Dialect stylization in radio talk

N I K O L A S   C O U P L A N D

Centre for Language and Communication Research,
Cardiff University, P.O. Box 94, Cardiff CF10 3XB, Wales, UK
coupland@cardiff.ac.uk

A B S T R A C T

Stylization is the knowing deployment of culturally familiar styles and identities that are marked as deviating from those predictably associated with the current speaking context. Dialect stylization involves performing non-current-first-person personas by phonological and related means, sometimes in play or parody. Although these processes may seem to be very local, it is arguably true that dialects are increasingly experienced in reflexive and mediated environments that breed stylization. One of these is light entertainment on radio; this article analyzes data from English-language national radio broadcasts in Wales. Welshness is self-consciously evoked in the data, partly through dialect performance, where the variables (ou) and (ei) are a rich semiotic resource, linked to nondialectal means of evoking Welsh cultural stances and practices. Although stylization is a form of strategic de-authentication, its ultimate relationship with authenticity is complex. As a facet of cultural performance, stylization can be part of a process of cultural reproduction, and I argue that this is the best interpretation of the present data. As a result, sociolinguistics may need to reconsider its assumptions about cultural authenticity. (Stylization, performance, authenticity, dialect style, English in Wales, radio talk, social identity.)*

Stylization is a concept originally associated with the literary and cultural criticism of Bakhtin (1981, 1986; see also Vološinov 1973, Wales 1989). For Bakhtin, stylization has a broad remit, identifying a general quality of language use contemporary to the era in which he wrote. In 1970, for example, he suggested, "Modern man does not proclaim"; rather, "he 'speaks with reservations'"; "he stylizes ... the proclamatory genres of priests, prophets, preachers, judges, patriarchal fathers, and so forth" (1986:132). Bakhtinian stylization is therefore a subversive form of multi-voiced utterance, one that discredits hegemonic, monologic discourses by appropriating the voices of the powerful and reworking them for new purposes. For Bakhtin, stylization is a core instance of his much-cited dictum that "our speech ... is filled with others' words, varying degrees of otherness or varying degrees of 'our-own-ness,' varying degrees of awareness and detachment" (Bakhtin 1986:89).

However, stylization can be analyzed with a narrower focus: in specific communicative contexts and at specific linguistic/semiotic levels, where its effects are created and experienced much more locally than Bakhtin implies. Single utterances can be stylized, when speakers are being studiedly "artificial" or "putting on a voice," as Rampton 1995 demonstrates in his analysis of stylized Asian English. Outside of speech itself, individual bodily gestures can be "stagey" or studiedly artificial, and visual images can be "over-drawn," defining the generic principle of cartooning. Fictional characters in theatre or TV comedy – in Shakespeare or Molière, but equally Sergeant Bilko – can be drawn in stylized forms, as larger-than-life and transparently inauthentic (Coupland in press a). The school of painting and architecture known as Mannerism, which involves excessive or affected commitment to a distinctive mode of representation, institutionalizes stylized visual representation. Some fashions of dress and whole subcultural styles, such as Glam and Glitter rock in the 1970s, have used stylization socio-politically to symbolize rejection of mundane working-class social realities (Hebdige 1979:59ff.).

Stylization of and through DIALECT, my main concern in this article, also offers distinctive meaning possibilities. Dialect stylization allows us to interpret Bakhtin's "multiple voicing" rather literally. But again, I would suggest, a perspective that attends to local contexts and effects is most revealing. There is already considerable momentum to the argument that sociolinguistics can benefit by extrapolating and innovating beyond the classical Labovian sense of "stylistic variation" (Labov 1972). The concept of "styling" (e.g. Bell 1999; Cameron 2000; Coupland 1985, 1988, 2001; Eckert 2000; Rampton 1999; Eckert & Rickford 2001) is increasingly common in discussions of dialect variation, implying that dialect style needs to be viewed as a form of discursive social action. But again, as I construe it, "stylization" denotes a more specific set of discursive constructions than does styling in general. Stylization operates in a specific mode of social action, PERFORMANCE (Bauman 1977, 1992, 1996) in the strong, theatrical or quasi-theatrical sense of that term. A stylization perspective on dialect can extend the empirical study of sociolinguistic variation not only into discourse analysis but also into theories of performance of the sort recently developed in linguistic anthropology and cultural studies.

As part of this development, we are forced to reconsider the assumptions sociolinguistics has made about AUTHENTICITY – about the authentic status of naturally occurring language data, and about the cultural authenticity of dialect varieties. The most obvious manifestation of sociolinguistics' commitment to "authentic speech" is its traditional quest for the vernacular. But there has been the wider assumption that individual speakers, provided they are carefully sampled and can be observed in natural settings, speak as "true" representatives of their "traditional" speech communities and their particular positions within them. This view of authentic usage becomes difficult to sustain once we consider that

speech can, in some circumstances, involve performances of both ingroup and outgroup dialect styles. Indeed, the concepts of ingroup and outgroup themselves become problematic under these circumstances. So, in ways reminiscent of Goffman's discussion of speaking and listening roles (e.g. Goffman 1981), the concept of dialect stylization opens up questions of how and in what regard speakers OWN their speech and commit to its content and pragmatic/semiotic implications. Certain social theories suggest that, historically, there have been rather fundamental shifts in how people orient to social group identities and membership in late modernity; in light of these theories, stylization may prove to be a particularly contemporary mode of discourse.

These are the themes I come back to below in discussion of data from a local radio "light entertainment" show, broadcast in English in Wales. The data reveal different ways in which radio presenters playfully and creatively select from a pre-existing repertoire of culturally significant Welsh dialect forms of English to project shifting social personas and stances. These performances are in certain respects stylized, in that the presenters make it clear to their audience that the images they manufacture, and especially images relevant to Wales and Welshness, are "put on," "for now," and "for show." Their dialect performances need to be interpreted in relation to other sorts of discursive construction in the data, such as the stylizing of radio talk as gossip. The knowingness of these projections, the way they dislocate speakers from the most immediate socio-cultural meanings of their own speech styles, and the interpretive complexities that they trigger are what I take to be the hallmarks of stylization.

The interpretive sociolinguistic problem that motivates the analysis is, therefore, how we should see the relationship between stylized performance and authenticity in its many tantalizing dimensions. Sociolinguistics has certainly over-invested in "authentic speech" and has tended to ignore the complexities of how language use is implicated in constructing both authenticity AND INauthenticity, at varying levels. If stylization is a way of meaning that betrays its own artificiality, then by stylizing their representations, speakers DE-AUTHENTICATE themselves. All the same, I want to argue that stylized performance, including dialect stylization, can potentially deliver forms of personal and cultural authenticity that transcend local playfulness, so that the identificational effect is neither mere play nor outright parody. The social meanings that are constructed through the radio show talk do not, I argue, ultimately undermine or downgrade cultural Welshness. In fact, it is their quality of pastiche that immunizes them against the implication that these dialect forms might have been designed to capture "real" and historically continuous Welshness. That "straight" formulation might be too obvious and stark a claim to succeed in the late-modern climate. The stylizing of ingroup markers is arguably a characteristically late-modern symbolic practice that can achieve a distanced validation of speakers' social identities.

Before moving to the data analysis, I give a schematic overview of stylization processes and show how several previous studies have contributed to this perspective.

To restate two basic contrasts, invoking the idea of stylization in relation to dialect implies seeing dialect as PERFORMANCE rather than as BEHAVIOR, and (like all sociolinguistic styling) as SOCIAL PRACTICE rather than as VARIATION. The term "behavior" objectifies and automatizes language use as an "out there" social reality, amenable to sociolinguistic surveying based on random sampling. Variation implies a language system perspective. By contrast, dialect styling in general and stylization in particular are variation seen strategically from the viewpoint of social actors. To style dialect is to construct a social image or persona that interconnects with other facets of a speaker's communicative design (ideational, relational, pragmatic, nonverbal) in a particular event or act. Dialect styling is motivated, although this is not to claim that speakers will consciously and metalinguistically represent their motives and strategies. Styling may project more or less predictable social attributes, and "being predictable" is of course itself a communicative goal holding priority in many social situations. Labov's work (e.g. 1972) on stylistic variation, particularly his theorizing of hypercorrection, was a crucial first step towards this more open, strategic, social-constructivist conception of style. However, Labov's agenda for the analysis of style variation was precisely to demonstrate the normal tolerances and shared tendencies of style shift within speech communities. The principles of naturalism and realism that have driven variationist sociolinguistics (cf. Figueroa 1994:69ff.) hold that a speaker's dialect is a rather direct behavioral manifestation of cultural identity. It has been consistent with these principles to demonstrate that a particular direction and a fairly predictable extent of style variation define a regular "cultural pattern" in an urban community. In this account, "performance" (a term that has not typically been used) could only mean "fulfilling normative cultural predictions."

Two different but related paradigms – on audience design (e.g. Bell 1984, 1992, 1999) and on communication accommodation theory (e.g. Coupland 1984, Giles, Coupland & Coupland 1991) – were early proponents of the view that language style should be explained as clusters of strategic response to audience characteristics. Both explained the creative potential of speakers to construct new relational effects through stylistic choice. Giles et al.'s "convergence, maintenance and divergence" are sociolinguistic strategies said to follow from specified interpersonal ambitions; Bell's framework, and especially his concept of "initiative style," emphasize that there are alternative design options for speakers. In an early overview, I attempted an integrated perspective on dialect style, modeling style as STRATEGIC PERSONA MANAGEMENT – the deployment of different personal identities and interpersonal images (Coupland 1988).

