

## **Las 3 dimensiones performativas y su grado de peso; indicadores en el análisis conversacional**

Katya Mandoki

“Las 3 dimensiones performativas y su grado de peso: análisis de un caso” *Signos Literarios y Lingüísticos IV.1* enero-junio 2002. Dpto. de Filosofía. UAM –Iztapalapa. ISSN 1665-1316. PP. 61-74.

En el trabajo propuesto se presentarán los conceptos de las 3 dimensiones performativas y sus grados de peso como herramientas teóricas para abordar el análisis conversacional. Estos conceptos se ilustrarán a través de 2 ejemplos: a) una conversación telefónica grabada entre el entonces presidente de Estados Unidos John F. Kennedy y el Gobernador del Estado de Mississippi Barnett a raíz de los disturbios en la universidad de Mississippi el 30 de septiembre de 1962, y b) 4 llamadas al número de emergencia 911 registrados y acotados por Don Zimmerman.

Este análisis partirá de la actualización de las funciones del lenguaje elaboradas con lucidez por Roman Jakobson aplicadas la teoría de los actos de habla, particularmente a la taxonomía de John Searle y Daniel Vanderveken. La propuesta intenta no sólo demostrar que hay mucho más que información en los intercambios lingüísticos como lo ha enfatizado Hermann Parret, sino que es posible realizar análisis más detallados de estos al distinguir entre dimensión y función performativa.

Funciones lingüísticas y fuerzas ilocutivas en el análisis conversacional

2.\* *Dimensiones Logos, Ethos and Pathos*

Al proponer un "pathos razonable", Parret proyecta la distinción entre



en esas condiciones.---(1.0)

GOB. U...h pero pero - pero podemos  
 JFK [ Vas ] hay que hacer orden [allá y luego podermos hacer  
 algo sobre Meredith

GOB: [ podemos ] ro::de::arlo con muchos  
 'oficiales

JFK: Bueno hay que tener a alguien ahí ahora para hacer orden, y  
 detener los tiros y disparos. Después nosotros - usted y yo vamos a habra::r  
 por teléfono sobre Meredith (2.0)  
 Pero primero hay que hacer or::den

GOB: [[ Sta::bbien ] Voy- Voy a llamarl y decirles que  
 traigan cada- cada oficial que pue::dan?

---

A un nivel general, la conversación es conativa en el sentido de Jakobson, es decir, cada participante está tratando de convencer al otro de actuar de cierto modo. En un nivel particular, Barnett despliega una exhortación titubeante y débil al suplicar POR FAVOR, ¿no podría dar una orden? donde por el hecho de iniciarse en negativo le resta fuerza ilocutiva. Kennedy usa el mismo término de orden, como y a vimos, pero en un conativo de mucha mayor fuerza ilocutiva por repetición y por el tono de mandato y autoridad con que lo enviste. LA función expresiva se manifiesta en el tartamudeo de Barnett, indicial de la ansiedad que lo embargaba y de su sumisión ("voy a llamar", desacuerdo("pero") estupefacción ("uh"), mientras Kennedy muestra una gran impaciencia al interrumpir a Barnett y s toma turnos más largos, con lo cual denota ethos. LA función fática se presenta por la repetición de términos como "policía estatal" "bueno" "está bien". Los enunciados referenciales están en señalar el policía muerto, el disturbio, mientras que los enunciados metalingüísticos en la redefinición o traducción del hombre muerto como policía estatal.

## ILOCUTIVOS DIMENSIÓN *PATHOS*

Indicadores cualitativos de peso: a) volumen, b) acento, c) extensión silábica y d) repetición  
 e) pausas f) ritmo g) titubeo h) traslape

