Beeching, Kate, Ghezzi, Chiara & Molinelli, Piera, 2018. Chapter 1. Introduction. In Beeching, Kate, Ghezzi, Chiara & Molinelli, Piera (eds.), *Positioning the self and others. Linguistic Perspectives*. 1-18. Amsterdam: Benjamins (Pragmatics & Beyond New Series 292).
https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.292.01bee

Chapter 1: Introduction

Kate Beeching, Chiara Ghezzi and Piera Molinelli

1. Overview

This volume brings together contributions inspired by discussions that took place during the Panel "Positioning the self and others: Linguistic traces" which was held at the 14th IPrA Conference in Antwerp, 26-31 July 2015. Though much work has been done in the area of positioning in social psychology and in the field of identity construction, less work has been done on the linguistic markers which serve to position self and other(s) in a range of contexts. This volume, therefore, aims to fill this gap in the literature by focussing specifically on the linguistic means used to index the relationship between the self and other(s) in different types of communicative activity. The volume makes no claims to exhaustivity. The linguistic features which primarily emerged as relevant from the different contributions are : a) T/V address terms and vocatives, b) pragmatic markers c) code switching/code choice and d) orthography. These elements relate, in the case of a), to the conventionalised encoding of social hierarchies and power relations, in the case of b), to stance-taking and social indexicalisation and, in the case of c) and d), to more broadly circulating language ideologies.

The volume is unusual in a number of ways:

- the range of languages which are covered: Bergamasco, Brazilian Portuguese, English, Finnish, French, Georgian, Greek, Italian, Latin, Russian, Spanish and Swedish;

- the inclusion of different communicative settings and text-types: workplace emails, everyday and institutional conversations, interviews, migrant narratives, radio phone-ins, dyadic and group settings, road-signs, service encounters;
- its consideration of both synchronic and diachronic factors (the latter feature in two of the chapters);
- its mix of theoretical, methodological and analytical approaches.

The different chapters offer a variety of perspectives on how speakers and writers project their identities and stances in relation to their interlocutors, through language. The volume brings together contributions with a more formal linguistic focus of a quantitative type with others which take a more qualitative, discourse-analytic, emergent approach. It investigates the impact which social factors have on the connotations which (the use of) a specific language or linguistic items have for the projection of an individual's identity, but also the impact which these factors have on the development of the pragmatico-semantic structure of particular linguistic items, at lesser and greater time-depths, in synchrony and diachrony.

The Introduction is structured in the following way. Section 2 is devoted to definitions of, and key distinctions between, terms such as positioning (2.1), identity (2.2), indexicality (2.3), (inter)subjectivity (2.4) and ideology (2.5), drawing out the ways that positioning can be conceptualised and how the volume contributes to our thinking in these areas through its focus on particular linguistic features. Individual chapters are summarised in Section 3, and Section 4 provides an overview of the contribution of the volume as a whole, focussing on address terms (and vocatives), pragmatic markers, code switching and code choice and orthography, and highlighting the findings from the different chapters.

2. Positioning, identity, indexicality, (inter)subjectivity, ideology

2.1 Positioning

This section introduces the notion of 'positioning', the theoretical and methodological approaches taken to positioning in the different contributions to the volume and how the volume might be said

to contribute to our thinking in the different fields where positioning is relevant. The notion of positioning is familiar from the field of social psychology, from Davies and Harré's (1990) introduction to the discursive production of selves and Harré and Van Langenhove's (1991) outline of the ways in which we position ourselves in discourse. Positioning theory has at its core the idea of discursive practice and goes back to Bakhtin, Benveniste, Wittgenstein and Foucault. Our social reality is constructed, reproduced and can be contested through repetitive acts of daily interaction. Institutional and rhetorical practices are important elements in the constitution of social reality but it is through conversations that our positionings in relation to one another and to the broader social system are reproduced and transformed. As interactions unfold, speakers shape social reality. Against this broader sociological and psychological background to positioning, the present volume takes a more incisively linguistic focus at the interface of sociolinguistics and pragmatics and contributes to a number of ongoing debates in linguistics. In general, and in the conceptualisation adopted in the current volume, sociolinguistics and pragmatics can be said to intersect over issues to do with context. While pragmatics focuses on how speakers make meaning in (contextualised) interactions (meanings which are not necessarily derivable from the propositional or locutionary semantics in an utterance), sociolinguistics looks at social meaning making, and how speakers position themselves linguistically in relation to relevant ideological and cultural factors and social and power hierarchies. In line with the more general move towards constructionism over the last 50 years, variationist sociolinguists (e.g. Eckert 2012) trace 'three waves' of variationist study, all of which continue to have currency in contemporary sociolinguistics, though somewhat contentiously. By first wave studies, Eckert refers to the classic Labovian variationist tradition launched in the 1960s in the US and picked up by Trudgill in the UK in the 1970s. The variationist method uses survey and quantitative methods to examine the relation between linguistic variability and major demographic categories (class, age, sex, ethnicity). These studies reveal the "big picture" of the social spread of sound change, with change in the U.S. spreading outward from the upper working class. The second wave of variation studies employs ethnographic methods which give local

meaning to the more abstract demographic categories outlined in the first wave. Both first and second wave studies focus on some kind of speech community, and examine linguistic features as local/regional dialect variants, viewing them as identity markers. Building on the findings of the first and second waves of variation studies, the third wave focuses on the social meaning of variants of a particular variable. It views styles, rather than variants, as directly associated with identity categories, and explores the contributions of variants to styles. In shifting the focus from dialects to styles, it shifts the focus from speaker categories to the individual construction of personae. Coupland (2007) provides examples of the ways that speakers draw on stereotypes to 'style' their language creatively in discourse.

