Research, Rituals and Reciprocity: The Promises of Hospitality in Fieldwork

Rosita Henry & Michael Wood
(James Cook University)

Abstract:

In this paper we draw on anthropological and linguistic research concerning Papua New Guinea (PNG), including the work of Alexandra Aikhenvald, to consider hospitality in fieldwork. We look at how fieldworkers and research participants construct and enact obligations and expectations that arise in the field. With reference to our own fieldwork experiences among the Kumula of the Western Province and the Penambi Wia of the Western Highlands Province, we explore promises as they are expressed especially in formal public definitions of hospitality performed in feasts and field schools and in small rituals of everyday hospitality that focus on dyadic relations between guest and host. We argue that the enactment of hospitality between researchers and their hosts creates expectations of continuing reciprocity in the transfer not only of knowledge but also other yet unknowable, hoped for, potentialities that a continuing social relationship might bring. The promise of hospitality involves an openness to the new, to the unexpected and to the other.

Introduction

Attempting to become embedded in a natural speech community lies
at the very heart of Alexandra Aikhenvald's research endeavour.
Throughout her distinguished career she has advocated for
'immersion fieldwork' as '…the backbone of an empirically-based
science of linguistics' (Aikhenvald 2007: 3). For Aikhenvald, firsthand
documentation in the field 'is essential for our understanding of
human languages, their structural properties and their genetic
relationships' (2007: 3). In this paper we reflect on the nature of the
relationships between field researchers and the speech communities
that host us, focusing particularly on practices of hospitality and the
promises, obligations and expectations that are entailed.
Young (2020: 5) provides us with a working definition of hospitality
as follows:

Hospitality is …a set of practices for establishing social relations
between hosts and visitors … if we think of hospitality as a formal
system for establishing a set of relations meant to negotiate encounter,
it emerges as a kind of practical pidgin language for the negotiation of
alterity.

Yet, hospitality is not simply the transformation of alterity into
sociality. It is also a practical language for the assertion of identity
(sameness), and at its best the practice of mutual care and 'love'
(Aikhenvald 2013). It, like gift-giving, 'involves reciprocity, a tension
between spontaneity and calculation, generosity and parasitism,
friendship and enmity, improvisation and rule; like the gift, hospitality
encompasses distant agents, it embeds social transactions in
materiality and raises complex questions relating to economy and
time' (Candea and da Col 2012: S1-S2).

Hospitality: The political economy of the stranger guest

The hospitality that was granted to us as anthropologists among the Kumula and the Penambi Wia respectively, and that is granted to researchers in many different fieldwork contexts, has long been understood to be structured by cultural imaginaries of the stranger and the host. In some Melanesian contexts, for example, effective and dangerous power is typically thought to be a property of an external 'other'. Such an 'other' in colonial times could take the form of the European who was in fact the local ruler and representative of the sovereign. Europeans could also stand for forms of vitality derived from outside of the local world (Candea and da Col 2012: S7) and were understood as capable of redefining relationships with the dead and redefining inequalities in the global distribution of wealth and technology. Hospitality to the stranger emerged primarily on the horizon of an anticipated future and an ability to provisionally and partially incorporate the stranger within existing 'socio-cultural geographies' (Frieze 2009: 52). Yet such hospitality never fully assimilates the stranger into the self.

There is often a persisting sense of a partial or incomplete relationality between researcher and host that can amplify into a non-relation. Hospitality in research is not just organised by mutual sharing of value but also by the negative contours of sociality (Shryock 2019, Serres 2007). Such negative contours involve the creation of a world without exchange where consumption can occur without sharing, where nothing we possess is given to another, where one can accumulate without adequate reciprocity or indeed any reciprocity. Such a world of taking without giving is ultimately defined by theft - of cultural heritage, of intellectual property, of anything. This is a world defined by inadequate recognition, or by the complete substitution of self by an intrusive other who comes to speak for you and who seemingly never stops speaking for you or about you. This is a world of accumulation rather than transaction. In PNG the stranger, such as a visiting European researcher, can be understood as a hoarder, as defining a site of vast accumulation without any capacity to share, give or transact. This kind of subject also informs post-colonial critiques of colonial knowledge production as appropriation, ceaseless accumulation and even destruction. This subject is no longer a guest, but an exploitative, deceptive other. At best such a researcher-guest is

considered a parasite (Serres 2007) who is sincerely engaged in recording, securing and partially consuming local forms of social, linguistic and cultural expression.

On the other hand, the critique of the researcher in PNG as a knowledge extractor is balanced by PNG understandings of relations with Europeans as opening up 'roads' and other possibilities of extraction of valuable things from the Europeans without return. Such narratives imply that Papua New Guineans could potentially be equivalently parasitic on strange researchers. The two extractive economies are not necessarily morally equivalent – the foreign researcher currently contains more oppressive characteristics than any PNG extractor. Nonetheless both outline some of the current liveliness of negative hospitality involved in fieldwork by strangers.

