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General information

**Tutorial** with Ian Schwarz:
Mo 12-13, Geb. C5 3, Raum 4.08

→ No sign-up on CLIX is necessary to attend the tutorial, I will sign you up manually in the first session so you can access course material.
→ attendance may be mandatory only for Alte Studiengänge or ERASMUS…
→ … but **recommended for everyone** as preparation for the Final Exam!
• **Bibliography, script, etc:**
  Please find course material on CLIX (if registered) or in the IB!

• **Website:**
  Please check the English Linguistics homepage (http://www.uni-saarland.de/fak4/norrick/) regularly for important information, events, etc! Course material will also be uploaded there.

For questions concerning organization, please contact me at s9iaschw@stud.uni-saarland.de !!
General information

- **Final Exam:**

  The final exam will take place near the end of the semester, probably on July 23, 2013.

  Attendance requirements (lecture):
  → don't miss more than 2 lectures!

  Sign-up for the Final Exam:
  **No official registration process** – you are registered if you show up for the final exam.
The lecture starts at 4 p.m. sharp this semester, so make sure you get here early enough!
1. Introduction

1.1 Preliminary definitions

- Discourse Analysis is the study of language in use in context
• What is Context?

Firth says: “Voices should not be entirely dissociated from the social context in which they function […] all texts should be regarded as having ‘the implication of utterance’ and be referred to typical participants in some generalised context of situation” i.e.

A. Relevant features of participants: persons, personalities.
   i. The verbal action of the participants.
   ii. The non-verbal action of the participants.
B. Relevant objects
C. Effect of the verbal action
Discourse as language in use in context

Either **spoken**:

A: three pounds of apples please.
B: jonathan or mcintosh?
A: jonathan.
B: three pounds?
A: yeah.
B: okay.
Or written:

Pare, core and slice thinly:
4 cups tart apples
Place them in a 6 x 9-inch pan.
(Joy of Cooking, I.S. Rombauer & M.R. Becker)

Southern crab apple (malus angustifolia) leaves are elliptical to ovate, 1 to 3 inches long and 0.5 to 2 inches wide. They have toothed margins, a wedge-shaped base, and blunt to pointed apex.
(Trees of North America, C. Frank Brockman)

I gathered what apples I could, cut some in slices, and dried them on the boulder in the sun.
(My side of the mountain, Jean C. George)
• Discourse is language above the level of the sentence, i.e. two or more sentences in a coherent unit

• What is coherence?

➔ Speakers and writers construct their talk and texts to fit the current context and foregoing talk or text, thereby signaling coherence, while listeners and readers interpret talk and text based on the context and foregoing talk or text, thereby inferring coherence.
• Much of what Discourse Analysis is about is the more precise definition of
  – language use
  – language in context
  – coherence

• Consider initial examples as objects of Discourse Analysis:
use, context, coherence;
register, presuppositions, sequentiality
2. Uses of Language

2.1 Functional theories of language

- Bühler: "Organon-Modell": 3 factors, 3 functions
• Behaviorism:
  → Bloomfield:
  Language as Stimulus and Response, Story of Jack and Jill

• Simple Stimulus (S) and Response (R):
  \[ S \rightarrow R \]
  apple \rightarrow hunger, desire for apple

• Language as *substitute response and substitute stimulus*
  \[ S \rightarrow r \ldots s \rightarrow R \]
  apple \rightarrow verbal act \ldots understanding \rightarrow obtain apple
• Malinowski: language as instrument of activity in concrete “context of situation” also “phatic” function: “mere exchange of words” and magic function

• Jakobson extends Bühler’s 3 (or 4) factors and 3 functions to yield 6 factors and 6 focuses or functions:
• Factors:
• Functions:

- Referential
- Poetic
- Phatic
- Metallic
• **referential** (denotative):
  to convey messages or information

• **emotive** (expressive):
  to express attitudes, feelings, and emotions

• **conative**:
  to persuade and influence others through commands, and entreaties

• **poetic**:
  to indulge in language for its own sake

• **phatic**:
  to establish and maintain social relations

• **metalingual**:
  to clear up difficulties about intentions, words, and meanings
• Hymes extends Jakobson’s 6 to 7, expanding Context into: Topic & Setting

• Hymes later splits Sender into Speaker and Addressor etc for a total of 17 functions

• Firth and Halliday as functionalists

• Halliday develops general concepts for describing how Firth’s context of situation determines types of meaning expressed:
  – Field (activity, subject matter),
  – Mode (channel, genre),
  – Tenor (social relations)
• Linguistic features associated with configuration of situational features constitute a Register (personal narrative, oral, among friends)

• Register coupled with context of culture determine choices in discourse

• 3 major functional-semantic components:
  – Ideational
    • Experiential: reflecting context of culture
    • Logical: abstract
  – Interpersonal: social, expressive, appellative
  – Textual: coherence in text and context
• e.g. every clause involves choice in system of *Theme*, dividing content into *theme-rheme*

• and every spoken *tone* group involves choice in system of *Information Structure*, dividing it into *given-new*

→ Thus: Hallidayan Systemics naturally applies to texts, and supplies special category for spoken discourse
2. Uses of Language

2.2 Language Uses: speech events, text types

- For any linguistic community, we can recognize certain events such as: salestalk, chat, gossip, debate, sermon etc

- and typical written forms: recipe, personal and business letters, newspaper column, sonnet, short story etc
2.2.1 Speech events

• Encompass multiple speech acts; culturally defined

  – **Speech situation:**
    scene (cultural) and setting (physical)
  – **Speech event:**
    within speech situation, composed of speech acts
  – **Speech act:**
    minimal unit of speech event
• For example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>speech situation</th>
<th>speech event</th>
<th>speech act</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>market place</td>
<td>transaction</td>
<td>offer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conversation</td>
<td>story</td>
<td>preface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ceremony</td>
<td>prayer</td>
<td>invocation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Components defining speech events:

→ Hymes’ **S-P-E-A-K-I-N-G** Grid with factors collectively defining a speech situation

→ The categories apply to written texts as well as speech events as such, but there are important differences in the ways they apply
• **Setting:** physical and social scene
• **Participants:** Addressor, Addressee, Audience
• **Ends:** purpose of event, goals of participants
• **Act-Sequence:** message form and content: request-comply-thank etc
• **Key:** manner and tone: mock versus serious, perfunctory versus painstaking etc
• **Instrumentalities:** channel (verbal and non-verbal forms of communication): register, variety, dialect, gestures etc
• **Norms:** conventions of language interaction and interpretation "no gap, no overlap" in conversation, "speak only when you're spoken to" for children etc
• **Genre:** story, poem, proverb, lecture, advertisement etc
2.2.2 Written representation versus interactional speech

→ Talk versus Text

Talk:

• Biological givens:
  lungs, vocal chords, tongue, lips (breath group; intonation group)

• for the ear
  – stress-timing (versus syllable-timing),
  – intonation (contours and stresses)
  – prosody (tempo, volume, rhythm, voice quality)
Talk:

• for current, local listeners (evanescent)
  – bound to context/participants
  – markers of relationship (Terms of Address, pronouns: you, we, let’s)
  – deixis (that book, your desk, this map, here, behind me, now)
  – attitude (surely, really, kind of, maybe, I guess)

• produced in real time
  hence: hesitation, pauses, fillers, reductions, repair, digression, dynamic topic development, generalized vocabulary, repetition, formulaic speech etc
Talk:

- speech rate constrained by organs of speech (esp. lungs, lips, tongue)
  - speech rate varies from about 3 words/sec (about 180 words/minute) to a maximum of about 5 words per second (about 300 words/minute)
  - even in practiced performance of read/memorized text, limit around 5 words/sec
  - women tend to talk faster than men
  - because of stress-timing, word length has little effect on speech rate
Text:

Cultural conventions:

• by hand

• for the eye
  – left to right, in lines, with spaces
  – sentences, words, letters, caps/lower case, diacritics, punctuation

• for any present or future reader even removed spatially (permanent)
  – relatively context free
  – generally accessible, impersonal
Text:

- produced at leisure
  - hence: time to edit full sentences, eliminate false starts, hesitations etc

- reading rate almost unlimited
  - not constrained by organs of speech or hearing
  - depends on visual skills, practice, interest, goals
Special features of Talk (versus Text)

• Spoken language is typically face-to-face:
  • eye contact,
  • gesture,
  • spatial orientation;
  • voice quality (volume, pitch, timbre),
  • accent,
  • prosody (tempo, rhythm)

→ Only the last three (voice quality, accent, prosody) are heard on phone, but we can still identify callers we know and even tell how they're feeling
• Spoken language is organized around the Intonation Group:
  – *Intonation group*:
    • pause, *and* five words,
    • with one or two intonation peaks
    • first Given then New

so, so I went I went in
and I had the ball,
and I just like turned around
and I shot it-
didn’t even look
and it like hit off the backboard
so hard.
it was so bad
• Spoken language is edited on-line:
  – restarts, self-correction
  – little pre-modification,
  – concrete contextual reference,
  – no sentential orientation,
  – paratactic relationships between short intonation units

there's this guy
and he's really old
and he's got this dog
like a really ugly dog
and he walks in here
• For written text, we’d prefer:

A rather old gentleman with a terribly ugly dog walked through the front gate.
• Spoken language is full of cues:
  – Besides all the information conveyed visually and through the voice, face-to-face talk contains cues to the listener about how to take the message, e.g.

  Jack: **Hey**, have you seen Al and Judy?
  Jill: **Well**, I saw Judy.
  Jack: Al was with her **though, right?**
  Jill: They’ve **kind of** been **like** fighting, **y’know**?
• These cues are often called *Discourse Markers* at the beginning and ends of units and *Hedges* internally.

• They're not usually present in written messages, so that readers must cue more on neutral lexical meaning, compare:

Jack asked Jill if she’d seen Al and Judy. Jill said she’d seen Judy. Jack asked if Al had been with her and Jill said they’d been fighting.
• One can find stretches of everyday conversation where every single turn begins with a discourse marker rather than part of a grammatical unit

<2> And that came through the mail.
<1> Well isn’t that nice?
<2> Yeah. Oh, she’s a, but like you said, she’s cute as, y’know, Kaliber.
<1> Yeah, Keely will love this. She’s just really, yeah, she has a special jewelry box that she puts those things in and
<2> But I’m trying to get things, uh, as soon as you move back here, why, there’ll be things that you can have, too, that you can move, y’know.
<1> Well, I’m hoping. Yeah, I would like to move back to Chicago or some place around here.
<2> Uh-huh, well, now, in the area some way.
<1> Yeah, I don’t know. Mark doesn’t want to leave California, though. This is the problem.
<2> Yeah. Yeah, it is. Well, you get settled someplace sometimes, y’know, and it just hits you.
<1> Well, he’s doing a lot of acting and singing and that’s really the, I guess it’s the place.
<2> Yeah, uh-huh.
<1> But he can do that in
<2> But this is all experience, too.
Deixis in speech versus writing

in face-to-face speech deictic expressions refer to 
the position, place, time 
of the speaker: 
  *here, over there, in my hand, right now, yesterday*
or the hearer: 
  *on your left, just behind you*

in written text, the writer specifies some character or 
object as deictic reference point (*to the left of the house, just behind Judy*)
Spoken vs written media

Biber considers spoken & written as separate media for different functions with different stylistic tendencies:

passive, nominalization, contraction, 1st and 2nd personal pronouns
• Passive includes:
  – Sue was greeted formally by the mayor.
  – Sue was greeted formally at town hall.
  – The woman (who was) greeted formally left early.

