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I

There has been much discussion of intra-lingual varieties in recent years.1 Catford has pertinently stated the problem which has prompted this discussion and justified the need to solve it (1965:83): "The concept of a "whole language" is so vast and heterogeneous that it is not operationally useful for many linguistic purposes, descriptive, comparative and pedagogical. It is therefore desirable to have a framework of categories for the classification of "sub-languages" or varieties within a total language.'

This article will discuss such a framework with particular reference to the nature of the various categories that might be involved; tentatively suggest categorized situational distinctions, which, in the light of subsequent linguistic description, might lead to further sub-categories of the spoken and written modes; and comment on the current terminological confusion in this area of study, a possible barrier to illumination and perhaps in part the result of uncertainty about the nature of the categories concerned. It will conclude with an outline view of the possible uses of varieties description and the place of such activity within linguistics.

As the terms 'context', 'contextual', 'situation', 'situational' will be used it will be as well if what is understood by them here is stated straightaway. By situation is meant the study of those extra-textual features, linguistic and non-

[1] This article was first presented as a paper to the Spring Meeting of the Linguistics Association of Great Britain, March 1966. I am indebted in its making to discussions with J. W. Spencer, R. J. Handscombe and J. O. Ellis but they have no responsibility for it.
linguistic, which have high potential relevance to statements of meaning about the texts of language events. By context is understood the correlations of formally described linguistic features, groupings of such features within texts and abstracted from them, with those situational features themselves constantly recurrent and relevant to the understanding of language events. Situation is an aspect of the description of language events, not a level of language or linguistics. Context is seen as a level of language, as its concern is with certain patterns and pattern correlations which are part of that abstraction from phenomena that leads us to say 'This is language'; to identify, that is, certain forms of behaviour as linguistic behaviour. In other words the view taken is that of Catford (1965:1-5) that neither substance nor situation are themselves language; what is language is the patterning linguistic behaviour implicitly imposes on both substance and situation. Context and situation are taken to cover concepts of 'context of experience', 'context of culture' and 'context of situation' as used by Malinowski (1923, 1935) and Firth (1930, 1937, 1957, 1964). Both context and situation are conceived of as the concern, within the linguistic sciences, of semantics, analogous to the concern of phonetics both with the description of the phonic substantial aspect of language events and with phonology.

II

For Catford (1965: 84) 'a language variety is a sub-set of formal and/or substantial features which correlates with a particular type of socio-situational feature'. A variety category can be thought of then as a kind of contextual category, correlating groupings of linguistic features with recurrent situational features. My suggestion is that as well as such contextual categories – IDIOLECT, TEMPORAL DIALECT, MODE, are among those we have been offered – it is also helpful to be explicit about and use in the description of language events aiming towards statements of meaning a separate, though related, set of situational categories for the description of those socio-situational features which may be expected to correlate with sub-sets of linguistic features. Catford (1962) was very much aware of this but more recent discussion, including that of Spencer & Gregory (1964), has given the appearance of taking the situational correlates for granted and proceeded, in the absence of detailed exemplificatory and situational description, mainly in terms of very hypothetical contextual categories.

Situational events are considered here to be part of the data of linguistics, as well as phonic events (cf. Allen 1957: 24), and to be equally describable. The difference between situational and other kinds of linguistic description has been greatly exaggerated. Much of the absence, with some notable exceptions (e.g. Robins, 1952; Allen, 1956; Mitchell, 1957; Halliday, 1959; Dixon, 1964, 1965; Ellis, 1966; Pike, 1954, 1955, 1960; Kachru, 1966), of development of
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contextual and situational statement has been due to what might well be termed a remarkable failure of nerve, a fear as to what is a describable relevant situational feature, a situational 'fact'. But, as Allen (1957: 10) pointed out, 'there are no facts in linguistics until the linguist has made them; they are ultimately like all scientific facts the products of imagination and invention. "Experience by itself is silent and it requires an hypothesis to give it a voice."' Such hypotheses are the concern of this article.

The other related dragon in the path of situational description has been the apparently infinite extensiveness of notions of 'situation'. This has been made much of by Katz & Fodor (1964: 24) among others. The suggestion sometimes seems to be that because situation cannot be described exhaustively, it should not be described at all. It seems to be implied that grammatical description in contradistinction is not infinitely extensive, that a sort of exhaustiveness is possible there. This is perhaps an illusion. Any monolithic grammatical model which aims to be productively explicit will, as a consequence, fail to be explicit about and overtly recognize all the possible relationships in a language which might be called grammatical, a point that lurks behind Bolinger (1961a, b) and Quirk (1965). The idea even of grammatical exhaustiveness towards the data, the phenomena to be explicitly described, is, in transformational grammar, quite acceptably evaded by introducing the notion of the 'well-formed sentence' which is what it attempts to be explicitly exhaustive about. There is no claim to, indeed no apparent interest in, being exhaustive about what actually happens in the linguistic behaviour from which the idea of a language has been abstracted. Exhaustiveness anywhere in a science seems to be an impossibility; situation differs from no other aspect of our work in this.