In many quarters it has become deeply unfashionable to take an unproblematised 'first wave' approach to social categorisation, which focuses on speakers' age, social class, gender and ethnicity and traces linguistic change through apparent time, typically examining the influence of both social class and gender in such changes; the apparently deterministic and undynamic nature of such attributions is unpalatable and suggests that 'positions' are immutable and cannot be negotiated, reinforcing essentialist conceptualisations. Styling arises, however, out of stereotyping and stereotypes are caricatures or exaggerations of features characterising particular celebrities or social types – what is more, styling is a relatively unusual and skilled performance. As Rickford (2001: 20, emphasis in the original) points out:

> Some verbal (and non-verbal) performances, especially those that involve radio broadcasts, large audiences and public occasions **are** more stylized than others… There are undoubtedly parallels to this kind of stylization in one-to-one conversation, but the opportunities and possibilities for it seem to increase as audience size grows.

Bucholtz and Hall (2010: 20) suggest that the most striking cases of identity construction or discursive positioning are when speakers 'sever the ideologically expected mapping between language and biology or culture' (transgender identity; ethnic, racial and national boundary

crossing). They contend, however, that 'identity is discursively produced even in the most mundane and unremarkable situations'.

Many of the chapters in the volume look at the ways that speakers position themselves in precisely such mundane and unremarkable situations. The contributors strive to highlight the 'positionings we live by' (to take up Lakoff and Johnson's 1980 wording about metaphor) in other words to reveal the unconscious ways in which language positions us and our relationship with our interlocutors. It is possible in this way not only to unveil normative social categorisations but also to critique them. On the one hand, speakers can find themselves positioned in relation to one another through socially conventionalised items such as T/V address forms (see chs 2 and 3). On the other hand, speakers draw on pragmatic markers for a wide range of purposes, positioning themselves in relation to their own speech (*if you like*, ch. 6) and modalising (*et tout*, ch. 7) and, in doing so, mediating their relationship with their interlocutors (positioning themselves and others). What is more, the rise in the use of particular pragmatic markers amongst young people constitutes a form of generalised 'styling' which creates in-groups and out-groups at particular points in time (cases in point include *genre* and *être là* in ch. 7, *look* in ch. 8, *cioè* in ch. 9). In other words, these items become indexical (see section 2.3 below).

Positioning can be considered to be the result of the negotiation between speakers and their interlocutors in relation to their choice of a particular linguistic feature which can be more or less conscious and free. Such a negotiation may occur at different levels: a) an individual level– e.g. how a teenager chooses to speak to his/her peers; b) a social level, through socially conventionalized norms which speakers may decide to follow or not – e.g. T/V address forms–; c) institutional level, through more or less codified religious, social and political norms on which the individual has no possibility of choice – e.g. road signs.

The positioning of the self and other(s) relates to identity work, but also to face work and politeness. Politeness theory in the Brown and Levinson (1987) mould uncovered the ways in which the weightiness of the speech act (degree of linguistic politeness) is conventionally or normatively

related to social distance and power differentials between speakers. Though Brown and Levinson's (1987) model has been roundly criticised by both researchers working on East Asian languages, and by those who believe that im/politeness is in the ear of the hearer, and is construed dynamically, it remains the seminal work in the area of politeness, and can help in the analysis of the ways that speakers position self and other in everyday interaction, managing both their own and their interlocutor's face. Chapters in the volume which focus on address forms (ch.3), greetings (ch.4) and veracity (ch.13) make reference to Brown and Levinson's model, while Leech (2014) and Culpeper (2011) underpin the analysis of the adolescents' (im)politeness in ch.8.

Two chapters in the volume (chs. 2 and 6) draw, conceptually and methodologically, on variational pragmatics, a relatively new approach to the thorny problem of circumscribing pragmatic variability across regional varieties of pluricentric languages. These chapters can be said to attempt to capture norms in the ways that speakers position themselves, albeit focussing on different linguistic features (address terms in ch.2 and metacommenters in ch.6), in different languages and national varieties, Sweden Swedish vs. Finland Swedish and European French/English vs. North American French/English respectively.

Meanwhile, constructionist and (interactional) sociolinguistic approaches which fully recognise the dynamic and flexible performance of social identities, including the ways the speakers position self and other in discourse (Ochs, Schegloff and Thompson 1996; Bucholtz and Hall 2005, 2010; Jaffe 2009) are drawn upon in a range of chapters across the volume (chs. 2, 4, 8, 10, 11) to underpin the analysis of the data. Chapters 7, 11 and 13 focus particularly on the positioning of self in narrative genres (Bamberg 1997; De Fina et al. 2006; Bamberg et al. 2007; Bamberg 2010).

A final, more technical, aspect of positioning which is covered in the volume relates to the syntactic positioning of linguistic items (which position self and other) on the syntagmatic chain. This is discussed by Salameh Jiménez et al. in Ch. 5. This chapter contributes to debates on (inter)subjectivity and (inter)subjectification (see Section 2.4 below) and whether more subjective forms occur on the left periphery of the argument structure while more intersubjective forms tend to

occur on the right periphery (a hypothesis proposed in Beeching and Detges (eds) 2014). Jiménez et al.'s proposal of the Val.Es.Co. or VAMs model of discourse segmentation breaks new ground by further defining the type of unit (out of a total of eight) over which intersubjective pragmatic markers have scope. This model is also adopted in ch. 9, Ghezzi's study of *cioè* in contemporary Italian.

