this site is similar to the ancient Basket Maker cereal and is still grown by the modern Pima and Papago. On the other hand, the maize grown in the Pueblo area today is very different from the early Basket Maker type, and is the product of modification due to the continual introduction of new genetic strains. It logically follows these new genetic strains did not pass through the Hohokam area and may have been introduced through north-central Mexico. The existence of two major routes for diffusion of high cultural traits from Mexico into the southwest may explain why the Puebloan ceremonial and material complex differs so strikingly from the Hohokam.

The "Fusion Period" which followed was characterized by a contraction of the area occupied by the sedentary peoples. This resulted in heightened contact and many technical improvements. However, it seemed to have been a period of stress correlated with a long drought, arroyo cutting and perhaps a growing pressure of nomadic tribes. Several favorable areas were abandoned during this period. The Fusion Period ended with the coming of the Spaniards and the beginning of the "Historic Period" in the American southwest.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
MADISON, WISCONSIN

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BREW, J. O., 1946, Archeology of Alkali Ridge, Southeastern Utah. *Papers of the Peabody Museum, Harvard University*, Vol. 21.

GLADWIN, H. S., 1948, Excavations at Snaketown IV. Reviews and Conclusions. *Medallion Papers* No. 38, Gila Pueblo, Globe, Arizona.

HAURY, E. W., 1936, The Mogollon Culture of Southwestern New Mexico. *Medallion Papers* No. 20, Gila Pueblo, Globe, Arizona.

———, 1945, The Problem of Contacts Between the Southwestern United States and Mexico. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, Vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 55–74.

———, 1950, *The Stratigraphy and Archeology of Ventana Cave, Arizona.*

KELLY, I., 1943, West Mexico and the Hohokam. *Sociedad Mexicana de Anthropologia. Tercera Reunion de Mesa Redondo.* Mexico, D. F.

KIDDER, A. V., 1927, Southwestern Archeological Conference. *El Palacio*, Vol. 23, no. 22, Nov. 26, 1927, pp. 554–561.

KLUCKHOHN, C. K. M., AND W. H. KELLY, 1945, The Concept of Culture. *The Science of Man in the World Crisis*, ed. by R. Linton, pp. 78–106.

MCGREGOR, J. C., 1941, *Southwestern Archeology.*

MANGELSDORF, P. H., AND E. SMITH, 1949, New Archeological Evidence of Evolution in Maize. *Botanical Museum Leaflets, Harvard University.*

MARTIN, P. S., 1943, The SU Site—Excavations at a Mogollon Village, Western New Mexico. Second Season 1941. *Anthropological Series, Field Museum of Natural History*, Vol. 32, No. 2.

REED, E. K., 1950, Eastern-Central Arizona Archeology in Relation to the Western Pueblos. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, Vol. 6, No. 2, Summer 1950, pp. 120–138.

ROBERTS, F. H. H., 1937, Archeology in the Southwest. *American Antiquity*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 3–33.

SAYLES, E. B., AND E. ANTEVS, 1941, The Cochise Culture. *The Medallion Papers, No. 29, Gila Pueblo*, Globe, Arizona.

TYLOR, E. B., 1898, *Anthropology*

WORMINGTON, H. M., 1949, Ancient Man in North America. *The Denver Museum of Natural History Popular Series*, No. 4, Third Edition.

RESPECT BEHAVIOR ON PONAPE: AN ETHNOLINGUISTIC STUDY[1]

By PAUL L. GARVIN and S. H. RIESENBERG

THIS paper is concerned with describing verbal and nonverbal patterns of respect in Ponapean culture, and with pointing out some of the significant parallels between the two, as well as showing the functional integration of verbal patterns into the basic framework of nonverbal culture.

The natives of Ponape are organized into more than twenty matrilineal, totemic, and exogamous clans. The island is divided into five independent tribes, often called districts in the literature: Kiti, Sokehs, Net, Uh, and Madolenihm.[2] In each of these there are two lines of chiefs, headed respectively by officials called Nahnmwarrki and Nahnken. Each is organized on a feudal basis, being subdivided into a number of sections whose heads are appointed by, and formerly held their posts under, the principal tribal chiefs. Most of the sections are organized similarly to the tribes, with their own lines of titles; they are further subdivided into farmsteads, occupied by separate

[1] The high volcanic island of Ponape lies in the eastern Caroline Islands. The main island of Ponape, together with a number of basaltic, alluvial, and artificial islands in the lagoon and some coral islets in the encircling reef, has an area of about 129 square miles. The population numbered in 1947 approximately 5,700, of whom about 1,200 persons were natives of other islands in the Carolines.

This paper is based on the results of the authors' participation in the Coordinated Investigation of Micronesian Anthropology, under the sponsorship of the Pacific Science Board of the National Research Council, June-December 1947 for Garvin, June 1947–January 1948 for Riesenberg. In addition to the sponsoring agency, many agencies of the U. S. Navy and other branches of the U. S. Government extended their support to make this research project possible, all of which is hereby gratefully acknowledged. The publication of this paper was in part made possible by a subsidy from Faculty Research Committee, which is likewise hereby gratefully acknowledged.

[2] In this paper, the recommendations of the ad-hoc Committee on Ponapean Orthography, George P. Murdock, Chairman, memorandum of August 4, 1948, are followed as regards the spelling, in the body of the text, of native names and terms commonly used in the ethnographic literature on Ponape. In all other cases, Garvin's transcription is followed for all the forms transcribed or retranscribed, by Garvin. A few forms collected by Riesenberg and unknown to Garvin are cited in the former's transcription and indicated by daggers (†); one or two forms cited after Hambruch, 1932–36, are indicated by double daggers (‡).

Garvin's phonemic symbols have the following values:

Vowels: a, low vowel (cf. French *aller*); *ɔ*, mid-open back vowel ("open o," cf. French *mort*); *ɛ*, mid-open front vowel ("open e," cf. French *mère*); *o*, mid-closed back vowel ("closed o," cf. French *peau*); *e*, mid-closed front vowel ("open e," cf. French *été*); *u*, high back vowel (cf. *pool*); *i*, high front vowel (cf. *peel*); *ə*, indeterminate vowel (cf. second vowel in *paddock*). *Diacritics:* ˙ (raised dot), vowel length; ′ (acute accent), primary stress; ‵ (grave accent), secondary stress; ‿ (superscript arc), joining of several words run together in the same stress group. *Consonants: p*, voiceless lenis bilabial stop; *t*, voiceless lenis dental stop; *ṭ*, voiceless retroflex stop (as in some Indic dialects); *k*, voiceless lenis velar stop; *s*, dental sibilant; *m*, bilabial nasal; *n*, dental nasal; *ŋ*, velar nasal; *r*, tongue-trip trill; *l*, lateral; *w*, bilabial semi-vowel; *y*, palatal semi-vowel. For a statement of Ponapean Grammar, see Garvin, 1951a.

households. In theory all the land within a tribal area belonged ultimately to the Nahnmwarrki and Nahnken, who received regular tribute and whose rule was absolute; since 1912, when private deeds of land ownership were issued by the Germans, this has not been true.

The two lines of tribal chiefs are each composed of a similar series of titles which have a definite rank order. The first twelve titles are considered the most important, but the lists of titles collected include many more than twelve. These first twelve titles appertain to the twelve senior males of a particular sub-clan, the two ruling sub-clans being different in each of the five tribes and intermarrying exclusively. The holders of the highest titles in the Nahnmwarrki line (*pàli͡sówpeyti*) will be referred to as the A-line, those of the Nahnken line (*pàli͡nâ·nken*) as the B-line; the Nahnmwarrki may then be referred to as A1, the Nahnken as B1, and the ranked titles in the two lines as A2, A3, A4, . . . , and B2, B3, B4, ...[3] The two sub-clans which hold most of the titles are equated with the two lines; a man of another sub-clan or clan who holds a high title is, however, also a member of the nobility. Holders of lesser titles and of titles outside of the two series constitute a kind of minor nobility. All other persons are commoners.

