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AUCKLAND, NEW ZEALAND
HONORIFIC RESOURCES FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF 
HIERARCHY IN SAMOAN AND POHNPEIAN

ELIZABETH KEATING 
University of Texas at Austin

ALESSANDRO DURANTI 
University of California—Los Angeles

In this article, we examine and discuss the particular set of linguistic forms that linguists call “honorifics” as they are employed in two highly stratified Pacific societies, Pohnpei and Samoa. We show how members of these two societies creatively use honorifics and other semiotic resources to achieve and redistribute social power and meaningful social difference among themselves. Understanding the dynamics of social stratification in societies where stratification is explicitly constructed and valued leads to a better understanding of how ideas of social inequality endure through daily interaction.

Honorifics have captured the interest of anthropologists and linguists because they provide evidence about how people jointly negotiate a system of shared understandings about group and individual ranked relationships. Because relationships are explicitly marked in spontaneous speech, such instances can be collected, analysed, and discussed with native speakers to arrive at a better understanding of the relationships between linguistic forms and their social meanings (a method called “metapragmatics” by Silverstein 1977, 1981, 1998; see also Irvine 1998).

We begin by providing some background and a descriptive framework for comparing the structure and use of honorifics in social interactions in the two societies. Then we discuss three properties that we believe are fundamental to the instantiation of hierarchy in the Pacific: creativity, the establishment of particular participant roles and the exploitation of multiple semiotic resources. In order to effectively represent the complexity of phenomena usually described under the rubric of honorifics, we propose three different levels of analysis: a grammatical level, a speaker level and an activity level. Our study of Pohnpei and Samoa honorific language highlights the importance of activities in building a cultural notion of superior and inferior roles, including roles other than those of speaker and addressee, and considers as well the interplay of symbolic systems other than language.

Our field research in Pohnpei (Keating) and Samoa (Duranti) included intensive participant observation as well as extensive audio and video recordings. We have undertaken a comparative study of Pohnpei and Samoa
honourifics for a number of reasons. First, they offer similar and yet distinct systems of honourific forms and social stratification, and they are related historically to each other and to other stratified Pacific societies that likewise employ honourifics. Second, we believe that looking at societies where stratification is explicitly constructed and valued is useful for understanding the dynamics of differentiation and how ideas of social inequality are implemented in everyday interaction. Third, each of us can draw from recordings of spontaneous verbal interaction in Samoa and Pohnpei and this allows for a level of descriptive adequacy that is rare in earlier literature on the subject, most of which is based on elicitation, informal observation or questionnaires.

Pohnpei & Samoa: Social Organisation & Linguistic Resources

Samoa (formerly Western Samoa) is in the segment of the Pacific conventionally referred to as “Polynesia” and Pohnpei in the segment referred to as “Micronesia”. Samoa and Pohnpei share certain cultural attributes considered to be part of a wider Pacific Island cultural repertoire. In a number of Pacific societies, and particularly in the larger islands and island groups of Micronesia and Polynesia, are found linked notions of chiefs as representatives of deities with prerogatives of sanctity and of pyramidal or class-based social structures predicated on ascribed status in which power is centralised; along with practices of chiefly tribute and the kava ceremony, and the elaboration of honourific usages and language (see Kirch 1984:281, Reisenberg 1968:111). Linguists argue on the basis of lexemes reconstructed for Proto Oceanic, the language that was ancestral to all the Austronesian languages of Melanesia, Polynesia (including Samoa) and Nuclear Micronesia (including Pohnpei), that a system of hereditary rank was ancestral too (Pawley and Ross 1993:444). The reconstructed term for chief, *ariki, can be discerned in the Pohnpeian title of the paramount chief, Namwarki, and is obvious in the Samoan term ali'i 'chief'. Rehg (n.d.) argues, again on linguistic evidence, that West Polynesians, probably Samoans, voyaged to Pohnpei, and that this contact played a role in shaping Pohnpeian culture. A Pohnpeian term for food or kava served before a formal meal or kava ceremony, ohwoadang has a Samoan origin (Geraghty 1994:244).

However, the honourific vocabularies, which are the focus of this article, in Pohnpei and Samoa (and indeed elsewhere) are believed to have emerged independently from similar contexts and ideas about ruling authority and social difference. Samoan, like some other West Polynesian languages, developed a complex set of honourific words called ‘respect vocabulary’ (‘upu fa’aiaoalo) probably within the last 1000 years (Andrew Pawley, pers. comm.). The small number of honourific cognates between Samoan and Tongan suggests that Pacific societies developed honourific lexicons independently and that the few shared lexical items are likely to be the result of contact (e.g., during the Tongan occupation of Samoa around the year 1200, see Krämer 1994 [1902]).

Honorifics: A Brief Introduction

The study of honourifics has been of great interest to scholars because honourifics provide grammatical evidence for ways in which members of communities make, moment by moment, linguistic choices that organise important social distinctions. Honourifics are prevalent among a wide range of genetically unrelated languages, for example, in Africa and Australia, and specifically in Urdu-Hindi, Lhasa Tibetan, Persian, Mongolian, Thai, Tamil, Burmese, Vietnamese, Zuni, Tewa (southwest United States), Nahuatl (Mexico), Japanese, Korean, Javanese and Mongolian. In the Pacific, honourifics are characteristic of Pohnpeian, Tongan and Samoan, and present, though less pervasive, in other languages (see Agha 1994 and Irvine 1985 for reviews of this literature). Studies of honourific speech have discussed its role in creating human relationships pertaining to status, demeanour, respect, deference, power, social distance and solidarity. Descriptions of honourific systems typically focus on a set of contrasts which emerge from a set of choices speakers can make when referring to another person or to that person’s actions. Honourifics can mark different types of familiar relationships as well, for example some Australian Aboriginal languages have honourific lexicons (so-called “mother-in-law” or “brother-in-law language”) to mark specific kin relations (Dixon 1971, Haviland 1977).