Moreover the infinite extensiveness of situation can surely be bounded by criteria of relevancy and of viability of description. Relevancy is to be decided largely in the light of the purposes for which the particular statement is being made. This sober rule might be suggested: that the linguist draws upon situational features to the extent necessary in order to make a statement of meaning concerning the text satisfactory for the explicit purpose for which he is examining and describing that particular text, and to the extent to which he can maintain viability (keep his statements public rather than private), whichever sets the earlier limit: relevancy or viability.

Those situational elements which are potentially contextually relevant to given linguistic forms or groups and complexes of forms are discovered, or 'invented', by commutation, by changing, as Catford (1965: 36) noted, situational features and observing what textual changes take place, by changing an item or items in the text and observing what situational change occurs. This entails careful and continuous contrasts amongst the records, substantial and situational, of related series of language events. The process is not unlike that employed in grammatical and phonological analysis. Gardiner (1932: 6) wrote:
'This then is my method: to put back single acts of speech into their original setting of real life and thence to discover what processes are employed, what features involved.' Taken literally this is nonsense; we cannot 'put back single acts of speech', part of an irreversible sequence of human behaviour, 'into their original setting of real life' but we can, of course, employ actual records, our imagination and memory to do situational analysis as we do in other areas of linguistic observation and description.

We are helped in doing this by language's social function. As Gardiner (1932: 11) pointed out 'in the traffic of daily life situations are constantly arising so closely similar that we do not hesitate to speak of them as the "same situation". Every language has its own fixed ways of coping with certain recurring situations'. A necessarily early step in contextual and situational description is to move towards determining 'these fixed ways'.

So situational description does well to concern itself initially with what are constant features of the extra-textual circumstances of language events which have high potential contextual significance. The situational features involved in varieties distinction are, as recent writers have noted (e.g. Catford 1962, 1965; Halliday, McIntosh & Strevens 1964), of this kind, relating as they do to reasonably permanent characteristics of the user and recurrent characteristics of the user's use of language.

III

The categories of idiolect, temporal, geographical, social, standard and non-standard dialects, the dialectal varieties as they are called here, all have a long history of recognition and use in philological and linguistic scholarship. They may be regarded, with the possible exception of the standard/non-standard distinction as used here, as at least potentially general contextual categories of language variation. These general categories realize descriptive categories when they are applied to a particular language. In the same way as general grammatical categories such as unit and structure are only exemplifiable, realizable, in a particular specification of, say, the sentences of English, so too a general contextual category such as temporal dialect is workable with, interestingly useful, when it is realized descriptively in terms of a particular language. So categories such as Old and Middle English, American and British English, Upper Class English, Middle Class English are descriptive contextual categories, instances of temporal, geographical and social dialects in a particular language.

Diagram I displays the situational categories set up to describe these extra-textual features whose regular correlations with certain linguistic features leads to the establishment of contextual categories of dialectal language variety. Users' individualities, temporal, geographical and social provenances, and ranges of intelligibility pattern with idiolects, temporal, geographical
### DIÁRAM I

**suggested categories of dialectal variety differentiation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>situational categories</th>
<th>contextual categories</th>
<th>examples of English varieties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>individuality</td>
<td>idiolect</td>
<td>Mr. X's English, Miss Y's English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temporal provenance</td>
<td>temporal dialect</td>
<td>Old English, Modern English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geographical provenance</td>
<td>geographical dialect</td>
<td>British English, American English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social provenance</td>
<td>social dialect</td>
<td>Upper Class English, Middle Class English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>range of intelligibility</td>
<td>standard/non standard dialect</td>
<td>Standard English, Non Standard English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DIALECTAL VARIETIES:**
- the linguistic reflection of reasonably permanent characteristics of the user in language situations
social, standard and non-standard dialects. The descriptive contextual categories, the varieties within a language, have to be ultimately realized in a statement of the linguistic forms which regularly correlate with the categorically described situational features.

The description of the situational features itself involves DESCRIPTIVE situational categories. 'Nineteenth century' as an instance of temporal provenance has a different meaning when applied in the situational description of an English text than it does in that of a German text, for example. The linguistic component of the realized descriptive contextual category would attempt to delineate its INDEXICAL MARKERS: the grammatical, lexical, phonological/graphological features peculiar to and characteristic of itself, and give some indication of its COMMON CORE features, the features it shares with one or more other varieties. Such exemplified descriptive contextual categories are statements then of what Firth (1964: 173) called 'common verbalizations' of 'common situational contexts' and 'experiential contexts' of the users of the language.

Some of these dialectal varieties can already be seen as partially exemplified descriptive contextual categories. The grammars of Old English, the lexicons and various glossaries of Old English, together comprise an admittedly unorganized but still useful exemplification of a temporal dialect in English, contrasting with that represented by the grammars and dictionaries of Middle and Modern English. The grammatical work of Fries (1940, 1952), Francis (1958) and Hill (1958) together with the lexicographic statements of Webster's Third International Dictionary present descriptive contrasts within geographical dialect of the American-British kind when compared to British lexicographic and grammatical statements, and in this respect the results of the Survey of English Usage directed by Randolph Quirk at University College, London, are eagerly awaited. Further descriptive geographical dialect information with additional relevance to standard/non-standard contrasts emerges from the English Dialects Survey at Leeds. Ross's (1954, 1956) rather idiosyncratic work on 'U' and 'non-U' English presents a partial beginning on contemporary British social dialects. Social dialects at an earlier point on the diachronic dimension, in the eighteenth century, are represented by the many handbooks of that time on Polite and Vulgar English. Literary stylistics has thrown some light on written idioloects. Such descriptive statements may not be all that one might want them to be from the point of view of comprehensive and consistent variety differentiation, but they do yield some descriptive information for these purposes. They do not relieve current linguistics of the need to establish more organized realizations of the descriptive contextual categories of language variation, but in the meantime use can be made of them.

