

# **Prolegomena to the pragmatics of “situational-intentional” varieties in Kilivila language**

Gunter Senft

*Max-Planck-Institut für Humanethologie*

## **1. Introduction\***

In his classic essay “The Problem of Meaning in Primitive Languages” Bronislaw Malinowski (1936) emphasizes — among other things —

“that language is essentially rooted in the reality of the culture, the tribal life and customs of a people, and that it cannot be explained without constant reference to these broader contexts of verbal utterance” (305),  
“that in a ... language the meaning of any single word is to a very high degree dependent on its context” (306),

and

“that language in its ... original form has an essentially pragmatic character; that it is a mode of behaviour, an indispensable element of concerted human action” (316).

Malinowski derived these conclusions from his experiences during his epochal ethnographic field-research on the Trobriand Islands.

A closer look at the metalinguistic vocabulary of the Trobriand Islanders reveals that Malinowski’s pointed — etic — conclusions basically have their — emic — equivalents in the metalinguistic knowledge that is codified in Kilivila, the Austronesian language of the Trobriand Islanders.

The salient relevance of the concepts codified by these metalinguistic terms is so important for the Trobriand speech-community that it is one of the first characteristics of the language which is — and must be — recog-

nized by a linguist doing field research on the Trobriands. S/he will only progress in her/his attempts to learn and speak Kilivila properly, is s/he grasps these concepts — concepts that are the prerequisites for the pragmatically adequate use of the language.

This paper presents these concepts and attempts to analyze them with respect to their function for the members of the Kilivila speech community.

## 2. “Situational-intentional” varieties in Kilivila language

The Trobriand Islanders do not only distinguish local varieties, or dialects, of their language and socially stratifying and stratified varieties, but also varieties that I have called “situational-intentional” varieties. With the term “situational-intentional varieties” I refer to language varieties or “registers” that are used in a given special situation — hence “*situational-intentional*” varieties — and that are produced to pursue (a) certain intention(s) — hence “*situational-intentional*” varieties (Senft 1986a: 124). These situational-intentional varieties will be in the focus of interest in the following sections of this paper.<sup>1</sup>

Kilivila native speakers differentiate at least seven of these varieties. I will present, define,<sup>2</sup> and characterize each of these varieties; the most important of them will be illustrated with respect to their specific features, variants, and usage; moreover, the function(s) of these most important varieties will be discussed.

### 2.1 “*Biga Bwena*” — “*Good Language*”

“*Biga Bwena*” is the most general name for a language variety a speaker produces, matching both in style and lexicon the situation — with speaker and hearer with their individual status and the communicative issue involved — in an appropriate way. In choosing this variety a speaker tries to make a good impression on the hearer, of course. This general concept applies to all Kilivila registers with its emphasis on using language adequately with respect to the situational communicative context.

“*Biga Bwena*” is a label hearers use in qualifying a speaker’s utterances. Someone who is known for his constant use of “*Biga Bwena*” enjoys a good reputation and much social prestige, irrespective of his status within the otherwise pronounced clan-hierarchy of Trobriand society.<sup>3</sup>

## 2.2 “*Biga Gaga*” — “*Bad Language*”

“*Biga Gaga*” is just the opposite of the “*Biga Bwena*”-variety. It not only includes swear-words, “four-letter words,” obscene speech, and the verbal breaking of taboos, but also encompasses all situationally inadequate verbal behaviour. The use of this variety most often implies distancing of the speaker to the hearer, and aggression by insulting or deriding the hearer. Its use is — at least officially and in public — not approved by the community; more often than not sanctions are imposed against someone who uses this variety. In its generality this concept applies to all Kilivila registers, too, laying its emphasis on using language inadequately to the situational communicative context.

“*Biga Gaga*” is a label hearers use in qualifying a speaker’s utterances.

In certain communicative contexts, however, the use of swear words, “four-letter words,” obscene speech, and the verbal breaking of taboos — features otherwise characteristic for the concept expressed by the term “*Biga Gaga*” — are approved by the community. We will consider this fact in the following section.