• Nominalization includes:
  – -tion, -ness, -ity, -ment
  – short list makes counting easier
  – but it covers too much, e.g. moment
  – and it covers too little, e.g. comparison, deference
• Contraction includes:
  • speech contains more contractions than written texts, not just the shortened forms institutionalized in both speech and writing, e.g.
    – can’t, won’t; she’ll, they’ll; I’m, we’ve, you’re, he’s
  • but also compound contractions, as in:
    – they’ll’ve left by now,
    – they won’t’ve left yet
    – she can’t’ve gone far,
    – we’d’ve seen them, if they were here
  • and reduced forms like:
    – some people from town’ll be there too
    – I hope to’ve finished by noon,
    – the one she wanted’s already gone
• 1st and 2nd personal pronouns are very frequent in face-to-face talk, as in passage above:

<2> but I’m trying to get things, uh, as soon as you move back here, why, there’ll be things that you can have, too, that you can move, y’know.

<1> well, I’m hoping.
yeah, I would like to move back to Chicago or some place around here.
3. Pragmatics

• Analytical tools developed in pragmatics have found frequent application in discourse analysis

• Much of Linguistic Pragmatics grew out of Natural Language Philosophy: Wittgenstein “meaning as use” and “language games”
3.1 Presupposition

- Russell’s analysis: The present King of France is bald:
  - The sentence asserts: there’s a present King of France and he’s bald.
  - so if there’s no such king, the sentence is false.

- Strawson: existence is not a predicate, it’s presupposition:
  - so if there’s no present King of France, the sentence is simply meaningless, rather than false.
  - existential presupposition as a semantic notion.

- Constancy under Negation test:
  Mary’s car is fast → Mary has a car
  Mary’s car is not fast → Mary has a car
Types of presupposition

- **Factive** (with factive predicates):
  - Bill regrets/resent that Suzy won the game
    - Suzy won the game
  - Suzy is happy/sad that she won the game

- **Non-Factive**
  - Nancy imagined/pretended she was rich
    - Nancy was not rich

- **Lexical**
  - Vera stopped smoking
    - Vera used to smoke
  - Tony failed again
    - Tony failed once before
Types of presupposition

- **Structural**
  
  Why did Harry steal the money?
  → Harry stole the money

- **Counter-Factual**
  
  If you were my friend, you’d help
  → You’re not my friend
Types of presupposition

• In early linguistic treatments of presupposition
  ➔ presupposition as a semantic property of sentences (Katz 1977)
  ➔ and even of particular lexical items (McCawley 1968; Kiparsky and Kiparsky 1970)

  – Verbs murder and kill both assert that the object ends up dead,
  – but murder presupposes the act was intentional by subject;
  – assassinate presupposes beyond murder that object held political office
Types of presupposition

• Now linguists accept pragmatic account of presupposition
• Presupposition in terms of appropriateness, assumptions of speakers, and reasonable inferences by listeners

• Stalnaker's (1974) definition of pragmatic presupposition:

A proposition B is a **pragmatic presupposition** of a speaker in a given context just in case the speaker assumes or believes that B, assumes that his audience assumes or believes B, and assumes or believes that his audience recognizes that he is making these assumptions.

• Note *recursive* assumptions in this definition
3.2 Cooperative Principle, Conversational Maxims

- Grice (1957, 1975) grounds theory of meaning in speaker intentions

- recursive assumptions influence meanings even of logical connectors in context

- Grice's notion of implicature gave linguists a way of developing inferential models of meaning

- Grice’s intentional approach appears in Searle’s Speech Act Theory as well.
Grice distinguishes natural and non-natural meaning

**natural meaning:**

- causal connection between sign and meaning, as in: 
  dark clouds mean rain, red spots on skin mean measles 
- no intention necessary on part of sender 
- in fact, speakers may convey meanings they’re trying to hide, as in: 
  Al said no, but his smile showed he meant yes 
  Al’s overly careful pronunciation means he’s nervous
natural and non-natural meaning

**non-natural meaning** (*meaning*$_{nn}$):

- no causal connection between sign and meaning, instead someone uses sign *intending* to convey meaning.
- Grice then makes intention and the recognition of intention the basis of *meaning*$_{nn}$ generally.
- S **meant**$_{nn}$ $z$ by uttering $U$ if and only if:
  (i) S intended $U$ to cause some effect $z$ in recipient H.
  (ii) S intended (i) to be achieved simply by H recognizing that intention (i).
• S gets H to think or do something just by getting H to recognize that S is trying to cause that thought or action. Attaining this state of mutual knowledge is the goal of communication.

• S's intention becomes **mutual knowledge**:

• S knows that H knows that S knows that H knows (etc *ad infinitum*) that S has this particular intention.

• When S speaks literally, H understands what is meant by recognizing S's intention to convey a meaning based on the literal meaning of what S says.

• But S can mean something more or different than S literally says.
• At this point, Grice's theory of meaning extends into a theory of language use and *inference*.

• According to the *Cooperative Principle* and the *Conversational Maxims*, communication works because hearers recognize that speakers produce messages with the intention that hearers recognize their intentions, and hearers derive meaning from apparent violations of the Maxims via inference.
• At this point, Grice's theory of meaning extends into a theory of language use and *inference*.

• According to the *Cooperative Principle* and the *Conversational Maxims*, communication works because hearers recognize that speakers produce messages with the intention that hearers recognize their intentions, and hearers derive meaning from apparent violations of the Maxims via inference.
The Cooperative Principle (CP)

• Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged
The maxims

- conversational maxims reflect common-sense rules for everyday communication
- they allow hearers to fill in understood assumptions and make sense of apparent violations of the CP
The maxims

• **Quantity**
  1. Make your contribution as informative as is required (for current purposes of the exchange)
  2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required

• **Quality**
  Try to make your contribution one that is true.
  1. Do not say what you believe to be false
  2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence
The maxims

• **Relation**
  Be relevant

• **Manner**
  Be perspicuous
  1. Avoid obscurity of expression.
  2. Avoid ambiguity.
  3. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
  4. Be orderly.
3.2.1 Opting out of maxims: Hedges

• We can get a better idea of how the maxims work by considering standard formulas speakers use to opt out of them

• **Quantity:**
  as you probably know/to make a long story short . . .

• **Quality:**
  as far as I know/I'm not sure, but . . .

• **Relation:**
  by the way/oh, I was just thinking . . .

• **Manner:**
  this may sound a bit confused/odd, but;
3.2.2 Implicatures

→ Generalized conversational implicature

• A speaker can *use* the Maxim of Quantity to invite the inference that no more can be said, as in:
  Al: I hope you brought the bread and the cheese.
  Sue: I brought the cheese.
  → I didn't bring the bread

• this creates a *Generalized conversational implicature* “Sometimes the lecture is interesting.”
  → not usually, not always
→ Particularized conversational implicature

• A speaker might also *violate* the Maxim of Relation to force the hearer to draw a special conclusion, as in:
  Sue: Are you coming to the big party tonight?
  Al: My parents are visiting.
  → I'm not coming

• Grice calls this a *Particularized conversational implicature*. 
→ Conventional implicatures

• Grice also identifies *Conventional implicatures* connected to particular words

Even George came to the party.
→ it was unexpected

Judy hit Al and he cried
→ Al cried after Judy hit him and because she hit him
3.2.3 Figurative language

- Grice sees the same process at work in figurative language generally, e.g.

- if S says *I love this kind of weather* in a sleet storm, H will first access the literal meaning, then recognize S’s intention to speak ironically based on the violation of the maxim of quality, then H will recognize S’s intention to convey a meaning opposite to the literal statement.

- if S says *the early bird catches the worm* at the stock exchange, H will first understand the literal meaning, then recognize S’s intention to speak metaphorically based on the violation of the maxim of relation, then H will work out some salient similarity between early birds catching worms and early investment in the given context.
According to Grice:

- First figure literal meaning, and check against context
- If it fits, okay, but check for implications
- If it fails to fit, look for a way to make it relevant
two-stage theory of meaning

→ always begin with a literal meaning,
→ then go on to work out an additional or figurative meaning in context

• helps explain interpretations which replace literal readings, e.g. irony, metaphor
• these involve guessing about the speaker’s intention,
• but why should literal meaning?
• or even the inferences like Generalized conversational implicatures?
Relevance theory

- follows Grice’s intuition that utterances raise expectations of relevance
- no need for Co-operative Principle and maxims
- essentially reduces Grice’s apparatus to the single maxim of relevance
- expectations of relevance raised by an utterance are precise enough, and predictable enough, to guide the hearer towards the speaker’s meaning
- *Relevance* includes whatever allows the most new information to be transmitted in the current context on the basis of the least amount of effort required to convey it
Presumption of Optimal Relevance

• ostensive stimulus is relevant enough for it to be worth the addressee’s effort to process it
• ostensive stimulus is the most relevant one compatible with the communicator's abilities and preferences
• Metaphors and other rhetorical figures interpreted based on their relevance
  
  The early bird catches the worm
  The mayor is skating on thin ice with her new tax proposal
• even gestures can be interpreted in line with relevance
3.2.4 Presumptive meanings

- Levinson (2000) replaces Grice’s account of generalized conversational implicatures;
- particularized conversational implicatures require other explanations
- Levinson claims existence of “preferred interpretations” is self-evident
- Three heuristics account for generalized inferences → “There’s a blue pyramid on the red cube”
• **first heuristic** (labeled Q): “what isn’t said, isn’t”
  → rules out a whole number of states-of-affairs
  e.g., the inference “there is not a cone on the red cube”

• **second heuristic** (called I): “what is simply described is stereotypically exemplified”
  e.g., there is direct contact between the pyramid and the cube; if the contact was indirect, the speaker should have said so, because the stereotypical situation described by “on” involves direct contact.
• **third heuristic** (called M): counterpart of the second: “What’s said in an abnormal way, isn’t normal; or marked message indicates marked situation” e.g., if someone should say: “The blue cuboid block is supported by the red cube” one can infer that the block in question is not a stereotypical one

→ The marked form “cuboid” licenses the inference that the block is not a canonical cube.
3.3 Speech acts

- Austin’s (1962) *How to do things with words*
  - we use language to accomplish actions,
  - not just to make true or false statements.