It is within such an ecology of alien power and ambiguous possibility that the anthropologist or the linguist arrives as a guest and begins work. Gaining access to the field and acceptance within a community generally requires a key member of that community to be willing to take responsibility for the researcher. Fieldwork, especially in remote regions, often places a researcher in a position in which they must rely on the hospitality of members of the community, and where they become dependent on the cultural, political and environmental knowledge of their hosts to facilitate research access to others in the community or to ensure their safety in the field.

The relationship between researcher and research participant has received much attention in the literature, especially since the reflexive turn in anthropology and moves for greater collaboration between researchers and their hosts (Glowczewski et al. 2013, Modan 2016, Rice 2011, Schwartz and Lederman 2011, Yamada 2007). What we write may be an ethnography, a grammar or a dictionary or a work that addresses debates from within our respective disciplines, but if we are to succeed in our endeavours we must, as Jane Hill proposes, 'incorporate a cultural and ethnographic understanding of language into the very foundations of our research' (2006 : 113). This echoes Aikhenvald's commitment to "immersion fieldwork".

Immersion fieldwork and reciprocity

In the face of increasing language endangerment and the threat of language extinction, Aikhenvald has strongly advocated for recording languages as spoken naturally within their social and cultural contexts. This she argues can only be done through 'immersion fieldwork', which she defines as 'observing the language as it is used, becoming a member of a community, and often being adopted into the kinship system' (Aikhenvald 2015: 21).

Dobrin and Schwartz (2016: 254) argue that linguistic fieldwork requires that 'linguists and community representatives work together as equal partners to design and establish project goals that will serve both academic and community needs'. Such research aims to create accessible and useful material for community members. What is ultimately promised by this mutual engagement is that the hospitality of the research participants is reciprocated by the researcher with valued language material. However, the language material valued by the research participants may not be the same as that valued by the researcher. For example, Aikhenvald (2013: 178-9) lists, in order of merit, the outcomes of her research work that are valued by academia (such as monographs and papers on typological topics, language contact, and language change) in comparison with the outcomes that are valued by her Tariana research participants (such as dictionaries and text collections). She notes,

   ...academia tends to discard what the Tariana value. As a result, the more I succeed academically, the more unfulfilled debt I feel with respect to what I ought to do for the remaining Tariana speakers, my Tariana family. There is never enough.

In some contexts, value may not be ascribed by research participants to the existing language at all, nor to any materials produced about it. Rather, what might be valued is new forms of expression and access to the language, knowledge and institutions of the powerful; or gaining access to a text in English may be more useful to community members than having it written in a heritage language few understand (Dobrin and Schwartz 2016: 255-56).

Immersion fieldwork enables researchers to grasp the culturally specific values that often inform local expectations of research

outcomes. It allows researchers to engage with members of speech communities 'in ways that resonate with their cultural values, even though these may be implicit or counterintuitive from the researcher's point of view' (Dobrin and Schwartz 2016: 256). It is only by attuning ourselves to what constitutes adequate reciprocity for our research participants that we can begin to understand what good relationships might look like from their perspective (Dobrin and Schwartz 2016: 160). However, reciprocity, certainly in the PNG contexts in which we have worked, does not just privilege the host's perspective but typically involves a continuous series of 'promissory prestations' (Dapuez 2013) that continually redefine the hospitable actors, their perspectives on each other and their value to each other.

Hospitality as promissory gift

How does the stranger become someone you care for? We think this is achieved through what we call here hospitality. We argue that hospitality enables incorporation of the researcher into social relationships, without the eradication of difference, by drawing host and guest into promissory relations of possibility. Such promises can involve long-term relationships of care between researcher and particular members of the host community. An initial act of hospitality can open up the possibility of an open-ended series of transactions. However, as Dapuez (2016) notes:

…to ensure that they continue through time, promises and engagements need to be particularly and timely fulfilled. Just as gifts can sometimes work as instruments for producing engagement, gifts also realize a vow in an object with the aim of promising an even larger or meaningful object. After the movement of a minor gift that realizes the vow in an object, engagement is actualized. In these cases, the given gift does not close any reciprocity circuit…but the given object refers to a promise already made, becoming a promissory gift.

In other words, the aim of hospitality and the series of transactions it initiates is to allow the relationship and its imagined possibilities to continue into an indefinitely defined future, even if expectations sometimes remain unfulfilled.

To make good on promises in the particular and timely fashion expected can be difficult. Aikhenvald (2015:23) reflects on this in relation to her own fieldwork as follows:

   Being integrated into the Tariana community of Santa Rosa in northwest Amazonia, and into the Manambu community at Avatip in New Guinea, has never been easy for me. The 'adopted' family ties impose moral and financial obligations, and may even hamper further research.

