capable of recovering the social assumptions that underlie the verbal communication process by focusing on actors' use of speech to interact, i.e. to create and maintain a particular definition of a social situation. Relies upon Geoghegan's (1970) study of address rules in Samal (a Philippine language) which distinguished between "code rules" (specifying what can be said) and "marking rules" (which convey social meaning by contrast with code meanings, i.e. through context and social expectations. [Pers. note: the article does not make Geoghegan's terms clear, but what I have written I think approximates the idea]. By analysis of taped classroom interaction between teacher and small children, authors show that marking rules differ between the adult teacher and the children, leading to miscommunication between them.


A very basic text for the study of sociolinguistics -- maybe THE basic text. Includes, notably, an excellent introduction by Gumperz (see separate entry) and quite lengthy and informative introductory notes to each essay included in the collection. Three sections: I. ethnographic descriptions (this section clearly fits into the ethnography of communication tradition). II. "Discovering Structure in Speech" includes ethnomethodology papers and what would clearly be called sociolinguistics papers by Ervin-Tripp and Friedrich (see entries). III. concerns linguistic codes papers, including Blom & Gumperz (see entry), Fishman and Basil Bernstein. The Appendix, by Joel Sherzer & Regna Darnell, gives a bibliography for background reading and an "Outline Guide for Ethnographic Study of Speech Use." Altogether a key volume.


Begins with a survey of diverse language situations and language use in varied cultures. Blames linguistics for having been concerned only with referential, not social meaning. Calls sociolinguistics a movement to redress this wrong. Is generally a call for "sociolinguistic" description and taxonomy as a first step.


Note, first, that the volume in which this article appears is a key one for the sociological study of symbolic interaction, including essays by key thinkers in this field such as George Herbert Mead. Mills' essay is like an epiphany. His point, basically, is that people feel they have to give reasons for their actions, and what "reasons" are possible, while they seem inherently logical, are in fact conventions of a given culture.
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PART I: SPEECH. EVENT ETHNOGRAPHY OF SPEAKING
AND ANTHROPOLOGICAL APPROACHES TO ANALYSIS OF CONVERSATION

Agar, Michael. Cognition and Events, in Sanches and Blount, pp. 41-56.

Using as material the jargon of street junkies, shows that in order to understand the language one must understand the event structures which gave rise to it. Describes in detail how he arrived at word meanings through elicited frames, thereby demonstrating the "psychological reality of event concepts." [personal note: I found this article obvious and not new, but I am told it is regarded as a significant illustration of ethnography of speech related to event structures].

Albert, Ethel. Culture Patternning of Speech Behavior in Burundi, in Gumperz and Hymes, Directions, pp. 72-105.

From introductory note by editors: this article was one of the first in anthropology to study speech as a thing in itself. "This paper is especially valuable for its portrayal of the relations between cultural patterns of speech and personal strategies.

From text: "The primary intention of this paper is to explore the concepts and categories that may be useful for constructing cultural patterns of speech behavior.

This article is particularly interesting and pleasant to read. It relates social use of speech to cultural values; thus, the "ethnography" of speech is explained and motivated in the context of the culture described, not just "listed." In addition to a complete discussion of speech forms and speech attitudes in Burundi (Africa), the article ends with very useful and sensible suggestions for others doing field work (for example, Don't ask direct questions; try to learn unconscious ways in which informants signal, e.g. lying; (lying is a respected and valued form of speech in Burundi); get comparative accounts).

[personal note: Albert notes that cultural Values underlying speech patterns she describes seem to be similar to those in other African and mediterranean countries. In fact, they seem to be closely related to values and speech habits in Greece, in some ways, and thus are of special interest to me.]

Basso, Keith H. 'To Give Up on Words': Silence in Western Apache Culture. in Giglioli, pp. 67-86.

Focusing on "focused gatherings" or "encounters" (cf Goffman), shows that silence is the preferred mode of "communication" in the face of ambiguity or unpredictability, for Western Apaches. Discusses its use in such settings as "dating," reunions between parents and children, etc.

One of the basic texts in the area of ethnography of speaking, speech events, etc. The preface includes some interesting background about the development of the field, noting that it "was called into being by Dell Hymes' seminal essay of 1962," [referring to Hymes, *The Ethnography of Speaking*, in Gladwin & Sturtevant, eds., *Anthropology and Human Behavior, Washington DC*], and then the 1964 Gumperz & Hymes collection in *American Anthropologist, The Ethnography of Communication*. The present volume grew out of a conference in Austin in April 1972. Includes articles by Gillian Sankoff, Elihor Keenan, Roger Abrahams, Harvey Sakcs, Keith Basso, Dell Hymes, and others. Includes a large number of elegant examples of ethnographies of speaking in a variety of cultures.


An invaluable summary of work in ethnography of speaking to date. Defines the field as a part of linguistic anthropology which combines the study of language as grammar with the study of cultural rules by which language is used. Surveys and summarizes important publications and theories, including such diverse areas as pidginization and creolization, Labov's on narrative, the Sudnow volume, Gumperz & Hymes *Directions*, folklore studies, and theories of frames from Bateson and Goffman. [note the overlapping of 'fields' I am categorizing separately in the bibliography].


From editors' introductory note: This essay is important because it doesn't just describe the verbal event but attempts "to how the forms in question are used in actual interaction, what they imply about language usage in relationships in the societies in which they occur. This is a classic illustration of the fact that communicative competence involves more than just grammatical skills." Describes in detail the verbal dueling which is common among pre-adolescent Turkish boys. The dueling consists of aggressive and obscene taunts of increasing intensity, reminiscent of the Black-American practice of "sounding" or "playing the dozens" which Labov has written about. The authors point out that the two crucial features of the dueling are 1) to force the opponent into a female, passive role, and 2) the retort must end rhyme with the initial insult. The authors conclude with a freudian analysis of the unconscious motivation behind the verbal dueling, reasoning that the boys unconsciously blame their mothers for the castration-like circumcision they underwent at about the age at which verbal dueling begins (even though the circumcision is carried out, without anesthetic, by men). The editors of the volume offer an alternative explanation by which "the duel ... tests the performers' ability to manipulate these emotion-charged topics within the constraints imposed by the speech event." [personal note: both explanations seem reasonable. The editors' view
is clearly more germane to the area of interest at hand. While the authors' psychological interpretation may also have some truth to it, it seems unreasonably misogynistic, in blaming the mother for the child's circumcision. It seems that a look at the inferior position of women in Turkish culture, which is commented upon by the authors as well, would be enough to explain the derogatory value of placing one's opponent metaphorically in this the female position.]

Frake, Charles O. How to Ask for a Drink in Subanum. in Giglioli, pp. 87-94. Originally published 1964.

A typical ethnography of the use of speech in an event in Subanum, Philippines. Referring, as usual, to Goffman's notion of "focused social gathering," describes in detail the discourse stages and social factors operating in gabi, translated "beer" drinking, which takes place at important gatherings. Shows that social relationships are "extended, defined, and manipulated through the use of speech."

Frake, Charles O. How to Enter a Yakan House, in Sanches & Blount, pp. 25-40.

Chooses an everyday, incidental act in which verbal behavior plays an important part, to show "what one needs to know in order to make sense of what does happen." Explains that cultural expectations define "distinctive settings in and around a house, the sequence whereby one moves through the setting, and the signals for initiating and terminating moves." In addition to the usual complete description of the detail of the event, includes a discussion of the bearing this sort of analysis has on the study of social encounters in general: 1) analysis of speech acts in actual performative contexts 2) use of these verbal performances to situate events both physically in space and conceptually along a dimension of formality and 3) the relationship between actual performances and the 'rules' for their interpretation.

A particularly interesting aspect of this study is the discussion of the ways in which the carefully described ritual is violated for the purpose of communicating social messages such as solidarity and humor. The shared expectations of participants derived from this competence [i.e. knowledge of the proper ritual] provides a background against which special meanings - hostility, affection, humor - can be marked. The problem is that a rule violation signalling humor in one situation may signal hostility in another. "One must bend the rules with care.... [personal note: Thus the omnipresent two-edged-sword of indirect or metaphorical communication of meaning: it can serve to establish rapport or otherwise communicate more efficiently and more satisfyingly than direct talk, but it can also be misunderstood.]

Good-humored and light-hearted essay. His "purpose here is to assess some of the methodological successes and failures of Cognitive Anthropology in terms of their implications for general conceptions of the relationship among behavior, verbal descriptions of behavior, cognition, and culture." I will focus on what is certainly one of the best-known items in the cognitive anthropologist's bag of tricks: the frame. Discusses its development and use in Cog. Anthro. Suggests that the "proper frame" for studying speech in context is an event, which is "not anything 'out there' at all. It is a unit whereby one organizes his accounts of what has happened, is happening, and will happen."

[Note: Frake's articles have the great advantage of being very well written and pleasant to read.]


An example of very recent work in the tradition at hand. Details different phone-answering habits and explains them in terms of the different social value attached to phone calling in the two cultures. The general observation is that for Americans, the caller has all the rights, and their openings are more direct. [Note: Godard doesn't comment on this, but it is clear that Lakoff's observation about Americans preferring a Camaraderie version of politeness as opposed to Distance or Deference explains the differences discussed.]


Suggests a useful technique for getting "natural" speech data. A native accomplice helps set up the right circumstances; the anthropologist "happens" to be there (sans tape recorder, which would intrude); another accomplice (in the case described, the first accomplice's teenage son) sits close by, say in the kitchen, and writes down key factors. The anthropologist makes comments onto a tape recorder soon after. [personal note: some modification would be necessary for linguists who would insist upon having the speech recorded, but otherwise the idea has useful implications.]


A pioneering study, one of the first to show in detail both the linguistic repertoires of the groups studied and the social factors determining them. Communities studied are Hemnesberget, Norway, and Khalapur, India. Material for study is "the distribution of linguistic forms in everyday speech." The universe of analysis is a "speech community: any human aggregate characterized by regular and frequent..."
interaction over a significant span of time and set off from other such aggregates by difference in the frequency of interaction. Forms are selected for study primarily in terms "of who uses them and when." The conclusion is that "intergroup distinctions in linguistic behavior are attributable to the different ways in which participants of open and closed network groups ... define their mutual relationships."


A very useful historical survey and introduction to major concepts. [see above entry for definiton of speech community.]

Gumperz, John J. Introduction to Directions in Sociolinguistics (1972).

A very useful survey of modern linguistics and how it developed with regard to the study of social factors in speech. Includes excellent discussion of early speech community studies, Bloomfield, Saussure, Pike, Sapir, Boas, generative grammar, the Prague school, recent social dialect studies, Firth, etc. Discussion of basic sociolinguistic concepts, speech events, variables, repertoires. Ends with implications for fieldwork. [personal note: a goldmine of information].


Begins with an introduction to recent sociolinguistic studies. Then explains the Gumperz method of conversational analysis, stressing the notion that communication of affect and content are not separable (the distinction between core and marginal features is not tenable). Interpretive strategies, speech activities types, conventionalized expressions which play a crucial role in the identification of speech contexts. Includes key examples to illustrate. [note: without using the same terminology, refers to the secondary gain of indirectness which Lakoff calls Rapport].


Emphasized the importance of "public negotiations" (any interaction with strangers for a specific purpose) in modern life, and notes that cultural differences in the subtlest use of communicative processes is causing trouble for all. After a useful survey of related research by others, introduces Gumperz' notion of contextualization cues and shows how they work for good and ill. Observes, crucially, that discrepant use of such cues can continue to cause trouble and mutual misjudgments despite years of inter-group contact.
Gumperz, John J. Sociocultural Knowledge in Conversational Inference, in 28th Annual Round Table: Monograph Series in Languages and Linguistics, Georgetown University, 1977.

'Begins with an analysis and discussion of the contributions of three research traditions to an understanding of conversational inference: 1) ethnography of speaking 2) linguistic pragmatics 3) ethnomethodology. Later mentions as well the work of students of non-verbal behavior: Condon, Kendon, and Byers. Explains Gumperz' approach to speech activities and contextualization cues (i.e. prosody and paralinguistic features), with reference to examples from a) use of such cues in a linguistic joke and b) misunderstanding caused by the use of different cont. cues by a West Indian bus driver in London, England.


Demonstrates how different use of contextualization cues can lead to misunderstandings between speakers of British English and Indian English (i.e. native of India now residing in England). An elegant argument which first analyzes Indian English cues which are seen to function effectively in in-group talk among Indians and then shows how the same cues lead to misjudgment of intent in communication between Indians and native Britishers. Ends with an inspiring illustration of how a workshop conducted among Indian and British employees at an airport cafeteria made it possible for the participants to figure out for themselves what was going wrong and led to improved employee morale and relations.


