

Abstract

In the past several years, the social sciences have been articulating how emotion impacts cognition and social action. Linguists have underestimated the extent to which grammatical and discourse structures serve affective ends. A cross-linguistic analysis indicates that languages dedicate phonological, morpho-syntactic and discourse features to intensify and specify attitudes, moods, feelings and dispositions. These features provide an affective frame for propositions encoded. Such frames can be considered as part of the information expressed, as affective comments on the expressed propositions they address. These comments interface with gestural cues to provide interlocutors with critical information on which to base subsequent social actions.

INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we present a general framework for understanding affect in language. While the emphasis is on the grammatical and discourse organization of expressed affect, our framework draws on hypotheses put forward in theories of development and evolution. Our intention is to indicate processes that motivate verbal communication of affect and relate these processes to the pragmatics of affect across languages and speech communities.

We take affect to be a broader term than emotion, to include feelings, moods, dispositions, and attitudes associated with persons and/or situations. Our particular concern is with the conventional displaying of affect through linguistic means. We are not concerned with issues of speakers' actual feeling states or the extent to which their affective expression is sincere. Such relations between inner states and outward expression are culturally variable and have been considered in the ethnographic literature

on emotion (cf. among others Irvine, 1982; Lutz, 1985; Lutz and White, 1986; Rosaldo, 1980; Brenneis, 1987; E. Schieffelin, 1983; B. Schieffelin, 1986; Ochs, 1986; 1988). In this paper we indicate the enormous range of language forms that express affect across languages and speech communities. Our primary focus is on those linguistic features that key affect in everyday talk across a range of genres and social situations.

This paper will take the form of a number of general claims concerning functional and formal properties of affect in language. These claims are based on primary and secondary sources. Primary sources include transcripts of spontaneous speech in several languages and interviews with native speakers. The authors will rely in particular on their own in-depth ethnographic and linguistic research in Western Samoa (Ochs, 1986; 1988) and Papua New Guinea (B.B. Schieffelin, 1986; i.p.). Secondary sources on the linguistic structuring of affect are limited and dispersed and the contexts of use are usually not provided. Thus, the cross-linguistic component of this discussion is necessarily preliminary, laying out lines for future research on the expression of affect in language.

Social referencing in communication and development

Our approach centers on the notion of 'social referencing' as it has been considered in studies of the social development of children. A commonplace experience in the life of a human infant is an encounter with an entity that is novel to it. One problem for the child is to discover whether this entity is harmful or harmless, that is, something to be avoided or safely approached. Starting at approximately six months of age, infants in such situations begin to monitor the facial expressions of the significant others around them. For example, in American society, infants will turn to their mothers and search their faces for signs of positive or negative affect concerning the situation at hand. By 10–12 months of age, infants are able to use positive or negative affective information conveyed by the caregiver as a basis for their subsequent actions and dispositions towards the uncertain situation. Consequently, a child's understanding of novel entities develops through and is mediated by the facial expressions of others present. A number of developmental psychologists, including Klinnert (1978), Campos and Stenberg (1981), and Feinman (i.p.) refer to this process as social referencing. Klinnert et al. (1983) suggest that this type of monitoring and understanding of another's affective displays continues beyond the period of infancy and is crucial to the child's social and cognitive development. We concur with this conclusion and suggest further that social referencing plays an important role in language use and

language acquisition. Just as interactants use facial expressions to signal how they feel about entities, speakers use language for the same purpose. Moreover, just as interactants seek out affective information from one another's faces, so they seek out affective information from one another's language.

This position is strengthened by recent insights concerning the evolution of sophisticated communicative systems among mammals. These findings (McLean, 1978) indicate that the first vocalizations of mammals consisted of isolation or separation calls by young distressed infant mammals to their mothers. These vocalizations are linked to the development of the limbic lobe of the mammalian brain, which allows generation of emotional feelings and sociability among other functions. With respect to the concerns of this paper, it is important to note that audiovocal communication in primates is rooted in affective vocalization (Ploog, 1984). In humans, affective vocalization associated with the limbic system interacts with propositional speech associated with the expansion of the neocortex in humans, but the nature of that interaction is not clear. Izard (1984: 33) comments 'The central questions for the interested developmental psychologist are how do emotion-feeling processes and linguistic symbolic processes relate, and how does the addition of these great new capabilities affect the child?'

In this paper, we hope to offer some insight into the enigmatic relation of affect and linguistic symbolization. We propose that:

1. There are features in languages that speakers use to key affect to others.
2. Others use these features as a basis for constructing their own subsequent feelings, moods, dispositions and attitudes towards some uncertain information.

To state this in other words, we propose that beyond the function of communicating referential information, languages are responsive to the fundamental need of speakers to convey and assess feelings, moods, dispositions and attitudes. This need is as critical and as human as that of describing events. Interlocutors need to know not only what predication a speaker is making; they need to know as well the affective orientation the speaker is presenting with regard to that particular predication. The affective orientation provides critical cues to the interlocutor as to how that interlocutor should interpret and respond to the predication communicated. For example, interlocutors will respond differently if a speaker couches the predication in a positive or negative affective frame. Indeed, in some cases, the interlocutor will take the affective orientation as the point of departure for a subsequent topic. This happens, for example,

when someone makes a statement in a flippant or sarcastic manner and the response centers on the attitude presented rather than the propositional content of the response.