In scholarship on honourific language practices, a distinction has been made as to whether the grammatical marking of status is dependent on (i) who is referred to, (ii) who is addressed, and (iii) who is overhearing (bystander). It is important to note whether language forms are sensitive to or imply a particular type of relationship with who or what is being talked about (referent), the party that is being addressed by the speaker (addressee) or the party that is present but not addressed (bystander) (Comrie 1976, Levinson 1983: 90). The notion of who counts as a participant and ways that participation is organised, including how co-participants influence and participate in the negotiation of meaning, is an important focus of recent work on relationships between language and society (see Duranti 1997:294-321, Goffman 1981, C. Goodwin 1981, M. Goodwin 1990, Hymes 1972), and will be discussed more fully in the section below on the Nature of Participation. Some languages such as Hindi, Malayalam and Tibetan use only referent honourifics, whereas those such as Thai, Korean, Japanese and Javanese use
both referent and addressee honorifics (Irvine 1985). Pohnpeian (together with some Australian Aboriginal languages) is often cited as an example of a language with bystander honorifics (Garvin and Reisenberg 1952). In Pohnpeian, when the chief or some other high status person is present, the use of honorifics becomes relevant on that basis alone. Radio announcements are therefore made using honorific forms.

In some languages the honorific resources are quite limited, but in Samoan and even more so in Pohnpeian the resources involve a much wider range of word classes than pronouns—nouns, verbs, address forms and possessive constructions. For example, the English sentence “come here and take your food” can be rendered in Pohnpeian in the six ways, as set out in Table 1. Choices affecting the expression of status can be made for pronoun, verb, possessive classifier, and noun.

One can say ‘come’ in four different ranges of status, among them kohdo (‘come’ unmarked for status), patohdo (‘come’, referent of subject = low status), ketdo (‘come’, referent of subject = high status). The same is the case for Samoan, where for example, the verb ‘go’ can be realised in several ways, including: alu (‘go’ unmarked for status), afio (‘go’ referent of subject = chief), malu (‘go’ referent of subject = orator). In these two Pacific languages there is the possibility to code several different levels. This gives speakers increased resources for recognising multiple hierarchical relationships.

By choosing a particular word for the action ‘go’ a speaker also chooses to recognise and establish a particular status for the referent of the subject, i.e., the person who is going (see Nature of Participation below). And as we will show, word choice constructs relationships between the speaker and the referent as well as others involved in the interaction (addressee and bystanders or other listeners). The use of a low status or humble form for a participant can have the effect of elevating the status of other participants in an interaction without those participants actually being addressed or referred to. The elevation of a chief can be achieved exclusively through the humbling of a third participant. Thus when scholars speak of honorification, they are often talking about a process that in fact involves, in many cases, a speaker’s choice to humble him/herself or another person (see Keating 1998).

Phonological and morphological properties of language are also used to express status in Pohnpeian and Samoan. Honour can be shown in Pohnpeian, for example, through lengthening of vowels in speech, notably when greeting and when using the affirmative. This is very often expressed in the greeting kaselelehia ‘good day’ with the third vowel lengthened for one or two seconds to express the high status of the one greeted. In Pohnpeian the morpheme -iso is used as an affix for terms referring to the Nahknen (secondary chief) and the morpheme - leng (a bound form of the noun - lehng ‘heaven’) refers to the Namewarki (paramount chief), for example the use of the word irareileng for the paramount chief’s cane, but irareiso when speaking about the secondary chief’s cane (Rahg 1981). In Samoan there is a tendency to use more verb forms that contain the suffix (Ci)oa (Duranti 1984) for high status individuals (see Example 4 below with the deictic mai=ma+a). There are special high status affixes in both languages, but no low status affixes in Pohnpeian.

Honorific forms in Pohnpeian and Samoan can be highly polysemic. There is a simplification process that occurs at the lexical level, where the same honorific form expresses meanings that are usually expressed by separate words in non-status marked language. In Pohnpeian, for example, ‘see,’ ‘say,’ ‘know’ and ‘carry’ are expressed by the same low status verb, patohwan. A similar polysemy is noted in that the same high status verb, masaninh, can mean ‘say’ and ‘see’. Some of the usual attributes of depicted events or states or referents that separate them from other events or states or referents are suppressed in favour of separating the status of the person performing the depicted event from the status of other events. Samoan shows semantic ambiguity in the honorific words for body parts; for example, the same term is used for ‘eye’, ‘nose’ and ‘mouth’ (see Table 6). Many honorific vocabulary provide evidence for this same property—a limited and simplified set of lexical resources compared to common speech (see e.g., Agha 1994; Dixon 1971; Haviland 1979). In Tongan the unspecified commoner noun me’a ‘thing’ is used as a verb to refer to a variety of actions by nobles, such as ‘come’, ‘go’, ‘know’ (mea’), ‘read’ (me’ atohi), ‘run’, ‘see’, ‘sit’ and ‘speak’ (Philips 1991:374). Susan Philips noted that some Tongan honorific terms act like euphemisms for the “unfortunate actions” of high status people, for example the “kingly” word for ‘beat’ is the commoner word for ‘smudge’, the kingly word for ‘kill’ is the commoner polite form of ‘do’, and the kingly word for

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>you</th>
<th>come</th>
<th>here</th>
<th>take</th>
<th>your</th>
<th>food</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>re</td>
<td>apehdo</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>ketki</td>
<td>sowellimapi</td>
<td>konoat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>komw</td>
<td>ketdo</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>sowellimowi</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>pwenieu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>sak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ke')</td>
<td>kohdo</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>ale</td>
<td>kenounw</td>
<td>mwnge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>patohdo</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>patohwana</td>
<td>ahmw</td>
<td>tnggoel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
‘spit on’ is the commoner term for ‘to cool off’ (Philips 1991:380). In the in-law language spoken by the Dyirbal of Australia, polysemy is so extensive that syntactic and derivational forms must be used to express specific and detailed ideas (Haviland 1979:218), owing to a reduction in verb forms. The mother-in-law language uses “nuclear verbs” (a nuclear verb in English would be ‘look’ vs. ‘stare which has a more particular meaning) (Dixon 1971). Various authors related this reduction of meaning choices or simplification of lack of specificity to a flatness of affect or emotional equanimity as appropriate to relations of differential status (Geertz 1960:240, cf. J. Errington 1988:12, Irvine 1998), while others motivated it on the grounds that it heightens particular aspects of contextual meaning (Agha 1993).

