

# ***heṭ* and *teṣ*: Tradition and Conflict in Sitara Farman's *Sáreči*.<sup>1</sup>**

## **Non-Judicial Conflict Resolution in Northern Pakistan**

**Hugh van Skyhawk (Mainz)**

Page | 1

Whilst the rich vocabulary of pre-modern Burushaski is now in rapid decline owing to changes in the social, political, and economic environment in which it is spoken<sup>2</sup>, Burushaski has at the same time experienced an increase in its range of use as a result of these very changes.

Georg Buddruss has the merit of having first drawn scholarly attention to the emergence of written forms of hitherto exclusively oral languages of the Karakoram and Hindu Kush<sup>3</sup>. In a previous paper I have analysed examples of a new genre of verbal art in Burushaski, the satirical song, and its medium of presentation, the pre-recorded tape cassette<sup>4</sup>. In the present paper I shall discuss yet another genre of artistic communication in Burushaski: the radio-play.

As all other items for broadcast by Radio Pakistan Gilgit the radio-play in Burushaski must meet a number of requirements made necessary by the multi-religious context in which it will be heard: 1) it must be Islamic but not sectarian; 2) it must not disturb communal relations; 3) it must promote national unity; 4) it must be interesting. In addition, a fifth criterion applies especially to broadcasts in Burushaski: 5) it must overcome the differences—linguistic, social, and religious—between the Burushaski of Hunza the speakers of which are pre-dominantly Nizari Ismailis, who have more formal education, who are more modern in their life-styles, and who are generally more prosperous and the Burushaski of Nager, the speakers of which

---

<sup>1</sup> This article was first published in French in: “*heṭ* et *teṣ*: Tradition et conflit dans Sareci de Sitara Farman”, in: Tiffou, Étienne (ed.), *Actes du Colloque sur le Bourouchaski organisé à l’occasion du XXXVIème Congrès International sur les Études Asiatiques et Nord-Africaines (ICANAS) Montréal (27. 8. –7. 9. 2000)*, in: Bibliothèque des cahiers de l’Institut de linguistique de Louvain 113, Louvain-la-Neuve [Peeters], 2004: 83-96. I have revised and updated it to make it more easily accessible to interested readers in south Asia.

<sup>2</sup> Berger, Hermann, „*Das Burushaski–Schicksale einer zentralasiatischen Restsprache*“, published in the series *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse*, 1992, Bericht 1, Heidelberg [Carl Winter Universitätsverlag] 1992: 8 and 25.

<sup>3</sup> Buddruss, Georg, “*Neue Schriftsprachen im Norden Pakistans. Einige Beobachtungen*”, in: Assmann, Aleida and Jan, and Hardmeier, Christoph (edd.), *Schrift und Gedächtnis. Archäologie der literarischen Kommunikation I*, München [Wilhelm Fink Verlag] 1983: 231–244.

<sup>4</sup> van Skyhawk, Hugh, “*Underground Music in Gilgit*”, in: Stellrecht, Irmtraud (ed.), *Karakorum–Hindukush–Himalaya: Dynamics of Change*, published as volume 4.II in the series *Stellrecht, Irmtraud* (series editor), Culture Area Karakorum Scientific Studies, Köln [Rüdiger Köppe Verlag] 1998: 663–672.

are Twelver Shias, who are reluctant to modify traditional gender roles and, thus, to change the way of life they believe to be best for the propagation of Islam, who increasingly identify themselves with Shias elsewhere in Pakistan and, thus, with the image of an endangered minority, who have received less development-aid and are, thus, less prosperous.

