Faam-Bae’ said to Aeng-Doi, “When you reach home, remember me.”

Aeng-Doi said to Faam-Bae’, “When you go home, please visit my place.”

But Aeng-Doi knew (that) she and Faam-Bae’ could be husband and wife.

Faam-Bae’ didn’t know (that) Aeng-Doi (was) a girl.

How he would do later, he did not know [i.e. He did not know what would happen to them later].
(He) reckoned (that) Aeng-Doi was really a good friend only.

(When) Aeng-Doi returned home, (she) took off men’s clothes (and) put on women’s clothes, (she) was a beautiful lady.

Days passed by, ‘’Faam-Bae’ had been back to school.

He was really in a sad situation.

(When) Aeng-Doi was there, (they) always had two people, (when they) did whatever, (there were) two; as for sleep(ing), (he) did not sleep.

(When) Aeng-Doi was there, (they) always had two people; (when they) did whatever, (there were) two; as for sleep(ing), (there were) two.
Now he was only by himself, very lonely, very sad; further he said to his teacher (that) he decided (to) go home.

When (he) returned, (he) returned asking; (he) asked about Aeng-Doi’s house.

(He) entered Aeng-Doi’s house, sat down; saw Aeng-Doi came out, (and he) talked with her.

He still could not recognize Aeng-Doi, (he) wondered (and) suspected where she was from.

Her mother and others asked Aeng-Doi, “That (man), (he is) a man of which land?”
Aeng-Doi answered her mother and others, “He is not a stranger. He is…, We studied together in the same school for three years. He is my friend.”

Aeng-Doi’s mother and others believed Aeng-Doi’s words.

Faam-Bae’ didn’t believe yet.

Aeng-Doi said to Faam-Bae’, “We studied in the same school before; that’s me.”

Faam-Bae’ saw that woman, “He would not believe.
"Aeng-Doi said, "If you don’t believe this, let’s open our textbooks (and) compare them (and) see. That time we were in the same school (and) shared the book to read. Now we compare them."

"At that time, in school I thought s/he was a boy, being my playmate. Now I see a woman; I am afraid I must make husband and wife with her, I guess."

"Then Faam-Bae’ became unhappy (and) went home."

"They two indeed took out their books (and) compared, really (they) were right."
(When he) returned home, his heart was sad (and he) only wept and did not eat (anything).

His mother and others asked him, “Why did you come back from the school? Why do you not study? Why are you so skinny? Why do you not say anything?”

He said to his parents (that when) he was studying at school (he) had a friend.

At that time he did not know (she was) a girl, (he) regarded both as boys, made playmates.

They used to study shared a book (to) read; (they) used to write every thing (by) share(ing) a pencil.
At night (when they) slept, (they) shared a bed (to) sleep.

When (he) went to sleep, Aeng-Doi would come back (to their bed room).

He was at home by himself (and) felt very lonely, (he) again visited Aeng-Doi’s house saw a lady; now he wanted to have Aeng-Doi as his wife (so he) asked his parents what to do.

His parents answered Faam-Bae’, “You don't have to worry. Tomorrow we of course will go and help you to find (her).”
The next day, his mother and others [i.e. parents] indeed went to look for (her); as they arrived (they found that) Maajaa [i.e. Maa household] had arranged for a marriage with her first.

Being unable to do anything, Aeng-Doi said, “If you had revisited me three days earlier, you could have engaged me. Now Maajaa has already engaged me.”

There was nothing Aeng-Doi could do about it, (but she) tore her jacket’s long flap (and) got (to) write a letter (on it) (and) let his parents take it home.

His parents took it home actually gave it to Faam-Bae’.
He actually ate the letter.

(It) choked in his throat a needle pierced (his throat) (he) died.

(When) that letter choked (him and he) died, his parents were very sad; (they) went (and) invited a teacher [i.e. priest] searched for a site (to) bury Faam-Bae', (he) treded on (and) got a site (and they) buried (him) at the side of a big road.

And then when it was the day of the wedding, Maajaa and the relatives were taking Aeng-Doi back home [as a bride].
(It) reached the day (that) they would have a wedding. 101.2 the day (when) they send a daughter to marriage, 101.3 they went sending Aeng-Doi.

Their bride was so precious 102.2 (that they) would not let (her) walk on a road, 102.3 (so they) wove a sedan chair (and) carried it.

(As) they carried the sedan chair (and) reached there, 103.2 Faam-Bae’s grave side, 103.3 Aeng-Doi spoke out (and) asked (them to) let her come down to the ground for a while.

They didn’t know [why she asked] 104.2 (but they) actually let Aeng-Doi come down.
(She) went down to the ground, ran down to the lower place (of the road side) to the grave of Faam-Bae’, stamped her feet three times, she said, “If Faam-Bae’ has power and spirit, let the grave door open. If (you) have no power, no spirit, Maajaa is going to take (me) away.”

And indeed, the grave door really opened.

Maajaa’s people (tried to) catch (her) quickly, only managed to catch a bit of her jackets back flap.
FA.110
Maaih deix gorgv,
have some speak
vt adv v
"Mv sienx."
NEG believe
neg vt

Others said, “I don’t believe (it).”

FA.111
Maaz_Jaa mbuo gorgv,
Ma_house PL speak
n.prp pl v
"Mv sienx mv nyungc aeqv, ndaam ciu wetv."
NEG believe this kind TOP carry spade dig
neg vt pn.dem n top vt n vt

People of Maajaa’s household said, “If you don’t believe, why not get a spade and dig the grave?”

