Language in Society **26**, 221–246. Printed in the United States of America

Self-expression and linguistic variation

BARBARA JOHNSTONE

Department of English
Carnegie-Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

JUDITH MATTSON BEAN

Department of English, Speech, and Foreign Languages
Texas Women's University
Denton, TX 76204-1972
f_bean@venus.twu.edu

ABSTRACT

This article argues that self-expression is a crucial though heretofore largely overlooked part of the explanation for linguistic variation. Self-expression mediates between linguistic choices and social facts such as gender, occupation, linguistic ideology, and place of origin, as speakers use language not only to express their identification with or rejection of social groupings, but also to express their individuality. All language use is thus essentially idiosyncratic and syncretic. The point is illustrated with reference to case studies of the speech and writing of two Texas women who use language in public contexts. The article further argues for the sociolinguistic study of public modes of discourse in addition to "vernacular" modes, and for the need in sociolinguistic research for rhetorical as well as linguistic analysis. (Variation, self-expression, individuality, case studies, Texas, public speech)*

Dialectology began as an attempt to link linguistic variation systematically with region, showing how and why speakers from different areas spoke differently. With increasing social and geographical mobility in Europe and North America, region has become less significant than it once was in accounting for variation,[1] and sociolinguistics has explored new factors: linguistic differences among speakers have been shown also to correlate with social class, socio-economic status, age, gender, and ethnicity. Recent work on the causes of variation has suggested the need for still further avenues of explanation. Thus Bernstein 1993 shows that ethnicity, age, length of residency, region, education, rurality, income, and sex account for only 9–23% of the variance (depending on the set of phonological variables in question) among Texas speakers studied in a telephone survey. Research that suggests

© 1997 Cambridge University Press 0047-4045/97 $7.50 + .10

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500020911 Published online by Cambridge University Press

what some of the additional reasons for variation may be includes that of Lesley and James Milroy (Milroy 1987), who show that the number and strength of people's social ties correlate with how much they sound like others in their residential communities. More recently, Milroy 1992 has suggested that the interaction of linguistic politeness (Brown & Levinson 1987) with social status may be important. Bell 1984 brings a fundamental insight of rhetoric to bear on variation in reminding us that people's audiences affect how they speak. Guy Bailey and his co-workers (cf. Bailey 1991) have begun to demonstrate that linguistic choices can be linked with how strongly people feel about where they live, and what they buy and read. Work on linguistic ideology has suggested the mediating effects on linguistic choices and language change of a society's conceptualizations of language and its use, and the circulation of and struggles over dominant conceptualizations. This has come from linguistic anthropology (for overviews, see Joseph & Taylor 1990; Kroskrity et al. 1992; and Woolard & Schieffelin 1994),[2] as well as from sociolinguistics, where David Sankoff and his colleagues (Sankoff et al. 1989; Sankoff & Laberge 1978) have explored speakers' "linguistic market index" (how important it is in a person's job to sound correct) and "symbolic index" (people's values, attitudes, tastes and activities, and social milieux).[3]

We suggest that individual choice, based on speakers' particular and idiosyncratic self-images and in the service of self-expression, is another key to why variation exists and how it comes to be. We argue for an approach to variation that acknowledges and explores the role of the individual speaker in selecting and shaping the linguistic resources that are provided in his or her environment by a variety of models for talk and action. We exemplify this approach in this article with studies of the contrasting ways in which two Texas women employ the diversity of linguistic resources available to them. In the process, we provide justification for the following claims (some, though not all, novel) about sociolinguistic variation and its study:

(a) Speakers choose how to sound. Their choices are usually made unconsciously, though they can be the result of conscious adoption of a strategic style. Although social facts bear heavily on linguistic ones, social facts are not determinants of linguistic facts: the relationship between social facts and linguistic facts is not a cause–effect relationship.

(b) Speakers' choices, made from among the sociolinguistic resources available to them, may be ways of speaking associated with large groups (e.g. African-American Vernacular English), or they may be ways of speaking associated with smaller groups or even individuals (e.g. the way one's mother, teacher, or uncle talks).

(c) Linguistic choices are made on all levels, from how to sound to how to tell stories, be polite etc. Thus analysis of linguistic variation must be rhetorical as well as linguistic in the traditional sense.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500020911 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(d) Speakers' linguistic choices express one or more self-images. (Some people's self-images are relatively consistent from situation to situation, others' are relatively flexible.) Self-images may partly coincide with images of one or more groups, as speakers express identification with others; but self-images also reflect individuals' senses of themselves as different from others.

(e) Relatively public speech – speech which is relatively planned and self-conscious, and whose audience is not limited to family, peers, and immediate community – highlights linguistic choices expressive of self-image. If "vernacular" speech is best for showing how people's choices are influenced by social facts, public speech is best for showing the ways in which people's choices are self-expressive.

(f) Case studies – detailed ethnographic and linguistic analyses of individuals' talk and writing, and how they understand what they are doing with language – are a good technique for seeing how the individual enters into the set of factors that explain sociolinguistic variation.

In what follows, we discuss the theory that underlies our project, and we sketch our research methodology. We then present two case studies. We end with a discussion of the implications of our approach.

LINGUISTIC VARIATION IN CONTEMPORARY TEXAS

Sociolinguistic research in the US and Great Britain has, until recently, typically been carried out in relatively close-knit communities where everyone is more or less focused on the same models for talk, and makes use of the same sets of linguistic variants. Beginning with the Linguistic Atlas projects, research on language in the American South has likewise sought to describe the speech of fairly isolated, homogeneous populations such as those of small rural towns and urban ghettos.[4] It has been assumed that sociolinguistic models that accounted for the relatively stable patterns of variation found there would also account for patterns of variation in other settings.

Southern states may indeed at one time have consisted of homogeneous speech communities. For most of the region's history, people largely stayed where they were born; they interacted with the same people in their community, and few from outside it, all their lives. Hence they could be said to talk the way they did because of where they came from. But now fewer and fewer Southerners inhabit tightly focused speech communities analogous to those of Harlem, Detroit, or inner-city Belfast. We think it is worth studying those who do not.

Outsiders and Texans alike tend to think that there is a single linguistic model toward which all Texans either aim or decide not to aim.[5] But even the most casual observation shows that not all Texans speak alike, nor do all share the same norms for speech. What, then, might it mean to talk about

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500020911 Published online by Cambridge University Press

"Texas speech"? Many very different resources are available in Texas for the creation and display of idiosyncratic ways of being and sounding; and the many Texans who interact with people outside their immediate communities, either privately or in more public media, have access to varying sets of these resources. Texas is a particularly suitable locale for a study of the linguistic effects of multiple cultural models. To varying degrees, people in Texas speak English like Southerners, like Californians, like Midwesterners; they speak Spanish, Tex-Mex, Vietnamese, German, Czech; they use features of African-American English Vernacular and traditions of African-American oratory. They may project colorful, direct Western personalities, or genteel, indirect Southern ones. Texans shape languages to use as they shape individual identities in the "multidimensional social space" (LePage & Tabouret-Keller 1985) suggested by these and other possibilities.

Not all linguistic possibilities are open to all Texans: thus not all speak Spanish equally well, and some are only able to make small symbolic stabs at sounding Southern. Some Texans do continue to live in tightly focused communities in which linguistic resources are limited, and homogeneity is accordingly high. We are not trying to undo the results of dialectology based in such communities, but rather to extend the study of linguistic variation so that it provides a model of the language of people in other, more public contexts as well.

We are interested in a setting where multiple models exist for how to talk; we are interested in educated, mobile, middle-class people (not unlike ourselves and probably most readers of this article). The social ties of these people to one another, and to some of the people they seek to influence, are public rather than private; accordingly, they often employ public modes of discourse such as speech-making, teaching, publishing, and recording. In such settings, linguistic variation may best be understood as the result of individuals' creation of distinct voices that express changeable, idiosyncratic identities. We think that this process involves individual speakers' selection and combination of resources provided by the regional and social models available to them. In this, we take an approach modeled by Kroskrity 1993, who shows how the linguistic choices of the Arizona Tewa "reveal their biographies" (6). The Tewa, says Kroskrity, select from among a variety of identity options – which can, of course, be limited by such things as power relations (not all options are open to everyone, as we have pointed out above). In making choices about what language to speak in a given situation, the Tewa "display a strategy of selection from among a repertoire of culturally available identities" (6). The linguistic models associated with "culturally available identities," for Tewa or Texans, may in some cases have names (this is apparently true for the Tewa, who can draw on "English," "Hopi," or "Tewa" ways of talking). Other models may be referred to in other ways, some involving overt reference to talk (e.g. "sounding 'country' ") and some

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500020911 Published online by Cambridge University Press

not (being "friendly" or "independent," to cite terms Texans repeatedly use to describe how Texans do or should act). In the study of which we present part here, we are using interviews and more detailed case studies of Texas women to see where their speech models come from and what they consist of.