In examining a particular text in order to make a statement of meaning, it is necessary not only to apply to it descriptive contextual variety categories but
also to describe it situationally in terms of the situational categories. Certain aspects of the text's meaning may be 'profiled' as it were by so doing; this because in many interesting texts the situational description does not fit the contextual description in terms of the descriptive contextual categories; situational features of the text are not always correlating with the accustomed sub-set of linguistic features. For example, in a William Morris novel such as The Roots of the Mountains most of the language is representative of the temporal dialect of late nineteenth century English and would correlate with the situational description of the user's temporal provenance but there is a sedulous avoidance in this text, not usual in nineteenth century English, of those words from Greek, Latin, Italian and French which came into English during the late Renaissance and Restoration periods. And there are linguistic features in the text, particularly groups of lexical items like good folk, fare home, swains, well-wont fingers, thralls, webster, tabor, Redesman, minstrelsy, which are associated more usually with the temporal dialects of Late Middle or Early Modern English. This included earlier dialect creates then another temporal provenance for the text. Here situation is the tail wagged by a linguistic dog (cf. McIntosh, 1965: 9–20).

Parody may similarly be described in terms of the contrast between the user's individuality normally associated with certain linguistic features in the text and the actual identity of the user of the text's situation. Self parody might be describable in terms of an increase in density in the text of the indexical markers of the user's idiolect.

It is because part of the competence of the users of a particular language can be seen to be in their awareness of the 'common verbalizations' of 'common situational contexts' and 'contexts of experience' that the texts of language events can themselves create their own situations; call into relevancy extra-textual features not within the perceptually present situation. The suggestion is then that semantics, to increase viability, needs to make descriptively explicit these common verbalizations of common situations, and that descriptively realized contextual categories of variety distinction have a major part to play in this task. It follows that their use is greatly limited until the categories can be related to groups of given linguistic features regularly correlatable with given situational features.

The category of standard dialect is presented rather tentatively. As used here it is necessary for only a relatively small group of languages and those only at certain periods in their history. STANDARD here has no direct reference to the influence of particular geographical or social provenances. It does serve to indicate, where that is appropriate, what Abercrombie (1955: 11) has called 'the universal form' of a language: what enables, for example, certain users of English throughout the English speaking world to communicate intelligibly with each other. So USER'S RANGE OF INTELLIGIBILITY is offered as the related
category for situational description. Like all other dimensions of situation variation that yield language variation this, too, is a cline or continuum.

All the varieties discussed so far, the dialectal varieties, are concerned with the linguistic reflections of reasonably permanent characteristics of the user, a constant feature in language situations: 'reasonably permanent' and not 'permanent' because although a user’s individuality, temporal, geographical and social provenances, range of intelligibility within a community, all have a high degree of constancy, it is of course possible, as has already been suggested, for a language user to assume, at least partially, the linguistic habits of another individual, time, place and social class. Many English speakers control both a standard and non-standard dialect: the selection of one rather than another in different situations being closely linked with the question of use – particularly of addressee relationship, the type of situation variation yielding linguistic DIATYPIVARIETIES – the linguistic reflections of user’s use of language in situations.

IV

There has been as yet little organization of the description of, for example, present-day English towards a descriptive realization of the proposed categories of diatypic variation (Diag. 2). Work on the Nuffield Projects, The Survey of Educated English Usage and, with regard to Russian, the Contemporary Language Analysis Project at the University of Essex might reach towards so testing such categories.2

In the meantime categories of diatypic variation must surely be regarded as very hypothetical, the dimensions they represent not necessarily the only constant ones of this kind.

Catford (1965), Halliday, McIntosh & Strevens (1964), Strevens (1964), Strang (1962), Spencer & Gregory (1964) have, in published work, so far recognised three dimensions of variation contextually categorized in this article as FIELD, MODE and TENOR OF DISCOURSE. Situationally they are all related in a general sense to the role being played by the user in the language event. This role may be sub-categorized into the USER’S PURPOSIVE ROLE relating to the field of discourse, MEDIUM RELATIONSHIP relating to mode of discourse and ADDRESSEE RELATIONSHIP relating to tenor of discourse. Addressee relationship may be further distinguished into PERSONAL ADDRESSEE RELATIONSHIP and FUNCTIONAL ADDRESSEE RELATIONSHIP. For example, the general role the present author played teaching one of his classes at Leeds University might have been described as 'lecturing on the linguistic description of English to postgraduate

