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ABSTRACT

Little research has been produced on Participant/Topic (P/T) reference pattern analysis in colloquial Burmese. This study analyzes macrostructure, P/T reference patterns, correspondence between macrostructure and P/T reference patterns, and the use of Discourse Markers (DMs) that link information above the sentence level as they are found in two Christian sermons preached in colloquial Burmese.

The list of P/T reference resources found in the data includes Noun phrase, Attributive clause + 3P Pronoun, Pronoun, Demonstrative Pronoun, Zero reference and a subset of Zero reference, Zero cataphora.

For macrostructure analysis, Breeze’s message framework (as cited in Levinsohn, 2015b), and Levinsohn’s terminology and methods (2015b) are used. As for identifying the boundaries, global topic and local topics, Van Dijk’s criterion for grouping sentences and rules of information reduction (van Dijk, 1977) are used. Modified forms of Grimes’ span analysis (1972, p. 106-109) are used for analyzing the way P/Ts are mentioned first in the data and the number of times they are mentioned. For analyzing P/T reference patterns, Levinsohn’s (2015a) methods which are based on the methods proposed by Dooley and Levinsohn (2000) are adapted and used. The P/T reference strategies found in the data are sequential look-backward strategy and sequential look-forward strategy. Discourse Participants are encoded
differently than general P/Ts. Although the default encoding rules account for the most occurrences of Subjects and Non-Subjects, other factors such as activation state, semantic or grammatical ambiguity, boundary, emphasis, requirement to follow grammar, whether the referents are already mentioned at the beginning of the sentence or not, preference of the speakers, and the identity of the P/Ts impact the P/T reference patterns in predictable ways.

In Sermon 1, 38 different DMs are found, while in Sermon 2, 46 different DMs are found. The rate of occurrence of DMs in Sermon 1 and Sermon 2 is found to be very similar, one DM for 4 sentences in Sermon 1 and one DM for 3.9 sentences in Sermon 2. The DMs [dɔ́], [lɛ] and [dà.pè.mɛ́] are found to be the most commonly used DMs in both Sermon 1 and Sermon 2.

The data from Sermon 1 show that DM [dɔ́] is used as an anaphoric reference in most cases, and a cataphoric reference in a few cases. Although [cá.dɔ́] is similar in meaning to [dɔ́], it is not frequently used by the preachers. The DM [lɛ] functions as a DM for anaphoric reference in all cases in both sermons except for one instance of cataphoric reference in Sermon 2. The synonymous DMs, 1. [dà.pè.nɛ́], 2. [dà.pè.mɛ́], 3. [dà.pè.nɛ́.nɔ̀] and 4. [dà.pè.mɛ́.nɔ̀], function as anaphoric references and “Contrastive Information Markers”. However, it seems like 1. [dà.pè.nɛ́], the variant of 2. [dà.pè.mɛ́], and 3. [dà.pè.nɛ́.nɔ̀], the variant of 4. [dà.pè.mɛ́.nɔ̀], from Sermon 1 could be the idiolect or dialect of the preacher of Sermon 1 because only 2. [dà.pè.mɛ́] is found in Sermon 2.
บทคัดย่อ

มีงานวิจัยภาษาพูดพม่าจำนวนน้อยที่ได้สร้างขึ้นจากการวิเคราะห์ข้อมูลในรูปแบบการอ้างอิงจากผู้เข้าร่วมในฐานะผู้ช่วยงานวิจัยซึ่งได้ดำเนินการวิเคราะห์ข้อมูลจากผู้เข้าร่วมในฐานะผู้ช่วยวิจัย และความสัมพันธ์ระหว่างโครงสร้างภาษาและข้อมูลจากการอ้างอิงจากผู้เข้าร่วมในฐานะผู้ช่วยงานวิจัย และการใช้ดัชนีปริเฉทในการเชื่อมโยงข้อมูลข้างต้นในระดับประโยค จากระหว่างค่าคุณศาสตร์ของเครื่องมือสื่อแบบในภาษาพูดพม่า

รายการของแหล่งข้อมูลจากการอ้างอิงจากผู้เข้าร่วมในฐานะผู้ช่วยงานวิจัยที่พบในข้อมูลประกอบด้วย:
1. คุณประโยค สมรสนานบุรุษที่สัมมนา สำนักงานปฐมพุทธศักราช สำนักงานที่ปรึกษาศาสตร์ สำนักงานคุณธรรม และเซตย่อยของสรรพนามบุรุษ และการอ้างนิยม
กฎการเข้ารหัสเริ่มต้นจะเป็นเหตุให้เกิดหัวข้อย่อยและที่ไม่ใช่หัวข้อย่อยมากที่สุด ปัจจัยอื่นๆ เช่น สถานการใช้งาน ความคุมเครื่องในความหมายและไวยากรณ์ ชอบเขต ความสัมพันธ์ ความต้องการที่จะปฏิบัติตามหลักไวยากรณ์ ไม่ว่าจะเป็นผู้ถูกอ้างอิงจะถูกกล่าวถึงที่จุดเริ่มต้นของประโยค หรือไม่ก็ตาม ความชอบของผู้ที่ดู และแคละแนวภาพของผู้เข้าร่วมในฐานะนั้นจะเกิดขึ้นวิจัย สำนวนผลต่อรูปแบบการอ้างอิงผู้เข้าร่วมในฐานะนั้นจะมีการแสดงคำการณ์ได้

ในคำเทศนาที่หนึ่ง พบคณิตปริเฉท38จุด ในขณะที่คณิตปริเฉท46จุด ความถี่สัมพันธ์ของปริเฉทในคำเทศนาที่หนึ่งและคำเทศนาที่สองมีลักษณะคล้ายคลึงกันมาก ปริเฉทนั้นปรากฏในทุกๆประโยคนาคำเทศนาที่หนึ่งและปริเฉทนั้นปรากฏในทุกๆ36.9 ประโยคนาคำเทศนาที่สอง ปริเฉท[dɔ́], [le] และ [dà.pè.mɛ́] เป็นปริเฉทที่ถูกพบมากที่สุดในคำเทศนาที่หนึ่งและคำเทศนาที่สอง
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# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGR</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attrib.</td>
<td>Attributive marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE</td>
<td>Case marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLF</td>
<td>Classifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONN</td>
<td>Connector or Discourse Marker that connects sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONT</td>
<td>Continuous aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECL</td>
<td>Declarative mood marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOP</td>
<td>Department of Population from Myanmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Discourse Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVC</td>
<td>Dependent Verb Clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>END</td>
<td>A term of endearment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP</td>
<td>Emphatic marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>Euphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCL</td>
<td>A sound made as an exclamation because of fear, surprise or pain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>Future Tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HON</td>
<td>Honorific particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>Imperative mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTR</td>
<td>Interrogative mood marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRR</td>
<td>Irrealis mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLC</td>
<td>Myanmar Language Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC&lt;sup&gt;Time&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Noun Clause that indicate time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOMI</td>
<td>Nominalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Noun Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJ</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OED</td>
<td>Oxford English Dictionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1P</td>
<td>1st person pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2P</td>
<td>2nd person pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3P</td>
<td>3rd person pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFV</td>
<td>Perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phr</td>
<td>Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>Possessive marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN</td>
<td>Pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL.Male</td>
<td>A particle that shows politeness, used by males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>Politeness particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>Past tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/T</td>
<td>Participant/Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTCL</td>
<td>Particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUOT</td>
<td>Quotation marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFL</td>
<td>Reflexive case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLT</td>
<td>Relativizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBJ</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Zero reference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# GLOSSARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activation States</td>
<td>The state of a referent which can be given, semi-active or new depending on whether it is accessible to a listener or not (Chafe, 1994, p. 73).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activation Cost</td>
<td>Mental effort needed to change the activation state of a referent. Given information is least costly, semi-active information is somewhat more costly and new information is the most costly of all (Chafe, 1994, p. 73).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral discourse</td>
<td>A broad category including exhortation, eulogy and political speeches of candidates. It deals with how people did or should behave (Longacre, 1996, p. 9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrastiveness</td>
<td>The phenomena in which contrastive information tends to receive a primary accent (emphasis) even though the information is already active (Chafe, 1994, p. 77).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td>A term used in linguistics to refer to a continuous stretch of language larger than a sentence (Crystal, 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Marker</td>
<td>Connectives that are used to signal discourse structure and to link information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse participant</td>
<td>The preacher and the audience, i.e. the 1st and 2nd persons involved in the discourse event. (See Chapter 4 for more information)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General participant</td>
<td>Other 3rd person Participants/Topics (P/Ts) that are not Discourse participants. (See Chapter 4 for more information)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global topic</td>
<td>The topic under which a sequence of local topics can be grouped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifiability</td>
<td>The property of a referent based on which a speaker assumes whether a referent is identifiable for the listener or not (Chafe, 1994, p. 93).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local topic</td>
<td>The topic under which a sequence of sentences can be grouped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant/Topic</td>
<td>Non-abstract referents/abstract referents which are mentioned inside the sermons by the preachers. For example – Non-abstract referents: preacher, audience, God, etc. Abstract referents: faith, grace, sin etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referential Importance</td>
<td>The importance of a referent to the subject matter being verbalized (Chafe, 1994, p. 88).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting points</td>
<td>A subject referent to which new information is attached (Chafe, 1994, p. 83).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1
Introduction

Little research has been done in the areas of Participant/Topic (P/T) reference pattern and Discourse Markers with a focus on the behavioral genre. To fill the need in this area, this study analyzes macrostructure, P/T reference patterns, correspondence between macrostructure and P/T reference patterns, and the use of Discourse Markers (DMs) that link information above the sentence level.

This chapter includes background information about this study, the objectives of this thesis, a review of literature on Discourse Analysis, a brief description of the classification of the Burmese language, a presentation of the criteria used for data selection, background information about the preachers, a discussion of the scope of the study, a classification of the words and an explanation of the transcription system relevant to this research paper. The organization of the thesis is also previewed.

1.1 Background

Based on four years of personal translation experience and the things learned from other translators who have years of experience translating and training other translators, this researcher learned that woodenly translating a noun from a source language into a noun in a receptor language and a pronoun into a pronoun does not always produce a translation that is natural in the receptor language. Sometimes, translating in this manner can even produce a translation that is hard to understand, in part because it is difficult to keep track of the Participants/Topics (P/Ts) in a text. It is also realized that most translators, especially those with little or no translation experience, tend to focus on the word, phrase and sentence levels but not on levels above the sentence. In trying to solve issues like these, questions naturally arise such as “What is the default and natural way to refer to P/Ts that are found as Subjects or Non-Subjects throughout a text?”, “What are the commonly used discourse markers (DMs) in Burmese?” and “How often do these DMs tend to be used to link sentences in a text?”
Little research has been published in the area of discourse analysis of Participant/Topic reference patterns, macrostructure, boundaries and use of discourse markers (DM) in behavioral discourse of colloquial Burmese. For this reason, the focus of this thesis is chosen to be on Participant/Topic reference patterns, macrostructure, boundaries and the use of discourse markers in the behavioral discourse of colloquial Burmese.

1.2 Objectives
Objectives for this present research help to guide the parameters of this thesis. These objectives include the following.

- To discover the natural Participant reference patterns of the selected sermons, utilizing an analytical method based on several approaches.
- To discover the macrostructure of each sermon and the relationship between the macrostructure and the Subject and Non-Subject reference patterns if there is any.
- To identify all Discourse Markers that are used to signal discourse structure and to link information above the sentence level, to discover the rate of occurrence of DMs used in the selected sermons and to identify the most commonly used DMs.
- To apply the findings from this research to a text previously translated by another translator and comment on the translation.

1.3 Literature review on discourse analysis
The definitions given in Oxford online English Dictionary (OED, 2017), accessed on May 12, 2017, for the word “Discourse” is “A connected series of utterances: a text or conversation”. In a dictionary of linguistics and phonetics (Crystal, 2008), the definition of the word “Discourse” is more specific: “A term used in linguistics to refer to a continuous stretch of language larger than a sentence”.

In the 1960s and earlier years, the focus of structural linguistic research was largely focused on linguistic units such as words, clauses and sentences. Starting from the 1970s, a few early shapers (Grimes, 1972; Longacre, 1976; van Dijk, 1977) of the developing field of discourse analysis started to focus on linguistic units larger than a sentence. Later on, the term “Discourse analysis” began to be used as a multidisciplinary study as more and more researchers did their research on language
in relation to other disciplines. A few examples of discourse analyses done in relation to other disciplines are “Cognitive Psychology and text processing” (Bower & Cirilo, 1985), “Social psychology and discourse” (Robinson, 1985), “Artificial intelligence: modeling memory for language understanding” (Schank & Burstein, 1985), “Sociological approach to discourse analysis” (Corsaro, 1985), “Sociocultural dimensions of discourse” (Duranti, 1985), “Philosophy and discourse analysis” (Kasher, 1985), “Historical discourse” (Struwer, 1985), “Legal discourse” (Danet, 1985) and “Discourse, ethnicity, culture and racism” (van Dijk, Ting-Toomey, Smitherman & Troutman, 1998). In the 2000s, the term “Discourse Analysis” became more and more inclusive as more interdisciplinary studies were done and published. A few to name are “Gender and discourse analysis” (Coates, 2012), “Discourse-oriented ethnography” (Smart, 2012), “Discourse analysis and linguistic anthropology” (Richland, 2012), “Prosody in discourse” (Cheng & Lam, 2012), “Advertising and discourse analysis” (Freitas, 2012), “Asian business discourse” (Tanaka & Bargiela-Chiappini, 2012) and “Discourse and healthcare” (Harvey & Adolphs, 2012). As for some, they are interested not only in doing discourse analysis and describing their findings but also in influencing the culture through their research. Their area of study is called “Critical discourse analysis”. In this study, the focus of discourse analysis is on linguistic units larger than a sentence, and the relevance of linguistic units to mental imagery, memory and consciousness is also discussed in an attempt to explain the default and non-default linguistic patterns as proposed by Chafe (1994).

In this thesis, the term “Discourse analysis” follows Crystal (2008, p. 148) to refer to “a continuous stretch of spoken or written language larger than a sentence”. There are different kinds of spoken or written language data as some are produced by one person while others are produced by more than one person. Spoken or written language data produced by one person is called a monologue which can be differentiated into basically four etic types as proposed by Longacre (1996, p. 8-10). The four etic types Longacre proposed have been quoted again and again by many linguists since they were first introduced in 1976 (Longacre, 1976, p. 199-200). These four basic etic types are classified according to two parameters namely “Contingent temporal succession” and “Agent orientation”. Contingent temporal succession refers to a succession of events in which some (often most) of the events are contingent on previous events. Agent orientation refers to the presence of agent reference which is found throughout the discourse (Longacre, 1996, p. 8-9). The following table is an adapted form of the table Longacre proposed (1996, p. 10).
Table 1 Four monologue ethic types proposed by Longacre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+ Agent orientation</th>
<th>- Agent orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>+ Contingent succession</strong></td>
<td>Narrative discourse</td>
<td>Procedural discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Contingent succession</strong></td>
<td>Behavioral discourse</td>
<td>Expository discourse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Longacre subdivides Behavioral discourse into two different categories, one that has “Projection” and the other that does not have “Projection”. He groups “Hortatory discourse and Promissory discourse” as Behavioral discourse that has “Projection” and “Eulogy” as Behavioral discourse that does not have “Projection”. In this thesis, the data chosen for the analysis are two Christian sermons preached in colloquial Burmese by two different preachers. These sermons are hortatory discourses which can be classified as belonging to the “Behavioral discourse” etic type. Although the chosen sermons are found to contain embedded narratives, both can be classified as Behavioral discourse as the purpose of both speakers is to influence the thought and behavior of the listeners. As not much research has been done that focuses on Participant reference patterns and Discourse Markers used in spoken behavioral discourses in colloquial Burmese, it is hoped that the analysis and findings from this thesis will be a contribution toward the field of discourse analysis in Burmese.

1.4 Burmese language

Burmese is the official language of the nation of Myanmar which has an estimated total population of 51,486,253 (DOP, 2016, p. xi). The linguistic classification of Burmese can be seen in the following figure (Simons & Charles, 2017):

---

Burmese is an SOV language. Burmese dialects include Beik (Merguese, Mergui), Yaw, Mandalay Burmese, Yangon Burmese and a non-standard variety called Bomang used by Bangladeshi speakers (Simons & Charles, 2017). Colloquial Burmese, as distinct from literary Burmese, is used in everyday conversation while literary Burmese is mainly used in writing and in formal contexts (Jenny & Hnin Tun, 2016, p. 2-3).

A number of studies have been done on Burmese phonology. Some studies that have been located and surveyed are Maran, 1971; Thurgood, 1976; Watkins, 2001; Watkins, 2005; Jenks, 2007; Thein, 2008; Gruber, 2011 and Kelly, 2012. Research on Burmese Grammar has also been done and published by a number of linguists (Cornyn, 1944; Okell, 1969; Bradley, 1995; Okell & Allot, 2001; Kato, 2004; Watkins, 2005; Romeo, 2008; Hopple, 2011; Ozerov, 2012; Ozerov, 2015; and Jenny & Hnin Tun, 2016). In addition, studies on Classifiers (Ngansathin, 1991), Burmese Reflexives (Bradley, 1995, p. 139-172), Discourse Markers (Hnin Tun, 2006), Burmese particles as boundary marking units of text (Hopple, 2007), Psycho-collocational expressives in Burmese (Vittrant, 2010), Burmese patterns of euphony (Wheatley, 2013) and information packaging in colloquial Burmese (Ozerov, 2014) have also been located and consulted as of the time of writing this thesis. However, little research has been done in the areas of Participant reference patterns and Discourse Markers with a focus on the behavioral genre.
This thesis is written as an attempt to analyze and present the Participant reference patterns and the use of Discourse Markers in Burmese behavioral discourse. It is hoped that the findings from this research will begin to fill the gap in the area of Participant reference pattern analysis and the use of Discourse Markers in Burmese. It is also hoped that language learners, translators, trainers of translators and language teachers will benefit from the results of this study.

1.5 Data selection
Popular Myanmar Christian preachers' names were searched on YouTube and the videos with the highest YouTube view counts were chosen. The video sermons also needed to meet the criteria of being a complete sermon with the information about where and when the sermon was preached, recorded and uploaded, and had to be under 60 minutes of recording time. In this thesis, the two chosen sermons are referred to as Sermon 1 (Tun, 2014) and Sermon 2 (Toe, 2011). Sermon 1 was preached by Rev. Tin Maung Tun on May 18, 2014 at M.C.A Bangkok church, and it was about 39 minutes long. It was published on YouTube on May 19, 2014 by the “MCA Sermons” account owner. Sermon 2 was preached by Mr. San Toe on 29 May, 2011 at M.C.A Bangkok church, and it was 52 minutes long. It was published on YouTube on 1 December, 2011 by the “salaitiam 123” account owner. For a few analyses, a quick survey of 10 additional preachers and their sermons (Do, 2014; Oo, 2012; Myint, 2015; Pa, 2016; Yishey, 2016; Ra, 2016; Hla, 2017; Maw, 2017; Latt, 2017; Kyi, 2017) was done to expand meager data. All preachers were chosen from YouTube, and they all can speak Burmese well. The only criteria used for selecting these additional ten sermons to do a quick survey was for them to contain a full sermon from beginning to end, for the date of preaching to be available and for the preachers not to have strong mother tongue influence if their mother tongue is not Burmese.

1.6 Preparation of the data for analysis
Based on the preacher’s pauses, intonation, the occurrence of sentence final particles and the native speaker intuition of the author of this thesis, the sermon was broken down into lines or sentences and numbered for consistent reference during analysis.

Identification of lines or sentences in spoken Burmese is a difficult task as it is not easy to define a line or sentence and as the selected data is a spoken sermon in which a word, a phrase or a clause can be an independent line or sentence although
it has no sentence final particles. For this reason, breaking the sermon down into lines or sentences and numbering them is done as well as possible to reflect what the preachers might regard as separate lines or sentences. However, the author of this thesis does not claim that the analysis into lines or sentences in this thesis is the only correct way. It is not easy to define a line or sentence and a different native speaker can break the sermons down into lines or sentences differently depending on how he identifies a short pause, a long pause and a separate line or sentence.

Once the numbering of the lines or sentences was done based on the criteria mentioned earlier, narratives, comments inside the narratives and quotations were marked as they are outside the scope of the analysis for Participant/Topic reference analysis. However, as for the analysis of Discourse Markers (DMs), narratives and comments inside the narratives are not excluded. Doing all the steps mentioned above resulted in a transcription of Sermon 1 that had 736 lines or sentences and of Sermon 2 that had 1,225 lines or sentences.

### 1.7 Background information on the preachers

The preacher of Sermon 1, Rev. Tin Maung Tun, was born on 21 November, 1931 in Yangon and is still living in Yangon to date except for the period of time he studied an aircraft maintenance engineering course in London after his high school in Myanmar. His first language is Burmese, and Burmese is the medium of communication in his home. He can also speak English and Hindustani quite well. His parents can speak both Burmese and English. He was awarded a Doctorate of Divinity degree from The North Tennessee Bible Institute and Seminary, Clarksville, Tennessee, United States. Not much information could be collected for the preacher of Sermon 2. However, Mr. San Toe seems to be a native speaker of Burmese who is exceptional at preaching in colloquial Burmese.

Both Sermon 1 and Sermon 2 were preached by fluent speakers of Burmese. For this reason, their sermons were chosen for analyzing Participant reference patterns and the use of Discourse Markers.

### 1.8 Scope of this study

The scope of this study is limited to the two chosen sermons preached in colloquial Burmese. In addition, analysis of embedded narratives inside the sermon, laughter, exclamations, prosody, speech inside quotations, vocatives and subjects and objects inside nominalized Noun Phrases are not considered in this study. Complex
references, especially Demonstratives, which refer to ‘a whole sentence or two or more sentences’ are also beyond the scope of this study because they do not refer to a particular Participant/Topic as defined in this study.

1.9 Classification of words for Subject and Non-Subject reference pattern analysis
In this study, classification of the words into parts of speech for Subject and Non-Subject reference pattern analysis is done based on SEAlang Burmese dictionary (1993) which is based on the Myanmar-English Dictionary (MLC, 1993) compiled by the Myanmar Language Commission.

1.10 Transcription
Transcription of the tones is based on the accepted Burmese orthography and nasalized vowels especially the ones with high falling tones are differentiated from non-nasalized syllables with diacritics. Burmese orthography for vowels and tone marks, and IPA equivalents used in this thesis can be seen in the following table (In the table, ʔ and s are used as place holders for consonants):
Table 2 Burmese vowels, tone marks and IPA symbols used in this thesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowels</th>
<th>High falling tone [˥˩]</th>
<th>High falling tone (with nasalized vowels) [˥˩]</th>
<th>Low tone [˩]</th>
<th>Level tone [˧]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[e]</td>
<td>အိ ၊ ဣ ၄ [ʔɛ]</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>အိ ၊ ဣ ၄ [ʔɛ]</td>
<td>အိ ဣ ၊ ဣ [ʔɛ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[a]</td>
<td>အိ ၊ ဣ ၄ [ʔά]</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>အ ိ : [ʔά]</td>
<td>အ ိ : [ʔά]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are some Burmese words that are spelled differently from the way they are actually pronounced in natural speech. Such Burmese words are transcribed according to how they are actually pronounced in natural speech although they are spelled with a different consonant or vowel in written form. In this thesis, almost all Burmese words are transcribed as close by as possible to how they are actually pronounced in spoken Burmese. Burmese orthography for consonants and IPA equivalents used in this thesis can be seen in the following table:
Table 3 Burmese consonants and IPA symbols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonant Symbols</th>
<th>IPA Symbols</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[k]</td>
<td>[kʰ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[g]</td>
<td>[ɡ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ŋ]</td>
<td>[ŋ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[s]</td>
<td>[sʰ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[z]</td>
<td>[z]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[n]</td>
<td>[n]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[t]</td>
<td>[tʰ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[d]</td>
<td>[d]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[l]</td>
<td>[l]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[j]</td>
<td>[j]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[w]</td>
<td>[w]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[h]</td>
<td>[h]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʔ]</td>
<td>[ʔ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combination of consonant symbols utilized in standard Burmese orthography to indicate unique consonant sounds that are not produced by pronouncing each consonant in the combined forms are ကွေ့ [cá], ကွေး [cá], ကွေး [cʰá], ကွေး [cʰá], ကွေး [já], ကွေး [já] and ကွေး [já]. A few other consonant symbols are ကွေး [ʔl] and ကွေး [jwé], and a diacritic symbol is a voiceless symbol, ကွေး [ʔ], as in ကွေး [m̥á].