## 2.3 “*Biga Sopa*” — “*Joking or Lying Language, ‘Indirect’ Language*”

This variety is characteristic for Trobriand discourse and communication. It is based on the fact that Kilivila, like any other natural language, is marked by certain features that include “vagueness” and “ambiguity.” Both vagueness and ambiguity are used by the speaker as a stylistic means to avoid possible distress, confrontation, or too much and — for a Trobriand Islander at least — too aggressive directness in certain speech situations. If a hearer signals that s/he may be insulted by a certain speech act, the speaker can always recede from what s/he has said by labelling it as *sopa*, as something s/he did not really mean to say. This stylistic means of Kilivila plays an important part in everyday social life on the Trobriand Islands.<sup>4</sup> Thus, we will look at this metalinguistically expressed concept a bit more in detail.

Among the first pragmatic stratagems Trobriand children learn from their parents and peers acquiring their mother tongue is the adequate use of “*Biga Sopa*”. I will illustrate this process by the following examples.

From the very beginning of their early-childhood-socialization children are taught and even urged to recognize and respect the taboos of Trobriand

society. The general and sociological taboos that were listed and described by Malinowski (1927, 1929) are still valid for all Trobriand Islanders. These taboos affect among other things sexuality, sexual behaviour, and also speech behaviour — especially with respect to talking about sexual matters; however, “sex as such is not tabooed” (Malinowski 1929: 381)! These facts given, a linguist doing field research on the Trobriands is rather perplexed if s/he translates the following kind of lullabys and nursery rhymes from Kilivila into English:

- (1) *Yadubwe — togimona togima'ina,*  
*yaruboda.*  
*Yanagitovai — m!*  
*Yanagitovai — m!*  
 Bang, bang ((clapping hands)) — fuck, fuck again,  
 we can do it once more.  
 We will do it again — hm!  
 We will do it again — hm!
- (2) *Nunumwaye — tomwaye,*  
*kusisusi va bweme.*  
*Idoketasi popu.*  
 Old woman — old man,  
 you sit close to the yams-house.  
 They are fucking shit.
- (3) *Tobabane, Tobabane —'*  
*kwakeye lumta.*  
*Kwalimati.*  
*Kusivilago.*  
*Kuyomama.*  
 Tobabane, Tobabane —  
 you are fucking your sister.  
 You are fucking her to death.  
 You are turning around.  
 You are weary and tired.
- (4) *Kena, kena, kena — uruaru.*  
*Kwapu — kwesau —*  
*kwerigiri kara kena —*  
*inam karakena tamam.*  
*Bila itatau —*  
*kedoga.*

Lime spatula, spatula, spatula — clatter clatter.  
 You are licking — you take it out —  
 you are smacking licking his spatula  
 like your mother licking your father's spatula.  
 He will come, he keeps on coming —  
 small crooked stick.

These are examples of a Trobriand lullaby (1.), a nursery rhyme that children recite while spinning the top (2.), a nursery rhyme that is recited playing a certain string figure ((3.) see: Senft, Senft 1986), and a nursery rhyme children sing playing ring-a-ring-a-roses.

All these rhymes and the lullaby are examples that document the verbal breaking of taboos; the second example given above even documents the verbal breaking of the “supreme taboo of the Trobriander; the prohibition of any tender dealings between brother and sister” (Malinowski 1929: 437). However, it is not only with young children, but also with adults that I documented these verbal breakings of taboos — be it with male bachelors that accompany their bringing in the yams from the gardens to the village center dancing the “*mweki*”-dance and singing the “*mweki*”-songs, or be it with adults, even with highly respected chiefs, telling ‘dirty’ jokes.<sup>5</sup>

When I inquired with my informants about these verbal breakings of taboos, even informants that were quite strict with respect to social rules and regulations not only tolerated these texts but also admitted quite openly that they enjoy these texts very much — as excellent examples of “*sopa*.” According to their words, children reciting nursery rhymes like those presented above “were only playing” (“*emwasawasi wala*” — “they are only playing”), and adults and bachelors singing “*mweki*”-songs or telling ‘dirty’ jokes were only “joking” (“*esasopasi wala*” — “they are only joking”).

Now, what about these variants of “*sopa*”? Why are they not only tolerated but also taught to children by a society which is rather strict with respect to social taboos and which attaches great importance to modesty in speech behaviour (Malinowski 1929: 402ff.)?