- Austin recognized various sorts of “speech acts”

- His “performative analysis” identified particular verbs and sentences which we use to perform acts with social and interactional consequences
Searle (1969, 1975) developed Austin’s insights

Locutionary acts:
referring, predicating, negating, subordinating

Illocutionary acts:
naming, promising, apologizing, congratulating

Perlocutionary acts:
persuading, intimidating, incriminating
3.3.1 Speech act classification
(only illocutionary acts)

- **Declarations**
  - those kinds of speech acts that change the world via their utterance.
  - a. Priest: I now pronounce you husband and wife.
  - b. Referee: You're out!
  - c. Jury Foreman: We find the defendant guilty.
• **Representatives**
  → those kinds of speech acts that state what the speaker believes to be the case or not
    a. The earth is flat.
    b. Chomsky didn't write about peanuts.
    c. It was a warm sunny day.
  → In using a representative, the speaker makes words fit the world (of belief)

• **Expressives**
  → those kinds of speech acts that state what the speaker feels. They express psychological states and can be statements of pleasure, pain, likes, dislikes, joy, or sorrow.
    a. I’m really sorry!
    b. Congratulations!
    c. Oh, yes, great, mmmm, wow!
• **Directives**  
  → speech acts speakers use to get someone else to do something.  
  – Give me a cup of coffee.  
  – Could you lend me a pen, please?  
  – Don’t touch that.

• **Commissives** are speech acts which commit speakers to a certain course of action. In using a commissive, the speaker undertakes to make the world fit the words.  
  – I’ll be back in a minute.  
  – I’m going to get it right next time.  
  – We won’t ever do that again.
3.3.2 Felicity conditions on speech acts

- Felicity conditions must be met for speech acts to be successful
- **Generally:**
  - Speaker and addressee must share a common language
  - Speaker must make utterance understandable
- **For apologizing:**
  - Speaker has caused Addressee harm or trouble
  - Speaker feels sorry about it and seeks exoneration
- **For requesting:**
  - Some situation to be altered
  - Addressee can perform the act
  - Speaker has some right to ask Addressee to do it
3.3.3 Felicity conditions and *Indirect Speech Acts*

- Speakers can perform speech acts indirectly by mentioning felicity conditions.
- Thus, a speaker can apologize indirectly by saying:
  
  *I feel sorry for causing you trouble*  
  *Please forgive me for causing you trouble*

- Or for minor offenses, just:
  
  *Sorry.*  
  *Excuse me.*
• And a speaker can make an indirect request by saying:
  
  The door is open.
  The door needs to be closed.
  Can you close the door?
  I demand the door be closed.

• But what about:
  
  Were you born in a barn?
  There’s a draft in here

  → Such utterances might count as indirect requests to close the door as well, but they don’t relate to the felicity conditions in any regular way
there are lots of other forms of indirectness not covered as well:

- quoting, allusion
- proverbs, slogans
- voicing/ventriloquizing someone else
- metaphor
- modal constructions
3.4 Politeness and Politeness Theory

- politeness:
  showing awareness and consideration of another person’s public self-image
3.4.1 Politeness as a historical phenomenon

- Politeness as in-group behavior
- Politeness as code of civility
- Political Correctness as enforced politeness
3.4.2 Pronouns of power and solidarity

- Brown & Gilman (1960): semantics of power and solidarity in use of 2nd person pronouns in European languages

- In clearly stratified society, “power semantic” developed:
  - non-reciprocal V to mark deference,
  - then reciprocal V spread among nobility
• In more mobile society, “solidarity semantic” developed
  – reciprocal “non-solidary” \( V \) even among common people
  – reciprocal “solidary” \( T \) even among powerful people
• Also: reciprocal \( T \) to mark “shared fate”
• Note: “power semantic” still determines who initiates \( T \)
• and: “shared fate” only works when fate is lack of power
• pronoun use interacts with other systems like honorifics in Japanese
• English lost 2nd person pronoun distinction
3.4.3 Politeness in Linguistic Pragmatics

- Lakoff:
  Be friendly; Don’t impose; Give options

- Brown and Levinson:
  – positive and negative face,
  – positive and negative politeness
  – face wants and face threats
• **face:**  
  – a person’s public self-image as described in the study of politeness

• **positive face:**  
  – the need to be connected, to belong, to be a member of a group

• **negative face:**  
  – the need to be independent and free from imposition
• **face-saving act:**
  – saying something that reduces a possible threat to another person’s self-image
  
  **no harm done; it’s not your fault**

• **face-threatening act (FTA):**
  – saying something that represents a threat to another person’s self-image
  
  **you screwed up; you’re a phony**

• For Brown and Levinson, some acts are inherently face-threatening (FTAs), e.g. requests, invitations
• Distance and deference Politeness (Negative Politeness)
  1  Maintain distance (respect)
  2  Give options (deference)

• Camaraderie Politeness (Positive Politeness)
  Be friendly (solidarity)
• Spencer-Oatey (2002, 2005) rapport management system
  $\rightarrow$ rapport = relative harmony and smoothness of relations
  $\rightarrow$ interactants constantly re-evaluate rapport with respect to whether it is being enhanced, maintained or damaged

• Spencer-Oatey defines (im)politeness as “an evaluative label that people attach to behaviour, as a result of their subjective judgments about social appropriateness”
  – prescribed behavior is legally and/or socially obligatory,
  – proscribed behavior is legally and/or socially prohibited.
  – politic behavior (Watts 1989, 2003) is appropriate to the ongoing social interaction
  – only positively eventful behaviour counts as polite
  – while negatively eventful behaviour counts as impolite
3.4.4 Pre-sequences

- Pre-sequences avoid face-threatening acts
- At the same time, pre-sequences contribute to coherence in conversation

**Pre-request**

Ann: Would you do me a favor?
Bob: Sure.
Ann: Are you going to be needing your car this weekend?
Bob: Uh, not really.
Ann: Great. Could I borrow it Saturday night?
Bob: I guess so.
Ann: I’d have it back early Sunday.
• **Pre-invitation**

Ed: So are you busy Saturday night?
Judy: Not really.
Ed: Have you seen the new “Star Wars” movie?
Judy: No.
Ed: Do you want to go with me Saturday?
Judy: I’d love to.

• Of course, the recipient may anticipate the invitation, as in:

Ed: So are you busy Saturday night?
Judy: What do you have in mind?
Ed: Do you like Chinese food?
Judy: At which restaurant?
Ed: Kung Foo on Elm Street.
Judy: I’d love to.
• Pre-announcement

Ann: Oh, guess who I saw last night.
Bob: Who?
Ann: Judy.
Bob: Really?
Ann: Yeah. She was at the movies with George.
Bob: Wow.

• Compare:

Ann: Oh, guess who I saw last night.
Bob: Harry?
Ann: No, Judy.
Bob: Oh.
• Also:
  Ann: Do you know who I saw at the movies last night?
  Bob: Who?
  Ann: Judy.
  Bob: Wow.

• Compare:
  Ann: Do you know who I saw at the movies last night?
  Bob: No.
  Ann: Judy.
  Bob: Oh.

• Conclusion: If you can hear a question as a pre-sequence, do so
• **Conversation closings**, usually with **pre-closings**:
  Sue: Okay. See you Thursday.
  Joe: Yeah, Thursday.
  Sue: Okay, bye.
  Joe: Yeah, bye.
  Sue: Bye.

  Al: So if you're ever in Boston come and see us.
  Bea: You bet. Thanks.
  Al: Good to see you.
  Bea: Yeah. Take care.
  Bea: Bye.
3.4.5 The paradox of power and solidarity

- Power: superior, equal, inferior
- Solidarity: solidary versus unsolidary

- Solidary implies closeness, unsolidary implies distance

- But closeness also implies control (power), while distance renders power differences irrelevant

→ only those approximately equal in power negotiate dominance from one situation to the next
• Tannen proposes interrelated axes:
  – dominance and subordination
  – closeness and distance

• Ambiguity and paradox in power and solidarity
  – Making a request seems to signal dependence (one-down status), but it may signal expectation of fulfillment (one-up status)
  – Sharing possessions seems to signal solidarity (equal status), but it may signal an attempt to control (one-up status)
4. Coherence in Discourse

• Coherence
  = factors distinguishing discourse from unrelated sentences
• speakers signal how their talk fits the context;
• listeners interpret talk based on the context;
• together they constitute coherence in the discourse
• we must consider markers in discourse
• and models of how language users construct and construe coherent discourse
4.1 Frame theory

- Cognitive scientists invented frames (also variously called schemas, scripts and cognitive models) to model our recognition, categorization and memory for recurrent experiences

- Frames encode our typical expectations for objects and events

- Frame theory has roots in work by Bateson (1953, 1972), Goffman (1967, 1974)

- Fillmore (1976, 1985): frame theory in linguistic semantics
  → lexical frames represent knowledge of word meanings and their relations
• Tannen on frames
  – frame concepts for expectations about interaction,
  – e.g. for conversation and sub-genres like gossip and storytelling
  – and for relations between elements within genres
  – our frame for conversation ideally includes two people talking at a certain volume and tempo, taking turns speaking, sticking to a topic etc
  – frantic screaming, refusal to let the other person talk, constant interruption and ignoring the current topic constitute breeches in the system
• Framing, re-framing and meta-talk

• Conversationalists frame and re-frame their interaction with explicit statements about their talk and interaction; Bateson, Goffman, Tannen call this meta-talk, e.g.

Let’s have a little chat
Why do we argue all the time?
Is that a threat or a promise?
I don’t mean this as a criticism
• In Cognitive Linguistics frames are represented in *Idealized Cognitive Models (ICMs)*

• Frames (or ICMs) encode prototypes for objects, sequences of events, and causal relationships, which facilitate recognition, categorization and memory of sequences,

• e.g. our frame for birds includes prototypical bird like a sparrow with characteristic features like wings, feathers and a beak along with facts, e.g. birds fly, birds perch, birds sing, birds lay eggs

• items that fail to match prototypes are hard to classify, e.g. penguins and ostriches as birds
• Extending the notion of frame:
  – frames for stories guide tellers:
    • what sorts of stories are appropriate and what they include
  – frames for stories guide listeners:
    • what to expect in stories and how to respond to them
  – e.g. frame for a traditional romantic love story includes two people who meet, court, fall in love, usually while experiencing problems, become engaged, finally marry, go on a honeymoon, then take up housekeeping together and have children
• Stories that fail to match our frames are hard to understand, e.g. stories without clear causal connections and stories from other cultural contexts

• Judy and Harry had three children, before they moved in with each other and started going out together. Then Judy and Harry fell in love, once they went on their honeymoon in order to plan their marriage.
• Frames also account for inferences

• *semantic relation* between *robbery* and *crime*
  accounts for inferences like:
  
  Harry robbed a bank
  ➔ Harry committed a crime

• *frames* necessary for connections like:
  
  Harry and Judy robbed a bank
  ➔ Judy drove the getaway car
  
  Harry and Judy robbed a bank
  ➔ Harry and Judy split the money
  
  Harry robbed a bank
  ➔ Harry is serving a prison term
• Complete frame for bank robbery includes:
  – robbery is a crime,
  – robbers collect and later split money from bank,
  – one robber drives the getaway car,
  – getting caught involves a prison term etc
4.2 Cues and Keys in conversation

- Contextual **cuing** (Gumperz) and **keying** (Hymes):