In the following chapter, macrostructure and boundaries of a discourse are discussed. After a literature review, an analysis of one of the two sermons is offered as a supportive chapter for analyzing Participant/Topic reference patterns in Sermon 1 and Sermon 2.
Chapter 2
Macrostructure and boundaries of a discourse

This chapter discusses what macrostructure is and why macrostructure analysis is a useful step in discourse analysis. Different theoretical frameworks are presented as well as terms used in doing macrostructure analysis. Theories and methods proposed by Breeze and Levinsohn are discussed as well as Van Dijk’s criterion for grouping sentences (van Dijk, 1977, p. 138) and features proposed by Barnwell (1980, p. 237-241), Brown and Yule (1983), Givón (1983), Van Dijk and Kintsch (1983), Longacre (2010b, p. 138, 141) and Levinsohn (2015b, p. 90-103). Since macrostructure analysis is a preliminary step to doing Participant/Topic reference analysis, this chapter is presented as a supportive chapter for the subsequent chapter about Participant/Topic reference.

In this chapter, ‘local topic’, is used to refer to the topic under which a sequence of sentences can be grouped, and the term, ‘global topic’ is used to refer to the topic under which a sequence of local topics can be grouped. These terms are borrowed from van Dijk’s book, “Text and context explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse”, in which he refers to a referent as locally and globally topical (1977, p. 139). Terms such as ‘Introduction, Main body, Closure, THESIS and supportive information’ used by Levinsohn are also used in this thesis. The term ‘macrostructure’ refers to the structure of the whole discourse in this thesis.

2.1 Literature review on macrostructure and boundaries of a behavioral discourse

A text, a talk or a conversation in general is composed of a hierarchy of propositions which are used by the producers to tell the readers or listeners what it is about. This hierarchy of propositions is the ‘underlying structure’ or ‘macrostructure’ of a discourse. If a listener or a reader does not understand the propositions of a discourse and how these propositions are organized, he would not understand the point the discourse producer is trying to make through his discourse. Thus, understanding all the propositions made by a discourse producer and how these propositions are organized in a discourse is essential if one is to understand the topic
of the whole discourse. Likewise, for a discourse producer, it is important to organize and structure his propositions into topics and sections as he presents his argument. If he does not organize his propositions properly in a coherent and cohesive manner, he would not be able to make his point through his discourse and people will either poorly understand or not understand at all. Thus, understanding different components of a discourse is an essential step for discourse analysis and discourse production.

Linguists have proposed different but somewhat similar theories and methods to identify the macrostructure, global topics and local topics of different discourses. Van Dijk (1977) used the term, ‘macro-structures’, to refer to the underlying sections inside a discourse and the terms, ‘global meaning’ and ‘topic of a discourse’ to refer to what a text or a talk is about, i.e. its topic. He then proposed a formal criterion to identify the topic of each sequence of propositions and the topic of a discourse in general as follows:

“... the formal criterion that for a sequence (of sentences) to have a topic, each sentence (or its underlying propositions) must ‘satisfy’ this topic, directly or indirectly. A sequence with this property is coherent with respect to topic or, more broadly, to MACRO-STRUCTURE.” (p. 138)

Based on the criterion above, van Dijk proposed that one may expect a change of topic to occur if one of the sentences of a discourse no longer belongs to a given topic (p. 138).

To identify the global and local topics of a discourse of any genre, van Dijk (1977) proposed four rules of information reduction. The first rule he proposed is to ‘delete accidental information’, the second is ‘to delete inductively recoverable information’, the third is to make a simple generalization (for example, to generalize a ball, a doll, a toy-car to toys) and the fourth is ‘to make a generalized statement by integrating different parts under a topic’ (for example, to generalize 'tasks of buying wood, stones and concrete, laying foundation, erecting walls and making a roof' to 'building a house') (p. 144-145). It is obvious from the criterion and the rules van Dijk proposed that his theory and methods focus on the semantic nature of a discourse rather than on the surface linguistic features.

To analyze the macrostructure for all types of genres, Barnwell proposed taking into account both linguistic and semantic aspects of a discourse. She used the terms
‘paragraph’, ‘larger communication units’ and ‘boundary’ to talk about the macrostructure of a discourse. Her focus is less on coming up with statements of a global topic or local topics of a discourse and more on finding evidence for the boundaries of larger communication units. To identify the boundaries, she proposed features which can be grouped into two kinds: those which indicate the presence of a boundary (either the end or the beginning) of a (communication) unit and those which indicate some kind of internal unity of coherence within a unit (Barnwell, 1980). For identifying boundaries she proposed linguistic features which include the following:

- Grammatical markers, such as conjunctions,
- Change in place, time or participants,
- ‘Topic’ sentence or phrases (for example, “My next point concerns distribution:” ...),
- Summary statements,
- ‘Overlap’ clauses (for example, tail-head linkages),
- Rhetorical questions,
- Direct address,
- Use of certain tenses or adverbial tenses markers, and
- Other signals such as phonological signals (for speech) and the use of a new line, indentation and spacing (for written texts) (p. 237-239).

For identifying internal coherence Barnwell proposed both linguistic and semantic features. These features are as follows:

- Same time, same place, same topic, same participants,
- Parallel forms,
- Logical coherence, and
- Lexical coherence (for example, repetition of certain words or phrases either in an identical form or with slight modification) (1980, p. 240-241).

The criteria Barnwell proposed are useful to begin the identification of the boundaries and macrostructure of a discourse. However, her approach does not take the next step of how to identify the global topic and local topics of a discourse which van Dijk’s approach seems to do well.
Van Dijk and Kintsch (1983, p. 201-206) used the term “macrostructures” to refer to the underlying sections inside a discourse; they proposed that speakers and listeners use textual strategies for producing and identifying the macrostructures. The textual strategies they proposed are Structural signals, Syntactic strategy, Topic change markers, Semantic strategy, and Schematic strategy. The strategies they proposed suggest that both van Dijk and Kintsch agree that a discourse is composed of linguistic units that are larger than a sentence and that speakers use surface linguistic features to mark the boundaries of these linguistic units.

Van Dijk and Kintsch (1983) use the term ‘macropropositions' to refer to the local and global topics of paragraphs or sections within a discourse. They also proposed three reduction rules to identify the local and global topics (1983, p. 190). These rules are called ‘deletion’, ‘generalization’ and ‘construction’. However, in this thesis, the four rules proposed by van Dijk (1977, p. 144-146) are used rather than the three rules proposed by van Dijk and Kintsch (1983) because van Dijk’s four rules (1977) seem to be more specific than van Dijk and Kintsch’s three rules (1983) even though one can say that both rules refer to the same process in different words.

Brown and Yule (1983, p. 72-73) suggest that the topic of a discourse can also be equivalent to the title for some types of discourse. They also propose (p. 94-106) ‘topic boundary markers’ as a way of identifying the topics inside a written and spoken discourse. For written discourse, they propose linguistic markers, logic and semantics as tools for identifying the boundaries of topics. What Brown and Yule proposed for identifying the boundaries of topics for a written discourse is very similar to what the aforementioned linguists proposed. For spoken discourse, they propose ‘paratone’ or ‘speech paragraphs’ as tools for identifying the boundaries of topics. However, as paratones are outside the scope of this study, no acoustic analysis is made for identifying the boundary markers in this study.

Givón (1983) is similar to the linguists mentioned earlier when it comes to the existence of linguistic units inside a discourse that are larger than a sentence. Givón (1983, p. 36) proposed that a discourse unit (a linguistic unit inside a discourse) is likely to maintain five unities within it rather than across its boundary with another unit. The five unities Givón proposed are unity of time, unity of place, unity of action, unity of theme and unity of participants/topics. What Givón proposed is basically very similar to what Barnwell, van Dijk and Kintsch proposed.

Unlike Barnwell (1980, p. 237) who uses the term ‘larger communication unit’ and van Dijk and Kintsch who use ‘macrostructures’ to refer to the linguistic units inside
a discourse, Longacre used the terms, ‘Paragraph’, ‘onset’ and ‘end’, to describe the existence of linguistic units which are components of a discourse. He said that many languages use particles, back reference, setting, terminus, other surface features and thematic unity to mark the boundaries of paragraphs (Longacre, 2010b, p. 138). He also proposed basic parameters to a system of paragraphs in any language (Longacre, 2010b, p. 141). Even though Longacre uses a different terminology, it seems like he agrees that there are linguistic units inside a discourse and that speakers use surface linguistic features to mark the boundaries of these linguistic units.

The features and the basic parameters Longacre proposed for paragraphs in all genres (Longacre, 2010b, p. 141-151) are helpful for identifying paragraph boundaries in a discourse. However, van Dijk’s criterion for a paragraph (in van Dijk’s term, a series of sentences which can be grouped under a topic) and rules of information reduction (van Dijk, 1977, p. 144-146) seem to be more helpful for identifying the global topic and the local topics of a discourse.

To identify the boundaries inside the macrostructure of behavioral discourses, Levinsohn (2015b) proposed that the following features can be the signals for the boundaries:

- The presence of a point of departure,
- Connectives and juxtaposition,
- Summarizing expressions and cataphoric demonstratives,
- Inclusio structures, Chiastic and parallel structures,
- Rhetorical questions,
- Referent identification by means of a seemingly redundant NP,
- Vocatives,
- Orienters,
- Shifts of verb tense-aspect, mood and person, and
- Back-references (p. 90-103).

However, Levinsohn mentioned that in seeking to identify the boundaries, the analyst faces two challenges: 1) the paragraph or section may be a semantic unit characterized by having a single theme, not by the presence of certain surface features, and 2) the presence of any specific surface feature is seldom a sufficient criterion to identify a paragraph or section boundary (p. 89). Because of these
challenges, Levinsohn proposed that a non-narrative discourse be divided into larger and smaller units on semantic grounds while bearing in mind the existence or absence of supportive surface features (p. 90).

Linguists use different terms to refer to the different components of a behavioral discourse, specifically for discussing the macrostructure and boundaries of behavioral discourses and for discussing THESES (which include commands, requests, and mitigated commands in statement or question forms), supportive information for THESES and other information that is neither a THESIS nor supportive information. Some of the terms used by Longacre are ‘problem, command and motivation’, (Longacre 2010a, p. 239), while other terms such as ‘background information, commands, grounds’ (Doty, 1986, p. 52), and ‘THEESIS, supportive information’ (Levinsohn, 2015b) are used by other linguists.

In addition, in order to subdivide a behavioral discourse into large linguistic units, Levinsohn (2015b, p. 14) uses Breeze’s (1992) “message framework” defined as “material that provides a framework for the message without being part of the message itself”. This framework is comprised of “Introduction - which relates the author to the recipients and gives a greeting”, “Main body” and “Closure - which consists of personal notes and a benediction (Breeze, 1992, p. 319). Breeze’s message framework is an easy and simple way to divide a behavioral discourse on semantic grounds.

In this research paper, Levinsohn’s terminology is used for the macrostructure analysis of the selected sermons because categorizing the arguments and statements in the two sermons into only two general parts, THESIS and supportive information, simplifies the analysis. Breeze’s “message framework” and the components of the message framework, “Introduction, Main body and Closure”, are also used. In this research paper, the term macrostructure is used to refer to the whole structure of a discourse.

Greninger (2009), after analyzing the macrostructure of Solu Sherpa oral stories, suggests that “The modeling of comprehension by means of macrostructure analysis would be much more accurate if done by a native speaker of the language and culture under investigation” (p. 158). In line with Greninger’s suggestion, it is hoped that the macrostructure analysis in this thesis will be accurate as the author of this thesis is a native speaker of Burmese who grew up in Myanmar.
In this thesis the following concepts will be used to identify boundaries:

- Macrostructure, Global topics, Local topics and rules of information reduction (van Dijk, 1977),
- Message framework - Introduction, Main body, Closure - introduced by Breeze (1992, p. 319), and later quoted by Levinsohn (2015b, p. 14), and
- THESIS, supportive information (Levinsohn, 2015b).

Once the message framework is identified as proposed by Breeze (1992, p. 319), THESES and supportive information inside the Main body will be identified as proposed by Levinsohn (2015b). Then THESES and supportive information that can be grouped under a topic will be grouped and a local topic will be given to the group. Once different local topics are given to different groups of THESES and supportive information, the local topics that can be summarized under a topic will be grouped together and a global topic will be given to the group. This is how hierarchical macrostructure of the sermons will be identified based on Levinsohn’s method (Levinsohn, 2015b), Breeze’s message framework (Breeze, 1992) and van Dijk’s rules of information reduction (1977).

### 2.2 Application to the selected sermons

Through applying Breeze’s message framework (1992, p. 319) which provides a framework without being part of the message, and Levinsohn’s terminology and methods (2015b, p. 90), each of the selected sermons are broken down into Introduction, Main body and Closure.

As for identifying the boundaries, global topic and local topics inside each Main body of the selected sermons, Van Dijk’s criterion for grouping sentences (van Dijk, 1977, p. 138) and rules of information reduction (1977. p. 144-146) are applied to the two main sermons, and boundary and macrostructure analysis was done based on linguistic and semantic features as suggested by Levinsohn (2015b, p. 90-103).

Sermon 1 is a sermon that has 736 lines or sentences and the application of Breeze, Levinsohn and van Dijk’s methods produce global topics of Sermon 1 as shown in Table 4. However, the author of this thesis does not claim that the topics mentioned below are ‘the only correct topics’ because this author agrees with Brown and Yule (1983, p. 73) who proposed that there are a number of different ways of expressing the topic for any text. The topics mentioned below are the ones that are identified out of other possibilities that can help the listeners to understand what the text is about.
Global topics of Sermon 1

1. We need the word of God. [1-68]

2. God can cause a special change in one's life. The Bible tells us that He did that in the past. My experience shows me that He is still doing it. [69-335] & [576-716]

3. Be in constant communication with Jesus. [336-352]

4. If you do things just enough to fulfill your duty, you do not have hope. If you are one of those who pray but have doubts when God answers the prayer, repent. [353-556]

5. Be in constant communication with Jesus. [557-575]

6. Do not be a nominal Christian. [717-733]

By working bottom-up (identifying local topics and then grouping them into global topics), the macrostructure, global topics and local topics of Sermon 1 are identified as shown in Table 4. In Table 4, the largest boxes represent the message framework. The statements inside the Main body refer to the different global topics, and local topics that can be grouped under different global topics.

---

3 The numbers inside the square brackets refer to the line numbers of the transcribed sermon.
### Table 4 Macrostructure of Sermon 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Introduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[1-733] Main Body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1-68] Global topic: The word of God is like water and we need it. The word of God is for all and it can quench our thirst inside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local topic: The word of God is tasty and it's for all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local topic: It's important to be like water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local topic: Jesus is the true water who can quench our thirst inside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local topic: Water has proof (that it can do good things for us).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local topic: The true word of God can satisfy us inside and it's important for us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[69-335] Global topic: True word of God causes a special change in one's life and it makes a person want to go to church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local topic: The true word of God causes a special change in one's life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[78-317] Narrative: The lame man story from the bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[336-352] Global topic: Being in contact with Jesus starts from the heart and it is very important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[353-556] Global topic: If you do things just enough to fulfill your duty, you don't have hope. If you are one of those who pray but have doubt when God answers the prayer, repent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[557-575] Global topic: You don't need to know a lot. You don't need to be a Christian but it is important that you are in contact with Jesus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[576-716] Global topic: If a person meets Jesus Christ, he cannot resist changing his life (and a response to the skeptics who doubt the miracles). Nominal Christians left God in Sunday school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[717-733] Global topic: Don't be a Christian with apathy. (while Jesus is providing proof that the word of God is alive because you lose.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[734-736] Closure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benediction and question about the length of the whole sermon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The above macrostructure of Sermon 1 is provided as an example to show how the macrostructure analysis was done in this research in order to prepare the text for Participant/Topic (P/T) reference analysis. As the quotations, laugher, exclamation, narratives, mini lessons - lessons inside the narratives, and comments made during the narratives and vocatives are outside the scope of this study, identifying the boundaries, narratives, comments and imaginary conversations, local topics and global topics was done as a preliminary step in order to prepare the two main sermons for P/T reference analysis.

Macrostructure analysis was also done for Sermon 2 which has 1,225 lines or sentences. The application of Breeze, Levinsohn and van Dijk's methods to Sermon 2 produces global topics as follows. The topics mentioned below are the ones that are identified out of other possibilities that can help the listeners to understand what the text is about.

**Global topics and summary statements of global topics for Sermon 2**

[3-725] Choose Jesus. He is different. (Summary statement)

1. Our worship is special because our God is alive. Even though we cannot see Him, He is alive. [3-110]

2. Names have meanings. Jesus Christ's name means 'the one who will save people who have sin'. What Jesus did is good for us but suffering was not an enjoyable thing for Jesus and Mary. [221-326]

3. Jesus preached the word of God, showed miracles and conquered death. Only Jesus can conquer death. He is inviting you today. [332-491]

4. Every religion is good but you cannot follow even the common teachings. Because we cannot do it, Jesus came to pay the price for our sin. If we do not believe it, we will have to pay the price for our sin and end up in hell. If you still don't believe what He did for you, I'll give you time. [492-650]

5. Make your decision now because you don't know when you will die. We are about to die. Time flies. [698-725]
1. God molds those who believe Him. [726-931]
2. Obey God even when you don't understanding what's happening in your life. [927-838]
3. People want to understand first and then obey God. Try obeying God, you will understand the things that are happening in your live. [939-954]
4. Everything that happens in our lives is meaningful. God tells us to obey Him. You will understand as you obey. [1205-1210]
5. Please obey God no matter what is happening in your life. As you obey, you will understand. [1211-1224]

The data show that Sermon 1 does not have an Introduction as the preacher of Sermon 1 neither greets his audience nor says words of thanks to God or to the audience. He went straight into the topic of his sermon. However, the preacher of Sermon 2 used words of thanks to God and the audience as an Introduction to his sermon. A quick survey of additional ten sermons shows that 6 preachers used words of thanks to God or the audience as introduction to their sermons. Only one preacher used just a greeting as an introduction. It seems like using words of thanks to God or the audience is more common than using words of greeting for the introduction of a sermon in Burmese. Moreover, only one preacher mentions his name to greet the audience, and in this case, he mentioned that no one had introduced him to the audience. This may be due to the fact that the preachers are usually introduced to the audience by a master of ceremony before the preaching starts.

As for the closure of the sermons, the data shows that the two main sermons have closure in which the preachers bless the audience. It seems like it is a typical style to end a sermon with a blessing. A quick survey of ten additional sermons supports this conclusion as all of them have a blessing from the preachers as closures.
Chapter 3
Participant/Topic (P/T) reference


Terminology for the P/T reference analysis used in this study relies heavily on Levinsohn (2015a). Theories and methods proposed by Levinsohn (2015a; 2015b) for analyzing P/T reference in narratives and behavioral discourse, and Grimes for tracking P/T (1972) are used for the P/T reference analysis and the findings are presented together with the discussion using Chafe’s theory and methodology (1994). Finally the P/T analysis methodology used in this thesis is presented.

3.1 Literature review on participant reference
According to Dooley and Levinsohn (2000, p. 56), there are three tasks which are accomplished by the reference system used by a speaker/writer to refer to the participants in a story. These tasks are:

1. Semantic task: to identify the referents unambiguously, distinguishing them from other possible referents;
2. Pragmatic task: to signal the activation status and prominence of the referents or of the actions they perform; and
3. Processing task: to overcome disruptions in the flow of information.

The tasks above are applicable not only to narratives but also to other genres as every speaker/writer needs to use proper linguistic devices to accomplish the tasks mentioned above in order to produce a coherent and cohesive discourse which can be clearly understood by the listeners/readers. Otherwise, listeners/readers would not understand what a speaker is trying to say through the behavioral discourse. Thus, for discourse analysts, Participant reference analysis is an essential part of every discourse analysis.
3.1.1 Participant reference strategies
Grimes (1978, p. vii-viii) suggested that there are two distinct strategies that languages use for establishing and maintaining reference. Some languages use a ‘sequential policy’ in which the reference of one word is normally taken from the nearest word (a noun phrase) before it, while other languages use a ‘thematic policy’ in which one referent is distinguished from the rest when introduced and a special set of terms are used to refer to it no matter how many other things have been mentioned more recently.

Dooley and Levinsohn (2000, p. 59-60) used different terminology to refer to the two strategies Grimes suggested (Grimes, 1978, p. vii-viii). They use ‘sequential (look-back) strategies’ and ‘VIP (Very Important Participant) strategies’ to refer to Grimes’ ‘sequential policy’ and ‘thematic policy’. Unlike Grimes, Dooley and Levinsohn (2000, p. 59) proposed that all languages probably use both strategies at some times, but the extent to which a language prefers one over the other appears to vary considerably. In this study, the term ‘strategy’, not the term ‘policy’ is utilized.

3.1.2 Participant categories and ranking
Linguists have proposed different categories for the participants/topics of a discourse. In analyzing Mambila Folk Stories, Perrin (1978, p. 107) made a five-way distinction between supernatural, main, secondary, undeveloped secondary and tertiary participants based on grammatical features. In an article published in 1995, Longacre (2010c, p. 100-101) proposed three main categories of participants: Major participants, Minor participants and Props. The criteria he proposed for ranking participants are as follows: if a participant is relevant, for the most part, to the entire story, it is a Major participant; if its role is restricted but it acts throughout the story, it is a Minor participant; and if it does not act as a voluntary agent in its own right, it is a Prop. Dooley and Levinsohn (2000) proposed a four-way distinction ranking: Major participants, Minor participants, global VIPs and local VIPs. In her thesis about Kmhmu narrative texts, Osborne (2009, p. 85) made a four-way distinction between central participants, major participants, minor participants and peripheral participants.

All the P/T categories and ranking proposed by the linguists mentioned above are meant for the P/Ts inside narratives. In this study, Participants/Topics will not be categorized or ranked as proposed by the linguists mentioned above because the type of discourse used for this study is behavioral discourse, which is very different
from narrative discourse. Moreover, analysis and findings on “Discourse Participants” which refer to the preacher and the audience, i.e. the 1st and 2nd persons involved in the discourse event will be presented separately from other P/Ts. In addition, although the ranking of P/Ts is not done in this study, the local topics and global topics in the two main sermons are ranked based on semantic grounds (See Section 2.2).

3.1.3 Participant reference resources

Regarding Participant/Topic (P/T) reference resources and scale, Givón (1983, p. 18) proposed the Iconicity Principle which states, “The more disruptive, surprising, discontinuous or hard to process a topic is, the more coding material must be assigned to it.” Based on the Iconicity Principle, he proposed a scale for participant/topic identification. Givón’s scale is adapted by the author of this thesis and shown as follows:

more discontinuous/inaccessible topics (more encoding)

1. full NP’s
2. stressed/independent pronouns
3. unstressed/bound pronouns (‘agreement’)
4. Zero reference

more continuous/accessible topics (less encoding)

Figure 2 A scale of linguistic devices for participant/topic identification

(Givón, 1983, p. 18)

Figure 2 above shows that Givón’s scale is meant for spoken data as he differentiates between stressed and unstressed pronouns. As prosody is outside the scope of this study, stressed pronouns and unstressed pronouns will not be differentiated. Both stressed and unstressed pronouns will be treated simply as pronouns in this study.

Ariel (1991, p. 449) proposed a scale which is similar to Givón’s scale but has more detailed information. Ariel claimed it to be universal to languages and called it ‘hierarchy of accessibility markers’. The scale Ariel proposed can be seen in Figure 3:
The figure above shows that, for Ariel, the accessibility of a referent is indicated not just by linguistic forms, Participant/Topic reference resources, but also by prosody and gestures. As prosody and gestures are outside the scope of this study, Ariel’s scale will be not be used for analyzing the Participant/Topic reference resources in the two selected sermons. Moreover, Ariel differentiates between full name + modifier, full name, long definite description, short definite description, last name and first name. In this study, except for referring expressions (RLT Clause + 3P Pronoun) which refer to ambiguous referents, all of these will be simply treated as NPs as the focus is just to learn when NPs, Pronouns and Zero references are used. Stressed Pronouns and unstressed Pronouns will also be simply treated as Pronouns.