The idea of distinguishing a level of affective information within a communicative act is not novel in the field of linguistics. Sapir (1927) discussed the link between speech and personality traits. Bühler (1934) and Jakobson (1960) distinguished the emotive function from referential and conative functions of language. Lyons (1977) discussed a level of meaning he termed 'expressive'. And more recently, Irvine (1982: 32) has discussed an affective dimension of communication which 'would take in all levels of linguistic organization as well as nonverbal phenomena and the organization of discourse and interaction'. Our purpose here is not simply to reiterate that affect is a kind of information encoded in language. Rather, our purpose is to couch this fact in a functional perspective as part of a more general theory of human information processing and development. Affective features in language are members of a set of signs that regulate human behavior. They are crucial to the process of social referencing in which affective information is sought out and used to assess how one might construct a next interactional move.

Linguistic approaches to affect in language

There are two major channels used to convey affect—nonverbal and verbal. Nonverbal channels such as facial expression, gestures, body orientation and the like have been widely researched by social scientists (cf. among others, Bateson, 1972; Darwin, 1965; Ekman, 1984; Hinde, 1972; Eibl-Eibesfeldt, 1980). Our concern here is with the verbal channel, in particular, with the linguistic means available to language users to index particular kinds of affect. While there has been a virtual explosion of enthusiasm and research efforts in studying emotion in human information processing, we still know very little about the relationship between linguistic structure and emotion and even less about the role that language plays in mediating between cognitive and socio-emotional processes. We would like to know if affect cues from the verbal channel play the same roles as visual cues. How do affect cues from verbal and nonverbal channels interact in conveying affective information? Which parts of the linguistic system can serve affective functions? How does this vary cross-linguistically and across speech communities? These are among the many questions that need to be investigated.

In linguistic research on the expression of affect, there have been four major research orientations. The first grows out of the Prague functional-

istic perspective, represented by Jakobson (1960) and Stankiewicz (1964). These studies discuss the emotive functions of language and provide some examples of grammatical features that carry out these functions in different languages.

A second research orientation centers on the study of intonation. Bolinger (1948; 1978; 1982), Cruttendon (1981), Crystal (1969), Halliday (1975), Lieberman and Sag (1974) and others have devoted considerable attention to investigating the interaction of pitch and the conventional expression of different attitudes and feelings, such as surprise, restrained surprise, excitement and doubt.

A third research orientation focuses on narrative and other performance genres, such as plays and poetry. Bakhtin (1981) and Burke (1962), for example, have examined the many ways in which speakers/writers shape and color their messages to create a particular mood or to impact an audience in a particular way. In addition, sociolinguistic approaches to narrative discourse structure (cf. Labov, 1984; Labov and Waletzky, 1967; Labov and Fanshel, 1977; Schiffrin, 1987; Tannen 1982; 1987) have included affective reactions and evaluations as critical to the analysis of narrative structure. Labov (1984) has extended this research by focusing on linguistic features that index emotional intensity in narrative contexts.

Finally, a fourth research direction in the linguistic study of affect derives from research in child language development. Developmentalists have documented affect features that distinguish talk to children as a particular speech register in many speech communities. Ferguson (1956; 1964; 1977; 1982) has provided a comprehensive framework for considering the systematic patterning of affect in 'Baby Talk' register. Other researchers have begun documenting the acquisition of children's comprehension and production of lexical and grammatical expression of affect (see among others Bloom, i.p.; Bretherton and Beeghly, 1982; Clancy, 1986; Cruttendon, 1982; Dunn and Kendrick, 1982; Miller, 1986; Miller and Sperry, 1987; Ochs, 1986; Schieffelin, 1986; i.p.). These studies indicate that at the earliest stages of language development, children display competence in using affective terms and grammatical constructions to express feelings, moods, dispositions and attitudes. We can conclude from these studies, that from the child's point of view, expressive and referential functions of language are acquired in an integrated fashion, of a piece.

The linguistic expression of affect

Having proposed that affect features in language participate in a specific psychological process and provided an overview of the linguistic study of

affect, we turn now to linguistic resources used to express affect across languages. Linguistic resources for expressing affect include not only the lexicon but grammatical and discourse structures as well. Domains of grammar and discourse associated with affect are represented in Fig. 1.

