CONTENTS

Thomas, Nicholas, 1991. *Entangled Objects: Exchanges, Material Culture, and Colonialism in the Pacific.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tuimaleali'ifano, Morgan A., 1990. *Samoans in Fiji: Migration, Identity and Communication.* Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies of the University of the South Pacific.

Virchow, Rudolf, 1890. Hr. Virchow stellt der Gesellschaft vor eine Anzahl von Samoanern. *Verhandlungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte*:387-92.

———1895. Vorführung einer Gesellschaft von Samoanern. *Verhandlungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte*: 673-674.

Weiner, Annette, 1985. Inalienable wealth. *American Ethnologist*, 12(2):210-27.

———1989. Why cloth? Wealth, gender, and power in Oceania. In A. Weiner and J. Schneider (eds), *Cloth and Human Experience.* Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, pp.33-72.

———1992. *Inalienable Possessions: The Paradox of Keeping-while-giving.* Berkeley: The University of California Press.

Whistler, W. Arthur, 2004. *Rainforest Trees of Samoa: A Guide to the Common Native and Naturalized Lowland and Foothill Forest Trees of the Samoan Archipelago.* Honolulu: Isle Botanica.

Zimmerman, Andrew, 2000. Science as Schaulust in the Berlin Museum of Ethnology. In C. Goschler (ed.), *Wissenschaft und Öffentlichkeit in Berlin, 1870-1930.* Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, pp.66-88.

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 distribute 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

honorifics for a number of reasons. First, they offer similar and yet distinct systems of honorific forms and social stratification, and they are related historically to each other and to other stratified Pacific societies that likewise employ honorifics. 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 honorific 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, Nanmwarki, 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, *ahmwadang* has a Samoan origin[1] (Geraghty 1994:244).

However, the honorific 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 honorific words called 'respect vocabulary' (*'upu fa'aaloalo*) probably within the last 1000 years (Andrew Pawley, pers. comm.). The small number of honorific cognates between Samoan and Tongan suggests that

Pacific societies developed honorific 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 honorifics has been of great interest to scholars because honorifics provide grammatical evidence for ways in which members of communities make, moment by moment, linguistic choices that organise important social distinctions. Honorifics are prevalent among a wide range of genetically unrelated languages, for example, in Africa and Australia, and specifically in Urdu-Hindi, Llasa Tibetan, Persian, Mongolian, Thai, Tamil, Burmese, Vietnamese, Zuni, Tewa (southwest United States), Nahuatl (Mexico), Japanese, Korean, Javanese and Mongolian. In the Pacific, honorifics 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 honorific speech have discussed its role in creating human relationships pertaining to status, demeanour, respect, deference, power, social distance and solidarity. Descriptions of honorific 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. Honorifics can mark different types of familiar relationships as well, for example some Australian Aboriginal languages have honorific lexicons (so-called "mother-in-law" or "brother-in-law" language") to mark specific kin relations (Dixon 1971, Haviland 1977).

In scholarship on honorific 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 honorifics, 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 Pohnpei, 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), *maliu* ('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).[4] 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

Table 1:   Pohnpeian honorific forms.

you	come	here	take	your	food
re	*apehdo*	*me*	*ketki*	*sapwellimahr*[2]	*koanoat*
komw	*ketdo*	*me*	"	*sapwellimomwi*	"
"	"	*me*	"	"	*pwenieu*
"	"	*me*	"	"	*sak*
(ke[3]*)*	*kohdo*	*me*	*ale*	*kenoumw*	*mwenge*
"	*patohdo*	*me*	*patohwanla*	*ahmw*	*tungoal*

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 *kaselehlia* '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 Nahnken (secondary chief) and the morpheme *-leng* (a bound form of the noun *-lahng* 'heaven') refers to the Nanmwarki (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 (Rehg 1981). In Samoan there is a tendency to use more verb forms that contain the suffix *(Ci)a* (Duranti 1984) for high status individuals (see Example 4 below with the deictic *maia=mai+a*). There are special high status affixes in both languages, but no low status affixes in Pohnpeian.

Honorific forms in Pohnpei and Samoa 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, *masanih*, 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 vocabularies 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'i*), '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

'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 or 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 Nahuatl, 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 Shibamoto 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.