FA.112
Ninh_mbuo gengh mingh wetv.
3_PL really go dig
pn.p adv vi vt

They really went down (and) dug.

FA.113
Wetv dangh, wetv tong mc norm zouv aeqv,
dig awhile dig break_open that CLF grave TOP
vt adv v vt pn.dem clf n part

113.1 (They) dug awhile, 113.2 when (they) dug through (and) reached inside the grave, 113.3 (they) saw two butterflies fly up to the sky.

FA.114
Dongh naaic loz-hnoci Aengh*Doih m’daih
that_is that old-days Aeng-Doi from_the_beginning know
idntf pn.dem n n.prp adv vt

114.1 That was exactly what Aeng-Doi had known in the past from the beginning, 114.2 (that) she was destined to marry Faam-Bae’ 114.3 but she did not tell him all.

FA.115
Faam-Baeqv funx ninh zoux a’nziaauc_doic.
Faam-Bae’ assume 3sg BE friend
n.prp vt n.p vi n

Faam-Bae’ considered her as a friend.
FA.116

116.1

Aeng-Doi did not consider Faam-Bae’ as a (mere) friend; (she) knew (that) later they would have to be husband and wife.

FA.117

117.1

Because of that, (though) Maajaa had engaged (with her first) but she was not worried; (she) knew (that after they) died they would be able to marry.

FA.118

118.1

That was what she had written (to) tell Faam-Bae’ (to do) in the letter, (that is, he should) die first (and) wait for her (then) later (they) would marry.

FA.119

Later, (they) really married.

FA.120

Now they are married. Maajaa just completed the arrangements (of his marriage with Aeng-Doi), (but) of course (he) didn’t get to marry her.
Story 6 (AS): “A Story of Aahan”

Aa^han Gouv
Yunh Zoih gorn gv
Yunzoi speak
n.prp v

Yunzoi narrated.

AS.001
1.1
Maaih i_gox mienh za’gengh jomc nyei.
have married_couple person really be_poor PRS.ST
vt n n adv v.st asp

1.1 There was a couple 1.2 (who were) very poor.

AS.002
2.1
Jomc nyei, ninh mingh maaic gong lorz hnaangx nyanc.
be_poor PRS.ST 3sg go sell work look_for rice eat
v.st asp pn.p vi vt n vt n vt

2.1 Poor they were, 2.2 they went (and) did labor for other people 2.3 looked for rice (to) eat [i.e. made their living.]

AS.003
3.1
I_gox ndaam jienv ndaamx
married_couple carry SML.ACT carrying_pole
n vt asp n

3.1 The couple would carry baskets on their shoulders with poles 3.2 just like Northern Thai would do, 3.3 (they) went dangling, dangling and dangling.

AS.004
4.1
Mingh gau hmuangx aqv.
go DPCL dark CHG-O-ST
vi part adj part.asp

4.1 As they went, 4.2 (it) became dark.

AS.005
5.1
Hmuangx aqv, taux wuov ndaamx-jauv,
dark CHG-O-ST reach there half-way
adj part.asp v pn.dem n

5.1 It became dark 5.2 (when they) were on the way, 5.3 (then there was) a granary just like mine, 5.4 it has been built for long time.
6.1 (When they) arrive there, it became dark.

6.2 Ah, wherever (they) went, (they) have not gone as far as to enter a granary (to) sleep.

7.1 They crept into the granary.

7.2 A bear had given birth to a cub (there).

10.1 The bear really ran out (it) wanted (to) bite the couple.

10.2 There was nothing his wife could do, (she) was not strong.

12.1 (She) was carrying things.
(She) swung (it) dangling, dangling, then (she) took her carrying pole like this, that is, her pole was long, (she) released (it and) let (it) go down (and) stamped on this end (and it) came off; (she) stamped on this end let it drop (on the bear) (and it) pierced the bear.

(She) stabbed the bear’s mouth as (she) stabbed, shoved the pole really hard and the bear died.

Then the couple discussed.
They said, "Ah, what shall we do? We don't have a knife or a gun."

If you say… if his wife beat (the bear to death)... her husband would be ashamed more.

(If) say her husband beat… that’s not (that) the husband beat; (the truth is) his wife beat.

But his wife said, “Ah, I am a woman; I’m sure I don’t want an honor. I give it to you, you tell them you beat it."
23.1 Really this time (they) divided up the meat (and) took it (to) give to the governor.

24.1 (They) reached there, the governor asked them, “You don’t have a gun, don’t have a knife. How could you get the bear?”

AS.025

“Oh, we beat (it to death). (We) caught it (and) beat and beat. (We) took a stick and shoved (it) into its mouth repeatedly (and it) died.”

AS.026

“Wow! You are really very strong!”

AS.027

(The governor) entitled that man (to) be Bear the Brave.

AS.028

At this occasion (he) got one considerably big name.
Then another day, like the river down there (where) we ride a boat, there was a kind of crocodile, (which) was big.

People rode a motorboat to pass (the river), pressed down on the boat; it (the crocodile) came out pressed down on the boat; (the boat) turned over (and people) fell off, (to) eat.

There was nothing the Northern Thai people could do about it again.

(We) must go find that Bear the Brave and bring him here to let him catch (the crocodile).

(They) really went to look for (him).
As (they) reach there, (they) again passed (the river) paddling a boat.