Using a strategy similar to those employed in the preceding two papers, Gumperz shows that when black activist Dave Hilliard alienated his primarily white audience and got himself arrested for threatening the life of the president when he announced at a Sproul Plaza rally, "We will kill Richard Nixon," he was in fact using rhetorical devices of black preaching style which were intended to convey the meaning of destroying Nixon's influence, not his life. The technique used is not merely hypothesis but, first, presenting and analyzing an example of black preaching style taken from a radio broadcast in order to demonstrate the similarity of techniques (or contextualization cues), and, second, interviewing members of the black community about how they would express the idea of murder and what the expression "kill" would mean in context.


Purpose: "to work out an empirical method of conversational analysis
capable of recovering the social assumptions that underlie the verbal communication process by focusing on actors' use of speech to interact, i.e., to create and maintain a particular definition of a social situation. Relies upon Geoghegan's (1970) study of address rules in Samal (a Philippine language) which distinguished between "code rules" (specifying what can be said) and "marking rules" (which convey social meaning by contrast with code meanings, i.e., through context and social expectations. [Pers. note: the article does not make Geoghegan's terms clear, but what I have written I think approximates the idea]. By analysis of taped classroom interaction between teacher and small children, authors show that marking rules differ between the adult teacher and the children, leading to miscommunication between them.


A very basic text for the study of sociolinguistics -- maybe THE basic text. Includes, notably, an excellent introduction by Gumperz (see separate entry) and quite lengthy and informative introductory notes to each essay included in the collection. Three sections: I. ethnographic descriptions (this section clearly fits into the ethnography of communication tradition). II. "Discovering Structure in Speech" includes ethnomethodology papers and what would clearly be called sociolinguistics papers by Ervin-Tripp and Friedrich (see entries). III. concerns linguistic codes papers, including Blom & Gumperz (see entry), Fishman and Basil Bernstein. The Appendis, by Joel Sherzer & Regna Darnell, gives a bibliography for background reading and an "Outline Guide for Ethnographic Study of Speech Use." Altogether a key volume.


Begins with a survey of diverse language situations and language use in varied cultures. Blames linguistics for having been concerned only with referential, not social meaning. Calls sociolinguistics a movement to redress this wrong. Is generally a call for "sociolinguistic" description and taxonomy as a first step.


Note, first, that the volume in which this article appears is a key one for the sociological study of symbolic interaction, including essays by key thinkers in this field such as George Herbert Mead. Mills' essay is like an epiphany. His point, basically, is that people feel they have to give reasons for their actions, and what "reasons" are possible, while they seem inherently logical, are in fact conventions of a given culture.
Investigate the content of children's insults as a way of approaching cultural values. For example, black American children accuse each other of being babies and insult each other's parents. Samoan children do neither of the above but accuse each other of having Chinese eyes. Furthermore, the strength of the children's response to particular insults reflects the intensity of the respective value. For example, black American children become most angered at references to each other's looks. Finally, when children use insults incorrectly, the process by which they acquire values can be witnessed.

Nader, Laura. The Problem of Order in a Faceless Society.

After noting the problem of voicing complaints in a complex society such as ours (i.e. in contrast with Zapotec Indians who know the appropriate channels for directing complaints), and noting the further problems created by vertical as opposed to horizontal integration (i.e. doctors talk primarily to other doctors, etc.), Nader analyzes specific strategies of dealing with a complaint which she has dubbed "the No-job." That is, the employee, of the phone company for instance, whose job it is to say no. Interesting analysis of the verbal strategies used for accomplishing this end.

Sanches, Mary. Introduction to Pt II, Sanches & Blount.

Names 4 most important sources of thinking with regard to metacommunication: 1) "general" use of the term. 2) Bateson (see my entry for details about his theory. 3) Jakobson (1960) in Style in Language, ed. Thomas Sebeok. 4) symbolists in anthropology (e.g. Geertz). Sanches discusses the dual goal of this section of the book: 1) scientific schema for isolating different types of metacommunicative events and acts and 2) to understand how language as a behavior-generating model allows for an infinite number of speech events.


Another key collection of essays in the research tradition under discussion. Many of the articles included are found in this biblio.


Begins with an excellent discussion of trends in developmental psycholinguistics, inspired by Chomsky and McNeill, particularly the approach recommended by Slobin, et.al., A Field Manual for Cross-Cultural Study of the Acquisition of Communicative Competence (UCB LBRL 1967). Argues convincingly that the Manual failed, since it prescribed
elicitation procedures developed in American settings, in hopes of collecting comparable data, which were not applicable in different cultures for reasons well-documented by Schieffelin. Then S. outlines her own system for gathering developmental data in Papua, New Guinea, which consisted of recording speech from four children over an extended period of time in interaction with their own families in their own homes, engaged in ordinary activities. Focuses particularly on the use of the native term a:la:ma, by which mothers and older siblings purposefully teach young children to "talk hard," i.e. right. [Personal note: Very interesting data, clearly and delightfully discussed in a significant framework.]


Argues for an "action" approach to understanding behavior which seems to consist in a holistic (cf Percy Cohen) notion that "people are constrained by socially constructed reality" (as opposed to a "systems" approach) which sees people as constrained by external systems. Reference to social theorists Durkheim, Parsons, Schutz, as well as Symbolic Interactionists Rose and Blumer. Lists seven components of an Action approach, Basic elements seem to be 1) meaning as socially-constructed reality and 2) sociologists' task to understand inherent logic of data, not impose external logic on data.

Spradley, James P. The Ethnography of Crime in American Society.

A study of public intoxication in Seattle. By examining the various terms used by habitual offenders, discovered the social variables of public intoxication. In an interesting revelation of the ways in which different terms reveal different world views [my observation], notes that the same offenders are "down-and-outers" to outsiders; "common drunkards" to the court; "drunks" or "vagrants" to the police; "chronic alcoholics" to doctors and health officials; "the homeless man" to social scientists; and, to the men themselves, "tramps" or "inmates," or any of many subtypes of each (enumerated in the text). The in-group's own classifications are shown to reflect a complex set of distinctions all of which grow out of the main distinguishing factor of mobility. [note: Seems quite similar to the Agar study for street junkies, but this one, for some reason, is much more pleasant to read.]


An interesting ethnography of song in Tzeltal (Mayans). What is special about this study is its focus on the unique tension between freedom for creative expression within structural constraints. It is ... by means of constraints that creativity may be judged." Analyzes three sample songs. [Personal note: This is the central tension in art, most dramatically, and in all human culture.]
Swett, Daniel H. Cultural Bias in the American Legal System.

An excellent essay that makes painfully understandable the tragic cultural bias in law enforcement and adjudication. Systematically analyzes first police culture, showing how 1. recruitment, 2. enculturation, and 3. value systems of police aggravate a reciprocal, spiraling and self-reinforcing system of mutual stereotyping between police and cultural minorities. (In analyzing their value systems, presents four premises and five focal values and subsidiary values). Then discusses the culture of the criminal court, comparing professionals and non-professionals and showing how cultural differences between them lead to breakdown in communication. [Personal note: this is one of those articles after reading which I feel that my view of the world is forever changed. I can never look at a policeman the same way again. That's a strong testimony, I think.]


Discusses aspects of naturalness and data collection for sociolinguistic research. Attempts to dispel the bugaboo of the quest for "natural" data by asserting that "natural" speech is speech appropriate to the occasion and therefore has many forms. Solution proffered is to gather many varied types of data, both recorded and observed. Notes that one's own friends are among the best source. One type of data which Wolfson specifically rejects, however, is the pseudo-interview, designed to elicit spontaneous narratives [although she doesn't name names, it is clear that she is referring to the type of data-collection preferred by Labov and Linde]. Such phony-interviews make people nervous because it's not really an interview and not any other recognizable event either. (Quotes examples of "interviewees" resisting "interviewer's" attempts to elicit incidental narratives). After discussing pros and cons of a number of types of data for speech, outlines her own program for getting various kinds of speech on record to study the occurrence of the historical present in narratives.


Along with Roger Barker, Wright is what is known as an ecological psychologist. As a team, they had a crew of observers who followed children of a town around all day, recording what they did. This necessitated a system for categorizing and coding action. The most interesting distinction, for my purposes, is that between molar and molecular actions. Molar refers to goal-directed, conscious actions such as opening a door [i.e. can be identified by person in answer to the question, "What did you do?"], while molecular (also called actones, in one of a complex array of terminology they devised) refers to elements of that action [such as extending one's arm].
Part II: Discourse Analysis

Including Analysis of Conversation and Narrative; Ethnomethodology; Non-Verbal Communication

Argyle, Michael. The Laws of Looking, *Human Nature*, January 1978, pp. 32-40. This is a popularized version of Argyle's work on gaze. Includes discussion of cultural differences and observations such as the fact that women gaze at others more than men, adults more than adolescents; use of gaze as punctuation and in turn-taking. Suggests that the eye flash is used for emphasis [what Ekman would call a baton]. The most interesting observation, though this may not be a function merely of gaze, lies in results of an experiment which showed that when two people carried on an argument over the phone, using predetermined arguments, the one with the stronger arguments won. In person, however, this was not always the case.

Becker, Alton L. Text-Building, Epistemology and Aesthetics in Javanese Shadow Theatre, in Becker & Yengoyan, eds., *The Imagination of Reality*, Norwood, NJ: Ablex, to appear. [One of those monumental works that one wants to quote verbatim at every step, and for which paraphrase seems sacrilege. But anyway, here goes.] This paper makes crucial observations about aesthetics, text coherence, and the connection between art, madness, and the world. Specifically, it presents Javanese Shadow Theatre as an example of a system which follows constraints totally different from those Westerners take for granted. Begins by discussing relations that operate in any text: 1) coherence (relations of textual units to each other) 2) intention (relation of textual units to other texts in the culture) 3) intentionality (relation of units in the text to the intention of its creators) 4) reference (relation of textual units to non-literary events. Relational statements are metacommunication (cf Bateson). The basis of western narrative coherence is tense, while for Old Javanese literature it is a system of person. Basic constraints of western texts are unity and causality. Wayang (Javanese Shadow Theatre) plots are built "primarily around coincidence." A Wayang plot can begin at any point in a story; any scene may be transposed or omitted. However, it must begin and end in certain places. Since demons are believed, in Bali, to move in straight lines, a Balinese is quoted to explain, "'The music and shadow play move round and round and keep the demons out'." [note: contrast this, particularly, with American preference for "coming to the point; which Kaplan (see entry) characterizes by a straight line of logical reasoning and argument development.]

"The figure a sentence makes is a strategy of interpretation filling in subjectivity, temporality, referentiality, and intersubjectivity which ... helps the people it is used by understand and feel coherent in their worlds." Thus Becker affords a glimpse into the language and the world of Classical Malay by explicating a single sentence. Beginning with extended references to hermeneutic philosopher Paul Ricoeur and writer Gertrude Stein, shows how the sentence carries, one grammatically (through clause structure) and rhetorically (through sentence structure) from its actor outward to the landscape through which he moves, that is, from language to nature, as well as (seemingly paradoxically) from generality to particularity. [This paper, like the one preceding, has to be experienced.]

Bennet, Tina L. An Extended View of Verb Voice in Written and Spoken Personal Narratives, in Keenan & Bennet, pp. 43-49.

Analyzing the data (see Keenan & Bennet entry) with regard to verb voice, gives statistical observations such as that two-thirds more verbs appear in the first person in written discourse; 'progressive-like' verbs appear more in spoken; passives are infrequent in both modes but more infrequent in spoken; statives appear in first person for spoken narratives, non-first person for written. Etc. Rather a listing of such statistics without much discussion of significance. [Personal note: Maybe it's just me, as they say, but most of this struck me as confusing, inconclusive, or obvious, or all of the above.]


Bruner discusses the research and, briefly, the career and impact of the Russian cognitive psychologist Alexander Luria (who is perhaps best known for his split-brain experiments). Data for the present book are a study conducted in 1931 in villages of Uzbekistan and Kirghizia "to explore the psychosocial changes that occur as a peasant culture is transformed into a collectivist economy...." Written in the 1930's, the book was suppressed by Russian authorities until 1974 because it was deemed potentially insulting to the peasants, since it concludes that the peasant think more functionally and concretely, while literate groups think more abstractly. Bruner demonstrates, however, using Luria's own data, that the peasants' reported mental processes are not all that concrete. Bruner concludes, with reference to the work of Cole (see entry), that "the same basic mental functions are present in adults in any culture. What differs is the deployment of these functions: what is considered an appropriate strategy suited to the situation and task." [Personal note: This fits in with a wave of research concerning literate vs. non-literate rhetorical strategies (see Olson, Goody, Cole & Scribner entries) as well as Ekman's (see entry) notion of display rules. See also my own paper about Greek and American Oral Narratives.]

