CREATING EVIDENCE: MAKING SENSE OF WRITTEN WORDS IN BOSAVI¹

Bambi B. Schieffelin

Since their earliest contact with Europeans, the Kaluli people who live at the base of Mt. Bosavi in the Southern Highlands Province of Papua New Guinea have viewed books as powerful and authoritative sources of information that white people use to shape and control the behavior of others. In a narrative told to Steve Feld and myself in 1990 about government contact in the early 1940s, an educated Kaluli man told us about his father who had been selected by white patrol officers as the first local counsellor. As he put it, "my father was given the black shirt with a red stripe, the belt, knife, stick and *a book*, that book, people thought that if you kill, the blood of a dead person will go inside in the book, and the white man will know straight away and come and shoot you with a gun; that fear, everywhere so, everyone got frightened when my father got this."

This book, which was kept by the counsellor as part of his responsibilities and taken out only during infrequent government patrols made by white officers, listed the names of villagers. While Kaluli people did not share an understanding of why their names were written down by government people, they did not miss the fact that this book and its meanings were created and owned by white people, who used it as an instrument of control, authority, and information. These early census and record keeping activities, part of pacification efforts, were used to track and document Kaluli people in order to discourage their periodic relocation to new village sites, their solution to minimizing the depletion of local resources. This was one of the earliest experiences for Kaluli people of what books could do, and what people did with books.

In the mid 1960s two other changes occurred that would introduce additional ideas about books and literacy more generally - the first, which I would like to think was relatively benign though not inconsequential, was the arrival of anthropologists, first E. L. Schieffelin, followed by myself and Steve Feld, whose visitations of different durations would continue into the present. The second change which has had far reaching consequences for Kaluli social and ceremonial life, was the

¹ I would like to thank the National Foundation and the Wenner-Gren Foundation for funding fieldwork in 1984 and 1990. Thanks also go to Steve Feld and Elinor Ochs for their always helpful comments. Finally, I would like to thank Sue Gal and Kit Woolard for their cogent written comments, as well as the other members of the Center for Transcultural Studies Working Group on Language and the participants in the School for American Research Seminar on Language Ideologies for asking tough questions.

This essay is dedicated to the late Kulu Fuale; his patience and assistance in helping me understand the Kaluli language for over fifteen years was enriched by his unique linguistic curiosity.

establishment of a fundamentalist mission and air strip which was managed by a Papuan National until Australian missionaries arrived in the early 1970s.

This essay focuses on new communicative practices that emerged as a result of interactions between Kaluli people and Australian fundamentalist missionaries beginning in the early 1970s. To do this I draw on ethnographic and linguistic fieldwork begun in 1967 that has continued intermittently into the present. Taperecorded, transcribed analyses of social interaction over time and across a wide range of situations and activities, in addition to participant observation and informal interviews form the foundation of this analysis (Schieffelin 1986, 1990). Additional ethnographic, sociolinguistic and ethnomusicological analyses have also informed my assertions (Feld 1988, 1990; Feld & Schieffelin 1982; E.L. Schieffelin 1976).

As Kaluli people were introduced to new forms and sources of knowledge about their own and the outside world, their ideas about truth, knowledge, and authority were challenged and changed, affecting their communicative practices as well as their social structures. In such contact situations, new communicative practices express the interests of both the missionized and the missionizers. Kaluli people were active contributors to the linguistic and social reorganization of their own society, as evidenced in the emergence of several genres new to the area.

In such situations of social change, new language socialization activities often develop. Particularly relevant for this essay are literacy lessons and sermons, both of which constitute important activities for language socialization - socialization through the use of language and socialization to use language - which continues throughout the life cycle (Ochs & Schieffelin 1984). From a Kaluli perspective, lessons and sermons share interpretive frames and participant structures as they originate from the same source, the Christian mission. Combining spoken forms and written materials, both genres provide a new discursive space in which Kaluli people rethink their past, one consisting of particular social practices and beliefs - and distance themselves from it.

To accomplish this distancing, several techniques are deployed. In the literacy lesson and in the written text that it draws on, the terms *mo:lu*, *tamina* 'before', 'a long time ago, before' are systematically opposed to *o:go*: 'today, now' to create narratives about how things used to be, in contrast to how things are and should be. Part of this contrast invokes the source of the difference: What "our fathers" believed is contrasted with what "this book shows us really well" and what "new words which really tell us." New facts, such as those drawn from health lessons and bible stories are used to revise boundaries or create new ones. For example, Kaluli people are reminded both in the written text and in the oral presentations that "before we didn't know," "we didn't understand," in contrast to "we now know," "we hear it really well." In classroom interaction, students are asked to register their agreement with these claims.

The practices of the past and the present/future are also coded by their assignment to gender roles; women's beliefs and activities are connected with the past, what was done before the mission was established, while men's beliefs and actions are seen as forward looking, progressive, taking up the new ideas. Not surprising is the evaluation associated with each of these positionings: Women are negatively evaluated while men are viewed positively. These concepts are promoted in literacy materials and fortified through oral presentation and lessons by extensive linguistic means, including an innovation in the evidential system which further

underscores an increased remoteness of the not very distant past.

