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1. Introduction

As an unavoidable consequence of the marketplace phenomenon that typifies the contemporary academy (Bourdieu 1988 [1984]), the ‘factionalization’ of the social and behavioral sciences into sub-disciplines, academic specializations, theoretical schools, and methodological minorities can cause grave problems for the historiography of such disciplines. The study of pragmatics in the late twentieth century suffers from such a historiographic crisis. Divided into linguistic and anthropological linguistic orientations, the former is essentially unaware of the insights stemming from the latter, several exceptions notwithstanding (e.g., Verschueren 1994). In taking stock of the theoretical influences that have shaped contemporary pragmatics, clearly some relevant approaches have received little attention, or have been overlooked entirely, by the linguistic faction. One such omission is the intellectual lineage initiated by Roman Jakobson and followed up by his student, Michael Silverstein. The contributions made by these two individuals, and by students who have continued in this lineage, warrant reconsideration historiographically if for nothing more than bringing sociocultural considerations to bear on linguistic pragmatic problems. As one prominent anthropological linguist has observed, "pragmatic studies within linguistics and philosophy are strongly influenced by the theoretical and methodological concerns of those disciplines, which have very little interest or expertise in the study of culture" (Duranti 1994: 11). This paper attempts to redress this historiographic omission by enumerating on the recent contributions of Jakobson, Silverstein, and two of Silverstein's students.

Recently, Steve Caton (1993) has argued that "it is not unreasonable to date the beginning of a modern linguistic pragmatics from the publication in 1957 of Roman Jakobson's 'Shifters, verbal categories, and the Russian verb'" (1993: 335 fn.6).

---

1 I am grateful to Regina Bendix, Ward Goodenough, John Lucy, and an anonymous reviewer for detailed comments on an earlier version of this paper. Any oversights or misconstruals are my own.

2 The term 'historiography' is broadly construed herein to indicate the activity of textual exegesis where the text under interpretation has become a commodified entity in this marketplace. The amount of time that has passed since a text became available is irrelevant, as is the complete versus incomplete status of the author's oeuvre.
Pragmatics in its sociocultural application has its intellectual origins in the semiotic philosophies of Charles Peirce (1931) and Charles Morris (1938) and yet, Jakobson's contributions to this now pervasive mode of inquiry in anthropological linguistics should not be overlooked. Jakobson (1976, 1977), in fact, has discussed Peirce's influence with tremendous gratitude and laments the fact that he was the first linguist who utilized the theories of this 'pathfinder' in the science of language. Borrowing certain semiotic ideas from the writings of Peirce, especially his tripartite distinction of icon, index, and symbol, as well as the Saussurean distinction between 'langue' and 'parole,' the most significant point of Jakobson's 1957 article is to demarcate precisely the extent to which information about parole is encoded in grammar, referential indexes or 'shifters' cited as the linguistic signs responsible for this phenomenon. Even though he never formally advanced a theory of pragmatics, it is in his 1957 paper that Jakobson (1896-1982) ushered in what would become the defining concern of anthropological linguistic pragmatics in later years. This was an insistence that the context-sensitive or pragmatic function of speech have the same scholarly attention paid to it as the referential function of speech had for some time before.

Jakobson must equally get credit for reawakening in linguistics an interest in the functional analysis of the speech event, and it is his 1960 paper, "Closing statement: linguistics and poetics," where we find his clearest conception of this approach, the so-called 'means-end' model of the Prague Linguistic Circle, as described in his 1971 [1963] paper. Whereas much of previous theory had listed general sociological functions of language use (e.g., Bühler 1990 [1934]), the role of linguistic sign therein unclear, Jakobson proposed to begin with an analysis of the speech situation, placing the linguistic sign within it, and deriving an exhaustive typology of functions as they relate to the constituent factors of the situation. What Jakobson referred to as "the pragmatic approach to language" (1971 [1968]: 703) was this positing of a basic set of functions involved in the communicative act. That is, the referential, emotive, conative, phatic, poetic, and metalingual functions within a given speech situation vary in their relative importance and expressive salience, but are always present in the situation. In advancing such a functionalism, Jakobson showed that linguistic forms covary as the relations among components of the speech event change and are modified. Regarded as a pioneer of this functionalist approach in the analysis of the speech act, subsequently followed up by anthropological linguists Dell Hymes (1968 [1962], 1974a [1970], 1974b,1975) and Michael Silverstein (1975a, 1976b, 1985a), Jakobson brought to structural linguistics a model for demonstrating that contextual factors necessarily impinge on language form itself. Jakobson's factor-function characterization of the

---

3 What Jane Hill (1992) has referred to as the "anthropological critique of pragmatics" (1992:67).


5 So-called because these 'duplex signs' simultaneously shift their focus at the level of message and code.
speech event inaugurated a new perspective in the anthropology of language, supplying the basis for a pragmatic orientation that would, in later years, yield dramatic results in anthropological fieldwork and ethnolinguistic scholarship. The aim of this paper is to outline the bedrock of a modern pragmatics inherent in Jakobson's 1960 and later works, specifically in his exegesis of the factor-function approach to the speech act. In what follows, I will trace linear movements along shared intellectual-theoretical traditions of the late twentieth century, influential trends which recreated and modified these traditions. As an exercise in intellectual history, this paper will chart Jakobson's functionalist orientation on the speech act through Silverstein's (b. 1945) retooling of such under the aegis of pragmatics, culminating with a discussion touching on the recent work of several of Silverstein's students, Charles Briggs (b. 1953) and Greg Urban (b. 1949), both of whom have made contributions to ethnolinguistics from such a pragmatic orientation. Silverstein's approach warrants attention insofar as he has integrated theoretical claims laid out separately by Jakobson in his 1957 and 1960 papers. Silverstein's formulation of pragmatics synthesizes Jakobson's 1957 notion of speech indexicality with his 1960 functional diagram of the speech event, two concepts Jakobson never himself connected. Further, Silverstein's (1985b) article presents this integration in ethnolinguistic context, and both Briggs and Urban rely on this approach in their own studies.

On a more general level, this paper seeks to address a problem in intellectual historiography. One of the unfortunate circumstances that accrues to many instances of historiography of the social and behavioral sciences is the widespread neglect of research that does not follow suit with prevailing notions of what constitutes such an exercise, or what type of content ought to be included in such a historiographical project. Aggravating the problem is the stance endorsed by some historians of intellectual property that various approaches to empirical phenomena may be discounted and judged ineffectual on grounds that the property in historiographic question differs too profoundly with their own theoretical or methodological agenda. These scholars concentrate on large portions of some historiographic achievement, yet include in their discussion only those ideas that corroborate the historiographic object from a privileged position. Well-informed proponents may be placated, chalk up such neglect to a type of historiographic ideology, however it is difficult to ignore oversights that misrepresent seminal portions of the history.

As I explained above, the situation is particularly problematic in pragmatics, a field of study consisting of both linguistic and anthropological linguistic groupings, the influence of the former superseding that of the latter only in membership count, not in the ability to account for patterned, linguistic phenomena. For example, among the
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6 In the present paper, I will be utilizing the term 'ethnolinguistic' and 'anthropological linguistic' in a synonymous manner.