One thing that many of our research participants have in common is that they overtly and sometimes vociferously resist talking about themselves in terms of gender, ethnicity, or class; they insist that their linguistic behavior is not determined by their membership in one demographic group or another. We think they are right. Still, stereotypes associated with profession, gender, ethnicity, and class are resources on which speakers can selectively draw. For example, an Anglo Texan woman might express one sort of Texas identity by employing linguistic features associated with the old South – including displays of politeness, indirectness, and respect for kin and elders, as well as careful, elocutionary diction. She could express another sort of identity by employing speech features associated with the West Texas pioneer (including the use of Spanish, or the use of nonce epithets or narrative strategies of persuasion). Alternatively, or in addition, a woman might draw on other images, such as the urbanite, or on the traditions of African-American speech performance. These models are fully realized only in parody; they are abstractions available for idiosyncratic realization by individuals. Furthermore, speakers draw on many models at once.

These sources of influence may be generalized ("the way women speak," or "correct Spanish," to cite terms our research participants use); but they are, we find, more often very particular ("my mother's teacher genes" or "the uncle who taught me to give speeches in Spanish"). Speakers may attempt to realize these models in their speech in order to conform to them, or they may speak in ways that display their resistance to them. For example, Johnstone 1995 shows how several of our case-study speakers resist gendered models for action and speech, but are eager to make use of regional models. Another important source of influence on an individual's speech is the need for self-definition and self-expression: the assertion and display of a unique, autonomous self (Johnstone 1991, 1996). Just as socially constituted groups of speakers differentiate themselves linguistically (as sociolinguistic research has abundantly illustrated), so do individual speakers. This reason for variation has been largely ignored in previous scholarship in sociolinguistics, and it is the focus here.

Our approach to linguistic variation expands on work by such authors as LePage & Tabouret-Keller (1985; cf. LePage 1968, 1980) concerning linguistic "acts of identity." The work of these scholars has been carried out in the multilingual, multi-ethnic societies of the Caribbean, in what began as an attempt to describe Caribbean varieties of English. Faced with a far more heterogeneous population than were other sociolinguists, LePage & Tabouret-Keller have suggested a different framework for understanding variability

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500020911 Published online by Cambridge University Press

among speakers. Their focus is on the role of linguistic choice in the expression of situated individual identity. They see language as the property of the individual, shaped by speakers and understood by hearers by means of pragmatic strategies, as much as by means of fixed or variable rules. Since we are looking not only at how speakers pronounce and construct words and sentences, but also at how they use them in stories, conversations etc., our work is also part of the small but growing body of research on sociolinguistic variation in pragmatics and discourse structure (Dines 1980, Tannen 1981, Coupland 1983, Johnstone 1990, 1992, 1993).

THE CASE STUDY AS A SOCIOLINGUISTIC TECHNIQUE

Drawing on case-study methodology developed by sociologists (e.g. Bellah et al. 1985), and used fruitfully in sociolinguistics by Macaulay 1991, we are conducting detailed case studies of the language of 10 women. We refer to two of these in this article. The women with whom we are working represent various regions of Texas, and various ethnic groups. Rural women as well as urban women are represented, of various ages.

In 9 of the 10 cases, we have spontaneous spoken interview data, as well as writing and more planned speech. However, our case-study data consist mostly of speech and writing that is more or less public: relatively elaborated, intended for a non-intimate audience, and relatively self-conscious. We are not seeking to elicit only the most vernacular speech. This is because our research site is not a self-contained neighborhood, and the ways of speaking we want to describe are not those of people who interact with one another in private. We are studying speech community in rather broad terms, in which public networks of influence replace private ones, and private networks can become resources in the creation of public ones. In designing our data-collection techniques, we have aimed to reflect the fact that many Texans do not interact mainly in dense social networks, and to further our goal of finding out what accounts for systematicity in the speech of people who are not using a non-self-conscious vernacular. As William Labov showed (1972:70–109), careful speech elicited in reading and minimal-pair tasks is (at least phonologically) less consistent than is more casual speech. But we are interested precisely in how speakers make use of the range of their linguistic resources. Relatively "performed" speech (Bauman 1977), in which speakers call attention to their linguistic virtuosity, is, we think, more likely to reveal how speakers organize diverse sociolinguistic resources than is relatively "vernacular" speech, which may in fact mask the full scope of a person's competence.

Because phonological variation is relatively easy to describe and quantify, most of the work toward developing models of variation has to date focused

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500020911 Published online by Cambridge University Press

on phonology. We include phonological variability as evidence in our study as well. We suspect, for example, based on work by Bailey 1991, that the glide-shortened (more monophthongal) pronunciation of /ai/ will be one indicator of a person's identification with a rural Anglo-Texan image. However, we are also interested in variability of other sorts: morphological, syntactic, and pragmatic. We think, for example, that sounding Southern is a matter not only of pronunciation, but equally of how linguistic politeness is expressed, how assertions are framed, how kin are addressed etc. (Johnstone 1992); that sounding Western can mean telling stories in a certain way; and that a small-town identity may be displayed through the use of private speech genres (such as personal narrative) in public contexts such as newspapers.

Research on choice of language or variety typically begins with options identified by the researcher, often corresponding to the names of languages or varieties. Hence African Americans are said to choose between African-American English Vernacular and Standard English, or Hispanics between Spanish and English. We suspect that these names may not always correspond to the distinctions on which speakers actually base their decisions. For example, features of what linguists call Southern speech (or, in more detail, Lower Southern and South Midland speech) can be heard throughout Texas; but there is little evidence that, when Texans employ these features, they are actually aiming at sounding Southern. Our interviewing suggests that most Texans do not think of "Texas speech" as Southern at all, and those who think of themselves as Southerners think of that as incidental to their being Texans. We need, then, to find a way to let our research participants identify the linguistic models on which they are drawing, rather than identifying them ourselves on the basis of linguistic distinctions that may not be emically relevant. To do this, we take our cues from the work of Preston 1989, 1993 in "folklinguistics," and from other ethnographic work on "talk about talk" (e.g. Stross 1974). We ask our participants to talk about where they come from, how people act there, and how they learned how to talk and behave; and we ask them to describe their views of the possible ways Texas women can sound and act.

In analyzing this material, we seek to find out how each woman's identity (or identities), as a Texan and as a public speaker or writer, is reflected in the ways she speaks and writes. We look for features of language corresponding to models for speaking that are relatively widespread in Texas; and we look for the more idiosyncratic sources of influence described by our participants, and uncovered by us in our reading about them and in their writing. We try to show how each woman draws on a variety of models for speaking, selecting from and combining aspects of these speech models as she creates an idiosyncratic voice – one which reflects her own sense of personal identity, and also displays her acceptance or rejection of qualities seen as shared by all Texans.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500020911 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The two women whose language use we describe in what follows are Molly Ivins and Barbara Jordan. Jordan was born in 1937, Ivins in 1944. Both spent their childhoods in Houston, Ivins in a wealthy White neighborhood and Jordan in a working-class Black one. Both are widely known in Texas and throughout the US. Ivins is a syndicated newspaper columnist, humorist, and best-selling author; Jordan, who died in January 1996, was a member of the House of Representatives in the 1970s, and later very visible as an elder stateswoman. Both are identified with political liberalism, among many other things. As Texas women with national visibility, both had to think about how to present themselves to audiences with strongly held, but not entirely accurate, notions of what Texans, Southern women, and (in Jordan's case) African-Americans are like.