These studies, building on Labov's initial insights into stylistic variation, were concerned mainly with what are usually considered to be speakers' "normal" or "primary" speech-style repertoires. Indeed, sociolinguistics has come to see style-shifting as normal, competent monolingual practice, in an ideological climate that acknowledges many speakers' multiple identities and the "bivalency" of sociolinguistic symbolism; bivalency is a term Woolard (1999:7) uses to connote legitimate simultaneous membership in more than one community. Several other recent studies have extended this perspective by examining how stylistic constructions can push beyond primary repertoires (as these are conventionally understood). In so doing, they challenge assumptions (as I mentioned above) about the naturalness of speech and about how it is owned and voiced. This is the point at which the analysis of styling moves into the analysis of stylization, whether or not individual studies foreground this term (and of course, individual researchers may well NOT endorse the specific sense of the term I develop below). Schilling-Estes 1998, for example, studies LANGUAGE DISPLAY by speakers in Ocracoke, North Carolina, and the theoretical importance of language display was established previously by Eastman & Stein 1993. Rampton 1991, 1995 shows how UK school students of Anglo, Asian, and Caribbean descent sometimes cross into ethnically salient dialects – fleetingly, sometimes subversively, and with complex socio-political implications. Other studies of sociolinguistic crossing across and within ethnic and cultural categories are collected in Rampton 1999, including new empirical analyses by Cutler, Bucholtz, Lo, Rampton, Johnstone, and Bell. Eckert's (2000) ethnographic studies of adolescents' vocal styling provide further rich and sociolinguistically detailed treatments of cultural construction through dialect style.

It is in Rampton's work that stylization, as opposed to styling in general, has been characterized most carefully. He analyzes how, in his data, stylized Asian English is an accent "put on" in projecting "a comic persona that was deferential, polite, uncomprehending and incompetent in English"; it was "typically described [by young people themselves] as a subterfuge that Indian and Pakistani youngsters use to undermine white authority figures" (1995:52–3). Stylization can be described as a "subterfuge" in the sense that speakers are projecting hypothetical identities. Whereas sociolinguistics has generally assumed that speakers speak in their own voices, *in propria persona*, stylizing speakers speak *in altera persona*, or at least allow that inference to be drawn. In stylizing, we speak "as if this is me," or "as if I owned this voice," or "as if I endorsed what this voice says." Stylized utterance is, to this extent, off-record, although the assessment of whether this utterance "is really mine" rather than "me playing" or "me subverting" can often be left deliberately unclear.

What follows, in the interest of brevity, is my own schematic, generalized summary of stylization processes, building on important insights in Rampton's and others' research. The significance of its various elements needs to be worked through in specific discursive instances.

Stylised utterances project personas, identities and genres other than those that are presumably current in the speech event; projected personas and genres have well-formed socio-cultural profiles and derive from known repertoires.

Stylisation is therefore fundamentally metaphorical; it brings into play stereotyped semiotic and ideological values associated with other groups, situations or times; it dislocates a speaker and utterances from the immediate speaking context.

It is reflexive, mannered and knowing; it is a metacommunicative mode that attends and invites attention to its own modality and radically mediates understanding of the ideational, identificational, and relational meanings of its own utterances.

It requires an enculturated audience able to read the semiotic value of a projected persona or genre; it is therefore especially tightly linked to the normative interpretations of speech and nonverbal styles entertained by specific discourse communities.

It instigates, in and with listeners, processes of social comparison and reevaluation focused on the real and metaphorical identities of speakers and their strategies and goals, but spilling over into reevaluation of listeners' identities, orientations, and values.

It interrupts a current situational frame, embedding another layer of social context within it, introducing new and dissonant identities and values; in doing this, its ambiguity invites reevaluation of pertaining situational norms.

It is creative and performed and therefore requires aptitude and learning; some speakers will be more adept at stylization than others; while style variation (e.g. dialectal style-shifting) is part of a (near?) universal communicative competence, stylization is more restricted, either by preference or by competence; some communities will be more prone than others to stylized utterance.

Since their performer needs to cue frame-shift and emphasize dissonant social meanings, stylized utterances are often emphatic and hyperbolic realizations of their targeted styles and genres.

Stylization can be analyzed as strategic inauthenticity, with complex implications for personal and cultural authenticity in general.

In semiotic terms, dialect varieties are particularly well configured for stylized performance because they do generally constitute known repertoires with known socio-cultural and personal associations – such as high/low socio-economic status, urban/rural, sophisticated/unsophisticated, trustworthy/untrustworthy, or dynamic/dull. In fact, these are the precisely the dimensions of social judgment that language attitudes research (e.g. Garrett, Coupland & Williams 1999) has established are regularly associated with dialect varieties. At the same time, dialect is only one dimension of social semiosis, and the data I discuss below show dialect stylization operating in relation to non-dialect dimensions of talk.

DIALECT STYLIZATION IN RADIO TALK

Broadcast talk is a natural environment for stylization. After all, talk in many broadcast genres is performed, and performed in a more specific sense than are the dialects of Okracoke speakers or Asian and Black schoolchildren in UK classrooms. The generic formatting of radio talk, and the fact that talk is often based around written notes if not scripts, ensure that much radio talk involves overtly motivated selections from preexisting stylistic repertoires, addressed to enculturated audiences (elements of the schematic summary above). Radio presenters may be expected to project preferred personas rather than, in any simple sense, 'their real selves'. In entertainment programs in particular, stylization is legitimated because many dimensions of authenticity (factual accuracy, consistency of self-representation, cultural continuity) are subordinated to the priority to entertain. This is certainly one motivation for using the present data. But two considerations need to be held in mind. First, the PROCESSES of stylization may not be fundamentally different in mediated and nonmediated contexts, even if media data give us rather clearer access to them. As Woolard 1995 shows in her analysis of the comedian Eugenio's Catalan/Castillian codeswitching in Catalonia, virtuoso professional performances can often generate complex refractions of popular linguistic practices. Second, there is a strong case that cultural reproduction is nowadays linked to mass-mediated representations and performances. If so, then the implications of media stylization carry well beyond the immediate context of mediated talk and back into the "real" and everyday world.

The data I consider are a series of extracts from a morning light entertainment show on BBC Radio Wales, broadcasting nationally (to the whole of Wales and adjacent regions of England) in English.[1] Radio Wales was reported as getting its highest weekly reach for two years in the first quarter of 1999, with 410,000 listeners (cf. the Welsh language station Radio Cymru's 176,000 and an overall population of about 2.9 million in Wales). The station has a mixed schedule, blending predominantly middle-of-the-road popular music with magazine programs, roadshows, and phone-ins, but also carrying regular "serious" news bulletins, as well as current affairs and sports coverage.

The show in question is *The Roy Noble Show*, and its presenter is probably the most popular radio presenter broadcasting in English in Wales at present. Roy Noble's (henceforth RN) publicity material talks of his "people's ways," and he is thought of as an unpretentious but educated man of the people (see, for example, his popular book on Wales, Noble 1999). Dialect (phonological, but also that aspect of dialect we can call "rhetorical localism" or "discourse accent") is an important part of this projection, and through his English usage, RN is audibly a "really Welsh" presenter. The radio show is based around light humor and the celebration of Welsh lore and customs. It provides a good deal of access to telephone callers (e.g. through quizzes and competitions), many of whom contact the show regularly. RN has a daily succession of affiliates on the show, including a

newsreader, a weather forecaster, a traffic updates announcer, and John Dee (JD), who features significantly in the extracts I shall focus on. JD performs a daily horoscopes feature on the show, followed by a segment on "today in history," done interactively with RN. Dee is a popular author on astrology, Feng Shui, and other lifestyle topics (see, for example, a feature on his writing in the *Homes* section of the *Western Mail*, 16 September 2000:3). The long extract I give most attention to below is the "today in history" sequence from a show broadcast live from the Royal Welsh (agricultural) Show in Builth Wells in mid-Wales on 20 July 1999. "Today in history" cycles swiftly through a range of historical figures and events that bear some relevance to the day and month of the broadcast.

The first extract is a transcript[2] of the first moments of the Builth Wells broadcast, and it illustrates RN's cultural, personal and dialectal broadcasting style. It also shows how culturally dense *The Roy Noble Show* often is; many of the references to Welsh cultural practices and symbols in ex. (1) will be opaque to nonlocal audiences.

(1) Opening sequence

    (A cockerel cries)
   1 R: o::h just a touch of him there (.)
            a:h Cledwyn brave cockerel of Newbridge (.)
            where were you at half past six when I needed you? (.)
            well it's half past six plus two now eight thirty on a Tuesday (.)
   5   Tuesday the twentieth of July (.)
            and we're running on Builth Wells time
            a very good morning to you
            Roy Noble here at the Royal Welsh uhShow
            and it's chorus line and beginners of course
  10   I'm up (.) with the Welsh mountain ponies in one ring
            beefy cattle in another (.) and show jumping in the horse ring
            oh yes (.) if you're mixing with the agricultural (.)
            we:ll you got to be up before the milkman unplugs his float (.)
            so then Tuesday curtain up (.)
  15   and we'll go for quality in all things after all
            quantity (.) is what you can count (.)
            quality is what you can count on

The fact that this particular broadcast comes from the annual national agricultural show (the Royal Welsh Show) gives an opportunity for RN to dwell on Welsh cultural themes and spaces as he opens his radio show, although these are generally very prominent in all his radio broadcasting. As well as establishing the physical location of the broadcast, the opening sequence in ex. (1) offers a jocular celebration of rural Welshness. RN gives the *brave cockerel of Newbridge* a traditionally Welsh male first name, *Cledwyn* (I assume, fictionally). The radio show generally strives to connect with all the regions of Wales, and RN often indicates his familiarity with rural as well as urban localities. Much of his scene-setting for this particular broadcast is picking out salient Welsh cultural signifiers, as the week of the agricultural show will feature them. In ex. (1), *chorus line and beginners* refers to singing competitions to be hosted at the show, modeled on the

national Welsh Eisteddfod (the annual choral and arts festival and competition); it is also a quotation from musical theater backstage jargon. *Welsh mountain ponies*, *cattle* and *show jumping* will be some of the categories of livestock to be judged.

