Preface

From June 24 to August 2, 1985, Georgetown University was host to the 1985 LSA/TESOL Institute, combining the 52nd Linguistic Institute of the Linguistic Society of America and the 7th Summer Institute of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. It was my privilege to organize and direct this joint six-week Institute, "Linguistics and Language in Context: The Interdependence of Theory, Data, and Application," as well as a concurrent four-week Institute nestled within the larger one, supported by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities. The NEH Institute, "Humanistic Approaches to Linguistic Analysis," highlighted the humanistic focus of the LSA/TESOL Institute and brought to it three additional faculty members; I was the fourth NEH faculty member. Each of us taught one week of the NEH Institute. Participants in the NEH Institute were twenty-five college and university faculty who teach introductory and intermediate level linguistics and language-related courses; many are accomplished researchers as well.

In addition to regularly scheduled courses and ancillary meetings and workshops, the 1985 LSA/TESOL Institute included nightly lectures. Each week a different scholar-in-residence delivered a series of lectures and seminars, beginning with a lecture on Monday night. On Tuesday nights the traditional Forum Lectures were delivered by scholars who came just for this purpose. Each Wednesday night, that week's NEH Institute faculty member delivered a public lecture. This volume includes most of those lectures, as well as a keynote address delivered by an Institute faculty member, Henry Widdowson, during the TESOL Summer Meeting held at the Institute.

This volume, then, reflects many of the themes, issues, and approaches that characterized the tripartite Institute. It is a companion to the 1985 Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics (GURT) which was held at the end of the first week of the Institute and in which all visiting faculty then in residence were invited to participate. Those lectures appear in the GURT volume and are listed as an Appendix to the Introduction.

The remainder of this Preface, based on my remarks at the Institute's

opening ceremony, places the Institute in personal and historical context and acknowledges the many people who contributed to it.

The 1985 LSA/TESOL Institute

In 1973, I was a teacher of remedial writing, freshman composition, and English as a Second Language at Herbert H. Lehman College of the City University of New York. That summer I went to the Linguistic Institute at the University of Michigan. I attended classes all day, and I went to lectures in the evenings. It was at, and because of, that Institute, "Language in Context," that I decided to become a linguist. So I have a personal debt to Linguistic Institutes. My way of repaying that debt was organizing and directing the 1985 LSA/TESOL Institute: the first one since 1973 to focus on language in context, or, broadly speaking, sociolinguistic/discourse approaches to language.

The History of Linguistic Institutes

Nineteen eighty-five was the second year the LSA and TESOL Institutes were jointly held, and the third time Georgetown University hosted a Linguistic Institute. The first and second times were 1954 and 1955. (It was then standard for a university to host the Institute two years in a row.) The 1985 Institute took its place in a long tradition. (The following information comes from "The History of Linguistic Institutes" by Archibald Hill and from earlier Institute brochures, all of which were provided by the Linguistic Society of America.)

The first two Linguistic Institutes were held in 1928 and 1929 at Yale University. The next two, in 1930 and 1931, were held at the College of the City of New York. All four of these Institutes were directed by Edgar Sturtevant. Hill reports, "Preliminary costs . . . were guaranteed by a group of thirty-two of the most distinguished members of the Society" including Boas, Bloomfield, and Sapir. Because of economic conditions, Institutes were then discontinued until 1936 when they began again and were held five years in succession at the University of Michigan, directed by Charles Fries. At these Institutes, the connection between linguistics and the teaching of languages was central.

The 1936 Linguistic Institute included "luncheon conferences." The brochure explains, "These luncheon conferences will be held in one of the private dining rooms of the Michigan Union and will cost each member attending fifty-cents for his luncheon." (It most likely was "his" luncheon. The list of 16 faculty members includes not a single woman.) The maximum fee for tuition was $39; a single room cost $3–5 per week; board was $4–7 per week. The railroads offered a special

1 + ½ fare for Institute participants. Visiting scholars were admitted free.

The University of Michigan again hosted the Linguistic Institute from 1945 to 1950. About the 1945 Institute, Hill writes, "In addition, the lectures contained the first appearance of what has come to be the most theatrically and linguistically effective performance of many Institutes, Professor Pike's "Demonstration of an Introductory Analysis of a Language Unknown to the Linguist." Exactly 40 years later, Professor Pike performed a similar demonstration at the 1985 Institute.