Despite these similarities between Ivins and Jordan, there is no reason to suppose that the two should speak alike. Ivins is White, and Jordan was African-American; this fact alone would lead us to expect variation. What is interesting about these two speakers is how dissimilar their language is, the ways in which it is dissimilar, and the reasons. As our analysis will show, Jordan and Ivins make very different choices about how to express identities as individuals, Texans, and women. The two voices that result are different in ways that cannot be fully captured in terms of ascribed characteristics such as gender and ethnicity.

Work of the kind we present here has one practical drawback: it is difficult to report in summary form. The only way to present this kind of particularistic analysis adequately is to do so slowly, at length, and with extended examples, so that readers come as close as possible to hearing the voices in question. This is impossible in an article of the present format. The case we are making in this paper is primarily theoretical, rather than empirical; we think it important to illustrate its usefulness nonetheless, even if only briefly. Expanded versions of both the analyses presented here can be found elsewhere (Bean 1993; Johnstone 1996, Ch. 5).

MOLLY IVINS: FLEXIBILITY, REBELLION, STRATEGIC TEXANNESS

Molly Ivins was born in California of parents from Illinois.[6] Moving to Texas as a young child, she grew up in an exclusive Houston neighborhood and attended private school. She earned her B.A. at Smith College in Massachusetts, studied political science in Paris, and received an M.A. from Columbia School of Journalism. Ivins worked as a journalist in Austin and Houston, then moved to Minneapolis, Denver, and New York before returning to Texas to write for the *Dallas Times Herald* and the *Fort Worth Star Telegram*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500020911 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In her writing, syndicated nationally in newspapers and collected in two books (Ivins 1991, 1993), she often plays the role of a "professional Texan"; features of speech associated with the frontier and with cowboy myths are used as linguistic resources, in ironic commentary on Texan and national culture. But Ivins is not simply adopting, for purposes of entertainment, a foreign voice; her stereotypical Texas speech makes fun of stereotypical Texans, but it also identifies her as a Texan. Far more liberal than most Texans, Ivins uses language to position herself as both an insider and an outsider, simultaneously identifying with Texas culture and rebelling against mainstream, conservative Texas. She shifts in and out of her West Texas voice between clauses and within them – sometimes in humor, sometimes for ironic criticism, to express her regional and individual identity. Shifts away from her Texas voice tend to be into very formal, elevated standard language that marks her as educated and cosmopolitan. Ivins also expresses in her speech her REJECTION of another of the possible models for the action and speech of a White female Texan, that of the Southern belle. Ivins' discourse allows us to examine the interplay of regional and individual identities and the strategic use of regional identification for rhetorical ends.

Keenly aware of regional stereotypes and role models for the South, West, and Texas, Ivins responds to them in *Molly Ivins can't say that, can she?* (1991), in her newspaper columns, and in *Nothin' but good times ahead* (1993). She humorously comments on the limited roles available for aspiring Texas women – cheerleader, beauty queen, or traditional Southern lady. She rejects them all, associating herself through speech and dress with the myth of independence and freedom associated with the frontier, the cowboy, and the Western woman. Ivins often makes explicit her identification with the West: "I have spent most of my life in the West ... The people I admire most in our history are the hell-raisers and rabble rousers, the apple-cart upsetters and plain old mumpish eccentrics" (1993:114). Four features of Ivins' discourse can be identified particularly with her expression of her Western regional identity: highly performed narrative involving marked nonstandard forms and comedy; speech play including humorous invective and poetic turns of phrase; figurative language; and directness, including the swearing and "earthiness" of diction that especially mark Ivins as resisting the model of the Southern belle.[7]

These features help establish Ivins as a Texan familiar with the stereotypical speech ways of the frontier. However, her particular, idiosyncratic USE of these features expresses her individual identity. Her fluency in switching in and out of this style displays verbal sophistication and virtuosity.[8] Her writing illustrates what Bell 1984 calls "initiative style shifting," i.e. unpredictable changes of register which persuade by creating dramatic verisimilitude and humor, and which carry the weight of a speaker's claim to identity

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500020911 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with an "external reference group" (Bell 1984:183, 191). In other words, like many "dialect" writers, Ivins is appealing to readers who do not use her adopted regional dialect, and who will identify with her linguistic sophistication perhaps more than with her Westernness.

One of the most notable features of Ivins' "frontier style" is her dramatic storytelling. Ivins performs narratives with dialect and comic sense, particularly in her political satire. For example, Ivins describes a debate over a Texas redistricting bill. She writes that, in 1971, State Representative Guy Floyd of San Antonio –

> a good ol' boy who had been shafted by the bill, rose to remonstrate with the chairman of the Redistricting Committee ... "Lookahere, Dell-win," said Floyd, much aggrieved, "look at this district here. You've got a great big ball at the one end, and then a little bitty ol' strip a' land goes for about 300 miles, and then a great big ol' ball at the other end. It looks like a dumbbell. Now the courts say the districts have to be com-pact and contiguous. Is that your idea a' com-pact and con-tiguous?" Delwin Jones meditated at some length before replying, "Whaell, in a artistic sense, it is." (Ivins 1991:15)

This passage represents widely held stereotypes of West Texas speech. A laconic pace is created through the use of the discourse markers *whaell*, *lookahere*, and *now* at the beginnings of sentences and with the long pause described before Jones replies. The non-standard South Midland phonology that characterizes West Texas speech is represented by "eye dialect" (*ol'*, *a'*) and the expressions *great big ol'* and *little bitty ol'*, and South Midland morphophonology by *a artistic*.

In framing the story, Ivins' narratorial voice is sometimes depicted as using standard, even elevated, speech. However, even here she shifts styles. For example, she begins the redistricting story with colloquial phrasing (*a good ol' boy who had been shafted by the bill*) then switches to more formal diction (*rose to remonstrate with the chairman of the Redistricting Committee*). She goes on to identify him as a man *much aggrieved*. Through such formal lexical choices, Ivins makes an implicit claim to the intellectual authority of outside observer and critic. Through phrasing such as *good ol' boy*, she invokes and satirizes a regional stereotype,[9] while also displaying her identity with it through her fluency in it.

A second feature of Ivins' writing is speech play, which not only entertains the listener but also displays the imaginative linguistic skills of the speaker. One analyst of Texas writers (Vliet 1983:111) suggests that a tradition of invective, or creative insult, is characteristic of the frontier and West Texas. Ivins frequently makes use of this tradition in her political commentary. For example, to insult a state commission she writes (Ivins 1992), "I once suggested that the Public Utility Commission be razed to the ground and salt

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500020911 Published online by Cambridge University Press

strewn in the field where it stood – seemed like the only sensible solution." The elevated, literary diction and hyperbole in the first part of the statement contrast with the straightforwardness of the second, again displaying Ivins' multivocal identity.

Other elements of Ivins' speech play which demonstrate verbal dexterity are poetic turns of phrase and the use of sound patterns such as alliteration. For example, she often uses pairs of words linked by sound, as when she writes that the Texas senate was so "racist and reactionary" that it was enough to make one "despair of democracy," or when she describes one politician as a "peerless parliamentarian" and another as being "as cantankerous as he was conservative" (Ivins 1991:18, 19).

A third discourse feature associated with the frontier is creative, unconventional figurative language.[10] In particular, Ivins repeatedly coins colorful and humorous similes and metaphors. These incongruous comparisons, often phrased in colloquial diction, frequently contrast with otherwise standard syntax, creating style shifts within sentences. For example, Ivins associates herself with a legendary Dallas Cowboys football player to display both her stances as insider and outsider in Texas (tall, but female and liberal) when she characterizes herself by writing that being six feet tall, she was "the Too Tall Jones of my time." She describes her liberal political philosophy in a conservative state by writing that she felt the need to explain the "odd hitch in my gitalong," softening the offense of exceptionalism by placing it in a framework that evokes Texas mythology – Western eccentricity and individualism.

A fourth element of Ivins' "frontier talk" is the directness associated with earthy diction and swearing. Thus, in recreating the style of 1970s Texas politicians debating a "Clean Crapper bill," she directly challenges norms for genteel Southern women's speech: "the delights of peein' against the back wall after a good whisky drank were limned with excruciating detail."[11] Here again we see Ivins' characteristic style shifting: *were limned with excruciating detail* creates a contrast with the earthy language of the sentence's subject noun phrase, and by implication a contrast between two voices. This pattern is repeated often, sometimes accompanied by overt statements of Ivins' ambivalence toward Texas. Using swearing in her journalism and talk, she draws on a tradition of tough-talking, self-reliant Western women and men, who speak their minds and do not mince words. (See, for example, Saum's 1990 study of 19th century letters by Westerners.)