Previous work has shown differences between a native speaker’s intuitions about the usage of honorifics and the way these forms are actually used in interactions. For example, in analysing grammaticalised respect in Nahualt, Hill and Hill (1978) showed that what speakers self-report about how they use honorific speech in their conversations offers only a limited picture of how they actually show respect to one another. Philips (1991) noted how in Tonga, government-sponsored tutorials about Tongan honorific vocabulary emphasise only a small set of honorific forms, forms that are the most salient part of speakers’ conscious repertoire. The repertoire in use is much richer, but is only evident when actual language data is examined (see also Shihamoto 1987 for Japanese).

In order to represent effectively the dynamism of phenomena usually described under the rubric of honorific register, we use three different levels of analysis: a grammatical level, a speaker level and an activity level. We first discuss how honorific language forms are formally part of the linguistic system, including classes and sentence structures; then we discuss speakers’ usage; and finally we mention some ways in which the use of these forms is related not only to the persons present but also to the activities in which speakers are engaged.

**ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK: GRAMMATICAL LEVEL.**

In both languages status-marking is concentrated around verbs such as movement in space, description of mental states (e.g., thinking, planning), eating, speaking, perceptual domains (e.g., seeing and hearing), existential expressions, body parts and other nouns, and possession. Many verbs and nouns are not status-marked, for example, join, change, organise and work. Tables 2, 3 and 4 provide some examples of Pohnpeian and Samoan honorific forms. Note the similarities between the two languages in the activities—‘know’, ‘see’, ‘eat’, ‘come’, ‘go’, ‘speak’—and items—dwellings—that are marked and are focuses of status-marking in both languages.

### Table 2: Pohnpeian low status and high status honorific forms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ese</td>
<td>patahwan</td>
<td>mwahngih</td>
<td>mwahngih</td>
<td>mwahngih</td>
<td>know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kilang</td>
<td>patahwan</td>
<td>masonih</td>
<td>masonih</td>
<td>masonih</td>
<td>see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mwenge</td>
<td>tungol</td>
<td>koamot</td>
<td>pwenieu</td>
<td>sak</td>
<td>eat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lokata</td>
<td>mpatov</td>
<td>pozingok</td>
<td>masonih</td>
<td>masonih</td>
<td>speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koko</td>
<td>mpatohdi</td>
<td>kadoapehdo</td>
<td>kado</td>
<td>kado</td>
<td>come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kohla</td>
<td>mpatohlo</td>
<td>kefa</td>
<td>kefa</td>
<td>kefa</td>
<td>go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ihmw</td>
<td>ihmwi</td>
<td>tehnpas</td>
<td>tehnpas</td>
<td>tehnpas</td>
<td>house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pwond</td>
<td>pwond</td>
<td>werek</td>
<td>werek</td>
<td>werek</td>
<td>spouse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3: Samoan high status honorific forms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common</th>
<th>High Status</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>liloa</td>
<td>silafia</td>
<td>know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va'ai</td>
<td>silaisila</td>
<td>see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ai</td>
<td>taimafa</td>
<td>eat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4: Examples of Samoan honorific forms that distinguish between chief and orator statuses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common</th>
<th>High Status [chief]</th>
<th>High Status [orator]</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tautala</td>
<td>saumoa</td>
<td>fetala'i</td>
<td>speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sau</td>
<td>afio mai</td>
<td>molu mai</td>
<td>come, arrive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alu</td>
<td>afio</td>
<td>molu</td>
<td>go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fafe</td>
<td>maota</td>
<td>laoa</td>
<td>house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to'ahu</td>
<td>faletau</td>
<td>tausi</td>
<td>spouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'oe</td>
<td>lau afiga</td>
<td>lau tafõ</td>
<td>you(r honour)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both Pohnpeian and Samoan allow for a gradation within the category of high status, so that there is both a high status and a very high status. In Samoan, some lexical items are specific to the status of chief (ali'i) whereas others are specific to orators (nula'ale) (see Table 4), with the former to be understood in general as superior to the latter (but there are exceptions, with some high status orators out-ranking some low status chiefs). In Pohnpeian some terms are specific to the paramount chief (Namnwarki) and some to the paramount chiefess (Likend), others are specific to the secondary chief and chiefess (Nanken and Nankenikei) (see Table 2). In Pohnpeian, honorific speech further marks the paramount chief as in a class by himself when the chief’s actions are linked with meteorological events, e.g., the word for his anger is also the common word for ‘windy’. While there are many high status nouns, there are only two low status nouns (‘food’ and ‘speech’). There are high status pronouns, but no low status pronouns, except for possessive pronouns. The Pohnpeian chief is addressed with the third person plural pronoun and a plural form is affixed to his address term because he embodies the authority of past chiefs, the ancestor spirits. Pohnpeians using honorific speech thus construct both visible and invisible participants, past and present authorities.

Honorary nouns differentiate high status bodies from others. Table 5 lists some of the Pohnpeian nouns for chiefly body parts; Samoan nouns for some body parts are listed in Table 6.

Table 5: Words for some body parts in Pohnpeian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common</th>
<th>High Status</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>poiikwai</td>
<td>koa, orevae</td>
<td>body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moangle</td>
<td>koabkenneni</td>
<td>head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pitanaonge</td>
<td>tiosenicempiu</td>
<td>hair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kutoar en mas</td>
<td>linurepeleng</td>
<td>eyeball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tinwe</td>
<td>keinuhi, sisiwai, kunwani</td>
<td>nose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ewe</td>
<td>dawase</td>
<td>mouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peh</td>
<td>kunwetik</td>
<td>hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neh</td>
<td>aotowetane</td>
<td>leg, foot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although there are no low status body parts in either language, in Pohnpeian low status can be marked on body parts through using an honorific possessive construction, as shown in line 2 of the following example—“my [low status] hair”.

