



## On the relationship of the “Ethnography of speaking” to the “ethnography of communication”

Wendy Leeds-Hurwitz

To cite this article: Wendy Leeds-Hurwitz (1984) On the relationship of the “Ethnography of speaking” to the “ethnography of communication” , Research on Language & Social Interaction, 17:1, 7-32, DOI: [10.1080/08351818409389191](https://doi.org/10.1080/08351818409389191)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351818409389191>



Published online: 21 May 2009.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 43



View related articles [↗](#)



Citing articles: 6 View citing articles [↗](#)

# **On the Relationship of the “Ethnography of Speaking” to the “Ethnography of Communication”**

*Wendy Leeds-Hurwitz*

## **On the Relationship of the “Ethnography of Speaking” to the “Ethnography of Communication”**

*Wendy Leeds-Hurwitz*  
University of Wisconsin-Parkside

Over the past twenty years, two terms, the “ethnography of speaking” and the “ethnography of communication” have been used to refer to a single field of study. It is time to stop a moment, and consider how these names have been employed by researchers in the past, in hopes of achieving greater clarity in the future.

It might be argued that time spent on a consideration of terminology is time wasted, that doing an ethnography (of speaking or of communication) would be far more productive. The present paper assumes a different starting point. In an early discussion concerned with terminology, Dell Hymes, the creator of both phrases, points out:

In the short period since the pattern of the term adopted here was put forward, in the form of the ‘ethnography of speaking’, there has seemed to be a responsiveness among anthropologists not elicited in my experience by such terms as ‘pragmatics’ or hybrids of the parent stock of ‘-linguistics’. It may be that this is an instance of what

Williams (1960:357) states in a more general context as the fact that 'our vocabulary, the language we use to enquire into and negotiate our actions, is no secondary factor, but a practical and radical element in itself. To take a meaning from experience, is in fact our process of growth'. Perhaps to call a concern the ethnography of communication, rather than pragmatics, is for anthropologists no terminological quibble, but an active difference (Hymes 1964c:12):<sup>2</sup>

If it was important in 1964 to deliberate on terminology, it is equally important today to consider what use has been made of the various terms in the intervening years.

The first point to be made is that the "ethnography of speaking" and the "ethnography of communication" are far from the only labels which have been used in referring to a particular approach to the patterned use of communicative resources. Some of the others have been intended essentially as synonyms,<sup>3</sup> some are derivative terms referring to related subjects,<sup>4</sup> some refer to *parts* of the "ethnography of speaking",<sup>5</sup> and some to more than speaking.<sup>6</sup> None of these has so far been granted the widespread use of the "ethnography of speaking" and the "ethnography of communication", although two, the "ethnography of writing" and the "anthropology of communication" have achieved a certain level of currency. I will return to the latter terms at a later point in this paper, but the remaining ones will be ignored, since for the most part they have each been used by only a single author, and have had no real influence on the field.

In addition to a proliferation of names, there is one additional form which has been used to refer to the analytic approach advocated by Dell Hymes, that of "no-naming". Many of the people who engage in research concerned with the ethnographic study of either language or communication do not explicitly label it at all. When the content of their work is considered, these authors are just as significant as any of those

discussed here (if not more so, since many of those included here do not do ethnography but merely refer to the approach). However, within the boundaries of this paper, authors who do not explicitly use the terms "ethnography of speaking" and/or "ethnography of communication" have little place.<sup>7</sup>

There are two aspects of the use of the terms, the "ethnography of speaking" and "ethnography of communication", to consider: their usage by Dell Hymes, and their usage by others. In the first case, since Hymes is the one who called this field of study into being, the way in which he has used its various names is worthy of extensive consideration. Second, since knowing what terms have been proposed is only one part of the story, the way in which others have chosen to use them is the rest.

The obvious place to begin is with the various writings of Dell Hymes. These will be taken chronologically since that will permit us to note changes as they occurred over time. The first article of relevance is "The Ethnography of Speaking" which appeared in 1962.<sup>8</sup> In this article only the phrase "ethnography of speaking" appears; the "ethnography of communication"; has not yet been introduced. To understand why this is the case it is necessary to look both at the definition and at the underlying reason a new approach was proposed at all.

The definition offered in 1962 is the following: "The ethnography of speaking is concerned with all the situations and uses, the patterns and functions, of speaking as an activity in its own right" (1962:16). It appears as though only speaking, and not a broader conception of communication, is being proposed here. The primary reason for this may be found in the logic underlying the felt need for this approach. In specific, the "ethnography of speaking" was designed to fill "the gap between what is usually described in grammars, and what is usually described in ethnographies" (1962:16).<sup>9</sup> Another way of phrasing this is to suggest that Hymes was attempting to encourage

research interest on the part of linguists in speech (*la parole*) as well as language (*la langue*) (1962:45).<sup>10</sup> Looking at the theoretical role which the “ethnography of speaking” was designed to fill, it is easy to understand why that was the term of choice, rather than the “ethnography of communication”.

At the same time, even in this early article, Hymes includes a caveat which would permit a broader interpretation. It appears in the discussion of a communicative event, where Hymes writes: “In discussing it, I shall refer to speech and speaking, but these terms are surrogates for all modes of communication, and a descriptive account should be generalized to comprise all” (1962:24). Note that although Hymes himself does not really speak to the notion of communication and what it would be here, he does imply that the study of communication would be broader than the study of speaking.<sup>11</sup>

Two years after the first programmatic paper, in 1964, there were three relevant publications by Hymes. The most significant of that year is the “Introduction” to “The Ethnography of Communication”, a special issue of the *American Anthropologist* edited by John Gumperz and Dell Hymes. At one point in this paper Hymes specifically notes: “I have elaborated some of the notions in this section and the next in other papers ... Where this paper differs from the others in conception, it takes precedence” (1964c:28, note 3). This appears to be his feeling throughout not only this article but all the others: that the most recent formulation of his ideas should always be taken to supercede earlier versions. By this point in time, “ethnography of communication” clearly emerges as the preferred term, as its use in the title of the volume demonstrates. However, some ambivalence apparently remains; the terms “language” and “communication” still appear several times together in the introductory pages (1964c:8) and Hymes argues that the “ethnography of communication” would look to *la parole* over *la langue* (1964c:11). This latter choice especially serves to keep the discussion at the level of speaking. What

seems to be happening here is the substitution of the term "communication" for "speaking", accompanied by an incomplete revision of the underlying conception of the approach. There is, of course, an excellent reason for enlarging the study of speaking to all of communication, which is that it would lead to greater adequacy of the ethnography, and it is presumably this which Hymes was intending to include by the switch to the larger term.<sup>12</sup>

