The Ethnography of Speaking

Richard Bauman; Joel Sherzer

Annual Review of Anthropology, Vol. 4 (1975), 95-119.

Stable URL:
http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0084-6570%281975%292%3A4%3C95%3ATEOS%3E2.0.CO%3B2-F

Annual Review of Anthropology is currently published by Annual Reviews.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/journals/annrevs.html.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

http://www.jstor.org/
Wed Feb 22 05:17:49 2006

Copyright 1975. All rights reserved

THE ETHNOGRAPHY OF SPEAKING

§ 9554

Richard Bauman and Joel Sherzer
Department of Anthropology, University of Texas, Austin, Texas 78712

INTRODUCTION

The ethnography of speaking has had a relatively brief history as a named field of inquiry, dating back only to 1962 and the appearance of Dell Hymes' seminal essay, "The Ethnography of Speaking" (66). As with any such field of inquiry, however, many precursors can be identified, together with much work that is complementary to or convergent with the ethnography of speaking itself. For the purposes of this review, we have construed the field as narrowly as possible, drawing upon related work where useful or necessary, but maintaining the distinctiveness of the ethnography of speaking as a field of research.

We will first attempt to identify the nature and source of this distinctiveness, both by contrasting the approach of the ethnography of speaking to those of related lines of inquiry within linguistic anthropology and by specifying the particular underlying concerns of the ethnography of speaking itself. We will then proceed to a brief history of the field between 1962 and the present. The most extensive section of the review will attempt to delineate the specific range of problems that have developed as the principal concerns of the ethnography of speaking during the years since its inception. Finally, we will suggest what appear to be emerging as future directions for the field.

LINGUISTIC ANTHROPOLOGY AND THE ETHNOGRAPHY OF SPEAKING

The ethnography of speaking is part of linguistic anthropology, arising out of the traditional anthropological concern with the interrelationships among language, culture, and society. Its focus, however, is upon aspects of interrelationship that are missing from both grammars and ethnographies taken separately or analytically combined. Grammars deal essentially with the structure of languages as abstract and self-contained codes, ethnographies with the patterns and structures of sociocultural life. There is much to be learned through correlation or conflation of these differentially focused products of linguistic and anthropological inquiry, but the ethnography of speaking centers its attention upon

an entirely new order of information, bridging the gap between what is conventionally found in grammars on the one hand and ethnographies on the other; its subject matter is *speaking,* the *use* of language in the conduct of social life.

The special concern with speaking, however, is perfectly compatible with a continued interest in a range of problems that have been of longstanding concern within linguistic anthropology. From this point of view, the ethnography of speaking is not so much a branch or subdiscipline within linguistic anthropology, but a distinctive and complementary approach to a range of basic and well-recognized concerns. The point may be clarified by a series of examples.

Linguistic anthropology traditionally has been concerned with the description of the languages of nonliterate peoples, the peoples anthropologists have tended to study. Thus, anthropological linguists have been the primary source of descriptions of the phonological, syntactic, lexical, and semantic systems of the "exotic" languages of the world. Look for an account of the Apachean languages, for example, and you find such works as Harry Hoijer's basic studies of "The Apachean Verb" (65), devoted to this basic component of the Apachean languages conceived of as linguistic codes. An ethnographer of speaking, however, might tend rather to investigate when the language is used at all, as Keith Basso has done in his article on silence in Western Apache culture (13). By inquiring ethnographically into the range of situations in which, according to informants, "it is right to give up on words" (13, p. 217), Basso was able to determine that the absence of speaking, in Western Apache culture, is associated with social situations in which the status of the focal participants is marked by ambiguity. Under these conditions, established role expectations lose their applicability, and the sense of predictability in social interaction is lost. Basso concludes that "keeping silent among the Western Apache is a response to uncertainty and unpredictability in social relations" (13, p. 227). Thus, where the anthropological linguist would study the grammatical rules by which the language is organized, the ethnographer of speaking is concerned with the cultural rules by which the social use and nonuse of the language is organized.

Another traditional concern of linguistic anthropology is the historical relationships among languages, again especially the languages of the nonliterate peoples typically studied by anthropologists. Here the primary focus has been on genetic groupings, but there is interest as well in the borrowing of linguistic traits and diffusional and areal patterns. Thus, for example, Murray Emeneau (35) has devoted an article to the extensive evidence of lexical, phonological, morphological, and syntactic borrowing among the three major linguistic families of India (Indo-Aryan, Dravidian, and Munda), constituting India as a linguistic area. Ethnographers of speaking are also interested in linguistic diffusion and areal patterns. But the questions they ask have to do with the kinds of actual communicative conditions that are necessary for speakers of genetically unrelated or distantly related languages to pick up features of language or ways of speaking from one another (Sherzer & Bauman 119). [It is for this reason that ethnographers of speaking have played a central role in the studies of pidginization and creolization (see Hymes 74).] Thus Gumperz & Wilson (63)

approach the problem of language convergence along the Indo-Aryan/Dravidian border in India by focusing on interacting social groups within a specific village as they alternate among varieties in their linguistic repertoire in the course of natural conversation. Patterns of social use suggest ways of accounting for patterns of linguistic borrowing.

In recent years, ethnoscience and structural semantics have been important concerns of linguistic anthropologists. Semantic features, relationships, and systems in such domains as kinship, firewood, color, or disease, are analyzed as keys to the elucidation of native cultural categories and systems of classification. Much productive work, for example, has been done on native systems of biological classification; the most exhaustive of these studies is Berlin, Breedlove & Raven's *Studies in Tzeltal Botanical Ethnography: Principles of Classification* (25). Ethnographers of speaking are likewise interested in the structure of semantic systems and their linguistic expression, but, as before, the focus is different, centering on the social use of linguistic forms in speaking. Thus, for a given semantic paradigm, the ethnographer of speaking might ask such questions as, when, why, in what form, and by whom is the paradigm used in speaking? Does it, for example, serve as an organizing principle for a particular form of discourse? Joel Sherzer (118) has recently analyzed an elaborate ethnobotanical taxonomy of hot pepper from the Cuna, of the kind that would likely be of interest to the ethnoscientist. Sherzer's interest, however, is in the fact that this taxonomy constitutes the structural framework for a curing chant, in which it is projected, taxon by taxon, onto a parallelistic verse pattern. The taxonomy is known in full only to specialists in the chant. Its use in the construction of the chant allows for lengthening of the overall performance, which is valued by the Cuna as both medically effective and esthetically pleasing as a form of verbal art.

Linguistic anthropologists have long found it useful to collect the texts of verbal art forms, especially narratives, as a means of obtaining a corpus of natural extended discourse for linguistic analysis (Samarin 110). Traditionally, this analysis has been concentrated upon the sentence as the fundamental unit, but narrative texts of course also provide the wherewithal for the investigation of linguistic patterns beyond the sentence, a developing focus of linguistic interest. Accordingly, linguistic models have been of considerable importance in the development of approaches to the analysis of narrative structure. One might cite the recent work of William Labov and his associates, who collected a corpus of narratives as a means of assembling a body of basic linguistic data in their New York City study (90), but who have also been interested in the structure of narrative itself. The structural units of narratives in the model developed by Labov & Waletzky (93) are linguistic units, i.e. clauses; the analysis employs linguistic techniques in the elucidation of linguistic structures beyond the sentence. The study of verbal art has also been a prominent interest of the ethnography of speaking. This is hardly surprising, since the verbal art forms of a community and the situations in which they appear are frequently the most conspicuous, attractive, or powerful sectors of the speech economy of that

community, in the eyes of participant and ethnographer alike. A principal concern in the ethnography of spoken verbal art is with the performance or other communicative uses of verbal art forms in social interaction. Thus, Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett's analysis of "A Parable in Context" (86), like Labov & Waletzky's study, also deals with narrative in a modern urban setting, and also involves the close analysis of a text, but centers on the use of the parable for rhetorical purposes within a specific situation and the relationship between the structure of the narrative as told and the structure of social relations within that situation. The concern is with the use of the spoken form in the conduct of social life.

In attempting to elucidate the distinctiveness of the ethnography of speaking as a perspective or approach within linguistic anthropology, we have relied initially on contrast, attempting to clarify the special concerns of the ethnography of speaking in terms of their complementarity to those of other sectors of linguistic anthropology with reference to a series of broader disciplinary concerns. Let us now proceed to a more explicit delineation of the field.