### DIAGRAM 2

suggested categories of diatypic variety differentiation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>situational categories</th>
<th>contextual categories</th>
<th>examples of English varieties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>purposive role</td>
<td>field of discourse</td>
<td>Technical English, Non-Technical English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medium relationship</td>
<td>mode of discourse</td>
<td>Spoken English, Written English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addressee relationship</td>
<td>tenor of discourse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) personal</td>
<td>personal tenor</td>
<td>Formal English, Informal English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) functional</td>
<td>functional tenor</td>
<td>Didactic English, Non-Didactic English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DIATYPIC VARIETIES: the linguistic reflection of recurrent characteristics of user's use of language in situations
diploma students'. The 'lecturing' component could largely be dealt with in terms of medium relationship, part the speaking of what is written, part monologuing. The didactic element in the 'lecturing' and the 'to postgraduate diploma students' would determine the degrees of didacticism and formality in the functional and personal addressee relationships. What remains, 'on the linguistic description of English', reflects the purposive role of the user, the situational category related to field of discourse. There was some suggestion in Spencer & Gregory (1964: 87) that subject matter was the related situational category to field. This was mistaken: subject matter itself represents a possible abstraction from the habitual co-occurrence of certain linguistic items with certain situational features; it does not indicate what are the situational features involved. SOCIAL ROLE was offered by Catford (1962, 1965) as the situational correlate of his REGISTER which reasonably closely corresponds to FIELD OF DISCOURSE; but SOCIAL ROLE is a little too vague and perhaps open to confusion with SOCIAL PROVENANCE. PURPOSIVE ROLE is meant to echo Gardiner's (1932: 98) point that in speech events participants are revealing 'an intelligible purpose'.

Such purposive roles may be specialized or non-specialized. Non-specialist roles such as 'establishing personal contact' have a number of possible related fields such as 'weather', 'health', 'projected holidays', 'current news'. Specialized roles relate to specialist fields, and are most likely to have a one-to-one field relationship. For example, the linguist operating as linguist uses many lexical items unlikely to occur elsewhere, items like phoneme, morpheme, allophone, as well as items occurring in other fields, when the user is fulfilling other roles, items like subject, complement, voice, mood, nominal, verbal, but with their collocational range considerably restricted. Grammatical characteristics seem to consist in the recurrence of certain patterns unlikely to be so frequent in discourse of a more general nature. The incidence in scientific writing in English of passive verbal groups has been often instanced; significant too might be the incidence of certain types of lengthy pre- and post modification of nominal heads relating to the need in specialist activities for definition and precision as economically as possible. The special role of religious worshiping relates to a field of discourse marked by a high incidence of vocative nominal groups, imperative clauses, and subjunctive and modal verbal groups.

Descriptive classification of English according to field of discourse could lead then to a useful initial distinction between what might be called Technical Englishes and Non-Technical Englishes, between, that is, those Englishes where the field-purposive role correlation so determines the language that it becomes in many respects restricted to that role and those acquainted with it, and those Englishes which, although they may have in any particular discourse a specific field, are not so restricted. More delicately one could distinguish within Technical Englishes amongst the English of Mathematics, the English
of Psychology, Legal English and Religious English; and within Religious English between that of Religious Worship and that of Religious Discussion. These Technical Englishes need not be confined to academic subjects; rather they can range from the language used by an electrician and his mate discussing the procedures involved in installing an immersion heater to that of a financial discussion in one of the merchant banking houses of the City of London. A descriptive approach sensitive to situational and linguistic patterns and pattern correlations should eventually be able to describe the fields of any discourse with varying degrees of specificity, whether it be the shifting ground of two witty, sophisticated conversationalists, the unified intricacies of a scientific paper or the chatter of phatic communion. This is, of course, something of an act of faith, although an interesting pioneering investigation into the fields of discourse in children’s spontaneous speech is represented by Handscombe (1965). If fields of discourse are initially established and exemplified from the examination of the texts of events in which there is one clearly dominant purposive role being played by the user, the recognition of minor or included fields within a more complex discourse can lead the linguist to look again at the purposive role aspect of the text’s situation and attempt to determine the sub-roles suggested by the ‘included’ fields.

Ellis (1965) recognises a fourth category of diatypic variation along with field (which he sees as correlating with subject matter), mode, and style of discourse. This he chooses to call role ‘the dimension correlating with social or other role of the utterance or text’ (what Catford (1962, 1965) took as the situational correlate of his register) ‘for example, conversation, literature, technical writing’. In the framework presented here such a use of ‘conversation’ would be dealt with largely in terms, situationally of medium relationship, contextually, of mode with some reference to the fields and tenors of discourse normally associated with this mode, noting perhaps the comparative rarity, in contrast to other modes, of technical fields. ‘Technical writing’ would involve primarily field and mode of discourse with reference to the restricted range of tenors patterning with such field-mode combinations. ‘Literature’ too would involve all the dimensions and something more besides. role as used by Ellis seems then to be a conflation or realignment of the other dimensions rather than one of the same status. Such conflation at a more advanced stage in varieties description will be useful and for some purposes necessary but they are perhaps better delayed until there is more descriptive realization of the other individual dimensions.8