The two other publications appearing in 1964 present the two terms as being essentially interchangeable.<sup>13</sup> The first of these was "A Perspective for Linguistic Anthropology". Perhaps the most critical phrase in this article is the one that suggests that the approach Hymes wants to advocate "may be called *the ethnography of speaking or of communication* (1964a:101, emphasis in original). Here the intended usage is clearly one of synonymy and, in keeping with that, both terms appear throughout the article with no distinctions (see 1964a:102, 103, 105, 106). At the same time that this is so, it should be noted that the definition of the general research concern refers solely to speaking, not to a broader conception of communication (1964a:101).

The third article in 1964, "Directions in (Ethno-) Linguistic Theory", also seems to use the two terms equivalently. The critical phrase to note is the following: "For ethnography to make its necessary contribution to ethnolinguistic theory, there must be descriptions of communities focussed on *speaking and communication*" (1964b:42, emphasis added).

In his 1966 article "Two Types of Linguistic Relativity" Hymes does not use either term; nevertheless, this article is noteworthy for the fact that in it Hymes publishes his own "ethnography of speaking" (for the first and last time) utilizing materials collected by someone else in the process of a more standard ethnography.<sup>14</sup> In so doing, his efforts are focussed on language rather than communication. This limited focus may

have had an unintended impact on the development of the "ethnography of communication" as a concerted research activity; regardless of what he recommended that others do, Hymes himself looked only at language, and it may have appeared as if that was what he was advocating.

His second 1966 publication, "The Anthropology of Communication," is aimed at neither a linguistic nor an anthropological audience, but primarily at readers within the discipline of communication. As a result it is, in many ways, distinct from the majority of the articles he has written. Perhaps due to this it is rarely cited by those who follow his approach from within the fields of anthropology and linguistics. (The publications most often mentioned seem to be Hymes 1962, Gumperz and Hymes 1964 and 1972.) In this article Hymes never explicitly describes the way in which the terms "ethnography of speaking" and "ethnography of communication" are related to each other, but it is here that he does offer for the first time a clear distinction between speaking and communication:

... It is most of all through work known as paralinguistics, kinesics, and the like, and through work known as sociolinguistics, and ethnography of speaking, that human communication theory acquired its present prospect of central importance in anthropology. The one has extended the scope of active concern 'vertically' , from 'articulate speech; to the full spectrum of modalities, or channels, employed in human communication, and the other has extended the scope of concern on a 'horizontal' plane, from the referential use of the single linguistic code to the full round of the communicative activity of a community (1967b:16-17).

The place of the "ethnography of speaking" and "ethnography of communication" in relation to the other terms given in the above quote must be understood by implication: the

"ethnography of speaking" is one approach within the field of "sociolinguistics", and the "ethnography of communication" is one part of the "anthropology of communication". He does explicitly say that the "anthropology of communication" includes "sociolinguistics", among other things. This is very different from the suggestion in 1964 that the "ethnography of speaking" and the "ethnography of communication" are interchangeable; they have now moved to separate levels in the hierarchy of terminology.

If this new conception were followed consistently in later writings, it could be accepted as replacing the earlier equation between speaking and communication. In fact, however, Hymes returns to the latter formulation, which results in some confusion for his readers.

In his 1970 article, "Linguistic Method in Ethnography", Hymes once again returns to using the "ethnography of speaking" as his term of preference (1970:308). In addition, it is here that he first mentions ethnology as well as ethnography as having a central role in his approach, something that only a few other authors have picked up on.<sup>15</sup>

In 1971 Hymes published an explicit comparison of terminology in his "Sociolinguistics and the Ethnography of Speaking". Unfortunately he does not include the "ethnography of communication" in this review. He begins with a cogent separation of "sociolinguistics" and the "ethnography of speaking": "'Sociolinguistics' is the most recent and most common term for an area of research that links linguistics with anthropology and sociology. 'Ethnography of speaking' designates a particular approach" (1971:47). Here he again refers to the roots of the "ethnography of speaking" as being a combination of anthropology and linguistics:

Ethnography of speaking, as sketched above, would be a linguistics that had discovered ethnographic foundations,



and an ethnography that had discovered linguistic content, in relation to the knowledge and activities for use of knowledge (competence) of the persons whose communities were studied (1971:81).

One result of this discussion of the gap between anthropology and linguistics which Hymes intends the new approach to fill is that the term "communication" finds no place; for communication is not a part of the traditional study of either area.<sup>16</sup>

Hymes' contribution to Gumperz and Hymes (1972) is a revision of his 1967 article, "Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Setting", but neither term appears within the article itself. It is, however, interesting to note that in the editors' introduction to this article, the phrase "ethnography of speaking" is used rather than "ethnography of communication", despite the fact that the volume is titled *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*.

Another article appearing in 1972 was "The Contribution of Folklore to Sociolinguistics". Here again Hymes uses "ethnography of speaking" to refer to the approach, as is the case in the last two publications above. To wit: "There are many particular problems and interests that go to make up sociolinguistic research. I take the ethnography of speaking, the description and explanation of the use of language, as fundamental to them all" (1972b:45).

In Hymes' article "Speaking and Language: On the Origins and Foundations of Inequality among Speakers," published in 1973, the terms used are "ethnography of speaking", "ways of speaking", and a new one, "ethnography of writing". Writing was mentioned as an appropriate part of the "ethnography of speaking" as early as 1962 and periodically after that (1967), but the term "ethnography of writing" was not used. Once introduced this phrase has been used by several other authors. Of

these the most significant is a theoretical consideration of what an "ethnography of writing" should entail, by Keith Basso.<sup>17</sup> In this Basso suggests that the "ethnography of writing" would be one part of the ethnography of communication":

... The ethnographic study of writing should not be conceived of as an autonomous enterprise, divorced and separate from linguistics, kinesics, proxemics, and the like, but as one element in a more encompassing field of inquiry which embraces the totality of human communication skills and seeks to generalize about their operation vis-a-vis one another in different sociocultural settings (1974:426).