Status within each of the clans is finely graded. The sub-clans of each clan are for the most part considered to be descended from a family of sisters, and are ranked according to the relative age of their ancestresses. Of the two clans which rule each tribe, only members of the highest sub-clans are normally eligible for high titles. Within the sub-clan each man is graded according to seniority of matrilineal descent, and titles are distributed roughly according to the same standard. Two men holding the same title in different tribes are not equal, for the five tribes are likewise graded. Nor are heads of sections on the same level, for some sections are superior to others. Within each commoner clan, grading also proceeds according to seniority, and section titles are awarded with some respect to such seniority. Thus no two men have precisely the same rank.

Status, however, does not always correspond strictly to position in the title series. In precontact days rank in terms of title was the primary determinant of social status and prestige; it is now one of the essential factors, along with elements of status and prestige arising from the acculturative situation, such as wealth, position with regard to the occupying power, education, position in the church, and the like.

In terms of aboriginal usage, the serial ranking of titles is not valid for some titles which fall outside the double series and which appear to be older than these and of priestly origin, and therefore are considered to be of high prestige value; this is also true of some of the section chief titles and of certain titles

[3] We here follow the useful method of notation found in Bascom, 1946, p. 54 ff. and passim.

relating to geographical areas which no longer function politically. Even within the title series, status does not always correspond strictly with position. The concept of *waw*, honor, is significant in this connection. Thus children born to men who later become Nahnmwarrki or Nahnken, known as *ɟíya·kɛpɛ*, have less *waw* and receive less deference than their younger brothers, *ɨpwi͡n͡po·͡n͡wârawar* (lit.: birth upon the ditch), who were born after their father's accession to these high titles; the latter sit in the highest position in the community house, above the *ɟíya·kɛpɛ*, who, however, receive higher titles because of their seniority by birth.

Interpersonal behavior on Ponape is characterized by differences in attitude in terms of status and prestige. Attitudes with regard to rank, that is, title, are more clearly defined and more definitely formalized than those contingent upon other determinants of status. The basic distinction is between attitudes toward superiors in title and respected equals on one hand, and attitudes toward familiar equals and inferiors in title on the other. The former are characterized by more or less clearly defined demonstrations of respect, the latter by their absence. These differences in behavior exist on both the verbal and the nonverbal plane. On both planes, respect behavior is better defined, more elaborate, and more strictly mandatory on ceremonial occasions than in other cultural contexts. The verbal patterns emphasized in this paper are those followed in everyday life; nonverbal patterns are described in both ceremonial and nonceremonial contexts.

Patterns of verbal respect are often conveniently referred to as honorific speech; hence, the basic distinction in terms of verbal behavior is that of honorific versus non honorific or "common" speech. Honorific speech is in turn often differentiated into respect honorific, used with any higher titles up to and not including the two highest, and with respected equals, including foreigners who are obviously outside of the rank scale; and what may be called royal honorific, used with the two highest tribal titles. Honorific speech, especially to royalty, is used not only in addressing superiors, but in any act of speech in their immediate presence. The use of royal honorifics is mandatory in speaking also *of* the two highest titles even in their absence. Royal personages themselves, on the other hand, do not employ royal honorifics, but in public, at least, use respect honorifics in speaking to each other, employing common speech to inferiors.

Native terminology differentiates honorific usage in terms of social situations rather than grammatical pattern: respect honorific speech is *lòkaya͡n͡méyŋ*, speech of gentlemen; royal honorific speech is either *lòkaya͡n͡pàɟo·ŋ͡sówpeyti*, speech of talking-to Sowpeyti (highest chiefs), or *lokàya͡n͡impɛ̀͡n͡sówpeyti*, speech of in-the-presence of Sowpeyti.[4]

[4] This classification is in accord with data obtained by Garvin; somewhat different is a classification obtained by Riesenberg and based on words signifying motion. Hambruch, 1932–36,

PATTERNS OF VERBAL RESPECT

Honorific speech on both levels consists in the use of a series of honorific morphemes which differ semantically, but not distributionally, from other morphemes[5] in the language, and fall into various classes of morphemes and morpheme clusters with the latter. Honorific person markers are integrated into the general person marker system, other honorifics fall into various less specialized morpheme classes and form parts of or constitute standard-type phrases. Of the latter, a few are sufficiently generalized semantically to be considered honorific empty stems[6] and honorific classifiers; the rest form a separate lexical stratum and can be grouped together as honorific vocabulary.

In addition, there is a series of terms of address corresponding to the various titles. These do, however, not follow the dichotomies of honorific speech as outlined above, but are rather applied according to the structuring of title in the various tribes. Although they therefore do not properly form part of honorific speech as defined above, we include in this section a short discussion of them following the analysis of honorific speech proper.

1. *Honorific person markers.* Honorific person markers are used in addressing single persons; in plural and dual situations, common (nonhonorific) markers are used in all cases.

Respect honorific person markers are a separate series of morpheme clusters characterized by the honorific number indicator -i,[7] preceded by second person indicator and appropriate type indicator (subject-object or possessive): *kó-mw-i*, you; *ó·-mw-i*, *nów-mw-i*, *-o-mw-i-*, yours.

Royal honorific person markers, on the other hand, are phonemically identical with the shortened and porte-manteau[8] third person plural-dual person marker series: *i·-r*, you; *a·-r*, *-a-r*, your; M *rɛ*, K *re*, you.[9] It may be better to say that these third person markers are used as royal honorifics. This usage may then be interpreted as a symbolic removal of the highest chief from the speaker-hearer relationship in the speech situation by the use of the third person. Parallel respect by avoidance is shown the Nahnmwarrki in a number of nonverbal patterns.[10] It may be reasoned that respect by avoidance—which on the nonverbal plane primarily affects Nahnmwarrki—on the verbal plane is extended to include, in a weakened, symbolic, form, both highest chiefs.

The feature of plurality in the royal honorific person markers has a parallel in the use of the immediate pluralizer *-ka*[11] in the set expressions *mó· = n = sapw-aka*, sirs (lit.: those ahead of the land), *isó·-ka*, sirs, used in greeting or thanking *either one* of the highest chiefs; *ka-sɛlè·l-ya‿mó· = n = sapw-aka* good day, my lord; *kalâyan‿ɛn‿mó· = n = sapw-aka*, thank you, my lord (lit.: grace of sirs); and in the greeting to the Nahnken *ka-sɛlè·l-ya‿isó·-ka*, good day, my lord; reported in Hambruch.

2. *Honorific empty stems.* These are empty verb stems[12] marking either an attitude of respect on the part of the speaker toward others (honorific), or an attitude of humility of the speaker about himself and his group (humiliative). Honorific empty stems are used in addressing, or speaking of, higher—includ-

vol. II, p. 363, gives a similar classification of four levels of speech: *kâʃilo* speech, used in speaking with the highest chiefs, e.g., A1–A4; ‡*apeto* speech, used with lower chiefs, e.g., A5–A7; *kó·to*, used in speech with freemen; and *ʃâyato*, used in speech with commoners; Hambruch does not, however, indicate that these words signify "to come." Riesenberg verified this terminology from two sources: Joseph Iriarte, Nahnken of Net, told him that titles A1 to A7 and B1 to B5 as well as priestly titles (prefix *saw-*) are *kâʃilo* in Net, chiefs from A8 and B6 down are ‡*apeto*, and commoners are *kó·to;* and the Nahnken of Madolenihm said A1–A8 and B1–B8 are *kâʃilo*, lower titles are ‡*apeto*. It appears that the Hambruch classification, as confirmed by Riesenberg, represents a somewhat archaic type of usage. More recent usage in regard to verbs of motion is discussed further below.

[5] Linguistic terminology in this paper is identical, or correlated, with that used in Garvin, 1951a. Ponapean grammar is there treated on three levels of integration: morphology, dealing with the functioning of morphemes within words; phraseology, dealing with the functioning of words within phrases; and syntax, dealing with the functioning of phrases within sentences. In the morphology are also treated morpheme clusters, that is, sequences of morphemes that function within words in the same manner as single morphemes. The phraseology deals primarily with standard-type phrases, that is, the more common types of phrases in the language. The treatment of syntax is of little importance for the present paper.

Morpheme classes (some of them including morpheme clusters as well) that are important for the purpose of this paper are person markers which serve to denote person with the verb and possession with the noun, and classifiers which are morphemes used in conjunction with nouns denoting various classes of objects, such as elongated objects, round objects, food, and the like.