In an attempt to discuss the relevance of language to mental imagery, memory and consciousness (Chafe, 1994, p. ix), Chafe proposed a list, which is called, in this thesis, scale for Participant reference resources. Chafe’s list is somewhat similar to the scales proposed by Givón (1983) and Ariel (1991). The following figure is adapted from what Chafe proposed for spoken and written communication in general (1994, p. 71, p. 75):
Chafe (1994) also mentioned that a speaker’s choice to use a full noun phrase, a pronoun or some other linguistic device is influenced by Activation States and Activation Cost. Activation State of a referent refers to whether the state of the referent is given, accessible or new information to the listeners at the current point of the conversation as assumed by the speaker (p. 71-73). Activation Cost refers to the amount of mental effort needed to change the Activation state of a referent into a more identifiable state for the listener. Chafe sees Identifiability as the discourse properties of referents and explained that “An identifiable referent is one that is (a) assumed to be already shared, directly or indirectly, by the listener; (b) verbalized in a sufficiently identifying way; and (c) contextually salient” (p. 94).

The three different Activation States of referents proposed by Chafe (1994, p. 73) are diagrammed in Figure 5:

![Figure 5 Activation States, Activation Costs, and Time](Chafe, 1994, p. 73)

Through the diagram in Figure 5, Chafe proposed that the Activation State of a referent is active and given if the speaker assumes that the listener has already been given information about the referent at a certain point of the conversation, and the Activation State of a referent is inactive and new if the speaker assumes that the information about the referent has not been mentioned to the listener before. If the Activation State of a referent is active, the Activation Cost is low, and depending on
the language in focus, a Pronoun or a Zero reference may be used by the speaker. However, if the Activation State of a referent is inactive or new, the Activation Cost is high, and a NP may be used by the speaker, and if the Activation State of a referent is semiactive - in peripheral consciousness - the Activation cost will be medium. (Chafe, 1994, p. 72-73).

Chafe's (1994) theory about the properties of referents, Participant reference resources, Activation States (given, accessible and new info) and Activation Cost identifies factors not utilized in the methodology proposed by Levinsohn (2015a) (2015b) to analyze Participant reference. For discussing the findings on default and non-default Participant reference patterns found in the two main sermons, Chafe’s above mentioned theory and terminology will be used in this study.

In an article published in the journal of Language Research in December, 1995, Longacre (2010c) proposed Participant reference resources in terms of universals and tendencies in languages and suggested that the resources be arranged according to the decreasing explicitness of references in a narrative. The following figure is the adapted list of Participant reference resources proposed by Longacre (2010c, p. 98).

1. Nouns (including proper names) accompanied by qualifiers
2. Nouns (including proper names) without any qualifiers
3. Surrogate nouns that serve as substitutes for (1) and (2) or as the highest level of participant reference within a given narrative
4. Pronominal elements
5. Affixal elements
6. Zero reference, where conventions of usage make such reference unambiguous

**Figure 6 Universals and tendencies in Participant reference resources and the scale of explicitness (Longacre, 2010c, p. 98)**

Longacre (2010c, p. 99), then, proposed that such a list can be relatively universal in regard to levels 1-3 above but considerable language specific variation can be encountered on levels 4 and 5, and certain languages of Asia employ level 6. It seems like the distinctions Longacre made in Figure 6 will be useful in weighing the ways different P/Ts are introduced not only in narratives but also in the two main sermons.
Figure 6 also shows that Longacre distinguished between Nouns with qualifiers, Nouns without qualifiers and surrogate Nouns. In this thesis, these referring expressions will simply be called NPs as the focus is not to analyze different types of NPs but to learn when NPs are used, and when Pronouns and Zero references are used. Burmese does not have many kinds of participant reference affixes on verbs, so this category is not relevant to this thesis.

According to the three different Activation States of referents proposed by Chafe (1994, p. 73), the top levels in Longacre’s list are the most likely Participant reference resources that may be used by a speaker for activating inactive or new referents. The levels in the middle of the list are very likely to be used for semiactive referents, and the levels at the bottom are very likely to be used for already active or given referents.

Although the scales proposed by Givón (1983, p. 18), Ariel (1991, p. 449), Chafe (1994, p. 71, p. 75) and Longacre (2010c, p. 99) seem to be different in details, the similarity among them is the position of NPs, at the top, the position of Pronouns, in the middle, and the position of Zero references, at the bottom. This shows that Givón, Ariel, Chafe and Longacre generally agree with each other although the details they proposed and the things they focus on - linguistic forms, prosody and gestures - are different. In this study, of all the Participant/Topic reference resources found in the two main sermons, NPs are normally used for inactive or new information, Pronouns for semiactive information, and Zero references for active or given information.

Regarding Givón’s Iconicity Principle, Levinsohn (2015a, p. 124-125) commented, in his self-instruction materials on narrative discourse analysis, that the Iconicity Principle (which in turn affects Givón’s scale) does not seem to cover the relative status of the participants (whether two major participants are interacting or one major and one minor participant are interacting), salience of the participants (whether the participants are global VIPs, local VIPs or just major participants), and whether or not the reference to a participant follows a reported speech. He then proposed an alternative way to analyze the system of reference in a language in terms of default and marked encoding values and explained his alternative as follows:
Default encoding values are identified for various situations in which, in Givón’s terms, there is no great discontinuity or surprise.

Marked encoding values are those that are other than the default encoding for a specific situation.

In this thesis, the analysis and findings from the selected behavioral discourse are presented in terms of default encoding and non-default (or marked) encoding following Levinsohn’s suggestion mentioned above.

3.1.4 Methods for identifying and tracking Participants/Topics

As for tracking participants/topics, Grimes (1972, p. 106-109) described a span analysis by using a Thurman chart to give a visual picture of participant/topic continuity. In this study, a modified version of Grimes’ span analysis (1972, p. 106-109) which is based on Thurman chart is used to find out when each P/T is introduced and how many times they are mentioned in the two main sermons.

To classify different referents inside a discourse, Prince (1981, p. 233-253) proposed categories such as new entity, inferable entity, evoked entity etc. based on the surrounding text and the situation in which the discourse is produced. However, just as Ariel correctly pointed out (1988, p. 67-69), the categories Prince proposed are properties of referents, not linguistic categories. For Prince, a NP can be a Pronoun or a Noun (1981, p. 236). She did not propose a method to analyze the relationship between the categories she proposed and the different linguistic encodings. Thus, Prince’s method is not used in this study.

Givón (1983, p. 13-15) takes a quantitative approach and proposed two methods which measure ‘Referential distance (look-back) and Persistence (decay)’. Although Givón’s approaches are good at measuring the continuity of a Participant/Topic, his approaches are not used in this study because the use of modified form of Grimes’ span analysis (1972, p. 106-109) which is based on Thurman chart is adequate for analyzing the way P/Ts are introduced and how many times they are mentioned.

Ariel (1988, p. 69-71) did an analysis on four fictional texts and showed a way to track the use of different Participant reference resources based on whether they are used in the same sentence, previous sentence, same paragraph or different paragraph. Ariel’s method seems to be very useful for tracking different P/Ts, and the way different Participant reference resources are used for them inside written
texts as sentences and paragraphs are clearly indicated by the author. However, using Ariel’s method to analyze spoken data can result in varying results because the way the original discourse producer defines a paragraph can be quite different from the way the listeners/readers define a paragraph.

In an attempt to explain different degrees of givenness of the referents, and the use of different Participant reference resources, Baumann and Riester (2012) proposed detailed categories for the referents found in a discourse. What they proposed is very detailed for categorizing the referents based on their information status. However, as their focus is on the referential and lexical givenness of a referent by looking at the semantic, prosodic and cognitive aspect, and as they did not propose any method for tracking the relationship between the information status of the referents and the different Participant reference resources used for them in a discourse, what they proposed is not used in this study as the focus of this study is to analyze different Participant/Topic reference resources used for different referents in different contexts. For this reason, Levinsohn’s method (2015a) which is based on the method proposed by Dooley and Levinsohn (2000) is preferred over the method proposed by Baumann and Riester in this study.

Dooley and Levinsohn (2000, p. 65-66) proposed an approach in which a chart of references in a text is prepared, referents are numbered and the context in which each reference to a participant/topic occurs is identified. Except for one modification of the definition of N1 (2015a, p. 128), Levinsohn’s method (2015a) is the same as the method proposed in Dooley and Levinsohn (2000). In this study, a modified form of Levinsohn’s method for tracking the P/Ts inside narratives (2015a) which is based on Dooley and Levinsohn’s approach (2000, p. 65-66) is used for analyzing the Participant/Topic reference patterns in the two main sermons.

As a part of their analysis, Tebow (2010, p. 62) and Edwards (2011, p. 77), in their theses used a Simple Count method which simply keeps track of each instance of the participant being activated and the participant(s) with the highest number of activations are categorized as the most important. Linguists4 have been using this method for many years and this method is very similar to the way P/Ts are tracked using a Thurman chart except for the use of numbers. However, this method is not as detailed as the method proposed by Levinsohn (2015a) as it does not take into account the contexts in which different encodings for the referents are used.

4 A few to name are Givón (1983), Tebow (2010) and Edwards (2011).
In this study, modified forms of Grimes’ span analysis (1972, p. 106-109) which is based on a Thurman chart is used for analyzing the way P/Ts are mentioned first in the data and the number of times they are mentioned. As for analyzing Subjects and Non-Subjects, the different contexts in which they are found, and the use of Participant reference resources, Levinsohn’s context based method (2015a, p. 128), which was also used by Tebow and Edwards is used.

3.1.5 Participant/Topic (P/T) reference resources in Burmese

The Participant/Topic (P/T) reference resources found in the two main sermons are arranged below in Table 5 according to the decreasing level of explicitness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5 Participant/Topic reference resources in Sermons 1 and 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Noun phrase⁵, Attributive clause + 3P Pronoun⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pronoun⁷, Demonstrative Pronoun⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Zero reference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.5.1 Rationale for ranking P/T reference resources

In Table 5, “Attributive clause + 3P Pronoun” is placed at the same level as Noun phrase because, in both Sermon 1 and Sermon 2, it is used by the speakers to refer to a non-specific referent in an S4 context (See 3.2 for the definition of S4 context).

---

⁵ Full name + modifier, full name, long definite description, short definite description, last name and first name altogether are treated as NPs in this study as the focus is just to learn when NPs, Attributive clause + 3P Pronouns, PNs and Zero references are used for different Subject and Non-Subject contexts.

⁶ Attributive clause + 3rd person pronoun. It is not treated as a Pronoun Phrase or a NP in this paper. It is treated as a separate Participant/Topic reference resource because its use is special as it is normally used to refer to non-specific referents or a person in general.

⁷ 1st person pronoun, 2nd person pronoun or 3rd person pronoun

⁸ A Demonstrative that functions as a pronoun to refer to a particular referent. Demonstratives that are used to refer to a sentence, a paragraph or paragraphs are outside the scope of this study.
An example can be seen in line (463) from Sermon 2. Brackets are provided to help the readers understand the sentence structure. The information inside the open and closed parenthesis which is placed at the end of the free translation indicates from which sermon the data comes. The “Attributive clause + 3P Pronoun” that refer to a non-specific referent is shaded in grey. Line (462) is provided as necessary context.

In line (463), the “Attributive clause + 3P Pronoun” is used in an S4 context to refer to a non-specific referent. Therefore, “Attributive clause + 3P Pronoun” is ranked in the same place as a NP in Table 5.

In Table 5, Demonstrative Pronouns are ranked at the same level as Pronouns because in the selected sermons, Demonstrative Pronouns are used as references to refer to different referents.
An example can be seen in line (52) from Sermon 1. Line (51) is provided as a necessary context in the following example.

(51) ၽမ ၊ ၽမကဲ့သို့ရာ က ၊ ၼန် ကြည့်သေးသော ကလည်း အရည်ပြောင်း သည် တဒက ကြည့်သည် တယ က ကြည့်သည် တယ က ကြည့်သည် တယ
rum drink  want  DECL

FT: [People] want to drink rum. (Sermon 1)

(52) ၽမ။ ၽမန်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်
 ၽမ။ ၽမန်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်
 ၽမ။ ၽမန်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်
 ၽမ။ ၽမန်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်န်

FT: That [is] also [a kind of] liquid. (Sermon 1)

In the example above, the determiner, ၽမ။ [ʔɛ̃.dà] ‘that’, is used in line (52) to refer to ၽမ။ [ʔæ] ‘rum’ mentioned in line (51). For this reason, Demonstratives are ranked at the same level as Pronouns in the P/T reference resource table, Table 5. The choice between a Demonstrative Pronoun, and a 1P, 2P or 3P Pronoun depends on who/what the referent is. Normally, Demonstrative Pronouns are used for inanimate objects and 1P, 2P or 3P Pronoun are used for people and animals except for cases in which a speaker uses a literary device, personification.

3.2 Methodology used for this study
In this study, the selected Burmese sermons were prepared for charting and analysis by transcribing them, editing the texts, segmenting and numbering the texts into lines or sentences which are most likely to be treated by the speakers as separate sentences because according to Grimes (as cited in Levinsohn, 2015a, p. 13), “the texts that yield the most consistent analysis are edited texts.” Then Breeze’s message framework (1992, p. 319) was used to break the two main sermons down into Introduction, Body and Closure.

Once boundary and macrostructure analysis was done and the scope of the analysis was identified, the following steps were taken. These steps are adapted based on the guideline given by Dooley and Levinsohn (2000) for analyzing narrative discourse, and Levinsohn (2015a; 2015b) for analyzing non-narrative discourse:
1. Prepare a modified form of Grimes’ span analysis (1972, p. 106-109) which is based on Thurman chart to analyze the way different P/Ts are introduced, and the number of times they are mentioned in the two main sermons,

2. Mark Subject contexts (S1-S4) as well as Non-Subject contexts (N1-N4) to analyze the Participant/Topic reference patterns of Subjects and Non-Subjects (Levinsohn, 2015a, p. 128),

3. Calculate the percentages for Discourse participants, and general P/Ts in order to find out the default P/T reference patterns and non-default P/T reference patterns.

4. Inspect all the texts for non-default encodings, and propose a rule for each Subject context and each Non-Subject context for Discourse participants by looking at the boundaries from macrostructure analysis, and Subject contexts and Non-Subject contexts.

5. Incorporate any modifications to the proposed rule.

6. Mention the non-default encodings, and propose possible pragmatic motivations for deviances from default encoding using Chafe’s theory (1994).

7. For general P/Ts (that are not Discourse participants), repeat step (4-6).

In order to do the step (2) mentioned above, the following definitions for different Subject contexts were formulated by modifying Levinsohn’s original definitions (2015a, p. 128):

- S1: the subject inside either the dependent or independent clause is the same as the subject of the independent clause in the previous sentence;
- S2: the subject was the addressee of the previous direct or indirect speech;
- S3: the subject of the dependent or independent clause of a sentence is the same as a referent that plays a role other than S1 or S2 in the previous clause/sentence;
- S4: the subject was not involved in the previous sentence.

As for the Non-Subjects, the following definitions for different Non-Subject contexts were formulated to do the step (2) mentioned above by modifying Levinsohn’s original definitions (2015a, p. 128):
- N1: the referent occupies any Non-Subject argument role in the current and in the previous sentence;
- N2: the referent was the speaker of the previous direct or indirect speech;
- N3: the referent was involved in the previous sentence in a role other than N1 or N2;
- N4: the Non-Subject was not involved in the previous sentence.

The definition for N1 in the list above is different from the definition which was first proposed by Dooley and Levinsohn (2000, p. 66). It was updated by Levinsohn in his later publication (2015a, p. 128). According to personal communication with Dr. Stephen Levinsohn on February 6, 2017, the reason for the change is as follows:

“Because it seemed to fit the facts better. By definition, references in S1 and N1 are going to be minimal, whereas those in S3 and N3 may be more explicit. My observation was that, once a referent has been referred to in any Non-Subject role in one clause, the default way of referring to him or her if in a Non-Subject role in the next clause is minimal.”

Some linguists have used the old definitions of N1 and N3 in their studies (Osborne, 2009; Tebow, 2010; Edwards, 2011). In this study the definition, marking and analysis of N1 and N3 are different from those theses as the improved definition of Levinsohn (2015a, p. 128) is used. The findings and discussion in the following sections are based on the results produced by the steps and methods explained mentioned above.

---

9 The first definition which was proposed by Dooley and Levinsohn (2000, p. 66) for N1 is “the referent occupies the same non-subject role as in the previous clause or sentence”
Chapter 4
Analysis and findings on references to Discourse Participants in the two sermons

In these sermons, there are two “Discourse Participants”: the preacher and the audience, i.e. the 1st and 2nd persons involved in the discourse event. Referring expressions used for the Discourse Participants who are physically present in the same room at the time of preaching are different from the referring expressions that refer to other 3rd person P/Ts. All the referring expressions for the Discourse Participants refer to four possible groupings of these participants: 1. the preacher, 2. the audience, 3. both the preacher and the audience, or 4. Ambiguous referent. All four are analyzed and discussed in this chapter, while the analysis and findings on other P/Ts are discussed in the subsequent chapter.

4.1 Introduction of the Discourse Participants
Referring expressions are used in a number of different ways to refer to the Discourse Participants. In each sermon, some referring expressions refer to the preacher, some refer to the audience, some refer to both the preacher and the audience while others are an ambiguous identification which can be interpreted as the preacher and the audience, the audience or people in general depending on the context. This section discusses how these referents are first mentioned by the preachers. A quick survey of 10 additional Christian sermons preached by ten different preachers (Do, 2014; Oo, 2012; Myint, 2015; Pa, 2016; Yishey, 2016; Ra, 2016; Hla, 2017; Maw, 2017; Latt, 2017; Kyi, 2017)\(^\text{10}\) shows that the aforementioned four possible groupings of these Discourse Participants are commonly used in the sermons\(^\text{11}\).

\(^{10}\) All these preachers were chosen from YouTube and they all can speak Burmese well. The only criteria used for selecting these sermons was for them to contain a full sermon from beginning to end, the date of preaching and for the preachers not to have strong mother tongue influence if their mother tongue is not Burmese.

\(^{11}\) Embedded prayers, in which God and the Discourse Participants are referenced, inside these sermons are outside of the scope of this study.
4.1.1 The preacher

In each of the two main sermons studied, the preacher is first mentioned in the beginning part of the sermon using a Zero reference. An example can be seen in line (1) from Sermon 2 in which the preacher is encoded with a Zero reference. The understood reference to the preacher is bolded in the free translation.

(1) ဘုရ်းသခင် ကန်ကန်သားန်ဦးတို့ တရှ်ဦးစွချီးမွန်း ချီးမွန်းေါယလိုော့ ကြား

God grace HON CASE.OBJ first

FT: First, [I] praise the grace [of] God. (Sermon 2)

The data from Sermon 1 and Sermon 2 suggest that using a Zero reference is very likely to be a default way for a preacher to refer to himself/herself for the first time in a sermon. A quick survey of 10 additional Christian sermons preached by ten different preachers supports this finding as the preachers are first referred to with Zero references 8 times and with Pronouns 2 times in these sermons.

The second Discourse Participant found in the selected sermons is the audience and ways in which the audience is first mentioned in Sermon 1 and Sermon 2 are discussed in the following section.

4.1.2 The audience

In Sermon 1 and Sermon 2, the audience is first mentioned with different referring expressions. In Sermon 1, the audience is first mentioned with a Zero reference. This can be seen in the following example in which the understood reference to the audience is bolded in the free translation.

(2) "နှုကေဆို n̥oú.gə.bà sʰə.dà nɛ nɛ le nɛ le

the Word the thing called little little just with also

နည်းနည်းတလ်းနည်း nɛnɛnɛnɛnɛnɛ

just with also

မမိနလျက bə də ló

relish NOMI POL EMP the thing called
Today, [I] want to tell [you], "The Word [of God] is tasty even if [it] [is] just a little." (Sermon 1)

However in Sermon 2, the audience is found to be first mentioned with NPs which are the head of an attributive clause. This can be seen in line (2) from Sermon 2 in which individual members of the audience are mentioned with NPs as a whole. These NPs are shaded in grey in line (2) and bolded in the translations.

(2) ဒီ တနော့ dì né jaú,ʃí là té mf.bá mja
this day arrive come Attrib. parent PL

ŋì ʔa.kò
younger brother older brother

maù ŋa.má mja né sʰà.jà sʰà.jà.má
younger brother younger sister PL and teacher.male teacher.female

ʔa.lou -go ʔa.tʰu.be be ce.zu.tì bà dè ló
all CASE.OBJ especially EMP thank POL DECL EMP

LIT: [I] especially thank all [of] [you:] parents, younger brothers, older brothers, younger sisters [for a woman], younger sisters [for a man], male teachers and female teachers who have come [here] today.

FT: [I] especially thank all [of] [you:] parents, brothers and sisters and teachers who have come [here] today. (Sermon 2)

---

12 According to SEAlang Burmese dictionary (1993), the word ʔa.lou ‘all’ can be interpreted either as a Pronoun or an Adjective. In this paper, ʔa.lou ‘all’ is interpreted as an Adjective whenever it is modifying a NP and as a Pronoun whenever it is used independently.
Line (2) from Sermon 2 shows that the referring expression used for the audience for the first time in Sermon 2 is a NP especially when the audience is the head of an attributive clause. However, when just the audience is mentioned for the second time, it is encoded with a Zero reference. This can be seen in line (10) from Sermon 2 in which the understood reference to the audience is bolded in the free translation. Lines (8-9) are provided as necessary context in the following example.

(8) ၱFTP: Many types of worship exist.

(9) ၱFTP: Among them, our worship [style] here is special. (Sermon 2)

(10) ၱFTP: By saying like this, I am not telling [you] "[Our worship style here] is not the same as other churches." (Sermon 2)

---

13 This particle can be interpreted either as a nominalizer or a topic marker (Okell & Allott, 2001, p. 74-75). In some cases, the line between the functions is blurry and it can be interpreted as performing both functions or either one. In line (7) in Sermon 2, it is interpreted as a topic marker.
The data from Sermon 1 and Sermon 2 for the first mention of the audience are not conclusive. In all three cases mentioned above, the audience is the addressee in a dialogue where the participants of the discourse event are known before the sermon begins. A quick survey of 10 additional sermons shows that 5 NPs, 4 Zero references and 1 Pronoun are used to refer to the audience for the first time. It seems like the decision about whether to use a NP or a Zero reference to refer to the audience for the first time depends on the personal choice of a preacher as the number of NPs is about equal to the number of Zero references. As the data for this research is limited, more research is recommended to confirm or refute this finding.

The third grouping of the Discourse Participants is both the preacher and the audience and the way the preacher and the audience collectively are first mentioned in Sermon 1 and Sermon 2 is discussed in the following section.

### 4.1.3 Both the preacher and the audience

In each sermon, the preacher and the audience collectively are first mentioned with a Pronoun, as can be seen in line (14) from Sermon 1. The plural pronoun referring to the preacher and the audience is shaded in line (14). Line (15) is provided as necessary context in which the preacher and the audience collectively are referred to with a Zero reference.

(14) ဗိုလ်မှူးများကို ပြောဆိုပြီး တရမဟား ဘူး ော့က ကျွန်းတွေကို ျပဳပြော
sometimes come if 1P PL CASE.SBJ water Neg be Neg

kʰa.mjá
POL.Male

FT: Sometimes, we are not [like] water. (Sermon 1)

(15) အရည်ဖျင်သည် အချိန် ျမန်?
liquid be tend to DECL right?

FT: [We] tend to be [like] liquid, right? (Sermon 1)

The data from Sermons 1 and 2 suggest that using a Pronoun is very likely to be a default way for a preacher to refer to himself and the audience collectively in a sermon. A quick survey of 10 additional Christian sermons preached by ten different
preachers supports this finding as the audience and the preacher collectively are first referred to with Pronouns 9 times and with Zero cataphora 1 time.

The fourth grouping of the Discourse Participants is the ambiguous referent and the ways the ambiguous referent is first mentioned in Sermons 1 and 2 are discussed in the following section.

4.1.4 Intentional ambiguity
Referring expressions are sometimes used by the preachers to be intentionally ambiguous in reference to the Discourse Participants. Examples are found in both sermons. They can be interpreted either as “the preacher and the audience”, “the audience” or “people in general”. In Sermon 1, an ambiguous referent is expressed with a Pronoun. This can be seen in line (3) in which the ambiguous pronoun is shaded.

(3) နှုကေအစစဟုကြည့်သည်
the Word genuine for all [of us/people]. (Sermon 1)

In Sermon 2, the ambiguous referent is found to be first mentioned with a Zero reference in line (5). The understood reference is bolded in the free translation.

(5) အတွေ့အပါ၍ဆိုကင်း၊
so ask [we/people] have something to ask. (Sermon 2)

A quick survey of 10 additional sermons shows that Zero reference is used in each sermon to refer to the ambiguous referent for the first time. It seems like the use of a Zero reference is the default way of referring to it for the first time.