The local and indeed the parochial are emphasized, with endearment but also with gentle irony. The phrase *up before the milkman unplugs his float* conjures an image meaningful to most British people.[3] On the other hand, *running on Builth Wells time* is a within-Wales reference to the fact that the town has a relatively remote, rural location in mid-Wales, away from the main centers of population. The aphorisms at the end of ex. (1), centering on *quality in all things*, are another typical feature of RN's personal broadcasting style. Most of his shows begin with a homespun truth or lifestyle comment, often implying a restrained but self-sufficient outlook. They usually carry connotations of warmth, low ambition, and social support, and these will strike many listeners as reflecting one modality of working-class Welshness. Ex. (1) is representative of how *The Roy Noble Show* repeatedly touches on the traditional "rich points" of cultural Welshness (Coupland 1995; cf. Agar 1991).

In addition to the predictable attributes of all broadcast talk, there are already specific indications in ex. (1) of RN's talk being a performed discourse. His *oh yes* at line 12 does self-commentary and mild self-mockery of RN's pride in associating with the agricultural classes of Wales. The Royal Welsh Show can itself perhaps be thought of as a stylized and certainly a self-reflexive representation of Welsh farming culture, for example in recontextualizing livestock farming as aesthetic competition (grooming and parading of cattle). But RN's representation of the event fictionalizes and mythologizes it further. His mock awe of the farming classes over-represents the status of farming in contemporary Wales (the industry is suffering acutely in economic terms) and under-represents his own experience of rural life. RN's discursive style marks the fact that his representations take the form of quotations – voicing what people might conventionally think of farming, of rural Wales, of Welsh life. In this regard, his use of aphorisms drawn from a known repertoire of culturally conventional and formulaic sayings is more literally quotative. More generally, RN's rhetorical style is playful and verbally innovative, as in the comment about the milkman's float.

In terms of speech style, RN's delivery in the extract is fast, presumably because his spoken introduction to the broadcast is script-based, but with some extemporizing. Interactive sequences, like the "today in history" sequence with JD that I consider below, are much more spontaneous. But there too, the level of historical detail in JD's accounts suggests there is scripted support. In terms of RN's DIALECT style in ex. (1), several features are distinctive in that they constitute (to different degrees) stereotypes of southern Welsh English. RN shows so-called /h/ dropping (absence of audible voiceless vocalic onset in *half past*, *his*), which is a strong but geographically diffuse stereotype, but not alveolarization of

(ng) (*running*, *jumping*, *mixing*), which is similarly coded. General social dialect variables in British English, such as (h) and (ng), connote social-class status more than regional/national identity, even though they are common in many dialects of Welsh English.[4] Then, RN has a variably but frequently flapped /r/ as a partial trill – a feature of pronunciation in southwest Wales English, under substratal influence from the Welsh language. Flapped /r/ occurs not only intervocalically (*after all*), but also in post-consonantal position and word-initially (*brave, Royal*). But RN's speech is always non-rhotic (/θɜːti/ "thirty"), whereas the English speech of some other Welsh speakers, when heavily Welsh language-influenced, can be rhotic. RN regularly has the falling (more to less prominent) diphthong /iw/ (*Tuesday*) that is widely available throughout Wales as a feature of both Welsh itself and Welsh English speech. /iw/ again has strong diagnostic value for "Welshness," although unlike other features mentioned here it tends NOT to be "corrected" toward Received Pronunciation, which has /juː/ in *Tuesday*. RN has schwa-opened /ai/ (*line*), and realizations of the *up* vowel also in the region of schwa, which are again diagnostic of Welshness but not regularly "corrected."

Two variables that I consider in detail below are (ou) and (ei), labeled by their typical realizations in "standard" English English (Received Pronunciation, henceforth RP). In each case, in the specific lexical environments I discuss shortly, monophthongal variants of these variables are strong stereotypes of Welshness in English. They are geographically associated with the southwest in particular (and certainly excluding Cardiff, the capital city in the southeast). The monophthongs are part of vernacular speech norms in southwest Wales, although for many speakers they are highly volatile stylistically. Our earlier research has shown that the rural southwest of Wales is a vibrant perceptual home base for "true Welshness" (Garrett, Coupland & Williams 1999). (Monophthongs for RP (ou) and (ei), of course, also mark local vernaculars in several speech communities beyond Wales, such as in areas of the north of England, Ireland, Scotland, and the Caribbean.)

In ex. (1), RN has (ou) as [oː] (*Noble* [his own name], *ponies, float*, *so*) but as [ou] (in *Show*). He has (ei) as [ei] (*eight, Tuesday*), but otherwise (outside this extract) variably as [eː], e.g. in the first and last syllables of *Radio Wales*, which is of course a frequent phrase in the discourse of the show. It also happens that *The Roy Noble Show* features a daily drama or "mini-soap," called *Station Road*. For RN, the prominent vowels in each word of this phrase are also regularly monophthongs (/ˈsteːʃən ˈroːd/). Over all, then, RN's pronunciation clearly images him as a south Wales English-speaker, with flapped /r/, monophthongal [oː] for (ou), and [eː] for (ei) being among the most perceptually resonant and "most Welsh" features.[5]

(2) John Dee's arrival

    1 R: <u>mor</u>ni̲ng <u>John</u>
        J: good morning Roy y see this hand
        R   yes
        J: see this hand <u>here</u> (.) it's been <u>shak</u>en (.)

```
  5      this hand has been shaken
     R:  ((by so many people yesterday))
           [
     J:    by a Ieuan (.) by a Ieuan
     R:  by a Ieuan?
             [
     J:          and I don't mean any old Ieuan
                   [      ]
 10  R:             h yes
     J:  any old Ieuan any any ello– any old Ieuan
                             [  ]
     R                       yes
         no
     J:  h oh (.) guess y well you know who
 15  R:  you had a good day go on=
     J:  =I had a good day look
     R:  two lords and two rugby players
                   [
     J:             t two lords and four international
         rugby players
                 [
 20  R:          yeah fw stick with me kid
                               [
     J:                        u huh
     R:  stick with me kid
     J:          [
     R:          pretty good
                    [
 25  R:          I make
                   [
     J:            pretty good score even for (.)
         (laughing) The Royal Welsh Show I got to say it
                             [
     R:                      sh ah ha
         stick with me and there's Linda see we shook hands
 30      with Linda over there (( ))
                 [
     J:          yes yes hello give her a wave there we are
                                         [
     R:                                  yeah there
         we are
 35  J:  hey
     R:  th what
           [
     J:    it's the Tuesday forecast
     R:  ((it is))
         [
     J:  we've arrived again second day of the Royal Welsh Show
                                             [
 40  R:                                      yes
     J:  and Cancerians (.) Cancerians are you listening (.) are n truly
         in a business-like frame of mind …
```

We find many of the same dialect features in JD's speech as in RN's. Ex. (2) marks the moment, in the same broadcast program of which ex. (1) is the opening sequence, when John Dee arrives at the microphone. He too has variable

/h/ dropping (absence of /h/ in *hey*) and maintains the velar in (ng) (*listening*). He also has falling /iw/ (*Tuesday*), schwa-opened /ai/ (*Ieuan*) and a schwa realization in *up*. JD, however, does not have the flapped /r/. His (ou) realizations in this extract are diphthongal (in *old, Show*). With (ei), JD has [ei] (*shaken* in line 4), although his realization of *shaken* in line 5 is close to monophthongal. His realizations of *players* (lines 17, 19) and *frame* (line 42) are both clearly diphthongs. Over all, JD is dialectally less southwest Wales and rather more south Wales valleys, consistent with more frequent diphthongization of (ou) and (ei) and non-flapped /r/. Both speakers' speech generally affords them "truly Welsh" stereotyped characteristics (see again Garrett et al. 1999), although this generalization proves to be too broad in view of the systematic stylization of vocal styles they (particularly JD) produce.

JD too is in performance mode. His discourse style is heard as "camp," although in the present text this might be a reflection of how he self-presents as interested in his physical self (e.g., his hand has been shaken at the show by two lords and two rugby players) more than the phonetics and prosodics of his voice. JD's joke at the beginning of ex. (2) is preplanned, even though it miscarries slightly. He obviously intends to say *any any any old Ieuan*, which is a verbal play on one line of the Cockney scrap-merchants' song "Any old iron": "Any any any old iron." *Ieuan* (['jaian] or, with more characteristically Welsh language phonology, ['jeian]) is a fairly common Welsh language-associated male personal name. The *Ieuan* in question is Ieuan Evans, a rugby-playing folk hero. JD's styled reaction to having shaken hands with Ieuan Evans could again be described as mock awe, and this is how he comes to claim that this Ieuan was not just *any old Ieuan*. More generally, JD's *hey* (line 35) suggests a gossip frame because it casts what follows it as surprising and newsworthy at that point in the talk. It, of course, can't be genuinely surprising; what follows is the planned and mainly scripted astrology forecast. Similarly, *see this hand here*, the opening utterance after the exchange of greetings, constructs the conversation as if it were gossip.

The dialect dimension of JD's performance becomes clearly apparent in later extracts. But even here, we can see how he infuses dialect imagery into his discourse. In constructing Welshness, and indeed Welsh parochialism, some speech features carry their symbolism more directly than others. As an INdirect instance, social class values can mediate symbolically between speech style and Welshness. As mentioned above, some speech features function as stereotypes of low sophistication and power, and as class markers rather than regional or national ones. JD's /h/-dropped *hey* (just referred to, see line 35 of ex. [2]) not only casts JD as doing gossip; its /h/-dropped realization momentarily locates him as an unsophisticated gossiper. In turn, "unsophisticated" is open to interpretation as a working-class WELSH trait, in the context of JD apparently being awed by meeting a Welsh rugby hero.

