
PERSPECTIVE

Genre, Intertextuality, and Social Power

Charles L. Briggs
VASSAR COLLEGE

Richard Bauman
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

This article addresses the relationship between discourse, textual and social order, and power by means of an examination of the concept of genre. It begins with a critical review of the way genre has been used in linguistic anthropology. A distinction is delineated between approaches that take for granted the status of genre as a tool for classifying and ordering discourse and those that contend with elements of generic ambiguity and dynamism. Proceeding to outline a new approach to genre, the discussion analyzes a wide range of intertextual relations that are deployed in constituting generic links. A series of examples contrasts strategies for minimizing gaps between texts and generic precedents with strategies for maximizing such gaps. A final section points to the ways that investigating generic intertextuality can illuminate questions of ideology, political economy, and power.

Why devote an article in the *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* to the subject of genre? It must be admitted from the outset that genre engenders a number of possible objections when pre-

sented as an analytic tool for the study of speech. Like such notions as *text*, *genre* strikes some practitioners as too global and fuzzy a concept to be of much use to detailed formal and functional analysis. Its association with literary theory and critical practice may similarly suggest that it is not likely to be illuminating with respect to either "everyday conversation" or "ordinary" linguistic processes. It is generally used, after all, in *classifying* discourse; typological tasks are often rejected by empiricists and anti-positivists alike, and some researchers will find it difficult to believe that the use of broad empirical categories is likely to be of much use to fine-grained analysis of particular social interactions. Beyond these issues, all of us know intuitively that generic classifications never quite work: an empirical residue that does not fit any clearly defined category—or, even worse, that falls into too many—is always left over.

In defending our chosen topic, we could point out that the concept of genre (with or without the label) has played a role in linguistic anthropology since at least the time of Boas. Generic classifications helped set the agenda for research on Native American languages. The study of genre was later boosted by ethnoscience, structuralism, the ethnography of speaking, and the performance-centered approach to verbal art. The recent popularity of Bakhtin's translinguistics and new perspectives on emotion and gender have similarly accorded new cachet to generic investigation. The first part of our article will thus be devoted to a critical discussion of the place of genre within linguistic anthropology.

As will become apparent in the second part, our goal is not to defend the concept or to claim that it should occupy a more central role in linguistic anthropology. We will rather argue that its nature and significance have been misconstrued in certain fundamental ways by proponents and critics alike. Although the same could be said of research on genre in folkloristics and literary theory as well as in linguistic anthropology, these areas lie beyond the scope of this article. This misapprehension has contributed to the ambivalent reception that the concept has received and its periodic movements in and out of scholarly fashion. We will argue that grasping the complex intertextual relations that underlie genre, along with the way these relations are closely linked to social, cultural, ideological, and political-economic factors, can offer insight into why studies of genre have proved to be so problematic. We hope to be able not only to provide a more solid foundation for investigations of genre, but also to show how research on generic intertextuality can illuminate central issues in linguistic anthropology.

The Boasian Tradition

As we have noted, genre—as term and as concept—has achieved currency in contemporary linguistic anthropology largely under the stimulus of the ethnography of speaking, performance-centered approaches to verbal art, and the work of Mikhail Bakhtin. To be sure, the foundations of this interest in genre were laid much earlier, principally at the points

of convergence between linguistic anthropology and the adjacent discipline of folklore, in which the generic shaping and classification of oral forms has been a fundamental concern. In particular, generic issues (though not the term) played a certain operational role in the Americanist tradition of Boas and his intellectual heirs, although the concept was seldom the focus of critical examination in their work. Given the centrality of texts in the Boasian tradition, rooted in the philological foundations of Boasian anthropology, discrimination among orders of texts was at times seen to be a necessary task, at least for certain purposes.

The most prominent use of generic distinctions in the Boasian line occurs in the organization of text collections. Perusal of these collections, however, reveals that the grouping of texts within their pages is frequently quite ad hoc, without discussion of the conceptual basis of the respective sections. Sapir, for example, in his classic collection *Wishram Texts*, writes only that "the arrangement of the texts under the heads of Myth, Customs, Letters, Non-Mythical Narratives, and Supplementary Upper Chinookan Texts, is self-explanatory and need not be commented upon" (1909:xii). The distinction between myths and tales or historical narratives attributed by Boas to North American cultures generally had some effect in shaping text collections (see, e.g., Reichard 1947), but other sorting principles, such as grouping by informant (see, e.g., Reichard 1925), may also be found. One noteworthy feature of Americanist text collections in the Boasian tradition is the frequent inclusion of a corpus of "ethnological narratives" (e.g., Sapir and Hoiyer 1942) or "ethnographic texts" (e.g., Jacobs 1959), generic rubrics that reflect the Boasian predisposition toward cultural information in entextualized packages. This genre brings into special relief the way in which generic categories and textual forms are cocreated by the ethnographer and the consultant (see Briggs 1986).

Boas's own work displays a marked ambivalence about the usefulness of generic categories. On the positive side, he does suggest the need to record the full array of verbal genres because of their varying "stylistic peculiarities" (1940c[1917]:200), in tacit recognition that discourse form is a significant patterning principle in the organization and distribution of linguistic structure, and he does direct attention to the presence or absence of particular verbal genres in a culture's repertoire as a means of testing (generally, debunking) universalistic theories of the origin and development of literature (1940c[1917]:209). Overall, however, Boas treats generic distinctions with varying degrees of care and precision. In certain instances, he displays a tendency to use generic designations rather casually. In the opening paragraphs of "The Development of Folk-Tales and Myths" (1940b[1916]:397), for instance, folktales and myths are first separated terminologically, then (apparently) merged under the general rubric of *tales*, after which (again apparently) *folk-tales* becomes the cover term.

If this is an instance of casual sliding across a range of terms, there are other points at which the absence of clear generic distinctions in Boas's writings rests on a more principled foundation. In his comparative in-

vestigations of the narrative repertoires of North American peoples, Boas discovered that particular themes and motifs might diffuse, with some degree of independence, to combine and recombine with other elements in a variety of shifting ways. In larger scope, by whatever criteria one might employ to make generic distinctions between myth and folktale, for example, Boas perceived that there is "a continual flow of material from mythology to folk-tale and *vice versa*" (1940b[1916]:405). Boas's distrust of various attempts to discriminate between narrative genres was further bolstered by his perception that such distinctions did not remain consistent for specific narratives across group boundaries; once again, by whatever criteria the distinction was attempted, narratives that were clearly genetically related might appear in one group's repertoire to belong to one class, and in the neighboring group's repertoire, to another. Hence, Boas attributed the "somewhat indefinite" use of the terms *myth* and *folk-tale* to "a lack of a sharp line of demarcation between these two classes of tales" (1940a[1914]:454). Boas's critique of generalized, a priori, analytical genre definitions rests on a substantive test of a particular kind: it is not their productiveness in delimiting categories of cultural forms within cultures that is at issue, but their inconsistency in capturing genetically related cultural items across cultures that renders them of questionable usefulness for Boas's purposes.

There is, however, one basis for discriminating between myths and folktales to which Boas is prepared to accord a degree of legitimacy and productiveness—this is a distinction purportedly "given by the Indian himself" (1940a[1914]:454). "In the mind of the American native," Boas writes,

there exists almost always a clear distinction between two classes of tales. One group relates incidents which happened at a time when the world had not yet assumed its present form, and when mankind was not yet in possession of all the arts and customs that belong to our period. The other group contains tales of our modern period. In other words, tales of the first group are considered as myths; those of the other as history. [1940a(1914):454–455]

Concerning this purportedly local distinction, Boas reminds us that here, too, historical and comparative investigations reveal movement between the two classes, and thus from his "analytical" point of view, this way of sorting out narrative genres is no better founded than those devised by scholars. It does, however, have the advantage of corresponding "to concepts that are perfectly clear in the native mind. Although folktales and myths as defined in this manner must therefore still be studied as a unit, we have avoided the introduction of an arbitrary distinction through our modern cultural point of view, and retained instead the one that is present in the minds of the myth-telling people" (1940a[1914]:455).

Several elements are significant here. First, observe that Boas attributes the distinction between myth and folktale that he outlines to American Indians generally; he never finds it necessary or useful to explore the distinction directly and in detail in any given Native American culture. Rather, he generalizes broadly and summarily, remaining far more cen-

trally interested in those particularistic historical and comparative investigations that require that "folk-tales and myths . . . still be studied as a unit" (1940a[1914]:455).

A further point that is especially worthy of attention is Boas's repeated insistence on how "perfectly clear in the mind of the Indian" is the distinction between myths and historical tales. One wonders at the basis for Boas's assurance in this regard, especially in light of his observation that "historical tales may in the course of time become mythical tales by being transferred into the mythical period, and that historical tales may originate which parallel in the character and sequence of their incidents mythical tales" (1940a[1914]:455). Apparently, Boas did not encounter—or chose to disregard—instances in which his consultants saw particular narratives as generic hybrids or as categorically ambiguous. Nevertheless, the distinction drawn by Boas between analytical genres and local categories represents an early invocation of a persistent issue in linguistic anthropology and adjacent disciplines.

Among Boas's students, one who stands out for his considered attention to the problematics of genre is Paul Radin. Radin's most significant contribution is his "Literary Aspects of Winnebago Mythology" (1926), which takes its opening frame of reference from Boas but departs from Boas's approach in markedly important ways. Radin begins by observing that "it has been frequently pointed out that many Indian tribes divide their myths into two groups, one coinciding in the main with our category of myth proper, and the other with that of our semi-historical legend or novelette," noting that "the two types are set off from one another by objective differences in style," some of which are defined in terms of linguistic elements and structures (1926:18). Noting that "this distinction between myth (*waika*) and the tale (*worak*) is very strong and every tale is classified by them in one or another category" (1926:18), Radin might seem to be casting his account in the mold provided by Boas. Even here, however, the Winnebago case demands qualification of the general schema, as being "at variance with all conventional ethnological classifications: an origin story, being regarded as accounting for true happenings, must fall into the category of the 'tale' " (1926:21). Radin is thus clearly concerned, as Boas and others appeared not to be, with locally defined generic discriminations, adding to the preceding one still others, having to do with occasions of use and *dramatis personae*.

The most striking discovery that flows from Radin's attentiveness to Winnebago bases for discriminating among orders of narrative is the availability of a third classificatory possibility, "a mixed category, the 'myth-tale' " (1926:18). So much for Boas's "perfect clarity." Radin goes on to elaborate:

The differentiation between a myth and a tale can be made, then, for the Winnebago on several counts, none of them mutually exclusive, and the proper classification of any one story is sometimes therefore a question of the weighting of several factors. . . . In any case it is clear that whenever we encounter a story of what might be called a mixed type, we can never be certain what

weighting of the various factors will seem proper to the Winnebago, and, in consequence, to what category the story will be assigned. [1926:21–22]

Now, although Radin might seem to be conceding an inability to disentangle the various bases employed by the Winnebago for assigning a given narrative to one or another category, his insight is far stronger than that. What he is saying, rather, although in preliminary and partial terms, is that generic categories represent flexible social resources in two senses: (1) the selection of one or another basis for categorization will depend upon situational factors, and (2) the generic calibration of a narrative, by combining within it features characteristic of contrasting types, will likewise depend upon situational and strategic factors, such as clan politics. To the best of our knowledge, however, this remarkable insight was never significantly exploited beyond this essay, by Radin or anyone else, for the next half-century.

Formal Definitions of Genre

Outside the Boasian tradition of linguistic anthropology, but convergent with it in certain respects, was a small line of scholarship devoted to the formulation of structural definitions of oral genres. Thomas Sebeok, in his classic article, "The Structure and Content of Cheremis Charms" (1964[1953]), cites the stylistic analysis of folklore texts by Boas and some of his students (e.g., Radin, Reichard) among other lines of structural analysis, but identifies his own analysis most centrally with symbolic logic and the morphological analysis of the Russian formalist folklorist, Vladímir Propp. Propp's influential study is well known and has been the subject of much critical discussion; there is no need to recapitulate his argument here, beyond noting that Propp offers his analysis of fairy tale morphology as the basis of a hypothetical *definition* of the genre (1968[1928]:99), an element missing from the Americanist line of formal stylistic analysis. "Much in the sense in which Vladímir Propp argued that all fairy tales are uniform in structure," Sebeok argues, "one is compelled to recognize that every Cheremis incantation belongs to the same structural type" (1964[1953]:363).

Sebeok describes his analytical strategy as follows: "Our analytical procedure will be an application of binary opposition as a patterning principle: that is, we shall repeatedly divide sequences dichotomously until the ultimate constituents are reached" (1964[1953]:360). The charm is thus divided by sections, sentences, clauses, and actor-action phrases, the ultimate contrastive constituents, the relationships between which are rendered in symbolic logic notation to yield the defining structure of the genre.