What Ivins calls "speaking Texan" has a more personal function as well: displaying public freedom of expression and forthrightness, which are sometimes denied the traditional Southern woman. Through her linguistic choices, she simultaneously asserts her toughness and her sense of play. Linguistic resources associated with region (the West) and gender (maleness) give Ivins a way of emphasizing her convictions; the resources of class (standard speech) give her a means of grounding her intellectual analysis. Together,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500020911 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Ivins' choices from the resources available to her, and her juxtapositions of them, allow her to establish a clearly individual discourse style, and to express a clearly individual identity.

BARBARA JORDAN: CONSISTENCY AND CONSTANCY

Barbara Jordan was raised in a working-class Houston neighborhood.[12] She was educated in a racially segregated public high school, and at historically Black Texas Southern University, before going to Boston for law school. Like Ivins, Jordan returned to Texas, first to practice law in Houston, and soon to enter state and then national politics. A member of the US House of Representatives for three terms (where she was the first African-American woman from the South), Jordan became well-known for her televised speech as a member of the House Judiciary Committee during deliberations over the possible impeachment of Richard Nixon; rather than taking a partisan stance, she presented a careful analysis of the Constitution. Jordan was keynote speaker at Democratic nominating conventions in 1976 and 1992. After leaving the House, she taught public policy at the University of Texas. Widely regarded as a model of political probity, she was ethics advisor to former Texas Governor Ann Richards, and she was often called upon to comment on ethical issues.

Jordan came to prominence through astute politics, partly conducted through public oratory that seemed to her audiences both inspired and inspiring. Both in public oratory and in face-to-face interviews, she spoke slowly, in a low, intense voice, articulating clearly and making it apparent that she was choosing words carefully. But her fame as a public speaker is not just a result of her delivery. She projected tremendous personal authority in her speaking. She was believable because of the strong, upstanding, powerful character she displayed. To use the terminology of Aristotelian rhetoric, Jordan's appeal was primarily ethical, primarily a result of the compellingly believable persona that she presented.

Like that of Ivins, Jordan's public discourse is framed mostly in a standard, literary variety of English. This is true even in the unplanned, spontaneous talk of our interview with her, which was by far the least conversation-like of all the interviews we have carried out. Even responses of the most mundane sort, such as her answer to a question about whether her high-school debate teams were co-ed, were phrased in strikingly literary syntax: "Certainly in the debates we would have, uh, we, there were boys and girls on a given team, and, both the team of which I would be a part and the opposing team." Unlike Ivins, though, Jordan was not primarily a writer. She did not, in fact, write out even her most formal oratory. Jordan's decision not to prepare speeches completely in advance was evidence of the value she placed on extemporaneous oral articulateness,[13] an attitude that came from

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500020911 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the preaching tradition of the Baptist church (her father was a minister), from her high school and college debate training, and from her training as a lawyer. Her presence and that of her audience were, for her, the source of the power of her words: "After [a speech] is given," she told us, "it's dead." What Jordan valued was not just the ability to think of something to say in any situation, but the ability to think of the one RIGHT thing to say and to phrase it accurately, precisely, and with meticulous care. As she put it, "The beauty of, of expression is finding the, the right word that is really no other word would suffice, for communicating that idea. That's what appeals to me about language." By choosing to speak extemporaneously rather than read from a script, and by choosing to speak on pre-planned occasions the same way she did on unplanned ones, Jordan made displays of easy thoughtfulness and mastery of language.

Jordan's displays of care in the structuring of talk and in lexical choice (she spoke in our interview, for example, of "the violence that school desegregation *wrought* in Boston") can be connected both to her legal training and to the African-American tradition of speech performance (Abrahams 1962, 1976, Balester 1993) with which she identified. In her words, "there are any number of people who are public speakers who try to reflect what they have heard from their minister ... It is because of that preaching that influences, I think, the way that a person who is Black would deliver an address or a speech." Though she was wary of "preachifying" and resisted consciously sounding poetic, Jordan's discourse, in interviews as in her speeches, was characterized by performance features such as dramatization, repeated rhythms, repetitive phonological patterns (such as alliteration and assonance), syntactic parallelism, and deliberate pacing. This is true whether she was delivering a speech or answering interview questions. An example from the former was the beginning of her 1976 keynote address to the Democratic Convention; in switches between conversational talk – "What in the world am I supposed to say?" – and high rhetoric, she created drama which was sustained by patterns of repetition, some of which we have pointed up here:

> One hundred and forty-four years ago, members of the Democratic party first met in convention to select a presidential candidate. Since that time, Democrats have continued to
> convene once every four years and
> draft a party platform and
> nominate a presidential candidate.
> And our meeting this week is a continuation of that tradition. But
> there is something different about tonight.
> There is something special about tonight.
> What is different?
> What is special?

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500020911 Published online by Cambridge University Press

I, Barbara Jordan, am a keynote speaker.
A lot of years have passed since 1832, and during that time it would have been most unusual for any national political party to ask that a Barbara Jordan deliver a keynote address ... but tonight here I am. And I feel that notwithstanding the past that my presence here is one additional bit of evidence that the American Dream need not forever be deferred.

Now that I have this grand distinction what in the world am I supposed to say?

I could easily spend this time praising the accomplishments of this party and attacking the Republicans
but I don't choose to do that.
I could list the many problems which Americans have.
I could list the problems which cause people to feel cynical, angry, frustrated: problems which include
lack of integrity in government;
the feeling that the individual no longer counts;
the reality of material and spiritual poverty;
the feeling that the grand American experiment is failing or has failed.
I could recite these problems and then
I could sit down and offer no solutions.
But I don't choose to do that either.
The citizens of America expect more. They deserve and they want more than a recital of problems.
We are a people in a quandary about the present.
We are a people in search of our future.
We are a people in search of a national community.

Repetition and constructed dialog (Tannen 1989) create drama in the following interview excerpt (Angelo 1991) about political ethics:

It is not right;
it is not correct;
it should not occur.
These things may not be illegal, but it is so important for a public servant to sort out what is legal from what is ethical. I tell appointees, "You must not engage in any fine-line drawing." Ed Meese as Attorney General did that many times. It is not enough for the Attorney General to say, "I have not violated the law."

Particularly striking about Jordan's discourse was its consistency. The same mix of elevated style and performed drama that characterized her oratory also characterized her talk in the interviews. (For this reason, she could be an intimidating interlocutor.) As Johnstone has shown elsewhere (1996, Ch. 5), Jordan's discourse was stylistically consistent across speech tasks; her writing

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500020911 Published online by Cambridge University Press

is speech-like, and her speech writing-like, so that her public voice sounded the same in both media. Linguistic consistency was for Jordan a sign of moral constancy. It was itself consistent with the other ways that Jordan made this point about herself, including her disregard for appearances and her lifelong refusal to adapt to social expectations about how a Southern Black woman should live, behave, and sound.

DISCUSSION

To summarize what have of necessity been summaries themselves:[14] Molly Ivins presents a multivoiced linguistic identity. She alternates speech features associated with Western and male ways of talking – which are highly marked in writing – with a standard, eloquent style that draws attention to itself through occasional hyper-elevation. She also makes a point of displaying both her competence at and her rejection of the traditionally female, Southern speech model that she claims Texas women of her generation and background were encouraged to adopt. Barbara Jordan's speech was characterized by unusual consistency from situation to situation. She drew on some of the traditional characteristics of African-American public speech, such as extreme attention to diction and lexical choice, syntactic parallelism, and formality of style; but she rejected others. She also rejected pressure to adapt her talk to her audience. Jordan's persuasive power depended on her personal moral authority, which required constancy in image and consistency in talk.

Thus we see Jordan and Ivins as resourceful users of language, with access to many ways of speaking. As each has created a style of her own, each has drawn on some of the same resources – standard usage, elevated diction, marked regional and ethnic features – but each in a different way and to very different effect. We emphasize that what should be surprising about the two linguistic biographies is not the fact that these two voices are different and distinctive. We all know that individuals have individual styles, particularly individuals who think about how they write and sound. What should be surprising is the fact that sociolinguistic theory has so little to say about these voices, and about individuals' voices in general.

