Asif Agha

1. Enregisterment and Communication in Social History

In previous work, I have characterized enregisterment as a social process whereby "diverse behavioral signs (whether linguistic, non-linguistic, or both) are functionally reanalyzed as cultural models of action, as behaviors capable of indexing stereotypic characteristics of incumbents of particular interactional roles, and of relations among them" (Agha 2007a: 55). The capacity of speech and accompanying behaviors to acquire stereotypic indexical values, and thus to be treated as semiotic registers differentiable from each other, has consequences for how interpersonal roles and relationships are communicated in every known society. Yet since these models are unevenly distributed and variably centered in social practices, their empirical study requires attention to the processes and practices whereby performable signs become recognized (and regrouped) as belonging to distinct, differentially valorized semiotic registers by a population, and once formulated as models of conduct, undergo forms of further regrouping and reanalysis within social history, thereby yielding fractionally congruent variant models, often for distinct populations.

To speak of "registers" is to speak of a sociohistorical snapshot of a process of enregisterment, and thus to consider particular phases or segments of social history from the standpoint of sociocentric models of significant conduct. The case of "speech registers" is the special case where the behaviors at issue include speech behaviors (or, where utterances occur as part of these behaviors), and thus a case where performable actor personae may be understood as speaker personae, and models of conduct as "ways of speaking" (Hymes 1974). To understand how such models of conduct emerge, for whom they do so, or how they appear to persist in certain times and places requires attention to the metapragmatic activities through which criterial behaviors are distinguished from others, are typified as indexicals of act or actor, and, through social regularities of typification and dissemination, acquire stereotypic indexical values for those acquainted with them.

The articles in this volume consider register models associated with a great many forms of interpersonal behavior, and, in each case, identify cultural models of communicative conduct that are expressed through these behaviors. Whichever ones of these cases we consider – whether the carefully timed

deployment of speech, melody and gesture by Karelian lamenters; or of Arabic and Danish lexemic partials in utterances by Copenhagen schoolchildren; or of speech, gesture, bearing and dress by politicians in France; or of Spanish or Hebrew utterances by Latino bilinguals in Israel; or, indeed, if we consider any of the other cases discussed in this volume – we are considering activity routines in which the deployment of speech and non-speech behaviors is organized into cultural models of significant conduct, whose semiotic partials are typically recycled from behaviors otherwise known to current interactants (often under fractionally distinct models of performance or construal) and, through a dialectic of norm and trope (Agha 2007a: 5–10), are reanalyzed and renormalized into models distinctive to particular social groups and their practices, whence they become ethnographically observable and amenable to study by anthropologists, linguists and others.

Each such model is located in a particular time and place in social-demographic history; none of them is intelligible to all who perceive the behaviors that express it; and some among them are subject to competing valorizations by those who have stakes in such models. Any register model is minimally a three-dimensional object of study, that is to say, is empirically identifiable only at the intersection of three distinct variables, whose values shape its organization and change (Agha 2007a: 167–170): it is expressed or made manifest through criterial behaviors (its *repertoires*), which have stereotypic indexical values (its *social range*) for persons who recognize or perform such signs in their practices (its *social domain*). For any such model, the values of these variables are identified by researchers through attention to the reflexive activities that formulate its felt discreteness in acts of performance and construal by users, and thus furnish evidence for its social-interpersonal existence at some given time, and, across a series of observations, furnish evidence for change. When the behaviors that express a register model are grouped into partly non-overlapping repertoires by distinct populations, or become subject to competing valorizations, fractionally distinct variants may effectively co-exist with each other, thereby differentiating persons and groups from each other, and, through the reanalysis of repertoires and their stereotypic indexicality over time, may result in subsequent changes in group-relative identities and relationships within social history.

Language Contact

Several accompanying papers explore forms of enregisterment in situations of language contact that emerge from wage-labor migration or trade, and thus explore situations where more than one "language" – in the sense of a phono-lexico-grammatical system; hereafter, a PLG system – is available in discursive interaction, and where distinct social categories of persons formulate distinct models of the stereotypic indexical effects of utterances sourced from one or the other PLG system (see Agha 2007b for a discussion of "language", and Agha 2009 for a discussion of bilingualism). Before we turn to questions of how perceivable behaviors, including speech behaviors, may be treated as

stereotypic indexicals belonging to registers of conduct, or how metaprag-
matic typifications provide data on such models, it is worth observing that a
PLG unitization of speech tokens (into phonemic or morphemic unit-types,
for example) does not by itself suffice to identify units of social indexicality.
Indeed, the speech tokens that are treated as stereotypic social indexicals in
some community need not be sourced from any one PLG system, but may
exhibit fractional fidelity-to-type in relation to units of more than one such
system. Although this form of hybridity is common in register formations
of many kinds, it becomes especially salient under conditions of language
contact. An example from Copenhagen youth speech is described in the
passage quoted below (where the italicized comments in square brackets are
my own interpolations):

> In the exchange in example 2, Michael asks for glue or paste. Esen answers with
> the construction "eine limesteife". The word "eine" is associated with German,
> and this is quite straightforward. However, the word "limesteife" [*pronounced as
> li:mestajfe; understood as 'gluestick'*] is not associated with any language or variety
> (that we know of). The element "lim" pronounced with a long high front vowel
> ([i:]) equals the Danish-associated word for "glue", and the middle -e- may also
> be associated with Danish, as many compounds associated with Danish have an
> -e attached to the first element as a compound marker. This is not the case of
> the word "lim", however. In addition, the element "steife" is not associated with
> Danish, and neither with German in any sense that would give an immediately
> accessible meaning here. It may sound like a German word to the Danish ear, but
> not to the German ear [*i.e., may differ in perceived fidelity to PLG type for distinct
> social domains of speaker*]. This feature does not lend itself to being [*uniquely*]
> categorized in any [*one*] "language" [*by all speakers*]. The word "limesteife" indexes
> "German" to a Danish person. It would be a possible member of the set of fea-
> tures which a Dane could construct as "German". However, it is highly unlikely
> to be designated as a member of a set of features constructed by a German as
> "the German language". It is nonetheless possible to analyze it, to find a meaning
> in the context precisely because we analyze at the level of features. (Jørgensen,
> Karrebaek, Madsen and Møller 2011: 25.)

The expression "eine limesteife" is uttered as a speech token by Esen in
response to Michael's query, and is intelligible in relation to it. Yet the speech
token does not exhibit unambiguous fidelity-to-type with respect to word-
types from either Danish or German: Esen's utterance is fractionally congru-
ent with both Danish and German along distinct dimensions of phonological
or morphoysntactic organization, and thus comprises a blend of two distinct
PLG systems. I have argued elsewhere (Agha 2009) that bilingualism is a
social practice that involves the transposition of speech tokens across geo-
graphic or social settings in ways that alter their "type"-level construal, both
at the level of grammar and social indexicality: bilinguals reanalyze PLG
blends not only as grammatical types but also as stereotypic indexicals of role
and relationship (and hence reanalyze the register models used to interpret
them) in in-group encounters. When bilinguals form an immigrant minor-
ity in a destination locale, their in-group metapragmatic treatment of their

own practices comes into contact with out-group metapragmatic frameworks employed by monolinguals native to that locale, yielding forms of social differentiation not anticipated in either framework.

In contemporary Copenhagen youth speech, several features of speech behavior are grouped together as isopragmatic indexical repertoires (i.e., are treated as having comparable indexical values), and two such repertoires are shown in the columns of Table 1. Each repertoire is emblematic of a distinct youth identity, the contrast between them differentiating a register boundary.[1]

Table 1. Enregistered emblems of "Integrated" vs. "Street" persona

	"Integrated" demeanors	**"Street" demeanors**
repertoires	creaky voice syllables	absence of creaky voice
	stress-timed prosody	syllable-timed prosody
	longer vowels	shorter vowels
	standard word order, gender	non-standard word order and noun gender
	Danish PLG sourcing	non-Danish PLG sourcing ("polylingual" lexemes)
	polite phrases	swearing, slang
	high pitch	affricated-palatal /t/, fronted /s/, voiceless uvular /r/
stereotypic	higher class (wealth)	toughness
social	sophistication, authority	masculinity
indexicality	academic skill	academic non-prestige
	self-possession	absence of politeness
	Danishness	panethnic "street" persona

Source: Madsen 2013, Quist 2008.