The most important type of phrase in the structure of honorific speech is the hypotactic phrase, which in general consists in a verb subordinated to a verb, or a noun subordinated to a noun. The first element, the *dominant*, is linked to the second element, the *subordinate*, by the hypotactic particle M *ɛn* K *en* (see fn. 9). Hypotactic phrases translate into English as _____ to _____ if they contain verbs, _____ of _____ if they contain nouns.

[6] The term "empty stem" is here used to designate a verb or noun stem with no definite lexical meaning.

[7] Indicators are the component parts of a person marker morpheme cluster, denoting number (plural, dual, honorific), person (first, second, third), and type (subject-object, possessive, noun-like) respectively. Person markers are either pronouns, that is, separate words, or noun suffixes; in the latter case, the form is quoted with a preceding hyphen.

[8] The term porte-manteau is here used for a single form that stands for two or more morphemes: the single form M *re*, K *rɛ* (see fn. 9) stands for the two morphemes type indicator *i-* and person indicator *-r-* (see fn. 7). An example of a porte-manteau morpheme in a better known language is the form /o/ (written *au*) in French, which stands for both the preposition *à* and the article *le*, and yet cannot be subdivided into further linear components.

[9] The abbreviations M, K before forms quoted in this section refer to the major dialectal divisions on Ponape: M for main dialect, spoken in the tribes of Sokehs, Net, Uh, and Madolenihm; K for Kiti dialect, spoken in the tribe of that name.

[10] For details of this see the following section.

[11] This is one of a series of morphemes used to mark plurals in Ponapean nouns; it is termed immediate pluralizer, because in addition to denoting plurality it also has a local connotation of closeness, as opposed to remoteness in the morpheme termed remote pluralizer.

[12] See fn. 6.

ing the highest—titles; humiliative empty stems are used in speaking of others—including the speaker—in the presence of optionally higher, mandatorily the highest, titles.

The honorific empty stem is *kaţ*, with sandhi alternant[13] *kaţi-;* the humiliative empty stems are *pâţo·* with sandhi alternant *paţo·w-*, and *paţó·wan. kaţ* and *pâţo·* are used as stems for verbs denoting states of body; semantic specialization occurs by means of suffixes or reduplication: *kâţi-to* (hon.), *paţó·to* (hum.) come, *kâţi-la* (hon.), *paţó·-la* (hum.) go, *kâţikaţ*, (hon.) *pàţopâţo·* (hum.) stay. *paţó·wan* is used by itself as a generalized verb of sensory perception and mental state, before suffixes it serves as a stem for verbs of transitive motion that are semantically specialized by suffixes: M *i⁀sò·-ţɛ⁀paţó·wan*, I don't know, think, see, hear (hum.); *pàţo·wán-to* bring (hum.), *pâţo·wâl-la* take-there (hum.)

Both *kaţi-* and *paţo·w-* occur as determinants of hypotactic action phrases;[14] in these phrases, the subordinate verb serves as carrier of the lexical denotation, and the determinant gives it the required honorific connotation; M *rɛ⁀kàţi⁀n⁀kâţi-la*, you are going-there (royal hon.), M *i⁀pìl⁀paţò·w⁀ɛn⁀róŋ*, I also heard (hum.). Hypotactic phrases with honorific determinant are often used with honorific vocabulary as subordinates;[15] equally often, hypotactic phrases with honorific determinant and common subordinate are used where no suitable honorific vocabulary item is available, or where the speaker does not know the correct item.

3. *Honorific classifiers.*[16] Two nouns, *ţúŋol*, empty noun stem,[17] and *sak* Nahnken's (and some other titles') feast food, are in nonceremonial situations used as humiliative and respect honorific possessive classifiers respectively for nouns denoting food: *ţúŋol* is then preceded by *n*-initial possessive pronouns,[18] *sak* followed by possessive suffixes: M *nɛy⁀ţùŋol⁀pwí·k*, my pig (hum.) M *sak-ò-mw-i⁀kis⁀in⁀mwóyɛ*, your (bit of) food. It is interesting to note that the level of respect differs for the use of *sak* as a noun on ceremonial occasions, and its use as a possessive classifier in other culture situations.

Another honorific classifier followed by either respect or royal honorific possessive suffixes is *sapwillim-*; this classifier occurs in contexts where in common speech *n*-initial possessive pronouns are called for: M *nɛy⁀séri*, my child, *sapwìllim-ɔ-mw-i⁀séri*, your child (hon.).

In ceremonial situations, the following pattern is followed:

Food and everything connected with food, when the Nahnmwarrki is concerned, are spoken of as *kónoţ;* in relation to the Nahnken, they are *sak*. These terms are applied to the persons themselves as well as to the articles: the Nahnmwarrki himself is *kónoţ*, the Nahnken *sak*. Everything else belonging to both Nahnmwarrki and Nahnken is *sapwíllim*. When the Nahnmwarrki is present at a feast, the food of everyone else is *ţúŋol* except that of the Nahnken, which remains *sak*. If the Nahnmwarrki is absent, the second chief in his line, A2, takes his place but is then *sak;* and if A4 is the highest of his line present he too becomes *sak;* but if the A3 is the highest chief of the A-line at the feast he is *kónoţ*. No satisfactory explanation could be obtained for making A3 but not A2 *kónoţ*. In each case lower chiefs in both lines are *ţúŋol*, while the Nahnken remains *sak*. But A5 or holders of lower titles in the A-line remain *ţúŋol* even if they are the senior A-line chiefs present. If the Nahnken is absent, the B2 takes his place and becomes *sak*, and lower titles in both lines remain *ţúŋol;* but if B3 or lower is the senior B chief present he remains *ţúŋol*.

When title-holders below A4 and B2 are at home or at a section meeting and no men senior to them are present, they may be called *sak*. Among commoners, in the absence of chiefs, the term *kaŋ* is used for food. Some informants extended the use of the term *sak* as far as A12 and B12 as well as to a number of titles not in the A and B series, making those below *ţúŋol;* but perhaps they were thinking of other occasions than feasts in the community house, when strict usage is required.

Besides the Nahnmwarrki and A3 certain title-holders outside the two series are *kónoţ*. Most of these titles are ancient priestly ones, though certain other priestly titles are found to be *sak*. Unlike the case of the A3, these *kónoţ* titles remain *kónoţ*, regardless of presence or absence of the Nahnmwarrki. When a man holds two titles, one of them *sak*, the other *kónoţ*, he is considered as *kónoţ* on feast occasions.

Wives of all men who are *kónoţ* are ‡*pweniu*, wives of men who are *sak* are also *sak*.

There are some variations in this pattern from tribe to tribe.

Men entitled to *kónoţ* formerly received the largest shares in the distribution of food at feasts. Some of these titles have sunk in importance: the present *sáwko·ŋ* of Net, a title in neither line but with the right of *kónoţ*, refused at the time the title was offered him to accept it unless he was accorded *sak* only; he felt that since his share of food would be small, *kónoţ* would be an empty honor and a mockery.

4. *Honorific vocabulary*. Under the heading of honorific vocabulary are included a large number of items which are differentiated for common speech and honorific speech of one or both levels of respect. Honorific vocabulary items are both verbal and nominal; the latter may include both single nouns and nominal phrases. In most cases, a threefold differentiation is made between common, respect honorific, and royal honorific. Other cases, however,

[13] Sandhi alternants are variant forms of morphemes used in sandhi, that is, in cases where modifications in their phonemic shape are conditioned by the immediate vicinity of certain types of other morphemes.

[14] Hypotactic action phrases are hypotactic phrases containing verbs; see fn. 5.

[15] See section 4, below. [16] See fn. 5. [17] See fn. 6.

[18] Ponapean has two series of possessive pronouns, with initial vowel and initial *n* respectively, each used with a different set of nouns.

show the same item for both common and respect honorific, and a different item for royal honorific; still others show one item each for common and honorifics of either level. Semantically, honorific vocabulary includes primarily names of body parts and verbs marking states of body and bodily activities, but also a number of other items that can be checked in the appended honorific glossary. Their use is mandatory in polite discourse.

Differences in the vocabulary of various levels of respect consist mainly in the use of different lexical items; in addition, a number of royal honorific vocabulary items show recurrent morphemes which appear to be culturally significant.