- Conversation is a speech event or discourse type with its own characteristic cohesive devices and coherent structure
• Conversationalists:
  – cooperate to negotiate interactional parameters;
  – adopt a particular **key** for their interaction (chatty, business-like etc), signalling assessment of direction and goals of talk
  – have a range of strategies for creating coherence and maintaining involvement;
  – coordinate their talk and secure up-take with:
    • body language,
    • paralinguistic features like intonation, volume, tempo,
    • interactional **cues** like understanding checks and attention signals,
    • discourse markers, hedges, evidentials, and tags
• Understanding checks: *y’know, right?, huh?*

• Attention signals: *m’hm, uh-huh, wow, really?*

• Discourse markers: *well, I’m not sure*
  *anyway, she finally quit it doesn’t matter though they all left early, *y’know

• Hedges: *kind of, sort of, a little (bit), well, let’s say*
• Evidentials:  
  as far as I know, I guess, clearly, probably
• Tags:  
  – canonical tags: with auxiliary, reversed negative polarity and personal pronoun  
    It’s cold, isn’t it?  
    It’s not cold, is it?  
    Judy will win, won’t she?  
    Judy won, didn’t she?  
  – invariant tags: right, okay, huh; see also dialectal innit  
    It was Judy, right?  
    I’ll do it, okay?  
    So Judy won, huh?  
    They lost again, innit?
• Conversation also has characteristic structures and sequences
  → move, turn, pair, exchange; pre-sequence

Sue: hi. greeting
Jill: hi. greeting
Sue: so, how have you been. question
Jill: not so well really. answer
Sue: oh I’m sorry to hear that. response
Jill: how about you? question
Sue: not too bad, I guess. Answer
Jill: yes, one muddles through. response
Sue: by the way, I’m looking for Al. statement?
Jill: I just saw him at Lou’s. response
Sue: really? response
Sue: who else was there?
Jill: Fred.
Sue: wow.
are you busy right now?
Jill: not really.
Sue: would you do me a favor?
Jill: sure.
Sue: would you call Al for me?
Jill: sure.
Sue: great.
thanks.
Jill: no problem.
• Compare transcription of natural conversation

• ADDIE & BRIANNE

Addie  they just [decided about=]
Brianne  [I see]
Addie  =six o’clock
Brianne  oh really?
Addie  that’s so late to be [home]
Brianne  [oh] they’ll be gone a while
        [((laughs))]    
Addie  [yeah]
        ‘so- so you’re gonna be HOME then?=  

Brianne ((laughs))
Addie =or will you be just gonna hangin around with Brianne?
I’m like ‘yeah, probably’
‘well GOOD’
ha [ha ha]

Brianne [ua::h]
Addie ‘we’re going shopping,
and you can take care of Amanda
when she gets back’.

Brianne so:
Addie so I was like ‘well, sure’
like I mean we might-
Addie: we might- we might have gotten a movie
‘**well** just wait till she gets BACK and then she-’
[(((laughs)))]

Brianne: [mmh]

Addie: [((laughs))] **but** I was like ‘**well**, I don’t know’
‘**cause like** we don’t have a car or anything’

Brianne: yeah.

Addie: ‘I suppose we might just be hanging around’

Brianne: hanging

Addie: and she was like ‘**GOOD well** then we can go SHOPping’

Brianne: [(((laughs)))]

Addie: [((laughs))] and I said ‘sure’
Brianne  I know I'm so tired
we were all over to Dubuque today
Addie  oh yeah
Brianne  bopping around
Addie  oh jeez
Brianne  I had to- uhm (1.0)
to get fitted for my bridesmaid dress
Addie  O::h
Brianne  oh God
I was like ready to tell Moira I couldn't be in her wedding.
• Insertion sequence:

Nan: what time do you get to work?
Aaron: Friday?
Nan: yeah.
Aaron: oh, between seven thirty and eight, quarter to eight.
Nan: well, I might not be there the second you get to work
• Double insertion sequence:

A: Do you want to go to the movies?
B: Can Judy come along?
A: Is Judy back from school already?
B: Yeah.
A: Then she can come along.
B: Well, then let’s all go.
• Recurrent pairs, sequences, exchange types along with cues create characteristic coherence in conversation

• **Conversational repair**: For clarification and correction

  → Self-repair:
      I saw Judy last Tuesday- sorry, Monday.

  → Other-initiated repair:
      A: I saw Judy last Tuesday.
      B: Uh, Tuesday?
      A: Oh, yeah, I saw her on Monday at the party.

  → Other-repair:
      A: I saw Judy last Monday.
      B: You mean Tuesday.
      A: Yeah, I saw her at Nancy’s.
• In real talk repair may take up several turns

PAMELA: I bit my tongue the other day, because remember, .. you said to Deven, well, I really want to spend time with you?

DARRYL: Yeah?
PAMELA: And then we went to the Chalk .. Fair, and then he took off with Tobias?

DARRYL: The Chop Fair?
PAMELA: The Chalk.
DARRYL: [Oh, PAMELA: [The Chalk Fair].
DARRYL: .. unhunh]?
PAMELA: (H) And he took off with Tobias?
DARRYL: Yeah?
Listenership in English conversation

• when one speaker has the floor, others actively demonstrate listenership and encourage the speaker to continue with audible and visible signals

• they engage in “activities in the back-channel”—as opposed to the main channel occupied with talk by the primary speaker (Ingve 1970)
Response tokens

- *uh-huh* and *mhm*, are specialized for signaling listenership

Mary: but anyway, I did it from memory.

Sabina: *uh-huh.*

Mary: and I, I surprised myself.

Ted: and I was in plays fairly solidly all year.

Ashley: *mhm.*

Ted: and so I would come home at really weird times.
Schegloff (1982) calls *uh-huh* and *mhm* continuers.

The usage of “uh huh”, etc. (in environments other than after yes/no questions) is to exhibit on the part of its producer an understanding that an extended unit of talk is underway by another, and that it is not yet, or may not yet be (or even ought not yet be) complete. It takes the stance that the speaker of that extended unit should continue talking, and in that continued talking should continue that extended unit.
• *yeah* as a continuer

BRAD: our blue book usually shows the U=hers.

TAMMY: ... *yeah*.

BRAD: our older Uhers.
Newsmarking items

• change-of-state tokens such as *oh, hm, really*

Joyce: and so we had a good visit. She's seen everybody.

Joan: *oh.*

Joyce: yeah, so she's over here now.

ANGELA: so they put a whole new mechanism in on side.

DORIS: *hm.*

ANGELA: and I wasn’t prepared for them to.
really and oh really

Fred: well I do think I'm kind of on the short side
Mark: really?
Fred: I guess I'm about average height, probably

→ the combination oh really

Judy: and Shelley's probably gonna come work for me.
Carol: oh, really?
Judy: she resigned this weekend.
Assessments

- evaluative items such as *wow, gosh, yuck, oh my god*
  
  Janet: he weighs a hundred and thirty pounds.
  Marge: **WOW**.
  Janet: I was like, how did you do that?

  Gloria: didn’t give the people enough time to get off the train.
  Elizabeth and about four or five other people.
  Matthew: **gosh**.
  Gloria: couldn’t get off,
  and they had to go to the next station.
Assessments

Rebekah: Adam had like blood coming out of his eyes.
Judith: *yuck.*
Rebekah: and like throw up on his collar.

Pamela: and, uh, he had ba- barricaded himself in his apartment.
Lisa: *oh, my god.*
Pamela: and for THREE DAYS tried to burn, burn it down.
Agreeing with assessments

1 Bernice: oh, oh, worse,
2 it was like,
3 it was like as bad as Middlebury at its most intense,
4 but i- it lasted all year,
5 it wasn’t over in nine weeks. ((laughs))
6 Allen: oh my GOD.
7 Bernice: I know I’m,
8 I have so much grey hair.
Incorporating listener assessments

1 Anne:  yeah.
2 John and uh uh Elizabeth.
3 and Maureen.
4 all did a reading.
5 Betty:  [oh how nice.]
6 Anne:   [and then-]
7 yeah it was beautiful.
8 and then Kevin did the eulogy.
Incorporating listener evaluations

1  Bea: it was just so great to be outdoors.
2  with all these sort of you know, 
3  nice people and arty people and, 
4  Ally: well that was refreshing.
5  Bea: it was very refreshing.
6  and then it went into the night.
7  so I was out there at night wi-
8  Ally: yeah.
9  Bea: stars and the moon.
and we had a campfire and singing and all that.

Ally: oh that’s wonderful.
Bea: it was really great.
it was very,
Ally: good for the soul.
Bea: yeah really good for the soul.
Ally: yeah.
4.3 Coherence through repetition, parallelism, formulaicity

4.3.1 Repetition

• Following Gail Jefferson (1972), distinguish:
  → repeats, which perform a specific operation on their original,
  → random repetition, which only contributes to cohesion
• repetition to ensure coherence,

    I gave up my permanent (coughs) **my permanent** job here.

• recipient repetition to signal understanding,

    H through Bittman in the form of legal fees for distribution to these people. Then you've got it.

    P **In the form of legal fees.**
      I see. And then . . .

• This sort of repetition does not affect our understanding of the original
• Proper repeats spotlight their originals and perform some operation on them, e.g. questioning repeats which register surprise, this prompts the original speaker to revise

• Jefferson’s example: two repeats and responses, a defense and a revision.

Ste: One, two, three, four, five, six, eleven, eight, nine, ten.
Sue: Eleven? eight, nine, ten?
Ste: Eleven, eight, nine, ten.
Sue: Eleven?
Ste: Seven, eight, nine, ten.
Sue: That’s better.
First, a repeat signals correction
P: He has turned it over to the Grand Jury.
E: **Turned it over to the** Justice Department.

Second, a repeat signals appreciation
Rog: He’s a politician.
Al: Yes. I’m a politician. I think I’m greater than all of you.
Rog: I beg to differ with you.
Al: hehh heh hhh “I beg to differ with you.”
• Third, a repeat can affirm its original

A: She bought a chest of drawers from um what's that gal’s name?
   Just went back to Michigan. Helen um
B: Oh I know who you mean, Brady, Brady.
A: Yeah. Helen Brady.
B: M-hm.

• This affirmation can expand and amplify

E: And this was in a stone castle, you see. Bloody cold.
F: A stone castle, and excessively bloody cold.
• repeat with negation serves to deny the original

G: They go in the tavern.
   You can’t go in there an-
H: You can go in there too.

• Fourth, repeats to request information

C: I started hearing this tick tick tick tick and the-
   I just hung up and ran.
   God uh I didn’t know.
D: “Tick tick tick?”
C: Thought it was a time bomb or, y’know.
• A single speaker can produce all these sorts of repeats, e.g. negate and revise:

My builders- no, not my not my builders- my my landscape gardener people.

• Or simply repeat with an appropriate change:

I’m sure that Jack is uh is uh in some ways a better man to work with- an easier man to work with- than Dan Ross.
• repeat a phrase to sentence to highlight it, as in:

He wanted the operation to fail. And he admitted it, admitted it.