Pronouns

First person:

Kaluli: *nelo*: 'to me' – appeal, *niba* 'I not you' – assertive
 Samoan: *ita* 'poor me', *sina* 'poor my' – sympathy
 Hawaiian: *ku'u* 'my' – affectionate
 Japanese: male and female pronouns vary in intimacy

Second person:

Spanish, French, Italian etc.: t/v pronouns – intimacy/distance, respect/disrespect
 Japanese: pronouns used by male speakers vary in affect
 Samoan: *ise* – anger

Third person:

Italian: *questo, quello, questa, quella* – can be used for negative affect towards humans, *lui, lei* – can be used for positive affect towards objects.
 English: *she, her, he, him* – in presence of referent can express negative affect

Reflexive:

Spanish: *se* – intensification e.g. *se lo comió todo* 'she ate it all up'
 Italian: *se* – intensification e.g. *se lo mangio tutto* 'she eats it all up'

Determiners

Samoan: *si* 'the dear' (sing.), *nai* 'the dear' (pl.) – sympathy determiner

Mood

Dyirbal: *-bila* – possible event has unpleasant or undesirable consequences
 Japanese: conditional *ba* – speaker hopes situation will be true vs *to/tara* – negative attitude/warnings
 English: *if only* – speaker has positive attitude

Tense/aspect

English: *-ing* progressive stative – increase dynamism, vividness, e.g. 'I am missing you terribly'

Verb voice

Thai, Japanese: adversative passive
 English: 'get' passive, e.g. 'he got stabbed'
 Malagasy: active voice – confrontative, passive and circumstantial voice – polite

Casemarking

Spanish: dative – intensify involvement, affect e.g. *mi hijo no me come nada* 'my son won't eat anything for me'
 Italian: dative – intensify involvement, affect e.g. *non mi mangia niente* 'he doesn't eat anything for me'

Number/gender/animacy marking

Russian, Polish: plural inflection for single referent – emphasis
 Russian: feminine gender of NP – more incriminatory, more emotional weight, e.g. (speaking to a man) *dura* 'fool'
 Russian: animate marking for inanimate referent – humor, affection, negative or sarcastic effects

Other particles/affixes

Japanese: sentence-final particles emphasize strength, *zo, ze* or softness associated with male/female demeanor *wa, no*
 Samoan: *mai, atu* – deictic particles, intensifiers *a, ia, fo'i* – intensifiers *e* – intensifier, negative affect
 Kinyarwanda: diminutive/augmentative noun affixes to convey positive or negative affect, e.g. *-gi-* in *i-gi-kobwa* 'my beloved girl' *we, ye, yehe, he* – intensifying particles.
 Wolof: *de, daal, waay, kat, kay* – intensifiers
 Kaluli: suffixes on verbs, sentence particles, e.g. *-lodo* 'sadness' *-life* – intensifiers of negative directives
-a-, -a:ya-, -bala-, -bale, -sa:la- – emphasis, intensity
-a, -o intimacy marker added to personal names, kinterms
 Classical Greek: *me* – clause initial or after initial item, emotional tone, also anticipatory adversative
 Italian (Roman): *ao* – negative affect, e.g. *ao ma che sei matto?! 'hey are you crazy?!'*
-etto, -etta 'sweet little'
-ino, -ina 'young, small'
-accio, -accia 'bad, nasty'
-uccio, -uccia 'somewhat positive but not too much', e.g. *caruccia* 'somewhat pretty' (f)
-otto, -otta 'jolly' can be affectionate
-one augmentative, e.g. *professorone* 'very good medical doctor'
 Spanish (regional): *-in, -ino, -ico, -illo, -uco* – diminutives, positive affect
-on, -aco, -azo – augmentatives, derogatory
-ucho, -uelo, -zuelo – diminutives, derogatory
-uzo, -acho – derogatory
re (que) (te), super-, -esimo, -isismo – adjectival intensifiers
 Nahuatl: honorific affixes on nouns, e.g. *tzin* – diminutive, affectionate, not on 1st person pronouns

Reduplication

Wolof: *lu bari* 'a lot' vs *lu bari-bari* 'a lot'

Phonology

Intonation:

English: e.g. stylized low-rise as in I'm _{com}ing

Voice quality:

Tuvaluan: choppy speech – excited, used to report others' speech monotone – planned, calm, used to report own speech
 Samoan: loudness, lengthening, stress, glottal stop – intensifier
 Kinyarwanda: vowel lengthening – intensify feeling

Sound repetition:

alliteration

Sound symbolism:

English: /fl/, /sn/ e.g., *flip, flap, sniff* etc.

Italian: /sh/ can be intensifier/deintensifier e.g., *shtupido* 'stupid', *ti shpaka la testa* 'I crack your head,' *ti dishtruggo* 'I'll destroy you', *shciafi* 'slaps'

Samoan: fronting – refinement, backing – earthiness

Lexicon

interjections

response cries; threat startles, revulsion sounds, strain grunts, pain cries, sexual moans, floor cues, etc.

descriptive terms vs personal names for humans:

Tuvaluan: descriptive terms – sarcasm, treated like object

Malagasy: personal names – wishing evil, nomen omen

archaic terms – solemn tones or irony

respect vocabulary

praise names, e.g., '*the one who does not hesitate to act*'

nicknames, truncated names, gossip names, deviant forms of kinterms

Verb variants:

Spanish: *ser* vs *estar* e.g., *es bonito* 'it's pretty' vs *está bonito* 'how pretty it is'

graded sets:

Samoan: *aua* 'don't ...' *soia* 'cut it out!'