One of these recurrent morphemes is the honorific suffix *-isoˑ*, in sandhi[19] after vowels *-ysoˑ*. This suffix is identical with the honorific prefix *isoˑ-* used in appellatives for a number of higher tribal titles, as may be seen in section 5 below. As a suffix, *-isoˑ∼-ysoˑ* has been found with the following royal honorifics: (all forms are M) *limɛ̂-ysoˑ*, arm; *kɛrɛ̂-isoˑ*, bathing place; *kupúr-isoˑ*, chest, breast; *rɛrɛ̂-isoˑ*, cane, *lɔˈk-isoˑ*, footbath water; *kərɛ̂mwɔl-isoˑ*, joy; *rɔˑ-páp-isoˑ*, litter; *rèrr⌒inˑ⌒pɛ̂-iso*, pillow; *mwɔlɛ̂-isoˑ*, sitting place. Of these *limɛ̂-yso*, arm, *kupúr-iso*, chest, breast, *mwɔlɛ̂-iso*, sitting place, appear to be formed by adding the royal honorific suffix *-isoˑ∼-ysoˑ* to the respect honorific lexeme.[20] *rɔˑ-páp-isoˑ*, litter, is formed by adding the royal honorific suffix to a geminate stem,[21] the first part of which appears to be the common-respect honorific lexeme *rɔˑ*, litter. The second morpheme of the compound, *pap*, occurs also as part of the compound *kɛlɛ-páp-isoˑ*, A1 and B1's room in feast house, as in section 3, above; it may perhaps be identified to mean high chief's seat.

The other recurrent morpheme in royal honorific vocabulary is the noun *ləŋ*, heaven, sky, which occurs as the subordinate of a number of hypotactic noun phrases,[22] all of which appear to be compound-type descriptive phrases: *ur⌒ɛ̂l⌒ləŋ*, blanket (lit.: cover (?) of heaven); *rèrr⌒in⌒ɪɛrɛ́ˑ⌒l⌒ləŋ*, eyelashes (lit.: lashes (?) of drowning of heaven); *rɛk⌒ɛ̂l⌒ləŋ*, finger (lit.: outrigger stanchion of heaven); *lɔk-pil⌒îl⌒ləŋ*, washing, bathing (lit.: washing-water of heaven).

The morpheme *ləŋ* occurs particularly in the more esoteric and ritual aspects of behavior. For example, in the Madolenihm kava ritual, the kava leader calls out to the men who are bringing the hibiscus bast used to wring out the pounded kava root, *†koˑteyˑ⌒lɛ̂ŋ*, *†koˑteyˑ⌒mwáw*, come-of-heaven, come-of-good. One of the men who hold the cup to catch the kava as it is wrung out is called the *lɔˈŋpeyk*. When not in use the cups are kept in a *tów⌒ləŋ*, a split stick. If

[19] Cf. fn. 13.

[20] The term lexeme is here used to designate a morpheme with lexical meaning.

[21] Geminate stems are compounds formed of two stems of the same class, that is, two noun stems or two verb stems. The geminate stem listed here consists of two noun stems.

[22] See fn. 5.

during the pounding bits of kava root spray in the direction of the Nahnmwarrki this is called *ʧɪpɛr⌒ɛ́l⌒ləŋ*. The principal kava-pounding stone in Madolenihm is *upɛ̂y⌒ləŋ*, and one of the hand-mullers used on it is called *mɔlɛ̂y⌒ləŋ*.

This use of the morpheme *ləŋ*, sky, heaven, can well be considered to be a reference to the supernatural importance of the highest chiefs, examples of which follow below:

The failure to fulfill obligations due to a political superior or to neglect his prerogatives results in punishment, *riyála*, damnation, in the form of disease or other misfortune of supernatural origin. The mood of a chief, the headman of a sub-clan, or the senior male of a family, is considered to be always in harmony with the mood of his spiritual partner, who is an ancestral ghost, *áni*. Anger at neglect of observances of fealty is communicated to the ghost; even if the human partner is unaware of such neglect the ghost will know of it; and *riyála* befalls the offender or, commonly, his child. An ordinary ghost can visit *riyála* only upon his descendants; but the *áni* of a Nahnmwarrki is more than an ancestral ghost; he is a god, an *†aniwos*, and the founder of his clan, and as such he can punish anyone in the Nahnmwarriki's tribe. The supernatural sanctions surrounding a Nahnmwarrki's authority seem thus to spring from those which reinforce the authority of the head of a kinship unit; but just as the Nahnmwarrki's coercive powers transcend blood ties to include all persons in his realm, so his personal deity has powers beyond those of lesser spiritual beings. When it is only a family ghost who has been angered it may be propitiated directly by an appropriate ceremony; but when it is an *†aniwos*, the Nahnmwarrki must act as an intermediary, for he has more direct access to the spiritual world.

The character of the respect shown to the Nahnmwarrki is indicated by various deference patterns accorded without distinction to him and to spiritual figures. In the Nahnmwarrki's canoe one attendant formerly did not paddle but sat facing him in the same attitude of respect that, in the fishing canoe, one of the fishermen is supposed to exhibit facing the empty seat reserved for *nâˑnulap*, the fishing deity. Dead heroes of high rank are in the mythology not easily distinguished from gods. Difference in etiquette observed for commoners and for chiefs continues after death; a commoner is referred to after decease by a burial name prefixed by *nál⌒ləŋ*, in heaven, but a high chief's burial name always contains the stem *luˑk*, the name of a god; e.g., *lùˑk⌒ɛn⌒lɔˈŋ-sir* (*ləŋ*, heaven, *siˑr*, dart game), *lùˑk⌒ɛn⌒sóˑ-pur* Luhk of no-return (*i.e.*, died a hero's death in war). Both during the lifetime and after the death of a high chief his tribe formerly abandoned use of any word which contained or resembled his name. though not his title. When a new house is built no one may enter until the Nahnmwarrki or Nahnken has come and offered prayers, otherwise a *riyála* will befall the culprit.

Supernatural figures in prayers and mythology are in most cases addressed

by royal honorifics. Thus the goddess Ilake is addressed as *iso·*- (Hambruch, vol. II, p. 134); the gods *táwkaʇaw* and *nánsaƥwɛ* are asked to send food in the phrase *kaʇikì·to‿kónoʇ* (Hambruch, vol. II, p. 236). Food and drink of the gods is always *kónoʇ* for male deities, ‡*pweniu* for female deities (Hambruch, vol. II, pp. 134, 136, 236, 237, 324), and often for minor ghosts (II: 238).

In the person marker series, however, royal honorific forms are not used; thus *lù·k‿nánsapwɛ* is addressed as *kómwi* (II: 103), likewise *nánsapwɛ* (III: 347) and other divine figures (II: 134; III: 225; II: 82, 136, 175, 236, 237; III: 193). This may be interpreted as an indication of the non-inclusion of the deities in the pattern of "splendid isolation" of the Nahnmwarrki.

5. *Terms of address.* The holders of most of the older titles, that is, those prefixed *saw-* which seem to antedate the series prefixed *na·n-*, have a special title of address, *pɔwi* or *pɔ́'wio*. This term is identical with the term for spouse, and is said to refer to the bond between ruler and people.

The Nahnmwarrkis have additional titles, too. The Nahnmwarrki of Madolenihm, for instance, is addressed by the title *ísipaw;* the Nahnmwarrki of Uh also has the title of address of *sáŋaro* which is also the name of a god; in Sokehs the highest chief was addressed as *ìso·w-áni*, Lord ghost. All Nahnmwarrkis are likewise known as *wàsa‿lápalap*, important place, and as *mó· = n = sapw-aka*, sirs, (lit.: those ahead of the land), referring to the first fruits they receive, and various of them have one or more titles of reference in addition to that of Nahnmwarrki.

None of these terms is exactly equivalent to any other. In Madolenihm, *wàsa‿lápalap* is preferable to *ísipaw* as a form of direct address, while in Uh *sáŋaro* is preferred to *wàsa‿ lápalap*. *ìso·w-áni* was used in place of *ná·npwiʇak*[23] during a period of mourning for the deceased ruler of Sokehs, while during his life the latter term was ordinarily used. In direct address to a Nahnmwarrki, *wàsa‿lápalap* is usually used to attract his attention, *mó· = n = sapw-aka* during the speech which follows. *sáwkisa* is used in referring to the Nahnmwarrki of Kiti during food distribution at a feast, but in the part of Kiti known as *wɔ́'ne*, where the *sáwkisa* title originates, it is used on other occasions, too. In referring to the Kiti Nahnmwarrki's belongings, as when one observes his canoe passing or asks where his house is or refers to his wife, the proper term is *ró·sa;* this term is also used in address when his B-line relatives are present.

