SUMMER INSTITUTE OF LINGUISTICS
PUBLICATIONS IN LINGUISTICS AND RELATED FIELDS

Publication Number 51

PAPERS
ON
DISCOURSE

JOSEPH E. GRIMES, EDITOR

A PUBLICATION OF
THE SUMMER INSTITUTE OF LINGUISTICS
1978

ISBN 0-88312-061-5

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 76-18496

Copies of this publication and other publications of
the Summer Institute of Linguistics may be obtained from

Summer Institute of Linguistics
Center Book Store
7500 W. Camp Wisdom Road
Dallas, TX 75236

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Parji Conversational Strategies and Performative Particles

Beth Morton

Abstract

Lakoff (1971) has pointed out that in situations where the speaker wishes the hearer to do something, English uses modal *will*, *may*, *might*, or *should* attached to the main verb to express varying degrees of politeness. In analogous fashion, Parji uses five performative particles for the sole purpose of giving information about the speaker's attitude to his hearer and to the information he is giving. These function in basically the same way in commands, conversations, and stories. In commands, they reflect an attitude of the speaker ranging from finality to insecurity. In conversations, they indicate rhetorical relationships between propositions, and in stories they signal tension points.

This paper discusses a set of the particles in Parji[1] which I term **performative** particles.[2] Their role in the process of communication is to give information about the speaker's attitude to his hearer and to the information he is giving.

I attempt to specify the distinctions which motivate the speaker's choice between

[1]Parji is a Dravidian language of India. It is spoken by a tribal group in Bastar District of Madhya Pradesh. The data on which this paper is based were taken mainly from a computer concordance of texts processed at the University of Oklahoma in a program funded by NSF Grant GS-1605. The texts were collected in the village of Tiriya during 1967-68. Extra data were drawn from texts published in Burrow and Bhattacharya (1953), and from conversational material collected in the village of Kakalgura in the early part of 1973. The paper was written during June to August of 1973 at a workshop conducted by Dr. Joseph Grimes at Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal.

The phonemes of Parji are short vowels *i*, *e*, *a*, *o*, *u*; long vowels *ii*, *ee*, *aa*, *oo*, *uu*; stops *p*, *b*, *t*, *d*, *ṭ*, *ḍ*, *k*, *g*; affricates *c*, *j*; liquids *r*, *l*, *ṛ*; nasals *m*, *n*, *ŋ*; semivowels *v* and *y*. Three slightly differing dialects are represented in the examples given in this paper, hence some differences in morphemes occur.

[2]I think the term is justified because the use of these particles is specified more by 'conditions pertaining to appropriateness' than in terms of 'truth values' (Ross 1970.222, following Austin). A speaker's attitude to his hearer may or may not be justified, but the basic assertion, 'This is my attitude,' can only be questioned for truthfulness where the speaker is deliberately trying to deceive his hearer, as in a situation where diplomacy is more likely to be useful than overt aggressiveness. This extension of the use of the term 'performative' to include the particles described in this paper seems reasonable as linguists more and more investigate contextually-linked phenomena and the implications and presuppositions made in the transference of information from one person to another. My feeling is more that there are several different types or levels of performative enveloped in this one term. A possible further distinction that emerges in the Parji data is that between the speaker's attitude to his information and his attitude to his hearer. How to handle this, or whether it is necessary, is not yet clear.

individual particles, and to show the unity underlying their use in such diverse circumstances as in simple one-word commands, in conversations, where they join propositions, and in stories, where they signal tension points.

COMMANDS, SUGGESTIONS, AND PLEAS

Speakers of English use a variety of expressions such as 'Well, . . . ', 'What about . . . ', '. . . , you see.' 'Look here: . . . !' to imply various moods and otherwise unstated propositions which in languages like Parji are expressed by specific particles. These particles have no separate lexical meaning. In addition, as Lakoff (1971) has pointed out, in situations where the speaker wishes the hearer to do something, English uses modals *will*, *may*, *might*, or *should* attached to the main verb to express varying degrees of politeness.

Thus, to borrow one of Lakoff's examples, a hostess at a dinner party offering cake to a guest could say:

You must have some of this cake. or
You should have some of this cake. or
You may have some of this cake.

And in such a social context, the degrees of politeness being expressed would range from most polite for the first example (said to someone the hostess was putting above herself in rank), to least polite for the third example (used only by a mother to her child who was also at the party), with the second example lying somewhere between and expressing a certain casualness.