Common	Low	High Status [chief]	High Status [chieftess]	High Status [2nd chief & chieftess]	English
ese	*patohwan*	*mwahngih*	*mwahngih*	*mwahngih*	know
kilang	*patohwan*	*masanih*	*masanih*	*masanih*	see
mwenge	*tungoal*	*koanoat*	*pwenieu*	*sak*	eat
lokaia	*patohwan*	*poahngok*	*masanih*	*masanih*	speak
kohdo	*patohdo*	*ketdo/apehdo*	*ketdo*	*ketdo*	come
kohla	*patohla*	*ketla*	*ketla*	*ketla*	go
ihmw	*ihmw*	*tehnpas*	*tehnpas*	*tehnpas*	house
pwoud	*pwoud*	*werek*	*werek*	*werek*	spouse

Table 3: Samoan high status honorific forms.

Common	High Status	English
iloa	*silafia*	know
va'ai	*silasila*	see
'ai	*taumafa*	eat

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

Common	High Status [chief]	High Status [orator]	English
tautala	*saunoa*	*fetalai*	speak
sau	*afio mai*	*maliu mai*	come, arrive
alu	*afio*	*maliu*	go
fale	*maota*	*laoa*	house
to'alua	*faletua*	*tausi*	spouse
'oe	*lau afioga*	*lau tāfā*	you(r honour)

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 (*tulāfale*) (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 (Nanmwarki) and some to the paramount chieftess (Likend), others are specific to the secondary chief and chieftess (Nanken and Nankeniei) (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.

Honorific 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.

Common	High Status	English
paliwar	*kahlap, erekiso*	body
moange	*kadokenmei*	head
pitenmoange	*ikosenieuieu*	hair
kutoahr en mas	*limarepeleng*	eyeball
timwe	*keinuhnu, sisipwai, kumwuni*	nose
ewe	*dauase*	mouth
peh	*kumwutik*	hand
neh	*aluweluwe*	leg, foot

Table 6: Words for some body parts in Samoan.

Common	High Status	English
ulu	*ao*	head
lauulu	*lauao*	hair
mata	*fofoga*	eye
isu	*fofoga*	nose
nutu	*fofoga*	mouth
lima	*'a'ao*	hand, arm
vae	*'a'ao*	leg, foot

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, chieftess and other community members – POHNPEIAN (note: **boldface** is used to highlight the linguistic items being discussed)

01 Woman: *ma i patohwante*   *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***   ***tungoal***   *moange*
Ps.Cl.1S*   PsCl.[low status]   hair
my (low status) hair
*Ps.Cl.=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.[5] 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 *patowan* or a high status form *ketin* 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, Gossen 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* **medemedewe**
      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   **sapwellimatail werek**   *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 (*maliu 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[6]

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

02   *se'i fai le suāki 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[7] 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.[8] In Pohnpeian there is a single domain of low status but, as in Samoa, 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 Samoa because of the existence of low status forms. Because of the existence of special forms for the paramount chieftess (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 *ahmwa* '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—POHNPEIAN

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

(...)

02 Chief: *kumwa kohdo   mah   iang sukedi*
              you   come.here first   join pound
              you guys come here first and join the pounding
              [*overlap with speech below*]

03 Woman: *kumwa **kihsang**   mah   **ahmwa**   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 tungoal 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 chieftess. *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 chieftess 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)[9] doing
it was said no one knows (they of low status) what you two are
doing?

(…)

02   ***dene***   *L ((name)) oh* **sapwellimen**   *X ((title)) pwutak*
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 leai gi 'āiga e kaufa'alupea akua*", 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 Pohnpei 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 Chieftess 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 *mahsen* 'speak [high status]', line 02, but the chieftess 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=Chieftess)—Pohnpeian

01 MC: *na kumwail lihakan*   *kumwail menlau*
so you.all women.there you.all thanks/please
so all you women you all please

02   *patohdo*   *ansouwet Likend   pahn* **mahsen**.
come [low status]   now   chieftess   will speak[high status]
come here now the chieftess 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 kumwail pwihn keiehu*
that I stand up[low status]   before you.all group first
that I stood up before you all of Section One

In Example 8, a casual speech by the Chieftess, she does not status mark the verb *sansal* ('show') when referring to another, lower status participant's actions, though the one doing the action refers to his own same action by using *patohwen* before the verb *sansal*.