---

[3] Since this paper was read at the Nottingham Meeting I have had the benefit of helpful and clarificatory comment from J. O. Ellis (by private communication) and suspect that the above misinterprets him. It appears that what he referred to in Ellis (1965) with regard to role were aspects of “conversation” (namely, personal interchange), of “literature” (i.e. in abstraction from mode), and of “technical writing” (its expository-ness); and that it is these which make necessary “the distinction of role” I. I agree with him that these have to be catered for but at the moment prefer to do so in terms of personal and functional addressee relationships and tenors, and am grateful to Ellis’ queries and comments for leading me to be more explicit here about these concerns than I was in the earlier presentation of this paper.
In the case particularly of tenor of discourse such descriptive realization might lead to the discernment of at least two (as here) and possibly several related sub-dimensions. Taking it that tenors of discourse result from the mutual relations between the language used and the relationships among the participants in language events, this relationship may be seen, as it has been so far, as one which varies from extreme degrees of formality to extreme degrees of informality; that is in terms of personal relationships between the addresser and addressees. More sophisticated investigations may lead, however, to the discernment and establishment of other related contrastive points in human social relationships, such as didactic and non-didactic, expository and non-expository, which have marked mutually determining correlations with the language used in the context of these relationships. It is to cater for such relationships that the sub-categories of functional addressee relationship and functional tenor are suggested.

A detailed consideration of user’s medium relationship will show how diversification of the situational description might yield a framework for arriving at a useful sub-categorization of the contextual category of mode of discourse: useful alignments, that is, of linguistic features with situational features.

Diagram 3 displays these ‘suggested distinctions’ along the dimension of situation variation categorised as user’s medium relationship.

The relationship of a language user to his medium may be seen initially as the simple one of which he is using, of whether he is speaking or writing: which in terms of the groups of linguistic features correlating with each yields such descriptive contextual modes in a given language as spoken English and written English. But as soon as relationships such as those between lectures and articles, between conversations in real life and dialogue in novels and plays, have to be considered, distinctions amongst modes of discourse, if they are to be really useful, have often to be more delicate than the primary one between spoken and written. So looking again at situation we may distinguish speaking into speaking spontaneously and speaking non-spontaneously (cf. Abercrombie, 1963). Speaking spontaneously may then be distinguished into conversing and monologuing.

Conversing is the medium relationship in those speech situations in which there is a possibility of spontaneous interchange between two or more people. Although as Abercrombie (1963) points out, the bulk of all language is the result of such activity, little is as yet known descriptively about it. Modern tape-recorders have solved the physical problem of obtaining texts but possible moral problems remain. The surreptitious recording of people conversing is not unlike opening other people’s letters, yet there is a fear that if the participants in
DIAGRAM 3
suggested distinctions along the dimension of situation variation
categorised as user's medium relationship
a conversation know they are being recorded this is likely to affect them and produce non-typical samples.

Such is the dilemma of the morally sensitive linguist but some of his less scrupulous colleagues have obtained material by concealed recording.-- for which the morally sensitive linguist is no doubt eternally grateful. Others, particularly those working with children (e.g. R. Hasan and R. J. Handscombe on the Child Language Survey of the Nuffield Foreign Languages Teaching Materials Project), have found that open recording produces quite typical examples after time has been allowed for the novelty to wear off. As yet there is no full systematic statement of the linguistic features which might serve as the indexical markers of a contextual category of conversation mode, but various suggestions have been made. Quirk (1955) has pointed to the incidence of what he calls 'intimacy signals' and Abercrombie (1963) to what he calls 'silence fillers', phrases like sort of, kind of, you know, I mean to say. Abercrombie (1963) points out that intonation rather than pausal features frequently mark the end of the grammatical unit sentence. In terms of most existing grammars, which are based on written language, or the speaking of what is written, or what is imagined to be spoken spontaneously, the grammar of conversation has a certain incompleteness. In terms of the grammatical model I use this shows itself in the number of sentences which consist of only one clause which itself consist structurally only of one or more Adjunctival or Z elements, Z being a nominally expounded element not in an overt relationship to a Predicator. Preliminary observations suggests that the increase of pronouns and deictics without an intra-textual referent might be a significant marker, one of these features which distinguish conversation from that other kind of spontaneous speech which occurs when we are monologuing.