The ethnography of speaking is concerned first of all with patterns and functions of speaking, patterns and functions that organize the use of language in the conduct of social life. The fundamental premise of the ethnography of speaking, consistent with its roots in anthropology, is an essentially relativistic one, the understanding that speaking, like other systems of cultural behavior—kinship, politics, economics, religion, or any other—is patterned within each society in culture-specific, cross-culturally variable ways. This relativism extends beyond the scope of the traditional linguistic relativism [now also called into question by Hymes (71, 77)] which holds that all languages, no matter how they may differ from each other in structure, are equally capable of serving the communicative purposes of their speakers. The foundation of the ethnography of speaking is built rather on the premise that the variability of linguistic structures across languages is only part of our concern as linguistic anthropologists; we must investigate also the cross-cultural variability of the patterns that organize the use of language in speaking and the functions that are served by speaking in society (69). These patterns and functions are to be discovered through ethnography.

Consistent with current views of the nature and purpose of ethnography, the ethnography of speaking may be conceived of as research directed toward the formulation of descriptive theories of speaking as a cultural system or as part of cultural systems. In order to construct such theories, we need to formulate, heuristically for the present but theoretically later, the range of things that might enable us to comprehend the organization of speaking in social life, the relevant aspects of speaking as a cultural system.

METHODS AND MILESTONES

The ethnography of speaking first emerged as a named field of inquiry in 1962, with the publication of Dell Hymes' essay, "The Ethnography of Speaking"

(66). The essay was essentially programmatic, identifying a hitherto neglected area of study for anthropology and outlining a framework for its study. Hymes endeavored to fill the gap between what is usually described in grammars and what is usually described in ethnographies: both use speech as evidence of other patterns; neither brings it into focus in terms of its own patterns. The ethnography of speaking, as conceived by Hymes, was to be concerned with the situations and uses, the patterns and functions of speaking as an activity in its own right. Emphasizing the need for fieldwork, Hymes outlined a framework for the ethnography of speaking, based upon Roman Jakobson's six-part model of a communication system (82). Hymes' model consists of seven components, separating into two components the referential and situational aspects of what Jakobson has labeled "context." Thus, every speech event involves as systemically interrelated components: 1. a Sender (Addresser); 2. a Receiver (Addressee); 3. a Message Form; 4. a Channel; 5. a Code; 6. a Topic; and 7. a Setting (Scene, Situation). Corresponding to these seven factors are seven types of function: 1. Expressive (Emotive); 2. Directive (Conative, Pragmatic, Rhetorical, Persuasive); 3. Poetic; 4. Contact; 5. Metalinguistic; 6. Referential; 7. Contextual (Situational). These functions are associated most directly with their correspondingly numbered components, and are most easily identifiable in utterances focused on those respective components, but Hymes stresses that all features of the speech event may participate in all the functions.

Much the same model, with the addition of an eighth element, the event itself, and a more sophisticated dynamic approach to the concept of function, was presented in Hymes' introduction to the special publication of the *American Anthropologist* on *The Ethnography of Communication* (61), edited jointly with John Gumperz and published 2 years after his original essay. *The Ethnography of Communication* is made up largely of contributions by a group of anthropologists and linguists from California—10 of the 14 contributors were then at Berkeley or Stanford. The organizing principle of the collection was a shared interest in language as situated within communicative events, from a perspective which viewed communicative form and function as standing in integral relation to one another. Like the earlier essay by Hymes, *The Ethnography of Communication* was essentially a programmatic work; the contributions are indentified by Hymes as converging and contributing toward the ethnography of communication, but by implication not yet exemplifying it. Some of the papers are conceptual, some substantive, but only the contribution by Gumperz, on "Linguistic and Social Interaction in Two Communities" (55) reports on fieldwork expressly and primarily undertaken for a purpose which might appropriately be called the ethnography of speaking. The other contributions are relevant insofar as they deal with the kinds of problems and concerns that are involved in the ethnography of speaking. The papers on " 'Rhetoric,' 'Logic,' and 'Poetics' in Burundi" by Albert (10) and on "How to Ask for a Drink in Subanun" by Frake (42) are ethnographically derived accounts of the cultural patterning of speaking in particular societies, but are the byproducts of fieldwork undertaken with other problems in view. As before, Hymes urges in his "Introduction: Toward Eth-

nographies of Communication" (67) that fieldwork devoted to the ethnography of speaking in its own right be undertaken, presenting as a guide for the purpose a framework substantially similar to the one outlined earlier in "The Ethnography of Speaking."

Five of the contributors to *The Ethnography of Communication,* including Gumperz and Hymes, were also included in William Bright's *Sociolinguistics* (31), published 2 years later, but based upon a conference held in 1964. It is worth remarking that the appearance of Bright's book represented the most substantial linking, up to that point, of the ethnography of speaking with the developing discipline of sociolinguistics, its strongest prior identification having been with linguistic anthropology [the implications of these and related terms are discussed by Hymes; on the general relationship between sociolinguistics and the ethnography of speaking, see Hymes (68, 78).]

In a special issue of the *Journal of Social Issues* on "Problems of Bilingualism," edited by John Macnamara and published in 1967 (95), Hymes (70) renewed his call for fieldwork in the ethnography of speaking, but presented a more fully adapted and developed framework for the purpose than in his two earlier articles. A collection on bilingualism represented an appropriate context within which to present this new formulation, "Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Setting," as bilingualism is the most widely recognized form of linguistic diversity in communities, and as such has been of considerable interest in the ethnography of speaking; John Gumperz (56) and Susan Ervin-Tripp (36), another contributor to *The Ethnography of Communication,* also contributed to the issue. By the time of writing, Hymes had been working with a substantial body of ethnographic data on speaking, much of it abstracted from general ethnographies. This work proved the earlier framework to be in need of refinement to be maximally useful for the ethnography of speaking. Accordingly, Hymes adapted, rearranged, and extended his earlier model of a speech event, devoting attention also to the problem of the social locus of description. As reformulated, the framework is coded mnemonically by **SPEAKING,** thus: **S**etting, or Scene; **P**articipants or Personnel; **E**nds (both goals/purposes and outcomes); **A**ct Characteristics (both the form and the content of what is said); **K**ey (tone, manner, or spirit in which an act is done); **I**nstrumentalities (channel and code); **N**orms of Interaction and of Interpretation; **G**enres (categories or types of speech act and speech event). Hymes makes clear that this heuristic set of components is not to be viewed as a checklist of discrete elements by emphasizing the need for statements concerning the interrelationships among components.

This model of the interaction of language and social setting was later adapted and expanded in a revised version of the article (76), but the 1967 version, as well as the earlier 1962 framework, are the ones that have guided most of the work on the ethnography of speaking that has appeared in print thus far. We should also mention in this context the "Outline Guide for the Ethnographic Study of Speech Use," by Joel Sherzer and Regna Darnell (120). Growing out of the same project that led to the development of the SPEAKING model, Sherzer &

Darnell's guide is divided into five sections, covering areas which had been addressed to greater or lesser extent in Hymes' articles, but framing them in a way that is most useful for fieldworkers. The problem areas covered in the outline guide are: 1. analysis of the use of speech; 2. attitudes toward the use of speech; 3. acquisition of speaking competence; 4. the use of speech in education and social control; 5. typological considerations.

The third of Sherzer & Darnell's problem areas is itself the focus of the most comprehensive and detailed field guide in the ethnography of speaking, *A Field Manual for Cross-Cultural Study of the Acquisition of Communicative Competence* (second draft—July 1967) (123), edited by Dan Slobin and written by a faculty-student team at Berkeley. The *Manual* is designed on the premise that "language acquisition studies should be broadened to include not only the traditional formal core of language, but competence in the use of language" (123, p. x), and that such studies need to be conducted ethnographically. The sections of the *Manual* bearing most centrally on the sociocultural matrix of language use were written for the most part by Ervin-Tripp and Gumperz, and represent a substantial contribution to the conceptual and methodological literature on the ethnography of speaking.