Wolof: *dara, darra, tuus, gatt* 'nothing' ... 'absolutely nothing'

Word order

Hawaiian: preposed demonstrative conveys either positive or negative affect e.g., postposed demonstrative *nei* 'affection'

Discourse structure

code-switching:

taboo words

dialects to intensify, e.g., use Prague dialect in literacy Czech

baby talk register to pets and lovers in certain societies

couplets

repetition of own/other's utterances

affective speech acts/activities:

teasing, begging, apologizing, oaths, praises, insults, compliments, assessments, complaints, accusations, blessings, joking, shaming, ridiculing, hortatives, laments, placations, etc.

Figure 1. Examples of linguistic expression of affect

Pragmatic properties of affect markers

1. Affect intensifiers and specifiers

The features listed in Fig. 1 serve two basic affective functions:

1. That of modulating the affective intensity of utterances (affect intensifiers; Besnier, 1989; Labov, 1984; Ochs, 1986)
2. That of specifying particular affective orientations of utterances, such as pleasant surprise, pity, or irritation (affect specifiers; Ochs, 1986)

Labov (1984) considers the use of perfect tense and quantifiers as affect intensifiers in English. These features are part of a larger category of grammatical structure that can augment or diminish the intensity of affect. This category includes such structures as word order, right and left dislocation, tense-aspect marking, emphatic particles and affixes, adverbs, reversals in nominal inflections for gender, number and animacy, reduplication, repetition, intonation and a variety of other prosodic devices. In our research, it appears that there are more linguistic structures functioning as affective intensifiers than as affective specifiers.

As affective specifiers, we would expect widespread use of the lexicon. Surprisingly, however, structures at all levels of grammar are resources for specifying affect. Common affect specifiers across languages include verb voice (e.g. the adversative passive in Japanese and Thai; the active voice to indicate negative affect in Malagasy), affixes (e.g. the elaborate nominal suffixes in Italian expressing positive and negative affect such as *-ino, -etto, -accio, -uccio, -otto, -one*; the extensive verbal suffixes in Kaluli expressing annoyance, sadness, surprise and support; in Japanese and Dyjirbal, affixes that encode positive or negative orientations to a possible future event), particles (e.g., in Samoan, particles used to convey negative affect), determiners (e.g., in Samoan, the sympathy-marked determiner), conjunctions (e.g., the 'if only' conjunction in English to signal positive affect to some possible event or situation), intonation, and voice quality.

From this cross-linguistic research, it appears that linguistic structures more often specify a range of affective meanings than pinpoint a precise affective meaning. Thus, many structures simply encode 'positive affect' (which may cover happiness, excitement, love, sympathy) or 'negative affect' (which may cover sadness, worry, anger, disappointment). One implication of this finding is that affect tends to be specified syntagmatically through co-occurring or emergent features in talk, gesture, facial expression and other semiotic systems.

2. Affect keys

Linguistic features that intensify or specify affect function as 'affect keys' (cf. Hymes, 1972; Gumperz, 1977). Affect keys index that an affective frame or a process of affective intensification is in play. Affect keys may index anger, sarcasm, disappointment, sadness, pleasure, humor, or surprise, coarseness, and gentleness, among many other affective meanings.

Affect keys vary in their scope of influence within and across clauses. They may operate on:

1. A referent
2. A proposition
3. A sequence of propositions

Affect keys that operate on referents expressed through noun phrases abound in Yiddish, where curses and blessings key particular attitude towards an entity referred to by a noun phrase (cf. Matisoff's (1979) detailed study of psycho-ostensives in Yiddish):

- (1a) *Mayn shver, a krenk zol im arayn in di yasles ...*
'My father-in-law, may a disease enter his gums ...'
(1b) *Mayn zun, zol er zayn gesunt un shtark, vet mir dos shikn aher.*
'My son, may he be healthy and strong, will send it here to me.'
(1c) *Governer Reygn, zol er oysgemekt vern, git mayn zun dem profesor, a gezunt tsu im, keyn hesofe nit hayyor.*
'Governor Reagan, may he be erased, isn't giving any raise this year to my son the professor, a health to him.'

As Matisoff points out, these expressions 'leave no doubt about the speaker's psychic attitudes toward the various parties to the action' (1979: 5). Equally lovely examples of affect keys that operate on referents abound in Turkish, as discussed by Tannen and Oztek (1977).