Forms of address are also used for lower titles. For the A2 the appellative is *ná·npwiʇak*, for the A3 it is *ná·niyaw*, for the A4, *ná·nno*. In Net, A5 and A6, according to one informant, A5 to A10 according to another, have the honorific form of address *isó·;* Madolenihm informants make this term applicable from A5 to A14.[24] A11 and a lower title, *sówmataw*, are in Net addressed as *sá·u*. B1 to B4 in most of the tribes are called *isó·*, but one Net informant gives B3 as *sá·u* and B5 as *lu·k*. These are all used for the sake of politeness, the proper titles theoretically being reserved for reference; but the distinctness between the two sets of titles is no longer always maintained.

Though the Nahnmwarrki in food distribution is everywhere considered *kónoʇ*, a term discussed above in section 3, some informants say this is only because of the additional, older titles which he possesses. Thus in Kiti the Nahnmwarrki title is said of itself to be *sak*, but its holder is *kónoʇ* because of his additional older titles of *sáwkisa* and *ró·sa*. The present A6 of Kiti because of his wealth and Westernization has been given the title *ró·sa*, which normally belongs to the Nahnmwarrki, and now he too is considered to be *kónoʇ* and is third in food distribution at feasts, following A1 and B1.

[23] *ná·npwiʇak* is the title of address of the *wása·y* (A2) who, for certain legendary reasons, was the highest chief in Sokehs, while no Nahnmwarrki (A1) existed.

[24] For the suffix *iso·*~*-yso·* in honorific vocabulary, see above, p. 208.

NONVERBAL PATTERNS OF RESPECT

Nonverbal patterns of deference on Ponape are primarily concerned with emphasizing the isolated position and social supremacy of the Nahnmwarrki and, in lesser degree, of other high chiefs.

This is graphically demonstrated in the seating arrangements during ceremonials in the community house. The building is arranged with low platforms on the two sides and a higher platform at the front; the Nahnmwarrki, Nahnken, their wives, and sometimes other high chiefs—details vary from tribe to tribe—sit on the high front platform facing the rest of the people on the side platforms and on the central ground-level area; the Nahnmwarrki's position is farthest to the front. No one, with certain exceptions, may sit or stand so that his head is higher than that of the Nahnmwarrki.

In passing a man of high rank a commoner must bend low, and he must crawl before a seated chief. If a man wishes to climb a tree near the house of a man of high title, he must first obtain permission from that man; and he must descend if a chief comes near.

Formerly it was taboo to touch the Nahnmwarrki on pain of death, especially his head or face, or even his skirt; though the penalty is nowadays void, the attitude of respect continues, as does belief in the sacredness of the head. A high chief was not to be awakened except by pulling the tuft of hair on his great toe, the part of his body farthest from his head. The personal attendants of high chiefs, who sit before the latter on the front platform, have the duty of enforcing the rule against standing with the head higher than the men they serve; formerly they might thrust an offender through with a spear; they and certain other men also see that no one uses common speech and that everyone speaks quietly. These attendants, *á·rir*, sit in a special posture, with head averted and bowed, and pass kava or other objects to their master in a special manner and without looking at his face; when the chief has drunk he thrusts the cup back, without looking at the attendant and paying no heed as to whether he is prepared to receive it.

This symbolic removal from direct contact with social inferiors is seen again

at propitiatory ceremonies, when the presence of the supplicant is completely ignored by the chief, who converses only with an intermediary who himself must be of high rank.

With certain exceptions, no one might enter the house of a Nahnmwarrki. Near the community house was formerly built a small chief's house, which served as a place of concealment for the Nahnmwarrki during meetings in the community house or while a feast was being prepared there; when all was made ready he would take his place on the main platform. Further aloofness was ensured in the community house by a small structure (*kɛlɛ-pâp-iso·*) on the main platform, with a wall two or three feet high, behind which the Nahnmwarrki and Nahnken sat; again the fiction was maintained of remoteness from the masses, however inadequate the actual concealment.

On the chief's canoe a little shelter was sometimes built on a special lee platform serving to hide him from the vulgar gaze. When the canoe in which a Nahnmwarrki or Nahnken travels reaches the bank, he alone may step ashore amidships; all others must leave from positions close to bow or stern. When a canoe approaches the shore close to where a high chief waits, it must not be under sail, and all passengers must remain seated until it touches land. Boatmen in a canoe meeting a chief's canoe make a wide detour and salute by slackening sail, to allow it to flutter, or lower sail entirely; one end or the other of the canoe, depending on the tribe, must be foremost; if the canoe is not under sail but being punted, the boat men take seats. Even today the canoe will remain halted until waved on by an attendant of the chief. A canoe, passing a chief's house, must likewise wait to be waved on; formerly this applied to pedestrians also, who had to sit in the path some distance away and wait for permission to go on, and then proceed in a bent posture.

As recently as 1925 commoners could not converse directly with a Nahnmwarrki, and to this day many commoners do not initiate conversation with a man of high title. Commoners employ a special tone in talking to chiefs, being careful to draw out vowel sounds. They are supposed to talk only in answer to direct questions, and then make the answer as short as possible. If a titled man begins a conversation with the customary greeting, a commoner should not respond as to an equal but avert his gaze and answer with a prolonged *e·y*. When a chief comes to a pause in what he is saying, the commoner interjects an *a·* in abject agreement.

A commoner may not eat at all with a Nahnmwarrki or Nahnken; if he eats or drinks with any other man of superior rank, he must partake slowly, so as not to be sated first. Remnants from a Nahmnwarrki's food or drink may not be consumed by commoners. A commoner could not touch a high chief's gourd or coconut-shell water bottle; today the prohibition applies to glass containers. If a man of high rank stops at an inferior's house, he must be given a full bottle to drink from. In the house of a host or in the community house

sennit must be tied around the neck of the bottle offered to a Nahnmwarrki, and twelve leaves of a type of citrus or of Campnosperma are tied to the side; four leaves must be used as a stopper. For a Nahnken only ten leaves are used.

Privileges of a Nahnmwarrki were once almost unbounded. He had sexual access to any woman he desired, married or not, and did not have to reckon with a husband's jealousy as a lesser man might. He could commit clan incest, even to taking a parallel cousin, which would have meant death to a commoner. It was forbidden even to joke at such behavior. Such arbitrary rights extended also to personal belongings and to land, which could be confiscated at the will of the Nahnmwarrki and redistributed to whomsoever he pleased.

A common practice of chiefs until recently was to throw stones when vexed for any cause; often it was done simply to impress the people with their lowly status, or because this was the kind of behavior expected of a chief. As soon as a man was promoted to Nahnmwarrki he might throw stones at the assembled people, and they would flee and return bearing kava, the traditional manner of propitiating an offense, though here symbolizing the social gulf now arising between them and their chief. At a feast of atonement it was considered proper conduct for the chief being appeased to throw stones. A certain Nahnken of Kiti is said to have carried a stone in each hand every time he entered the community house, and to have flung them at random among the assembled people; he considered this a form of elegance, incumbent upon a man in his position.