Example 8:   During kava drinking at the Chief's house—Pohnpeian

01 C: S,(title), **komw**   *keida   ekis*
           S (title) you[high status]   move.up a.little
           S, move up a little

02   *pwe   komw   sohte sansal*
           because you[high status] not   clear
           because you are not clearly visible

03 S: *ahka   ngehi me   keiehu **patohwen** sansal*
           of.course I   the.one first [low status] clear
           of course I'm the one who shows up the best

In Example 9, two different speakers choose different status levels for the same activity (buying trousers) by the same person.

Example 9:   Conversation at the Chief's house—Pohnpeian

01 N: *i **ale** kihda rausis eisek paiehu*
           I take/buy   trousers ten   four
           I bought fourteen pairs of trousers
(....)

04 LA: *ke **patohwansang** ia?*
           you take.from   where?
           where did you buy them?

Analysis at the speaker level shows a high degree of choice, metapragmatic awareness of choices and context, and that the choices made by one speaker can be resisted or sequentially re-characterised by another.

ANALYTIC FRAMEWORK: ACTIVITY LEVEL

At the activity level (an analytical level first discussed in detail by Levinson 1979), speakers' choices when using the honorific register recognise or establish a context in which hierarchy and its implied range of social

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.

Common Form	Honorific Form	English
Samoan		
'ua 'ai Tui	*'ua taumafa Tui*	Tui has eaten
le mea'ai a Tui	*le meataumafa a Tui*	Tui's food
Pohnpeian		
liho mwengehr	*Likend pweniehr*	The woman/chieftess has eaten
mwengen liho	*pwenieu Likend* (also, just *pwenieu* can be sufficient)	The woman's/chieftess's food

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 Pohnpei and Samoa. 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 /o'o aku/ '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 afionga*).

Example 10:   SAMOAN ("Pastor & deacon", from Duranti 1992a:84-85)

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

[...]

160 F: *'ou fai aku i si   ko(ea)inga '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: *"fingagalo   malie ia."*
                wish [+chief]   agree emph
                "'(if your) wish does agree.'"

163(0.3)

164 A: (?)

165 F: *"lau afioga (...)"*
                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   *Mwohnsapwo*
                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 Pohnpei and Samoa, differences which are instantiated in a person's utterance can also be expressed through posture, gesture or space. For example in Pohnpei directionality and position of the body conveys social difference in seating arrangements, where chiefs and chieftesses 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/low 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 Pohnpei, 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.[10] 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.[11] The Bible was translated using honorific register in both Pohnpei and Samoa, 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, chieftesses, or other high status persons might be in the audience. As in many Pacific Islands, the radio is an important source of news in Pohnpei and Samoa, 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 Pohnpei and Samoa 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 Pohnpeians 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[12]

(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 participant 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 Pohnpei and Samoa 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 *koanoat, pwenie, 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 *ali'i*. The term 'orator' is used to translate the term *tulāfale*, which 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, 'ita,* and *ta'ita*, 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 (*tautala leaga*), 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 agentive 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.
9. D is an abbreviation for 'dual'.
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 *'ava* is made by reconstituting a powder in a special bowl, in Pohnpei kava (called *sakau*) is made by pounding freshly dug up roots and squeezing the juice from the roots through hibiscus bast 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 interactants 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).