The volume as a whole explores the tension between the normative and the discursive – and it does so by drawing on a range of theoretical and methodological traditions, at the interface between sociolinguistics and pragmatics. Not only is positioning analysed looking at the ways that particular language forms come to have particular social indexicalities (Chapters 2-9) which can in turn be drawn upon strategically for particular purposes (for instance in emails) but also (in Chapters 10-13), in relation to more widely circulating social attitudes and ideologies, following a tradition exemplified by De Fina *et alii* (2006).

2.2 Identity

As the third wave of sociolinguistic studies has shown, situated language use helps shape relations between interactants. These, more or less conscious, linguistic choices have an important role in the construction of a person's linguistic identity and combine to position a person vis-à-vis others Locher and Graham 2010:3). Identity has been widely analysed in the social and behavioural sciences (cf. Lavie and Swedenburg 1996; Jega 2000) and in such fields as sociolinguistics, interpersonal pragmatics, social psychology and narrative studies through different theoretical and methodological approaches (De Fina 2010). The perspective of these studies has gradually shifted from a vision of identity as a fixed set of categories that can be attributed to the individual or to the group towards a social constructionist approach which understands identity as a process in flux enacted in concrete social encounters and social practices. In such a perspective identity can be considered highly negotiable in interaction, emergent and largely co-constructed (De Fina 2010: 206-7).

Language is an ‘identity marker’ par excellence as it plays a central role in both interpreting and proclaiming identity ('language acts are acts of identity' Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1985: 181). Yet, within the perspective of this volume, the linguistic behaviour is not given *a priori*, instead it is a dynamic process taking place in specific contexts of interaction, which have specific pragmatic and socio-cultural coordinates. This implies that the identities construed through language use in such contexts are variable and indexically connected to social categories.

Such a concept of identity subsumes “many of the theoretical constructs used to study identities: it connects utterances to extralinguistic reality via the ability of linguistic signs to point to aspects of the social context” (De Fina *et alii* 2006: 4).

Indexicality therefore relates linguistic signs such as pragmatic markers, address terms, utterances, code or orthographic choices, etc., to complex systems of meaning such as ideologies, social representations about group membership, social roles and attributes, presuppositions about all aspects of social reality, individual and collective stances, practices and organizational structures (De Fina 2010: 215).

One of the aims of this volume is therefore to consider identity from this perspective as the product of these dynamic psychological and cultural processes by which speakers construct and express their senses of self. In other words, identity is conceived here in terms of constructions of the self through the use of language in context and of the different ways in which “people position or construct themselves and are positioned or constructed by others in socio-cultural situations through the instrumentality of the repertoires of languages at their disposal and with reference to all of those variables that are identity markers for each society in the speech of its members” (Omoniyi and White 2006: 1). This implies integrating analysis of how speakers encode their identities and subjectivities through language, but also how they discursively construct them.

In this volume identity is considered as “the social positioning of self and other” (Bucholtz and Hall 2005: 586; 2010: 18). Bucholtz and Hall’s (2010: 19) broad and interdisciplinary approach to the investigation of identity includes a number of analytical levels - they cite, for example, vowel quality, turn shape, code choice and ideological structure, all of which operate at ‘multiple levels

simultaneously'. Bucholtz and Hall's (2010: 9-27) approach to the analysis of identity includes five principles which need to be taken into consideration: Emergence, Positionality, Indexicality, Relationality and Partialness. Some chapters in the current volume (chs. 10-13) embed their analysis of everyday interactions (spoken or written) within a consideration of the macro, socio-cultural and ideological factors identified by Bucholtz and Hall and provide further evidence of the validity of their approach. Valentinsson's analysis of a dinner-time conversation, for example, illustrates the way that code-choice (Spanish or English) indexes and establishes an ideological linguistic hierarchy – in the US, English is seen as the more appropriate language for talk about science, scholarship and academia. In their analysis of narratives of return migration to Greece, Nikolaou and Sclafani observe interesting patterns of membership categorisation, indicating different levels of identity (dis)affiliation. Code-switching, reported speech and pronoun shifting emerge as strategies which are used in the performance of hybridity. Guerini's analysis of the spelling choices made on road-signs representing the local Bergamasco dialect reveals institutional identity-making of an ideological sort, authorising and legitimating Bergamasco as a local identity marker distinct from that associated with standard Italian. For its part, Höfler's ethnographically informed conversation analysis of interviews with members of Georgia's Greek community identifies the discourse marker *chestno govorya* ('honestly speaking') as a means speakers employ to approach difficult topics and establish membership categories such as 'Christians' and 'Muslims'. These chapters focus on macro categorisations, such as national, local or religious identities and the extent to which speakers affiliate to those categorisations. Approaching issues of identity through an ethnographic, bottom-up analysis of interviews and everyday language data allows the researcher to keep an open mind with respect to which language items emerge as salient in the enactment of identity. The shifting affiliations expressed by the speakers highlight the importance of positionality, indexicality, relationality, and, last but not least, partialness. Not only does the researcher influence the way that the data are collected and analysed, but the cultural

identity enacted by the participants can only be said to be partial, subject to both ideological and contextual constraints.