Parji expresses similar shades of meaning with a set of five particles: *ge*, *go*, *gat*, *ek(e)*,[3] and *ni*. To describe what comes out in English as politeness, or the lack of it, would impose on this informal society an idea that is alien to it (certainly there is no equivalent in Parji vocabulary for 'politeness'). Congeniality is probably a better term.

One or another of these particles almost always occurs attached to a verb in the imperative. This, then, takes on the character of either a command, a suggestion, a plea, or sometimes almost a protest. The range of semantic variation can be expressed in terms of two variables, the power structure and the speaker's assessment of the hearer's attitude as it is established by the prevailing situation, or by what the speaker already knows of the hearer.[4]

The first variable, the power structure, describes the relationship of the speaker to the hearer in terms of status or physical strength, or temporary situational advantage or disadvantage. The latter overrides the former: the village strong man drowning in the river is in no position to exert superior status; he is less than the weakest in this situation. A rating of + is given when the speaker is superior to the hearer: for

[3]*eke* is a two-syllable word except where it is attached to another particle to form part of a larger phonological word, when the final *e* is elided.

[4]Again this parallels Lakoff's investigations for English, where she isolates two factors: relative rank and the desirability of the action.

instance, a father in relation to his child, a king to his subject, a tiger to a cow.[5] = means that they are equal: a friend to a friend, members of the same peer group to each other. − is used when the speaker is inferior to the hearer. It is the reverse of rating +: a child to his father, a subject to his king, a cow to a tiger.

The second variable, the speaker's rapport with his hearer, involves his assessment of whether he thinks the person being spoken to would be willing to do what he wants him to, or whether he would not want to either because he dislikes the speaker, or at least was not sufficiently well-disposed towards him to overcome his aversion to doing something inconvenient or difficult. Again, three ratings can be given: + for favourable: the hearer is well-disposed towards the speaker; = for neutral: no particular feelings either way, and in any case, it doesn't matter much; and − for unfavourable or unwilling.

The situational use of the five particles can then be specified from the following chart:

	Power structure	Speaker-hearer rapport	Situational meaning
ge	+	+	finality
	+	=	
go	+	−	opposition
	=	−	
gat	=	=	neutral
eke	=	+	mutuality
	−	+	
ni	−	=	insecurity
	−	−	

Thus, *ge* is the high-rank performative, and *ni* the low-rank performative, with the others somewhere in between. Speaker-hearer rapport is only consistently relevant in the middle ranks where status is approximately equal. For *ge*, high rank implies among other things the ability to enforce an action. This makes rapport with the

[5]Since in Parji stories, animals hold lively conversations with each other, this is a perfectly valid speech relationship.

hearer irrelevant, except in cases where there is extreme opposition or hostility coming from the hearer. In those cases, it is rank that becomes irrelevant because the hearer is not about to be influenced by the normal conventions. In this case, a *go* situation develops, producing the overlap in use noted on the chart.

Similarly for *ni*, since the speaker is unable to use coercion because of his low status, he cannot expect anything from his hearer. Hence the derived meaning of insecurity. Furthermore, whatever rapport there may be, whether positive or negative, is not a matter that the hearer considers of much consequence. The speaker can expect to be ignored simply because of his low rank, except in a situation where the hearer is a friend. In this case, an *eke* situation develops, producing the other overlap noted on the chart.

ge commands are typically brief and peremptory, with little explanation or justification given: *caawa uyu ge papa, iine.* 'You take the rice out to your uncles today, nephew.' *tiita eroḍ, eyu ge.* 'When a bird comes, shoot it.' (This is a father speaking to his son. No argument is expected, so nothing is said beyond the bare requirements of specifying what is to be done.)

go commands are often part of an argument in which a previous conversational exchange has made the hearer's antagonism clear and overt. The commands themselves are much more wordy than *ge* commands. They include repudiations of the previous arguments and further justifications as to why the hearer should obey the speaker: *'inin baande uydan be, kawri muḍloŋin!' 'era, era. inin aklaṭ cenoḍ, ancik ciydan. uyu ciy* ***go.***' ' "Do you think I'd help you, you . . . crocodile!" "Oh stop it. When you want to come across from the other side of the river, I'll bring you on my back. Go on, pull me to the water." ' (This is a badly burnt crocodile trying to talk a man into pulling him to the river. The traditional antagonism between men and crocodiles, who are equals when each is in his home territory, is being preserved by *go.*) *'baabare go cendan be! aan paapkul genjera goora eddav be.' 'cen* ***go.*** *aan caaṛa ciydan.*' ' "I won't go! My babies will starve and shrivel up." "Oh, get on with it. Go. I'll feed them." ' (This is the goddess Parbati speaking to a spider. The intense opposition felt by the spider has taken precedence over the goddess's superior status, which would normally allow her to expect an order to be carried out without argument. The spider is obviously ignoring rank in this situation.)