Despite such constraints, radio-plays in Burushaski are highly successful both in Hunza and in Nager. One obvious reason for this is the sagacious choice of themes relevant to life in a time of changes that would have been unimaginable even a generation ago: family health problems and care of infants, tradition and modernity in family relations, the impact of modern agricultural methods on time-honoured traditions of land use, extra-judicial conflict resolution. However, a politically correct didactic orientation alone will not bind listeners to their radios and make them demand that a programme be broadcast again and again. Equally important are the evocation of an acoustic stage by means of true-to-life characterisation and a verisimilitude of narrative details, witty and heart-warming dialogues, appropriate use of idiomatic expressions supported by paralinguistic features such as volume and pitch of voice, intensity of breathing, tempo of speech, and degree of clarity of enunciation. As in other performance genre such as the stage or film, the components of the successful radio-play merge into a complex unity that cause the listener to willingly suspend his disbelief and attribute reality to that which he hears. Owing to their close proximity to social reality, an analysis of such components of the performance will, perforce, require an understanding of the social situation in which they unfold their inherent meaning.

To concretise the foregoing discussion, the remainder of this paper will be devoted to the analysis of the popular radio-play *Sáre'ci* written by Sitara Farman, a schoolteacher from Aliabad, Hunza. The plot of *Sáre'ci* concerns the conflict that arises in an imaginary village of Burushaski speakers when an innovation in animal husbandry, the introduction of a new breed of goat from Tajikistan that can leap over traditional brushwood walls, threatens the success of innovations in agriculture, such as the introduction of imported fruit trees and fodder grasses. The owner of the goats, named Phultúniş ('Mr. Bellows'), which is allegorical for the fiery effect he has on relations with his neighbours, misuses an ancient agricultural tradition known both in Hunza and Nager: *heṭ*, the letting loose in autumn of livestock to graze freely on harvested fields. When repeated remonstrations and even physical coercion in the form of a fist fight with a neighbour and the threat of legal proceedings fail to convince Phultúniş to

mend his ways, five of his neighbours, including a female relative, form a *pañcāyat*, an arbitration group consisting of five members known in South Asia since ancient times, and mete out punishment to Phultúniş by hiding his goats for fifteen days to make him repent his obstinacy. By so doing the neighbours resort to a system of arbitration older than the ‘*adālat* or court of the ruler or the *lambardār* system of arbitration by clan headmen.

Ultimately, Phultúniş repents, agrees to compensate his neighbours for the damage done by his prodigious goats, and harmony is restored in the community by the swearing of traditional oaths rather than by the verdict of a court or the resolution of a village Union Council. It is noteworthy that in meting out punishment to Phultúniş the *pañcāyat* shows concern that the punishment be neither excessive nor vindictive, but only achieve the goal of bringing Phultúniş’ conduct in conformity with the welfare of the village community (line 339).

The setting of *Sáreći* is a village located between 1500 and 2500 meters above sea level. Thus, the planting of fruit trees and fodder grasses is more important economically than innovations in animal husbandry. Had the village been located above 2700 meters there would have been a different village economy: only one harvest instead of two annually, increased importance of Yak, goat, and sheep keeping, greater dependency on hunting. Thus, the introduction of a new, superior breed of goats would have taken precedence over innovations in fruit trees or fodder grasses. As both in Hunza and Nager villages with a pre-dominant orchard economy and two harvests annually are more numerous than high altitude villages with a pre-dominant animal husbandry economy and one harvest annually, the setting of the play and the conflict that forms its focal point will easily be understood by the majority of Burushaski speakers both in Hunza and Nager. Notable exceptions are the villages of Śimśaal in the Gojal region of Hunza and Híspar in Nager both of which are situated between 3,000–3,200 m. above sea level.

Despite the economic correspondances between Hunza and Nager, the author and actors of *Sáreći* had to surmount a number of difficulties resulting from the linguistic and religious differences between Burushaski speakers in Hunza and Nager. Should the actors speak the Hunza or the Nager dialect of Burushaski? Surprisingly, they speak both dialects. Of the six actors in the play two are from Nager, two from Hunza, and two from Danyor. Each speaks his own dialect as if the characters lived in a village in which their dialects were spoken side by side in everyday life. The mention of the *Kalimah* (278), the profession of belief in Islam, and

obligatory prayers, *namāz* (281), place the play firmly in a Muslim social context, while any mention of such divisive terms as *imām bārah* or *jamā'at khāna*, which designate the houses of prayer for Twelver Shias and Ismailis, respectively, is judiciously avoided by speaking only of prayer and not of the place in which it is performed. Thus, the imaginary village of *Sáre'ci* overcomes the divisiveness of social reality and listeners accept the alterations for the sake of the deeper sense of reality the drama conveys.