This is different from Hymes' earlier classification of the "ethnography of writing" as one part of the "ethnography of speaking" (1962:26,45).

Hymes' contribution to the 1974 Bauman and Sherzer volume, *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*, is entitled "Ways of Speaking". In this he continues the use of the name "ethnography of speaking" rather than "ethnography of communication". He explains the relationship between the "ethnography of speaking" and "ways of speaking" as follows: "If one accepts 'ethnography of speaking' as name for the enterprise, still the name refers to the approach, or the field, not to the subject matter itself. What we study is 'ways of speaking'" (1974:445). The implication in this, as in all the publications since 1967, is that the terms regarding speaking and communication are to be used interchangeably.

*Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*, is not a new effort, but instead a republication (in revised form) of many of the articles discussed previously, as well as others. Chapters one and two are the most significant for this discussion. Chapter one, "Toward Ethnographies of Communication", is a revision of the introduction to Gumperz and Hymes (1964), and so refers primarily to the "ethnography of

communication''. In this Hymes clearly identifies the "ethnography of speaking" and the "ethnography of communication" as two distinct entities: "ethnography of communication" is the broader term, and includes the "ethnography of speaking" as one of its parts (1974b:8).

The linguistics that can contribute to the ethnography of communication is now generally known as sociolinguistics, and it is here that my own training and experience lie. Such a sociolinguistics, however, is not identical with everything that currently comes under that name. The sociolinguistics with which we are concerned here contributes to the general study of communication through the study of the organization of verbal means and the ends they serve, while bearing in mind the ultimate integration of these means and ends with communicative means and ends generally. Such an approach within sociolinguistics can be called, in keeping with the general term, ethnography of communication, the study of the "ethnography of speaking".

The argument here is that the "ethnography of communication" is a cover term, which should be taken to include "sociolinguistics", which in turn includes the "ethnography of speaking". This would be reasonable, except for the fact that when the argument is continued in Chapter two, "Studying the Interaction of Language and Social Life" the "ethnography of speaking" and the "ethnography of communication" are equated, and are described as both being a part of "sociolinguistics". (This chapter was originally Hymes' contribution to Gumperz and Hymes [1972].) After giving an argument for the need for a description of the interaction between language and social life Hymes writes: "Such work is the essence of what may be called the ethnography (and ethnology) of *speaking and communication*, as an approach within the general field of sociolinguistics" (1974b:32, emphasis added). So he has introduced a different outline of the relationship, one

where "sociolinguistics" is to be taken as not a part of the "ethnography of communication" but a more comprehensive term than that, and the "ethnography of speaking" is once again viewed as being equivalent to the "ethnography of communication". In later articles he returns to using the "ethnography of speaking", but it is difficult to tell whether he is referring to a narrow or broad conception. (see Hymes 1975:365, 1976:237, 1980:91, 140).

Also in Chapter two of *Foundations in Sociolinguistics*, Hymes introduces an additional term for the approach, namely "speech economy", when he writes that viewing ways of speaking from the vantage point of contexts and institutions "could support an alternative conception and name for the focus of the descriptive enterprise, which might be expressed as the study of the *speech economy* of a community" (1974b:46, emphasis in original). But this is not the only synonym mentioned in this book. In Chapters three and seven ("Why Linguistics Needs the Sociologist" and "The Contribution of Poetics to Sociolinguistic Research") Hymes discusses the "ethnography of symbolic forms" which he explains as including "myth, ritual, song, chant, dance, and the like, and the subtler forms of daily life" (1974b:140, see also 81). He separates this from "the analysis of patterns of language use" in a way which would seem to imply that the "ethnography of symbolic forms" is intended to be another name for the "ethnography of communication" (or possibly a yet larger conception), and the "analysis of patterns of language use" as another way of referring to the "ethnography of speaking". And in yet a third chapter ("Social Anthropology, Sociolinguistics, and the Ethnography of Speaking") he supplies an additional synonym when he suggests that "broadly conceived, indeed, stylistics can be almost indistinguishable from ethnography of speaking..." (1974b:105). This chapter is a revision of Hymes (1971), but this quote does not appear in the earlier publication. What is most interesting about these new phrases put forth by Hymes is the lack of response in the literature regarding them.

This is the last of Hymes' publications to stress the ethnography of speaking approach, although there are several later ones which mention it in passing. In "The Pre-war Prague School and Post-war American Anthropological Linguistics", Hymes qualifies his usage by referring to his own call for an "ethnography of speaking" (1975:365). In "Towards Linguistic Competence" and "The State of the Art of Linguistic Anthropology" he uses "ethnography of speaking" to refer to the approach as a whole, making no mention of communication (1976:237 and 1977:59). In the chapter called, "What is Ethnography?" in *Language and Education: Ethnolinguistic Essays* he refers to the "ethnography of speaking", but adds no clarification as to how he is intending the term to be understood (1980:91, 140). It appears that over the past nine years, then, Hymes has not focused on either the "ethnography of speaking" or the "ethnography of communication" to the extent that he did during the previous years.

What has been discovered through this careful reading of Hymes' work? It appears that there is a series of stages through which Hymes proceeds in his work:

- 1) he introduced the approach in 1962 as the "ethnography of speaking", since it was designed to fill the gap between anthropology and linguistics.

- 2) in 1964 he substituted the term "ethnography of communication", in order to enlarge the area of study and to permit a broader, more adequate approach to communicative behavior, using the terms first together, and then interchangeably;

- 3) in 1967 he implied a separation, with the "ethnography of communication" as the more general, and the "ethnography of speaking" as one part of it; but

- 4) in later publications the two phrases continued to be used interchangeably; until

5) in 1974, when he confused matters by publishing material from 1964 next to material in direct opposition from 1967 so that the book argues both positions in turn.