Contrasts between "integrated" and "street" behaviors involve multiple dimensions of PLG organization, including phonology, lexis and morphosyntax: contrasts of pronunciation include presence versus absence of creaky voice, stress-timed versus syllable-timed prosody, longer versus shorter vowels (except before syllables with schwa). Morphosyntactically, "street" utterances can have SVO word order in environments where "integrated" utterances exhibit VSO inversion, and "common" gender marking where the latter exhibit neuter gender forms. Perhaps the most salient features of "street" repertoires are lexical items sourced from languages other than Danish and tropically altered in significance, including cases where word-forms sourced from PLG systems like Turkish, Arabic, Kurdish or Serbian acquire features of word-sense or stereotypic indexicality wholly or partly reanalyzed when they occur in Danish utterances.[2]

Any repertoire-centric conception of registers – and, in particular, any reductionist attempt to equate register formations with just their repertoires – readily deconstructs itself because it cannot account for the principle of selection whereby speech behaviors are grouped into repertoires: How are the behaviors that comprise these repertoires differentiated from all other behaviors? Why do the ones grouped into repertoires in Table 1 have comparable social indexical values? (For instance, why do palatalized /t/ and polylingual

lexemes both index "street" demeanors?) Answering these questions requires attention to the metapragmatic activities through which social persons differentially respond to and typify speech behaviors, whether implicitly or explicitly, and through such treatment differentiate repertoires from each other and formulate their stereotypic indexical values (Agha 2007a: 147–157).[3]

Møller (this volume) uses the term "languaging" to describe acts of sourcing units of a PLG system in utterances. Cases where units of more than one PLG system are sourced in a single utterance (as in the "eine limesteife" example above) may be termed "polylanguaging." The practice of drawing on multiple PLG systems is common not only in the "street" register of Danish but in youth registers all over the world – the United States (Eble 1996), Japan (Gagne 2008), Indonesia (Smith-Hefner 2007, Boellstorf 2004), Africa (Newell 2009, Samper 2002, Githinji 2006) – and, in all cases, attention to the metapragmatic practices of users clarifies the social range of indexical values, including the social personae (youth, social class, sexuality, cosmopolitanism, and others), indexed by their use.

In multilingual settings, the differential enregisterment of speech varieties need not, of course, be limited to phonemic or lexemic segments of PLG systems but may extend to the use or non-use of entire PLG systems, whether viewed as "dialects", "sociolects" or "languages" (Agha 2007a: 132–142). The ratified use (or non-ratified use, or avoidance) of one or another such "language" in specific interactional settings itself constitutes metapragmatic data on speech valorization, data on the degree of "fit" or indexical congruence (Agha 2007a: 24) of utterances with the construable settings in which they are performed. In the multilingual classroom setting discussed by Møller, where the official language of instruction is Danish, students who are asked to recite versions of a Danish poem in their home languages exhibit avoidance of these languages, but only in specific co-textual scenarios: Israh resists using Arabic "as part of a presentation in front of teachers, classmates and researchers" but freely uses Arabic (including Arabic curses) when addressing peers *sotto voce* in the same classroom. Similarly, Fartun resists reciting the Somali version of the same Danish poem when she is asked to give an "onstage" presentation to the entire class. By contrast, both students had been perfectly willing earlier on to include their Arabic and Somali versions of the poem in digital sound files to be played impersonally in a collective class performance. It is only when these sound files are misplaced, and students are asked by teachers to recite their poems orally and individually before their classmates, that they exhibit a sustained pattern of avoidance. Thus, neither Israh nor Fartun appear negatively to valorize the "social voices" associated with Arabic and Somali performances, but do negatively valorize performances that link these languages to their own biographic identities or "individual voices" (Agha 2005b: 39–45) in Danish-dominant public settings, where such performances would make Israh and Fartun appear less "integrated".

Madsen (this volume) shows that even the metapragmatic expression *integreret* ['integrated'] has a prior social history of dissemination through which it becomes known to Copenhagen youth, and, once it enters their usage, is converted into a register name through a process of lexemic reval-

orization. The word-form *integreret* has been used for some time in official State discourses (formerly by the Danish Ministry of Integration, nowadays by the Ministries of Law and of Social Affairs), but not with the same sense, and thus not as the same lexeme. In its bureaucratic usage, which reflects the mediatized projects of a State bureaucracy (cf. Agha 2012), the term denotes a population (not a speech variety) that stands in a specific relationship to the State: it names a minority immigrant population that the State seeks to assimilate into a mainstream national culture. From a bureaucratic stand-point, such a minority population is "integrated" to the degree that it has adapted its practices to those of majority Danish society, often in response to policy efforts by the Ministry that is tasked with bringing about this type of accommodation. The integration of a minority by a Ministry is, of course, a large-scale metapragmatic project, a social engineering task that, given the continuous in-flow of new immigrants, can never be wholly completed once and for all. Hence the effective integration of populations is, in practice, a degree notion, and distinct minority populations (as well as distinct generations within a minority population) may appear by Ministry criteria to be integrated to different degrees within Danish society. Any such mediatized project of assimilation thus yields society-internal criteria of group differentiation.

In the metapragmatic discourses of minority schoolchildren, the term "integrated" undergoes several transformations. First, whereas in Ministry discourses the term "integrated" denotes a culturally assimilated population, in youth discourses it denotes the performed demeanors of individual students, including their speech behaviors. Second, the framework of social differentiation implied by Ministry discourses is fleshed out in youth discourses as a contrast between enregistered emblems, as in Table 1, where the behavioral routines that express "integrated" vs. "street" demeanors are grouped into distinct repertoires (shown in the top half of the table) and each is associated with contrastive indexical stereotypes (shown in bottom half). Third, these emblems are indexically selective for specific activity routines and participation frameworks: "integrated" speech is said to be appropriate in addressing teachers, or addressing elderly Danes to whom one wishes to show respect, but not in talking to one's own relatives (with whom one speaks "normal Arabic"), nor with friends within peer groups with whom "street" language is more appropriate (Madsen 2013). These emblems are thus deployed through a reading or construal of the current interactional scenario that forms a multi-modal context (now treated as an emergent semiotic co-text) for acts of speaking; they are indexically selective for distinct co-textual scenarios in this sense. Fourth, since these emblems are expressed through multiple indexical cues, which may be deployed in a gradiently congruent manner, it is possible to inhabit "integrated" and "street" personae to different degrees in social interaction, as is the case with enregistered emblems in any society (see Agha 2007a: 265–267). Finally, the term "integrated" has been tropically generalized among Copenhagen youth as an expression usable ironically to formulate metapragmatic commentary on the very idea of a Standard, so that schoolchildren now use the term not only to speak of vari-

eties of Danish but also of "integrated" (vs. normal) Arabic, where varieties of a distinct language become enregistered in ways analogous to Danish; or describe Urdu as "integrated Punjabi", a formulation where two distinct languages are ironically ranked on a cline of social indexicality, but where the mutually unintelligibility of their PLG systems becomes irrelevant.

It would be a mistake to imagine that the recycling and reanalysis of metapragmatic models from mediatized discourses (such as State discourses about integrated populations) into everyday discourses (such as youth discourses about integrated speech) is a unidirectional process, or to imagine that here the story of register differentiation comes to a halt. We have simply examined two historical phases of a social process, and identified two distinct models of personhood, which, although indexically linked to each other (the latter is produced by immigrants, which the former classifies), are not models for the same social actors. In a third metasemiotic formulation of register contrasts, the speech of Cophenhagen youth is further recycled and differentially revalorized in mediatized artifacts disseminated to national target markets that extend well beyond, but also include, the very children whose speech these artifacts incorporate: on the Danish national TV channel DR2, a comedy sketch show, *Det Slører Stadig* ['It Still Veils'], deploys scripted activity routines for characters that partly recycle and partly transform the diacritics shown in Table 1. For instance, the character of Latifah, a female student, deploys the audible partials of "street" language along with visible diacritics of a "gangster" persona (track suit bottoms, hooded sweatshirts, gold chains, large earrings, heavy make-up) thus extending both the semiotic range of the register formation (from audible to visible signs) and the social domain of its circulation (from school settings to national television), thus transforming the register even if its speech repertoires remain the same.

The incorporation of street and integrated registers within a TV show, which is both a mediatized artifact and a televisual commodity, formulates them as commodity registers designed for a national target market (for a discussion of other cases, see Agha 2011: 44–46). The indexical selectivity of youth registers for co-textual scenarios of appropriate use is also preserved, but is now rendered salient for TV audiences through hyperbolic exaggeration in comedic routines: when Latifah discusses nuclear physics with a blond (and visibly non-minority) fellow student, she speaks fluent "integrated" speech; but when she answers her cell phone, and speaks to a presumed fellow "gangster", she switches back to "street" in a seamless and thus comedic change of footing. Finally, in episodes where Latifah interviews adult non-minority persons of higher social status than herself (such as professors and politicians), her explicit use of metapragmatic descriptions (like "ordinary" versus "integrated") for differences in speech behaviors between herself and her interlocutors makes the register boundary salient for those Danes who neither live in Copenhagen nor happen to be schoolchildren, thus expanding the social domain of those able to recognize the register contrast to a potentially nationwide audience.