In a supplement to the original version of the article, published in 1964, Sebeok adds to his morphological analysis of the Cheremis charm an examination of its poetic style. Although charm structure is invariant in defining the genre, "each text is marked by a unique set of features which impart to it a certain particularity and concreteness or—to borrow a label from literary criticism—texture. An extremely interesting fact about the

data is this: that striking symmetries are found to characterize each message no less than the work itself" (1964[1953]:363). The contrast is thus between "general structure" and "individual texture." Sebeok goes on to analyze the structure of a charm text in terms of syllabic patterns and phonological and syntactic parallelism. There is structure at both levels, but morphological structure defines the entire genre, whereas textual structures organize individual texts. The assignment of priority to morphological structure over textural patterns has significant implications: it is an analytical, not an ethnographic, operation. How Cheremis people conceive of the genre, what features define or characterize it in their understanding and practice, remains outside the purview of Sebeok's analysis.

Like Sebeok, Alan Dundes draws his inspiration from the work of Propp in insisting on the primacy of morphological analysis in the study of folklore genres. For Dundes, the determination of morphological structure opens the way to the investigation of many folkloristic problems of which one is genre definition (Georges and Dundes 1963:111). Again, like Sebeok (and Propp), Dundes sees morphological structure as the locus of invariance in folklore forms, but although he acknowledges the variant nature of style or texture, he places more emphasis on content as a variant element: "Content may vary, but form is relatively stable" (1965:127; see also 1964:25, 53). Dundes's focus on "variability within a given frame" (1964:25) leads him to employ such linguistic models as Pike's tagmenic analysis (Dundes 1964) and Hockett's topic-comment analysis (Georges and Dundes 1963) in his structural explorations.

There is a certain ambiguity in Dundes's writings on the structural definition of genre. At times, he advances structural analysis as the basis of genre definition itself: "An immediate aim of structural analysis in folklore is to define the genres of folklore" (Georges and Dundes 1963:111; see also Dundes 1964:105). At other times, however, he points up the inadequacy of a reliance on morphological structure alone. Among the conclusions he draws in *The Morphology of North American Indian Folktales* (1964), for example, is the following:

Another conclusion suggested by the present analysis is the confirmation of the notion that myth and folktale are not structurally distinct genres. In fact, morphologically speaking, myths and folktales are one and the same. This means that the distinction between them is wholly dependent upon content criteria or totally external factors, such as belief and function. [1964:110]

In general, then, Dundes's writings raise another persistent problem in regard to genre definition, namely, what feature(s) constitute a sufficient or adequate basis for defining a genre: morphological structure, content, belief, function, and so on?

Much the same problem arises in Charles T. Scott's *Persian and Arabic Riddles: A Language-Centered Approach to Genre* (1965), another attempt at the formal definition of genre. Scott goes to striking lengths—even contortions—to confine his analysis within the disciplinary boundaries of linguistics, but is ultimately forced to concede the inadequacy of this ap-

proach. At the end of his monograph Scott essays a "definition of the riddle genre that is recognized as being incomplete":

The riddle is defined as a grammatical unit of discourse, externally distributed within a matrix of longer discourse or of nonverbal behavior, and internally composed of two obligatory utterance-level units, between which there obtains a partially obscured semantic fit. [1965:74]

What makes the definition incomplete is that the matrix of longer discourse, or of nonverbal behavior in which the genre occurs, is left undescribed because that is the province of anthropology. Scott concludes then, that

linguistic units alone are not sufficient to provide a complete definition of a literary genre. They are relevant to a description of the internal composition of a genre, which is a necessary component of a definition. However, a description of the nonverbal matrix within which the genre is distributed is a further necessary component of a definition, and linguistics cannot provide this description. It is in these terms that we support an earlier assertion . . . that the linguist, within the restrictions of his discipline, is compelled to take an incomplete and unsatisfactory position with respect to literature. [1965:74]

Genre in the Ethnography of Speaking

With the emergence of the ethnography of speaking in the early 1960s, as we have suggested at the beginning of this article, genre assumes a significant place in the repertoire of concepts in linguistic anthropology (Philips 1987). Neither the term nor the concept figures in Dell Hymes's pioneering essay, "The Ethnography of Speaking" (1962), although the significance of genre is anticipated in Hymes's considerations of speech events and linguistic routines. Genre is mentioned only in passing in Hymes's "Toward Ethnographies of Communication" (1964), but this article likewise adumbrates the later frames of reference in terms of which Hymes locates genre within the conceptual and analytical framework of the ethnography of speaking. In the 1967 article, "Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Setting," genre achieves a clear place in the program, which is subsequently expanded and elaborated in a range of further programmatic essays. In general terms, Hymes's writings offer three complementary perspectives on genre: (1) genre as category or type of speech act or event; (2) genre as a nexus of interrelationships among components of the speech event; and (3) genre as a formal vantage point on speaking practice. Taken all together, Hymes's writings (1967, 1972a, 1972b, 1974, 1975a, 1975b) offer a rich and ramified framework for the exploration of genre, but the scope and focus of this article require that we limit our discussion to selected points.

One significant issue addressed by Hymes has to do with the scope or comprehensiveness of genre as an organizing factor in the speech economy of a community. At first, Hymes suggests that "it is heuristically important to proceed as though all speech has formal characteristics of

some sort as manifestation of genres; and it may well be true" (1972a:65). Elsewhere, it is genres and speech acts that jointly constitute the domain of ways of speaking (1972b:50). Later, in "Ways of Speaking" (1974), this position is hedged: "It is tempting to generalize the [category] of genre . . . so that all verbal material is assignable to some genre. . . . My own hunch is that communities differ in the extent to which this is true, at least in the sense of tightly organized genres" (1974:443-444). From this vantage point, then, the task becomes one of discovering what portion of the speech economy is generically organized, what portion escapes generic regimentation, and why.

This question is further underscored in substantive terms through the juxtaposition of related ethnographic accounts by Gary Gossen and Brian Stross. Consistent with the perspective of the ethnography of speaking, Gossen (1972, 1974) approaches the speech genres of the Chamula people of highland Chiapas as locally constituted and systemically interrelated, in powerful contrast to the scholarly tradition of reliance on a priori, universalistic, Western-based analytical genres, atomistically defined and etically applied.¹ Some Chamula genres may be analogous to Western ones, but the categories and their organization are ultimately fundamentally different. In discriminating the Chamula system of generic categories, Gossen employs the structural-semantic analytical techniques of ethnoscience, which encouraged the exploration of lexicalized category systems, to discover the comprehensive taxonomic organization of the Chamula domain of *sk'op kirsano* 'people speech', from the everyday to the most highly formalized and densely meaningful genres. As speaking is a cultural focus in Chamula, the cultural organization of this generic taxonomy is complex and resonant, encompassing interrelated and isomorphic formal, functional, situational, social organizational, axiological, ethical, and cosmological principles. The categorical elucidation of Chamula ways of speaking thus offers a powerful vantage point on Chamula culture and society in general. Gossen's analysis underscores the productiveness of a systemic ethnographic perspective as against a focus on selected or privileged genres (e.g., myth) alone, or on mere generic inventories (as in Shimkin 1964[1947]).

As illuminating as Gossen's analysis may be, though, it also displays the limitations of a rigorously taxonomic classificatory perspective on genre. Some of the most salient limitations may be highlighted by comparing Gossen's work and that of Brian Stross on the neighboring Tenejapa Tzeltal (1974). Gossen's taxonomy of Chamula genres of verbal behavior carries the taxonomic organization down to fifth level taxa. In discussing his methodology, Gossen acknowledges that first, second, and third level taxa represent "general agreement" among his six male informants, who ranged in age from 18 to 60. Informants did not agree with the same degree of consistency on fourth and fifth level taxa, although if fewer than half did not agree on the definition of a category and its placement in the system, it was not included in his considerations. The resultant schema yields an organizing framework of great order and powerful integration, a succinct view of Chamula language, society, and cul-

ture as an integrated system. But what of the kinds of people's speech concerning which there was only limited agreement or consistency—or none at all?

This messy underside of people's speech is what draws the attention of Brian Stross in his analysis of Tenejapa Tzeltal labels for kinds of speaking (1974). The Tenejapa Tzeltal, as noted, are neighbors of the Chamula in highland Chiapas, speakers of a related Mayan language. Stross finds a four-level taxonomy of kinds of *k'op* 'speech' that is quite similar to the one discovered by Gossen. He goes on, however, to record 416 additional terms in the Tzeltal metalinguistic lexicon—not an exhaustive and finite list, but simply as many terms as he managed to collect before giving up the elicitation process. Moreover, he gives us some of the rules for generating additional acceptable terms within this highly productive metalinguistic system. The important point is that his informants could not agree upon the assignment of these terms to superordinate categories. Stross, then, offers us a category system that is open, ambiguous, flexible, disorderly: "The Tzeltal domain of speaking is in fact an open system with fuzzy boundaries. . . . As such it is highly adaptable to change in the social environment and must be seen as constantly evolving" (1974:213). Taken together, Gossen's and Stross's explorations reveal genre systems in their contrasting capacities as spheres of order and as open-ended spheres of expressive possibility. The counterposition of the two investigations must also raise questions concerning the isomorphism of generic systems and other aspects of culture. Whereas Gossen's analysis highlights strong structural correspondences, the amorphous openness and flexibility revealed by Stross calls into question what the overall fit might be.

In establishing the place of genre in the conceptual repertoire of the ethnography of speaking, one important task has been to articulate the relationship between genre and other core concepts and units of analysis, such as speech act, speech event, and speech style. This task represents another prominent concern in Hymes's programmatic essays. Like many other issues, this one emerged into focus in stages. In one early formulation, Hymes blurs distinctions in stating that "by Genres are meant categories or types of speech act and speech event" (1967:25). Elsewhere, however, he articulates several bases for distinguishing among these units of analysis. As early as 1964, Hymes suggests that "from one standpoint the analysis of speech into acts is an analysis of speech into instances of genres. The notion of genre implies the possibility of identifying formal characteristics traditionally recognized" (1972a:65). That is to say, in these terms, the notion of speech act focuses on speaking in its guise as social action, whereas the concept of genre directs attention to the routinized, conventionalized organization of formal means, on the formal structure of language beyond the sentence (1972b:48). This is not merely an analytical distinction; local conceptions of the organization of the domain of speaking may be articulated in terms of categorical systems of speech acts as well as of genres (see Abrahams and Bauman 1971).

If genre affords a formal vantage point on speech acts, speech styles offer a formal vantage point on genre. Building upon the work of Susan Ervin-Tripp (1972), Hymes (1974) develops a concept of speech styles as organized in terms of relations of co-occurrence and alternation:

One can characterize whatever features go together to identify a style of speech in terms of rules of co-occurrence among them, and can characterize a choice among styles in terms of rules of alternation. The first concept gives systematic status to the ways of selecting and grouping together of linguistic means that actually obtain in a community. The second concept frees the resulting styles from mechanical connection with a particular defining situation. [1974:434]

Significant speech styles may be associated with social groups (varieties), recurrent types of situations (registers), persons (personal style), specific situations (situational styles), and genres (genre styles). Genre styles, then, are constellations of co-occurrent formal elements and structures that define or characterize particular classes of utterances. The constituent elements of genre styles may figure in other speech styles as well, establishing indexical resonances between them. Additionally, particular elements may be abstracted from recognized generic styles and employed in other discursive settings to endow them with an indexical tinge, a coloration, of the genres with which they are primarily associated and the social meaning that attaches to them, as when students perceive an instructor to be "preaching at them" in a classroom lecture. In a related manner, a subset of diacritical generic features may be combined with those that characterize another genre to effect an interpretive transformation of genre, a phenomenon that Hymes terms "metaphrasis" (1975a). Finally, elementary or minimal genres—irreducible generic structures—may combine in a variety of ways into complex, incorporative genres, as is widely noted of African oratory, for example, or riddle ballads. Considered in these terms, genres may be seen as conventionalized yet highly flexible organizations of formal means and structures that constitute complex frames of reference for communicative practice.

Greg Urban, in his study, "The Semiotics of Two Speech Styles in Shokleng" (1984a), develops this line of analysis in especially suggestive ways. The two speech styles featured in Urban's essay are in fact generic styles, one associated with origin-myth narration and the other with ritual wailing. Extending the principle of co-occurrence, Urban notes that "speech styles are inherently indexical, since their use co-occurs with some other entity, namely, the context or subject matter" (1984a:313). He goes on to offer a close semiotic analysis of origin-myth narration and ritual wailing that elucidates the webs of interrelationship that link them to other ways of speaking in Shokleng and to explore the communicative capacities of generic speech styles more broadly.