MULTI-LEVEL STYLIZATION

Against the general background of these two preliminary extracts, we can now turn to a more extended sequence, ex. (3), for more detailed analysis. In the extract, John Dee introduces nine topics with relevance to "today in history": Saint Wilgerfortis's Day, the national day of Belgium, the birthdays of Ernest Hemingway and Jonathan Miller, the Battle of Shrewsbury, the death of Harry Hotspur, the Battle of the Pyramids, the opening of the Tate Gallery, and the moon landing. The extract is revealing about how speakers can stylize interaction, and stylize dialect, as we began to see in the JD fragment in ex. (2), as part of AND IN RELATION TO their framing of talk in other respects. In view of the social meanings established above for (ou) and (ei), we can approach the longer extract with the expectation that JD deploys monophthongisation of (ou) and (ei) specifically in the interest of styling himself as more than usually "really Welsh," although the reading of particular strategies and effects will require close attention to other facets of discourse.

(3) Today in History

```
   1   J:   today Roy
       R:   yeah
       J:   is saint Wilgerfortis's day
       R:   Wilgerfortis's day?
   5   J:   yes now w wuz saint Wilgerfortis was a a Portuguese
            princess of the sixth century AD and her father
       R:   yeah
       J:   wanted to marry her off (.) to some (.) Saracen prince (.)
            but she didn't want any of it
                                              [
  10   R:   ah
       J:   so she had a had a
                               [
       R:   (( )) who had good swords
       J:   ye that's right (.) she curved very curved (.) and er she had
            a good pray (.) you see
  15   R:   uh
       J:   and she woke up in the morning and she had a beard (2.0)
            and then the Saracen prince didn't want to marry her (.)
            understandably enough
                                       [
       R:                              well you can understand that
  20   J:   so now she is the patron saint (.) of circus performers
       R:   is she really? (.) saint Wilgerfortis
                                                  [
       J:   ((yes)) saint Wilgerfortis (.) patron saint of circus
            performers (.) national day of Belgium as well
       R:   is it?
  25   J:   achieved independence from Holland-
       R:   is it go((nna)) stay Belgium? it's thinking of breaking up isn't it?
       J:   Belgium is (.) is it?
                                [
       R:   yeah your Walloons and your Flemings
       J:   you well they've been like that they've always been like that
                                               [           ]
```

```
30                                          haven't they
        R:                                  yeah
        J:    Ernest Hemingway (.)
        R:    yeah
        J:    considered by some to be the greatest writer since Shakespeare
35            I think that's a bit of an overstatement but never mind he's be
              fairly well up the list he was born in eighteen ninety nine
              (intake) and doctor Jonathan Miller (.)
        R:    oh w
        J:    now there's a multi-talented fella
40      R:    absolutely he didn't know which way to turn did he
        J:    (intake) no we
                                  [
        R:            so many talents
        J:    i it's in the arts now isn't it
                                       [
        R:                       ((yeah I can understand that))
45      J:    ats r Battle of Shrewsbury terrible day for us
        R:    what?
        J:    awful day for the Welsh
        R:    Shrewsbury?
        J:    Battle of Shrewsbury (.) we didn't get there see
50      R:    ((er we were late))
        J:    for once (.) for once our rotten weather defeated us (.) we'd
              used it to defeat other people (.) before this
        R:    mind you if I'd have been a Welsh commander going to any battle
              I'd have been chuffed and I'd say "now don't let's rush boys (.)"
55      J:    no w tha
        R:    "by the time we get there perhaps it'll be over"
        J:    well yes (.) unfortunately the out the wrong side won and of course
              the death of Harry Hotspur (.)
        R:    oh yeah
60      J:    yes Earl of Northumberland or was he Duke of Northum
                                                          [
        R:                                                he was
              a great fixer wasn't he
        J:    uh Harry Hotspur?
        R:    mm
65      J:    oh he was he was married to one of Glyndwr's daughters
        R:    was he?
        J:    he was that's right so he went in fourteen oh three (intake)
              Battle of the Pyramids as well (.) Napoleon had a very good day
              (.) he
              [
70      R:    was that in the sand then?
        J:    oh ye:::s in the sand (.) he defeated the Mamalukes (.)
        R:    did he?
        J:    and there's nothing worse than a case of Mamalukes in
              seventeen ninety eight
              [
75      R:    where were they from then the Mamalukes?
        J:    oh the Mamalukes ruled Egypt (.)
        R:    oh did they?
        J:    they did
        R:    so they were from all over Egypt
80      J:    yeah y you could say that they were (.) u:m (.) they were um (.)
              they were um (.) they were slaves technically (.) they were very
              posh slaves
```

```
        R:   wa like your Spartacus?
        J:   oh l oh posher than Spartacus oh all silk tents and curved swords
   85   R:   did they?
        J:   yes a un unfortunately some of the Mamalukes (.) er lacked
             certain attributes (.) that the rest of us take for granted
        R:   never
        J:   they di::d
   90   R:   didn't they?
        J:   o:h yeah
        R:   never had their pudding did they?
        J:   no weren't allowed to breed see
        R:   oh I see (sniggers)
                            [
   95   J:           (breathy sniggers) and the Tate Gallery opened
        R:   did it?
        J:   yes of course this was Tate (.) as in Tate and Lyle
        R:   as in sugar
             [
        J:   the sugar magnate
  100   R:   yeah
        J:   he opened the Tate gallery and this opened in eight eighteen
             ninety seven (intake) and (.) first (.) footprint (.) day
        R:   wha
        J:   Neil Armstrong (.) of course he landed on the moon
  105   R:   I thought you were going to talk about er wk er what's his name
             now (.) man who found Man Friday
        J:   no that's was
                        [
        R:              (( ))
        J:   Robinson Crusoe
  110   R:   s
        J:   you mean Alexander Selkirk
        R:   yeah that's
                        [
        J:              that was his real name
        R:   that's right
  115   J:   no no we're talking about Neil Armstrong (intake) he first
             actually set foot on the moon (.) ah this was in ah nineteen
             sixty wa nine wasn't it
        R:   yuh
        J:   thirty years ago today (.) and his words (.) now i these this
  120        was supposed to be an ad lib (.) but it's not
        R:   no
        J:   it was carefully scripted you know "one small step for a man
             a giant leap for mankind" and he fluffed it
        R:   yes
  125   J:   he didn't say that at all
        R:   no
        J:   he said "one small step (.) for man (1.0) a giant leap for mankind"
             which makes no sense whatsoever but never mind
                                                      [
        R:                                            we got the gist of it
  130   J:   we got the gist of it (.) in the end (.) right
                            [
        R:                  got the gist of it (.) we did indeed
        J:   but one interesting point about er lunar module
        R:   yes
```

```
        J:   the thing that landed you know "the eagle has landed"
 135    R:   m
        J:   actually (.) it's surprising (.) to note (.) that it had less of
             a computer system (.) than a modern car (.)
        R:   does it?
        J:   it did
 140    R:   oh ((sort of )) in on a wing and a prayer
        J:   yeah well the chips were a bit bigger i those days
        R:   it didn't have a wing even
        J:   no (laughs) no not at all (laughs)
                     [
        R:           ((it's like just coming down like (.) let's try here))
```

(ei) and (ou) are worked quite hard in ex. (3), especially in JD's speech. Several generalizations can be made about JD's and RN's pronunciation of these two variables in the extract. Both speakers use both diphthongal forms ([ei] and [ou]) consistently in particular lexical sets. Table 1 sets out two lexical sets for each variable, with the leftmost (set A) column of instances for each variable listing forms where the diphthongal realization is omnipresent for these speakers. (An apparent exception is *always* at line 29, but this word has a reduced high front vowel in its final syllable. Similarly, *unfortunately*, at lines 57 and 86, has short /e/.) That is, *day*, *saint*, *they*, *prey*, *eight*, *always*, *Hemingway*, and also *know*, in all cases in the extract, are pronounced with diphthongs in RP-like fashion. In

TABLE 1. *Two lexical sets for (ei) and two for (ou) in south Wales English.*

(ei)		(ou)	
Set A	Set B	Set A	Set B
(to)day	patron	know	woke
saint	Shakespeare		Napoleon
they	slave		no
pray	overstatement		woke
(ninety)eight	great		don't
always	Tate		over
Hemingway	magnate		opened
	name		so
	take		go(ing)
	late		oh
	make		supposed
	AD		Crusoe
			note
			over(statement)
	[Radio]		
	[Wales]		
	[Station]		[Road]

fact, norms for vernacular usage for most southwest Wales speakers of English dictate that monophthongization is not possible in set A words (see Table 1).Then, as second generalization, RN almost uniformly produces monophthongs of all words in the other lexical sets (the rightmost columns in Table 1) where both monophthongal variants and diphthongal variants are possible realizations. There are two exceptions, both with utterance-initial *oh*, at lines 59 and 77. On the other hand, RN's *oh* at the start of line 94 and his *so* at the start of line 79 are both monophthongal. His realizations of *breaking* (line 26), *late* (line 50), *great* (line 62), and *name* (line 105), and also of *going* (line 53), *don't* (line 54), and *over* (line 56), have monophthongs, which are close to categorial in his speech elsewhere in the data.