One may discern in the history of academic disciplines particular points at which consolidations are made, trends emerge, and new disciplinary configurations become clear. For the ethnography of speaking, 1972 was such a benchmark year, coincidentally marking the end of the first decade since the appearance of Hymes' original essay. The year was noteworthy, first of all, for a number of significant publications which indicate important directions and influences for the field. Pivotal here was *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication* (62), edited by Gumperz and Hymes, essentially a sequel to their 1964 compilation. To an extent, the volume looks back over the prior development of the field: eight of the fourteen contributors to the original work are represented also in the new collection, several of the contributions are reprints of articles published earlier in other places, and Hymes' own contribution (76) is an elaboration of his 1967 article on "Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Setting" (70). At the same time, the collection includes new work by students of Gumperz and Hymes, including the "Outline Guide" by Sherzer & Darnell (120) and an important paper on Black English by Claudia Mitchell-Kernan (99). Particularly significant are three articles by sociologists Harold Garfinkel (45), Harvey Sacks (106), and Emmanuel Schegloff (114). The 1964 collection included a paper by sociologist Erving Goffman (48), with whose work the contributions by Garfinkel, Sacks, and Schegloff have certain basic affinities, but the inclusion of three separate articles by the latter group marked especially strongly the emerging rapprochement between ethnomethodology and the ethnography of speaking, based upon a common interest in patterns, uses, and functions of language as an instrument of social life. This shared interest is evident as well in a second volume that appeared in the same year, *Studies in Social Interaction,* edited by David Sudnow (128), a collection of ethnomethodological studies devoted most cen-

trally to conversation in social interaction. Garfinkel (46), Sacks (105), and Schegloff (113) are represented here as well, as is William Labov, a contributor to both volumes by Gumperz & Hymes. Labov's paper on "Rules for Ritual Insults" (92) is included also in Thomas Kochman's book, *Rappin' and Stylin' Out: Communication in Urban Black America* (88), a third volume published in the same year, in which the ethnography of speaking has a significant place. Kochman's own contribution, "Toward an Ethnography of Black American Speech Behavior" (89), is especially noteworthy in this connection, as are the papers by Roger D. Abrahams (4) and Claudia Mitchell-Kernan (98). Taken all together, the work by the sociologists in the Gumperz & Hymes and Sudnow volumes and the ethnographic work we have mentioned on Black English give an especially strong indication of the extent to which the ethnographic perspective on speaking was being turned to the illumination of aspects of contemporary American society in addition to the more remote milieux traditionally studied by anthropologists.

In 1964, the promise of the relationship between the ethnography of speaking and sociology was far from clear; by 1972, as we have indicated, it was readily apparent. Much the same might be said of another discipline, namely, folklore. Like sociology, folklore was represented by one contribution in *The Ethnography of Communication,* "Proverbs and the Ethnography of Speaking Folklore," by E. Ojo Arewa and Alan Dundes (11). Dundes also participated in *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication* with an article on "The Strategy of Turkish Boys' Verbal Dueling Rhymes," co-authored by Jerry W. Leach and Bora Özkök (34), but the strongest signs of the developing rapprochement between folklore and the ethnography of speaking lay elsewhere, in a volume edited by Américo Paredes and Richard Bauman, entitled *Toward New Perspectives in Folklore* (100) (originally published in 1971 as a special issue of the *Journal of American Folklore).* Verbal art had always been at the center of folklore as a field of study, and a natural focus for ethnographic studies of spoken forms; in the Paredes & Bauman volume the contributions by Bauman (17, 18) and Ben-Amos (24) argue for the reorientation of folkloristics toward the ethnography of artistic verbal performance, while Hymes (75) suggests that the lead taken by folklorists in the conceptualization and study of genre and performance might contribute toward the further development of the ethnography of speaking itself, where these are equally central matters. *Toward New Perspectives in Folklore* also contains two articles based directly upon fieldwork in the ethnography of verbal folklore: Dennis Tedlock's paper on Zuni (129) and Gary Gossen's on Chamula (52).

Three more developments of 1972 remain to be mentioned. The first is the inception of the journal *Language in Society,* under the editorship of Dell Hymes. While the charter of *Language in Society* encompasses essentially the whole field of sociolinguistics, it has, not surprisingly, been the source of publication for a number of significant papers on the ethnography of speaking.

The second event was the Twenty-third Annual Georgetown University Roundtable, dedicated in that year to "Sociolinguistics: Current Trends and

Prospects." Although the ethnography of speaking per se was not a focus of the roundtable, its themes and concerns were closely linked to topics discussed in the large plenary sessions and small interest group sessions. The roundtable is reported by Shuy (121).

The other event of importance was the Conference on the Ethnography of Speaking, held in Austin, Texas, in April 1972. By that time, the field of the ethnography of speaking had finally developed to the point where a significant number of scholars had taken up the repeated calls for fieldwork issued during the first decade, and carried out original research directly in that area. Acting on the premise that the field would benefit from the coming together of these scholars to present and discuss their findings toward a synthesis, however exploratory, the authors of this review organized the Austin conference. Our view of the present shape of the field, as presented in these pages, derives largely from that conference and work in the two succeeding years on the book which was its outgrowth, *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking* (22).

PRINCIPAL CONCERNS

In the years since the inception of the field, several principal concerns have emerged as central to the ethnography of speaking as practiced. One of the foremost of these has been the elucidation of the complex system of resources available to and utilized by members of a community in the conduct of speaking. Fundamental to the ethnography of speaking is a departure from the one culture-one society-one unitary language conception underlying traditional language and culture study; empirical study reveals a diverse range of resources put to use in the creation of situated discourse, drawn upon and manipulated in the conduct of speaking in social life.

Means of Speaking

Among the resources of interest to the ethnographer are those we might call, following Hymes (79), the means of speaking, such as linguistic repertoire, genres, acts, and frames—the building blocks out of which utterances are fashioned. The linguistic repertoire of a community is "the totality of linguistic resources (i.e. including both invariant forms and variables) available to members" of that community (58, p. 21). The repertoire or segments of it, may, of course, be described in abstract formal terms, but that would be antithetical to the purposes of the ethnography of speaking; the ethnographer is interested rather in the socioexpressive meanings inherent in the use of linguistic features or systems, the ways in which their use as such conveys social meaning.

The focus of attention in the study of the social meaning of linguistic forms may be as limited in scope as a single linguistic feature. Consider, for example, Paul Friedrich's analysis of nineteenth century Russian pronominal usage (44). The linguistic repertoire made available to speakers two forms for the second person singular, *ty* and *vy*, but actual usage covaried with no fewer than ten socioexpressive factors. It is worth noting, with reference to Friedrich's study,

that it is nonetheless exemplary of the ethnography of speaking as an approach for being based on evidence concerning speaking in social interaction from novels, for "ethnographic accuracy was an aesthetic imperative" (44, p. 274) in the Russian literature of this period. What is necessary are accurate data concerning speaking in social life, whether derived from fieldwork, literature, historical documents, or some other reliable source.

Friedrich's study illustrates how complex and revealing the analysis of a single feature of linguistic repertoire can be, but most studies of linguistic repertoire tend to focus on those larger systems of co-occurrent features making up the speech varieties and registers within the community, the former associated with social groups, the latter with recurrent types of situations (Hymes 79). The question one asks is what are the significant linguistic systems available to members of the community, and what meanings and functions do they carry? In the heavily multilingual Northwest Amazon, tribal languages play an important symbolic role in the regulation of marriage, in what amounts to a system of linguistic exogamy (81). On the Indonesian island of Roti, local dialect contrasts provide the wherewithal for an elaborate ritual tradition of canonical parallelism (40). Among the Malagasy of the Vakinankaratra, the contrasting speech styles of *kabary* and *resaka* symbolize respectively good, indirect, male, cermonial speech versus bad, direct, female, worldly speech (84). Examples might be proliferated at length. The concept of linguistic repertoire is a fundamental departure from the traditional conception of one people-one homogeneous and unitary code. In all these cases, the ethnographer is concerned with integrated systems characterized by heterogeneous and diverse repertoires, each with its own structure, each component with its own social meanings and functions within the larger whole.

We stress that the ethnography of speaking, consistent with its sociolinguistic perspective, is concerned with the linguistic repertoire in terms of the structure of its use and role in sociocultural life. The work of Ervin-Tripp, building upon that of Gumperz, is highly suggestive here, arguing that linguistic means are put to use in terms of sociolinguistic rules, which have two aspects—alternation (selection among means) and co-occurrence (syntagmatic organization of means) (37). Basic to the process of selection among means is the social meaning with which particular means are invested in a given community. Where particular means have recognized symbolic significance, the selection process has an essentially sematic component. Thus in the town of Hemnesberget, Norway, studied by Blom & Gumperz (26), a choice between Ranamål, the local dialect, and Bokmål, the standard language, is bound up with differences in social status, place of origin, topic, and other factors, with each of the varieties encoding specific social meanings in these domains. Underlying these choices for the inhabitants of Hemnesberget is the additional factor of values, that it is good to express one's identification with fellow natives and friends and thus to speak dialect with them, that it is proper to be polite to strangers and thus speak standard in their presence, etc. Much of the literature on code-switching is

oriented, most appropriately, toward these factors of the social meaning and values carried by the respective codes.