As soon as the boat passed to reach the middle of the river, the crocodile, which was really absolutely black and wide, came out.

He was very afraid, (his) body trembled, jerked intensely.

Those people, those who were inside the boat, took spears (and) pierced (it), took guns (and) shot, shot (it and it) died.
“Don’t you yet pierce it.”

“I’m just releasing feces to let it eat.”

“I want to catch it alive.”

“I want to take it bound to show gratitude to the provincial officer.”

“How come you guys pierced it to death?”

He said like that.

Yes, this time (he)’s got to go again.

(He) taking this crocodile (and) went to the provincial office.

(The governor) appointed him again (to) be Suthi the Brave.
Duqv i nom mbux Aa*Han_Mix, Aa*Han_Suv*Tiqc duqv daaih aqv. get two CLF name Bear_the_Brave Suthi_the_Brave get come PFT vt numb clf n n.prp n.prp vt v.asp part.asp

46.1 (He) has got two names, Bear the Brave (and) Suthi the Brave; 46.2 (he) got (them).

Da’nyic hnoi youc maaih diuh domh naang. hlo nyei. second day also have CLF big snake big PRS.ST fall that village person n n seq.mk vt clf adj n v.st asp vi pn.dem n n yietc norm mungv. yietc norm zingh nyei mienh. one CLF town one CLF city POSS people POSS water_source numb clf n nmb clf n poss n poss n

47.1 Then another day, 47.2 there was a gigantic snake, (which) was big 47.3 fell into a city water source for the residents of the whole town, the whole city.

Za’gengh mv duqv wuom nyanc aqv. really NEG get water eat CHG-O-ST adv neg vt n vt part.asp

Indeed, (people) became unable to get the drinking water. (i.e. the water became undrinkable.)

Naang za’gengh hlo haic bieqc gu’nyuoz mingh. snake really big very enter inside go n adv v.st adv vi n v.asp

The really very big snake fell into (the well).

Aengx caangh_laangh naaic laangz mienh. yietc norm fouv-zingh nyei mienh. again discuss that village people one CLF capital_city POSS people adv v pn.dem n n numb clf n poss n

And again the people of that village, of the whole capital discussed.

Hm, maih hah fungc zoux. well... NEG be_able_to how-come do intj neg aux adv vt

Well, there was nothing (they) could do about it.

Aqv_zuqc mingh lorz Aa*Han_Mix, Aa*Han_Suv*Tiqc daaih zorqv hnangv. must go look_for Bear_the_Brave Suthi_the_Brave come take no_other_way aux vi vt n.prp n.prp v.dr vt adv

There is no other way than (we) must go look for Bear the Brave, Suthi the Brave (and ask him to) catch (the snake).
53.1 Mingh lorz ninh mingh taux wuov norm laangz buangh zuqc ninh
vi vt pn.p vi v pn.dem clf n vt part pn.p
53.2 go look_for 3sg go reach that CLF village meet GOAL 3sg
53.3 mingh taux wuov norm laangz buangh zuqc ninh

53.1–53.4 (They) went (to) look for him, went (and) reached that village, found him (there), (he was) like help(ing) you (to) make a fence.

54.1 Yiem wuov weih laatc cipv jienv yie wuov nyungc nzuqc_paiv
vi pn.dem vt n vt asp pn.p pn.dem n n
54.2 be_there there wall_in fence stick DUR 1sg that kind scabbard
54.3 heuc ninh, call 3sg v pn.p

54.1–54.4 Being there, (he was) build(ing) in a fence sticking a scabbard like mine (in his back part of the belt); (and they) called him. (He answered) “Ah, I will go and see that kind (of thing).”

55.1 Ndau juiz deix
land be_steep some
n v.st adv
55.2 eix_leiz wuom-kuotv yiem ndiev maengx ninh yiem jiex maengx.
meaning well exist down_there side 3sg be_in up_there side
n n vi adv.loc n pn.p vi n n
55.1–55.3 The land was steep, which means the well was on the lower side, he was on the upper side.

56.1 Mingh taux yietv ngamv njiec, nzuqc_paiv yietv donx naaiv
vi v adv vi vi n adv vt pn.dem
56.2 go reach as_soon_as squat go_down scabbard as_soon_as hit this
56.3 ninh wuov biu go/nyoz m/aqv.
3sg just that jump inside RSLT
56.4 pn.p adv pn.dem vi n adv

56.1–56.4 (They) went (and) reached (the well), as soon as (he) squatted down his scabbard hit this [i.e. his back], he just fell down there inside (the well).
Wow! The Northern Thai really praised him very much.

Look at him, (he) arrived here (he) immediately jumped into the well.

(He) took the snake by the neck, grabbing (it)

Those people took spears pierced (and) pierced repeatedly (the snake) (and it) died.

Therefore, (the governor) again gave him another title (to) be Snake the Brave.

This time it was really good.

(He) actually got money and clothes.

The governor was really happy about him.

And then another day, again there was a disturbing tiger.
There was a person 66.2 the tiger came (and) bit (him); 66.3 then (it) bit chickens, 66.4 then (it) bit pigs, 66.5 (it) wanted all people!

(They) discussed (saying) Ah, there’s nothing (we) can do (about it).

(We) must go look for Bear the Brave, Snake the Brave, Suthi the Brave and have him catch (the tiger), there is no other way.

And then (they) went (and) found him.

He went down there, like in this village, he went down there at the stream.