Hymes's observation that attention to rules of alternation organizing choices among speech styles "frees the resulting styles from mechanical connection with a particular defining situation" (1974:434) implicates the relationship between genres and speech events. The casual merger of genres and speech events in the early literature of the ethnography of

speaking soon yielded to the documentation and analysis in the field-based literature of the transferability of genres from their primary situational contexts of use to other speech events as well as to the differential mobilization of particular genres in a range of events. Joel Sherzer, for example, traces the various contexts in which *ikarkana*, or curing texts, figure in San Blas Kuna culture, from the primary magical uses for curing, disease prevention, improving abilities, and general control of the spirit world to the rehearsal of an *ikar* by specialists, the teaching and learning of an *ikar*, and the chanting of an *ikar* for entertainment on festive occasions, each of which is marked by formal and functional differences (Sherzer 1983:118–120). In a similar vein, Alessandro Duranti explores the formally and functionally contrastive uses of the Samoan genre of oratory, called *lauga*, in ceremonial events (especially rites of passage) and in a type of political meeting called *fono*. Sherzer's and Duranti's analyses establish that the generic specification of the *ikar* or *lauga* cannot be accomplished by the examination of texts alone, but resides rather in the interaction between the organization of the discourse and the organization of the event in which it is employed; the ways and degrees to which a genre is grounded in, or detachable from, events is to be discovered.

The Kuna and Samoan examples raise one further point, also adumbrated by Hymes in various writings. The most salient difference identified by Duranti between *lauga* in the *fono* and *lauga* in other ceremonial events has to do with performance. The ceremonial *lauga* "is the socially recognized domain of 'performance' par excellence" (1984:235), in the sense of a display of verbal virtuosity, whereas the *lauga* in the *fono* is delivered and received in a very different, more instrumentally oriented mode. Likewise, the *ikar* as featured in festive occasions is framed primarily as virtuosic performance, in practicing as rehearsal, in teaching as demonstration, and so on. These cases, then, highlight the variable relation of genres to performance and to other frames. That this line of inquiry has been pursued most fully in relation to performance (Bauman 1977b; Hymes 1975a) is understandable in light of the long-standing centrality of artistic "literary" forms in the study of genre more generally. Most significant here is the recognition that not every doing of even the most poetically marked genres is framed as performance, or as full performance, in the sense of the assumption of accountability to an audience for a display of virtuosity, subject to evaluation for the skill and effectiveness with which the display is accomplished.

Of recent work in the exploration of genre in linguistic anthropology, William Hanks's essay, "Discourse Genres in a Theory of Practice" (1987), stands out as the most direct and critical attempt to synthesize a conception of genre and to offer a comprehensive framework for its investigation. Although the contributions of the ethnography of speaking are fundamental to Hanks's treatment of genre, his analytical framework is most immediately a synthesis of Mikhail Bakhtin's sociological poetics and Pierre Bourdieu's theory of practice. In marked contrast to conceptions of genre—formalist and otherwise—in which genre is a structural property of texts, Hanks conceives of genre as an orienting framework

for the production and reception of discourse. In Hank's perspective, "The idea of objectivist rules is replaced by schemes and strategies, leading one to view genre as a set of focal or prototypical elements, which actors use variously and which never become fixed in a unitary structure" (1987:681). Generic structures and functions, which are normatively specified in formalist and eufunctional approaches, "become problematic achievements in a practice-based framework" (1987:681). More specifically, Hanks defines genres as "the historically specific conventions and ideals according to which authors [in Bakhtin's sense of authorship as the production of utterances] compose discourse and audiences receive it. In this view, genres consist of orienting frameworks, interpretive procedures, and sets of expectations that are not part of discourse structure, but of the ways actors relate to and use language" (1987:670).

The principle of historic specificity is especially important; it builds into the notion of genre the recognition of historical emergence and change (see also Hymes 1975a), again in radical contrast to treatments of genres as timeless, fixed, unitary structures. In Hanks's framework, genres occupy a dual relationship to historically situated action. Genres are at the same time the ideational outcomes of historically specific acts and among the constituting, transposable frames of reference in terms of which communicative action is possible; they are thus open to innovation, manipulation, and change (1987:671, 677). Hanks goes on to offer a penetrating elucidation in terms of form-function-meaning interrelationships of the emergence and transformation of genres of 16th-century Maya discourse as part of the emergence of new, hybrid forms of discourse under rapidly changing colonial conditions. Here, the "stylistic, thematic, and indexical schemata" (1987:668) that constitute a range of available generic orienting frameworks become resources for the shaping of new discursive practice.

The Problematics of Genre

On the basis of the foregoing survey of perspectives on genre in linguistic anthropology, let us attempt to abstract and summarize the principal issues, problems, and ways of thinking about them that have characterized the field in order to establish a frame of reference for the discussion that follows.

One of the most central and persistent approaches to genre is from the vantage point of classification. Here, in its most basic terms, genre serves as a way of making categorical discriminations among discursive forms, which may be conceived of in textual terms, as verbal products, or in practice-based terms, as ways of speaking (and writing). The scope of genre, its range of applicability, varies among approaches. The term may be limited to "literary" forms, as forms of verbal art, or it may be extended to encompass a broader range of discursive forms, including, potentially, the entire domain of verbal production. Likewise, genre may be reserved for named categories of discourse, or, alternatively, all discursive

sive forms may be taken to be generically regimented. The latter view, that there is no speaking without genre, may be stated axiomatically, as given, or hypothetically, as to be discovered.

The use of genre as a classificatory concept does not necessarily imply self-conscious attention to classification itself as an intellectual problem. Indeed, much work in the field tends to treat each generic category atomistically. Some significant work, however, has been devoted to the systematic organization of generic classifications, from the vantage point of either scientific taxonomy or the ethnographic investigation of locally constructed classification systems. The former, it is worth noting, fosters a conception of generic categories as necessarily mutually exclusive, consistent with the canons of scientific taxonomy, while the latter more often reveals generic categories that overlap and interpenetrate in a range of complex ways, or aspects of verbal production that are resistant to orderly categorization. Implicated here as well, of course, is the etic-emic distinction—a priori, analytical, universalistic categories, usually labeled in Western terms, versus locally constituted classification systems, employing local labels, which are to be discovered.

The criteria employed to define genres have included a wide range of features, ultimately taking in everything that people have considered significant about discourse: form, function or effect, content, orientation to the world and the cosmos, truth value, tone, social distribution, and manner or contexts of use. Definitional efforts in linguistic anthropology, however, are distinguished by the centrality of formal patterns, whether as the sole basis of definition or in relation to function, content, or context. The most significant dimension of contrast among formal perspectives on genre distinguishes those approaches that identify the formal organization of genre as an immanent, normative, structuring property of texts from those that view generic form as a conventionalized but flexible and open-ended set of expectations concerning the organization of formal means and structures in discursive practice. The latter view tends to raise the emergent properties of discursive organization to parity with the socially given, normative dimensions of generic structure.

Finally, we would register the very broad contrast between those approaches to genre that treat genre as a problem in its own right and those that explore the interrelationships that link genre to other terms, concepts, and sociocultural factors. Within linguistic anthropology in particular, one line of inquiry has concerned itself with the relationship between genre and other sociolinguistic organizing principles, especially speech acts, speech events, speech styles, and frames. In broader anthropological compass, investigators have analyzed dimensions of interrelationship between genres or genre systems and other cultural domains, such as ethics and cosmology, or other social structures, such as institutions or systems of social relations.

Whatever the focus of inquiry may be, however, the broadest contrast that characterizes understandings of genre in linguistic anthropology (and, we might add, in adjacent disciplines) sets off those approaches that constitute genre as an orderly and ordering principle in the organi-

zation of language, society, and culture from those that contend with the elements of disjunction, ambiguity, and general lack of fit that lurk around the margins of generic categories, systems, and texts. In the section that follows, we offer in exploratory terms a perspective on genre that brings the fuzzy fringes of genre to the center of the intellectual enterprise.

Generic Intertextuality

The preceding discussion suggests that genre has been under-theorized in linguistic anthropology. Beyond the fact that it has been put to a wide range of analytic and descriptive uses, practitioners have generally simply assumed that they and their audiences know what genres are and what makes them work. We suggest that this general failure to examine critically the nature of genres and to devote sufficient attention to their limitations as tools for classifying discourse is motivated in part by the persistence of the orientation toward genre laid out by Aristotle in the *Poetics*. Aristotle (Telford 1961:1-2) suggested that to distinguish such types as epic or tragedy we must discern three elements of "the composite whole" of a given work: (1) the formal means by which an object is imitated, (2) the objects which are imitated, and (3) the manner of imitation (first-person narration, third-person narration, or acting). Although a great deal of discussion has centered on questions of mimesis and representation and on the *differentia specifica* of particular genres, Aristotle's emphasis on genre as dealing with works in terms of the way that features of their global construction place them within poetic types has endured.

We noted above that Bakhtin's work has stimulated a rethinking of, and a new emphasis on, genre in linguistic anthropology and other fields. His characterization of genre is particularly rich in that it sees linguistic dimensions of genres in terms of their ideologically mediated connections with social groups and "spheres of human activity" in historical perspective (1986:65). By drawing attention to "complex" genres that "absorb and digest" other generic types, Bakhtin challenged the notion that genres are static, stylistically homogeneous, and nonoverlapping units (of which more later). In spite of the many advances he made in this area, however, Bakhtin's own definitions of genre are strikingly similar to Aristotle's: An early work, *The Formal Method in Literary Scholarship*, suggests that "genre is the typical totality of the artistic utterance, and a vital totality, a finished and resolved whole" (Bakhtin and Medvedev 1985[1928]:129), while one of his last essays, which focused specifically on "speech genres," suggests that genres are "certain relatively stable thematic, compositional, and stylistic types of utterances" (1986:64). Like Aristotle and his followers, Bakhtin laments the failure of researchers "to meet the fundamental logical requirement of classification: a unified basis" (1986:64). In spite of the profound shift he effects in the theoretical placement of genre, Bakhtin thus casts genre as a tool for both classifying texts and grasping their textual structure by looking in each case for a "unified" set of generic features.

The basic question here concerns the manner in which discourse is seen as "containing" structure, form, function, and meaning. Since Jakobson has played such a key role in shaping how linguistic anthropologists (inter alia) approach poetics, let us examine what he considers to be the proper analytic focus. In concluding his classic "Concluding Statement: Linguistics and Poetics," Jakobson (1960:365) argues for a strict distinction between the study of invariants and variables in poetic patterning, on the one hand, and concern with variability in the "recitation" of a particular poetic work, on the other. He cites the "sage memento" of Wimsatt and Beardsley in arguing that "there are many performances of the same poem—differing among themselves in many ways. A performance is an event, but the poem itself, if there is any poem, must be some kind of enduring object" (1960:365–366, emphasis in original). Jakobson makes it clear that the study of performance will not inform our understanding of the "enduring object," and it is accordingly not useful "for the synchronic and historical analysis of poetry" (1960:365).

To be sure, the last 20 years have witnessed a shift in orientation from *text* to *performance*, with the latter term drawing researchers' attention to both social and poetic dimensions of the assumption of accountability to an audience for a display of virtuosity, subject to evaluation (Bauman 1977b; Hymes 1975a). Although concern with performance has helped shift researchers' focus from the "enduring object" to the process of poetic production and reception, this change runs the risk of simply drawing the analytic drawstrings wider—to encompass the relationship between linguistic and social or cultural dimensions of a given interaction—rather than questioning the equation of poetics with immanent features of particular discursive acts. Not only is the focus too narrow, but it lies in the wrong place as well.

Intertextual Strategies and Genre

An initial clue that can help us build an alternative approach to the study of genre—and of poetics and performance in general—is provided by Bakhtin's view of intertextuality. Kristeva neatly captures the contrasting basis of Bakhtin's thinking along these lines:

Bakhtin was one of the first to replace the static hewing out of texts with a model where literary structure does not simply *exist* but is generated in relation to *another* structure. What allows a dynamic dimension to structuralism is his conception of the "literary word" as an *intersection of textual surfaces* rather than a point (a fixed meaning), as a dialogue among several writings: that of the writer, the addressee (or the character), and the contemporary or earlier cultural context. [Kristeva 1980:64–65, emphasis in original]

Two facets of this characterization are crucial. First, structure, form, function, and meaning are seen not as immanent features of discourse but as products of an ongoing process of producing and receiving discourse. Second, this process is not centered in the speech event or creation of a written text itself, but lies in its interface with at least one other utterance.