Now that the use of these terms by Hymes has been clarified, it is time to look at how others have used them. It is not enough in a discussion of terminology to see what has been proposed; the use of the terms by people other than the one who has invented them must be understood as well. The consideration of work by others will be divided into three sections: first, the three major collections of articles; second, the single introductory textbook written so far on the subject; and third, any other books and articles.<sup>18</sup>

The first two collections of articles to be considered were edited by Gumperz and Hymes. Hymes' own contributions to these have already been discussed, but it is necessary to look at the contributions of the other researchers. Although Hymes uses the phrase "ethnography of communication" in his introduction to the 1964 special issue of the *American Anthropologist*, and although the title of the collection is "The Ethnography of Communication", none of the individual authors uses that phrase to refer either to their own work or to the approach in general. Instead, three call the approach the "ethnography of speaking" (Albert 1964:35, Frake 1964:127, Arewa and Dundes 1964:71); two use "sociolinguistics" as a cover term (Ervin-Tripp 1964:86, 91, Gumperz 1964:137); and one selection invents an additional term: the "ethnography of speaking folklore" (Arewa and Dundes 1964:72). The remainder of the contributors do not use any term to refer to the approach. The obvious conclusion seems to be that between 1962 and 1964 Hymes revised his terminology but others, even those included in the 1964 volume, were not prepared for the change, and did not make it when he did. The fact that in a volume entitled the "ethnography of communication", the contributors use the phrase "ethnography of speaking" adds to the impression that the terms are synonyms.

In the Gumperz and Hymes 1972 volume, *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*, the use of the names is again interchangeable. In the introductory paragraphs to the selections, the editors use the phrase "ethnography of speaking" four times and "ethnography of communication" once with no apparent difference in meaning. The work of Hymes (1972:35,37), Frake (1972:108) and Garfinkel (1972:303) are all described as being within the framework of the "ethnography of speaking", but that of Dundes, Leach, and Ozkok is described as a part of the "ethnography of communication" (1972:130), although all of the work mentioned focuses on verbal data. The various authors use "ethnography of speaking" once (Albert 1972:73), "ethnography of communication" once (Schegloff 1972:349), "ethnography of speaking folklore" once (Dundes et al. 1972:134), and "ethnography of kinship" once (Tyler 1972:255). Neither term appears in the preface, introduction, or plan of the book, although in all three sections "language" and "speaking" are constantly referred to, and "communication" hardly appears at all. The conclusion here must be that although "ethnography of communication" is the term of choice (witness the book's title) the meaning of the terms, "ethnography of speaking" and "ethnography of communication", is essentially the same.

The identical conclusion must be drawn from the third major collection of papers, *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*, edited by Richard Bauman and Joel Sherzer. Here again both terms are used interchangeably. One author uses both terms in the same article making no obvious distinction between them (Grimshaw 1974:422, 424). One uses "ethnography of speaking" (Fox 1974:65) and one "ethnography of communication" (Philips 1974:92). The editors nearly always use "ethnography of speaking" (as in their book title, their introductions to the volume and to the separate sections, and the article by Bauman). Buried in the introduction to part six, however, is the following overt recogni-

tion of how the terms have been used (1974:417):

During the past decade and even at times in this volume, "the ethnography of speaking" and "the ethnography of communication" have been used almost interchangeably. One of the contributions of this field has been the understanding that various communicative modes (verbal, proxemic, kinesic) are not absolutely independent of one another but are rather interrelated in various ways in various societies. Nevertheless, the papers in this volume do focus on speech as a central concern.

This recognition of the way in which the terms have been used is not followed up with suggestions as to the ways in which they might best be used in the future.

These three volumes may be the major collections, but they are far from the only places where people talk about or utilize Hymes' approach. One of the most significant publications to appear so far is the introductory textbook by Muriel Saville-Troike, entitled *The Ethnography of Communication: An Introduction*, for once an introductory text has been written a new field can be said to have become thoroughly established. This book covers both the history and the method of the approach. Saville-Troike uses the term "ethnography of communication" to refer to the field (as, for example, 1982:1, 2, 9, 11) but throughout the book she shifts between a conception of the field as limited solely to language and one which would include a broader view of communication. In the theoretical discussion, the notion of communication is mentioned repeatedly but in actual application the focus is without question on speaking alone. This shift is typical of discussion of the field and is frequent in the writings of other authors as well.

In addition to the Saville-Troike textbook, there are literally hundreds of articles written to date which either identify themselves as being within the general tradition, or which



discuss the tradition. The main conclusion to be made from reading these is that the terms "ethnography of speaking" and "ethnography of communication" appear with approximately equal frequency, and are used interchangeably. In general, a single term is used by the majority of the individual authors, but the way one author uses one term appears identical to the way in which another author will use the other term.

A check was made to discover what accounted for each author's preference. What might be expected to be the most critical factor, subject matter of the publication, seems to have had no apparent influence on choice of terminology. Virtually all of the articles which use the terms in the process of doing an ethnography consider speech alone, and do not include the other channels, as would be necessary for a true "ethnography of communication". This is despite the fact that nearly half the authors reviewed label their work as being "ethnography of communication". This problem was recognized in 1977 by Sherzer, who in an appraisal of the "ethnography of speaking" points out (1977:51):

A final theoretical issue has to do with the relationship between the ethnography of speaking and the ethnography of communication. While both terms have been used for the field I am discussing here, I think it is fair to say that there is as yet no real ethnography of communication, in that almost all research has focused almost exclusively on language and speech.

Six years later his point is still valid: it would be hard to point to any ethnography written so far, no matter what its label, and say that it was a complete "ethnography of communication."<sup>19</sup>

Other criteria were checked for determining why authors chose one term over the other. These criteria included the following: the publication in which the article appeared, author's field of training (where known), date of publication,

theory versus data orientation, and references cited. Of these, each had a slight influence, but none seemed to be a determining factor. In other words, articles appearing in linguistics journals were more likely to use the phrase "ethnography of speaking" than "ethnography of communication", whereas for articles in communication journals the opposite was found to be true. Those trained in linguistics were more likely to favor "ethnography of speaking", those in anthropology, "ethnography of communication". No consistency due to a data-versus-theory orientation was found, so that whether an author was doing ethnography or talking about the subject in theoretical terms seemed to have no effect on term choice. Since most authors cited publications which used both the "ethnography of speaking" (as Hymes 1962) and "ethnography of communication" (as Gumperz and Hymes 1972), the role of references cited was negligible.