Expressions with *gat* often occur when the speaker is not particularly concerned about the outcome of his order. He is neutral towards the hearer and neutral about what the hearer may do: *keembur aḍḍu cendam gat. menur* ***gat.*** 'I'm going to go and get some medicine. You stay here.' (This was said to a social equal in a situation where it was immaterial to the speaker what the hearer did in her absence.) *doora olek kurdel uuṛu cenam, mit. cenam gat.* 'Let's go to the rich man's house and dig up some of his yams, friend. Let's go.' (The speaker is going to go anyway, whether his friend comes or not.)

eke expressions usually sound more like friendly requests or suggestions for joint action than like orders. The speaker is fairly confident that the hearer will go along with what is being proposed, and so the tension of the *go* situation is lacking: *inyot meram bitram naatin tindam be? bulki cendam . . . iṭ polub menda. cenar* ***eke.*** 'What

will we find to eat, so deep in the jungle? We're going to get lost . . . There's a village over there. Let's go.' A man says to his wife, *'ana kudra paapkul cuaṛendan. oociyam.' kor aṭṭer gene ari 'uyu* ***eke****. a nelok mer ti mendaw.'* ' "I saw some baby doves over there. Let's fatten them up to eat." They killed and cooked a chicken and he said, "Okay, take it to them. They're in that kapok tree." '

ni expressions, on the other hand, usually sound more like pleas. They express considerable anxiety, because the speaker is at the mercy of the hearer in some way or another and has no way of enforcing his request except by calling on the better nature of the person he is addressing: *'ebbe tindan be' eṭṭo. 'cuuṛ* ***ni****. inin anyot kombaḍ tag kaanyi kili endren . . .'* ' "Aha, now I will eat you," said the crocodile as he grabbed the man. "Oh please, listen. I brought you all this way . . ." ' *caadjan illocil kaanpoḍ kaanpoḍ kaanpoḍ kaanpoḍ kaanpoḍ kaanpoḍ paṇḍ cendov ge. anatle 'dada, dada, peep* ***ni*** *dada. aaṭ pakkot?'* 'The seven girls searched and searched all over the place for their playmate. Then they called, "Older brother, older brother, come out. Where are you hiding?" ' The girls in this situation are at a considerable disadvantage; not only is their playmate older than they are, and so higher in status, but he also has an invulnerable hiding spot from which he need emerge only when he wants to.

The dividing lines between the use of these different particles are by no means hard and fast. In the first place, status is a slippery concept. As Lakoff points out, it is up to the speaker to assert superior rank if he has it. He must be willing to make his claim to superiority overt, and if necessary back it up. There are some situations where the speaker might not want to do so. A parent speaking to a child may wish to encourage his cooperation rather than emphasize that compliance will be exacted by force. In this case, *eke* rather than *go* would be used.

In any case, superior social rank can often be cancelled out by superior physical strength or wealth. Again, in a situation where rank has not previously been established, the speaker can sometimes bluff and choose a rank relationship that suits him: *aklaṭ burṛat cayindu gene. 'eṭe pokkiyan be? moŋgor maama! anun denḍek aklaṭ uy ciy* ***ni****.'* 'On the other side of the river was a dead cow. The jackal said to himself, "How shall I get across?" then, "Hey, Uncle Crocodile! Please, just quickly, take me across to the other side." ' The jackal uses the term 'Uncle' when he addresses the crocodile to put himself into a relationship of junior relative. Thus he can use the humble *ni* request form and make a spurious claim for the assistance which an older relative should give a younger. Given the crocodile's superior power in the water, assuming this pose is the only way the jackal can hope to get across to the other side of the river and not get eaten up in the process.