Example 1: Drinking kava with the paramount chief, chiefess and other community members – POHNPEIAN (note: boldface is used to highlight the linguistic items being discussed)

01 Woman: ma i pathamant i pahn wiada
if I [polysemic low status state] only I will do up
if I had only known (I of low status) I would have done up

02
ei               tunga
Ps.Cl.1S*   PuS[low status]       hair
my (low status) hair
*Ps.1S=possessive classifier, 1=first person, S=singular.

Nouns other than body parts include dwellings, vehicles and, most importantly, food, which in Pohnpeian is a major focus of status marking. As previously mentioned, in Pohnpeian a morpheme can be affixed to any noun to indicate the status of the secondary chief, or to refer to items of the paramount chief.
Both Pohnpeian and Samoan recognise the high status of the referent, but only Pohnpeian has a wide range of expressions marking low status. In Pohnpeian interactions, there is a higher occurrence of low status forms than high status forms. In Pohnpeian, any verb can be status marked by the addition of a low status form patawan or a high status form keith preceding the verb. This is a highly productive mechanism for signalling status differences.

Effects on the sentence structure.

Another aspect of the grammatical level is how the choice to use honorific forms can affect the composition of sentences. We found in our data that when honorific forms are used, the same action or state may be expressed in a coordinated structure (using conjunctions like 'and' or 'or'), each of which is marked for a different status of the referent. This is similar to the poetic phenomenon known as parallelism which results in couplets, triplets, and other textual elaborations and which draws distinctions between participants in the same event (e.g., Fox 1974, Gosson 1974, Jakobson 1960). As Jakobson described, the poetic features of language promote "the palpability of signs" (Jakobson 1987:69). The use of particular devices, such as repetition and parallelism turns language into a multiply sensory experience, with great power to build a unity of established values and speakers. Sound can play a central role in this.

By using more complex sentence structures, instead of relying on the similarity of joint actions, speakers focus hearers on the separateness of these actions and the differences among individuals or groups performing such actions. This added complexity is illustrated in Examples 2 and 3 for Pohnpeian and Example 4 for Samoan. In Example 2, phrases are joined by conjunctions to describe joint but separate actions—first, actions of existing and, second, actions of thinking. Thus, both audience members of low status (with the appropriate verb form, for example) and those of high status (with the appropriate verb form) are included by the speaker's address.

Example 2: Youth orator, speaking at an island-wide youth event organised by the Catholic Church—POHNPEIAN

01 oh koarosie me ketket de pato
and all here that are [high status] or are [low status]
and all of you who are here (those of high status) or are here
(those of low status)

(....)

02 kitail en tepda kupwukupwure de medemedew
we all to begin thinking [high status] or thinking
let's all start thinking (those of us of high status) or thinking

In Example 3 two different statuses of possession ("our" high status and "our" low status) and of nouns (high status spouses vs. low status spouses) are the focus of an activity joined with a conjunction, even though the subject is the same ("we").

Example 3: Speech by a woman at a feast—POHNPEIAN

01 patpato tikitikieng ohng eh
talking [low status] small to for uh
talking [we of low status] a little bit (i.e. nicely) to uh

02 sapwellimatil weker kan de
our [high status] spouse [high status] those or our high status spouses or

03 atail tungoal pwoud kan
our Ps.Cl. [low status] spouse those our low status spouses

In the Samoan (Example 4) the predicate "come" is repeated twice in order to accommodate the different honorific forms reserved for chiefs (afio mai) and orators (malili mai) respectively.

Example 4: L., the wife of an orator in the village, politely invites the members of the inspection committee to have breakfast—the invitation is taken to be formulaic and is politely refused—Samoan

01 L: afio maia ma malili mai
move [deictic]+(Cl)a and move [deictic]
do come [chiefs] and come [orators] (inside)

02 se'i fai le suki a le keigeikiki lea e fai.
let do Art tea of Art girl little that Comp so that (you) (can) have the tea made by this little girl.

Even though in both Pohnpeian and Samoan, honorifics are a set of special lexical items, our data show that there are important differences in the range and expression of these linguistic phenomena in the two languages. We notice that there is more structural elaboration in the expression of high status than low status in both languages. In Samoan there are no structures for directly
expressing low status. In Pohnpeian there is a single domain of low status
but, as in Samoan, there are two (and sometimes three or more) domains of
high status; high statuses are multiple and differentiated whereas low status
is unitary and undifferentiated. High status-marking can be expressed in
diverse ways, e.g., involving a larger set of relations. In Pohnpeian, many
more people can be referents for honorific forms than in Samoan because of
the existence of low status forms. Because of the existence of special forms
for the paramount chiefess (a verb for eating, a noun for food, a possessive
classifier), Pohnpeian can mark gender with honorific forms, whereas Samoan
cannot. Although Samoan has genitive constructions involving honorifics,
only Pohnpeian has honorific possessive adjectives and pronouns.

Analysis at the grammatical level shows that there is a range of grammatical
resources for marking differential status in these languages, yet the range of
forms is limited. In a stretch of discourse only some of the lexical items will be
honorific forms and from the forms that are available in the linguistic system,
members of a speech community will mark some terms and not others.

ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK: SPEAKER LEVEL

When we look at the speaker level, we notice that the use of honorific codes
is not rigidly obligatory, even though native speakers emphasise obligation
in their discussions and when they are instructing us about these forms.
Rather, honorifics are used creatively by speakers. In a group of participants
with given status differences, the use of honorifics cannot be predicted with
certainty. Speakers make choices about when to use the forms and how to
use them, and they show reflexivity and metapragmatic awareness in their
judgements. We discuss aspects of choice and reflexivity below, as well as
the idea of resistance to status constructions.