Monologuing is taken to be the user's medium relationship in those speech situations in which the other people present, if any, do not join in, or at least are not meant to, except perhaps to show approval or disapproval. Some after-dinner speeches, much classroom teaching and a large part of all sporting commentaries are likely to produce the sort of texts from which a mode of monologue might be established. Many radio and television 'discussions' and conversations like those of club bores, university dons and schoolmasters (used as they are to the one-way traffic of the class-room) are often the consequence of monologuing rather than conversing. Naturally in examining the texts and situations of many language events it is going to be difficult to separate conversation from monologue, monologuing from conversing; the boundaries between the categories, situationally and contextually, will often be blurred. Nevertheless there seems good reason for supposing that it is worth postulating a contextual category of spoken language monologue distinguished from conversation. In texts which could be described as the linguistic output of monologuing there seems to be more phonological, grammatical and lexical
cohesion — and pronouns and deictics more frequently have an intra-textual referent as opposed to a direct reference to a non-linguistic feature within the perceptually present situation. In monologue the situation created by the language itself tends to assume greater importance relative to the external situation. The greater continuity, cohesion and self-containedness one expects and usually finds in monologue is no doubt related to Coleridge's 'sense of prospective' in the educated speaker, an idea of what he is going to say next and its relationship to his present utterance. Monologue is perhaps very much a mode of the educated speaker. On tapes of spontaneous speech of Yorkshire mill workers recorded by Janetta (1966: section 8, sheet C), the only portions which situationally and contextually might be classed as monologuing/monologue, occurred in the anecdotal parts of the text. In these passages there was a marked increase of cohesive features at all levels and noticeably more additional independent and adjunctival dependent clauses per sentence than there was in the surrounding conversational portions of the tapes in which the majority of sentences consisted of only one independent clause; reported clauses being the main sub-class of dependent clause when these did occur.

Speaking non-spontaneously divides into reciting and the speaking of what is written. Reciting is used to cover the medium relationship in the telling of stories, poems, singing of lyrics and other songs belonging to an oral tradition. This form of linguistic activity is likely to be more important in the discovery and description of modes within a non-literate society than it is within a literate one. In our society some types of joke and the lyrics of certain songs in rugby team buses and sports changing rooms might fall into this category. However, in societies such as ours most non-spontaneous speaking is probably the speaking of what has been written. It may be the speaking of what is written to be spoken as if not written, or of what is written to be spoken with no such conventional pretence, or the speaking of what is written not necessarily to be spoken. The proposal is that the medium relationships of writing be sub-categorized in terms of the degree of orientation of the writing towards the possible speaking of it. This is not in itself to suggest that writing is derived from speech, to assert any casual relationships of that sort between the media; it is to maintain that in societies such as ours all that is written can and may be spoken and that a considerable, perhaps increasing proportion of such language has the speaking of it definitely in mind; and that the converse is not so true, that except when dictating we rarely speak with the writing of what we have spoken in mind.

Nearer to spontaneous speech, but not of course identical with it as Eliot (1959) and Abercrombie (1963) have in their own diverse ways pointed out, one might expect to find the speaking of what is written to be spoken as if not written, i.e. the speaking of the texts of plays, films, some radio and television scripts, some political speeches, sermons and 'lectures'. Such texts
might be linguistically distinguishable from other written texts through a
greater comparative incidence in them of the favourite grammatical patterns of
spontaneous speech, and from texts of spontaneous speech through less
frequent use of pronouns and deictics without intra-textual referents, and other
grammatical and lexical features resulting from the fact that texts associated
with this medium relationship probably use language to create their situations
to a greater extent than we do when speaking spontaneously. The fundamental
difference between the speaking of what is written to be spoken as if not written
and ordinary speech is that the one is planned, prepared behaviour, the other
spontaneous; a play or film largely creates its own situation and patterns of
contextual relations, has a definite beginning and end, and is remarkably and
significantly more compact and self-contained than the situations in which
conversing and monologuing occur.

Other language is written to be spoken with no effort made to conceal its
written origins. In this category might be included liturgical prayer, news
bulletins on radio and television, airport and railway station announcements,
many sermons and speeches, most academic conference papers, most poetry.
Among its mode markers might be features of varied repetition, different in
kind from the repetitions found in spontaneous speech, the fillers of conversa-
tion used often while we think of the next thing to say. In language written to be
spoken the repetition is usually quite premeditated and certainly necessary for
effectiveness when the written text is to be spoken in those situations in which
the addressees cannot conveniently ask the speaker to repeat what he said
earlier, when they cannot ‘turn back a page’ as it were. Successful texts written
to be spoken often show a consciousness of the usually irreversibly sequential
nature of speech activity and make the same point over again in slightly
different ways. Part of the failures of those lectures and conference papers
which are the reading aloud of articles lies in their lack of such repetition.
Linguistically this feature manifests itself in grammatical and particularly
lexical repetition at different places in the text. In Halliday (1964), a paper read
at a round table conference of linguists, the following related passages dis-
tributed throughout the text may be compared from this point of view:
‘Language may be described for a wide range of purposes; or if that’s begging
the question I want to ask, there is a wide range of purposes for which a
description of language may be used.’ (11); ‘I would also wish to include among
the possible goals of linguistic theory, the description of language for the pur-
pose of various specific applications; goals which may be thought of as external
to linguistics but for which, linguistics is part of the essential equipment.’ (13);
‘I would defend the view that different co-existing models in linguistics may
be regarded as appropriate to different aims, rather than as competing con-
tenders for the same goal.’ (13); ‘to exemplify my earlier point that the features
of a description and therefore of the model that lies behind it, are relatable to
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the aims of the model and through these to particular applications of linguistics.' (23)

Liturgical prayer has its own type of this variation with the repetitions more juxtaposed than in other texts within this category. Here the varied repetition is also a mark of its purposive role—field of discourse correlation, distinguishing it from the English of Religious Discussion. The Collect for Purity from the Book of Common Prayer exemplifies this type of varied repetition: ALMIGHTY God, unto whom all hearts be open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid: cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of Thy Holy Spirit that we may perfectly love thee and worthily magnify Thy Holy Name; through Christ Our Lord. Amen. Unto whom all hearts be open, all desires known, from whom no secrets are hid: grammatical variation within grammatical repetition; different lexical items but with similar set membership: hearts, desires, secrets, open, known, hid. Note too the adverb—verb colligations perfectly love, worthily magnify: the adverbs perfectly and worthily from the same set, and the verbs magnify and love substitutable for each other in such texts in the language of the time.