7 For this statement to be valid, Jakobson's 1956 paper, "Metalanguage as a linguistic problem," must be included in this 1960 and later rubric. The major portion of the the 1956 article is reiterated, quite literally, in this 1960 paper, and so this does not really cause any overt chronological discrepancies.
four major historiographic texts on pragmatics published in the last ten to fifteen years by linguists (i.e., Gazdar 1979; Leech 1983; Levinson 1983; and Mey 1993), the overall neglect afforded anthropological linguistic insights by their counterparts, particularly the work of Silverstein, attests to the chronic lack of disseminiation, and even intentional disregard, that characterizes the contemporary historiographic period. Without realizing it, one prominent historiographer epitomized the problem when he speculated "who would regard his [Silverstein's] output as in a particular way pioneering where pragmatics is concerned" (Koerner 1994: personal communication). This paper, although not initially conceived as such, offers an elaborate response to this opinion.

Emulating a technique used by Koerner (1990, 1991), we can draw the following filiation to illustrate my point: Jakobson → Silverstein → Briggs, Urban. In this way, Jakobsonian functionalism, and its succession into pragmatics of a decidedly ethnolinguistic character will be the dominant interest presented in this paper. Individually, each of these scholars has made original and poignant contributions to the general interests of linguistics and anthropological linguistics; the ‘lineage’ being imposed here, stemming from Jakobson and including Silverstein, Briggs, and Urban exists as one among many, each involving these individuals. The role or effect of educational mentoring will be addressed herein. However, what primarily concerns us are the patterns of usage and processual stages in the prolongation of theoretical claims, and how such claims are believed valid in light of ethnolinguistic observation. Publications by Darnell (1974, 1990), Hymes (1983), and even Silverstein (1986, 1989, 1991) himself detail the need for an ongoing historiography of the language sciences, and have given inspiration to this paper as a contribution to the history of anthropological linguistics. What is presented here is but one take on the relatively recent contributions of Jakobson to Silverstein and more tangentially, to Briggs and Urban.

The decision to focus on these four individuals (Jakobson, Silverstein, Briggs and Urban) should not be taken to imply neglect towards a myriad of other scholars that could have been included in the present discussion. Ethnolinguists such as Benveniste, Boas, Bauman, Friedrich, Gumperz, Hymes, Kurylowicz, Newman, Sapir, Sebeok, Sherzer, Voegelin, and Whorf, among a great many others, have all effected or been effected by one or more of these four scholars. This paper will emphasize the mentor-student arrangement in which the student has a temporal and proximal link to his mentor. Such a situation is uniquely significant in the intellectual development of the student, and therefore necessarily excludes many of the aforementioned individuals. The relationship among these four scholars to be discussed herein is predicated on linear arrangements, and I will restrict myself to these four. Historiography utilizing both linear and non-linear perspectives, or a combination of the two, have their relative strengths and drawbacks. I do not wish to enumerate these here nor to discuss the ideological ramifications of privileging linearity and direct contact. In this paper, linear relations will be drawn on to demonstrate the effect mentoring and the inspiration of one’s teachers have had on the development of certain ethnolinguistic concerns, and those academic affiliations and temporal/proximal influences that facilitated such developments.
2. Jakobson’s functionalism

Much of what will be discussed herein, under the general rubric of functionalism, owes its inception to Jakobson, and has been reworked by Silverstein. Silverstein studied under Jakobson in the late sixties and early seventies at Harvard University where Jakobson was Professor of Slavic Languages and Literatures and of General Linguistics, and has elaborated along semiotic-functional lines much of what Jakobson first conceptualized when he himself combined Peircean semiotics with his own Prague School structuralism. Silversteinian pragmatics, as will be made more clear, took an impetus from Jakobson’s appropriation of Peirce’s semiotic analysis of the sign and “although Jakobson...had already analyzed referential categories of grammar as ‘indexical,’ it was Silverstein who suggested that this sign-category might be usefully applied to the study of nonreferential uses of language” (Caton 1990: 159). Equally important to Jakobson was the fact that structuralism, of the type advocated by his Prague School colleagues, was viewed as being comprised of aggregate functions. "Structure in its proper sense...is a set of functions organizing atomized empirical reality" (Novák 1932 in Steiner 1978: 360). Structure, then, is predicated on a set of functions bound through internal interconnections into such a structure. Specifically, the Structuralists saw language as an instrument of communication, consisting of a number of functions which differed according to the goal for which they were utilized. However, as long as the Structuralists analyzed these functions from ‘natural’ language use, the multiplicity of functions served by language prevented them from arriving at any definite number of functions. Only by suspending this ‘natural attitude’ (i.e., by bracketing off all the social and psychological conditions of the act of communication, and taking into account only the act itself) did the Prague Structuralists arrive at the functional invariants of language (Steiner 1978: 381 fn.48). The first among the members of the Circle to take this step was Karl Bühler (1990 [1934]) who reduced the speech event to its three basic components (speaker, listener, and topic) and ascribed to them three basic functions (expressive, appellative, and presentational). Bühler’s preliminary typology of the functions of language was more fully elaborated by Jakobson (1960), and it is his typology that has achieved notable status in the anthropological literature (cf. Hymes 1968 [1962]; Silverstein 1985a).

Although Silverstein has ostensibly defined the field of pragmatics by his own original contributions, there is a definite link to be seen with the theories of his former teacher. One of the most productive tracks taken by Silverstein (and, in time, his own
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8 For insight into one of this indirect influences, Hill and Mannheim (1992) discuss Silverstein’s use of Whorf.

9 Silverstein received his doctorate from Harvard’s Department of Linguistics in 1972, and immediately secured a faculty position in the Department of Anthropology at the University of Chicago. He is currently the Samuel N. Harper Professor in the Departments of Anthropology, Linguistics, Psychology, and in the Committee on Ideas and Methods at the University of Chicago.
students) has been the application of Jakobson's multifunctional perspective of the communicative event to specific, ethnolinguistic problems. Such problems bear out the reality of some of what Jakobson put forth, combining linguistic theory with an appraisal of context-sensitive language use. To achieve this via empirically-grounded research, Silverstein had to amend to Jakobson's 'etic' framework of the speech event and its interacting components an 'emic' perspective. Emic, in this sense, demarcates a move from the strictly theoretical to the ethnological, from linguistic to ethnolinguistic. That is, "any pragmatic form is a signal that can be used both in effecting specific contextual changes and in describing them. And the description can focus on any of the components of the speech event: speaker, hearer, audience, referent, channel, signal, time, locus, or some relationship between these" (Silverstein 1981b: 15).

Whereas Jakobson was a theoretical linguist, never engaging in fieldwork in the anthropological sense, and focusing his attention primarily on Slavic languages and literatures, Silverstein and his Chicago students (Briggs and Urban) have been much more ethnographically-oriented, expanding the domain of research by focusing, in large part, on non-Western societies and languages. Such interests have much to do with Silverstein's insistence that "distinct pragmatic meanings yield distinct analyses of utterances, thereby severing our dependence on reference as the controlling functional mode of speech" (1976b: 21). The social ends accomplished by the pragmatic function of language are just as important as the propositional ends manifested by the referential function. An example of this pragmatic function is illustrated by the 'mother-in-law' language of Dyirbal which involves a special lexicon, referentially identical with the standard lexicon, that must be used in the presence of one's mother-in-law. "Use of this special language signals no change in referential content (what is being said), but only a change in situational or pragmatic context (to whom one is speaking)" (Mertz 1985: 6). Recent ethnolinguistic scholarship has, in part, dedicated itself to describing pragmatic function, and recently monographs extolling the pragmatic dimensions of language and the interaction these dimensions obtain with referentiality have been produced by a younger generation of anthropological linguists (e.g., Errington 1988; Hanks 1990), many of whom could be included in the Silversteinian intellectual lineage, having had Silverstein as their intellectual mentor while working towards the doctorate in Anthropology at the University of Chicago. Their descriptions of pragmatics (referential and nonreferential indexical signification) within an ethnographic surround augment Jakobsonian 'invariant' functionalism with Silverstein's claim that "various indexical systems are superimposed one on another in any phenomenal linguistic signal and are 'in play' to different degrees, over the realtime course of using language" (Silverstein 1987a: 32).