REFERENCES CITED

Agha, Asif, 1993. Grammatical and indexical convention in honorific discourse. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 3(2):131-63.
———1994. Honorification. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 23:277-301.
Bascom, William R., 1965. *Ponape: A Pacific Economy in Transition*. Anthropological Records, No. 22. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Bauman, R., 1975. Verbal art as performance. *American Anthropologist*, 77:290-311.
Bott, Elizabeth, 1972. Psychoanalysis and ceremony. In J.S. LaFontaine (ed.), *Interpretation of Ritual*. London: Tavistock, pp.121-53.
Comrie, Bernard, 1976. Linguistic politeness axes: Speaker-addressee, speaker-reference, speaker-bystander. *Pragmatics Microfiche*, 1.7, A3-B1.
Dixon, Robert M.W., 1971. A method of semantic description. In D. Steinberg and L. Jakobovits (eds), *Semantics: An Interdisciplinary Reader in Philosophy, Linguistics, and Psychology*. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp.436-71.
Duranti, Alessandro, 1981. Speechmaking and the organisation of discourse in a Samoan *fono*. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 90:357-400.
———1984. Lauga and talanoaga: Two speech genres in a Samoan political event. In D.L. Brenneis and F.R. Myers (eds), *Dangerous Words: Language and Politics in the Pacific*. New York: New York University Press, pp.217-42.
———1992a. Language in context and language as context: The Samoan respect vocabulary. In A. Duranti and C. Goodwin (eds), *Rethinking Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p.77-99.
———1992b. Language and bodies in social space: Samoan ceremonial greetings. *American Anthropologist*, 94:657-91.
———1994. *From Grammar to Politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
———1997. *Linguistic Anthropology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Duranti, Alessandro and Elinor Ochs, 1986. Literacy instruction in a Samoan village. In B.B. Schieffelin and P. Gilmore (eds), *Acquisition of Literacy: Ethnographic Perspectives*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex, pp.213-32.
———1990. Genitive constructions and agency in Samoan discourse. *Studies in Language*, 14(1):1-23.
Errington, J. Joseph, 1988. *Structure and Style in Javanese: A Semiotic View of Linguistic Etiquette*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Fillmore, Charles, 1968. The case for case. In E. Bach and E.T. Harms (eds), *Universals of Linguistic Theory*. New York: Holt, pp.1-88.
———1977. Topics in lexical semantics. In R. Cole (ed.), *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, pp.76-138.
Firth, Raymond, 1939. *Principles of Polynesian Economy*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
———1970. Postures and gestures of respect. In J. Pouillon and P. Maranda (eds), *Echanges et Communications;melanges offerts a Claude Lévi-Strauss a l'occasion de son 80eme anniversaire*. Mouton: The Hague, pp.188-209.
Fox, J.J., 1974. 'Our ancestor spoke in pairs': Rotinese views of language, dialect, and code. In R. Bauman and J. Sherzer (eds), *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.65-85.

Fried, Morton, 1967. *The Evolution of Political Society*. New York: Random House.

Garvin, Paul and S. Reisenberg, 1952. Respect behavior on Ponape: An ethnolinguistic study. *American Anthropologist*, 54(2):201-20.

Geertz, Clifford, 1960. *The Religion of Java*. New York: The Free Press.

Geraghty, Paul, 1994. Linguistic evidence for the Tongan Empire. In T. Dutton and D.T. Tryon (eds), *Language Contact and Change in the Austronesian World*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp.233-49.

Goffman, Erving, 1981. Footing. In E. Goffman (ed.), *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, pp.124-57.

Goodwin, Charles, 1981. *Conversational Organization: Interaction Between Speakers and Hearers*. New York: Academic Press.

Goodwin, Marjorie, 1990. *He-Said-She-Said: Talk as Social Organization Among Black Children*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Goody, Esther, 1972. 'Greeting', 'begging', and the presentation of respect. In J.S. Fontaine (ed.), *The Interpretation of Ritual*. London: Tavistock, pp.39-72.

Gossen, G.H., 1974. To speak with a heated heart: Chamula canons of style and good performance. In R. Bauman and J. Sherzer (eds), *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 389-413.

Haviland, John, 1979. How to talk to your brother-in-law in Guugu-Yimidhirr. In T. Shopen (ed.), *Languages and Their Speakers*. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop, pp.160-238.

Hill, Jane and Kenneth Hill, 1978. Honorific usage in modern Nahuatl. *Language*, 54(1):123-55.

Hopper, P. and S.A. Thompson, 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language*, 56:251-99.

Hymes, D., 1972. Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds), *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, pp.35-71.

——1975. Breakthrough into performance. In D. Ben-Amos and K. Goldstein (eds), *Folklore: Performance and Communication*. The Hague: Mouton, pp.11-74.

Ide, Sachiko, 1989. Formal forms and discernment: Two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness. *Multilingua*, 8(2-3):223-48.