• cohesive **repetition** reflects a common setting and topic;
• but **repeats** have specific rhetorical purpose, as in King’s “I have a dream” speech
4.3.2 Parallelism

- **parallelism** is repetition of pattern, not entirely dependent on particular sounds, lexical items or meanings:
  - at the phonological level: rhyme, alliteration, assonance;
  - at the word level: lexical repetition;
  - at the semantic level: repetition of sense in paraphrase and counterstatement.
- See “I have a dream” speech for examples.
4.3.3 Formulaicity

- Formulaicity includes:
  - recognizable collocations
  - pre-formed phrases
  - idioms
  - recurrence of patterns created within a text or discourse
  - (Tannen’s “spontaneous formulaicity”)
  - **intertextuality** = importing constructions from recognizable sources
  - it may have special significance for coherence
- Again, see “I have a dream” speech.
Martin Luther King: “I have a dream”

Go back to Mississippi, go back to Alabama, go back to Georgia, go back to Louisiana, go back to the slums and ghettos of our northern cities, knowing that somehow this situation can and will be changed.

Let us not wallow in the valley of despair.

I say to you today, my friends, that in spite of the difficulties and frustrations of the moment, I still have a dream.

It is a dream deeply rooted in the American dream.
I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal."

I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia the sons of former slaves and the sons of former slave-owners will be able to sit down together at a table of brotherhood.

I have a dream that one day even the state of Mississippi, a desert state, sweltering with the heat of injustice and oppression, will be transformed into an oasis of freedom and justice.
I have a dream that my four children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character.

I have a dream today.

I have a dream that one day the state of Alabama, whose governor's lips are presently dripping with the words of interposition and nullification, will be transformed into a situation where little black boys and black girls will be able to join hands with little white boys and white girls and walk together as sisters and brothers.

I have a dream today.
I have a dream that one day every valley shall be exalted, every hill and mountain shall be made low, the rough places will be made plain, and the crooked places will be made straight, and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together.
4.4 Coherence versus Cohesion

- **Coherence** derives from:
  - speakers (and writers) working to signal their understanding and expectations about the aim, topic and direction of the ongoing discourse in the current context,
  - and from listeners (and readers) working to interpret their cues to insure understanding of the ongoing discourse,

- **Cohesion** consists in the individual grammatical and lexical devices signaling coherence within the discourse itself
Cohesion in terms of Halliday’s language functions:
  – Ideational,
  – Interpersonal
  – Textual:

A. Structural
  1. Thematic (Theme-Rheme)
  2. Information (Given-New)

B. Cohesive
  1. Reference
  2. Ellipsis and substitution
  3. Conjoining
  4. Lexical cohesion
• A sentence with a cohesive device like she or and is an “invitation to a text.”

• Another sentence with a key to the meaning of such devices can create text.
4.4.1 Thematic structure

• Basic insight: Clauses typically fall into two parts; the first identifies what the clause is about (theme), the second says something new about the theme (rheme)

My sister borrowed this hammer from the plumber. The plumber lent this hammer to my sister.

• Prague School: Functional Sentence Perspective (FSP) (Mathesius, Firbas, Vachek, Danes)

• Communicative dynamism from low to high: Theme-Rheme
• Theme is usually subject: 
  **The duke** gave my aunt that teapot.

• Note the effect of passives: 
  **My aunt** was given that teapot by the duke. 
  **That teapot** the duke gave my aunt.

• Halliday: Theme as “point of departure for message”
  – a function in the clause as message (ideation)
  – versus clause as exchange (interpersonal)
  – and clause as representation (textual)
• Consequently, not limited to subject proper:
  – Adverbial:
    Once I was a real turtle.
    Very carefully she put him back on his feet.
  – Prepositional phrase:
    For want of a nail the shoe was lost.
    With sobs and tears he sorted the cards.
  – Explicit theme marking:
    As for my aunt, the duke gave her that teapot.
    About that teapot - my aunt received it from the duke.
• Characteristic themes:

  – Conjunctive elements:
  
  that is, at least; briefly, in fact; instead; meanwhile, finally; therefore, in that case, nevertheless

  – Modal elements:
  
  probably, certainly, perhaps, usually; in my opinion, frankly; evidently; fortunately; initially; on the whole
• Thematic equatives:
  The one who gave my aunt that teapot was the duke.
  What the duke gave to my aunt was that teapot.

• Clauses as themes:
  If the duke gives my aunt anything it will be the teapot.
  Where I come from, they're all mad.
4.4.2 Information structure

• Basic insight: tone groups in speech typically fall into **Given** information and **New** information

• Halliday: Tone group
  Tone group may match clause, but need not; it corresponds to a single unit of information; not determined by foregoing discourse, but by what speaker wants to say and current assessment of hearer's informational requirements

• Discourse must start somewhere, so discourse unit may consist entirely of new information.
  Okay.
  This **guy** walks into this **bar**.
• Given information tends to be recoverable from context or foregoing text, hence it may receive no expression at all.

  – From context: (looking at spilled food):
    What a mess!
    **This letter here** is addressed to Sue.

  – From foregoing text:
    **She** should be along any minute now.

    Sue: Judy finally has a job offer.
    Bill: Great.

• Therefore, an information unit consists of an obligatory New element plus an optional Given.
• Characteristically:
  Given information precedes New information; and New information receives the stress

I had one of those nice old *tropical* houses
I was very *lucky*

it was about thirty years *old*
on stone *pillars*

with a long *staircase* up

and folding *doors*

back to the verandah
• Themes tend to be Given, and Rhemes tend to be New, but no correspondence is necessary

Where did your aunt get that teapot?  
She got it from the **duke**.  Theme = she  
The **duke** gave it to her.  Theme = the duke
4.5 Reference and co-reference

- Reference hooks discourse to its context and co-reference (anaphora) relates referring expressions within the discourse

- So Reference is basic to our understanding of both coherence and context in discourse
4.5.1 Words as referring expressions:

- Names and definite descriptions
- Russell, Peirce, Ogden & Richards:

→ The semiotic triangle
• Word as Sign, Language as Code:
• consider examples: *tree, unicorn, justice* etc
  – only works for one word at a time, not sentence
  – only works for nouns, not adverbs, prepositions etc
  – and only for static objects, not relations in time, e.g. *alimony, opera, even rise and fall, scar* etc
4.5.2 Deixis

- Deixis (or Indexicality) is the pointing function of language
- Deictic expressions shift their referents depending on who’s speaking, with whom, where and when
  - Personal pronouns: I, you, he, she, it
  - Adverbials of time/place: now, then; here, there
  - Prepositions: in front of, behind, above, beside

Yesterday she did the same to that one over there with him.

- Deixis in written texts: earlier, below, in the following, in the preceding paragraph, in the next section
4.5.3 Reference in context

- Reference as a speech act (Searle):
  - Speakers use words (and gestures) to refer, i.e. to identify the objects under discussion for audience

- Reference interpretation and cognitive models (Chafe, Reinhard, Ariel): Accessibility, Distance, Definiteness

- Pragmatic accounts of co-reference (Prince, Levinson, Clark): Referring as a cooperative/collaborative process
• Exophoric reference: to objects in the context
• Endophoric reference: to objects identified elsewhere in text
  ➔ Then two identification devices are “co-referential”

*She* just can’t take care of *herself*.

• Here *she* and *herself* are co-referential, but reflexives are grammatical sentential devices rather than textual coherence devices

• *She* could refer to someone in the context (exophoric) or to someone identified elsewhere in the text (endophoric), e.g.

  *Jill* is irresponsible. *She* just can’t take care of *herself*.

• Then *Jill*, *she* and *herself* would all be co-referential, though only *she* counts as a textual cohesive device.
• Note: **anaphoric** reference to previous text, as in most cases, versus **cataphoric** reference to following text, as in:

   I would never have believed **it**:
   Now even Judy has quit her job!

• Major disjunction between speech roles:
  – 1st and 2nd person (**I, you, we**) refer to participants in interaction (hence exophoric),
  – 3rd person (**he, she, it, they**) refers (endophorically) to someone/something in text, except in reported speech, e.g.

Here’s a note from Sue.
She writes, “I leave for Lyon tonight.”
• Note: only *it* has “extended reference” to whole phrase, clause, paragraph, topic, e.g.

> Judy was drinking again.  
> And driving drunk.  
> She ran into a tree, and broke both legs.  
> And *it* doesn’t surprise me a bit.

• Here *it* can refer to the injury, the accident, the drinking and driving or the whole incident.
• Other referential cohesive devices:
  – this, that;
  – here, there;
  – now, then, as in:

    We're going to Italy in June. This will be our first visit. We expect to enjoy ourselves there. Then we'll have a good time.

  – such, some, fewer, more, as in:

    Judy’s selling pink apples. Such apples are rare. We all want some. Bill has fewer than Judy. We hope he can get more.
4.5.4 Reference as process and negotiation in conversation

- Clark & Haviland experiments on negotiated reference in task-related interaction

  i. *Self-corrected noun phrases*

  She was giving me all the people that were gone this year- I mean this quarter y'know

  - *all the people that were gone this year* begins referential process
  - *I mean this quarter* is a *self-initiated repair*.
  - Note *y'know* as understanding check
ii. *Expanded noun phrases*

– noun phrase may be correct, but speaker changes course

Sally: Take the spout– the little one that looks like the end of an oil can–

Jill: Okay.

Sally: -and put that on the opening in the other large tube.
With the round top.

→ Sally expands **the spout** with an extra noun phrase.
iii. *Episodic noun phrases*

- *episodic noun phrase* = a single noun phrase divides intonationally into two information units
- in the passage above, Sally says **the other large tube**
- then adds **with the round top** under a separate intonation contour
iv. *Other-corrected noun phrases*

- The process may even involve the addressee in the repair.

  Bill: How long you going to be here?
  Ann: Uh- not too long. Uh just till uh Monday.
  Bill: Till- a you mean like a week from tomorrow.
  Ann: Yeah.

→ Here we begin to see the truly interactive/collaborative nature of reference
→ But speakers are not merely reactive
→ They may also bring addressees into the referential process, as in following examples
v. **Trial noun phrases**

– noun phrase with a rising intonation requests collaboration, as in:

Sal: Okay now, the small blue cap we talked about before?
Jill: Yeah.
Sal: Put that over the hole on the side of that tube-
Jill: Yeah.
Sal: that is nearest to the top, or nearest to the red handle.

**the small blue cap we talked about before?** requests feedback
Jill confirms understanding with **Yeah**.
• When addressees don’t understand, the process continues, as here:

Al: well I was the only one other than than the uhm tch Fords?
   Uh Mrs, Holmes Ford?
   Y’know uh the the cellist?
Betty: Oh yes. She’s she’s the cellist.
Al: Yes. Well she and her husband were there.
vi. *Dummy noun phrases*

– Speakers may initiate referential process with dummy noun phrases like: *what’s-his-name, whatchamacallit, thingamabob*

   If he puts it into the diplomatic bag, as um-*what’s-his-name*,
   Micky Cohn, did,
   then it’s not so bad

→ *What’s-his-name* is inadequate as a definite description,

→ but it initiates the referential process
vii. *Proxy noun phrases*

speakers may signal that a noun phrase is to come next, but the addressee actually utters it:

Molly: That tree has, uh, uh
Vera: Tentworms.
Molly: Yeah.
Vera: Yeah.