Fedorova (this volume) shows that when monolinguals adapt their speech to the co-presence of bilingual others, the indexical selectivity of speech for

social category of interlocutor can shape the speech repertoires understood as appropriate in interacting with them. When Russians interact with foreigners, the variety of Russian they speak does not constitute a single register of "foreigner talk", as earlier writers supposed (Ferguson 1981),[4] but tends to be differentiated through indexical selectivity for the kinds of persons they imagine their interlocutors to be. Fedorova compares the speech varieties Russians use in interactions with two kinds of foreign others: one data set involves interactions with ethnic Chinese along the Russian–Chinese border, the other involves interactions with foreigners primarily from Western countries in St Petersburg. In both cases, the variety of Russian used for foreigners differs from speech patterns used among Russian native speakers, but involves distinct speech patterns for the two kinds of foreigners.

Table 2. Enregistered styles of foreigner talk in Russian

	Chinese interlocutors		**Western interlocutors**	
Repertoires:	impolite pronouns		minimal ellipsis, diminutive avoidance,	
	imperative mood		slower speech rate, Russian glossed,	
	pejorative other-voicing		"helpful" other-voicing	
Participation frameworks:	S	A	S	A
	Russian	Chinese	Russian	Westerner

Note: S = Speaker, A = Addressee. Source: Fedorova 2013, and this volume

Russian speakers appear to have derogatory stereotypes about ethnic Chinese along the Russian–Chinese border (Fedorova 2013). The variety of Russian they use in speaking to Chinese interlocutors (shown on the left in Table 2) is deformed along dimensions of PLG organization that are consistent with pejorative stereotypes: the pronominal contrast between second person polite and impolite forms is neutralized in favor of impolite forms; distinctions of tense and mood tend to be neutralized in favor of imperative verb forms; and a distinctive lexical repertoire, which simulates Chinese mispronunciations of Russian words, is common in talking to Chinese interlocutors in a pattern of pejoratively other-voiced speech.

By contrast, in the St. Petersburg data (shown on the right), where foreign interlocutors are primarily Westerners (often foreign students or guests), Russian speakers exhibit speech patterns that selectively deform everyday Russian along quite distinct dimensions: at the level of PLG organization, they tend to use "more formal, grammatically correct forms of speech"; their utterances tend to minimize ellipsis of copulas and inter-clause conjunctions (which are common in speaking to native speakers), and to avoid diminutives (which imply intimacy), thus deploying a grammatically hypercorrect and lexically formal register of Russian; their speech also has a slower speech rate, includes metalinguistic glosses of Russian words, and is sometimes voiced as the speech of their Western interlocutors, as if designed to help them with their Russian.

In each case, cultural models of "kinds of persons" shape the speech varieties felt to be appropriate in interacting with them. Each variety involves a co-occurrence style (Ervin-Tripp 1986), in which a number of features occur together in a distinctive way (thus comprising its diacritics, Agha 2007a: 248), and constitutes an enregistered style (Agha 2007a: 185–188) insofar as it is indexically selective for a distinct interactional scenario: when Russians talk to Chinese interlocutors their speech contains impolite pronouns, direct commands and pejorative other-voicing; when they speak to Westerners their speech tends to be grammatically hypercorrect, lexically formal, and includes "helpful" other-voicing. The difference cannot be explained as a regional dialect difference "between Western and Eastern Russia" because Russians who use the first pattern for Chinese interlocutors in Chita (a town on the Eastern border with China) switch to "the same hypercorrect strategies" found in St. Petersburg when they talk to European visitors to Chita (Fedorova 2013: 78, n. 9). Each pattern of PLG deformation and other-voicing constitutes an enregistered style that is indexically selective for, or appropriate to, a particular scenario of interpersonal conduct, where it formulates images of self and other in ways intelligible to its users. And since each enregistered style is expressed through multiple co-occurring cues, it is always possible to inhabit these roles and relationships to gradient degrees, just as in the Danish case discussed above.

In discussing Latino migrants in Israel, Paz (this volume) also describes a case where the activity routines of bilinguals are indexically selective for categories of interlocutor, but the cultural models through which these routines are construed, which Paz calls "domestic intimacy" and "stranger sociality", are very different from the ones discussed above. These models emerge for Latino immigrants in Israel not merely through contact between the Spanish and Hebrew languages, nor merely between their speakers, but also through "contact" between cultural models for construing speech and speakers, between models these immigrants bring from the home country and those they encounter in Israel. Latino migrants experience a sharp contrast between cultural norms of *educación* ['refinement, cultivation'] to which they were socialized in Latin America and the relative directness of Israeli interactional norms, which they contrastively associate with rudeness or aggression. ln Israel, where Latinos encounter both norms, *educación* is associated with in-group domestic interactions among their friends and kin, participation frameworks in which Spanish is also appropriate. By contrast, Israeli interactional styles (of both speech and non-speech behavior) are perceived as lacking *educación*, as direct and sometimes rude. Since Latinos use Hebrew in out-group settings with Israeli citizens, they come to associate PLG units of the Hebrew language with indexical stereotypes of aggression, and their own use of Hebrew with social distance and out-group forms of "stranger sociality". This situation is complicated by the fact that Latino children are socialized to Israeli norms of directness while growing up in Israel, and deploy them along with Hebrew utterances in interactions with parents. In such situations, parents perceive their children as performing stranger sociality within the home, and Hebrew as a register of social

distance in in-group settings. This contrastive valorization of PLG units of distinct languages – with Spanish as stereotypically indexical of greater politeness, and Hebrew of greater directness and aggression – has a relatively small social domain within Israeli society, namely the Latino migrant community itself.

Despite obvious differences, the Danish, Russian and Israeli registers exhibit some common features: although all three cases involve co-textual arrays in which PLG tokens occur, the principle of register differentiation is not a PLG system but the treatment of otherwise diverse signs – whether differing in sense along dimensions such as presence vs. absence of propositional content (lexical items vs. prosodic contours), or differing in signal-scope as localizable vs. configurative signs (morphemes vs. their constituent-order), or differing in sensory channel as audible vs. visible signs (allophones vs. apparel) – as stereotypic indexicals of comparable activities or personae, as evidenced in the metapragmatic practices of their users. Diverse behaviors are likened to each other, or unitized as signs of the "same" register, by the comparability of their stereotypic indexical values for users, which enables the analyst to group them into repertoires. Their grouping into repertories, their stereotypic indexical values, and their users (who formulate the model) are correlative dimensions of any such register, providing criteria on the identifiability of the register formation and of its semiotic partials, and on their differentiability from those belonging to other models of conduct. And insofar as unitized items of a repertoire appropriately co-occur with each other, they form enregistered styles, which are indexically selective for specific co-textual scenarios, in which they express images of actor or activity type that may be inhabited to gradient degrees. Similar processes are at work in the cases to which I now turn.

Enregisterment within and across Genres

The term "genre" has been used in a great variety of ways to describe enregistered styles of varying degrees of complexity and indexical selectivity for interlocutors and settings. When distinctive devices recur within a genre, each indexes the fact that the genre's performance is now under way, thereby "keying" its performance (Bauman 1977). Bauman lists a series of devices that are distinctive to many performance genres, and function as diacritics distinguishing a genre's performance from other discursive behaviors, but observes that any such list is of "limited utility" because such devices exhibit enormous variability across traditions, and the empirical task is always to identify "the culture-specific constellations of communicative means that serve to key performance in particular communities" (Bauman 1977: 22), or, in my terms, to identify the register models of conduct that are distinctive to a genre's performance,[5] and which, in turn, enable participants to recognize its distinctive devices and infer from their performance that it (and not some other activity) is now under way, or who is doing it, or what they are doing through it, or to whom.