In conclusion, it may be stated that up to the present the terms "ethnography of speaking" and "ethnography of communication" have been used interchangeably by the majority of those who have used them at all, and that this is probably traceable to the shifts in Hymes' own usage of the terms. In this light, I would like to propose the following resolution to the problem: Hymes has suggested that there are two different approaches, and he has elaborated on the differences between them in at least some of his writings. As there are currently two names available, and two approaches which can be distinguished, it makes little sense to continue using these names as if they referred to a single approach. It is to be hoped that in the future those who follow either of these approaches will be more explicit about what they intend their work to exemplify: the "ethnography of speaking" or the "ethnography of communication". There is an important difference between the two, despite the fact that at the moment the difference is more potential than actual.

## ENDNOTES

1. I would like to thank Stuart Sigman and Yves Winkin for their comments on an earlier version of this paper.
2. Hymes (1964) was not the only occasion on which discussion of related terminology took place. Around the same time there was an exchange of views concerning the terms linguistic anthropology, anthropological linguistics, ethnolinguistics, psycholinguistics, and sociolinguistics in *American Anthropologist*. See Teeter (1964), Voegelin (1964), Hymes (1966). See also Hymes (1971) for discussion of the relationship of "sociolinguistics" to the "ethnography of speaking".
3. For example, "descriptive sociolinguistics" (Grimshaw 1971:135-137), "ethnographic or sociolinguistic approaches to linguistic anthropology" (Tanner 1967:38), "ethnographic perspective on the study of language use" (Bauman 1974:144), "communicative ethnography" (McDermott and Church 1976:133), "ethnographic approaches to the study of communication" (Bauman 1971:xii), "ethnography of speech behaviors" (Abrahams 1975:287).
4. "Ethnography of speech" (Murray 1979:211, Chaney 1982:6, Edwards and Rosberg 1975:295), "ethnographer of speaking" (Jules-Rosette 1978:81-82, Bauman 1974:145), "ethnographer of communication" (Mehan 1972:1), "retrospective ethnography of speaking" (Burke 1981:24).
5. "Ethnography of speaking folklore" (Dundes, Leach, and Ozkok 1972:134, Arewa and Dundes 1964:71, Menez 1975:131), "ethnography of verbal art" (Bauman 1977:12), "ethnography of performance" (Bauman 1975:34-35, 1977:28), "ethnography of artistic verbal performance" (Bauman and Sherzer 1975:12), "ethnography of spoken verbal art" (Bauman and Sherzer 1975:98).
6. "Ethnography of reading" (McDermott, 1977:174-180, Sherzer 1977:148), "ethnography of learning and teaching" (Sherzer 1977:151), "ethnography of writing" (Basso 1974, Sherzer 1977:148), "ethnography of literacy" (Szwed 1981), "anthropology of communication" (Hymes 1967b, Teeter 1973, Schmitz 1977). This bears witness to the fact that few ethnographies have confronted the issue of a general (and generalizable) notion of communication; each author focuses on his own slice of the behavioral pie.
7. Some examples are the following: Pride and Holmes (1972), Faris (1966), Foster (1971, 1974), Bahr (1975), Samarin (1969), Keenan (1973), Brenneis (1978), Rosaldo (1973), Bricker (1973), Salmond (1975), Mitchell-Kernan (1972), Abrahams (1970, 1972), Gossen (1971), Ben-Amos (1975), Haviland (1977). In line with this, there are numerous authors who cite Hymes' work without using either of the names for his approach. These also will be ignored in the current context.
8. Hymes (1961) is often cited as being a more accurate beginning of the proposed "ethnography of speaking", which it obviously is. But since neither of the two phrases under discussion here appear, this discussion begins with Hymes (1962).
9. Further comments on the "ethnography of speaking" as tying together linguistics and anthropology may be found in Hymes (1962:18, 48); and Hymes

- (1963b); see Ornstein and Murphy (1974:42) for their recognition that this is what he is doing.
10. See Ardener (1971:lxiv) where he says that the "ethnography of speaking" is "a realization of the social anthropology of *la parole*".
  11. It is possible that Hymes views communication theory as being generalized from a theory of speech (see Sigman, this issue).
  12. The exact meaning of "ethnography" is not discussed in this article, for it is never called into question. For definition of the term, and explanation of how he uses it, see Hymes (1974:10, 1980: 73-78, 88-101) and Winkin, this issue.
  13. What is used here is always the chronological date of publication (across years); not of writing of the various articles).
  14. Hymes (1966:123) provides the following rationale for what he is doing in a footnote: "A general theory must depend primarily upon fresh studies from on-going cultures; but it must also be as extensively comparative as possible. Because of this, and because the data in question might otherwise be overlooked, as sparse and as not having been obtained with the theory in mind, I try to show that something can be gleaned from past ethnography."
  15. See, for example, Grimshaw (1974:424), as well as Hymes (1976:237) for further discussion of the need for the ethnology of speaking and communication.
  16. In this article Hymes not only discusses the relationship of linguistics to anthropology, but adds folklore into the equation as well. The critical comment suggests that "folklore is a special case of the ethnography-of-speaking approach" (1972c:47). It is Richard Bauman who has explained the logic behind this most clearly, when he said that the "ethnography of speaking" could serve as "a focal point around which a reintegration of linguistics, anthropology, and folklore may be effected" (1977b:17). See Menez (1975:13), Arewa and Dundes (1964), and Dundes, Leach and Ozkok (1972:134), for elaboration of the approach Dundes labels the "ethnography of speaking folklore". One of the major themes in current folkloristic studies, the concept of folklore as communication, owes a direct debt to Hymes and his approach. (See Ben-Amos 1968, Ben-Amos and Goldstein 1975:3, Hendricks 1970:694, Bauman and Sherzer 1974:311, and Gossen 1974:viii for further discussion of this point). It is interesting to note that a parallel shift in terminology occurred: in 1971 the approach was referred to as "folklore in context" and it was related to the "ethnography of speaking" (Ben-Amos 1971:10); but by 1975 the same author says the approach of "folklore as communication" owed a debt to the "ethnography of communication" (1975:3). The connection between folklore and the "ethnography of speaking" has been noted negatively by Bloch in a review of Bauman and Sherzer (1974), where he suggests that folklore genres play an overly important role in the studies included in that volume (Bloch 1977).
  17. See Stubbs (1980:17, 164), Szwed (1981), and McDermott (1977) for discussion of the ethnography of writing; see Siegel (1981) and Basso and Anderson (1973) for examples of it. Related to this is the ethnography of silence, another aspect of

the "ethnography of communication" which is discussed in Basso (1972), and Samarin (1965).