→ double *uh* acts as proxy noun phrase.
viii. Explicit query

– Speakers may explicitly ask hearer to help

Bill: When uhm what’s that Russian chap’s name who was here for a while.
Judy: Shaumyan.
Bill: Shaumyan, yeah. When he was here uhm I gave a lecture.

– speakers go beyond issuing standard noun phrases
– They deliberately draw addressees into the process
– Speaker and addressee expend extra effort, generally together, to make sure reference has been understood
4.5.5 Reference as cohesive device

- Consistency of reference to certain characters or entities contributes to textuality
- Auditors must track referents through an entire text; as with filing system: files are opened, left open, closed; referents filed away, discarded etc
- Other contributors to cohesion, according to Halliday, are:
  
  **Substitution, Ellipsis, Conjoining, Lexical Cohesion**
Substitution

In Reference, 2 expressions point to same thing, in Substitution, one item replaces another; Reference is a meaning relation, Substitution is a word relation:

- Nominal: one, ones, same
- Verbal: do
- Clausal: so, not
In Reference, it as a subject and direct object noun phrase refers to the same entity as the prepositional object a new house in the preceding sentence (anaphora):

John has moved to a new house. It is beautiful. We saw it the other day.

the phrase a new house could not recur, as it does below:

A new house is beautiful. We saw a new house the other day.
• By contrast, in Substitution, the replacement fulfills the same grammatical role as the original; and the original could reappear.

I don’t like this old knife. I need a new one.

Judy already knows it. In fact, everybody does.
• **Nominal substitution**
  – Replace noun phrases with: one, ones, same
    Judy has a **dog**. I want **one** of my own.
  – part of the original may be “repudiated,” e.g.

    Judy has a **a big black dog**.
    I want **a little grey one**.

    **one** replaces **dog**, but descriptors are repudiated

    Harry buys old cars. Still, Judy prefers new **ones**.
    Harry drinks beer. Yeah, Judy drinks the **same**.
• Verbal substitution

– Replace verbs with do:
  Did anyone feed the cat? Somebody did.
  Joe never finished his book. But he might have done.

– Note: AE either: . . . might have or . . . might have done so
  Can lions climb trees? No, but leopards can do.
– Again AE either: . . . can or . . . can do so
• **Clausal substitution**
  
  – Replace clauses with *so*; replace and negate with *not*

  The newspaper says it’s going to rain. But I don’t think so.
  Has Judy already left for London?
  I certainly hope not.

  → Everyone says Judy is guilty.
  → If *so*, she’ll go to prison. If *not*, she’ll go free.
Ellipsis

• Substitution by zero, and upgrading of word functioning as deictic, numerative, epithetic or classifier to head

Nominal ellipsis

Peter wrote this book. Then he wrote that ___. Nancy sold five pictures. Then she sold another ___.
Maggie tried red tags first. Then she tried blue ___. 
Verbal ellipsis

Have you been swimming? Yes, I have ___. What have you been doing? ___ swimming.

→ Verbal ellipsis is always accompanied by omission of the related clause elements, e.g. in operator ellipsis, the subject NP is also omitted
Compare so-called Gapping or Branching, possible only within the sentence, so not cohesive:

Some were crying and others ___ laughing. Judy ordered wine and Roger ___ beer.

compare:
Were you crying? No, ___ laughing. Rats like cheese. Yes, they do ___. No, they don’t ___.

• Note especially:

Ellipsis in conversational storytelling:

This poor kid leaves home.
Still real young.
Goes to the big city.
Works his way up.
Earns a fortune.
One day he goes back.
Says to a guy he meets.
Remember little Joey Brown?
Conjoining

Additive Conjoining

- Basic level: AND, when it operates conjunctively, between two sentences, to give cohesion, i.e. to create text
  
  Jill said she was leaving. **And** out she went.

- But not coordinative **and** with retrospective effect, as in:
  
  Jill said she was leaving, going home **and** never returning.

- where **and** is retrospectively projected to give the sense that Jill is leaving **and** going home **and** never returning

- Also: **further**(more), **moreover**, **in addition**, **besides that**, **incidentally**, **by the way**, **similarly**, **on the other hand**
  
  Jill left town. **Moreover**, she never came back.
Adversative Conjoining

- but, yet, still, nevertheless, however; actually, on the contrary; anyhow, at any rate, in any case

Judy never gave up. But/Yet/Still she often despaired.
Judy never gave up. Anyhow/In any case, she survived.
Causal Conjoining

- so, thus, hence, therefore; as a result of that, because of that

- with regard to this, otherwise, apart from this

Sally left. **Therefore**, George was free to go. Sally must have left. **Otherwise** George wouldn't have.
Temporal Conjoining

• Basic form: **then**
  
  Sue got up. **Then** she looked around. **Then** she made plans.

• But also: **next, afterwards; at once, immediately; soon, later etc**
  
  Sue got up. **Next** she looked around. **Later** she made plans.

• Temporal cohesion is basic clausal relation in narrative. Labov makes it a defining property. Even without lexical expression, temporal ordering is imputed.

  Sue got up. She looked around. She made plans.
Lexical cohesion

• Through **Reiteration** (verbatim repetition):
  Alice saw a mushroom.
  **The mushroom** was enormous.
• Through a **Synonym**:
  Alice saw a mountain.
  **The peak** shimmered in the distance.
• Through a **Superordinate**:
  Alice saw a willow.
  **The tree** was wet with dew.
• Through a **General Noun**:  
  Alice saw a deer.  
  **The creature** grazed on the meadow.

• **General Nouns**:  
  people, person, man, woman, child, creature;  
  thing, object, stuff, affair, matter, place, idea

• But also: **the poor dears, the crazy fool, the lucky devil** etc  
  Alice saw a deer.  
  **The girl** adored **the creatures**.
Judy recalled Al’s promise. The **guy** had lied to her. The **idea** of Al’s embrace was repugnant to her. She was sick of the whole **affair**.

- Note the use of the definite article **the**, since these “general nouns” are generally known.
- Note also the stance conveyed: contemptuous or sympathetic, e.g.:
  - Judy recalled Al’s promise. The **bastard** had lied to her.
  - Sue pitied Judy. The **poor dear** had suffered enough.
• **Collocation** is another dimension of lexical cohesion.

• According to Halliday, a word can establish cohesive ties not only to synonyms, close synonyms, superordinates and subordinates, but also to:
  
  – **Complementaries:** wet/dry, high/low, hate/love, order/obey
  
  – **Words from the same series:** Monday/Thursday, red/blue
  
  – **Words occurring in collocation:** bird/fly, spade/dig, book/read

• These relations establish links which guide us through texts.
5. The Analysis of Context

5.1 Firth’s “context of situation”

• Recall Firth’s definition of the “context of situation”

→ Voices should not be entirely dissociated from the social context in which they function. . . . all texts should be regarded as having “the implication of utterance” and be referred to typical participants in some generalised context of situation" i.e.

A. Relevant features of participants: persons, personalities.
   i. The verbal action of the participants.
   ii. The non-verbal action of the participants.

B. Relevant objects

C. Effect of the verbal action
5.2 Features of context

- Following Jackobson (1960), Hymes developed a detailed description of various features of context for speech events
- Addressor, Addressee, Audience; Topic
- Setting: time, place (indoors/outdoors, furniture, tools),
- physical relations (posture, gesture, facial expression)
- Channel (speech, telephone, e-mail, writing, signing, drumming)
- Code (language, dialect, style)
• Message form (chat, debate, letter, joke)
• Key (serious, playful, perfunctory, thoughtful, hurried)
• Purpose (participant aims)
• Event (cocktail party, business meeting, formal lecture)

e.g. one utterance: “There aren’t enough chairs”
Separate contexts: Lecturer to janitor, Lecturer calls home
5.3 Co-text and Context

• Foregoing text as determinant of Topic, Co-reference, etc
• Following text, reactions, effects:  
  A matter of method
• Meaning Determined by following Turns

(1) Ann: Do you want to come along?
   Hal: Yes.
   Ann: Then we'll need another car.
   → Request for info, Reply, Justification for question

(2) Ann: Do you want to come along?
   Hal: Yes.
   Ann: Great!
   → Offer, Acceptance, Comment
(3) Ann: Do you want to come along?
Hal: Yes.
Ann: You better be ready in five minutes.
Hal: Okay.
→ Pre-warning, Reply, Warning

(4) Ann: Do you want to come along?
Hal: Not really.
Ann: We sure wish you'd come.
Hal: Okay then.
→ Pre-invitation, Refusal, Invitation, Acceptance
(5) Ann: Do you know who's coming?
Hal: No, who?
Ann: Mary, Betty and Ron.
→ Pre-announcement, Reply, Announcement

(6) Ann: Do you know who's coming?
Hal: Yeah. Mary, Betty and Ron.
Ann: Oh.
→ Request for info, Answer, Comment
5.4 Relations between Participants

- Gender
- Power
- Interactional History
5.4.1 Gender

- Traditional gender stereotypes:
  - Women talk faster,
  - more expressively,
  - more overall,
  - interrupt more,
  - swear less,
  - use more color words, more hedges, tags

→ all of these then judged signs of lower status
• Early linguistic writing on gender
  – Jespersen, Lakoff: Largely introspective, confirms stereotypes, looks for differences, finds deficiencies

• Binary Distinctions and Markedness
  – Langue versus parole (competence versus performance)
  – Synchrony versus diachrony
5.4.2 Feminist Linguistics

• Stage 1: Accept binaries, attempt to eliminate bias
  – **Man**, generic **he**, **Mrs/Miss** versus **Mr**, **host** versus **hostess**
  → Note: English drops differences; German accentuates them

• Stage 2: Question binaries, reduce to power differential
  – Argue for women’s language as more involved, more cohesive,
  – women as better listeners, linguistic innovators
• Stage 3: Reject Binary Thinking
  – Reveal male/white/hetero-sexual bias in prevailing **Discourses**
  – Study power relations in particular **Texts**
  – Ask how language system and practice **construct** gender

→ see Bing & Bergvall
5.4.3 Power

→ transitive feature of relationships
→ socially constructed (not given) in language

• Correlation Socio-linguistics (Labov, Trudgill)
  → Match social factors with linguistic features

• Discourse and Ideology (Althusser, Fowler)
Linguistic Indicators (Fowler’s Checklist)

(1) Lexical processes

– abstract versus concrete:
  Force may be used - The cops will be there
– general versus specific:
  The media expect - The SZ predicts

(2) Transitivity:

John opened the door - The door opened
Circumstances dictate the raising of taxes
(3) Syntax:
deletion, nominalization, passivization
We want you to arrive early
Please arrive early
Early arrival will be appreciated

(4) Modality:
modals, permit, predict, likelihood etc

(5) Implicature:
The party is low on funds > Please send money
(6) Presupposition:

By how much were you exceeding the speed limit when you ran the stop sign?
> you were exceeding the speed limit
> you ran the stop sign

(7) Turn taking:

• length and number of turns, selection of next speaker, back-channeling and interruption etc
5.5 The search for Context

• Structural Linguists work from sound to word to sentence, and naturally from sentence to context (though discourse is always more than a collection of sentences)

• CA (Conversation Analysis) also works from local turn-by-turn level to participants and context, requiring micro-level evidence for macro-level postulates

• Either way there’s a problem of connecting Micro to Macro
The Principle of Local Interpretation

• Construct only the minimal context necessary for immediate interpretation (Brown and Yule)

A man and a woman are sitting in a living room. The man is bored. He goes to the window. He goes out, goes to a club, has a drink, talks to the bartender.
The Principle of Analogy

- Construct a context to conform with usual expectations for similar events

The baby cried.
The mommy picked it up.
The myth of the “null context”

• Unlike structural linguists, language users comprehend “top down” and hermeneutically i.e. back-and-forth from local to general,

• In recognition of allophones, allomorphs, phrases etc, the next higher unit (or context) is necessarily given

• “Syncategorimaticity” also shows that knowledge of the whole phrase must precede analysis of the parts, consider:

white wine/bread/pepper/people/lie
Context as the basis of comprehension, not something we construct from sentence meaning

- Some linguists work from context to utterance, from utterance to word, and from word to sound,
  - Anthropological Linguistics of Hymes,
  - Interactional Sociolinguistics of Gumperz, Tannen
  - Systemic-Functional Linguistics of Halliday,
- they work from the macro-level of situation, context and participants, through analysis of current interaction to micro-level of individual exchange or utterance (and back), so problem of connecting levels doesn’t arise
6. Discourse genres

• Instead of defining discourse as coherent clauses or language use in context, let’s work inductively from discourse types to generalities
  – Narrative
    • Conversational narrative
    • Literary narrative
  – Joke
  – Instructions
  – Argument/Conflict talk
  – Public debate
  – Sales talk
6.1 Narrative as a discourse genre

• Narrative is a speech event or discourse type with its own characteristic cohesive devices and coherent structure
6.1.1 Narrative frames

- Fairy tale formulas:
  Once upon a time, Long ago and far away . . . And they lived happily ever after
- Literary schemas: exposition, complication, climax, denouement
- Conversational formulas
  Prefaces and Closings
  - Formulaic prefaces: “you’ll never believe what happened”
  - Discourse markers: “well, this ONE time”
  - Initial disfluencies: “so, anyway, these- this one girl”
  - Formulaic closings: “and I lived to tell about it” “and the rest is history”
Ann: sewing is, something I want to go back to. I acquired an absolutely magnificent sewing machine by foul means. *did I tell you about that?*

Betty: no.

Ann: well when I was doing freelance advertising, the advertising agency that I sometimes did some work for rang me...
Shel: {laughs} I guess I better go.
Cal: you don’t have to.
Shel: na, I don’t have to,
but if I want to get up tomorrow morning I do.
guess-

oh I couldn’t believe it,
I was so happy.
I wanted to go home Friday morning, right?
this guy’s leaving early early Friday morning.
well I have an eight o’clock class
that I don’t want to miss because . . .
CLOSINGS

Conrad: so at least they knew that my heart was in it.
Ellen: that’s right.
Conrad: and uh and so I did that and- and here I am.

Jim: well I think y’know here were two sisters who didn't have a brother and two brothers who didn't have a sister and I think the idea was an exchange of a kind

Vera: You were being an educator.
Jim: Yeah.
Marsha: and he doesn’t remember too much about it.

Patricia: you never do, because it takes seconds for it to happen.

Marsha: he- I can- he fought the car for a good ten, fifteen seconds before we lost total control.

Patricia: well the only thing you can both say is thank God you’re safe. that’s all.
6.1.2 Labov’s Analysis of Spoken Personal Narrative

- narration as method of recapitulating past experience
- by matching a verbal sequence of clauses to the sequence of events reported
- narrative as sequence of past tense clauses
- sequentially ordered with respect to each other

so he get all upset.
then I fought him.
Reversing the order destroys the sequence as a narrative proper or changes it into a different story:

then I fought him.
so he get all upset.

Besides temporally ordered narrative clauses, also other “free” clauses are typically found in stories.
1 so I went in
2 and I had the ball,
3 and I just like turned around
4 and I shot it-
5 didn’t even look
6 and it like hit off the backboard
7 so hard.
8 it was so bad
• For any story we can determine a “skeleton” of narrative clauses and free clauses assigned to specific function elements

  – Abstract, answers the question “What was this about?”
  – Orientation, answers the questions “Who, what, when, where?”
  – Complicating action
  – Evaluation, answers the question “So what?”
  – Result/resolution, answers the question “What finally happened”
  – Coda, puts off further questions about what happened
A simplified version of a spontaneous conversational narrative:

**ABSTRACT**
I remember the most embarrassing moment of my life happened then (during training at Burger King.)

**ORIENTATION**
it was my first job, and I was nervous and there’s so much to learn.
we were learning the drive-through.

**EVALUATION**
just the thought of speaking into that microphone.
I was so embarrassed.

**COMPLICATING**
the first time I had to do it,

**ACTION**
I said: “welcome to McDonald’s.”
and everybody just laughed at me.

**RESULT**
I didn’t try to pull it off as a joke.

**CODA**
that was my very first job.
• Prefaces, formulaic introductions and codas, episodic divisions, discourse markers, chains of co-reference, dialogue, evaluation help create narrative coherence along with skeleton of narrative clauses.

• FIRST JOB
  Ellen what was YOUR first job?
  April first job um,
  oh: that was at the Halsted Burger King
  in Halsted Illinois.
  and I remember,
  the most embarrassing moment of my LIFE happened then. ((laughs))
Ellen: ((laughing)) what does that MEAN? ((laughing)).

April: ((laughing)) um no this is just-
I can’t believe I did this, but- um I was really nerv-
and there’s so much to learn.
I mean y’know there’s so many things at Burger King,
you have to [make and uh-]

Ellen: [how old were you?]
April: I was like a sophomore in high school.
Ellen: okay.
April: yeah, [the summer after my sophomore year.]
Ellen: [you were young,] okay.
April: and um we were learning the drive-through.
and just the thought of speaking on- into that microphone.
and y’know into outside-
Ellen: yes.
April: and you have to pretend to take orders.
and, and I was so embarrassed.
and the FIRST time I had to do it, I said “welcome to McDonald’s,
[may I take your order?”]
Ellen: [oh NO ((laughing))).
April: and everybody just LAUGHED at me ((laughing)).
Ellen: ((laughing)) did you try and pull it off like a joke,
like you meant to say that?
April: no. ((laughing))
Ellen: no.
((laughing)) good job.
April: yeah, that was my very first job.
Analyzing Conversational Storytelling

1  Ned:   what about this flying?  
2   you had a pilot’s license?  
3  Winifred: sure.  
4  Ned:   when- how did you- learn to fly?  
5  Winifred: well ((laughing)) my first s- serious boyfriend became a pilot.  
6   and I got really interested,  
7   I flew with him a lot.  
8   so I decided I’d like to learn to fly myself.  
9  I just love to fly.  
10  so ah-
Ned: was this still- in the thirties, before the war?

Winifred: yeah.

so- I went out to the airport and- just met some people out there and started taking flying lessons.

and the day-

I went up to- with the-

the first- the last flight with a- pilot

Ned: yeah.

Winifred: he said uh did I ever do a barrel roll in a plane?
and I said “no.”

and he said “you wanna try it?”

and I said “sure.” ((laughter))

so he- flipped that thing over

((laughing))

I had- my eye on the odometer

and it kept going down and down

and I thought “oh well, this is it” ((laughter))

I knew I was gonna die that time

‘cause he couldn’t get that thing

back over.

and all of a sudden he got that

thing turn back over
and started climbing
and didn’t say a word for about five minutes. ((laughter))
and finally he said
“Winifred, you do know how to pull that
thing on your parachute, don’t you” ((laughter))
and I didn’t say it
but what I thought
at five hundred feet
the parachute wouldn’t have done much good.
((laughter))
Reducing performance to narrative

- delete listener input
- eliminate disfluencies
- consolidate narrative clauses

1 well ((laughing)) my first serious boyfriend became a pilot.
2 and I got really interested,
3 I flew with him a lot.
4 so I decided I’d like to learn to fly myself.
5 so I went out to the airport
and just met some people out there
and started taking flying lessons.
and the last flight with a pilot
he said uh did I ever do a barrel roll in a
plane?
and I said “no”.
and he said “you wanna try it?”
and I said “sure”. ((laughter))
so he flipped that thing over
((laughing))
I had- my eye on the odometer
and it kept going down and down
and I thought “oh well, this is it”. ((laughter))
I knew I was gonna die that time
‘cause he couldn’t get that thing back over.
and all of a sudden he got that thing turn back over
and started climbing
and didn’t say a word for about five minutes. ((laughter))
and finally he said
“Winifred, you do know how to pull that thing on your parachute, don’t you” ((laughter))
Tagging sections

ORIENTATION
1 I decided I’d like to learn to fly.
2 so I went out to the airport
3 and just met some people out there
4 and started taking flying lessons.

ABSTRACT
5 and the last flight with a pilot
he said uh did I ever do a barrel roll in a plane?
and I said “no”.
and he said “you wanna try it?”
and I said “sure”. ((laughter))
so he flipped that thing over ((laughing))
I had my eye on the odometer
and it kept going down and down
and I thought “oh well, this is it”. ((laughter))
I knew I was gonna die that time
‘cause he couldn’t get that thing back over.
and all of a sudden he got that thing turn back over
and started climbing
and finally he said
“Winifred, you do know how to pull that thing on your parachute, don’t you”. ((laughter))
and I didn’t say it
but what I thought
at five hundred feet
the parachute wouldn’t have done much good.
6.1.3 Plots and motifs

- Characteristic story plots and motifs:
- recurrent scenarios for story types and for individual episodes in larger narratives, e.g. Quest, Journey, Revenge Tragedy etc
- cf. scripts (or dynamic frames) for restaurant, birthday party etc
- Quest: Motivation, Preparation, Journey, Discovery, Confrontation, Victory, Return
- Journey: Departure, Sights, Lost Way, Confrontation, Return
- Most work on motifs is based on folk tales and medieval romances.
- Typical examples are found in children's stories today, e.g. in LING-LING THE LITTLE PANDA
LING-LING THE LITTLE PANDA

In a quiet valley far away from here lived a little panda named Ling-Ling with her mother and father. Ling-Ling was a carefree little panda, but she longed to see the world beyond the bamboo forest. So one day she said goodbye to her sad parents and headed west across the river. Ling-Ling traveled far and wide. She saw mountains and valleys and villages. Once she became quite lost in a dark swamp, but a friendly brown bear helped her find her way out. She even had to run from mean hunters who tried to catch her in their big net. After many days and many miles, Ling-Ling missed her mother and father; she yearned for her quiet valley. Eager to be home again, the little panda hurried back to her old bamboo forest. Her mother and father greeted her with grateful tears and she told them all her adventures. Now Ling-Ling was truly happy and she never left the bamboo forest again.
• LING-LING: JOURNEY MOTIF
(In a quiet valley far away from here lived a little panda named Ling-Ling with her mother and father. Ling-Ling was a carefree little panda, but she longed to see the world beyond the bamboo forest.)