Theories of language use that begin with groups, rather than with individuals – like theories of language that begin with languages and dialects, rather than with speakers – make it difficult to hear particular voices, and harder to take them seriously as part of the explanation for variation. As one textbook on sociolinguistic theory puts it, "truly idiosyncratic speakers have never emerged from our researches ... no sample population to date seems to have included one. For the most part, people sound the way you would expect them to sound given the facts about their class, sex, age, and region" (Chambers 1995:100, 101). The standard approaches to contextual variation, too, are based on abstraction away from individual speakers: the Labov-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500020911 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ian characterization of "style" as resulting from a speaker's level of self-consciousness (Labov 1972:70–109), or accommodation theory (Giles & Powesland 1975) with its descriptions of how speakers systematically adapt to their interlocutors. In both these models, different speakers in equivalent contexts are ideally expected to behave exactly the same way.

But contexts are never equivalent, because no two speakers could possibly be linguistically identical. In the inevitable sense that no two people share exactly the same linguistic memories, no two people speak alike: every speaker is idiosyncratic. Class, sex, age, region, the nature of the linguistic task, and the makeup of the audience all have an important bearing on how people sound; but they do not DETERMINE how people sound. These social facts, along with other factors such as ethnicity, ideology, and identity, provide (or withhold) resources among which individuals choose as they decide how to be and talk. Individuality mediates between social facts and linguistic ones; and though it is the least tractable variable of all (not quantifiable, very hard to describe), it is an essential part of how the details of variation come to be.

Our interest in the role of the individual in linguistic theory harks back to Edward Sapir, who was adamant about the importance of the individual in language and culture.[15] If one looks at culture from the perspective of a child acquiring it, Sapir noted, one sees that culture is not a unitary whole. Each individual's culture is different (Sapir [1934] 1949:590–97). In *Language*, he defined his topic as "the collective art of expression, a summary of thousands upon thousands of individual intuitions" (Sapir 1921:231). Sapir pointed out again and again that the abstractions studied by anthropologists and linguists – cultures and languages – should not be taken as real:

> In linguistics, abstracted speech sounds, words, and the arrangement of words have come to have so authentic a vitality that one can speak of "regular sound change" and "loss of genders" without knowing or caring who opened their mouths, at what time, to communicate what to whom. ([1939] 1949:579)

Sapir argued for an approach to culture and language that would not take itself too seriously as a science. Here he touched on the problem of scientism in linguistics:

> It is not really difficult, then, to see why anyone brought up on the austerities of a well-defined science of man must, if he is to maintain his symbolic self-respect, become more and more estranged from man himself ... The laws of syntax acquire a higher reality than the immediate reality of the stammerer who is trying to "get himself across" ... ([1939] 1949:580)

Sapir by no means abandoned abstractions such as "the laws of syntax." He wanted linguists and anthropologists only to be able to think both ways:

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500020911 Published online by Cambridge University Press

from the perspectives of the individual and the social. Individual behavior is always socially conditioned, "the complex resultant of an incredibly elaborate cultural history" ([1938] 1949:572); but "conversely, no matter how rigorously necessary in practice the analyzed pattern may seem to be, it is always possible ... for the lone individual to effect a transformation of form or meaning which is capable of communication to other individuals" (572–73). As a result, the only way to come to a complete understanding of culture is through "a minute and sympathetic study of individual behavior ... in a state of society" (576).

Anthropologists who work with native speakers are regularly faced with individual style and idiosyncrasy, and are led to wonder in what sense an individual speaker can embody a language or represent its other speakers (see Craig 1979, Coulmas 1981 for discussions of the concept of the representative native speaker). Dell Hymes, in particular, has taken up and expanded on Sapir's recurring interest in the linguistic individual. Commenting on Bloomfield's analysis of Menomini, Hymes (1974:72) remarks on the absurdity of describing most of the remaining speakers of a language as incompetent to speak it, noting that such a case "forces us to face the fact that for both the individual and the community, a language in some sense is what those who have it can do with it – what they have made of it, and do make of it." Hymes defines linguistic competence as "personal ability (not just grammatical knowledge, systemic potential of a grammar, superorganic property of a society, or, indeed, irrelevant to persons in any other way)" (1974:206). Elsewhere (1979:36), Hymes suggests that individual differences be given "foundational status" as a "vantage point from which to consider questions of method and theory in the study of language in general."

We stress that by individuality we do not mean individualism.[16] Individualism – the idea that people do or should act in their own interest and/or attempt to express unique selves – is a matter of ideology, linguistic and otherwise. Individualism is a cultural fact which is by no means universal; individuality is a biological and cognitive fact which is. There is no doubt that the American ideology of individualism influences both the speakers we have described; both are fiercely individualistic, seeing their uniqueness as both a precondition for and a perquisite of their success.[17] But ideologies such as individualism are part of one layer in the process by which people create voices, and individuality is another.

Some societies encourage the linguistic expression of individuality and others discourage it, just as some value individual expression in other modes more than do others. There are speech communities in which predictable, formulaic language is valued more often, and others in which it is usually heard as meaningless. In Bali, for example (Geertz 1984), individuals are seen as characters playing parts in a "never-changing pageant" (128). Individuals

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500020911 Published online by Cambridge University Press

are defined by titles and designations, as an actor is defined by a role, and consistent performance of one's role is what matters. Idiosyncrasy is shameful: when people let individuality show, they fall out of character.[18]

The history of individualism in the West has been the topic of recurring discussion. The essay of Mauss 1938 on the social history of the person and the self describes the concept of the person as arising in classical Rome, when the "persona," or social role played by an individual, came to be thought of as a legal entity, a "person." Mauss' student Dumont (1985) traces the subsequent development of the person as the locus of morality. Contemporary individualism, both utilitarian (the idea that each person is motivated by his or her own legal and financial interests) and expressive (the idea that truth can be ascertained by looking inward, and conveyed though speech and imagery that are not bound by social convention), is widely seen as having its origins in the European Renaissance (cf. Greenblatt 1980), though some trace it further back (e.g. Morris 1987). The late 18th century Romantic movement added the themes of individual difference and the moral importance of self-fulfillment, of acting according to one's own originality (Taylor 1989); individuals were now valued not only as legally, economically, and morally autonomous, but also as unique. While individualism has been seen as a characteristic of Western society in general, Americans have long been characterized as even more individualistic than others; the French visitor Alexis de Tocqueville first used the term *individualism* to describe us in the 1830s.

However, our suggestions about the fundamentally individual nature of language apply not just to people who especially value individuality. This is because individuality is a prerequisite for humanity. There is a great deal that can vary cross-culturally about people's conception of personality, but some aspects of selfhood do not vary. As Hallowell 1955 points out, self-awareness – a sense of oneself as separate, autonomous, and temporally continuous – is functionally important in the maintenance of social life. If people were not aware of themselves as distinct from others, and of other individuals as distinct from each other, they could not function in communities. In one way or another, culture provides individuals with ways of orienting themselves as individuals: ways of identifying themselves and others (such as names and terms for relationships), ways of valuing and evaluating themselves and their actions, ways of displaying the continuity of their memories and physical beings. Through their talk (as well as through other aspects of their behavior), individuals display the fact that they are individuals. To use the common phrase for this, people express themselves with everything they do – whether or not self-expression is at the moment, or in the context, particularly valued or even thought relevant at all. A society in which everyone always talked alike, in which people were linguistically indistinguishable from one another, would be unthinkable. People UNDERSTAND each other because they use familiar sounds, words, and syntactic patterns, for the most part.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500020911 Published online by Cambridge University Press

When speakers do new things, they usually suggest what they mean by the newness; but as LePage & Tabouret-Keller point out (1985:12), "[James] Joyce only provides a somewhat extreme example of what we all do with language." People KNOW each other because each has a unique way of sounding, an individual voice.