It is rather trivial to remark that every society puts some of its realms, domains, and spheres under certain specific taboos. It seems to be even more trivial, however, to point out that taboos are ignored — all the more, the stricter the society asks exact obedience of its members with respect to the observance of these taboos. A society can secure its members’ obser-

vance of certain taboos — especially of taboos that are rather important for its social construction of reality, indeed — by allowing the discussion of its taboos — especially of the sociologically less important ones — as topics of discourse and of conversation. Moreover, it may even allow its members to imagine the ignorance of taboos — in a fictitious way, of course. This is exactly how and why so-called “safety valve customs” develop (see Eibl-Eibesfeldt 1984: 492ff.; Heymer 1977: 187; Senft 1987). The lullabys, nursery rhymes, “*mweki*”-songs, and jokes presented or referred to above as variants of the “*Biga Sopa*”-concept are excellent examples of such “safety valve customs.” With respect to the function of safety valve customs it becomes evident why these variants of the “*Biga Sopa*”-concept are a necessary part not only of the socialization process of Trobriand children,<sup>6</sup> but also of the everyday social life of Trobriand adults. These rhymes, songs, and jokes are classified as “*sopa*”, as “play”, as something fictitious in Trobriand society. With these variants of the concept the Trobrianders generate a social “space” — a “forum” — where the breaking of taboos is allowed, if it is done verbally, of course. This “forum” permits a specially marked way of communication about something, “one does not talk about” otherwise.

Another more special variant of the “*Biga Sopa*”-concept are satirical songs (“*butu-* (+ suffix of possessive pronoun series IV)” e.g.: *butula* = her/his personal satirical song); they mock at possible kinds of behaviour which deviate from the social norm by means of irony, satire, and banter. These “*butusi*” (“their satirical songs”) thus serve the function of a sociological tool to secure the society’s rules of conventional decorum and etiquette in a rather subtle way by marking someone’s sociologically deviant behaviour and asking mildly for immediate correction.<sup>7</sup>

Besides these more specific variants of the concept, the Trobrianders employ the “*Biga Sopa*”-variety in everyday conversation, in small talk, in flirtation, in public debates, and in admonitory speeches as an artistic means of rhetoric to avoid possible distress, personal confrontation, and too aggressive directness. It can also function to relax the atmosphere, and to maintain the exchange of contrary arguments, because the concept of “*sopa*” allows to disguise one’s thoughts verbally and to state thoughts without the dangers of personal exposure.<sup>8</sup> As prescribed by Trobriand etiquette, a hearer must not be offended at all by a speaker’s utterance, if the speaker recedes from what s/he has said by labelling it as “*sopa*.”

Thus, this situational-intentional variety channels emotions, especially aggressive ones, it keeps aggression under control, and it keeps possibilities of contact open (see: Lorenz 1963; Eibl-Eibesfeldt 1979). This concept with its tension-releasing functions secures harmony in Trobriand society and contributes to maintaining the Trobriand Islanders' "social construction of reality" (Berger and Luckmann 1966).

#### 2.4 "*Biga Pe'ula/Biga Mokita*" - "*Heavy Language/Hard Words/True Language/Direct Language*"

This variety is just the opposite of the "*Biga Sopa*" variety. It is rather rarely used;<sup>9</sup> however, when used, the directness of the speaker indicates that s/he is completely aware of the fact that s/he has to take all risks of stripping away ambiguity and vagueness with which one normally can disguise one's own thoughts, and that s/he can stand to argue publicly in terms of the "heavy" dimension of truth. Thus the use of this variety implies an important personal and social impact of what is said; moreover, the use of this variety is explicitly marked by a speaker, declaring that what s/he is going to say or what s/he has said is not "*sopa*" but "*Biga Pe'ula*" or "*Biga Mokita*."

This concept is the necessary complement to the concept of "*sopa*." Its rather rare use signals the social significance of both concepts: The use of the "*Biga Pe'ula*"-variety on the one hand inevitably will demand action that for either party involved in such a speech event may be dangerous or even fatal (see Weiner 1983: 696). The concept of "*sopa*," on the other hand, offers the only possibility to avoid such potential consequences that may turn out to be fatal not only for individuals but also for the society as a whole.

#### 2.5 "*Biga Tommwaya/Biga Baloma*" — "*Old People's Language/Language of the Spirits of the Dead*"

This archaic language variety is very rarely used as a kind of "sociolinguistic variable," indicating high social status in everyday discourse and conversation. However, it is used in magic formulae and in special songs sung at the harvest festival ("*milamala*") and during a certain period of mourning (see Senft 1985a, b, c); both magic formulae and songs have been passed on from generation to generation with the immanent claim to preserve their

linguistic form. The majority of the people citing these magic formulae and singing these songs do not or no longer understand their semantic content, their meaning.