• Departure
So one day she said goodbye to her sad parents and headed west across the river.

• Sights
Ling-Ling traveled far and wide. She saw mountains and valleys and villages.

• Lost Way
Once she became quite lost in a dark swamp, but a friendly brown bear helped her find her way out.
• **Confrontation**
  She even had to run from mean hunters who tried to catch her in their big net. (After many days and many miles, Ling-Ling missed her mother and father; she yearned for her quiet valley. Eager to be home again,)

• **Return**
  the little panda hurried back to her old bamboo forest. Her mother and father greeted her with grateful tears and she told them all her adventures.
  (Now Ling-Ling was truly happy and she never left the bamboo forest again.)

→ By way of review, consider all aspects of cohesion in LING-LING: Reference, Substitution, Ellipsis, Conjoining, Lexical cohesion; also narrative coherence according to Labov
6.2 Jokes

6.2.1 Joke Structure

• Jokes can be poetic (language based) or prosaic (situation based)
• Poetic jokes are generally untranslatable:
  Two Eskimos sitting in a kayak were chilly, but when they lit a fire in the craft, it sank, proving once again that you can't have your kayak and heat it too.
• Prosaic jokes work in any language:
  A girl comes home in tears after the first day at school. Her mother asks what’s wrong, and the girl says: “I can’t read, I can’t write, and now I’m not supposed to talk.”
- Joke structure
  - *build-up* is body of the joke
  - *punchline* structurally closes the joke.
    The punchline semantically reverses the sense expected from build-up
  - *pivot* = word or phrase around which dual meaning potential revolves
A panhandler came up to me today and said he hadn’t had a bite in weeks, so I bit him

- **BUILD-UP A** a panhandler came up to me
  - **BUILD-UP B** he said he hadn’t had a bite in weeks
- **PUNCH C** I bit him

→ “had a bite”
  - belongs structurally to the build-up,
  - functions semantically as the pivot.

- **BUILD-UP A** panhandler came up to me today and said he hadn’t
- **pivot** had a bite in weeks,
- **PUNCH** so I bit him

→ Pun based on idiomatic versus literal meaning of “have a bite”
A guy walks into a bar and orders a beer. He is standing there at the bar and he hears a voice say, “You’re a great looking guy.” He looks around, but there is nobody there. He turns back around and he hears the same voice say, “I think you’re a really good person.” It keeps happening and he keeps looking around, but he can’t see anybody talking. Finally he says to the bartender, “What’s going on here. I keep hearing a voice but when I look around there’s nobody there.” And the bartender says, “It’s the peanuts, They’re complimentary.”
• All build-up till the final punchline: “they're complimentary”
• No pivot as such, just examples of compliments
• Pun based on double meaning of “complimentary”
6.2.2 Jokes performance

• Compare written joke text with performance

Seeing-eye dog (printed text)
A blind man walks into the middle of a department store with his seeing-eye dog. He picks up the dog and swings it around and around by its tail. “May I help you?” asks a saleslady aghast. The blind man replies, “No thanks, I’m just looking.”
→ Seeing-eye dog (transcribed performance)

1 um yeah,
2 there was this blind guy with a seeing-eye dog?
3 and he goes into this department store?
4 and starts swinging the dog around by its tail.
5 a saleslady comes up and asks,
6 “well, may I help you?”
7 and he says,
8 “no thanks, I’m just looking.”
• intonation units versus sentences
• “there is …” construction (line 2)
• “this blind guy” versus “a blind man” (line 2)
• units beginning with “and” (lines 3, 4, 7)
• hesitations (line 1)
• discourse marker (line 6)
• punchlines identical
PEANUTS (performance)

1 Larry: did- didn’t you tell the one about the- the guy in the bar
2 who who suddenly uh- starts hearing these nice things said about him?
3 Claire: what were the nice things?
4 Larry: guy’s standing there at the bar.
5 and he- and this VOICE says,
6 “gee, you're such a GREAT looking guy.”
7 and he looks around and there’s nobody there.
8 turns back around and he hears the same voice say,
“y’know I just think you're a really good person.”

((Several listeners giggle))

y’know he keeps looking around,

he can’t see anybody talking.

and it keeps happening

and he finally says to the bartender, he says,

“What’s- what’s going on here. I keep hearing all these- and I look up-”

and the bartender says,

“It’s the peanuts, they’re complimentary.”

((General laughter))

Claire: now that’s ((laughing)) that’s cute.
characteristic joke syntax,
- missing article:
  "guy's standing there at the bar" (line 4)
- subjectless clause
  "turns back around" (line 8)
- repetition of says:
  "he finally says to the bartender, he says" (line 14)
- false starts:
  "and he- and this VOICE says" (line 5)
  "what's- what's going on" (line 15)
- discourse markers:
  "gee, you’re" (line 6)
  "y’know" (lines 9 and 11).
• rapid accumulation of information occurs just before the punch-line,
• incomplete structures and the switch of perspective:

I keep hearing all these- and I look up-” and the bartender says,
6.3 Instructions as a discourse genre

- Instructions (note plural) are utterances to elicit actions (also called: directions)
- Instruction (no plural) is utterances to effect learning (also called: teaching)
- Instructions are special in having actions (not knowledge) as their aim and effect;
- We can directly observe how Instructions work (or fail to work)
- by following Instructions, someone can learn to accomplish an aim or develop a skill,
- but instructions in the narrower sense are only the action elicitations;
  e.g. classroom instructions aim to get specific actions accomplished ("get out your atlases") rather than to instill any knowledge of geography as such.
Some instructions come from an authority with potential sanctions attached (military officers, supervisors at work, flight attendants in airplanes): recipients follow these out of respect or fear or to get some task accomplished expeditiously.

Other instructions come from a source of information, which recipients seek out for their own benefit (travel directions, recipes, how-to manuals): recipients follow these out of self-interest.
• In terms of illocutionary force, instructions count as directives, canonical directives are realized in direct imperative grammatical form.

• But a set of instructions generally contains moves not themselves directives e.g. to facilitate uptake and insure correct performance of the actions specified.

• Even the directive moves need not be direct (speech acts), i.e. simple imperatives.
• **Variant types of directives**

*Direct imperative*

- hand in your homework
- please hand in your homework
- I want you to hand in your homework
- could you hand in your homework
- it’s time to hand in your homework

*Politeness marker*

- please hand in your homework
- I want you to hand in your homework
- could you hand in your homework
- it’s time to hand in your homework

*Indirect*

- I want you to hand in your homework
- could you hand in your homework
- it’s time to hand in your homework
1st person plural

let’s hand in our homework
now we’re going to hand in our homework

Presupposition

of course you’ve already handed in your homework
you should have all handed in your homework
• The classic form for instructions is a set of imperatives containing active verbs, e.g. descriptions for finding a place, turn left into High Street, and turn left at the first traffic light. then keep on straight to the water tower, take a right just after the water tower, and then take the next street to the right.
• In other contexts such as airplanes and school classrooms, instructions frequently employ positive politeness strategies

at this time we’re asking you to please see that your seat belts are buckled

okay, let’s check our math homework please
• Instructions from third grade math class:

1. if these are not NEAT (1.0)
2. I’ll give them BACK to you. (6.0)
3. Ryan?
4. get to work. (5.0)
5. SO.
6. you're figuring out
7. again
8. how many different ARRAYS.
9. you can find.
to give you those-
PRODUCTS.

you have counters in front of you (2.)
USE them. (5.0)

make sure you PUT the number.
twenty-one (8.0)
do nice neat work.
I’d like to be able to hang these UP.
do a neat JOB.
or get it BACK.
Within the framework of directive utterances in instructions:

- threats and warnings,
  in “if-then” form (lines 1-2)
  and in “do x, or y” (lines 18-19)
- statements with the force of imperatives,
  “you’re figuring out, again, how many different ARRAYS, you can find” (lines 6-9)
- even wishes can take on directive force in the context of instructions,
  “I’d like to be able to hang these UP” (line 17).
- imperatives within the scope of other, more general directives,
  “do x and make sure y” (lines 13-14)
• Instructions may include descriptions, e.g. a picture or an initial example in class:

okay.
so what I want you to DO.
since I said twelve,
using your counters
okay
and your paper and pencil
I want you to see how many different arRAYs
you can make,
that will give you-
an answer.
of twelve.
and you need to work it out just-like this
you have to draw the picture.
count it out first . . .
with your counters.
and then draw the pictures that go with these.
do you understand that?
I want to see the counters used first
and then you transfer from what you do with the counters
onto your paper. ...
just like I did on the board.
how many different ones can you come UP with. that would give you a PROduct. of TWELVE. (6.0) ((children arranging counters)) use your counters? to make the arRAYS, and then draw a PICture of what you did on your paper. (3.0) just like I did on the board. I gave you an arRAY? for TWELVE (1.5) and that’s what you need to do. you need to use your COUNters
to make arrays of twelve ((writing on the board)) use the counters. to make a picture on your desk. and then once you HAVE one … take the information and draw it onto your paper. (6.0)

yeah and make sure you put-put the PROBLEM by it. okay …
• Note verbatim repetitions and rephrasing
• Notice also the use of **okay** and **yeah** to segment instructions,
• as well as the understanding check **do you understand that?**
• More instructions from a third grade math lesson

Teacher:
1 now, if you look at page two, 0, seven,
2 that’s what you have for homework tonight.
3 numbers four to nineteen. (5.0)
4 notice
5 four, five, and six,
6 is exactly the same
7 with what you were just doing,
8 on page two, 0, four.
9 copy-
Kelly, Deanra- (1.0)
and complete.
that means I need to see the pictures
and I need to see the completed problem.
and you’ll notice
that numbers four, five and six,
have a and b underneath them.
make sure:
that you copy it correctly,
and complete it correctly. (3.0)
number seven asks you to draw a picture
that means-
we’re not chatting, Francis, right now. (1.)
it asks you to draw a picture,
what’s another word for to draw a picture?
Nina: product?
I mean: array:
Teacher: array.
product is just the answer.
and then nine and ten,
are word problems,
and then eleven through nineteen is just review. (4.0)
questions.
• besides *Direct imperatives* (e.g. copy and complete, line 9-11),
• moves such as *Explanations* (e.g. that means . . ., line 12),
• *Specifications* (e.g. and I need to see . . ., line 13),
• *Hints* (e.g. you’ll notice . . ., line 15),
• *Reminders* (e.g. make sure . . ., line 18),
• *Understanding checks* (e.g. what’s another word for . . ., line 25)
• *Requests for Feedback* (e.g. questions, last line).
• *Self-interruptions to reprimand students* (lines 10 and 22).
• Next week: WRAP-UP SESSION