Anthropologists, linguists and other field researchers, often make promises to research participants and they make promises to us. Promises have complex properties and are not necessarily always kept by either side. This may be due to misunderstandings about whether a promise was made in the first place or to different ideas about the moral status of particular promises - whether it is actually necessary to 'make good' on them.

There are often multiple culturally specific understandings of a promise in play in these contexts. Such understandings are also reflected in Smith's (1997: 154) account of promising, which in her terms is a moral institution that

   …gives agents the power to control the moral status of their future actions. By making a promise to do A an agent makes A obligatory for him, and thus typically changes its moral status…Some promises convert an otherwise morally neutral act to an obligatory one, while others merely render more obligatory an act that was already morally required.

In terms of our own cultural values, as researchers, breaking a promise has negative moral value. On the surface of things, at least trying to uphold a promise is something that we take for granted is crucial for creating and maintaining good relations with others. Yet, much like many politicians, we sometimes do not 'make good' on our promises.[1] In the context of fieldwork we might prevaricate by making promises that we know are expected of us or that we feel obliged by our hosts

---

[1] For example, a recent media headline: '*Will Papua New Guinea's New Leader Make Good on His Reform Promises?*' (WPR 14 June 2019)

to make, even though we are not certain we can keep them. In other words, we might take risks in making promises in the hope of being able to make good on them later, but not sure that we can. There are also promises we might make and then subsequently regret, say if we discover that fulfilling the promise might cause more harm than good. Or we might say we will do something without meaning it to be a binding promise, but it is interpreted as such by our hosts, and vice versa.

In addition, the speech act of promising in other cultural contexts can take a different form to Anglo-European performances of promises (Rosaldo 1982: 216). In egalitarian societies, where promises cannot easily be enforced, a hospitable openness to a visitor might be an effective way to engage with the potential powers contained in that stranger. Offering hospitality to a stranger reflects a kind of hopefulness about a future state that cannot yet be fully understood or fully realised. The promise of what such hospitality might return is indefinite and ambiguous and there is no clear time of fulfillment. In PNG, promises are often a fundamental part of an economy of future revelation.

Drawing on our fieldwork experiences in PNG, we reflect below on some long-term relationships we developed with particular research participants that centred on both promises that involved binding obligation and promises involving possibilities that may be revealed. In our discussion we outline some of the temporal and spatial complexities of 'making good' on promissory obligations and more diffuse expectations. We position these promises as something realised in our long-term interactions with our research participants. We emphasize daily interactions, as it is in such interactions that both hospitality and promises are publicly generated, displayed and critically evaluated. It is in food sharing, mobilizing resources for life cycle payments and feasts and other mundane transactions that hospitality and promises of reciprocity are realised. Promises are now also routinely defined by formal contracts that can facilitate often unequal access to the status, wages, land and wealth that emerge from such state authorised promises. The promises of the contract and market and the promises of the gift co-exist, sometimes productively and sometimes in destructive tension with each other, and both crucially define the nature of research and its social relationships.

The gift of hospitality: Penambi Wia promises

Perhaps it is unusual, but it can happen that a friendship precedes fieldwork. This was the case with Rosita Henry's fieldwork among the Penambi Wia in the Western Highlands of PNG. In fact, the friendship in question began while she was still at high school. A Penambi Wia girl, Maggie Leahy (Maggie Wilson after marriage) had attended the same boarding school in Australia with Rosita. Maggie was a fluent speaker of Temboka, which belongs to a linguistic continuum that includes Melpa spoken by the people living north of Mt. Hagen township and the language known as Ku Waru (as documented by Merlan and Rumsey 1991), spoken in the Western Nebilyer Valley, Western Highlands Province of Papua New Guinea. The speakers themselves call their way of speaking *tok ples* (in Tok Pisin) or *mbo ung* (lit. seedling/cutting talk) in their *tok ples*. The metaphor of planting, growth and fertility is cosmologically and ontologically important for peoples of the Western Highlands, who refer to themselves as *mbo* - planted beings (seedlings, cuttings or offshoots). This is important for comprehending the promise of hospitality, as understood among Penambi Wia people. Penambi Wia think of themselves as offshoots grown from the work invested in them by others. In turn, their relationships with others have to be cultivated and fertilised by their own labour, including acts of hospitality.

Maggie and Rosita maintained the friendship they had begun during their schooldays for over 40 years, until Maggie passed away in 2009, but the relationship they forged has lasted well beyond her death. When Rosita went to PNG to conduct field research for a postdoctoral project, Maggie became more than a friend extending hospitality to another friend, but an invaluable cultural guide and source of insights into the political complexities of social relations in the Highlands of PNG. In other words, Maggie became what some researchers call a 'key informant'. The friends began to plan to work together as research partners on a project exploring problems of gender relations and women's political empowerment. Although, Maggie's death interrupted these plans, the promises that Maggie and Rosita made to

one another continue to be fulfilled after Maggie's death and will possibly do so after Rosita passes away through the strong relations that have been created among their children.