A considerable amount of language is, of course, WRITTEN NOT NECESSARILY TO BE SPOKEN, the bulk of what has been studied as language in our schools and universities in the past. Some of it, particularly dialogue and some monologue in novels might be classified situationally as WRITTEN TO BE READ AS IF HEARD (cf. Gregory, 1965). Linguistic features such as ambiguities which are only apparent when a vocalization of the text is in mind (i.e. homophonous ambiguities rather than homographic ones), and items such as he said gently, he roared, she screamed, introducing or concluding what is graphologically indicated as direct speech mark such portions of text as invitations to an auditory experience. Spencer (1965) has tentatively suggested that it might be possible to distinguish what is WRITTEN TO BE READ AS IF OVERHEARD, exemplified in some of the monologues in Joyce's novels. There remains that which is WRITTEN TO BE READ in the sense of 'not read aloud', for example: essays, narrative and descriptive passages in novels, learned books, much journalism. The attempt to find linguistic markers patterning with all these situational distinctions, the attempt to establish modes, descriptive contextual categories such as SPONTANEOUS ENGLISH SPEECH, ENGLISH WRITTEN TO BE SPOKEN, may lead either to a conflation of some of the situational distinctions in one contextual category, or to further distinctions. It might, for example, be difficult to establish significantly independent indexical markers for the distinction between what is written to be read as if heard and what is written to be read as if overheard and a contextual category which correlates with a conflation of both might be more useful. On the other hand looking closely at the linguistic differences between texts within what is here the same situational category might lead us to realize an important situational distinction not exhibited in his
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initial framework of classification. There must be the same mutually nourishing two way process between situation and context as between other levels and aspects of the description of language and language events.

Description for the purpose of rhetorics, prescriptions based on description, must bear in mind the effectiveness of texts in terms of whether or not the medium relationship has been successfully reflected in the language chosen. This would be particularly important in the WRITTEN TO BE SPOKEN AS IF NOT WRITTEN and the WRITTEN TO BE SPOKEN areas. Here the linguist might make use of informants' responses to the spoken versions of the texts as a check on his own opinion as to their success. Such activity might be seen as a move towards a really useful discussion of the use of language in literature and in non-literate texts, of judgements of style relative to the author's aims, the effects he is trying to produce.

VI

The terminological confusion in this area of study is such that it merits discussion.

Any variety distinguished according to user's characteristics is referred to in this article as a DIALECTAL VARIETY, all of them as DIALECTAL VARIETIES. Halliday, McIntosh & Strevens (1964) and Catford (1965) use DIALECT or DIALECTS in these senses.

In this article any variety distinguished according to characteristics of use is referred to as a DIATYPIC VARIETY, all of them, as the DIATYPIC VARIETIES. Halliday et al. (1964: 90) use REGISTER, REGISTERS, in these senses, writing 'registers . . . may be distinguished according to field of discourse, mode of discourse, style of discourse.' Strang (1962: 18) seems to use the term STYLE in this sense as a category conflating the different dimensions although one must note that she does see the different styles cutting across differences of medium. She writes: 'within each of the media, these are different types of English for different purposes – for friendly letters, business correspondence, legal documents etc. and for conversations, lecturing, public worship etc.'

What is here called FIELD OF DISCOURSE is the same term and seems to have the same application as that of Halliday et al. (1964), but Strevens (1964) followed Catford (1962, 1965) and used REGISTER for this dimension. Strang (1962: 19) also uses the term REGISTER distinguishing 'differences of subjective register – those which characterize a particular social role of the speaker – and objective register – those which are adopted in relation to a particular social bond with the person, persons addressed' – which latter use would approximate to what others have called TENOR or STYLE, OF DISCOURSE. Quirk (1962) used the term TRADE DIALECTS for what have been called fields or registers and elsewhere (1964: 64) appears to use the term STYLES in a similar sense, instancing as one sort of variety according to use 'the range of styles found in scientific, religious, fictional, poetic and other usage'.
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MODE OF DISCOURSE is the term used for the spoken-written dimension by Halliday et al. (1964), Catford (1965), Spencer & Gregory (1964), but Strevens (1964) and Strang (1962) use MEDIUM for this dimension.

What is here called TENOR OF DISCOURSE is called 'style of discourse' by Halliday et al. (1964: 92), by Strevens (1964) and by Catford (1965) without the inverted commas. OBJECTIVE REGISTER seems to be the corresponding term used by Strang (1962) and Quirk (1964: 64) appears to favour REGISTER for this dimension, writing 'the range of registers (slang, colloquial, formal etc.).'