A complete explication of a theory of language which looks to semantic structure as its basis. Postsemantic processes (though not transformation as such) considered are 1) linearization processes which convert non-linear semantic structures into sentences 2) deletion processes, motivated by a "drive toward economy," and 3) literalization and agreement processes which "add and redistribute semantic and postsemantic units." Suggesting a mobile rather than a tree structure, Chafe acknowledges a debt to Chomsky as well as to Fillmore's case grammar. His basic training, however, as he explains in a revealing and moving personal account of the development of his thought which makes the introduction one of the book's finest elements, was structuralist, and the two themes which underly the theory are 1) the view of language as a system linking meaning with sound and 2) the attempt to identify certain noun-verb relations as forming the backbone of semantic structure. Two crucial notions, furthermore, which emerge are 1) the distinction between old and new information which has influenced virtually all linguistic and psycholinguistic theory since the book's publication and 2) idiomaticization, prefiguring current preoccupation with formulaic speech. [Personal note: it may be interesting to note here that Olson (see entry) identifies Chafe (on the basis of this book) as the Big Daddy of the school of linguistic thought which locates 'the meaning in the context' and Chomsky as the Big Daddy of 'the meaning is in the text'. Secondly, this book contains 'one of my favorite quotes': "...the complexities of the universe, linguistic or otherwise, are so vast that one cannot help but be awed and humbled by them, and that arrogance in a linguist betrays at least a lack of perspective on the problems which confront him." I would just like to add, "or her."]


Suggests a term and a field for study, "psychosemantics." Discusses the existence of three kinds of memory: surface, shallow, and deep, which find verbalization, respectively, in the use of no temporal adverb, a weak temporal adverb, and a strong temporal adverb. The explanation of this phenomenon relates to consciousness and thus foreshadows following paper. [Note: Chafe's suggestion that linguistics broaden its field of inquiry is not only heartening but also part of a zeitgeist which can be seen also in the work of Lakoff (see entries) and in the general upsurge of interest in sociolinguistics.]


Suggests that the notion of consciousness is important to linguistics, particularly in understanding the crucial linguistic distinction between what Chafe now calls given and new (previously called old and new) information. "Characterizes consciousness as "a narrow spotlight
that can at any one time be directed at only a small area of the available scene -- but a spotlight that wanders constantly, sometimes with purpose and sometimes not." Suggests that given/new distinction corresponds to "a speaker's assumptions as to what is in his addressee's consciousness at the time of speech. Such well-known linguistic phenomena as intonation, pronominalization, and to a lesser extent word order, are governed in a crucial way by these assumptions." Notes that apparent counterexamples to the correspondence between given/new distinction and intonation turn out to be attributable to contrastiveness. Ends with review of relevant research: Halliday on theme and Czechoslovakian linguists' theme/rheme distinction. Finally, suggests an egocentrism principle which has "that sparkle of intuitive truth: "Whenever a speaker's knowledge is such that, for him, consciousness of X entails consciousness of Y, he will assume that the addressee's consciousness of X entails consciousness of Y also." [Note that Chafe's notion of consciousness prefigures his later concept of focus.]


Continuing in the area of "psychosemantics" introduced in "Language and Memory" (though no longer using that term), asks "what kinds of processes [a person] must apply to convert his knowledge [of an event] predominantly nonverbal to begin with, into a verbal output?" Suggests another tripartite model: schemata, frames, and categories, which require a speaker to "match the external representations of particular events and individuals with internally represented prototypes." Verbal evidence that such choices are being made consist of hesitations and fillers.


Using detailed data from oral narratives produced by his own UCB Project, contrasts the "hierarchical" model of cognition and verbalization which he formerly believed in with a "flow model" which he now finds more satisfying. The hierarchical model had consisted of four levels of integration of cognitive material: memories, episodes, thought, and foci, reflected in verbalization in syntactic boundaries, intonation contours, hesitations, and the use of conjunctions. The flow model is described this way: As one moves from focus to focus, or from thought to thought, there are at certain points significant breaks in the coherence of space, time, characters, events, and worlds. Such breaks lead to conspicuous hesitations, and are identified as paragraph boundaries in written language. People seem not to store episodes as such, however, but rather to store coherent scenes, temporal sequences, character configurations, even sequences, and worlds, all of which interact with each other to produce greater or lesser boundaries when some or all of them change more or less radically. "Thesis supported by plenty of
specific examples from the narratives as well as plenty of statistical data. [Note similarity between the shifting foci and the darting spotlight of the consciousness metaphor in "Language and Consciousness." Note too the continuity with the non-linear concept of semantic structures in Chafe's 1970 book.]


Basic question: Are cultural differences "the result of differences in basic cognitive processes, or are they merely expressions of the many products that a universal human mind can manufacture, given wide variations in conditions of life and culturally valued activities?"

Though not clearly stated, implications accrue toward hypothesis that cultural differences are not located in basic cognitive processes. Includes useful historical survey chapter, as well as a chapter discussing the Whorfian hypothesis, and a lengthy bibliography on cross-cultural research. [Note: the studies reported on are strikingly narrow in scope, typically involving a simplified and concrete task administered in an experimental format to children or adults in a "primitive" setting and in the US.]


Calls into question the hypothesis that improved writing skills leads to improved thinking skills. [Personal note: this hypothesis is the least professed bulwark of remedial and freshman writing programs, as I know from having been part of numerous ones.] Reference to work of Havelock, Goody, Ong; summarizes theories of literacy and cognition. Cites findings of their own research among Vai (N.W. Liberia), with the conclusion that literacy improves performance on certain cognitive tasks but not "general mental abilities."


With reference to the work of Halliday and Schutz, examines the development of children's cognitive and linguistic processes. Basic claim is that language should be thought of as "intrinsically social," and that "children's social and linguistic development are intrinsically interrelated." Basic argument is that children's developmental pattern is from a reciprocity principle (others = me) to a reflexivity principle (other ≠ me). This hypothesis is very well argued and thoroughly convincing. [Note: in other terms, one may say that a child treats everything as given, or is overapplying Chafe's principle of egocentrism. Furthermore, it seems that application of the reflexivity principle can only be approached as a goal; that communication between adults is continually hampered by lapses into the reciprocity principle. By the way, I have a bit of a problem keeping the terms straight; the distinction between reciprocity and reflexivity as terms keeps getting fuzzied in my mind. The theoretical distinction, however, is absolutely clear and functional.]

Begins by discussing a theory of context as "a framing device for the semantic interpretation of message intent," context as a "socially dynamic" force which is "a part of the interactive process, rather than assuming it to be a parameter or social given...." Based on examples from children's speech, concludes that "child speech is more literal and yet at the same time apparently more indirect than adult speech. This apparent paradox is the result of the children's speech being tied more closely to the situation and the meanings depending more upon negotiation of meaning in the present interaction or from very recent past encounters." Interesting observations include the fact that "for children, the division between foreground and background features is more fluid than for adults"; there is a "lack of modality redundancy in children's communication," and children, "while using situation switching, have not yet, it is presumed, developed sufficient communicative memory to use metaphorical [code] switching."


Borrowing the term "back-channel" from Yngve (see entry), and writing within the ethnomethodological paradigm, discusses three types of signals which, in ordered sequences, mark units of interaction during speaking turns: 1) speaker within-turn signal 2) auditor back-channel signal and 3) speaker continuation signal. Data is from videotapes of 1) male therapist, female patient initial psychotherapy interview and 2) two male therapists discussing a patient. Most interesting observation (from my point of view) is that an early auditor back-channel response is an indication that the auditor is ahead of the speaker, and the speaker should jump ahead, while a late back-channel response indicates that the auditor is not quite following. [He doesn't say this, but definition of "early" and "late" would of course be a cultural or strategic construct. Personal note: Much of the discussion here struck me as either circular or obvious or both. The choice of data seemed screamingly marked, and dramatized the tremendous amount of affect and content which is ignored by such a structural approach. Finally, the data is only obliquely referred to; it is never presented nor analyzed in detail. What is presented instead is charts, numbers, and X.]


Interesting discussion of similarities and differences in non-verbal communicative signals, especially those involving the face. Suggests that the eyebrow-flash, when greeting from afar, is a universal (although he notes that in Japan it is considered indecent). Having filmed facial expressions of emotion in blind and deaf children, he concludes that facial expressions of emotion are innate.

The last word [or the last wink?] on facial expression research. Includes chapter by Ekman himself in which he surveys cross-cultural studies of facial expression. The thrust of his argument is that whereas facial expressions were once considered universal, there developed a trend toward considering them socially-determined (he blames Birdwhistell for this, among others), like everything else. Shows why studies which seemed to support such an interpretation are not valid. Proffers instead the theory (convincingly) that facial expressions of emotion are universal; it is display rules (i.e. when it is deemed appropriate to show expressions) that differ from culture to culture.


Tells all that Ekman knows about brows (which is probably as much as or more than anyone else in the world), including their use as a baton (to emphasize a word or phrase in conversation, or as an emblem (not accompanied by speech). Discusses notion of display rules [see above entry] and experimental data documenting them. An excellent introduction to the sort of thing Ekman does, which is truly overwhelming. [Note: Having recently just about completed what amounts to an etic analysis of facial movements, he and Friesen are embarking on emic analyses.]


A very complete and clear article. Begins with summary of their work to date (not telling findings but describing areas). Suggest that origin, usage and coding (the latter is defined as rules which explain how the behavior contains or conveys information) are the three aspects of non-verbal that must be understood. Discuss these three parameters for each of five categories of nonverbal behavior: 1) emblems, which have a "definition" or verbal translation. 2) illustrators, of which there are six types: batons, ideographs, deictic movements, spatial movements, kinetographs, and pictographs, all of which serve to illustrate what is being said. 3) affect displays, primarily involving the face. 4) regulators, which "maintain and regulate the back-and-forth nature of speaking and listening," by urging the speaker to hurry up or slow down, for example. 5) adaptors, called the most difficult to describe and believe in (!), which are presumably originally learned as adaptive behavior to fulfill needs, e.g. wiping of lips with tongue or hand. Three types are distinguished: self-adaptors, alter-adaptors, object-adaptors. An accompanying chart makes all the above plain.
Erickson, Frederick. One Function of Proxemic Shifts in Face to Face Interaction in Kendon, Harris, Key, eds., The Organization of Behavior in Face to Face Interaction. The Hague, Chicago, Monte Carlo, 1976.

In studying videotaped counseling sessions, discovered that proxemic shifts are often parallel to topic shifts. They occur at the beginning and end of a segment, and correspond to shifts in content, style, and interaction process. Always occur with "uncomfortable moments." However, they occur less at segment boundaries in intra-ethnic encounters ("not clear why").


Based on counseling interviews (video-taped) between counselors and students of different and similar ethnic backgrounds. Discovered that the most usable information was gleaned by the students when the counselor's ethnic background was similar to theirs. First reviews relevant research. Then shows the effects of differing expectations about how listenership and speakership is to be carried out and signalled. Basic finding is that (for example) black Americans in the study tended to maintain eye contact while speaking and make eye contact only sporadically while listening. In contrast, the white speakers tended to look steadily at their interlocutor while listening and allow their eyes to dart about while speaking. The result in inter-ethnic communication was that the black student appeared to the white counselor to be not listening or not understanding, since the black listener often "missed" the speaker's LRRM (Listener-Response-Relevant-Moment; i.e. a signal that some response from the listener is expected), and the white speaker similarly. "missed" some of this listening responses the black listener made according to his own conventions. The result was that the counselor employed one of two forms of hyperexplanation: talking down or giving reasons, repeatedly. The impression, not otherwise explicable to the student, is that the counselor thinks he is stupid. This is altogether a crucial paper, clearly set forth and well demonstrated by examples from the data.


Whereas he used to think the LoDagaa of Northern Ghana memorized the Bagre, he now believes it is a process of creative reconstruction from a schema. With reference to Bartlett and Lord, discusses oral versus literate uses of memory, noting that it is only in literate societies that verbatim memory flourishes, since that type of memory is associated with formal schooling. Writing is said to affect memory in three main ways: 1) by making possible the greater ordering of things 2) adds a visual, spatial and motor element 3) facilitates rehearsal by making it possible to check back to the text.