4.1.5 Summary for the introduction of the Discourse Participants
The way Discourse Participants are mentioned for the first time in Sermons 1 and 2 can be seen as a summary in the following table:
Table 6 Introduction of Discourse Participants in the two main sermons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Discourse Participants</th>
<th>P/T reference resource</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Preacher</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>Ø / Noun Phrase</td>
<td>Depends on speakers’ choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Both preacher and audience collectively</td>
<td>Pronoun</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Intentionally ambiguous referent</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Intentional ambiguity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned in Table 6, the data from Sermon 1 and Sermon 2 suggest that using a Zero reference is very likely to be a default way for a preacher to refer to himself/herself for the first time in a sermon. As for the audience, the data from Sermons 1 and 2 are not conclusive. It seems like the decision about whether to use a NP or a Zero reference to refer to the audience for the first time depends on the personal choice of a preacher. As for referring to the preacher and the audience collectively, a Pronoun is very likely to be the default way. As for the intentionally ambiguous referents, using a Zero reference seems to be the default way. The following section discusses the Subject reference patterns for the Discourse Participants.

### 4.2 Subject reference patterns for the Discourse Participants
This section discusses the Subject reference patterns for the Discourse Participants found in Sermons 1 and 2 by proposing rules, describing exceptions, revising rules and providing examples for default encodings. Non-default encodings that do not follow the revised rules for S1-S4 contexts are also mentioned at the end of each section. After the first section on S1-type encoding, the whole discovery and refinement procedure is not demonstrated again in the subsequent sections. Only the final result, the revised rule with an example, is explained.

#### 4.2.1 S1: Default encoding for the Discourse Participants
The S1 context is one in which the subject of the dependent or independent clause of a sentence is the same as the subject of the independent clause in the previous sentence. This definition of the S1 context is the slightly modified version of
Levinsohn’s definition for S1 context (2015a, p. 125). According to the analysis of referring expressions that refer to the Discourse Participants in S1 contexts in the two sermons, the default encoding in S1 contexts is a Zero reference, as 88% of references in S1 contexts are encoded by Zero references. The distribution of P/T reference resources (arranged in descending order from most encoding to least encoding) in S1 contexts in the two sermons can be seen in Table 7:

Table 7 Distribution of P/T reference resources in S1 contexts in the two sermons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P/T reference resources</th>
<th>Number of occurrences</th>
<th>Rounded Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noun Phrase</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributive clause + 3P pronoun</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrative Pronoun</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero reference</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows that, in S1 contexts, which are expected to have less coding than S4 contexts as the referents have already been mentioned in the previous sentence (See section 3.2 for the definition of S1 context), the majority of the Discourse Participants are encoded with Zero references.

For cases in which the subject, in either the dependent or the independent clause of the sentence, is the same as the subject of the independent clause in the previous sentence, the following default encoding rule is tentatively proposed which would cover 88% of the S1 instances.

Where a subject in either the dependent or the independent clause of a sentence is the same as the subject of the independent clause in the previous sentence, the default encoding is a Zero reference.

An example which follows the proposed default encoding rule for a Discourse Participant in an S1 context can be seen in line (62) from Sermon 1. The understood subject in an S1 context is bolded in the free translation. Line (61) is provided as necessary context.
As for Grandfather, the older [I] get, [I] have to drink water.

As for me, the older [I] get, [I] have to drink water. (Sermon 1)

In the case of very early morning, [I] have to drink water.

Although the proposed S1 rule predicts a Zero reference for Discourse Participants, there are referents which use more encoding than Zero references. These references are discussed in the following sections as the rule is refined.

In the data, 2 instances of Noun Phrases (NP) referring to Discourse Participants are found in S1 contexts. To discover a likely reason why the default Zero reference is not used in each case, questions are asked to discover: 1) whether the SBJ would be unacceptably or unintentionally ambiguous if a Zero reference were used, 2) whether other P/T reference resources could be used instead of the NP, 3) whether the use of a referring expression that is not a Zero reference is meant to highlight information and 4) whether any other possible explanation exists or not. After asking these questions, it is found that in one instance out of 2, the default Zero reference cannot be used. If used, the SBJ would be unacceptably semantically ambiguous, i.e. the audience might not know clearly who the referent is. For this reason, the NP seems to be used to avoid semantic ambiguity. Besides, this NP in an S1 context is also found to be in a sentence that is at the beginning of a paragraph with a new topic. This NP is found in line (589) from Sermon 1 in which the subject encoded with the NP in an S1 context is shaded. Line (588) is provided as necessary context.
(588) တယော့မယ့် ပိုင်းစွဲ မရှိခဲ့ တယ်

really happen NOMI say will

LIT: [I] will tell [you] what really happened.

FT: [I] will tell [you] a true story. (Sermon 1)

(589) ကယော့မယ့် ပိုင်းစွဲ မရှိခဲ့ တယ်

really happen NOMI with only link link and

LIT: Grandfather, no matter when, [always] takes evidence [by] linking the
Word of God only with what really happened.

FT: [I], no matter when, [always] take evidence [by] linking the Word of God
only with a true story. (Sermon 1)

In line (589), instead of using a kinship term NP in the S1 context, the preacher
could have used a Pronoun to refer to himself. The choice between a Pronoun or a
kinship NP seems to depend on how the speaker prefers to refer himself. Age may
also play a role in this case because the preacher of Sermon 1 was probably the
oldest person in the church at that time.

The reason for the second instance of a NP which does not follow the default rule for
S1 contexts seems to be because of Burmese Grammar. This can be seen in line (714)
from Sermon 1 in which the SBJ encoded with a NP in an S1 context and the
Contrastive Topic Marker တော့ [dó] (Zaw, 2017) are shaded. Line (713) is provided
as necessary context.
In line (714), the Contrastive Topic Marker တ ော့ [dɔ́] follows the SBJ and the use of တော့ [d5] necessitates the use of a referring expression that is not a Zero reference. However, this also means that a Pronoun could have been used instead of a kinship term NP. In Sermon 1, the data (including the sentences inside the embedded narratives) show that the preacher used ကျွန တ [cʊ̀.nɔ̀] 'I', a Pronoun, to refer to himself alone a total of 5 times and he used အဘ [ʔə.bá] 'grandfather', a kinship NP, for a total of 16 times. In Sermon 2, the data (including the sentences inside the embedded narratives) show that the preacher used ကျွန တ [cʊ̀.nɔ̀] 'I', a Pronoun, to refer to himself alone a total of 44 times but he never used a kinship NP to refer to himself alone. The choice of a Pronoun or a kinship term NP seems to be a personal choice of the preacher.

In the data, there are also 13 instances of pronouns (See Table 7) referring to Discourse Participants in S1 contexts. Of these instances, four seem to be used to avoid semantic ambiguity. If Zero references were used in these cases, the SBJs would be unacceptably ambiguous or unknown. An example can be seen in line (21)

---

14 Line (713) is interpreted as "[I] have no problem" in this case although some might argue that it should be interpreted as "Business/Problem does not exist". These two different interpretations are possible because ၬင် can mean either "be" or "have" according to SEAlang Burmese dictionary (1993). In this paper, ၬင် in line (713) is interpreted as "have". This decision is based on how people usually ask questions like "Why have you come here?" and how the answers are given. For example - Question: "ကိုစစ်ရှိလိုဒီကိုလိုနဲ့" What business/problem do [you] have - for [you] have come here? Answer: "ဒီအိမ်ကိုတရင်းချင်လိုးလိုး" [I have come here] because [I] want to ask if [you/the owner] want to sell this house.
In line (21) from Sermon 1, if the pronoun had been left out, then the audience might have understood that the SBJ in line (21) is different from the SBJ from line (20). In 3 instances out of 13, Pronouns seem to be used to avoid both semantic and grammatical ambiguity. (Grammatical ambiguity refers to a state in which it becomes ambiguous whether an utterance is a direct or a reported speech.) If Zero references were used in these cases, the SBJs would be ambiguous, and it would not be clear whether the preacher was employing direct speech or indirect speech. An example can be seen in line (562) from Sermon 2 in which a Pronoun in S1 context is shaded. Line (561) is provided as necessary context.
Line (562) 

(562) င် သတဌင်း ကိုင်းနှစ်ကြိမ်: 

tie də.ɡɛ́ loú nai tə.la

2P really do can INTR

FT: Can you really do [it - living your life obeying all religious teachings]? (Sermon 2)

If a Zero reference were used for the SBJ in S1 context, listeners would think that the SBJ could be “You” (indirect speech) or “I” (direct speech), i.e. the difference between “So ask yourself if you can do it” or “So ask yourself, ‘Can I do it?’” Therefore, the use of a Zero reference in line (562) would cause grammatical ambiguity. It seems like the preacher chose to use more than a Zero reference in line (562) in order to avoid grammatical ambiguity.

In 5 instances out of 13, Pronouns seem to be used to highlight the referents. In all these cases, although Zero references could be used, the preachers chose to use Pronouns. An example of highlighting referents can be seen in line (1213) from Sermon 2 in which the Pronoun in an S1 context is shaded. Line (1212) is provided as necessary context.

(1212) င် သတဌင်းပေါ်ပြီး 

tie nətʰaù bà

2P obey POL

FT: You, please listen. (Sermon 2)

(1213) ကိုင်းနှစ်ကြိမ်းမှာ င် သတဌင်း 

na.tʰaù ji ti nə.lɛ̀ lə lef mɛ̀

obey if 2P understand come will will

FT: If [you] obey [what God says], you will come [to] understand [what God is doing]. (Sermon 2)

In 1 instance out of 13, a Pronoun seems to be used not only to avoid semantic ambiguity but also to indicate the beginning of a new global topic. If a Zero reference were used in this case, the SBJs would be unacceptably ambiguous or unknown. This can be seen in line (1211) which is found at the beginning of a new global topic, “Please obey God no matter what is happening in your life. As you

---

15 Line (562) is treated as an independent clause because of the long pause after line (561).
obey, you will understand,” in Sermon 2. In line (1211), the referent encoded with a Pronoun in S1 context is shaded. Lines (1209-1210) are provided as necessary context.

(1209) 

na.₄₇aù  bà  

obey  POL

FT: [You] obey please. (Sermon 2)

(1210) 

na.₄₇aù  ji.né  na.lè  là  dë  
obey  while  understand  come  DECL

FT: While [you] are obeying, [you] come to understand [what God is doing]. (Sermon 2)

(1211) 

dà.jaù  ?a.jaù.tai  jë  ?a.tà.tà  mà  dì  gə.né  tì  

for this reason  each one  POSS  life  LOC  this  today  2P

bà  pʰjì?  ñ  lè  

what  happen  CONT  INTR

FT: For this reason, (in each one's life) how are you doing today? (Sermon 2)

Although a NP, for example - ìnõòq [mei.ʃʰwè] ‘friend’, could also be used for the SBJ in line (1211), the preacher has chosen a shorter reference (a Pronoun) over a longer reference (a NP).

Analysis of the references to Discourse Participants in S1 contexts suggests that the use of P/T reference resources can also be affected by who the Discourse Participant is. This can be seen by looking at the table below.
The data from the table above show that a preacher may use a NP (a kinship term), a Pronoun or a Zero reference to refer to himself. However, detailed analysis of the data shows that one preacher uses only zero reference or a pronoun to refer to himself; the other preacher uses zero reference, pronouns, and sometimes a kinship term NP to refer to himself. Age and closeness of his relationship to his audience may play a role in this case as he is likely to be the oldest person in the room and someone who knows the audience well. As for “both the preacher and the audience” and “Ambiguous referent”, only Pronouns and Zero references are found to be used, not other P/T reference resources. These data seem to suggest that when a referent in S1 context is not encoded with the default Zero reference, the use of P/T reference resources also depends on who the Discourse Participant is, apart from the Preacher's personal preference.
Based on the observations mentioned above, the S1 rule for the selected sermons is revised as follows:

   Where a Subject in either the dependent or the independent clause is the same as the subject of the independent clause in the previous sentence, the default encoding is a Zero reference, except in the cases of avoiding unacceptable semantic ambiguity or grammatical ambiguity, indicating a boundary, highlighting referents for emphasis or needing to follow the grammar, in which cases the referents may be encoded with a Pronoun or a kinship term NP. The choice of encoding depends on the preference of the speaker and who the Discourse Participant is.

The data show that, in general, Discourse Participants in S1 contexts in the two main sermons are treated as active referents, and Zero references are normally used for them. However, they may also be referred to with a Pronoun or a kinship term NP as not only the activation states of the Discourse Participants but also semantic and grammatical ambiguity, boundary, emphasis, grammatical requirement, and the identity of the Discourse Participants influence the choice of Participant/Topic reference resources used for the Discourse Participants in S1 contexts.

The revised S1 rule accounts for 110 instances (100%) of all the Discourse Participants in S1 contexts in the selected sermons. There is no exception to the revised rule for the S1 context. The following section briefly discusses the references to Discourse Participants found in S2 contexts in the two main sermons.

4.2.2 S2: Default encoding for the Discourse Participants
The S2 context is one in which the subject in a sentence is also the addressee of the previous direct speech or indirect speech. This definition of the S2 context is the slightly modified version of Levinsohn’s definition of the S2 context (2015a, p. 125) (See section 3.2 for the definition of the S2 context). According to the analysis of S2 contexts in the two sermons, the number of S2 contexts is found to be very few. Only 3 SBJs, 3 Zero references, in S2 contexts are found in the data. (See Appendix A for detailed information.) For this reason, a default encoding rule for SBJs in S2 context is not proposed for the Discourse Participants. The following section discusses the references to Discourse Participants found in S3 contexts in the two main sermons.
4.2.3 S3: Default encoding for the Discourse Participants

The S3 context is one in which the subject of the dependent or independent clause of a sentence is the same as a referent that plays a role other than S1 or S2 in the previous clause/sentence. This definition of the S3 context is the slightly modified version of Levinsohn’s definition of the S3 context (2015a, p. 125) (See section 3.2 for the definition of the S3 context). According to the analysis of references to Discourse Participants in S3 contexts in the two main sermons, the number of S3 contexts is also found to be few. There are only 30 SBJs in S3 contexts. (See Appendix A for detailed information.) Yet, a default encoding rule for the S3 context is still proposed in this section. The analysis of S3 contexts for the Discourse Participants in the S3 context in the two main sermons was done using the discovery and refinement procedure demonstrated for the S1 context (See section 4.2.1) and the resulting refined rule for the S3 context is as follows:

*Where a Subject in either the dependent or the independent clause is the same as a referent that plays a role other than S1 or S2 in the previous clause/sentence, the default encoding is a Zero reference, except in the cases of avoiding unacceptable semantic ambiguity or highlighting referents for emphasis, in which cases the referents may be encoded with a Pronoun. The choice of encoding depends on the preference of the speaker and who the Discourse Participant is.*

The data show that, in general, Discourse Participants in S3 contexts in the two main sermons are treated as active referents, and Zero references are normally used for them. However, they may also be referred to with a Pronoun or a NP as not only the activation states of the Discourse Participants but also semantic and grammatical ambiguity, boundary, emphasis, grammatical requirement, and the identity of the Discourse Participants influence the choice of Participant/Topic reference resources used for the Discourse Participants in S3 contexts.

An example which follows the above rule for a Discourse Participant in an S3 context can be seen in line (1222) from Sermon 2. The understood subject in an S3 context is bolded in the free translation. Line (1221) is provided as necessary context.
The revised S3 rule accounts for 30 instances (100%) of references to Discourse Participants in S3 contexts in the two main sermons. There is no exception to the revised rule for the S3 context. The following section discusses the references to Discourse Participants found in S4 contexts in the two main sermons.

4.2.4 S4: Default encoding for the Discourse Participants

The S4 context is one in which the subject of the dependent or independent clause of a sentence does not occur in the previous sentence. This definition of the S4 context is the slightly modified version of Levinsohn’s definition of the S4 context (2015a, p. 125) (See section 3.2 for the definition of the S4 context). The analysis of references to Discourse Participants in S4 contexts in the two main sermons was done using the discovery and refinement procedure demonstrated for the S1 context (See section 4.2.1) (See Appendix A for detailed information.) and the resulting refined rule for the S4 context is as follows:

Where a Subject either in the dependent or independent clause of a sentence is not involved in the previous sentence, the default encoding is a Zero reference except in cases of avoiding unacceptable semantic ambiguity, indicating a boundary, highlighting referents for emphasis or needing to follow the grammar, in which cases the referents may be encoded with a Pronoun or a NP. The choice of encoding depends on the preference of the speaker and who the Discourse Participant is.

The data show that, in general, Discourse Participants in S4 contexts in the two main sermons are treated as active referents, and Zero references are normally used for them. However, they may also be referred to with a Pronoun or a NP as not only the
activation states of the Discourse Participants but also semantic and grammatical ambiguity, boundary, emphasis, grammatical requirement, and the identity of the Discourse Participants influence the choice of Participant/Topic reference resources used for the Discourse Participants in S4 contexts.

An example which follows the above rule for a Discourse Participant in an S4 context can be seen in line (339) from Sermon 1. The understood subject in an S4 context is bolded in the free translation. Line (338) is provided as necessary context.

(338) ၏။ ၎င်းကြည်စွာ မိုး ။
that the Word HON
FT: That [is] the Word [of God]. (Sermon 1)

(339) " မိုးကြည်စွာ မိုးကြည်စွာ မိုးကြည်စွာ မိုးကြည်စွာ မိုးကြည်စွာ မိုးကြည်စွာ မိုးကြည်စွာ မိုးကြည်စွာ မိုးကြည်စွာ မိုးကြည်စွာ ။
the Word HON LOC evidence have POL DECL QUOT
c မိုးကြည်စွာ မိုးကြည်စွာ မိုးကြည်စွာ မိုးကြည်စွာ မိုးကြည်စွာ မိုးကြည်စွာ မိုးကြည်စွာ မိုးကြည်စွာ မိုးကြည်စွာ မိုးကြည်စွာ မိုးကြည်စွာ ။
say want DECL
FT: [I] want to tell [you], "The word [of God] has evidence". (Sermon 1)

The revised S4 rule accounts for 144 instances (100%) of references to Discourse Participants in S4 contexts in the two main sermons. There is no exception to the revised rule for the S4 context. The following section discusses the references to Discourse Participants found in N1 (Non-Subject) contexts in the two main sermons.

4.3 Non-Subject reference patterns for the Discourse Participants

This section discusses the Non-Subject reference patterns for the Discourse Participants found in Sermons 1 and 2 by proposing rules and providing examples for default encodings. The analysis of N1-N4 contexts for the Discourse Participants in the two sermons is done using the discovery and refinement procedure demonstrated for the S1 context (See section 4.2.1). Therefore, the whole discovery and refinement procedure is not demonstrated again in the subsequent sections. Only the final result, the revised rule with an example, is explained for each type of Non-Subject contexts.
4.3.1 N1: Default encoding for the Discourse Participants

The N1 context is one in which the Non-Subject of the dependent or independent clause of a sentence is the same as the Non-Subject of the independent clause in the previous sentence. This definition of the N1 context is the slightly modified version of Levinsohn's definition of the N1 context (2015a, p. 125) (See section 3.2 for the definition of the N1 context). According to the analysis of N1 contexts in the two main sermons, the number of N1 contexts is also found to be few. There are only 11 Non-Subjects in N1 contexts. Yet, a default encoding rule for the N1 context is still proposed in this section. (See Appendix A for detailed information.) The resulting refined rule for the N1 context is as follows:

Where a Non-Subject, in either the dependent or the independent clause, is the same as the Non-Subject of the independent clause in the previous sentence, the default encoding is a Zero reference, except in the cases of avoiding unacceptable semantic ambiguity or indicating a boundary, in which cases the referents may be encoded with a Pronoun. The choice of encoding depends on the preference of the speaker and who the Discourse Participant is.

The data show that, in general, Discourse Participants in N1 contexts in the two main sermons are treated as active referents, and Zero references are normally used for them. However, they may also be referred to with a Pronoun or a NP as not only the activation states of the Discourse Participants but also semantic ambiguity, boundary, and the identity of the Discourse Participants influence the choice of Participant/Topic reference resources used for the Discourse Participants in N1 contexts.

An example which follows the above rule for a Discourse Participant in N1 context can be seen in line (588) from Sermon 1. The understood Non-Subject in N1 context is bolded in the free translation. Line (587) is provided as necessary context.

(587) စိန့်မယ ပမာ
        ပမာ မည်
        tell  will

FT: [I] will tell [you]. (Sermon 1)
The revised N1 rule accounts for all 11 instances (100%) of references to Discourse Participants in N1 contexts in the two main sermons. There is no exception to the revised rule for the N1 context. The following section briefly discusses N2 (Non-Subject) contexts although no references to Discourse Participants are found in this context in the two main sermons.

4.3.2 N2: Default encoding for the Discourse Participants
The N2 context is one in which the Non-Subject of the dependent or independent clause of a sentence is the speaker of the previous direct or indirect speech. No instance of an N2 context is found in the two main sermons. It may be because of the behavioral genre or because of the limited scope of the study which does not include the narratives embedded in the sermon or the comments made by the preachers while telling the narratives. The following section discusses the references to Discourse Participants found in N3 contexts in the two main sermons.

4.3.3 N3: Default encoding for the Discourse Participants
The N3 context is one in which the Non-Subject of the dependent or independent clause of a sentence occurs in the previous sentence in a role other than N1 or N2. This definition of N3 context is the slightly modified version of Levinsohn’s definition of the N3 context (2015a, p. 125) (See section 3.2 for the definition of the N3 context). According to the analysis of N3 contexts in the two main sermons, the number of N3 contexts is also found to be few. There are only 13 Non-Subjects in N3 contexts. Yet, a default encoding rule for the N3 context is still proposed in this section. (See Appendix A for detailed information.) The resulting refined rule for the N3 context is as follows:
Where a Non-Subject, in either the dependent or the independent clause, is the same as a referent that plays a role other than N1 or N2 in the previous clause/sentence, the default encoding is a Zero reference, except in the cases of avoiding unacceptable semantic ambiguity, in which cases the referents may be encoded with a Pronoun. The choice of encoding depends on the preference of the speaker and who the Discourse Participant is.

The data show that, in general, Discourse Participants in N3 contexts in the two main sermons are treated as active referents, and Zero references are normally used for them. However, they may also be referred to with a Pronoun or a NP as not only the activation states of the Discourse Participants but also semantic ambiguity, and the identity of the Discourse Participants influence the choice of Participant/Topic reference resources used for the Discourse Participants in N3 contexts.

An example which follows the above rule for a Discourse Participant in a N3 context can be seen in line (660) from Sermon 2. The understood Non-Subject in a N3 context is bolded in the free translation. Line (659) is provided as necessary context.

(659) ᵁ t̪ú -gò kʰɔ̀ ɔ̀ ći bà
3P.OBJ CASE.OBJ call try POL
FT: [You] try calling him. (Sermon 2)

(660) ᵃ tʰu  mè
answer will
FT: [Jesus] will answer [you]. (Sermon 2)

The revised N3 rule accounts for all 13 instances (100%) of references to Discourse Participants in N3 contexts in the two main sermons. There is no exception to the revised rule for the N3 context. The following section discusses the references to Discourse Participants found in N4 (Non-Subject) contexts in the two main sermons.

4.3.4 N4: Default encoding for the Discourse Participants

The N4 context is one in which the Non-Subject of the dependent or independent clause of a sentence is not involved in the previous sentence. This definition of the N4 context is the slightly modified version of Levinsohn’s definition of the N4
context (2015a, p. 125) (See section 3.2 for the definition of the N4 context). (See Appendix A for detailed information.) The resulting refined rule for the N4 context is as follows:

Where a Non-Subject, in either in the dependent or independent clause of a sentence, is not involved in the previous clause/sentence, the default encoding is a Zero reference, except in the cases of avoiding unacceptable semantic ambiguity or grammatical ambiguity, indicating a boundary, highlighting referents for emphasis or needing to follow the grammar, in which cases the referents may be encoded with a Pronoun or a NP. The choice of encoding depends on the preference of the speaker and who the Discourse Participant is.

The data show that, in general, Discourse Participants in N4 contexts in the two main sermons are treated as active referents, and Zero references are normally used for them. However, they may also be referred to with a Pronoun or a NP as not only the activation states of the Discourse Participants but also semantic and grammatical ambiguity, boundary, emphasis, grammatical requirement, and the identity of the Discourse Participants influence the choice of Participant/Topic reference Resources used for the Discourse Participants in N4 contexts.