Certainly, the success of *Sáre'ci* derives to no small degree from the generous portions of village humour contained in the mutual reviling indulged in by Phultúniş and his likewise allegorically named neighbours, Supálo ('Mr. Rich-in-Grain'), Sugúuyo ('Mr. Diligence'), Mayún ('Mr. Oriole'), Bíibo (?), and his sharp-tongued kinswoman Hayaatí, which sustain the interest of the listener in the first of the three phases of the play. *Sáre'ci* begins *in medias res* with the first of Phultúniş' neighbours, Sugúuyo ('Mr. Diligence'), who comes to remonstrate with him. The breakdown of communications and village solidarity becomes obvious in the arrogant voice and diction used by Phultúniş in the initial dialogue:

1. Phultúniş: Hey you there! What is your name? I've forgotten your name. Are you Sugúuyo ('Mr. Diligence'), or which *-úuyo* are you?<sup>5</sup>
2. Sugúuyo: Peace be upon you, elder brother! You got it right! You were right in saying Mr. Diligence!
3. Phul.: And peace be upon you, too! May seventeen *saláams* be upon you! And why have you penned up my goats?
4. Sug.: O elder brother! Did I do wrong to pen up your yellow goats?
5. Phul.: What?
6. Sug.: Did I pen them up wrongly?
7. Phul.: Oh! Was it other than your right to pen them up?
8. Sug.: Of course not! You enjoy their milk, and I will nourish them for you! I did make a mistake, a big mistake! Look here! Become a human being after all, won't you?
9. Phul.: I am looking, my father. What else (can I do)?

---

<sup>5</sup> The barbed allusion is to Burushaski *agúuyo* ('Mr. Sloth').

10. Sug.: I went to great trouble and expense to bring over apple trees from Beirut!
11. Phul.: May I be a sacrifice for you!
12. Sug.: I spent my life force and wealth bringing over pomengranites from Turkey! They don't grow by themselves!
13. Phul.: Why not? Why not?
14. Sug.: I brought over acacia trees from England for my sheep and goats. People say that they have good leaves (for fodder).
15. Phul.: May I be a sacrifice for you!
16. Sug.: Do you understand now?
17. Phul.: May I be a sacrifice for you! Go on! Go on!
18. Sug.: And look down! There is a green garden, isn't there? I brought over the grass in that garden from Switzerland! I brought over the seeds and made the same sort of grass grow here!
19. Phul.: Why not? Why not?
20. Sug.: These things ...
21. Phul.: Are you finished? Now it's my turn! I brought over these goats from Fairy Land<sup>6</sup>, didn't I? And now I will bring over some more!
22. Sug.: May I be a sacrifice for you! If you brought them over from Fairy Land, then you should make them stay in a 'Fairy Land' and not among my trees!
23. Phul.: O Light of my Eye!
24. Sug.: Oh! Your goats are not goats! They are wolves! They peel (the bark) off my trees! And they peeled (the bark) off my 'whatcha m'call it'<sup>7</sup> as well!
25. Phul.: That's too much! Shut up! Enough of that! We'll call some neighbours, turn out (the goats), feed them, and (ask): 'O elder brother! Are these goats or wolves?' And if he says they're goats, I'll crack your skull, all right?

---

<sup>6</sup> *Paristáan* here = Tajikistan.

<sup>7</sup> = bu.Ng. *esaalés*.