Silverstein's own linguistic work on Worora, an Australian aboriginal language

10 Other ethnolinguists who could be included in the lineage, in addition to Briggs and Urban, include the following. Dates in parenthesis indicate the year they received their doctorate from the University of Chicago's Department of Anthropology: J. Joseph Errington (1981), Richard Parmentier (1981), William Hanks (1983), Bruce Mannheim (1983), and Steve Caton (1984).
of the Northern Kimberley coast (1986), Dyirbal, an Australian aboriginal language of
the Cairns Rain Forest (1976a, 1981a),11 and the Wasco-Wishram dialect of Chinook,
attests to a concern with expanding the traditionally held belief that the referential
function of speech be the basis for linguistic theory.12 For example, in his work on
case-marking, Silverstein has demonstrated that referential indexical features, as well
as purely referential ones, are to be taken into consideration when seeking to explain
the patterns differentiating noun-phrase types in language (cf. Lucy 1992a: 96-99,
1992b: 68-71). In simplified terms, Silverstein's interpretation of noun-phrase types
argues for a 'hierarchical' model in which those forms that depend on the immediate
context of speech for their explication be marked differently than those that do not.
Specifically, regular 'splits' of case marking between nominative-accusative and ergative-
absolutive paradigms are shown "to be readily characterizable in terms of the resultant
ordering of referential features" (Lucy 1992a: 68). In organizing these features in
'referential space,'13 Silverstein (1981a, 1985c, 1987b) presents a cline of extensional
reference "for what the gradually more extensive groups of denotational categories
differentially include by way of characterizing potential referents" (1987b: 147). What
this means is that there is a gradual and uniform change in the conditions of reference
as one moves in either direction along this cline. At one extreme end of the cline,
denotational categories denote indexically and always refer to entities that are the very
conditions for using any tokens of language at all, always presupposable in the acts of
reference. These are the necessarily constituted roles of speaker and addressee. At the
other end, reference heavily depends on the presupposition of syntactico-semantical
category types in morphosyntactic structure, organized in linguistically-stipulated
utterance formations. These types, 'segmentable natural kind things,' are "intensional
categories the interrelated structure of which corresponds to the set of all possible
distinct morphosyntactic patterns in a language" (Silverstein 1987b: 153) whose
referential components for accomplishing extensionalization are much less dependent
on indexicality for explanation. Thus, the indexical factor is most important at the one
end, in the region of personal deictics, and the semantico-syntactically-based
extensionalizations are most important at the other end, constituted by abstract entities
of extension.

From this data, Silverstein (1987b) presents the argument that it is on the
indexical end of the cline that the self-referential quality of speech, that is, the ability
of forms to refer to their own relationship in the speech situation, is demonstrated.

11 Silverstein's Dyirbal data comes from Dixon (1972).

12 When listing the various languages with which Silverstein has worked, American English (1984,
1985d, 1987c) features prominently. However, because this paper focuses exclusively on his
ethnolinguistic studies, I have chosen not to discuss herein this facet of Silverstein's contribution.

13 I refer the reader to Silverstein's two-dimensional figure of such, originally printed in (1981a), and
Referencing the act of speaking itself through the use of personal deictics, self-referentiality is made possible by the pragmatic function (indexicality). In such an interpretation, Silverstein not only demonstrates the relationship that the pragmatic function of language has with its referential counterpart, but points to an interesting phenomenon whereby native speakers are, for the most part, unaware of this indexical level. Silverstein offers an explanation when he explains that there is a marked difference in the nature of characterizability conditions on extendable objects. And it is this seemingly less obviously transparent involvement of factors of indexicality...that makes the experience of extending entities with [intensional syntacticosemantic] categories...appear to be less 'centered' in the pragmatics of the communicative event, more a matter of applying language to a decentered and 'objectively categorizable' universe 'out there,' that exists - in some sense - independent of such pragmatic events of communicating about it. (1987b: 157)

Silverstein's interest in accounting for the relationship between actual language use and native speaker awareness of such language use (1976b, 1979, 1981b) relies heavily on what he has called 'metapragmatics,' the referring to and predicating about the pragmatic function of language. Metapragmatics, in this way, is the reconstruction of an indexical signalling event, the picking out of and supplying information about a pragmatic act. Metapragmatics "is a description of an indexical signalling event" (Silverstein 1987b: 159). As such, the metapragmatic function is based on referentiality and operates concurrently with the pragmatic one. "Without a metapragmatic function simultaneously in play with whatever pragmatic function(s) there may be in discursive interaction, there is no possibility of interactional coherence, since there is no framework of structure...in which indexical origins or centerings are relatable one to another as aggregated contributions to some segmentable, accomplishable, event(s)" (Silverstein 1993: 37). The coincidence of these two functions is described by Silverstein as "the unavoidability and transparency of metapragmatic reference" (1981a: 241). That metapragmatic reference should be unavoidable and transparent to the native speaker is, in some part, predicated on the nature of the 'marked' noun-phrase to foreground the event of speaking. The linguistic ideology of the native speaker, as will be explained, highlights awareness of the referential function of language while hindering awareness of the indexical function. Such an ideology of reference (Silverstein 1979) is caused by the inclination of native speakers to "objectify on the basis of analogies to certain pervasive surface-segmentable linguistic patterns, and act accordingly" (Silverstein 1979: 202). In other words, Silverstein makes a distinction between the linguist's trained analysis of language and the 'secondary rationalizations' of native speakers.

Inherently included in the act of speaking by virtue of the personal deictics, the transparency and unavoidable coincidence experienced by the native speaker of metapragmatic code to its pragmatic object code arises from having to functionally
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14 This correlates with what Silverstein (1993) has called 'denotationally explicit' metapragmatic sign function. However, it also holds true for 'denotationally implicit' or 'virtual' metapragmatic functioning.
differentiate a ‘plurifunctional’ sign. Both indexical and referential sign modalities are united, even laminated, in one sign token. Specifically, the personal deictics denote by virtue of the fact that they unavoidably index their denotata, which are therefore characterizable as the pragmatic conditions presupposed by these forms. Silverstein (1987b) contends that

the indexical presuppositions, hence pragmatics, of the use of each of these forms, are precisely what are extendable by them; hence, the indexical function is transparently represented in the characterizability conditions, that is, the conditions for extensional use of the denotational category. At the same time, it is clear that the very form that is the indexical signal is the signal that refers to what is indexed; hence, to isolate the indexical sign is to isolate the referential sign, and there is unavoidable coincidence of these two modalities. So we might see the denotational content of these [personal deictic] categories as a transparent and unavoidably coincident metapragmatics for their own indexical conditions of occurrence, their pragmatics. They are, in effect, INDEXICAL DENOTATIONALS, the denotational content of which is transparently metapragmatic with respect to its denotational coincident pragmatic content. (1987b: 162)

More will be said about metapragmatics as a prominent semiotic-functional concern, especially in its service to the ethnolinguistic work of Briggs and Urban, but realize that Silverstein’s claim of metapragmatic transparency and unavoidability is grounded in linguistic scholarship; such scholarship forms the basis from which to advance semiotic-functional observations. Such claims have been utilized by Silverstein’s students in different ways, both prescriptively (Briggs 1986), and with guarded optimism (Errington 1985, 1988). Clearly, Silverstein’s claims establishing the unavoidable and transparent nature of metapragmatic functioning take an impetus from Jakobson’s positing of a metalingual function, where language has as its object the code itself. This paper is most concerned with this avenue of Silverstein’s work, and mentions his linguistic studies of case-marking only to show that empirical research underlies his semiotic-functional arguments.