The relationship between social facts and facts about how individuals talk may be roughly sketched as follows. In the first layer, biological characteristics like sex and skin color, biographical ones like place of birth, and ascribed ones like gender and ethnicity can be either accepted or resisted. In the second layer, ideologies about what these characteristics entail linguistically (how women sound, or how Texans sound) can be accepted or (sometimes with difficulty) rejected. In the third layer, strategic, individual choices among the resources provided in the second layer create actual utterances. Ideologies – conventionalized links between linguistic forms and social groups – mediate between social facts and the individual speakers who create utterances, not between social facts and the linguistic facts of actual utterances. It remains true, of course, as pointed out by Silverstein 1979, Woolard & Schieffelin 1994, and others, that ideologies can be said to mediate between social facts of the gender/ethnicity sort and linguistic structures such as English, African American Vernacular English, or the ways of speaking of the Kuna (Sherzer 1983). But we are not talking about linguistic structure here: our goal is the more concrete one of sketching the process by which UTTERANCES come to be.

We need to stress that this process is not necessarily conscious; in fact, it is probably never completely conscious. (Even the most literate writers of the most edited prose can not identify all the resources on which they draw, or describe all their choices in juxtaposing sounds and words and styles as they do.) Speakers are generally quite unaware of what their speech reveals about them and how. Nor do we claim that people are conscious of the linguistic stereotypes on which they draw. Although it is interesting and revealing to ask people about linguistic stereotypes, we do not take their responses as definitive explanations for their linguistic choices. This does not mean, however, that speakers are not making choices, or that their choices are not self-expressive. Perhaps it is the often stagey quality of what well educated Americans think of as especially self-expressive – the poetry of Whitman, autobiographical writing, Method acting – that makes this difficult to see.

We see all language use as essentially syncretic, in the sense that Hill & Hill 1986 illustrate: a result of situated choices among and combinations of the possibilities provided by the varieties fully or in part available to speakers. Sometimes the varieties in question are fairly easy to label: Spanish and Nahuatl, for example, in the case of Hill & Hill's Nahuatl speakers. Sometimes they are more idiosyncratic, as when a person finds herself talking "like her mother" or saying "the kind of thing my uncle used to say." The mod-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500020911 Published online by Cambridge University Press

els on which speakers draw can come from a variety of sources, including family, vocation, region, ethnicity, and culture; and they can be used in a variety of ways, sometimes adopted in full (in some cases because there is no choice), sometimes drawn from in part. They are not just models for ways of speaking, but for ways of acting and being – providing the metaphors by which an individual connects to her culture(s), and mediating between the individual and society.[19]

Our work is in part an attempt to suggest a bridge between sociolinguistic theory and contemporary ethnographic work on language and variety choice in modern or post-modern societies (cf. Woolard 1989, Gal 1993) with its analytical focus on heterogeneity and conflict, ideology and politics, and personal identity. Just as ethnicity is "situated" (Cohen 1978), arising on the spot in interaction as people categorize themselves and others, so are the emergent ways of speaking that we conveniently label *varieties*, *languages*, *registers*, or *dialects*. We suggest that regional identity is situated in the same way, and hard to separate from other sources of linguistic possibilities. A person who lives in Texas can sound like other Texans or not; sometimes, or sometimes not. People in a mobile, heterogeneous society cannot be said to speak as they do mainly because of where they come from, though where one comes from is, of course, an important source of influence – especially in phonology, perhaps the most robust of linguistic levels (Ash 1988, Macaulay 1991).

Our work argues for rhetorical and stylistic discourse analyses as analytical tools in sociolinguistics. We are not the first to make the point that there is variation beyond the levels of sounds and syntax, and that it should be studied. We underscore the value of illuminating the levels on which people make choices about how to narrate, how to be polite, how to persuade, and how to be indirect – with the same light, and at the same time, as we illuminate the levels on which people make choices about whether to say [rayt] or [ra:t], or whether to use negative concord. The range of resources available to speakers, and thus the processes by which people choose how to sound, may in some respects be more evident on the higher levels than on the lower.

The study of individuals' linguistic voices is most often employed as a critical tool in the study of particular individuals and particular texts. Thus students of the style of Flannery O'Connor or of William Faulkner's *As I lay dying* are typically interested in what O'Connor was like, and what she might have meant by her writing – or in how Faulkner's novel might most rewardingly be read. Studies of individuals' styles also contribute to practical knowledge about the possibilities for style: people read the orations of Gorgias and Cicero to learn about the language of classical oratory, and fiction by Joyce Carol Oates to find out how contemporary English can be crafted. Stylistics, as the term is used by rhetoricians and literary critics, usually means the study of individual voices for critical purposes such as these.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500020911 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Our purpose in writing about individual voices is linguistic, not critical. We are not primarily interested in how paying attention to individual voice helps us understand how particular individuals talk and write; or in how it helps in the analysis of stylistic possibilities of a language, genre, or literary period. Instead, our purpose is to show how paying attention to individual voice helps in understanding language. But although the goal of this study is not critical, its methodology borrows from literary criticism. This is because the linguistically attuned close-reading techniques of discourse analysis provide the best way of seeing what is individual about language.

Finally, we suggest that a full understanding of variation needs to be based on an understanding of public, relatively self-conscious speech, as well as more private, vernacular forms. Interestingly, historical scholarship about the "public sphere" in Western culture in the tradition of Habermas 1989 suggests that public discourse is essentially understood as anonymous and disinterested; these characteristics are what enable the public media to define a sphere of influence separate from the state and from society. (Warner 1990 shows, for example, how the abstraction of an "American public" that could critique the colonial administration developed as the discourse of the increasingly influential public print media came to be understood as transcending individual voices and opinions.) Our work has not been designed to engage with that of Habermas,[20] but the juxtaposition of the two approaches raises some potentially interesting questions. Why, for example, in talk that is meant both to reflect and to argue for widely shared political and ethical values (Barbara Jordan's famous 1974 speech to the House Judiciary Committee, or Molly Ivins' political commentary) do the particular, idiosyncratic voices of the two speakers come through so clearly?

It is by no means the case that the processes we have examined apply only to public discourse. Speakers make use of available resources whenever they speak or write; they can do nothing else. But speech addressed to a wider audience than one's friends and intimates, speech that is at least in part "performance" (Bauman 1977), speech that is often relatively planned and relatively self-conscious provides, we claim, the best source of evidence about the full range of a speaker's linguistic competence. To understand what makes people speak as they do, we need to look not just at the situations that are most likely to display the shared *langue* which has been the major focus of linguistics (and the shared speech community norms for using it, which have been the focus of much linguistic anthropology); we need also to look at more heterogeneous linguistic situations.

NOTES

* We developed the theoretical framework of this study jointly; it is largely based on Johnstone's previous work. Bean is responsible for the work on Molly Ivins; Johnstone is responsi-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500020911 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ble for the work on Barbara Jordan, and for the planning and writing of this article. We owe special debts to each other and to Delma McLeod-Porter, who worked with us in the earlier stages of the project. We are grateful for discussions with and readings by colleagues at Texas A&M and elsewhere: Scott Austin, Guy Bailey, Jack Chambers, Kathleen Ferrara, Jane Hill, Susan Gal, an anonymous reviewer for another journal, and several anonymous reviewers for the NEH. Most have been encouraging, and all have been helpful. We would like to dedicate this essay to the memory of Barbara Jordan. It was a great privilege to have met her.

[1] Johnson 1992 shows that the factor of region accounts for most of the lexical variation described in Linguistic Atlas research in the American South in the 1930s, but that sex, age, and race account for most of the variation found today.

[2] Much of this work builds on that of Silverstein 1979.

[3] See also Kroch & Small 1978 on linguistic effects of the ideology of standard grammar, and Eckert 1990a,b on "symbolic capital" associated with linguistic choices.

[4] The South is probably the best described of American linguistic regions. Data collection in the tradition of linguistic geography (Pederson et al. 1986–92, Atwood 1962) has formed part of the basis for sociolinguistic studies of the varieties spoken by Southern Whites and Blacks (see Montgomery & Bailey 1986 for some recent work, McMillan & Montgomery 1989 for references to hundreds of other studies). Eastern and coastal Texas were included in fieldwork for the *Linguistic atlas of the Gulf states* (Pederson et al. 1986–92); much of Texas was settled by Southerners, and some Texans still indisputably sound Southern. Thus work on Southern dialectology has been extended into Texas, most notably by Guy Bailey and his co-workers (Bailey & Bernstein 1989, Tillery 1989, Bailey 1991, 1996, Bailey et al. 1991a,b, Bailey & Thomas 1992, Bernstein 1993).