In the afternoon of that day, (they) heard (a sound of) the upper village people.
They made a lot of noise chasing the tiger (and they) came.

When they came chasing the tiger (and) reached there, he climbed up a tree (and) stayed above.

Underneath the tree was hollow.

The tiger arrived there slinking along but did not come in (the hole).

(It) did not go anywhere but entered that hole of the tree.

(Its) tail was outside.

The tail was long (and) it stayed outside.

Those people came chasing (it) with a loud noise, came shooting guns.
(As) they come a little closer, he came down a little.

(As) they come a little closer, he came down a little.

It looked like (that) when those people arrived there he ran down pulling the tiger’s tail.

(He) shouted to them, “Come quickly! I’ve just managed to catch the tiger.”

Those people arrived, shooting repeatedly.

(They) pierced and pierced (the tiger) pierced (it) dead.

(He) took it back (to) let the governor look at (it).
The governor furthermore called him Tiger the Brave, Tiger the Brave.

Tiger the Brave got (awarded) four times.

(He) was really strong.

(There) were many fighters, many soldiers; they destroyed everywhere.

There was nothing (he) could do about it.
Ah, (we only) order Bear the Brave, Suthi the Brave, Snake the Brave, Tiger the Brave (to) go (and) catch (the soldiers), there is no other way.

If we don’t, (we) can’t win and then we do not have magic here.

The governor’s people) went far down there (and) finished talk (with the brave man); on the slope on the opposite side of the great mountain.

From there as he went up there, there was one kind of fern.

Among the trees here a kind of fern traversed completely.

He climbed up sitting there.

The numerous soldiers really came.
Many thousand, (or we) don’t know if it was how many thousand, how many ten-thousand.

Didn’t know where they stayed either.

(They) went (and) were resting at the tree base, numerously resting there.

They were there (and they) discussed (i.e. they were discussing there).

“Oh, it’s scary! We are not afraid of the village people, we are not afraid of the people of the city. We only fear Snake the Brave, Bear the Brave.”

He could hear (the soldiers’ conversation) staying above.

“Oh! If (we) get Bear the Brave, Snake the Brave killed, the people of the whole village are not enough for us to eat for breakfast.”
He was terrified very much, terrified so much (that his) body trembled, clinging to a tree.

(His) body trembled much continuously.

(The area was) all white (with) the soldiers (holding) spears (and) guns, (they) were there cook (ing) food.

As for him, his body trembled terribly.

As for this place, we are here, (we) suspect (that) they won’t come here.

If (they) really come here, (we) don’t have guns, don’t have swords.

Can't do anything.
Suddenly they saw (the brave man) fall down. (they) were really terrified very much.

He was scared very much.

His body trembled very much.

The fern cracked down, so (he) zoomed down to the ground with a sound of spurting air.

He couldn’t help.

(He) got up quickly clapped (his) hands beat (his) thighs.

“Bear the Brave, Snake the Brave, Suthi the Brave, that’s me myself!”
(Even though) today (he) is alive, since he frightened them today, let's see, we only discuss here, there is no way to describe where he flew from.

(He) didn't remember to look at the fern.

Oh! (they) ran away, so he took the soldier's guns and shoot repeatedly, and chased them away furiously.

Then he further carried their guns.

They all ran away.

(He) went back carrying the guns on his shoulders, and let the governor look (at them).
(He) shot (and) defeated (them) all, they all completely ran away.

The officer then let the people go get (their) guns and other things and come back.

Then this time, (the governor) assigned one corner of a region (with) one capital city (to) let him make a living.

Really he also became big.

Before that the couple was really very poor.

I have told you.
Story 7 (BS): “A Story of Big Snake”

Big snake

BS.001

1.1 Lox-hnoi maah dauh ong yungz dupv siec dauh sieqv.
old-days have CLF old_man give_birth get seven CLF daughter n vt clf n vt n clf n

1.3 dorh hlo daaah.
raise big come vt v.st vi

1.1 In the old days, there was an old man; 1.2 (he) begat seven daughters 1.3 (and he) raised them (that they become) big.

BS.002

2.1 Ninh_mbuo lueic, mv oix zoux gong.
3.PL lazy NEG like do work pn.p v.st neg v.mod vt n

2.1 They were lazy, 2.2 (they) didn’t want to work.

BS.003

3.1 Ninh die buatc ninh_mbuo lueic hai oc ziouc mingh mangc ndsu.
3sg father see 3.PL lazy very so go look land pn.p n v pn.p v.st adv seq.mk vi vt n

3.1 Their father saw that they were very lazy, 3.2 he then went to look at a piece of land.

BS.004

4.1 Mangc duqv siec norm zorng, siec norm horngz aeqv,
look can seven CLF mountain seven CLF gully TOP v v.aux n clf n n clf n top

4.2 4.3 nzoux daaah, ziouc gongv mbuox ninh sieqv mbuo,
return come so_then speak tell 3sg daughter PL v vi seq.mk v vt pn.p n pn

4.1 (He) could look at seven mountains and seven gullies, 4.2 (he) came back; 4.3 (he) then spoke (and) told his daughters, “Tomorrow go and clear a field. You must clear (it) all day until (you get it) done.”
The following day, then, his daughters went.

If (they) did not complete (and) cut, 5.2 (and they) would come back, 5.3 he would want to kill his daughters.

The following day, then, his daughters went.