I will not consider the use of this variety as a sociolinguistic variable and as a feature of magic formulae (see 2.6.) in this section, but I will discuss its variants realized as mourning- and as harvest-festival-songs a bit more in detail (see also Senft 1987).

The harvest-festival is still the great event for the Trobriand Islanders in the course of the year (see Malinowski 1935). The period of harvest-festivals may last for about three months; it is a period of happiness, of conviviality, of dances, of villagers visiting each other, of flirtation, and of amorous adventures — at least for the adolescents and bachelors.

After getting in the yams harvest, the Trobrianders open the “*milamala*,” the period of harvest-festivals, with a cycle of festive dances accompanied by drums and songs (“*wosi*”) that are related to the dance cycles. Most of these songs — or “*wosi milamala*” — consist of verses with two or three lines each; they are repeated ad libitum, and they have a very characteristic melody.<sup>10</sup> The songs are not only sung to open the festivals, but they are also sung in the late evenings, and sometimes they form the transition from one festive day to the other. As said above, these songs are sung in the “*Biga Baloma*”-variety of Kilivila language. They are a manifestation of the Trobrianders’ belief in an immortal spirit — called “*baloma*” — that lives in a kind of “paradise” in the “underworld” of Tuma Island (see Malinowski 1916); however, these spirits of the dead cannot only be reborn — according to the Trobrianders’ belief — they can also visit their former villages, and they do this regularly during the “*milamala*” period.

Therefore, the traditional opening of the festivals with the singing of the “*wosi milamala*” is also a salute to the spirits of the dead; moreover, the singing of these songs during the nights of the “*milamala*”-period is done in honour of and to celebrate the “*baloma*.” This is not the only function of the use of this variety codified in these songs, however.

As said above, the “*milamala*”-period is characterized by conviviality, flirtation, and amorous adventures. During such festive periods, social norms, rules and regulations are interpreted in a more liberal and generous way than otherwise. This may lead to jealousy and rivalry that — in escalation — may even threaten the community. The “*wosi milamala*,” however, also serve the function to prevent such a development. The songs remind the Trobrianders of the presence of the “*baloma*” and of the social norms



that are valid even for the spirits of the dead “living” in their “paradise.” The “*baloma*” must not be offended by unseemly and indecent behaviour — and this includes jealousy amongst bachelors. Keeping this in mind, everyone must control his/her personal behaviour — and his/her emotions, because nobody would dare to offend the spirits of the dead. Therefore, the singing of the “*wosi milamala*” assures the community that there is a virtually transcendental regulative controlling its members’ behaviour and thus warding off developments that may turn out to be dangerous for the community.

The “*wosi milamala*” are also sung after the death of a Trobriander and during the first mourning ceremonies (see Weiner 1976; Senft 1985c).

The Trobrianders believe that the “*baloma*” of a dead person stays with his/her relatives for some days before it goes to Tuma Island. This eschatological “fact” is the only link between mourning ritual and harvest-festival. On the basis of this belief the functions of the “*wosi milamala*” in connection with the mourning ritual can be described and interpreted in the following way: The songs — especially those songs that describe the care-free “life” of the spirits of the dead in their Tuma “paradise” — may ease the “*baloma*”’s grief of parting; moreover, the songs should also console the bereaved, reminding them of the fact that dying is just a “rite of passage” (van Gennep 1909), a transition from one form of existence to another.

Referring to this common knowledge coded in the community’s religious superstructure, the songs sung in the “*Biga Baloma*”-variety contribute to channel and control emotions during the mourning ceremonies and to maintain the bonds between members of the community that is stricken with a case of death, because it permits a “distanced reenactment of situations of emotional distress” (Scheff 1977: 488; see also Senft 1985a: 136).

## 2.6 “*Biga Megwa*” — “*Language of Magic*”

This language variety is very similar to the “*Biga Tommwaya/Biga Baloma*”-variety. However, the variety of magic formulae not only encompasses archaic Kilivila words, syntactic constructions, and shades of meaning, but also so-called “magic words” and loan words from other Austronesian languages (see Malinowski 1935 II; Senft 1985b). This variety is highly situation-dependent, of course, very onomatopoeic and metaphoric. It is the most important part of the socially so eminent role of magic in Trobriand life.

