THE DISCOURSE LEVEL IN CHRAU

Dorothy THOMAS

Summer Institute of Linguistics

0. Introduction.

1. Connecting.
   1.1. Cohesive function of participant focus.
   1.2. Linkage.

2. Segmenting.
   2.1. Paragraphs.
   2.2. Discourse margins.
   2.3. Discourse nucleus.

3. Prominence.
   3.1. Local verb density.
   3.2. Omissions and breakdowns.
   3.3. Participant focus.
   3.4. Cycling and overlaying.

   4.1. Cycling and overlaying.
   4.2. Introductions.

5. Styles.
   5.1. General verb density.
   5.2. Medial rhyming.
   5.3. Descriptive adverbs.
   5.4. Reduplication.
   5.5. Loanwords.

6. Discourse types and sample texts.
   6.1. Narrative discourse structure.
   6.2. Expository discourse structure.
   6.3. Hortatory discourse structure.
   6.4. Epistolary discourse structure.

0. Introduction.

This is the first in a series of three articles, the other two being on the paragraph level in Chrau and sentence-level semantics in Chrau.¹ A South Bahnaric language of the Mon-

¹Data for these papers were collected in Vietnam under the auspices of the Summer Institute of Linguistics between 1959
Khmer family, Chrau is spoken by about 15,000 people in that part of Vietnam lying from 60 to 150 kilometers east and east-northeast of Saigon. The phonemes of Chrau are here represented as p, t, ch, k ~ c, q ~ q; v, d, j, g; b, d; m, n, nh, ng; w, y; r, l; s, h; i, ë, e; (u̯), o, a; u, ò, o; î, ê; â, û; ü, õ; ï, (u̯). The two nuclei in parentheses are of very limited distribution outside loanwords.

Chrau has at least two discrete levels above the sentence (cf. David Thomas, 1971: chapter 12). In spite of the lack of inflectional endings used by many languages for signaling, both of these levels and types of discourse can be signaled by means of lexical items, by grammatical styles, or by orientation. Noteworthy in this respect is the relative density of verbs in certain types of discourse (§5.1) and in certain stages in the plot (§3.1).

Many aspects of what it commonly referred to as discourse are found on all levels of language. This paper is limited to description of the hierarchical discourse level, i.e. the highest structural level of the language; the discussion is further limited to structured discourse and hence excludes "rambles" (cf. Thomas and Watson, 1976: §3.1).

Most of the texts used here were first recorded on magnetic

and 1975. The analysis presented here is based mainly on fourteen texts (with reference to many others) and a computer print-out of a concordance of over one hundred pages of text. The latter was made on the IBM 1410 computer at the University of Oklahoma under Grant GS-270 of the National Science Foundation. It has been very helpful to have a linguist and Chrau speaker at hand in the person of my husband, David Thomas, who has made valuable criticisms and suggestions. My colleagues Richard Watson and Maxwell Cobbey have also given much stimulus.

2E.g., Nambiquara of Brazil and Bahinemo of New Guinea (see Callow, 1974: 23, 22).
3E.g., Bororo of Brazil and Saramaccan of Surinam (Callow, loc.cit.).
tape and then transcribed by another Chrau.\textsuperscript{4} He frequently did some editing, especially of one text, \textit{jêng sipǎm}, which in its original form was somewhat disconnected.\textsuperscript{5} The letters illustrating epistolary discourse were of course all written and received through the mails.

1. Connecting.

1.1. Cohesive function of participant focus.

One important phase of making a discourse hang together is keeping straight who or what is being talked about. In Chrau, focus on one participant or concept through long stretches of discourse helps to accomplish this. The same participant focus can carry beyond a paragraph or even through a whole discourse, but usually a change of focus onto another participant or concept indicates a change of paragraph.

Whoever or whatever is in focus is, once focus has been established, commonly referred to by nēh or a zero subject. Complicating this is the fact that nēh has multiple functions, serving as (1) nonreferent focus marker, (2) pronoun reference to item in focus, (3) possessive pronoun referring to a possessor who may or may not have been in focus, (4) antecedent of relative clause, and (5) dummy subject. Usually nēh is singular, but the plural marker khāy is often omitted.\textsuperscript{6} Nēh can re-

\textsuperscript{4}Copies of these tapes as well as microfiche copies of the transcriptions of them are available through the Dallas office of the Summer Institute of Linguistics.

\textsuperscript{5}As Grimes (1968: 42) remarks, "...The texts that yield the most consistent analyses are edited texts. Certain people in any society have a reputation for consistently producing the kind of discourses people want to listen to. Part of the reason people like these discourses must lie in their well-formedness; ...even people who produce highly valued discourses recognize that certain parts of what they say can be improved by being reshaped or edited."

\textsuperscript{6}Sedang, another Mon-Khmer language of Vietnam, has a third-person dual pronoun to help disambiguate reference; cf. Smith (1976: 166).
fer to people, abstract ideas, animals, spirits, and things. One positive factor is that it is specific, whereas vu, another third-person pronoun, is usually nonspecific and nonfocus.

a. One system sometimes used in narrative discourse to keep participants straight is to keep the focus exclusively on the discourse hero. He may never have any other introduction than nēh. Other participants are referred to in relation to him: pōp nēh 'his brother', si-ur nēh 'his wife', and the like. By this system names are not needed, and are in fact seldom used.

b. Another system to keep participants straight is to bring a participant into focus by adding a demonstrative after his name or role in the subject position; throughout the following section nēh refers back to that focused participant. The usual demonstrative for this function is nōq; e.g., klō nōq... nēh... nēh... 'that man... he... he...'. If the introduction with nōq was in the predicate, it must be repeated in the subject slot before focus is established; e.g., ...klō nōq. Klō nōq... nēh... nēh... '...that man. That man... he... he...'. To change the focus, the same system can be used for a different participant/concept. However, if the new topic has been introduced earlier in the discourse, with or without nōq, change of topic can be signaled by tīq 'that (distant)', heq 'this', or lōt (or lōt tēa) 'this (more recent context than heq)'. These demonstratives can follow either a noun or nēh; e.g., noun heq 'this ----' or nēh heq 'this (other) one'. In the legend Can-jāng Canjōi a man marries first a woman and then a monkey:

Vi cāh tāt si-ur tōm wōq pā, ca vu mapanh ham neg. remember to wife first more neg. as they say crave
cō dōq nōq ui, hwāt si-ur lōt-tēa.
part. monkey that too-bad throw-out wife previously-mentioned

He didn't miss the first wife any more; as they say, he craved
the monkey and threw out the other wife.

The man Canjiang is in focus, marked by a zero pronoun. The two wives are not in focus even though dóq 'monkey' is marked with nəq and si-ur 'wife' is marked with iêt təq, as they are in the predicate positions. But in the following sentence the focus is changed to the first wife when she is referred to as si-ur iêt in a subject position:

si-ur iêt gũq ayh, thet thet nəh buôn, nəh wife previously-mentioned live alone tsk-tsk she sad she

The other wife lived alone, tsk-tsk; she was sad, she...

c. In conversational paragraphs the focus shifts to each new speaker, usually with the formula nəh nhaɪ 'he said'. Within a direct quotation nəh refers to a third person; within indirect quotations, however, it refers to the person quoted. In the legend of The Coconut Child there is a conversation between the King and the Coconut's mother:

King: Aɣ sɪq ːoq, sɪq nhaɪ bəɣ nəh pənən əc ɡə you return imp. return tell to him say I not give con əh-puː təq mə con sai. child youngest emph. for child marry

She reports: Nəh nhaɪ nəh əc ɡə təq mə con sai. he said he not give emph. for child marry

King: You go home, return and tell him I won't give my youngest child for [your] child to marry.

Mother: He said he wouldn't give [his child] for you, child, to marry.

The King uses nəh and con to refer to Coconut, but the mother in reporting his speech uses nəh to refer to the king. In referring to a third person in an indirect quotation, a noun or name must be used. Thus in the legend of The Stupid Man,
Nēh panh **si-ur** nēh hāi nēh.
He said his **wife** harmed him.

Following a conversation there is frequently no indication of who is in focus. Usually it is the person who would respond in action to the final quotation. If the speaker said he would do something, the nēh refers to him; but if he told someone else to do something, then nēh refers to this other person. In the legend of *Canjiang Canjōi*, the first wife is speaking:

...ānh ēq ēq u tēh heq wōq dāng. Aheq nēh saq hao
I not stay at earth here more not now she go up
chhuōi tu vlo...
clear to above

'...I'll not stay on earth here any longer.' So **she** went clear up to...

In this case the speaker suited her actions to her words, so remained in focus and remained nēh. But in the legend of *The Six Brothers*, a demon has just challenged the oldest brother to a duel, then:

Nhāng aheq nēh tām-pām bay chaq, nēh...
truly now he fought with demon he
Now **he** really did fight with the demon, **he**...

The one challenged responded with action, so comes into focus and is referred to by nēh.

*d.* Still another system for keeping participants straight, which operates over a shorter stretch of discourse, is the use of a noun + nēh in the subject to bring a participant into focus; e.g., Nhuôn nēh... nēh... 'The Vietnamese... he...'. This focus-changing use of nēh is potentially ambiguous with the possessive use of nēh: if a noun can be possessed
by a third person in the context, possession is understood. If the possessor is in the first person there is no problem, as two pronouns occur; e.g., con ănh nêh... nêh... 'my child... he...' But with a third-person possessor only one pronoun occurs; that is to say, nêh is sometimes a portmanteau carrying both the possessive and the focus-changing functions; e.g., con nêh... nêh... can be either 'his child... he (the child)...' or 'his child... he (the father)....' Most commonly the phrase is used in two different sentences to change focus in the second sentence. Thus in the legend of The Six Brothers:

Vap nêh aheq... En cähr ta-au vap nêh... Nêh father their here then awake tomorrow father their he chêq con nêh... leave children his

Their father here... Then the next morning their father... He left his children...

Again:

...nhai bay ăh nêh. ăh nêh säng sima tell to younger sib. their younger sib. their bid porcupine saq roc, nêh panh... to get he said

...tell their younger brother. Their younger brother told the porcupine to go get [them], he said...

In both of the above examples the final nêh no longer refers to the first but to a new participant. And sometimes the system fails. Even in a sentence with a reinforced vap nêh... vap nêh... the focus does not change:

Aheq vap nêh tût kwá... En nôq vap nêh iao now father their angry very after that father their lead
vət nēh chhuoi tu sùng nggô.
carry them clear to in jungle

Now their father was very angry... Then their father took them clear off to the jungle.

To summarize the above four systems for keeping participants straight, demonstratives or nēh after a noun bring a participant into focus; he is thereafter referred to as nēh until a new participant comes into focus. But in conversations the responder, either in speaking or in action, is nēh. In indirect quotations the quoted speaker is nēh. And in some narratives the discourse hero is nēh.