Participants

I was particularly pleased to have on the faculty of the 1985 Institute someone who had also been on the faculty of the 1955 Institute at Georgetown: Charles Ferguson. Indeed, the 1985 Institute had a large and stellar faculty, including seven scholars from abroad (Michael Canale, Robert Cooper, Florian Coulmas, Beatriz Lavandera, Andrew Pawley, Suzanne Romaine, Henry Widdowson); five from the Washington, DC area (Jo Ann Crandall, Robert Johnson, Scott Liddell, Richard Tucker, Walt Wolfram); and fifteen from Georgetown University, including members of the French (Simon Battestini), English (Daniel Moshenberg), and Philosophy (Steven Kuhn) Departments as well as Linguistics (Walter Cook, S.J., Francis Dinneen, S.J., Ralph Fasold, Charles Kreidler, Robert Lado, Peter Lowenberg, Solomon Sara, S.J., Deborah Schiffrin, Shaligram Shukla, Roger Shuy, John Staczek, Michael Zarechnak). The twenty-three visiting faculty members from other states were Kathleen Bailey, Russell Campbell, Wallace Chafe, Mark Clarke, Jenny Cook-Gumperz, Frederick Erickson, John Fanselow, Lily Wong Fillmore, John Gumperz, Evelyn Hatch, Shirley Brice Heath, Robin Lakoff, Diane Larsen-Freeman, Michael Long, James McCawley, Marianne Mithun, Joan Morley, William Moulton, Susan Philips, Haj Ross, Leonard Talmy, Rita Wong, and Vivian Zamel. One-week scholars-in-residence were Emanuel Schegloff (week one); Elinor Ochs and Bambi Schieffelin (week two); Charles Fillmore (week three); and Paul Hopper (week four). Forum lecturers were Kenneth Pike, Paul Friedrich, Stephen Krashen, Peter Strevens, Muriel Saville-Troike, and William Labov. The NEH faculty were A. L. Becker, Ray McDermott, Harold Rosen, and I. John Gumperz held the Linguistic Society of America Chair. William Moulton held the Herman Collitz Chair.

There were also numerous lectures, meetings, workshops, and conferences which contributed to the richness and excitement of the Institutes. These events and their organizers were: Jens Allwood and Per

Linell ("Reconsidering structuralist linguistics"); Paul Chapin ("Everything you ought to know about how to apply for an NSF grant"); Florian Coulmas ("The national language question"); Hans Dechert ("Current trends in European second language acquisition research"); Richard Frankel ("Exploring the medical encounter through micro-interactional analysis"); Roy Freedle ("Cognitive and linguistic aspects of language test performance"); Donald Freeman ("Experiential language teacher education: A workshop in issues, practices, and techniques"); David Hiple and Judith Liskin-Gasparro ("Four-day oral proficiency workshop"); Joyce Hutchings (TESOL Summer Meeting); Leah Kedar ("Language and power"); Joan Morley and Sandra Silberstein ("The art and science of materials development"); Livia Polanyi ("Syntactic and semantic aspects of discourse structure"); Deborah Schiffrin (Linguistic Institute summer meeting); John Staczek ("Colloquium on Spanish, Portuguese, and Catalan linguistics"); Len Talmy and Deborah Tannen ("Analyzing videotaped interaction: Loud family tapes"); Jackie Tanner ("Media software development for ESL teachers"); and Anne Walker and Judith Levi ("Language and the judicial process"). I organized a concluding NEH Conference 'Interpretation in Linguistic Analysis,' as well as a public presentation entitled 'Women and Men Talking,' which featured Robin Lakoff, Susan Philips, Frederick Erickson, John Gumperz, and actors from Horizons Theater.

These faculty members, lecturers, and organizers; those who participated in these events; and the students and visiting scholars, constituted the Institute. The nearly 550 students and visiting scholars also came from all over the world. Some (by no means all) of the countries they came from are Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, El Salvador, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Holland, Honduras, Egypt, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hong Kong, India, Iran, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Korea, Kuwait, Malaysia, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Taiwan, Tobago, Togo, Trinidad, Turkey, and Venezuela.

Acknowledgements

The last part of my opening remarks were devoted to thanking the many people who helped make the 1985 LSA/TESOL and NEH Institutes happen. Such thanking behavior is a ritual within the ritual which is the opening ceremony. The fact that it is a ritual does not mean that it is not sincere. Quite the contrary, the thanking is ritualized because it is so universally true that such events do not materialize without the efforts of a great many people.

First, my earnest thanks go to the Institute staff. Associate Directors Diane Larsen-Freeman and Wallace Chafe helped define the themes, design the curriculum, and select faculty for the TESOL and LSA components, respectively. Assistant Director Heidi Byrnes helped with administrative tasks, especially those associated with the 1985 GURT. Maya Mozoomdar was an exemplary special assistant before the Institute began; Fiona Burnett was our incomparable secretary during the period of the Institute.

I was helped by a great many student volunteers, including Larry Bell, Gayle Berens, Susan French, Susan Hoyle, Carolyn Kinney, Katherine Langan, Clare O'Leary, Cindy Roy, Stuart Showalter, Fran Smith, Edwin Solis, Belle Tyndall, Lucy Vanderwende, and Monique Wong. Venetta Acson was a special consultant. The LSA staff offered continual and varied support, especially John Hammer, Margaret Reynolds, and Bernarda Erwin; likewise, the TESOL staff, especially Carol LeClaire and Susan Bayley. The LSA Committee on Institutes and Fellowships and the TESOL Committee to Select the Ruth Crymes Fellow deserve thanks too.