Notes that modern culture is both oral and literate, and that the relationship between these two modes is a source of problems. The advent of literacy made possible a permanent record of the past and its beliefs, thereby ushering in the task of historical enquiry and also scepticism. It became possible to build up and test explanations and to develop a "logical, specialized, and cumulative intellectual tradition." [This is one of the basic texts in the tradition of oral/literate culture which includes a number of the entries in this bibliography.]


Begins with a summary of philosophical and linguistic theory about cultural relativity, of rhetoric and logic. Discusses findings of a study which analyzed the compositions, written in English, by students of various language backgrounds. Concludes that speakers of other languages adhere to different rhetorical models, and illustrates these by simple diagrams. In Arabic (and other Semitic) languages, "paragraph development is based on a complex series of parallel constructions," and coordination is valued rather than subordination. Oriental (Chinese and Korean) languages are said to be "marked by what may be called an approach by indirection," and "much greater freedom to digress or to introduce extraneous material is available in French, or in Spanish...." Concludes that contrastive rhetoric must be taught as we now teach contrastive grammar, and suggests some ideas for how this may be done. [Personal note: Although it is little known in linguistics, this is one of my favorite articles.]


Makes the interesting (and apparently valid) claim that communicative strategies learned early in life are not replaced by later-learned strategies but rather are "retained, to be relied upon under certain communicative conditions." Specifically, suggests that adults employ more sophisticated communicative patterns in planned discourse, but in unplanned discourse "they rely more heavily on morpho-syntactic and discourse skills acquired in the first three to four years of life." Data presented to support hypothesis is drawn from child/child communication (her own); child/adult (Lois Bloom's); and adult/adult (Jefferson's and Schegloff's). Note that "planned" in this study refers to planned written, while "unplanned" refers to unplanned spoken. Work remains to be done on planned spoken and unplanned written texts.
Keenan, Elinor O. & Tina Bennet, eds. Discourse Across Time and Space. Southern California Occasional Papers in Linguistics No. 5, May 1977. (Department of Linguistics, University of Southern California)

A collection of articles by Keenan and others associated with her, based on the following data: 6 narratives were given orally and spontaneously by students in a composition class about a near-death experience (cf. Labov), and then the same people went home and wrote up the same experiences. Includes useful bibliography by area/topic. [Note: An excellent idea for real data, comparing written and spoken modes. Work seems influenced by ethnomethodologists, sometimes happily, sometimes less so. See individual entries.]


For authors, topic "is not a simple NP but a proposition (about which some claim is made or elicited)." They "propose here a dynamic model of the way in which speakers establish a discourse topic." Drawing upon data from three sources; 1) Lois.Bloom's tapes of mother/child interaction 2) conversations between twin children 3) group therapy session transcribed by Gail Jefferson. Model (also shown graphically) includes the following: 1) secure attention 2) speak clearly 3) give sufficient information to identify objects 4) give sufficient information about relationships between objects mentioned. The development of competence in children "concerns the extent to which a child is able to determine the discourse topic of a conversational partner." [Note: "discourse topic" as outlined here is similar to Gumperz' notion of "thematic progression." Seems right.]

Kempton, Willet. The Rhythmic Basis of Interactional Micro-Synchrony, ms.

Birdwhistell and Scheflen study kinesics. Condon (and later, Kendon) studies micro-kinesics. Kempton [his name is one more credential for his role in the field] explains their work, which uncovered the completely awe-inspiring fact of synchrony at the micro level over a baffling range of interactions. That is, when someone speaks, s/he exhibits self-synchrony: the parts of their body move in sync with each other and with speech -- i.e. in the same frame of a movie film! Even more astounding, there is interactional synchrony: the hearer's movements are in sync with the speaker's. Different parts of the bodies move at different speeds and in different directions, but they change direction at the same moment. Self-synchrony is even found in neonates (that's newborns).


Discusses synchrony (see preceding entry) in primates and in various exceptional situations. E.g. monkeys exhibit dysynchrony just before
(Kempton, Review, cont'd)

departure. Dyssynchrony is also observed in pathological behavior, Parkinsonism, stuttering, schizophrenia, aphasia, Huntington's chorea, epilepsy, autism, retardation, and reading problems. More synchrony is observed between members of the same sub-culture, between mothers and their infants, between men and women. Reference made to Lomax's work on cantometrics exhibiting "choral cohesiveness," which seems to be a related phenomenon. [Personal note: this is more evidence for the existence of similar communicative strategies among members of similar subcultures; further explanation for the satisfying feelings associated with communicating with someone of a shared background.]

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara. The Concept and Varieties of Narrative Performance in East European Jewish Culture, in Bauman & Sherzer, pp. 283-308.

Shows that narration of stories is a "cultural focus" in east European Jewish society. Stories are told regularly to make a point. "My aim, then, will be to characterize storytelling in east European Jewish culture of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, particularly in tradition-oriented circles. Defines and describes various types of stories told, from least to most formal, giving examples of each type. Ends with comparison of formal and informal types.


Discusses the syntactic functions coordination and subordination as treated in three traditions: pedagogical grammar, contemporary rhetoric, and transformational grammar, and opts for an eclectic approach. Suggests that the measure for counting is an "idea unit" which a communicator has in mind and can encode at the phrase, clause or sentence level. Such units can then be combined by coordinating conjunctions, subordinate "signal" words, or dependent phrases. Hypothesizes that "the totally unsophisticated communicator knows and uses none of these devices, and relies instead on the principle of 'nextness' to create connections between ideas."


Suggests that before attempting to analyze complex narratives such as myths, epics, etc., scholars should grapple with "the simplest and most fundamental narrative structures ... in direct connection with their originating functions." Suggests that such narratives are "oral versions of personal experience." This paper then analyzes such narratives elicited from speakers of Black English [not sic] in New York. The analysis is formal and functional. [Note: the attempts at
formalism are annoying to me but the reference to actual narratives which are quoted at length are excellent. This paper is a precursor of the following.]


This is a key article in narrative study from any perspective. Structural analysis: narrative contains 1) abstract 2) orientation 3) complicating action 4) evaluation 5) result 6) coda. Of these, evaluation is the most significant for content analysis. It consists of the speaker's attempts to answer in advance the hearer's question, "So what?" I.e. it shows what the speaker thinks is tellable about the story. Shows numerous linguistic techniques for accomplishing evaluation. [Note: If you're going to read anything about narratives, read this.]


A long and interesting discussion of rhetorical strategies in writing and speech. Basically distinguishes between the concept of meaning as inherent in the text associated with writing (and with Chomsky in linguistics) as opposed to meaning residing in context, associated with speech (and with Chafe). Oral statements are said to appeal to common experience for meaning, whereas written statements depend on prior agreement about rules of argument. Children are said to ignore or misinterpret utterances which express meaning other than that expected (contrary-to-fact, entailment, comes later). Most common reasoning is really enthymeme: logical steps are omitted. What people consider "logical" in fact, is what they agree with. [All this and more.]


Quote: "In this paper I will be arguing for the need for a pragmatic theory of narrative to account for the surface structure phenomena which are common in the narrative texts of real speakers." Outlines others' approaches to narrative analysis and their inadequacies. Leasing heavily on Labov's notion of "evaluative," makes the key observation: "People regularly understand a given narrative text to be about something other than the events or changes of state in the narrative." Two kinds of structures are posited: temporal (ie sequential events) and durative/descriptive (spatial, characterological, etc.). After analyzing in detail a priceless narrative entitled The Lady and the Housefly, concludes by suggesting a formalism (not
yet worked out) which builds "on the concept of mutually contextualizing frames -- each frame containing a structure governed by its own rules, and the three frames as a whole constituting a narrative frame operating within the communicative structure as one way of encoding and reporting information to other people."


Hypothesis is that what the point of story can be is culturally constrained. Demonstrates this by analyzing in detail a story told by a woman in a group discussion and showing that the speaker and her audience negotiate the point of the story until they agree upon one and the speaker can move on to another. Includes comprehensive bibliography of sources on narratives. [Personal note: the story here analyzed is the one I collected which is also the subject of my own paper, "Well What Did You Expect?" (BLS 3) as well as "The Effect of Expectations on Conversation" (Discourse Processes, to appear). Polanyi's paper contains key insights into the cultural constructs underlying discourse.]


A very basic text in narrative analysis, since it was one of the first. It is what Dundes (in the introduction) calls a syntagmatic structural approach, tracing the linear sequence of events, as opposed to a paradigmatic structural approach (cf. Levi-Strauss) tracing underlying patterns and binary oppositions. Propp does not concern himself with context and culture... Simply breaks fairy tales into component parts and studies them in terms of the functions of dramatic personae.


Ross is "interested in how we perceive and understand the connections between some parts of texts." Thesis is that this is accomplished by means of "covert pieces of information" which he calls "structures of expectation." [Personal note: I have borrowed this term from Ross; it seems like the simplest and most accurate way of expressing what has been called scripts, schemata, frames, templates, etc.]


Discusses puns as a way of showing what ethnomethodology can do. Thus, aim is "to show a conversation sequential ordering [sic] that can be found for a characterizable class of puns. Data from a group therapy session for adolescent boys. After presenting the excerpt
(Sacks, Puns, cont'd).

which contains the pun, shows that 1) puns often occur in proverbials 2) proverbials often occur on story completions, as a way of exhibiting understanding of the story 3) there is then a systematic possibility for puns "in the potential for a congruence between the concrete materials of the proverbial and the concrete materials of the story." Presents a "Preference rule" for understanding: "Given the detection of a proverbial in a sentence, Prefer to use idiomatic over concrete understanding of it."

[Personal note: the copy I had to read was illegible on alternate pages, I think I got the gist of it but wouldn't swear by this summary.]


Analyzes the telling of a dirty joke [the one about the three sisters who get married on the same night and all sleep in their mother's house that night...] by an adolescent boy in a group therapy session. Shows how it adheres to story structure; then analyzes the "constructional core" of the joke; then presents four features of stories as communication followed by five ways in which jokes differ. Finally, presents three ways in which dirty jokes are special. Ends with a pithy analysis of what this dirty joke could do for the 12-year-old sister who purportedly had been heard to tell it in the first place. [Note: This paper gets better as it goes along. While the structural commentary seems pretty obvious, the observations about joke telling as opposed to story telling in general and about the purposes served by the dirty joke for its teller are quite enlightening.]


Discussion of the same joke as above but rather less interesting, since it is concerned only with "the sequential organization of the telling..." which is seen as being comprised of "three serially ordered and adjacentely placed types of sequences which we call the preface, the telling, and the response sequences." [My impression is that, while less interesting, this paper is more typical of ethnomethodological studies.]


Attempts to show what might go into determining the "truth" of a statement and chooses the statement "Everyone has to lie" as an "exercise." Proceeds with a word by word analysis which contains some interesting observations about conversation [but on the whole leaves me puzzled and bored.]

Discusses how people go about closing conversations. Specifically, demonstrate three strategies: 1) adjacency pairs 2) warrants (state or imply reasons the other will recognize as pre-closing) 3) pre-topic pre-closing (information elicited at the beginning of the conversation).

[Note: This is one of the best ethnomethodology papers I've seen since it both accomplishes their stated purpose of showing that conversation is structured and systematic and also includes rather intuitive and content-based observations about conversational interaction.]


This is probably the key ethnomethodology track. Suggests "a model for turn-taking in conversation [which is] locally managed, party-administered, interactionally controlled, and sensitive to recipient design." After reviewing some relevant background literature, set forth rules for turn-taking in conversation. This system is said to account for a number of characteristics of conversation which the authors describe and discuss. [Note: turn-taking is chosen as a paradigmatic example of the structure of conversation. As can be sensed from the relatively straightforward statement of purpose quoted above, this paper, like all others by its authors, is so wracked with bizarre terminology, distorted syntax and unwieldy circumlocutions, that the very valuable -- in fact, pioneering -- insights are nearly obscured.]


"Formulating-place" means choosing a word or phrase to refer to a place. Shows strategies used to do this, including 1) location analysis (employing 'commonsense geography') 2) membership analysis (reflecting assumptions about what the other person may be expected to know by virtue of 'group membership'; i.e. which frame is cued 3) topic or activity analysis (includes a number of sorts of formulations which are symbolically represented, e.g. geographical, representing e.g. a street address). There is quite a bit more of specific strategies with examples. Concludes with observation that such a system must operate for other "formulations" such as age terms, temporal, etc.