JD, however, shows considerable variation with both variables. In the first 33 lines of the extract, *AD* (line 6), *woke* (line 16) and the two occurrences of *patron* (lines 20 and 22) give opportunities for monophthongs, but all are in fact diphthongized (although *woke* is an indeterminate case). This pattern, incidentally, allows JD to pronounce *patron saint* echoically (repeating the diphthong) when he is using his "less truly Welsh" voice. But in the remainder of the extract, we find him using clusters of monophthongal forms, including some quite stark and rapid monophthongal/diphthongal alternations. These occur in four main places in the extract: in the *Ernest Hemingway* segment, around line 34; in the *Harry Hotspur* segment, around line 65; in the *Battle of the Pyramids/Mamalouks* segment, around line 68; and in the *Tate Gallery* segment, around line 95.

Several interpretations of JD's variable pronunciation with (ei) and (ou) are possible. The conventional variationist account is to treat JD's selection of some monophthongal and some diphthongal variants as unmotivated at the local level of discourse, and to build interpretations of his "stylistic level" only on the basis of aggregated frequency data. That is, across a stretch of talk such as ex. (3), he would emerge as having a moderately high "level of nonstandardness" (if we assume – controversially, in this case – that monophthongs are "nonstandard"). In fact, JD's scores would be 75% for (ei) and 68% for (ou). This, however, would be to under-interpret by a considerable margin what is achieved stylistically in the data. An integrated analysis of discourse processes and phonetic styling shows that much more is happening in the data, especially as regards persona management and the negotiation of cultural authenticity and inauthenticity. My main argument is that the data show JD's and RN's talk to be stylized at several levels, and that it is only under this rubric that we can make sense of the sequence as a contextualized dialect performance.

First, we need to examine these phonological variables as two of many other semiotically loaded variables in the talk. Beyond segmental variables, there is a mass of prosodic and paralinguistic data, some of which I will mention below. But there is also the full range of stylistic meaning generated through non-phonetic/phonological aspects of discourse. We know – and, more important, the audience of the show knows – that the sequence is in some sense non-serious. It can be

called a CARTOONING SEQUENCE, where voices and stances are not to taken at face value. It is performance talk. Although the main topic of talk in "today in history" is historical and factual, these exchanges contain some historically fictionalized and gratuitous elements. The RN and JD episode in ex. (2) opened with mock gossip, and the program itself (see ex. [1]) was opened as *a show*. The audience has a warrant, that is, to interpret dialect styling as framed by these considerations, and in fact as a contextualization cue (in the sense of Gumperz 1982). Dialect, then, cannot be assumed to be an independent, let alone a background, dimension of the speech event, and dialect voicing draws attention to itself at particular points in the data. Dialectal dissonances, when they occur, are not to be interpreted as random variation. They are a device of reflexivity – a way of making us appreciate the studied artificiality of the speech event.

(4) (repeated fragment of 3)

                                  D

32   J: Ernest Hemingway (.)
       R: yeah

                                          D   M

       J: considered by some to be the greatest writer since Shakespeare

                                M   M

35   I think that's a bit of an overstatement but never mind he's be

                                      D

       fairly well up the list he was born in eighteen ninety nine (intake)

The *Ernest Hemingway* sequence, starting at line 32 of ex. (3), is a case in point. Ex. (4) is a repeated transcript of this sequence with realized variants of (ou) and (ei) marked on it: diphthongal realizations are marked with superscript D and monophthongal realizations with superscript M. The sequential organization of the whole "today in history" episode will have become familiar to listeners by this stage, even on the basis of this broadcast alone. It will be more firmly so for regular listeners, since the format of *The Roy Noble Show* is highly predictable. The episode as a whole is structured by JD's switching abruptly into a new topic, centering on a person or event in history with some connection to the day of the broadcast. At line 32 of ex. (4), therefore, the utterance *Ernest Hemingway* is a new-topic announcement. The convention is for JD then to make a comment, often factual, about the topic, and to follow this with a more personalized interpretation or further commentary, and this is the pattern in ex. (4). The discourse structure typically establishes two stances or orientations to content – one relatively authoritative and historical, and the other resolutely personal and local. JD voices both stances, but he plays off one against the other. In the Hemingway sequence, this stance shifting is marked overtly in the lexico-grammar. The claim that Ernest Hemingway is *the greatest writer since Shakespeare* is represented as an anonymous but non-idiosyncratic claim (*considered by some* – where the *some* are presumably literary critics, and therefore establishment figures). The second stance is the one JD purports is his own view (he says *I think*), and it undermines the public claim, reassessing the public stance from a local and parochial viewpoint.

These stances are not defined phonologically, or NOT ONLY phonologically. But the discourse structure sets up an appropriateness that the second, local voice should include the phonetic symbolism of parochialism, and this is precisely what the monophthongal forms of (ei) and (ou) connote. The point is not whether JD's pronunciation of *overstatement*, with its two monophthongal variants, is done "in his own real voice." The generic context of broadcasting and entertainment makes this inaccessible information. But it does matter that the voicing of the second-comment persona should be marked as opposed to the establishment voice, and the switch into monophthongs is a relevant semiotic resource for this purpose. The stance switch could have been achieved without phonetic support, but it is more compelling for being marked at multiple levels.

(5) (repeated fragment of ex. 3)

```
     58        the death of Harry Hotspur (.)
               M
          R:   oh yeah
     60   J:   yes Earl of Northumberland or was he Duke of Northum
                                                         [
          R:                                             he was
                    M
               a great fixer wasn't he
          J:   uh Harry Hotspur?
          R:   mm
               D
     65   J:   oh he was he was married to one of Glyndwr's daughters
          R:   was he?
                              M                    D
          J:   he was that's right so he went in fourteen oh three (intake)
```

The *Harry Hotspur* topic, beginning at line 58 of ex. (3), and repeated as ex. (5), has its conventionally "straight" announcement as a new topic and factual first account (lines 57–65). JD's *oh* at the beginning of line 65 is diphthongal. Line 67 shifts stance, particularly in the clause *so he went*, which is a mildly disrespectful metaphor for Harry's death and has a monophthongal *so* and a dropped /h/ in *he*. The dating phrase (*in fourteen oh three*), on the other hand, is a factual, historical postscript, and it is semiotically congruent that the diphthong should return for that *oh*.

(6) (repeated fragment of ex. 3)

```
                                         D                    D
     68        Battle of the Pyramids as well (.) Napoleon had a very good day
               (.) he
               [
     70   R:   was that in the sand then?
               M
          J:   oh ye:::s in the sand (.) he defeated the Mamalukes (.)
          R:   did he?
                                             M
          J:   and there's nothing worse than a case of Mamalukes in
```

```
                              D
                seventeen ninety eight
                [              D
     75   R:    where were they from then the Mamalukes?
                      D
          J:    oh the Mamalukes ruled Egypt (.)
                    D       D
          R:    oh did they?
                        D
          J:    they did
                    M   D                 M
          R:    so they were from all over Egypt
                         D        D               D
     80   J:    yeah y you could say that they were (.) u:m (.) they were um (.)
                      D          D        M              D
                they were um (.) they were slaves technically (.) they were very
                          M
                posh slaves
          R:    wa like your Spartacus?
                      M   M                    M
          J:    oh l oh posher than Spartacus oh all silk tents and curved swords
                          D
     85   R:    did they?
          J:    yes a un unfortunately some of the Mamalukes (.) ah lacked
                                               M
                certain attributes (.) that the rest of us take for granted
          R:    never
                      D
          J:    they di::d
                          D
     90   R:    didn't they?
                      *
          J:    o:h yeah
                                          D
          R:    never had their pudding did they?
                    M
          J:    no weren't allowed to breed see
                M
          R:    oh I see (sniggers)
```

The *Mamalukes* sequence that directly follows (see ex. [6]) is the most heavily
burlesque of the whole extract. Its straight factual component is dispensed with
quickly – simply the announcement of *the Battle of the Pyramids* (line 68). Then
the remainder of JD's account of the Battle of the Pyramids is constructed around
blatant stereotypes of the Ancient East (*all silk tents and curved swords*) – im-
agery that falls within Said's (1978) critique of Western stereotypes of Oriental-
ism. Once again, the more personal stance invokes parochial understandings (they
were *posh slaves*) and mild salaciousness (the Mamalukes *lacked certain attributes*,
i.e. had no testicles). From the word *Napoleon* (line 68) onward, JD produces
exclusively monophthongal variants of (ou) and (ei) in permissible environ-
ments, of which the most prominent are the pure [e:] monophthongs in *slaves*
(line 82 and line 83), plus the three [o:] monophthongs in the three occurrences of
oh in line 85. "Slaves" is, in historical terms, a minimally precise interpretation of

who the *Mamalukes* were, and the attribute *posh* confirms that the account is being constructed from an unsophisticated viewpoint. The adjective *posh*, etymologically identifying sailing cruise passengers who selected "port out, starboard home" cabins on ocean journeys, designates upper social class and privilege, but the word articulates privilege from a lower-class, unprivileged position.

During the *Mamalukes* sequence, JD fleetingly borrows from a culturally known performance repertoire to heighten the effect of history being discussed in the genre of gossip. The comment *nothing worse than a case of Mamalukes* (line 73) is from a known repertoire of British "silly humor" whereby any unfamiliar (and often foreign language-derived) phonotactic string can be apparently misheard to mean an obscure illness, often sex-related. More directly, JD's *they di::d* (line 89 – with low pitch, heavy breathiness, and an exaggerated fall–rise tone) and *o:h yeah* (asterisked in line 91 to indicate it is a special case – with maintained very high pitch and heavy nasalization) allude intertextually to specific comic creations in earlier days of British broadcasting. JD is borrowing from a more specific known British stylistic repertoire for doing camp gossip.[6] These are set-piece, QUOTATIVE STYLIZATIONS; two others in ex. (3) are *Alexander Selkirk* (line 112), which JD performs in a stylized Scottish accent (including trilled rhotic /r/), and *the eagle has landed* (line 135), which is performed in a phonological style that British listeners associate with U.S. English, plus low pitch and slow rate, evocative of heavily dramatized announcements.