Literacy and social change

This essay draws on a body of ethnographic work that views literacy practices and activities as historically contingent, ideologically grounded and culturally organized (Besnier 1995; Collins 1991; Duranti & Ochs 1986; Gewertz & Errington 1991; Guss 1986; Heath 1983; Kulick & Stroud 1990; McKenzie 1987; Street 1984; Street & Besnier 1994). This work demonstrates that societies "take up" or organize literacy practices in culturally variable ways depending on who is interested in literacy, and how literacy is viewed. As with other genres and activities, those involving literacy practices are constituted through specific interactional roles, arrangements, and sequences which use particular forms of language to enact social relationships and negotiate social identities. In situations where literacy is introduced as part of Christian missionization, literacy activities are often shaped by competing epistemological and cultural frameworks. These frameworks are encoded in the ways in which information is presented, knowledge is talked about, and analogies are drawn; they are also apparent in the connections that can *not* be made. Forms of resistance to literacy practices reflect not only linguistic ideology, but social and historical forces more broadly. Thus it is also useful to situate this work within current ethnohistorical accounts of competing language ideologies that have played a role shaping colonial and missionary encounters (Cohn 1985; Comaroff & Comaroff 1991; Fabian 1986; Mignolo 1992; Rafael 1988).

Truth and evidence for it

Kaluli people, like many Papua New Guinean societies are concerned with the source and truth of what they and others know. They have well elaborated ideas of how truth is constituted, proven and linguistically marked. In the so-called "old" days, before missionaries, government patrols and anthropologists, sources of knowledge and proofs of truth were relatively stable - what the "fathers" said was what was known and believed by mature members of society. There was little reason to doubt the truthfulness of what had always been said about the natural and supernatural worlds that Kaluli people inhabited. Through direct experience, the spoken word and face to face interaction, cultural knowledge was orally represented, and authority and responsibility could be argued, and often were.

Through the mid-1970s and into the 1980s the missionaries introduced new facts about the world, ones they claimed to be either scientific or religious. These facts were soon represented through new words, genres, registers and conventions for speaking. Literacy in the vernacular and Tok Pisin was introduced. The Bosavi mission primary school used English as the language of instruction, but Kaluli people did not know either English or Tok Pisin. The few who successfully completed six years of primary school were drafted immediately into mission service: Some were trained as pastors, store assistants or medical assistants. All became important players in the changing social order. With the exception of one individual whose narrative opened this essay, before the early 1980s no one had been

educated beyond grade six.

The fundamentalist missionaries worked hard to establish their authority and took the view that conversion should move rapidly. Their evaluations of local cultural practices were echoed in Kaluli conversations, arguments, and sermons. By 1984 Kaluli people had given up traditional ceremonies and many "traditional" practices. With Christianity and its new material resources, the social organization of Kaluli society began to change: What had been a small scale egalitarian society began to reshape itself into a loosely stratified society with new roles (jobs) such as pastor, deacon, aid post orderly, and trade store manager. Eventually, Christians and non-Christians took up residence in different parts of the village. Whatever power had been granted formerly to older men was now taken by those who had gained knowledge of how the mission, the mission store, and the missionary worked.

These social changes had linguistic consequences. Young men who acquired Tok Pisin extended their interactional range and could work as interpreters for the government patrol officers. The few young men who became literate in Tok Pisin and Kaluli, and were part of the mission effort, collaborated with the Australian missionary and translated texts from Tok Pisin (*Nupela Testamen*) or English (health booklets and literacy primers) into new varieties of the Kaluli language - varieties that were constructed by a powerful non-native speaker in conjunction with native speakers who wanted to acquire power. Of the four mutually intelligible dialects in the Bosavi area, one had been randomly selected earlier by a mission field linguist to be used for the orthography (Rule 1966) and many features of dialect variation exist in the literacy materials, in addition to many spelling inconsistencies and syntactic simplifications and errors.

As a result of these collaborations, a new medium was created - booklets printed in a new variety of the vernacular. Written with the authority of the mission, they introduced several new types of evidence into Kaluli life; the first is the written Kaluli word. Simple but dramatic narratives urged social change. The motif here, and in sermons, was consistent: The past versus the present/future, articulated through examples of Kaluli ways of life which were depicted as backwards, wrong, and deriving from false beliefs, in contrast with European ways of doing things (from building houses, to health practices to hair styles) which were presented as new, right and good. Simple line drawings by the missionaries served as illustrations. Narratives took place in recognizable local places, and characters had Kaluli names. To make these narratives more believable, the missionary illustrated the more advanced booklets with black and white photographs of local people engaged in the activity described in the narrative. So in reading the texts, Kaluli could see themselves imaged, participating in the new practices being promoted. These graphic and photographic images were used as and became evidentials, that is, another new source of evidence for authority and truth. Combined with print, they became a source of knowledge that could be seen, referred to and reported on. Booklets introduced new information in new formats. They became the source of that information, and evidence for it. Those with access to these new sources of knowledge and truth, or those who could claim to understand them, became authorities themselves.

Evidentials

From a linguistic perspective as well as a social perspective, Kaluli people have always been concerned with evidence. Their language provides them with a range of evidentials, morphological and lexical means used by speakers to formally mark the source or evidence for the basis of their assertions, their attitudes towards knowledge, and the responsibility assumed in making a claim. Evidential particles, metalinguistic verbs (e.g., verbs of saying) and other sensory verbs indicating sources of knowledge (e.g., hearing, seeing), and reported speech are just some of the means by which speakers establish the "truth" of their assertions and take responsibility for them. For example, in Kaluli discourse, ranging from casual conversation to more formal arguments, speakers indicate through morphological or lexical means whether what they are saying derives from direct experience, visual, verbal or sonic information, speech reported to them or re-reported to them, common knowledge, or inference made from other secondary evidence.