The term "register" has become influential in studies of oral performance through the elegant work of John Miles Foley, who drew on a broad literature in linguistic anthropology,[6] including Bauman's own seminal work on performance, to answer questions initially posed in Milman Parry's and Albert Lord's work on Yugoslav epic (and on its implications for Homeric epic), to which their Oral-Formulaic Theory was proposed as a candidate answer. These questions began as a puzzle: what is the "special technique of composition" which allows the Yugoslav bard, who "has not memorized his song" but "is composing as he sings," to produce novel songs at an extraordinarily rapid speed? (Lord 1960: 17). Does this ability rely on familiarity with some special units that enable larger wholes to be composed during performance? How are such units to be identified? When asked about this ability, the bards themselves replied by describing their familiarity with each *reč* ['word'] of the song, and by expressing confidence in their own ability to repeat a song *reč za reč* ['word for word'] across instances of performance. Yet the metalinguistic term *reč* does not only denote a word (in the sense of a "lexical item") in a PLG system. It also denotes verbal units of more varied kinds, including a ten-syllable poetic line, a combination of such lines, a speech, a scene, and others. The metalinguistic term *reč* thereby unitizes performance, segmenting performed utterance into significant partials, but in a way Parry and Lord found puzzling.[7] Parry proposed the term "formula" (for a metrically configured group of words) to describe one such type of unit, and Lord proposed that a "formula pattern" (involving prosodic, metrical and morphosyntactic templates) is "the fundamental element in constructing lines" (Lord 1960: 17). Although this proposal has proved highly influential in subsequent work, it does not provide criteria for identifying all "culture-specific" units for all known genres of performance, and thus does not enable their comparative study. Moving beyond Parry and Lord, Foley interprets "the *reč* as an integer" and, citing Bauman's observation that units of performance tend to be culture-specific (see Foley 1995: 11, n. 21), observes that "each culture and language and genre will establish its poetic "lexicon" of integers more or less differently" (Foley 1995: 23), thus incorporating Bauman's criterion into his own highly synthetic and insightful approach to the study of registers of oral poetic performance. Foley uses the terms "expressive integers" or "structural integers" for the unitized co-textual arrays (of varied signal scope) that comprise the register's expressive repertoires; the term "metonymic significance" for their indexical significance, which differs from their localizable-propositional content, and appears "metonymic" because it enables audiences to anticipate unfolding motifs developed later in performance, of which these indexically valued utterance-partials appear to be *pars pro toto* segments and proleptic signals (Foley 1995, 2002b); and "performance arena" for the setting in which these indexical signs are appropriately and effectively performed, which includes the characteristic activities or situations during which the register is typically performed, as well as "a suitably prepared performer" and "a suitably prepared audience", that is, includes speech participants who are acquainted with the register (or belong to its social domain), and whose presence in the current participation framework enables its effective performance and construal.[8]

Thus although Foley's proposals constitute a genuinely original and synthetic approach to oral poetic registers, they are entirely compatible with approaches to register formations of other kinds in contemporary linguistic anthropology, not least because they share common intellectual roots.

I noted earlier that when the behaviors that express a register model are re-grouped into partly non-overlapping repertoires by distinct populations, or are treated as appropriate to distinct settings or activities, and thus as having distinct indexical values, fractionally distinct register models effectively co-exist with each other, and such differences indexically differentiate the social groups whose practices these are. We have so far been focusing on cases where the reanalysis of PLG units across register boundaries (and their grouping with other features, such as prosody, speech rate, or interlocutor-origo voicing) differentiates groups and practices from each other. When partials of a recognized genre are regrouped or re-bundled in performance, or are performed appropriately in distinct contexts, they exhibit the same kind of register differentiation, a feature obscured by the classification of the performance (as an undifferentiated whole) into one genre or another.

Genre taxonomies have proved to be handy ways of describing verbal practices in folklore because they allow scholars to classify performances (often in the form of recorded or transcribed text-artifacts of performances), and to sort them within archives, corpora and compendia. They continue to remain useful for this purpose even if the criteria that are used to differentiate genres from each other are enormously varied in the literature,[9] perhaps because they reflect the varied interests and concerns of the scholarly projects that rely on them. Moreover, since the term "genre" is used in different ways in distinct disciplines (e.g., literary criticism vs. folklore), and in schools of thought within them, it is worth noting that, in folklore, recent approaches view genres not as idealized categories but as open frameworks for the entextualization of expressions in social situations. As Frog points out in his article in this volume, a focus on the genre characteristics of performance attends more to the placement of verbal devices within performable wholes rather than on the social indexical values of the devices themselves. Since a focus on the genre characteristics of performance by no means precludes an interest in its register characteristics, these two distinct spheres of analytic concern can complement each other in several ways, as they often do in contemporary folklore research. In order to approach their complementarity, however, it is useful to begin by noting a difference between genre taxonomies and register models: insofar as genre taxonomies rely on external criteria of classification, they do not permit access to the principles by which speech behavior is organized into register models of conduct by those whose behavior it is.

Kallio (this volume) discusses a corpus of Ingrian oral poetry, which was collected by more than twenty scholars between 1853 and 1938, and contains a large number of items (5,500 poems, 500 musical notations, and 170 short sound recordings). Each item is a record of a performance, and the size of the corpus captures a broad stretch of the social history of performances. In working through the corpus, Kallio notes that observable features of style in poetic performance vary quite substantially within the corpus itself, so

that most poems contain features of more than one genre. Whereas genre taxonomies do not make this variation tractable, an approach that treats elements of performance as semiotic partials of register models, and hence as social indexicals, shows that "even the most problematic Ingrian recordings are amenable to analysis as natural results of the use of specific registers in atypical contexts, resulting in fractionally distinct variants, which are often adopted as typical for distinct performance situations by distinct users" (Kallio, this volume).

Kallio's analysis relies on viewing stylistic features not as isolable devices in performance, but as indexically motivated elements of enregistered styles. Viewed as separate items, the stylistic devices that occur in this corpus (specific poetic themes, melodies, rhythms, vocal styles, opening formulas, forms of repetition, speech rate, kinesic accompaniments) appear enormously heterogeneous in form and isolable significance (as do the Russian and Danish ones discussed above), and many aspects of their significance are obscured when they are inspected in isolation: the significance of devices that lack propositional content (speech rate, melodies, kinesic behaviors) becomes difficult or impossible to describe; and devices that do have isolable propositional content (formulas, song lyrics) also have non-propositional indexical values in performance, which such a treatment obscures. However, when these devices are evaluated as segments of multi-channel sign-configurations in which they exhibit recurrent forms of co-variation with each other, and with identifiable features of setting (actors, activities, participation frameworks), observable patterns of their recurrent and ratified co-deployment across time and place themselves constitute a kind of implicit metapragmatic data on stereotypic indexicality. In ratifying their recurrent co-deployment, audiences recognize that they typically go or "fit" together, i.e., are indexically congruent with each other. In some cases, metapragmatic descriptions are also available, which furnish explicit evidence. In a few cases, atypical usages are construable as meaningful tropes whose construal appears to presuppose the stereotypic values from which they depart, thus confirming the analysis.

One type of regularity of recurrent patterning is the co-deployment of linguistic and non-linguistic signs in the same activity routines. Thus when a characteristic four-beat melody regularly occurs in a large number of Ingrian wedding songs (identified by thematic content), the melody appears stereotypically to index the activity routines that accompany it over a large number of ratified performances. And in "atypical" usages when performers explicitly say that with the "same wedding melody [we] sing to children" (Kallio, this volume), their reports provide explicit metapragmatic data of two kinds: the performer's explicitly calling it a "wedding melody" confirms its stereotypic indexicality qua musical phrase, and the predicate describes the appropriateness of the melody (but not of the thematic content of wedding songs) to acts in which "[we] sing to children," thus specifying the indexical selectivity of the melody qua extractable sign-fraction for a distinct participation framework for at least this social group, the referents of "we". Entirely distinct melodies recur in songs recited at calendric rituals of "swinging" on a large swing (large enough to seat 10 or more people) at the beginning of summer. In one case,

where two singers are performing a "swinging song" but do so with a 5-beat melody typical of lullabies, the ethnographer records that a young girl was present at the time. The 5-beat melody is atypical for swinging songs, but used here because it is indexically selective for the child. Similarly, formulas and melodies from "the most formal and ritualistic registers of wedding song" – where their formality mediates relations between the bride's and groom's families, who are strangers to each other at the wedding – are also used to bid welcome to strangers of other kinds, including "foreigners, such as scholars, fieldworkers or even presidents" (Kallio, this volume), and are thus treated as extractable fractions of wedding songs that are now unitized as indexicals of formal greetings of more varied kinds.

In other cases, patterns of the recurrent linear placement of elements in a song provide implicit metapragmatic data. Kallio notes that distinctive verbal formulas and melodies typically occur at the beginning of *Kokkovirsi*, the bonfire song, where young maidens sing and dance together at seasonal festive bonfires. The recurrent song-initial placement of these devices formulates them as diacritics of the *Kokkovirsi* song genre, as keying its performance, but also as stereotypic indexicals of the life stage and activities of the young maidens who sing these songs. By contrast, wedding songs, which begin with distinct melodies and formulas, mark a life cycle transition for the bride as she prepares to leave her friends and natal family. When *Kokkovirsi* formulas and melodies occur in wedding songs sung by the bride's friends, they occur in the middle of the song, and in these non-initial song segments index the co-membership of bride and singers in a past community of young maidens, even as the rest of the song laments the bride's immanent departure from it.

It will be evident that the treatment of genre partials as stereotypic indexical signs of a register requires attention to a wide range metapragmatic data (which are not available for many performances recorded long ago, as Kallio's observes). When such data are indeed available they permit the formulation of specific empirical hypotheses about the way in which unitized indexical signs in many channels of performance clarify the significance of these performances for informed audiences, that is for speech participants who belong to the register's social domain (but not, of course, for others who may also be present during performance.) And such hypotheses can be tested or improved upon by considering additional data within the limits of empirical access.