Such stipulations, deriving eventually from Silverstein’s own fieldwork data, are useful in ethnolinguistic scholarship insofar as they provide the neophyte researcher with at least a partial ‘model’ of what to expect regarding native language ideologies. Such ideologies, as "any sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification or perceived language structure and use" (Silverstein 1979: 193), are articulated by native speakers through several semiotic-functional factors, as identified by Silverstein (1981b). For example, one of the identified factors encapsulating native linguistic ideology is what Silverstein calls "unavoidable referentiality" (1981b: 5) Unavoidable referentiality is an inherent quality of plurifunctional signs by which the referential-and-predicational mode of such signs are more salient to native description than their concomitant indexical mode. Specifically, it is this factor that can be correlated to the ‘unavoidability’ of metapragmatic
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15 For an enumeration of Silverstein’s other factors that impinge on native linguistic ideologies, see Lucy (1992a: 117-126).
reference, as described above. However, in Silverstein's conceptualization, language function as analyzed by the trained anthropological linguist is to be kept distinct from native awareness of this function. As seen here, though, certain semiotic phenomena can be calqued from the level of language function onto the level of native speaker awareness. For example, the unavoidability and transparency of metapragmatic reference of language use finds expression in speaker awareness as unavoidable referentiality. Besnier (1993), in describing affect producing devices in Tuvaluan, contends that speakers are more aware of lexical devices (e.g., "hurry!") for marking affective meaning than of intonation and stress because the former are singular in purpose, and therefore more available to explanation. The latter, Besnier explains, "are less readily identifiable as the vehicle through which these emotional states are communicated" (1993: 194), having to be superposed on the syntactic structure of a sentence whose primary purpose is to communicate referential meaning.

What remains to be seen is how the emphasis on native language ideologies by Silverstein (1979, 1981b) has had an impact on the ethnolinguistic scholarship of his students. This will be accomplished further in the paper, but first we must backtrack slightly and focus on those aspects of Jakobson's functionalist typology that influenced Silverstein's pragmatics. Jakobson's stipulation regarding language reflexivity, as emphasized in his 'poetic' and 'metalingual' functions, prefaced Silverstein's pragmatics and metapragmatics, and having familiarized ourselves with some of Silverstein's agenda, it is necessary to see some earlier influences on his subsequent work.

3. Jakobson's reflexivity

When the overall orientation of a speech situation is directed towards the message, that is, directed towards the communicated expression, the poetic function is said to be dominant. From Jakobson's functionalist perspective, the purpose of the poetic function is to focus the message on itself and in this respect, the poetic function is 'introversively' or reflexively semiotic. Reflexivity is intrinsic to the poetic functioning of language because the message itself is being indexed on by virtue of a poetic configuration. By identifying poetry as introversive semiosis, as a reflexive activity, Jakobson shows how a laying down of patterned text in syntagmatic and paradigmatic arrangements can comment on the message. Here the basic semiotic activities of selection and combination are being manipulated to create the poetically-structured verbal interaction.

The poetic function of language is implicated in all language use in the regular structuring of meaning into utterances and texts. Because language is structural, the poetic function is always operating. This process is made explicit when formal units are considered on their combinatory positions within the sequential order of linear discourse. Thus, the fundamental poetic principle is sequential measure, or meter, in terms of which the linear signal can be measured off into quantifiable units. Elements within the same utterance in sequentially-definable positions are equivalent insofar as they can be metaphorically compared and contrasted. It is stressed that any linguistic
form can serve as the basis for poetic structure, defined with respect to the principle of meter. Silverstein (1984) has pushed this type of analysis and demonstrated that poetic structure is immanent in the real-time work of everyday, dyadic conversation. This harks back to Jakobson's insistence that the definition of the poetic function is purely formal and operational, possessing no inherent aesthetic quality, and made manifest in everyday discourse as it is in formal performance (Friedrich 1986).

What has been come to be known as 'poetry' (by our culture's ethnocentric evaluation of such) has a particular poetic structure, but not all poetic structure comes under the definition of what our culture calls poetry. The units relevant to poetic structures can be at any level of language, so that there are word-measured poetic structures, phrase-measured, those measured over whole sentences, etc. The Jakobsonian conceptualization of a poetic function in language becomes a prerequisite to any analysis of cross-cultural language use, availing the researcher a means by which to comparatively study metrical arrangement. However, the poetic function exists only as one among many within an interactional matrix of the sort envisioned by Jakobson (1960). To see this, a synopsis of his functional typology of the entire speech event must be forthcoming.

As a structuralist, Jakobson was able to theoretically outline the constituent elements of, and place in a proper perspective, speech interaction, therefore accomplishing a description of a social-scientific phenomenon that had long eluded a complete characterization. This is not to imply that what resulted was a finished typology; certainly the Jakobsonian model could have and did undergo successive revisions by other scholars (cf. Hymes 1968 [1962]; Silverstein 1985a). Briggs (1986) has done an outstanding job in his book, *Learning How to Ask*, of positing both the advantages and shortcomings of these analyses, and so that is not our task here. What will be accomplished by the following discussion is a summation of Jakobson's detailed model of explanation that would later inspire application from an ethnographic and comparative perspective in the work of Silverstein, Briggs, and Urban.

The first of the factors in any speech act focuses on the 'addresser' and involves "the speaker's attitude towards what he is speaking about" (Jakobson 1960: 354). It has been termed the 'emotive' function due to the expressive style of the utterance(s) involved. It is important to see that in positing a purely emotive function, Jakobson was not being reductionistic and emphasizing a nonlinguistic aspect of language, but extremely attentive to the details; the emotive aspect according to him flavors all of our utterances to some extent and is inherent even when seemingly absent. Moving on, the second of the six factors of any utterance highlights to whom the utterance is directed, the 'addressee.' This factor has a 'conative' function insofar as language is being used to achieve a result in an addressee, in accordance with the addresser's wishes. Third, the 'referential' function which coincides with the 'context' factor operates within the interaction as the someone or something spoken of, or more purposefully, the entity in the external world to which a linguistic expression refers. However, for the interaction to work properly, a channel or 'contact' is the fourth factor that must be present as the accompanying interpersonal communicative stance serving a 'phatic' or socially-binding function.
Fifth, the ‘code’ is the factor of the speech event necessary as a gamut of interpretive conventions which enables expression and response to that expression. It is the linguistic raw material mutual intelligible to both speaker and addressee. The ‘metalingual’ function which corresponds to the code is the intent of a speech event towards a direct elucidation of the code. And finally sixth, the ‘message’ factor is the communicated expression itself and an explication of this message (which indirectly and tacitly makes reference to the nature of the code as well) is the goal of the ‘poetic’ function. As the relative importance of the six factors are ever changing in the course of social interaction, so too is the relative hierarchy of the functions.