(7) (repeated fragment of ex. 3)

```
                                          M              M
    95   J:   (breathy sniggers) and the Tate Gallery opened
         R:   did it?
                                     M              M
         J:   yes of course this was Tate (.) as in Tate and Lyle
         R:   as in sugar
              [
                             D
         J:   the sugar magnate
   100   R:   yeah
                   M          M                M       D     D
         J:   he opened the Tate gallery and this opened in eight eighteen
              ninety seven
```

Finally, *Tate* in ex. (7) is another highly prominent monophthong in JD's dialect styling, with four monophthongal realizations of the (ei) variable in this one lexeme densely interspersed into lines 95–101. These contrast sharply with JD's particularly clear and long-gliding diphthong in *magnate* at line 99. The effect created is that JD is actively seeking out opportunities to deliver "truly Welsh" realizations of *Tate* which are grossly dissonant with his otherwise common (ei) diphthongs. Once again, the issue is not whether JD has diphthongs in his basal vernacular, but rather what he can achieve in this situated discourse through the occasional prominent use of the monophthong. The fact that his most prominent monophthongs occur in cartooning passages cues us to hear them as stylized – as

knowingly inauthentic. Then in turn, when prominent monophthongs surface in the discourse, we can hear them as contextualization cues to JD's stylizing. This constitutive relationship is important, for example, in the case of *Tate*, because there is no inherently Welsh quality or association in either the Tate sugar company or the Tate Gallery. Once it is established that stark, stylistically incongruent monophthongal [e:] projects a parochially Welsh discursive stance, we hear JD's mention of *Tate* through a Welsh ideological filter.

STYLIZATION AS DE-AUTHENTICATION

I suggested in the earlier schematic summary that stylized utterance dislocates a speaker from the persona he or she voices, and from the pragmatic implications of what is said. This means that, under stylization, it can often be unclear just what levels of ownership, authorship, and endorsement are being implied in a given utterance. There can be a gratuitous element in stylization, and no doubt some stylizations are performed purely for play or for semiotic mystification, without recoverable motivations or implications. (See Bakhtin 1965 on carnival; also Hill & Hill 1986, Hill & Irvine 1993, Rampton 1995:314ff.) But the potential for this sort of engineered obscurity also makes it unclear what the precise target of JD's stylization is in the data we have been discussing. I have focused on the stylizing of Welshness because this is consistent with the basic format of *The Roy Noble Show*, and because it is what the social meanings of the (ei) and (ou) dialect variables that we have tracked primarily implicate. But JD and RN, jointly in their interaction, are also complicating how we should read the genre of their talk. Before considering the stylization of Welshness further, it will be useful to assess JD's and RN's treatment of the historical material that is the focus of their talk. In one way at least, they are engaged in de-authenticating history.

In the authorized discourse of academic history, we expect to find circumspection, factual accuracy, seriousness, objectivity, a certain abstraction, sanitized accounts of motive, coherence, rationality, and so on. What I am calling "cartooning" in the present data involves the speakers in discursively subverting these principles. So, for example, with *Saint Wilgerfortis*, the first topic of the ex. (3) series, the initial announcement that it is her saint's day, and the definition of who she was (lines 1–6), are "straight" historical discourse. But the straight account begins to crumble at line 8, because *marry her off* is dissonant with the authorized style. Its dropped /h/ in *her* provides part of the effect. But the phrase also implicates misogyny (a daughter as a perceived burden and a father who is dismissive of her wishes), which would not fit the authorized mode, and we suspect that JD is gratuitously embroidering on the historical facts. Similarly, note the surreal quality of the reported event, a woman's growing a beard overnight. Although this bizarre event may or may not be part of the historically transmitted version, other clearly fictional elements are interspersed, such as RN's first mention of *swords* (line 12). This seems to be an unscripted extrapolation from JD's

mention of *Saracen prince* at line 8. When JD picks up the theme later (*curved very curved*, at line 13), the detail of curvature is historically gratuitous and playful. Dialect, at least in the respect I have approached it here, has no part in this particular cartooning sequence, although other resources (e.g. the lexico-grammar of *had a good pray*, lines 13–14) does work similar to that of the dialect forms we examined earlier.[7]

In their rerendering of a media conversation as gossip, we might also say that JD and RN are stylizing conversation itself. Many exchanges beyond the ones I examined above would support this reading. The features that undermine historical discourse actively reconstruct the interaction as gossip. We might list RN's repeated evaluation of the newsworthiness of JD's accounts, including showing surprise and even shock at historical facts (lines 21, 24, 40, 66, 72, 77, 85, 88, 90, 96, 138); the mild salaciousness of the speakers' comments on historical events (lines 18–19, 86–94); or the propensity to fictionalize accounts and render them more vivid (lines 12 and following, 53–56, 73). So the stylistics of gossip are performed, although of course there remains a fundamental disjunction between that style and the ideational content. However recontextualized and stylistically subverted, the nine events being commemorated in ex. (3) remain historical events which are not in themselves "gossipable." In fact, "gossiping about history" is normally a generic tautology. The gossip frame is therefore perceptibly one that is put on for effect. We know JD and RN have fabricated it, and we hear that they enjoy sharing in their fictive construction, as does their audience. At the same time, we suspect that a genuine enough interest in historical detail – albeit repackaged in the mode of trivia – drives their daily engagement with "today in history." The discursive construction of the event is fundamentally dualistic.

The fact that JD and RN introduce the social meaning of "real Welshness" – dialectally, as discussed earlier – into these mock-gossip sequences invites us to hear the discursive style that they are pastiching as a WELSH cultural style. "Gossiping over the garden fence" is indeed part of the mythology of the working-class Welsh experience, and especially that of the south Wales Valleys, although of course it has wide currency elsewhere also. Ex. (3) in fact evokes Welsh cultural styles in other ways too, most notably RN's anti-heroism in his fictionalized role as *a Welsh commander* of troops (line 53 and following). His espoused philosophy is *now don't let's rush boys*, which recycles an ingroup myth of Welsh pragmatism versus militaristic idealism.

Overall, there are many reasons to argue that the "today in history" sequence, and indeed *The Roy Noble Show* as a whole, articulate a parochially Welsh perspective not only on Welsh English speech but, in Hymes's (1972) expression, Welsh WAYS OF SPEAKING, and indeed Welsh WAYS OF BEING. But JD and RN simultaneously give us ample evidence that what they are constructing is not a perspective they necessarily endorse as their own, or one that relates in any simple way to lived reality or felt authenticity. Like JD's monophthongs, the cultural symbolism of "today in history" is certainly Welsh, but more accurately, it is

"Welsh in performance" or "Welsh as we know it can be, but is not necessarily so for us, despite appearances."

RE-AUTHENTICATION THROUGH STYLIZATION

In the wake of discursive layers of stylization, it may be difficult to see any residual cultural authenticity in the data. Can there be any communicated sense of valued or endorsed Welshness in the speech event? Can the stylized Welshness of *The Roy Noble Show*, and of similar mediated versions, connect with lived experiences of Welshness and the Welsh social identities that many people who live in Wales vociferously claim to inhabit (Eustace 1998)? In this final section, I want to suggest that some authentic form of Welsh identity not only survives its stylization but is even an achievement of it.

I began by critiquing sociolinguistics' perspective on cultural authenticity and continuity, and the particular assumption that dialects are "out there" as part of the "real sociolinguistic stuff" of observable culture. As late modernity and globalization accelerate, it is reasonable to argue that these assumptions become even less appropriate. Dialects, of course, remain a feature of local community practice, but there are increasing opportunities, including through the mass media, to experience dialect when it is dislocated from its traditional contexts. If "experiencing" includes reflexive and evaluative engagement, then a degree of distancing from normative contexts is a prerequisite for dialects to carry their social meanings. Studies of dialect styling have shown us how dialect forms can be recontextualized from ground to figure in order to do creative discursive work, usually within the speech communities that form their "natural" domain. But dialect stylization involves more radical dislocations and more vivid and more complex recontextualizations. The issue in dislocation is not at all linguistic distance, but range of social and personal identification.

It may be useful to contrast the present analysis with an old example (Coupland 1984). Accommodative style-shifting through dialect has been shown in many studies to be a communicative resource for symbolizing interpersonal distance. An office worker, in the case I considered in 1984, can present alternative social personas through her speech, quite closely attuned to the social and linguistic characteristics of her interlocutor clients. This sort of persona management through dialect style appears to be commonplace (see the studies cited earlier), but the social identity tolerances of self-presentation in such instances are heavily circumscribed. Style-shifting can, of course, miscarry when it is identified as strategic and willful (people "trying too hard" and "not being themselves"), but it generally does not infringe our expectations that speakers will have consistent personal and social identities. The office worker is, without the normal tolerances of that attribution, "being herself," even though she subtly modifies the symbolized strength of her allegiance to the community's vernacular norms. With stylization, as in the instances I have considered from *The Roy Noble*

Show, "being oneself" is precisely what IS rendered open to question. The media framing of talk, as a "show" with "performers," and as a show rather systematically designed to create a pastiche of its factual and cultural contents, projects variable Welsh identities that are not anchored in personal histories.

The social theoretic and discourse analytic wings of sociolinguistics are increasingly receptive to ideas of cultural hybridity (Bhabha 1994; Jaffe MS; Woolard 1995, 1999) and the local contextualization of identity (e.g. Antaki & Widdicombe 1988), but perhaps sometimes uncritically. To recognize the view that social identities can be, or even necessarily are, multiple is usually argued to be a liberal and progressive antidote to assuming that each person inhabits a given and single social identity. This traditional and allegedly repressive ideology is called essentialism. The idea of authentic cultural experience is held to be essentializing and therefore suspect. But it is surely simplistic to posit that multiplicity and hybridity are necessarily good and that essence and authenticity are necessarily bad. There are challenging and intriguing qualifications and interaction effects.