The other variable, speaker-hearer rapport, may also not be firmly established. In this case, diplomacy may cause a speaker to choose one particle where another less diplomatic speaker would have chosen another. Again, as noted above, situational factors may outweigh rank, as in the example given of the spider speaking to the goddess Parbati. The spider throws propriety to the winds in her indignation at what is being asked of her, and expresses overt hostility: *baabare go cendan be!* 'I . . .

won't go!' The goddess then, apparently bristling in reaction, uses *go* in her reply instead of the more normal *ge*.

The derived situational meanings are: *ge* 'finality', *go* 'opposition', *eke* 'mutuality', *ni* 'insecurity', and *gat* 'neutrality'. These meanings, which apply even in ill-defined situations, are often more useful for an understanding of what is being expressed than a knowledge of the speaker's and hearer's ranks and views of each other. These can be defined only in more tightly structured situations.

The less sharply defined concepts are the ones that apply when the particles are used in conversational exchange. Thus, the particles can be defined in terms of two elements, a common performative element, 'I am ordering or requesting you, and I want a response,' plus one of the situational meanings specified above.[6] *gat* is then the unmarked performative.

CONVERSATIONAL TACTICS

The use of *ge*, *go*, *gat*, *eke*, and *ni* is not restricted to imperatives. Parji conversation is studded with them. So the basic specification of the particles needs to be enlarged to include a three-way performative option: 'I order or request you', 'I say to you', or 'I ask you'. More generally, the use of a particle means 'I am pointing out to you some element in what I am saying which has the quality of finality, opposition, mutuality, insecurity, or no extra quality'. In the last case (*gat*), the purpose of the performative is simply to highlight slightly the element it is attached to.

The particles are attached to the topic of a sentence, which can be any element: verb, surface subject, object, or a time or locative expression.

ge is often used to give finality to a statement: *cendan ge*. 'And now I am going. I can't stop any longer.' It is also used to close a conversation or incident where the

[6]The extra 'I want a response' element distinguishes these particles from the implicit performatives that Ross considers to be a part of every affirmative sentence. Whether Ross's hypothesis is true or not, the particles do seem to have this evocative element.

An interesting parallel to this two-part performative is discussed by Schreiber (1972) for English. He distinguishes the occurrence of manner adverbials such as *frankly*, *truthfully*, *confidentially*, and *briefly* where they occur within a statement such as, *He told me confidentially that he didn't believe a word John said*, from where they occur tacked on to the beginning of a sentence and in no sense modify the information being given or requested: *Honestly, does Puppy really have a pedigree?* or *Frankly, I don't think so*. In these sentences, the adverb is in construction with the sentence as a whole. Schreiber, following on from Ross, analyses these as the only elements that surface from an underlying performative sentence that dominates the statement following: *I request that you tell me honestly whether it's true or not that Puppy has a pedigree* and *I tell you frankly that I don't think he does*. The general part of the performative sentence is deleted by Ross's rule of Performative Deletion, leaving only the extra adverbial element.

The difficulty with handling the Parji elements along the same lines is, of course, that the particles have no separate meaning outside their performative function. Hence the performative sentences suggested for Parji are not to be taken as a claim for their form, but simply a representation in English of the evocative meaning that these particles certainly have.

information or article asked for has been produced, and the speaker considers there is nothing more to be said. In so doing, he asserts his status as the bearer of superior knowledge: *id* ***ge***. 'Here it is, so that's that. (Stop looking; now we can get on with what we were doing before.)' Elsewhere, *ge* expresses clarification of a topic: *in toleḍ* ***ge***, *Mongay*. 'It's your brother she's asking about, Mongay.' *ari keeṭi–keeṭi* ***ge***–*cen*. 'And the winnowing basket—the winnowing basket I mean—go and get it.'

go conveys a very definite idea of opposition to a person or idea: *are* ***go***? 'But where is it? (How can you be so unreasonable as to expect me to bring it if I don't know where it is?)' *ḍenḍek* ***go***. 'Not now—later. (Stop hurrying me.)'

gat attached to statements and questions provides as little colour as in commands: *anuŋ ok key menda* ***gat***. 'Well, I've still got one hand left.'

ni again presents a feeling of insecurity or uncertainty, especially when the information being given is second hand so the speaker's reliability could be questioned: . . . *are* ***ni*** *kaakal aṛaye ge*. '. . . and somewhere—I don't know where—there aren't any crows.'

Both *eke* and *go*, however, have what appears to be a new correlative function when used in statements. Instead of marking the end of a statement or piece of conversation, like *ge*, they glue elements of it together in pairs by setting one proposition against another. Again, the meaning that comes through for *eke* contrasts with that conveyed by *go*.