In all such cases, register models tend to involve both discursive and non-discursive signs. For instance, performances of Serbian *bajanje* ['magical charms'] include a range of "linguistic, paralinguistic and non-linguistic" expressive integers (Foley 1995: 127) – including the conjurer's leaning over and whispering the charm in the patient's ear, speaking softly and very rapidly, using an archaic lexicon, distinctive neologisms, an octosyllabic poetic line, and characteristic patterns of rhyme, parataxis, and parallelism – and which, despite their apparent heterogeneity (to outsiders) as behaviors of phenomenally distinct types, are grouped together under a scheme of metasemiotic construal whose elements indexically imply each other in appropriate use, and thus appear unified (to members of its social domain) as indexically congruent sign-partials of a register's repertoires. Such "cross-modal icons"

are commonplace and well described for register formations around the world (Agha 2007a: 179–185).

Similarly, the enregistered styles of Karelian lament involve a variety of discursive and non-discursive signs – including prosodic features, such as pharyngeal constriction and "cry breaks" (Urban 1988); melodic contours (Tolbert 1990); metrical patterning of PLG types, as in alliteration; kinesic routines, such as swaying or rocking the body (Honko 1974); and a distinctive lexical repertoire (Leino 1974) – whose routinized co-occurrence yields multi-channel sign-configurations traditionally performed in specific rituals (such as funerary or wedding ceremonies) but also on other occasions. Although most of the same features recur across performances, distinct co-occurrence styles were apparently normalized as appropriate to distinct rituals or to distinct segments of ritual cycles.

Stepanova (this volume) shows that whereas these enregistered styles exhibit features common to a variety of lament traditions in the region (including Karelian, Ižorian, Votic, Vepsian and Seto laments), and thus comprise what she terms a "pan-regional semiotic register" of lament, differences among lament registers indexically differentiate locale-specific lament traditions and the social identities of their practitioners. Since lamenters are traditionally women, each lament style stereotypically indexes the female gender of performer, a pan-regional feature. However, the lexical register of lament is differentiated in each such lament tradition into a core lexicon (terms for kin, divine beings, and self) and a situation-specific lexicon (terms for things only occasionally relevant to lament performance), but the difference is handled differently across traditions, thus differentiating traditions and practitioners from each other. And since the core lexicon is more widely known by lamenters in each tradition, variable degrees of familiarity with the situation-specific lexicon indexically differentiates specific types of lamenters *within* each tradition.

Tolbert describes varied atypical situations where laments were said to occur in everyday life. In such situations, lamenters evidently conformed to norms to gradient degrees, as in cases where a person could start to "almost lament" on the phone simply by "sprinkling" her speech with its distinctive lexicon and heightened intonation (Tolbert 1988: 114). This suggests that register partials of the lament genre could be variably sourced from the more elaborate enregistered styles and deployed with gradient fidelity to norm, thus permitting occasion specific interactional tropes, as with any other register of conduct.

The above cases also show that the register organization of devices used in any performance genre may be diverse not only in phenomenal characteristics (such as audibility or visibility) but also in the degree to which they constitute localizable vs. configurative signs. Frog (this volume) discusses the latter issue for poetic utterances, where unitized signs of a register may be highly localizable (such as lexical items) or highly configurative (such as poetic lines, or arrays of lines), and thus appear to constitute small or large "orders of signifiers". They are unitized as signs of a register by social regularities of reflexive treatment – whether through implicit regularities of ratified

construal or through explicit metapragmatic descriptions, as discussed above – which also formulate the significance they have for informed audiences.

On the other hand, when such signs are examined in isolation from the metapragmatic practices that formulate them as signs, differences of perceivable channel or signal scope appear to constitute a puzzle, as they did in earlier approaches (see n. 4).

Issues of signal scope do not pertain only to the discursive devices that are treated as the register's signs but also to the span of discourse that separates them from the discursive devices whose co-occurrence they index, which often occur later (and are thus indexed in a proleptic fashion) within performance, so that the register's devices appear to be (metonymic) parts of larger wholes. For instance, Foley observes that South Slavic phrases of the form "He/she spoke" (where the verbum dicendi need not be "speak", but some more specific hyponym) constitute a class of utterances that introduce reported speech frames. However in the repertoires of poetic register, members of this class function in much more indexically specific ways:

> On the other hand, a verbal phrase of precisely the same metrical extent, "He cried out," when delivered at or near the beginning of a performance, has deep and telling reverberations, signifying *the lament of the prisoner-protagonist in the Return Song*, a particular brand of shrieking loud and persistent enough to *move the captor and his wife to bargain for the prisoner's release* and leading eventually *to his Ithaka-like arrival, disguised as a beggar, to compete against a gathering of suitors and attempt* to *reclaim his South Slavic Penelope and his home*. (Foley 1995: 96; italics mine.)

Foley observes that in South Slavic epic, performance initial utterances like "He cried out" index (to an informed audience) that a variety of specific episodes are likely to unfold later in performance, an effect which Bauman 1992a calls "building a structure of anticipation," and which Foley terms their metonymic indexicality. In the above quote, Foley describes these episodes in capsule summaries (which I indicate approximately by italics). Within the performance, however, they unfold as the activities of characters in subsequent "episodes" of the performance. Thus performance-initial localizable expressions of the type "He cried out" stereotypically index the subsequent co-occurrence of more extended thematic episodes, but only for audiences acquainted with the poetic register and its tradition. And for audiences also familiar with the Odyssey, for instance, they also liken the final episodes of the Slavic epic to the return of Odysseus to Ithaka, and to his wife, Penelope, as Foley suggests in the above quotation.

At the same time, it is worth noting that the unitized signs of a register's repertoires (of whatever signal scope) are only experienced in events of performance under conditions of further contextualization by other signs, which occur as emergent co-textual arrays (as is the case with all indexicals; for deictics, see Agha 2007a: 48–50), and which "fill in" aspects of significance additional to any significance that is stereotypically associated with the register's signs themselves. The formula "he cried out" is a formulaic template,

which includes many variants (like *i pocmili* ['and he cried out'] and *sužanj cmili* ['the prisoner cried out']). The invariant features of the template qua register partial involve only some (and not all) phrase-internal features of its PLG organization. Hence some of its variant features inevitably occur *within* the same phrase token where the template occurs.

Lamb (this volume) discusses this issue for the case of formulas in Gaelic prose narratives. He observes that, for each of the formulaic templates he discusses, a large number of instances recur in the narratives of storytellers separated from each other in time and place. When these templates recur across many performances – or are "consistent across many users", sometimes across a span of centuries (Lamb, this volume) – their recurrence across locales provide evidence for a sociological regularity, namely that these patterned templates are comparably enregistered for (or recognizable to) a wide social domain of speakers within Gaelic traditions of storytelling. Some of the templates he discusses are illustrated below in English translation:

NP_i <u>raised music and vanquished</u> (NP_i's own) <u>sadness</u>

NP_i <u>was far from</u> NP_i's <u>friends and near</u> NP_i's <u>foes</u>

NP_i saw/thought that NP_i was <u>far from</u> NP_i's <u>friends and near</u> NP_i's <u>foes</u>

NP_i <u>put</u> <u>the binding of the three narrows</u> on NP_j <u>firmly and painfully/tightly</u>

But what exactly recurs? Which among the PLG features of these templates are recurrent partials of a register of performance? Certain features of PLG organization, such as their organization as noun phrases or adverbial phrases, and much of the non-deictic lexical material that fills these phrasal slots, appear fixed across the instances that Lamb analyzes (and this material is indicated here by underlining). But constituents that have deictic features, whether involving NP level deixis (pronouns and anaphors) or clause-level deictic contrasts (active vs. passive voice), vary readily across instances (and these lexical segments are not underlined). The following attested examples of the last formulaic template above (along with narrators' name) exemplify some of these issues:

(a) [He$_i$] <u>put</u> [<u>the binding of the three narrows</u>] [<u>on</u> him$_j$] [<u>firmly and painfully</u>] (MacGilvray)

(b) [He$_i$] <u>put</u> [<u>the binding of the three narrows</u>] [<u>on</u> them$_j$] [<u>firmly and painfully</u>] (Gillies)

(c) [<u>The binding of the three narrows</u>] was <u>put</u> [<u>on</u> them$_j$] [<u>firmly and tightly</u>] (MacLennan)

Although the repertoires of this register of storytelling involve relatively invariant PLG templates (often of multi-clausal signal-scope), only devices that convey context-independent propositional content appear to be invariant in form across acts of using them. Devices such as deictics vary across instances because they anchor referents to some here-and-now of performance, an issue entirely independent of the register consistency of phrase

tokens, or of their fidelity to the register's sign-types. Items of the register thus co-occur with other items within the same phrase tokens in discontinuous intercalation. And although the register's devices are context-independent from the standpoint of the propositional content of the phrases in which they occur, they readily function as stereotypic social indexicals at the level of the narrative as a whole, where, in each instance of performance, they formulate the narrative as traditional storytelling, the narrator as a proficient exemplar of its tradition, and formulate the phrase token itself as a proleptic signal metonymically indexing features of performance yet to come during that very telling, but do so effectively only for an informed audience, namely for participants who belong to the social domain of the register.

