

Anthropology 4:

# Culture and Communication

Professor Alessandro Duranti

Winter 2020

Lecture 1: Introduction to the course

# Today

1. General information about the course
2. Goals and themes of the course.
3. Introduction to Linguistic Anthropology

## General Information about this course

1. This course counts as a GE course in the SOCIAL SCIENCES.
2. It is the first in the **linguistic anthropology** series.
3. Linguistic anthropology is **one of the 4 traditional subfields of anthropology** as practiced in the U.S. and Canada.

4 traditional branches of anthropology in U.S.

- 1. Biological** (formerly physical) anthropology
- 2. Sociocultural** anthropology (formerly Ethnology)
- 3. Linguistic** anthropology
- 4. Archaeological** anthropology

# Organization of course & Participation

Your instructor and the lectures

The TAs and the sections

Questions and comments - use “Chat”.

The audience as co-author – engage with questions raised by Instructor and your T.A.

Classroom etiquette – show your face if you can, mute audio unless told otherwise.

## Readings:

1. **A. Duranti** (2008) *Linguistic Anthropology : A Reader. Second Edition.* Wiley-Blackwell. [selected chapters, also available as pdf's on class website]
2. **Robin Conley** (2016) *Confronting the Death Penalty: How Language Influences Jurors in Capital Cases.* Oxford University Press.
3. A few articles & chapters posted on the class website to help you clarify some concepts found in the two books.

# Questions during & after Lectures

If you have a question about the readings or the lectures, use the “Chat” in Zoom. Write to your T.A. who can let me know or respond later during the meeting of your section. I welcome requests for clarifications or topic-relevant comments. I might also elicit questions during my lectures to check whether I am being understood and to get you intellectually involved in a topic or issue.

You should also feel free to write to me **via email** ([aduranti@anthro.ucla.edu](mailto:aduranti@anthro.ucla.edu)) if you have questions about the lectures or the assignments.

# Professional development & Intellectual Curiosity

Know the **names** of the **authors** and the **titles** of their **books or articles**

What kind of anthropologist/linguist/sociologist/etc. is the Author?

What other books did the Author write?

What are the topics and issues the Author has been focusing on?

What methods did the Author use?

## Grading

There will be 6 assignments based on concepts and methods covered in readings and class lectures. Your grade will be based on the total points you have in 5 out of 6 assignments (we will discard the lowest score, including “zero” for not completing an assignment in time).

No midterm.

The last assignment will count as our “final.”

# Break

Questions?

## 2. Goals of the course

1. Define Linguistic Anthropology, its Object of Study, Methods, and Goals.
2. Demonstrate what we gain from an anthropological study of linguistic phenomena.

3. Become an expert on language as a human faculty that empowers speakers to communicate, learn, perform all kinds of joint tasks, and be part of one or more (speech) communities.
4. Gain the **analytical tools** needed to capture language in the stream of interaction, produce transcripts, interpret them by means of ethnography and placing them in the “**context of situation**,” and propose theories about what people **do** with language and other semiotic codes as well as about what language itself **does** (for and to people).
5. Understand in what ways language is typically a **non-neutral medium**.

# Main themes of the Course

The use of language(s) and their implications.

The **influence** of the language we use on our thinking, doing, and feeling used to be called the issue of “linguistic relativity.” We will reframe it as the issue of the “agency” of speakers vs. agency of languages.

Agency is here used as a variant of “power” or “force”.

What properties of languages give them agency (power, force)?

# Why do anthropologists study languages?

Goal: We study languages to gain an understanding of their speakers' ways of thinking, acting and feeling. (Related to but different from Linguistics)

Assumption: languages in general and particular uses of languages in context reveal something about their users, their ways of thinking, acting and feeling.

Implications: By using languages to know (about) their speakers', we also learn about particular properties of languages.

### 3. Introduction to Linguistic Anthropology

Was born in the U.S. and Canada with the study of American Indian/Native American languages (sponsored by the Federal Government)

Focus on **spoken** language, less interest in **written** languages

(There are exceptions, e.g., Mayan languages, which were written before contact with Europeans, are studied by linguists and archaeologists working in Mesoamerica).