Where *eke* expresses complementarity, *go* expresses exclusion: *ale re, murtacile. amuŋ paaṭa paḍ ciyur; aam* ***eke*** *eenduram*. 'Grandmothers, sing for us; and we, **on our part**, will dance.' *Nowrangpur ti eedom, iin* ***go*** *Beth oori berota* . . . 'We arrived in Nowrangpur. But you Beth, you didn't come yesterday . . .' (If Parji had morphemes to mark inclusive/exclusive distinctions, no doubt the exclusive morpheme would be used on the verb of the first sentence.)

Where *eke* relates *like* elements, *go* implies unlike elements: *ok ka* ***eke*** *coon menda ge; ok ka* ***eke*** *ruup menda* ***ge***. 'In **one** gourd there was gold, in the **next** silver.' *ana mari arti coknil, eeḍ* ***go*** *cetterul, ari eeḍ* ***go*** *jandel*. 'And **some** gave dishes; **others**, however, gave spoons, and **still others** gave pots.'

Where *eke* implies that the second action is a natural result of the first, *go* implies a contrary-to-expectation relationship: *paḍcil kic poḍ eendurar. kic* ***eke*** *citra*. 'The boys dance on top of the fire, **and so** the fire goes out.' *ebe je re baaca. ipoṭ* ***go*** *tindan*. 'And now—you escaped before. **But**, this time, I'm going to eat you!'

Where *eke* expresses reciprocity, *go* expresses denial of relationship: *o gaḍid, inen* ***eke*** *kunti cipri ti roje diina cinyom, amuŋ* ***eke*** *inen iin cinyot*. 'Oh herdsman, we gave food to you every day, so today you are giving to us.' *'naato ciydan?' 'iin* ***go*** . . .' ' "What shall I give you? Tell me." "No, **you** decide." '

Where *eke* expresses cooperation, *go* expresses the dissociation of one group from another: *ale maacil, paḍcil: ete caajuram be? aam* ***eke*** *ok ok payca pattipar* . . . 'Well, guys, what shall we do? We two will collect money from you all . . .' *aam*

olek **go** *bodlam bedda. av* **go** *aaro dec to benyondav.* 'The blame for this will fall on **us. They** have come from far away. . .'

Where *eke* expresses compatibility, *go* expresses incompatibility. An *eke* form is an explanation, a *go* form is a complaint or expostulation: *aan billey enni kili atten eke.* 'I thought you were a cat, that's why I hit you!' *aan potta panyoya. iin* **go** *anin teegot.* 'I'm still hungry, although you told me there would be plenty. You told me a lie.' *iin* **go** *dinyolec bommel cuur cuuri pokkiyat. banelec bommel cuur cuuri pok ni!* 'You count with your eyes half shut. Open them up wide!'

Not all parts of the propositions being related need be overtly expressed. The second proposition may delete from its surface representation any element that is identical with one in the first. In addition, the first proposition may be expressed by one speaker, the second by his respondent. Thus in the example already given, *go* is used in a dialogue, with most of the second sentence missing: A: *naato ciydan?* 'What shall I give you?' B: *iin* **go**. 'You-opposition.', that is 'It's not for me to tell you. You must say.' The second proposition is a reply to the first, and in it everything except the part in opposition has been deleted by an identity operation.

This provides the link between the examples given above and the commands with *go* and *eke* described in the previous section. In the commands there are also two propositions involved, although the exact form of the first is usually implicit rather than overtly expressed. Prior to the command, there is a discussion or argument, or else a nonverbal situation exists which is understood by both the speaker and the person who is addressed. From this situation, the speaker draws a conclusion or makes a presupposition, which then constitutes the first proposition. The command is a response and forms the second proposition.[7] Thus, some women chasing a dog into the jungle say, *ete eddam be? inyot meram ti ber kattom. aandumo. ete eddam be?* 'What will we do? We've come so far into the jungle, and it's getting dark. What will happen to us?' Then one says, *it polub menda. cenar eke.* 'There's a village over there. (We can stay the night there.) Let's go.' The assumption that they will be able to stay overnight in the village, and that this is what the other women will want to do, is not stated, but is directly implied by the situation and previous conversation. Again, in the previous example where the spider defies the goddess Parbati: *baabare* **go** *cendan be! aan paapkul genjera goora eddav be.* 'I won't go. My babies will die,' the goddess's response picks up the spider's challenge: *cen* **go**. *aan caara ciydan.* '**Nevertheless** go. I'll feed them.'