The whole day (they) finished cleared all, 7.2 (they) then came back, 7.3 (they) spoke (and) told their father, “We have cleared them all. Dad, tomorrow (you) do all day until (it will be) complete.”

The following morning, their father ate a breakfast, 8.2 (he) then sharpened (his) axe; 8.3 (he) carried (it) on shoulder (and he) went 8.4 (to) start chopping a tree.
When he arrived at the mountain-field, he saw many trees, he became worried (that he would) not manage to cut (them).

He then one time cried, one time called (i.e. crying and calling] (to) the world, whoever wants a wife, come help him cut down the tree.

(When he) called, then soon (he) saw (that) a big snake came.

(When it) came (and) reached (to the man), then (it) asked him why (he was) crying.

He said, “Very sad (that) I can’t cut the tree down completely. Later when it’s dark, when I return home, my daughters would not give me food to eat.”
The big snake then said, “Don’t be sad. I will help you cut down. You stay back. You go up there, the upper field and watch me.”

It [snake] then took that old man’s axe, went down to the lower field, then began to cut down.

(Cutting) one tree (was a matter of) just one stroke (of the axe).

(II) came up to the upper field, then (he) threw down the axe, so the tree snapped completely.

(The snake) cut down (the tree) completely, (but it) was not so dark (yet).
Then this old man returned carrying the big snake.

(When he) returned to the door front, he ordered his first daughter (to) open the door (to) let the big snake enter.

His first daughter then said, “I won’t open. A big snake is very ugly. How can a big snake enter the house?”

(He) further called his second daughter to come (and) open (the door).

The second daughter also said in the same way, “I won’t open.”

(He) called as far as the Third daughter.
(She) could not help; 25.2 (she) went crying 25.3 (and) opened the door (to) let the big snake come in.

Her father again ordered the third daughter (to) take a stool (to) let the big snake elder brother sit.

The third daughter further said, “How can a big snake ever know sitting on a stool?"

(He) further order the second daughter to take (a stool).

The second daughter also said in the same way (that she would) not take (a stool).
(He) called as far as the third daughter; 31.2 (she) could not do anything [to reject him], 31.3 (she) then went crying 31.4 (and) took the stool (and) came 31.5 (and) let the big snake elder brother sit on it.

(He) further ordered the first daughter 32.2 (to) make a fire (i.e. make a fire) 32.3 (and) boil water 32.4 (to) let the big snake elder brother take a bath.

The first daughter said (that) she would not boil.

How can a big snake possibly take shower, I wonder.

(He) further ordered the second daughter 35.2 (and) (she) in the same way said 35.3 (that) she would not boil (water).
(He) further called as far as the third daughter also could not do anything.

No matter how much (she) hated (it), (she) had to go crying to heat up water (to) let the snake take a shower.

(When she) boiled (it) and finished pouring (into a basin), (she) then called the snake (to) go and take a shower.

The big snake went (and) took a shower.

The third daughter then thought about, “Ah, (my) father no matter what orders me to go and follow the snake only.”

She then went (to) inspected (and) saw (that) the snake washing himself.

(Shes) looked (and) saw (that) it was not a snake, (but) that (it) was a good man.
In a short while, when (it became) time (to) eat rice [i.e. have a meal], her father called the first daughter again (to) prepare a meal (to) let the snake elder brother eat.

The first daughter said again, “I won’t prepare (anything). How could a big snake possibly know eating rice?”

Their father order again the second daughter to prepare (food).

The second daughter also said in the same way (that) she would not look for (food).
Now matter how she dislike (the idea), (as to the degree of her) crying, even if so, (she) had to go and find food (to) let the snake eat.

(After they) finished having a meal, their father told again the first daughter (to) lay out [a bed or mattress on the] place [for the big snake to sleep on] (to) let the big snake sleep.

The first daughter said, “I won’t overlay (a mattress). How come I should overlay a place for a big snake to sleep? Can’t it just coil around on the ground there?”

(He) again ordered her younger sister, the second daughter, (to) go and overlay a (sleeping) place.
(He) again ordered his third daughter to go and overlay.

As for the third daughter, no matter how (she) disliked [the idea], and yet (she) could not do anything [to reject it].

(She) had to listen to her father’s word (and she) went (to) overlay a place.

The big snake told the third daughter, “You don’t have to specially overlay (a bed). Just pick up a woven tray and put it there; that’s just fine.”

So the third daughter went and took a woven tray hither, (and she) placed it in the central part of the house, (and) said to the big snake, “Elder brother! You must be tired. Come and lie down.”
Then the snake slitheringly went into the woven tray thither, (and it was) coiling around in the woven tray, (was) sleeping inside the woven tray there.

The following morning, (after they) ate breakfast, their father then told the First daughter, saying, “Wrap your blanket, and follow the big snake to be his wife.”

The first daughter said, “How come I should go? The big snake is terribly ugly. I won’t marry (it).”

(He) further appointed the second daughter to go and follow the big snake elder brother.
The second daughter also said in the same way (that) she would not go.

Again (he) appointed the third daughter.

(She) could not do anything, (she) got up crying (and) went, folded up a blanket (and) following the big snake went.

She used (her) big toe clawed the big snake’s tail. (i.e. clawed the big snake’s tail with her toe.

The snake turned around hither (and) looked (at her) well; then said to her, “Don’t do that.”
She said, “I just forgot to look; it’s only I accidentally stepped on you.”

The snake went (on) again.

(They) went for a while, \(^7\) she immediately clawed (it) again.