The study of code-switching has proven both a frustrating and rewarding area of research. It has become quite clear that it is impossible to predict (in terms of linguistic and social factors) every code switch in advance of its occurrence, especially in instances of rapid code switching. Rather, the distinction between situational and metaphorical switching (Blom & Gumperz 26, Gumperz & Hernandez 60) or predictive, unmarked switches and interpretive, marked switches (Sankoff 111) is a crucial one. Drawing on her research among the Buang of New Guinea, Sankoff argues that in switches among three languages (Buang, Neo-Melanesian, and Yabem) certain factors tend to be predictive (receiver's ethnic identity, situation, topic, channel) while others tend to be interpretive (tone, speaker's linguistic competence and impression he wishes to convey about himself, message form). In sum, code switches always have social meaning. In some cases the social situation conditions the switch; in others it is the switch itself that provides the new social meaning to the verbal interaction.

In addition to linguistic repertoires, verbal genres also represent means of speaking inasmuch as they constitute culturally conventionalized utterance types which can be employed in the construction of discourse. Genres are verbal forms organized at a level beyond the grammar. The concept of genre has long been especially central to folklore, where the focus of attention is on the esthetically marked genres, but much of the attention of traditional folkloristics has been on etic genre systems, oriented principally toward comparative study (Ben-Amos 23). When approached ethnographically as part of the means of speaking of a particular community, the task is one of discovering the culture-specific generic forms and systems in terms of which members of the community organize the domain of speaking. The most comprehensive study of a native system of verbal genres is Gossen's elucidation of the Chamula native taxonomy of the domain *sk'op kirsano* "people's speech" (52). It is interesting that Gossen found agreement among informants to four taxonomic levels; below that both agreement and taxonomic structure began to dissipate. This, however, is the point at which Brian Stross finds the problem intriguing (127); he has collected and analyzed 416 generic terms for speaking from the neighboring Tenejapa Tzeltal below the level analyzed by Gossen. Together, the work of Gossen and Stross plus that of Victoria Bricker (30), presents an impressively extensive picture of the native genres of an area.

With reference to the native organization of the domain of speaking, the members of a community may conceptualize speech activity in terms of acts rather than genres. Speech acts and genres are, of course, analytically distinct, the former having to do with speech behavior, the latter with the verbal products of that behavior. A speech act is an utterance looked at from a functional point of view, a way of doing something with words, to paraphrase J. L. Austin (12). [For an application of Austin's theory of speech acts in the ethnography of speaking, see Foster (39).] It is in this sense that a community's range of speech

acts constitute means for the conduct of speaking—they represent conventionalized ways of doing things with words, ready-organized building blocks with which to construct discourse.

Much of the work on speech acts in the ethnography of speaking has been approached in terms of the larger framework of events (see below), although there has been some significant work devoted to speech acts themselves. Interestingly, this work has been concentrated in large part on Afro-American cultures. Claudia Mitchell-Kernan has published a number of studies devoted to a range of Afro-American speech acts, in particular *signifying, loud-talking,* and *marking* (97–99). Some of the same acts and related ones have been studied by Labov and his colleagues in the course of their extensive work on Black English vernacular in New York City (90). Thomas Kochman (89) has analyzed a more comprehensive series of speech acts characteristic of urban Black culture, and elucidated the relationships among them, based upon his research in the Chicago area. Kochman has stressed in particular the adaptive potential of the speech acts he has analyzed. One of the first scholars to undertake the ethnographic study of Afro-American speech patterns was Roger D. Abrahams. Abrahams' most recent and comprehensive work is an attempt to synthesize his own and others' studies in terms of a native taxonomy of Afro-American speech acts and a semantic analysis of each of the terms within it (7). A comparative perspective is provided by Abrahams & Bauman's taxonomic study of native terms for speech acts in St. Vincent, within the framework of the symbolic and evaluative dimensions of the domain of speaking in St. Vincentian culture (9).

The final means of speaking we will discuss, one that bears an important relation to both genres and acts, is the frame. The notion of frame is drawn chiefly from Bateson, though the component of a speech event that Hymes labels "key" is related to frames. A frame is a metacommunicative device which signals the interpretive context within which a message is to be understood, a set of interpretive guidelines for discriminating between orders of message (Bateson 14, pp. 177–93, 222). Examples of frames might be joking, in which the words spoken are to be interpreted as not seriously meaning what they might otherwise mean, imitation, in which the manner and/or matter of speaking is to be interpreted as being modeled after that of another person or persons, and translation, in which the words spoken are to be interpreted as the equivalent of words originally spoken in another language or code. Framing is accomplished through the employment of culturally conventionalized metacommunication, i.e. each speech community will make use of a structured set of distinctive communicative means from among its resources in culturally conventionalized and culture-specific ways to signal or key [to use Goffman's term (50)] the range of frames available to members. Frames constitute means of speaking insofar as they represent culturally provided mechanisms which are intrinsic to utterances, one of the building blocks of utterances. An act or genre may remain constant or identifiable across frames in a series of utterances, but different frames will transform the utterances in which the acts or genres are employed into functionally and semantically different forms. A myth may be rendered

playfully or as performance, a command may be given seriously or jokingly, with both meaning and function different in the two latter as opposed to the two former cases. Our discussion of frames as a means of speaking is more general and definitional than the discussions of other means because there has been very little work published on frames thus far, although their relevance to the ethnography of speaking has been established in print. Bauman (21) has recently published a conceptual article, from the perspective of the ethnography of speaking and with ethnographic examples, of performances as a frame constitutive of verbal art. Goffman's book on *Frame Analysis* (50), which develops and applies the concept of frame, promises to be a milestone work in the field. For the most part, however, the work remains to be done.

Social Roles and Communicative Competence

To consider linguistic repertoires, genres, acts, and frames as means of speaking is not to approach them as an inventory of abstract phenomena to be described solely in formal terms. At the center of the ethnography of speaking remains the conduct of speaking, in which the means are employed by actual speakers in the course of social life. Consideration of the speakers themselves and of social roles as they relate to speaking has been another focus of interest in the ethnography of speaking.

Societies seem to vary considerably with regard to the degree to which language and speech enter into the definition of roles. Toward one extreme perhaps might be the Cuna, for whom speaking is a cultural focus; most Cuna roles are achieved rather than ascribed, and most are defined quite explicitly in terms of speaking ability (Sherzer 117). Toward the other extreme are the La Have Islanders, for whom speaking is not a self-consciously important domain, and who do not define any of the roles in their social structure with reference to speaking (Bauman 19).

Not only role definitions, but role dynamics may be centrally bound up with speaking. Bauman (20) has analyzed the role conflict to which the seventeenth-century Quaker minister was especially susceptible by virtue of his role as a speaker in a society which placed paramount moral value on silence. We are not accustomed to looking for the roots of role conflict in a society's patterns of speaking, but this is the very point of doing ethnographies of speaking, to uncover the variety of distinctive ways that speaking ramifies through social and cultural life, without taking any aspect of the domain for granted.

The relationship between speaking and social roles has received especial attention in the study of Afro-American patterns of speaking. Kochman has devoted an entire section of his book (88) to expressive role behavior, including both scholarly and literary treatments of the communicative correlates of certain Black roles. Among all the students of Afro-American ways of speaking, Abrahams has been most actively concerned with the expressive component of roles. Based upon his work in Afro-American societies in the United States and the West Indies, Abrahams has identified a general Afro-American role type he calls "the man of words," with two subtypes, the "sweet talker," whose

performances build upon the elevated use of oratorical standard English, and the "broad talker," who raises the vernacular to the level of verbal art (2, 3). Especially valuable have been Abrahams' studies of the sociocultural matrix within which the man of words acquires his competence (4, 6).

Until quite recently, ethnographic studies of speaking and social roles in Afro-American society dealt all but exclusively with male patterns and roles. Beginnings have been made, however, toward redressing the imbalance, including Beverly Stoeltje's article on the expressive role behavior of Black women (125) and the more extensive survey by Abrahams (8). Margaret Brady (29) has approached the problem from a developmental point of view, with particular reference to folklore forms and the way in which they figure in the sociolinguistic development of Black girls. Martha C. Ward's monograph, *Them Children* (131), deals ethnographically with speech development among both sexes of Black children in a Louisiana parish.

Both problems, of course—the acquisition of communicative competence and the relationship between speaking and sex roles—have relevance beyond the Afro-American context discussed above. The literature includes ethnographic studies of acquisition and development of aspects of the linguistic repertoire (e.g. Blount 28, Kernan 85, Stross 126), as well as the development of children's competence in peer group interactions (McDowell 96) and interactions with adults (Blount 27). Hymes has been especially concerned with the development of a conception of communicative competence consistent with the basic premises of the ethnography of speaking in a way that Chomsky's abstract and purely mentalistic conception is not. Hymes' notion of competence is a competence for use, involving the knowledge and ability to speak in ways that are both grammatical and socially appropriate (70, 73; see also 65, 120).