Thus the only difference, apart from morphological structure, between a command with *go* or *eke* and the sets of conjoined propositions just described is that in a command the first proposition is normally implicit, and elsewhere it is normally overtly expressed, however incompletely.

Thus the function of *go* and *eke* is to set one element against another, both in commands and statements. They may set one character and his actions against another: *padic cuurrad ge. ayal eke navmo ge.* 'The boy looked at the woman. As

[7]In its wider sense, a presupposition is 'whatever has to be assumed to be true in order for an utterance to be meaningful' (Muraki 1972.300).

for the **woman**, she just **smiled**.' They may also set one object against another: *meelin cap kadra ge. veyin* ***eke*** *tinda ge.* 'He tipped out the wine, but the **rice** he ate.' One period of time may be set against another: *are baaciline ţeegot epipoḍ. ipoţ* ***go*** *tindan!* 'You deceived me before and got away, but **now** I am going to eat you!' or one location against another: *iini* ***go*** *verruv be niir aycil.* '(The girl is not **there** any longer.) But **here** the women will come to draw water (and she may be among them).' They may simply set one action against another: *cella gen ti eroya, adug naane niit miyu mendum* ***eke***. 'We can't stay sitting on the bough all the time. We'll go and bathe in the water instead.' In each case, it is the second of the two elements being related in this way that has the particle attached to it.

Occasionally both elements have *eke* and *go* attached to them. In these cases, there would seem to be a larger unit involved, of which both elements are a part; as a pair they are being set against it. The gourds in the previous example that have gold and silver in them are two of a pile: *paḍic* ***eke*** *telkul vaalemed ge. ok ka* ***eke*** *coon menda ge. ok ka* ***eke*** *ruup menda ge.* 'When he had harvested the gourds, the boy cut off their tops. 'In **one of them** there was gold, and in **another one** silver.' Occasionally also, and particularly in explanations, it is the first element that has the particle attached, because in terms of time sequence, it is actually the later of the two actions: *iin bele ebor* ***eke*** *tindan be enmot, enḍe uyu ciy endut.* 'Now you say you'll eat me, when before you were asking me to help you.'

The basic assumptions for *eke* and *go* are thus two. First, it is assumed that there is a common topic; that is, the two members of the conjunct pair are related to each other in some way, either because of their inherent qualities or identical grammatical category, or simply because they form a set through being juxtaposed in time and location. The second assumption is that in some sense or another the elements need to be distinguished from each other, either by comparison or contrast.[8]

STORY-TELLING

Within the structure of narrative as a whole, *ge*, *go*, and *eke* take on other functions, while *gat* rarely appears at all (only once outside quoted conversation in any piece of text so far recorded), and *ni* disappears altogether.[9]

ge, in accordance with its function as the concluding element in a conversation, acts as a verbal full stop on the end of information units (Halliday 1967). These are

[8]The second assumption distinguishes *eke* and *go* from the connective *ari* 'and'. (Parji has no 'but', although it does have means of expressing this relationship, usually by simple juxtaposition of two independent sentences.) *ari* unites elements under the one NP or VP node in the surface structure of a sentence: *kube kube diina mendam be, Lecmi* ***ari*** *aanu* ***ari*** *Nancy* ***ari*** *Beth.* 'Many many days we'll stay there, Lecmi and I and Nancy and Beth.' *tiţţa delkul eedom* ***ari*** *mari cen kaţţom.* 'We arrived at midday and then left again.' In these sentences, there is no sense of elements being set one against the other. The relationships established are simply listing relationships, either with or without a time sequence.

[9]There are other performative particles that also occur in narrative. *naane* 'this is how it was' signals the end of an episode or incident, and the announcement initiator *ale* appears in rhetorical questions and statements that introduce new settings, situations, or occasionally characters.

usually one sentence long, although smaller units within the sentence can also be marked out in this way: *ana gene dec deciyaler* ***ge****, ger geriyaler* ***ge*** *cenni kili caṛaŋ merkul mendav* ***ge*** *ana beṇḍ tinder* ***ge****.* 'There, so it is said, the local people (***ge***), the village people (***ge***) went, and where there are pipal trees (***ge***), they cooked and ate (***ge***).'