26. Sug.: Their faces are like goats but their habits are like wolves!
27. Phul.: Uncouth person! Uncouth!
28. Sug.: You have the same habits as your livestock!
29. Phul.: Oh! Become a human being, o brother! Look here! Animals were created by God to be free creatures, but you have penned them up!
30. Sug.: O Light of my Eye! There are rules for having freedom!
31. Phul.: Eh? That is free which should be penned up. You've let the dogs free which should be penned up, but have penned up my goats which should be free!
32. Sug.: Look after your goats! If a dog comes then you pen it up! But your goats are not to be free in my garden!
33. Phul.: It would be better for you if you let them out right now, wouldn't it? Look here good fellow! They've been penned up since morning. How shall I drink their milk later on?
34. Sug.: All right. Listen to me. I respect you. But don't try to misuse my respect. This time I'll let them out for you. But if they come again, the goats will no longer be in your hands!
35. Phul.: No. What you said is wrong. You yourself should protect your fields, gardens, and expensive trees. You don't have the right to detain and pen up my goats!
36. Sug.: If I must protect my grass and gardens, then you must also protect your goats!
37. Phul.: O good fellow! My goats are animals that roam about. O my brother! Are they some sort of slaves? They are free creatures and they roam about!
38. Sug.: O good fellow! These (creatures) are for you. You get the advantages from them. You drink their milk. They make dung for you. They don't make anything for me! They only eat and break down my trees, spoil my grass gardens, and leave not even a stone on my wall! But you drink their milk!
39. Phul.: This is just a lot of talking! Everyone gets advantages from these (goats) not only I. Stop (talking) and turn out my goats! Don't waste time!

40. Sug.: Take your goats now. Take them. But watch out next time!
41. Phul.: No, no. There's nothing to watch out for next time! Build your own wall and keep it closed! I'm not responsible for that!
42. Sug.: No, enough! You say they're free, do you? If you say they are free, then I will let some wolves come and stay with your goats!
43. Phul.: We'll see about that when the time comes. We'll decide at that time.

Music, fade out.

More than a third of the 453 lines of the play, which is spoken rapidly in about forty minutes of air time, are devoted to the mutual remonstrations and harangues between Phultúniş and his angry neighbours in the course of which the radio audience at home repeatedly breaks out in laughter. All this mutual reviling is couched in the traditional speech etiquette of the Burusho and culminates at line 100 in a fistfight performed with obvious gusto that would in no way suffer by comparison with similar scenes of slapstick nose-twisting, ear-pulling, skull-thumping, and face-slapping in the films of Stan Laurel and Oliver Hardy. The donnybrook rages on up to line 111, at which point hundreds of listeners in Hunza and Nager are holding their stomachs with laughter. The dialogue then becomes more serious as the neighbours discuss (111–123) going to court to force Phultúniş to mend his ways. The subject is then dropped by the discussants without further explanation. Nor is an explanation necessary for the listeners who know only too well that getting one's grievances redressed by legal proceedings can be a costly and time-consuming undertaking for people of modest means.

Comic relief of considerable social import is also provided by the confrontation between Phultúniş and Hayaatí in which Phultúniş counters the reproaches of his kinswoman by accusing her of being a lazy modern woman who is afraid of getting her hands dirty. Lines 51–54 would be familiar to fans and foes of the late Ghulam Abbas (1958-1998), alias Díro ('The Bullet'), who was a well-known writer of satirical songs in Burushaski that targeted the exaggerated expectations of the younger generation of Hunza women some twenty years ago

who had grown up in a time of rapid economic development in the tourist industry and rapidly increasing levels of formal education for females<sup>8</sup>:

51. Phul.: They are goats, aren't they? They should roam about freely in the world. You should protect your own crops. Cover the corn on your roof with some cloth. If you put a little cow-dung on your hands in the same place that you apply cosmetic creams and then rub it (on the trees), how will (the goats) eat anything there? Instead of doing that you paint your nails with nail polish and have no desire to rub cow-dung. But you are closing the mouths of my goats! How strange!
52. Hayaatí: Be gone, elder brother! Did I just spend Rs. 90 on nail polish and polish my nails just to put my hands in cow-dung? Are we supposed to rub cow-dung on trees?
53. Phul.: Then what else do you want to rub, my sister?
54. Hay.: Away with you, father! Keep your livestock inside! Why should I spoil my hands?