For example, the claim that social and cultural identities are necessarily hybrid in the late-modern world does undervalue many people's experience of group membership. Welshness remains, in some ways and for some people, an essential and defining quality, not only an authentic experience but an AUTHENTICATING one. We should not be too ready to dismiss cultural essentialism as if it were inevitably a naïve or pernicious assumption. Karim 1997, Said 1978, and others show that it CAN ALSO be this, especially when a cultural uniformity is imputed by powerful outgroups with vested interests in containing and perhaps exoticizing cultural "Others" (Coupland in press b). Sociolinguistics has long maintained that languages and language varieties can and often do focus a sense of cultural essence – who people feel they "really and fundamentally are" (cf. Fishman 1992). The conditions of late-modernity add layers of complexity and conditionality to many people's senses of cultural essence, but they do not simply neutralize them.

At the same time, authentic cultural belonging finds expression by less direct and less continuous routes in late-modernity. It is increasingly unlikely that a sense of cultural essence will spring from people's deep and continuous embedding "in the culture," and therefore from supposedly pure traditional cultural practice. These notions are increasingly idealizations in a mobile, globalized, and reflexive world (although we might wonder whether "purity" of this sort actually EVER existed outside of idealizing research designs, such as traditional dialectology surveys). The idea that cultural identities must either be "traditional" or else "impure" is, again, surely incorrect.

If we accept that culture is a discourse that sediments texts, which in turn realize it (Bauman 1996, Bauman & Briggs 1990, Hanks 1996, Irvine 1996, Urban 1996), then cultural belonging is itself an active, iterative, reconstructive process. It is not the perpetuation of an identificational state, indexed by symbols such as the use of dialect forms. A sense of essence must therefore reside in local

processes of enacting or reconstituting culture – in what Bauman and others call ENTEXTUALIZATION. And creativity in the performance of culture is endemic in the cumulative process of entextualization. Bauman writes: "One of the key issues on which understanding of the process must rest is the dynamic tension between the ready-made, socially given element, that is, the persistent cultural entity that is available for recontextualization in performance, and the emergent element, the transformation of this entity in the performance process" (1996:302). Bauman's perspective is similar to that of Giddens 1996, who argues that tradition is a form of "formulaic truth" recreated in the present:

> I shall understand "tradition" in the following way. Tradition, I shall say, is bound up with memory, specifically ... "collective memory"; involves ritual; is connected with what I shall call A FORMULAIC NOTION OF TRUTH; has "guardians"; and, unlike custom, has binding force which has a combined moral and emotional content ... the past is not preserved but continuously reconstructed on the basis of the present ... Tradition, therefore, we may say, is AN ORGANIZING MEDIUM OF COLLECTIVE MEMORY. The "integrity" of tradition derives not from the simple fact of persistence over time but from the continuous "work" of interpretation that is carried out to identify the strands which bind present to past. (Giddens 1996:63–64, with original emphasis)

But equally, the creative entextualization of cultural content and forms does not itself guarantee faithful cultural reproduction. Whether reproduction happens, and what new glosses are added to cultural meanings when they are entextualized, depends crucially on the framing and keying of particular performances. A sense of cultural continuity is a situational achievement, requiring performers or "guardians" to re-create a relevance for old meanings in new contexts. Under this framework, stylization seems to be as promising a performance device for cultural reproduction as any other. In fact, it manages to AVOID certain pitfalls, such as naive hyper-traditionalisation.

 In the case of Welsh cultural traditions, the documentary mode of cultural representation has been notoriously skewed by over-romanticizing. We think of the singing miners, extended families, and industrial poverty of *How Green Was My Valley*, and the childhood memoirs of Richard Llewelyn, supposedly documenting school life in Wales, including experiences of "the Welsh Not."[8] Not surprisingly, the very notion of "traditional Welsh culture," which these sources have sought to recycle and which resurfaces regularly in TV dramas in and about Wales, nowadays seems suspect to many, acting as a repressive force against social change. Contemporary Wales is coming to terms with political devolution within the UK, developing new socio-economic priorities after the devastation of heavy industry and with the decline of its agricultural base, and striving to establish a new identity within Europe and the world. A vibrant sense of national identity persists in Wales, and it has ethnolinguistic bases both in the consolidation of numbers of self-categorizing Welsh language speakers (about half a mil-

lion, or one-sixth of the overall population, calculated from the 1991 census) and in distinctive varieties of English. But there is an increasing awareness that the traditional icons of Welsh identity are poorly suited to current Welsh aspirations and opportunities, even though they construct a public face for Wales that Welsh people cannot set aside, and probably do not altogether want to. After all, there is another crucial voice in the political mix, even though it is one not heard in the data – RP, the voice of middle-class Englishness. Modern, incipiently more in-dependent Wales finds discomfort in the sociolinguistic associations BOTH of its own socially disadvantaged industrial past AND of hegemonic English culture.

The creative entextualizations of Welshness in *The Roy Noble Show* find a solution to this paradox in the form of dialect stylization. The playful, erratically voiced Welshness that the presenters construct, frame-marked for inauthenticity, is a set of traditional symbolic forms held up for scrutiny and offered for reeval-uation. These presenters are not "guardians of culture" (to use Giddens's term, in the quote above) as much as facilitators of cultural reassessment. In their styling of dialect, but with massive support from other discursive constructions, the pre-senters repackage traditional ways of speaking, reflecting them back to the com-munity with which they are associated. The transparent knowingness of the representation ("this is us momentarily playing at being the real, traditional us") gives the audience license to enjoying the parading of themselves, and even to find it confirmatory, credentializing, and solidary – as well as humorous.

There is an important distinction between stylization, as evidenced in these data, and parody. Criterially, parody would actively discredit the cultural forms being entextualized and position the presenters outside or above the practices they represent (Hutcheon 1985, 1994; Kelly 1994; Morson 1989). John Dee's occasional stark monophthongisations are better described, in Morson's term, as METAparody, since they "mock not only a 'target' text [or, in this case, a target dialect style] but also their own superior reworking of that prior text" (Kelly 1994:56; Morson 1989:67).[9] The humor they occasion is laughter WITH rather than AT speakers of Welsh English. And precisely through the transparent know-ingness of John Dee's performed metaparody, the listening audience is also able to absolve him from any unqualified charge of "mocking the Welsh." The dialect style being stylized is, after all, current in the (southwest Wales) community, although variably across different social groups. The style generally attracts judg-ments of "true Welshness" within Wales, as our previous studies of language attitudes show, although the present data suggest that invoking "true Welshness" discursively is a far more interesting and contextualized process than simply "displaying the voice."

Living a culture has to be a self-reflexive process, unless we want to claim that cultural authenticity is visible only to outgroup members or critical observers such as sociolinguists or anthropologists. Once we become aware, we have suf-fered what Rousseau called "the wound of reflection." But this wounding is also an opportunity, and increasingly an inevitability. It opens up different ways of

orienting to cultural content and engaging creatively with cultural signification. Dialect stylization is best understood in these terms: as a means of deploying normative community speech forms at one remove, without overtly subscribing to the norms of tradition and cultural continuity, but also without discrediting their cultural value.

N O T E S

* I presented versions of this article to the Stanford University Style, Language and Ideology Consortium in April 2000, and as a plenary talk at the International Conference on Language and Social Psychology, Cardiff University, June 2000. I am grateful to colleagues associated with these events for their support and critical feedback; also, and in particular, to Allan Bell, Justine Coupland, Janet Holmes, Barbara Johnstone, Ben Rampton, Joanna Thornborrow, and Kathryn Woolard for detailed comments on an earlier draft. The usual caveats definitely apply.

[1] This study extends previous investigations of Welsh English in radio broadcasting that focused on other data (Coupland 1985, 1988, 2001). Part of the cultural significance of the present data is that only in the last decade has Radio Wales involved Welsh English accentedness as a substantial element of its populist appeal in light entertainment broadcasting. Strikingly, *The Roy Noble Show* is now one among at least six popular shows on Radio Wales actively to represent the regional and supposedly 'nonstandard' English dialects of Wales, which had previously been considered inappropriate for public broadcasting.

[2] R identifies Roy Noble and J identifies John Dee. Transcripts are close to orthographic. Overlapping turns are marked by the vertical alignment of speakers' turns, linked by a square bracket. A colon denotes vowel lengthening beyond the normal range for that feature. (.) denotes a brief pause; longer pauses are times in seconds, e.g. (1.0). Underlined characters show syllabic emphasis. Inaudible or only partly audible strings are enclosed in double parentheses. Single parentheses enclose my own occasional comments on the delivery of following utterances or nonlinguistic speech noises, such as (laughs). No attempt is made to indicate the phonetic quality of sociolinguistic variables in the main transcripts, although selected portions of text and specific features within them are annotated in this way in later extracts.

[3] Milkmen, where the institution survives in Britain, deliver milk around the houses on an electric vehicle called a float, and the float has to be unplugged from its electrical charging point before the milk round starts.

[4] "Welshness" has an inherent class dimension, probably related to Wales's political history as a breeding ground for left-of-center radicalism and trade unionism.

[5] (ou) is actually a more complex variable that I represent it to be here, in that it has three meaningfully distinguishable states. Centralized onset of the diphthong (in the area of schwa), as in Received Pronunciation, is heard as extremely "non-Welsh" and "posh." More open and retracted onsets are less "posh" and are common in eastern dialects (including Cardiff). But it is the monophthong/diphthong difference that symbolizes east/west, and correspondingly, low/high Welshness. What I am designating monophthongal variants of (ou) include those with very short glide elements, but not reaching beyond central position.