Wilce and Fenigsen (this volume) focus on the lexical partials of lament performances, in both Karelian laments and their adpatations in laments of contemporary Finnish lament revivalists, which the revivalists call *itkukieli* ['lament language'], and which Wilce and Fennigsen call "lament register". This discussion illustrates a process common to many register systems, where the effects of extended semiotic arrays tend to be associated with some of their partials. Although Karelian laments involve multiple semiotic cues that comprise an enregistered style (as noted above), the lexical repertoires distinctive to lament are the most readily extractable sign-fractions of the performance, and hence susceptible to varied forms of metapragmatic commentary and reanalysis. The presence of these lexical items within funerary laments was traditionally assigned a specific significance: Stepanova (this volume) points out that the dead were believed to no longer be able to understand colloquial speech and the lexical register of Karelian laments was regarded as a special language that they could understand, culturally ratifying it for communication with supernatural powers.

Yet these lexical items do not establish social relations among specific persons by themselves, but only through a voicing structure formulated by co-occurring signs. The voicing structure of funerary lament enacts relationships between the bereaved who are co-present and the deceased addressed by the lament. When the lamenter addresses the deceased in the presence of bereaved living relatives, the latter are formulated as its ratified overhearers (Wilce and Fenigsen, this volume). The lamenter may perform her own personal grief but also the grief of the deceased's living relatives. The lamenter was understood "as a mediator, in whose laments emerges not only her own voice, but also the voices of the living community, the deceased and [the community of] the dead" (Stepanova 2011: 138). The living and the deceased could thus both be understood as the principals of the message animated and delivered by the lamenter on their behalf. The expressions that comprise the lexical repertoires of lament include deverbal noun phrases – as in the example cited by Wilce and Fenigsen (this volume), *O šie miun armahane n-ihalane n-imettäjäzeni* ['Oh, you$_i$ dear gentle one who suckled me$_j$'] – whose referents, persons i and j (indicated by subscripts in the gloss), are identified by deictic reference transposed through this voicing structure and situation: the referent of me$_j$ (person j) could be understood as the lamenter, who animates it, a co-present relative, the overhearer-principal, or even the

deceased; and the referent of you$_i$ (person i) as the one who gave birth (not to the lamenter but) to person j, whoever that may be in relation to the circumstances of utterance. The lamenter is thus globally formulated throughout the performance as an intermediary between the living and the dead in one or the other of these ways.

As expressions that occur in more local stretches of utterance, the lexical items of lament register "fill in" additional features of role and relationship. They identify referents through matrilineal tropes for kin-reference[10] and person tropes for self-reference. They index deferential avoidance and intimacy: avoidance/deference is marked by acts of referring to deceased persons through elaborate circumlocutions (rather than personal proper names),[11] and intimacy by diminutive suffixes. The individuals (living and dead) among whom relations of deference and intimacy are being performed by the lamenter are understood, once again, through the voicing structure of the lament. And since the same lexical item may be used for more than one type of kin, the referent of any expression "is clear both to the reciter and to the listeners" (Leino 1974: 116) only under conditions of entextualized performance where co-occurring signs enable reference maintenance (as in other honorific registers, Agha 2007a: 323–324) through co-textual arrays of signs that are less transparent to native speakers than are lexical items, and thus less readily discussed as extractabilia from performance.

Thus although lament performances mark social relations among identifiable persons through a multi-channel array of signs, the lexical register of lament is more readily discussed out of context than is the enregistered style of which it is an element. Native speakers thus reanalyze an enregistered style as a lexical register of forms that possess an indexical force that actually derives from the semiotic array as a whole (for similar forms of misrecognition in other languages, see Agha 2007a: 286–293, 322–332).

The reanalysis of register partials can take a variety of other forms too. The derived composite need not constitute a distinct register in the sense of a social-semiotic regularity comparably recognized and used by many persons. In some cases it constitutes an emblem of a highly distinctive persona associated with just a few people, or even a single individual, as some of the other authors in this volume show.

Singular Personae

Kaartinen (this volume) discusses a chronicle from Eastern Indonesia whose author, Kende, draws on a range of devices from registers of writing and verbal art to fashion a document that depicts his community's political history. The chronicle neither belongs to an established genre nor signals conventional expectations in a reader. Rather it employs devices sourced from several distinct registers (and of varied signal-scope and stereotypic indexicality), whose very juxtaposition signals the document's genre hybridity and singularity, even as its register partials formulate a composite sketch of who it attempts to reach, what it seeks to convey, and how it derives its own authority.

The chronicle is only recognizable as a form of political communication to someone acquainted with local models of doing politics. In the village of Banda Eli, political authority is vested in two kinds of chiefly offices, the *Ratu* and the *Kapitan*, each associated with a distinct participation framework of chiefly communication: the *Ratu*'s "inside speech" is understood as an appropriate response to disputes that have arisen within households and intra-familial networks, where it seeks to bring about reconciliation, and where the Bandanese language is appropriately used as a register of in-group intimacy. The "outside speech" in which the *Kapitan* is expected to be proficient presents the unity of his community to outsiders, its stereotypic addressees, where the national language Malay/Indonesian is appropriately used as a register of out-group communication.

Since Kende holds the office of *Kapitan*, and since his chronicle is composed in Malay, it is formulated as a form of political communication addressed to outsiders. But it is written in *Jawi*, a register of writing that employs Arabic script for Malay, thus imposing some further indexical selectivity on its addressees/readers. Since the Latin alphabet has replaced *Jawi* in Banda Eli and other regions, many members of Kende's own community (and from elsewhere) cannot easily read it. The chronicle is indexically selective for outsiders who have a certain kind of traditional cultivation, a feature marked globally by the use of *Jawi* script throughout the document.

Other devices that recur within the chronicle are of more limited signal-scope and more varied in indexical effects. Although the document describes historical developments in Kende's community to outsiders, it does not do so as a "history" that depicts chronologically sequential events leading up to the present but as a "chronicle" of bounded episodes serially involving specific characters from the past, each story providing a charter for some specific set of present-day relationships. These episodes depict encounters between Kende's community and various historical others, such as colonizing Europeans, other indigenous chiefs, Muslims elsewhere in the Islamic world, and functionaries of the modern Indonesian State. In each narrative episode, these outsiders interact with local incumbents of the chiefly office held by Kende's ancestors in the past and by Kende at the time of writing, thus highlighting his positional authority within his community in a "heroic I" addressed to his readers. When Kende's ancestors encounter ethnolinguistic others, the utterances assigned to these others are sometimes presented as songs within direct reported speech frames – whether songs depicting dialogues between ancestors, or songs of lament at losses in war – where the laments and narrated dialogue belong to traditional registers of verbal art, and where the voicing of songs as reported speech imply that these utterances are reproduced verbatim in the chronicle, and thus citable as "proof" of its accuracy and veracity within the chronicle itself. The protagonists of several episodes are enumerated in finite lists, a device used in ceremonial registers to recite ancestral names, titles and place names, where the recitation formulates society as an orderly whole, a formulation now incorporated in Kende's written account of his own community's historical past. The use of Arabic titles for subsections of the chronicle formulates it as belonging to a literary register of writing, and

the specific titles Kende uses for its sections – *muqqadimah* ['introduction'], *bab* ['part'], *pasal* ['chapter'] – likens the episodes they describe to portions of traditionally larger literary works, as if excerpted from them.

The juxtaposition of devices sourced from distinct public registers into the chronicle formulates a composite indexical sketch of the characteristics of its author and his addresses that is recoverable neither from the denotational content of its PLG units, nor from its ambiguous genre characteristics. And although the registers on which it draws are social regularities, their juxtaposition in the chronicle constitutes a highly singular, potentially unique, performance. Kende's wide register range is emblematic of his singularity, and formulates the chronicle he composes through it as a "monument" of a tradition that is perhaps disappearing. But the performance doesn't end with the act of composing the chronicle. The fact that Kende chooses to have his writings divided among faraway kin after his death suggests that, through their access to his achievement, others may yet be able to grasp and potentially to continue the chiefly tradition of which he is an exemplary member.