The process of extra-judicial conflict resolution in the village forms the subject matter of the remaining 273 lines of the play. First, a lengthy discussion of the situation by the members of the *ad hoc pañcāyat* (175–239), then (240–290) the meting out of the punishment awarded to Phultúniş, namely, that his goats be 'goat-napped' and hidden away for fifteen days while Phultúniş' resistance to the will of the village majority is slowly broken down by endless walking in search of his lost goats. By the technique of acoustic fade-out the listener is then transported forward in time to the point at which Phultúniş' peers begin to feel sorry for the suffering he and his family are enduring (339–346) and caution that excessive punishment is likely to lead to revenge by Phultúniş' sons when they have grown up or by the relatives of his wife who will fail to see any justice in punishing their daughter or sister along with her husband:

339. Sup. (to his allies): There is a custom (for punishment) in our country. And if another of our brothers comes and says that we should not have given him so much punishment there will be serious accusations against us when it comes out. When his sons have grown up they will accuse us. If our sister's father or brothers come and accuse us,

---

<sup>8</sup> Owing to their controversial contents, the highly popular songs of the late Ghulam Abbas Golden were never broadcast by Radio Pakistan Gilgit. Cf. van Skyhawk 1998: 663–672.

they will say: “She is a respectable lady, after all, isn’t she? Why didn’t you look after her?”

370. Sup. (to Phul.): I know you got a hard punishment. But, it was your own fault. The punishment didn’t come from us or from anyone else in the village, but from your own short-sightedness, o Brother! Look here! You didn’t watch out for the trees of your neighbours, nor for the trees of respectable ladies, not even for the trees of your own relatives! You damaged the trees saying: “I brought over goats from Tajikistan!” Saying: “Since the time of my forefathers, 200 years ago, there has been the freedom to let loose livestock after harvesting the field (*het*)!” You said: “There are liberties!” You said: “There is freedom!” Your neighbours felt the pain of losing their property, just as you now feel the pain of losing your goats.

Especially striking in the context of reconciliation is the emphasis placed upon the ancient tradition of swearing an oath (*tes*) in preference to the modern practice of passing a resolution in the Union Council of the village:

388. Sup.: For the future we will pass a resolution<sup>9</sup>. Not even one goat shall come out of the pen. If you are grazing them, they shall be in front of you, and you shall follow them. Following them you shall take them to the barren lands. When you bring them back, you shall put them in your own pen or cattleshed. Have you decided to accept this, or not?
389. Phul.: Oh! You say ‘resolution’. O brother! Forget the ‘resol-’ (*qarār-*) and the ‘-ution’ (*’dād*)! I will swear an oath, o brother! I swear that you will not see (the goats) again!
390. Sup.: Then why not? Enough!
391. May.: May I be a sacrifice for you! He spoke sweetly. He himself spoke very well.
392. Sup.: Our fathers and grandfathers didn’t follow resolutions. They only swore oaths, didn’t they?
393. May.: Yes, yes. From (the time of) my grandfather’s grandfather up to today they have taken oaths. These papers (resolutions) don’t mean anything! Swear an oath!

---

<sup>9</sup> = u. *qarār’ dād*.