Some speakers are very skillful in balancing these different rules, in some cases even maintaining a discourse hero through parts of the discourse and not others. For example, in The Six Brothers the youngest brother is introduced long after the minor characters; however, he has an exceptionally long string of noun phrases to introduce him. He reappears throughout the rest of the story, frequently without the usual demonstratives. With the exception of the last example in section ñ above, the other characters are always carefully differentiated either by full noun phrases or by observance of the rules for focus.

But there is also the problem of performance. More blatant than the second example in section ñ is the slip in one episode of The Rabbit and the Tiger stories:

Aheq sipai saq a nēh. Nēh hao vlo chhô...
now rabbit went from him he climb up tree

Now the rabbit left him. He climbed up a tree...

From the context it is the rabbit, not the tiger, who goes up the tree.
In certain situations nēh needs no antecedent. In the following example the phrase 'at there' limits khay nēh to the inhabitants of the village named:

...Tān Phū, khay nēh u nōq khay nēh...
  Tān Phū  pl. he at there  pl. he

...Tān Phū, those there they...

1.2. Linkage.

a. One very common method of tying discourses together in Chrau is tail-head linkage. Specifically, the end of one paragraph, either the last phrase or clause or even the whole last sentence, is repeated at the beginning of the next paragraph. This "echo" is frequently in the form of a paraphrase; cf. David Thomas (1971: 169-70).

b. Narrative discourse linkage includes temporal sequence markers; hence the Initial Echo is frequently followed by the sequence markers en (nōq) 'then', en wōq 'then further', or en tān'hui 'later on'. From one legend:

...En nēh ōp sa.  פופ sa en nēh...

...Then they prepared a meal.  พอ After preparing the meal,  they...

If there is no Initial Echo, the new paragraph usually has ncai, en nōq, en, mōh, or en kē 'then', as in the first sentence above; cf. §6.1c, Sample Text.

One text is basically about two trips into the jungle and what happened on the way home. After the introduction, each paragraph begins and ends with the verb sīq 'return'. This of course is the epitome of tail-head linkage (actually it is tail-head-tail), and very effectively ties the different paragraphs together as well as demarcating them.

c. Another fairly common type of linkage is head-head, with each episode or paragraph starting in the same way. In one
expository discourse (cf. §6.2c, Sample Text) four out of seven paragraphs begin with the Vietnamese loanword còn 'as to'.

Similar to this mechanism is tail-tail linkage, with successive paragraphs ending in the same way. In Yâq Cê Var 'Accusing the Lieutenant', an expository discourse, four out of the first seven paragraphs end up saying in some way that the lieutenant won't let the villagers go outside to market.

d. Logical relationship linkage between paragraphs is more common in nonnarrative discourse than in narrative discourse. Even narrative discourse, however, does sometimes combine logical and temporal relationships: nōq nōh 'so then' (cf. §6.1c, Sample Text, last paragraph). Nōq 'so' and canōq 'like that, thus' are the commonest markers of cause and result relations (cf. §6.3c, Sample Text, last two paragraphs). Khoi 'also' and khoi canōq 'also like that' tie together similar developments or ideas (cf. §6.3c, Sample Text, paragraph 3).

2. Segmenting.
2.1. Paragraphs.

a. Paragraph theme changes are usually marked by change of orientation: either new participants take over, the time shifts, or the location changes. Usually there is a combination of two or more of these changes.

Time shifts state a specific time such as ta-ao 'tomorrow', đúng năr 'in the daytime', or vi mau 'in the afternoon'; or they may indicate the passage of time (not just 'and then'), as tan'hui wōq 'later on' or khi jōq alūr wōq 'a long time later'.

Location change is usually marked by the verbs saq 'go' or sīq 'return', followed by a new location or activity.

Change of participant focus as discussed in §1.1b is a clear indication of a break. However, focus change is not
necessary. New participant orientation—that is to say, change of initiator, reactor, and tertiary (cf. Grimes (1972: 97) and Wendland (1975: 50))—usually corresponds to other major changes (cf. Charts 3, 5, and 6).

In first-person discourse a shift from von 'we (inclusive)', with a somewhat editorial force, to ănh 'I' marks a more personal involvement on the part of the speaker, and hence a change in theme.

b. Nonnarrative discourses do not have some of the more obvious signals of change cited above, but indicators are not wanting. Adom 'in the old days', lục Ngọc 'at that time', ahọ́ pòh môq 'from now on', and alur hẹ̀q 'after this' set paragraphs off from others marked by vrẹ̀q 'now'. Vrẹ̀q can also simply mark a new stage in the theme without designating actual present time, much as in English. As already mentioned, the Vietnamese loan cố can be used at the opening of a new paragraph. A Chrau word, sǐq 'about', can also be used to change the theme, but this may be a calque. Purists prefer sǐq, but the Vietnamese word is very commonly used.

c. A change in semantic domains also frequently accompanies a theme change. In another episode of The Rabbit and the Tiger, in one paragraph words associated with weaving occur: 'cut rattan', 'weave', and 'basket'. At the end of the paragraph the tiger tells the rabbit to watch the meat. At the beginning of the next paragraph the tiger goes off for the rattan and then words associated with meat occur: 'cut', 'meat', 'bones'. The introduction of meat at the end of the first paragraph and reference back to rattan in the next help to mark the shift in semantic domain and hence the paragraph break.

Note also in §6.1c, Sample Text, paragraph 2, the words winh 'beg' (occurring three times) and an nhỏ iuh 'gave him'. Then come the thing given, du pàng khăn 'one classifier-
for-flat-object cloth', and the verbs vāţ 'carry (in the hand)' and lāq 'spread out'. Beg and give are related; cloth and its special classifier, as well as verbs which fit with cloth, are also related. None of these words occur in the succeeding para-

2.2. Discourse margins.

Especially in narratives, distinctive paragraph types mark off settings, introductions and conclusions from the body of the discourse. These tend to be situational descriptive para-

graphs and are made up mostly of existential, equational and adjectival sentences.

In the setting we are introduced to the first partici-

pants and, sometimes, to the location. Not infrequently there is information on the size of the hero's family, even though its other members may never again enter the narrative. In Přau Klô Dlu Neêt two orphan girls are introduced but no names are given.

In the introduction, which may or may not be in the same paragraph as the setting, the problem is stated. In Přau Klô Dlu Neêt the problem is that the girls have no man to go hunt-

ing for them.

The main body of the narrative then switches to narrative paragraphs, with temporal sequence.

An expository discourse has a topic rather than a set-

Paragraph types will be discussed in detail in another pa-

per. The main distinction between them is in their time orient-
tation. Narrative paragraphs are in sequential past. Situation-
al descriptive paragraphs are in the past, present or future, but not in sequential time. Volitional paragraphs are in the future tense and in the imperative mode. Concept descriptive paragraphs are in general nonsequential time. Procedural para-

graphs are in general sequential time. Dialogue paragraphs may be in any time orientation, but are characterized by multiple speakers.
ting, and usually opens with Nhal... 'Talk about...' The intro-
duction is an extended definition of the topic, while the
nucleus may have embedded narrative discourses or descriptive
paragraphs.

In hortatory discourse the setting can be an embedded
narrative discourse or a situational descriptive paragraph. The
nucleus includes volitional paragraphs.

Conclusions in nonnarrative discourse are paraphrastic
or resultative of the whole preceding discourse.

Any type of discourse may have a finis. This is usually
simply "That's all" or "Like that," but in hortatory discourse
a terminus is more common. The terminus is usually a short re-
minder to listen (obey).

Epistolary discourse is quite rigid in form, and thus
simple to segment. The setting and finis are set off graphical-
ly, while the introduction and conclusion have typical topics
(cf. §6.4a).

2.3. Discourse nucleus.

Within the nucleus of a discourse there are often groups
of paragraphs which function together as a unit. The special
organization of plot in narrative discourse will be discussed
in §6.1. Here we are concerned with the systematic repetition
of items in a discourse. Chrous narrative discourse has what
Wendland (1975: 34) calls lexical recycling, here termed simp-
ly cycling. Chrous nonnarrative discourse has what Grimes (1972)
calls overlays.

a. Cycling.

Wendland has found that in the Chewa of Africa re-
peated event sequences or cycles pattern together. I am calling
such events cycles and a group of repeated cycles a set of cy-
cles.⁸ A narrative can have several different sets of cycles. A cycle may be a complete episode.⁹ A set of cycles can also have a complete plot structure with a climax which frees the plot to move on. On the other hand, some stories have cycles with no real final climax or a final climax which is frequently omitted, as in the tales of *The Rabbit and the Tiger*.

In the legend of *The Six Brothers* there are a number of such sets of cycles. The father takes his sons to the jungle and tries to lose them. Each time they return, and their step-mother is angry. But in the fifth cycle the children are rescued by a porcupine and stay in the jungle. In the next set of cycles a demon comes each day and challenges the oldest brother to a duel. The intermediate cycles are condensed, but the demon always wins until the youngest brother takes over and wins. He then acquires great riches from the demon. In the last set of cycles the father comes, but as he approaches everything he meets tries to bite him—even inanimate objects.

In the first set of cycles, each cycle is a complete episode in itself, while the set encompasses a complete plot with climax and resolution. The second set, although abbreviated,¹⁰ is similarly structured. But the final set involving the biting incidents merely has repeated actions.

b. Overlays.

Grimes (1972: 516) describes overlays, with special

---

⁸Wendland (loc.cit.) uses overlay after Grimes, but his use of the term blurs the distinction between his own cycles and Grimes's planes.

⁹"An episode may be defined as a close-knit temporal sequence of logical paragraphs that manifest a mini-plot structure..." (Wendland, 1975: 25).

¹⁰Wendland (1975: 35) notes that in Chewa there is a tendency, though not a strong disposition, for the first and last cycles to be most fully developed.
reference to the languages of New Guinea, as repetitions of the same facts with a few details added each time. The difference between overlays and cycles is that in overlays new information is cumulative (more information on an old topic) whereas in cycles it is not cumulative but information on a different event which distinguishes the latter from other similar events.

Grimes further terms the repeated stretch of an overlay a plane. This means that a plane is to an overlay as a set of cycles is to a cycle. So far overlays have been found in Chrau only in expository discourse; for examples see §6.2a and c.

3. Prominence.
3.1. Local verb density.

At the climax of the plot (where the plot is all tied up, the point of highest tension, the hero's nadir), the relative density of verbs becomes quite low. Then when the plot is untangled (dénouement, the hero's success) there is a dramatic change to a very high density of verbs. These are the lowest and highest points in a narrative, and give clear indication of the plot structure. Introductions and conclusions have relatively low verb densities.