Affect keys that operate on a proposition are illustrated in examples (2a-2d) below:

- (2a) *Dem kumendikn zumer vel ikh, im yirtse hashem, farbrengen afn breg-yam.*
'I'll spend next summer at the seashore, if God wills it.' (Matisoff, 1979: 46)
(2b) Terry: THAT'S NOT DAYDREAMING! ... darn it!
Frank: [(laughter)
(Tannen, 1986: 38)
(2c) E: AW::righ ty I don'know what Bt:me izit, I-I=
N: [(allri-)
E: =woke up et s::six this mo:rnin g=
N: [Oh: my G*od
(Drew, 1984: 144)
(2d) G: I thought (.) God dammit I thought I got in
love with this broad you know,
(Jefferson, 1984: 350)

Example (3) illustrates affect keys that operate on a sequence of propositions:

- (3a) *Forzamt di ban, ongevorn di gesheftn, a brokh, a kog, a yomer, a gevalt!*
'Missed the train, ruined the business deal, what a calamity, what a debacle, what a kettle of fish, what a crock!' (Matisoff, 1979: 14)

Affect keys that operate on sequences of propositions are characteristic

of narrative openers and closings. For example, in many languages, narratives often open with expressions such as 'I'm so excited' or 'I'm really upset' or 'Poor me' or 'Oh no!'. These utterances serve as an affective frame for the story that follows. Responses to 'How are you?' in a greeting sequence can also act as affect keys that frame a story or description that follows. For example, responses such as 'I'm a little down' or 'Not too good' may indicate to the hearer an affective orientation towards subsequent events described by the speaker.

Examples (3b) and (3c) illustrate how sympathy-marked first person pronouns in Samoan often preface a story. These pronouns (*ka, ka ika*) indicate to hearers how the speaker feels towards the events that follow and attempt to elicit that affect (sympathy) from hearers.

- (3b) F: Uhhh (PAUSE) *sa'o aa le mea ga ka*
right emph ART thing that I-dear
popole ai le lo'omakua le tagi
worry PRO ART oldwoman ART cry
'Uhhh (PAUSE) it's true that the thing poor me worried about was the old woman crying'

L: *Kalofa e sh*
pity emph emph
'what a pity'

- (3c) F: *Ka ika ia agagei (PAUSE)*
I-dear emph just before
'Poor me earlier today.'

L: *Ko'a e alofa kele*
just ? love much
'Oh, you're full of love.'

F: *Ioe.*
Yes
'yes.'

Examples (3b) and (3c) along with (2c) illustrate that affect keys can operate not only within the turn of a single speaker, but across speakers' turns as well. In (3a) and (3b), one speaker provides an affect frame for the sequence of clauses produced by the previous speaker. In (2c), one speaker keys affect for a proposition expressed by the previous speaker.

Certain response cries (Goffman, 1981) may also function as affect operators on sequences of propositions. For example, those response cries characterized as 'floor cues' function in this manner. Cries, such as 'Good

God!' uttered while reading a newspaper, encourage listeners to ask for information that will clarify the cry (Goffman, 1981: 106).

Affect keys abound in highly formal or ritual events as well as in the informal contexts illustrated thus far. Affect keys often serve as boundary markers that initiate or terminate events with a certain affective tone, such as solemnity or joyfulness. In ritual events, affect keys are often formulaic and highly salient.

3. Keys as affective comments

Another way to treat the relation between an affect key and the informational construction it modifies is to consider the affect key as a *comment* and the construction as its *topic*. In (1a), the affective expression *a krenk zol im arayn in di yasles* 'may a disease enter his gums' constitutes an affective comment on the referent expressed in the NP *mayn shver* 'my father-in-law'. In (2a), *im yirtse hashem* 'if God wills it' is an affective comment on the topic *dem kumendikn zumer verl ikh farbrengen afn breg-yam* 'I'll spend next summer at the seashore'. In (2b) 'darn it' is an affective comment on the clausal topic 'that's not daydreaming'. In (3a), *a brokh, a kog, a yomer, a gevalt* 'what a calamity, what a debacle, what a kettle of fish, what a crock' are affective comments on the sequence *forzamt di ban, ongevorn di gesheftn* 'missed the train, ruined the business deal'. Similarly, in (3c) speaker L's utterance *ko'a e alofa kele* 'Oh, you're full of love' is an affective comment on an entire narrative sequence.

This way of looking at affect indicates that topic-comment is not a unitary relation. While preserving the notion that 'topic' constitutes old information and a center of attention or *leitmotif* (Givón, 1979) and 'comment' constitutes newer information about that topic, we suggest that any one clause may evidence a plurality of topic-comment relations. Here we have identified a kind of topic-comment relation in which a referent, proposition or propositional sequence may constitute the topic of *affective* new information. Such affective topic-comment relations may co-occur with other types of topic-comment relations, which have yet to be lineated in the literature. In certain cases, the topics of affective and non-affective comments are the same, as in (1a), (1b), and (1c). In other cases, the topics differ, as in examples (2a)–(3c). For example, in (2d) 'I' constitutes the topic of the comment 'thought God dammit I got in love with this broad you know', whereas the proposition expressed as 'I got in love with this broad you know' appears to be the topic addressed by the affective comment 'God dammit'.

4. Ordering of affect keys

Affect keys may appear in three positions with respect to constructions they modify: antecedently, concurrently and subsequently.

Initiators

Let us call 'affect initiators' those affect keys that appear before the referents, propositions, or sequences of propositions they modify. This ordering is visualized below:

	referent
KEY	proposition
	sequence

Initiators provide an affective frame for interpreting and evaluating information expressed in a construction that follows. Interjections, hortatives and other formulaic expressions are frequently used as initiators as are address terms, adjectives, adverbs and determiners. Example (4) shows an interjection in Kaluli (Papua New Guinea) used as an initiator:

- (4) *Heyo!* Ge ga andoma
 sorry you woman none
 'SORRY! You have no woman!'