It was James Alatis, Dean of the School of Languages and Linguistics and Executive Secretary of TESOL who initiated the idea for a joint LSA/TESOL Institute at Georgetown. His support was crucial throughout, and others in his office provided invaluable help: Richard Cronin, Jose Hernandez, John Staczek, and Josette Selim. The Linguistics Department secretary Carolyn Leilich cheerfully absorbed many pressures exerted by the presence of the Institute.

The Institutes were under the direct jurisdiction of the School for Summer and Continuing Education, of which I thank Dean Michael Collins and Esther Rider, Director of Summer Sessions. Outstanding for their patience and organization were the Registrar, John Peirce, and Associate Registrar Jan Doehlert.

I also thank those who provided funding for aspects of the program: the National Endowment for Humanities, and staff members David Wise and Jack Meyers, for support of the NEH Institute, "Humanistic Approaches to Linguistic Analysis"; the National Science Foundation for support of the conference "Language and the Judicial Process"; and the DC Community Humanities Council, the British Council, the Adrian Akmajian Memorial Fund of the Linguistic Society of America, and WAMU radio host Diane Rehm, for making possible the special public presentation, "Women and Men Talking: A Cultural Approach to Understanding Male/female Communication."

There are two people I haven't mentioned because mention alone is inadequate to the task of acknowledging their contributions. Every person I have named enabled some aspect of the Institutes, but there

are two people who enabled every aspect. They are Carol Kaplan, my assistant, and Gerald Sullivan, Associate Dean of the School for Summer and Continuing Education.

I dubbed Carol Kaplan Ms. A&B because she cheerfully, tirelessly, and ably handled the masses of details and people that besieged her, always working Above and Beyond what might reasonably be expected.

Gerald Sullivan was the Institute's Guardian Angel from the time I first wrote the proposal, three years before the Institutes took place. He continued to be a stalwart, untiring, and unflappable support at every stage. He was the key person in making all arrangements from budget and fellowships to parking and field house membership. His unwavering faith in the Institutes' success became a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Deborah Tannen

New York, NY

Introduction

It is an exciting time in linguistics. With the burgeoning of research in discourse, our field has seen a broadening of scope and diversifying of methods of inquiry. This window-opening has ushered in invigorating debate about the nature of language and of linguistics: the relationship between the individual and the social, the fixed and the novel, the theoretical and the empirical, the humanistic and the scientific. As Clifford Geertz (1983:8) demonstrates in his essay "Blurred Genres" (an essay which uses as one of three examples the work of a scholar included here: A. L. Becker), current scholarship is experiencing "significant realignments in scholarly affinities," so that "a growing number of people trying to understand [human behavior] have turned to linguistics, aesthetics, cultural history, law, or literary criticism for illumination rather than, as they used to do, to mechanics or physiology."

Paul Hopper concludes in his lecture included in this volume that our field reflects "two competing ideologies, corresponding broadly to the two major intellectual trends of our day: structuralism, with its belief in and attention to a priori structures of consciousness and behavior, and hermeneutics, with its equally firm conviction that temporality and context are continually re-shaping the elusive present." The 1985 LSA/TESOL Institute brought together scholars who represent the latter trend or are actively struggling with the challenges it poses. Institute participants who attended the daily classes and listened to the nightly lectures took part in their interchanges. This volume, which includes all but a few of the lectures delivered at the Institute, invites a wider audience of readers to participate as well.

Part of the excitement of this new dialogue comes from its interdisciplinary roots. To better understand the nature of language, linguists are working alongside colleagues from anthropology, sociology, psychology, literature, and education. All these fields are represented in this volume (and in its companion volume of lectures from the 1985 Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, composed of papers by Institute faculty members listed in an Appendix).

In its very title, reflecting its joint nature, the 1985 LSA/TESOL Institute was about connecting the field of linguistics with related

disciplines, in particular the teaching of English to speakers of other languages. The subtitle of the Institute was "Linguistics and Language in Context: The Interdependence of Theory, Data, and Application." "Theory," "data," and "application" were intended as constitutive, not additive. The conviction underlying this choice of subtitle is that linguistic research should entail all three at once. It needs a simultaneous commitment to close observation of real language in context, a broad and inclusive theoretical perspective, and attention to the uses of our research. The Institutes grew out of a wish to bring together researchers who were working in this spirit, to communicate with each other and to display a panorama of the work they are doing. In a sense, the need to link scholars who ordinarily work in relative isolation is a human counterpart to the need to link microanalysis with wider perspectives of theory and application.

The title of the NEH Institute, whose faculty members gave lectures to the larger Institute which are included here, was "Humanistic Approaches to Linguistic Analysis." The focus of this Institute was the relationship between the language of everyday conversation and the language of literature, including poetry. This theme runs through a number of the lectures included in this volume, not only those of the NEH faculty.

The Institutes thus represented a range of research—a range, moreover, that in itself contributes to an understanding of the relationship among theory, data, and application. The volume as a whole, reflecting the crystalline microcosm of individual lectures, is about connecting observation and understanding, and putting them to use.

SECTION ONE: HUMANISTIC APPROACHES TO LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS.