Demonstrates the integration of two preferences, that is, two principles which operate when a speaker chooses a way to refer to a person s/he is talking about. They are 1) minimization (i.e. prefer a single reference term) and 2) recipient design (i.e. prefer a term the hearer will recognize). The preference for a recognitional is shown to be stronger, but the preference for minimization is relaxed step by step: that is, information is added bit by bit (often with rising intonation, called "a try-marker"). [Note: Despite the usual maddening syntax and opaque terminology, this is a brief and rather elegant analysis of strategies used in conversation.]


In the spirit of ethnomethodology, makes observations about "repair," i.e. corrections of previous utterances. What is particularly interesting about this study is its analysis of repairs for politeness, with reference to the work of R. Lakoff. Suggests, sensibly, that "Additional investigation of communicative repairs may be useful to scholars and practitioners alike in that they may help us to identify and verify the pragmatic rules of specific communicative encounters."


Together with Turner, the basic ethnomethodology collection. Also includes pieces by scholars not specifically characterized as ethnomethodologists, such as Labov ("Rules for Ritual Insults").


The handiest collection of ethnomethodology papers, including an introduction by Turner explaining the development of the field and its name.


Imagine this statement: "No one has made any kind of a systematic study of how turn changes in dialog." Suggests that linguistics broaden its scope to include the study of "state of mind", that it begin to study conversation and particularly turn-taking [though the nominalization hasn't been formed yet]. Coins term "back-channel" for listener responses and makes some observations about turn-taking based on video-taped dyadic conversations between grad students. [A pioneering article, to say the least, and pleasantly a clearly written. Reinforces the impression that ethnomethodology could have been great if it had been written in a straightforward manner.]
Part III: Sociolinguistics


Clarifies his theories about elaborated vs. restricted code, also called universalistic vs. particularistic. Explains his debt to Durkheim and Marx on a macro level and Mead on a micro level.
[Note: The tone of this paper is defensive; he has clearly come under attack because of the way in which his thesis that lower class people employ a restricted code has been interpreted and applied.]


This is probably the original and classic code-switching study, establishing code-switching as a key locus of investigation for discovering social meaning of language use. After attributing their conceptual framework for social analysis to the work of Leach, Barth, and Goffman, authors describe Ranamal and Bokmal, two codes (i.e. forms of language or dialect) in the linguistic repertoire, corresponding roughly to a local dialect and a standard spoken Norwegian. Data are tape recordings of group discussion among friends at the home of local native. Key finding is the contrast between reported attitudes toward and denial of the use of standard on the one hand, as opposed to its actual use in spontaneous conversation. (Even after hearing tapes of the conversation, local informants refused to believe they were made in that town until they recognized the voices of their fellow townspeople.) Thus demonstrates dramatically the sub-conscious nature of language use. Also discusses the difference between situational and metaphorical switching.


Investigates "lies implicit in presuppositions, deletions, indirections, and loaded and jargonesque elements in the lexicon." Shows that "within language, valutive features are transmitted from one part of the lexicon to another by hidden linkups that doubtless reflect some basic fact about where and how the lexicon is stored in our brains." [Note: The latter is alluding to the basic process of metaphor and paradigmatic association of meaning. This article is refreshingly concrete, clear, and rooted in the real world. It also contains one of my all-time favorite quotes: "A loaded word is like a loaded gun, sometimes fired deliberately, but almost as often by accident. And even when you feel like firing one on purpose, it has to be in your possession first. Lots of casualties, some crippling ones, result from merely having weapons around."]

An introductory text full of fine observations about language as well as linguistics. Focuses on the impact of language on people's lives. [Note: one of the few linguists to mention, even briefly, the work of General Semanticists.]


The classic and pioneering study of pronouns t/v (i.e. the use of the second person singular vs second person plural in direct address). Diachronic as well as synchronic survey, using literature as source as well as conversations. Authors surmise that the use of t is gradually replacing v. Five sections roughly: 1) semantic evolution of pronouns 2) semantic differences between languages 3) connection between social structure, group ideology, and semantics of pronouns. 4) relationship between consistent pronoun choice and class status or political ideology. 5) variation of pronouns as expression of moods and attitudes. [Note: The dual scale, "power" and "solidarity," are crucial in understanding the universal motivation behind language use. In fact, they correspond in some basic way with Lakoff's two general politeness criteria, defensiveness and rapport.]


Experiment involved having children give each other instructions about how to build tinkertoys constructions. Findings: 1) children used prosody, especially negotiated patterns, to convey information which presumably would be lexicalized at a later stage of development. 2) children use mostly direct imperatives and imperatives containing pronominals to guide action. Also noted lack of formalized beginning sequences and lack of modality redundancy that would be expected in adult instructions (i.e. intonation plus lexicalization).


Basically, tests Lakoff's observations about women's language (see entry) among children and adults, from the point of view of stereotyping (not production). Finding verify empirically what Lakoff hypothesized, i.e. that the verbal forms she asserts are associated with women are in fact so. Edelsky further discovered, interestingly, that children exhibit increasing competence in identifying these stereotypes, but at different ages they use different strategies for making these judgments. Finally, older children (6th graders) have even more stereotyping than adults!
At 1st grade, the typical logic exhibited was: 'damn it' = bad word = angry = man. At 3rd grade: profanity = male; niceness = female. At 6th grade: 'niceness' was subdivided into a) substitute for profanity and b) 'love word', both identified as female. Furthermore, Edelsky distinguishes between two kinds of acquisition: Pattern B is the sort that shows increasing agreement until older childhood but then a decrease of agreement among adults; it is apparently learned deductively through direct injunction such as "Ladies don't swear," and indeed children made such evaluative statements during interviews. Pattern A, however, exhibited a steady increase of consistent responses with no decrease in adulthood and is probably learned inductively. This refers to such sex-linked usages as "adorable". [Note: This is a very interesting and useful article. Everyone should have it handy for when critics object to "intuitive" or "introspective" nature of women's language hypothesis.]


From introductory note by editors: "...the essay is seen to stand as a path-breaking [sic] integration of diverse lines of work, and to reveal more concretely than ever before the presence of a coherent field in which one can identify cumulative lines of research."

"Alternation" and "co-occurrence" are sociolinguistic analogues of paradigmatic and syntagmatic axes (cf Jakobson & Halle). The former is defined as "choice among alternative ways of speaking"; the latter as "interdependence within an alternative."

Discussion of current theories by Geoghegan (address rules) and other systems of analyzing address; notes possible problems created by use of differing sociolinguistic rules; introduces such sociolinguistic notions as linguistic repertoire, speech act, register, etc.; concludes with discussion of the problem of different conceptions of "rule."


Thorough cataloguing, with examples, of six types of directives, enhanced by frequent reference to information about children's acquisition of forms. Data was gathered by her students in a wide variety of settings. Types: 1) need statements 2) imperatives 3) imbedded imperatives 4) permission directives ("May I have...") 5) question directives ("Gotta match?") 6) hints ("The matches are all gone"). Analyzes differences between these various forms with respect to three dimensions: 1) explicitness 2) discourse constraints 3) neutralization. [This seems to mean, ambiguity]. Includes excellent observations about possible misunderstandings, humor, interpretive principles. Ends with crucial statement: "A skilled speaker relies on the contrast between what is expected and what occurs as a resource for implying meaning...."

Focusses on children's use of directives. Begins with summary of adult directives from "Sybil." Examines briefly related research by others. Asks 4 questions: 1) what forms do children use? 2) how well can they infer directive function? 3) systematic shifts depend on social context? 4) which social information about speech context can they infer earliest? Finds that "wide use of tactful deviousness is a late accomplishment." Children regularly miss directive intent when what is wanted is not overtly identified. Hypothesizes, seemingly correctly, that the ability to comprehend hints is due to the late-developing ability to understand the needs of others and willingness to gratify those needs. [Note: this amounts to what Cook-Gumperz calls the reflexivity principle]


Collection of papers originally presented at symposium on child discourse, AAA meeting in Mexico City, 1974. Preface notes that "Most of the contributors to this volume owe their interest in the ethnography of speaking, or their current conceptualization of approaches to child sociolinguistics, to Dell Hymes or John Gumperz." Notes connection, too, to group which produced "A Field Manual for Cross-Cultural Studies in the Acquisition of Communicative Competence," ed. by Slobin et al. Three sections of this excellent collection are I: Speech Events II: Function and Act III: Social Meaning.


Another classic. Coins term in its title. Study of language situation in Arabic, Modern Greek, Swiss German, and Haitian Creole. Distinguishes between a High (H) and Low (L) form of each language, and outlines their interrelationships and use. Makes reference to similar situations at other times and places. Suggests three conditions which lead to diglossia and three possible developments (stable diglossia, standard H, or standard L).


Analysis of Syrian Arabic politeness formulas, with reference to related forms in English as well as ritualistic behavior in animals. Includes good bibliography of work on formulaic speech to date. [Personal note: Inclusion of this article here is by way of redress for having omitted it in bibliography of my own paper on formulaic expressions (BLS III)].

General introduction to sociology of language by one of its first and most prominent proponents. Suggests two basic questions: 1) descriptive -- what is the social organization of language use? and 2) what accounts for changes in (1)? Reference to some key issues such as code-switching (cf Blom & Gumperz); bilingualism (e.g. unstable, as with US immigrants, vs. stable, as with French Canadians). Looks to applied sociology of language in such areas as native and second language teaching, translation, creation and revision of writing systems, language policy, language planning.


Inspired by Brown and Gilman (see entry). Data are from Russian novels. Suggests that pronoun choice depends on 4 parameters: 1) social context, 2) biological factors (e.g. age), 3) social and group phenomena (e.g. authority), 4) solidarity. Notes metaphorical use for sarcasm and irony as well as sex differences in usage. Discusses relationship and significance of synchronic vs. diachronic factors. Gives extended examples of two phenomena: "switching" and "breakthrough." (Latter refers to use of different pronoun as signal for breakthrough in relationship dynamics). Makes a plea for the recognition of the intangible nature of the impact of pronoun use as an example of "the more general phenomenon whereby people think or feel one continuous message while enunciating a second string of overt forms" and a call to linguistics to broaden its horizons to "grapple" with "some of the most challenging experience" and also thereby "be capable as well of predicting future events more fully and realistically." [Note the mounting evidence of the zeitgeist calling for a broadening linguistic horizons.]


The most basic and handy collection of essays on sociolinguistics. Contains nearly all the key figures in the field with no throwaways at all. Run down to the corner store and buy your copy.


Goffman is a giant. His theories of interaction inform everything anyone has written in the last two decades about interaction, whether they know it or not (most know it). Basically, his is a theory of face and of masks. Anything anyone does has in it an awareness of how
such behavior would or will appear to other members of society. Suggests a continuum ranging from a situation in which one is taken in completely by one's own "mask" to a situation in which one is not taken in at all. It seems likely that the latter is nonexistent. The kernel unit is not the individual but the team: "a set of individuals whose intimate co-operation is required if a given projected definition of the situation is to be maintained." Takes literally Shakespeare's metaphor that "all the world's a stage" by employing a "dramaturgical approach" distinguishing between "front region" where "audience" is vs. "back region" (eg kitchen vs. living room; locker room vs. court. Note however that the distinction need not be physical. E.g. some women feel themselves to be in a "front region" whenever there is a man around.) The possibility for brilliant insights within this paradigm is endless. This is the basic one of a series of book Goffman has written extending and embellishing his metaphors.


Fascinating analysis of the consequences in interaction of the possession of a "stigma": any characteristic that an individual feels would discredit her/him in the eyes of others. Distinguishes three types: of body, of character, of tribe. Most examples are taken from such obvious stigmas as blindness, hardness of hearing, facial disfigurement, Jewish or Negro heritage. However, the patterns hold for any secret failing one believes s/he would better not have. "The most fortunate of normals is likely to have his half-hidden failing, and for every little failing there is a social occasion when it will loom large, creating a shameful gap between virtual and actual social identity." Discusses such crucial factors as discredited (Stigma is known) vs. discreditable (could become known); the own vs. wise (people who are actually stigmatized vs. those who associated themselves with the own voluntarily); the politics and strategies of passing. There's much more [the book seems to become a predictable cataloguing of instances but don't give up -- the end is the best part]. I'll just end with a favorite quote: "The normal and the stigmatized are not persons but rather perspectives.... And since interaction roles are involved, not concrete individuals, it should come as no surprise that he who is stigmatized in one regard nicely exhibits all the normal prejudices held toward those who are stigmatized in another regard." [Note: you can tell by his choice of the words "nicely" and "normal" what a fine writer Goffman is.]