With reference again to men and women, Keenan (84) shows that the distinction between two styles of speaking—the elegant, allusive and valued *kabary* and the plainer, more concrete and direct *resaka,* constitutes an important aspect of sex-role definition among the Malagasy of the Vakinankaratra, for *kabary* is conceived of by both sexes as the province of men and *resaka* of women. The difference between men's and women's speech may be seen in broader terms as one of differential access to resources of speaking within communities. This is a problem of very great practical as well as theoretical interest, deserving of far more attention than it has hitherto received. One of the few works to address this phenomenon directly is Goldstein's pioneering study in the ethnography of verbal folklore on riddling traditions in northeastern Scotland (51).

Speech Events

The description of means of speaking and their availability to speakers is important to the ethnography of speaking as a way of beginning to specify how speaking is patterned in particular communities. For the actual performance of speaking, however, as it is embedded within and instrumental to the conduct of social life, the frame of reference and unit of analysis is the event or scene, the

point at which speakers and means come together in use. From the very first, the analysis of speech events has been central to the ethnography of speaking as empirical contexts within which speech activity is situated and acquires meaning.

This focus on the event as the unit of analysis rests upon an ample conceptual base. Jakobson's original model (82), which was influential in the development of Hymes' framework for the ethnography of speaking, was in effect a model of a speech event. Hymes himself has devoted considerable attention to the notion of the speech event. The SPEAKING mnemonic (70, 76) is a guide to the components of a speech event; thus the event may serve as the point of departure for the elucidation of the components and their interrelationships, with any of the components providing an entree into the event. The event as the unit of analysis also derives support from other analytical constructs that have figured in the recent development of ethnographic and social interactional theory. Particularly influential have been Frake's emphasis on the importance of the scene in ethnographic description (41) and Goffman's work on encounters (47).

There is some potential for confusion in the terminology employed in this sphere of the ethnography of speaking. The most general term is Frake's "scene," which is any culturally defined bounded segment of the flow of activity and experience. With reference specifically to speaking, Hymes (70, 76) has distinguished between the speech event, a scene that is best described in terms of rules for speaking, and the speech situation, in which speaking occurs but which is organized in terms of another order of activity; in terms of concrete examples, the difference is that between a political debate and a football game. While this is an important conceptual distinction, it has not been prominent in the ethnographic literature, principally because ethnographers of speaking have concentrated their attention overwhelmingly on what are, in Hymes' terms, speech events. There has thus been a tendency to use the term "event" in a general, unmarked sense, to designate all scenes analyzed in the ethnography of speaking, and we have followed this usage here.

Because of the very nature of the speech event, descriptions of such events are characteristically framed in terms of the integration of the diverse components out of which they are constructed. At the same time, individual studies do tend to foreground one or another element or structural principle. The discussion that follows will exploit that tendency as a basis from which to make clear some of the principal themes that characterize the description of speech events, but it should be borne in mind that the integrated, systemic nature of the events is always a central theme as well.

The highest level problem in the study of speech events is that of identifying the events themselves in ways consistent with native understandings and sufficient to differentiate them from each other. This is the problem to which Frake's study of Yakan litigation (43) is addressed, i.e. how to identify an event as litigation *(hukum)* by contrast with all the other events labelled by natives *magbissāh* "talking to each other." Frake proceeds by structural semantic analysis in terms of four semantic features (topic, purpose, role structure, and

integrity) to differentiate litigation from discussion, conference, and negotiation, the remaining three events in the set.

Frequently one of the most salient features of speech events is the setting, or range of settings, in which they occur. This, in fact, may be a definitive attribute, as, for example, among the La Have Islanders of Nova Scotia, for whom the principal speech event is a session of talk at the general store (Bauman 19, cf Faris 38). Abrahams has identified the distinction between house, yard, and crossroads as diagnostic of speech events in St. Vincent (4), and house and street as basic to the differentiation of speech events among urban Blacks in the United States (7).

In the determination of the structure of speech events, several kinds of organizing principles have proven especially fruitful. It may be revealing, for instance, to distinguish general social interactional ground rules which give structure to particular events or classes of events within a community. Some of these ground rules are general and diffuse, extending beyond speech events and establishing the continuity between speaking and other forms of expressive behavior. Philips, for example, demonstrates that there is a unified set of rules which regulate participation in a range of scenes on the Warm Springs Reservation in Oregon, including traditional religious events (such as wakes, memorial dinners, and religious feasts), war dances, and general councils (102).

Other types of ground rules are more closely tied to speech itself. Thus Goffman (49) and Sacks, Schegloff, and their associates (108, 115), in their studies of (essentially American white middle class) conversation, point to interchanges of utterance pairs as a basic organizing principle. Sacks and Schegloff argue that the complications of conversation can often be reduced to the operation of two basic rules, namely, that one person talks at a time, and that silence must be repaired. That not all societies share these rules is demonstrated by Reisman (103), who discusses Antiguan peasants, among whom, in a range of situations, one is likely to hear an entire group maintaining what Reisman terms a "contrapuntal conversation," with all voices participating simultaneously, each aggressively carrying its own burden.

A larger element of personal competence and volition enters into a further factor giving shape to speech events, namely, the social interactional strategies employed by the participants as they manipulate the resources available to them in the course of events. Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (86) carefully documents the use of a parable in a corrective interchange, in which she examines the alternative means available to her informant for use in that situation and the way in which her goals led her to the strategy of employing the indirection of a parable for corrective purposes and to the selection of a particular story for the purpose. More general is Irvine's demonstration (80) that within the basic structure of an obligatory dyadic greeting exchange in the Wolof greeting there is room for strategic manipulation in which two individuals can affect their own rank and especially the nature of their subsequent interaction. Salmond (109) shows that the social relationships among participants in Maori rituals of encounter cause

the rituals to develop into oratorical contests, and she articulates the strategies available to the contestants.

Several points are worth noting about the Irvine and Salmond analyses. Both are exemplary cases of the systematic elucidation of event structures in terms of a succession of interrelated acts. This succession of acts serves as a coherent framework for an integrated accounting of the personnel, forms, and strategies that go into the production of discourse. Frake's account of drinking encounters in Subanun (42) is also worthy of mention in this connection.

Irvine and Salmond's analyses, as well as others by Sherzer (116) and Hymes (76), are rendered all the more systematic by their utilization of formal means drawn from transformational-generative grammar in the exposition of the structures with which they are concerned. Formalization for the mere sake of formalization is not a goal of the ethnography of speaking any more than it is a goal of other approaches to the study of language and speech. Rather, formal rules help to systematize description and bring out aspects of the relationship of speaking to social life that would not otherwise be apparent. Formal description forces attention to structure, and, as Hymes (76) has noted further, it is through formal statements that one can make a precise claim as to what it is a member of society must know in knowing how to participate in a speech act or event. Grimshaw (54) stresses in addition that formalization reveals and highlights parallels with other domains and across systems, thus opening up possibilities for a unified theory of human behavior.

The ethnography of speaking shares with the rest of anthropology an interest in describing cultural life in terms of general patterns of expectation and activity. But by focusing on events as the major unit of analysis, and analyzing them at the closely focused level of speaking interaction, the ethnographer of speaking is especially closely attuned to the unique and emergent qualities of events and other structures related to speaking. The concept of emergence is necessary to the ethnography of speaking as a means toward comprehending the uniqueness of individual events within the context of speaking as a generalized cultural system in a community. All speech events are in some ways unique, and one wants to be able to appreciate the individuality of each, as well as the general structure common to all.

Interest in emergent structures has centered chiefly on three aspects of the speech event: the event itself, the text, and the social structure. In the marriage *kabary* of the plateau Malagasy (Keenan 83), the ground rules for the event, as negotiated and asserted by the participants, shift and fluctuate during the course of the event itself under the pressures of competition and conflicting interest. This makes for an especially variable and shifting event structure, and it is the factors that make for this variability that represent the principal focus of Keenan's analysis. Darnell (33) describes a narrative performance on the part of an elderly Cree narrator that is especially noteworthy in that it involved the ethnographer and her husband as central participants, and took place under such conditions of change that the narrator could neither have experienced its like

before nor anticipated its configuration. Nevertheless, the narrator was able to use his competence creatively to carry off a performance.