We have spoken of "certain exceptions" to these behavior patterns. These may be seen in both verbal and nonverbal habits of deference. The *serî·-so·*, a term used loosely but denoting essentially title-holders in the B-line; literally, noble children, have the position of fictitious children of the A title-holders. Actually, because of intermarriage between the two clans composing the A and B lines, men of each line were, prior to the time of mission influence, both fathers and sons of men of the other line. As ascribed sons of the men of A-title, the *serî·-so·* have a number of special privileges. Traditionally, they may violate all sorts of standards of behavior to which others must conform. They may sit or stand anywhere in the community house during feasts, in contrast to the commoners and the A-line, who have their fixed places. They need not bow when they pass the Nahnmwarrki. A *serî·-so·*, it is said, can always be recognized by his loud talking and his free demeanor; this is particularly true in the community house, but to some extent carries over into other situations. "They go about yelling and respect nobody." The head of the *serî·-so·* line, the Nahnken, who is regarded as the eldest son of the Nahnmwarrki, may take familiarities with his ascribed father permitted no one else. At a feast of propitiation given the Nahnmwarrki on behalf of some offender, should the Nahnmwarrki be recalcitrant in accepting the cup of kava which signalizes

his forgiveness, the Nahnken, who because of his more personal contact with them traditionally intercedes with the Nahnmwarrki on behalf of the people, might go so far as to violate the sacredness of the Nahnmwarrki's head by seizing it and forcing the draught down his throat. The Nahnken may take an impertinent tone in conversation with the Nahnmwarrki, using common speech. Cases are known where the Nahnken, on being struck by the Nahnmwarrki, has responded in kind.

The theory behind these behavior patterns is that the Nahnmwarrki is an indulgent "father" and permits his "sons" to take liberties that no one else may dare to take. Not so with the A-line; such men, though potential heirs to the Nahnmwarrki's position, must be meek and humble, for they have no fiction of being favored children to support any untoward behavior. On the other hand, though they may not act unconventionally and indecorously, men in the A-line are accorded some privileges toward B-line title-holders.

Thus, though only A2, A3, and A4 may enter the Nahnmwarrki's house, and no man with an A-title may enter his sleeping chamber, the Nahnken and lesser men in the B-line may enter both house and bedroom. Conversely, men in the Nahnmwarrki's line only may enter the Nahnken's house and bedroom. In the small chief's house near the community house only A2 might enter if the Nahnken was there alone, B2 if the Nahnmwarrki was there alone, but neither if both ranking chiefs were present; lower title-holders could remain outside and converse with the Nahnmwarrki, but not commoners.

The Nahnmwarrki's principal wife was not supposed to be seen by any man but her husband, except when she attended feasts, when she sat by her husband on the main platform of the community house. It was the clan-brethren of the Nahnmwarrki, which would include all men of A-title, who particularly might not look at her; they were required on signal to flee from the community house when she approached. This was not the case with the wife of a Nahnken or other high chief. Men of the A-line show particularly exaggerated respect to the Nahnmwarrki if they are in a canoe that passes his; formerly they had to jump out into the water and, holding to the gunwales, bow their heads. Clansmates of the Nahnken show similar deference toward him. In the community house, if it is necessary to fetch some object suspended from the rafters while the Nahnmwarrki is present, one the of highest *serî·-so·* chiefs (B1 to B4), or a son of a member of the sub-clan to which the Nahnmwarrki belongs, or the *mwarrkî·‿ɟik*—who, though having a low title in the A-line, is also considered to be the Nahnmwarrki's son—must climb up to get it; no one else may raise his head this high.

When the Nahnmwarrki sits on the main platform all men of the A-line except those whose duties require them to be elsewhere must be in the central ground-level area at work on the stone ovens or pounding kava. Certain officials at feasts, such as the men who call out stages in the kava pounding

and in the distribution of the food, have duties which require them to stand on the main platform, but these officials must be of the B-line. Only members of the B-line may speak at length to the Nahnmwarrki, and only members of the A-line to the Nahnken. The prohibition against touching leavings from a Nahnmwarrki's meal or drink applies to his clansmates as well as to commoners, but not to chiefs B1 to B8; similarly, the Nahnken's leavings may be taken only by A1–A8. Litter-bearers and personal attendants for both Nahnmwarrki and Nahnken must be of the opposite chiefly line. Apart from his personal attendants, only chiefs B1–B4 may hand objects to the Nahnmwarrki, as may also sons of men of the Nahnmwarrki's sub-clan; and similarly, only A1–A4 and sons of the Nahnken's sub-clan may hand objects to the Nahnken. In the feast of propitiation, to beg forgiveness of a man in the A-line a man of the B-line should serve as go-between, and vice-versa; if it is the Nahnmwarrki who has been offended, the intermediary should be the Nahnken, B2, or B3, and the equivalent persons in the A-line should function if it is the Nahnken who is to be placated.

It is the Nahnken who is most often approached to act as go-between because he is considered the protector of the people against the wrath of the Nahnmwarrki, who is traditionally remote from the commoners. The pattern of atonement has bearing on rank and respect attitudes. A high chief is supposed to have the attitude that all difficulties and unpleasant events are things that pass and should be ignored. A Nahnmwarrki, ideally, should not scold or lose his calm but should remain dignified under any stress. Therefore, when he takes offense at someone he is supposed to be amenable to reason, and to be placated. When the intermediary pleads for forgiveness of the offender he quotes such sayings as *mɛ̀n‿in‿káso·r sówpeyli*, chiefs forgive people (lit.: people of forgiveness, chiefs), *mɛ̀n‿in‿kâo· áramɛs*, commoners injure people (lit.: people of destruction, commoners), the purport of this being that, though commoners are base in nature, a noble ought to disregard offensive acts. This ideal character structure, though it may not always be fulfilled, is thus a part of the class system; it helps to reinforce the social distance between the high chiefs and the lesser people. The power ascribed to kava to enforce reconciliation is a recognized and arbitrary mechanism which reminds a Nahnmwarrki of the behavior expected of him, and he is supposed not to be able to scorn the proffered cup.

INTERPRETATION

Functionally, there are two major aspects of honorific verbal behavior: on the one hand, the learning involved in acquiring especially honorific vocabulary, and the factors of prestige and acculturation involved in its command; on the other hand, the underlying attitudes of respect as manifest in honorific speech patterns, paralleled by non-verbal patterns.

1. *Learning.* The acquisition of a separate stratum of honorific vocabulary involves considerable effort on the part of the native speaker. That this is true in terms of Ponapean culture and not merely in the opinion of outsiders is borne out by the fact that not all native speakers of Ponapean are equally proficient in its use. In general, respect honorifics are used more frequently than royal honorifics; thus, the more royal honorifics a man knows, the greater is his prestige, just as in our culture there is the prestige of "having a large vocabulary." As a matter of fact, Ponapean opinion about the "good" or "bad" language of native speakers is in terms of proficiency in honorific vocabulary as a criterion: "So-and-so speaks a very fine Ponapean; he knows all the honorifics." Obviously, the closer a speaker is to the top titles, the stronger his feeling about the "correct" use of honorific vocabulary. Those who are not too proficient in its use help themselves by using lexical items of lesser respect levels as subordinates of hypotactic phrases with honorific determinants. This is not considered disrespectful, as would be the complete neglect of honorific speech, but is definitely taken as an index of "not very good speech" and deplored by older Ponapeans as a sign of the times and of a gradual breakdown of the pattern of respect.

The acculturative process, which is gradually leading to a leveling out of the scale of rank and the creation of other prestige factors is the major contributing factor in the decrease of proficiency in honorific vocabulary, alluded to above. Social pressures contingent upon rank and making complete observance of the rules of honorific speech a major consideration have lessened since the contact period. Honorific vocabulary in general, but especially royal honorifics, are slowly going out of use, just as are patterns of deference, though on the more basic levels of integration verbal behavior showing respect persists. But more and more native speakers have restricted the use of honorific speech to person markers, empty stems, classifiers, and a few of the most common vocabulary items. Some of the younger speakers, especially those in close contact with Americans and out-islanders, are practically limited to respect honorific person markers alone, except when directly in the presence of high chiefs. Speakers, however, have an ideal pattern of complete use of all aspects of honorific speech, though the behavioral pattern is more or less removed from the ideal.

The most essential honorific forms, in native eyes, were seen very clearly at an intertribal council meeting, when a number of chiefs complained to the civil authorities that their non-Ponapean interpreters were behaving insolently by using common language. The chiefs agreed that a minimum of three respect honorifics would satisfy their notions of decorum: *kômwi*, you, *ma·sani*, to say, and *sak*, to eat.

2. *Degree of Pattern Involvement.*[25] The basic variable of both verbal and

[25] Cf. Garvin, 1951b, section II.

nonverbal respect behavior on Ponape appears to be the underlying attitude of respect. This attitude is in turn a concomitant of the rank scale, and to the extent to which the latter is losing its significance as a basic determinant of status and prestige, the former is weakened and the behavior pattern on both the verbal and the nonverbal plane changes. The striking parallelism of verbal and nonverbal behavior may again be pointed out here; we refer back to the many instances quoted above.