Bakhtin's interest in a "translinguistics" that is vitally concerned with intertextuality has clearly provided part of the force that lies behind the recent interest in reported speech evident in linguistic anthropology and other fields.² A number of works have pointed to the way that intertextual relationships between a particular text and prior discourse (real or imagined) play a crucial role in shaping form, function, discourse structure, and meaning; in permitting speakers (and authors) to create multiple modes of inserting themselves into the discourse; and in building competing perspectives on what is taking place.

We would argue, similarly, that genre cannot fruitfully be characterized as a facet of the immanent properties of particular texts or performances. Like reported speech, genre is quintessentially intertextual. When discourse is linked to a particular genre, the process by which it is produced and received is mediated through its relationship with prior discourse. Unlike most examples of reported speech, however, the link is not made to isolated utterances, but to generalized or abstracted models of discourse production and reception.³ When genre is viewed in intertextual terms, its complex and contradictory relationship to discourse becomes evident. We suggest that the creation of intertextual relationships through genre simultaneously renders texts ordered, unified, and bounded, on the one hand, and fragmented, heterogeneous, and open-ended, on the other. Each dimension of this process can be seen from both the synchronic and the diachronic perspective.

Viewed synchronically, genres provide powerful means of shaping discourse into ordered, unified, and bounded texts. As soon as we hear a generic framing device, such as "once upon a time," we unleash a set of expectations regarding narrative form and content. Animals may talk and people may possess supernatural powers, and we anticipate the unfolding of a plot structure that involves, as Propp (1968[1928]) showed us long ago, an interdiction, a violation, a departure, the completion of tasks, failure followed by success, and the like. The invocation of genre thus provides a textual model for creating cohesion and coherence, for producing and interpreting particular sorts of features and their formal and functional relations all the way from particular poetic lines to the global structure of the narrative. We would like to call attention not simply to the structural effects but to the process itself—the generation of textuality or, as we referred to it in an earlier work, entextualization (Bauman and Briggs 1990).

When viewed in diachronic or, as Bakhtin put it, vertical perspective,⁴ generic intertextuality provides a powerful means of ordering discourse in historical and social terms. Genres have strong historical associations—proverbs and fairy tales have the ring of the traditional past, whereas electronic mail (E-mail) is associated with the ultramodern. Genres also bear social, ideological, and political-economic connections; genres may thus be associated with distinct groups as defined by gender, age, social class, occupation, and the like. Invoking a genre thus creates indexical connections that extend far beyond the present setting of production or reception, thereby linking a particular act to other times,

places, and persons. To draw on the terminology we used earlier, generic features thus foreground the status of utterances as recontextualizations of prior discourse. Even when the content of the discourse lacks a clear textual precedent, generic intertextuality points to the role of recontextualization at the level of discourse production and reception. Genre thus pertains crucially to negotiations of identity and power—by invoking a particular genre, producers of discourse assert (tacitly or explicitly) that they possess the authority needed to decontextualize discourse that bears these historical and social connections and to recontextualize it in the current discursive setting. When great authority is invested in texts associated with elders or ancestors, traditionalizing discourse by creating links with traditional genres is often the most powerful strategy for creating textual authority (see Briggs 1988; Gossen 1974; Kuipers 1990). Building on Bourdieu (1977). We can say, thus, that generic intertextuality affords great power for naturalizing both texts and the cultural reality that they represent (see also Hanks 1987).

The variability that is evident in the way generic intertextual relationships are created points to an extremely important dimension of the diachronic dynamics of genre. We drew attention above to the fact that linguistic anthropologists, linguists, folklorists, and literary critics have largely followed Aristotle in viewing genre in empirical terms as involving a process through which rules or conventions impose structural and content-based constraints on textual production. Even writers who are particularly interested in the way speakers and hearers and writers and readers resist these rules and conventions generally see the nature of the entailed intertextual relations as relatively transparent and automatic. The fallacy of this assumption is evident when one realizes that genres are not road maps to particular texts. Invocations of genre rather entail the (re)construction of classes of texts. Specific features are then selected and abstracted, thus bringing into play a powerful process of decontextualization (see Bauman and Briggs 1990). As scholars in a number of fields have suggested, the power of genres emerges from the way they draw on a broad array of features—phonological, morphological, lexical, and syntactic, as well as contextual and interactive (see, for example, Ben-Amos 1976[1969]; Leitch 1991). By choosing to make certain features explicit (and particularly by foregrounding some elements through repetition and metapragmatic framing), producers of discourse actively (re)construct and reconfigure genres. Note the great similarity between the discourse practices associated with the use of genre in shaping extextualization, on the one hand, and the scholarly practices of linguistic anthropologists, literary critics, and the like, on the other: both entail creating classes of texts, selecting and abstracting features, and using this process in creating textual authority. (More later on the importance of this analogy.)

We have argued that the central role played by an active sociocultural and linguistic process of creating intertextual relations in genre renders it a powerful means of creating textual order, unity, and boundedness. The dynamic and constructed character of this relation is apparent in that

the same text may be connected to the same genre to varying degrees, in highly contrastive ways, and for quite different reasons. We would now like to suggest that it becomes evident that these intertextual relations are not simply automatic effects of immanent properties of texts when the focus is shifted to the way that generic intertextuality simultaneously produces the *obverse* of these properties. Turning first to the synchronic dimensions of this problem, although generic intertextuality may help imbue texts with order, unit, and boundedness, it also draws attention to the *lack* of self-sufficiency and autonomy of the formal-functional configuration of the discourse at hand—recourse must be made to other discursive formations to interpret its patterning and significance. In Bakhtin's terms, genre points to the inherent dialogicality of the word. Just as genre can create order and sense in a text, it can render texts chaotic, fragmented, and nonsensical.

When viewed diachronically or vertically, the fit between a particular text and its generic model—as well as other tokens of the same genre—is never perfect; to paraphrase Sapir, we might say that all genres leak. Generic frameworks thus never provide sufficient means of producing and receiving discourse. Some elements of contextualization creep in, fashioning indexical connections to the ongoing discourse, social interaction, broader social relations, and the particular historical juncture(s) at which the discourse is produced and received. In short, other pragmatic and metapragmatic (cf. Silverstein 1976, 1992) frameworks must be brought into play in shaping production and reception.

The process of linking particular utterances to generic models thus necessarily produces an intertextual *gap*. Although the creation of this hiatus is unavoidable, its relative suppression or foregrounding has important effects. On the one hand, texts framed in some genres attempt to achieve generic transparency by *minimizing* the distance between texts and genres, thus rendering the discourse maximally interpretable through the use of generic precedents. This approach sustains highly conservative, traditionalizing modes of creating textual authority. On the other hand, *maximizing* and highlighting these intertextual gaps underlies strategies for building authority through claims of individual creativity and innovation (such as are common in 20th-century Western literature), resistance to the hegemonic structures associated with established genres, and other motives for distancing oneself from textual precedents.

Examples of Strategies for Manipulating Generic Intertextuality

One of the most interesting facets of the way genre enters into discourse production and reception is the great variation that is evident in strategies for manipulating such gaps. Although we cannot present even a schematic inventory of the means by which intertextual distance is suppressed and foregrounded, some examples may serve to illustrate both the range of possibilities and the profound linguistic and social impact of these intertextual differences.

Kuipers's (1990) analysis of Weyewa ritual speech in Sumba, Indonesia, provides a striking example of the process of minimizing intertextual

gaps. Ritual specialists attempt to decrease the distance between the "words of the ancestors" and their invocation in ritual performances. The three types of "ritual speech" with which Kuipers is primarily concerned—"divination," *zaizo* rites of placation, and "rites of fulfillment"—involve progressively greater suppression of demonstrative and personal pronouns, locutives (which frame discourse as reported speech), and discourse markers, features that contextualize the performance in its unique social and historical setting. The process goes hand in hand with building greater textual authority—and narrowing intertextual gaps—by affording more prominence to dyadic parallelism and proper names.

Such strategies for minimizing intertextual gaps bear directly on recent discussions of the complex social processes involved in the construction of history, tradition, authenticity, ethnicity, and identity (see, for example, Appadurai 1981; Clifford 1988; Dorst 1989; Handler and Linnekin 1984; Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1991). Invocations of genre provide powerful strategies for building what Anderson (1991[1983]) terms "imagined communities." As in the Weyewa case, the speech genres that comprise the "talk of the elders of bygone days" among Spanish speakers in New Mexico play a key role in this process; unlike Weyewa "ritual speech," however, their use in constructing history, tradition, and ethnicity differs from genre to genre in both practice and ideology (see Briggs 1988).

The spiritual efficacy and experiential intensity of Lenten performances of hymns and prayers is contingent upon the progressive displacement of any perceived separation between the words uttered by Christ and the Virgin Mary in the course of the crucifixion, their inscription in sacred texts, and their utterance in performance. Worshipers assert that the written texts used in Lenten rituals have been handed down verbatim through the generations. Unison recitation suppresses intertextual variation within performances by regulating the volume, pitch, rate, breath, syntax, lexicon, and rhetorical structure of each worshiper's discourse production to such a point that differences between individual voices are nearly erased. The ritual process symbolically strips away elements that contextualize performances in terms of the social, temporal, spatial, and historical parameters of contemporary society and renders the here and now an icon of the crucifixion tableau. In attempting to achieve symbolic unification with Christ and the Virgin, participants deny the intertextual gap to such an extent that they seek to overcome the opposition between signifier and signified itself, merging the experience of the worshipper and that of Christ and the Virgin (as textually constructed). The control over ritual intertextuality that this process confers on the "Brothers," particularly elderly officers in the confraternity, affords them a great deal of religious authority and social power in general in their communities.

Mexicano speech genres are organized along a continuum, from genres that emphasize entextualization to those in which overt contextualization is crucial (Briggs 1988). Whereas hymns and prayers are highly exten-

tualized, oral historical discourse is the most contextualized. In oral historical discourse, elders attempt to maximize the gap between "the talk of the elders of bygone days" and the contemporary discursive settings in which it emerges. One way in which this process is undertaken involves avoiding direct discourse, recasting this "talk" as the speaker's own utterances and personal experience; direct intertextual links to the words of "the elders of bygone days" are thus avoided. The maximization of intertextual distance plays a central role in both the rhetorical patterning of the discourse and its explicit framing by virtue of the way it motivates point-by-point contrasts between life *antes* "in bygone days" and the present. This is not to say that the discursive *effect* of such strategies is to achieve some sort of complete separation of text and genre—any invocation of generic features creates both intertextual relations and intertextual gaps. Such maximization is rather a rhetorical strategy that foregrounds the latter dimension of generic intertextuality.

Unlike the Weyewa case, this strategy does not render the discourse any less powerful in social terms than attempts to minimize the intertextual distance. For Weyewa, the ability to silence all dissenting voices and impose "unity" by linking monologic utterances as directly as possible to the "words of the ancestors" provides the central means of investing speech genres and individual performances with ritual and social power. In the *Mexicano* case, on the other hand, both minimizing and maximizing strategies, as differentially distributed according to genre, are used in appropriating—and (re)constructing—"the talk of the elders of bygone days," thereby legitimating courses of action and positions of social power.

Although genres tend to be linked to particular sets of strategies for manipulating intertextual gaps, it is clearly not the case that selection of a particular genre *dictates* the manner in which this process will be carried out. Transformation narratives ("myths") told by Warao storytellers in eastern Venezuela present narrators with a wide range of possible ways of manipulating intertextual gaps between the powerful speech of characters who lived "when our world was still being formed," the individual who told the particular narrative to the present narrator, and the narrating event. Authoritative, semantically monologic performances attempt to reduce the intertextual distance to zero, merging primordial and contemporary realms by suppressing explicit contextualization and centering the discourse deictically in the narrated (rather than the narrating) events (see Briggs 1992a). Like *Mexicano* oral historical discourse, Warao dialogic performances point precisely to differences between the two textual planes, playfully recontextualizing quoted utterances in both primordial and contemporary realms. Pedagogically oriented performances create maximal intertextual distance by focusing on the storytelling process itself, thus rendering the time when "our world was still being formed" experientially inaccessible. Not only can tokens of the same genre be performed in these intertextually contrastive fashions, but the same individual also can tell the same narrative in these three ways (see also Hymes 1985).

A shift in key (see Hymes 1972a) can similarly produce highly contrastive types of intertextual relations for the same genre. Recall Sherzer's (1983, 1991) analysis of the way that Kuna *ikarkana* can be used for practice, display, and as entertainment at drunken gatherings as well as in curing rituals; each type of performance would seemingly be related to quite different strategies for treating intertextual gaps.