18. In order to obtain a large number of articles which use either the "ethnography of speaking" or the "ethnography of communication" a computer search was made of articles which cited Hymes (1962), Gumperz and Hymes (1972) or Bauman and Sherzer (1974). The data base used was the Social Science Citation Index. This resulted in a list of several hundred references, many of which led in turn to further sources. These articles were reviewed for their use of the terms "ethnography of speaking" and "ethnography of communication", and only those making explicit use of the terms were considered. A complete bibliography is not included in this paper as it would be both unwieldy and unnecessary for the argument, but is being used as the beginning of a longer bibliography of materials in the "ethnography of communication".
19. See Bright (1966:313) for similar comments as of four years into this approach. Hoben has pointed out one part of the problem when she suggested: "Just as no one has yet written the complete grammar of a language, so no one has yet written the ethnography of speaking for a speech community. In fact, the field is so new that it is not always clear what sorts of statements or rules such a study would entail" (1976:385).

#### REFERENCES

- Abrahams, Roger D. 1970. "A performance-centered approach to gossip." *Man*. 5:290-301.
- Abrahams, Roger D. 1972. "Joking: the training of the man of words in talking broad." In Thomas Kochman (ed.) *Rappin' and Stylin' Out: Communication in Urban Black America*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, pp. 215-240.
- Abrahams, Roger D. 1975. "Folklore and communication on St. Vincent." In Dan Ben-Amos and Kenneth Goldstein (eds.) *Folklore: Performance and Communication*. The Hague: Mouton, 1975, pp. 287-300.
- Albert, Ethel M. 1964. "'Rhetoric', 'logic' and 'poetics' in Burundi: culture patterning of speech behavior." In John Gumperz and Dell Hymes (eds.) "The Ethnography of Communication." *American Anthropologist*. 66(6):35-54.
- Albert, Ethel M. 1972. "Culture patterning of speech behavior in Burundi." In John Gumperz and Dell Hymes (eds.) *Directions in Sociolinguistics: the Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, pp. 72-105.
- Ardener, Edwin. 1971. "Introductory Essay." In Edwin Ardener. *Social Anthropology of Language*. London: Tavistock, pp. ix-cii.
- Arewa, E. Ojo and Alan Dundes. 1964. "Proverbs and the ethnography of speaking folklore." In John Gumperz and Dell Hymes (eds.) "The Ethnography of Communication." *American Anthropologist*. 66(6):70-85.
- Bahr, Donald Morris. 1975. *Pima and Papago Ritual Oratory: a Study of Three Texts*. San Francisco: Indian Historian Press.

- Basso, Keith H. 1974. "The ethnography of writing." In Richard Bauman and Joel Sherzer (eds.) *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*. London: Cambridge University Press, pp. 425-432.
- Basso, Keith H. and N. Anderson. 1973. "A Western Apache writing system: the symbols of Silas John." *Science*. 180:1013-1022.
- Bauman, Richard. 1971. "Introduction." In Richard Bauman and Americo Paredes (eds.) *Towards New Perspectives in Folklore*. Austin: University of Texas Press for the American Folklore Society, pp. xi-xv.
- Bauman, Richard. 1974. "Speaking in the light: the role of the Quaker minister." In Richard Bauman and Joel Sherzer (eds.) *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*. London: Cambridge University Press, pp. 144-160.
- Bauman, Richard. 1975. "The theoretical boundaries of performance." In Marcia Herndon and Roger Brunyate (eds.) *Proceedings of a Symposium on Form in Performance, Hard-Core Ethnography*. Austin: Office of the College of Fine Arts, University of Texas, pp. 28-44.
- Bauman, Richard. 1977a. "Verbal art as performance." In Richard Bauman (ed.) *Verbal Art as Performance*. Rowley: Newbury House, pp. 3-58.
- Bauman, Richard. 1977b. "Linguistics, anthropology and verbal art: toward a unified perspective, with a special discussion of children's folklore." In Muriel Saville-Troike (ed.) *Linguistics and Anthropology*. Georgetown University Round Table. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, pp. 13-36.
- Bauman, Richard. 1977c. "Settlement patterns on the frontiers of folklore." In William Bascom (ed.) *Frontiers of Folklore*. Boulder: Westview Press for the American Association for the Advancement of Science, pp. 121-131.
- Bauman, Richard and Joel Sherzer. 1974. *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Bauman, Richard and Joel Sherzer. 1975. "The ethnography of speaking." *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 4:95-119.
- Ben-Amos, Dan. 1968. "Toward a Componential Model of Folklore Communication." *Proceedings of the International Congress for Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, Volume 2: Ethnology*. Tokyo: Science Council of Japan, pp. 309-311.
- Ben-Amos, Dan. 1971. "Toward a definition of folklore in context." *Journal of American Folklore*. 84:3-15.
- Ben-Amos, Dan. 1975. *Sweet Words: Storytelling Events in Benin*. Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues.
- Ben-Amos, Dan. 1977. "The context of folklore: implications and prospects." In William Bascom (ed.) *Frontiers of Folklore*. Boulder, Col.: Westview for the American Association for the Advancement of Science, pp. 36-53.
- Ben-Amos, Dan and Kenneth Goldstein. 1975. "Introduction." In Dan Ben-Amos and Kenneth Goldstein (eds.) *Folklore: Performance and Communication*. The Hague: Mouton, pp. 1-7.