Mayan glyphs, from *Dresden Codex*

# Break

Questions? Comments?

# 2 ways of studying indigenous languages

1. Starting in the late 16th century, missionaries wrote grammars and compiled dictionaries for a practical purpose, i.e., to translate the Bible into the languages of the people they wanted to convert.
2. Starting in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, linguistic anthropologists wrote grammars and compiled dictionaries of previously unwritten languages to study the culture of their speakers. The Federal government sponsored these studies for its own practical goals (e.g., document relationship among Indian tribes).

# 1. Missionaries' Grammars

There are excellent grammars written by Christian missionaries starting in the late 16<sup>th</sup> and early 17<sup>th</sup> century all the way to recent times (the Summer Institute of Linguistics is a faith-based organization with broad goals that has been producing grammars and dictionaries).

**Goal:** to convert the natives, translate the Bible.

**Early Method:** use knowledge of European, especially classical languages (Ancient Greek, Latin) to analyze other languages.

**Problem:** impose categories that do not fit the type of language being analyzed.

## Example from a 1603 Grammar

Ludovico Beronio (b. 1552 in Italy – d. 1625 in Peru), a Jesuit missionary, wrote a grammar of **Aymara**, one of the two major languages of Peru (the other one being Quechua).

ARTE  
Y GRAMMATICA  
MUY COPIOSA  
DE LA LENGUA  
AYMARÁ.

*Con muchos, y varios modos de hablar para su  
mayor declaracion, con la tabla delos  
capitulos, y cosas que en ella  
se contienen. &c.*

Compuesta por el P. Ludouico Bertonio Romano de  
la compaňia de Iesu en la Prouincia del  
Pitu, dela India Occidental.



603

En Roma por Luis Zannetti, Año de 1603.

CLAVDIVS AQVAVIV A,  
Societatis Iesu Præpositus Generalis.

CVM hanc Linguae Aymaraicæ regni  
Peruani Grammaticam, a P. Ludouico  
Berthonio, nostræ Societatis Sacerdote  
compositam, nonnulli in ea prouincia eius-  
dem Societatis Sacerdotes, dictæ linguae  
periti recognouerint, ac in lucem edi posse  
probauerint; facultatem concedimus, vt ty-  
pis mandetur, si Reuerendiss. D. Vicesg. &  
Reuerendiss. P. Magistro Sacri Palatij vide-  
bitur. In quorum fidem has literas manu  
nostra subscriptas, & sigillo nostro munitas  
dedimus Romæ XXVIII. Decembris 1602.

Claudius Aquauira.

A 2 De

Bertonio identifies 5 vowels in Aymara, like in Castillian (Spanish)

*Dela Pronunciacion y orthographia.*

**A**s vocales en esta lengua son cinco, como  
en la castellana, que son a, e, i, o, u: pero es  
le sauver que la e, y la i muchas veces son tan se-  
mejantes en la pronunciacion, que apenas se di-  
tinguen. y lo mesmo acontece en la o, y, u, las  
quales muchas veces se pueden poner la vna en  
ugar dela otra: aunque otras veces cada vna  
se distingue muy bien dela otra.

# 3 Aymara Vowels (i, a, u) & Allophones

## *ALFABETO ÚNICO OFICIAL*

### VOCALES:

Anterior **i**  
Cerrada

Semi abierta [e]



**u** Posterior  
Cerrada

[o] Semi abierta

From a 1993  
corrected version of  
Bertonio's 1612  
*Vocabulario de la  
lengua Aymara*

Alargamiento vocálico es /~/: i, ü, ä.

(+) Las vocales i, u, en cercanía de las consonantes q, qh, q', x; tienen sonido alofónico; la i suena como [e] y la u suena como [o].