Another example of the use of highly contrastive intertextual strategies in different performances of the same genre is apparent in Duranti's (1984) Samoan data, as discussed above. When fully performed in ceremonial contexts, *lauga* foreground intertextual relations with generic precedents. In political meetings (*fono*), on the other hand, elaborating stylistic features in displaying one's competence, vis-à-vis the textual authority invoked by the genre, is far less important than using *lauga* in shaping the ensuing discussions. Thus, both the nature of the intertextual links to prior and subsequent discourse and the strategies that guide the reception of *lauga*, and evaluations of the manner in which it is performed, contrast radically between settings. As was the case in the Warao and Kuna examples, these differences in strategies for creating intertextuality lie at the heart of both formal and functional patterning as well as the social power of the discourse.

Strategies for maximizing and minimizing intertextual gaps can coexist even more intimately as they enter dialogically into constituting the same text or performance. In nightlong performances of nativity plays (termed *coloquios*) in the Mexican state of Guanajuato, intertextual gaps are necessarily created as the script is subjected to a series of transformations; this process of recentring the text in performance takes place as the script is copied out, learned, rehearsed, and performed (see Bauman 1992b). In a production in Tierra Blanca de Abajo studied by Richard Bauman and Pamela Ritch, all the actors save one accepted the authority of the written script, as mediated by the *primer encargado*, the individual who has overall control of the production, and the prompter; they accordingly attempted to memorize their lines and reproduce them *por pura frase* 'by exact phrases' (i.e., word-for-word). Although they acknowledged that such factors as limited literacy, imperfections in the script, difficulties in hearing the prompter, lapses in memory, and the like prevent exact reproduction of the script, they sought to reduce the intertextual gap to zero. Fidelity to genre and text entailed adhering to a number of formal constraints, particularly the production of octasyllabic lines with assonant endings on alternating lines; assonance alternated with other patterns, such as rhymed couplets. Similarly, the script was rendered in a highly conventionalized style of delivery that featured three or four regular stresses per line and a fixed intonational pattern that was repeated (by some actors) for each line.

The actor who plays the Hermitaño (Hermit) adopted a mode of creating intertextuality that was diametrically opposed to that taken by the other actors. Although the fact that he is illiterate augmented the "technical" limitations to intertextual transparency, his departure from the script was more squarely motivated by a carnivalesque and subversive

stance. As the Hermitaño offered few of his lines directly from memory, the prompter fed him his lines one-by-one, in a manner audible to the audience. Unlike the other actors who required prompting for each line, however, the Hermitaño decided whether to remain faithful to the stylistic and content-based features of the text and genre—the dominant intertextual ideology—or to transform it. He linked his utterances to text and genre by creating three types of intertextual relations. First, he often repeated at least some of the lexical items in the line as spoken by the prompter, and the syntactic structure remained largely identical across the two renditions; he repeated some lines verbatim. Second, the Hermitaño matched the phonological features of the line-final words in his utterances to those of their counterparts in the script. Third, the Hermitaño retained the characteristic intonational style of the *coloquio*. This retention of octasyllabic lines, rhyming schemes, and intonational patterns thus created strong generic intertextuality both with the essential characteristics of the *coloquio* and with the lines as read by the prompter.

With the exception of the lines he repeated verbatim, however, the Hermitaño's discourse departed subversively from the types of generic constraints observed by the other actors. Although the language of the *coloquio* and of the prompter's recitation was archaic, elevated, pious, and often magniloquent, the Hermitaño's recasting of them was colloquial, debased, richly sexual, and coarse. He similarly displaced much of the semantic content of his lines; although the sexual and other allusions he substituted can be parsed individually through familiarity with community social relations and the actor's own biography, they were so poorly linked to each other semantically that the Hermitaño's speeches essentially added up to rich nonsense. Interestingly, the Hermitaño created his parody by transforming features of the phonological patterning associated with the genre—alliteration, assonance, and rhyme—through punning. The strategies he adopted go beyond the creation of comic effect to objectify and foreground the pragmatics of recentering the text in the production process, as undertaken by the other actors, the *primer encargado*, and the prompter. By subversively recasting the lines that were recited for him by the prompter (and are heard by much of the audience as well), the Hermitaño revealed the central role played by the suppression of intertextual gaps in the genre. The Hermitaño's dramatic anti-language (Halliday 1978:164–182) called attention to the possibility of creatively exploiting intertextual gaps rather than attempting to render them invisible. Yet the Hermitaño's burlesque creation and proliferation of such gaps is itself a generic convention of the *coloquio*; the Hermitaño is traditionally expected to take liberties with the scripted text. As performed, the *coloquio* genre exploits two strongly contrasting intertextual strategies.

The *coloquio* example points to the way that different strategies can be invested in different roles in the same performance. The tall tale provides a case in which different ways of approaching intertextual gaps are undertaken by the same participant and serve as constitutive features of the genre. Tall tales generally begin as personal-experience narratives; this

framing entails a commitment to recounting episodes of the speaker's own life in a truthful manner. This told-as-true quality is signaled by metanarrative devices that assert the text's faithfulness, both to the events themselves and (through reported speech) to previous renditions of part or all of the narrative. A strategy used by a master Texas storyteller, the late Ed Bell, additionally involves directly addressing the audience's state of belief or disbelief and the credibility of the story itself: "And I don't blame y'all if you don't believe me about this tree, because I wouldn't believe it either if I hadn'ta seen it with my own eyes, I don't know whether I can tell ya how you could believe it or not, but that was a big tree" (Bauman 1986:99).

As the story progresses, however, it increasingly transcends the limits of credibility. Hyperbolic details and metanarrative indications of the decreasing believability of the events create a sort of generic static, as it were, that interferes with interpreting the discourse as the relation of personal experience. The unreal qualities eventually become sufficiently prominent to lead most audience members to reinterpret the story as a tall tale. The genre thus involves a transformational process in discourse reception that moves from accepting strategies that seek to minimize intertextual gaps to perceiving a growing gap between the discourse and its purported generic framing to embracing a different form of generic intertextuality, one that celebrates intertextual gaps as powerful creative tools (see Bauman 1986:78–111, 1987).

The movement evident in tall tales from one type of generic intertextuality to another points to the status of what Bakhtin (1986[1979]) refers to as *secondary* or *complex* genres as powerful means of creatively exploiting intertextual gaps. Here, possibilities for manipulating the gap between discourse and genre are multiplied as a text is linked to more than one set of generic features, to a genre that is itself mixed, or to both. Beyond opening up a range of possible interpretive relationships between generic precedents and the discourse being produced and received, mixing genres foregrounds the possibility of using intertextual gaps as points of departure for working the power of generic intertextuality backwards, as it were, in exploring and reshaping the formal, interpretive, and ideological power of the constituent genres and their relationship.

Let us turn to another type of Warao discourse in illustrating the role of intertextuality in mixed genres. When someone dies, female relatives compose and sing *sana* 'laments' until after the return from the graveyard (see Briggs 1992b). Beyond expressing the anger and sadness of the mourner, *sana* offer sharp criticism of actions seen as having contributed to the death or threatening the well-being of members of the community. One woman generally composes verses containing new material while the remaining wailers sing refrains—and listen. The other participants then either repeat the verses, changing both deictic elements and semantic content to reflect their own experience, or present their own verses.

Sana performances regulate intertextuality in three significant ways. First, wailers use reported speech in extracting discourse from a wide range of genres, including gossip, conversations, political rhetoric, ar-

guments, and dispute mediation events. The intertextual reach of *sana* is thus quite impressive in that performers both create links with other lament performances and assimilate a broad range of other genres to the lament. Wailers exploit intertextual gaps to great effect by constantly reinterpreting this prior discourse in terms of the way its recontextualization is affected by the death and by juxtapositions with other reported utterances. Deictics and tense/aspect forms further manipulate the distance between reported and reporting speech. A second dimension of this intertextual regulation pertains to the carefully orchestrated polyphony that dominates performances. Extremely subtle features of the tempo, pitch, volume, and timbre of the women's voices, as well as the poetic interrelations between the verses they sing, foreground the emergence of both individual voices and a collective discourse (see Briggs 1989); the latter dimension shields individual wailers from retribution. Recall Urban's (1988) analysis of the way the iconic relations between the acoustic features of individual voices, other tokens of the genre, and the "natural icons" of crying constitute "meta-signals" regarding social solidarity and "adherence to a collective norm" in examples of ritual wailing recorded in other areas of South America. Warao women use the form, content, and performance dynamics of their laments in calling such social norms—and claims by others to adhere to them—into question. Third, these same features of *sana* regulate the intertextual relations between their laments and future discourse. *Sana* are seldom criticized or reinterpreted; although their content is subsequently recontextualized in narrative accounts of "what the women are crying," women sometimes specify in their *sana* how these stories should be told and to whom.

The interaction between gender and genre is crucial here. Outside of laments, Warao women have very little role in the production and reception of "mythic" narratives, political rhetoric, and shamanistic discourse. The ability of *sana* to incorporate other genres and, exploiting intertextual gaps, to question their authority provides women with frequently recurring opportunities to have a more powerful role in discourse production and reception. Research by Feld (1990a[1982], 1990b) and Seremetakis (1991) on the role of polyphony and intertextuality in, respectively, Kaluli (New Guinea) and Inner Maniat (Greek) laments points to the powerful role that generic intertextuality plays in constituting—and transgressing—gender roles. (We will have more to say about the relationship between gender, emotion, and genre below.)

Axes of Comparison

These examples point to the broad range of strategies that are used in minimizing and maximizing intertextual gaps. While we are still far from being able to present an exhaustive inventory of the forms of intertextuality associated with genre, we would like to adumbrate some of the principal loci in which variation is evident with respect to the nature of generic intertextuality and the means by which intertextual gaps are manipulated.

1. One axis of comparison is provided by the dimensions of the textualization process that are exploited in creating and manipulating intertextual relations. Just as phonology, lexicon, morphosyntax, rhetorical structure, turn-taking, thematic content, prosody, gesture, participation roles, and other features can be used in linking discourse to generic precedents, strategies for minimizing and maximizing intertextual gaps can draw on an equally broad range of features. Dell Hymes (1981), Virginia Hymes (1987), and others have documented the recurrent use of rhetorical progressions of narrative action and patterns of versification in creating intertextual continuity and variation in Native American narratives. Bauman (1986:54-77) argues that West Texas oral anecdotes, which use reported speech in building a punch line, are more stable over time than those in which reported speech is not the point of the story. As evident in the *coloquio* example, one of the most common strategies is to use formal features in creating generic intertextuality, while disjunctions in semantic content, participant structures, metapragmatic frames, and the like are used in challenging generic precedents; clearly, these relations can also be reversed.

2. Another source of variability with respect to the degree to which generic relations create order, unity, and boundedness lies in the fact that all genres are not created equal—or, more accurately, equally empowered—in terms of their ability to structure discourse. While “ordinary conversation” affords much greater room for disorder, heterogeneity, and open-endedness, some genres of ritual discourse provide almost no room for these characteristics or for structural flexibility in general. The Weyewa and *Mexicano* examples illustrate the differential distribution of this ordering capability by genre within particular discursive economies.

3. The power of genre to create textual structure also varies in keeping with the degree to which the generic patterning is imposed on a particular body of discourse. Although connections between a particular text and its generic precedent(s) sometimes crucially shape the formal structure and social force of the discourse, in other cases generic intertextuality is simply one of the available interpretive options. The use of *lauga* in ceremonial and political contexts provides an example in which these two options are evident in the case of a single genre. Generic features may not be overtly marked, and features that do appear may be foregrounded to various degrees (through repetition, metapragmatic signaling, et cetera) (see Briggs 1988). As we will argue below, the fact that the capacity of genre to create textual order, unity, and boundedness can be invoked to varying degrees is of profound interactive, ideological, and political-economic significance.

4. One of the most interesting loci of variation involves the extent to which intertextual strategies become, in Silverstein's (1992) terms, denotatively explicit, in the sense that the metapragmatic framing of intertextual relations is marked overtly through the denotative content of the entailed expressions. With regard to the preceding examples, Warao ritual wailing and Texan tall tales make extensive use of explicit framings, whereas the Hermitaño's subversive transformations are not explicitly

signaled. The latter example will serve as a warning against jumping to the ready (and ethnocentric) conclusion that denotationally explicit signals will be more salient in every case; when semantic interpretability is greatly limited by auditory interference, the use of unintelligible lexicons or languages, and the like, implicit signals expressed through prosodic or visual features may be more accessible. Basso's (1984) analysis of Apache moral narratives similarly provides a telling example of the social power of implicit framings. These parsimonious narratives contain little explicit information on intertextual relations; the framing seems to be limited to a statement regarding the place in which the reported event took place ("it happened at") and its temporal locus ("long ago"). The point of the performance is to induce an individual who is present to link her or his recent behavior—and what community members are saying about it—to the moral transgression committed in the story. Interestingly, these narratives contain explicit statements of intertextual relations (provided by the opening spatial and temporal frames) as well as entirely implicit relations (the link to talk about a member of the audience). This case also points to the fallacy in assuming that intertextual relations are established by performers or authors alone: a crucial part of the process of constructing intertextual relations may be undertaken by the audience.