Concurrents

Affect keys that appear simultaneously with the expression of the referent, proposition or sequence of propositions they modify we call 'affect concurrents'. This relation is represented below:

KEY
referent
proposition
sequence

The category of affect concurrents draws on possibly the widest range of phonological, morphological, syntactic, and lexical constructions. A common way of expressing an affective key concurrently in many languages is through intonation, voice quality, or other phonological devices such as sound symbolism. Other frequently used concurrents are affect particles and verbal and nominal affixes. As noted earlier, these elements may act as affect intensifiers or they may specify a particular type of affect. For example, example (5), taken from Kaluli, includes an affect suffix (*-lo:do:*) on the verb that specifies how the speaker feels about the proposition expressed.

- (5) Ha:na:nolo:do:
go 2P FUT AFFECT SUFFIX
'Sadly enough you're going'

Further affect concurrents include such morphological and syntactic phenomena as tense-aspect marking, nominal inflections for gender, animacy and number, determiners, quantifiers, adverbials, conjunctions, verb voice, mood and word order. For example, in Black English Vernacular and certain other dialects of English, the particle *done* serves as a marker of perfect aspect and/or as an affect intensifier as illustrated in (6) below.

- (6) ... and done got the nerve to lie to me ... talkin' 'bout he went to the office.
(Labov, 1984: 47)

In Russian and other Slavic languages, animate marking in noun phrases referring to inanimate referents may convey a variety of affective dispositions, including humor, affection, or sarcasm (Stankiewicz, 1964). In Russian, the reversal of masculine and feminine gender-marking carries more emotional intensity than their unmarked counterparts. Similarly, the use of plural marking for singular referents is strongly emotive (Stankiewicz, 1964: 243).

The use of verb voice to convey affect concurrently with the expression of a proposition is found in a number of languages, most notably Thai, Japanese, and Malagasy. As noted earlier, in Thai and Japanese, the passive voice is typically associated with unpleasant or adversative dispositions towards an event. Indeed, in Thai, propositions of a positive nature (from the speaker's point of view) are not acceptable in the passive voice (Kwachka et al., 1973; Noss, 1964). Thus, a statement such as 'The teacher praised her' is unacceptable in the passive except if it is meant as ironic, i.e. that the teacher spoke badly about the girl. In Malagasy, passive and circumstantial voices are the norm, and active voice is viewed as overly direct, confrontative, and rude (Keenan (Ochs), 1976).

Terminators

The third ordering of keys and the constructions they modify consists of a construction followed by an affective key. We call keys in this position 'affect terminators':

referent
proposition KEY
sequence

Affect terminators draw on the same pool of linguistic resources as affect initiators, i.e. interjections, formulaic expressions, hortatives, address terms, adverbs, adjectives, and so on. Additionally, they may use certain

linguistic features that function as concurrents such as sentential particles. Illustrations of affect terminators appear in examples (1a-1c), (2a-2c), and (3a-3c).

Given the multifunctionality of language (Duranti, 1987), it is important to note that any one affect marker in context can serve not only as an initiator, a concurrent, or a terminator but in more than one of these positions at the same time. A key that provides affective information concurrently about a referent or a proposition may additionally help to key how a speaker or others feel about antecedent or subsequent propositions. Consider example (3b), taken from Samoan, which illustrates the use of the sympathy-marked first person clitic pronoun (*ka* 'poor me'). In this context, the affect construction serves as a concurrent, keying sympathy for the first person referent (a concurrent) and at the same time, the construction serves as an initiator, helping to set up an affective frame for the subsequent proposition and others that comprise the narrative told.

Affect initiators and affect terminators can be produced by the same speaker who refers to the topic referent, proposition, or sequence of propositions (that is, they can be self-produced), or they can be produced by some other interlocutor (that is, they can be other-produced). Examples (1a-1c), (2a, 2b), and (3a) illustrate self-produced terminators. Examples (2c), (3b), and (3c) illustrate other-produced terminators. In example (2b), Frank's laughter also functions as an other-produced affective terminator, framing the talk that precedes it.

Coda

The perspective on linguistic expression of affect that we have adopted here is rooted in the notion of social referencing, whereby interactants seek out affective information from significant others in their social environment to better understand and respond to uncertain information. Social referencing is a critical process not only in infancy but throughout the lifespan of all members of society. Social referencing makes possible cooperation and communication in all spheres of social life. Interpretations of political actions and subsequent political moves are based as much on the affective manner in which those actions are performed as on the actions themselves. Political strategists try to analyze whether a move is bluff or a real threat and formulate policy based on their assessments. In many societies, friendships and other intimate relationships also depend on individuals' abilities to seek out, recognize, and respond appropriately to their partners' feelings about a given situation. In all

societies, members must be attentive to the affective keys provided by others. These keys often define social contexts and are the basis for successful participation in those contexts.