Choice

Within the formulaic nature of these forms, there is nevertheless creativity
that is expressed in a variety of ways. Even in highly stratified societies the
linguistic recognition and construction of hierarchy and status differentiation
entails an element of choice. In exercising particular choices, speakers can
show verbal skill, and speakers can show their own understanding of and
stance towards the social system. They can show that a particular kind of
activity is taking place, where social hierarchy is being made relevant. In
the use of honorific forms in Example 5, not all Pohnpeian participants
choose to use honorific forms. Some participants switch from everyday
speech to honorific forms at a certain point in the activity, even though the
composition of the participants remains constant. In Example 5, line 01, the

Menindei (Master of ceremonies) uses the common form of 'come', kohdo,
even though the chief is there. In line 02 the chief himself speaks, not using
honorific forms (this is just as would be predicted, since Pohnpeian chiefs
do not use status-marked forms except in oratory). A woman speaker also
does not use honorific replacements for kohdo 'come', for kihsang 'take off'
and for ahmw 'your'. In the same interaction, a few minutes later however,
line 04, the Menindei suddenly switches to honorific forms for 'take off'
(patohwansang) and 'go up' (patohdala).

Example 5: Sakau with the secondary chief—POHNPtIAN

01 Menindei: uh uh uh nahn kohdo
              uh uh buddy come here towards me
              uh uh buddy come here

02 Chief: kumwa kohdo mah iang sukedì
you come here first join pound

03 Woman: kumwa kihsang mah ahmw seht kan
         you take from first your shirt those by you
         you two first take off your shirts

04 Menindei: patohwansang ahmw sehten
           take [low status], from your(S) shirt that by you
           take off (you of low status) your shirt

05 koh patohdala
          you move [low status], upwards there
          you go up there (you of low status)

This choice to switch into honorific forms is neither completely consistent
nor predictable, since the Menindei marks relevant verb forms but not the
relevant possessive classifier ahmw in line 04 (in honorific register ahmw
tungool sehten 'your low status shirt'). The man who is instructed to take off
his shirt is being instructed to move up higher on the platform to sit beside
the chief and act as his kava server. Coincidently, this movement to higher
status space is accompanied by a choice to use a form which lowers status through language (see Activity Level section below for more discussion of spatial expressions of hierarchy).

Reflexivity

In addition to choice, reflexivity is another aspect of honorific usage we notice at the speaker level. It is manifested by choices made when speakers are ventriloquising or reporting the speech of others and when speakers give public displays of metapragmatic awareness. In the case of reported speech, through the narration of past or future events, speakers can encode honorific marking and all its entailments in their own and others' past and future utterances. In Example 6, a Pohnpeian woman uses the reported speech form dene (line 01) during a story she told to the paramount chiefess. Dene can be translated as 'it was said'. Here, although there is an anonymous speaker, honorific forms are made relevant in the presence of the paramount chiefess to whom the speaker relates the past event in the present context.

Example 6: A speaker reporting another's speech in a conversation at a feast—POHNPEIAN

01 S: dene sohte me patohwan dahme kumwa wiwian?
it is said no one that know[low status] what you(D) doing it was said no one knows (they of low status) what you two are doing?
(...)

02 dene L (name) oh sapwllimen X (title) pwwatak
it is said L (name) and Ps.Cl.[high status]. of X (title) boy they say that L and X's (he of high status) boy are

03 kin patpato rehra
habitually staying[low status] there location of them always staying (they of low status) with them

Although this speech was reported from a different context, the present context makes the use of honorific forms appropriate and shows that speakers' choices interact with the activity level and participants (see Example 10 below).

In actual statements of metapragmatic awareness, speakers also show their knowledge of the use of these forms. In Samoa, in actual performance, speakers may interrupt themselves or others in the middle of a ritual speech and remark on the inconsistencies between the formulaic nature of honorific expressions and the situation-at-hand. For example, in an exchange of ceremonial greetings prior to a fono ‘chiefly meeting’ recorded in 1988, a senior orator initiated his reply to the welcoming greeting of those already in the house by remarking that there were no chiefs to be ceremonially greeted—'e lea gi 'iga e kaufa atupe a kaua', a statement that could be seen as both a complaint about the chiefs' absenteeism and a justification for the senior orator not mentioning them in the following greeting.

Negotiation and Resistance

Given that any person has a range of possible social personae, the use of a specific honorific form can indicate one of these possible social roles. Participants display both an acceptance of the role being chosen for them through the honorific usage or they can resist (e.g., verbally or kinetically) in various ways. In Pohnpeian two different speakers in an interaction may give a different status to the same activity by the same person. In this way, simplistic contrasts of “high” and “low” are subverted by interactants who employ a range of creative acts and add complexity. In Example 7, the Chiefess resists the high status conferred on her by the Master of ceremonies when introducing her speech. In the introduction by the Master of ceremonies, her activity is referred to as very high status by the verb mhausen ‘speak [high status]’, line 02, but the chiefess herself subsequently uses the low status term patohdo ‘stand [low status]’ to refer to herself and her activity of speaking before the community, line 05.

Example 7: Introduction to oratory and oratory at a feast (MC = Master of ceremonies, C = Chiefess) — Pohnpeian

01 MC: na kumwailihiakan kumwaili mentau
so you all women there you all thanks please
so all you women you all please

02 patohdo ansouwe Likend pahn mhausen.
come [low status] now chiefess will speak [high status]
come here now the chiefess is going to speak
(...)

04 C: I tamataman mwohn pahr ehu de riau samwalahr
I remember before year one or two gone already
I remember one or two years ago

05 me i patohda mwohn kumwaii pwihi keiehu
that I stand up [low status] before you all group first
that I stood up before you all of Section One
relationships and semiotic codes is made relevant. An important part of any activity is the organisation of participants' roles. This goes beyond the traditional dyadic relation of speaker and hearer and includes a wider range of possible roles (e.g., audience, referents, bystanders, or other listeners) (Goffman 1981). Another important aspect of the activity level is the role of multiple semiotic codes and the interpenetration of codes that characterises activities. Honorifics define the relevant participants in the interaction, which also works to define the activity itself.