406. Phul.: Never again will my neighbours even see the faces of my goats!
407. Sup.: Why not?
408. Phul.: If they damage anyone's trees or roof may there be no electric light in my house!
409. Sup. May.: *aamûin, aamûin!*
410. Phul.: May I see a tap but there be no water!
411. Sup. May. Sug.: *aamûin, aamûin, aamûin!*
412. Phul.: May potatoes come out of my tin of *ghî!*
413. Sup.: *aamûin!*
414. Phul.: May I not see the white line<sup>10</sup>!
415. Sup. May. Sug.: *aamûin, aamûin, aamûin!*
416. Phul.: If I bring home kerosene, may water come out (of the jerry can)!
417. Sup. May. Sug.: *aamûin, aamûin, aamûin!*
418. Phul.: May my hens lay eggs in other's places!
419. Sup. Sug.: *aamûin!*
420. May.: May they lay eggs in my place! *aamûin!*
421. Phul.: And tell me now, are there not those oaths of our own country that one swears?
422. Sup.: No! No! Don't stop with these! There are the great oaths of our ancestors. Swear them! Swear them! Go on!
423. Phul.: Just wait a moment.
424. May.: You left out the beautiful oaths!
- At this point the actor who portrays Phultûniş clearly shifts the pitch of his voice to a deeper tone and slows the tempo of his enunciation to express reverence and dignity:
425. Phul.: May there be no mother's milk when a child is born (in my house)!
426. Sup. May. Sug.: *aamûin, aamûin, aamûin!*

---

<sup>10</sup> bu. *burûm şin* = milk.

427. Phul.: May it be our fate to be obliged to get milk powder from outside (our family)!
428. Sup. May. Sug.: *aamín, aamín, aamín!*
429. Phul.: May that aged butter (*maltás*) that is brought for the midwife when a child is born turn out to be only boiled buttermilk (*burús*)!<sup>11</sup>
430. Sup. May. Sug.: *aamín, aamín, aamín!*
431. Phul.: May my children never obey me!
432. Sup. May. Sug.: *aamín, aamín, aamín!*
433. Phul.: Are these not enough?
434. Sup. May. Sug.: That's enough!
451. May.: Should we give him his goats?
452. Sup.: Yes. Let them go.
453. May.: Come now. Follow me. Take the name of Allah (s.w.t.) and we will go. Come in the name of Allah (s.w.t.)!

### **Afterthoughts in the Sociology of Communication**

In 1992, when the first television receiver with satellite dish antenna was installed in Karimabad, Hunza, a crowd of some fifty men jostled one another in the street until the wee hours of the morning in order to catch a glimpse through the open door of a tea shop of the fascinating pictures that flashed by in the window of this Pandora's Box of high technology. Today, all types of television programming, from the most sublime cultural events to the most pernicious pornography, are easily available in Hunza (to a far lesser degree in Nager and non-existent in the remote village of Hispar) either from the satellite dish or from imported or smuggled DVDs and video cassettes.

---

<sup>11</sup> The dish of kernels saturated in aged butter is called *chamíríki*. Cf. Müller-Stellrecht, Irmtraud, *Materialien zur Ethnographie von Dardistan (Pakistan). Aus den nachgelassenen Aufzeichnungen von D.L.R. Lorimer. Teil I. Hunza*, published as Band 3/I in the series Jettmar, Karl (series editor), *Bergvölker im Hindukusch und Karakorum*, Graz [Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt] 1979: 174.

But not even in Hunza has “video killed the radio star”<sup>12</sup>, at least, not yet. Sequences of abruptly changing optical impressions, ranging from film clips of the solemn pathos of Princess Diana’s funeral procession to the beefy hedonism of *Bay Watch*, however stimulating they might be initially, do not satisfy man’s need to understand himself and his fellow men by means of words spoken in his own mother tongue. The mere presence of television receivers and of people sitting in front of them does not mean that communication—in the sense of understanding and reflecting upon symbolic representations of meaning—has taken place.

For most listeners the radio-play in Burushaski is the first departure from a circular mode of communication typical of oral genre in which the audience forms an integral part of the performance to a linear mode of communication typical of electronic communications media in which performers and audience are no longer in physical proximity and, thus, no longer involved in a functional dialogue with one another.<sup>13</sup>

While Bertolt Brecht’s prophesy that radio-plays could lead to the alienation of the individual from active participation in society and become the most dangerous form of alcoholism, “silent drunkenness”<sup>14</sup>, proved to be true for many people in Europe and America, it is unlikely that this will be the case for the listeners of the Burushaski programme of Radio Pakistan Gilgit, owing to the close-knit relations of the members of the Burushaski language community.