Where this volume departs somewhat from Bucholtz and Hall's approach to identity which (quite justifiably) recommends attending to all five principles simultaneously, is in its focus on the specific linguistic items which seem to operate cross-linguistically to allow speakers to position themselves and others. Chapters 2 – 9 attempt to tease out which forms do which type of work, and to investigate the relationship between identity work and linguistic structure, at both a lexical semantic and syntactic level. This implies a level of generalisation which departs from the local ethnographically specific cultural positions and temporary and interactionally specific stances and participant roles which form the focus of much of the more subjective discourse-analytic investigation of identity. The attempt here is to identify the linguistic correlates of these instantiations of identity work.

Chapters 2 – 9 take specific speech events and linguistic items as their point of departure and explore the ways that these are used in naturally occurring data to position speakers and listeners. Two chapters investigate address forms, which can serve to position speakers in (a)symmetric social distance and power relationships. In using particular address forms, instead of positioning themselves explicitly in relation to macro identity categories of nationality or religious affiliation, speakers implicitly enact social hierarchical identities in relation to one another. Though negotiation is possible, the penalties for breaching normative practices in the use of address forms generally preclude unconventional usages. The (a)symmetric adoption of T/V and other forms positions speakers in relation to each other in a social hierarchy, and establishes a particular social identity of a specifically relational sort. That is not to say that these positions do not shift across national boundaries, or across time, as we shall see in Norrby et al.'s and Molinelli's chapters, respectively. The use of address forms has been little studied in works specifically on identity, yet they are, in many languages, pivotal ways of positioning speakers and their social identities in relation to one another.

Debray and Reissner-Roubicek's chapter on the formulation of greetings and closings in workplace emails in Brazilian Portuguese shows how the presence or absence of greetings and closings and the adoption of particular stylistic registers position writers on a relational axis, creating intimacy or distance dynamically as well as more conventionally. Again, the doing of identity work in emails – and specifically in relation to the ways that openings and closings are realised linguistically – has not previously received detailed examination.

Pragmatic markers also emerge in the volume (Chs 6 – 9) as an important way for speakers to position themselves and to do identity work. As Beeching (2016: 4) argues, pragmatic markers are multifunctional, but they are particularly associated with spoken interaction, and serve to index both informality and belonging to particular social groups. Beeching's chapter in the current volume explores metacommenting expressions such as *if you like* which at one and the same time allow speakers to distance themselves from their own words and elicit the condonement and understanding of their interlocutors. The chapter reveals the ubiquity of these forms in English and French, and how they vary across varieties in Europe and America. Chapters by Secova and Aijmer highlight markers used by young speakers in French and English respectively. Whereas the quotative (*genre, être là*) and general extender (*et tout)* forms used by the speakers in Secova's data appear to be incoming forms, Aijmer highlights attention-getters such as *look, listen* or *excuse me* as being particularly frequent in, and characteristic of, adolescent talk. Both appear to be classic examples of the process of indexicalisation discussed in Section 2.3 below. Once again, forms can attract new indexicalities over time, as Ghezzi's chapter on *cioè* convincingly demonstrates. Once associated with youthspeak in Italy, *cioè* is gradually falling out of use. These chapters demonstrate that, once candidate forms for identity work are identified at a lexical level, variational pragmatic and corpus linguistic methods can be used to quantify and further explore their uses. Again, this is not an approach which is traditionally associated with work on identity construction, but has very evident potential.

2.3 Indexicality

The term ‘indexicality’ is adopted in two fundamentally different ways in the volume. Aijmer (ch.8) uses it in the sense commonly accepted in pragmatics to talk of the way that language forms ‘index’ or ‘point at’ other language forms. The pronoun ‘he’ can refer to ‘Jack’ for example and ‘here’ or ‘now’ can refer to particular contextual correlates (‘Bristol’ or ‘Bergamo’; ‘April 2015’ or ‘October 2020’). The term ‘indexicality’ has other associations in sociolinguistics and this is the type of indexicality which is most often referred to in the volume. It was Ochs (1992) who first highlighted the notions of direct and indirect indexicality (direct indexicality being the use of ‘girl’ to refer to a young female and indirect indexicality being the heavy use of, for example, the quotative *be like* which is typical of girls and thus comes to indirectly index ‘girl’). She focussed on the way in which linguistic forms used in performing specific interactional activities can come to ‘index’ a social identity and gives the example of a mother using baby-talk which, as it is associated with responding to a child’s needs, comes to index the social identity of care-giver to children. Silverstein (2003) developed the model, referring to the three steps or layers as *n*-th order indexicality, *n* +1-th order indexicality and (*n* + 1) + 1-th-order indexicality. Johnstone (2010:31) shows how a particular pronunciation of *aw* in Pittsburgh comes to index the friendly social identity of authentic Pittsburghers, while Beeching (2016: 16) argues that the use of certain pragmatic markers can equally have such values, indexing informality, intimacy, shared knowledge, but also youthspeak. Contributions to the current volume show the importance of particular linguistic resources in the creation, enactment, and ascription of identities when they are used by speakers or writers to represent themselves or their fictional characters as members of societal groups (see e.g. T vs V address forms in present or past societies, see also Culpeper 2011; *if you will* in Canadian and US English vs *if you like* in British English, Eng. *look* or It. *cioè* in young speech, Fr. *et out* in different generations of speakers).