In the legend of Prau KLô Dlu Nsêt 'The Young Mushroom Man' there is a set of cycles in which the orphan girls go out and see an animal and wish they had a husband to kill it. Each time they come home, there is the animal in their kitchen. At the climax to the set of cycles, KLô Dlu Nsêt reveals himself as their benefactor, then hides in a drinking straw. Thereafter he comes out occasionally and plays on flutes. The Grandfather in the Sky, Cô Nhút Cô Nhōq, hears the flutes and comes to see what is going on. The confrontation between him, Nsêt and the girls constitutes the final climax. Both the first and second climaxes have very low verb densities; at the final resolution
or dénouement the verb-count is at the highest. Cf. Chart 4 and §6.1c, Sample Text.

3.2. Omissions and breakdowns.

Omissions and breakdowns of careful schemes for differentiation are indicative of the narrator's emotional involvement. Lapses of this kind are likely to happen around the clímax or dénouement.

a. In the final dénouement of *Prau Klô Dlu Nsêt* there are several sentences in which it is unclear to whom nēh refers:

Nōq en di cō nōq gēh poq khày nēh nái bāy nēh so then the grandfather that had visit them say to (?)

cańōq caheq. Panh nēh khoi nēh gēh vu padār nēh like-that like-this say he also he has someone send him

juť yūp an vi lōh-sat. En nái bāy cō descend help give where hard-up then say to grandfather

nōq cō nēh iēt gēh en an nēh bāy ur nōq. that grandfather he hear can then let him with women that

So then the grandfather visited them, told (?) what it was like. Said he, he also had someone sending him down to help out where was hardship. After telling the grandfather, the grandfather he understood, then let him stay with the women.

In the first sentence nēh could refer either to the grandfather or to the others. In the second sentence either the grandfather is still talking or Nsêt is answering him. In the last sentence, although the grandfather is clearly in focus, the final nēh because of the context has to refer to Nsêt.

Throughout the rest of *Prau Klô Dlu Nsêt* there is liberal use of names; but precisely at the point where the plot is about to be untangled, where the verb-count is highest and noun phrases are kept to the minimum, the pronoun mechanism
breaks down.

In the legend of La-u 'The Coconut' nēh regularly refers to the Coconut unless there is a conversation, until the climax is reached; then sometimes the King's daughter is in focus, sometimes the King or even a dove. In most cases, however, these three are brought into focus by proper means.

b. In the legend of Prau Khăn Căm 'The Magic Cloth' a location change is omitted (cf. §6.1c). The husband has obviously gone home and spread the cloth out, expecting to feed his wife; but there is no mention of location or change of location. This comes at the end of the first climax.

3.3. Participant focus.

Focus on participants has the dual function of fixing attention on one item above others and of keeping reference clear. The function of nôq and nēh in this latter respect has already been discussed (cf. §1.1).

a. The pronoun nēh is marked for both focus and specificity; vu is unmarked. Although vu usually has a nonspecific function, it can refer to a very specific person for nonfocus. In the introduction to the legend of The Six Brothers, the step-brother is in focus and is referred to as nēh while the six brothers, not in focus but forming a specific group, are referred to as vu:

Con si-ur yöng nôq niêôt, cô saq sîông rôm diêt.
child wife aunt that lazy always go swing dance always

Cô n praú ndu pôp ōh vu tîq vu
as-to six people older-younger-sibling they there there

uâyh da vu saq re rôm dò. Saq sîq
industrious emph. they go field field-things go return

saq ǔm. Cô nēh aheq, cô nēh hao vîô chhôc nēh
go bathe as-to him here always he climb up tree he
The child of the second wife was lazy, always going to swing and dance all the time. As for those other six brothers, they were very industrious; they went to the fields, etc. [They] went home and took a bath. As for him (the other one), he always climbed up into trees and made them sway. He made those trees sway, then he took sooty charcoal and smeared his face. After that he returned home. Those six returned; they bathed clean and then returned; as for him, he didn't bathe.

In this paragraph the contrast between the two kinds of action is sharpened by the use of nēh and vu instead of nēh and khây nēh.

b. In discourse with first person involvement the speaker can focus on himself by using ānh 'I' or he can refrain from focusing by using vôh 'we (incl.)'; cf. §6.2a.

3.4. Cycling and overlaying.

The repeated pattern in cycles and overlays shows what the narrator is emphasizing in a theme (cf. Grimes, 1972: 516; and Wendland, 1975: 32). In The Six Brothers ($2.3a$) the first set of cycles emphasizes the repeated attempts to lose the children in the jungle. This is a dastardly act; it means murder, and children are highly prized in Chrau culture. The next set of cycles emphasizes that the spirit forces can be overcome and brought to one's aid. The last set of cycles emphasizes that because the father has broken the rules the rules now work against him.
4. *New information.*

On the discourse level of the hierarchy Chrau has several means of slowing down the rate of introduction of new information. Basically, these conform to the means used on lower levels for the same purpose, namely repetition and paraphrase.

4.1. *Cycling and overlaying.*

One function of cycling and overlaying is to slow down the rate of introduction of new information (cf. Grimes, 1972: 520). Only the first cycle or plane is completely new. After that, although the focus of the discourse is on repeated elements, the listener's attention is fixed primarily on the new developments. He is able to relax his attention somewhat (while listening to legends, Chrau tend to wander in and out) and even catch some old information he may have missed in a previous telling. Secondarily, he listens to the repeated elements for enjoyment of the style, which often involves chanting, medial rhyming, reduplication and descriptive adverbs (cf. §§5.2-4), with no need to listen for details.

4.2. *Introductions.*

New participants are sometimes introduced at the end of one paragraph, only to be reintroduced at the beginning of the next. At their first introduction these new participants are quite unexpected, and no information is provided about them except their name or role. Then in the second introduction they may occur in the subject slot, with or without further information about them. If they are brought into focus with n Ethiopia, they are thereafter referred to as n Ethiopia.

This repetition of introductions helps to clarify both that there is a new participant and who he is. There are two instances of this feature in *Prau Klô Dlu Nsêt:*

...n Ethiopia en Klô Dlu Nsêt n Ethiopiaphone. *P* Klô Dlu Nsêt n Ethiopia...

...so then the Young Mushroom Man heard. *P* That young Mushroom Man...
and

...nọq Cọ Nhụt Cọ Nhọq chẳng. Ṭ Cọ Nhụt Cọ Nhọq panh...
...so Grandfather Nhụt Nhọq heard. Ṭ Grandfather Nhụt Nhọq said...

5. Styles.

David Thomas (1971: 216) describes three styles for Chrau: classical, formal, and colloquial. Classical style ranges from chants to legends and folktales (approaching colloquial style). His formal style would include our expository discourse, some hortatory discourse, and epistolary discourse. His colloquial style ranges from legends to conversations.

5.1. General verb density.

These differences in style for different types of discourse show up strikingly in the percentage of verbs used in each—that is to say, the number of verb words divided by the total number of words.\footnote{Maxwell Cobbey (to appear) has done a statistical count of nouns and verbs in Roḍlai, a Malayo-Polynesian language bordering Chrau on the east. His findings are somewhat similar, although he did not have as great a variety of texts.} Colloquial style tends to show the highest percentage of verbs, epistolary style the lowest. One text examined is pure dialogue and has the highest percentage of verbs. The next is a very emotional hortatory text in which the first and second persons predominate, and the percentage is almost the same. Legends, which contain much dialogue, are next with a somewhat lower percentage. Then there is a big gap before two expository texts and a first-person narrative with little dialogue; thereafter a small gap before two hortatory texts and, finally, two letters (see Chart 1).

David Thomas (1971: 217) notes the use of more noun subjects in formal style. This is the reciprocal of low verb density (i.e., longer and more frequent noun phrases) and agrees
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>discourse type</th>
<th>title</th>
<th>verb percentage</th>
<th>style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dialogue</td>
<td>ṃp pâm</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>colloquial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hortatory</td>
<td>Tâch gõng</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>narrative, legend</td>
<td>Prau Khăn Gûn</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>narrative, legend</td>
<td>Prau Klô Dłu Nsêt</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>classical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expository</td>
<td>Jêng sipãm</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expository</td>
<td>Vu gêh ohaq</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>narrative, 1st per.</td>
<td>Saq nggô</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hortatory, #2, #3</td>
<td>(by Y)</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>letter #2</td>
<td>(by N.S.)</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>letter #1</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>formal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 1: Verb densities by discourse type.

with the findings shown in Chart 1, where written communications have the lowest verb densities.

5.2. Medial rhyming.

As described by David Thomas (1971: 218) and Cooper (1973: 33), medial rhyming is a common feature in Mon-Khmer. It is used most often in Chrau by expert speakers,¹² being less common in colloquial style than in classical, but is not inap-

¹²"Different social structures may generate different speech systems or linguistic codes. The latter entail for the individual specific principles of choice which regulate the selections he makes from the totality of options represented by a given language." (Bernstein, 1964: 56).
appropriate in any style. Certain rhymes are in common use; for example, lōq sāq rāq ndu 'everybody' (literally 'every soul rāq person', rāq being a nonce form), for the more prosaic āp ndu, and saq chroc vrī mi sa 'lost in the jungle and soaked' (literally 'go lost jungle rain eat'), a euphemism for chūt sūng vrī 'died in the jungle'.

Trōq jāng tĕn and chih tavūn are types of chants which use medial rhyming extensively. Experts in these styles are rare, and said to reside mostly at Bảo Chánh. Chants are use many archaic words and pronunciations. Regrettably, we do not have translations of the chants which were recorded.\textsuperscript{13}

5.3. Descriptive adverbs.

Mon-Khmer languages have a special wordclass which may be called descriptive adverbs.\textsuperscript{14} Like the ideophone of Africa, members of this class are "often onomatopoeic, [and describe] a predicative, qualitative or adverb in respect to manner, colour, sound, smell, action, state or intensity" (Doke, 1935: 118-9, quoted in Watson, 1966: 8).

Such adverbs are vivid descriptions, highly specific of sensations, as phwōng 'suddenly awake', phūt 'sound of small things taking off', pruh 'of action of standing up', latīh la-tōh 'of a drunkard going or sitting limply'. They tend to be reduplicative, as with the last example, but are not necessarily so. As with such English expressions as kerplunk! and r-r-rip!, they also tend to be used only in colloquial and classical styles; the Chrau say in fact that such words are inappropriate in serious writing.

\textsuperscript{13}See note 4.

\textsuperscript{14}Banker for Bahnar (1965: 22, 35) calls them "descriptive adjectives and adverbs; Miller for Brôu (Brü) (1964: 47) calls them "modifiers"; Watson for Pacōh (1966: 12) calls them "descriptives", and Diffloth for Semai (1976) calls them "expressives".
5.4. Reduplication.

David Thomas (1971: 155) lists three types of reduplication in Chrau: *simple*, consisting of a pair of identical forms (e.g., ḕẖ ḕẖ 'moving quickly'), *altering*, in which the second member of a pair has been altered in some way (e.g., phung lung 'heavy falling'), and *additive*, in which the second member adds a homorganic nasal or a presyllable (e.g., ṭẖ nggẖ ṭẖ 'noisy').