It has been argued by Mannheim (1986) that four of the functions Jakobson has posited are ‘extroversively’ semiotic, in that the object of the message is outside the medium: The context which is the object of reference, the addressee as the object of the conative function, the addresser as the object of the emotive function and the social relationship between participants in the speech event as the object of the phatic function. As mentioned previously, two are ‘introversively’ or ‘reflexively’ semiotic, in that their object is the sign activity itself: The metalingual function questions the message as to the nature of the linguistic code, focusing on the generic conditions of the sign activity. The poetic function focuses on the particular message form, utilizing the principle of equivalence to select from the syntagmatic and paradigmatic possibilities to recast the message into another one. Jakobson states, "the selection is produced on the base of equivalence, similarity or dissimilarity, synonymity and antonymity, while the combination, the build-up of the sequence, is based on contiguity. The poetic function projects the principle of equivalence from the axis of selection into the axis of combination. Equivalence is promoted to the constitutive device of the sequence" (Jakobson 1960: 358).

Jakobson makes the argument that like the poetic function, the metalingual function "also makes a sequential use of equivalent units when combining synonymic expressions into an equational sentence" (Jakobson 1960: 358). This is only true, however, in terms of grammatical concordance. He explains that "poetry and metalanguage...are in diametrical opposition to each other: In metalanguage the sequence is used to build an equation, whereas in poetry the equation is used to build a sequence" (Jakobson 1960: 358). The two differ in yet another way. Recall that "metalanguage makes explicit, aware, and discursive reference to the nature of the linguistic code. Verbal art makes implicit, subliminal, and non-discursive reference to the code in the process of focusing on the message" (Mannheim 1986: 52). This is the seminal differentiation from the standpoint of reference: Whereas metalanguage seeks to propositionally explain the code, the poetic function seeks to interpret and translate the message.

Jakobson's insights regarding reflexivity, as important as they were on an individual basis, were never integrated into his larger speech-act schemata. His extroversive functions remained virtually apart from his introversive ones, and his model of speech interaction was in this sense incomplete. However, Jakobson's unfinished project was to be taken up by Silverstein who demonstrated that reflexivity is immanent and pervasive in social linguistic interaction. In the course of this synthesis, Silverstein
was to redefine in Jakobson's model those features that presented obstacles. Thus, Jakobson's reliance on lingua-structural meaning was to be enhanced with Silverstein's social pragmatic insights. For Jakobson's (1960) model, this would entail the addition of a indexically-constituted, functional explanation of the speech event.

4. Silverstein's functionalisms

As discussed previously, one of Silverstein most insightful contributions in the intellectual lineage under discussion was the positing of a 'metapragmatics' (1976b; 1985a), or the describing of the pragmatic use of language. Metapragmatics, as the metalinguistic reporting that describes pragmatic language use, utilizes the same basic code (or grammar) to describe or characterize this pragmatics. It is essentially speech about context-related speech, using language to communicate about the activity of using language. In accomplishing this, metalanguage relies on language's own reflexive ability. Jakobson (1960) has laid the groundwork in ascribing the metalingual function, speech focused towards the explication of the code. In the Silversteinian regimentation, metalinguistic activity is fundamentally metapragmatic, that is, for him most reflexive language deals with the appropriate use of language.

In his recent paper, "Metapragmatic discourse and metapragmatic function," Silverstein (1993) has taken up the notion of entextualization,16 and dissected it into its constituent parts, making its role in discursive interaction more discernible. It is important to sketch his distinctions, along functional lines, so that Jakobson’s (1960) continuing involvement in his thinking is revealed. Within discourse, according to Silverstein (1993), three levels of interactional semiosis may be said to be in play at any given moment. First, there is the 'discursive interaction,' the sociocultural use of language that seems "to have a coherence as a dynamic event that maps presupposed cause onto entailed effect" (1993: 36). Second, there is the construing of this interaction as an entextualizable entity, an 'interactional text,' attributing to the facts of discourse some cohesive structure (cf. Silverstein 1985a: 140). As explained in the previous section, the metapragmatics of any piece of discourse necessarily interacts with the pragmatics of that speech so

that at least implicitly models the indexical-sign-in-context relationships as event-segments of interactional text. (1993: 36)

In effect, the metapragmatic function defines indexicals as interpretable events of such-and-such type. This understanding of discursive interaction as events of such-and-such type. This understanding of discursive interaction as events of such-and-such type.

---

16 Bauman and Briggs (1990, 1992) have also elaborated on this term and its applications.
type is the creation of interactional text. When considering this process, it is obvious that metapragmatic function is as pervasive (and necessary) in language use as is the pragmatic function. Here Jakobson's insistence that "we practice metalanguage without realizing the metalingual character of our statements" (1985 [1956]:117) has undergone further elaboration by Silverstein.

Finally, a third level posited in the entextualization schemata is that of 'denotational text' where referring-and-predicating are understood as the central, purposive functions of discursive interaction. When reference-and-predication is privileged to the exclusion of alternate functions, a denotational text is being created. It is stressed here that the denotational text is but one model of discursive coherence, and any interpretation of what actually happened as a denotational text stems an analysis of discourse operating under a metapragmatic requirement "that every indexical be referable to a text-sentence that corresponds to some syntactic structure of denotationally evaluated morphosyntactic form" (1993:37). Before discussing the effects of privileging such reference-and-predication denotation as the primary function of language, which leads directly to the critique that Silverstein (1985b, 1987a) has lodged against Jakobson's factor-function approach, the validity of positing the entextualization process as actually conforming to what happens in discourse must be assessed.

Participants in discursive interaction entextualize insofar as they have in mind accessible 'cognitive' representations of what is going on from particular interpretative perspectives. This means that while indexicality is a relationship of sign-tokens to their contextual surround, cognitive models of what is generated by and in indexicality of behavioral forms are probably generally in the form of textual interpretations of various sorts, highly influenceable by systems of discursive knowledge. As speakers and hearers, we do not literally 'presuppose' and 'entail.' These are semiotic relationships between signs and their indexical contexts. As Silverstein (1993) is quick to point out, there are logical relations of presupposition and entailment at the level of metapragmatic propositions about signals-in-context. To the extent that one believes that our interactional intentionality is composed of such propositional attitudes, then one might say that speakers and hearers also 'presuppose' and 'entail.' The object of the present paper is not to trace the theoretical underpinnings of entextualization, and so, I will discontinue such discussion at this time. I emphasize, though, that Silverstein's pragmatics delve far into the 'cognitive' side of discursive phenomenon.

When considering the aforementioned problem of privileging reference-and-predication as the overwhelming function of language, Silverstein (1985b, 1987a) diverges with his mentor, demonstrating that Jakobson's (1956, 1960) conceptualization of functionalism was 'pragmatic' only in assigning functions to the speech situation. What is most interesting about Silverstein's reconfiguration is the fact that had Jakobson incorporated his earlier stipulations on the indexical dimension of language (1957), into his conceptualizations of speech-act functionalism (1956, 1960), Silverstein's critique of such may have been unnecessary. So as not to frame the critique as being directed solely at Jakobson, Silverstein's (1985b, 1987a) complete clarification of the role of 'function' in language-centered theories will be addressed, positing two problematic functionalisms that are both intrinsically deficient in terms of his own
The first view on human language that falls short in terms of his pragmatic functionalist perspective is what Silverstein (1985b, 1987a) has called 'structural functionalism.' In this view, formal linguistic structure is abstracted and divorced from the actualities of speech performance. It is completely centered towards referentiality in that this theory about language, having the sentence as its ideal, posits a "formally complete object of linguistic study, in which form...can be systematically related to meaning" (1987a: 18), and the referential relationships that develop herein are constant, identifiable without knowledge of actual usage. It becomes increasingly apparent that what it at stake if this structural function of language is endorsed is the actual contextual knowledge of any speech event; in its place is sort of a 'synthetic,' universally-applicable, propositional knowledge of reference and predication guided by the generic matrix of grammatical constraints. It is 'structural' in this sense, positing "a particular kind of functional explanation that situates the central linguistic cognitive process in autonomous grammatical structure" (1987a: 22), independent of any facts of actual linguistic usage.