Selected evidentials in Kaluli *(recent innovations)

- lo:b speaker's assertion is based on visible/visual evidence that can be shared by addressee. *Magu we mogago:lo:b* 'this banana is bad I see'; *Do:wo: ha:na:nigabo:lo:b* 'my father is about to go I see'.
- o:m speaker's assertion is based on deduction or inference from something sensed aurally or through other senses, but without attribution of particular source. *To o:dowayo:m* 'there's talk around I'm hearing' *No: mun o:dowayo:m* 'there is the smell of cooked meat I'm smelling'
- ko indicates direction in which an event being talked about is taking place.
- a:le used in interrogative forms to indicate doubt regarding accuracy of information, can elicit confirmation from addressee. *Dimia:iba:le?* 'I wonder if he will give it?'. Also used when wondering aloud to indicate uncertainty and possibly seek an opinion from addressee, *Ha:na:no:wa:le?* *mo:ha:na:no:wa:le?* 'I wonder will I go? Will I not go?'.
- le ~ -de indicates certainty of assertions, really/truly/only. *Hede:le* 'it's really true'; *Ho:nde* 'it's really water and not anything else.'
- mala: ~ -bala: negative after inference indicating disappointment. *Ne alima:no:mala:* 'I will not lie down' (seeing there is still more work to be done).
- malo: ~ -balo: affirmative emphasis after question or when answer is opposite to what is expected. *Aoleya:le?* 'is it his real brother?' *aolemalo:!* 't's truly his *real* brother!' but *aolemala:!* 'it's not his real brother!'²
- lo:do: emphasis with disappointment/sadness. *Ha:na:no:lo:do:* 'alas you are going away'.

² The form -mala: has two distinct meanings which are disambiguated by stress/pitch differences in the language. These are not indicated in the orthography.

**-lo:do: a:la:bo:* 'we now know from this source, we did not know before' (used when referring to information from written sources)

**hia* extended use from the Tok Pisin 'here', visible/visual evidence, used to indicate meaning similar to *-lo:b*.

Evidence based on verbal sources use a range of forms, such as *-do:* Immediate repeat of direct quoting of someone else. For example, Speaker A *->B we!* 'here'. Speaker C *->B wedo:!* 'here' (he/she said). The majority of evidentials for reporting speech, however, are formed with *a:la:ma/a:la: sama* 'say like that.' Context and pronouns clarify number and person. Such forms include:

<i>a:la: siyo:</i>	used for speaker self report or to report what another has said
<i>a:la: sa:labeka:</i>	'some one else recently said' (not used for 1st person)
<i>a:la: siyo:laleka</i>	3rd hand reported speech
<i>a:la: siyo:lo:bo:ka:</i>	4th hand reported speech
<i>a:la: sili sa:la:ingab</i>	someone (sing/pl) is saying (duration)
<i>a:la: sili sa:la:ingo:</i>	someone (sing/pl) was saying (duration)
<i>a:la: salan</i>	generally said/one says (habitual)

Other sensory verbs are also used as evidentials, and the appropriate noun disambiguates or adds emphasis when needed. For example, *dabuma* 'hear,' but it can also mean 'smell,' *goloma* 'touch,' *bo:ba* 'see,' *asuluma* 'think, feel, know, understand, experience.'

Emphatic markers, both lexical and morphological are used extensively with evidentials. For example,

<i>-ka:</i>	emphasis when close to addressee - 1st time or 1st repeat
<i>-a:</i>	emphasis - 2nd repeat
<i>-o</i>	emphasis when calling out to addressee
<i>mada</i>	'really', 'very'
<i>hede</i>	'true'
<i>hedele</i>	'really truly'
<i>made hedele</i>	'really very truly'

In contrast to the more narrow linguistic view of evidentials which tends to focus on categories of "truth" (Jakobson 1957), a broader social interactional perspective displays their multifunctionality (Silverstein 1985). Bybee describes evidentials as "markers that indicate something about the source of the information in the proposition (1985: 184)." Willett has pointed out that the notional boundaries of evidentiality are still unclear, but as a semantic domain, evidentials "participate in the expression of the speaker's attitude toward the situation his/her utterance describes (1988: 52)." Bendix suggests that it is not enough to analyze the epistemological categories of evidentials, but one must view them as important resources used by speakers to manipulate claims of responsibility and evidence in strategic interaction (1994: 243). The social and historical context of the topic of talk, as well as the social relationship that holds between interlocutors can affect the choice of evidential marker, which, as Fox and Clifford point out, is sensitive to differences in claims to authority (1991). Emphatic markers, affect markers and evidentials often co-occur in the same word or same utterance, and must be considered together. Analyses of evidentials in discourse highlight the importance speakers attach to establishing their authority with their audience, while

acknowledging the dialogical nature of the production of meaning. Evidentials are used to convey affective and propositional meanings, and the same evidential markers may serve both functions. Haviland suggests "propositions ... live in a moral universe, which includes not only what participants take as true, or what they agree to think, but also agreements about *how* to think and feel about what they agree upon" (1989: 61). Persons not only exchange claims about the world, but their affective stances towards such claims. Givón (1982) has pointed out that speakers and hearers have an implicit contract to mark degrees of certainty in their propositions. Propositions that are to be taken for granted and viewed as unchallengeable by the hearer require no evidentiary justification by the speaker. Propositions that are asserted with relative confidence and are open to challenge by the hearer require evidentiary justification (*ibid*: 24). Furthermore, in situations of conflict, what may be contested is not the claim itself, but how someone knows it. Thus the use of an evidential is telling, and its choice is critical.

Drawing on linguistic examples, Chafe and Nichols suggest that an analysis of evidentials reveals a "natural epistemology" (1986: vii). I would like to suggest that when evidentials are examined in the context of their use in social interaction, such analysis reveals a "cultural epistemology." Everyday talk offers excellent opportunities to examine how individuals persuade, argue and make claims using evidentials. Activities of talk in situations of rapid social change often take up the topic of competing epistemologies, each differently valorized. Such cultural situations may result in linguistic innovations, expressed through evidentials as well as other linguistic means. I share a view with other linguistic anthropologists (e.g., Haviland 1989; Hill & Irvine 1993; Lucy 1993) that the encoding of knowledge, authority and truth is a linguistic as well as a social phenomenon; the two must be viewed as interdependent.