The four lectures in Section One are by the faculty who taught for one week each in the NEH Institute. A. L. Becker begins "Language in Particular: A Lecture" by asking, "If there is a linguistics in the humanities, . . . what might it be and how might we do it and why would we want to do it . . . ?" For him, the road to such a linguistics has been "the particular." Noting some philosophical strands of humanistic linguistic analysis, Becker suggests that we need humanistic linguistics, not to replace the scientific kind, but to do work that cannot be done within it.

Sounding a theme that is also discussed by Friedrich, Pike, and others in succeeding lectures, Becker notes that humanistic linguistics puts the observer back into our work. Demonstrating with sentences

produced on the spot by audience members, Becker proposes an understanding of grammar similar to what Hopper, in a later lecture, calls the "emergent grammar hypothesis": that language is modeled on prior text, "drawn from lingual memory and reshaped to present circumstances." He explains, "Our discipline and our rigor in humanistic linguistics comes . . . . from the particularity of the text-in-context, not from the rigor of the rules." Put another way, the discipline "comes not from theory but from a language."

To answer the last of his initial questions, why would we want to do this kind of linguistics, Becker, following Geertz, reminds us that our goal is "to learn to converse with those we have difficulty conversing with," "our own neighbors and family or people halfway round the world," and, Becker concludes, to learn to respect others "as the practical first step in having my own differences respected." Thus, Becker's lecture provides a foundation for the collection by expressing the Institute's theme: our understanding of language (i.e. theory) and observations of particular bits of language (what might be called data) are inseparable from each other and from the practical use of language in everyday life (application).

Becker cites Ortega y Gasset's observation that "speech consists above all in silences. A being who could not renounce saying many things would be incapable of speaking." This could be a lead-in to the second NEH lecture. Ray McDermott shows that "Inarticulateness" can be "organized": "occasions on which people are left without words are systematic outcomes of a set of relations among a group of persons bound in a social structure." McDermott illustrates "two ends of a continuum of mastery and disappointment . . . ." At the apparently articulate end he considers the writers of the Irish Literary Renaissance, showing the inarticulate in even their work and the "institutionalized use of their texts—riot, exile, and condemnation." At the "mutterance" end, he introduces Horace, who fails at school, and White-Thunder, a Menomeni Indian described by Bloomfield and discussed by Hymes, who lacked facility in both Menomeni and English.

McDermott is interested in "institutional arrangements." For both the apparently articulate and the apparently inarticulate he asks, "First, what was their situation and what language resources did they have available for explicating and transforming their situation? Second, what effects did their talk have on the conditions that so limited them?" McDermott invites us to "move slowly away from a linguistics of speakers towards a linguistics of participation . . ."

McDermott offers a supremely social view of language. He also claims that an amoral linguistics is not worth having: Insight must become a means to "organize a better world." Like Becker, he is

concerned with understanding not only speakers of different languages and cultures but "your spouse or your neighbors." Moreover, insight into what makes some (others) inarticulate is inseparable from insight into what makes others (us) articulate. Self-knowledge is a goal of analyzing others.

Harold Rosen's NEH lecture is, like Becker's and McDermott's, an essay. Including his own creative writing as material (as Friedrich and Pike also do), Rosen argues for the centrality, force, and pervasiveness of "The Autobiographical Impulse." He asks, Why is narrative so universal? And why is it "so constantly thwarted, put down, and often explicitly outlawed in our educational system and in 'high' discourse"? In counterpoint to McDermott, Rosen cites de Certeau to the effect that "memory emerging as narrative is one means available to us for asserting our authority against institutionalized power . . ."

Rosen shows that narrative, like dialogue, is a way of thinking and learning. Narrative is a social activity, a means of presentation of self. Furthermore, telling the past negotiates it: "The existence of a genre, learnt in thousands of tellings, offers us a framework which promises order and control." He concludes with a practical recommendation: that narrative be recognized and incorporated in educational and other institutional discourse.

Rosen argues, "Autobiographical stories often lie completely concealed beneath the genres which come to be defined precisely by their omission of personal stories." He cites Gilbert and Mulkay's observation of the excitement that emerges when scientists tell about their discoveries, contrasted with the burial of that excitement in their scholarly writing. This discussion prefigures a theme of the next and last NEH lecture, my own, "Hearing Voices in Conversation, Fiction, and Mixed Genres." I discuss a passage from a book by Mary Catherine Bateson who, because of her conviction that suppressing emotion in scholarly discourse obscures meaning, used fictional techniques in writing the proceedings of a scholarly conference. This example highlights the emotional basis of understanding in language which is the key to my idea of "involvement."

My lecture begins with discussion of the centrality of dialogue in storytelling, and the role of storytelling in creating involvement. Then, to support the claim that dialogue in conversational storytelling is constructed, not reported, I examine the dialogue in a story told in conversation. I then demonstrate that constructing dialogue is part of a pattern of vivid storytelling by reference to a pilot study by Mary Ott comparing how Brazilian and American speakers told Little Red Riding Hood. Next, I present dialogue from an American novel which was introduced by graphic verbs. I turn then to three spoken and

written genres produced by junior high school students: a school writing assignment evidencing stilted dialogue; a sharply contrasting conversational story; and a kind of written conversation: notes passed to friends which are strikingly similar in idiom to the conversational story. In conclusion, I cite the dialogue of a Hasidic Jew as rendered by a journalist, to emphasize the impossibility of deriving meaning from text without interpretation by individuals in interaction.