The Trobriand Islanders still believe in the power of the magical word; they use magic as a means to reach certain aims and to control nature. They distinguish between “black magic” that causes illness or even death, beauty- and love-magic, magic that is used in building canoes, safety magic against witches and sharks, garden magic, and weather magic.<sup>11</sup>

The clear structure and the use of special figures of speech do not only mark these texts as something extraordinary, they also guarantee the learnability and the stereotypical reproduction of the memorized formulae.

Someone who recites a magical formula appeals to his/her addressee — be it person, animal, plant, or natural and supernatural phenomenon — in a very direct manner. With the help of magic the magician attempts to force his/her will on his/her addressee — even far-reaching requests are expressed verbally without any moderation. In connection with the discussion of the “*Biga pe’ula*”-variety we emphasized that such a verbal behaviour may have fatal consequences. With the use of the “*Biga Megwa*”-variety, however, the situation is different. The explicit stylistic marking of the magical formulae as something extraordinary is a means to signal the addressee that these speech acts will — and must — put a great strain on the communicative interaction. Thus, the formal characteristics of the formulae serve the function of a pronounced signal: By the means of the formal verbal domain the licence to strain the communicative interaction in the verbal domain with regard to the contents is sought. The “*Biga Megwa*” concept, then, utilizes this licence to ward off any possible consequences of the strains that affect the communicative interaction which takes place in the magic rites — according to the Trobriander’s conviction, of course.

### 2.7 “*Biga Tapwaroro*” — “*Language of the Church*”

This variety of Kilivila is only used in church. When the Overseas Missions Department of the Methodist Church commenced work in the Trobriand Islands in 1894, its headquarters was established in Kavataria on Kiriwina Island. Thus this variety is heavily based on the language variety spoken in Kavataria and its neighbouring village Oyabia; it shows traces of archaic language and it has borrowed quite a number of loan words from Dobu language, because the Methodists started their missionary work in Milne Bay on Dobu Island and used Dobu language as their lingua franca in the area (Dutton, personal communication).

I do not want to discuss this situational-intentional variety in more detail here; I have only mentioned it for the sake of completeness.

## 2.8 *Summary*

This section has overviewed the seven types of situational-intentional varieties in Kilivila language; with the most important of these varieties the emphasis of the discussion was put on their specific communicative functions.

But what about the general function of these varieties that are obviously quite important for the Kilivila speech community? In the following section I attempt to answer this question.

### **3. The general function of situational-intentional varieties: The concept of “ritual communication”**

Every speaker of a natural language must learn the rules of the nonverbal and the verbal communicative behaviour that are valid for his/her speech community.<sup>12</sup> In the course of this learning process one of the most important objectives is to understand and to duplicate the construction of the speech community’s common social reality.<sup>13</sup> During this learning process, verbal and nonverbal patterns and modes of behaviour must be coordinated and harmonized, too.

The thus duplicated social construction of reality must be safeguarded and secured especially with respect to possible “sites of fracture” like cooperation, conflict, and competition within the community. The safeguarding of the duplicated social construction of reality is warranted by the ritualization of verbal and nonverbal communication. The ritualization of communication relieves the tension in critical social situations and regulates social differences and dissensions

- by the increasing of the harmonizing functions of speech,
- by the creation and stabilization of social relations, and
- by the distancing of emotions, impulses, and intentions (see Callan 1970: 80ff.; Hartmann 1973: 137ff.).

Thus, the ritualization of communication increases the predictability of human behaviour; moreover, it also opens room and space where behaviour can be tried out — playfully — without any fear of possible social sanctions.

Therefore, we can define “ritual communication” as a type of strategic action, that serves the functions of social bonding and of blocking aggression, and that can ban elements of danger which may affect the community’s social harmony within the verbal domain just by verbalizing these elements of danger and by bringing them up for discussion.