The health lesson

My analysis of Kaluli literacy lessons, which introduce "scientific facts", shows innovations in morphological forms expressing epistemic stance, as well as in rhetorical and event structures. These linguistic changes are a notable response to missionization and underscore Kaluli concern with the sources and nature of knowledge and truth.

The particular event I draw from is a transcribed audio-taped literacy lesson that took place in 1984 at the Bosavi mission school. It is part of a larger project on Kaluli language use and social change with Steve Feld that draws on materials collected since 1967. In this new speech event, as in other innovated genres, all levels of language have been affected - the phonology, morphology, lexicon, syntax, semantics, pragmatics and of course, the cultural assumptions that organize speech activities. In spite of the fact that literacy instruction events draw on models of instruction imported from Western classrooms, there is clear evidence of local language ideology throughout. We will see how at a particular point in Kaluli history, written texts were granted authority as Kaluli people constructed linguistic means for entitling texts and making them authentic and authoritative sources of factual knowledge, even when there was no basis in fact for doing so.

The participants in this speech event are the instructor, Kulu Fuale, one of

the few Kaluli Christians trained to teach vernacular literacy, and 24 teenaged male students in the 5th grade class. Kulu, who was fluent in Tok Pisin and spoke a little English called this a "health lesson." The lesson lasted 45 minutes; most of the time was spent focused on a booklet about malaria.

Two printed texts that have been translated into the vernacular are used in this event. The first, a booklet about malaria, is based on an English script, and is widely used by missionaries in Papua New Guinea. The Kaluli version was created and translated by Keith Briggs, the missionary in charge of the Bosavi station, collaboratively with Kulu Fuale. However, during the course of the lesson Kulu repeatedly asserts that "Briggs wrote it." Kaluli people do not take credit for the production of these materials. The remainder of the lesson drew on a second written text, a selection of verses from the New Testament translated from Tok Pisin into Kaluli by Kulu. Both are presented as containing truths previously unknown. This essay focuses on the first part of the health lesson.

I base my analysis on my transcription of the entire 45 minute long audiotaped event, during which time Kulu reads from and talks about both written texts, writes on the board, talks about other topics, and elicits class responses. The transcription and the printed texts must be considered together because of two significant relationships: between the written texts and the oral text (word-word relationship), and between the oral presentation and the world that is represented, or misrepresented, through it. Selections from the transcript will be used to illustrate how evidence is marked in a variety of ways.

General participant and event structure

The introduction of Christian church services and adult literacy classes exposed the Kaluli people to a radically different presentational and participation structure. Previously, in most Kaluli speech situations, no single speaker controlled the floor, speakers self-selected and many voices, some quite loud, made simultaneous contributions to whatever topics were being entertained. In contrast, Christian speaking events can be characterised as those in which a single speaker controls the floor and, in addition, has all the relevant and correct information. There are no interruptions; group response is elicited, coordinated and in unison, in response to questions that seek one answer. Question/Answer sequences which are used in local sermons are similar to those found throughout lessons. They are unlike any other discourse sequence I have recorded in over 150 hours of transcribed Kaluli speech. They resemble the Western-style classroom Q/A sequence with one correct answer, which is searched for until it is reached. Furthermore, Christian discussion is orderly and voices are never raised. Literacy lessons are similar in this regard. In addition, they share framing devices and the participant structure found in local sermons. This is not surprising given the strong influence of and connection between Christian activities and schooling, including vernacular literacy classes. For example, in this literacy lesson, Kulu begins the class with the directive that all will sing a song that

uses a popular hymn melody to which he has set new words.³

- KF] tambo
1 everyone
- 2 gisalowo: mo:la:bi
will sing a song
- 3 (sings) ne o:ba: ganalabo: da:da:sen da:da:sen da:da:sen
I hear hear hear birds singing
- 4 okay
okay
- 5 one two (class sings song in unison)
one two
- 6 mada o:m
thank you

##

After singing the first line of the song, Kulu uses 'okay' (4) as a discourse boundary marker, and counts in English, 'one, two' so that the students will all sing together. This introduced style of singing departs from Kaluli song style which has a very different aesthetic structure (Feld 1988). After the students sing, Kulu thanks them. The use of *mada o:m* 'thank you' which is viewed by Kaluli people as a mission-introduced concept and expression also marks this as a Christian activity.

All of the students have copies of the booklet on malaria and its prevention called *Hamule e walaf bo:lo*: 'Hamule got sick' and standing in the front of the class Kulu announces the topic (9) "what mosquitoes do" and directs everyone's attention to the book, the source of the information.

³ Inconsistencies in orthography are due to the preservation of the dialect features of speakers. Inconsistencies in the written texts are presented as they appear in the original materials. There are inconsistencies of spelling, as well as grammatical errors throughout the written literacy materials, and these sometimes cause difficulty in reading. There are discussions in the lesson of problems with the "writing" (spelling), but those discussions are beyond the scope of this paper.

The transcription preserves the breath grouping of the speaker, and the numbers used throughout indicate those breath groups. However, in some lines, (153), breath groups are indicated as in the original transcript using the transcription convention -. Also used is s/c for self corrections by speakers. Selections from the transcript are used to illustrate particular points, but the sequential numbers of the complete transcript are retained to make this analysis usable with other analyses of the same transcript. A break in sequence is indicated by ##. There are no interruptions or overlaps in this speech event. Boldface is used to indicate the phenomena of interest.