Darnell's analysis attunes us to another type of emergent structure as well. Folklorists have tended to work with texts as abstract forms, with an ideal normal form as the frame of reference. The ethnographic study of texts emergent in performance events has made it possible to comprehend the uniqueness of folkloric texts as performed in terms of the interplay between traditional means, individual competence, and the interactional dynamics of the specific situation. The text of the traditional tale eventually told by Darnell's narrator could only have been the product of that unique event. Lord's (94) pioneering study of the Serbocroatian epic singer should be mentioned as an important precursor of this kind of analysis; Sacks' study of the telling of a traditional dirty joke in conversation (107) is a model of closely focused investigation of this same phenomenon.

In the study of social structures as emergent in speech events, the lead has been taken by the ethnomethodologists, who share a community of interest with the ethnographers of speaking insofar as speaking is the principal instrument by which social structures are created in the course of and through social interaction. However, the creation of structures of social relations is a prominent theme in the ethnography of speaking as well; it is central to Irvine's study of Wolof greetings (80), Rosaldo's analysis of Ilongot oratory (104), Bauman's essay on verbal art as performance (21), and others.

Speech Community

Our consideration of the resources of means available for the conduct of speaking in social life has required that we ask also to whom they are available, by whom they are used, and to whom are to be attributed the patterns that are inherent in or emergent from this activity of speaking, an activity worthy of study in and for itself. This leads us to the question of the social unit or locus of description of speaking, whether speaking is viewed in terms of means and resources, events, or emergent discourse structures. Not infrequently in the ethnography of speaking, this question is not problematic, in that ethnographers of speaking conduct their inquiry and analysis in terms of social units that are more or less standard as loci of description in ethnography generally—a village (Tenejapa, Chiapas), an identifiable ethnic group or tribe (the Apache), an ecologically delimited geographical area such as an island (Roti), a religious denomination (the Quakers), an Indian reservation (Warm Springs), etc. There are, of course, important theoretical issues involved in such practices for anthropology generally, but most of these are beyond the scope of this review. [For an excellent discussion see Hymes (72).]

Some aspects of the problem of the locus or unit of description for speech, however, are fundamental to the conceptual framework of the ethnography of speaking and must be addressed. The most important point is that no matter what the societal locus of description may be, it is conceived of as fundamentally an organization of diversity [in the sense of Wallace (130)], insofar as access to

and command of resources for speaking as well as knowledge and ability for the conduct of speaking (i.e. speaking competence) are differentially distributed among members of the social unit. This is the only perspective consistent with a line of inquiry that focuses in substantial part on the ethnography of events in the manner outlined above, and takes as one of its fundamental points of departure the diversity of resources for speaking in any social unit. In the same way, patterns of speaking that are revealed by the ethnography of speaking may be attributed collectively to the social unit whose speech economy is being described, but emergent patterns and structures are also at the center of the ethnography of speaking and sustain the perspective of heterogeneity and diversity as well.

The ethnography of speaking is thus radically at odds with the traditional, idealized conception of a speech community as homogeneous and unitary—one society, one language—upon which much linguistic (as well as anthropological) theory has been based. Rather, it utilizes such definitions of speech community as that of Gumperz (57), which focuses on frequency of social interaction and communication patterns within a group or groups, and Hymes (76), which focuses on shared rules for speaking. Speech communities are thus defined in terms of overlapping and mutually complementary resources and rules for the production and interpretation of socially appropriate speech.

The criteria which determine and define speech communities may be of varying levels of abstraction and relate to different aspects of language and speech. Thus Labov (91) and Sankoff (112) have focused on rules for the production of particular linguistic features, especially features of surface phonology and grammar. These rules reflect statistical tendencies and relate the linguistic features in various linguistic contexts to social groupings and situational contexts. Sankoff summarizes recent research dealing with linguistic variation and relates it to the ethnography of speaking. She focuses especially on two communities in which she herself has carried out research: the French-speaking community of Montreal, Canada, and the Tok Pisin speech community of Lae, New Guinea. Sankoff stresses that the rules she, Labov, and others posit are community-wide abstractions; they are real, however, for every individual member of the community, who reflects them in production, interpretation, and attitudes.

The criteria delimiting and determining speech communities may also be shared ground rules and principles of speaking. Thus Philips (101) discusses the rules for the interplay of silence and speech which permeate Indian communicative activities on the Warm Springs Indian reservation, and contrast sharply with such non-Indian activities as those which occur in school classrooms. Philips (102) demonstrates that there is a unified set of rules which regulate participation, boundaries, and timing of a wide range of communicative activities on the Warm Springs reservation.

Finally, speech communities may be viewed in terms of general cultural themes regarding language and speech and underlying all communicative behavior. Thus Gossen (53) describes the Chamula metaphor of heat, a metaphor

central to Chamula social life and expressive behavior, operating not only in nearly all kinds of speech performances, but in ritual action, the life cycle, the agricultural cycle, the day, the year, individual festivals, political power, and economic status. For the seventeenth century Quakers (Bauman 15, 20) the most powerful moral distinction contrasted speaking as a whole with refraining from speech, silence. For the Quakers, speaking itself was disvalued, silence carrying an especially high degree of moral and symbolic significance.

Research in the ethnography of speaking has stressed the existence of diverse kinds of speech communities in various parts of the world and has emphasized the point that the definition of such communities and their boundaries continues to be problematical and in need of careful empirical study. A most fascinating area in this regard is the Northwest Amazon region of South America, in which speech communities seem to consist of longhouses, into which marry women of diverse language groups, with the result that each longhouse-speech community is, by definition, linguistically heterogeneous (Jackson 81, Sorenson 124).

It often seems that individuals are oriented to participation in several and overlapping speech communities. Thus the Rotinese orient themselves to their own *nusak* "domain" for the purposes of everyday interaction, while they orient themselves to the entire island of Roti, with its dialect complexity, for the purpose of formal, ritual speech (Fox 40). Abrahams (7) has argued for the existence of a single Black speech community within the United States as a whole. The individual members of such a community would also be members of the New York City speech community, the Oakland speech community, etc. Each one of these speech communities can be defined in terms of the kinds of criteria we have just discussed. Which one or ones an individual orients himself to at any given moment is part of the strategy of speaking.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

We have attempted thus far to discuss the ethnography of speaking in terms of its place within linguistic anthropology, its conceptual framework, its history, and the substantive work of the past few years. We will conclude by suggesting possible directions for the future.

The development which seems to be most immediately in prospect is the publication of more complete ethnographies of speaking, devoted to particular societies (cf Hogan 64). Such works will constitute the first full-scale analyses of the patterns and functions of speaking as they ramify throughout the sociocultural life of whole communities, standing as, or approaching, the comprehensive theories of speaking as a cultural system which represent the first major goal of the ethnography of speaking.

A further prospect is an increase in the number of available case studies of speaking in particular societies. Although the areal coverage of Bauman & Sherzer (22) spans many of the major culture areas of the world, the studies reported on are in many instances the first and only direct explorations in the ethnography of speaking for those areas. Moreover, in this early stage of the development of the field, the tendency has been for ethnographers to study

societies or activities in which speaking is a cultural focus and a positively valued activity (but see Bauman 19). Consequently, a reliable base for comparative generalization is yet to be developed since societies differ as to the importance of speaking, both absolutely and relative to particular contexts. As the record expands, however, a more confident ethnology of speaking will be possible. And, as more research is done within geographical areas already represented in the literature, areal patterns and influences will become amenable to investigation.

Like most ethnography, the ethnography of speaking has been synchronic in scope, and studies of change in patterns and functions of speaking within particular communities are conspicuously lacking in the literature (for exceptions cf Abrahams 1, Bauman 20, Rosaldo 104). We expect that this situation will change as ethnographic base lines are established from which processes of change may be analyzed either forward or backward in time, and ethnographers of speaking turn more to the investigation of historical cases through the use of historical materials.

Many more prospects for the ethnography of speaking might be suggested, but perhaps the most important lies in its potential for the clarification and solution of practical social problems. Through awareness of and sensitivity to the socioexpressive dimension of speaking, and to intergroup differences in ways of speaking within heterogeneous communities, ethnographic investigators are particularly well equipped to clarify those problem situations which stem from covert conflicts between different ways of speaking, conflicts which may be obscured to others by a failure to see beyond the referential functions of speech and abstract grammatical patterns. Understanding of such problem situations is a major step toward their solution, laying the groundwork for planning and change. Some work in this branch of applied ethnography of speaking has already been proposed and carried out (e.g. 5, 16, 32, 59, 87, 101, 122), and we are convinced that the next decade will see more and more ethnographic studies of speaking in schools, hospitals, and other institutions of contemporary culture in heterogeneous societies, toward the solution of practical social problems.