The confusion throughout the literature is then considerable. The present author would like to defend and recommend the usage adopted in this article. This is not to be construed as a criticism of other people's work, but as a tentative attempt to suggest a non-ambiguous terminology for the dimensions of variety differentiation suggested here.

DIACRITICAL VARIETY is preferred to DIALECT because of the frequent use of the latter term when unmodified to refer to geographical or regional dialects.

DIATYPIC VARIETY is preferred to REGISTER as a general term for variety distinguished according to use because of the use of register in at least two other senses within the literature and in yet another sense within phonetics. FIELD is preferred to REGISTER as a dimension term for the same reason. Because of the exotericism of literature the use of the expression 'the register of literature' is also to be questioned. The language of literature is so unrestricted that to term it a register is apt to be misleading.

MODE is preferred to MEDIUM because it allows more specific and complex distinctions than that which is usually spoken of as a medium's distinction; that is the substantial distinction between speaking and writing. MEDIUM RELATIONSHIP can then be used as a situational category. MODE has now the added advantage of being the word in general use.

TENOR is preferred to STYLE for obvious reasons. STYLE has had for a long time in literary and linguistic study a quite different application and inverted commas are hardly sufficient to set it apart. Even within variety differentiation it is used in two, possibly three, different senses. TENOR (in the Oxford English Dictionary sense of 'way of proceeding') is so little used nowadays except unambiguously in the discussion of music that it has some of the advantages of neutrality.

VII

The discovery and dissemination of knowledge, indeed the question 'what is knowledge?' seems to be inextricably involved with questions of application to human welfare: and so a clear terminology and regularly revised descriptive research are especially desirable in this area of our activity because descriptively realized contextual categories of variety differentiation would have a wide range of possible uses. Eight may be suggested: their use in the language
teacher's choice of materials (cf. Halliday et al., 1964); in the making of rhetorics (cf. Warburg, 1961); in the judgement of correctness or, preferably, appropriateness of usage (cf. Halliday et al., 1964); in the establishment of translation equivalence (cf. Catford, 1965); in the study of style especially in the establishment of relevant norms for comparison and contrast (cf. Enkvist et al., 1964); in the collection and assessment of a representative corpus for descriptive statements about a language; in sophisticating the institutional labelling of items in dictionaries; and in statements of meaning for explicit purposes in regard to specific texts.

It is when it is concerned with this last use that linguistic semantics is here conceived of as being most itself. What is to be expected of semantics is that it should enable one to explicate, in a reasonably viable way, the meaning of particular texts, and to compare and contrast as regards their meaning, diverse texts. This interest in the particular seems quite proper because as Lyons (1963: 23) has indicated 'any meaningful linguistic unit, up to and including the complete utterance has meaning in context'. There is also the rather extreme opinion of Firth (1957: 190) that the use of a word is 'subject to the general rule that each word when used in a new context is a new word'.

The categorical framework discussed in this paper is to be seen, together with other categories of a similar kind (such as contextual kinds of sentence-command, statement, question, promise, wish etc.; contextual sets resulting from the correlational alignment of collocationally determined sets and situationally determined sets; frameworks for context of situation description like those put forward by Firth (1950) and used by Mitchell (1957)), as part of a possible macro-framework of inter-related contextual and situational categories. Such a hypothetical macro-framework, descriptively realized and constantly renewed through the observation of events and the use of informants, could be seen as an attempt to make explicit the 'assumed background of common contexts of experience' (Firth, 1964: 174) which together with the 'perceived situation' (Firth, 1964: 174) enables us to live through the noise we make with our faces and the scribbles we make with our hands. Such an ordered framework would be a means of extending the viability, the operational adequacy, of our statements of meaning and an important source of prompting in semantics.

To semantics' need both for schematic constructs and for a concern primarily with the meaning of particular texts, might be added that it should be conducted with an explicit awareness of the purposes for which the meaning of the text is being investigated. The infinitude of any text's meaning may be operationally limited not only by treating it in the particular and by self-imposed boundaries of viability but also in terms of the purposes for which it is being examined. A statement of meaning made with a view to inter-lingual translation would seem likely, when compared to one made for the elucidation
of other native speakers, to select different relevancies, a different ordering of shared relevancies, amongst extra-textual features.

The type of linguistic and situational description discussed here, the concerns that lie behind this article, need not be taken to be in any way hostile to current concerns with modelling linguistic competence, rather as a perhaps necessary complement to them. Part of the linguistic competence of a native speaker is a competence in a host of varying circumstances. Any model of linguistic competence which takes a de-situationalized view of language activity is that much impoverished. Competence-dominated linguistics faces the danger of sidling into psychology; performance-dominated linguistics of drifting into sociology. The one focuses on language as human behaviour, the other as social behaviour; but linguistics is perhaps most itself and preserves its integrity when it focuses on language as human, social behaviour, when it has a balanced concern both with modelling linguistic competence and with what actually happens in situations, patterns discoverable in the records of language events. A constant recourse to the records of such events, records of both phonic and graphic substance and of possibly relevant extratextual features, is perhaps the key to balance; the language event being both a manifestation of competence and an instance of performance must remain our point of departure and return.
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