While even in Brecht’s time, in the early years of the radio-play in Germany (1924–1932), the first radio studios in Hamburg, Frankfurt, and Baden-Baden employed professional actors who came from all parts of Germany and were known personally only to an insignificant percentage of the radio audience<sup>15</sup>, the actors of Radio Pakistan Gilgit’s Burushaski

<sup>12</sup> The song “Video Killed the Radio Star” by the English pop-music group “The Buggles” in 1979 relates to concerns and mixed attitudes towards 20th-century inventions and machines for the media arts. Long before TV, there were shows on the radio. Radio stars were like TV stars are today. The concept of the “Radio Star” actually existed well into the 1950s. Video (TV) killed the Radio Star because as TV became more popular, there were fewer and fewer radio shows until one day there were none. The writers of this song were little boys when radio shows died out and TV took over. It is a bittersweet irony that this was the first song played on the now world-wide Music Television (MTV) network at midnight plus one minute on August 1, 1981.

<sup>13</sup> On formal dialogues that are not functional dialogues see Tedlock, Dennis, and Mannheim, Bruce (edd.), *The Dialogic Emergence of Culture*, Urbana and Chicago [University of Illinois Press], 1995: 4.

<sup>14</sup> Brecht, Bertolt, “Der Rundfunk als Kommunikationsapparat”, in: Schöning, Klaus (ed.), *Neues Hörspiel. Essays, Analysen, Gespräche*, Frankfurt am Main [Suhrkamp Verlag] 1970: 9ff., especially p. 13.

<sup>15</sup> Klose, Werner, *Didaktik des Hörspiels*, second, revised edition, Stuttgart [Verlag Philipp Reclam jun.] 1977: 29.

programme are well known in the Burushaski language community and represent real personages of everyday life in Gilgit, Hunza, and Nager. They are identified with more than just their stage voices and the characters they portray.

While the listener cannot respond directly to the performance as in oral genre in Burushaski, he is, on the other hand, not left alone in an inner dialogue with a voice for which he cannot attach a familiar face.<sup>16</sup> The radio-play in Burushaski is, thus, closer to the everyday life and self-understanding of its listeners than radio-plays in the West. Through its linguistic immediacy, spirited performance, and compelling local relevance it plays a role in the life of the Burusho that can neither be filled by the kaleidoscope of the satellite dish nor the cheap thrills of the blue-movie video-cassette.

### **Acknowledgement**

Without the patient help of my field assistant, Inam Karim, son of Ghulam Murtaza of Altit, Hunza, through whose eyes I had the insider's view of this and other radio-plays in Burushaski, this paper could not have been written in its present form. Inam Karim has remained in contact with me and my son, Leif (b. 1993), whom he had known in Altit as a small child in the years 1995-1996, up to the present day (2019).

---

<sup>16</sup> I contrasted the active role of the audience of a performance of oral literature with the passive role of the audience of a radio or television programme in van Skyhawk, Hugh, "On heroes in the Karakoram", in: Brückner, Heidrun, van Skyhawk, Hugh, and Zoller, Claus Peter [edd.], *The concept of the hero in South Asia*, Delhi [Manohar Publishers]: 75-98. These remarks apply primarily to the programmes of distant broadcasters such as satellite television or long-range radio broadcasts from India (All India Radio) or the Urdu-Service of Radio Pakistan whose broadcasters a listener in Hunza or Nager will never see and, never respond to directly. For the reasons I have given above, the Burushaski programme of Radio Pakistan Gilgit occupies an intermediate position between a performance at which the audience and the performers are co-present and can respond directly to one another and an electronically transmitted performance at which they are often at great distances from and cannot respond directly to one another.