An example which follows the above rule for a Discourse Participant in a N4 context can be seen in line (354) from Sermon 1. The understood Non-Subject in a N4 context is bolded in the free translation. Line (353) is provided as necessary context.

(353) ဒုယစချက်တည်ကြည့်တောက်တွင်
dú.ta.já ʔə chá
second one CLF.Info
FT: The second point (Sermon 1)

(354) ၂နာကမ်းမှာပြခြင်းဖြစ်သည်
jets kʰú be pjɔ bà mè di né
two CLF.Object only tell POL will this day
FT: [I] will tell [you] only two points today. (Sermon 1)

The revised N4 rule accounts for 37 instances (100%) of references to Discourse Participants in N4 contexts in the two main sermons. There is no exception to the revised rule for the N4 context.
4.3.5 Summary

In the two main sermons, referring expressions used for the Discourse Participants are different from the referring expressions that refer to other 3rd person Participants/Topics (P/Ts). All the referring expressions for the Discourse Participants refer to four possible groupings of these participants: 1. the preacher, 2. the audience, 3. both the preacher and the audience, or 4. Ambiguous referent.

The data suggest that using a Zero reference is very likely to be a default way for a preacher to refer to himself/herself for the first time in a sermon. As for the first mention of the audience, the data from the two main sermons and 10 additional sermons are not conclusive. It seems like the decision about whether to use a NP or a Zero reference to refer to the audience for the first time depends on the personal choice of a preacher. Another possibility is that there is no single default to refer to the audience for the first time. As for a preacher to refer to himself/herself and the audience collectively in a sermon, using a Pronoun is very likely to be a default way. It seems like using a Zero reference is the default way of referring to an ambiguous referent for the first time.

Default encoding patterns for the Discourse Participants in different Subject and Non-Subject contexts are shown in Table 9. The data in Table 9 represent all the first mentions and all subsequent mentions of the referents. The data for S2 and N2 contexts are not enough to propose default encoding rules.

Table 9 Default encodings for the Discourse Participants in different contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant/ Topic reference resources</th>
<th>S1, N1</th>
<th>S2, N2</th>
<th>S3, N3</th>
<th>S4, N4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø, Ø</td>
<td>Ø, Ø</td>
<td>Not enough data, No data</td>
<td>Ø, Ø</td>
<td>Ø, Ø</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It seems logical to conclude that Discourse Participants in different Subject and Non-Subject contexts are normally treated as active referents, and Zero references are normally used for them. However, they may also be referred to with other P/T reference resources as not only the activation states of the Discourse Participants but also semantic and grammatical ambiguity, boundary, emphasis, grammatical requirements, and the identity of the Discourse Participants tend to influence the choice of P/T reference resources. The following chapter discusses the references to general Participants/Topics (P/Ts) that are not Discourse Participants in the two main sermons.
Chapter 5
Analysis and findings on general Participants/Topics (P/Ts) in the two sermons

In the two main sermons, there are “Discourse Participants” (See Chapter 4) and other Participants/Topics. Referring expressions used for the Discourse Participants who are physically present in the same room at the time of preaching are different from the referring expressions that refer to other 3rd person Participants/Topics (P/Ts). All the referring expressions for P/Ts that are not Discourse Participants will be called general P/Ts from this point on in this thesis. These general P/Ts are analyzed and discussed in this chapter.

Linguists have proposed different categories or ranks for the Participants/Topics of a discourse (Grimes, 1978; Longacre, 2010c; Dooley & Levinsohn, 2000; Levinsohn, 2015a; Levinsohn, 2015b). However, in this analysis, general P/Ts will not be categorized or ranked. Only their S1-S4 and N1-N4 contexts and the encodings used for these contexts will be analyzed.

5.1 Introduction of general Participants/Topics
In this section, three general Participants/Topics (P/Ts) are selected as samples to describe the ways general P/Ts are normally introduced in the two main sermons. These three P/Ts are selected based on the criteria that the number of times the P/Ts were mentioned needs to be the highest among the general P/Ts. In Sermon 1, the number of times "浥ipient" [jè] ‘water’ was mentioned is the highest (32 times) and in Sermon 2, the number of times "Jesus Christ’ and ‘God’ are mentioned were the highest (102 times for "Jesus Christ’ and 58 times for ‘God’). In the rest of the section, the ways "浥ipient” [jè] ‘water’ (from Sermon 1), "Jesus Christ’ and ‘God’ (from Sermon 2) were introduced are discussed.
In Sermon 1,浥ipient [jè] water is first mentioned in line (4) using a NP. This can be seen in the following example in which浥ipient [jè] ‘water’ is shaded in grey. Line (3) is provided as context.
In Sermon 2, ဘုရ်စသခင် [pʰə.jə.pa.kʰɪ] ‘God’ is first mentioned at the very beginning of the sermon using a NP. This can be seen in the following example in which ဘုရ်စသခင် [pʰə.jə.pa.kʰɪ] ‘God’ is shaded in grey.

Also in Sermon 2, သူဂူတင်ကော [jə.sʰǔ.kʰə.jə.tɔ̀] ‘Jesus Christ’ is first mentioned in line (170) using a NP. This can be seen in the following example in which Jesus Christ is shaded in grey. Line (169) is provided as necessary context.
5.2 Subject reference patterns for general Participants/Topics

This section discusses the Subject reference patterns for all general Participants/Topics from the two main sermons not just the few discussed in the previous sections. The analysis of S1-S4 contexts for all general P/Ts is done using the discovery and refinement procedure demonstrated for the S1 context (See section 4.2.1). Where there are non-default encodings, that do not follow the revised rules for S1-S4 contexts, they are also mentioned at the end of each section.

5.2.1 S1: Default encoding for general Participants/Topics

The S1 context is one in which the subject of the dependent or independent clause of a sentence is the same as the subject of the independent clause in the previous sentence. The resulting refined rule for the S1 context is as follows (See Appendix B for detailed information.):

Where a Subject in either the dependent or the independent clause is the same as the subject of the independent clause in the previous sentence, the default encoding is a Zero reference, except in the cases of avoiding unacceptable semantic ambiguity or grammatical ambiguity, indicating a boundary, highlighting referents for emphasis or needing to follow the grammar, in which cases the referents may be encoded with a Pronoun, a Demonstrative Pronoun or a NP. The choice of encoding depends on the preference of the speaker and who/what the Participant/Topic is.

The data show that, in general, general P/Ts in S1 contexts in the two main sermons are treated as active referents, and Zero references are normally used for them. However, they may also be referred to with a Pronoun or a NP as not only the activation states of the general P/Ts but also semantic and grammatical ambiguity, boundary, emphasis, grammatical requirement, and the identity of the P/Ts influence the choice of Participant/Topic reference resources used for the general P/Ts in S1 contexts.
An example which follows the above rule for a general Participant/Topic in an S1 context can be seen in line (32) from Sermon 2. The subject in an S1 context is bolded in the free translation. Line (31) is provided as necessary context.

(31)

ဗူး - က
3P.OBJ CASE.OBJ

တွေ့ရှိမှုကို နိုင်ငံသားက
သူကို ကြိုးစားနိုင်သည်
၎င်းကို ကြိုးစားနိုင်သည်
sore disease heal give can Attrib. God CASE.SBJ

ဗူး နိုင်ငံသား
life alive stay DECL

FT: The God who can heal him is alive. (Sermon 2)

(32)

ဗူး နိုင်ငံသား
life alive because blessing ask get to EMP

FT: Because [God] is alive, [we/people] get to pray/ask-blessing [to/from God]. (Sermon 2)

The revised S1 rule accounts for all 108 instances (100%) of general P/Ts in S1 contexts found in the selected sermons. There is no exception to the revised rule for the S1 context.

5.2.2 S2: Default encoding for general Participants/Topics

The S2 context is one in which the subject in a sentence is also the addressee of the previous direct speech or indirect speech. There are no references to P/Ts in S2 contexts in the two main sermons. For this reason, a default encoding rule for general P/Ts in the S2 context is not proposed.
5.2.3 S3: Default encoding for general Participants/Topics

The S3 context is one in which the subject of the dependent or independent clause of a sentence is the same as a referent that plays a role other than S1 or S2 in the previous clause/sentence. According to the analysis of general P/Ts in S3 contexts in the two main sermons, the number of S3 contexts is found to be few. There are only 32 Non-Subjects in S3 contexts. Moreover, the data from the two main sermons disagree with each other. This can be seen in the following table:

Table 10 The distribution of references in S3 contexts for general P/Ts in the two main sermons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Participants/Topics</th>
<th>Noun Phrase</th>
<th>Attributive Clause + 3P Pronoun</th>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Demonstrative Pronoun</th>
<th>Zero reference</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sermon 1</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>10 (76%)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sermon 2</td>
<td>8 (42%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (21%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>6 (32%)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>9 (28%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (16%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>16 (50%)</td>
<td>32 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows that in Sermon 1, the number of Zero references is more than the number of NPs, Attributive Clause + 3P Pronoun, Pronouns and Demonstrative Pronouns. According to the data in Sermon 1, it seems like the default encoding for general P/Ts in S3 contexts is a Zero reference. However, the table above also shows that in Sermon 2, the number of NPs is more than other participant resource types. According to the data in Sermon 2, it seems like the default encoding for general P/Ts in S3 contexts is a NP. Because of this disagreement between Sermon 1 and Sermon 2 for the general P/Ts in S3 contexts, a default encoding rule for the S3 context is not proposed in this section. More research is recommended to see whether the data from Sermon 1 or the data from Sermon 2 indicate the default encoding for general P/Ts in S3 contexts. The following section discusses the references to general P/Ts found in S4 contexts in Sermons 1 and 2.
5.2.4 S4: Default encoding for general Participants/Topics

The S4 context is one in which the subject of the dependent or independent clause of a sentence does not occur in the previous sentence. The resulting refined rule for the S4 context is as follows (See Appendix B for detailed information.):

Where a Subject in either the dependent or independent clause of a sentence does not occur in the previous sentence, the default encoding is a Noun Phrase, except in the cases of referring to a non-specific referent\(^{16}\) where the referent may be encoded with ‘an Attributive Clause + 3P Pronoun’, a non-specific Pronoun or a Zero reference; in the cases of the use of ‘sequential (look-forward) strategy’ in which the referents may be encoded with a Zero cataphora; or in the cases in which the Subject is mentioned once at the beginning of the sentence where the referent may later be encoded with a Zero reference or a Pronoun. The choice of encoding depends on the preference of the speaker and who/what the Participant/Topic is.

The data show that, in general, general P/Ts in S4 contexts in the two main sermons are treated as inactive or new referents, and NPs are normally used for them. However, they may also be referred to with ‘an Attributive Clause + 3P Pronoun’, a Pronoun or a Zero reference as not only the activation states of the general P/Ts but also the use of ‘sequential (look-forward) strategy’, and whether the referents are mentioned once at the beginning of the sentence or not, and the identity of the P/Ts influence the choice of Participant/Topic reference resources used for the general P/Ts in S4 contexts.

An example which follows the above rule for a general Participant/Topic in an S4 context can be seen in line (217) from Sermon 2. The subject in an S4 context is shaded in grey. Line (216) is provided as necessary context.

---

\(^{16}\) A non-specific referent is a general referent that can be used for anyone. For example - a person or people in general.
The data from the two main sermons suggest that Burmese is using a P/T reference strategy that is different from either of the two strategies, ‘sequential (look-back) strategy’ and ‘VIP (Very Important Participant) strategy’, proposed by Grimes (1978, p. vii-viii) and later adopted and renamed by Dooley and Levinsohn (2000, p. 59-60). The strategy Burmese uses is a sequential (look-forward) strategy in which a Zero cataphora is first used in the beginning of a sentence to refer to a referent which is later explicitly mentioned with a Pronoun or a NP.

An example for the use of Zero cataphora for a general Participant/Topic in an S4 context can be seen in line (5) from Sermon 1. The subject in an S4 context which is encoded with a Zero cataphora is bolded in the free translation. Lines (3-4) are provided as necessary context.
In line (5), a Zero cataphora, translated as ‘one’ in the free translation, is used inside the dependent clause which occurs at the beginning of the sentence. It refers to [lù.dai] ‘everyone’ which is mentioned later. One way to test a Zero reference to see if it is a Zero cataphora is to read only the dependent clause which occurs at the beginning of the sentence to a native speaker and ask him who the subject is. If it is a Zero cataphora, the native speaker would not be able to say for sure who the subject is even though he might make guesses based on the context. He would not be able to tell who the subject is until the independent clause, where the referent that the Zero cataphora refers to is explicitly mentioned, is read. The use of Zero cataphora suggests that Burmese uses ‘a sequential strategy that looks forward (looks to the right of the reference in focus)’. This strategy will be called the ‘sequential (look-forward) strategy’ in this thesis. Because of the use of this ‘sequential (look-forward) strategy’, the referent in an S4 context in line (5) which is not mentioned in lines (3-4) seems to be encoded with a Zero cataphora even though it is a referent in an S4 context.

The data from the two main sermons suggest that once a referent is explicitly mentioned at the beginning of a sentence either with a NP or a Pronoun, it is natural to later refer to the same referent with a zero reference although it is not mentioned in the previous sentence. An example can be seen in line (939) from Sermon 2 in
which the referent that is first mentioned at the beginning of the sentence is shaded in grey and a later understood reference to the same referent is underlined in the free translation. Line (938) is provided as necessary context.

(938) န်းတထငရငာ
na.tʰaù ji na.lè là lei mè
obey if understand come will will
FT: If [you] listen to [what Jesus says], [you] will understand [what Jesus is doing]. (Sermon 2)

(939) လူတွကန်းလည်မှ
lù -dwè -gá na.lè thè na.tʰaù cʰì tà
human PL CASE.SBJ understand only when obey want EMP
FT: Only when people understand [what Jesus is doing], [they] want to obey [what Jesus says]. (Sermon 2)

The revised S4 rule accounts for 230 (93%) out of 248 instances of references in S4 contexts which refer to general P/Ts in the two main sermons. There are 18 exceptions (7%) to the revised S4 rule. The Subjects in these cases are encoded with non-default encodings. These non-default encodings are discussed in the following section.

5.2.4.1 Non-default encoding for general Participants/Topics in S4 contexts
This section describes the instances in which the preacher does not follow the default encoding pattern of the revised S4 rules for general P/Ts.

In the two main sermons, there are 17 instances of referents in S4 contexts (7 in Sermon 1 and 10 in Sermon 2) which are encoded with Zero references. For 16 out of 17 instances, a possible explanation is that when the preachers assume that there is enough contextual information for the listeners to identify the referents without the risk of confusion, Zero references can be used. An example can be seen in line (342) from Sermon 1. The subject in an S4 context is bolded in the free translation. Line (341) is provided as necessary context.
In Sermon 1, the preacher used a non-default Zero reference encoding to refer to his sermon or what he is going to say. This can be seen in line (1) in which the subject in an S4 context is bolded in the free translation. Line (2) is provided as necessary context.

(1) ရ ှ ည  ရ ှ ည long long
d  ီ ်းက  ီ ်း big big
c  ီ ်းက  ီ ်း wide wide
မဟ ု   ေါဘ  ူ  ်း Neg be

FT: [My sermon/What I am about to say] is not very long [and] splendid.

(2) "ʃè ʃè we we ci ci cè cè ma houù bà bu long long far far big big wide wide Neg be POL Neg

FT: Today, [I] want to tell [you] "The Word [of God] is tasty even if [it] [is] just a little."

The reason why the preacher used a Zero reference to refer to a subject in an S4 context is unknown. More research is recommended to see if this is a natural way of referring to what the preacher is going to say in a sermon.
In Sermon 2, one subject in an S4 context is found to be a quoted sentence. This can be seen in line (25) in which the SBJ in an S4 context is shaded in grey. Line (24) is provided as necessary context.

(24) တသသွ  ်း  ော့ လူ
t̪è t̪wa té lù t̪wa ?aú.mé jì ṭò pʰó be
die PFV Attrib. human go remember if cry to only
t̪è dè
be DECL

LIT: If [we/people/a person] go [and] remember a dead person, the only [thing] that is [left for] [us/them/him] [to do] is cry.

FT: If [we/people/a person] remember a dead person, the only [thing] that is [left for] [us/them/him] [to do] is cry. (Sermon 2)

(25) တယရမ ိ အန ဂ တ ိ ကျမ  ်းမ ှ
jè.j àú.mí ʔə.nà.gá ʔà sʰ.ò.ló.jì.jì
for this reason Jeremiah future scripture LOC in the case of
" ဒါော့တကက င ော့
ʃí.cʰà bà dè
sure include DECL

FT: For this reason, "Don't remember a dead person" is surely in Jeremiah. (Sermon 2)

The following section discusses the references to general P/Ts in N1 (Non-Subject) contexts in the two main sermons.
5.3 Non-Subject reference patterns for general Participants/Topics

This section discusses the Non-Subject reference patterns for general Participants/Topics (P/Ts) from the two main sermons. The analysis of N1-N4 contexts for the P/Ts is done using the discovery and refinement procedure demonstrated for Discourse Participants in the S1 context (See section 4.2.1). Where there are non-default encodings, that do not follow the revised rules for N1-N4 contexts, they are also mentioned at the end of each section.

5.3.1 N1: Default encoding for general Participants/Topics

The N1 context is one in which the Non-Subject of the dependent or independent clause of a sentence is the same as the Non-Subject of the independent clause in the previous sentence. The resulting refined rule for the N1 context is as follows:

Where a Non-Subject, in either the dependent or the independent clause, is the same as the Non-Subject of the independent clause in the previous sentence, the default encoding is a Zero reference, except in the cases of avoiding unacceptable semantic ambiguity, indicating a boundary, highlighting referents for emphasis or needing to follow the grammar, in which cases the referents may be encoded with a Pronoun, a Demonstrative Pronoun or a Noun Phrase. The choice of encoding depends on the preference of the speaker and who/what the Participant/Topic is.

The data show that, in general, general P/Ts in N1 contexts in the two main sermons are treated as active referents, and Zero references are normally used for them. However, they may also be referred to with a Pronoun, a Demonstrative Pronoun or a NP as not only the activation states of the general P/Ts but also semantic ambiguity, boundary, emphasis, grammatical requirement, and the identity of the P/Ts influence the choice of Participant/Topic reference resources used for the P/Ts in N1 contexts.

An example which follows the above rule for a general Participant/Topic in an N1 context can be seen in line (323) from Sermon 1. The understood Non-Subject in an N1 context is bolded in the free translation. Line (322) is provided as necessary context.
If the word [of God which is] evidence of God's grace, mercy and power becomes alive with strange signs, [we/people/a person] definitely go in to God's school.

FT: If the word [of God which is] evidence of God's grace, mercy and power becomes alive with strange signs, [we/people/a person] definitely go in to [a] church. (Sermon 1)

[We/people/a person] cannot stay without coming to [God's school].

FT: [We/people/a person] can't help wanting to go to [church]. (Sermon 1)
5.3.3 N3: Default encoding for general Participants/Topics
The N3 context is one in which the Non-Subject of the dependent or independent clause of a sentence occurs in the previous sentence in a role other than N1 or N2.

The resulting refined rule for the N3 context is as follows:

Where a Non-Subject, in either the dependent or the independent clause, is the same as a referent that plays a role other than N1 or N2 in the previous clause/sentence, the default encoding is a Zero reference, except in the cases of avoiding unacceptable semantic ambiguity, indicating a boundary, highlighting referents for emphasis or needing to follow the grammar, in which cases the referents may be encoded with a Demonstrative Pronoun, a Pronoun, an Attributive clause + 3P or a NP. The choice of encoding depends on the preference of the speaker and who/what the Participant/Topic is.

The data show that, in general, general P/Ts in N3 contexts in the two main sermons are treated as active referents, and Zero references are normally used for them. However, they may also be referred to with a Pronoun, a Demonstrative Pronoun, an Attributive clause + 3P or a NP as not only the activation states of the general P/Ts but also semantic ambiguity, boundary, emphasis, grammatical requirement, and the identity of the P/Ts influence the choice of Participant/Topic reference resources used for the P/Ts in N3 contexts.

An example which follows the above rule for a general Participant/Topic in N3 context can be seen in line (426) from Sermon 2. The understood Non-Subject in a N3 context is bolded in the free translation. Line (425) is provided as necessary context.

(425) တန က  ဆ  ု ်း  naú.sʰouʔə cʰá -gá tʰu.cʰa dè the last one CLF.Info CASE.SBJ be special DECL
FT: The last thing is special. (Sermon 2)
(426) တက င  ်းကင  တအ က
kau.gi ʔaú mjà.ji pà mù jè.sʰú
sky under earth on LOC Jesus

FT: Under the sky, on the earth, Jesus alone can do [it]. (Sermon 2)

The revised N3 rule accounts for all 44 instances (100%) of references to Discourse Participants in N3 contexts in the two main sermons. There is no exception to the revised rule for the N3 context.

5.3.4 N4: Default encoding for general Participants/Topics
The N4 context is one in which the Non-Subject of the dependent or independent clause of a sentence is not involved in the previous sentence. The resulting refined rule for the N4 context is as follows:

Where a Non-Subject, in either the dependent or independent clause of a sentence, is not involved in the previous clause/sentence, the default encoding is a Noun Phrase, except in the cases of referring to a non-specific referent where the referent may be encoded with ‘an Attributive Clause + 3P Pronoun’, a non-specific Pronoun or a Zero reference; or in the cases in which the Non-Subject is mentioned once at the beginning of the sentence where the referent may later be encoded with a Zero reference. The choice of encoding depends on the preference of the speaker and who/what the Participant/Topic is.

The data show that, in general, general P/Ts in N4 contexts in the two main sermons are treated as inactive or new referents, and NPs are normally used for them. However, they may also be referred to with a Pronoun, a Demonstrative Pronoun, ‘an Attributive clause + 3P Pronoun’ or a Zero reference as not only the activation states of the general P/Ts but also whether the P/Ts are mentioned once at the beginning of the sentence or not, and the identity of the P/Ts influence the choice of Participant/Topic reference resources used for the P/Ts in N4 contexts.

17 A non-specific referent is a general referent that can be used for anyone. For example - a person or people in general.
An example which follows the above rule for the encoding of general P/Ts in N4 contexts can be seen in line (21) from Sermon 1. The Non-Subjects in N4 contexts are shaded in grey. Line (20) is provided as necessary context.

(20) ကျွန်တို့ လိတွေ့ရှိတွင်: ကျွန်တို့ အရောင်ကို အခြေ ဖော် ပြချက် ကျော် နွေးတွင်
   ကြည့် လေ့ လာ တယ် ၊ နွေးတွင်
   1P  PL  orange  liquid  also  drink  possible  can  DECL  right?

FT: We can also drink orange juice, right? (Sermon 1)

(21) ကျွန်တို့ ဖွံ့ဖြိုးအားလုံးတွင်မှ ကျွန်တို့ ဖွံ့ဖြိုးအားလုံးတွင်မှ ကျွန်တို့ ဖွံ့ဖြိုးအားလုံးတွင်မှ ကျွန်တို့ ဖွံ့ဖြိုးအားလုံးတွင်မှ ကျွန်တို့ ဖွံ့ဖြိုးအားလုံးတွင်မှ ကျွန်တို့ ဖွံ့ဖြိုးအားလုံးတွင်မှ
   ကြည့် လေ့ လာ တယ် ၊ နွေးတွင်
   1P  PL  now  age  in  the  case  of  as  for
   Pepsi  PL  Coca Cola  PL

FTA: Nowdays, we drink Pepsi and Coca Cola. (Sermon 1)

The revised N4 rule accounts for 323 instances (90%) of 357 references to Discourse Participants in N4 contexts in the two main sermons. There are 34 exceptions (10%) to the revised N4 rule. The Non-Subjects in those cases are encoded with non-default encodings. These non-default encodings are discussed in the following section.

5.3.4.1 Non-default encoding for general Participants/Topics (P/Ts) in N4 contexts

This section describes the instances in which the preacher does not follow the default encoding pattern of the revised N4 rules for general P/Ts.

In the two main sermons, there are 30 instances of referents in N4 contexts (6 in Sermons 1 and 24 in Sermon 2) which are encoded with non-default, Zero references encodings. For these cases, a possible explanation is that when the preachers assume that there is enough contextual information for the listeners to identify the referents without the risk of confusion, Zero references can be used. An example can be seen in line (574) from Sermon 2. The Non-Subject in an N4 context is bolded in the free translation. Lines (572-573) are provided as necessary context.
In reality, however, I, according to what my mouth recites, I cannot live [my life] in reality.