Languages of the world are responsive to this fundamental human need to express and assess affect. Further, they are responsive at all levels of linguistic structure. One cannot argue for a clean division of labor between areas of grammar assigned to logical and affective functions. One cannot argue, for example, that syntax exclusively serves logical functions while affective functions are carried out by intonation and the lexicon. Affect permeates the entire linguistic system. Almost any aspect of the linguistic system that is variable is a candidate for expressing affect. In other words, language has a heart as well as a mind of its own.

References

- Bahktin, M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination*. In M. Holquist, (ed.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Besnier, N. (1989). Conflict management, gossip, and affective meaning on Nukulaelae. In *Disentangling: The Discourse of Conflict and Therapy in Pacific Cultures*, K. Watson-Gegeo and G. White (eds.), Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bloom, L. (In press). Developments in expression: affect and speech. In *Psychological and Biological Approaches to Emotion*, N. Stein, B. Levinthal, T. Trabasso (eds.), Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bolinger, D. (1948). The intonation of accosting questions. *English Studies* 29: 109–114.
- (1978). Intonation across languages. In *Universals of Human Language II*. In J.H. Greenberg et al., (eds.), 471–524, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- (1982). Intonation and its parts. *Language* 58: 505–533.
- Brenneis, D. (1987). Dramatic gestures: the Fiji Indian pancayat as therapeutic discourse. *Papers in Pragmatics* 1: 55–78.
- Bretherton, I. and Beeghly, M. (1982). Talking about internal states: the acquisition of an explicit theory of mind. *Developmental Psychology* 18: 906–921.
- Buhler, K. (1934). *Sprachtheorie*. Jena: Fisher.
- Burke, K. (1962). *A Grammar of Motives and a Rhetoric of Motives*. Cleveland: The World Publishing Co.
- Campos, J. and Stenberg, C. (1981). Perception, appraisal and emotion: the onset of social referencing. In *Infant Social Cognition*, M.E. Lamb, L.R. Sherrod (eds.), Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Clancy, P. (1986). The acquisition of Japanese. In *Cross-Linguistic Studies of Language Acquisition*, D. Slobin, (ed.), Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cruttendon, A. (1981). Falls and rises: Meanings and universals. *Journal of Linguistics* 17: 77–92.
- Crystal, D. (1969). *Prosodic Systems and Intonation in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Darwin, C. (1965). *The Expression of Emotion in Man and Animals*. Chicago: University Chicago Press.
- Drew, P. (1984). Speakers' reportings in invitation sequences. In *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.), 129–151, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dunn, J. and Kendrick, C. (1982). The speech of two and three year olds to infant siblings. *Journal of Child Language* 9: 579–595.
- Duranti, A. (1987). Four properties of speech-in-interaction and the notion of translocutionary act. Paper presented at the Linguistics Society of America Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California.
- Eibl-Eibesfeldt, I. (1980). Strategies of social interaction. In *Emotion: Theory, Research and Experience*, R. Plutchik, M. Kellerman (eds.), 57–80, New York: Academic Press.
- Ekman, P. (1984). Expression and the nature of emotion. In *Approaches to Emotion* K.R. Scherer, P. Ekman (eds.), 319–343, Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Feinman, S. (In press). Social referencing in infancy. *Merrill Palmer Quarterly*.
- Ferguson, C. (1956). Arabic baby talk. In *For Roman Jakobson*, M. Halle (ed.), The Hague: Mouton.
- (1964). Baby talk in six languages. *American Anthropologist* 66: 103–114.
- (1977). Baby talk as a simplified register. In *Talking to Children*, C. Snow, C. Ferguson (eds.), New York: Cambridge University Press.
- (1982). Simplified registers and linguistic theory. In *Exceptional Language and Linguistics*, L. Obler, L. Menn (eds.), 29–66, New York: Academic Press.
- Givón, T. (1979). *On Understanding Grammar*. New York: Academic Press.
- Goffman, E. (1978). Response cries. *Language* 54: 787–815. [reprinted in *Forms of Talk*, 1981, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.]
- Gumperz, J. 1977. Sociocultural knowledge in conversational inference. In *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics*, M. Saville-Troike (ed.), Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 191–212.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1975). *Learning How to Mean*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hinde, R.A. (ed.) 1972. *Non-Verbal Communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hymes, D. (1972). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*, J. Gumperz, D. Hymes (eds.), 35–71, New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.
- Irvine, J. (1982). Language and affect: Some cross-cultural issues. In *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics*, H. Byrnes. (ed.) Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Izard, C. (1984). Emotion-cognition relationships and human development. In *Emotions, Cognition and Behavior*, C. Izard, J. Kagan, R. Zajonc (eds.), 17–37, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jakobson, R. (1960). Linguistics and poetics. In *Style in Language*, T.A. Sebeok (ed.), 350–377, Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Jefferson, G. (1984). On the organization of laughter in talk about troubles. In *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, J.M. Atkinson, J. Heritage (eds.), 346–369, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keenan (Ochs), E. (1976). On the universality of conversational implicatures. *Language in Society* 5: 67–80.
- Klinnert, M. (1978). *Facial expressions and social referencing*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Denver.
- Klinnert, M., Campos, J.J., Sorce, J.F., Emde, R.N., Svejda, M. (1983). Emotions as behavior regulators: Social referencing in infancy. In *Emotion: Theory, Research and Experience*, R. Plutchik, M. Kellerman (eds.), 257–285, New York: Academic Press.