Similar to reduplication is the use of semantic pairs such as ṭẖ ṭẖ 'older and younger siblings' and huch sa 'drink and eat'. Such pairs may also be separated, as huch yẖ sa yẖa 'drink enough and eat enough'.

Reduplication is most common in classical style, but is also found in formal style (cf. §6.3c). Normally only stylized reduplications occur in conversation, though legends, which are at the lower end of the classical scale, are full of them.

5.5. Loanwords.

Sanskrit, Cham and Cambodian borrowings are so old in Chrau that the Chrau themselves do not recognize them as such. Older Vietnamese loans have been completely assimilated. A completely assimilated Vietnamese form has no lexical tone, whereas recent loans from Vietnamese retain their tone.

All types of Chrau discourse except chants make use of Vietnamese loanwords, especially function words such as mà 'but', còn 'as to', hẽ 'whenever', nghèo 'if', phải 'must', là 'copulative', có 'continually', ṭẖ 'from', and kwá (quá) 'very'. After function words the next most common class of loans comprises words used mainly in a Vietnamese environment, such as bác sĩ 'medical doctor'.

6. Discourse types and sample texts.

The various discourse types found in Chrau (*narrative*, *expository*, *hortatory* and *epistolary*) are probably universal.
Even the formulae for these different types are almost identical with those reported by Longacre for the Philippines and New Guinea (1968: 1-49; 1972: 133-58). What is language-specific is how a given language, as a defining characteristic, differentiates its discourse types. Verb density patterns, for example, may or may not be distinctive, while person orientation depends to a certain degree on the semantic division of the pronouns.

In Chraw, narratives tend to be in either the first or third person, with the second person usually reserved for embedded quotations (occasionally the listener is exhorted to listen). Hortatory discourses tend to be topic-oriented or to have first person inclusive and third person nonspecific pronouns. The following sections provide discussions of the formulae and fillers for the various discourse types, charts of skeleton discourses, and sample discourses.

6.1. Narrative discourse structure.

The plot structure of narrative discourse has been mentioned previously. The build-up of suspense to a climax, followed by a solution, appears to be a universal structure. Longacre (1976, citing Thrall et al.) observes that "...the antecedent tradition goes back to classical times." He terms it a "deep structure" composed of Exposition, Inciting Moment, Developing Conflict, Climax, Dénouement, Final Suspense, and Conclusion. Wendland (1975: 40, 41) recognizes for Chewa the Introduction, Development, Climax and Resolution, of which the first and last are optional.

a. For Chraw we find the following narrative formula:
   \[ t \ \text{Title} \ t \ \text{Setting} \ t \ \text{Introduction} + \ \text{Episode}\n \ t \ \text{Dénouement} \ t \ \text{Conclusion} \ t \ \text{Comment} \ t \ \text{Finis}. \]

---

15 These types should presumably include procedural and descriptive discourse, but our corpus was prematurely closed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>narrative</th>
<th>expository</th>
<th>hortatory</th>
<th>epistolary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>formula</strong></td>
<td>title</td>
<td>topic</td>
<td>+ setting</td>
<td>+ setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>setting</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ nucleus</td>
<td>+ introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>introduction</td>
<td>introduction</td>
<td>+ nucleus</td>
<td>+ nucleus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dénouement</td>
<td>+ conclusion</td>
<td>+ terminus</td>
<td>+ conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ finis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comment</td>
<td>finis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>paragraph types</strong></td>
<td>+ situational descriptive</td>
<td>+ descriptive</td>
<td>+ volitional</td>
<td>+ volitional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ narrative</td>
<td>+ narrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ concept descriptive</td>
<td>+ descriptive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ dialogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>interparagraph linkage</strong></td>
<td>tail-head</td>
<td>causal rel.</td>
<td>causal rel.</td>
<td>usually unrelated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>temporal sequence</td>
<td>contrastive rel.</td>
<td>contrastive rel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>participants</td>
<td>head-head</td>
<td>tail-tail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>persons</strong></td>
<td>1, (2), 3</td>
<td>1, 2, (3)</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>verb density</strong></td>
<td>legends: high</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>highest</td>
<td>lowest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st-pers. nar.:</td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>purpose</strong></td>
<td>entertain</td>
<td>inform</td>
<td>advise</td>
<td>any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>instruct</td>
<td>convince</td>
<td>instruct</td>
<td>correct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 2: Discourse Structures.
The Title is usually the name of the hero or heroes, or of some distinctive item or action in the first sentence. It is commonly preceded by nhai 'tell'. The Setting, Introduction, Conclusion and Comment normally comprise situational or concept descriptive paragraphs (§2.2) and in this respect contrast with the Episode and Dénouement, which are usually narrative paragraphs.

The Episode develops the conflict presented in the Introduction. There may be any number of episodes, either separate or embedded (cycles), but at least the last one must have a climax. The Dénouement resolves the conflict. Although the Episode and Dénouement have the same paragraph types, they may be distinguished in Chrau by their relative verb densities. A climax paragraph has low verb density, a Dénouement paragraph very high verb density followed by extremely low verb density in the Conclusion.

The Conclusion and Comment can be distinguished by paragraph types, being situational descriptive and concept descriptive respectively. Semantically, the Conclusion tells what happened ever after. The Comment is completely outside the plot.

b. In Prau Klô Dlu Nsêt there are two climaxes, equally marked, but the final Dénouement is more strongly marked than the transitional one (cf. Chart 3). In Prau Khăn Gôn (§6.1a) the first cycle has a strongly marked climax (P 4), but the final cycle climax (P 7) is weakly marked. However, the final Dénouement (P 8) is strongly marked. The whole final cycle could be considered the Dénouement for the first cycle.

c. Sample text.

In the following text, note the pronoun nêh. Unless someone else is properly identified (P 6, st. 2: patau nêh... nêh) and apart from dialogue where the next speaker becomes nêh
Chart 3: Discourse Structure of Kiê Diu Neêt.

*The asterisks in this column mark theme changes, along with lexical markers.*
(P 7, st. 5: mőh nēh nhai), nēh refers to the hero-husband (P 8 begins with nēh sīq 'he returned', but at the end of P 7 nēh was the shop lady). The one occurrence of nēh when it does not refer to people is in P 3, st. 3, where it is the dummy subject of lūh (cf. P 8, last sentence). In P 1, st. 2, nēh refers to both the husband and the wife, while in P 9 it is simply not clear whether it refers to both or only to the husband.

Note also the repetition. Wěnh 'beg' occurs three times in the first two sentences of P 2. First we learn that the husband goes begging; then we learn where and, finally, what. This serves partly to introduce additional information slowly and partly to underline the begging. In the first paragraph, however, the couple's poverty is underlined by paraphrase, not exact repetition. The husband and wife are hard up, they have nothing at all, they don't do anything, and finally the wife realizes her husband doesn't know how to work.

There is a relatively small number of Vietnamese loanwords in this text. There is one example of a descriptive adverb, which is also reduplicative: tông lông 'headlong' (P 8, st. 7). There is also a semantic pair, n' hôp jina (P 9), both members of which mean 'rich'.

In the Setting, there is a poor man and his wife. In the Introduction, the extremity of their poverty is described as is the hero's problem, which is that his wife chases him continually. Then come two cycles. The first is the Episode; this has a climax marked by low verb density as the hero is completely unsuccessful. The second is the Dénouement, which maintains high verb density except for a slight dip in the verb count where there is some uncertainty about the outcome. In the Conclusion, they "live happily ever after".

---

16 These are: kwa (Vietnamese quả), ncai (Chrau en + Vietnamese kê vây), buôn, khăn, búa, tiêm, đợ, hiêp, bà, kwan (quán), lōi, là, mãm, khối.
Setting and Introduction

Paragraph 1: Situational descriptive. (22.6% verbs)

1 Hỏi nói chang*var ndu si-ur siklo noq lôh-sat* time that hear two person wife husband that hard-up lông goi. 2 Nêh eq geh* jên lêq. 3 Var ndu si-ur very very they not have money at-all two person wife siklo nêh noq saq; dăng opr*pâch lây. 4 En noq si-ur husband they that go not do thing any after that wife nêh noq châm* duôn. 5 Môh si-ur say* nêh niêt* kwa, dăng his that weave hat then wife see he lazy very not gu* opr* pâch lây. 6 Si-ur nêh dâm* diêt nêh ncai know do thing any wife his chase constantly him then nêh buôn* he sad

Episode (cycle 1)

Paragraph 2: Narrative. (26.4% verbs)

1 Ncai nár noq nêh saq*winh* then day that he go beg he go up clear to vi patau, nêh wînh*, nêh wînh* piêng sa. 2 Nêh saq*hao* chhuoi tu where king so he beg he beg rice eat king know

---

Narrator: Cô Lacunh. Verbs have been marked with asterisks. Only main verbs have been counted; pre-verbs, post-verbs, and embedded verbs were not counted (sa of piêng sa was not counted, but in piêng si-ur nêh sa it was). There is bound to be some indetermination in counting, as in the first paragraph, where it is questionable whether n'hâp-jîna and pôh-mvôq are to be taken as single units or not; it is significant that either way the verb percentage is still much lower than elsewhere.
nêh lāp*, patau gù* nêh wōq. "Mōh patau an* nêh luh he enter king know him more then king give him for du pāng khān. "En kê nēh panh*; "Vrēq pāch heq sīq*; one piece cloth then then he say now thing here return mōq óp* cò?" 6Patau panh*; "Māy vāt* sīq* pāch heq, cāphon* how do sir king say you carry return thing here hear may lāq* u cāđār may nōq. 7Ncai may gōh* pe māt, may you spread on table you that then you knock three time you cop* muōi var pe lā lūh* du mām pēng an* may luh count one two three is out one tray rice give you for may sā; si-ur sīlō pāch may tē." you eat wife husband thing you raise

P 3: Narrative. (28.9% verbs)

1En kê mōh chāng lōi patau, nēh sīq* 2Ndōh tāt* then then hear words king he return not-yet reach nhi, nēh sāq*nāc trong, nēh gōh* lūh* du mām pēng. 3Nēnh house he go half road he knock out one tray rice it lūh* du mām pēng sa cò nhāng. 4Mōh nēh sāt 5Sa* en out one tray rice eat truly then he eat eat already nēh huch* alāc vanhūf* he drink wine drunk

Climax

P 4: Narrative. (24% verbs)

1Mōh nēh sīq* tu nhi bā kwan sāy* vanhūf* alāc. then he return to house Mrs. shop see drunk wine 2Mōh nēh nhai*nēh gēn* khān nōq. 3En kê mōh bā kwan then he say he have cloth that then then Mrs. shop tām-gāl* bāy nēh. exchange with him
Transition: Episode 1, Introduction 2