FT: However, in reality, I cannot live [my life] according to what my mouth recites. (Sermon 2)

In Sermon 2, there is 1 Pronoun in an N4 context. This can be seen in line (456) in which the referent in an N4 context is shaded in grey. Lines (454-455) are provided as necessary context.

FT: When our sin arrives on Jesus Christ, we no longer have sin. (Sermon 2)
In Sermon 2, 3 Non-Subjects in N4 contexts are found to be quoted sentences. This can be seen in line (581) in which the Non-Subject in S4 context is shaded in grey. Line (580) is provided as necessary context.

(580) "နိုင်ငံတော်များ" စနစ်
jóútʰú mə loú né sʰó
case Neg make Neg.IMP say
jè.sʰú poù ci -gò dó zə.bè.pe le né
Jesus picture big CASE.OBJ however jasmine little with
FT: [God] says "Don't make statue", however, [Christians] [put] little jasmine flowers [on] Jesus' big picture. (Sermon 2)

(581) နိုင်ငံတော်များ
jó nà tà dó
cont NOMI however
QUOT
FT: What [Christians] are reciting, however, [is] "Do not make statue." (Sermon 2)

5.3.5 Summary
In the two main sermons, referring expressions used for the general P/Ts are different from the referring expressions used for the Discourse Participants.
According to the analysis of the three general P/Ts which are selected as samples for analyzing the way general P/Ts are first mentioned in the data, it seems logical to conclude that using a simple NP is very likely to be a default way to introduce general P/Ts.

Default encoding patterns for the general P/Ts in different Subject and Non-Subject contexts are shown in Table 11. The data in Table 11 represent all the first mentions and all subsequent mentions of the referents. There is no data for S2 and N2 contexts to propose default encoding rules.

**Table 11 Default encodings for the general Participants/Topics in different contexts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant/Topic reference resources</th>
<th>S1, N1</th>
<th>S2, N2</th>
<th>S3, N3</th>
<th>S4, N4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø, Ø</td>
<td>No data, No data</td>
<td>Inconclusive finding, Ø</td>
<td>Noun Phrase, Noun Phrase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It seems logical to conclude that not only the Activation States of the general P/Ts but also semantic and grammatical ambiguity, boundary, emphasis, grammatical requirements, and the identity of the Discourse Participants tend to influence the choice of P/T reference resources. The following section discusses the theory and methodology proposed by Levinsohn.

### 5.4 Evaluation of the theory and methodology proposed by Levinsohn

The theory and methods mainly used in this thesis for finding the Subject reference patterns and Non-Subject reference patterns are the ones proposed by Levinsohn (2015a, p. 128) which is mostly based on what Dooley and Levinsohn proposed (2000). Based on this research, his theory and methods prove to be very useful for finding the default patterns, which are the majority, and non-default patterns, which are the minority. Although his methods are not meant for identifying the sequential look-forward strategy, because of the use of his methods, evidence of the sequential look-forward strategy and other non-default encodings are easily identified. Levinsohn’s theory and methods prove to be very useful for finding the Subject reference patterns and Non-Subject reference patterns in different contexts.
5.5 Residue
The following are outside the scope of this study although they are important things to consider: Narratives embedded inside the sermon, comments that are closely tied to the embedded narratives, vocatives, prosody, subjects and Non-Subjects inside nominalized phrases, English words and sentences inside the sermons and comments made on these English words and sentences, sentence length and logical connections. More research is recommended for these topics in the same kind of genre.

For this study, analysis was done using Microsoft Excel. Because of the large amount of data and the limitations of the software, counting the Subjects and Non-Subjects had to be done manually on many occasions. If would be really helpful for discourse analysts if a software application were available that can handle the kind of discourse analysis done for this thesis and that supports Unicode.
Chapter 6
Discourse Markers in Sermons 1 and 2

6.1 Introduction
The objectives of this chapter are (1) to identify what kind of Discourse Markers (DMs) are used to signal discourse structure and to link information above the sentence level in a behavioral discourse spoken in the colloquial Yangon Burmese dialect, (2) to find the most commonly used DMs, analyze those DMs and explain the meanings and functions, (3) to find out the rate of occurrence\(^\text{18}\) of DMs used in Sermons 1 and 2, and (4) to check for similarities and differences in Sermon 2.

6.1.1 Relevant literature review
Stevenson and Eveleth’s dictionary (1966), Okell’s reference grammar of colloquial Burmese (1969), Sein’s dictionary (1981), the Myanmar Language Commission’s dictionary (1993) and Okell and Allot’s Burmese/Myanmar dictionary of grammatical forms (2001) are available as published materials at the time of writing this thesis. Hnin Tun’s research (2006) which was done based on 27 texts (p. 155) from four genres: narratives, personal interviews, dialogue in fiction and radio dramas (p. 127), and Ozerov’s research (2014) on the system of information packaging in colloquial Burmese was done based on recordings of read narratives, short unplanned narratives and spontaneous interviews that deal with a few of the DMs discussed in the subsequent sections. Their findings are mentioned and discussed in the relevant sections of the selected DMs. Part of this thesis reporting a preliminary analysis of the DM data from only one sermon (Sermon 1) was presented at the Payap University Symposium (Zaw, 2017, p. 534-547).

\(^{18}\) In Zaw’s paper (2017, p. 534-547), “rate of occurrence of DMs” is referred to as “relative frequency of DMs”. In this thesis, “rate of occurrence of DMs” is used as it is more accurate.
6.1.2 Data analysis

Based on the preachers’ pauses, intonation, the occurrence of sentence final particles and the native speaker intuition of the researcher, the sermons were broken down into sentences and numbered for this study. Only the connectors, particles, NPs and demonstratives which connect the information in different sentences were chosen as the DMs for this study as the scope of the study is DMs that function above the sentence level.

Analyzing the functions and the environment of the most commonly used DM was done as follows: The functions of the DM were determined by analyzing whether the DM 1) connects the sentences on either side of the DM, 2) connects to information that was mentioned earlier in further removed sentences by functioning as an anaphoric reference or 3) connects to information that was to be mentioned later in the discourse by functioning as a cataphoric reference.

6.2 The results and discussion

In the following section, the findings from Sermon 1 are presented and discussed as a demonstration. The findings from Sermon 2 are later discussed briefly. According to the criteria mentioned in 6.1.2, the DMs shown in Table 12 are found in Sermon 1. In Table 12, all DMs are grouped based on the similarity of their semantic meaning except for the demonstratives which vary in meaning but are still grouped together because of their similarity in form and function, and then the group of DMs with the highest number of occurrences are put on the highest position on the list and the group of DMs with the lower number of occurrences are mentioned later in descending order. The groups of DMs are listed in descending order of frequency in the table. Out of all the DMs mentioned in the table below, only number 1-7 were chosen for analysis in this thesis due to space and time limitations. More instances of use would be needed to pursue analysis of the remaining DMs.
Table 12 DMs in a colloquial Burmese behavioral discourse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>English meaning</th>
<th>Burmese</th>
<th>IPA</th>
<th># of occurrences</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>However, as for</td>
<td>ဒါ၏၌ [dɔ́] 19</td>
<td>dɔ́</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>However in the case of N</td>
<td>ကျတွ [cá.dɔ́] 20</td>
<td>cá.dɔ́</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Also</td>
<td>လည် [lɛ́] 21</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>But</td>
<td>တော့တွ [dà.pè.nɛ́]</td>
<td>dà.pè.nɛ́</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>But</td>
<td>တော့မွ [dà.pè.mɛ́]</td>
<td>dà.pè.mɛ́</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>But</td>
<td>တော့တန် [dà.pè.nɛ́.nɔ̀]</td>
<td>dà.pè.nɛ́.nɔ̀</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>But</td>
<td>တော့မွတန် [dà.pè.mɛ́.nɔ̀]</td>
<td>dà.pè.mɛ́.nɔ̀</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>So</td>
<td>ဆိုတွ [sʰɔ́.dɔ́] 9</td>
<td>sʰɔ́.dɔ́</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>So</td>
<td>အတွ [ʔɛ.dɔ́]</td>
<td>ʔɛ.dɔ́</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>So</td>
<td>အတွေးကလိုလျှင် [ʔɛ.dɔ́.gá.ló]</td>
<td>ʔɛ.dɔ́.gá.ló</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>So</td>
<td>အတွေးကလို [ʔɛ.dì.dɔ́]</td>
<td>ʔɛ.dì.dɔ́</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Demonstratives: this</td>
<td>ဒါ [dà] 12</td>
<td>dà</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Demonstratives: these</td>
<td>ဒါတွ [dà.twè] 13</td>
<td>dà.twè</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Demonstratives: this-little</td>
<td>ဒါတွေ [dà.le] 14</td>
<td>dà.le</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


20 The meaning of ကျတွ [cá.dɔ́] is mentioned as “However, as for” in Zaw’s paper (2017, p. 534-547)

21 In the preliminary analysis paper on Sermon 1 (Zaw, 2017), the number of လည် 3 [lɛ́] was not added. See section 6.5 for more information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>English meaning</th>
<th>Burmese</th>
<th>IPA</th>
<th># of occurrences</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Demonstratives: that</td>
<td>အ ဒါ</td>
<td>?e.dà</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Demonstratives: those</td>
<td>အ ဒါတ ွ</td>
<td>?e.dà.twè</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Demonstratives: that</td>
<td>အ ဒါတလ</td>
<td>?e.dà.lè</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>For this reason</td>
<td>ဒါတကက င  ော့</td>
<td>ð'àĄ钠á</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>For this reason</td>
<td>ဒါတကက င ော့ မို ော့လို ော့</td>
<td>ð'àĄ钠.mó.ló</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>For this reason</td>
<td>ဒါတကက င ော့</td>
<td>ð'àĄ钠</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>For this reason</td>
<td>ဒါတကက င ော့ မို ော့လို ော့</td>
<td>ð'àĄ钠.mó.ló</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>After that</td>
<td>မေ ူမစများ</td>
<td>pji.dó</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>After that</td>
<td>မေ ူမစများ</td>
<td>pji.dé.ʔə.kʰà .má</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Only after that</td>
<td>မေ ူမစများ</td>
<td>pji.dó.má</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>The reason why is</td>
<td>မေ ူမစများ</td>
<td>bà.ló.sʰò.dó</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Then</td>
<td>မေ ူမစများ</td>
<td>ð'àĄ钠.né</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>In addition to</td>
<td>မေ ူမစများ</td>
<td>pji.dó.lè</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>In addition to</td>
<td>မေ ူမစများ</td>
<td>pji.dó.lè</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>At that time</td>
<td>မေ ူမစများ</td>
<td>ð'àĄ钠.ʔə.kʰà</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>At that time</td>
<td>မေ ူမစများ</td>
<td>ð'àĄ钠.ʔə.cʰe l.má</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Like that</td>
<td>မေ ူမစများ</td>
<td>ð'àĄ钠.lè</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Like that</td>
<td>မေ ူမစများ</td>
<td>ð'àĄ钠.lè</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Then</td>
<td>မေ ူမစများ</td>
<td>naúʔ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Once (you) finish</td>
<td>မေ ူမစများ</td>
<td>pji.jí</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22 Demonstratives that modify NPs are not marked and counted in this research. For example - that dog, this man etc. These demonstratives and NPs work together to link information in different sentences/lines. However, as the author of this thesis is interested only in Demonstratives, only Demonstratives with no attached NPs are counted in this study.
In Sermon 1, the most commonly used DM is ဝန် မိုး [dó]. However, a quick analysis of Sermon 2 shows that the most commonly used DM is လည် [lɛ] in Sermon 2. In Sermon 1, 38 different DMs are found while in Sermon 2, 46 different DMs are found. In Sermon 2, all DMs except for 5 DMs, are found to be exactly the same or similar in meaning to the DMs found in Sermon 1. However, the rate of occurrence of DMs in Sermon 1 and Sermon 2 is found to be very similar, one DM for 4 sentences in Sermon 1 and one DM for 3.9 sentences in Sermon 2.

None of the DMs in lines (4, 6 and 7) from Table 12 are found in Sermon 2. Perhaps like No. 4 and the variant No. 5, and No. 6 and the variant No. 7 are the idiolect or dialect of the preacher of Sermon 1. As this research is limited to two sermons, more research is recommended for these DMs.

The subsequent sections discuss the functions and uses of ဝန် [dó], ကျတေ [cá.dó], လည် [lɛ], and the synonymous 1. ဒါနော [dà.pè.nɛ́], 2. ဒါနေမ [dà.pè.mɛ́], 3. ဒါနေနတ [dà.pè.nɛ́.nɔ̀] or 4. ဒါနေမတန [dà.pè.mɛ́.nɔ̀], DMs found at the top of the lists in the table above. Of these DMs, ဝန် [dó], လည် [lɛ] and 2. ဒါနေမ [dà.pè.mɛ́] are also found to be the most commonly used DMs in Sermon 2.
6.3 တ ပြ  [dʒ], DM #1

Okell and Allot’s remarks about the three different senses of တ ပြ  [dʒ] can be summarized as follows:

- တ ပြ 1 - ‘at last, after all, inevitably, nearly, merely’; with negative verbs (no) longer, (no) more; verb modifier which comes after the verb (2001, p. 77),
- တ ပြ 2 - ‘however, but; as for, at least’; sentence medial phrasal particle which comes after either NP or VP (2001, p. 78), and
- တ ပြ 3 - ‘when Verb; because, since, as V'; subordinate clause marker which comes after the verb (2001. p. 78).

The data from Sermon 1 suggest that တ ပြ  [dʒ] functions as a DM that connects information over the span of two or more sentences when it is used in the sense of တ ပြ 2 [dʒ] - ‘however, but; as for, at least’ as mentioned in Okell and Allot’s dictionary (2001, p. 78). The data agree with the fact that တ ပြ 1 [dʒ] is just a verb modifier. It is not a DM. As for တ ပြ 3 [dʒ], the data suggest that it is a subordinate clause marker that functions only at the sentence level. Although Stevenson and Eveleth’s dictionary and MLC’s dictionary also have entries for တ ပြ  [dʒ], it seems that the sense of တ ပြ  [dʒ] as ‘however, but; as for, at least’ is missing in these entries. Sein’s dictionary (1981) has no entry for တ ပြ  [dʒ] at all.

The use of တ ပြ 2 [dʒ] as a DM that functions as an anaphoric reference can be seen in line (58). It activates all the information in the preceding lines (48-57). In the following example, line 48-57 are provided in Burmese and in English as necessary context.

(48) အထွက်သြဖင တပြ ဗမြေညမ တပြ စည်ဘီယဆို သိကိကယ ။ 
FT: Especially in Myanmar, people like draught-beer very much.

(49) စည်ဘီ ယတသကချင ယ တန မဋ 
FT: They want to drink draught-beer.

(50) သူ လည်း အရည်တန မဋ 
FT: It is also a kind of liquid, right?

(51) ရမတသကချင ယ မဋ 
FT: People want to drink rum.

(52) အမယမ်းယမိ မဋ 
FT: Rum is also a kind of liquid.

(53) အမယမ်းယမိ မဋ 
FT: Ah... People become excited and happy after drinking rum.

(54) မိုးဗေဒ မဋ 
FT: They become excited and happy.
(55) တော့ ယ  FT: They become happy.

(56) စက်းက တလ်းလ  FT: Their speech becomes slow.

(57) တွ ော့ ကရ  FT: They say whatever comes into their mind without any
purpose.

(58) တရက  jè -gá  d偶然 ။ ပေး ာ့ ကြည့် နိုင်စု:  
but  water  CASE.SBJ  however  that  like  Neg  true  Neg  
တ  ော့  
jè -gá  
water  CASE.SBJ

FT: But water, however, is not like that.

In the examples above, တော့ 2 [dɔ́] follows the Subject and functions as a DM by
refreshing all the information mentioned earlier in (48-57) and signaling to the
listeners that the topic in the subject NP of line (58) and the topic in the following
lines will be different from the topic in (48-57), in this case, “Water is completely
different from beer and rum”. တော့ 2 [dɔ́] functions as a “Contrastive Topic Marker”
in line (58). Although တော့ [dà.pè.né] ‘but’ is found at the beginning of line (58), it
seems safe to conclude that တော့ [dà.pè.né] ‘but’ has no impact on the function of
တော့ 2 [dɔ́] as တော့ 2 [dɔ́] still activates the previously mentioned information with
or without တော့ [dà.pè.né] and only 3 sentences, about 10.3%, out of all the 29
anaphoric reference usages of တော့ 2 [dɔ́] in Sermon 1 are found to co-occur with
တော့ [dà.pè.né] at the beginning of the sentence. A quick survey of Sermon 2 shows
that there are many examples in which တော့ 2 [dɔ́] does not co-occur with တော့ [dà.pè.né]
although it is used as an anaphoric DM. Of all the 36 instances of the DM
တော့ [dɔ́] in Sermon 1, 29 instances, about 80.5%, are used as DMs that function as
anaphoric references.

Sermon 1 also shows that တော့ [dɔ́] is not only used to activate previously
mentioned information but can also be used to signal that the information in a later
sentence will be different from the sentence where တော့ [dɔ́] occurs. It tells the
listeners that there will be a subsequent sentence that starts with ‘but’ or ‘however’.
The use of တော့ [dɔ́] as a DM that functions as a cataphoric reference can be seen in
line (70) where it anticipates a contrasting sentence in line (74):
FT: Nowadays, people say, "Wow, the sermon is very good," but

Sometimes, because the preacher speaks well, the audience thinks the sermon is good, right?

Sometimes, because the preacher tells jokes the audience is happy, right?

Sometimes, because the preacher gives a lesson, the audience gets something out of the sermon.

But, were they really spiritually encouraged?

In (70), တော့ [dɔ́] is used as a DM for connecting (70) and (74). It functions as a DM by signaling to the listeners that (70) will eventually be followed by a sentence that starts with one of several words for 'but' or 'however' and the information in it will contrast with the information in line (70). The example above also seems to suggest that the subsequent sentence that begins with 'but' or 'however' does not necessarily need to occur immediately after the sentence containing တော့ [dɔ́] because lines (71-73) occur between lines (70) and (74). Of all the 36 instances of တော့ [dɔ́] in the selected data, 2 instances, about 5.5%, are used as DMs that function as cataphoric references.

The use of တော့ [dɔ́] as a DM that functions as an anaphoric reference or cataphoric reference can be described with a schema as follows:

```
[(CONN) [NP_{Time}] dɔ́ / [DVC] dɔ́ / [NP/PN]_{SUB/OBJ} dɔ́ ...]
```
In the schema shown above, CONN refers to a connective which may occur at the beginning of a sentence. NP refers to a Noun Phrase that indicates time. DVC refers to a dependent verb clause, and PN refers to a Pronoun. In a sentence, တ ော့ [dɔ́] may follow these.

The schema above can be used for all the occurrences of the DM တ ော့ [dɔ́] in Sermon 1. In Sermon 1, တ ော့ [dɔ́] is the most commonly used DM. In Sermon 2, တ ော့ [dɔ́] is the second most frequently used DM, and it is used as a contrastive marker that connect two or more sentences. An example for the use of တ ော့ [dɔ́] as a contrastive marker can be seen in line (360) in which တ ော့ [dɔ́] is shaded in grey. Line (359) is provided as necessary context.

(359) နွေးာ့ြေနိုင်းလူလည်း တော့ də go pjá nai tɛ̀ lù le jī dē  supernatual power show can Attrib. human also exist DECL
LIT: [A] person who can show supernatural power also exists.

FT: A person who can do miracles also exists.

(360) သို့အောက်ပါနောက် တော့ dɔ́ pjá nai tɛ̀ lù -gá dǝ́ mja dè  sermon show can Attrib. human CASE.SBJ however PL DECL
LIT: [A] person who can show [as] sermon, however, are many.

FT: People who can preach, however, are many. (Sermon 2)

In summary, the occurrences of တ ော့ [dɔ́] in Sermon 1 suggests that when it is used in the sense of တ ော့ ၂ - ‘however, but; as for, at least’ as mentioned in Okell and Allot’s dictionary (2001, p. 78), it functions as a DM for either anaphoric reference or cataphoric reference. This finding agrees with the description of တ ော့ [dɔ́] by Jenny and Hnin Tun (2016, p. 59), and Ozerov (2014, p. 198) as ‘contrastive marker’. Of all the 36 instances of the DM တ ော့ [dɔ́] in Semron 1, 29 instances, about 80.5%, function as anaphoric references and 2 instances, about 5.5%, function as cataphoric references. The functions of the remaining 14% are not analyzed and discussed in this thesis due to space and time limitations. A quick survey of Sermon 2 also support the finding that တ ော့ [dɔ́] functions as an anaphoric reference in most cases (47 instances) and cataphoric reference in a few cases (11 instances). The following section discusses the function and use of ကျတော့ [cá.dɔ́] in the selected sermon.
6.4 ကျတ ော့  [cá.dɔ́], DM #2

In Okell and Allots’ Burmese/Myanmar Dictionary of Grammatical Forms (2001) the entry for ကျတ ော့ [cá.dɔ́] is found under the entry for ကျ [cá]. It is described as an affix that follows NP and its meaning is given as “when we get to N, where N is a time or a place; when you consider N, in the case of N” (p. 15). The use of ကျတ ော့ [cá.dɔ́] in the current data suggest that it functions as a DM when it means “when we get to N, where N is a time or a place; when you consider N, in the case of N” with the additional meaning, ‘however/as for’.

The selected data suggests that when ကျတ ော့ [cá.dɔ́] ‘however in the case of N’ is used with a NP or NC\text{time}, it activates the information mentioned earlier and gives a hint to the listeners that information after it or the information in a subsequent sentence will be a contrastive statement, a complaint, or will have a negative connotation. The contrastive or negative information that follows ကျတ ော့ [cá.dɔ́] ‘however in the case of N’ can be in the sentence that immediately occurs or in a subsequent sentence. The use of ကျတ ော့ [cá.d5] ‘however in the case of N’ as a DM that functions as an anaphoric reference can be seen in line (396). It activates all the information in the preceding lines (392 and 394). In the following example, lines (392-395) are provided in Burmese and in English as necessary context.

(392) တေ ရု သည တထ င ထ ၌ အကျဥ်းတနရစဥ သင်းဝင သူ ို ော့သည ዃ FT: While Peter had to stay in the prison, church members

(393) ဘယ လို တြေ လ ጆ FT: What does the bible say?

(394) သ ူ ော့ အဖ ိ ု ော့ ကက ိ ်းစ ်း၍ ဘ ု ရ ်းသခင က ိ ု ဆ ု တ င်းေဌန ပေကက ယ ዃ FT: They tried to pray to God for him.

(395) ဟ တလလူ ်းယ ်း ጆ FT: Halleujah

(396) ဒါ ကျတ ော့ dà cá.dɔ́ ta.mè.dɔ́ -tòe -tùe -kà lòú this however apostle PL CASE.SBJ do NOM 

FT: However, this was not done by the apostles, right?
In line (396), ကျတတိုက် [cá.dɔ́] ‘however in the case of N’ is attached to တ [dà] which refers to the information in lines (392 and 394). When ကျတတိုက် [cá.dɔ́] ‘however in the case of N’ is used like this, it activates the information in (392) and (394) to which တ [dà] refers and signals to the listeners that the information that follows it is a contrastive statement.

In the following examples, ကျတတိုက် [cá.dɔ́] ‘however in the case of N’ is used to activate the information in the preceding sentence and give a hint to the listener that what follows is a complaint or a statement of negative connotation.

(721) သ် သမ ချင် လိုချင် နှယ်တွေတွေအတွေ့အကြုး အင်မနာယက်မှမေးတယ် ခစ်တယ်

FT: There are families who, with their heart, take pride in their children.

(722) ကျတတိုက် အချိန်က ʔə_cʰó cá.dɔ́ kʰə.le -ká mə jì mə pʰjíʔ  ló

some however child CASE.SBJ Neg be Neg possible because

သ်တောင်တွေ ပြည်သောထောင်စုတွေကို

ʔə jàú နə jàu jǜ tʰa pji.dɔ́

one CLF.Person two CLF.Person have PERF after that

အတဖမှတောင်မှတောင် များတွေ

ʔə.tʰei dò né pe tʰa ci là tó

baby sitter royal with only leave NOM big become when

ရက် မှန်သားတွေလည်း လောလောင်ချင်း

ʔə.pʰè bè tų́ ƚə ƚó me jǜ.já tè

father Question 3P SF.INTR because ask have to SF.DEC

FT: However, some had one or two children as it was impossible not to have children. But they left their children only with the baby sitter. As the result, the children don't really know who their father is and people have to ask, “Who is your father?”