Noyes (this volume) discusses a case where the "classical" register of French political conduct, whose last exemplar was Charles de Gaulle, and which had since come to be seen as a "dead letter" or as emblematic of a bygone era, is suddenly brought back to life in public sphere media discourses, which treat the suicide of a Prime Minister, Pierre Bérégovoy, as a sign of the register's rebirth. Registers of political conduct appear inscrutable to outsiders because they draw selectively on the semiotic resources of a particular tradition. Within France, the "classical" register has involved a mode of presentation of a politician's public persona through a mastery of "linguistic, kinesic and visual forms" and the "material signs and stages that sustain it," which emerged as an enregistered model for bourgeois elites (in contrast to aristocrats) after the French Revolution, and grew in social domain after post-1880s educational reforms, when national schooling made its symbolic goods available to a lager public. But although the register became more widely recognized through schooling, the competence effectively to perform its emblematic ease and self-possession remained restricted to those born in "high bourgeois" circles, as was de Gaulle. By contrast, Bérégovoy, who was of working class origins, and never attended an elite school, was caricatured in political cartoons as lacking elegance as he rose through the ranks of the Socialist party. Yet after his nomination as Prime Minister and his naïve involvement in a scandal that cost the Socialist party an election, his apparent suicide was construed in the national press as indicating an "honorable" and "honest" politician who takes responsibility where others don't, and as "thus superior to all of us". This metapragmatic construal does not liken Bérégovoy's conduct as displaying de Gaulle's ease and self possession, but as "dignified" because it signals a commitment to the integrity of an office and a responsibility to those who elect him to it. In being reanimated, the register is partly re-interpreted. And the exemplary sample of the new emblem is a singular individual, Bérégovoy. However, once it re-enters public sphere discourses, the emblem remains available in evaluations of subsequent leaders, like Nikolas Sarkozy, as Noyes shows in her discussion. Whether or not it will come to

constitute a widely enregistered new model of "classical" political conduct, and will consistently count as a new standard remains to be seen, of course, as is always the case at seemingly incipient moments of register change.

Cultural Models of Conduct in History

The enregisterment of performable signs as indexicals of actor or activity type, and thus as cultural models of conduct, is an ongoing semiotic process in social history, a process mediated by the reflexive treatment of differences in behavior as indexicals of distinct actor personae or interpersonal activities, and thus as signs capable of differentiating roles and relationships in inter-action. Various disciplines that study features of communication – whether its "language" or its "genre" – encounter such systems of social indexicals in their data, and thus encounter the register organization of communicative conduct, a type of social-semiotic organization that requires distinct methods for its study.

The accompanying articles show that register formations are germane to varieties of speech and conduct in any sociohistorical milieu. And through the extraordinary care with which they describe the workings of register phenomena in their data – a few aspects of which I have attempted to bring together in comparative terms here – these articles show that attention to the register organization of behavior reveals aspects of meaning-in-conduct that remain opaque unless we attend to the reflexive processes through which features of interpersonal conduct are modeled as significant by those whose conduct it is.

These studies also make clear that the register organization of discursive behavior cross-cuts its PLG organization or any "genre" classification it may be given. I noted earlier that a PLG unitization of sentence-internal speech tokens does not suffice to identify stereotypic social indexicals of actor or activity type, nor their social-demographic organization as models-for particular users. The register organization of communicative behavior is orthogonal to, or cross-cuts, its grammatical organization, even if both forms of semiotic organization intersect in audible samples of speech behavior. Similarly, the genre organization of discourse into taxonomic text-types (by whatever criteria) is orthogonal to *both* its PLG organization *and* its register organization, even if all three types of organization are routinely evidenced in the same apparently continuous stretches of speech behavior. Nor do all three forms of semiotic organization have the same social domain: a speaker of some language who can routinely construe the PLG organization of its utterances is typically familiar only with a few genres of verbal art, and with only a few of its speech registers.

Whether the reanalysis of speech behaviors into distinct register models of conduct involves the reanalysis of PLG units or of genre partials or of both, whether these are sourced from one locale or from many, whether non-discursive signs are also involved or not involved, the reanalysis yields a register model insofar as otherwise diverse behaviors are grouped together

into repertoires with a characteristic (and characterizable) range of stereo-typic indexical values for some social domain of users, and is empirically identifiable only by attention to their reflexive practices. Indeed, all of the specific kinds of sign-types discussed above (lexical registers, enregistered emblems, enregistered styles, etc.), which are characteristic of register forma-tions in societies around the world, are formulated as register partials through the reflexive practices of users, and change through them.

Effective competence in a register includes knowing when not to use it. Although individuals differ in their register range (the number and kinds of registers they effectively command), acts of deploying any one of them are susceptible to evaluations of appropriateness to setting both by the one deploying them and by other members of the current participation frame-work, and hence are interpersonally effective only when current interactants have a symmetric grasp of the register model and of the indexical selectivity of register partials for contextual variables. Indexically non-congruent displays – the use of hyper-polite speech in intimate settings, of women's speech by men, of slang in job interviews, etc. – are often avoided by persons acquainted with stereotypic indexical values; and, when they are actually enacted, are under-stood as tropic enactments that have some interaction-specific significance, but only by those acquainted with the register models on which they trope. And some among these tropic enactments are reanalyzed into fractionally congruent contrastive models, which differentiate persons and groups from each other, and thus make intelligible socially organized forms of semiotically expressible sameness or difference.

As we approach the study of register phenomena in different times and places around the world, we are able, in any given instance, to observe only a few of the features that processes of enregisterment make palpable to those who live with each other through them. But the set of phenomena that a col-lective project (such as this volume) brings to light is of course much wider than what any of us can individually glimpse or seek to describe. And if these efforts are successful, other issues, which we have not yet imagined, can also be explored, simply because other persons have imagined them and are enact-ing them through models of conduct elsewhere, together and on their own.

Notes

1   I have observed elsewhere that: "From the standpoint of its persona-indexing effects, any register constitutes a class of enregistered emblems [... which] convey stereotypic images of persons [...] We distinguish such formations from each other as distinct 'registers' when we approach them from the standpoint of repertoires; but if we approach them from the standpoint of personae, we are distinguishing enregistered emblems from each other" (Agha 2007a: 236). To this we may add the observation that when we distinguish these formations from the standpoint of social domain, we are distinguishing the socially organized cultural practices of identifiable popula-tions.

2   The case of American youth slang – where word-forms are sourced from Spanish, Yiddish or African American Vernacular, and distinctly enregistered in the speech of college students – is perfectly analogous (see Eble 1996: 74–97). So also are a very

wide variety of forms of repertoire sourcing and reanalysis in adult speech from registers around the world, as in the case of Chinese elements in polite Japanese, Arabic in Persian, Sanskrit in Thai or Tibetan, Latin in English, and so on.

3   The details of how such metapragmatic data may be studied, how forms of typification formulate the significance of what they typify, how metapragmatic models differ in institutional authority or social dissemination, or enable forms of footing and alignment in social life, may be found in Agha 2007a (chapters 3–5) and Agha 2005b. I highlight a few issues in the discussion below.

4   In early work (such as Ferguson 1981), the word-form *register* is believed to name "one of the most promising tools of discourse analysis" even though the "problems inherent" to its empirical use are identified in questions like "How is a register identified? What constitutes a register? Do registers overlap?" (Ferguson 1981: 10), which writers in this period appear unable to answer. The general trend, instead, is to use the word-form *register* to describe variation in the use of PLG systems without explicit criteria for identifying either variants or their social significance. The reliance on intuitive criteria and a PLG-centric focus on something called a "language system" (as discussed in Susanna Shore's paper in this volume) impose severe limitations on early approaches (as discussed in Agha 2007a: 167–168 and Agha 1998: 154). Although the word-form *register* occurs both in earlier static approaches and in more recent reflexive approaches such as mine, it does not have the same word-sense, and is thus not the same lexeme. Hervey 1992 describes the older lexeme as follows: "It must also be said that, in spite of its place in systemic linguistics (Halliday and Fawcett 1987) this term remains one of the vaguest, fuzziest and least sharply defined in the repertoires of linguists and laymen, both of whom use it without any precise and clear sense of what they mean by it" (Hervey 1992: 189), a lack of clarity whose result is that many authors of this period "shy away from using the term "register" altogether", while others use it inconsistently (Hervey 1992: 191).

5   The italicized interpolations below highlight the approximate correspondence or overlap between Bauman's terminology and my own: Bauman is proposing that the comparative study of genres requires that the analyst be able to identify "the culture-specific constellations of communicative means [*repertoires and styles*] that serve to key [*stereotypically to index*] performance [*or genres of performance*] in particular communities [i.e., *for a social domains of users*]," and is thus urging that the analyst be able to identify registers models presupposed in use. Since any performance in which a register's tokens occur also has entirely distinct characteristics, including some that are entirely emergent within that performance (as discussed later in this article), the study of performance relies on many other analytic techniques too, the ability to identify register partials being one among them.

6   Foley 1995 relies upon and cites a wide range of studies in linguistic anthropology, including work by James Fox on Rotinese ritual language, Keith Basso on Apache place names, Ellen Basso on Kalapalo storytelling, Dell Hymes on Chinookan narratives, Paul Friedrich on Homeric formulas, Dennis Tedlock on Zuni and Quiché Maya, Joel Sherzer on Kuna speech styles, Greg Urban on Amerindian ritual wailing, Steve Feld on Kaluli lament, Tony Woodbury on Yupik Eskimo texts, Jane Hill on Mexicano women's narratives, and a great many others.