All the NEH lectures provide examples of "humanistic approaches to linguistic analysis," where "humanistic" is language-focused, context-sensitive, and concerned always with the effects of language use on people.

SECTION TWO: THE NATURE AND USE OF LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTIC THEORY.

In "Emergent Grammar and the A Priori Grammar Hypothesis," Paul Hopper identifies two approaches to grammar "whose polar extremes are dominated by radically different understandings of the nature of human language." The "a priori grammar attitude" (APG) sees grammar as "a discrete set of rules which are logically and mentally presupposed by discourse," so that "grammar is logically detachable from discourse and precedes discourse." In contrast, the "emergence of grammar attitude" (EOG) sees "grammar as the name for a vaguely defined set of sedimented (i.e. grammaticized) recurrent partials whose status is constantly being negotiated in speech . . ." The two approaches to grammar are "competing ideologies, corresponding broadly to the two major intellectual trends of our day: structuralism, with its belief in and attention to prior structures of consciousness and behavior, and hermeneutics, with its equally firm conviction that temporality and context are continually re-shaping the elusive present."

Like Widdowson, Hopper notes that divergent paradigms entail different ideas of data (intuition and made-up sentences vs. real language) and different attitudes toward temporality (grammar as static, an object existing in speakers' minds vs. grammar as a real-time activity, not homogeneous). Whereas APG is "indifferent to prior texts," not distinguishing between repetitive utterances (such as idioms and proverbs) and "bizarre fictional sentences," EOG is concerned with "strategies for building texts."

Supporting the EOG, Hopper demonstrates the efficacy of "a textually-based argument concerning some aspects of emergent clause structure" in a nineteenth century Malay written narrative. Adopting Becker's term "text-building strategies," he argues, "It is from such

natural ways of constructing discourse . . . that the phenomena we think of as 'grammar,' such as the classification of verbs into transitive and intransitive, perfective and imperfective, and so on, develop and become sedimented."

Finally, Hopper takes up the "debate over functionalism." He questions the simplistic correspondence of sentence grammar and discourse grammar and observes, "The assumed priority and autonomy of the Sentence are at the head of a line of implications which lead to the 'modularity' of syntax, semantics, and pragmatics—the separation of structure from meaning, and meaning from use." Thus, like many of the authors in this volume, Hopper argues against atomism in favor of a holistic view of language.

In the next lecture, Emanuel Schegloff demonstrates the pioneering and still most influential paradigm for analyzing conversation. Like McDermott, Schegloff is interested in "the organization of social action." Conversation becomes the focus of analysis because it is "the primordial site of sociality and social life." Essential to Schegloff's approach is continual return to the data. For him, the observation of a phenomenon in a videotape of interaction is not the end of observation, but its beginning: occasion for rerunning the bit of tape innumerable times to refine and check analysis.

In "Discourse as an Interactional Achievement II: An Exercise in Conversation Analysis," Schegloff examines two short segments from a casual conversation videotaped by Marjorie and Charles Goodwin. To give a sense of his analysis, I will summarize a small part.

In one segment in the videotape, a speaker, Mike, produced two head shakes, one horizontal and one vertical, both accompanying similar verbal utterances. Thus the negativity or positivity of the head shakes reflects not grammatical negativity or positivity but agreement or disagreement, that is, a feature of the relationship of the utterance to a preceding utterance. The lateral shake is also used as an intensifier. Furthermore, head gestures are unusual gestures in that they can be produced by hearers rather than speakers. In another segment, Mike, this time apparently a listener, also shakes his head, beginning just after Curt utters a word with a pitch peak and raised amplitude. Since a pitch peak can be a way of marking that a turn is about to end, Mike's head gesture may be that of an incipient speaker, about to disagree with what Curt has just said. Schegloff argues that the continuation of Curt's utterance must be seen as a response to this incipient disagreement, and therefore as an interactional product and achievement.

Schegloff goes on to show that the whole sequence is topic-proffering, characterized by several tries. He accounts for two cut-offs of the first

component of Curt's turn. The first is a repair probably occasioned by an overlap. The second takes into account a remark made by another speaker, Phyllis, which otherwise seemed to have been ignored. Schegloff proposes, finally, that the placement of the second repair is responsive to the impending possible completion point of the utterance.

Based on analysis of such details, Schegloff addresses the theoretical problem, "How is it that with the use of abstract formal resources interactional participants create idiosyncratic, particularized . . . interactions?" In conclusion, referring to the incorporation in his analysis of such traditionally nonlinguistic concerns as gesture and interactional contingencies, Schegloff reminds us that "the fabric of the social world does not seem to be woven with seams at the disciplinary boundaries." As a result, we need "a stance toward the organization of inquiry concerning social life which interweaves linguistics, together with other traditional and not-so-traditional disciplines, as parts in a larger social science, one which is both humanistic *and* scientific."