[6] The first incarnation was probably in the comic gay characters of Jules and Sandy from the 1960s BBC Radio program *Round the Horn*, carried forward through the Charles Hawtry and especially Kenneth Williams figures in the long series of *Carry On* films. A similar stylistic configuration occurs in *Monty Python's* gossiping housewife characters (played by men), and in the similar but North of England comic female characters performed by Les Dawson and Roy Barraclough on British TV.

[7] Events commonly represented in the syntactic slot "have a good x" include "sleep," "look," "gossip." The grammatical sequence is predisposed to representing actions of local, personal experience, with an implication that the action is routine and enjoyable. *Had a good pray* therefore localizes and trivializes praying. A similar semantic coloring is achieved in RN's *your Walloons and your Flemings* (line 28) and *your Spartacus* (line 83). The structure "your x," when actual ownership of any sort is non-relevant, is a familiarizer. It might be a dialectally restricted structure, but it is pragmatically interepretable independently of this. It represents its nominal as featuring in the everyday experience of speaker and listener. This sense is directly confirmed in the next turn, where JD agrees

372

(line 29–30) that *they've always been like that*. JD adds mock disparagement to the reference to Walloons and Flemings, as if they were children behaving badly rather than groups involved in socio-political struggle.

[8] The Welsh Not, which some commentators spell "Knot," is probably the most powerful iconic representation of historical English repression of Welsh language and cultural life. It was a wooden plaque on a string that was hung around the neck of any child heard speaking Welsh at school, and passed from one child to the next until the eventual incumbent was punished at the end of the day.

[9] Although it relates to literary parody in particular, Kelly's summary of this argument is illuminating:

> Morson uses three qualifying criteria for admitting a work into the class of parodies: (a) It must evoke or indicate another text, (b) it must be antithetical to that other text, and (c) it must clearly be intended to have "higher semantic authority than the original" text (Morson, p.67) . . . When this third criterion goes unsatisfied, Morson declares the dialogical relation to be, not that of parody, but of what he calls METAPARODY. . . [However] Parody is never a mere subjugation of one text or convention by a posterior imitation, but a complex and varying transaction between texts that can be experienced as mockingly comic or movingly elegiac. (Kelly 1994:56)

Similar complexities are theorized by Bakhtin through the concepts of UNI-DIRECTIONAL and VARI-DIRECTIONAL DOUBLE-VOICING (Bakhtin 1984), discussed and applied to sociolinguistic data by Rampton (1995:222–3, 299–300). In the uni-directional case, a speaker voicing a prior style endorses or validates it. In the vari-directional case, the speaker voices the style with the intention of discrediting it (that is, parodies it). This two-term opposition in terms of "directions" is, however, too stark to be applicable to the John Dee case, because it stops short of articulating specific motivations, contexts, norms, and modes of reception. In arguing that John Dee's dialect stylizations are not parodic, I am not suggesting that what he achieves is (unequivocally?) "uni-directional" or a simple form of cultural endorsement. Establishing criteria – formal or contextual – for distinguishing parody from metaparody is important, but difficult. The most persuasive criterion in the present analysis is contextual: that *The Roy Noble Show* orients warmly and sympathetically to Welshness in all respects, dialectal and non-dialectal (see ex. [1] and the commentary on it), beyond stylizing sequences.

REFERENCES

Agar, M. (1991). The biculture in bilingual. *Language in Society* 20:167–82.
Antaki, Charles, & Widdicombe, Sue (1998), eds. *Identities in talk*. London: Sage.
Bakhtin, Mikhail M. (1965). *Rabelais and his world*. Trans. Helen Iswolski. Cambridge, MA.: MIT Press.
———— (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. Ed. M. Holquist, trans. C. Emerson & M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.
———— (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. Trans. Vern W. McGee, ed. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.
Bauman, Richard (1977). *Verbal art as performance*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.
———— (1992). Performance. In R. Bauman, ed., *Folklore, cultural performances, and popular entertainments*, 41–9. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.
———— (1996). Transformations of the word in the production of Mexican festival drama. In Michael Silverstein and Greg Urban (eds.), *Natural histories of discourse*, 301–27. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.
————, & Briggs, Charles (1990). Poetics and performance as critical perspectives on language and social life. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19:59–88.
Bell, Allan (1984). Language style as audience design. *Language in Society* 13:145–204.
———— (1992). Hit and miss: Referee design in the dialects of New Zealand television advertising. *Language and Communication* 12:327–40.
———— (1999). Styling the other to define the self: A study in New Zealand identity making. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3:523–41.
Bhabha, Homi (1994). *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.

Cameron, Deborah (2000). Styling the worker: Gender and the commodification of language in the globalized service economy. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4:323–47.

Coupland, Nikolas (1984). Accommodation at work: Some phonological data and their implications. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 46:49–70.

———— (1985). "Hark, hark the lark": Social motivations for phonological style-shifting. *Language and Communication* 5:153–72.

———— (1988) *Dialect in use: Sociolinguistic variation in Cardiff English*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

———— (1995). Pronunciation and the rich points of culture. In J. Windsor Lewis (ed.), *Studies in English and general phonetics: In honour of Professor J. D. O'Connor*, 310–19. London: Routledge.

———— (2001). Language, situation and the relational self: Theorising dialect style in sociolinguistics. In Penelope Eckert & John Rickford (eds.), *Style and variation*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

———— (in press a). Stylised deception. In Adam Jaworski, Nikolas Coupland, & Darius Galasinski (eds.), *The sociolinguistics of metalanguage*.

———— (in press b) 'Other' representation. In J. Verschueren, J-O. Ostman, and J. Blommaert (eds.), *Handbook of pragmatics*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Eastman, C. M., & Stein, R. F. (1993). Language display: Authenticating claims to social identity. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 14:187–202.

Eckert, Penelope (2000). *Linguistic variation as social practice*. Maldon, MA & Oxford: Blackwell.

Eckert, Penelope & John Rickford. (2001), eds. *Style and variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eustace, Elizabeth (1998). *Representations of Welsh and Scottish identities: Attitudes towards standardness in English and the indigenous languages*. Ph.D. thesis, Centre for Language and Communication Research, Cardiff University.

Figueroa, Esther (1994). *Sociolinguistic metatheory*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Fishman, Joshua (1992). *Reversing language shift: Theory and practice of assistance to threatened languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Garrett, Peter; Coupland, Nikolas; & Williams, Angie (1999). Evaluating dialect in discourse: Teachers' and teenagers' responses to young English speakers in Wales. *Language in Society* 28:321–54.

Giddens, Anthony (1996). Living in a post-traditional society. In Ulrich Beck, Anthony Giddens, & Scott Lash, *Reflexive modernization: Politics, tradition and aesthetics in the modern social order*, 56–109. Cambridge: Polity.

Giles, Howard; Coupland, Justine; & Coupland, Nikolas (1991), eds. *Contexts of accommodation: Developments in applied sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goffman, Erving (1981). *Forms of talk*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Gumperz, John J. (1982) *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hebdige, Dick (1979). *Subculture: The meaning of style*. London: Methuen.

Hanks, William F. (1996). Exorcism and the description of participant roles. In Michael Silverstein & Greg Urban (eds.), *Natural histories of discourse*, 160–200. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Hill, Jane, & Hill, K. (1986). *Speaking Mexicano*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Hill, Jane & Irvine, Judith T. (1993), eds. *Responsibility and evidence in oral discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hutcheon, Linda (1985). *A theory of parody*. New York: Methuen.

———— (1994). *Irony's edge: The theory and politics of irony*. London: Routledge.

Hymes, Dell (1972). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In John J. Gumperz & Dell Hymes (eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics*, 35–71. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Irvine, Judith T. (1996). Shadow conversations: The indeterminacy of participant roles. In Michael Silverstein & Greg Urban (eds.), *Natural histories of discourse*, 131–59. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Jaffe, Alexandra (MS.). Comic performance and the articulation of hybrid identity.

Karim, H. K. (1997). The historical resilience of primary stereotypes: Core images of the Muslim other. In S. H. Riggins (ed.), *The language and politics of exclusion: Others in discourse*, 153–83. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kelly, Katherine E. (1994). Staging repetition: Parody in postmodern British and American theatre. In

Barbara Johnstone (ed.), *Repetition in discourse: Interdisciplinary perspectives*, vol. 1, 55–67. Norwood, NJ.: Ablex.

Labov, William (1972). *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Morson, Gary (1989). Theory of parody. In G. S. Morson & C. Emerson (eds.), *Rethinking Bakhtin*, 63–86. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Noble, Roy (1999). *Roy Noble's Wales*. Cardiff: Western Mail Books/University of Wales Press.

Rampton, Ben (1991). Interracial Panjabi in a British adolescent peer group. *Language in Society* 20:391–422.

———— (1995). *Crossing*. London: Longman.

———— (1999), ed. *Styling the other*. Thematic issue of *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3.4.

Said, Edward (1978). *Orientalism*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Schilling-Estes, Natalie (1998). Investigating "self-conscious" speech: The performance register in Ocracoke English. *Language in Society* 27:53–83.

Urban, Greg (1996). Entextualization, replication and power. In Michael Silverstein & Greg Urban (eds.), *Natural histories of discourse*, 21–44. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Vološinov, Valentin Nikolaevič (1973). *Marxism and the philosophy of language*. Trans. Ladislav Matejka & I. R. Titunik. New York: Seminar Press. [First published 1929 and 1930.]

Wales, Katie (1989). *A dictionary of stylistics*. London: Longman.

Woolard, Kathryn A. (1995) Changing forms of codeswitching in Catalan comedy. *Catalan Review* 9:223–52.

———— (1999). Simultaneity and bivalency as strategies in bilingualism. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 8:3–29.