The snake turned around toward (her and) said, “Don’t do that! Next time I will do it to you. Then you will cry, ‘Oh, it hurts!’”

She said again, “Can’t you see it’s an accident!”

The snake also didn’t say anything either \(^7\) (but) again went on.
The third time [when she clawed it], then it (the snake) turned around toward (her) \(^{74.2}\) (and) pecked her (in the) knee.

So she said (that it) hurt very much, \(^{75.2}\) (and she) rolled in, rolled out, \(^{75.3}\) cried (and) said, “It hurts very much. I can’t go any longer.”

The snake turned around again (and) came back, \(^{76.2}\) spat saliva \(^{76.3}\) helped her smeared \(^{76.3}\) then (the wound) got healed.

And then (she) got up (and) went following the snake.

When (they) went, \(^{78.2}\) as (they) reached a stream, \(^{78.3}\) it (snake) spoke (and) told its wife \(^{78.4}\) (that she should) stay there at the side of the stream (and) wait for him.
It went to the side of the valley (and) washed (his) body [i.e. took shower].

“You stay here. (If) you see water coming out with its colors in green, red, yellow and blue, don’t put your finger in it.”

(He) finished telling (her), then he has gone.

His wife was there.

Soon, (she) saw (the colored water) came out.

She saw (that) the water was very beautiful, so she pointed her finger (into the water); (she) really kept her finger touching (the water).
When she saw her husband come out, it frightened her, hid her finger, did not let her husband see it.

When her husband reached hither, then ordered his wife (to) give him her finger (to) look at.

His wife would not let him look at (it).

When (he) asked, (she) therefore let him look at (it).

Actually the finger is attached (to the hand).
(They) married for three years, (she) gave birth and got a baby son.

(she was) carrying her baby on the back, then (she) returned home to pay respect to her parents after the wedding.

(She) returned (and) reached her father’s house, (she) was staying there for three days.

Her elder sister then deceived her younger sister (and) said, “There are very delicious fruits down there near the pond. I want to go get fruits and eat.”

Her younger sister said, “I can’t go carrying my baby on my back.”

Her elder sister, the second one, said, “Don’t be afraid, we can go.”
(She) could not do anything; she went following (them and) reached a root of the fruit (tree).

Then as her elder sister promised (to) help her younger sister carry the baby, (she, i.e. the elder sister) called her younger sister (to) climb the tree (and) pick fruits.

Her younger sister said, “I can’t go up.”

Her elder sister said, “You can go up.”

So her sister climbed up.

She climbed up to the end of a branch.
Her elder sister stayed at the root of the tree, then (she) pinched the baby (and made the baby) cry, then (she) lied (and) deceived her younger sister (and) said, “(Your) baby wants (your) bracelet and silver necklace.”

Her younger sister then took (them off and) threw down (and) finished giving (them).

She pinched again for the second time, the baby cried again.

Her elder sister said again, “The baby wants a silver chain (and) earring, he’s saying.”

Her younger sister gave (them) down (toward) again.

Again (the baby) for the third time, her elder sister said, “The baby wants a turban (and) waist sash.”
She said for the fourth time, “(The baby) wants (your) clothes.”

(When) the elder sister talked about these things, her younger sister said, “How come I can give (them)? (I) feel ashamed very much.”

Her elder sister said, “Don’t be afraid. There are no people around us, only us. No shame, you can give them all.”

So her younger sister gave up all of her dress.

In the fifth time, the elder sister said again, “The baby wants that bunch of fruits at the end of the branch down there, he said.”
The younger sister said, “I can’t go.”

The elder sister said, “Yes, you can; just creep and go.”

Her younger sister then went creeping (and) reached the end of the branch.

Her elder sister then cut down the tree at its base; then the tree fell down.

Her younger sister then crashed down into the pond, then died there in the pond.
Then her elder sister took her younger sister’s clothes and the whole set of dress (and) put them on; (she) then carrying the baby went home.

The younger sister’s husband also knew [what had happened] but he did not say anything.

At night when they went to bed, her husband then asked her, “A couple evenings before you offered your hair to me as a pillow. Tonight why do you not offer?”
His wife answered him (and) said, “Oh, I don’t have hair. When I came home, (I found) they were lazy, they didn’t cook rice. As I cooked rice, the fire singed all my hair.”

Her husband didn’t say anything.

Then the following morning they folded blankets very early and went home. Her husband then ordered his wife (to) go (and) open the bedroom door.

His wife (tried to) open (the door) and yet (it) would not open. Her husband further went (to) help his wife (and it) opened.
BS.128

128.1 Ninh nqox aengx heuc ninh auv koi faang koi kapv. 3sg husband further order 3sg wife open box open woven_basket_with_a_lid

128.2 pn.p n adv v pn.p n vt n vt n

128.1 Her husband called his wife again 128.2 (to) open the box 128.3 (and) open the basket.

BS.129

Koi yaac maiv nqoi. open and_yet NEG be_apart

vt top neg vi

(She tried to) open but (they) would not open.

BS.130

Wuov nzunc hnoi ninh nqox zibuc gorngv, this-time 3sg husband so_then speak

adv.tmp pn.p n seq.mk v

"Yietc_gau meih koi duqv koi nqoi. usually 2sg open managed_to be_apart

adv pn.p vt vt vi

Lh_muonz meih fih_ryungc koi maiv nqoi aqv?" tonight 2sg why open NEG be_apart CHG-O-ST

adv.tmp pn.p q vt neg vi part.asp

This time her husband then said, “Usually you can manage to open. Tonight how come you became unable to open?”