Kulu is holding the booklet

##

9 o:go: kiso:wa:lo: dimidabo: ko:lo: kiso:wa:lo: dimidabo: ko:lo: agelema:niki
*today what the mosquitoes do, what the mosquitoes do that's what we are
 reading about*

10-11 we bo:ba, Hamule we
look at this , Hamule here (re the booklet)

12 taminamiyo: kiso:wa:yo: a:la: dimidabo:lo:do: a:la:bo: niyo: mo:asulan ko:sega
*before, what mosquitoes do *we now know we did not know these things but*

13 mo:lu nili doima:yo: ko:sega o:go: dinafa asulab buko: wema: walasalab
before our fathers (erg), but now we really know this book (erg) shows/instructs

14 a:la:fo: ko:lo: niliyo: buko: wena ba:da:sa:ga:
therefore when we look in this book

15 tif s/c taminamiyo: niyo: mo:asulo: ko:sega no niyo: nulu alifo: alifo:labamiyo:
 kiso:wa:lo: nanog diabo: we aungabo:lo:do: a:la:bo:
*later s/c before we did not know but when we are sleeping at night the work
 mosquitoes do is like this *we now know*

16 buko: wenamilo: to salab we da:da:sa:ga: asuluma:niki
listening to what the words in this book say makes us know/understand
 ##

Kulu (9) sets up a rhetorical framework of contrast that organizes much of the lesson: what was believed in the past as opposed to what is now known. In creating the contrast he uses an innovative evidential construction -lo:do: a:la:bo:. This form, used repeatedly throughout the text, (for example, 15) has the meaning 'known from this source/not known before,' and marks information that is new, true and only known from the written word. This evidential does not appear in any traditional speech genres nor is it used in other relatively recent forms of Kaluli discourse, such as translation situations involving Tok Pisin. It is an innovation by Kaluli speakers to mark new information and its new source. Kulu further elaborates this theme of contrasting the past (13 and also 15), 'what our fathers (knew) before' with the state of knowing in the present, 'but now we really know,' and makes the source lexically explicit, *buko: wema: walasalab* 'this book shows/instructs.' Note that 'his book' is marked with an ergative/instrumental case marker, IT is the agent (or instrument) which instructs and shows, (*wala sa:lab* 'show and speak') and it is by looking at the book (14) and listening to what the words in this book say (16), that understanding or knowledge is obtained. This mode of achieving understanding is different from the ways Kaluli usually learn, which is by listening to what many others say, arguing with them, watching them, and being instructed while participating (Schieffelin 1990). Source or evidence is made explicit, as is the sensory mode in which it is offered. The book has been granted an authoritative voice and becomes an authoritative source. This new evidential marker is only used in speaking. It never

appears in written form. In fact, no evidential markers appear in secular written vernacular texts, a point I will return to.

In addition to this innovative evidential which we will see more of below, other evidential forms are used to indicate different sources of information. In directing the class's attention to the booklet, Kulu (KF) uses the evidential marker -*lo:b* 'visually evident' to guide students to the top of the page, the place that they are to begin reading the text aloud as a group (27-28). He counts 'one two' in English to get them into vocal synchrony in the same way as when he instructed the group to sing in the opening of the class (5).

##

- KF] wa:la a:no: o:bo:lo:bo:? taminamilo: o:deyo: agela:bi one two
 27 what is it (**obv**) on the top (of the page)? read the firstpart, one two
- 28 ha:ga a:no: agela:bi
 what's underneath, read

Students slowly read aloud, syllable by syllable, a short text in Kaluli about preventing sickness in Bosavi.

- KF] okay
 29 okay

Marking the end of the group reading with the boundary marker 'okay' (29) which is used in Christian speech events, Kulu asks a number of questions which do not relate to the reading that has just been done. Instead, they relate to the cover of the literacy booklet which he is holding up and displaying to the class. The cover is simple: The words "Bosavi" and "Malaria" are typed in small letters at the top of the page. In the center of the page is a black and white drawing of a mosquito (side view), which is encircled. Placed below the drawing and filling the bottom half of the page is the title written in large bolded capital letters, HAMULE E WALAF BO:LO:. It is apparent from the response of the students that the referent about which Kulu is speaking is not at all clear.

- 30 a:no: o:ba?
 what is it?

- student] walaf
 31 sickness

- KF] kalu wi o:ba?
 32 what is the person's name?

- class] Hamule
 33

KF] Hamule Hamule a:no:

34 *Hamule it's Hamule*

35 e o:ba: walaf bo:lo:**lo:bo**:?
from what did he get sick (obv)?

36 walafo: o:ba: walaf bo:lo:**lo:bo**:?
sickness, from what did he get sick (obv) ?

37 walafo: o:b walaf bo:lo:**lo:bo**:?
sickness, from what did he get sick(obv) ?

student] malalia

38 *malaria*

KF] wa:la buko: a:no: bo:ba wa:la wa:lamilo: a:no: bo:ba

39 *look on the front of the book, on the front, look on the front [drawing of mosquito]*

student] kiso:

40 *mosquito*

KF] a:no: wiyo: o:b salaba? (pointing to title) Hamule e walaf bo:lo:
41 *what does the name say? Hamule he got sick*

42 a:no: piksa we o:bo:**lo:bo**:?
this picture, what is it (obv)?

class] kiso:

43 *mosquito*

##

In lines 30-34 Kulu establishes that what he wants the group to focus on is the title of the booklet. Once that is established, he attempts to elicit a particular response to his question about the source of Hamule's sickness. His attempt to get the class to view the drawing of the mosquito above the title as visual evidence of the source is accomplished over several turns. Using the evidential marker *-lo:b*, Kulu asks the class three times (35-37) about Hamule's sickness, what caused it, what it was. What is visually obvious is the drawing of the mosquito and after receiving an answer to his third question, Kulu asks the class to look at the picture on the cover of the booklet (39) for the answer. His assumption is that the visual evidence is obvious. When only one student answers *kiso*: 'Mosquito,' Kulu explicitly refers to the picture (42). Only then does he get the desired group response. Throughout his talk about the source of the sickness, malaria (25-37, 42 and elsewhere), he uses the evidential

form *-lo:b* to indicate that the information is *visually* available.⁴

In contrast to this pattern of evidential choice, when Kulu refers to information, or wants the class to focus on information that is in the written texts, he shifts to evidentials that mark verbal evidence. In other words, the print and the book are classified as speaking subjects. Printed words do not have the same evidential status as graphic representations or as something visually evident. In addition Kulu marks these speaking subjects with ergative case marking, and uses verbs of speaking such as *a:la:ma* 'say like that' and *sama* 'speak/say' to provide evidence for what is in the text, as well as to give authority to the text, verbal authority. He extends this authority to himself at the same time.

##

- 52 **mada** a:la:sa:ga: kalu nowo: walaf bo:lo:wamiyo: kalu nowo: walaf ba:labamiyo: o: walafdo: a:na diya:sa:ga: a:la:sa:ga: no ami dimian**ka: a:la: salabka: wema:**
really after one man gets sick, another man gets sick, (the mosquito) takes from the sick one and then gives it (malaria) to another man it really says like that, this (erg-book)

- 53 walafdo: a:na diya:sa:ga: nowa dimian**ka: a:la: salab** walafdo: a:no: ho:bo:wo: wasuliya:sa:ga: nowa iliga:ifa:la:i **so:lo:lka:** e mulumudo: a hononamilo: walaf ege owami a:na wa:ta:sa:ga: kalu amiyo: o:lanka:
having taken from a sick one, it really gives to another it says, after mixing the blood of the sick one it sends (the sickness) to many I'm really saying, in the sickhouse over there, after drawing the sickness in the needle (stinger), (mosquito) really shoots (injects) a man

##

Kulu uses *wema: a:la: salabka:* 'this one (the book, marked with the ergative casemarker) really says like that', (52) *buko: wema: ... walasalab* 'this book instructs' (62), *a:la: salab* 'it says like that' (53) in addition to variants of these expressions to locate the source of his assertions about mosquitoes. In addition he frequently adds *so:lo:lka:* 'I'm really saying', combining a range of emphatics including *-ka:* and *-balo:* 'emphatic counter to expected' (60) and other lexical items including *mada* 'really,' *hede* 'truly,' with their own emphatics to substantiate his own authoritativeness.

##

- 60 ni welo: nan**balo:** ko:lo: sab**ka:** ho:bo:wo: ko:sega ho:bo:wo: nan**balo:** a:no:

⁴ Throughout the lesson, students do not use evidentials in their answers. In fact, their clipped one word responses here and throughout the lesson have no morphological marking at all. In conversation, an answer would be marked with the evidential *-lo:b* to indicate that the hearer shares the same evidentiary base with the speaker. The only form produced by a student that resembles an evidential occurs in response to a question Kulu asks about how many students are in the class. One student responds using a codeswitched English and Tok Pisin utterance "twenty two *hia*" 'twenty two here'. This is the context in which *-lo:b* would be appropriate, but it is not used. I am currently examining the extent to which Tok Pisin *hia* is being used as an evidential in other types of Kaluli discourse.

noma:lo:wo: nowa a: dia:fa:na:lila wo:gelabamiyo:
*they really drink from us that really live here, blood but they really drink blood,
 from one to another they keep on putting it in mixing it all up*

- 61 o: walaf ko:li ko:lilo:wo: a:na fa:la:lowabka: a:la: salab
all different sickness really comes up from that mixing it says like that

- 62 a:la:fo: ko:lo: o: walaf mo: a:no: o:go: buko: wema: iliki nimo: walasalab
 a:no:
*therefore the sickness's beginning/cause now having this book (erg) instructs us
 about that*

- 63 mo:wo: mada dinafa do:do:l
I really hear/understand the cause well

- 64 a:la:fo: ko:lo: ege buko: lidisi buko: wenami wema:yo: mada nafa salab
therefore uh book, in this literacy book this (erg) really says it well
 ##

Kulu's extensive use of emphatic markers intensifies his assertions about the "facts," their truthfulness, and how well they are stated. The literacy book not only instructs and really says it, but says it really well (64). These assertions are repeated throughout the lesson, and are not to be challenged.

Kulu not only presents the book as a speaking subject with its own voice, but talks about how Papua New Guineans only recently have seen them, and heard them speak.

##

- 57 Papua Nugini kalu we taminamiyo: wengo:wo: mo:ba:ba: ko:sega
PNG men didn't see one like this (book) before but

- 58 no mada o:g Hamule buko: wema:yo: kobale walasalab nimo:wo: kiso:wo:
 nulu ya:sa:ga: alifo:lab ami e nanog diyaki a:namiyo: kalu ho:bo:wo:
 wo:gelaka: a:la: salab
*really today this Hamule book (erg) instructs us well- mosquitoes having come
 at night while we sleep they do their work there really mixing men's blood it
 says like that*

##

Books become the source of understanding through hearing them speak. Kulu asserts, 'I hear/understand the reason from the book', (63) 'we are really hearing new words spoken' (71) and reminds the class to think about and remember what they are hearing that is new.

