I never know what to say when someone asks what I have done and do. So much of it has depended and depends on circumstances. I have never done anything I would myself describe as theoretical or ethnographic (in a strict sense of either term), although I have often written about ideas, and spent a fair amount of time hanging around Indians. I am interested in what is done in the study of the use of language, oral narrative and poetry, the history of anthropology and linguistics, Native Americans, theology.

Increasingly I have been focussing on the analysis of oral narratives, bringing out what turns out to be organization in terms of lines and groups of lines, verses and stanzas, in effect, not paragraphs. The entry for 'Poetry' in the Journal of Linguistic Anthropology 9(1-2): 191-3 (2000) addresses this. Such interpretation has proven valuable to members of Native American communities from which such texts have come. But I have also provided a new introduction, somewhat autobiographical, for Reinventing Anthropology, recently reprinted.

What's interesting is real work. I am always interested in combating elitism and narrowness and the playing of 'Western mind games' (as one friend once put it) at the expense of the rest of the world. The justification for the existence of anthropology is to find out about the world, not produce third-rate philosophers. Two vital issues for the field are (a) to ensure that anthropologists are the knowledgeable peers of members of any other discipline concerned with peoples and topics anthropologists study and (b) to justify scholarship in its relation to the interests and abilities of others.

Specializations
I still know something about the history of anthropology and of linguistics, and ethnography of speaking, but am actively concerned mostly with verbal traditions and languages of Oregon and Washington. (Other cases come up, as recently Wintu (Loon Woman), Mohave (Kroeber's texts), Saami ('Lapp'), and characteristics of oral epic (because of gatherings at Turku)).

2. The SPEAKING model of speech analysis:
In order to speak a language correctly, one does not only need to learn its vocabulary and grammar, but also the context in which words are used. In the speaking model the following aspects of the linguistic situation are considered:
S - Setting and Scene - The setting refers to the time and place while scene describes the environment of the situation.
P - Participants - This refers to who is involved in the speech including the speaker and the audience.
E - Ends - The purpose and goals of the speech along with any outcomes of the speech.
A - Act Sequence - The order of events that took place during the speech.
K - Key - The overall tone or manner of the speech.
I - Instrumentalities - The form and style of the speech being given.
N - Norms - Defines what is socially acceptable at the event.
G - Genre - The type of speech that is being given.


3. In 1964 Gumperz and Hymes edited a special issue of the American Anthropologist which they entitled "The Ethnography of Communication." It contained numerous articles by leading scholars in the fields of anthropology, sociology, linguistics, philosophy, and
psychology who addressed themselves to the issue of the social basis of verbal communication. The original publication has since gone out of print due to its importance and popularity, and it has been revised, updated, and expanded into *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication* (1986).

4. Hymes was inspired by Noam Chomsky's distinction on **linguistic competence** and **performance**. He proposed that we should study the knowledge that people have when they communicate—what he calls **communicative competence**. Just like linguistic competence which tells you whether a sentence is grammatical or not, communicative competence tells you whether an utterance is **appropriate** or not within a situation.

- According to Chomsky (1965):
  Linguistic theory is primarily about the language of an **ideal speaker-hearer**, in a completely **homogeneous speech community**, who knows its language perfectly and is unaffected by grammatically irrelevant conditions, such as memory limitations, distractions, shifts of attention and interest, and errors (random or characteristic) in applying his knowledge of the language in actual performance.
  --this is the **generative linguistic** tradition, especially prominent in the USA

"A record of natural speech will show numerous false starts, deviations from rules, changes of plan in mid-course, and so on." Chomsky (1965: 31)

- Agreeing with Garfinkel (1972), Hymes (p.55) says that "what to grammar is imperfect, or unaccounted for, may be artful accomplishment of social act."

- Hymes has a clever analogy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>linguistic competence</th>
<th>linguistic performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>innately-derived power in the Garden of Eden</td>
<td>eating the apple, thrusting the perfect speaker-hearer into a fallen world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intuition and linguistic knowledge of an abstract, isolated, ideal speaker-hearer</td>
<td>real speech of interlocutors in a social world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internal to linguistic structure</td>
<td>external to linguistic structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language form</td>
<td>language function &amp; use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grammaticality as a criterion</td>
<td>acceptability as a criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East coast linguistics (US)</td>
<td>West coast linguistics (US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Building (UA)</td>
<td>Haury Building (UA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generative Linguistics</td>
<td>Linguistic Anthropology, Sociolinguistics, Functional Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Chomskyian school)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>la langue</em> (de Saussure)</td>
<td><em>la parole</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Looking at an idealized simplified abstract system is a scientific consequence that formal linguistics adopts. It results in the prestige of an elegant, simple system which claims to be more fundamental to human life—making linguistics an advanced science.
Some questions you may ask to challenge this assumption:
- Does an ideal speaker-hearer exist?
- Is there a homogeneous speech community?
- Does language serve any function other than communication?
- Should language exist if it has no function at all?
- Is there any linguistic structure that is not associated with language use?

5. Hymes proposes a theory of language performance (i.e. language use). Its criterion is acceptability. This theory pursues the models/rules that underlying people's linguistic performance. This is what he calls communicative competence.

6. With great ambition, Hymes provides a framework to go beyond the distinction between competence and performance, since both can be important. Hymes asks four questions concerning language and other forms of communication (culture):

- (To what degree) is something formally possible?
  - "Something possible within a formal system is grammatical, cultural, or, on occasion, communicative. (p.66)"

- (To what degree) is something feasible in virtue of the means of implementation available?
  - psycholinguistic factors such as memory limitation, perceptual device
  - what is biologically and psychologically feasible

- (To what degree) is something appropriate in relation to a context in which it is used and evaluated?

- (To what degree) is something in fact done, actually performed, and what does its doing entail?
  - Knowledge of probabilities: This has to do with whether something is common or not. When something uncommon occurs, people may feel strange.