2.4 (Inter)subjectivity and (inter)subjectification

In the enactment of their identities, speakers express their *subjectivity* which includes their intentions, attitudes and beliefs. Both identity and subjectivity refer to the social nature of language,

but, while identity concerns the sociolinguistic characterization of an individual in relation to a social context, subjectivity refers to the pragmatic dimension of the individual in relation to a speech event.

Subjectivity emerges in a pragmatic perspective as it relates to the ways in which speakers express their perceptions, feelings and opinions in discourse (cf. Benveniste 1971). As Lyons says, subjectivity is "the way in which natural languages, in their structure and their normal manner of operation, provide for the locutionary agent's expression of himself and his own attitudes and beliefs" (1982: 102). In a more general sense, subjectivity is "the capacity of the speaker to posit himself as subject" (Benveniste 1971: 224). Although the expression of subjectivity is a necessary condition for each speaker, the ways in which it is enacted are different in each language in a given socio-historical moment. Linguistic strategies that speakers use to express their subjectivity conventionalize and interact with linguistic structure in a diachronic process of subjectification. Pragmatic markers provide substantial evidence of grammaticalisation through processes of (inter)subjectification, issues which are touched upon in both Beeching's study of metacommenters (*if you like/sort of*) and Secova's study of quotatives (*c'est genre)*, while the structural issues relating to the syntactic positioning of (inter)subjectified elements are addressed in Salameh Jiménez et al.'s chapter on discourse units and peripheries.

2.5 Ideology

Ideology is a term used to refer to political, cultural, religious and social beliefs which are often opaque to those who hold them and intrinsic to the language forms and assumptions they adopt. Kienpointner and Stopfner (2017) provide an interesting discussion of the history of and different interpretations of the term 'ideology', and relate this particularly to (im)politeness. With particular regard to language, it is broadly agreed by sociolinguists that there is an 'ideology of the standard' (Milroy e.g. 2001) which promotes the national, standard, language over regional languages, dialects or varieties of a language. The equality in structure but difference in status between a language and a dialect has been jokingly referred to in the saying that a language is nothing more

than a ‘dialect with an army and navy’. The standard language is often at the heart of the creation of a nation state. It is the standard which has prestige in a particular society and the standard language is enshrined in printed form and is often the only variety taught in schools (and through which other subjects are taught). This ideology of the standard can make speakers internalise a sense of shame about their own language/variety. The chapters in the volume indicate the ways that underlying ideologies are reflected in language forms, such as address terms (see chs. 2 and 3), or in attitudes to language choices, which are reproduced or contested (see ch. 11, Valentinsson’s analysis of a married couple’s use of English, or a particular variety of Spanish, over the dinner table or ch. 12, where Bergamasco orthography in road-signs signals an ideological decision to support the local language).

The different chapters in this volume examine in detail the linguistic resources that index the relationship between the self and the other(s) by combining analysis of specific speech events or language forms across representative samples of particular speakers (Chapters 2-9) with the detailed analysis of data and interviews with individuals set within the wider context of communities, societies and the ideologies which circulate within those societies (Chapters 10-13).

3. Summary of the chapters

In **chapter 2** Norrby *et alii* investigate positioning through address practice in service encounter data in the two national varieties of Swedish: Finland Swedish and Sweden Swedish. They draw on video-recorded service encounters at box offices in Finland and Sweden where a customer requests or collects a pre-booked ticket to a play, a concert or sports event. Such encounters typically consist of brief interactions between strangers in highly routinized, yet very dialogic settings. The authors focus on how the participants in the interactions use – or do not use – address pronouns to position themselves in relation to one another in the social roles of customer and staff-member and how other aspects such as the national variety of a language, age of speakers, and situational circumstances also impact on the positioning of self and other through address forms.

C**hapter 3** by Piera Molinelli considers speakers' positionalities through address choice from a socio-historical pragmatic perspective by investigating the socio-cultural and linguistic factors which triggered and constrained changes in address choice from Latin to Italian. Socio-historical pragmatics represents a well-established line of research (see, e.g., Culpeper and Kytö 2000, Taavitsainen and Jucker 2003, Archer and Culpeper 2003, Andersen and Aijmer 2011, Ghezzi 2015). This diachronic analysis considers some of the steps which turned out to be crucial in the pragmatic development under scrutiny: Classical Latin, Late Latin, Old Italian, and subsequent changes in 16th/19th century Italian.

In **chapter 4**, Debray and Reissner-Roubicek explore the ways in which interlocutors position self and others in workplace emails in Brazil. They focus specifically on the positioning of interlocutors as close or more distant in terms of their relationship, and discuss the reason for their specific strategic choices in terms of existing research on national and organisational culture in Brazil. In paying attention to the way social relationships at work are indexed through language, a focus on specific features in emails seems particularly warranted due to the reportedly large shift in emphasis in Brazilian workplaces from verbal to written communication as a way of getting things done (Pacheco de Oliveira 2009).

In **chapter 5** Salameh Jiménez *et alii* consider how speaker positioning is managed at the utterance level through the use of discourse markers. In recent years, the issues of subjectivity and intersubjectivity have been widely explored in semantics and pragmatics and efforts have been devoted to studying the relationship between the expression of (inter)subjectivity through linguistic items and the presence of these items on the left or right periphery of the argument structure. The use of the Val.Es.Co. model of discourse segmentation which distinguishes between *initial position* with scope over a smaller, monological unit and *initial position* with scope over a wider, dialogical unit is argued to shed greater light on the periphery problem.