In all mythological stories, and optionally in just-for-fun stories, *ge* alternating with the quotative *gene* is tagged on to the end of every sentence from start to finish.[10] In mythological stories, *ge*, together with the use of paired sentences in which the information stated in the first is given again in slightly different words, gives an effect of extreme deliberateness which is suitable to the significance of the story but makes it very slow listening: *baada portal mendid* ***gene****, duuka portal mendid* ***gene****.* 'There was an orphan boy with no one to look after him, **it is said**. There was an orphan boy without a home, **so the story goes**.' *menuŋ menuŋ menuŋ menuŋ naane, ek jiyat ermeḍ* ***ge****. duwi jiyat ermeḍ* ***ge****.* 'After a long long time, he grew up (***ge***). He became an adult (***ge***).' *ek jiyat, dawi jiyat enyed erod naane, neliŋ geriyal paap jenom enyeḍ* ***ge****. baador geriyal paap jenom enyeḍ* ***ge****.* 'When he was become an adult, grown-up, this is what happened, the moon-house child was born (***ge***). The cloud-house child was born (***ge***).'

The occurrence of *eke* and *go* in stories is much more sporadic. They appear mostly within quoted conversation. They also occur, however, in the event sequence, where the following pattern of occurrence emerges: If we think of a Parji story as a series of episodes each consisting of an action or set of actions by one character and the reaction of another character to what the first does, then it appears that *eke* and *go* occur where the second character is brought into focus through his reaction. This marks the changeover point from action to reaction.[11] The event so marked is either the climax itself or the first of a series of events forming the climax.

At this point in some episodes, the two main characters have been introduced and have been through a period of interaction, following the initial action by the first character. Thus in one story, the two main characters of the first episode are the jackal and a lump of earth. The jackal finds the lump of earth and suggests they go bathing together. This is the first event, the action by the jackal. They both jump in and out of the river, and then in again. This is the second event, the interaction between the jackal and the lump of earth. Then *kaḍu eke niir ti biir cenda.* 'As for the lump of earth, it dissolved in the water.' This is the counter-event or reaction to

[10]In the latter, it is more frequent for *ge* and *gene* to be dropped after the introductory sentences.

[11]Episodes are not all of this action-reaction form. There is a less dramatic type which is simply an account of what one character does, and here *go* and *eke* do not occur. The term 'reaction' is used in its loosest sense. It includes actions and changes of state. The causal connection between the reaction and the action that elicits it is not always direct. Rather it is a situation of event and counter-event, as viewed by the story-teller from outside the temporal sequence. The counter-event is not always the only part in the episode marked by *eke* or *go*. Other incidents within an episode may also be marked in this way, where two characters are involved. More normally, however, the story-teller reserves the use of these particles for the significant point in the episode that leads into the climax.

the preceding events. It begins the climax of this episode. The jackal demands the return of his friend, or that a fish be given as a substitute. A fish jumps out onto the river bank, and the second episode starts. The jackal seizes the fish, puts it out to dry, and goes away, leaving it unwatched. This is the first event of this new episode and consists of the action by the jackal. When he comes back, as a result of his negligence, *miini* ***eke*** *anan cilla mendu.* 'The fish—it had disappeared.' This is the counter-event for this episode and the beginning of a new climax. The jackal again demands the return of his property, or that a substitute be given. The stump on which the fish was drying splits into kindling, the jackal takes it, and the third episode begins on the same plan. After this, the use of *eke* ceases, presumably because the pattern of expectation in this cyclic story has been established, so that the story-teller does not feel the need to point out what his listener can already anticipate.

In this story, the tension or changeover point is where the second character disappears and thus produces the condition that moves the story into the next episode, where another character is introduced in his place. In the story of the horrible brothers Atek and Bitek, it is the death of a secondary character that forms the first reaction point. This is preceded by a considerable amount of interaction between Bitek and his brother and some cattle. Then the story-teller focuses on Bitek and his sister-in-law: *atek mari tariyat ked cap cinyed cond ti. ad* ***eke*** *cimka cenda, canya.* 'And then Bitek poured the hot broth into his sister-in-law's mouth. She fainted and died.' This results in a hasty change of locale by Bitek and his brother, taking them to where they meet a rich man and go to work for him. In this new, temporary state of equilibrium, Bitek is minding the goats, a peaceful enough occupation, but then: *iita meyul markipmov. i padic* ***eke*** *cured aru 'maramov' etted.* 'The goats were chewing their cud. And the boy, when he saw them, said, "They are making faces at me!" ' His reaction of anger and spite to the goats' innocent action leads to the mutilation of the goats and another hurried departure to a new place, where another episode starts.