Literature Cited

1. Abrahams, R. D. 1967. The shaping of folkloric traditions in the British West Indies. *J. Interam. Stud.* 9:456–80
2. Abrahams, R. D. 1970. Patterns of performance in the British West Indies. In *Afro-American Anthropology: Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. N. E. Whitten Jr., J. F. Szwed, 163–79. New York: Free Press
3. Abrahams, R. D. 1970. *Positively Black*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall. 177 pp.
4. Abrahams, R. D. 1972. Joking: The training of the man of words in talking broad. See Ref. 89, 215–40
5. Abrahams, R. D. 1972. Talking my talk: Black English and social segmentation in Black communities. *Florida F/L Rep.* 10:29–38
6. Abrahams, R. D. 1972. The training of the man of words in talking sweet. *Lang. Soc.* 1:15–29
7. Abrahams, R. D. 1974. Black talking on the streets. See Ref. 22, 240–62
8. Abrahams, R. D. 1975. Negotiating respect: Patterns of presentation among Black women. *J. Am. Folklore* 88
9. Abrahams, R. D., Bauman, R. 1971. Sense and nonsense in St.

Vincent: Speech behavior and decorum in a Caribbean community. *Am. Anthropol.* 73:762–72
10. Albert, E. M. 1964. "Rhetoric," "Logic," and "Poetics" in Burundi. See Ref. 61, 35–54
11. Arewa, E. O., Dundes, A. 1964. Proverbs and the ethnography of speaking folklore. See Ref. 61, 70–85
12. Austin, J. L. 1965. *How to Do Things With Words*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press. 166 pp.
13. Basso, K. 1970. To give up on words: Silence in the Western Apache culture. *Southwest. J. Anthropol.* 26:213–30
14. Bateson, G. 1972. *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*. New York: Ballantine. 517 pp.
15. Bauman, R. 1970. Aspects of Quaker rhetoric. *Quart. J. Speech* 56:67–74
16. Bauman, R. 1971. An ethnographic framework for the investigation of communicative behaviors. *Asha* 13:334–40
17. Bauman, R. 1972. Differential identity and the social base of folklore. See Ref. 100, 31–41
18. Bauman, R. 1972. Introduction. See Ref. 100, xi–xv
19. Bauman, R. 1972. The La Have Island general store. *J. Am. Folklore* 85:330–43
20. Bauman, R. 1974. Speaking in the light: The role of the Quaker minister. See Ref. 22, 144–60
21. Bauman, R. 1975. Verbal art as performance. *Am. Anthropol.* 77
22. Bauman, R., Sherzer, J., Eds. 1974. *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*. London/New York: Cambridge Univ. Press. 501 pp.
23. Ben-Amos, D. 1969. Analytical categories and ethnic genres. *Genre* 2:275–301
24. Ben-Amos, D. 1972. Toward a definition of folklore in context. See Ref. 100, 3–15
25. Berlin, B., Breedlove, D., Raven, P. 1973. *Studies in Tzeltal Botanical Ethnography: Principles of Classification*. New York: Seminar Press. 744 pp.
26. Blom, J. P., Gumperz, J. J. 1972. Social meaning in linguistic structures: Code-switching in Norway. See Ref. 62, 407–34
27. Blount, B. 1969. *Acquisition of Language by Luo Children*. Berkeley: Lang.-Behav. Res. Lab. Work. Pap. 19. 224 pp.
28. Blount, B. 1972. Aspects of socialization among the Luo of Kenya. *Lang. Soc.* 1:235–48
29. Brady, M. 1974. 'Gonna shimmy shimmy 'til the sun goes down': Aspects of verbal and nonverbal socialization in the play of Black girls. *Folklore Ann., Cent. Intercult. Stud. Folklore Oral Hist.* 6:1–16
30. Bricker, V. R. 1972. The ethnographic context of some traditional Mayan speech genres. See Ref. 22, 368–88
31. Bright, W., Ed. 1966. *Sociolinguistics*. The Hague: Mouton. 324 pp.
32. Cazden, C. B., John, V. P., Hymes, D., Eds. 1972. *Functions of Language in the Classroom*. New York: Teachers Coll., Columbia Univ. 394 pp.
33. Darnell, R. 1974. Correlates of Cree narrative performance. See Ref. 22, 315–36
34. Dundes, A., Leach, J. W., Özkök, B. 1972. The strategy of Turkish boys' verbal dueling rhymes. See Ref. 62, 130–60
35. Emeneau, M. 1956. India as a linguistic area. *Language* 32:3–16
36. Ervin-Tripp, S. 1967. An Issei learns English. See Ref. 95, 78–90
37. Ervin-Tripp, S. 1972. On sociolinguistic rules: Alternation and co-occurrence. See Ref. 62, 213–50
38. Faris, J. 1966. The dynamics of verbal exchange: A Newfoundland example. *Anthropologica* 8:235–48
39. Foster, M. K. 1974. When words become deeds: An analysis of three Iroquois longhouse speech events. See Ref. 22, 354–67
40. Fox, J. J. 1974. 'Our ancestors spoke in pairs': Rotinese views of language. See Ref. 22, 65–85
41. Frake, C. O. 1964. A structural description of Subanun 'religious behavior.' In *Explorations in Cultural Anthropology*, ed. W. Goodenough, 111–29. New York: McGraw-Hill
42. Frake, C. O. 1964. How to ask for a drink in Subanun. See Ref. 61, 127–32
43. Frake, C. O. 1972. "Struck by speech": The Yakan concert of litigation. See Ref. 62, 106–29
44. Friedrich, P. 1972. Social context

and semantic feature: The Russian pronominal usage. See Ref. 62, 270–300
45. Garfinkel, H. 1972. Remarks on ethnomethodology. See Ref. 62, 301–24
46. Garfinkel, H. 1972. Studies of the routine grounds of everyday activities. See Ref. 128, 1–30
47. Goffman, E. 1961. *Encounters*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill. 152 pp.
48. Goffman, E. 1964. The neglected situation. See Ref. 61, 133–37
49. Goffman, E. 1971. *Relations in Public*. New York: Basic Books. 396 pp.
50. Goffman, E. 1974. *Frame Analysis*. New York: Harper & Row. 586 pp.
51. Goldstein, K. S. 1963. Riddling traditions in Northeastern Scotland. *J. Am. Folklore* 76:330–36
52. Gossen, G. H. 1972. Chamula genres of verbal behavior. See Ref. 100, 145–67
53. Gossen, G. H. 1974. To speak with a heated heart: Chamula canons of style and good performance. See Ref. 22, 389–413
54. Grimshaw, A. D. 1974. Data and data use in an analysis of communicative events. See Ref. 22, 419–24
55. Gumperz, J. J. 1964. Linguistic and social interaction in two communities. See Ref. 61, 137–54
56. Gumperz, J. J. 1967. On the linguistic markers of bilingual communication. See Ref. 95, 48–57
57. Gumperz, J. J. 1968. The speech community. In *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, ed. D. L. Sills, 9:381–86
58. Gumperz, J. J. 1972. Introduction. See Ref. 62, 1–25
59. Gumperz, J. J., Herasimchuk, E. 1973. The conversational analysis of social meaning: A study of classroom interaction. See Ref. 121, 99–134
60. Gumperz, J. J., Hernandez, E. 1972. Bilingualism, bidialectalism, and classroom interaction. See Ref. 32, 84–108
61. Gumperz, J. J., Hymes, D., Eds. 1964. *The Ethnography of Communication. Am. Anthropol.* 66(6), part 2. 186 pp.
62. Gumperz, J. J., Hymes, D., Eds. 1972. *Directions in Sociolinguistics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston. 598 pp.
63. Gumperz, J. J., Wilson, R. 1971. Convergence and creolization: A case from the Indo-Aryan/Dravidian border. See Ref. 74, 151–67
64. Hogan, H. n.d. *An Ethnography of Communication Among the Ashanti*. Penn-Texas Work. Pap. Socioling. 1. 217 pp.
65. Hoijer, H. 1945, 1946, 1948, 1949. The Apachean verb. *Int. J. Am. Ling.* 11:193–203; 12:1–13, 51–59; 14:247–59; 15:12–22
66. Hymes, D. 1962. The ethnography of speaking. In *Anthropology and Human Behavior*, ed. T. Gladwin, W. C. Sturtevant, 13–53. Washington, D.C.: Anthropol. Soc. Wash.
67. Hymes, D. 1964. Introduction: Toward ethnographies of communication. See Ref. 61, 1–34
68. Hymes, D. 1966. On anthropological linguistics and cogeners. *Am. Anthropol.* 68:143–53
69. Hymes, D. 1966. Two types of linguistic relativity. See Ref. 31, 114–58
70. Hymes, D. 1967. Models of the interaction of language and social setting. See Ref. 95, 8–28
71. Hymes, D. 1967. Why linguistics needs the sociologist. *Soc. Res.* 34(4):632–47
72. Hymes, D. 1968. Linguistic problems in defining the concept of 'tribe.' In *Essays on the Problem of Tribe*. Proc. AES Ann. Spring Meet. 1967, ed. J. Helm, 23–48
73. Hymes, D. 1971. Competence and performance in linguistic theory. In *Language Acquisition: Models and Methods*, ed. R. Huxley, E. Ingram, 3–24. London/New York: Academic
74. Hymes, D., Ed. 1971. *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages*. London/New York: Cambridge Univ. Press. 530 pp.
75. Hymes, D. 1972. The contribution of folklore to sociolinguistic research. See Ref. 100, 42–50
76. Hymes, D. 1972. Models of the interaction of language and social life. See Ref. 62, 35–71
77. Hymes, D. 1973. On the origins and foundations of inequality among speakers. *Daedalus* (Summer 1973) 59–85
78. Hymes, D. 1974. *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. Philadelphia: Univ. Pennsylvania Press. 245 pp.