##

- 67 wena asula:sa:ga:yo: go:no: gelo: alilabamiyo: nuluwo: asula:bi kiso:wa:yo:
 wengo: nanog diabo:lo:bo:no: a:la:bo:
*when you think about this, when you are sleeping at night remember
 mosquitoes do this *we now know don't forget*

- 68 a:sa:ga: Papua Nugini us wenamiyo: taminamiyo: asula:leno:? gimo: a:dabu
bo:do:lka: giliyo: sama asula:leno:? kiso:wa:yo: a:la: nanog diabami walafo:lo:
kalu amiyo: a:la: kaluka:isale amiyo: a:la: balabo:lo:b a:la:bo:

*in the PNG interior here did we know this before? I'm asking you all again, you
all say it did we know this before? that it was the mosquitoes work that made
men sick, men and women too *we now know*

class] mo:asula:len

69 *we didn't know*

KF] mo:asula:len **hede salab**

70 *we didn't know, that's truthfully said*

- 71 mo:asula:lenka: a:la: salab ko:lo: o: niliyo: hedele ho:gi to salabo:lo:do: a:la:
asula:sa:ga: dinafa asuluma:niki

*we didn't really know it says like that, we are really hearing new words spoken
we now know after thinking about them we will understand

##

The visual and the verbal: Captioned photographs

The literacy booklet that is used in this lesson is illustrated with black and white photographs of Kaluli people that are captioned in the Kaluli language. These present an interesting site in which to examine evidential choice, that is, how particular evidentials mark particular aspects of the information Kulu is querying. At different points in the lesson Kulu asks the class to look at these captioned pictures as the source of information in order to answer his questions. For example, one picture shows Kaluli adults and children sitting around and eating. The caption reads:

Hamuleyo: walafo bulufo: ko:lo: eso:lo: kalukaisale ma:no: dowo:ta:sa:ga:
sagalaki mo:no:

When Hamule got well, men and women in his family cooked food and ate happily.

##

- KF] falelo: dowo: ko:lo: -- o: ba falelabiki sagalab -- a:no: wagaba? nodowa
153 hono so:wagaleno: sagala:li o:siyo: -- mo:wo: ha:h? sagalo: ilido: dowab
a:no: -- walafo: dowo:lo:bo:?

*because he got well -- because he is already well they are happy --what
about it? on the other side there--the child is happy right there it said--
what's the reason? they are happy -- is there sickness (obv)? (from the
picture)*

student] falele

154 *he got well*

- KF] falelo: ko:**lo:b** sagalab kelego: dima:daki a:la:fo:ko:lo: o:go: sagalab a:no:
 155 o:bdo: miyo:wagaba?
he got well (obv) (from the picture) so they are doing happy things, this happiness now, what brought it?
 ##

Kulu uses the same pattern of evidential marking in Q/A sequences where the focus of attention is captioned photographs. Here he carefully distinguishes between evidence which is visually evident (-*lo:b*) and that which is verbally evident (*o:siyo:*). For example, the caption says that men and women are happy and Kulu asks that the students produce the reason for that. This requires inferencing. When no response is forthcoming, he provides a possible answer, directing students to base their explanation on how people look in the photograph - *walafo: dowo:lo:bo:?* 'is there obviously sickness?'. When the student was able to provide the correct answer, Kulu reinforces it, using the evidential marker, which the student does not.

In and out of the text

While much of the information Kulu talks about is covered in the text, there are several places where Kulu's words radically depart from the text and from any general Kaluli or Western instructed notions about illness. Despite his extensive use of evidentials and emphatics, and assertions of telling the truth (74) there is considerable leeway for inventiveness. Kulu's words are never challenged by the class.

##

- 73 igo:wo: na:sa:ga:yo:lo: ka:yo: ka:yo: diniya o:lo:so:fa ko:lo: na:sa:ga:yo:lo:
mada ge alifo:likiyo: mego:fo:lo: hononaka a:la: ko:la:liya: dia:ta ka
 alifo:mela:**ika:**
after eating wild pig too fish, fish cooked in a pot, having eaten those things, really while you are sleeping, into your mouth which is open, gets put in there when you are really sleeping
- 74 **mada hede so:lo:l**
I'm really telling the truth
- 75 a:la:fo: ami eyo: o: egeyo: ko:lo: **mada** ege ko:li hinigan ilayamilo: ta:sa:ga:lo:
 a:namilo: gesinamilo: babido: a:no: no a:no: ko:lo: meyo:diliya: ya:ga: a:naka
 asifa: yaka
then they (mosquitoes) the wachamacallit, really the wachamacallit different dirt from the shit house stays there on their claws (legs) sticking there and they (mosquitoes) come around smelling, come and sit there in the mouth
- 76 a:la:ta bes hononamiyo: nagalo:wo: a:na dimia:ni mogago: e gesinamilo:
 babidiliya:ga:lo: yab a:no: ge alifo:laba **mo:ba:daka: a:la: salab**
then they give tooth aches in there, with bad stuff sticking on their claws they come when you are sleeping you really don't see it, it says like that
 ##

Kulu is able to claim authority through asserting the existence of a text that in fact is nonexistent. There is no text that talks about mosquitoes and tooth decay, nor is this an idea that is shared among Kaluli people. Kulu is listened to as a teacher and a Christian, and he becomes a conveyer and interpreter of new truth because he can read the words and mark them convincingly.

The literacy lesson closely resembles sermons with its essentially monologic style, combining reading plus speaking by a knowledgeable leader. The speaking takes place without the usual feedback that organizes all other speech events and creates cohesion. Throughout this event, Kulu proposes that the class trust the language to mean what it says, to take it as literal truth. Facts are made into objects that can be pointed to in the texts, referenced through particular language forms. The genre marks the activity as being one in which only truthfulness is asserted, as in sermons, but in the literacy lesson, particular evidentials help constitute a genre and an interpretive framework for learning. It is monologic, without an author present. Without an author there is no one with whom to argue - Kaluli people have yet to have a dialogue, or an argument with a printed text.