Nice little introduction to Goffmanian approach. Social situations (called "encounter" or "face engagements") have regulations and processes and structure; although they are not "intrinsically linguistic," yet they are often expressed through "a linguistic medium." Distinguishes between correlational drive (the social
determinants of speech and indicative elements (properties discoverable in speech).

Halliday, M.A.K., Angus McIntosh, and Peter Stevens. The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching, Indiana U. Press.

Discusses key linguistic concepts and their bearing on social interaction. E.g. dialect, register, grammar and lexis, field of discourse (topic), mode of discourse (e.g. lecture), style of discourse (e.g. colloquial), restricted languages (e.g. the language of contract bridge).


Called sounding, ritual insults concern relatives and are composed of obvious untruths. (True allegations are denied and can lead to hostility). Competitive enterprise with the winner achieving increased power in the group. Practiced among male youths of black inner city culture. [Personal note: This entry should really be in Pt. I of bibliography. Sorry.]


This is Labov's classic study of sociolinguistic variables in New York City speech. It represents the "variability" paradigm of sociolinguistic research. It must be called brilliant, pioneering, and stuff like that.

Correlates linguistic variables with non-linguistic variables of social structure. Identifies sociolinguistic markers (e.g. /θ/ in NYC speech) which varies with class and social situation.

The sampling of large numbers of people in different situations yields an elegant graph in which use of forms of these markers (e.g. /θ/ vs. /θ/ vs. /θ/ for the sound spelled "th") varies regularly according to social situation ranging from casual to formal speech to word lists (most "careful"), and also according to the social class (as measured by traditional sociological measurement devices such as income and occupation). Includes key observations about the relationship between language and social factors, e.g.: "If a certain group of speakers uses a particular variant, then the social values attributed to that group will be transferred to that linguistic variant." Variability is seen to travel "through the system in a wave-like motion." [Hence "wave-theory" of variability.] Lower middle-class women are found to exhibit most speech-consciousness (this is crucial, since they are the ones who becomes teachers), while the second-highest status group shows the most extreme style shifting. Final section, where he turns to discourse analysis, is not nearly as good as the part described above.
Another monumental work. Dispelled once and for all the "deprivation" theory of black language which had inspired the infamous Bereiter and Engelmann materials based on the theories of Basil Bernstein, assuming that black children "have no language" and attempting to teach them one from scratch. Shows that NNE (Negro Nonstandard English) is a rule-governed dialect; some rules presented are 1) negative concord [note the difference in bias from what was formerly called "double negative"] 2) pluperfect (had came) 3) negative perfect (I ain't had) 4) negative preterite (I ain't go) 5) negative inversion (don't nobody know) 6) invariant 'be' 7) optional copula (which can be deleted just where standard English can contract!!!) 8) dummy 'it' for 'there' full forms of auxiliaries.

In his enthusiasm for proving (which he does amply) that black children are verbally dextrous, Labov gives a rather slanted and unfair example of standard speech which is verbose, repetitive, and empty. Also makes the wonderful observation that "The highest percentage of well formed sentences are found in casual speech, and working-class speakers use more well formed sentences than middle-class speakers. The widespread myth that most speech is ungrammatical is no doubt based upon tapes made at learned conferences, where we obtain the maximum number of irreducibly ungrammatical sentences." [Even when he's taking swipes at his colleagues, you can't help cheering him on.]


Settles at last [I wish] the question of whether the "generic" use of "he" actually "means" either "he" or "she" to people. By giving subjects sentences and testing their understanding of the meaning, discovered that 80% of subjects inferred "he" from "he": that is, they took the "generic" to refer to masculine.


Analyzes Lahu jokes based upon puns, polysemy, misunderstandings, occurring in the context of bilingual contact between Lahu and Shan speakers and bidialectal contact between Yellow Lahu and Black Lahu speakers. Shows that jokes reveal pecking order and social relations. Remarks on the surprising fact that through such jokes Lahu make themselves the butts of their own jokes. [I humbly point out that it is specifically those Lahu who try to "put on airs" by speaking Shan or thinking that they understand Shan who become the butts of the jokes, which thereby become a mechanism for enforcing group solidarity. This is a delightful article which identifies a significant locus for linguistic analysis.]

Structural as well as psychological analysis of expressions in Yiddish which are inserted, Thank God, in Yiddish conversation, serving the overt function of expressing the attitude of the speaker to the content of the statement. Distinguishes between: 1) bono-recognition (thanks and congratulations) 2) malo-recognition (lamentation and sympathy 3) bono-petition (asking for good) 4) malo-fugition (warding off evil). Then discusses particular semantic categories (death-related expressions, curses, oaths). Includes numerous delightful and rich examples from literature and conversation, as well as numerous brilliant and true observations about language. [Personal note: This has to be one of the loveliest works I have ever read in linguistics.]


Yet another study which confirms experimentally what Lakoff said about women's speech style. Found "a stereotype of speech patterns matching Lakoff's hypothesis, and further implicated language style in a more general sexual steretpotype. Regardless of speaker sex, masculine patterns received greater competence-efficiency rating while feminine speech patterns received higher social warmth scores." [This too confirms Lakoff's hypothesis.]


And yet another. Developed a set of sentences reflecting Lakoff's categories of male/female speech (e.g. use of declaratives vs. tags and hedging). Asked subjects to rate whether speaker was probably male or probably female. Hypothesis confirmed. Then get this: A second group of subjects was asked to rate whether each sentence was "probably written by someone intelligent" or not. Voila. Resulting pattern was consistent with the ratings of the first group, with sentences described as "masculine" attributed to "intelligent" speakers and sentences thought to be uttered by "women" attributed to "probably not intelligent" speakers.


Noting Lakoff's hypothesis that women are "more polite" than men and an accusation by C. Kramer in Psychology Today that this is just "folk-linguistics," attempts to find out what really goes on by placing a tape recorder on the desk of the secretary of the Speech Communication Department and thereby recording, unbeknownst to everyone except the
secretary herself, 21 different conversations in 10 minutes. Findings: males and females equally polite (judging by number of turns judged to exhibit politeness) but that men and women showed different types of politeness and different specific features. i.e. women were found to use more positive politeness (cf Brown & Levinson: 'satisfies one's need for approval and belonging' [i.e. Lakoff's 'rapport' principle, I'd say]) while men shows equal use of positive and negative politeness (cf Brown & Levinson negative pol.: "reduces the imposition of a statement," [i.e. Lakoff's deference or distance]). These findings are discussed in an interesting way. Problems are noted in implementing Brown & Levinson method (which she was trying to do here), and alterations are suggested. [It's a miracle anything turned up at all, considering the bias of the data: i.e. the secretary herself knew of the recording; the secretary accounted for an inordinate percentage of the female turns; the power/role differences between male professors and female others; the fact that male academics, cf Lakoff, do not generally employ stereotypically "male" speech patterns.]


Authors wired up two young couples who were vacationing at a resort and thereby continually monitored and recorded everything they said to each other or to anyone else between 8AM and 12 midnight over a period of time [wasn't clear how long; seemed to be at least a week]. Present article is called a pilot study and concerns the talk of one of the couples. Contains four types of analysis: 1) ecological (episodes, subepisodes: where, they went; what they did.) 2) structural (statistics such as amount of talking time, proportion of talking time, average unit length, etc.) 3) functional (relational vs. informational function) 4) dynamic analysis (along 3 variables: state, locus-direction, bond; i.e. the affect). The functional analysis (3) consisted of classifying utterances as one of 6 types: 1) expressive statement 2) excogitative statement ("thinking aloud") 3) signomes (report speaker's present physical or psychological states) 4) metrones (valuative statements) 5) regones (regulative statements) 6) structones (informational statements).

Discussion consists of fascinating observations about what was going on interactionally between Roz and her husband Jock [I can't help thinking this was an intentional pun] and how it was reflected in their speech. Includes a rather lengthy transcript of a single episode, which cries out for further analysis [though they made a good start]. [Personal note: although the terminology is a bit unwieldy, inspired by the ecological psychologists Barker and Wright no doubt, yet the concrete analysis of conversation I think surpasses anything that has been done since. These results are called "pilot" but I understand nothing was done since. What a pity. What I want to know is: How can I get my hands on the tapes? This is a really exciting study. But I doubt it would get past any human subjects committee today!]
Part IV: Pragmatics

[Including Speech Acts in Linguistics]


Distinguishes between contrastive accent (which is not phonetically definable) and contrastive stress (which is phonetically definable as a shift in stress). Contrastive stress normally implies the presence of contrastive accent, but the converse is not necessarily true. [Personal note: I have included this study not because its findings are especially useful but because a) it was focusing on intonation at a time when few other linguists were doing so and b) because of the cute way the sentences are laid out on the page to indicate their intonation. No kidding, that's one possible transcription convention which has been tried.]


Authors state that they are the first to use philosophy of language Speech Act Theory in linguistics! Apply it to study of the modals can, shall, should, will. Make the interesting claim that there are only two tenses in English: PAST and PRESENT, or better, PAST and NONPAST. Note that they consider only the epistemic sense (in their discussion of can) as modal; the root sense of can is called non-modal.


Stated major aim is to account for the amazing cross-cultural similarity in conversational strategies. Hypothesize that the reason is the universal politeness. Question they ask is, "What sort of assumptions and what sort of reasoning are utilized by participants to produce such universal strategies of verbal interaction?" With reference to data from a number of different cultures; their procedure is to postulate a Model Person (MP), who is endowed with two special properties -- rationality and face. There are two identified components of face: negative face: "the want of every 'competent adult member' that his actions be unimpeded by others," and positive face: "the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others." There exist, correspondingly, negative and positive politeness strategies. Remaining heuristic terms include FTA ("face-threatening acts") and going on record or off record [which correspond roughly to direct and indirect communication]. Acknowledge debt to Gumperz, Grice and Lakoff. [Note: A long work that is really the whole book it is in. The identified positive and negative wants do actually have the ring of truth about them.]

This is the basic book on speech act theory and linguistics. Brings together at last the crucial papers by Grice, Searle, and Gordon and Lakoff.


An excellent review of intonation studies to date followed by an introduction to his system of analysis and transcription, which is the most comprehensive approach to intonation in print.


In an attempt to show a way of dealing with semantic and syntactic properties of indirect speech acts, confines discussion to "three or four illocutionary types (statements, questions, requests, and occasionally others) and a narrow range of distinct surface forms, mainly declarative, interrogative and imperative sentences containing modal's, verbs of saying or others, and pronouns." Compares the properties of the indirect speech acts with their corresponding direct speech act. Surveys approaches of Gordon & Lakoff; Heringer and her own earlier work; Sadock and Green, showing weaknesses in them. Concludes by suggesting "a structure combining the structure of an illocutionary with a structure expressing emotional attitudes of the speaker toward the act," but does not know at the time of writing what such a structure might be.


Observes that a linguist cannot talk about grammaticality without reference to context. "A theory of language must be informed by a theory of conversation...." Notes some sociolinguistic approaches which seem useful to him (eg Fishman's, 'microsociolinguistics, Hymes' 'communicative competence') and summarizes some communicative act functions and their linguistic properties. Concludes: "I no longer believe that it makes sense to talk about a grammar generating a set of grammatical sentences in a language, unless the term 'grammatical' means nothing more than 'capable of being parsed.'" Says, finally, that while transformational grammar can probably be adjusted to incorporate sociolinguistic information, "when an analysis requires that much use of brute force, the facts that led to the analysis are much more interesting than the theory which got reshaped to incorporate them." [Personal note: this comment can be applied directly to the entry immediately preceding.]
Fillmore, Charles J. May We Come In? Semiotica (1973).

Using the title sentence as a sample sentence, shows everything a speaker must "know" in order to understand it. What is significant about the present paper is that it makes a strong case for the necessity of extensive knowledge about context for the sentence to be understood.


Quote: "In this paper I will state for linguistics an interpretation of the terms syntax, semantics, and pragmatics; I will suggest an approach to the analysis of discourse that I favor -- an approach that consists in describing the pragmatic conditions of different types of discourse and in identifying the lexico-grammatical concomitants of these conditions; and I will demonstrate this approach by identifying a number of properties of a particular type of fictional narrative."

Syntax is seen as form; semantics as form and function; pragmatics as form function and setting. Discussion of pragmatic approach includes numerous key concepts such as "dynamic or developmental approach" (emphasizing development through time); external and internal contextualization; norms of interpretation. Suggests, finally, that "the language of face-to-face conversation is the basic and primary use of language, all others being best described in terms of their manner of deviation from that base." In addition, suggests as loci of study "deviating types of discourse" and literary conventions. [Note: This is a really nice article.]