In both these stories, one of the main characters remains constant throughout the story: the jackal in the first story, and Bitek in the second. The other main character of the episode changes each time. This is the typical pattern for nonfactual stories. Accounts of actual happenings, and procedural discourses frequently involve changing pairs of main characters. Thus in a description of the Parja Diwalli festival, successive episodes involve firstly the villagers as a group and the herdsman, then the herdsman and the priest's wife. This is followed by an episode involving the villagers and the herdsman again, then the herdsman is involved with the women of the village. These episodes are not all marked with *eke*; the action is going along evenly, and there is little tension. In the final episode where the boys and girls of the village engage in horseplay together, however, there is considerable excitement, producing a double climax: *padcil kic podi eendurar . . . kic citoto erod maacil* ***eke*** *nirkitav.* 'The boys dance on top of the fire which the girls have lit . . . When the fire goes out, the girls light it again.' After this happens three times, *maacilin ciruŋ padcil meykitar. maacil eke padcilin meykitar.* 'The boys smear the girls with mud, and the girls smear the boys' and so the festival ends.

Stories which use the other particle *go* can also be of this form, but more often they involve a set of two main characters who remain constant throughout the story, in sustained opposition to each other. These can be traditional enemies like the jackal and the tiger or the crocodile, or a government official and a villager. In other stories, the opposition between the characters arises out of the first incidents of the story, like a boy and his father who leaves him to drown in the river. In still other stories, the opposition is implicit in the background to the story, as in a story of a wife deceived by her husband because, it is implied, they have disagreed over what he should be getting to eat. (Since the folk stories are so well known from the telling and retelling, this type of background is very frequently left out.)

Thus in one story of the jackal and the crocodile, the first episode tells how the jackal manages to eat the crocodile's babies: *'okurin uyu' eṭṭo gene. uyi kili gooli* ***go*** *aklaṭ monor ṭenki erare tindo gene.* '"Take one (of my sons off to school)," said the crocodile. The jackal took the baby crocodile and, over there out of sight, gobbled him up until his stomach was almost bursting.' And so a whole series of episodes begins in which the crocodile tries to retaliate against the jackal. First of all, he lies in wait for the jackal in the river: *baar ceŋge poori kaṭṭo menda ge. poori mendanug naane, gooli* ***go*** *cendo ge.* 'The crocodile hid himself alongside a log in the river. When he was lying there, up came the jackal to drink.' Here the tension point of the episode has been reached by the jackal coming within reach of the crocodile again, so that he is grabbed and extricates himself only by bluff.

A series of similar incidents takes place, until the crocodile is lying burnt in the river. In this final episode, a cow and a man are also involved as minor characters, and much argument takes place without any resolution. Then at last, *aaṭeli* ***go*** *gooli lu lu lu lu benyo gene.* 'From somewhere came the jackal scampering up,' and by his cunning finally vanquishes the crocodile completely and eats him up.

The purpose of this discussion is to indicate that in stories, as in conversation, *go* and *eke* function to mark a relationship between two characters and their actions. In stories, however, the fact that the actions are members of bipartite sets is often not as clear cut as in conversation. The relationships being established are frequently on a larger episode-size scale, so that it is more convenient to think of a whole series of actions by one character being linked with a set of actions by another.

The question also arises as to what motivates the choice of one particle against the other. As in conversation, the choice rests mainly with the speaker, and arises out of the view of his characters that he wishes to establish. He must decide whether he considers his main characters to be fundamentally in opposition to each other or not. For jackal and crocodile or tiger stories, *go* is obligatory because of the nature of the characters, but in some other stories, one speaker may choose to use *eke* where another chooses *go*. It is interesting that the scale of the decision is normally larger than a single episode. Stories usually have *eke* relationships throughout, or *go* relationships throughout; they are either *eke* stories or *go* stories.

And so the performative nature of *go* and *eke* again comes into play. Not only is a relationship being established between two characters and their actions, but the story-teller is interjecting his interpretation of these actions as either cooperative or

competitive, and at the same time signalling to the hearer, 'Hey, sit up and take notice. This event is significant. Now things are really getting under way!'