BS.131

Ninh auv dau ninh nqox gorngv, 3sg wife answer 3sg husband speak

pn.p n vt pn.p n v

"Maiv hiuv. NEG know

neg v

Naaiv hieh_guav ga’haaiv weic_haaix_ryungc koi mv nqoi my_bei.” this monster why open NEG be_apart I wander

pn.dem n q vt neg vi part.f

His wife answered her husband (and) said, “I don’t know. I wonder why these monster things won’t open.”

BS.132

132.1 Ninh nqox aengx mingh tengx ninh koi, 3sg husband again go help 3sg open

pn.p n adv vi vt pn.p vt

132.2 aengx zorqv koi nqoi nzengc m’aqv. again take open be_apart consumed RSLT

adv vt vt vi vi asp

132.1 Her husband went again (and) helped her open, 132.2 (he) again took (it) open completely.
The following morning (he) again ordered his wife (to) go (and) call [domestic] animals [to come for feeding].

His wife further (i.e. indeed) went (and) called animals.

[Though she] called (animals), even one kind (of animal) did not return.

[None of] a cow, a horse, a chicken or a pig did not return.

Her husband said againin, “This morning why don’t the animals you take care of every morning return?”

His wife answered, “I don’t know. I wonder why a dead person or an animal won’t return at all this morning?”
Her husband again went (and) helped her call (the animals to return) then all the animals came back.

This time, he has got a permanent servant (to) help him.

Then his servant went (to) cut horse grass, (and he) heard (that) there was a dove coming (and it) called (and) said, “Horse grass servant, servant! A baby is crying in the house or not?”

So the servant became sad very much, (he) did not cut horse grass, (he) only listened to the bird crying.”

In one day (till) dark, (he) could cut only one unit of horse grass.
(When he) came back, the horse did not have enough food.

His employer scolded him.

He said, “There are too many prickly thatch, I can’t cut much [horse grass].”

So his employer gave him (a pair of) shoes (he) went wearing (them) (to) cut.

(He) went to the place to cut horse grass, (he) again heard that bird cry again.

He again listened to the bird cry(ing), (he) did not have a peaceful heart (to) cut (grass).
The whole day till dark (he) got only one unit of grass (and) returned, and the horse did not have enough (to) eat.

His employer scolded him again.

He said again, “There are lots of thorns; I can’t cut (grass).”

He further gave him clothes.

The following day, he went taking (the clothes) (to) cut.
He listened to the bird again, the whole day till dark (he) could cut only one unit of horse grass (and) took it back (home); and the horse did not have enough (to) eat.

His employer scolded him again, “Why do you not cut horse grass?”

He said again, “The sunshine is too severe, I can’t cut. I only hide myself in the shade.”

His employer further gave him a hat (to) put on.

The third day he further went putting on the hat (and) cut.
(he) went the whole day till dark, yet (he) got only one unit of horse grass, returned home carrying it.

His employer scolded him again.

So he had no excuse to say anything; he therefore said to his employer, “There is nothing but because the bird came frequently and cries on a tree above me. As soon as I reach there, then the bird cries.”

His employer asked him, “How did the bird cry?”
His servant then said, “The bird cried ‘A horse grass servant, servant! Is the baby crying in the house?’”

Then his employer thought that might be his wife.

Then his servant said, “If you don’t believe (me), come with me tomorrow. Don’t kill me yet, now. Tomorrow, when you and I go together, if the bird still does not cry, then of course you can kill me.”

The following morning his employer then went following him.

(They) went to the place where he stayed every day, but the bird wouldn’t make its call.
His employer said, “Well…you said that a bird cries. But today it doesn’t.”

So the employer pulled out a knife (and) wanted to kill him.

His servant said, “Don’t kill me yet! Wait for a second.”

Then he called out, “You, that bird! If you have life and spirit, come quickly and cry. You cried and entice me to be sad everyday, making me unable to cut grass for horses to eat. Now, come out quickly to let my employer listen to you. Otherwise, he is about to kill me.”
This time the bird actually flew in and it sat on a branch above, then cried there.

Then the bird really flew in, (it) sat on his palm; then following the sleeve came in, entered a pocket.

So he took it home.
The following morning, his wife got up carrying the baby; before she helped wash her baby’s face, the baby cried.

His wife was not good at soothing the baby, (she) took the baby (and) let him look at the bird; (the baby) went very close (to the bird); the bird looked (at the baby) and felt very sorry the baby had a lot of eye mucus.

Then she from inside the cage thrust out her neck (and) help her baby picked eye-mucus.

As soon as (she) thrust out her neck, (she) only pecked her baby’s eye mucus.
His wife said, “That ghost bird is only pecking my baby’s eye blind.”

Then she just beat the bird to death.

This time her husband further took (the dead bird), dressed the meat (to) eat, (he) further gave his wife to eat.

When her husband ate (it), (it) tasted delicious.

When his wife ate (it), (it) was not delicious.

(When) her husband ate (it) (it was) sweet; (when) his wife ate (it), (it was) very bitter and also rough (so she) could not swallow (it).
His wife took, sprinkled, threw (it) away, (it) further sprouted a bitter vegetable (and it) grew.

His husband again picked (it) up (and) cooked (and) ate (it), and (it) was delicious (and) sweet.