The last chapter in this section, William Labov's "The Judicial Testing of Linguistic Theory," looks at the nature of theory through the lens of its use. Labov reports on his participation in three legal cases. Consideration of the reception of his and his colleagues' linguistic evidence by the courts casts light on "the familiar problems of the relations between theory and practice, theory and data, theory and facts."

In the first case, linguists were asked to testify as to whether the wording of a letter was biased. The letter, to be sent to black steel workers in Pittsburgh along with a check in settlement of a national class action suit, explained that accepting the check entailed relinquishing claim to a potentially much larger settlement in a pending local class action suit. The lawyers representing the steel workers in the local suit felt that the letter's explanation of the recipients' options was biased in favor of accepting the check and waiving rights to the pending claim. Labov and his colleagues agreed. Their analysis indicated that the letter was comprehensible and objective, "but where the document was comprehensible, it was not objective; and where it was objective, it was not comprehensible."

The judge was sympathetic to the perspective of the expert witnesses but allowed the letter to go out with only minor changes. In the second case, however, involving letters notifying welfare recipients that their benefits would be curtailed, the judge ordered that a new letter be sent, one which made clearer the possibility of appeal. The result was that far more recipients appealed the curtailment of their benefits.

The third and last case involved the incarceration of a man accused of having made threatening telephone calls. Comparing tapes of the

actual telephone threats to tapes of the defendant uttering the same words, Labov determined that the caller spoke in Eastern New England dialect whereas the defendant spoke in New York City dialect, and phonetic differences between the two exist at levels beyond conscious control. Using a variety of types of linguistic analysis, Labov convinced the judge that his findings were fact, not opinion. The defendant was freed.

Labov notes that many academic linguists see theories as their end product, so that "facts are valued to the extent that they serve a theory . . ." He suggests, instead, that theories be created to resolve questions about the real world; that they be based on observation and experiment; and that it is "the application of the theory that determines its value." Labov's own paper offers a model of the use of linguistic theory in the pursuit of social justice.

SECTION THREE: POETRY: LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS AND LANGUAGE TEACHING.

All three chapters in the third section deal with analysis of poetry. Two are also concerned with language teaching, as are two of the chapters in the final section.

Widdowson begins his lecture, "Poetry and Pedagogy," by observing that poetry is normally placed outside the scope of applied linguistics and language teaching. (One might also observe that it has been infrequently included within the scope of linguistics.) Citing a literary scholar who believed poetic language is unique in requiring the reader to fill in meaning, Widdowson notes that all language requires this. In poetry, however, meaning is more often by association, or correspondence. (It is just this observation that leads Paul Friedrich, in the book from which the subsequent lecture is taken, to argue that all language is more or less poetic.) In language teaching, as in linguistics, there is a continuum between two poles (Hopper's two poles of grammatical theory are recalled by association): on the one hand, the study of language as science, associated with rules and assumptions of objectivity; on the other hand, the study of language as art, associated with focus on the particularity of the data.

Widdowson joins others in this volume in opposing "the needless opposition between form and meaning." Studying poetry along with other forms of discourse calls attention to the language as well as its meaning. Literature, by representing life rather than commenting on it, can be "a means of engaging the previous experience of learners as mediated through their mother tongue and bringing it to bear on the

learning of the new language," fulfilling a goal of pedagogy to observe the formal properties of language by using language in context.

Paul Friedrich, in "The Unheralded Revolution in the Sonnet: Toward a Generative Model," also posits a continuum, "from a routine conversation to stylized and deeply conventional poetic forms." The sonnet "illustrates one extreme case of 'poetic language,' with acutely constraining rules, patterns, and conventions of all sorts for all levels of sound and meaning."

The language of the sonnet illustrates "the fissures and even the breakdown of order and convention in several ways." After outlining the history of the sonnet, its varying forms, its determining structures, and its rules and how they are broken, Friedrich examines the place of the sonnet in contemporary poetry. Asking why the form has endured, he considers the richness of prior text: echoes of all the sonnets that came before.

Friedrich applies to language the principle of indeterminacy in physics ("the observer is an integral part of the universe of observation"). He includes in his exploration his own experience of writing sonnets. In this argument and this practice, his lecture prefigures the next one, Kenneth Pike's "Bridging Language Learning, Language Analysis, and Poetry, via Experimental Syntax."

Like Friedrich, Pike reflects a theme of the NEH Institute: the relationship between poetry and conversational language. He further relates both to second language pedagogy. He uses his own creative writing as objects of analysis and introspection, seeing the two as inextricable (echoing Friedrich and also McDermott). The rejection of autonomy is central to Pike's view of language and linguistics. Like many others in this volume, he discusses the concept of context.