In **chapter 6**, Beeching takes a variational pragmatics approach to the analysis of metacommenting forms in English and French, in Europe and Canada/the US, drawing on a range of time-dated

corpora. Metacommenters allow speakers to position themselves as ‘non-expert’ or tentative in their choice of expression. English and French draw pragmatically on similar linguistic resources for their pool of metacommenters, subjectivity being expressed through *sort of/kind of* and *like* in English, and *genre, comme* and post-posed *quoi* in French, while intersubjectivity is inherent in the personal pronouns in *if you like/if you will* in English and *si tu veux/si vous voulez* in French. Rates of usage, however, are shown to vary across languages and across varieties.

In **chapter 7,** Secova takes a cross-linguistic and variationist perspective to the analysis of speakers’ positionality through reported speech. Drawing on a recent corpus of contemporary London English and Paris French, the author analyses functional similarities and differences in the use of new quotatives (similarity quotatives *be like* in London; *genre, en mode, (faire) style, être comme ça* in Paris and deictic quotatives *this is* + SPEAKER in London, *être là* in Paris) and general extenders (e.g. *and stuff* in London, *et tout* in Paris). While different variants in both languages are indirectly associated with different social personae, they perform similar pragmatic functions such as hedging, marking solidarity and appealing to common knowledge between the speaker and the interlocutor(s).

In **chapter 8**, Aijmer considers the nature of the indexicality of a group of pragmatic markers derived from attention-getters such as *look, listen, hey, come on*. Prototypically attention-getters point forwards to what is coming next in the discourse. However, the attention-getters used by adolescents in the Bergen Corpus of London Teenager Language (COLT) studied here acquire a social indexicality, too. Young people seem to have more relaxed turn-taking rules and pay less attention to politeness than adults do (Andersen 2001). Both *look* and *listen* are excellent devices for controlling the conversation. *Look* can introduce a new voice in the dramatized narrative, and is also used to interrupt and to mark disagreement in conflictive ‘but’-talk.

In **chapter 9**, Ghezzi also focuses on the social meanings acquired by a pragmatic marker when used by young speakers. The chapter analyses the evolution of the constellation of indexicalities and social meanings acquired by the pragmatic marker *cioè* lit. ‘that is (to say)’ in Present-Day

Italian from the late 1970s to the present day. *Cioè* is traditionally described as a discourse marker with a reformulating and corrective value (Bazzanella 1995). However, in Present-Day Italian it has also developed a third order indexicality as its use in the 1980s was associated with a young speech style (cf. Silverstein 2003; Goldoni 1977). The marker peaked in frequency, degree of polyfunctionality and types of structural contexts of occurrence in the 1980s. Today, however, *cioè* represents a regressing variable in young speech, which is outnumbered by other incoming variables (e.g. *tipo* lit. 'type').

In **chapter 10**, Valentinsson considers how the interconnection between the micro level of conversation and the macro level of language ideologies is shaped through speakers' positionalities. The chapter presents an analysis of an excerpt from a family dinnertime conversation among an English-Spanish bilingual family in the southwestern United States. A turn-by-turn analysis of an argument about 'proper' varieties of Spanish reveals that stance-taking moves such as presupposition and code-choice are linguistic forms that can convey speaker subjectivity, and they do this by generating (ideological) implications. Crucially, this shows how micro-level relationships constructed between 'the self' and 'others' through interaction constitute some of the 'mediating links' between forms of talk and ideology.

Chapter 11, by Nikolaou and Sclafani, also focuses on the need to connect momentary stances and alignments in interaction with macro-level social categories in order to understand the 'emergent' nature of identity (Bucholtz and Hall 2005; Jaffe 2009). The chapter explores the narrative construction of identity in interviews with 11 second generation biethnic Greeks, (mainly Greek Americans) who relocated to their parents' homeland as adults within a decade prior to the interviews. Return migrants constitute an understudied group, especially from a sociolinguistic perspective, and Nicolaou and Sclafani argue that understanding the complex positioning of identities among this group provides unique insights into the broader ideologies that mediate hybrid and hyphenated identities in general.

In **chapter 12**, Guerini analyses the symbolic import of spelling choices in the enactment of local identities in some municipal authorities in the province of Bergamo (Northern Italy). The chapter focuses on the introduction of road signs displaying both the Italian and the local Italo-Romance dialect (Bergamasco) version of the place-names. The author argues that the very decision to consider the local Bergamasco dialect eligible for public display at the initiative of an official authority carries social and political meaning. The analysis of the graphic solutions adopted in order to write a language currently used almost exclusively in spoken form (i.e. the local Bergamasco dialect) reveals the identity-related value of spelling choices.

Höfler, in **chapter 13**, focuses on the social and cultural positionalities by members of the multilingual Georgian Greek community in interviews. Contrary to most current assumptions about how identification and language use fit together, Georgian Greek informants assert that the languages they speak are not necessarily a major determining factor for their Greekness. The chapter analyses the meta-communicative means speakers employ in the interviews in order to pragmatically restrict statements about the respective in- and out-groups to the sphere of their personal experiences and opinion. Discourse markers like *chestno govorya* 'honestly speaking' serve as strong disclaimers that what follows has face-threatening potential. The analysis focuses on elucidating the positioning(s) of the speaker and the boundaries drawn in instances highlighted by *chestno govorya*.