Since travelling from Australia to attend Maggie's funeral in 2009, Rosita has been a regular guest of Maggie's family and her lineage – the Wia Ulgamp Komp – while conducting field research to complete Maggie's life story (Wilson 2019). During one field trip, Rosita brought her daughter, Roselani, then a medical student, to do a placement at the nearby hospital in Mt Hagen. Several years later, Rosita also invited her younger sister, Rosemarie to help her with an ethnographic field school run in collaboration with Maggie's daughter, Bernadine. The field school was itself a highly structured reflexive enactment of a ritual of hospitality (Pitt Rivers 2012) providing the students with the knowledge and organisational infrastructure relevant to being a good guest/visiting researcher who ideally can move across, and articulate between, multiple differences in culture, language and power.

The field school was held once a year for 4 years, until the Covid-19 pandemic prohibited travel. For Rosita, the field school presented a means to meet the promise of the hospitality that the Penambi Wia had extended to her in the past. Field school funds enabled the student group to appropriately recompense members of the host village for their hospitality, their time and knowledge. Both this small contribution to the local economy and access to a wider social universe was appreciated by our hosts. The students were incorporated as guests via the hospitality rituals of the host community. In turn, the host community was incorporated into the staged rituals of the field school, including the welcome and farewell ceremonies and the public presentation of gifts and speeches.

The field schools drew Rosita more deeply into a promissory relationship with Maggie's kin who continue to hope that she will return one day with another group of students and that past students will come back. Their expectations have been partly met by the fact that several students did in fact return. Rosita's sister, Rosemarie returned to continue her doctoral research and one of the fieldschool students, Jack Growden, returned to do research for his honours thesis. Later, Jack established a not-for-profit organisation, called Litehaus, to supply computer technology to schools in PNG and he has

returned numerous times, on occasion with other past students. The fact that Rosemarie, Jack and other students came back is significant. While Penambi Wia and their neighbours, the Kopi tribe, are used to tourists coming and going, never to be seen or heard of again, return visits hold the promise of reciprocities that flow from the growth of long-term relations. That Rosita not only brought her own sister and daughter but also returned each year with groups of students to the village, some of whom themselves returned, is in itself the expression of the continuing promise of her friendship with Maggie.

The promise of the relationship partly found expression in the small contributions that Rosita made to bridewealth exchanges and to mortuary exchanges - what she has elsewhere called 'gifts of grief' (Henry 2012), the field school, and the completion and presentation of her research work on Maggie's memoir (Wilson 2019). However, ultimately it was Rosita's willingness to share her own kin (in a sense to gift something of herself) that cemented her 'social ties' with Maggie's kin, including everything that lies hidden behind that dispassionate phrase – 'social ties'. As Graeber (2001: 161) notes, social scientists rarely use terms such as 'surrender, forgiveness, renunciation, love, respect, dignity, redemption, salvation, redress, compassion, everything that is at the heart of relationships between people'.

Graeber (2001), in his review of the debates about Mauss's (2016) famous study of gift exchange, distinguished between 'open' and 'closed' forms of reciprocity. He noted that 'reciprocity keeps no accounts, because it implies a relation of permanent mutual commitment; it becomes closed reciprocity when a balancing of accounts closes the relationship off, or at least maintains the constant possibility of doing so' (Graeber 2001: 220). Hospitality, we argue, is an expression of open reciprocity. The gift of hospitality lies in its promise – that is, the generative possibilities of the relationship that it forges.

Among Penambi Wia people and their neighbours in the Western Highlands, the generative possibilities of relationships are expressed in daily life both privately, through everyday acts of sharing, especially food, and publically, through large scale ceremonial gift exchanges. An

example of promises made privately between individuals in the context of everyday life is the practice of reciprocal food naming. Some foods commonly found as reciprocal names include: *kaimegl* – liver, *mokh* – leg of pig/pork, *kantemung* – a type of cucumber, *towe* and *kennge* –types of banana, *gey puk* – sweek potato, and *mundumong* – heart.

In practice, two people share a piece of food and from then on call each other by the name of that food. The pair enter into a sort of relationship contract with one another. The quality of relationship that is signified by the use of these reciprocal names suggests that defining them as 'terms of endearment' is appropriate. For example, the term *kennge* – a type of banana – is also commonly used to mean 'sweetheart' (Wilson 2019: 115). No longer do the two people address one another by their proper names. From the time they make the vow, they reciprocally address one another by the name of the food they shared. During the ethnographic field school, several of the students were encouraged by their host mentors to enter into such reciprocal food-name agreements.