Irvine, Judith, 1974. Strategies of status manipulation in the Wolof greeting. In R. Bauman and J. Sherzer (eds), *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.167-91.

——1985. Status and style in language. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 14:557-81.

——1998. Ideologies of honorific language. In B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard and P. Kroskrity (eds), *Language Ideologies*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 51-67.

Jakobson, R., 1960. Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics. In T.A. Sebeok (ed.), *Style in Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 350-77.

Jakobson, Roman, 1987. Linguistics and poetics. In K. Pomorska and S. Rudy (eds), *Language in Literature*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 62-94.

Keating, Elizabeth, 1998. *Power Sharing: Language, Rank, Gender and Social Space in Pohnpei, Micronesia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

——2000. Moments of hierarchy: Constructing social stratification by means of language, food, space and the body in Pohnpei, Micronesia. *American Anthropologist*, 102(2):303-20.

Kirch, Patrick V., 1984. *The Evolution of Polynesian Chiefdoms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Krämer, A., 1994 [1902]. *The Samoa Islands. An Outline of a Monograph with Particular Consideration of German Samoa, Volume I: Constitution, Pedigrees and Traditions*. Translated by Theodore Verhaaren. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Krämer, A., 1994 [1902/3]. *Die Samoa-Inseln*. Stuttgart: Schwertzerbartsche.

Levinson, Stephen, 1979. Activity types and language. *Linguistics*, 17, 365-399.

——1982. Caste rank and verbal interaction in western Tamilnadu. In D. McGilvray (ed.), *Caste Ideology and Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.98-203.

——1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marshall, Mac, 1979. *Weekend Warriors: Alcohol in a Micronesian Culture*. Palo Alto: Mayfield Publishing.

Milner, George B., 1961. The Samoan vocabulary of respect. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 91:296-317.

Ochs, E., 1986. From feelings to grammar: A Samoan case study. In B.B. Schieffelin and E. Ochs (eds), *Language Socialization Across Cultures*. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp.251-72.

Pawley, Andrew and Malcolm Ross, 1993. Austronesian historical linguistics and culture history. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 22:425-59.

Philips, Susan, 1991. Tongan speech levels: Practice and talk about practice in the cultural construction of social hierarchy. In R. Blust (ed.), *Currents in Pacific Linguistics: Papers on Austronesian Languages and Ethnolinguistics in Honour of George W. Grace*. Pacific Linguistics, C-117. Canberra, pp.369-82.

Rehg, Kenneth, 1981. *Ponapean Reference Grammar*. Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii.

——n.d., The Linguistic Evidence for Prehistoric Contact Between Western Polynesia and Pohnpei. Unpublished manuscript.

Reisenberg, Saul, 1968. *The Native Polity of Ponape*. Smithsonian Contributions to Anthropology, 10. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Shibamoto, Janet, 1987. The womanly woman: Manipulation of stereotypical and nonstereotypical features of Japanese female speech. In S. Philips, S. Steele, and C. Tanz (eds), *Language, Gender, & Sex in Comparative Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.26-49.

Shimizu, Akitoshi, 1987. Feasting as socio-political process of chieftainship on Ponape, Eastern Carolines. In I. Ushijima and K. Sudo (eds), *Cultural Uniformity and Diversity in Micronesia*. Senri Ethnological Studies 21. Osaka, pp.129-76.

Shore, Bradd, 1982. *Sala'ilua: A Samoan Mystery*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Silverstein, Michael, 1977. Cultural prerequisites to grammatical analysis. In M. Saville-roike (ed.), *Linguistics and Anthropology: Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1977.* Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, pp.139-51.

——1981. *The Limits of Awareness.* Sociolinguistic Working Paper No.4. Austin: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

——1998.The uses and utility of ideology: A commentary. In B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard and P. Kroskrity (eds), *Language Ideologies.* New York: Oxford University Press, pp.123-45.

Toren, Christina, 1988. Children's perceptions of gender and hierarchy in Fiji. In G. Jahoda and I.M. Lewis (eds), *Acquiring Culture: Cross Cultural Studies in Child Development.* London: Croom Helm, pp.225-70.

SHORTER COMMUNICATION

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 $^{13}C/^{12}C$ 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.