[5] Alternatively, one sometimes hears the claim made that Texas speech is disappearing; this also reflects a monolithic view of the variety. People who make this claim identify Texas speech with the speech of older rural White males. The view is represented in interviewees' saying things like, "I guess you can still hear [Texas speech]. There are pockets of it." The state's public relations experts play on the notion of an exotic Texas dialect in tourism advertisements saying, "Texas friendly spoken here."

[6] Information about Ivins' life is from Schwartz 1992. An expanded version of this sketch of Ivins' style is Bean 1993.

[7] Though the situation has been muddied in recent times, two groups of White Americans originally settled in Texas: plantation owners, mainly from the coastal South, and poorer people from the piedmont and mountain South. Each group brought its own dialect of English – Southern in the case of the former group, and South Midland in that of the latter – and settled in different parts of the state: the planters mainly in the better-watered eastern part of the state, and the South Midlanders further west. The speech patterns associated with the culturally and geographically western part of Texas, roughly west of a line connecting Dallas, Austin, and San Antonio, are based on those of the South Midland. Dobie (1974:45) suggests that the culture of traditional West Texas, and thus much of the language use, is rooted in the "realism of southern folk," in contrast to the idealism of the slave-holding aristocrats.

[8] Scotton (1983:126) points out that speakers negotiate multiple identities by demonstrating competence in multiple codes. Ivins' display of an idiosyncratic voice can also be seen as a way of resisting the pressure of mass communication to reduce individual attributes of speech (Bell 1984:171).

[9] In so doing, Ivins employs a common device in American humor, juxtaposing (as did Mark Twain) two incongruous speech styles for what critic Richard Bridgman (1966:10) calls "their easy irony."

[10] See Collins & Clayton (1991:135–37) on figurative language from West Texas folk speech.

[11] The passage from which this quote comes was written 20 years ago, about what Schwartz 1992 has called "the old Texas" – "a sorry joke for all thinking people, easy to parody." Schwartz also points out that Ivins "hasn't yet found a way to capture the place that is Texas now" (166).

[12] Biographical information is from Jordan & Hearon 1979, Crawford & Ragsdale 1992:321–31, and Weddington et al. 1977, as well as from our interview with Jordan.

[13] Jordan made this claim in our interview; and it is backed up in the Barbara Jordan archives at Texas Southern University, which contain her notes for speeches.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500020911 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[14] Our plan eventually is to produce a book in which each case study gets a chapter This might begin to do justice to the detail in which each voice could and should be described

[15] This material about Sapir is slightly adapted from Johnstone 1996 20–21

[16] See Johnstone 1996, Ch 4 et passim, for more detailed discussion of the issues touched on in this paragraph

[17] It should be noted that not all our research participants are equally individualistic As students of linguistic ideology point out, ideologies and societies are not necessarily co-extensive, ideologies can compete with each other, as individuality and the ethic of "family values" do in Texas Furthermore, our participants vary among themselves, in the same way societies have been shown to vary, in how homogeneous the individual is expected to be For some of the Texans we are studying (such as Barbara Jordan), personality is expected to be consistent For others, personality expresses itself in flexibility of identity

[18] Claims for conceptions of person like the Balinese have also been made by Read 1955 for the Gahuku-Gama (New Guinea) and by Dumont 1970 for India Shweder & Bourne 1984 report on a questionnaire study of concepts of person in India

[19] The work of Bakhtin 1980 provides another metaphor for the linguistic process we describe here As people talk, they appropriate and juxtapose various "voices," either by direct quotation or in more indirect ways J Hill 1985 illustrates the usefulness of Bakhtin's model in describing the uses of Spanish in Mexicano (Nahuatl), and of Mexicano in Spanish, by Malinche Volcano peasants in Mexico

[20] See Gal & Woolard 1995 for recent work in linguistic anthropology that is designed to explore the sociolinguistic implications of Habermas' ideas

REFERENCES

Abrahams, Roger D (1962) Playing the dozens *Journal of American Folklore* 75 209–18

_____ (1976) *Talking Black* Rowley, MA Newbury

Angelo, Bonnie (1991) An ethical guru monitors morality *Time*, June 3, 9–10

Arieli, Yehoshua (1964) *Individualism and nationalism in American ideology* Cambridge, MA Harvard University Press

Ash, Sharon (1988) Speaker identification in sociolinguistics and criminal law In Kathleen Ferrara et al (eds), *Linguistic change and contact* (Proceedings of NWAV XVI), 25–33 Austin Department of Linguistics, University of Texas

Atwood, E Bagby (1962) *The regional vocabulary of Texas* Austin University of Texas Press

Bailey, Guy (1991) Directions of change in Texas English *Journal of American Culture* 14 125–34

_____, & Bernstein, Cynthia (1989) Methodology for a phonological survey of Texas *Journal of English Linguistics* 22 6–16

_____, & Thomas, Erik (1992) A case of competing mergers and their resolution *SECOL Review* 16 179–200

_____, & Tillery, Jan (1991) *Anymore* they say in Texas Paper presented at Southeastern Conference on Linguistics, Knoxville, TN

_____, Wickle, Tom, & Sand, Lori (1991a) The focus of innovation in Texas *English World-Wide* 12 195–214

_____, _____, _____ (1991b) The linguistic landscape of Texas *North American Culture* 7 19–46

Bakhtin, Mikhail M (1980) *The dialogic imagination* Austin University of Texas Press

Balester, Valerie (1993) *Cultural divide A study of African-American college-level writers* Portsmouth, NH Boynton/Cook-Heinemann

Bauman, Richard (1977) *Verbal art as performance* Rowley, MA Newbury [Reprinted, Prospect Heights, IL Waveland, 1984]

Bean, Judith Mattson (1993) "True grit and all the rest" The expression of regional and individual identity in Molly Ivins's discourse *Southwestern American Literature* 19 35–46

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500020911 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Bell, Allan (1984). Language style as audience design. *Language in Society* 13:145–204.
Bellah, Robert N., et al. (1985). *Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life*. Berkeley: University of California Press
Bernstein, Cynthia (1993). Measuring social causes of phonological variation in Texas *American Speech* 68.227–40.
Bridgman, Richard (1966). *The colloquial style in America*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
Brown, Penelope, & Levinson, Stephen D. (1987) *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
Chambers, J. K. (1995). *Sociolinguistic theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Cohen, Ronald (1978) Ethnicity: Problem and focus in anthropology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 7:379–403.
Collins, Mary Evelyn, & Clayton, Lawrence R (1991) Gone with the drawl: Changing patterns in Texas folk speech. *Journal of American Culture* 142:135–37
Coulmas, Florian (1981), ed *Festschrift for native speaker* The Hague: Mouton.
Coupland, Nikolas (1983) Patterns of encounter management: Further arguments for discourse variables. *Language in Society* 12:459–76.
Craig, Colette G. (1979). Jacaltec: Fieldwork in Guatemala. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Languages and their speakers*, 3–75. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Crawford, Ann Fears, & Ragsdale, Crystal Sasse (1992). *Women in Texas. Their lives, their experiences, their accomplishments*. 2nd ed. Austin, TX: State House Press.
Dines, Elizabeth (1980) Variation in discourse – "and stuff like that " *Language in Society* 9:13–31.
Dobie, J. Frank (1974) *Guide to life and literature of the Southwest*. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press.
Dumont, Louis (1970). *Homo hierarchicus* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
_____ (1985). A modified view of our origins: The Christian beginnings of modern individualism. In Michael Carrithers et al. (eds.), *The category of the person: Anthropology, philosophy, history*, 93–122. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press
Eckert, Penelope (1990a) Cooperative competition in adolescent girl talk *Discourse Processes* 13·92–122.
_____ (1990b) The whole woman: Sex and gender differences in variation. *Language Variation and Change* 1:245–67.
Gal, Susan (1993). Diversity and contestation in linguistic ideologies· German speakers in Hungary *Language in Society* 22 337–59.
_____, & Woolard, Kathryn (1995), eds. *Constructing languages and publics*. (*Pragmatics*, 5:2.) Antwerp. International Pragmatics Association.
Geertz, Clifford (1984) "From the native's point of view": On the nature of anthropological understanding In Shweder & LeVine 1984·123–36. [Orig. pub. in *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 28:1, 1974.]
Giles, Howard, & Powesland, P. F. (1975) *Speech style and social evaluation* London· Academic Press.
Greenblatt, Stephen Jay (1980). *Renaissance self-fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* Chicago. University of Chicago Press.
Habermas, Jurgen (1989). *The structural transformation of the public sphere*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Hallowell, A. I (1955). The self and its behavioral environment In his *Culture and experience*, 75–110. Philadelphia· University of Pennsylvania Press
Hill, Jane H. (1985). The grammar of consciousness and the consciousness of grammar. *American Ethnologist* 12:725–37.
_____, & Hill, Kenneth C (1986). *Speaking Mexicano: Dynamics of syncretic language in central Mexico*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
Hymes, Dell (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
_____ (1979). Sapir, competence, voices. In Charles J. Fillmore et al. (eds.), *Individual differences in language ability and language behavior*, 33–45. New York: Academic Press.
Ivins, Molly (1991). *Molly Ivins can't say that, can she?* New York. Random House.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500020911 Published online by Cambridge University Press