In this lesson, the written text and photographs are used to construct a reality that can henceforth become a material base for changes in social and linguistic ideologies and practices. These texts and their readings establish a new discursive orientation to knowledge, truth, authority and time itself. The written text explicitly denies that Bosavi people had reasons or beliefs before contact. It presents a view that people can have control over their health if they listen to the new words. In spite of this, many local concerns are articulated throughout the lesson - and one is the Kaluli concern with evidence. Printed text and photographs come to satisfy that interest, while providing representations for re-imagining local life as Kaluli people see themselves re-located in books. In contrast to earlier fears about what white people would know about them from a book, today Kaluli names written in books take on a new meaning. Through collaboration between Kaluli and missionaries, not only have Kaluli people been re-imagined as modern Christians, but their linguistic resources have been adapted to accommodate this new view of themselves and their world. In creating themselves as a public of modern Christians, they use visual evidence in addition to printed texts. Perhaps this is the beginning of an imagined community, a prerequisite, I suspect, for a public sphere.

References

- Bendix, Edward (1994) The grammaticalization of responsibility and evidence: Interactional manipulation of evidential categories in Newari. In J. Hill & J. Irvine (eds.), *Responsibility and evidence in oral discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 226-247.
- Besnier, Niko (1995) *Literacy and emotion on a Polynesian atoll*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bybee, Joan (1985) *Morphology: A study of the relation between meaning and form*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Chafe, Wallace & Joanna Nichols (eds.) (1986) *Evidentiality: The coding of epistemology in language*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Cohn, Bernard (1985) The command of language and the language of command. *Subaltern Studies* 4:276-329.

Collins, James (1991) Hegemonic practice: Literacy and standard language in public education. In C. Mitchell & K. Wesler (eds.), *Rewriting literacy: Culture and the discourse of the other*. New York: Bergin & Garvey, 229-253.

Comaroff, John & Jean Comaroff (1991) *Of revolution and revelation: Christianity, colonialism and consciousness in South Africa*, vol. 1. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Duranti, Alessandro & Elinor Ochs (1986) Literacy instruction in a Samoan village. In B.B. Schieffelin & P. Gilmore (eds.), *The acquisition of literacy: Ethnographic perspectives*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 213-232.

Fabian, Johannes (1986) *Language and colonial power*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Feld, Steven (1988) Aesthetics as iconicity of style, or, 'lift-up-over-sounding': Getting into the Kaluli groove. *Yearbook for Traditional Music* 20:74-113.

Feld, Steven (1990) *Sound and Sentiment*. 2nd edition. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Feld, Steven & Bambi Schieffelin (1982) Hard words: A functional basis for Kaluli discourse. In D. Tannen (ed.), *Georgetown university roundtable on languages and linguistics 1981*, Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 351-371.

Fox, Barbara & Joseph Clifford (1991) Evidentiality and authority in English conversation, ms.

Gewertz, Deborah & Fredrick Errington (1991) *Twisted histories, altered contexts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Givón, Talmy (1982) Evidentiality and epistemic space. *Studies in Language* 6:1.23-49.

Guss, David (1986) Keeping it oral: A Yekuana ethnology. *American Ethnologist* 13:3.413-429.

Haviland, John (1989) 'Sure, sure': Evidence and affect. *Text* 9:1.27-68.

Heath, Shirley (1983) *Ways with words*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hill, Jane & Judith Irvine (eds.) (1993) *Responsibility and evidence in oral discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jakobson, Roman (1957) Shifters, verbal categories, and the Russian verb. Russian Language Project, Dept of Slavic Languages & Literatures, Harvard University.

Kulick, Don & Christopher Stroud (1990) Christianity, cargo and ideas of self. *Man* (n.s.) 25:70-88.

Lucy, John (ed.) (1993) *Reflexive language: Reported speech and metapragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McKenzie, D.F. (1987) The sociology of a text: Oral culture, literacy and print in early New Zealand. In P. Burke & R. Porter (eds.), *The social history of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 161-197.

Mignolo, W.D. (1992) On the colonization of Amerindian languages and memories: Renaissance theories of writing and the discontinuity of the classical tradition. *Comparative Studies in Society and*

History 32:310-330.

Ochs, Elinor & Bambi B. Schieffelin (1984) Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories and their implications. In R. Shweder & R. Levine (eds.), *Culture theory: Essays on mind, self and emotion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 276-320.

Rafael, Vincente (1988) *Contracting colonialism: Translation and Christian conversion in Tagalog society under early Spanish rule*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Rule, Murray (1966) Customs, alphabet and grammar of the Kaluli people of Bosavi, Papua. Mimeo, Unevangelised Fields Missions.

Schieffelin, Bambi B. (1986) The acquisition of Kaluli. In Dan I. Slobin (ed.), *The cross-linguistic study of language acquisition. vol 1*. Hillesdale, N. J. : Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 525-593.

Schieffelin, Bambi B. (1990) *The give and take of everyday life: Language socialization of Kaluli children*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Schieffelin, Edward L. (1976) *The sorrow of the lonely and the burning of the dancers*. New York: St. Martins Press.

Silverstein, Michael (1985) The functional stratification of language and ontogenesis. In James V. Wertsch (ed.), *Culture, communication, and cognition: Vygotskian perspectives*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 205-235.

Street, Brian (1984) *Literacy in theory and practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Street, Brian & Niko Besnier (1994) Aspects of literacy. In T. Ingold (ed.), *Companion Encyclopedia of Anthropology*. London: Routledge, 527-562.

Willett, Thomas (1988) A cross-linguistic survey of the grammaticalization of evidentiality. *Studies in Language* 12:1.51-97.