One of the first and best known attempts to incorporate indirect speech act phenomena in a formalistic linguistic paradigm. Stated purpose is "twofold: first, to outline a way in which conversational principles can begin to be formalized and incorporated into the theory of generative semantics; and, second, to show that there are rules of grammar, rules governing the distribution of morphemes in a sentence, that depend on such principles. Our strategy for beginning to incorporate such observations into a theory of grammar and for stating rules of grammar in terms of them is based on the notions of natural logic and of transderivational rules...." Coins the term of the title for "conversational principles." Presents formalizations for such postulates as sincerity conditions, reasonableness conditions, and Grice's cooperative principle, why questions used as indirect suggestions.
Green Georgia M. How to Get People to Do Things with Words: The Whimperative Question, in Cole & Morgan, pp. 107-141.

First considers four approaches to the problem of how sentences which have the forms of questions can be understood as requests for action. They are: 1) Sadock's hypothesis that such forms, called "Whimperatives," can be analyzed as "a conjunction of a question and an imperative," 2) "by deriving them from structures in which the ordered disjunction of the activity requested and the 'tell me' request (the question) are embedded as the complement of a verb of requesting or whatever [sic]," 3) seeing them as "simple imperatives to which tags have been added and then preposed" 4) Gordon & Lakoff's analysis [see above]. After discussing the relative merits of these arguments, discusses 5 ways of getting people to do things with words: orders, demands, requests, pleas, and suggestions. Introduces term "impositive" for the class of speech acts which intend to impose the speaker's desire on the addressee. Concludes with detailed analysis of why Gordon & Lakoff's approach fails (according to Green).


At last in print (as opposed to xerox), Grice's enormously influential William James Lecture (Harvard 1967) on speech acts [or part of one anyway].

-Begins by noting that philosophical writings in logic to date had maintained that "there are...divergences in meaning between, on the one hand at least, some of what I shall call FORMAL devices (represented by symbols) "and, on the other, what are taken to be their analogs or counterparts in natural language." Suggests that philosophers have adhered to either formalist or informalist groups, depending upon whether they considered the formal or the "natural" language system to be superior. It is the expressed purpose of this paper to show that "the common assumption of the contestants that the divergences do in fact exist is (broadly speaking) a common mistake, and that the mistake arises from an inadequate attention to the nature and importance of the conditions governing conversation."

Therefore undertakes to show the systematic nature of natural conversation. Basic concern is conversational implicature. Asserts that conversation proceeds on a cooperative principle, composed of the following categories, with the following maxims: 1) Quantity: a) Be as informative as required and b) no more informative than required. 2) Quality: Make contribution true, a) Don't say what you believe to be false b) Don't say what you have no evidence for. 3) Relation: Be relevant 4) Manner: Be perspicuous a) avoid obscurity b) avoid ambiguity c) be brief d) be orderly.

Does not claim that people DO follow these maxims but that it is REASONABLE for people to follow them. Failure to follow them can take the forms: VIOLATE, OPT. OUT, CLASH, FLOUT. The result of not following the maxims is conversational implicature.

Concerns "pre-sequences" (cf Sacks, Schegloff, Jefferson: e.g. "well," "uh-oh"). "which bear a formal relationship to the expressions used to perform the illocutionary acts, that form adjacency pair parts in conversation. I will attempt to defend two claim... The first is that pre's of the type to be discussed and indirect illocutionary acts based on felicity conditions are actually two sides of the same coin, both pragmatically and syntactically. Secondly, while some aspects of utterances used for indirect acts may become conventionalized, corresponding utterances used for pre's are never conventionalized in the same manner."

James, Deborah. Some Aspects of the Syntax and Semantics of Interjections. CLS 8 (1972), 162-172.

Begins by noting that "hesitations have always been looked upon as clear examples of performance as opposed to competence; that is, as not part of the underlying system of language." Argues that they should be considered part of speaker's competence. Shows a systematic relationship between "uh," "oh," and a simple pause, and that they are in semantically paradigmatic relationship to each other. Then distinguishes between two different uses of "oh"; sentence initial and sentence medial. Turning to Ross' notion of "islands" (sentence parts which cannot have anything move into or out of them, including sentential subjects, complex noun phrases, and coordinate structures), notes that interjections cannot refer to anything inside an island.


Discusses "the question of the appropriate contextual environments of a few of the epistemic modals, of between a modal and an apparent paraphrase. Focuses on can and may; should and must; periphrastics able to and have to; certain correlations between "the use of epistemic modals, the use of performative verbs, and the use of certain syntactic constructions; the modal will. Concludes, "the choice of modals, root and epistemic, is based partly on what might be called pragmatic grounds: that real-world situations and social and other contextual assumptions must be brought into consideration, even when we are thinking in terms of classical syntactic and semantic rules...."


From abstract: "This paper discusses a number of examples in several languages that show that, in order to predict correctly the applicability of many rules, one must be able to refer to assumptions about the social context of an utterance, as well as to other implicit assumptions made by the participants in a discourse." Begins by noting that it is often
assumed that features of "exotic" languages, such as honorifics in Japanese, are strange phenomena with no English counterparts. Demonstrates amply, through extended examples of "politeness" from English conversation, that the use of modals, of tag-type "requests" and "dubitatives" (and related words) function in English rather like honorifics in Japanese. The important conclusions are: "we should not assume a language cannot make a distinction just because it has no exclusive form by which to make it," and "it is essential to take extralinguistic contextual factors into account: respective status of speaker and addressee, the type of social situation in which they find themselves, the real-world knowledge or beliefs a speaker brings to a discourse, his lack of desire to commit himself on a position, etc." [Note: this article is a key statement on the need for pragmatics in linguistics.]

Lakoff, Robin. The Logic of Politeness; or, Minding Your P's and q's. CLS 9 (1973), pp. 292-305.

Suggests two overall Rules of Pragmatic Competence: 1) Be clear and 2) Be polite. Strategies associated with the first of these, that is Rules of Clarity, have been formulated by Grice as his Conversational Maxims. Lakoff here presents strategies which govern applicability of the second: Rules of Politeness, which are 1) Don't impose, 2) Give options, and 3) Make A feel good -- be friendly. Rule (1) is associated with academese and technical terminology; R2 with hedging and euphemisms; R3 with the use of tu (cf Brown & Gilman), nicknames, etc. These three rules are universal, but cultures may "differ in their interpretation of the politeness of an action or utterance" because they have "different orders of preference for these rules." Suggests that Americans, more and more, tend to prefer R3 while more stratified societies opt more for R1. These rules are not merely linguistic but also apply to "all cooperative human transactions." The significant broad implication of this study is "that we follow pragmatic rules in speaking, just as we follow semantic and syntactic rules, and all must be a part of our linguistic rules." [Note: This study can only be called a benchmark and pioneering. The number of papers since that have referred to Lakoff's Rules of Politeness can truly not be numbered. The basic strategies represented by the three Rules have that ring of epiphany; indeed they identify some true universal about human motivation.]


see over.
Notes that discussions of diachronic linguistics have centered on phonological, morphological, syntactic, and semantic change. Suggests that what must now be incorporated into a theory of linguistic change is "contextual change": "changes that occur in the minds of the users of language, which shape the final form of their utterances; and govern their interpretation of the utterances they encounter." In fact, "this sort of change is the impelling force behind many of the other kinds of linguistic change." Supports this hypothesis with a detailed and lucid discussion of various translations of the Aeneid. Asserts that contextual information is "linguistic" "insofar as meaning is linguistic," and is crucial not only to poetry but to an understanding of all levels of language.


Suggests that the passion for formalism exhibited by transformationalists is dangerous and misguided; misguided because one must know much more than often is known about a phenomenon before it can be formalized, and dangerous because it may be driving out of linguistics many of the most talented graduate students who have a taste for relevance (and many of these happen to be women). Suggests that linguistics broaden its horizons to consider such questions as 1) language and minorities 2) politeness, etc. 3) pathological and aberrant language 4) use of language for special effect (literature, advertising, propaganda). Concludes with a detailed description of the course she has designed (Linguistics 120). [Note that this is another voice in the general cry for the broadening of the field of linguistics; it is an especially well-argued one.]


Includes two linguistics papers: "Language and Woman's Place," originally published in *Language in Society*, and "Why Women are Ladies," found also in Berkeley Studies in Syntax and Semantics. This is the crucial, original, seminal statement about the way in which language considered appropriate for women to use is different from that for men, and the socio-psychological consequences by which women are double bound: i.e. if they "talk like a lady," they will be judged incompetent, fuzzy-minded, frivolous; if they don't, they will be judged unfeminine, aggressive [in its pejorative sense, reserved mainly for women]. The two choices, in other words, are to be "less than a woman or less than a person."

The first paper deals with two broad areas: 1) how it is considered appropriate for women to talk and 2) language used to talk about women. [Both sections are extremely comprehensive, concise, and perspicacious.] Concludes that "linguistic imbalances are worthy of study because they bring into sharper focus real-world imbalances.
and inequities. Briefly discusses suggestions that have been made to alter the language, noting which seem reasonable to her. The second essay continues the discussion of "the relationship between women's language, language referring to women, and politeness" and "the reasons behind this relationship." Suggests that an awareness of "what we're doing, why we're doing it, and the effects our actions have on ourselves and everyone else will afford us "the power to change."

The second essay takes the form of a response to objections and misinterpretations which had been raised in reaction to the ideas put forth in the first part. [Note: Lakoff's work on "women's language," as is well known, has, like her work on politeness, become one of the central topics in linguistics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics. A plethora of papers and experiments have arisen in response, and nearly all have confirmed her hypotheses.]


A linguist's response to the accusations made by Newman (and many others) that the English language is being destroyed by change. Tackles, too, the question of whether such change could be stopped, even if it were desirable. Argues convincingly (and delightfully) that "a form of expression is worthy of criticism if and only if it interferes with the intelligibility of what it seeks to express." Makes the significant observation about language that people don't say precisely what they mean because they don't want to; there are purposes served by lack of clarity which are greater. Notes, for example, that a paradoxical situation is established by demands such as Newman's. Criticizing people for their way of speaking can only create insecurity which can only lead to increased use of hedging and other defensive forms. [This paper is full of insightful observations about language and should be read, for ammunition, by anyone who feels called upon to explain ("you're a linguist -- what do YOU think?" why prescriptive and proscriptive approaches to language use are misguided.]


Argues convincingly for a holistic approach to human behavior, positing co-occurrence expectations for all forms of a person's "style": i.e. their speech, mannerisms, habits, etc. Like language, personality style has deep and surface structure as well as analogues of ambiguity and paraphrase. Demonstrates linguistic correlates in communicative strategies which she has already outlined (i.e. distance, deference, and rapport) to Shapiro's system of psychological
styles (for example, the "diffuse attention" associated with "hysterics" is closely related in intention and effect with a "deference" strategy in speech. It is not surprising, then, that "hysterics" are more often women, as deference has been shown to be a speech style associated with women). [Note: This is a truly path-blazing approach, incorporating a theory of communicative strategies in a larger theory of personality and human interaction.]


Continuing in the paradigm established in the above work, demonstrates that style, like languages, is rule-governed and has surface and deep structure. Discusses ambiguity and paraphrase in personality styles and resultant possibilities for misunderstandings. For the first time, suggests that the Rules of Politeness, later called Rules of Rapport, which are associated with general strategies called distance, deference, and camaraderie (representing increasing acknowledged involvement between the participants), are not hierarchical but rather best conceptualized as a continuum, with the Rules of Clarity representing the far-left pole and camaraderie to the far right. Thus a person's style may be at only one point on the continuum in any given phrase, but as a whole, their speech contribution can be a mixture of these strategies, and their style can move on the continuum in response to changing situations. [A key development in Lakoff's theory of communication style.]


Given the existence of two subsystems of language: 1) a syntactico-semantic component (cf. Chomsky, etc.) and 2) a pragmatic component (cf. Grice, Gordon & Lakoff, etc.), two conclusions are readily suggested: 1) that these two components "are relatively free of interaction" and 2) that the "syntacticosemantico component is regular in such a way that it might be described as 'pragmatically transparent,' that is, that the principles involved in the derivation -- the mapping between logical structure and surface structure -- do not have the effect of obscuring properties having crucial pragmatic consequences" [i.e. that the sentence doesn't end up meaning something quite different from the meaning of its derived parts.] Shows, however, that both these assumptions cannot be held; either one is wrong or the other is. Worked out in terms of Ross' "island" constraints.