# Aymara Vowels: 3 Phonemes (i, a, u) & 2 Allophones (e, o) - “assimilation” to place of articulation

After consonants pronounced in the back of the vocal cavity (for example /x/ or /q/), the vowels /i/ is lowered to [e] and the vowel /u/ is lowered to [o]

Fonema	Alófono (s)	
/j/	[h]	
chajitu	[čahitu]	‘destemplarse los dientes por tomar algo demasiado caliente o demasiado frío’
chaxi	[čaxe]	‘resfrío’
aljaña	[alhaña]	‘vender’
alxaña	[alxaña]	‘haber comprado ya’

x is the “ch” of Bach.

Ex. /čaxi/ → čaxe

(p. 33 of *Aymara: Compendio de estructura fonológica grammatical*, available online)

# Missionaries' classical training

European missionaries used their knowledge of the grammar of Ancient Greek and Latin to describe indigenous languages. This allowed them to be comprehensive and sophisticated but they also applied categories that did not much the language type they were studying.

*De los Pronombres segunda Parte  
de la oracion. Cap. 2.*

**L**os Pronombres son de dos maneras, vnos primitiuos como ego, tu, ille &c. otros derivatiuos como meus, tuus, suis noster & vester. Los primitiuos en esta lengua son *Na* vel *naa*, que significa ego. *Huma* tu, *Hupa* ipse, *Vca*, ille, *Cuu* ille mostrandole con el dedo. *aca* iste vel hic, *aquyri* el mas cercano entre muchos, *cuuri* el mas apartado, y todos se declinan como *auqui*. Pero porque ay algo que notar sobre el pronombre *Na* porne su declinacion entera de singular y plural.

Nominatiuo	<i>Na</i> ego
Genitiuo	<i>Nana</i> mei
Datiuo	<i>Nataqui</i> mihi
Accusatiuo	<i>Na</i> e me
Ablatiuo	<i>Nampi</i> mecum

**Plural.**

Nomin.Excl.	<i>Nanaca</i> Hiussa nos
Genit.	<i>Nanacana</i> Hiussana nostri
Datiuo	<i>Nanaca</i> Hiussataq. nobis
Accusat.	<i>taqui</i>
	<i>Nanaca</i> Hiussa como nos
Ablat.	<i>Nanacam</i> Hiussampi. nobiscum

pi.

Lo

B

**L**o que ay que notar acerca deste pronombre primitiuos es; que no siempre que en esta lengua hemos de dezir nos otros, podemos vsar de *nanaca*, sino es menester distinguir dos modos de hablar: porque quando uno habla con otro, o otros, y dice nos otros sauemos, dezimos &c. en aquel pronombre nos otros puede incluir la persona o personas con quien habla, y este es el primer modo de hablar al qual llamaremos inclusivo. el otro modo es quando uno en aquel pronombre nos otros no incluye la persona o personas con quien habla. el qual caso no se puede dar sino quando ay como dos viados, de suerte que fuera del que habla aya otro o otros que sean dela misma calidad, o ayan hecho lo mesmo que la persona que habla: y de la otra parte aya una personal o muchas con quien se habla, que ne sea de aquella calidad, o no aya hecho lo mismo que la persona o personas que hablan, al qual modo llamaremos exclusivo. y porque esto importa mucho para la propiedad y claridad del hablar lo explicaremos con algunos exemplos, aduirtiendo primero que quando el pronombre nos otros es exclusivo vsaremos de *nanaca* o de los de mas casos deste plural segun el verbo pidiere: y quando es inclusivo vsaremos de *Hiussa*, que sin la particula *naca* es plural, aunque puede ponerse ornato, y declinarse como qualquiera otro nombre. Sea pues el exemplo verbi gratia si yo hablando con uno, o con muchos dixesse: nos otros. adoramos

# Latin 2<sup>nd</sup> Declination

**Hortus**, *garden*; stem, **hortō-**.      **Bellum**, *war*; stem, **bellō-**.

SINGULAR.