In line (722), ကျတတိုက် [cá.dɔ́] ‘however in the case of N’ is used as a DM to activate all the information in (721) and to signal that the NP it attaches to is different from the information mentioned earlier and has negative connotation. In the case of lines (721-722), it tells the listeners that people mentioned in line (722) are different
from the people mentioned in line (721) and the speaker’s attitude towards the parents who let their children grow up with the baby sitter is negative.

Of all the 6 instances of ကျတော့ [cá.dʒ] in the selected data, all instances, 100%, are used as DMs that function as anaphoric references.

The use of ကျတော့ [cá.dʒ] as a DM that functions as an anaphoric reference can be described with a schema as follows:

\[\text{[(CONN) [NP/PN
SBJ/OBJ / [NP }_{\text{Time}}\text{ cá.dʒ ...}]}\]

In the schema shown above, CONN refers to a connective which may occur at the beginning of a sentence. \(\text{NP}_{\text{Time}}\) refers to a Noun Phrase that indicates time. PN refers to a Pronoun. In a sentence, ကျတော့ [cá.dʒ] may follow these. The schema above can be used for all the occurrences of the DM ကျတော့ [cá.dʒ] in the selected data.

In summary, the occurrences of ကျတော့ [cá.dʒ] in the selected data suggests that ကျတော့ [cá.dʒ] has the additional meaning ‘however’ besides the meaning “when we get to N, where N is a time or a place; when you consider N, in the case of N” as explained by Okell and Allot (2001, p. 15). When it is used in the sense of ကျတော့ [cá.dʒ] ‘however in the case of N’, it functions as a DM for anaphoric reference. Of all the 6 instances of the DM ကျတော့ [cá.dʒ] in Sermon 1, all instances, 100%, function as anaphoric references. The data from both Sermon 1 and Sermon 2 show that although ကျတော့ [cá.dʒ] is similar in meaning to တည် [dʒ], it is not frequently used by the preachers to connect two or more sentences. It is found only 6 times in Sermon 1 and 5 times in Sermon 2.

6.5 လည် [lɛ], DM #3

Okell and Allot’s remarks about လည် [lɛ] can be summarized as follows (2001, p. 217-218):

- လည်: 1 or က (follows a phrase) - also, as well, too, in addition; (in parallel clauses) both Phr1 and Phr2, neither Phr1 nor Phr2; sentence medial phrasal particle; the spelling က is often used in colloquial Burmese, but လည် [lɛ] is regarded as correct;

- လည်: 2 or က - short for ရင်လည် [jɪ̀.lɛ] ‘either Phr1 or phr2’ (p. 218, 230)
In Hnin Tun’s thesis (2006, p. 221), the additional discourse function of လည်း [lɛ] is stated as “express lack of reason for surprise, naturally; expresses self-defense, self-justification, reproach, complaint”.

The data from Sermon 1 suggest that လည်း [lɛ] functions as a DM that connects information over the span of two or more sentences when it is used in the sense of လည်း 1 [lɛ]. Although လည်း [lɛ] is found after ၿ [jɪ̀] as shown in လည်း 2 [lɛ] (Okell & Allot, p. 218, 230) in the data, the sense of လည်း 1 [lɛ] is used in these cases and none of the sentences in the selected data are similar to the example sentences in Okell and Allot’s book. The example sentences in their book seem to be unnatural, archaic or from a dialect that is different from Yangon dialect. Therefore, လည်း 2 [lɛ] is not discussed in this thesis. As for လည်း 1 [lɛ], when it is used to connect information over two or more sentences, the connections seem to be very strong and obvious (uses of လည်း 1 [lɛ] seem to be almost obligatory for naturalness and for grammatical reasons) while the connections indicated by the uses of လည်း 3 [lɛ] seem to be very weak (uses of လည်း 3 seem to be optional). In this thesis, only the function and the uses of လည်း 1 [lɛ] is discussed although လည်း 3 [lɛ] connects information in two or three sentences). See the discussion and examples in Hnin Tun’s thesis (2006) for more information about လည်း 3 [lɛ].

The use of လည်း 1 [lɛ] as a DM that functions as an anaphoric reference can be seen in line (7). It activates all the information in the preceding lines (5-6). In the following example, lines (5-6) are provided in Burmese and in English as necessary context.

(5) စက်းမတန်တသကာ့လိုြိုင်းတရလိုယဲ  FT: Whether [he] can speak a language or not, right?, everyone who drinks [or] needs [water] needs water.

(6) ဒါတကကငော့တသကာ့လူိုင်းတရရော့အရသနော့မမိနလျက်ခင်းရှိေါယဲ  FT: Therefore, everyone who drinks [water] gets the taste and relish from water.
In line (7), ကြန်: 1 [le] is attached to a NP, God's word which is like water, and it indicates that God's word has all the attributes mentioned in lines (5-6).

In addition to the above finding from Sermon 1, a quick survey of Sermon 2 shows that there is an instance in which ကြန်: 1 [le] is used as a DM that functions as a Cataphoric reference. This can be seen in line (195) in which ကြန်: 1 [le] is shaded in grey. Lines (193-194) and (196-200) are provided as necessary contexts.
In line (195), 〔lę〕1 [lę] indicates that an additional person or additional group of people will be mentioned in the next sentence. As 〔lę〕1 [lę] indicates, in line (196), the preacher mentioned that Muslims also use the calendar. Uses of 〔lę〕1 [lę] in lines (196-199) are anaphoric references and they indicate that the NPs they attached to are groups of people in addition to the people mentioned earlier.
The use of လည  ်း [lɛ] as a DM that functions as an anaphoric reference and cataphoric reference can be described with a schema as follows:

\[
((\text{CONN}) \ [\text{NP}_\text{Time}]) / ([\text{NP}/\text{PN}]_{\text{SBJ/OBJ}}) / ([\text{DVC}] / [\text{DEM}] \ [lɛ] \ldots)
\]

In the schema shown above, CONN refers to a connective which may occur at the beginning of a sentence. NP_{Time} refers to a Noun Phrase that indicates time. DVC refers to a dependent verb clause. PN refers to a Pronoun, and DEM refers to a Demonstrative pronoun. In a sentence, လည  ်း [lɛ] may follow these. The schema above can be used for all the occurrences of the လည  ်း [lɛ] in the selected data.

In summary, the occurrences of လည  ်း [lɛ] in the selected data suggests that when it is used in the sense of လည  ်း 1 [lɛ] - “also, as well, too, in addition; (in parallel clauses) both Phr1 and Phr2, neither Phr1 nor Phr2” as mentioned in Okell and Allot’s dictionary (2001, p. 217-218), it functions as a DM for anaphoric reference in all cases in Sermon 1, and cataphoric reference in one case in Sermon 2. Of all the instances of the DM လည  ်း [lɛ] in Sermon 1, 76% is used in the sense of လည  ်း 1 [lɛ], 28 instances. The functions of the remaining 9 instances, 24%, is used in the sense of လည  ်း 3 [lɛ]. In the section below, a group of DMs that have similar semantic meaning and that function as Contrastive Information Markers will be analyzed and discussed.

6.6 ဒါတေန [dà.pè.nɛ́], ဒါတေမ [dà.pè.mɛ́], ဒါတေနတန [dà.pè.nɛ́.nɔ̀], ဒါတေမတန [dà.pè.mɛ́.nɔ̀], DMs #4, 5, 6, 7

No entry is found for 1. ဒါတေန [dà.pè.nɛ́], 2. ဒါတေမ [dà.pè.mɛ́], 3. ဒါတေနတန [dà.pè.nɛ́.nɔ̀] or 4. ဒါတေမတန [dà.pè.mɛ́.nɔ̀] in Judson’s Burmese-English Dictionary (Stevenson & Eveleth, 1966, p. 498), Okell’s reference grammar (Okell, 1969) or Sein’s dictionary (1981). In MLC (1933), in the entry for ဒါ [dà], ဒါတေမ [dà.pè.mɛ́] is described as a conjunction which means ‘but, however or nevertheless’ (p. 208). In Okell and Allot’s dictionary (2001), in the entry for ဒါ [dà], 1. ဒါတေန [dà.pè.nɛ́], 2. ဒါတေမ [dà.pè.mɛ́], 3. ဒါတေ တန [dà.pè.tɛ́] and 3. ဒါတေမလို [dà.pè.mɛ́.ló] are explained as meaning ‘but, however’ (p. 103).

As a native speaker of the Yangon Burmese dialect, the author of this thesis classifies 1. ဒါတေန [dà.pè.nɛ́], 2. ဒါတေမ [dà.pè.mɛ́], 3. ဒါတေနတန [dà.pè.nɛ́.nɔ̀] and 4. ဒါတေမတန [dà.pè.mɛ́.nɔ̀] as DMs that can be used interchangeably to mean ‘but’. 2. ဒါတေမ [dà.pè.mɛ́] is used in written Burmese, but the free variant 1. ဒါတေန [dà.pè.nɛ́] used
in spoken Burmese is rarely written. Replacing ဒါတေန ော့ [dà.pè.nɛ́] with ဒါတေမ ော့ [dà.pè.mɛ́], ဒါတေန ော့တန [dà.pè.nɛ́.nɔ̀] or ဒါတေမ ော့ တန [dà.pè.mɛ́.nɔ̀] apparently does not change the meaning of the sentence or discourse. The data from the sermon analyzed agrees with MLC (1933, p. 208) and Okell and Allot (2001, p. 103) on the meaning and function of these DMs.

In the following sentence, line (18), ဒါတေမ ော့ [dà.pè.mɛ́] ‘but, however’ is used as a DM to activate the information in the preceding sentence, line (17), and to introduce contrasting information.

(17) ဒါတေမ ော့ မရ ှိ ဘ ူ ်း။ FT: Water has no taste.

(18) ဒါတေမ ော့ သုံး မှ သူ မ ှ ိ  ယ ံ က် ကို  တေ အခါမှ ၈၃ နှ စ က ဟ တလလူ ်းယ ်း။

FT: But water has meaning and benefit.

In the example above, ဒါတေမ ော့ [dà.pè.mɛ́] is used at the beginning of line (18) and functions as a DM by activating all the information mentioned in line (17) and signaling to the listeners that the information that follows ဒါတေမ ော့ [dà.pè.mɛ́] will contrast with the information in line (17). In line (18), ဒါတေမ ော့ [dà.pè.mɛ́] functions as a “Contrastive Information Marker” where the topic “water” is the same in both lines (17) and (18).

The data from Sermon 1 also suggests that ဒါတေမ ော့ [dà.pè.mɛ́] can also be used to introduce a reason for previously mentioned information. This can be seen in lines (249-252). In the example below, lines (249-251) contain the information that ဒါတေမ ော့ [dà.pè.mɛ́] activates.

(249) ဒါတေမ ော့ သုံး မှ သီချင ်းသ တလ်းက ိ ု လည ်း ကက ိ က သိ ယ ိ က ေါ ယ ။

FT: When I talk about God’s goodness, I, an eighty-three year old man, shout ‘Hallelujah’.

(250) ဒါတေမ ော့ သုံး မှ သီချင ်းသ  တလ်းက ိ ု လည ်း ကက ိ က သိ ယ ိ က ေါ ယ ိ က ေါ ယ ။

FT: I also like the music.

---

23 This is a locative that functions as a subject marker in this case. See the definitions of မ ှ in SEnAlang Burmese dictionary (1993) and the explanation in Okell and Allot’s Dictionary (2001, p. 171). The use of မ ှ as a subject marker is common in possessive cases in which the possessors function as subjects and possessions function as objects.
(251) FT: I am also satisfied with the musicians.

(252) FT: But the reason why I'm satisfied with these things is because God's goodness is in my heart.

In the example above, 2. ဒါတေန [dà.pè.mɛ́] is used at the beginning of line (252) and functions as a DM by linking all the information mentioned in lines (249-251) and introducing the reason for the information in lines (249-251). In this case, it functions as a DM by introducing a reason while the demonstrative, ဒါ [dà] and the plural marker, တ။ [twè], activates the things the preacher mentioned earlier in lines (249-251). Of the total of 25 occurrences, 1. ဒါတေန [dà.pè.nɛ́] occurs 80%, 2. ဒါတေန [dà.pè.mɛ́] occurs 12%, 3. ဒါတေနတန [dà.pè.nɛ́.nɔ̀] occurs 4% and 4. ဒါတေနတန [dà.pè.mɛ́.nɔ̀] occurs 4% respectively. The data suggests that 1. ဒါတေန [dà.pè.nɛ́] which occurs 80% seems to be the preferred choice of the selected preacher.

The use of 2. ဒါတေန [dà.pè.mɛ́] as a representative for other DMs, 1. ဒါတေန [dà.pè.nɛ́], 3. ဒါတေနတန [dà.pè.nɛ́.nɔ̀] or 4. ဒါတေနတန [dà.pè.mɛ́.nɔ̀], and as a DM that functions as a Contrastive Information Marker can be described with a schema as follows:

[dà.pè.mɛ́ NP/PN SBJ/OBJ ...]

In the schema shown above, NP refers to a Noun Phrase, and PN refers to a Pronoun. In a sentence that has 2. ဒါတေန [dà.pè.mɛ́], it is always found at the beginning of the sentence.

The schema above can be used for 96% of all the occurrences of the synonymous 1. ဒါတေန [dà.pè.nɛ́], 2. ဒါတေန [dà.pè.mɛ́], 3. ဒါတေနတန [dà.pè.nɛ́.nɔ̀] or 4. ဒါတေနတန [dà.pè.mɛ́.nɔ̀] in the selected data.

In summary, the synonyms 1. ဒါတေန [dà.pè.nɛ́], 2. ဒါတေန [dà.pè.mɛ́], 3. ဒါတေနတန [dà.pè.nɛ́.nɔ̀] and 4. ဒါတေနတန [dà.pè.mɛ́.nɔ̀] can be used interchangeably to mean ‘but’ without affecting the meaning of the sentence or discourse. These DMs function
as anaphoric references and “Contrastive Information Markers”. The data from Sermon 1 analyzed also suggests that these DMs can also be used to introduce a reason for previously mentioned information. In a quick survey of Sermon 2, 1. ဒါတေန [dà.pè.nɛ́], 3. ဒါတေနတန [dà.pè.nɛ́.nɔ̀] and 4. ဒါတေမတန [dà.pè.mɛ́.nɔ̀] are not found in Sermon 2. Only 2. ဒါတေမ [dà.pè.mɛ́] is found in Sermon 2. It seems like 1. ဒါတေန [dà.pè.nɛ́], the variant of 2. ဒါတေမ [dà.pè.mɛ́], and 3. ဒါတေနတန [dà.pè.nɛ́.nɔ̀], the variant of 4. ဒါတေမတန [dà.pè.mɛ́.nɔ̀], could be the idiolect or dialect of the preacher of Sermon 1. A quick survey of Sermon 2 supports the finding from Sermon 1 that 2. ဒါတေမ [dà.pè.mɛ́] functions as anaphoric references and “Contrastive Information Markers” (34 instances in Sermon 2), and can also be used to introduce a reason for previously mentioned information (1 instance in Sermon 2). In the following section, the rate of occurrence of DMs for selected sermons are discussed.

### 6.7 The rate of occurrence of DMs in Sermons 1 and 2

The data from Sermon 1 show that the rate of occurrence of DMs for the selected colloquial Burmese behavioral discourse is one DM for every four sentences. The rate of occurrence of DMs in Sermon 2 is one DM for 3.9 sentences, and it is very close to the rate of occurrence of DMs in Sermon 1. This can be seen in Table 13 as follows:

**Table 13 The rate of occurrence of DMs in the selected colloquial Burmese behavioral discourse**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total # of DMs</th>
<th>Total number of sentences</th>
<th># of sentences per DM</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sermon 1</td>
<td>182 (25% of total sentences)</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sermon 2</td>
<td>314 (26% of total sentences)</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1:3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, it can be concluded that the data from Sermon 2 support the finding from Sermon 1.
6.8 Conclusion for Discourse Markers in Sermons 1 and 2

The data shows that there are 38 different types of DMs in Sermon 1 which are used to make connections above the sentence level in Sermon 1, and 46 in Sermon 2. The DM that is mostly commonly used is တ ော့ [dɔ́] ‘Contrastive Topic Marker’ in Sermon 1, and လည ်း [lɛ] ‘also, as well, too, in addition’ in Sermon 2. The rate of occurrence of DMs is one DM for every four sentences for Sermon 1, and 3.9 for Sermon 2.

The remaining 14% of the total instances of the DM တ ော့ [dɔ́] in Sermon 1 was not analyzed and discussed in this thesis because more research needs to be done on these areas. In the selected data, in one instance တပ န [dà.pè.nɛ́] is found to be preceded by a connective in line (672) in Sermon 1. It seems like the preacher decided to change the topic after saying the connective.

The synonymous 1. တပ န [dà.pè.nɛ́], 2. တပ မ [dà.pè.mɛ́], 3. တပ နေ [dà.pè.nɛ́.nɔ̀] and 4. တပ မနေ [dà.pè.mɛ́.nɔ̀] are found only in Sermon 1, not in Sermon 2. The preacher from Sermon 2 only used တပ မ [dà.pè.mɛ́]. The variation between 1.တပ န [dà.pè.nɛ́] and 2. တပ မ [dà.pè.mɛ́]; and the variation between 3. တပ နေ [dà.pè.nɛ́.nɔ̀] and 4. တပ မနေ [dà.pè.mɛ́.nɔ̀] might be the idiolect of the preacher from Sermon 1. It could also be a dialect feature. More research needs to be done on this.

The data used for this preliminary research is limited and came from only two preachers. In order to be able to make more generalizations about the DMs and their functions in the behavioral discourse of colloquial Burmese, more research should be done by analyzing more data that comes from a variety of speakers from different religious backgrounds.

The findings from this research can be used by language learners, language teachers and translators alike to be able to predict the commonly used DMs in behavioral discourse of colloquial Burmese, to understand more about Burmese and to produce Burmese discourses that are natural and cohesive.
Chapter 7
Application of the findings

The findings in the previous chapters are about Participant reference resources, Participant reference patterns, the use of Discourse Markers (DMs) and the rate of occurrence of DMs found in selected Christian sermons preached in colloquial Burmese.

It is hoped that these findings will be useful for language learners to be able to produce and understand natural behavioral discourse in Burmese. Language teachers may also find the findings in this thesis useful for preparing lessons on Participant/Topic reference patterns and DMs. Those whose work involves training translators and checking translations may also find the findings from this thesis useful.

In the subsequent sections, the findings from this thesis are used as a general standard or general tendency to check and compare Participant reference resources, Subject reference patterns, the use of Discourse Markers and the rate of occurrence of DMs found in Paul’s letter to Titus, one of the books from the New Testament translated by Adoniram Judson, the most commonly used Burmese Bible translation (Judson, 1835). The use of Non-Subject reference pattern is not discussed in this thesis due to the limitation of space and time. The reason for choosing Paul’s letter to Titus is because it is similar to Sermon 1 and Sermon 2 in many ways. Just like Sermon 1 and Sermon 2, Titus is a behavioral discourse produced to ask the reader to do several things although it is only 50 sentences long. Although Titus is a short letter, ten global topics are found in it while in Sermon 1, 5 global topics are found, and in Sermon 2, 10 global topics are found. It is hoped that this chapter will be a useful example of applying some of the findings from this thesis. The following comments are exploratory and suggestive rather than being exhaustive.

---

24 Although there is a difference between oral behavioral discourse and written behavioral discourse, Titus was chosen as it is similar in genre to the selected two main sermons.
7.1 Participant reference resources

Analysis of the subjects in Titus in Burmese shows that there are 92 subjects. Among these subjects are 30 NPs, 5 instances of Attributive Clause + 3P Pronoun, 14 Pronouns, 0 Demonstratives and 43 Zero references. As the majority of referents in S4 contexts are encoded with NPs and the majority of referents in S1 contexts are encoded with Zero references, a general conclusion can be made that the Participant reference resources used in Titus is similar to the Participant reference resources used in Sermons 1 and 2. Participant/Topic reference resources found in Titus are arranged in the following table according to the decreasing level of explicitness:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant/Topic reference resources in Titus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Noun phrase, Attributive clause + 3P Pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Zero reference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in the table above is similar to the data in Table 5 presented in Section 3.1.5 for Sermons 1 and 2. This similarity can be taken as an indicator that, in general, the translator of Titus uses the natural P/T reference resources\(^{26}\) found in the behavioral discourses spoken in colloquial Burmese.

7.2 Introduction of Discourse Participants in Titus in Burmese

Based on the findings from Sermons 1 and 2, referents in S4 contexts which refer to the writer of Titus, his reader and both the writer and the reader are carefully separated and compared with the references used for general P/Ts to see if they are treated differently. As Titus was written to just one person, ambiguous references are not found in Titus even though they are common in Sermons 1 and 2.

In Titus, the author, Paul, is first mentioned in the beginning part of the letter using a NP. In Sermons 1 and 2, the preachers are first mentioned in the beginning part of the sermon with Zero references. Although the way Paul is first mentioned in Titus in Burmese is different from the way the preachers are first mentioned in Sermons 1

---

\(^{26}\) The data from Titus show that Demonstrative Pronouns are not used all by themselves to refer to the referents. Demonstrative Pronouns found in the data are used as a modifier to NPs or Pronouns to refer to specific referents that have already been mentioned. These modifiers are outside the scope of the study as they are treated as constituents of NPs.
and 2, the difference is understandable because at Burmese churches, masters of ceremony usually introduce the preachers to the audience before the preachers are invited to the podiums.

The analysis of the Participant reference resources used for the author in the later part of Titus in Burmese suggests that the Participant reference resources normally used for the author in S4 context are Zero references, and this usage is very similar to the way the preachers are mentioned in Sermons 1 and 2, natural sermons.

The way Titus, the intended reader of Paul’s letter, is first mentioned in Titus in Burmese found to similar to the way the audience is first mentioned in Sermon 2, and another 5 sermons from the quick survey. Thus, it can be concluded that the way Titus is first mentioned in Titus in Burmese is similar to the way the audience is first mentioned in more than half of the contemporary sermons analyzed in this study.

The way both Paul and Titus collectively are referred to in Titus in Burmese is also found to be the same as the way both the preacher and the audience collectively are referred to. A Pronoun is used to first mention both Paul and Titus collectively, and Pronouns are used for the preachers and the audiences collectively in Sermons 1 and 2. Thus, it can be concluded that the way Paul and Titus collectively are first mentioned in Titus in Burmese is the same as the way a preacher and an audience collectively are normally first mentioned in natural sermons.

7.3 Introduction of general Participants/Topics in Titus in Burmese
The way general Participants/Topics (P/Ts) are first mentioned in Titus is found to be the same as the way general P/Ts are normally first mentioned in Sermons 1 and 2. NPs are used for mentioning a P/T for the first time in Titus as well as in Sermons 1 and 2.

7.4 Subject reference patterns for Discourse Participants
The data from Titus in Burmese show that the encodings used for the Discourse Participants in S1 contexts follow the revised rule for S1 contexts from Sermons 1 and 2. Thus, it can be concluded that the encodings used for the Discourse Participants in S1 contexts in Titus in Burmese is similar to encodings found in natural sermons, and therefore, natural. (See Appendix C for detailed information.)
No Discourse Participant in S2 contexts is found in Titus in Burmese. Therefore, no discussion about the S2 contexts is mentioned here.

The data from Titus in Burmese show that the encodings used for the Discourse Participants in S3 contexts follow the revised rule for Discourse Participants in S3 contexts. In the Burmese translation of Titus, most Subjects in S3 contexts are encoded with Zero references, and most Subjects in S3 contexts found in Sermons 1 and 2 are also encoded with Zero references. Thus, it can be concluded that the encodings used for the Discourse Participants in S3 contexts is similar to the encodings found in natural sermons, and thus, natural. (See Appendix C for detailed information.)

The way general P/Ts are mentioned in S4 contexts is also found to be the same as the way general P/Ts are mentioned in S4 contexts in Sermons 1 and 2. The default encoding used for general P/Ts for the first time and for the S4 contexts is NP. Therefore, it can be concluded that the way general P/Ts are first mentioned in Titus is the way general P/Ts are referred to in natural sermons. (See Appendix C for detailed information.)

In the Burmese translation of Titus, 4 references which do not clearly point to any referents are also found in lines (13, 33, 34 and 36) (Chapter 1- verse 13, Chapter 3-verses 4-6, 8) - These references are the Subject [ʔì.t̪ʌ́.t̪è] in line (13) (Chapter 1- verse 13), the main Subject encoded with a Zero reference in line (33) (Chapter 3- verse 4-5), the main Subject encoded with a Zero reference in line (34) (Chapter 3- verse 6) and the main Subject [ʔì.zə.ga.t̪ì] in line 36 (Chapter 3- verse 8). These references are found in sentences where there is no Subject or unclear Subjects. These types of references are indicators that point to the need for improving the translation for clarity. Comprehension tests should be carried out to see if readers who have never read the Burmese translation of Titus understand who is who or what Paul is talking about in these verses, and necessary translation adjustment should be made to improve the translation.