Our overview of the situational-intentional varieties and their specific function in the previous chapter has shown that these varieties of Kilivila in general serve the functions as they are expressed by this concept of “ritual communication.”<sup>14</sup>

There is no metalinguistic expression in Kilivila that can be compared with our — etic — concept of “ritual communication,” indeed. However, it is evident that all the forms and functions of the concept that we, from the etic point of view, call “ritual communication” are specially marked in Kilivila, too. This marking of texts and of communicative situations as something special as well as the respective metalinguistic reflections are codified in the Kilivila lexicon. Therefore, it seems to be quite legitimate to conclude that the considerations that are the basis for the etic concept of “ritual communication” have their emic equivalents; they are expressed in the meta-linguistic knowledge and in the situationally and intentionally adequate linguistic behaviour of Kilivila native speakers.

Thus, we have come back again to Malinowski’s considerations in connection with “The Problem of Meaning in Primitive Languages.” I hope that this paper could help to support Malinowski’s ideas about the nature of meaning by going back to his ethnographic sources. Moreover, I hope that these prolegomena presented in the discussion of the situational-intentional varieties in Kilivila and their function in ritualizing communication could elucidate that these varieties and their general social function must be considered in detail with respect to the pragmatics of the language of the Trobriand Islanders.

## NOTES

- \* This paper is based on the results of 15 months of field-research on the Trobriand Islands in Papua New Guinea. I want to thank the “Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft” (“German Research Society”) for financing the project “Ritual Communication on the Trobriand Islands” (Ei-24/10-1). I am also very much indebted to I. Eibl-Eibesfeldt and to my colleagues at the “Forschungsstelle für Humanethologie in der MPG” (Research Unit for Human Ethology within the Max-Planck-Society, Seewiesen) for their support in realiz-

ing this project. I want to thank the National and Provincial Governments in PNG and the IPNGS for their assistance with, and permission for, our research project. Last but by no means least I want to thank the people of the Trobriand Islands, especially the inhabitants of Tauwema, for their hospitality, friendship, and patient cooperation. Without their help writing this paper would have been impossible. I owe Bob Deutsch thanks for having corrected what the author supposed to be English.

1. I refer the reader who may be interested in the local varieties and/or in the socially stratifying and stratified varieties to Senft 1986a: 6-10, 126-129.
2. All definitions of the varieties were first given in Senft 1986a: 124ff. I want to emphasize here once more that I am dealing with speakers' categories and *not* with analyzer's categories!
3. With respect to Trobriand society see e.g.: Malinowski 1929, 1935; Powell 1957, 1969a&b; Weiner 1976, 1977, 1983.
4. This kind of situational-intentional variety is also to be found in other cultures of PNG and probably all over Melanesia (see Strathern 1975; Parkin 1984; Senft 1985d; Watson-Gegeo 1986). With respect to the concept "*sopa*" see Arndt and Janney n.d.: 129:

"In situations where the speaker experiences high levels of uncertainty, i.e., where he is unsure about whether he can predict his partner's behavior, he tends to modify his own behavior so as to minimize the possible risks."

232:

"When levels of uncertainty are high, people become uncertain about how to behave appropriately. Given this problem, they naturally tend to behave as unspecifically as possible, in a sense acting as vaguely as the situation permits so as to be in a position to defend themselves from real or imagined attacks with the excuse that they have not meant what their partners think they meant."

5. The "*mweki*" is the male bachelor's dance, danced at the beginning of the harvest festival, accompanied by songs with rather blunt sexual allusions. "*-mweki-*" is a verbal expression that can be translated as "to move to and fro, to move up and down." To give an example of these songs:  
*Yakamesi kabutumala —*  
*layayosa o takekaya Boveyaga.*  
*Lekakemasi Boveyaga.*  
*Lekakemasi Boveyaga.*  
 "We — the bachelors —  
 we have here on our table Boveyaga.  
 She is fucking with us, Boveyaga  
 She is fucking with us, Boveyaga."  
 As to jokes, see Senft 1985d, e.
6. That nursery rhymes similar to the Trobriand ones are to be found in our society, too, is documented — at least for German children — in Rühmkorf (1967) and Bornemann (1973, 1974).
7. To give an example: After the first 8 weeks of my staying in their village, the Tauwemians were not satisfied with the progress I made with respect to my acquisition of Kilivila. Thus they invented the following song — my "*butugu*" — an incentive to try even harder, indeed:

*Gunter, Gunter — tokabitam.*

*Tolela Germany.*

*Gala anukwali la biga.*

“Gunter, Gunter — clever man.

He comes from Germany.