		TERMINATION.		TERMINATION.
<i>Nom.</i>	hortus	-us	bellum	-um
<i>Gen.</i>	hortū	-ī	bellī	-ī
<i>Dat.</i>	hortō	-ō	bellō	-ō
<i>Acc.</i>	hortum	-um	bellum	-um
<i>Voc.</i>	hortē	-e	bellum	-um
<i>Abl.</i>	hortō	-ō	bellō	-ō

PLURAL.

<i>Nom.</i>	hortū	-ī	bella	-a
<i>Gen.</i>	hortōrum	-ōrum	bellōrum	-ōrum
<i>Dat.</i>	hortūs	-īs	bellīs	-īs
<i>Acc.</i>	hortōs	-ōs	bella	-a
<i>Voc.</i>	hortū	-ī	bella	-a
<i>Abl.</i>	hortūs	-īs	bellīs	-īs

## C. Julius Caesar *De bello gallico*

[4] [...] Qua de causa Helvetii quoque reliquos Gallos virtute praecedunt, quod fere cotidianis proeliis cum Germanis contendunt, cum aut suis finibus eos prohibent aut ipsi in eorum finibus **bellum gerunt.**

... for which reason the Helvetii also surpass the rest of the Gauls in valor, as they contend with the Germans in almost daily battles, when they either repel them from their own territories, or themselves wage **war** on their frontiers.

# Samoan grammar 1918: prepositions are treated like “cases” (suffixes) in Latin

## DECLENSION OF PRONOUNS

It might be mentioned that an ablative case can be formed by the use of the preposition *e*, by, through.

### FIRST PERSON SINGULAR

Nom.	'o a'u, 'ou, ta,	I
Gen.	'o a'u, or a a'u,	of me, mine
Dat.	mo a'u, ma a'u (mo'u, or ma'u),	to me
Acc.	ia te a'u,	me
Abl.	e a'u,	by me, through me

### *Dual*

Nom.	'o i tāua,	we two (inclusive)
Gen.	'o i tāua,	of us two (,,)
Dat.	mo i tāua,	to us two (,,)
Acc.	ia te i tāua,	us two (,,)
Abl.	e i tāua,	by us two (,,)
Nom.	'o i māua,	we two (exclusive)
Gen.	'o i māua,	of us two (,,)
Dat.	mo i māua,	to us two (,,)
Acc.	ia te i māua,	us two (,,)
Abl.	e i māua,	by us two (,,)

### *Plural*

Nom.	'o i tātou,	we (inclusive)
Gen.	'o i tātou,	of us (,,)
Dat.	mo i tātou,	to us (,,)
Acc.	ia te i tātou,	us (,,)
Abl.	e i tātou,	by us (,,)

## Correction:

To be consistent with the spelling of the pronoun for 'I' or 'me' a'u [a?u], the word tāua 'we two' should be spelled tā'ua because it has a glottal stop sound [?] in it and pronounced [ta:?ua]

# Samoan grammar 1918

## WORD SYSTEM

### SINGULAR

*Nom.* *'o le fale*, the house.

*Gen.* *o le*, or *a le fale*, of the house.

*Dat.* *mo*, or *ma le fale*, to the house, for, or,  
with the house.

*Acc.* *i le fale*, the house, in the house.

*Voc.* *le fale e!*, house !

## Next Lecture: Boas and Malinowski

We will start from documentation of spoken languages and discuss the practice of transcribing a language.

Focus on two authors: Franz Boas (in the U.S.) and Bronislaw Malinowski (in the U.K.). Boas was German and Malinowski was Polish.

They developed ways of documenting languages as a key aspect of doing anthropology.

The methods they developed had theoretical implications.

# Review

Important differences between:

1. Language (in general, as a human faculty) vs. a language (in particular)
2. Goals of linguistics vs. goals of linguistic anthropology.
3. Grammars of indigenous languages written by missionaries vs. those written by linguists and anthropologists
4. Influence of the study of classical languages on the earlier study of American Indian languages (example: Aymara vowels and personal pronouns). Same use of Latin grammar to describe Samoan in early 1900's.