The Nature of Participation

The use of honorific forms in the two societies shows that a wide range of participant roles are made relevant in constructing status relationships. In terms of traditional grammatical roles, however, participants are the parties constituted by the syntactic and semantic framing of the utterance (Hopper and Thompson 1980). The grammar of languages allows distinctions to be made between the participant that acts (Actor) and the goal or location of that action, and between the party that initiates or causes a certain change of state (Agent) and the one that undergoes that change (variously called by semanticists Object, Patient, or Undergoer) (see Fillmore 1968, 1977). When a particular individual occupies the Actor or Agent role this may trigger the selection of particular verb forms in honorific register. For example, if the referent of the subject of the clause, Tui, as in 'Tui has eaten', or the head of a genitive construction, Tui, as in 'Tui's wife', may be a person whose status warrants the use of a honorific form, e.g., a chief, such a form may be selected.

Table 7: Agent role or head of a genitive construction triggers selection of honorific forms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Form</th>
<th>Honorific Form</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samsan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ua 'ai Tui</td>
<td>'ua taumafa Tui</td>
<td>Tui has eaten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>te mea 'ai a Tui</td>
<td>te meataunamata a Tui</td>
<td>Tui's food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pohnpeian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liho mwengaehr</td>
<td>Likend pweniehr</td>
<td>The woman/chiefess has eaten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mwengaehr liho</td>
<td>pweniehr Likend (also, just pweniehr can be sufficient)</td>
<td>The woman's/chiefess's food</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our data shows, however, that the agent is not the only trigger for honorific forms, and it is not just the referent that is important in selecting status. The social identities of a larger number of those who are present are relevant for the use and selection of honorific forms in both Pohnpeian and Samoan. In Example 10, in Samoan, the grammatical roles and the traditional speaker/hearer distinction are shown to be not the only relevant distinction for the use of honorific forms. The social identities of other participants are, in fact, more crucial in this case. In the conversation reproduced in Example 10, Pastor F, in talking to deacon A about the high chief Salanoa, uses the status unmarked verb form lo'o akulu ‘arrive’ instead of the chiefly honorific form afio atu (in line 149). But when a little later in the exchange (lines 162 and 165), Pastor F quotes himself talking to Salanoa (for a different, past audience), he uses high status honorific forms (finangalo and lau afioni).


149 F: ga-ga o'o akulu lā Salagoa?  
pst pst reach dx there Salanoa  
did- did Salanoa get there?

[...]

160 F: 'ou fai akulu si ko(e)pinga o Salagoa. 'ia’,” 
I say dx to Aff old man Pred Salanoa well 
“I said to the dear old man Salanoa ‘well,’”

161 A: faiuiga lelei mea. 
interpret good thing 
“interpret things in a good way.”

162 F: “finangalo malie ia.” 
wish [+chief] agree emph 
“(if your) wish does agree.”

163(0.3)

164 A: (? )

165 F: “lau afioni (...)” 
your highness [+chief] 
your highness (...)

[Ed. note: dx = directional particle, Aff = affective or empathetic form of article.]

The absence of high status individuals at the time of the conversational exchange between A and F may have justified the absence of honorific speech when referring to such individuals, but when recounting situations in which such individuals were physically present, speakers impersonating themselves or others in those situations typically use honorific speech. Thus, the use of honorific speech is malleable to the “participant framework” (Goodwin 1990), for example, the presence or absence of others (in the current speech event). A particular “presence” or audience can also be reconstructed through reported speech. These interactions suggest that language registers are particularly sensitive not only to speaker and addressee but also to what have been traditionally thought of as “secondary audience” or “peripheral participants”.

The usual grammatical roles are insufficient to account for speaker choices in Example 11 in Pohnpeian, where a speaker chooses a high status form for ‘ask’, not when the chief is the petitioner, but when the chief is the one petitioned. In the sentence ‘then try and ask the chief’, asking the chief is construed to be a high status act. Asking the chief a question is expressed as a chief-involving activity even though the grammatical agent in the sentence is a low status person.

Example 11: Sakau with the paramount chief—POHNPEIAN

01 N: ke kahng? na song keinemwe rehn  
you refuse? then try ask [high status] location of 
you don’t believe me? then try and ask

02 Mwoholwsapwo  
chief there

the chief

Example 12 shows the same person being simultaneously referred to by two differently status marked terms, making the presence of the chief relevant. The speaker’s status in relation to the other is indexed by the first honorific, the subject pronoun komwi (the addressee is of higher status than the speaker), while the participation of the chief is taken into account in the choice of the second word, the honorific patowan (low status verb for ‘say’), i.e., the addressee is of lower status than the chief. This speaker can thus be exaltedly lowered (a difficult action to communicate in English). A three-way contrast between chief, addressee, and speaker can be developed.
Example 12: At a feast. High + low status in the same construction—Pohnpeian

01 A: komw  dehr  patowan  soahngen
you[high status]  not say[low status]  type.that
don't say that kind of thing

Interpenetration of Codes

The use of honorific register interacts with other types of semiotic behaviour (e.g., gestures, postures) within a culturally organised space. At the activity level we can see that language is only one of the codes that can index honorification and thereby index social differentiation, stratification, and particular contexts and participant relations. Other codes co-occur with speech. In both Pohnpeian and Samoan, differences which are instantiated in a person’s utterance can also be expressed through posture, gesture or space. For example in Pohnpeian directionality and position of the body conveys social difference in seating arrangements, where chiefs and chiefesses face downward in the feast house, while others face upward.