I do not speak (know) his language.”

Songs like this are quite effective, especially if one strolls through a village accompanied by a bunch of children singing one’s “*butula*.”

8. How this is done is illustrated in Senft: In press, and in Senft 1986b. See also Weiner 1983.
9. I could only document the use of this variety twice, and I only experienced the use of this variety — and its explicit marking, or course — in a discussion between the chief of Kaduwaga, Katubai, and me. For a discussion of this concept in relation with magic see Weiner 1983; a critical discussion of Weiner’s 1983 paper is given in Senft 1985b, Erratum.
10. To give an example of these songs:  
*Bakasirasi vaponu,*  
*bakavamapusi vana,*  
*bakavagonusi buita.*  
 “We surmount the waves,  
 we exchange herbs,  
 we pick the wreath.”
11. Examples of these formulae are given in Malinowski 1922, 1935; Senft 1985b, 1986a: 135-137.
12. For a discussion of the concept “speech community” see Senft 1982, Appendix 80ff.
13. This implies a dissociation of one’s group from other groups on the basis of one’s common social reality, too.
14. The formulation of this concept is based on discussions with I. Bell-Krannhals, I. Eibl-Eibesfeldt, K. Grammer, V. Heesch, W. Schiefenhövel, and B. Senft. I would like to thank them for all their critical remarks. With respect to the concept of “ritual communication” see: Eibl-Eibesfeldt 1979, 1984; Eibl-Eibesfeldt and Senft n.d.; Hartmann 1973; Heesch 1985; Keesing 1981: 342ff.; Senft 1987; Werlen 1984.

In the PRAGMATICS AND BEYOND NEW SERIES the following titles have been published and will be published during 1991:

1. WALTER, Bettyruth: *The Jury Summation as Speech Genre: An Ethnographic Study of What it Means to Those who Use it*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1988.
2. BARTON, Ellen: *Nonsentential Constituents: A Theory of Grammatical Structure and Pragmatic Interpretation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1990.
3. OLEKSY, Wieslaw (ed.): *Contrastive Pragmatics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1989.
4. RAFFLER-ENGEL, Walburga von (ed.): *Doctor-Patient Interaction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1989.
5. THELIN, Nils B. (ed.): *Verbal Aspect in Discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1990.
6. VERSCHUEREN, Jef (ed.): *Selected Papers from the 1987 International Pragmatics Conference. Vol. I: Pragmatics at Issue. Vol. II: Levels of Linguistic Adaptation. Vol. III: The Pragmatics of Intercultural and International Communication (ed. with Jan Blommaert)*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1991.
7. LINDENFELD, Jacqueline: *Speech and Sociability at French Urban Market Places*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1990.
8. YOUNG, Lynne: *Language as Behaviour, Language as Code: A Study of Academic English*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1990.
9. LUKE, Kang-Kwong: *Utterance Particles in Cantonese Conversation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1990.
10. MURRAY, Denise E.: *Conversation for Action. The computer terminal as medium of communication*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, n.y.p.
11. LUONG, Hy V.: *Discursive Practices and Linguistic Meanings. The Vietnamese system of person reference*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1990.
12. ABRAHAM, Werner (ed.): *Discourse Particles. Descriptive and theoretical investigations on the logical, syntactic and pragmatic properties of discourse particles in German*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1991.
13. NUYTS, Jan, A. Machtelt BOLKESTEIN and Co VET (eds): *Layers and Levels of Representation in Language Theory: a functional view*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1990.
14. SCHWARTZ, Ursula: *Young Children's Dyadic Pretend Play*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1991.
15. KOMTER, Martha: *Conflict and Cooperation in Job Interviews*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, n.y.p.
16. MANN, William C. and Sandra A. THOMPSON (eds): *Discourse Description: Diverse Linguistic Analyses of a Fund-Raising Text*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, n.y.p.
17. PIÉRAUT-LE BONNIEC, Gilberte and Marlene DOLITSKY (eds): *Language Bases ... Discourse Bases*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1991.
18. JOHNSTONE, Barbara: *Repetition in Arabic Discourse. Paradigms, syntagms and the ecology of language*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1991. n.y.p.
19. BAKER, Carolyn D. and Allan LUKE (eds): *Towards a Critical Sociology of Reading Pedagogy. Papers of the XII World Congress on Reading*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1991.