Suggests that the "distinction between verb, adjective, and noun is one of degree rather than of kind." Rather than being discrete items, suggests that they fall on a "quasi-continuum" like the cardinal vowels
in the vowel space. Because of the "squishy" nature of the distinction between these concepts, calls the hierarchy a "squish," suggesting that it is "the most normal situation in semantax [term from Georgia Green]." [I would add, and in the world. Seems very right and useful.]


Quote: "What I wish to do in this paper is develop a set of criteria which is capable of telling whether there is any meaning difference that attaches to such multiples speech act significances" [i.e. what have been called indirect speech acts.] Suggest that speech acts can be idioms in the same way that lexical items are. Points out that some seeming indirect speech acts are ambiguous; others not. I.e. The possible speech act force of "Is it cold in here?" (as am imperative to close the door) is ambiguous in all its forms, while "Why don't you feed the emu?" is a speech act idiom only in its request sense, while paraphrase brings out its other sense: "What's the reason that you don't feed the emu?" or "Tell me why you don't feed the duck." [No explanation is offered for the switch from emu to duck]. Asserts finally that "most questions are ambiguous between a request sense and a question sense" and distinguishes between true questions (where the information is wanted) and "requestions" ("the speaker is only interested in the act of telling"). [Personal note: I found this essay particularly difficult to get the point of; its arguments are not neatly summed up at beginning and end but rather are embedded in the text in a not immediately clear way.]


Explains three crucial components of a system for understanding language: rules, propositions, and meaning. Suggests two types of rules: regulative (e.g. etiquette) and constitutive (e.g. football, and also semantic rules of language). Propositions refer to the content of an utterance. Meaning is revised from Grice's notion to include two notions: illocutionary force (i.e. speaker's intention) and perlocutionary force (i.e. effect on hearer).

[Personal note: This is not the fullest statement of Searle's system, which is to be found in his book Speech Acts. I can only admit that I have a physical aversion to reading speech act theory and this is the best I can do under the circumstances. To be added later as well: "A Classification of Illocutionary Acts," Language in Society, Vol. 5, and "Indirect Speech Acts," in Cole & Morgan, pp. 59-82.

Van Valin, Robert. Meaning and Interpretation, ms.

This is a direct discussion of theories of meaning and their implications for a study of conversation. Development of theories of meaning over the last half century: 1) Locke: meaning of word = idea in mind; Sapir: meaning of word = image. 2) Mill, Russell: denotation [i.e. referential] theory: meaning = thing referred to.

Compares two general devices in conversation: communicative devices and conversational strategems. The first is a means by which a speaker accomplishes something with words and wants his addressee to know that s/he is doing so. The second is a means by which a speaker accomplishes something with words without the addressee knowing that s/he is doing so. [i.e. manipulating]. In other words, conversational strategems allow a person to conceal their purpose. In order to illustrate, gives six ways in which an addressee may not answer the question, "How old are you?" Of the six, three are communicative devices and three are conversational strategems. Includes such strategies as "deliberate ambiguity," "selection by reply" (its mirror image). [Personal note: This is a very interesting and practical paper. Intriguing for my own work is that footnote which mentions that Kóstas Kazazis says that many Greeks he knows are of the sort who will persist in questioning until they get either a truth or a lie for an answer. It is interesting for me, considering my findings that Greeks tend to be more indirect than Americans in some situations at least.]

This is a response to a paper by Margaret Mead suggesting that anthropologists' focus on ends is a form of manipulation of their subjects and therefore anti-democratic. Suggests putting the social scientist back into the experiment and "working in terms of values which are limited to defining a direction..." Bateson spends some time restating Mead's thesis and interpreting it. Suggests Americans try to be more like Balinese in enjoying and valuing an act and a moment for itself rather than for an end (although he suggests we do it out of hope rather than out of fear as they do). Finally, asserts that this new mode is possible because people do possess a faculty for "deutero-learning": learning to learn. It is by means of this process that subjects of an experiment learn to perform tasks better and better. Learning to approach tasks in a new way consists of "punctuating the stream of experience so that it takes on one or another sort of coherence and sense." [Note: this notion of punctuating experience seems to me to be one of key insights for understanding interaction.]


This is they key paper on frames. Introduces notion of multiple levels of verbal communication; hence metalinguistic (word ≠ thing) and metacommunicative ("the subject of the discourse is the relationship between the speakers"). The key insight controlling the essay is the paradoxical nature of abstraction. Hence the paradox inherent in the metacommunicative ("framing") message, "This is play" (i.e. "these actions do not stand for what they stand for"). Discusses various types of frames and abstractions and their uses (e.g. "the metaphor that is meant," like the flag men will die for). Discusses differences between primary and secondary process. It is the secondary process which distinguishes between play and nonplay. Applying insights to psychotherapy, suggests: 1) "word salad" of schizophrenia can be attributed to patient's failure to recognize the metaphoric nature of his fantasies. 2) The effectiveness of psychotherapy depends upon manipulation of frames; it is an attempt to change the patient's metacommunicative habits (the very nature of therapeutic communication is paradoxical just as the notion of play is; that is, it is not real and real at the same time). "The neurotic is driven to insert an 'as if' clause into the productions of his primary process thinking, which productions he had previously deprecated or repressed. He must learn that fantasy contains truth. For the schizophrenic, the error is in treating the metaphors of primary process with the full intensity of literal truth." [This essay is extremely complex (in its conception, not its writing). I have oversimplified necessarily, since it really has to be read -- many times -- to be appreciated.]

In this essay, "group" refers primarily to family, though it could also apply to a hospital ward or other environment relevant to the schizophrenic. Indicates, with examples, how communication of schizophrenic individuals can be explained. Hypothesis is that "the schizophrenic family is an organization with great ongoing stability whose dynamics and inner workings are such that each member in continually undergoing the experience of negation of self." This is why the schizophrenic acts as if he expects to be punished every time he indicates that he is right in his view of the context of his own message.


Based in part on Russell's Theory of Logical Types, locates the cause of schizophrenia in the paradoxical communication of the mother. Hypothesis is that the mother's paradoxical communication places the child in a double bind. She is purportedly frightened by the child's expression of love and therefore withdraws when child shows love, but when the child therefore withdraws too and does not show love, she accuses him of being unloving and demands love. If the child correctly distinguishes between mother's false expression of love and true hate, she becomes angry and denies it. Hence child must become unable to distinguish between orders of messages. [Note: this theory is fascinating in conception but annoying/misogynistic. The authors blame only the mother; the father apparently can do good if he is 'strong and insightful" (sic) but cannot do harm as the mother can. Hmmm.]


An "explicit" and "comprehensive" microanalysis of five minutes of discourse between a therapist and Rhoda, a 19-year-old anorexic patient. After discussing related research, including Hackett, et al., Bales, Goffman, Hymes, Scheflen, ethnomethodologists, speech act theory, develops a system for closely analyzing the linguistic and paralinguistic features of participants' speech. Method includes CUES (descriptive words); EXPANSION (filling in pro-forms and telling what "was really meant"); INTERACTION (describing what is being done). Suggest "rules of discourse" which purport to account for how meaning is derived from surface forms (e.g. rule of delayed request, rule of implicit responses). [Note: This work is a huge step forward, because of its close analysis of the text; its attention to paralinguistic features; its observation that "the fundamental coherence of conversation is reflected in connections between actions rather than connections between utterances." The work is frustrating, however, in its bias. Because it is co-authored by a therapist, the analysis is totally
from the therapist's point of view. Thus analyses were checked in playback with the therapist, but not with the patient. A therapist may be bound by such fealties; linguists, however, would be better served by an analysis which treats equally the points of view of both participants. We still need to examine for example ways in which the therapeutic paradigm of speaking influences the speech behavior of the patient.

Lakoff, Robin Tolmach. *Psychoanalytic Discourse and Ordinary Conversation.*

Expressed purpose is to "describe a system that is recognized as being in violation of the normal rules of discourse, in order to examine how participants cope with such a situation." Psychoanalytic discourse is chosen because it is an extreme instance of deviation and also has been extensively documented.

Notes two overriding assumptions in normal discourse: 1) The participants are rational and 2) All contributions benefit the participants. Then presents her own system of rules governing discourse: Principles of Communicative Competence, which include Rules of Clarity (based on Grice's Conversational Maxims) and Rules of Rapport (Lakoff's former Rules of Politeness). Asks then "to what extent and in what ways is psychoanalytic discourse a deviation from this model of ideal communication?" Quotes Freud's own statement of a Basic Rule, which is that the patient free associate (in violation of normal Rules). Lakoff further notes less obvious deviations such as non-reciprocity by which analysand apparently has power but analyst in fact does, a situation which emerges from consideration of the use of modals in Freud's commentary. Discusses further the Principle of Benefit with regard to the psychoanalytic interchange, as well as the paradox inherent in the seeming lifting of constraints on the analysant which is in fact imposition of constraints. While abrogation of the Rules of Clarity and Rapport are tolerated in psychotherapeutic discourse, yet those abrogations becomes themselves the subject of interpretation. Notes too that the analyst's prerogative of interpreting the patient's talk in fact violates the Principle of the patient's rationality. In this way, shows that the psychoanalytic communication system manipulates the same rules as normal discourse, only differently, and that the differences are tolerated by mutual consent of participants.


A fascinating discussion of the intersections of the fields of linguistics and psychoanalysis which makes clear basic principles of both. "Linguistics and psychoanalysis share common difficulties as sciences: the introspective and relatively unreplicable nature of the data, the multiplicity of factors to be taken into account in
explaining any piece of behavior, the fact that the findings of both fields can, in various ways, be embarrassing when revealed and are therefore especially subject to popular obloquy and distortion, the non-quantifiability of the results. They share common interests: the desire to understand why the human mind works as it does, and why it does not always function optimally." The basic correspondence which Edelson focuses on and Lakoff concurs about is the existence of deep and surface structures and rules linking them, and furthermore the significance of the concepts ambiguity and paraphrase. Some observations of Lakoff's go beyond Edelson's and clarify his notions of linguistic theory. E.g. he accepts the competence/ performance dichotomy, which she [correctly I believe] considers obsolete; she suggests instead that the "major distinction of relevance to both theories is that between intentional and unintentional utterance." The great benefit to linguists in this interchange of theoretical perspectives is the realization that "Language is thus just one way in which the human mind uses a single set of rules, and these rules underlie all our psychological capacities."


Analysis of how a therapy session begins, with data from an adult group therapy session, in the ethnomethodological mode. No overall comprehensive theory, but contains scattered interesting observations. Shows for example that in pre-therapy talk, therapist answers member's questions, but in therapy talk, therapist does not answer but turns them back on asker. Suggests that the silence between pre-therapy talk and therapy talk is the boundary, but only the therapist has ultimate authority to determine actual starting.


Outline of theory and methods of therapists at the Mental Research Institute in Palo Alto, derived from the paradoxical communication and double bind theories of Gregory Bateson (see entry). Key concepts include: the impossibility of not communicating; communication vs. metacommunication; the punctuation of a series of events; the distinction between analogic and digital systems (corresponding to psychoanalytic primary vs. secondary processes); symmetrical and complementary interaction [complementary schismogenesis is one of the most useful concepts I have come across for understanding conversational processes]. These concepts are illustrated with numerous examples of pathological interactions as well as reference to normal interaction and public events. An extended analysis is made of the interaction of the couple in the play Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf? Ends with a thorough discussion of paradoxical communication as a psychotherapeutic tool.

A sequel to the previous book. Focuses specifically on ways in which efforts to change an interactional system may fail or succeed. With reference to the Theory of Logical Types, suggests that attempts to change while remaining within the same type of behavior, that is, "first-order change," often leads to no change at all. (Hence a couple locked in a repetitive pattern of mutually reinforcing behavior). What is often effective, they claim, is second-order change, that is, "change of change," which may consist of doing something that seems quite illogical in order to break out of the system (i.e. solving the well-known nine-dot problem by drawing lines which go outside the frame of the square formed by the dots). Ways in which people avoid changing include: 1) "more of the same" [cf my favorite thing about the book: a cartoon of a couple leaning outside of a boat hanging onto ropes attached to the mast; each leans farther out in fear of the boat overturning because of the other's leaning out. What they need to do is not lean further out but let up; this would cause the other to come in too, to steady the boat. You have to see it, I guess.] 2) the terrible simplifications (thinking there's no problem when there is). 3) the utopia syndrome (thinking there's a solution when there isn't). Gives extended examples of problem resolution by "reframing" the situation and giving of paradoxical orders.