5: Narrative. (29.4% verbs)

1. En kē nēh gōh* wōq dāng gēh* piēng si-ur nēh sa†
   then he knock more not have rice wife he eat
2. En si-ur nēh nhāl*, "May mvārt"* then wife he say you lie

Dénouement (cycle 2)

6: Narrative. (32.1% verbs)

1. Ncai nēh saq*hao*lōp*patau wōq. 2. Patau nēh nhāl* nēh
   then he go up ask king more king he say he
   panh*, "Khān may nōq vu khūh* en doh, ānh gūt.*
   say cloth you that someone steal already already I know
3. Vrāq an* may du tong bua sīq*"
   now give you one stick hammer return

7: Narrative. (26.3% verbs)

1. Nhāng nēh sīq* vāt* du tong bua. 2. Nēh sīq*
   truly he return carry one stick hammer he return
   lāp* tiēm bā kwan. 3. Ncai nēh lōp* bā kwan, nēh nhāl*
   enter shop Mrs. shop then he ask Mrs. shop he say
   panh*, "Ay ndau ay nhūp* khān ānh. 4. Eq gēh* vu
   he say you yesterday you take cloth my not have anybody
   lāy, vrāq ay phāi trōh*pāch ānh je." 5. Mōh nēh panh*
   any now you must give thing my poss. then she say
   nēh eq luŋ*. 6. Nēh panh*, "Ay eq luŋ*, ānh an* bua pām*
   she not give he say you not give I let hammer beat you
   liēn." 7. Nhāng bua lūn* pām* pachāh* dō lēq trōh,
   immediately truly hammer out beat smash thing all entirely
Nøq heq tøq tīq. *Ncaï nēh iuṭ* gēh khān gēh dò that here there there then she give have cloth have thing wōq. more

Final Dénouement

P 8: Narrative. (30.2% verbs)

1Nēh sīq* nēh nhai*bày si-ur nēh, "Vṛeq voh khōi phūng* he return he say with wife his now we avoid fear pangot* en doh. 2PLōng sa gēh* mà ḏān gēh* du sinlō' hungry already already rice eat have and I have one thing wōq, dāng gēh* vu lāy hiōp* ānḥ gēh." 3Si-ur nēh more not have body any persecute me able wife his panh*, "May mvār*: "May sāng* bua may pām*ānḥ sēnt: 4May say you lie you send hammer you beat me see you saq* sa* huch* di gōq en, ncaï sīq* may nhai* pāch go eat drink too much already then return you say thing heq pāch nōq bāy ānḥ." 5En kē mōh siklō nēh panh*, here thing that with me then then husband he say, "Ay nhai*nhāng? ānḥ sāng*lūḥ*pām*" 6Nhāng bua nēh lōṭ* you say truly I send out beat truly hammer it run lūḥ* gēh* si-ur nēh du māṭ toṅg-loṅg lawāt* u nōq. out knock wife his one time headlong unconscious at there 8Nōq kē siklō nēh nhai*panh, "Nōq ay sāy* dāng? 9A, vṛeq so then husband he say saying so you see not ah now chōt*ānḥ gōh* lūḥ* plōng ay iuṅ ay saṭ." 10Nhāng nēh let me knock forth rice you for you eat truly he lāq* khān, nēh lāq* u cadār. 11Nēh gōh* pe māṭ, spread cloth he spread on table he knock three time
Conclusion

P 9: Situational descriptive. (15.4 - 20.0% verbs)

Nǒq mǒh něh tê* rup něh lawân, něh n'hapus-jina*
so then he kept body he permanently he rich rich
lawân, tâ† pōh-mvôq wǒq.
permanently forever more

TRANSLATION

1. At that time, listen, this husband and wife were very hard up. They didn't have any money at all. The husband and wife pair didn't go do anything. Then later the wife wove hats. Then the wife saw he was lazy and didn't know how to do a thing. The wife chased him all the time, so he was sad.

2. Then one day he went begging. He went clear up to the king's place, then he begged, he begged for rice to eat. The king knew he had come in, and further the king knew about him. Then the king gave him a cloth. He said, "Take this thing home, then what should I do, sir?" The king said, "You carry this thing home, hear, you spread it on your table, then knock three times and count 'One, two, three', and a tray of food will appear for you to eat, husband and wife and whatever you raise."

3. After hearing the words of the king, he returned. Before reaching home, just half-way, he knocked forth a tray of food. A tray of food to eat came forth, really. Then he ate. After eating he drank wine till he was drunk.

4. Then he went home to the house of the shop lady, who saw he was drunk with wine. Then he said he had that cloth. Then the shop lady exchanged with him.

5. Then he knocked again, but didn't have any food for his wife to eat. Then his wife said, "You're a liar."

6. Then he went up to ask the king again. The king said, "Your cloth there, someone has stolen it, I know. Now I'll give you a hammer to take home."

7. Truly, he returned carrying the hammer. He went back into the shop lady's store. Then he asked the shop lady, he said, "You took my cloth yesterday. There wasn't anybody else,
now you give it back." Then she said she wouldn't give it. He said, "If you don't give it, I'll make the hammer pound you immediately." Truly, the hammer came out and pounded and smashed everything up, this, that, and the other thing. Then she gave the cloth and other things.

8. He went home and said to his wife, "Now we won't have to worry about being hungry. We'll have rice, and I have one more thing so there won't be anyone able to persecute me." His wife said, "You're a liar. Tell your hammer to pound me for me to see. You go eating and drinking so much, then you return, you say this and that to me." Then her husband said, "Do you mean it? I'll send it out to pound." The hammer really did come out and beat his wife once. She fell headlong unconscious there. So then the husband spoke, saying, "So do you see or not? Ah, now let me knock out food for you to eat." Honestly, he spread the cloth, he spread it out on the table. He knocked three times, then a tray of food came forth, and the husband and wife ate until they were full.

9. So then he was able to take care of himself ever after, he was rich for ever and ever.

6.2. Expository discourse structure.

The development of expository discourse is mostly through logical relationships, although there is some temporal sequence.

a. The formula for expository discourse is: \( \text{Topic} \rightarrow \text{Introduction} \rightarrow \text{Nucleus} \rightarrow \text{Conclusion} \rightarrow \text{Finis} \).

The Topic is a statement of what the discourse will be about, and is usually a single sentence.

The Introduction is filled with a concept descriptive paragraph. It is an expansion of the Topic.

The Nucleus can also have embedded narrative discourses but is usually filled by concept descriptive and situational descriptive paragraphs.

The only Conclusion in our data is filled by a concept descriptive paragraph, and is a concise paraphrase of the preceding discourse.

The Finis is usually just ńeq en 'That's all' or 'Like that', but it may be expanded into ănh wînh náí ńeq u
'Here I ask to end my words'.

Overlays (cf. §2.3b) are common in expository discourse, but are by no means the only way to develop a theme in Chrau. Besides overlays, there is the traditional outline-like structure. "The basic idea is that semantic elements of equal weight in an outline are given comparable forms of expression, while any element that is subordinated to another is tagged as subordinate by the use of conjunctions, inflections, order, or embedding" (Grimes, 1972: 513, quoting Christensen, 1965).

Yāq Cô Var 'Accusing the Lieutenant' has an overlay of four planes at the beginning, each saying (with some repetition and some uniqueness) that the villagers are forced to work for nothing and not allowed to go out to market lest they accuse the lieutenant. In this text there is only one such overlay: the next point is made with an embedded narrative while the following points are made individually with outline-like structure.

The style of expository discourses is marked by medium verb density (cf. Chart 1), medial rhymes (notably in Jêng Sîpôm), and the absence of descriptive adverbs.

Cohesion is maintained chiefly by logical relationship, head-head or tail-tail linkage, and paraphrase.

b. Jêng Sîpôm is a discourse on being a shaman, its purpose being to defend the work of shamans. It is all in the first person. In the first half, where the speaker tells how he became a shaman, and in the next two paragraphs he uses ānh 'I', but in the other two paragraphs he uses von 'we (incl.)' and the indefinite third-person pronoun vu. In these two latter paragraphs he is talking about the work of shamans in general, not just about himself.

Throughout the concept descriptive paragraphs the speaker develops his argument through the use of negated anto-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>theme</th>
<th>P markers</th>
<th>participants*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Setting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>situational descriptive</td>
<td>People said I would become a shaman.</td>
<td>a long time ago</td>
<td>vu: initiators I: reactor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Nucleus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Section 1: personal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>narrative</td>
<td>The spirits made me crazy.</td>
<td>at that time</td>
<td>spirits: initiators* I: reactor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>situational descriptive</td>
<td>I'm O.K. now.</td>
<td>now</td>
<td>I: initiator*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>narrative</td>
<td>I became a shaman.</td>
<td>from....till now</td>
<td>I: initiator wife, deer: tertiary*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>concept</td>
<td>I try to make people well.</td>
<td>therefore</td>
<td>I: initiator pop oh: reactors* vu: tertiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>concept</td>
<td>I do my work well.</td>
<td>seeing like that</td>
<td>I, vu: initiators* pop oh: tertiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>descriptive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Section 2: general</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>concept</td>
<td>We go to help people.</td>
<td>today (summary at end)</td>
<td>we: initiators* spirits: reactors* vu: tertiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>concept</td>
<td>Shamans must have apprentices.</td>
<td>(see P closure above)</td>
<td>we: initiators* apprentices: tertiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>descriptive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Finis*

"That's all."

---

Chart 5: Discourse Structure of îîng Stîpâm.

*The asterisks in this column mark theme changes, along with lexical markers.*
nyms and causal sentences, with the two types sometimes embed-
ded in each other. Thus,

\[
\text{Vôn saq sảm vu von nhai bay yang an we go cure someone we talk with good-spirit make}
\]
\[
\text{vu đị yăh an vu vàng ji vậy, nỏq von gēh them part. well make them don't sick so so we have}
\]
\[
\text{phụt gēh phăn bay vu. Chỏ chaq-yang an von blessing have power with people neg. spirits make us}
\]
\[
\text{jěng sipểm mà von ēq saq sảm vu, nỏq von gēh become shaman but we not go cure people thus we have}
\]
\[
\text{bap. sin}
\]

We go to cure someone, we speak with the good spirits to
make them well, make them not sick; that way we have blessing
and power with people. [It is] certainly not that the
spirits make us become shamans, and then we don't go cure peo-
ple, that way we would have sin.

In this example both sentences are reason-result sentences, but
are at the same time in the negated-antonym relationship with
each other. And within the first sentence is the negated anto-
ym, "make them well, make them not sick."

In this text there is much parallelism between sen-
tences as well as embedding of causal or negated-antonym rela-
tionships. For example,

\[
\text{Něh cō chuţ, khoi yo soq n'hăm něh. Něh cō he who die also from placenta blood his he who}
\]
\[
\text{yăh, khoi yo soq n'hăm něh. well also from placenta blood his}
\]

He who dies, that's because of his fate. He who is well,
that's because of his fate, too.