Andrew Strathern understands this practice by relating it to Melpa ideas about humans as *mbo* 'planted' beings and the way that 'concepts of descent, kinship and locality…are mediated by ideas of substance created by food' (1977: 507). According to Strathern (1977: 507-508):

   …the sharer associates the other with himself metonymically through their act of sharing contiguous pieces of food. The metonymical act then sets up an association between them which is a metaphorical form of kinship…

Sharing food here is not merely a general statement that people are related through commensality. Sharing the food actually acts to *create* a relationship based on shared substance. In other words the practice is 'relationally constitutive' (Stasch 2011: 102). The food-name serves as a label of the created dyadic relationship and a description of the originating event of consuming the shared food (Stasch 2009: 82). Through this reciprocal naming, the memory and promise of the foundational event of commensality is maintained and alluded to every time the two people address one another (Stasch 2009: 82).

At the same time, this practice enables the avoidance of the use of proper names, which draw attention to persons as uniquely differentiated entities as opposed to metonymical related 'offshoots'. As with affinal relationships, where name avoidance is the rule, if one person in a food-name-sharing partnership, whether deliberately or accidentally, does not call the other by the agreed food name, but uses their proper name instead, a small fine can be demanded to restore continuity of the relationship (Strathern 1977: 509).

Proper names, or autonyms, stress individuality and imply a distinction between 'self' and 'other' (Levi-Strauss 1966:192). In contrast, the abrogation of the use of autonyms down-plays distinctions. Through the relinquishment of their personal names in favour of the commemorative name of a shared food the parties signify a close social bond through mutual identification. At the same time, by avoiding each other's personal names, like affines do, they signal that they are mutually separate. Paradoxically, name avoidance is a way that people reciprocally make themselves both strange *and* familiar to one another. As Maggie's son, Maki, explained to Rosita, the sharing of food and its name with his adoptive mother allowed him to avoid addressing her as mum and her him as son, while enabling a mother-son relationship to be gradually nurtured:

My mum and my nickname for each other is Punt…It's a kind of bean… It was comfortable calling her Punt because then I didn't have to call her mum, you know what I mean? It was my way of calling her mum, I suppose.

The mother-son relationship in this case was nurtured through kinship term avoidance. Name avoidance here 'makes relatedness through relational restraint' (Stasch 2011: 105).

While food name vows are made privately (though not secretly) between two people, among the Penambi Wia promises also feature in large public events such as compensation payments following conflict and warfare, bridewealth and mortuary exchanges among segmentary clan groups. The material goods presented at public ceremonial events are given in exchange for something of value (such as a relationship of alliance). The gifts represent an undertaking by the segmentary

groups to do, or forbear from doing, certain acts in relation to another group, but what is valued above all it is the promise of the relationship itself. Promissory gifts (gifts that promise more at a later time), such as pigs, vegetable foods and sums of money, presented at such exchanges, are acceptable as the materialisation of a continuing relationship. For example, if a man who was given a big pig by an exchange partner as contribution to his son's bridewealth is not able to pay it back when called upon to do so, he may secure the promise of the relationship by, instead, contributing a smaller promissory gift.

Each of the types of exchanges described above – from the personal sharing of food names to the public ceremonial exchanges between segmentary groups - may involve explicit speech acts of promise. However, promises can also be understood without the use of a speech act. A promise can be made, for example, through actions such the presentation of a promissory gift or an act of hospitality. Whether a promise is made via a speech or any other kind of act, it can be considered by Penambi Wia to be morally binding and sanctionable.

Yet, while promises are expected to be met, the ideal is that the relationship is not closed off but continues into the future. Here we can see promise expressed as potential. A relationship that has promise is one that fosters the growth of hope, which is in itself a value. The political vagaries of social relations and the uncertainties of human existence mean that promises may never be fully realised, and dreams sometimes shattered, but the promissory acts that define hospitality aim to allow hope to flourish.

Kamula hospitality story: A birthday party

The promise of continuing social relationships is also highly valued among the Kamula. Like the Penambi Wia, the Kamula use reciprocal naming to mediate relationships between self and other. This story focuses on inter-generational relationships through the development of naming practices and bringing Michael's children to the 'field'. At issue is the way a promise, in this case to maintain social relationships, might be understood to be something that can be practically extended across or over time. Once when some Kamula men were talking about the fact Michael had only managed to have daughters, there was a

fairly standard commiseration centred on their concern that Michael's 'bone' or male substance had not been reproduced. One man optimistically expressed the idea that Michael's daughters would have sons and those sons would continue to visit the Kamula much in the way Michael had. This was not so much a solution to Michael's lack of a son as a way of reproducing something like Michael's relationships with the Kamula if not in the next generation then in the generation after that of his daughters. In 2021 Michael learnt that Eleanor was expecting a son.

These Kamula's long term perspective was not entirely surprising and reflects to some extent a Kamula orientation to the long term organisation of sociality over time. It is not uncommon for forms of reciprocity to be extended over three generations. Take, for example, marriages, which are ideally supposed to be reciprocated immediately by an exchange of spouses, usually discussed in the literature as 'sister exchange'. If an immediate exchange cannot be organised then reciprocity for a marriage can be delayed until the next generation and the flow on effects in bestowal rights and associated adoptions means that the transaction may not be resolved until the next generation. At issue here is the salience of maintaining sociality through equivalence and in the case of Michael's daughters the same kind of long-term sociality by the substitution of their sons for him seemed to provide a possible kind of equivalence to Michael's on-going social relationships with the Kamula.