5. A similar note of caution should be sounded with respect to the use of oral versus written resources in creating intertextuality. The work of Goody (1977), Ong (1967, 1982), and other writers, who sharply distinguish between "orality" and "literacy" as distinct modes of discourse production and reception and cognitive orientations, would lead us to expect that intertextual gaps will be minimized when written texts are used. The written text is indeed regarded as authoritative—and intertextual gaps are highly constrained—in the case of the scripts used in Mexican *coloquios* and New Mexican notebooks containing hymns and prayers. Nonetheless, the (re)production of written texts, along with their reception and recontextualization (in either oral or written form), necessarily creates intertextual gaps. The Hermitaño example shows how these gaps can be creatively expanded in establishing intertextual relations. Heath's (1982) research on class differences in literacy practices suggests that learning to exploit intertextual gaps by linking "ways of taking information from books" to other types of discourse production and reception (such as providing descriptions of everyday objects and events) is a crucial prerequisite to success in school. (We will have more to say later about the connection between intertextuality, language socialization, and social class.) Hanks (1987) and Lockhart (1991) similarly demonstrate the way that the production of written documents by, respectively, the Maya and Nahua of colonial Mexico drew on generic innovation as a key response for negotiating rapidly changing social and political relations.

6. A number of writers have argued for the need to examine how genre shapes the expression of emotions as well as the related question of the relationship between genre and gender. In an early extension of the ethnography of speaking to issues of gender and emotion, Keenan (1974) describes Malagasy men's control over speech styles and genres

that minimize expressions of anger, criticism, and disagreement; women, on the other hand, use "unsophisticated" speech that expresses emotion in a direct and often confrontational manner. Feld (1990a[1982]) demonstrates the differing potential of contrastive genres for constructing emotions; in particular, women's ritual weeping provides a powerful means of expressing shared sentiments, whereas men's *gisalo* songs produce particular affective states in listeners. Schieffelin (1990) shows how Kaluli mothers develop teasing routines with sons yet discourage the same type of interactions—and the emotional expressions they occasion—with daughters. In a number of papers, Brenneis (1987, 1988, 1990) has pointed to the contrastive social values, patterns of social interaction, and emotional states that are evoked by different genres; he goes on to suggest that excluding women from participation in particular types of performances enacted by Hindi-speaking Fiji Indians largely prevents them from obtaining access to a number of culturally valued emotional experiences.

Naturalizing the connection between genre, gender, and emotional experience can in turn rationalize the subordinate status of particular social groups or categories of persons; Lutz's (1990) discussion of the association between "emotionality" and the female in Western society provides a case in point. On the other hand, individuals who enjoy less social power due to gender, age, race, or other characteristics may draw on particular genres in expressing the injustice of their situation or in attempting to gain a more active role in social and political processes; women's performances of ritual wailing provide a striking example (see Briggs 1992b; Seremetakis 1991; Tolbert 1990).⁵

7. The role of music in creating intertextuality is also fascinating. By virtue of its capacity for closely regulating pitch, timbre, tempo, volume, and other features, and its frequent use in regulating movement (through dance), music can provide a powerful resource in attempting to suppress intertextual gaps. The use of music in parody and satire (as in Brecht's plays) points contrastively to its potential for foregrounding intertextual gaps. Feld (1990a[1982]) shows how musical features can simultaneously create intertextual links to generic precedents and to quite different types of discourse; the tonal characteristics of Kaluli "melodic-sung-texted weeping" stimulate powerful emotional responses by connecting a woman's performance with the weeping of other women and with the tremendously evocative call of the *muni* bird. The fascinating problem of sonic or acoustic icons, including onomatopoeias, sound symbols, vocables, and the like, can be fruitfully analyzed with respect to their functions as powerful means of naturalizing intertextual relations. The relationship between musical and verbal modalities, along with dance, costume, and the like, in creating and challenging generic intertextuality constitutes an area in which further research is needed.

8. A final axis of comparison pertains to the nature of generic intertextuality. The framing of some texts aligns them closely with a single genre;

as we noted above, the link in other cases may be either to a number of different genres, to a mixed ("secondary") genre, or to both. Relations may be relatively fixed or emergent and open-ended. Warao ritual wailing, for example, affords a great deal of flexibility as to which genres are incorporated and how they enter into the performance. The routines performed by stand-up comics exhibit similar flexibility. In other examples, intertextual relations are established with two or more particular genres in relatively consistent ways.

Icelandic legends regarding magical poets, for example, embed recitations of verses imbued with magical efficacy into narratives (see Bauman 1992a). A number of types of intertextual relations play a central role in constituting these texts. First, narrators traditionalize texts, asserting their authenticity by recounting intertextual histories of the transmission of a particular example from narrator to narrator. This metanarrative framing both minimizes intertextual distance by constructing narrative continuity and maximizes the gap by questioning the authority of other interpretations of the story. Second, the intertextual gap between the reported recitation of the magical verse and its presentation in the narrative is minimized through the poetic distinctiveness of the verse. A gap remains, however, in that the narrator is not composing but re-presenting the magical verse; its performative potency for realizing supernatural violence is thus absent. Third, the narrative relates to the verse through content alone, describing the circumstances of its initial performance and reporting on its effects (e.g., a man cursed in a verse died in the brutal manner that it specified). Finally, the verse affects the narrative formally; magical verses extend beyond their textual confines to shape the lexical, grammatical, and rhetorical patterning of the narrative. Here the types of intertextual strategies that accrue to each genre as well as their dialogic interrelations are relatively conventional.

Broader Implications for Linguistic Anthropology

These examples suggest that generic intertextuality cannot be adequately understood in terms of formal and functional patterning alone—questions of ideology, political economy, and power must be addressed as well if we are to grasp the nature of intertextual relations. This discussion thus opens up a much larger theoretical and methodological issue that has emerged in linguistic anthropology and the study of discourse in general. At first glance, it seems as if the number of scholars who have aligned their work with the concept of discourse would have produced a fruitful integration or at least an articulation of a wide range of approaches and concerns. A closer look suggests that the highly divergent conceptualizations of the nature and significance of "discourse" have often *widened* the gap between research agendas. A great deal of recent work in linguistic anthropology resonates with Sherzer's call for a "discourse-centered" approach to the study of culture, one that focuses on detailed analyses of "actual instances of language in use," carefully documenting the relationship between formal and functional patterning and

dimensions of social interaction, social structure, and cultural processes (1987:296). The concept of "discourse" used by other scholars draws on Foucault, Bourdieu, and other post-structuralists; here, discourse is located more in the general processes by which social groups and institutions create, sustain, and question social power than in particular "speech events." Such practitioners are generally more interested in the rhetorical and political parameters of scholarly writing, mediated communication, and institutional discourse than in the situated speech of ethnographic "Others."

Unfortunately, this hiatus has further divided linguistic from social-cultural anthropology. The rift emerges in competing strategies for establishing textual authority, with linguistic anthropologists often claiming the low ground of methodological and analytic precision, and social-cultural types staking out the higher ground of sensitivity to the theoretical and political issues that prevail in the postmodern world. This situation frequently gives rise to ignorance of complementary perspectives and a hardening of intradisciplinary and epistemological lines. We believe that the perspective we have outlined in this article suggests ways that linguistic anthropologists can draw on the theoretical and methodological strengths of their training in challenging this unproductive opposition.

The preceding section focused mainly on formal and functional dimensions of strategies for creating intertextual relations. As we believe the examples clearly show, however, the roots of intertextual practices run just as deeply into social, cultural, ideological, and political-economic facets of social life as they do into the minutiae of linguistic structure and use. We would like to suggest that relations between intertextuality and ideology can be read in both directions—in terms of the way that broader social, cultural, ideological, and political-economic formations shape and empower intertextual strategies and the manner in which ideologies of intertextuality and their associated practices shape society and history.

The long-standing association between genre and order in Western discourse provides a strong sense of the impact of changing ideologies and social relations on intertextuality. The existence of a purportedly clearly defined and elaborate system of genres has often been associated with the social, political, and communicative value of national languages and literatures. For example, one of the central foci in many areas of Europe during the Renaissance was the legitimization of national languages (particularly vis-à-vis Latin and Greek) through the development and inculcation of an extensive set of rules for the generic structuring of texts (see Dubrow 1982:58; Lewalski 1986). Like the establishment of a standard language, the production of a presumably fixed set of generic conventions played a role in the creation of "imagined communities" (see Anderson 1991[1983]). The potential utility of an orderly system of literary genres for the establishment of an orderly social system was made explicit by such figures as Hobbes and Pope. A highly rigid characterization of genres formed a central concern during the neoclassic era in view of the prevalent fear of disorder in individuals and in society as a whole (see Dubrow 1982).

The association of genre with order has similarly often prompted those interested in countering established social and literary orders to challenge established genres or even the role of genres in general. The Romantics' search for a "natural" order led them, accordingly, to read the association between conventional order and genre as a basis for distrusting genre. Feminist scholars have argued that women often appropriate and manipulate generic conventions as a means of gaining entrance into male-dominated discourses (see Miller 1986). The scholarly production of such "folk" genres as the epic, proverb, fable, fairy tale, and ballad assisted in the nostalgic creation of a "folk" culture, which could be used in advancing nationalist agendas by appropriating the past as well as establishing the cultural autonomy and superiority of literary genres (see Hall 1981; Handler and Linnekin 1984; Herzfeld 1982; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1991; Stewart 1991).

A number of writers have argued that individual genres are hierarchically ordered (see, for example, Bourdieu 1991:67; Kuipers 1990; Leitch 1992:87). By virtue of the profound social and ideological associations of genres, hierarchies of genres are tied to social hierarchies. Given the connection between genres and conventional order, as well as their hierarchical organization, it is far from surprising that developing competence in different generic frameworks is a major focus of educational systems. Following Bourdieu's (1977, 1991; Bourdieu and Passeron 1977) analysis of the cultural politics of education, it is evident that the hierarchical organization of discursive competences according to genre provides efficient means for both controlling access to symbolic capital and evaluating the discursive competence of individuals.

Recall Heath's (1982) analysis of the connection between "ways of taking information from books" and educational success. The middle-class white, working-class white, and working-class African-American communities she studied were characterized by distinctive "ways of taking." Although books were accorded great authority and reading was highly encouraged in both of the predominantly white communities, the working-class parents "do not, upon seeing an item or event in the real world, remind children of a similar event in a book and launch a running commentary on similarities and differences" (Heath 1982:61). Heath reports that although bedtime routines were not common in the working-class African-American community, participation in oral storytelling and other forms of verbal art afforded children great acuity in creating intertextual relations, particularly as based on metaphorical and fictionalized links.⁶ Heath suggests, however, that classroom discourse discouraged these types of intertextuality "because they enable children to see parallels teachers did not intend, and indeed, may not recognize until the children point them out" (Heath 1982:70). She goes on to argue that the compatibility between the "ways of taking" inculcated by middle-class white parents—even before the children were reading—and those rewarded in the classroom fostered much greater success in school. Rejecting the genres that predominated in the African-American community and the narrow constraints on recontextualization that prevailed among white mem-

bers of the working class constituted crucial means of controlling access to symbolic capital.

Bauman's (1977a, 1982) account of children's "solicitational routines"—speech acts (such as riddles and knock-knock jokes) in which a response is solicited—presents analogous data drawn from genres in which literacy practices are not central. He suggests that solicitational routines provide contexts in which such educationally crucial intertextual skills as asking and answering questions can be learned and strategies for using them in gaining interactional power can be mastered. In an interesting parallel to Heath's data, the Anglo children in Bauman's Austin, Texas, sample were interested in a broader range of solicitational routines than either Chicano or African-American children; similarly, much more extensive intertextual relations between solicitational routines and television shows, comic books, and other forms of popular culture were evident in the repertoire of the Anglo children. Both sets of data suggest that both race and class regulate access to socialization into the types of intertextual strategies that are rewarded by the dominant society; the studies we cited earlier on genre and gender suggest that gender plays a crucial role in shaping the relevant socialization practices as well. We would go on to suggest that such differential distribution of competence in intertextual strategies provides an important means of naturalizing social inequalities based on race and ethnicity, gender, and social class.