Although this text is not as well constructed as the
other two examples of expository discourse (the Chrau editor substituted a new final paragraph for a rambling digression), from the standpoint of style it may be better than the others because of its parallelisms and medial rhymes. All three texts, however, have a large number of Vietnamese loanwords, especially for function words (in the above example yo 'from' is a loan). Without the Vietnamese function words, Chrau depends mainly upon juxtaposition of sentences and a minimum of Chrau connectives to show relations. Havránek (1964) reports for Czech free sequences of sentences in the folk speech with multi-valued conjunctions, but a tightly knit and integrated structure and specialization of conjunctions in standard speech. Even in folk speech Chrau is developing towards more specification.

c. The following sample expository discourse, Ưu gểh chaq, is an explanation of two kinds of Chrau sicknesses and their causes and also of the reason sorcery and demon possession are not common today.

The sample contains clear indicators of paragraph theme change: focus indicators, the Vietnamese loanword côn, and, in the last two paragraphs, references to the past. Paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 5 employ the focus indicator nôq. Paragraph 4 uses nêh heq, changing the focus to the previous concept in paragraph 2; only at the end of this paragraph is there a noun phrase for nêh. Although paragraph 2 starts out by discussing people possessed of evil spirits, it continues on into sorcery and then at its conclusion differentiates the two.18

Following the introduction come two different overlays intertwined. The speaker is describing and contrasting the

18 I was alerted to the possibility of a double theme by a description in Svelmoe and Svelmoe (1974: 130) of a paragraph with several "texts" in Mansaka.
effects of the "eating" of evil spirits and sorcery. In the first plane both overlays are presented; then overlay A has one plane, overlay B has one plane, and overlay A has another plane. Following these overlays comes a section consisting of two paragraphs in which the semantic domain switches from sickness to killing.

Throughout the concept descriptive paragraphs the speaker uses nêh for concepts, von and vu for people. In the first situational descriptive paragraph, however, nêh is absent, and vu refers both to those who practiced sorcery and to those who killed them. In the last paragraph nêh refers to those who practiced sorcery, vu to those who killed them; however, there is no clear introduction of nêh, probably because no focus is intended but only differentiation of two distinct groups.

This text does not rely so heavily on negated antonym sentences as Jêng Siipâm does. Its purpose is not so much to defend as to explain; hence there are more temporal-sequence, paraphrase and contra-expectancy sentences as well as causal sentences. For paraphrase, note paragraph 2, sentences 1-3, where the progression is from stomach-ache to diarrhea to loss of blood. For temporal sequence, note paragraph 4, sentence 4. For reason-result, see paragraph 7, sentence 5. For condition-result, see paragraph 7, sentence 4.

Although this text is of about the same length as Prau Khân Gân ($6.1c$), it has twice as many Vietnamese loans.¹⁹ There are no descriptive adverbs, but there are several semantic pairs: chàh laq 'sore + sore (= scabies)', mûh mêt 'nose + eyes (= face)', and nu von '(?) + body (= body)'.

¹⁹ These are: côn, ncai, bênh, yãng (vàng), yãng khê, cãi yî (cái gì), bính, bính cûi, khi, khi-khung, chiu, chuyen, hôi, bi, kwâ, thanh niên, thì-yụ (thè-du), chúng, chô, âúng (àúng), lân, hê, thì, âô, hay là, là, mả, lân lân, hôi.
Topic

Con nhai vu gêh chaq\textsuperscript{20}

Talking about people who have evil spirits

Introduction

\textbf{P1:} Concept descriptive.

Chaq nôq nêh gêh chaq, nêh khoi tampion evil spirit that he has evil spirit he also person voh, mà nêh lûn chaq, khoi ca tampion von caheq. we but he become evil spirit also like person we like this

\textit{Nucleus: Section 1}

\textit{Overlay A and B, plane 1}

\textbf{P2:} Concept descriptive.

\textsuperscript{1}Chaq nêh nôq lûn saq sa nêh cô ji evil spirit he that come out go eat he who sick candul. \textsuperscript{2}Nêh óp tarung. \textsuperscript{3}Nêh óp có saq nggô stomach he make diarrhea he make \(\emptyset\) go jungle lûn ayh n’ham, nôq ncaï diêt. \textsuperscript{4}Nêh hên du come out only blood so then constantly he appoint one khay, hay là hên pe khay. \textsuperscript{5}Túng nár nêh óp hò-loq. month or is appoint three month exact day he do owl \textsuperscript{6}Nêh óp sùng nom von yàng lêq, nêh óp von. \textsuperscript{7}Nêh óp he do in body we yellow all he do us he do von yàng khê. \textsuperscript{8}Ti jàng dô heq, nêh óp yàng éq us yellow (?) hand foot thing here he make yellow not gêh n’ham dô nôq. \textsuperscript{9}Remûf jreu sa, còn chaq have blood thing that yellow medicine eat as-to evil spirit

\textsuperscript{20}Informant: Hûng (1964).
sa nơq saq nggō tarung, lūh n'ham.
eat so go jungle spill come out blood

Plane A2

P3: Concept descriptive.

1Jrou sa nơq nēh ōp cāl-yī, nēh sa nēh ōp medicine eat that it do anything it eat it make
bình lēq sùng rup ti jāng dō heq yāng lēq. 2En sick all in body hand foot thing here yellow all then
cāi nēh ōp khi vōn chāh-laq. 3Khi ti jāng vōn thing it work when we scabies when hand foot we
aih caheq, khi-khūng nēh chāh-laq cambet. 4Tōh kīēt swollen like-this suddenly it scabies disappear pimple itch
ken nơq, Nhuôn nēh cuōl ghō nơq tōh kīēt. small that Vietnamese he call ghe that pimple itch
5Tōh kīēt lān lān diēt, lān māq lān māq lān. 6Nēh pimple itch gradually constantly time big time big time it
ōp vōn gēh bīnh-cūi, nơq là vu cuōl. make us have leprosy that is one call

Plane B2

P4: Concept descriptive.

1Cōn nēh heq nēh sa ngān. 2Khi-khūng lūh vi as-to it here it eat only suddenly come-out place
heq vi heq, nēh sa khweq. 3Khi nēh sa talaq here place here it eat holes when it eat intestines
khoi gēh, khi nēh sa ndwāch vōn khoi gēh. 4Nēh sa also have when it eat anus we also have it eat
diēt vōn chū ēq truh en vōn chūt. 5Nơq bīnh bīnh constantly we stand not able then we die that sick sick
Plane A3

5: Concept descriptive.
1Còn bệnh jrou sa nốq nêh őp yâng léq tì as-to sick medicine eat that it make yellow all hand jâng. 2Mûh mât yâng léq, candûl dò nốq. 3Nêh őp foot nose eye yellow all stomach thing that it make ti jâng dò aih dò nốq, heq khi nêh őp var hand foot thing swell thing that here when it make two chuyen nốq. 4Khi nêh őp tì jâng dò aih léq. 5Aih thing that when it make hand foot thing swell all Swell a jâng aih hao mà súng nòm yâng léq. 6Mà nêh sa léq from foot swell up and in body yellow all and it eat all n’ham en, nêh hen dûng khay nốq von churt. 7Jrou blood already it appoint exact month so we die medicine sa aih dâng nốq, nêh bệnh yang léq. 8Ti jâng nu nòm eat swell like that it sick yellow all hand foot body nêh en.

it finished

Nucleus: Section 2

6: Situational descriptive.
1Còn hôi nốq vu tê jrou chống vреш vu léq as-to time that one keep medicine not now one all-gone thừng tê en. 2Bì vu tachut kwá. 3Bì vu gêh phao dare keep already suffer one kill very suffer one have gun wât, khi vu gút wât. 4Vu nhup vu tachut, thành-niên (?) when one know (?) one take one kill youths
vrêq màq vu èq chú, vu cònh di yâh. 5Vu cònh ông now big one not stand-for one want to good one want do sa vu èq chú canôq.
eat one not stand-for like-that

P 7: Situational descriptive.

1Công adom có camvînh, vu chưt gõq lũng.
as-to long-ago grandfather old one dead much very
2Vu trloh daq, dăng vu pâh nco, dăng vu tancháp tanyông one throw water not one cut neck not one tie hang
vlo chho. 3Vu gõt nõq, dăng vrêq gõt thì nêh ông gêh.
above tree one know that not now know, he do can
4Hê vu gõt thì nêh gõq dăng gêh. 5Vu tachur chêq nêh,
if one know, he live not able one kill leave him
vrêq takiq vôq. 6Thî-yu hôi nõq du riêng ndu, now little only for-example time that one hundred person
vrêq cùng var pe ndu gêh. 7Chô còn dăng gêh now about two three person have not still not have
lêq tôq. 8Vrêq takiq, còn gêh gõq nõq lêq all-gone part. now little as-to have much that all-gone
en. 9Chô vu tachur vu èq chêq du mvu.
already not one kill one not leave one person

TRANSLATION

1. That person with an evil spirit, he has an evil spirit, he is also a person like us, but he became a person with
an evil spirit, just like us people.

2. That evil spirit comes out and goes to eat people who have stomach-aches. He makes diarrhea. He makes it that when
one goes to defecate only blood comes out, this goes on all the
time. He appoints one month or two months, or three months.
When the day comes, he becomes an owl demon. He makes our body
all yellow, he works on us. He makes us yellow khê. Hands and
feet and so on, he makes them yellow with no blood and things.
Jaundice is from sorcery, when spirits eat you have bloody stools.

3. What does sorcery do? It eats, it makes you sick all over the body, hands and feet, everything is yellow. And then it does it when we have scabies. When our hands and feet are swollen; then suddenly the scabies disappears. Small itchy pimples the Vietnamese call ghe, that itchy pimples. The itchy pimples get bigger and bigger all the time. It turns into leprosy, as they call it.

4. As to this other one, it just eats. Suddenly it comes out here and there, eating holes. Sometimes it eats the intestines, sometimes it eats our anus too. It eats all the time, when we can't stand it any longer we die. That's the sickness when evil spirits eat one.

5. Concerning sickness from sorcery, it makes one yellow all over the arms and legs. The whole face is yellow, stomach, everything. It makes the arms and legs, everything, swell up; it does both those things. When it makes the arms and legs swell all up. The swelling goes up from the legs, but the body is all yellow. But when it has consumed all the blood, it appoints the exact month, so we die. Sorcery makes swelling like that, it's the sickness of being yellow all over. Arms, legs, body it finishes.

6. Now in those days people practiced sorcery, but now people don't dare anymore. A lot of them were killed. They were killed by people with guns when they knew about it. They caught them and killed them, young people have grown up now and they won't stand for it, they want good. People want to make a living; they won't stand for it.