4. Conclusions

The principal aim of this collection was to draw together researchers interested in the linguistic means that speakers and writers draw upon to position themselves and others, subjectively and intersubjectively, at the interface of sociolinguistics and pragmatics. The different contributions (and we are far from claiming to be in any way comprehensive) highlight four main linguistic forms or strategies which serve to position speakers:

1. T/V address terms and vocatives

2. Pragmatic markers
3. Code switching and code choice
4. (Non-standard) orthography

T/V address terms, vocatives and pragmatic markers generally contribute to the ways that speakers do politeness, managing face and rapport and indexing social identities, such as being young or old, in particular power relations, or being socially distant or intimate (what we might refer to as discourse). Code-switching/code-choice and orthographic choices, on the other hand, generally serve to mediate or contest broader societal ideologies (what we might refer to as Discourse), in particular to do with national, local and ethnic identities. There is, however, some crossing of items from discourse to Discourse, and vice versa: T/V address terms for example are embedded, and shift, according to broader societal movements; *chestno govorya* (arguably a pragmatic marker) emerges as a veracity marker in comments on Discourse; non-standard orthography is used in emails to index intimacy (discourse). The existence of these cross-overs makes a strong case for the continued dialogue between researchers of a more quantitative and of a more qualitative orientation, showing the impact of ideology on social interaction and of social interaction on ideology.

The contributions gathered in this volume examine both synchronic and diachronic data, from the spoken and written varieties of different languages (different varieties of English and French, Greek, Italian, Spanish, Brazilian Portuguese, Bergamasco, Russian, Georgian and Swedish). In this way, evidence is adduced of the ways in which subjectivities and identities are articulated across a range of language families and language types. Not all languages have T/V systems, but where they exist, they work to maintain asymmetric power and social relations or to mediate (im)politeness or (dis)respect. Vocatives and other address forms (first name, title + second name), along with other stylistic choices, appear to serve a similar purpose in English which no longer has a T/V system. It is interesting that many European languages seem to be developing more symmetric T (or V) address systems – though this is far from being the case everywhere, and usage is far from

standardised. This is illustrated in Molinelli's chapter about T/V in Italy and Norrby et alii's chapter on address practice in Sweden Swedish and Finland Swedish.

While most languages have a range of pragmatic markers and modal particles at their disposal, these are not often translationally equivalent, although they play similar interactional and modalising roles in conversation, often downplaying overstrong assertions of opinion and thus showing respect for the opinions of others. The volume has a number of chapters on the use of markers by young people, how these evolve, and the functions they have. The London teenagers with their use of direct imperative forms to attract the attention of their peers seem to show very different relational practices from the subjects studied for example by Secova in Paris and London, or indeed from the young Italians using *cioè* studied by Ghezzi. This argues the need to include careful consideration of the degree of intimacy between interlocutors and the circumstances in which recordings are made.

Finally, the commodification we see in the use of Bergamasco as a means of proclaiming a regional identity is further confirmation of a tendency we see developing elsewhere. Beal (2009) talks about the ways that local dialect forms have been commodified as a form of tourist attraction in Newcastle (with local expressions appearing on mugs or T-shirts) and Ferguson (2013) shows how Guernésiais is being revived in street-signs on the island of Guernsey.

The volume set out to illustrate how speakers and writers position themselves in relation to their place in society and to each other as individuals, using a wide range of linguistic forms. The different chapters show how the speaker's identity is multifaceted and how individuals may have different degrees of freedom of choice of linguistic forms depending on the context of interaction (e.g. individual vs social vs institutional levels). These linguistic forms range from very small units such as diacritics, pragmatic markers and pronouns of address to larger ones such as closings, narrative construction or language choice. All of these forms have been shown to be drawn upon to reflect or to indicate ideological preferences, stances and attitudes with regard to the societies we

live in, the way we present ourselves as members of those societies, and to each other, in speech and writing, synchronically and diachronically, in a number of languages.

What emerges clearly from the collection as a whole is that, though the social indexicalities associated with linguistic forms shift and change to reflect broader cultural and ideological factors, individual speakers have a very rich palette of linguistic resources to draw upon in positioning themselves and others to construct their identities. We hope to have exemplified a small portion of these and to have stimulated further research studies in this vein.

References

Andersen, Gisle. 2001. *Pragmatic Markers and Sociolinguistic Variation: A Relevance-Theoretic Approach to the Language of Adolescents.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Andersen, Gisle, and Karin Aijmer. (eds). 2011. *Pragmatics of Society.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Archer, Dawn, and Jonathan Culpeper. 2003. "Sociopragmatic Annotation: New Directions and Possibilities in Historical Corpus Linguistics." In *Corpus Linguistics by the Lune: A Festschrift for Geoffrey Leech*, ed. by Andrew Wilson, Paul Rayson, and Tony McEnery, 37-58. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.

Bamberg, Michael. 1997. "Positioning between Structure and Performance." *Journal of narrative and life history* 7 (1-4): 335-342.

Bamberg, Michael. 2010. "Blank Check for Biography? Openness and Ingenuity in the Management of the 'Who-Am-I-Question'." In *Telling Stories: Language, Narrative, and Social Life*, ed. by Deborah Schiffrin, Anna De Fina, and Anastasia Nylund, 109-121. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Bamberg, Michael, Anna De Fina, and Deborah Shiffrin (eds). 2007. *Selves and Identities in Narrative and Discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Bazzanella, Carla. 1995. "I segnali discorsivi." In *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione. III Tipi di frase, deissi, formazione delle parole*, ed. by Lorenzo Renzi, Giampaolo Salvi, and Anna Cardinaletti, 225-257. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Beal, Joan. 2009. “Enregisterment, Commodification and Historical Context: “Geordie” versus “Sheffieldish”.” *American Speech* 84 (2): 138-156.