**7.5 Subject reference patterns for general Participants/Topics**

The data from Titus in Burmese suggest that the encodings used for the general P/Ts in S1 contexts follow the revised rule for S1 contexts for general P/Ts in Sermons 1 and 2. Thus, it can be concluded that the encodings used for general referents in S1 contexts is similar to encodings found in natural sermons, and therefore, natural. (See Appendix C for detailed information.)
No general P/Ts in S2 contexts is found in Titus in Burmese. Therefore, no discussion about the S2 contexts is mentioned here.

The data from Titus in Burmese show that general P/Ts found in S3 contexts is similar to the data from Sermon 2. More research is recommended to see if the encodings used for the general P/Ts in S3 contexts are natural and similar to the encodings found in most sermons. (See Appendix C for detailed information.)

The data from Titus in Burmese show that encodings used for the general P/Ts found in S4 contexts follow the revised rule for S4 contexts from Sermons 1 and 2 as all except 1 referent follow the revised rule for S4 contexts. (See Appendix C for detailed information.)

7.6 The use of Discourse Markers (DMs)
The types of DMs, most commonly used DMs and the number of DMs used in Judson’s Burmese translation of Titus can be seen in the following table (arranged from highest to lowest number of occurrences):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>English meaning</th>
<th>Formal / Literary Burmese</th>
<th>IPA</th>
<th># of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Because</td>
<td>အတကက င ်းမ ူ က ်း</td>
<td>?ə.cau.mù.ga</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Also/In addition</td>
<td>လည ်း</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>So</td>
<td>ထ ိ ု တကက င ော့</td>
<td>tʰò.ɟaú</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>However, as for</td>
<td>မ ူ က ်း</td>
<td>mù.ga</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>For this reason</td>
<td>သ ိ ု ော့ြဖစ ၍</td>
<td>ṭó.pʰji.jwé</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in the table above shows that all DMs, except [le], are formal or literary Burmese words and the most commonly used DMs in Titus are different from the ones found in Sermon 1. As the inventory of 5 DMs is found in Titus in Burmese, while 38 DMs are found in Sermon 1, a next reasonable step would be to test the Burmese translation of Titus by asking other native speakers of Burmese who have never been involved in the translation process for Titus and who have not read the Burmese translation of Titus before to see if they stumble when they read the translation and if they can understand the logical connections between the sentences and the literary Burmese words. If these native speakers stumble in reading the
translation and if they do not clearly understand the logical connections between the sentences, one should consider revising or improving the translation, or wait for a future study.

### 7.7 Rate of occurrence of DMs

The data from Titus shows that the rate of occurrence of DMs is one DM for every 4.3 sentences. This can be seen in the table below:

**Table 16 Comparison of the rate of occurrence of DMs in Titus and rate of occurrence of DMs in Sermon 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Total # of DMs</th>
<th>Total number of sentences</th>
<th># of sentences per DM</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Titus</td>
<td>12 (24% of total sentences)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1:4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sermon 1</td>
<td>182 (25% of total sentences)</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1:4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in the table above suggests that the rate of occurrence of DMs found in Titus is similar to the rate of occurrence of DMs found in Sermon 1. In Titus, the ratio of DMs to sentences is 1 to 4.2, and in Sermon 1, the ratio of DMs to sentences is 1 to 4. Thus, one can suggest that Judson’s Burmese translation for Titus is similar to the data found in a natural sermon in this aspect.

However, the data from Titus and Sermon 1 also show that the number of different DMs (5) found in Titus is much smaller than the number of different DMs (38) found in Sermon 1. This may be because of the difference in the size of the data in the translation of Titus and Sermon 1. More research is recommended to make comment or to draw conclusions on the use of DMs in Titus.

### 7.8 Summary

The analysis of Titus in Burmese (Judson, 1835) shows that the P/T reference resources used in Titus are very similar to the P/T reference resources found in...
Sermons 1 and 2 except for the lack of Demonstratives\textsuperscript{27} in Titus. The way Paul is first mentioned in Titus in Burmese is different from the way the preachers are first mentioned in Sermons 1 and 2. The way Titus is first mentioned in Titus in Burmese is similar to the way the audience is first mentioned in more than half of the 12 natural sermons analyzed in this study. The way both Paul and Titus collectively are referred to in Titus in Burmese is also found to be the same as the way both the preacher and the audience collectively are referred to in Sermons 1 and 2. The way general P/Ts are first mentioned in Titus is found to be the same as the way general P/Ts are normally first mentioned in Sermons 1 and 2.

The encodings used for the Discourse Participants in S1, S3 and S4 contexts follow the revised rules from Sermon 1 and Sermon 2. No Discourse Participant in an S2 context is found in Titus in Burmese. There are 4 references in Titus in Burmese which do not clearly point to any referents. The encodings used for the general P/Ts in S1, S3 and S4 contexts follow the revised rules from Sermons 1 and 2. No general P/Ts in S2 contexts are found in Titus in Burmese.

The rate of occurrence of DMs in Titus is similar to the rate of occurrence of DMs found in Sermon 1. In Titus, the ratio of DMs to sentences is 1 to 4.2, and in Sermon 1, the ratio of DMs to sentences is 1 to 4.

\textbf{7.9 Conclusion for checking naturalness in Titus translation}

It has been demonstrated how the findings from this thesis on Participant reference resources, Participant categories, Participant reference patterns, use of Discourse Markers (DMs) and rate of occurrence of DMs can be applied in checking a translation. These are a few ways out of many to check a translation for naturalness and clarity. One should not assume that the methods mentioned above are exhaustive because the scope of this research is preliminary and very limited. It does not include sentence length, average number of NPs found in a sentence, average number of DMs inside a sentence, collocation and many other issues related to language and culture. However, the author of this thesis hopes that the findings from this study will be useful for language learners, language teachers, translators,

\textsuperscript{27} The data from Titus show that Demonstrative Pronouns are not used all by themselves to refer to the referents. Demonstrative Pronouns found in the data are used as a modifier to NPs or Pronouns to refer to specific referents that have already been mentioned. These modifiers are outside the scope of the study as they are treated as constituents of NPs.
trainers of translators and those who check translations in one way or another. The author of this thesis also hopes that this thesis will pave the way for more research on Burmese especially in the areas of discourse analysis in the same and different genres.
Chapter 8
Conclusions

This thesis has examined macrostructure and boundaries, local and global topics of Sermons 1 and 2, Subject and Non-Subject reference patterns of Discourse Participants, SBJ and Non-SBJ reference patterns of general P/Ts, DMs found in Sermons 1 and 2, meaning and function of selected DMs from the list of the most commonly used DMs, and application of selected findings on a Burmese translation of the book of Titus from the Burmese Bible. In the subsequent sections, these findings are summarized, the methodology used for this research is evaluated, the contribution of the findings is discussed, and suggestions for further research are also given.

8.1 Summary of findings from Sermons 1 and 2
The analysis of the macrostructure and P/T reference patterns in Sermons 1 and 2 shows some correspondence between the macrostructure and P/T reference patterns. Other factors that influence the P/T reference patterns are activation state of the P/Ts, semantic or grammatical ambiguity, emphasis, requirement to follow the grammar, the identity of the P/Ts, whether the P/Ts are already mentioned at the beginning of the sentence or not, the preference of the speaker, the presence or absence of the P/Ts at the Discourse event, and whether a referent is a Discourse Participant or a general P/T. Using words of thanks to God or the audience is a common way for the introduction of a sermon in Burmese. It is also typical to end a sermon with a blessing.

Noun Phrases, Pronouns, Demonstrative Pronouns, ‘Attributive clause + 3P Pronouns’, and Zero references are identified as the Participant/Topic reference resources in the Sermons 1 and 2. Noun Phrases and ‘Attributive clause + 3P Pronouns’ are the most explicit referring expressions, Pronouns and Demonstrative Pronouns are less explicit referring expressions, and a Zero reference is the least explicit referring expression.
The analysis of Sermons 1 and 2, and a quick survey of ten additional sermons show that the P/T reference resources mentioned above are used in discernable patterns to introduce, identify and track the Discourse Participants and general P/Ts. The P/T reference strategies found in the two main sermons are sequential (look-backward) strategy and sequential (look-forward) strategy. These strategies interact with the contexts, P/T type, P/T reference resources in the two main sermons.

Analysis of the P/T reference patterns in Sermon 1 and Sermon 2 shows that Discourse Participants who are present at the Discourse events are encoded differently than general P/Ts.

Although the default encoding rules for the Discourse Participants and general P/Ts, account for the most occurrences of Subjects and Non-Subjects, other factors such as activation state, semantic or grammatical ambiguity, boundary, emphasis, requirement to follow grammar, whether the referents are already mentioned at the beginning of the sentence or not, preference of the speakers, and the identity of the P/Ts impact the P/T reference patterns in predictable ways which are described in the revised rules. A possible explanation for non-default encodings which are less than the default encodings is the assumption of the preachers that there is enough contextual information for the listeners to identify the referents without the risk of confusion.

In Sermon 1, 38 different DMs are found while in Sermon 2, 46 different DMs are found. However, the rate of occurrence of DMs in Sermon 1 and Sermon 2 is found to be very similar, one DM for 4 sentences in Sermon 1 and one DM for 3.9 sentences in Sermon 2. The DMs တ၀င [dɔ́], ကော်စား [lɛ] and 2. တယ်ပခု့ [dà.pè.mɛ́] are found to be the most commonly used DMs in both Sermon 1 and Sermon 2. However, the most commonly used DMs are တ၀င [dɔ́] in Sermon 1 and ကော်စား [lɛ] in Sermon 2.

The data from Sermon 1 show that DM တ၀င [dɔ́] is used as an anaphoric reference in most cases, and a cataphoric reference in a few cases. Although ကော်စား [cá.dɔ́] is similar in meaning to တ၀င [dɔ́], it is not frequently used by the preachers to connect two or more sentences. In Sermon 1, the DM ကော်စား [cá.dɔ́] functions as an anaphoric reference in all cases. The DM ကော်စား [lɛ] functions as a DM for anaphoric reference in all cases in Sermon 1 and Sermon 2 except for one instance of cataphoric reference in Sermon 2. The synonymous DMs, တ၀င
[dà.pè.nɛ́], 2. င်္ကာ [dà.pè.mɛ́], 3. င်္ကန္တော့မ်း [dà.pè.nɛ́.nɔ̀] and 4. င်္ကန္တော့မ်း [dà.pè.mɛ́.nɔ̀], function as anaphoric references and “Contrastive Information Markers”. However, it seems like 1. င်္ကာ [dà.pè.nɛ́], the variant of 2. င်္ကာ [dà.pè.mɛ́], and 3. င်္ကန္တော့မ်း [dà.pè.nɛ́.nɔ̀], the variant of 4. င်္ကန္တော့မ်း [dà.pè.mɛ́.nɔ̀], from Sermon 1 could be the idiolect or dialect of the preacher of Sermon 1 because only 2. င်္ကာ [dà.pè.mɛ́] is found in Sermon 2. The rate of occurrence of DMs in Sermon 1 is one DM for every 4 sentences, and in Sermon 2, one DM for every 3.9 sentences.

8.2 Evaluation of methodology
The two main sermons selected for analysis in this thesis are oral sermons. It is recognized that unlike written sermons, the selected oral sermons need more editing as preachers tend to make more mistakes when they speak than when they write. The author of this thesis agrees with Grimes (as cited in Levinsohn, 2015a, p. 13) who said, “the texts that yield the most consistent analysis are edited texts.” Thus, for doing similar studies, this author would recommend that oral sermons be carefully edited by focusing on the things that are within the scope of the study before data analysis is done.

As Discourse Participants are encoded differently in different contexts compared to general P/Ts, the author of this thesis would recommend that Discourse Participants be marked separately from general P/Ts, for the ease of tracking later, during the data analysis process.

Breeze’s “message framework” (1992, p. 319) is found to be useful and easy to apply to divide the components of a sermon into three simple parts. Rules of information reduction (van Dijk, 1977) are very useful to identify the local and global topics inside the Main body. Levinsohn’s categories of THESIS and supportive information are also very useful for identifying the arguments and statements inside the Main body. This author would recommend using these theories, methodology and terminology to do similar studies.

The theory and methods mainly used in this thesis for finding the SBJ reference patterns and Non-SBJ reference patterns are the ones proposed by Levinsohn (2015a, p. 128) which is mostly based on what Dooley and Levinsohn proposed (2000). Based on this research, his theory and methods prove to be very useful for finding the default patterns, which are the majority, and non-default patterns, which
are the minority. Although his methods are not meant for identifying the sequential look-forward strategy, because of the use of his methods, evidence of the sequential look-forward strategy and other non-default encodings are easily identified. Levinsohn’s theory and methods prove to be very useful for finding the SBJ reference patterns and Non-SBJ reference patterns in different contexts. Use of a reference grammar and a dictionary (when available) is highly recommended as there can be ambiguity as some NPs can arguably be identified as Subjects or Non-Subjects because of the main verb which have more than one meaning.

One of the challenges encountered during the data analysis process is the identification of lines or sentences. Identification of lines or sentences in spoken Burmese is a difficult task as it is not easy to define a line or sentence and as the selected data is a spoken sermon in which a word, a phrase or a clause can be an independent line or sentence although it has no sentence final particles. In this thesis, the sermon was broken down into lines or sentences based on the preachers’ pauses, intonation, occurrence of sentence final particles and the native speaker intuition of the author of this thesis. It was done as well as possible to reflect what the preachers might regard as separate lines or sentences. Another challenge that was encountered is the amount of data chosen for this thesis. The amount is too much and as the result, it took a long time to make changes and finalize the data analysis process. Another challenge is the lack of discourse analysis software that can handle Unicode characters. This author agrees with Hnin Tun (2006, p. 123) who pointed out that, to her knowledge, there is no concordancing software program available for texts in Burmese scripts. Another challenge encountered is, to my knowledge, there is no specific guidelines for analyzing P/T reference patterns inside sermons although Levinsohn (2015b) proposed some general guidelines for non-narrative discourse analysis. For this reason, this author had to revise the charts for data analysis once it is learned that Discourse Participants are treated differently from general P/Ts. Revising the charts that contain a large amount of data (about 1,900 lines) took a lot of time to finish whenever changes that have the potential to affect the findings for this thesis were made. Thus, less amount of data are recommended for researchers who want to do similar analysis.

Counting the number of DMs that function above the sentence level is found to be very useful for finding the rate of occurrence of DMs, and for checking a translation to see if more or fewer DMs occur in the language of the audience. Use of a reference grammar is highly recommended during the process of marking the DMs as there can be homophones, and one DM can have more than one function.
**8.3 Contribution of the findings from this study**

It is hoped that the findings from this study will be a contribution toward the knowledge about the Burmese language as no similar research on behavioral discourse has been identified especially on Participant/Topic reference patterns. It is also hoped that language learners, language teachers, translators and trainers of translators will benefit from this study.

**8.4 Further research**

To do a similar study, counting the numbers of Subjects, Non-Subjects and Verbs or Verb Phrases is recommended as they are linked directly to sentence length. Finding the natural or default sentence length of a sermon will be very useful as the findings can be used for translating, checking translation and training translators. As the author of this thesis does not differentiate between definite and indefinite NPs, full names and part of the name, further research can also be done to analyze different types of NPs. As prosody, gesture, embedded narratives and comments closely tied to the embedded narratives, quotation formula and vocatives are outside the scope of the study, more research can be done in these areas. As the selected two main sermons are limited to Christian sermons, more research can be done on different sermons preached from other religions. The findings for the general P/Ts in N3 contexts are inconclusive in this study. Thus, more research can be done for the general P/Ts in N3 contexts. As there is always room for improvement, and as the data used for this study is limited, the same research can also be done on other sermons, and the findings can be used to further describe the Burmese language.
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APPENDIX A
DATA FOR THE SUBJECT AND NON-SUBJECT REFERENCE PATTERNS FOR DISCOURSE PARTICIPANTS FOUND IN THE TWO MAIN SERMONS

Table 17 The distribution of references in S2 contexts broken down by the individual Discourse Participant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse Participants</th>
<th>Number of occurrences in S2 contexts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noun Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguous referent</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Preacher &amp; audience or People in general)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preacher</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference to both the preacher and the audience</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18 The distribution of references in S3 contexts broken down by the individual Discourse Participant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse Participants</th>
<th>Noun Phrase</th>
<th>Attributive Clause + 3P Pronoun</th>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Demonstrative Pronoun</th>
<th>Zero reference</th>
<th>Total number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(11%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(89%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguous referent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Preacher &amp; audience or People in general)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preacher</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(67%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(33%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference to both the preacher and the audience</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(25%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(75%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(17%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(83%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19 The distribution of references in S4 contexts broken down by the individual Discourse Participant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse Participants</th>
<th>Number of occurrences in S4 contexts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noun Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguous referent (Preacher &amp; audience or People in general)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preacher</td>
<td>5 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference to both the preacher and the audience</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>6 (4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20 The distribution of references in N1 contexts broken down by the individual Discourse Participant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse Participants</th>
<th>Noun Phrase</th>
<th>Attributive Clause + 3P Pronoun</th>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Demonstrative Pronoun</th>
<th>Zero reference</th>
<th>Total number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(90%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguous referent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Preacher &amp; audience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or People in general)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preacher</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference to both the</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preacher and the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(9%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(91%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21 The distribution of references in N3 contexts broken down by the individual Discourse Participant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse Participants</th>
<th>Number of occurrences in N3 contexts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noun Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguous referent (Preacher &amp; audience or People in general)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preacher</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference to both the preacher and the audience</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22 The distribution of references in N4 contexts broken down by the individual Discourse Participant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse Participants</th>
<th>Noun Phrase</th>
<th>Attributive Clause + 3P Pronoun</th>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Demonstrative Pronoun</th>
<th>Zero reference</th>
<th>Total number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (21%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22 (76%)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguous referent (Preacher &amp; audience or People in general)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preacher</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (33%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (67%)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference to both the preacher and the audience</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>9 (24%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>27 (73%)</td>
<td>37 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B
DATA FOR THE SUBJECT AND NON-SUBJECT REFERENCE PATTERNS FOR GENERAL PARTICIPANTS/TOPICS FOUND IN THE TWO MAIN SERMONS

Table 23 The distribution of references in S1 contexts for general Participants/Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Participants/Topics</th>
<th>Number of occurrences in S1 contexts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noun Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sermon 1</td>
<td>6 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sermon 2</td>
<td>11 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>17 (16%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24 The distribution of references in S4 contexts for general Participants/Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Participants/Topics</th>
<th>Number of occurrences in S4 contexts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noun Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sermon 1</td>
<td>62 (69%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sermon 2</td>
<td>125 (79%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total percentage</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25 The distribution of references in N1 contexts for general Participants/Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Participants/Topics</th>
<th>Number of occurrences in N1 contexts</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noun Phrase</td>
<td>Attributive Clause + 3P Pronoun</td>
<td>Pronoun</td>
<td>Demonstrative Pronoun</td>
<td>Zero reference</td>
<td>Total number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sermon 1</td>
<td>13 (39%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>18 (55%)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sermon 2</td>
<td>17 (36%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30 (64%)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Total number                | 30 (38%)                             | 0   | 1 (1%) | 1 (1%) | 48 (60%) | 80  (100%)
Table 26 The distribution of references in N3 contexts for general Participants/Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Participants/Topics</th>
<th>Number of occurrences in N3 contexts</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noun Phrase</td>
<td>Attributive Clause + 3P Pronoun</td>
<td>Pronoun</td>
<td>Demonstrative Pronoun</td>
<td>Zero reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sermon 1</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sermon 2</td>
<td>10 (26%)</td>
<td>3 (8%)</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>22 (58%)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>12 (27%)</td>
<td>4 (9%)</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>25 (57%)</td>
<td>44 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27 The distribution of references in N4 contexts for general Participants/Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Participants / Topics</th>
<th>Number of occurrences in N4 contexts</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noun Phrase</td>
<td>Attributive Clause + 3P Pronoun</td>
<td>Pronoun</td>
<td>Demonstrative Pronoun</td>
<td>Zero reference</td>
<td>Sentence</td>
<td>Total number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sermon 1</td>
<td>120 (90%)</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11 (8%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sermon 2</td>
<td>182 (82%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34 (15%)</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
<td>223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>302 (84.6%)</td>
<td>5 (1.4%)</td>
<td>2 (0.6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45 (12.6%)</td>
<td>3 (0.8%)</td>
<td>357 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX C

DATA FOR THE SUBJECT REFERENCE PATTERNS FOR DISCOURSE PARTICIPANTS AND GENERAL PARTICIPANTS/TOPICS IN BURMESE TRANSLATION OF TITUS

Table 28 Distribution of Discourse Participants and the P/T reference resources used in S1 contexts in Titus in Burmese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants/Topics</th>
<th>Number of S1 occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Participants</td>
<td>Noun Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Participants</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total percentage</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 29 Distribution of Discourse Participants and the P/T reference resources used in S3 context in Titus in Burmese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants/Topics</th>
<th>Noun Phrase</th>
<th>Attributive Clause + 3P Pronoun</th>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Demonstrative Pronoun</th>
<th>Zero reference</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Participants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total percentage</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30 Distribution of Discourse Participants and the P/T reference resources used in S4 context in Titus in Burmese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants/Topics</th>
<th>Noun Phrase</th>
<th>Attributive Clause + 3P Pronoun</th>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Demonstrative Pronoun</th>
<th>Zero reference</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Participants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total percentage</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 31 Distribution of general P/Ts and the P/T reference resources used in S1 context in Titus in Burmese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants/Topics</th>
<th>Number of S1 occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noun Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Participants</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total percentage</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 32 Distribution of general P/Ts and the P/T reference resources used in S3 context in Titus in Burmese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants/Topics</th>
<th>Number of S3 occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noun Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Participants</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total percentage</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 33 Distribution of general P/Ts and the P/T reference resources used in S4 context in Titus in Burmese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants/Topics</th>
<th>Number of S4 occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noun Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Participants</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total percentage</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX D

### SAMPLES OF CHARTS USED FOR DATA ANALYSIS

Table 34 Modified form of Grime’s span analysis for Sermon 2

|   | DD | DE | DFDG | DH | DI | DJ | DL | DM | DC | DS | DT | DJ | DU | DV | DX | DY | DZ | EA | EC | ED | EE | EF | EG | EH | EI | EJ | EK | EL |
|---|----|----|------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 1 |    |    |      |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 2 |    |    |      |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 3 |    |    |      |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 4 |    |    |      |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
Table 35S BJ reference pattern analysis for Discourse participants and general Participants/Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>S4 Content</th>
<th>Lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 (i)</td>
<td>S4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (i)</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S4, S4, S4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S4, S1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 36 Non-Subject reference pattern analysis for Discourse participants and general Participants/Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AG</th>
<th>AH</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>AN</th>
<th>AO</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>AR</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>AU</th>
<th>AW</th>
<th>AX</th>
<th>AY</th>
<th>AZ</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>BB</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>BD</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>BF</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>DB</th>
<th>DC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject reference pattern analysis for Discourse participants and general Participants/Topics

1. [Subject reference pattern analysis for Discourse participants and general Participants/Topics]
2. [Subject reference pattern analysis for Discourse participants and general Participants/Topics]
3. [Subject reference pattern analysis for Discourse participants and general Participants/Topics]
Table 37 Discourse Marker analysis for Sermon 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BH</th>
<th>BI</th>
<th>BU</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>CQ</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>CW</th>
<th>C Y</th>
<th>C Z</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>DB</th>
<th>DC</th>
<th>DD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 
5. 
6. 

Remarks:
- Table entries may include various discourse markers such as conjunctions, deixis, and other linguistic markers.
- Each entry may represent the frequency or occurrence of a specific discourse marker in the sermon.
- The table could be used to analyze the discourse structure and style of the sermon.
RESUME

Name: Mr. Lin Kyaw Zaw

Date of Birth: 10 January 1985

Place of Birth: Myanmar

Institutions Attended: 2005, English Major, Bachelor of Arts in Religious Studies, Myanmar Institute of Theology, Yangon, Myanmar.

2005, Diploma in English, World English Institute, Oregon, US.

2017, Master of Arts in Linguistics, Payap University, Chiang Mai, Thailand.