Pike suggests that an understanding of language and poetry, and the process of language learning, can be enhanced by experimenting with syntax: "the deliberate, systematic, patterned changing of a text in order to force the student to use different grammatical forms to paraphrase the same referential material." Whereas Widdowson discusses the benefits to language learners of reading poetry, Pike suggests that students write poems, and poems paraphrasing poems, to get a kaleidoscopic view of the poem's linguistic parts.

In keeping with the spirit of the Institute, Pike states at the outset that he wants to build bridges between theory and application, science and philosophy, form and meaning, the intellectual and the personal: "I wanted a theory that would allow one to live outside the office with the same philosophy one uses inside it. This required the development of a view which allowed one to integrate research with belief, thing with person, fact with aesthetics, knowledge with application of knowl-

edge." He notes that "pure formalism as such, without attention to referential social axioms, is powerless to capture the relevance of many discourse grammatical functions."

SECTION FOUR: LANGUAGE LEARNING AND TEACHING.

Muriel Saville-Troike ("From Context to Communication: Paths to Second Language Acquisition") reports on research conducted over the previous four years on the acquisition of English by children of varied language backgrounds. She joins the chorus of Institute voices when she notes, "collecting data only to confirm or disprove a priori hypotheses is likely to exclude crucial evidence for phenomena which occur in the process of language acquisition . . ."

Saville-Troike's study suggests stages of development in language learners within which she finds two types of learners: Type A ("other-directed") and Type B ("inner-directed"). Within each stage, learners of each type exhibit different communicative tactics. For example, at Stage II, when English first appears, she finds "two basic developmental strategies": "holistic" or "message-oriented" and "analytic" or "code-oriented."

Saville-Troike discusses implications of her study for second language acquisition theory as well as for teaching. For example, "the process of natural language learning is not unitary, and may take different paths." Whereas "meaningful context is critical for language learning," "over-emphasis on providing contextual meaning for students may actually inhibit their development of context-reduced/academic competence." She ends with a note of concern for the young subjects of her study: The acquisition of English by very young children "is quite likely to be at the expense of their native language development."

Stephen Krashen's "Do We Learn to Read by Reading?: The Relationship Between Free Reading and Reading Ability" represents an entirely different disciplinary and methodological mode of argumentation: quantitative analysis. Yet his approach to the teaching of reading is similar in spirit to the approach to language found in the other chapters in this volume. He argues for an integrated, holistic rather than atomistic view of language ability: Reading is not a bundle of autonomous, independently functioning skills, but an organic, context-bound, humanly motivated activity.

Krashen reviews the results of quantitative studies aimed at determining whether children who do more pleasure reading are better readers, as measured by tests of reading comprehension. He is concerned with reading programs implemented in schools; students' reports of

free reading outside of school, and the availability of books and other forms of print. He concludes that "free reading consistently relates to success in reading comprehension." If children spend a portion of their class time simply reading books—or comics!—of their own choosing, while their teacher silently reads for pleasure, their reading ability improves as much as or more than it does if their time is spent entirely on "skills" lessons.

In the final chapter of this section and this volume, "Language Learning and Language Teaching: Towards an Integrated Model," Peter Strevens notes that an "intellectual base" for the "massive array of published materials, of teaching techniques, and of professional support for the teacher and the learner . . . is supplied principally through applied linguistics . . ." He identifies four paradigms presently in use. The one he feels embraces the others and is seriously conducive to language learning is the teaching/learning paradigm. He discusses the components of language learning and how language teaching can successfully respond to an understanding of these components.

REINTEGRATING LINGUISTICS.

An intriguing analogue to the mission of this volume in linguistics is provided by neurologist and essayist Oliver Sacks' (1986, 1987) account of neuroanatomy. Sacks (1987:41) notes that advances in modern medicine resulted in "a real gain of knowledge but a real loss of understanding" because of compartmentalization into motor, intellectual, and affective domains and excessive abstraction associated with "narrow formulations or theories" (40) which he contrasts, citing William James, with " 'the light of the world's concrete fullness . . .'(41)." To regain understanding, he recommends that his colleagues "listen minutely" to patients and "observe them, everything about them, with a comprehensive eye" (40). Sacks calls for "a neurology of living experience."

The lectures in this volume represent a reach for a "linguistics of living language," indeed of "living experience." The scholars whose voices are heard here are striving for a linguistics rich in the details of description, not blindered by "narrow formulations and theories," not blinded to the "concrete fullness" of language by excessive abstraction, not blocked from understanding by compartmentalization into autonomous parts. Like Sacks' (1986:3) call for a "personalistic" science of neurology, is the call for a linguistics grounded in human experience, perhaps a "personalistic" linguistics.

A NOTE ON THE DIVERSITY OF EXPOSITORY VOICES.

All volumes of collected papers are characterized by a diversity of voices. Since this volume seeks to give a sense of the LSA/TESOL and NEH Institutes as an event, I see that diversity as a strength. The expository voices of the authors differ, even as individual voices and lecturing styles differ.