His wife ate but not delicious, (it was) bitter; (she) threw (it) away again.

Again (it) came out as a mustard green.

Her husband picked (it) again, cooked (and) ate (it), and (it) was delicious.

His wife ate (it) and (it was) not delicious, (it was) bitter.
She sprinkled, threw (it) away again to the lower side of the house. (it) further became a bamboo.

This time her husband did not pick (it).

Her husband then enclosed (it).

Later (when) this bamboo grew tall, its middle part became swollen up; he did not cut it.

Those people had a non-Mienh old woman.

Every morning (she) would come to this employer’s house (to) get fire.

(As she) took (the fire) till the last morning (she) came to take very early.
(She was) taking the fire, went back as far as the bamboo root three times.

This time, this employer then said, “You! (I) gave (you) the alive charcoal, but you!, you always let (it) die. This time (I will) give you the cold charcoal. You take it with you, try and see if it can burn or not.”

So this old woman went back taking the dead charcoal.

Then this old woman took (it) returned home, (and) lit the fire.

She returned again (and) hacked this bamboo (and) brought (it) back; (and) split it open then saw that the wife was inside.
Then she took (her and) kept (her) in the woven basket.

Her fire would not die permanently.

Later a son of the shop owner went to that old woman's house for a visit.

(He) saw a daughter living in this old woman’s house.

But (though) he visited her repeatedly, (he) still would go home.

Later, he wouldn't go home.

(It became) all dark, yet (he) would not go home.

His father went (to) look for (and brought him) came back.

He said he wanted to beat him.
He said, “Don’t beat (me). In that old woman’s house there is a beautiful woman just like my mother. She weaves clothes in that old woman’s place. She tells me to pick up things to hand over to her, or give water for her to drink. When she weaves cloth her thread often falls [on the floor]. She would tell me to pick it up to give her and to help other things.”

He said, “Then, do you see that she looks like your mother?”

He said, “Looks like.”

That old woman did not have anything, (she) only had a castrated pig.
So the employer made a plan (and) told the old woman (to) kill a pig (to) eat a birthday meal.

Otherwise, there was no way.

He then told that old woman to kill a pig to have a birthday feast.

The old woman had nothing to do (about it), (she) had to listen to his words, then killed (the pig and) prepared meal (to) eat.

(When she) finished preparing the delicious vegetables (and) delicious rice, [i.e. finished preparing a delicious meal or a feast] being at the base of the table (she) told him (to) come to have a meal.

So he went.
When (he) went there, 228.2 the old woman, 228.3 because (she) had a woven basket at the tail of the table, 228.4 his real wife is inside the woven basket.

That’s why he wanted to sit close to that woven basket.

The old woman said (that she would) not let him sit at the tail of the table, 230.2 and yet he would not listen (to her).
So he sat close to this woven basket, \( \text{\textsuperscript{232.2}} \) (he) ate food there; \( \text{\textsuperscript{232.3}} \) one time (he) ate food, \( \text{\textsuperscript{232.4}} \) one time the wife \( \text{\textsuperscript{232.5}} \) used a needle \( \text{\textsuperscript{232.6}} \) (and) pricked him [i.e. each time he ate food, the wife pricked him with a needle].

\( \text{\textsuperscript{233.1}} \) (When she) pricked (him) first time, \( \text{\textsuperscript{233.2}} \) he didn’t say anything.

\( \text{\textsuperscript{234.1}} \) (She) pricked (him) second time, \( \text{\textsuperscript{234.2}} \) then he turned around (and) looked.

\( \text{\textsuperscript{235.1}} \) (He) looked (at it) for a while, \( \text{\textsuperscript{235.2}} \) then said, “I wonder what this basket has (in it); it stung me.”

The old woman said, “Nothing. The woven basket is just empty.”

\( \text{\textsuperscript{237.1}} \) He didn’t say anything \( \text{\textsuperscript{237.2}} \) (but) started to eat the meal again.
The third time (he) felt (being) pricked, then he did not listen (to the old woman), stood up (and) wanted (to) open the woven basket (to) look (inside).

The old woman said, “There is nothing in it.”

Then the old woman embraced (the basket), not letting (him) open.

He also would not listen.

So he opened (it) then saw his wife was inside; then he (decided to) take her (to) go home, (he) didn’t eat the meal any more.
When (they) returned home, her elder sister saw (that) her younger sister was very beautiful.

She saw her younger sister had been reincarnated (to) come back.

She didn’t have an excuse.

She said, “Oh, M’Faam, you are very beautiful. How could you become as beautiful as this?”

Her younger sister, the third one, then said, “You see I am white; do you think I am beautiful?”

Her sister said, “You are beautiful.”
Her younger sister said, “If you want (to be) white (and) beautiful, boil three buckets of water.”

Then she told her younger sister, “Finished.”

Then her younger sister told her elder sister, “You get into the barrel to check it; Perhaps the barrel might be broken, I wonder.”

So her elder sister got inside (and) saw, said, “It’s not broken. Water won’t leak.”

Her younger sister ladled boiled water (and) poured into (the barrel).

Then her elder sister, in the water barrel, thrashed about (and) died.
The story of the Big Snake has finished.

As for her elder sister, (she) was boiled to death; (she) didn’t become anything.

Her younger sister died three times and could come back to life again.

Her elder sister died once, but could not become (even) one kind of bug.

The story of the Big Snake has finished.


---
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