- Brenneis, Donald. 1978. "The matter of talk: political performances in Bhatgaon." *Language in Society*. 7:159-170.
- Burke, Peter. 1981. "Languages and anti-languages in early modern Italy." *History Workshop Journal*. 11:24-32
- Bricker, Victoria. 1973. *Ritual Humor in Highland Chiapas*. Austin, Texas: University Press.
- Bright, William. 1966. "Language, social stratification, and cognitive orientation." In Stanley Lieberman, ed. "Explorations in Sociolinguistics." *Sociological Inquiry*. 36(2):313-318.
- Chaney, David. 1982. "Communication and community." *Communication*. 7:1-32.
- Dundes, Alan, Jerry W. Leach and Bora Ozkok. "The strategy of Turkish boys' verbal dueling rhymes." In John Gumperz and Dell Hymes, eds. *Directions in Sociolinguistics: the Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, pp. 130-160.
- Edwards, Jay and Michael Rosberg. 1975. "Conversation in a West Indian Taxi: an ethnolinguistic analysis." *Language in Society*. 4:298-321.
- Ervin-Tripp, Susan. 1964. "An analysis of the interaction of language, topic, and listener." In John Gumperz and Dell Hymes, eds. *Directions in Sociolinguistics: the Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, pp. 86-102.
- Faris, James C. 1966. "The dynamics of verbal exchange: a Newfoundland exchange." *Anthropologica*. 8:235-248.
- Foster, Michael K. 1971. "Speaking in the Longhouse at Six Nations Reserve." In Regna Darnell, ed. *Linguistic Diversity in Canadian Society*. Edmonton: Linguistic Research, Inc., pp. 129-154.
- Foster, Michael K. 1974. *From the Earth to Beyond the Sky: and Ethnographic Approach to Four Longhouse Iroquois Speech Events*. Ottawa, Canada: *Canadian Ethnology Service Paper Number 20, National Museum of Man Mercury Series*.
- Fox, James J. 1974. "Our ancestors spoke in pairs': Rotinese views of language, dialect and code." In Richard Bauman and Joel Sherzer (eds.) *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*. London: Cambridge University Press, pp. 65-91.
- Frake, Charles O. 1964. "How to ask for a drink in Subanun." In John Gumperz and Dell Hymes (eds.) "The Ethnography of Communication." *American Anthropologist*. 66(6):127-136.
- Frake, Charles O. 1972. "Struck by speech: the Yakan concept of litigation." In John Gumperz and Dell Hymes (eds.) *Directions in Sociolinguistics: the Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, pp. 106-129.
- Garfinkel, Harold. 1972. "Remarks on ethnomethodology." In John Gumperz and Dell Hymes (eds.) *Directions in Sociolinguistics: the Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, pp. 301-324.

- Geglo, David Welchman and Karen Ann Watson. 1978. "Courtship among the Kuarafi of Malaita: an ethnography of speaking approach." *Kroeber Anthropological Society Papers*. 57:92-121.
- Gossen, Gary H. 1971. "Chamula genres of verbal behavior." *Journal of American Folklore*. 84:145-168.
- Gossen, Gary H. 1974. *Chamulas in the World of the Sun: Time and Space in a Maya Oral Tradition*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Grimshaw, Allen D. 1971. "Sociolinguistics." In Joshua A. Fishman (ed.) *Advances in the Sociology of Language, Volume 1*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Grimshaw, Allen D. 1974. "Data and data use in an analysis of communicative events." In Richard Bauman and Joel Sherzer (eds.) *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*. London: Cambridge University Press, pp. 419-424.
- Gumperz, John. 1964. "Linguistic and social interaction in two communities." In John Gumperz and Dell Hymes (eds.) "The Ethnography of Communication." *American Anthropologist*. 66(6):137-153.
- Gumperz, John and Dell Hymes (eds.) 1964. "The Ethnography of Communication." *American Anthropologist*. 66(6).
- Gumperz, John and Dell Hymes (eds.) 1972. *Directions in Sociolinguistics: the Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Haviland, John Beard. 1977. *Gossip, Reputation, and Knowledge in Zinacantan*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hendricks, William O. 1974. "Linguistics and folkloristics." *Current Trends in Linguistics*. 12(2):661-681.
- Hoben, Susan J. 1976. "Amhara verbal behavior: a commentary." *Anthropological Linguistics*. 18(8):380-386.
- Hymes, Dell. 1961. "Functions of speech: an evolutionary approach." In Fred Gruber (ed.) *Anthropology and Education*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 55-83.
- Hymes, Dell. 1962. "The ethnography of speaking." In Thomas Gladwin and William C. Sturtevant (eds.) *Anthropology and Human Behavior*. Washington, D.C.: Anthropology Society of Washington, pp. 13-53.
- Hymes, Dell. 1963. "Notes toward a history of linguistic anthropology." *Anthropological Linguistics*. 5(1):59-103.
- Hymes, Dell. 1964a. "A perspective for linguistic anthropoogy." In Sol Tax (ed.) *Horizons of Anthropology*. Chicago: Aldine, pp. 92-107.
- Hymes, Dell. 1964b. "Directions in (ethno-) linguistic theory." In A. Kimball Romney and Roy G. D'Andrade (eds.) "Transcultural studies of cognition." *American Anthropologist*. 66(3):6-56.
- Hymes, Dell. 1964c. "Introduction: toward ethnographies of communication." In



- John Gumperz and Dell Hymes (eds.) "The ethnography of communication." *American Anthropologist*. 66(6)(2):1-34.
- Hymes, Dell. 1966a. "Two types of linguistic relativity: some examples from Amerindian ethnography." In William Bright (ed.) *Sociolinguistics*. The Hague: Mouton, pp. 114-167.
- Hymes, Dell. 1966b. "On 'anthropological linguistics' and cogeners." *American Anthropologist*. 68:143-153.
- Hymes, Dell. 1967a. "Models of the interaction of language and social setting." *Journal of Social Issues*. 23(2):8-28.
- Hymes, Dell. 1967b. "The anthropology of communication." In Frank E. X. Dance (ed.) *Human Communication Theory: Original Essays*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, pp. 1-39.
- Hymes, Dell. 1970. "Linguistic method in ethnography: its development in the United States." In Paul Garvin (ed.) *Method and Theory in Linguistics*. The Hague: Mouton, pp. 249-325.
- Hymes, Dell. 1971. "Sociolinguistics and the ethnography of speaking." In Edwin Ardener (ed.) *Social Anthropology of Language*. London: Tavistock, pp. 47-93.
- Hymes, Dell. 1972a. "Models of the interaction of language and social life." In John Gumperz and Dell Hymes (eds.) *Directions in Sociolinguistics: the Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, pp. 35-71.
- Hymes, Dell. 1972b. "On communicative competence." In J. B. Pride and Janet Holmes (eds.) *Sociolinguistics: Selected Readings*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, pp. 269-273.
- Hymes, Dell. 1972c. "The scope of sociolinguistics." In Roger Shuy (ed.) *Sociolinguistics*. Georgetown University Round Table Volume 23. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, pp. 313-333.
- Hymes, Dell. 1972d. "The contribution of folklore to sociolinguistic research." In Americo Paredes and Richard Bauman (eds.) *Towards New Perspectives in Folklore*. Austin: University of Texas Press for the American Folklore Society. pp. 42-50.
- Hymes, Dell. 1972e. "Editorial introduction." *Language in Society*. 1:1-14.
- Hymes, Dell. 1973. "Speech and language: on the origins and foundations of inequality among speakers." *Daedalus*. 102(3):59-85.
- Hymes, Dell. 1974a. "Ways of speaking." In Richard Bauman and Joel Sherzer (eds.) *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*. London: Cambridge University Press, pp. 433-451.
- Hymes, Dell. 1974b. *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: an Ethnographic Approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Hymes, Dell. 1975. "The pre-war Prague school and post-war American anthropological linguistics." In E.F.W. Koerner (ed.) *The Transformational-*