Beeching, Kate. 2016. *Pragmatic Markers in British English. Meaning in Social Interaction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Beeching, Kate, and Ulrich Detges (eds). 2014. *Discourse Functions at the Left and Right Periphery. Cross-linguistic Investigations of Language Use and Language Change.* Leiden: Brill.

Benveniste, Émile. 1971. “Subjectivity in Language.” *Problems in General Linguistics* 1: 223-230.

Brown, Penelope, and Stephen Levinson. [1978] 1987. *Politeness. Some Universals in Language Usage.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bucholtz, Mary, and Kira Hall. 2005. “Identity and Interaction: a Sociocultural Linguistic Approach.” *Discourse Studies,* 7 (4-5): 585-614.

Bucholtz, Mary, and Kira Hall. 2010. “Locating Identity in Language.” In *Language and Identities,* ed. by Carmen Llamas, and Dominic Watt, 18-28. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Coupland, Nikolas. 2007. *Style. Language Variation and Identity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Culpeper, Jonathan. 2011. *Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Culpeper, Jonathan, and Merja Kytö. 2000. “Data in Historical Pragmatics: Spoken Interaction (Re)cast as writing.” *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 1 (2): 175–199.

Davies, Bronwyn, and Rom Harré. 1990. “Positioning: the Discursive Production of Selves.” *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 20: 43-63.

De Fina, Anna. 2010. “The Negotiation of Identities.” In *Interpersonal Pragmatics*, ed. by Miriam A. Locher, and Sage L. Graham, 205-224. Berlin: Mouton.

De Fina, Anna, Deborah Schiffrin, and Michael Bamberg. 2006. *Discourse and Identity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eckert, Penelope. 2012. “Three Waves of Variation Study: The Emergence of Meaning in the Study of Sociolinguistic Variation.” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 41: 87-100.

Ferguson, Clare. 2013. “The Subjunctive in *Guernsey* French: Implications for Gauging Authenticity in an Endangered Language.” Unpublished PhD Thesis, UWE, Bristol.

Ghezzi, Chiara. 2015. “Thanking Formulae. The Role of Language Contact in the Diachrony of Italian.” In *Contatto interlinguistico fra presente e passato*, ed. by Carlo Consani, 315-343. Milano: LED.

Goldoni, Luca. 1977. *Cioè*. Milano: Arnoldo Mondadori Editore.

Harré, Rom, and Luk van Langenhove. 1991. “Varieties of Positioning.” *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 21 (4), 393-407.

Jaffe, Alexandra. 2009. *Stance: Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Jega, Attahiru (ed). 2000. *Identity Transformation and Identity Politics under Structural Adjustment in Nigeria.* Uppsala: Nordiska Africa Institute.

Johnstone, Barbara. 2010. “Locating Language in Identity.” In *Language and Identities*, ed. by Carmen Llamas, and Dominic Watts, 29-36. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Kienpointner, Manfred, and Maria Stopfner. 2017. “Ideology and (Im)politeness.” In *Palgrave Handbook of Linguistic (Im)politeness*, ed. by Jonathan Culpeper, Michael Haugh, and Daniel Kadar, 61-87. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By.* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Lavie, Smadar, and Ted Swedenburg (eds). 1996. *Displacement, Diaspora and Geographies of Identity.* London: Duke University Press.

Leech, Geoffrey. 2014. *The Pragmatics of Politeness.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Le Page, Robert B., and Andrée Tabouret-Keller. 1985. *Acts of Identity. Creole-based Approaches to Language and Ethnicity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Locher, Miriam A., and Sage L. Graham. 2010. “Introduction to Interpersonal Pragmatics”. In *Interpersonal Pragmatics*, ed. by Miriam A. Locher, and Sage L. Graham, 1-13. Berlin: Mouton.

Lyons, John. 1982. “Deixis and Subjectivity: *Loquor, ergo sum?*” In *Speech, Place, and Action: Studies in Deixis and Related Topics*, ed. by Robert J. Jarvella, and Wolfgang Klein, 101-124. New York: Wiley.

Milroy, James. 2001. Language Ideologies and the Consequences of Standardization. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 5 (4): 530-555.

Ochs, Eleanor. 1992. “Indexing Gender.” In *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*, ed. by Alessandro Duranti, and Charles Goodwin, 335-358. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, Elinor, Emanuel A. Schegloff, and Sandra A. Thompson (eds). 1996. *Grammar and Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Omoniyi, Tope, and Goodith White. 2006. “Introduction.” In *Sociolinguistics of Identity*, ed. by Tope Omoniyi, and Goodith White. London/New York: Continuum.

Pacheco de Oliveira, Lúcia. 2009. “Brazil.” In *Handbook of Business Discourse*, ed. by Francesca Bargiela-Chiappini, 400-411. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Rickford, John R. 2001. “Style and Stylizing from the Perspective of a Non-autonomous Sociolinguistics.” In *Style and Sociolinguistic Variation*, ed. by Penelope Eckert, and John R. Rickford, 220-234. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Silverstein, Michael. 2003. “Indexical Order and the Dialectics of Sociolinguistic Life.” *Language and Communication* 23: 193–229.

Taavitsainen, Irma, and Andreas H. Jucker (eds). 2003. *Diachronic Perspectives on Address Term Systems*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.