In September 2001, Michael visited the Kamula with his youngest daughter Eleanor and then he returned in December 2015 and again in January-Febuary 2017 with his eldest daughter Patricia. On the 2015 visit Michael and Patricia stayed with Hawo Kulu and his wife, who was pregnant at the time. After they left, she gave birth and she and Hawo decided to name the child after Eleanor. This naming after Europeans was by then a common feature of Kamula naming practices. Michael has a number of namesakes among the Kamula and his mother, Patricia and Eleanor are all part of existing namesake relationships.

Among the Kamula, creating a namesake relationship involves what the Kamula call a *daiyo* relationship. Such namesake relationships are established by the intergenerational transmission of names within a

named lineage or clan, including between living and dead members. A namesake relationship codes a specific history of the kin group's members. *Daiyo* relationships can also be established as a kind of reciprocity for a contribution to a husband's payment of bridewealth – a child from the marriage is named after the contributor. This suggests that a person (a child) can be understood as an extension or consequence of an other's consideration and generosity. However those in *daiyo* relationships are not supposed to completely intrude into each other's being – before *daiyo* can touch each other there should be an exchange of a small gift lest the younger namesake become ill due to the loss of his or her spirit into that of the more senior name sharer. This small ritual enacts an obligation not to encroach into each other and highlights differentiating relational otherness as part of this kind of dyadic sociality (Stasch 2009: 84). A *daiyo* relationship involves celebrating identity but simultaneously those in such a relationship need to be somewhat separate to each other. It is as if the underlying identification entailed by name sharing 'creates the need for avoidance in the first place' (Stasch 2009: 84).

Among the living, the term *daiyo* can be used by the two namesakes to directly address each other – typically on meeting they can boisterously call each other *daiyo*. The term *daiyo* effectively in such interaction replaces any use of the two namesake's actual shared name. What is enacted involves the simultaneous production a degree of identity (by the use of *daiyo*) and a degree name avoidance. In a broader sense namesake are both present and absent to each other and this becomes somewhat poignant when the namesake is between two persons who are physically absent to each other (such as with the two Eleanors) or where the namesake relationship involves both the living and the dead. This kind of sense of loss or absence is poetically amplified in Kamula performances of rituals concerning the dead where songs are sung in such a way that grief struck audience members weep at their own sense of loss and compassion for the dead. Ideally there should be a namesake relationship between the audience member and the person singing the song. The effects of time and death are expressed in the ritual as a beautiful, poetically intense emotionally intrusive destabilizing conjunction of the self and the deceased, mediated by the *daiyo* relationship, which creates both a remembered absence and an overwhelming cathartic presence.

In 2015 Michael and his elder daughter Patricia arrived at Wawoi Falls. Patricia, a dancer then developing a Master's thesis in dance, was hoping to learn some dances from Kamula women. In exchange for the women teaching Patricia their dances and songs each morning, Patricia taught, mainly young Kamula, some contemporary dance moves and ran exercise and pilates classes. Michael's primary function was to film the dances and songs the Kamula women taught Patricia and, in turn, Patricia's dance and pilates classes. Most of these activities took place in the local church. The songs were transcribed and translated primarily by their host Hawo Kulu who had previously worked on an SIL project that had translated the New Testament into Kamula. Gelabu, who had earlier named his daughter Patricia, also assisted in the transcription and translation.

A return trip in early 2017, to further pursue issues raised from Patricia's and Michael's earlier visit, corresponded with Patricia's birthday. Their hosts, Hawo, his wife and other family members and friends, decided that they would hold a birthday feast for Patricia and for their daughter Eleanor whose birthday was roughly the same as Patricia's. When the cooked food was ready to be blessed and eaten Patricia was asked to sit on the bench where the food was displayed. Hawo's wife sat next to Patricia with Eleanor on her lap. In a sense this highly staged celebration of hospitality merged two families into one via the physical proximity of Eleanor and Patricia, while also celebrating the differences between the two. As a celebration of the inter-generational sociality of two different, but similar families, the birthday party indexed what Hawo later described in a letter to Michael as our 'precious time together'. It was the realisation of the promise of long term inter-cultural sociality - of keeping one's word, a certain steadfastness in maintaining and developing relations (Ricoeur 2004:165) - here calibrated into the simultaneity of two birthdays. It was also about the promise of a future sociality as if it were already present in the birthday party because such a future could be based on similar kinds of long-term relationships and reciprocities.

The promise of Michael's future relationship also rested on past reciprocities and forms of political engagement. Michael's most obvious reciprocities involved routine payments to research participants either in cash or sometimes by the presentation of clothes

and other goods bought in Australia. Michael also organized visits by a couple students from James Cook University interested in studying topics of interest to the Kamula, but after their initial visit neither committed to developing long term relationships with the Kamula.