Pohnpeians and Samoans regularly interpret space to construe status differentials. In Samoan fono the space is arranged into ‘front’ and ‘back’ regions, which translate into high/lower status, the front being of higher status (Duranti 1981, 1992b). There is also a status distinction between centre and periphery (Shore 1982) in both societies. In Samoa where you sit during different activities can construct a particular, situation-specific status or identity and level and type of participation, and each seating plan conveys a particular social order-of-the-moment. The seating arrangement in turn is related to the progression of serving food and kava (a status marked activity in both societies). In Samoa people seat themselves inside the house according to an ideal plan structured on the basis of statuses (chiefs vs. orators), ranks (high vs. low ranking titles), and extent of participation (Duranti 1984:220). Samoan oratory (which contains honorific forms) must be performed by either standing or sitting in culture- and context-specific ways, with an audience assembled in a particular configuration. In Pohnpeian, vertical and horizontal space in the feast house has status meanings (see also Toren 1988 for Fiji). Participants actively manipulate this space in order to convey particular messages about relative status or about personal humility (for example, see Firth 1970).

Kava serving is another important way status is related to activity. The sequence of kava distribution signals the rank of those present (Keating 1998, Reisenberg 1968, Shimizu 1987) and situates gender within that hierarchy. In Samoa, on many occasions chiefs drink kava first. In certain types of meetings, however, this order is reversed and orators drink first. In the village of Falefā, where Duranti carried out fieldwork, there are fono where the highest-ranking orator present from each sub-village is served first (see Duranti 1994:74).

Asymmetrical distribution of food and drink is linked to asymmetries in social status in other societies with languages having honorific registers. For example, Haviland (1979:223) notes that among certain Australian cultures in former times in addition to language restraints between certain in-laws, there were strict restrictions on the sharing of food and possessions between a man and his parents-in-law. In western Tamilnadu (India) there is a relationship between the “giving” of “intimate” pronoun and food, and the giving of “distant” pronoun and services. In the case of giving food, the giver is higher than the receiver, in the case of providing service, the receiver of the service is higher than the provider (Levinson 1982:121). In Pohnpei, all food is regularly served out sequentially according to status (see Keating 1998, 2000). At all kinds of gatherings in Samoa, the quantity and quality food, and order in serving it also communicates status relations.

New Contexts for the Use of Honorific Forms

The extension of honorific use to new activities and contexts can illuminate some of the processes at work in status building and help us to understand the role of these forms in building contexts where authority or distinction is made relevant. For example, honorifics have recently been extended to new communicative contexts in the Pacific. The Bible was translated using honorific register in both Pohnpeian and Samoan, and Christian worship is also conducted in status-marked speech. In both societies, radio announcements are made with honorifics. Pohnpeians explain this by saying that honorific speech is appropriate because chiefs, chiefesses, or other high status persons might be in the audience. As in many Pacific Islands, the radio is an important source of news in Pohnpeian and Samoans, penetrating many households simultaneously on a daily basis and bringing information that links listeners to both a local (e.g., announcements of recent deaths and forthcoming funerals) and an international network (e.g., relatives abroad, international news). The introduction of literacy practices and the writing of honorific forms in the Bible has provided new contexts of representation for these forms and instantiated new relationships.

CREATIVITY, PARTICIPANTS AND MULTIPLE SEMIOTIC RESOURCES

We have discussed honorifics in Pohnpeian and Samoan by looking at what we see as three fundamental interconnected properties in the constitution of social hierarchy in these two societies: creativity, the establishment of particular participant roles, and the exploitation of multiple semiotic resources. Our
analytical framework examining grammar, speakers and activities is meant to elucidate aspects of honorific forms which show their range and complexity, and which can provide a means for further comparison among languages which exhibit these forms. We have also examined relationships between grammar, speakers, and activities.

Our examples show how honorific speech consists not only of particular words and rules for their use but of the particular choices, conditions and relationships that such words make possible. The use of honorific forms tends to be activity-specific in the two societies: according to their semantic properties—i.e., verbs denoting only certain activities are marked—and according to deployment—i.e., the same two speakers who are found using honorific speech in one activity may not use it in another situation (or even among the same participants). Also, not all forms which could be status marked in a particular utterance will necessarily be status marked.

Although speakers conceptualise honorific speech as obligatory with some referents and in particular contexts and make this explicit in discussions, studying everyday usage shows that it is not necessarily the referent, the context, or the participants which make these forms relevant, but some combination of all of these. Speakers highlight new emergent relationships among participants and new relationships towards the activity at hand. When examining how Polynesianans and Samoans employ their honorific linguistic systems, we notice that utterances with honorific forms can focus hearers away from shared categories for certain concepts such as spouses, possession and body parts. At the same time honorific forms create resemblances from among disparate concepts through polysemy, where some types of actions or items that are usually distinguished are subsumed under the same linguistic item, for example, body parts and movement. Separateness of some actions by some participants is constructed through complex sentences which use parallelism, and non-separateness of some types of actions vis-à-vis other actions is constructed through polysemy. Speakers can be held responsible for their ability to use honorifics in a way consistent with the general or conceptual view of the register as it pertains to the domain of performance (Bauman 1975, Hymes 1975, Ide 1989) and poetics. Even in highly stratified societies there is an important degree of choice in the recognition and construction of hierarchy.

Status marking in these two languages provides additional evidence for the importance of rethinking the critical factor of temporality in how participation is organised through language. If we look at the kinds of participant roles honorific registers construct, we can see that these are not simply roles of speaker vs. addressee but rather roles that reach from the past to the present and even into the future. Using a high status form can obligate one interactant to care for the dependency needs of the other, i.e., create a context in which a high status person is vulnerable to dependencies from low status individuals (cf. Duranti 1992a, Goody 1972, Irvine 1974), as well as link the chief with the ancestors of ‘long ago’—agents who are the source of his current spiritual power or mana.

The actual use of honorifics confirms that a more subtle distinction is needed than that between speaker and hearer in order to take into account the complex phenomenology of linguistic performance whereby, for example, speakers are not always the authors of their words and those who hear an utterance can have very different roles (e.g., primary vs. secondary audience, bystanders and other listeners). Studies of registers such as honorific registers have usually focused on the speaker. We notice, however, that register shifts are not just about differences in speakers’ language use but involve the construction of particular, recurrent, audience roles. Honorific utterances show us that our notion of who counts as a relevant participant in an interaction can be someone who is neither a speaker nor a hearer in a present context. By using honorifics, instead of focusing on the similarity of joint participatory actions, speakers can focus hearers on the separate quality of such actions.