One of the thorniest issues that divides social-cultural anthropologists from their linguistically oriented colleagues is the keen interest that many members of the former subdiscipline take in the "poetics and politics" of ethnography (see Clifford 1988; Clifford and Marcus 1986). Linguistic anthropologists—and more than a few social-cultural types as well—often regard their preoccupation with the writing of ethnography, both in "the field" and in the office, as a means of diverting scholarly energy away from the task of discovering the similarities and differences in the ways that people talk and act. Investigating intertextual strategies would seem to offer important possibilities for transcending this epistemological standoff. Fieldwork, analysis, and publication are just as dependent on intertextual strategies as are *coloquio* performances, ritual wailing, and the other forms we have discussed. Such techniques as interviewing draw on complex intertextual relations in creating discourse that is pre-configured for scholarly recontextualizations. As Paredes (1977) has so skillfully shown, ethnographers can be easily misled as to the types of generic intertextuality that their "informants" are using in framing their discourse. As in other types of discourse production and reception, what is negotiated is not just what types of intertextual links are being established, but who gets to control this process; race, class, gender, status, institutional position, and postcolonial social structures in general affect the production and reception of intertextual relations in fieldwork (see Briggs 1986; Mishler 1986).

A number of anthropologists have recently focused on literary intertextuality in ethnographic writing, illuminating the way that both fieldwork and its representation are shaped by intertextual relations; the ge-

neric parameters of ethnographies are shaped through intertextual links not simply with the discourse of Others, but with such literary genres as travel literature, autobiography, and colonial accounts (Clifford 1988; Clifford and Marcus 1986; Marcus and Fischer 1986; Taussig 1987, 1992). Although anthropological writing generally claims to derive its authority from knowledge gained "in the field," intertextual relations established through allegorical narratives and rhetorical tropes play a crucial role in creating authenticity and scientific authority. Examined from the perspective of the creation of generic intertextuality, these literary features are fascinating, both for the way they attempt to naturalize the ethnographer's control over intertextual processes and for the manner in which they seek to erase the monumental gap between the discourses they represent and their own textual representations. The extensive use of tape recorders in the field and side-by-side transcriptions/translations by linguistic anthropologists (present company included) clearly play a role in this process.

This is not to say that anthropological research, linguistic or otherwise, is untenable and should be abandoned. It is to say that fieldwork and its representation provide no less interesting examples of generic intertextuality than other types of discourse and that they are no less in need of scholarly attention. Attempts to dismiss analysis of the intertextual relations that we construct in the course of research and writing would seem to deny us vital information regarding the scientific status of these materials. Such proscriptions simply add up to another set of strategies for minimizing intertextual gaps; as in all such cases, we must inquire into the ideologies that sustain them and the power relations that render them effective or ineffective.

Conclusion

In this article we have critiqued views of genre that draw on purportedly immanent, invariant features in attempting to provide internally consistent systems of mutually exclusive genres. We presented an alternative view of genre, one that places generic distinctions not within texts but in the practices used in creating intertextual relations with other bodies of discourse. Since the establishment of such relations necessarily selects and abstracts generic features, we argued that generic intertextuality is not an inherent property of the relation between a text and a genre but the construction of such a relationship. A text can be linked to generic precedents in multiple ways; generic framings of texts are thus often mixed, blurred, ambiguous, contradictory. We accordingly suggested that generic links necessarily produce an intertextual gap; the strategies used for constructing intertextual relations can seek to minimize this gap, maximize it, or both. Choices between intertextual strategies are ideologically motivated, and they are closely related to social, cultural, political-economic, and historical factors.

Scholars have generally regarded systems of literary and speech genres as means of classifying or ordering discourse. Since intertextual relations

produce disorder, heterogeneity, and textual open-endedness, as well as order, unity, and boundedness, scholarly strategies for creating generic links similarly involve arbitrary selections between competing intertextual relations and are affected by ideological, social, cultural, political-economic, and historical factors. Therefore, no system of genres as defined by scholars can provide a wholly systematic, empirically based, objective set of consistently applied, mutually exclusive categories.

One of the most interesting lines of inquiry in linguistic anthropology and folklore (see Ben-Amos 1976[1969], 1992) has located the study of speech genres in the ethnographic study of locally constructed classification systems rather than in *a priori* analytic categories. This shift has had a positive impact on research by drawing attention to the processes of discursive ordering undertaken by a broader range of producers and receivers of texts than those associated with scholarly practices alone. Unfortunately, it has also helped displace the reification of generic intertextuality from scholarly discourse to representations of ethnographic Others. Ethnographically based studies often portray the situated use of ethnic genres as a process of applying relatively stable, internally consistent, mutually exclusive, and well-defined categories in the production and reception of texts. In representing such an orderly process, scholars run the risk of doubly mystifying the problem by failing to discern the ideologies and power arrangements that underlie local impositions of generic order as well as by covering up their own rhetorical use of genres in ordering ethnographic data. In so doing, scholars collude with the members of the community in question who are deemed to have control over the production and reception of intertextual relations; they similarly often overlook the existence of marginalized and dissenting intertextual strategies (but see Appadurai et al. 1991). While the research on speech genres conducted by the two of us over the years has attempted to analyze the social, political, and linguistic processes that shape the production and reception of verbal art, our work is hardly immune from this sort of reification.

Our goal in this article is thus not to "rescue" the category of genre from these difficulties or to assert its centrality to research in linguistic anthropology. Any attempt to champion—or to dismiss—the concept of genre would have strong ideological underpinnings. We have rather tried to use our discussion of genre as a means of raising some basic issues regarding discourse production and reception. In an earlier article (Bauman and Briggs 1990) we argued that discourse analysis cannot best proceed either by (1) studying (socio)linguistic elements and processes apart from the process of discourse production and reception or by (2) studying social interactions as analytic microcosms. We rather pointed to the fruitfulness of studying discourse vis-à-vis the way it is transformed in the course of successive decontextualizations and recontextualizations and of exploring the process of entextualization that provides the formal and functional basis for such transformations.

We have attempted to advance this line of inquiry here by drawing attention to some of the ways that linguistic anthropologists have used the

concept of genre in elucidating discourse processes; we have pointed to a number of problems in the theoretical underpinnings of these discussions that pose obstacles to progress along these lines. We went on to use the notion of generic intertextuality in analyzing particular strategies for decontextualizing and recontextualizing discourse, along with the ways that this process both reflects and produces social power. We hope that this discussion has demonstrated the value of integrating detailed formal and functional analysis, the sine qua non of linguistic anthropology, with attention to ideology, power, and scholarly practices. We also hope to have suggested some of the ways that such a critical synthetic approach can illuminate contrastive—and often competing—approaches to the study of discourse.

Notes

1. The way that a number of anthropologists approached ethnographically situated genres converged with work in folkloristics; the distinction drawn by Ben-Amos (1976[1969]) between "analytical types," the etic categories used by scholars in comparative research, and "ethnic genres," the emic categories used by members of particular speech communities, was highly influential.

2. See studies by Bauman (1986), Briggs (1990, 1992b), Goodwin (1990), Hymes (1981), Philips (1986), Silverstein (1985), Tannen (1989), Urban (1984b), and a volume edited by Lucy entitled *Reflexive Language: Reported Speech and Metapragmatics* (1992).

3. The qualifier here suggests the fact that there are important exceptions. Some types of reported utterances, such as proverbs, may be attributed not to a particular individual or speech event but to a category of speakers or simply to "tradition" (see Briggs 1988:101–135).

4. In developing his notion of the spatialization of the word in dialogue, Bakhtin discussed an opposition between the *horizontal* characterization of a word's status, a relationship between a writing subject and an addressee, and a *vertical* one, in which the word is viewed in its relationship to a preceding utterance.

5. Investigations of the relationship between genre and gender are currently providing a rich cross-disciplinary convergence of interests between linguistic and sociocultural anthropologists (see Appadurai et al. 1991; Gal 1991; Philips et al. 1987) and practitioners in such fields as ethnomusicology (see Herndon and Ziegler 1990; Koskoff 1989), folkloristics (Farrer 1975; Jordan and Kalčík 1985), and literary criticism (Miller 1986; Showalter 1985).

6. See also Labov (1972) on the sociolinguistic skills of inner-city African-American children; he similarly argues that the hegemony of sociolinguistic patterns associated with middle-class whites in schools thwarts the ability of African-American children to draw on their verbal abilities and sets them up for educational failure. Interestingly, Gates (1988) argues that intertextuality lies at the heart of African-American aesthetics.

References Cited

- Abrahams, Roger D., and Richard Bauman
1971 Sense and Nonsense in St. Vincent: Speech Behavior and Decorum in a Caribbean Community. *American Anthropologist* 73(3):262–272.

Abu-Lughod, Lila

1986 *Veiled Sentiments: Honor and Poetry in a Bedouin Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

1990 *Shifting Politics of Bedouin Love Poetry*. In *Language and the Politics of Emotion*. Catherine A. Lutz and Lila Abu-Lughod, eds. Pp. 24-45. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Anderson, Benedict

1991[1983] *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.

Appadurai, Arjun

1981 *The Past as a Scarce Resource*. *Man* 16(2):201-219.

Appadurai, Arjun, Frank J. Korom, and Margaret A. Mills, eds.

1991 *Gender, Genre, and Power in South Asian Expressive Traditions*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Bakhtin, M. M.

1986[1979] *The Problem of Speech Genres*. In *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, eds. Pp. 60-102. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. M., and P. M. Medvedev

1985[1928] *The Formal Method in Literary Scholarship: A Critical Introduction to Sociological Poetics*. Albert J. Wehrle, trans. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Basso, Keith H.

1984 *"Stalking with Stories": Names, Places, and Moral Narratives among the Western Apache*. In *Text, Play, and Story*. Edward Bruner, ed. Pp. 19-55. Washington, D.C.: American Ethnological Society.

Bauman, Richard

1977a *Linguistics, Anthropology, and Verbal Art: Toward a Unified Perspective, With a Special Discussion of Children's Folklore*. In *Linguistics and Anthropology*. Muriel Saville-Troike, ed. Pp. 13-36. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

1977b *Verbal Art as Performance*. Prospect Heights, Ill.: Waveland Press.

1982 *The Ethnography of Children's Folklore*. In *Children In and Out of School: Ethnographic Perspectives in Education*. Perry Gilmore and Alan Glatthorn, eds. Pp. 172-186. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

1986 *Story, Performance, and Event: Contextual Studies of Oral Narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1987 *Ed Bell, Texas Storyteller: The Framing and Reframing of Life Experience*. *Journal of Folklore Research* 24(3):197-221.

1992a *Contextualization, Tradition, and the Dialogue of Genres: Icelandic Legends of the Kraftaskáld*. In *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*. Alessandro Duranti and Charles Goodwin, eds. Pp. 77-99. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1992b *Transformations of the Word in the Production of Mexican Festival Drama*. In *The Decentering of Discourse*. Michael Silverstein and Greg Urban, eds. (in press).

Bauman, Richard, and Charles L. Briggs

1990 *Poetics and Performance as Critical Perspectives on Language and Social Life*. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19:59-88.

Ben-Amos, Dan

1976[1969] *Analytical Categories and Ethnic Genres*. In *Folklore Genres*. Dan Ben-Amos, ed. Pp. 215-242. Austin: University of Texas Press.