7   The field methods employed by Parry and Lord for identifying types of *reč* include two types of metasemantic queries (both discussed in Agha 2007a: 119–122) – namely, requests for denotational glosses of the term *reč* ("This *reč* in a song, what is it?"), and requests for the identification of referential samples ("Is this a *reč*?", "Is this also a *reč*?") – and thus rely on the reflexive abilities of native performers to identify units of performance (see Foley 2002a: 12–15 for examples of their queries, and the data they elicit through them). However, Parry and Lord relied on very limited types of reflexive data, namely explicit metasemantic queries, and seemed unable

to interpret the answers they elicited from singers ("When asked what a word is, he will reply he does not know, or he will give a sound group which may vary in length from what we call a word to an entire line of poetry, or even an entire song"; Lord 1960: 25), sometimes treating these answers as evidence of ignorance or confusion ("As I have said, singers do not know what words and lines are"; Lord 1960: 28).

8 In defining the "performance arena" of a register, Foley makes clear that although the term "arena" relies on a "spatial metaphor," it is not intended to describe "any geographically or temporally defined place" (Foley 1995: 47) but is meant instead to describe, for any given register, the setting (participants, activities and situations) to which its use is indexically appropriate, and which, when its performance is ritually recurrent, links the register to an interdiscursively identifiable "tradition" of performance, so that it is experienced as belonging not simply to one semiotic encounter but to a semiotic chain that links many encounters to each other (Agha 2005a).

9 Richard Bauman observes that the term "genre" has been defined in a variety of ways in the folkloristic literature, "ultimately taking in everything that people have considered significant about folklore: form, function of effect, content, orientation to the world and the cosmos, truth value, tone, social distribution, and manner or context of use" (Bauman 1992b: 54).

10 Leino 1974 shows that nominal expressions are (1) possessive phrases that denote mother or father through kinship tropes that transpose the zero-point of referential reckoning to a matrilineal kin, whether to the referent's mother (when referring to father) or to the speaker's own mother (when referring to her), where (2) the possessum is a deverbal noun derived from verb stems denoting nurturing or maternal activities, so that both features identify deceased kin through tropic centering within a matrilineal framework of social relations.

11 Registers of avoidance have been described for many other societies, including cases where avoidance marks deference to kin (Dixon 1971), often through activities involving intermediaries (Haviland 1979), or both to kin and non-kin (Irvine and Gal 2000: 39–47), or cases where avoidance vocabularies are associated not with deference but with rites of passage such as male initiation (Hale 1971). Some registers of affinal avoidance are performed through both discursive behaviors (a special lexicon) as well non-discursive behaviors: "Tabooed relatives did not look one another in the eye, did not stand face to face, and did not sit in each other's presence with legs parted" (Haviland 1979: 376). In the Karelian case, the taboo vocabulary is part of a specialized enregistered style in the case of funerary laments – involves intermediaries and voiced deference to deceased kin in a rite of passage where they transition into a category of supernatural beings – but the lexicon does not subserve all of these functions in its other uses, nor does it appear to be invariant as a lexicon across all uses.

References

Agha, Asif 1998. Stereotypes and Registers of Honorific Language. *Language in Society* 27: 151–93.

Agha, Asif 2005a. Introduction: Semiosis across Encounters. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 15(1): 1–5.

Agha, Asif 2005b. Voice, Footing, Enregisterment. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 15(1): 38–59.

Agha, Asif 2007a. *Language and Social Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Agha, Asif 2007b. The Object Called "Language" and the Subject of Linguistics. *Journal of English Linguistics* 35(1): 217–235.

Agha, Asif 2009. What Do Bilinguals Do? A Commentary. In *Beyond Yellow English: Toward a Linguistic Anthropology of Asian Pacific America*. Ed. Angela Reyes & Adrienne Lo. New York: Oxford University Press. Pp. 253–258.

Agha, Asif 2011. Commodity Registers. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 21(1): 22–53.

Agha, Asif 2012. Mediatized Projects at State Peripheries. *Language and Communication* 32: 98–101.

Bauman, Richard 1977. *Verbal Art as Performance*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Bauman, Richard 1992a. Contextualization, Tradition, and the Dialogue of Genres: Icelandic Legends of the *kraftaskáld*. In: *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*. Ed. A. Duranti & C. Goodwin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Pp. 127–145.

Bauman, Richard 1992b. *Folklore, Cultural Performances, and Popular Entertainments: A Communications-Centered Handbook*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Boellstorf, Tom 2004. Gay Language and Indonesia: Registering Belonging. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 14(2): 248–268.

Dixon, R. M. W. 1971. A Method of Semantic Description. In *Semantics: An Interdisciplinary Reader in Philosophy, Linguistics and Psychology*. Ed. D. D. Steinberg & L. A. Jakobovitz. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Pp. 436–471.

Ervin-Tripp, Susan 1986. On Sociolinguistic Rules: Alternation and Co-occurrence. In *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. Ed. John Gumperz & Dell Hymes. New York: Blackwell. Pp. 213–250

Eble, Connie 1996. *Slang and Sociability: In Group Language Among College Students*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Fedorova, Kapitolina 2013. Speaking with and about Chinese: Language Attitudes, Ethnic Stereotypes and Discourse Strategies in Interethnic Communication on the Russian–Chinese Border. *Civlisations* 62(1/2): 71–89.

Ferguson, Charle. 1981. 'Foreigner Talk' as the Name of a Simplified Register. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 28: 9–18.

Foley, John Miles 1995. *The Singer of Tales in Performance*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Foley, John Miles 2002a. *How To Read an Oral Poem*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Foley, John Miles 2002b. Selection as *pars pro toto*: The Role of Metonymy in Epic Performances and Traditions. In *The Kalevala and the World's Traditional Epics*. Ed. Lauri Honko. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society. Pp. 106–127.

Gagné, Isaac 2008. Urban Princesses: Performance and "Women's Language" in Japan's Gothic/Lolita Subculture. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 18(1): 130–150.

Githinji, Peter 2006. Bazes and Their Shibboleths: Lexical Variation and Sheng Speakers Identity in Narobi. *Nordic Journal of African Studies* 15(4): 443–472.

Hale, Kenneth 1971. A Note on a Walbiri Tradition of Antonymy. In: *Semantics: An Interdisciplinary Reader in Philosophy, Linguistics and Psychology*. Ed. D. D. Steinberg & L. A. Jakobovitz. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Pp. 472–482.

Haviland, John B. 1979. Guugu-Yimidhirr Brother-in-Law Language. *Language in Society* 8: 365–393.

Hervey, Sándor 1992. Registering Registers. *Lingua* 86: 189–206.

Honko, Lauri 1974. Balto-Finnic Lament Poetry. *Studia Fennica* 17: 9–61.

Hymes, Dell 1974. Ways of Speaking. In *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*. Ed. Richard Bauman & Joel Sherzer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Pp. 433–451.

Irvine, Judith T. & Susan Gal 2000. Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation. In *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Polities, and Identities*. Ed. Paul V. Kroskrity. Santa Fe: School of American Research. Pp. 35–83.

Jørgensen, J. N., M. S. Karrebaek, L. M. Madsen & J. S. Møller 2011. Polylnguaging in Superdiversity. *Diversities* 13(2): 23–37

Leino, Pentti 1974. The Language of Lament: The Role of Phonological and Semantic Features in Word Choice. *Studia Fennica* 17: 92–131.

Lord, Albert B. 1960. *The Singer of Tales*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Madsen, Lian Malai 2013. "High" and "Low" in Urban Danish Speech Styles. *Language in Society* 42: 115–138.

Newell, Sasha 2009. Enregistering Modernity, Bluffing, Criminality: How Nouchi Speech Reinvented (and Fractured) the Nation. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 19(2): 157–184.

Quist, Pia 2008. Sociolinguistic Approaches to Multiethnolect: Language Variety and Stylistic Practice. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 12(1/2): 43–61.

Samper, David A. 2002. Talking Sheng: The Role of a Hybrid Language in the Construction of Identity and Youth Culture in Nairobi, Kenya. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Smith-Hefner, Nancy J. 2007. Youth Language, *Gaul* Sociability, and the New Indonesian Middle Class. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 17(2): 130–150.

Stepanova, Eila 2011. Reflections of Belief Systems in Karelian and Lithuanian Laments: Shared Systems of Traditional Referentiality? *Archaeologia Baltica* 15: 128–143.

Tolbert, Elizabeth 1988. The Musical Means of Sorrow: The Karelian Lament Tradition. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Tolbert, Elizabeth 1990. Women Cry with Words: Symbolization of Affect in the Karelian Lament. *Yearbook of Traditional Music* 22: 80–105.

Urban, Greg 1988. Ritual Wailing in Amerindian Brazil. *American Anthropologist* 90(2): 385–400.

Registers of Communication

Edited by
Asif Agha & Frog