7. In the olden days of the old grandfathers, a lot of people died. People threw them into the water, or else cut their throats, or else tied them up and hung them on a tree. Whether people knew about it or not, they were able to do sorcery. If people knew about it, they couldn't stay around. People would kill them; now there is very little of it. For example, before there may have been a hundred people, now only about two or three. But it still hasn't completely died out. Now there are a few; the days when there were many are gone. People are killing them off, not leaving any.

6.3. Hortatory discourse structure.

Hortatory discourses are called in Chrau pàn cahya 'advise', chih nhai 'scold', or rach padau 'instruct'. They are marked by extensive use of imperatives and second-person pronouns.
a. The formula for hortatory discourse is: + Setting + Nucleus + Conclusion + Terminus.

The Setting in all three hortatory texts consists of a reference to a recent occurrence; it can have a narrative paragraph or a concept descriptive paragraph.

The Nucleus develops the theme. It is composed of volitional or situational descriptive paragraphs.

The Conclusion is a concise paraphrase of the discourse. It is filled with a volitional paragraph.

The Terminus takes the form of a charge addressed to the hearers, such as "So you'd better listen" or "So you'd better be careful." It too is filled with a volitional paragraph.

Verb density varies with the emotional involvement of the speaker. Wông gông, in which the speaker several times threatens death, has a very high density (cf. Chart 1). The two other texts, Nêh pân and Rach padau, have identically low densities.

Nêh pân and Rach padau both have a Terminus while Nêh pan also has a Conclusion. Wông gông has neither.

Nêh pân and Rach padau show considerable reduplication. Wông gông has none save in one sentence:

Vlam sipai pânh sipai, vlam sikwây pânh sikwây.
meet rabbit shoot rabbit meet mouse-deer shoot mouse-deer

If these three texts are representative of their categories, it may be said that on the basis of verb densities, formal structure and reduplicative style, pân cahya and rach padau are more formal while chih nhai is less formal and more spontaneous.

b. Wông gông was recorded on magnetic tape at our request. It was done as an older man scolding some younger ones
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>theme</th>
<th>lexical markers</th>
<th>P markers</th>
<th>participants*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>narrative</td>
<td>meat sold</td>
<td>yesterday</td>
<td>nēh: initiators</td>
<td>Ga Prsu: reactor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Setting**

**Nucleus**

| 2  | volitional    | get me some meat   | tomorrow        | I: initiator* | you: reactors* |
| 3  | volitional    | go hunting; I'll go to market | I'll go; market | I: initiator | you: reactors |
| 4  | situational   | nothing to eat      | now             | (soliloquy)   |               |
|    | descriptive   | get meat            | now             | I: initiator* | you: reactors* |

Chart 6: Discourse Structure of Wông gông.

*The asterisks in this column mark theme changes, along with lexical markers.*
for selling all the meat on hand, with the result that there is none left, and telling them to go for more and this time not sell it. The second half of the text is more of a ramble from the second day of recording, and is not treated here.

The narrative paragraph in the Setting is in the third person. Paragraphs 2, 3 and 5 are addressed to the boys, but paragraph 4 is a soliloquy by the disgruntled speaker.

ο. The discourse Nêh pân was recorded in a village after the commander, a lieutenant, had just delivered a lecture. He knew some Chrau, and his lectures tended to be basically Vietnamese with some Chrau thrown in; this may account for the comment in paragraph 2, sentence 10, to the effect that the commander was not speaking out of order. The speaker in Nêh pân is a Chrau soldier.

In both paragraphs of the Nucleus there are double themes. In the first the villagers are advised not to be angry with the lieutenant and reminded that he is right to tell them not to drink too much. In the second they are reminded that when drunk they cannot care for their weapons and that, while they are in this condition, the VC's might capture the village. The first paragraph is clearly a united whole, as the two themes switch back and forth; the second might be split into two at sentence 5 where the word vrêq occurs and the VC's come into focus. However, up to this point no one has been in focus, and the semantic domains covered in both halves are the same: weapons, drinking a lot vs. drinking a little. This is more a case of surface-level divisions than of deep structure.

In the Conclusion there is an unannounced switch back to the lieutenant as nêh.

Note the interparagraph linkage between paragraphs 2 and 3: ...thì khoi vu nhai canôq '...also they talk like that'.
Three types of reduplication are used: (1) altering: tacuq tacōq 'inebriated', tamvãq tamvây 'disorderly'; (2) separated semantic pairs: chẹq nuinh chẹq tó̂r 'set heart set ear', huch sēh huch alâc 'drink wine drink beer', nãc daq nãc trong 'half river half road', huch yụa sa yụa 'drink enough eat enough'; and (3) one nonseparated semantic pair: phao randâh 'gun gun'.

Our text has approximately the same ratio of Vietnamese loans as Vu qĕh chaq (§6.2c).²¹

Nēh pân

Setting

⁷¹: Concept descriptive.

¹Nēh pân pöp ³h heq nöq, bãy camvũm nēh he advise older sib. younger sib. here by words he nhai. ²Nēh jœ nēh cahya von. ³Pöp ³h châng speak he watch he advise us older/younger sib. listen hay dăng? or not

Nucleus

²²These are: hay, yụa (vụa), thỉ, là, tũ, lĩnh (presumably an old loan), càp, chi-huy, tamvãq-tamvây (presumably an old loan, phonologically well-assimilated), chô, thĩ-yũ, chùng, kwâ, phâi, tũ (apparently a slip of the tongue), nũu (nẹu), mà, côn.
von. 3Nể phosphoryl von hucht sehen hucht alăc. 4Canơq von vàng us he fear we drink wine drink beer so we don't chęp nuih chęp tór bay nể vây. 5Nể gulp u heq, nể set heart set ear with him thus he stay at here he gulp di mǎq u heq, nể cấp chi-huy von, nể phải stay to big at here he rank commander us he must sën von, nể chih nhai von. 6Canơq von vàng hucht alăc watch us he scold speak us so we don't drink beer gôq vây. 7Nể phosphoryl von vanhurł nắc daq nắc trong, von much thus he fear we drunk half river half road we vanhurł tacuq-taocz. 8Canơq nể chih nể cahya von. 9Von drunk inebriated so he scold he advise us we chęp nuih chęp tór, canơq von đang yah con tamun von set heart set ear so we not good child person we canơq đang yah. 10Nể nhai canơq khoi gal, ép panh so not good he speak like-that also right not say nể nhai tamvây đang. 11Nể nhai gal nể de, nể he speak disorderly not he speak right he poss. he ép iun caheq hucht sểh vanhurł saq nhai tamvăq-tamvây not let like-this drink wine drunk so speak disorderly bay vu. 12Chơ nể đang iun toq nểh. 13Pốp ơh with people not he not let emph. he older/younger sib.

Iést camvűm ănh nhai gal đang?

Hear word I speak right no

P 3: Volitional.

1Alur heq vu lày có síq tu heq, thì khoi vu nhai after this one any who return to hear , also he speak canơq. 2Canơq a heq pŏh mvŏq pốp ơh vàng like-that so from here on older/younger sib. don't
huch alăc gõq vày. "Thî-yû pôp ôh huch drink beer much thus for-example older/younger sib. drink prăm li, pôp ôh huch chùng pe li dâng five glass older/younger sib. drink about three glass amount nôq. "Nôq yùa von en, pôp ôh huch gõq that so enough we already older/younger sib. drink much kwâ en nôq vanhûl pôp ôh vî gút phao gâm very then so drunk older/younger sib. not know gun and căm pôp ôh u láy pâ. "Vrêq vur nêh lêq arrow older/younger sib. at any not now VC they past moçh von en, canôq von phâl huch yùa sa yùa. "Vâng near us already so we must drink enough eat enough don't von huch gõq. "Von huch gõq en nôq, en nôq vur us drink much we drink much already after that VC nêh lâp nêh tachût von. "En nôq chût, pach panh von they enter they kill us after that dead what say we dăng chût nôq. "A heq vur nêh lâp nêh pâm von, nêh not dead thus from now VC they enter they beat us they nhûp lêq phao randâh. "Nôq vu panh von heq bay vur. take all gun gun so people say we here with VC "Nôq vu nhûp von, vu doq tû von dâng gal, an so people take us people put prison us not right let von gîq súng nhi jingo.
us stay in house dark

Conclusion

¶ 4: Volitional.

¹Canôq nêh chîh nêh nhài von. ²Canôq von vâng chêq so he scold he talk us so we don't set
nuih bay nĕh văy. 3Níu nĕh nhai tamvăq tamvăy băy heart with him thus. if he speak disorderly with pŏp ŏh cŏn hŏm gĕh khananh heq wŏq. older/younger sib. still still have us (excl.) here more

Terminus

P 5: Volitional.
Nhai canŏq, pŏp ŏh phái chăng bay speak like-that older/younger sib. must listen to mĭnh ānh.
mouth my

TRANSLATION

1. He advised us here by what he said. He watches us and advises us. Did you listen or not?

2. So from now on, since the Lieutenant worked here, he watches us. He watches and advises us. He is afraid we drink wine and beer. So don't get angry with him. He lives here, he is important here, he is our commander, he has to watch us, he scolds us. So don't drink a lot of beer. He is afraid we'll be drunk half-way home, we'll be tipsy. So he scolds us and advises us. If we get angry, we are not good people, it's not good. He speaks right like that, he isn't speaking out of order. He speaks right, he doesn't allow drinking and disorderly talk. He absolutely will not allow it. Don't you think that's right?

3. After this, whoever comes here will also say the same thing. So from here on don't drink a lot. For example, you drink five glasses, drink about three glasses. That's enough for us, you drink a lot, then get drunk, you don't know where your gun and arrows are. Now the VC's are already nearby, so we must eat just enough and drink just enough. We mustn't drink much. We've drunk a lot, then the VC's will come in and kill us. Then we'll be dead, how can you say we wouldn't be dead? Now the VC's come in and beat us, take all the guns. So people will say we are with the VC's. So people will take us and put us in the tù, that's not right, they'll put us in prison.

4. So he scolds us. So don't get angry with him. If he talks bad to you, you still have us [soldiers] here.

5. Speaking like that, you must listen to me.
6.4. Epistolary discourse structure.

Although literacy in Chrau is relatively new, we have received letters from at least six different Chrau; of these we still have ten letters from four different people.

All of the writers of these letters had had some schooling in Vietnamese. This may account for the rigidity of form in all of the letters. When these individuals first began writing letters in Chrau, the letters themselves were quite stilted; as they gained experience in the new medium of expression, they retained the basic format they had started out with but added more content to the nucleus of their letters.

a. The formula for epistolary discourse is: + Setting + Introduction + Nucleus + Conclusion + Finis.

The Setting is filled by the place and date of writing, and usually a formal greeting.