This functionalism of language is nothing more than a highly structured system which seeks to impose a symbolic template on speech. Derived from the work of Saussure and Leonard Bloomfield, in this 'formalist' approach to language, surface lexical forms, individually or in grammatical construction, have been privileged so that, taken as a set, they "specify the 'function' of the lexeme or expression in the total grammatical system of the language" (1985b: 208). Thus, the delimitation of the totality of grammatical forms to be analyzed is, implicitly, restricted to the referential-and-predicational view of language. Reference, in this sense, is taken to mean sign units in grammatical arrangements, the meaning of which is a descriptive or referring proposition. "It is this referential function of speech, and its characteristic sign mode, the semantico-referential sign, that has formed the basis for linguistic theory and linguistic analysis in the Western tradition" (Silverstein 1976b: 14). For Silverstein, reference works in conjunction with indexicality, an aspect of language forgotten in this conceptualization.

The second theory on language that falls short of a pragmatic functionalism is what Silverstein has called 'illocutionary' or 'speech-act functionalism.' In this approach, advocated by philosophers of language such as Austin, Searle, and Grice, function is seen "as the purposive, goal-oriented use of speech...by intentional individuals in specific situations of discourse, each usage constituting a speech act" (1987a: 23). In opposition to the asocial, unconscious predication of the first functionalism, illocutionary functionalism posits a conscious and purposive behavior. The problem, though, that arises in this conception has to do with the reception or perlocutionary effects rendered with respect to the illocutionary desire. Specifically, we cannot uniquely associate any given illocution with a particular perlocution for two reasons.

First, "illocutionary function indicating devices are not necessarily explicit clause-level material" (1987a: 29). In other words, some designations of illocutionary functions in English, for example, cannot be realized by a uniquely apparent performatiave at the level of code. That is, there exists a "host of such linguistic devices, usages of which
have metapragmatic descriptions as conventional communication types, but...have no clause-level realization" (1987a: 30). Within the English language, this problem translates into an overabundance of metapragmatic illocutionary functions that do not find realization in actual performatives.

The second problem similarly deals with the absence of a one-to-one relationship between illocution and perlocutionary reception. Too few illocutions explicitly fail to designate within situational contexts perlocutionary effects that may be multiply interpreted. For example, in the illocutionary phrase, "Do you have the time?," a perlocutionary effect in the mind of the hearer might take the form of a demand or of an informational question, but there is, in the mind of the sender, a unique illocutionary intent being specified. The overall problem, then, with the illocutionary function of language stems from the fact that the degree of precision with which the illocutionary function operates in relation to perlocutionary reception is not accurate enough to rule out occasional misunderstandings within the speech event. There is no recourse towards clarification in this functionalism; a comprehensive model must be able to account for, and resolve, such a problem.

Silverstein includes among those guilty of prescribing a model of speech-act functionalism, Jakobson (1960) with his factor-function typology of the speech event, as well as the ethnography of speaking approach of Hymes (1974), and much of the pragmatics advocated by the strictly linguistic faction, as discussed in the introductory section. What bothers Silverstein about all of these approaches is the fact that they all see the activity of speaking as based on the individual's proposition-like classification model predicated on extensional reference. Such a model of language use seems to ask "when and how is it socially appropriate/correct/effective to refer-and-predicate with such-and-such forms in such-and-such context" (1987a:24)? This account of language is essentially a diagram built from a structural analysis of a maximally appropriate referring-and-predicating event, constructed without ever questioning the ability of such an abstracted schema to adequately describe, for example, indexical systems. This account is basically "an idealization of how lexical expressions propositionally or referentially function in grammatical patterns that underlie how certain utterances can...function in achieving effective referring-and-predicating results" (Silverstein 1987a: 25). Silverstein's insistence of the plurifunctionality of the linguistic sign, that is, the superposition of both referential and nonreferential functions in one sign, denies that reference-and-predication be the singular, functional reading. For him, the same signal serves in many functional systems simultaneously.

Hymes (1974 [1970]) is particularly problematic in this respect, insisting that the pragmatic (what he calls 'stylistic') and the referential functions of language are never co-occurrent. "What is stylistic in a given context cannot at the same time be referential, although the same feature may serve different functions in different contexts" (1974 [1970]: 161). Elsewhere, Hymes lumps both referential and stylistic functions into a category of 'structural' functions, and makes this distinct from a 'use' functions category. He contends that

'structural' functions have to do with the bases of verbal features and their organization, the
relations among them, in short, with the verbal means of speech, and their conventional meanings, insofar as these are given by such relationships. 'Use' functions have to do with the organization and meaning of verbal features in terms of nonlinguistic contexts. The two are interdependent, but it is useful to discriminate them. It seems likely that rules of co-occurrence can be considered to have to do with structural functions, and rules of alternation with use functions. (Hymes 1974: 439)

Hymes' dichotomization of structural from use functions reminds of Jakobson's invariant typology of the speech act into its six components where every factor can be seen to conform to a prefabricated function. However, Silverstein (1987a) has praised both Jakobson (1960) and Hymes (1974) for emphasizing indexicality in language. A footnote in one of Silverstein's articles (1979) assesses the extent to which the indexical function has been incorporated in their work. "Now-classic statements of at least portions of this [indexical] point of view are Jakobson (1971 [1957]: 130-47); (1960) and Hymes (1974 [1964]: 3-27); (1974 [1972]: 29-66). The first of these is explicitly semiotic and formally analytic; the perspective of the other three is clearly functional, but not especially semiotic, in light of the results of the first. This rapprochement is a more recent development in many later studies - including my own - influenced by the ones cited" (1979: 239 fn.11). In this quote can be discerned Silverstein's own view as to how he enters into the lineage under present discussion.17 Whereas Jakobson (1957) demonstrates an initial awareness of what would later become, in part, the indexical ground of Silversteinian pragmatic functionalism, he did not include these stipulations of the nature of the sign with his speech-act functionalist model (1960). That is, Jakobson did not inform his 1960 article with the formal-semiotic analysis as it was laid out in his 1957 publication. Similarly, Hymes (1974 [1964], 1974 [1972]) fails to realize that indexicality necessarily connects structural and use functions, thereby dissolving such an analytical distinction. From a certain perspective, Silverstein accomplishes what Jakobson and Hymes did not: The inclusion of speech indexicality in a speech-act functionalist template.