- Generative Paradigm and Modern Linguistic Theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 359-380.
- Hymes, Dell. 1976. "Towards linguistic competence." *Sociologische Gids*. 76:217-239.
- Hymes, Dell. 1977. "The State of the Art in Linguistic Anthropology." *Perspectives on Anthropology 1976*. Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association, pp. 48-70.
- Hymes, Dell. 1980. *Language in Education: Ethnolinguistic Essays*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Jules-Rosette, Bennetta. 1978. "Toward a theory of ethnography: the use of contrasting interpretative paradigms in field research." *Sociological Symposium*. 24:81-98.
- Keenan, Elinor Ochs. 1973. "A sliding sense of obligatoriness: the poly-structure of Malagasy oratory." *Language in Society*. 2:225-243.
- McDermott, Ray P. 1977. "The ethnography of speaking and reading." In Roger Shuy (ed.) *Linguistic Theory*. International Reading Association. pp. 153-185.
- McDermott, Ray P. and Joseph Church. 1976. "Making sense and feeling good: the ethnography of communication and identity work." *Communication*. 2:121-142.
- Mehan, Hugh. 1972. "Language using abilities." *Language Sciences*. 22:1-10.
- Menez, Herminia Q. 1975. "Filipino-Americana erotica and the ethnography of a folkloric event." In Dan Ben-Amos and Kenneth Goldstein (eds.) *Folklore: Performance and Communication*. The Hague: Mouton, pp. 131-141.
- Mitchell-Kernan, Claudia. 1972. "Signifying, loud-talking and marking." In Thomas Kochman (ed.) *Rappin' and Stylin' Out: Communication in Urban Black America*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, pp. 315-335.
- Murray, Stephen O. 1979. "The art of gay insulting." *Anthropological Linguistics*. 21:211-223.
- Ornstein, Jacob and R. Paul Murphy. 1974. "Models and approaches in sociolinguistic research on language diversity." *Anthropological Linguistics*. 16:141-167.
- Philips, Susan U. 1974. "Warm Springs 'Indian time': how the regulation of participation affects the progression of events." In Richard Bauman and Joel Sherzer (eds.) *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*. London: Cambridge University Press, pp. 92-109.
- Pride, J.B. and Janet Holmes (eds.) 1972. *Sociolinguistics: Selected Readings*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Rosaldo, Michelle Z. 1973. "I have nothing to hide: the language of Ilongot oratory." *Language in Society*. 2:193-224.
- Salmond, Anne. 1975. *Hui: a Study of Maori Ceremonial Gatherings*. Wellington: A. H. and A. W. Reed.
- Samarin, William. 1965. "Language of Silence." *Practical Anthropology*. 12:115-119.

- Samarin, William. 1969. "The art of Gbeya insults." *International Journal of American Linguistics*. 35(4):323-329.
- Saville-Troike, Muriel. 1982. *The Ethnography of Communication: an Introduction*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Schegloff, Emanuel. 1972. "Sequencing in conversational openings." In John Gumperz and Dell Hymes (eds.) *Directions in Sociolinguistics: the Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, pp. 346-380.
- Schmitz, H. Walter. 1977. "Interethnic relations in Saraguro (Ecuador) from the point of view of an anthropology of communication." *Sociologus*. 27(1):64-84.
- Sherzer, Joel. 1970. "La parole chez les Abipone: pour une ethnographie de la parole." *L'Homme*. 10:40-76.
- Sherzer, Joel. 1977. "Cuna Ikala: Literature in San Blas." In Richard Bauman (ed.) *Verbal Art as Performance*. Rowley: Newbury House, pp. 133-150.
- Sherzer, Joel. 1977. "The ethnography of speaking: a critical appraisal." In Muriel Saville-Troike (ed.) *Linguistics and Anthropology*. Georgetown University Round Table. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, pp. 43-57.
- Sherzer, Joel. 1977. "The ethnography of speaking." In Roger Shuy (ed.) *Linguistic Theory: What can it say about reading?* Newark: International Reading Association Publications, pp. 144-152.
- Siegel, Jeff. 1981. "Developments in written Tok Pisin." *Anthropological Linguistics*. 23(1):20-35.
- Stubbs, Michael. 1980. *Language and Literacy: the Sociolinguistics of Reading and Writing*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Szwed, John F. 1981. "The ethnography of literacy." In Marcia Farr Whiteman (ed.) *Writing: the Nature, Development and Teaching of Written Communication. Volume I: Variation in Writing: Functional and Linguistic-Cultural Differences*. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 13-23.
- Tanner, Nancy. 1967. "Speech and society among the Indonesian elite: a case study of a multilingual community." *Anthropological Linguistics*. 9(3):15-40.
- Teeter, Karl V. 1964. "Anthropological linguistics' and linguistic anthropology." *American Anthropologist*. 66:878-879.
- Teeter, Karl V. 1973. "Linguistics and Anthropology." *Daedalus*. 102(3):87-98.
- Tyler, Stephen A. 1972. "Context and alternation in Koya kinship terminology." In John Gumperz and Dell Hymes (eds.) *Directions in Sociolinguistics: the Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, pp. 251-269.
- Voegelin, Carl F. 1965. "Sociolinguistics, ethnolinguistics, and anthropological linguistics." *American Anthropologist*. 67:484-485.
- Williams, Raymond. 1960. *Culture and Society 1780-1950*. Garden City: Anchor Books.