A gauge for measuring the approximate depth, in psychological terms, of Ponapean attitudes of respect is afforded by what is here called the "degree of pattern involvement" in the use of honorific speech. By degree of pattern involvement is here meant the extent to which the overall cultural and linguistic pattern is involved in the differentiation of levels of respect in speech and nonverbal demonstrations of respect.

Honorific speech affects several levels of integration of Ponapean grammar:[26] the morpheme and word levels in the use of honorific person markers and empty stems, the phrase level in the use of honorific hypotactic phrases and classifiers, and the lexical level in the use of honorific vocabulary. Not only is there considerable pattern involvement in terms of the number of levels of integration affected, but the pattern involvement is increased by the fact that the specific morpheme and word classes concerned are extremely frequent in terms of situational use; in the case of honorific vocabulary, the considerable amount of selection required by the great number of honorific lexical items adds to the pattern involvement.

Similarly, nonverbal behavior showing respect is not limited to a few ceremonial occasions—though it is most pronounced and detailed at those times—nor is it confined to some isolated demonstrations of deference. Rather, it permeates the entire way of life of the average member of Ponapean society, and no interpersonal contact is possible without clear definition in terms of mutual status and the modes of behavior showing respect contingent thereon. Thus, though no such formalized statement as the one given about verbal patterns is possible here, in terms of penetration of most every phase of the culture, applicability to a variety of rôle contacts, and again, elaborate demands upon learning the correct modalities of behavior, we may, here too, speak of a considerable degree of pattern involvement as an index of the psychological depth of respect attitudes.

Finally, the depth to which attitudes of respect strike can be measured in situational terms, as is evident from the following instance:

Garvin recorded a traditional narrative from an elderly informant. In transcribing the narrative with an interpreter, the occurrence of humiliatives in speaking of some of the persons in the tale was noticed. The interpreter explained that the humiliatives were used in deference to the investigator—who,

[26] See fn. 5.

parenthetically speaking, was to that point unaware of the honor conferred upon him. The significant point seems to be that the content of the utterance is completely immaterial; presence of a respected person requires the use of appropriate honorifics.

CONCLUSION

The above remarks are an attempt to show the essential likeness of linguistic and extralinguistic cultural relations, and to point out how, in terms of relational variables, language can be considered a valid index of cultural and cultural-psychological structuring as well.

INSTITUTE OF LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY
WASHINGTON, D. C.
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII
HONOLULU, HAWAII

APPENDIX: HONORIFIC GLOSSARY[27]

amazement, C, H *puryámwey*, R *Éymwalu*
arm, C *pɛ·*, H *limɛ*, R *limÉ-yso·*
armpit, C *pá·⁀n⁀pɛy*, H, R *pá·⁀n⁀pwol*
ashamed, be C *námɛnək*, H, R *Éylɛ*
back, C *sá·u*, H, R *pÉlik*
basket (for food), C *kópow*, H *tó·to*, R *pálay*
bathing place, C, H *pil⁀ɛn⁀tú·tu*, R *kɛrÉ-iso·*
blanket, C, H *ʧé·y* (*ʧey-*),[28] R *ur⁀Él⁀ley*
blow (fire), C, H *péwk*, R unknown, but known to exist
breakfast, C *ʧéyet*, H, R *ka-mênsəŋ*
breast, chest, C *pá·⁀n⁀ɛt*, H *pá·⁀n⁀kupur*, R *kupúr-iso·*
call, C *Éker* (*-yékɛr*), H, R *mâlipɛ*
cane, C *sókon*, H *írarr*, R *rɛrÉ-iso·*
canoe, go by, C *tàkɛ⁀wá·r*, H, R *kàʧ⁀pó·⁀n⁀war*
cheek, C *liki⁀n⁀sép-ɛ*, H, R *liki⁀n⁀mwɔ'l-ɛ*
chest, see breast, chest
commission, task, C *ílak*, H, R *pɔ'rron*
cookhouse, see kitchen
cord, make, C *kɔ'lɛ⁀pwɛ·l*, H, R *kəpéwku·k*
cover oneself, C, H *katù-pwÉl-iti*, R *kómwaró·pw-ili*
defecate, C *pɛk*, H *pítak-ila*, R *lɔ'kɛwɛl*
dinner, C *mwòŋɛ⁀n⁀sówwas*~*mwòŋɛ⁀n⁀sɔ'wwas*, H, C *ka-sówʃik*~*ka-sɔ'wʃik*
draw water, C, H *íti⁀pil*, A1 *íl⁀konoʧ*, B1 *iti⁀sak*
dream, C, H *éwrɛmɛn*, R *álinan*
drink, C *nim*, H *tákɛ*, R *úrak*
drown, C *mópw-ila*, H, R *tɛrí·-la*

[27] This glossary contains only terms collected by Garvin. All forms are those of the Main dialect (M). C stands for common forms, H for respect honorifics, R for royal honorifics.

[28] Forms given in parenthesis are sandhi (see fn. 12) and compounding forms.

ear, C *sálay*, H *kɔ'roy*, R unknown, but known to exist
eat, C *mwóyɛ*, H *sa·k*~*sak*, A1 *kónoʧ*, B1 *sa·k*~*sak*
exhale, C *ɛsiŋá-ki-ta*, H, R *ɛ's-mɛmər-áta*
eye, C *áwa*, *ma·s* (*mɛs-*), H, R *sí·lay*
eyebrows, C, H *páti*, R *təkÉ·⁀n⁀ɛriŋ*
eyelashes, C, H *rèrr⁀in⁀mÉs-ɛ*, R *rɛ'rr⁀in⁀tɛrí·⁀l⁀ley*
finger, C, H *sɛ'ni⁀in⁀pÉ·*, R *rɛk⁀Él⁀ley*
fish (food), C *sáli*, H, R *îrap*
foot, see leg, foot
footbath water, C, H *pil⁀ɛn⁀wítɛ*, R *lɔ'k-iso·*
footsole, C *pá·⁀n⁀nɛ*, H, R *pà·⁀n⁀ɛpwÉl*
forget, C *manokÉ·-la*, H, R *malyÉ·la* (possibly connected with *mályel* headache?)
freeze, be cold, C *péw-ta*, H *lɛmwilɛmwíri-ta*, R *pwɛykɛntÉ·ninɛ*
get up, C *pówr-ta*, H, R unknown, but known to exist
gossip, C, H *lipánɛt*, R *pil⁀ɛn⁀pá·⁀n⁀wɛlí*
hair, C *piŋ⁀Én⁀mɔŋ*, H *piŋ⁀ɛn⁀ʧÉpwiʧɛp*, R unknown, but known to exist
hat, C *lisárop*, H, R *ó·pey*
hate, C *ʧáʧ-iki*, H, R *kalá·t-iki*
head, C *mo'ŋɛ*, H *ʧÉpi*, R *kàtɔk⁀ɛn⁀méy*
hear, C *roŋ*, H, R *kapáyrak*
heart, C *mɔ'ŋiyɔŋ*, H, R, *kúpur*
hot, to be, C, H *karakarr-áta*, R *kirrÉ·niyɔl*
house, C, H *i·m* (*i·mw-*, *imw-*, *im-*), R *ʧÉ·⁀n⁀pas*
hunger for fish, meat, C *mɛ·⁀n⁀kúmo·*, H, R *limwo·r*
joy, C *pÉrrɛn*~*pa'rron*, H *kùpur⁀pÉrrɛn*~*kùpur⁀pa'rrən*, R *kerÉmwol-iso·*
kitchen, C *imw⁀ɛn⁀kák*, H *imw⁀ɛn⁀wiya⁀sák*, R *imw⁀ɛn⁀pá·tak*
know, C *Ése*, H, R *mwá·ŋi*
leg, foot, C *nɛ·*, H, R *àluwÉlu* (*àluwÉluw-*)
lie down, C *wÉn-ti*, H *káʧi-ti*, R *kip-ɛti*
litter (carrying), C, H *rɔ·*, R *rɔ'·-páp-iso·*
long for, C *lɔ'ləyt*, H *lɔ'lɛ-pey-ki*, R *kùpur-péy-ki*
love, C *pɔ'kɛpɔk*, H, R *lɔ'llɔlɛ*
married couple, C *pópowt*~*pɔ'pɔwt*, H *wa'rək*, R *pə'ʧo·y*
mat, Ponapean C *lo·s*, H, R *mɔ'ʧɔr*
neck, C *kɛp⁀in⁀war* (*⁀wÉr-*)~*ʧɛpi⁀n⁀war* (*⁀wÉr-*), H, R *ʧɛpi⁀n⁀kásay*
nose, C *ʧi·m* (*ʧi·mw-*, *ʧimw-*, *ʧim-*), H, R *kɛynú·nu*
oil, C, H *kis⁀il⁀le*, R *marɛkÉ-iso·*
open one's mouth, C *sára-pesəŋ*, H *káʧi-pesəŋ sí·layi*, R *táwasɛ-pèsəŋ*
order, command, C, H *kosónnɛt*, R *pɔ'·yək*
penis, C *wi·l* (*wil-*), H unknown, R *kùrup⁀tɔlí·nɛ*
pillow, C, H *álul*, R *rèrr⁀in⁀pÉ-iso·*
place, C *té·u* (*tew-*), H, R *li·m* (*lim-*)
place, sitting, C *té·u* (*tew-*), H *mwɔ·l* (*mwɔl-*), R *mwɔlÉ-iso·*
podex, C, H *ká·wɛ*, R *kɛ·nú·mwir*
posture, walk C *sókosok*, H, R unknown, but known to exist
question, C *péyiak*, H *kalɛlápak*, R *kÉynamwa*
questions, ask, C *ítek*, H *kalɛlápak*, R *kÉynamwa*
quiet, be, C, H *nɛnnÉl-la*, R *tàʧamp-ála*
rest, C, H *kómmɔl*, R *rà·n⁀mwɔ'l-ɛti*
room, C, H *pÉrɛ*, R *wɛyp*