79. Hymes, D. 1974. Ways of speaking. See Ref. 22, 433–51
80. Irvine, J. D. 1974. Strategies of status manipulation in the Wolof greeting. See Ref. 22, 167–91
81. Jackson, J. 1974. Language identity of the Columbian Vaupés Indians. See Ref. 22, 50–64
82. Jakobson, R. 1960. Concluding statement: Linguistics and Poetics. In *Style in Language*, ed. T. A. Sebeok, 350–77. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press
83. Keenan, E. O. 1973. A sliding sense of obligatoriness: The polystructure of Malagasy oratory. *Lang. Soc.* 2:225–43
84. Keenan, E. O. 1974. Norm-makers, norm-breakers: Uses of speech by men and women in a Malagasy community. See Ref. 22, 125–43
85. Kernan, K. 1969. *The Acquisition of Language by Samoan Children.* Berkeley: Lang.-Behav. Res. Lab. Work. Pap. 21. 132 pp.
86. Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. 1975. A parable in context. In *Folklore: Performance and Communication,* ed. D. Ben-Amos, K. Goldstein. The Hague: Mouton. In press
87. Kochman, T. 1969. Social factors in the consideration of teaching standard English. *Florida F/L Rep.* 7:87–88 et seq.
88. Kochman, T., Ed. 1972. *Rappin' and Stylin' Out: Communication in Urban Black America.* Urbana: Univ. Illinois Press. 424 pp.
89. Ibid. Toward an ethnography of Black American speech behavior, 241–64
90. Labov, W. 1972. *Language in the Inner City.* Philadelphia: Univ. Pennsylvania Press. 412 pp.
91. Labov, W. 1972. *Sociolinguistic Patterns.* Philadelphia: Univ. Pennsylvania Press. 344 pp.
92. Labov, W. 1972. Rules for ritual insults. See Ref. 89, 264–314; Ref. 128, 120–69
93. Labov, W., Waletzky, J. 1967. Narrative analysis. In *Essays on the Visual and Verbal Arts.* Proc. AES Ann. Spring Meet. 1966, ed. J. Helm, 12–44
94. Lord, A. B. 1960. *The Singer of Tales.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press. 309 pp.
95. Macnamara, J., Ed. 1967. Problems of Bilingualism. *J. Soc. Issues* xxiii No. 2. 137 pp.
96. McDowell, J. 1974. *Interrogative Routines in Mexican-American Children's Folklore.* Austin: Work. Pap. Socioling. 20. 29 pp.
97. Mitchell-Kernan, C. 1971. *Language Behavior in a Black Urban Community.* Berkeley: Lang.-Behav. Res. Lab. Monogr. 2. 164 pp.
98. Mitchell-Kernan, C. 1972. Signifying, loud-talking, and marking. See Ref. 89, 315–35
99. Mitchell-Kernan, C. 1972. Signifying and marking: Two Afro-American speech acts. See Ref. 62, 161–79
100. Paredes, A., Bauman, R., Eds. 1972. *Toward New Perspectives in Folklore.* Austin: Univ. Texas Press. 181 pp.
101. Philips, S. U. 1972. Participant structures and communicative competence: Warm Springs children in community classrooms. See Ref. 32, 370–94
102. Philips, S. U. 1974. Warm Springs 'Indian time': How the regulation of participation affects the progression of events. See Ref. 22, 92–109
103. Reisman, K. 1974. Contrapuntal conversations in an Antiguan village. See Ref. 22, 110–24
104. Rosaldo, M. Z. 1973. I have nothing to hide: The language of Ilongot oratory. *Lang. Soc.* 2:193–223
105. Sacks, H. 1972. An initial investigation of the usability of conversational data for doing sociology. See Ref. 128, 31–74
106. Sacks, H. 1972. On the analyzability of stories by children. See Ref. 62, 325–45
107. Sacks, H. 1974. An analysis of the course of a joke's telling in conversation. See Ref. 22, 337–53
108. Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G. 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50:696–735
109. Salmond, A. 1974. Rituals of encounter among the Maori: Sociolinguistic study of a scene. See Ref. 22, 192–212
110. Samarin, W. J. 1967. *Field Linguistics.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston. 246 pp.
111. Sankoff, G. 1972. Language use in multilingual societies: Some alternative approaches. In *Sociolinguistics,* ed. J. B. Pride, J. Holmes, 33–51. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books
112. Sankoff, G. 1974. A quantitative

paradigm for the study of communicative competence. See ref. 22, 18–49
113. Schegloff, E. A. 1972. Notes on conversational practice: Formulating place. See Ref. 128, 75–119
114. Schegloff, E. A. 1972. Sequencing in conversational openings. See Ref. 62, 346–80
115. Schegloff, E. A., Sacks, H. 1973. Opening up closings. *Semiotica* 8:289–327
116. Sherzer, J. 1970. La parole chez les abipone. *L'Homme* 10:42–76
117. Sherzer, J. 1974. *Namakke, sunmakke, kormakke:* Three types of Cuna speech event. See Ref. 22, 263–82
118. Sherzer, J. 1974. *Semantic Systems, Discourse Structure, and the Ecology of Language.* Austin, Tex.: Work. Pap. Socioling. 17. 14 pp.
119. Sherzer, J., Bauman, R. 1972. Areal studies and culture history; Language as a key to the historical study of culture contact. *Southwest. J. Anthropol.* 28:131–52
120. Sherzer, J., Darnell, R. 1972. Outline guide for the ethnographic study of speech use. See Ref. 62, 548–54
121. Shuy, R., Ed. 1973. *Sociolinguistics: Current Trends and Prospects* (Georgetown Univ. Monogr. Ser. Lang. and Ling. 25). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown Univ. Press. 351 pp.
122. Shuy, R. 1974. *Problems of Communication in the Cross-Cultural Medical Interview.* Austin, Tex.: Work. Pap. Socioling. 19. 43 pp.
123. Slobin, D. I., Ed. 1967. *A Field Manual for Cross-Cultural Study of the Acquisition of Communicative Competence.* Berkeley: Lang. Behav. Res. Lab. 248 pp.
124. Sorenson, A. 1967. Multilingualism in the Northwest Amazon. *Am. Anthropol.* 69:670–82
125. Stoeltje, B. 1972–73. "Bow-legged bastard: A manner of speaking," speech behavior of a Black woman. *Folklore Ann., Cent. Intercult. Stud. Folklore Oral Hist.* 4 & 5: 152–78
126. Stross, B. 1969. *Language Acquisition by Tenejapa Tzeltal Children.* Berkeley: Lang.-Behav. Res. Lab. Work. Pap. 20. 273 pp.
127. Stross, B. 1974. Speaking of speaking: Tenejapa Tzeltal metalinguistics. See Ref. 22, 213–39
128. Sudnow, D., Ed. 1972. *Studies in Social Interaction.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall. 455 pp.
129. Tedlock, D. 1972. On the translation of style in oral narrative. See Ref. 100, 114–33
130. Wallace, A.F.C. 1970. *Culture and Personality.* New York: Random House. 270 pp. 2nd ed.
131. Ward, M. C. 1971. *Them Children.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston. 99 pp.