What Silverstein calls 'pragmatic functionalism' seeks to explain linguistic structures by their occurrence in, and by their serving as indexes of, particular presupposed communicative contexts of use. The advantage that pragmatic functionalism holds over structural and illocutionary functionalism is its indexical orientation. Indexicality is the missing component in such problematic functionalisms insofar as it links the elements of speech with the existential reality that is copresent with any utterance in the first, and in the second serves to solidify a unique correspondence between intent and effect in verbal action. "The indexical or pragmatic realm of function is, in a sense, the most elementary sign function in language. It

17 I do not overly concern myself with the work of Hymes in this paper, although he has had an indirect mentoring effect on Silverstein. For example, they share an ethnolinguistic interest in Chinookan, and Hymes was teaching at Harvard around the same time that Silverstein was an undergraduate there (AB 1965). An interesting historiographic aside concerning Hymes is that, like Silverstein in his "Shifters, linguistic categories, and cultural description" paper (1976b), he too has dedicated one of this more celebrated papers (1968 [1962]) to Roman Jakobson.
bespeaks the simple fact of the situatedness of language use as a social action in some context" (Silverstein 1985b: 225). Further, when undertaking ethnolinguistic analysis, Silverstein advocates a method directed towards discerning "the pragmatics of metapragmatic usage" (1985a: 138). This method entails not only the identification of this languages’s metapragmatic construction types, but equally involves a pragmatic interpretation of such types as they are systematically distributed in discourse.

5. Ethnolinguistic studies of Warao and Shokleng

The concept of metapragmatics, as instituted by Silverstein, has been responsible for spurring on late twentieth century ethnolinguistic research to a profound degree, and it is not farfetched to argue that such a theoretical conception is Silverstein’s most important contribution to the historical line under consideration. He himself admits to the importance of such when he states that

I am particularly concerned with the metapragmatic usages of different languages, because I believe that in this functional mode we will find an empirical entree into the conceptual understanding of language that each society of speakers brings to bear on the activity of actually using it, and hence, on its constituted norm. In other words, there is a necessary relationship between the way in which metapragmatic constructions of languages code the pragmatics of speaking, and the ideological and cognitive strategies that speakers employ in culturally-conceptualized situations of speaking. (1985a: 138)

Metapragmatics has an impact on contemporary anthropological scholarship insofar as recent years have seen the emergence of ethnography grounded in enunciating, to a certain extent, native pragmatic ideology (e.g., Errington 1985; Hanks 1993; Mertz 1993). In this way, metapragmatics may be included in the analytic arsenal of the ethnolinguist. For example, what the informant indicates as the pragmatics of a particular language is, in fact, the indigenous ideological representation of such pragmatics. Such a metapragmatics serves to illustrate this point, and recent scholarship focusing on the ideologies of language use (Kroskrity et al. 1992) is essentially part of a larger ethnolinguistic project.

This section will highlight the work of Briggs and Urban because, apart from their placement in the lineage having had Silverstein as a mentor, their ethnolinguistic work has focused on South Amerindian languages, one of my own professional interests. Anthropological linguistics in native South America has of late seen an increased interest (Urban and Sherzer 1988: 283), and although the pragmatic model is one of many now being applied, it deserves attention as a new approach to a culture area that has long been occupied solely by historical and structural linguists. The advent of pragmatics has produced some interesting findings linking language structure and use to its cultural context, and it is this recent, anthropological linguistic scholarship on South Amerindian languages that will receive attention. As a disclaimer, what follows is the most rudimentary of discussions, aimed at introducing the reader most generally to the manner by which the pragmatic-ethnological nexus has been demarcated by
Briggs and Urban. Specific insights and individual contributions fleshed out in Briggs' and Urban's work are far too numerous and complex to be adequately addressed herein.

Briggs has shown that ethnographic events such as disputes, mythological narratives, and ritual wailing, all of which are the proper provenance of anthropology, can yield important findings when looked at with an eye towards metapragmatics. Having studied at the University of Chicago's Department of Anthropology in the late seventies and early eighties, Briggs' ethnological interests are quite diverse, including Mexicano verbal art (1985a, 1985b, 1988a), fieldwork methodology (1984, 1986), ethnolinguistic studies utilizing Warao, an indigenous language of Venezuela (1988b, 1992a, 1992b, 1993a, 1994), and analyses of ideological and authoritative forces immanent in discursive phenomena (1993b, 1993c). What follows is a brief synopsis of how Briggs has applied the pragmatic and metapragmatic paradigm in his ethnolinguistic studies of Warao. Although Briggs has expanded the theories of Jakobson and Silverstein, his strength seems to be in rigorously applying what he has learned from his mentor(s) to the ethnological context. In this way, I will not be discussing Briggs' refinement of the theoretical lineage in which I have included him, but with his exegesis of theory as it relates to ethnolinguistics.

Much of Briggs' scholarship centers on configuring Jakobson's poetic function towards a better understanding of what McDowell (1986) has called 'folkloric semiosis.' "Folkloric semiosis transpires in the context of a face-to-face confrontation among the personnel. In folkloric semiosis sender and receiver are not only copresent, but also typically located within a proxemic range facilitating direct verbal and nonverbal interaction" (1986: 263). To further clarify this relationship, Briggs (1988b, 1992a, 1993) has enlisted Silverstein's metapragmatic orientation in recent studies on the Warao language. For example, the Warao conduct dispute mediation events in response to intra- and inter-familial conflict. Briggs (1988b) demonstrates the simultaneity by which metapragmatic features in narratives interpret the situation that gave rise to the conflict, regulate the ongoing interaction, and seek to determine the manner in which community members will relate after the event has concluded.

Briggs has found that the importance of competing modes of talking and associated ways of relating provides us with insight as to why Warao narratives can play such a crucial role in conflict and mediation. Narratives do not simply focus attention on events. Narrative resources are utilized in creating events out of experience. Poetically organized in complex ways, they provide narrators with powerful tools for embedding interpretations in action to such an extent that why something happened seems to flow naturally from a description of what took place. "The poetic dimension also calls attention to the narrating event, creating a powerful iconic relationship between what is said to have taken place and what is happening at the moment" (1988b: 485).

In another ethnographically-oriented paper, Briggs (1993) addresses the problem

---

18 Briggs received his doctorate in Anthropology in 1981 from the University of Chicago.
of multiple performances of the ‘same’ text. Briggs analyzes three renditions of a single Warao narrative by the same person in order to show how participants’ understandings of each performance play a role in differentiating the performance events. Silverstein (1993) has discussed the ‘calibration’ (i.e., relationship) of metapragmatic signaling event to entextualized or reported event-structure and Briggs employs this concept, focusing on the degree to which each of three performance types treats the relationship between narrated (reported or entextualized) events and narrating (signaling) events. The first type is the monologic performance which emphasizes the integrity of the narrated event, and the ‘disjoint’ or separate relationship the narrating event has to the narrated one. The second type, that of dialogic performance, emphasizes the link of narrated to narrating event by way of an explicit metapragmatics which spells out exactly how the two events are to be united. The final type is the acquisition-oriented performance that, in focusing on the pedagogical instruction of social interaction, emphasizes the process of producing a narrative, and so the calibration is reflexive, designating a relationship in which metapragmatic signaling and entextualized elements form part of the same discursive and interactional unit. In his concluding remarks, Briggs insists that his own ethnolinguistic studies of Warao have endeavored to demonstrate, most generally, that "metapragmatics does not simply enable us to disambiguate reference or to calibrate inferential processes - metapragmatics provides essential means of connecting discourse with lived experience" (1993: 207).