Michael has also intervened in Kamula and national debates concerning logging and carbon trade and helped organise funding for the construction of a guest house that was supposed to create an alternative flow of income to that provided by logging. It failed to do this and some supporters of logging started to accuse Michael of stealing from this project. Since neither the guest house nor logging really succeeded as effective development projects these debates faded away as interest shifted to discoveries of orphaned gas fields in and around Kamula and Doso lands, but our conflicts may resume in the near future. Such long-term relationships are complex and shifting, but always interesting and fulfilling.

CONCLUSION

The gift-like constructions of hospitality that we, following Candea and Da Col (2012), have positioned as the basis of our fieldwork and the social relations of information gathering and data acquisition, emphasize reciprocity and exchange and the possibility of subtle combinations of difference with similarity or identity. We have explored aspects of fieldwork through specific relationships of long-term, inter-generational hospitality. The concept of hospitality, like the gift, runs the risk of becoming vacuous when it is extended to any social relation, any exchange or reciprocating sociality. Thus, we have chosen to focus here on some rituals of incorporation that feature in the practice of hospitality.

We have looked at the way hospitality can be anchored in daily interactions that emphasise histories of social relationships based on name sharing and inter-generational transactions. Such transactions enabled us to highlight the role of the promise of relationships over the long term in the context of field research. We narrowly focused attention on rituals of hospitality that incorporate the outsider into the inside via the 'creation of bonds analogous to the adoption of new

kinship ties' (Da Col 2019: 20) as a way that might avoid some of the pitfalls of generalising hospitality to 'sociality' or the 'gift'.

The hospitable events we have reviewed were highly reflexive staged events, involving complex dynamics of presence and absence, similarity and difference, in which the promise of hospitality was defined across time, across barriers and periods of separation. We highlighted two elements of the promise - first, as involving obligation and an explicit and timely outcome and, second, as a horizon of possibilities. We focused on both these notions of promise as found in everyday naming relationships between researcher and researched.

The Penambi Wia relationships based on naming involve both obligatory and possible aspects of promise. These relationships index the nurturant capacities of food sharing as a fundamental basis to on-going sociality between researchers and their hosts. These sharers of food are forbidden to harm the relation (and each other) by drawing attention to the other by calling them by their proper name rather than by their relational name linked to the food shared. In the case of the Kamula, name sharing indexes the generative capacities involved in the literal and figurative reproduction of an other's life and identity. Among the Kamula, as presented here in one highly limited but deliberately chosen example, the emphasis is more on the incorporation of the other into another person - a person -person transformation, rather than the substitution of a thing (food, wealth) for a person as emerges in the Penambi Wia examples. Understood in these general terms the small dyadic relationships we have presented as rituals of incorporation are our host's definition and expression of some of the essential qualities of hospitality - intimacy, generosity, care, convivial commensality and affection.

Yet such understandings of hospitality only involve a small subset of the relationships that inform any fieldwork. It is the case that the promises of long-term field work are often suspended between the ongoing demands of binding promises and the 'work of time', which unravels and reweaves one's obligations and capacities in often unexpected and unfulfilling ways. As a result, complete fulfilment of any promise can be difficult to realise (Adams 1988, Hammett, Jackson and Vickers 2019).

There is also an 'evaluative volatility' (Stasch 2016: 15) in claims about research relationships. Some claims suggest research has a capacity to create an internationally significant good (as with the Australian government's funding of field schools), others argue that any research by outsiders is neo-colonial knowledge extraction typically without adequate reciprocity or any local utility or relevance. While research ethics demands reciprocity, as an 'unambiguously desirable' feature of the research relationship, and reciprocity is expected from our research participants, what is actually expected can remain undefined. Tensions between researcher and research participants are always possible as hopes remain unfulfilled. Indeed, expectations can change over time and what at one time was considered appropriate recompense may later be considered inadequate (Aikhenvald 2013). Researchers may even be the subject of threats to their lives and property. Yet, such threats, like promises, reflect hopes. Negative critiques of fieldwork relations are often about expectations not being fulfilled in a timely manner and can involve attempts to pressure, even coerce, researchers into conforming to these expectations.

We argue that hospitality between researchers and research participants is never fully defined by such tensions, as our case studies of inter-generational host-guest relationships, reveal. It is our hosts as much as us who define the hospitality of our mutual relationship and its promise. What hospitality promises can only ever be partially achieved and in this sense is always somewhat frustrating, but these frustrations do not define the totality of the relationship. Moreover, as with any social relationship, any apparent final 'resolution' of a specific issue has the capacity to generate further problems. Given our example of reciprocal naming, we researchers have yet to name any of our own family members with proper names derived from PNG. But we have begun to enmesh our families and histories in the social worlds of our host. It is from immersion in such a flow of interactions that hospitable fieldwork emerges both with its problems and its promises.