- 1992 Do We Need Ideal Types (in Folklore)? An Address to Lauri Honko. Turku, Finland: Nordic Institute of Folklore.
- Boas, Franz
- 1940a[1914] Mythology and Folk-Tales of the North American Indians. In *Race, Language and Culture*. Pp. 451–490. New York: Free Press.
- 1940b[1916] The Development of Folk-Tales and Myths. In *Race, Language and Culture*. Pp. 397–406. New York: Free Press.
- 1940c[1917] Introduction to International Journal of American Linguistics. In *Race, Language and Culture*. Pp. 199–210. New York: Free Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre
- 1977 *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Richard Nice, trans. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1991 *Language and Symbolic Power*. Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson, trans. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, and Jean-Claude Passeron
- 1977 *Reproduction: In Education, Society and Culture*. Richard Nice, trans. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.
- Brenneis, Donald
- 1987 Performing Passions: Aesthetics and Politics in an Occasionally Egalitarian Community. *American Ethnologist* 14(2):236–250.
- 1988 Telling Troubles: Narrative, Conflict and Experience. *Anthropological Linguistics* 30(3/4):279–291.
- 1990 Shared and Solitary Sentiments: The Discourse of Friendship, Play, and Anger in Bhatgaon. In *Language and the Politics of Emotion*. Catherine A. Lutz and Lila Abu-Lughod, eds. Pp. 113–125. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Briggs, Charles L.
- 1986 *Learning How to Ask: A Sociolinguistic Appraisal of the Role of the Interview in Social Science Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1988 *Competence in Performance: The Creativity of Tradition in Mexican Verbal Art*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- 1989 "Please Pass the Poison": The Poetics of Dialogicality in Warao Ritual Wailing. Paper presented at the Conference on Lament, Austin, Tex.
- 1990 History, Poetics, and Interpretation in the Tale. In *The Lost Gold Mine of Juan Mondragón: A Legend from New Mexico Performed by Melaquíes Romero*. Charles L. Briggs and Julián Josué Vigil, eds. Pp. 165–240. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- 1992a Generic versus Metapragmatic Dimensions of Warao Narratives: Who Regiments Performance? In *Reflexive Language: Reported Speech and Metapragmatics*. John A. Lucy, ed. Pp. 179–212. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (in press).
- 1992b "Since I Am a Woman, I Will Chastise My Relatives": Gender, Reported Speech, and the (Re)production of Social Relations in Warao Ritual Wailing. *American Ethnologist* 19(2):337–361.
- Clifford, James
- 1988 *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Clifford, James, and George E. Marcus, eds.
- 1986 *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Dorst, John D.
- 1989 *The Written Suburb: An American Site, an Ethnographic Dilemma*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Dubrow, Heather
1982 Genre. London: Methuen.
- Dundes, Alan
1964 The Morphology of North American Indian Folktales. *Folklore Fellows Communications*, 195. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.
- Dundes, Alan, ed.
1965 The Study of Folklore. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Duranti, Alessandro
1984 *Lauga and Talanoaga*: Two Speech Genres in a Samoan Political Event. In *Dangerous Words: Language and Politics in the Pacific*. Donald L. Brenneis and Fred R. Myers, eds. Pp. 217–242. New York: New York University Press.
- Ervin-Tripp, Susan
1972 On Sociolinguistic Rules: Alternation and Co-Occurrence. In *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. John J. Gumperz and Dell H. Hymes, eds. Pp. 213–250. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Farrer, Claire R., ed.
1975 Women and Folklore: Images and Genres. Special issue of *Journal of American Folklore* 88(347).
- Feld, Steven
1990a[1982] Sound and Sentiment: Birds, Weeping, Poetics, and Song in Kaluli Expression. 2d ed. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
1990b Wept Thoughts: The Voicing of Kaluli Memories. *Oral Tradition* 5(2/3):241–266.
- Gal, Susan
1991 Between Speech and Silence: The Problematics of Research on Language and Gender. In *Gender at the Crossroads of Knowledge: Feminist Anthropology in the Postmodern Era*. Micaela di Leonardo, ed. Pp. 175–203. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gates, Henry Louis, Jr.
1988 The Signifying Monkey: A Theory of African-American Literary Criticism. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Georges, Robert, and Alan Dundes
1963 Toward a Structural Definition of the Riddle. *Journal of American Folklore* 76(300):111–118.
- Goodwin, Marjorie Harness
1990 He-Said-She-Said: Talk as Social Organization Among Black Children. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Goody, John Rankin
1977 The Domestication of the Savage Mind. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gossen, Gary H.
1972 Chamula Genres of Verbal Behavior. In *Toward New Perspectives in Folklore*. Américo Paredes and Richard Bauman, eds. Pp. 145–167. Austin: University of Texas Press.
1974 Chamulas in the World of the Sun: Time and Space in a Maya Oral Tradition. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Hall, Stuart
1981 Notes on Deconstructing "the Popular." In *People's History and Socialist Theory*. Raphael Samuel, ed. Pp. 227–240. London: Routledge.
- Halliday, M. A. K.
1978 Language as Social Semiotic. London: Arnold.

Handler, Richard, and Jocelyn Linnekin

1984 Tradition, Genuine or Spurious. *Journal of American Folklore* 97(385):273-290.

Hanks, William F.

1987 Discourse Genres in a Theory of Practice. *American Ethnologist* 14(4):668-692.

Heath, Shirley Brice

1982 What No Bedtime Story Means: Narrative Skills at Home and School. *Language in Society* 11(1):49-76.

Herndon, Marcia, and Susanne Ziegler, eds.

1990 Music, Gender, and Culture. Wilhelmshaven, Germany: Florian Neetzel Verlag.

Herzfeld, Michael

1982 Ours Once More: Folklore, Ideology, and the Making of Modern Greece. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Hobsbawm, Eric, and Terence Ranger, eds.

1983 The Invention of Tradition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hymes, Dell H.

1962 The Ethnography of Speaking. In *Anthropology and Human Behavior*. Thomas Gladwin and William C. Sturtevant, eds. Pp. 13-53. Washington, D.C.: Anthropological Society of Washington.

1964 Introduction: Toward Ethnographies of Communication. In *The Ethnography of Communication*. American Anthropologist, Special Publication 66, Number 6, Part 2. John J. Gumperz and Dell H. Hymes, eds. Pp. 1-34. Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association.

1967 Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Setting. *Journal of Social Issues* 23(2):8-28.

1972a Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Life. In *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. John J. Gumperz and Dell H. Hymes, eds. Pp. 35-71. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

1972b The Contribution of Folklore to Sociolinguistic Research. In *Toward New Perspectives in Folklore*. Américo Paredes and Richard Bauman, eds. Pp. 42-50. Austin: University of Texas Press.

1974 Ways of Speaking. In *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*. Richard Bauman and Joel Sherzer, eds. Pp. 433-451. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1975a Breakthrough Into Performance. In *Folklore: Performance and Communication*. Dan Ben-Amos and Kenneth S. Goldstein, eds. Pp. 11-74. The Hague: Mouton.

1975b Folklore's Nature and the Sun's Myth. *Journal of American Folklore* 88(350):346-369.

1981 "In Vain I Tried to Tell You": Essays in Native American Ethnopoetics. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

1985 Language, Memory, and Selective Performance: Cultee's "Salmon's Myth" as Twice Told to Boas. *Journal of American Folklore* 98(390):391-434.

Hymes, Virginia

1987 Tonkawa Poetics: John Rush Buffalo's "Coyote and Eagle's Daughter." In *Native American Discourse: Poetics and Rhetoric*. Joel Sherzer and Anthony C. Woodbury, eds. Pp. 62-102. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jacobs, Melville

1959 Clackamas Chinook Texts. Part 2. Bloomington: Indiana University Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore, and Linguistics.

Jakobson, Roman

1960 Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics. In *Style in Language*. Thomas A. Sebeok, ed. Pp. 350-377. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Jordan, Rosan A., and Susan Kalčik, eds.

1985 *Women's Folklore, Women's Culture*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Keenan, Elinor

1974 Norm-Makers, Norm-Breakers: Uses of Speech by Men and Women in a Malagasy Community. In *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*. Richard Bauman and Joel Sherzer, eds. Pp. 125-143. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara

1991 Objects of Ethnography. In *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*. Ivan Karp and Steven D. Lavine, eds. Pp. 386-443. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Koskoff, Ellen, ed.

1989 *Women and Music in Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.

Kristeva, Julia

1980 *Desire in Language*. Leon S. Roudiez, trans. New York: Columbia University Press.

Kuipers, Joel C.

1990 *Power in Performance: The Creation of Textual Authority in Weyewa Ritual Speech*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Labov, William

1972 *Language in the Inner City*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Leitch, Vincent B.

1991 (De)Coding (Generic) Discourse. *Genre* 24(1):83-98.

Lewalski, Barbara Kiefer, ed.

1986 *Renaissance Genres: Essays on Theory, History, and Interpretation*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Lockhart, James

1991 *Nahuas and Spaniards: Postconquest Central Mexican History and Philology*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

Lucy, John, ed.

1992 *Reflexive Language: Reported Speech and Metapragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (in press).

Lutz, Catherine

1990 Engendered Emotion: Gender, Power, and the Rhetoric of Emotional Control in American Discourse. In *Language and the Politics of Emotion*. Catherine A. Lutz and Lila Abu-Lughod, eds. Pp. 69-91. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marcus, George E, and Michael M. J. Fischer

1986 *Anthropology as Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Miller, Nancy K., ed.

1986 *The Poetics of Gender*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Mishler, Elliot G.

1986 *Research Interviewing: Context and Narrative*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Ong, Walter J.

1967 *The Presence of the Word: Some Prolegomena for Cultural and Religious History*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

1982 *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. London: Methuen.

Paredes, Américo

1977 On Ethnographic Work among Minority Groups. *New Scholar* 6(1):1-32.

Philips, Susan U.

1986 Reported Speech as Evidence in an American Trial. In *Languages and Linguistics: The Interdependency of Theory, Data, and Application*. Deborah Tannen, ed. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

1987 The Concept of Speech Genre in the Study of Language and Culture. In *Working Papers and Proceedings of the Center for Psychosocial Studies*, 11. Pp. 25-34. Chicago: Center for Psychosocial Studies.

Philips, Susan U., Susan Steele, and Christine Tanz, eds.

1987 *Language, Gender and Sex in Comparative Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Propp, Vladímir

1968[1928] *The Morphology of the Folktale*. Laurence Scott, trans. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Radin, Paul

1926 Literary Aspects of Winnebago Mythology. *Journal of American Folklore* 39(151):18-52.

Reichard, Gladys

1925 *Wiyot Grammar and Texts*. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, 22 (1). Berkeley: University of California Press.

1947 *An Analysis of Coeur D'Alene Indian Myths*. *Memoirs of the American Folklore Society*, vol. 41. Philadelphia, Penn.: American Folklore Society.

Sapir, Edward

1909 *Wishram Texts*. Publications of the American Ethnological Society, vol. 2. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Sapir, Edward, and Harry Hoijer

1942 *Navaho Texts*. Iowa City: Linguistic Society of America and University of Iowa.

Schieffelin, Bambi B.

1990 *The Give and Take of Everyday Life: Language Socialization of Kaluli Children*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Scott, Charles T.

1965 *Persian and Arabic Riddles: A Language-Centered Approach to Genre Definition*. Bloomington: Indiana University Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore, and Linguistics.

Sebeok, Thomas A.

1964[1953] The Structure and Content of Cheremis Charms. In *Language in Culture and Society*. Dell H. Hymes, ed. Pp. 356-371. New York: Harper & Row.

Seremetakis, C. Nadia

1991 *The Last Word: Women, Death, and Divination in Inner Mani*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sherzer, Joel

1983 *Kuna Ways of Speaking*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

- 1987 A Discourse-Centered Approach to Language and Culture. *American Anthropologist* 89(2):295-309.
- 1991 Verbal Art in San Blas. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shimkin, Demitri
 1964[1947] Wind River Shoshone Literary Forms: An Introduction. In *Language in Culture and Society*. Dell H. Hymes, ed. Pp. 344-355. New York: Harper & Row.
- Showalter, Elaine, ed.
 1985 The New Feminist Criticism: Essays on Women, Literature, and Theory. New York: Pantheon.
- Silverstein, Michael
 1976 Shifters, Linguistic Categories, and Cultural Description. In *Meaning in Anthropology*. Keith Basso and Henry A. Selby, eds. Pp. 11-55. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- 1985 The Culture of Language in Chinookan Narrative Texts; or, on Saying that . . . in Chinook. In *Grammar Inside and Outside the Clause*. Johanna Nichols and Anthony Woodbury, eds. Pp. 132-171. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1992 Metapragmatic Discourse and Metapragmatic Function. In *Reflexive Language: Reported Speech and Metapragmatics*. John A. Lucy, ed. Pp. 33-58. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stewart, Susan
 1991 Notes on Distressed Genres. *Journal of American Folklore* 104(411):5-31.
- Stross, Brian
 1974 Speaking of Speaking: Tenejapa Tzeltal Metalinguistics. In *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*. Richard Bauman and Joel Sherzer, eds. Pp. 213-239. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tannen, Deborah
 1989 Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taussig, Michael
 1987 Shamanism, Colonialism and the Wild Man: A Study in Terror and Healing. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 1992 The Nervous System. New York: Routledge.
- Telford, Kenneth A.
 1961 Aristotle's Poetics: Translation and Analysis. South Bend, Ind.: Gateway.
- Tolbert, Elizabeth
 1990 Magico-Religious Power and Gender in the Karelian Lament. In *Music, Gender, and Culture*. Marica Herndon and Suzanne Ziegler, eds. Pp. 41-56. Berlin: Institute for Comparative Music Studies.
- Urban, Greg
 1984a The Semiotics of Two Speech Styles in Shokleng. In *Semiotic Mediation*. Elizabeth Mertz and Richard J. Parmentier, eds. Pp. 311-329. Orlando, Fla.: Academic Press.
- 1984b Speech about Speech in Speech about Action. *Journal of American Folklore* 97(385):310-328.
- 1988 Ritual Wailing in Amerindian Brazil. *American Anthropologist* 90(2):385-400.