Like Briggs, the ethnolinguistic work of Greg Urban (1981, 1984, 1985a, 1985b, 1986a, 1986b, 1989, 1991, 1993) emphasizes a similar interest in metapragmatics, most ostensibly, with demonstrating its applicability to the study of South Amerindian mythology. Urban received his doctorate from the University of Chicago's Department of Anthropology in 1978, and was one of Silverstein's first students to systematically apply his mentor's work on pragmatics to an anthropological context, specifically the mythology of Brazil's Shokleng Indians. Because Urban's overall argument has received steady treatment, in bits and pieces, over a long period of time (1981-1993), what is presented in the following account is a general discussion of his oeuvre. Specific articles will be considered only in relation to what are some of more Urban's general claims, and hence, will not be discussed individually. Unlike the work of Briggs which ranges over a variety of ethnolinguistic topics, Urban has focused quite extensively on the application of metapragmatics to various aspects of mythologic discourse. For Urban, in social anthropological terms, discourse is that which functions as social glue, binding individuals to collective norms. From this understanding follows what Urban (1991) calls the ‘discourse-centered approach to culture,’ the primary tenant of which is that "culture is localized in concrete, publicly accessible signs, the

---

19 Urban diverges from this general interest in his (1981) paper, which seeks to apply agent-and-patient-centricity concepts to mythology, and his (1985a) paper, which is a strictly linguistic discussion of ergativity and accusativity in Shokleng. In both, though, the parallel to Silverstein's work on noun-phrase categorization is apparent. His (1988) paper is slightly less ethnolinguistic because it deals exclusively with pronouns in English discourse on the subject of nuclear war. Additionally, in his (1992) paper, Urban provides a synopsis of Peirce's hand in all of this.
most important of which are actually occurring instances of discourse" (1991: 1). Subsequently, Urban understands mythology not as the mental object advocated by Levi-Strauss (1955), but as concrete, unfolding discourse. This mythology-as-discourse approach has several advantages, not the least of which is the ability of the myth, insofar as it contains instances of discourse as reported speech, to embody a kind of 'theory' about the relationship between speech and action. Urban describes it in this manner:

In a text, the speech that is reported typically has some relationship to other action that is reported, for example, the speech may be about action that has taken place or will take place, it may be a command, it may be a lie, and so on. By studying these relationships, one gains access to what might be termed the 'ethno-metapragmatic theory' the text embodies, that is, how the relationship between speech and action is conceptualized by the users of the language. (1984: 310)

As a semiotic system, language enables its users to speak about speech as well as about other types of action. In order that it be be effective for social ends, some kind of regimentation must take place whereby the culture in which it is based can appropriate this discourse for its collective needs. "Minimally, this would consist in a set of normative models which represent the consequences of using discourse in certain ways in various types of social situations. The collective social benefits or detriments could be brought, however dimly, into awareness" (Urban 1993: 242). Myths are capable of playing this normative role because, as replicative narratives, they depict the outcomes of metapragmatic activities. In myth, language is embedded in a representation of social situations and processes. Insofar as the myth enters into an indexical relationship with the world through what Urban (1993) has called 'aesthetic' representation, myth is simultaneously a metapragmatic and a pragmatic device, serving to "encode a vision of the relationship between speech and social action, but also to prescribe that relationship normatively to those who listen to it" (Urban 1984: 325). Insofar as a myth contains instances of reported speech, it necessarily also encodes a vision of language use, of how speech is embedded in social action and how it relates to nonlinguistic actions. Urban contents that:

Such an 'ethnometapragmatic' vision is open to scrutiny by any observer. If it is open to scrutiny, however, it is also accessible for manipulation by the myth-tellers themselves, who can shape the metapragmatic image embedded in the text to suit their own purposes. Consequently, insofar as the myth-tellers have the maintenance of the status quo among their goals, there is a natural tendency for myths to take on the design characteristics of a pragmatic device used for prescribing relationships between speech and action. (1984: 327)

In this manner, myths encode the object of the pragmatic lesson as part of their aesthetic structure. In addition, the metapragmatic message is housed within the

---

20 In his formulation of mythology, Levi-Strauss borrowed certain 'structural' ideas from Jakobson. See Moore and Olmstead (1954), Mounin (1974), and Turner (1977) for a discussion of this.
aesthetic zone which is already situated within the domain of discourse. What Urban contends for Shokleng mythology is iterated in Warao mythology (Briggs 1993a), and as it may be in the mythology of still other South Amerindian groups (e.g., Pressman 1991).

6. Conclusion

Metapragmatic inquiry of the sort described above by Briggs and Urban, in either its theoretical thrust (Jakobson → Silverstein) or in its ethnological thrust (Silverstein → Briggs, Urban), are both offspring of the intellectual lineage (Jakobson → Silverstein → Briggs, Urban) that has been considered in this paper. Metapragmatics, as it has grown out of the Jakobsonian paradigm, beginning ostensibly as a means of understanding the linguistic signal, has evolved from this purely linguistic modeling to include broader semiotic activity, now a means by which to conceptualize and explain the appropriate functioning of these signs in pragmatic usage. Silverstein's recasting of Jakobson's factor-function approach to the speech event to include elements of indexicality, as well as his insistence that the linguist must consider the 'native' viewpoint in interactional contexts, has produced this (meta)pragmatic account of communicative coherence and ability, as well as discrediting what Briggs (1992b) has called "the myth of the linguist as hero," the idea that the linguist is purportedly the only individual who has anything of relevance to say about language. It is the dialectic that emerges between informant and ethnolinguist, operating in a hotbed of ideological import, that stands to offer contrastive, and ultimately the most rewarding, insights.

With Silverstein's formulation of pragmatics in the early seventies (depicted in this paper as his connecting Jakobson's 1957 conclusions with his 1960 ones), the study of human communication was able to be rigorously discerning while addressing ethnographic diversity and variation. Many of today's leading linguistic anthropologists began their careers as students of Silverstein, and he was able to impart to them in his lectures and private sessions (Caton 1988: 253) an understanding of language in its myriad functional agendas. Taking what he had learned in decades past from an immigrant Slavicist at Harvard, Silverstein has brought to the University of Chicago an anthropology of language that eschews structural rigidity and seeks to illuminate language's comprehensive grounding in, and anchoring to, the ethnographic context.

Nevertheless, the historical movement from structuralism to pragmatics is exceedingly complex, and in no way has this paper sought to address all possible dimensions of this history. Rather, the object herein was to present one particular history as it was hammered out by several prominent scholars of language during the early sixties up to the present. The choice to focus on Jakobson, Silverstein, Briggs, and Urban was predicated as much by their general neglect in the field of linguistic pragmatics in past years, as by the recent interest these individuals have received from the anthropological faction (e.g., Lucy 1993). Remembering that Jakobson's factor-function criteria underwent careful reanalysis in light of Silverstein's ethnolinguistic interest, and in the subsequent ethnological studies of Briggs and Urban, this history,
in turn, will inform a new generation of scholars, many of whom are currently students of Briggs and Urban. Jakobson was certainly aware of the disciplinary history leading up to his particular moment within the linguistic sciences, and Silverstein, Briggs, and Urban of theirs in the anthropological linguistic tradition. The present work has documented the exchange of ideas not only from the disciplines of linguistics to anthropological linguistics, but from scholar to scholar in the context of academic affiliation and theoretical concern. As Silverstein has demonstrated, "pragmatics as a field is the study of the way indexical features of forms as used presuppose and create the very parameters of the event of communication, which is itself intersubjectively validated as purposive interlocutor activity through a socially shared system of meanings" (1985a: 134). Pragmatics as a field of study, then, must walk the fence between linguistics and anthropology, keeping a foot in each, cautious of stumbling head-over-heels into one or the other, and attentive to a historical trajectory peopled by scholars representing both.
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