In addition to personal stylistic variation, perhaps a reflection of it, there is variation in the degree and type of correspondence between what is printed here and what was heard by those present at the lecture. This range in what is represented by a written "paper" is a corollary in writing to a phenomenon I have discussed elsewhere (Tannen 1988): the diverse nature of the activity commonly referred to as "giving a paper" at a scholarly conference—an activity that takes a myriad forms, resulting from a variety of intertwined uses of speaking and writing and linguistic patterns associated with each. In a lecture series, no one tries to make individual speakers speak in the same way. Similarly, I did not try to make the Institute lecturers transform their lectures into writing in the same way.

Moreover, the diversity of expository voices reflects the disciplinary diversity of our field. The study of language is interdisciplinary by nature, so any volume seeking to include a range of linguistic approaches is, in effect, cross-disciplinary, representing a variety of theoretical and methodological paradigms.

The risks of interdisciplinary efforts are described by Henry Widdowson (Chapter Seven):

> The conventions of the paradigm not only determine which topics are relevant. They determine too the approved manner of dealing with them: what counts as data, evidence, and the inference of fact; what can be allowed as axiomatic, what needs to be substantiated by argument or empirical proof. The paradigm, therefore, is a sort of cultural construct . . . So the way language is conceived by another discipline, informed by another set of beliefs and values (the culture of a different tribe of scholars) tends to be seen as irrelevant, inadmissible, or misconceived. . . . This means that those who try to promote cross-cultural relations by being interdisciplinary are likely to be ostracized by both sides and to be stigmatized twice over as amateur or mountebank. The role is even less enviable for those who would seek to mediate not only across disciplinary boundaries laterally at one level of abstraction but also across different levels of abstraction by referring academic enquiry to the realities of practical applicability. This is what applied linguists try to do,

This is also what the 1985 LSA/TESOL and NEH Institutes tried to

do, and what the present volume tries to do in representing the Institutes. I hope that readers who affirm the need for interdisciplinary and applied cum theoretical studies, will attune their eyes to the varying voices much as we attune our ears to the cadences of different languages or varying accents in our own languages.

As lectures delivered at the LSA/TESOL Institute, the chapters in this volume represent a range of research in linguistics. The authors do not agree on all issues, methods, and approaches. Yet, diverse as they are, they share a commitment to gaining understanding through close observation of language in use, and to exploring ways that our discipline can be of use to people in their lives. They share a commitment to rigorous inquiry of theoretical and practical import.

Deborah Tannen

New York, NY

REFERENCES

Geertz, Clifford. 1983. Local knowledge: Further essays in interpretive anthropology. New York: Basic Books.

Tannen, Deborah. 1988. The commingling of orality and literacy in giving a paper at a scholarly conference. American Speech 63:1.

Sacks, Oliver. 1986. The man who mistook his wife for a hat and other clinical tales. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Sacks, Oliver. 1987. Tics. New York Review of Books, January 29, 1987, 37–41.

APPENDIX

Papers by LSA/TESOL Institute faculty included in *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1985. Languages and Linguistics: The Interdependence of Theory, Data, and Application,* edited by Deborah Tannen and James E. Alatis. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1986.

William B. Moulton (Emeritus, Princeton University). An unexplored semantic relation between verb and complement: Reciprocal

Walt Wolfram (University of the District of Columbia and Center for Applied Linguistics) (with Deborah Hatfield). Interlanguage fads and linguistic reality: The case of tense marking

Suzanne Romaine (Oxford University). The syntax and semantics

of the code-mixed compound verb in Panjabi/English bilingual discourse

Marianne Mithun (SUNY Albany). Disagreement: The case of pronominal affixes and nouns

Leonard Talmy (University of California, Berkeley). Force dynamics as a generalization over 'causative'

Scott K. Liddell and Robert E. Johnson (Gallaudet College). American Sign Language compounds: Implications for the structure of the lexicon

Andrew Pawley (University of Auckland). Lexicalization

Beatriz R. Lavandera (University of Buenos Aires). Intertextual relationships: 'Missing people' in Argentina

Florian Coulmas (Universität Düsseldorf). Nobody dies in Shangri-La: Direct and indirect speech across languages

Susan U. Philips (University of Arizona). Reported speech as evidence in an American trial

Robin Tolmach Lakoff (University of California, Berkeley). My life in court

Haj Ross (Massachusetts Institute of Technology). Languages as poems

Charles A. Ferguson (Stanford University). The study of religious discourse

Wallace Chafe (University of California, Berkeley). How we know things about language: A plea for catholicism

Rita Wong (San Francisco State University). Does pronunciation teaching have a place in the communicative classroom?

John F. Fanselow (Teachers College Columbia University). You call yourself a teacher? An alternative model for discussing lessons

Michael Canale (Ontario Institute for Studies in Education). Language assessment: The method is the message

G. Richard Tucker (Center for Applied Linguistics). Developing a language-competent American society

Robert L. Cooper (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem). Selling language reform

Shirley Brice Heath (Stanford University). Literacy and language change

Frederick Erickson (Michigan State University). Listening and speaking

Mark A. Clarke (University of Colorado at Denver). Conversational narratives as altered states of consciousness

Jenny Cook-Gumperz (University of California, Berkeley). Keeping it together: Text and context in children's language socialization