- Kwachka, P., Schieffelin, B.B., Reed, G. (1973). Group B was praised by the teacher: A preliminary survey of active and passive norms in Thai-Lue. Unpublished ms.
- Labov, W. (1984). Intensity. In *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics*, D. Schiffrin (ed.), 43–70, Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Labov, W. and Fanshel, D. (1977). *Therapeutic Discourse*. New York: Academic Press.
- Labov, W. and Waletzky, J. (1967). Narrative analysis: Oral versions of personal experience. In *Essays on Verbal and Visual Arts*, J. Helm (ed.), 12–44, Seattle: University of Washington Press for the American Ethnological Society.
- Lieberman, M. and Sag, I. (1974). Prosodic form and discourse function. *Chicago Linguistics Society* 10: 416–427.
- Lutz, C. (1985). Ethnopsychology compared to what: Explaining behavior and consciousness among the Ifaluk. In *Person, Self and Experience*, G. White, J. Kirkpatrick (eds.), 35–79, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lutz, C. and White, G. (1986). *The Anthropology of Emotions. Annual Review of Anthropology*, vol. 15, B. Siegel, A. Beals, S. Tyler (eds.), 405–436, Palo Alto: Annual Reviews Inc.
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*, vol. 1. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- McLean, P. (1978). The evolution of three mentalities. In *Human Evolution: Biosocial Perspectives*, 32–57, Menlo Park: Benjamin/Cummings.
- Matisoff, J. (1979). *Blessings, Curses, Hopes and Fears: Psycho-Ostensive Expressions in Yiddish*. Philadelphia: ISHI.
- Miller, P. (1986). Teasing as language socialization and verbal play in a White working-class community. In *Language Socialization Across Cultures*, B.B. Schieffelin, E. Ochs, (eds.), 199–212, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Miller, P. and Sperry, L. (1987). The socialization of anger and aggression. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly* 33 (1): 1–31.
- Noss, Richard. (1964). *Thai Reference Grammar*. Washington, D.C.: Foreign Service Institute.
- Ochs, E. (1986). From feelings to grammar. In *Language Socialization Across Cultures*. B.B. Schieffelin, E. Ochs (eds.), 251–272, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (1988). *Culture and Language Development: Language Acquisition and Language Socialization in a Samoan Village*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ploog, F. (1984). *The Behavioral Development of Free-Living Chimpanzee Babies and Infants*. Norwood, N.J: Ablex.
- Rosaldo, M. (1980). *Knowledge and Passion: Ilongot Notions of Self and Social Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sapir, E. (1949). *Selected Writings of Edward Sapir in Language, Culture and Personality*, ed. D. Mandelbaum. Berkeley: University California Press.
- Schieffelin, B.B. (1986). Teasing and shaming in Kaluli children's interactions. In *Language Socialization Across Cultures*, B.B. Schieffelin, E. Ochs (eds.), 165–181, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- (in press). *The Give and Take of Everyday Life: Language Socialization of Kaluli Children*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schieffelin, E.L. (1983). Anger and shame in the tropical forest. *Ethos* 11: 181–191.
- Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stankiewicz, E. (1964). Problems of emotive language. In *Approaches to Semiotics*, T.A. Sebeok, A.S. Hayes, M.G. Bateson (eds.) The Hague: Mouton.
- Tannen, D. (1982). Oral and literate strategies in spoken and written narratives. *Language* 58(1): 1–21.
- (1987). The orality of literature and the literacy of conversation. In *Language, Literacy and Culture: Issues of Society and Schooling*, J. Langer (ed.), Norwood: Ablex.

Tannen, D. and Oztek, P.C. (1977). Health to our mouths: Formulaic expressions in Greek and Turkish. In *Proceedings of the third annual Berkeley linguistic society*, K. Whistler et al. (eds.), 516–534, Berkeley: University of California.

Elinor Ochs is Professor of Linguistics at the University of Southern California. She received her Ph.D. in anthropology at the University of Pennsylvania in 1974. She has conducted field research in the Malagasy Republic, Western Samoa, and the United States and has written on language variation, acquisition, and socialization, often in collaboration with B. Schieffelin. Ochs has been a Guggenheim Fellow and has been supported by the National Science Foundation, National Institute of Child Health and Development, and National Endowment for the Humanities.

Bambi Schieffelin is Associate Professor of Anthropology at New York University. She received her Ph.D. in anthropology at Columbia University in 1979. She has carried out extensive field research in Papua New Guinea and among Asian minority communities in the city of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Schieffelin's research centers on language acquisition and language socialization. She has authored numerous articles and is currently writing a book on language socialization among the Kaluli of Papua New Guinea. Schieffelin together with Ochs has co-authored *Acquiring Conversational Competence* and co-edited *Developmental Pragmatics and Language Socialization Across Cultures*.