References
There are no sources in the current document.

Adams, Jacqueline 1998. The wrongs of reciprocity: Fieldwork among Chilean

working-class women. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 27(2): 219-
241.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2007. Linguistic fieldwork: setting the scene*. STUF -
Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 60 (1): 3-11.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2013. A story of love and debt: the give and the take of
linguistic fieldwork. *The Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology* 14:172-82.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2015. *The Art of Grammar: A Practical Guide*. Oxford
University Press.

Candea, Matei & Da Col, Giovanni. 2012. The return to hospitality*. Journal of the Royal
Anthropological Institute* 18 (S1): S1-S19.

Da Col, Giovanni. 2019. The H-factor of anthropology: Hoarding, hosting, hospitality.
L'Homme, 231-232(3-4):13-40.

Dobrin, Lise and Schwartz, Saul. 2016. Collaboration or participant observation?
Rethinking models of 'linguistic social work'. *Language Documentation and
Conservation* 10: 153–277

Dapuez, Andrés Francisco. 2013. Promissory Prestations. PhD thesis, John Hopkins
University.

Frieze, H. 2009. The limits of hospitality. *Paragraph* Extending Hospitality: Giving
Space, Taking Time. 32(1): 51-68.

Glowczewski, Barbara, Henry, Rosita and Otto, Ton. 2013. Relations and products:
Dilemmas of reciprocity in fieldwork. *The Asia Pacific Journal of
Anthropology,* 14(2): 113-125

Graeber, David. 2001. *Toward an Anthropological Theory of Value: The False Coin of
Our Own Dreams.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hammett, Daniel, Jackson, Lucy, and Vickers, Daniel. 2019. The ethics of (not) giving
back. *Area.* 51(2): 380-386.

Henry, Rosita. 2012. Gifts of grief: performative ethnography and the revelatory
potential of emotion. *Qualitative Research* 12(5): 528-39.

Hill, Jane. 2006. The ethnography of language and language documentation. In Jost
Gippert, Nikolaus P. Himmelmann & Ulrike Mosel (eds.). *Essentials of
language documentation,* 113–128. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Levi-Strauss, Claude. 1966. *The Savage Mind.* London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson Ltd.

Mauss, Marcel. 2016 [1925]. *The Gift. Expanded Edition.* Chicago: Hau Books.

Merlan, Francesca and Rumsey, Alan 1991. *Ku Waru: Language and Segmentary*

Politics in the Western Nebilyer Valley, Papua New Guinea. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Modan, Gabriella. 2016. Writing the relationship: Ethnographer-informant interactions in the new media era. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*. 26(1): 98-107.

Pitt-Rivers, Julian A. 2012 [1977]. The law of hospitality. *Hau. Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 2(1): 501-517.

Rice, Keren. 2011. Documentary linguistics and community relations. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 5:187–207.

Ricouer, Paul. 2004. *Memory, History, Forgetting*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rosaldo, Michelle Z. 1982. The things we do with words: Ilongot speech acts and speech act theory in philosophy. *Language in Society* 11:203–37.

Schwartz, Saul & Rena Lederman. 2011. Collaborative methods: A comparison of subfield styles. *Reviews in Anthropology* 40(1): 53–77.

Searle, John. 1979. *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Serres, Michel. 1980. 2007. *The Parasite.* Translated by Lawrence R. Schehr. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Shryock, Andrew. 2019. Keeping to oneself: Hospitality and the magical hoard in the Balga of Jordan. *History and Anthropology*, 30(5): 546-562,

Slotta, James. 2015. The perlocutionary is political: Listening as self-determination in a Papua New Guinean polity, *Language in Society* 44: 525–552.

Smith, Holly M. 1997. A paradox of promising, *The Philosophical Review* 106(2): 153-196.

Stasch, Rupert. 2016. Dramas of otherness. "First Contact" Tourism in New Guinea. *Hau: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*. 6 (3): 7-27.

Stasch, Rupert. 2011. Word avoidance as a relation-making act: A paradigm for analysis of name utterance taboos. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 84(1): 101-120.

Stasch, Rupert. 2009. *Society of Others: Kinship and Mourning in a West Papuan Place*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Strathern, Andrew J. 1977. Melpa food-names as an expression of ideas on identity and substance. *The Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 86 (4): 503-511.

Wilson, Maggie. 2019. *A True Child of Papua New Guinea: Memoir of a Life in Two Worlds.* Edited and with additions by Rosita Henry. Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland Press.

Young, Adrien. 2020. Putting anthropology in its (hospitable) place: Harry Shapiro's fieldwork on Pitcairn Island, 1934–1935. *History and Anthropology*, DOI: 10.1080/02757206.2020.1762591.

Yamada, Racquel-María. 2007. Collaborative linguistic fieldwork: Practical application of the empowerment model. *Language Documentation and Conservation* 1(2): 257–282