_____ (1992) For Democrats, Gore's a breath of fresh air *Fort Worth Star Telegram*, July 12
_____ (1993) *Nothin' but good times ahead* New York Random House
Johnson, Ellen (1992) *Lexical change and variation in the southeastern United States in the twentieth century* Dissertation, University of Georgia
Johnstone, Barbara (1990) Variation in discourse Midwestern narrative style *American Speech* 63 195–214
_____ (1991) Individual style in an American public-opinion survey Personal performance and the ideology of referentiality *Language in Society* 20 557–76
_____ (1992) Violence and civility in discourse Uses of mitigation by rural Southern White men *SECOL Review* 16 1–19
_____ (1993) Community and contest Midwestern men and women constructing their worlds in conversational storytelling In Deborah Tannen (ed), *Gender and conversational interaction*, 62–80 Oxford & New York Oxford University Press
_____ (1995) Sociolinguistic resources, individual identities and the public speech styles of Texas women *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 5 1–20
_____ (1996) *The linguistic individual Self-expression in language and linguistics* Oxford & New York Oxford University Press
Jordan, Barbara, & Hearon, Shelby (1979) *Barbara Jordan A self-portrait* New York Doubleday
Joseph, John E , & Taylor, Talbot J (1990), eds *Ideologies of language* London Routledge
Kroch, Anthony, & Small, Cathy (1978) Grammatical ideology and its effect on speech In David Sankoff (ed), *Linguistic variation Methods and models*, 45–55 New York Academic Press
Kroskrity, Paul V (1993) *Language, history, and identity Ethnolinguistic studies of the Arizona Tewa* Tucson University of Arizona Press
_____, Schieffelin, Bambi, B , & Woolard, Kathryn A (1992), eds *Language ideologies (Pragmatics*, 2 3) Antwerp International Pragmatics Association
Labov, William (1972) *Sociolinguistic patterns* Philadelphia University of Pennsylvania Press
LePage, R B (1968) Problems of description in multilingual communities *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 189–212 Oxford Blackwell
_____ (1980) Theoretical aspects of sociolinguistic studies in pidgin and creole languages In Albert Valdman & Arnold Highfield (eds), *Theoretical orientations in creole studies*, 331–68 New York Academic Press
_____, & Tabouret-Keller, Andree (1985) *Acts of identity Creole-based approaches to language and ethnicity* Cambridge & New York Cambridge University Press
Macaulay, Ronald K S (1991) *Locating dialect in discourse The language of honest men and bonnie lassies in Ayr* Oxford & New York Oxford University Press
Mauss, Marcel (1938) Une catégorie de l'esprit humain La notion de personne, celle de "moi " *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 68 263–81 [Trans by H D Wells, A category of the human mind The notion of person, the notion of self In Michael Carrithers et al (eds), *The category of the person Anthropology, philosophy, history*, 1–25 Cambridge & New York Cambridge University Press, 1985]
McMillan, James B , & Montgomery, Michael B (1989) *Annotated bibliography of Southern American English* Tuscaloosa University of Alabama Press
Milroy, Lesley (1987) *Language and social networks* 2nd ed Oxford Blackwell
_____ (1992) New perspectives in the analysis of sex differentiation in language In Kingsley Bolton & Helen Kwok (eds), *Sociolinguistics today International perspectives*, 163–79 London Routledge
Montgomery, Michael, & Bailey, Guy (1986) *Language variety in the South Perspectives in black and white* University University of Alabama Press
Morris, Colin (1987) *The discovery of the individual, 1050–1200* Toronto University of Toronto Press
Pederson, Lee, McDaniel, Susan Leas, & Dent, Borden D (1986–92) *Linguistic atlas of the Gulf states* 7 vols Athens University of Georgia Press
Preston, Dennis R (1989) *Perceptual dialectology* Dordrecht Foris
_____ (1993) The South The touchstone Paper presented at conference on Language Variety in the South II, Auburn, AL

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500020911 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Read, K. E. (1955). Morality and the concept of the person among the Gahuku-Gama. *Oceania* 25:233–82.
Sankoff, David, & Laberge, Suzanne (1978). The linguistic market and statistical explanation of variability. In David Sankoff (ed.), *Linguistic variation: Methods and models*, 239–50. New York: Academic Press.
Sankoff, David, et al. (1989). Montreal French: Language, class, and ideology. In Ralph Fasold & Deborah Schiffrin (eds.), *Language change and variation*, 107–18. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Sapir, Edward (1921). *Language*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.
_____ (1934). The emergence of the concept of personality in a study of cultures. *Journal of Social Psychology* 5:408–15.
_____ (1938). Why cultural anthropology needs the psychiatrist. *Psychiatry* 1:7–12.
_____ (1939). Psychiatric and cultural pitfalls in the business of getting a living. *Mental Health* (AAAS publ. no. 9), 237–44.
_____ (1949). *Selected writings in language, culture, and personality*, ed. by David Mandelbaum. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Saum, Lewis O. (1990). *The popular mood of America, 1860–1890*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
Schwartz, Mimi (1992). The price of being Molly. *Texas Monthly*, November, 138–42, 156, 158, 160, 162, 164, 166.
Scotton, Carol Myers (1983). The negotiation of identities in conversation: A theory of markedness and code choice. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 44:115–136.
Sherzer, Joel (1983). *Kuna ways of speaking: An ethnographic perspective*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
Shweder, Richard A., & Bourne, Edmund J. (1984). Does the concept of the self vary cross-culturally? In Shweder & LeVine, 1984:158–99.
_____, & LeVine, Robert (1984), eds. *Culture theory: Essays on mind, self, and emotion*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
Silverstein, Michael (1979). Language structure and linguistic ideology. In R. Clyne, W. Hanks, & C. Hofbauer (eds.), *The elements (Parasession to CLS 15)*, 193–247. Chicago: Chicago Linguistics Society.
Stross, Brian (1974). Speaking of speaking: Tenejapa Tzeltal metalinguistics. In Richard Bauman & Joel Sherzer (eds.), *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking*, 213–39. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
Tannen, Deborah (1981). New York Jewish conversational style. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 30:133–49.
_____ (1989). *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
Taylor, Charles (1989). *Sources of the self: The making of modern identity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Tillery, Jan (1989). *The merger of the phonemes /ɔ/ and /a/ in Texas: A study of sociological and phonetic constraints*. M.A. thesis, Texas A&M University.
_____ (1991). What Texans say they say and what they say. Paper presented at American Popular Culture Forum, San Antonio.
Vliet, R. G. (1983). The frontier of the imagination. In Don Graham et al. (eds.), *Texas literary tradition: Fiction, folklore, history*, 108-12. Austin: College of Liberal Arts, University of Texas.
Warner, Michael (1990). *The letters of the republic: Publication and the public sphere in eighteenth-century America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Weddington, Sarah; Hickie, Jane; & Fitzgerald, Deanna (1977). *Texas women in politics*. Austin, TX: Foundation for Women's Resources.
Woolard, Kathryn Ann (1989). *Double talk: Bilingualism and the politics of ethnicity in Catalonia*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
_____, & Schieffelin, Bambi (1994). Language ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23:55–82.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500020911 Published online by Cambridge University Press