The Introduction may contain an extended greeting or reference to a previous letter, or may express the purpose of writing.

The Nucleus consists of various embedded narrative, expository or hortatory discourses, frequently unrelated.

The Conclusion usually includes a blessing, and may include greetings to other people and last-minute thoughts.

The Finis may consist of formal greetings and expressions such as "That's all"; it always has a signature, with or without an address.

The style of epistolary discourse is marked by low verb density, a high proportion of loanwords (including nouns and verbs), and a full range of first-, second- and third-person pronouns. There is frequent reference to the recipient of the letter, invoking his reaction to matters being discussed. No use of descriptive adverbs or medial rhyming has
Because of the variety of discourse types which may be embedded in letters, the epistolary style shows a wide range of sentence-types. In some letters there is a high proportion of container clauses referring to awareness, such as ẵnh có nh 'I thought', ẵnh sỹ 'I see', nể sỉn 'he thought', and mở có sỉn 'What do you think, Grandfather?'

b. The following example of epistolary discourse is a single letter containing six different embedded discourses. In the discussion below all the semantic domains except in the last discourse are unique to their particular discourses.

Discourse 1 is expository, oriented to the writer's location: 'here' occurs four times, 'room' two times, 'office', 'work together' and 'stay together' once each.

Discourse 2 is expository, discussing the health of the writer's wife. There are four references to his wife, four to the care of her health, two to the improvement in her health.

Discourse 3 is an abbreviated dialogue paragraph consisting only of questions put to the recipients.

Discourse 4 is expository and has to do with business matters in connection with trips another Chrau was to make. Sums of money are mentioned five times, 'money' occurs three times, while Nh., the Chrau in question, is mentioned twice by name and referred to once by pronoun.

Discourse 5 is hortatory and concerns the desire of certain people to have a Chrau to work with them. The place as well as 'a Chrau to return' are mentioned twice.

Discourse 6, also hortatory, concerns the writer's plans for the future: 'return' occurs twice, 'don't want to stay any longer' once.

The paragraphing given in the text hereafter differs
slightly from that of the original. The writer occasionally used a dash instead of starting a new line, presumably to save paper. In addition, three paragraph breaks are made here to show logical paragraphs when there is participant change.

In respect to loanwords the writer is a purist: the letter contains only 15 Vietnamese words and one English word. A letter only one-sixth longer by another Chrau of comparable schooling and ability has 31 Vietnamese words. The writer of the present letter likes to invent new (Chrau) words when there is no Chrau equivalent, while in the same circumstances the other writer uses Vietnamese words. Still other Chrau fall between these two extremes. The orthography of Vietnamese loans in epistolary discourse is worthy of note. Three loans were spelt in Chrau: ĭwâng, chîch, yîёт. The following words need no respelling in Chrau but their tone marks were omitted: òhû hai, ḥê, chôc, cô, Bác-sî. The following likewise need no respelling but their Vietnamese tone marks were written in: đâc-biệt, diên-tìn, phong-túc, dơ, vân-phòng, chơ, tr'ai-tâm-cû.22

α. Here follows our sample text:

Setting

Nhaťrang, năr 9, khay 3, 1975
day month

Păng moq un cô,
greet visit grandmother grandfather

22 The high tone (') and the low-rise or low-stopped tone (,) were consistently written in; the low-nonstopped tone was written once and omitted once in a respelled word. The mid-rise tone (~ and ّ) was omitted twice and written once. Consistency in omitting the high tone and writing in the low-rise or low-nonstopped tone may reflect Chrau intonation patterns (cf. Dorothy Thomas, 1965: 9).
Introduction

Yâh boc hâng? Tâm-vatom u nôq yâh vui hâng?
good well no? meet at there good happy no?

Nucleus

Discourse 1:

Ănh gêh hao heq nât thu hai lor canôq tât
I have go-up here day Monday before like-that arrive
lôch du twâng. U heq khoi dûh dân XL, bây me măng
enough one week At here also hot like XL and just night
ndau gêh mi du simmron.
last have rain one shower

Oi ndau gêh K bây M tât môt ănh du mät,
morning yesterday have K and M arrive visit me one time
ăngh khoi lau khây nêh saq sên văn-phông me.
I also led them go see office new

U nhî me nôq vu an ănh bây si-ur siklô Banker
at house new that people let me and wife husband
ôp vrûq simô du lâm cót (du lâm cót vlâh pe). Ănh vât
do work same one cl. room one cl. room cut three I bring
lûh sirâq Yâng bây yiêt sirâq phong-tûc u nôq.
forth paper John and write paper customs at there

Vréq u heq khây nêh ayh tâm-vatom 2 dâq / l twâng.
now at here they only meet 2 time 1 week
Ayh 2 twâng làm ănh hôm u nhi nôq cô dác-biét ăp nôt
only 2 week when I still at home so special every day
ca mva tôq.
like year before
U heq vu an ănh gũq simobservable S (Nùng) sây at here people let me stay same with S and
cô C (Chăm).

grandfather C

Discourse 2:

May mo un cô gũh vou ngaũn diêt an
thanks grandmother/father have pray beg constantly for
si-ur ănh. Twâng lor nêh khoi gũh do ndêt wôq, sây
wife my week before she also have better bit more and
khoi gũh saq chích diêt ŕp năr. Lor a saq ănh
also has gone injection always every day before of go I
khoi gũh pân nêh vâng õp pâch lây cô canjâq, nggâm
also have advised her don't do thing any which heavy and
hẽ gũh ji lây nóq wînh Ng diên-tin an ănh gũt de
if have sick any so ask Ng telegraph let me know easy
ănh sǐq lawân. Ănh sinâng Vap Gùn có gôt
I return immediately I think Father Holy continually
an nêh du năr du camhâng. Châc u môçh tiêng khay
let her one day one strong Probably at near tail month
heq ănh lau nêh jur Saigon de saq vlam bâc-sì du đâq
here I take her down Saigon easy go meet doctor one time
wôq.
more

Discourse 3:

Un cô sǐq vläq palây Nhuオン u tiêng
grandmother/father return back place Vietnam at tail
khay 3 heq gal hâng? Bây, gũh chăng lo mé
month 3 here right ? and have hear over mother
un de lûh a nhi ji hôm?

grandmother poss. exit from house sick yet

Discourse 4:

Lor a hao N.T., ānh gēh sêń jën 5000d có before of go-up Nhatrang I have seen money which ănh hôm jo, ănh sây hôm 2000d, (3000d si-ur ānh gēh nham I still keep I see still wife my have borrow saq chy' en) nŏq ānh dop 2000d tâu Nh. chêq nēh saq mọq go market past so I give to Nh. to him go visit Trại-ťâm-cư Cảm Tấn. (Lăm jën nŏq lêq nŏq nanh refugee-settlement when money that gone so we song jën cō gēh nham 3000d tīq wōq.) repay money which have borrow that more ănh gēh nhai sĭq vrŭq heq bây Ng. lor a ānh I have talk about work this with Ng. before of I saq. ānh may mo Sidâch sây nēh khoi nhai panh khây lăm cō go I thank Lord see he also say say pl. time which ranang nŏq nēh saq bây Nh. tâu gatŭq nŏq. ānh hóm lùng free so he go with Nh. to place that I rejoice very păc'h nŏq. thing that

Discourse 5:

Wînh vou ngwân an gēh du mvu Chrau sĭq Tân Phú, ask pray beg let have one person Chrau return Tân-Phú khây nēh u nŏq khây nēh nhâng-bāng cŏNh gēh du mvu they at there they truly want have one person Chrau sĭq u nŏq.
Chrau return at there
Discourse 6:
Noq, chac 2 ha 2½ twang wọq anh siq, anh dang so probably or week more I return I not conh gúq jọq dòng wọq phùng vur tachâch trong en want stay long more more fear gaur (VC's) snap road then siq dang gēh. return not able

Conclusion
Gúq yăh aç! Nanh lawăn cāh tât un stay good imp. we always remember to grandmother cō. Wînh an anh păn mọq si-ur sîkłò pôp grandfather ask let me advise greet wife husband older sîb.

Bruce Grayden nggâm Dick.

and

Ngwăn Vap Gûn lawăn tê văt tât năr Nēh siq. beg Father Holy always keep carry till day He return

Finis
Son

TRANSLATION

Nhatrang, March 9, 1975

Greetings to you.
Are you well? Are the meetings there good and happy?
I came up here last Monday so that tomorrow it will be a whole week. It's hot like XL here, and just last night it rained a little.

Yesterday morning K. and M. came to visit me a bit, and I took them to see the new office.

At that new house they let me and Mr and Mrs Banker work together in one room (one room cut into three). I am translating John and writing a paper on customs there.
They are only meeting two times a week here now. Only the two weeks when I was still at home was it special every day like last year.

They let me stay together with S. (the Nung) and Mr C. (the Cham).

Thanks for praying all the time for my wife, last week she was also a bit improved and she also goes for injections every day. Before leaving I also advised her not to do anything heavy and if she is sick at all to ask Ng. to telephone me and let me know so I can return immediately. I think the Holy Father is continually making her stronger each day. Probably the end of this month I'll take her to Saigon to see the doctor once more.

You'll return to Vietnam the end of March, right? And have you heard about your mother getting out of the hospital yet?

Before coming up to Nhatrang I saw that the 5000d which I am taking care of still has 2000d (3000d of it my wife borrowed to go to market), so I handed 2000d to Nh. so he could go visiting at the Căm Tân refugee settlement. (When that money is gone, we'll repay the 3000d which we had borrowed.)

I talked about this with Ng. before I left. I thank the Lord I see he also said when he is free he will go there with Nh. I'm very glad about that.

Please pray for a Chrau to return to Tân Phú, they really want to have a Chrau come back here.

So probably in two or two and a half weeks more I'll return, I don't want to stay any longer for fear the VC's will cut the road and then I can't return.

Stay well! We always remember you. Let me greet Mr and Mrs Bruce Grayden and Dick.

May the Holy Father take care [of you?] till He returns.

Son.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Banker, John E.

Bernstein, Basil

Callow, Kathleen

Christensen, Francis

Cobbey, Maxwell

Cooper, James S.

Diffloth, Gérard

Grimes, Joseph E.
1968 The Thread of Discourse. ERIC Document ED-019669.


Havránek, Bohuslav


Longacre, Robert E.


Miller, John D.


Smith, Kenneth D.


Svelmoe, Gordon and Thelma


Thomas, David D.


Thomas, David, and Richard L. Watson

Thomas, Dorothy M.

1966    Chrau intonation. MKS II: 1-14. Reprinted in

Watson, Richard L.

1966    Reduplication in Pacoh. Hartford Series in Lin-
        guistics, No. 21. Hartford: Hartford Semi-
        nary Foundation.

Wendland, Ernst R.

1975    Lexical recycling in Chewa discourse. Workpapers
        of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, Uni-