satisfied, sated, C *mɛt-iyɛr*, H *it-iyɛr*, R *liki-yɛr*
see, C *mwása·n*, H *kilay*, R *ma·sani*
sick, C *sów-mwaw*, H, R *lú·mu·n*
sigh in one's sleep, C, H *lipóŋəpəŋ*, R *rerr‿in‿mwálu*
sleep, C *mɛyr*, H *sÉymwɔk*, R *sÉy-ti*
snack (after kava), C *kə'nɛy-sákaw*, H, R *pÉy-lɔl*
speak, C *lokáya*, H, R *ma·sani*
spouse, C *powi~pɔwi*, H *wə'rək*, R *likəni*
stay up nights (as, lovers), C, H *pÉ·ʃ‿in‿pòŋ*, R *kÉni‿in‿pòŋ*
supper, C *mwɔ'ŋɛ‿n‿póŋ*, H, R *kasi·‿poŋ*
task, see commission
think, C *lÉmɛlɛmɛ*, H, R *kùpukupúre*
thought, C *lámɛlam*, H, R *kúpur*
toe, C, H *sɛ'nti‿in‿nÉ·*, R *rɛk‿Én‿pwɛl*
tongue, C *lo·* (*lo·w-*), H, R *tínap* (*tínapw-*)
tooth, C *yi·*, H *inat*, R *ásay*
urinate, C *pipi·s*, H, R *kamwósul*
vagina, C *pi·pi* (*pi·piy-*), H unknown, R *jÉ·pan*
vomit, C *mmus*, H, R *kàliyáli*
wake up (intr.), C *piri-ta*, H, R *ó·p-ala wása*
wake up (tr.), C, H *pÉpɛ·t*, R *tɛlÉnsik*
walk, see posture, walk
warm oneself, C, H *rêyirəŋ*, R *kərəkərr‿ámwaw*
wash, C, H *wítɛ*, R *nil‿láŋ-ɛta*
wash, bathe, C *tú·tu*, H *lʃ'ki-pil*, R *lə'k-pil‿íl‿ləŋ*
wash hands, C, H *ɔ'mwiyɔm*, R *sikámwar-ata*
wash face, C, H *Épwinək*, R *mà·ləŋi-ta*
wash mouth, C *múkumuk*, H, R *táwa-to*
weep, C *sáŋisaŋ*, H *mwá·yey*, R *ʃɛnʃÉnir*
whisper, C *mwÉŋiniŋiŋ*, H *má·sɛn ʃikiʃik*, R *lóyloy ʃikiʃik*
whisper at night (as, lovers), C *lôkaya‿n‿nì·poŋ*, H *má·sɛn‿ɛn‿pòŋ*, R *pilipil‿Én‿p y*
wish, feeling like, C *insÉn*, H, R *kúpur*
wreath, C *ɛ'l‿in‿wà·‿n‿ʃú·ke* (*‿ʃú·kɛ·-*), H, R *lə'yələŋ*, A1 also *ni·n*

BIBLIOGRAPHY*

BASCOM, WILLIAM R., 1946, Ponape: A Pacific Economy in Transition, U. S. Commercial Company, Economic Survey of Micronesia, Vol. 8, Honolulu (mimeographed).

GARVIN, PAUL L., 1951a, A Linguistic Report on Ponape: I. Outline of Ponapean Grammar: II. Ponapean Conversational Texts. Unpublished ms. on deposit with Pacific Science Board.

———, 1951b, Structure and Variation in Language and Culture. In press with Proceedings of XXIXth International Congress of Americanists, New York, 1949.

HAMBRUCH, PAUL, 1932–1936, Ponape, In: Ergebnisse der Südsee-Expedition 1908–1910, II. Ethnographie: B. Mikronesien, Band 7. 3 vols.

* We here quote only publications used for reference in this study. For a critical survey of previous accounts of Ponapean grammar, some of which include references to honorific speech, see Garvin, 1951a, appendix to section I.

SOME HEAD-HUNTING TRADITIONS OF SOUTHERN NEW GUINEA

By JUSTUS M. VAN DER KROEF

HEAD-HUNTING and the complex system of ritual, religion and myth associated with it has at one time or another existed among most of the peoples of Melanesia. Traces of it can be found in numerous legends of the area.[1] The practice has continued to persist, particularly in New Guinea, although both the Dutch and Australian governments have undertaken strong measures to stamp out the custom. Little is actually known of the New Guinea types of head-hunting, beyond that which was studied—or in many instances merely inferred—by Kruyt, Vertenten and Nollen.[2] Many students, notably Kruyt, did not always allow for the individual differences in head-hunting techniques and rituals that exist among the peoples of New Guinea. Thus, though some communities on the Upper Fly River practiced cannibalism in conjunction with head-hunting, this was generally not the case with the hunters along the Southern coast. In the interior communities hunt each other without discrimination; in the South and East custom prohibits the hunting of friendly neighbors. Some groups sanction their head-hunting practices by religious beliefs, while others—particularly the Obadu in the East—do not. The present study is primarily concerned with some practices at one time prevalent among southern communities, notably the Marindese and Boetinese, among whom head-hunting follows a clear pattern of social motivation and moral-religious necessity.

The Marindese (or *Marind-anem*)[3] and Boetinese live scattered in some seventy-odd villages near or on the Southern coast, roughly between Okaba and Merauke. Their economy is of a mixed character. Cultivation of sago and coconut, in carefully tended communal garden plots, alternates with occasional hunting of *sahan* (a species of small kangeroo) and *basik* (wild boar, akin to the Javanese *babi roosah*). Until very recently the sexes lived apart, adult males in three or four men's houses of a character identical with similar institutions elsewhere in the Malay Archipelago, houses which are closely related to the drama and the dance of the community.[4] The women and small children live in the low, rambling women's quarters. Government of the communities is in the hands of the men's councils, which have representatives of each men's house; the council acts as a judiciary body and metes out punishment to offenders of custom. Before the active emergence

[1] Vor der Hake, 1934, pp. 19, 37, 78–84. Legends of cannibalism are probably even older.

[2] Kruyt, 1906; Vertenten, 1923, pp. 45–73; Nollen, 1924, pp. 3–19.

[3] Vertenten, p. 46.

[4] The influence of the Javanese men's house on the technique of the theater, for example, has been indicated by Rassers, 1931, p. 431.