Language, however, is only one of a bundle of resources used by participants to establish or corroborate the status of some individuals and groups of individuals in terms of others. Contexts and levels of participation are also differentiated through the organisation of bodies in space and the sequential organisation of activities. By looking at a multiplicity of semiotic resources we are able to identify a number of ways in which status construction works beyond notions of reference or address. These include sequentiality of food and kava sharing, the differentiation of activity space, the body and the apportionment of space. In some situations in Samoa and Pohnpei, honorific usage is more frequent or concentrated, for example oratory, in other activities, like kava drinking, which builds hierarchy through sequential relationships, language is not the primary means of building social difference.

* * *

We have designed a framework for looking at different honorific systems by separating grammatical, speaker and activity levels of honorific practice in order to understand the structure and use of status-organising resources in social life. We have demonstrated how creativity, participation and the use of multiple semiotic resources are crucial components of how hierarchy is activated and negotiated in social life between members of two Pacific communities.

While much of the scholarship on honorifics focuses on the role of honorifics in creating particular participatory roles and relationships, this account is too limited to describe the full range of use of these forms. Honorific forms, in addition to marking status relationships, create particular ideas of who counts as a participant, including those in reported past or sequentially
next activities. The construction of hierarchical relations is made even more complex through multiple symbolic codes. In Pohnpeian and Samoan, there is a high degree of complexity at the level of simultaneity of stances and codes and how participants in everyday settings creatively locate themselves and others in a universe of status relations, showing their skill and understanding of the social system as they take a position towards the system.

NOTES
1. The Samoan term is ‘amataga ‘beginning’.
2. When the honorific nouns koanoo, pwene, and sak are used, the possessive pronoun is sometimes left out. Native speakers explain that the honorific noun makes it clear whose food is being referred to.
3. The pronoun would not ordinarily be used in directives such as this in common speech. In cases of high status marking the pronoun is used more frequently.
4. The term ‘chief’ here is used to translate the Samoan term alii. The term ‘orator’ is used to translate the term tulafale, which was used to be translated as ‘talking chief’.
5. Samoan has a few such forms (see Milner 1961), for example, the first person pronoun forms ta, tita, and ta tita, which are also marked for affect (see Ochs 1986).
6. Samoan examples reproduce the phonology of actual use, which includes words in the so-called “bad speech” register (castataloalaga), as found in most informal and formal exchanges (see Duranti and Ochs 1986).
7. Literally ‘of this little girl’, see Duranti and Ochs 1990 and Duranti 1994 on the use of these genitive constructions for affective roles.
8. There are a few exceptions, for instance, the use of a common term in conjunction with a high status term may imply a lower status for the referent of the common term.
10. The importance of kava is often mentioned in Pacific literature (Bascom 1965, Kirch 1984, Marshall 1979, Oliver 1951), as well as its important relationship to local hierarchies (e.g., Bott 1972; Duranti 1981, 1994). In Samoa the beverage called ‘kava’ is made by reconstituting a powder in a special bowl; in Pohnpeian kava (called saaku) is made by pounding freshly dug up roots and squeezing the juice from the roots into a half coconut shell cup.
11. See Philips 1991 for a discussion of a similar extension of Tongan honorifics to these newer contexts.
12. The deployment of honorific practices in interaction can serve as a warrant against some future actions in the Wolof case reported by Irvine, where interactors resist performing the first greeting since that can put them in the high status position of responder to a supplicant. In some Pacific chiefdoms higher status people have obligations to care for those of lower status. The highest ranking person might be the hardest working because of obligations to show generosity (Firth 1939, Fried 1967).
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CHRONOLOGY IN KAUA'I:
COLONISATION, LAND USE, DEMOGRAPHY

MIKE T. CARSON
International Archaeological Research Institute, Inc., Honolulu

The compilation and publication (Carson 2005a) of 272 radiocarbon dates from confirmed archaeological contexts in Kaua'i Island of the Hawaiian Archipelago provide a substantive basis to address a number of chronological questions. In this article I will use this data compilation to address three topics: the timing of island colonisation, the chronology of land use, and some implications for palaeodemography. The timing of colonisation is of chief concern, given some unusually early dates of the first centuries A.D. in Kaua'i (Kirch 1985:87) that stand in contrast to a growing body of evidence supporting later dates of colonisation in the archipelago, which are closer to A.D.1000 (Athens et al. 2002, Masse and Tuggle 1998, Spriggs and Anderson 1993, Tuggle and Spriggs 2001). The evident trend in radiocarbon dates regarding colonisation reflects chronological development in land use intensity over the past several centuries, which is arguably related to population size.

A synthesis on an island-wide scale is especially instructive, because most chronological models are based on scattered fragments of incomparable data. The island-wide chronology provides a baseline for comparison of specific sites, valleys, or districts. It also provides a robust basis to compare with syntheses from other islands as they continue to develop (e.g., Weisler 1989), which may eventually lead towards updated archipelago-wide or even larger chronologies.

ANALYTIC PROCEDURES

The raw data for this analysis are 272 radiocarbon dates for charcoal samples from definable archaeological contexts in Kaua'i Island. All dates were calibrated at 2 Sigma (95.4% probability), using the OxCal programme (Bronk Ramsey 2001) and standard atmospheric data (Stuiver et al. 1998).

In accordance with the protocol for "chronometric hygiene" (Spriggs 1989, Spriggs and Anderson 1993), the most obviously unacceptable dates were excluded from the Kaua'i radiocarbon database. The immediately rejected dates are those involving terrestrial gastropod shells, sea urchin spines, non-cultural organic sediments, dispersed charcoal of mixed association, poorly documented context, lack of $^{14}C/^{12}C$ ratio correction, potential laboratory errors in sample processing, and one marine shell specimen of unknown stratigraphic provenience. In addition to these factors, Dye (1994a, 1995, 2000) reviews a number of problems with radiocarbon sample material and histogram interpretation that create misleading results in Hawaiian archaeology.