Cada uno de estos indicadores tiene sus funciones específicas. Tanto el volumen, como el acento, la extensión silábica y la repetición son indicadores directos de pathos pues son directamente proporcionales a éste: cuanto mayor volumen, acento, extensión o repetición

de una palabra o frase, tanto mayor peso de pathos despliega. Las pausas y el ritmo, por el contrario, dependen más directamente del contexto. Básicamente hay dos tipos de pausas: las distractivas que disminuyen el pathos y las enfáticas que lo incrementan. Las primeras se deben a la falta de concentración del hablante que distraen al oyente, y las segundas son para incrementar el peso de la última enunciación, y detienen al oyente para que se concentre en ésta. En cuanto al ritmo, la velocidad del discurso en situaciones de emergencia funciona en sí misma como función expresiva de la urgencia e incrementa el pathos, pero también puede operar como naturalidad en una conversación cotidiana como función expresiva de la viveza del hablante. El titubeo a su vez puede manifestar ansiedad en tanto función expresiva, incrementando el peso del pathos o bien a manera de pausa en el primer sentido como falta de concentración, y por tanto inversamente proporcional al pathos. Por último, el traslape en la toma de turnos es otra modalidad cuya función es expresiva en tanto impaciencia y aceleración del ritmo. En este caso el traslape

#### *PATHOS ILLOCUTIONARIES:*

c) extensión silábica

JFK: go:::, ha::ve, thou::ght, ri::ot, tho::se conditions, o::rder

Gov: Pre::s'dent, PLEA::SE, remo::ve, U:::h, sur::rou::ound, offi::cials A::right, ca::n

a) volumen acting also as accent

JFK: HOW CAN I REMO::VE HIM GOVernor

Gov: PLEA::SE

C) Repetition

JFK: 1. gotta get order...2. an' that's....were gonna have, 3. let's get or:::der, 4. to get order, 5. gotta get o:::rder (these repetitions are emphatic)

Gov: but-but-but, I'll I'll every-every (in this case repetition is expressive: stuttering, and can be interpreted as subtracting illocutionary force)

TABLA 2

2(31)

1	C:	DIO::S	[Exclamación] <i>expresiva</i>
2		MI ESPOSA SE ACABA DE <u>DISPARAR</u>	[Description] <i>referencial</i>
3		[.3]	
4		VEINTI DOS SESENTA AVENIDA (GRANT)	[Address]
			<i>referencial</i>
5			
6		<u>APURENSE:::::E</u>	[Marcador de urgencia] <i>conativa</i>
7	CT:	Qué pasó?	<i>conativa</i>

(32)

1	C:	hhh AY DIOS MÍ:O	[Exclamación] <i>expresiva</i>
2		ACABO DE LLEGAR A LA CASA	[Estado] <i>referencial</i>
3		Y MI ESPOSA SE DISPARÓ	[Descripción] <i>referencial</i>
4		hhh	<i>expresiva</i>
5		( ) NUEVE CUARENTA Y TRES ESTE (GREEN) RO:W	
			[Domicilio] <i>referencial</i>

(33)

1	C:	=Uh sí	[reconocimiento] <i>fática</i>
2		tenemos un niño pequeño	[On-Behalf-of] <i>referencial</i>
3		que no puede respirar	[Description] <i>referencial</i>
4		en el seis mil novecientos	
5		Marvin Lane	[Address] <i>referencial</i>

(34)

- 1 CT: 911 cuál es su *fática-conativa*
- 2 C: [ SI. [Acknowledgment] *fática*
- 3 NECESITO ] UNA AMBULANCIA [Request] *conativa*
- 4 CT: Cuál es el problema señora [Problem Query] *conativa*
- 5 C: N:O SE::, MI HERMANA *expresiva*
- 6 NO SE QUÉ LE PASA . *expresiva*
- 7 'hh ESTOY EN LA POSADA HERRADURA hh 'hh hh hh}
- referencial expresiva*
- 8 hh NO SE LA DIRECCIÓN hh 'hh AY: DIO:S MÍ::O *expresiva*
- 9 hh' hh POR FAVO::R APU:RENSE *conativa*

-----

--

*italicas* = Funciones lingüísticas de Jakobson añadida por mí .

#### ILOCUTIVOS DIMENSIÓN *PATHOS*

Indicadores cualitativos de peso: a) volumen, b) acento, c) extensión silábica y d) repetición

A) volumen 31: 1- 6 32:1-6 34:2-9

B) Acento 31:2 SHOT, 31:6 HURRY U:::P

C) extensión silábica 31:1 GO::D 31:6 U:::P, 32.1 GO:D

32:6 RO:W 34:5 DO:N'T KNOW:: 34:9 GO::D hh' hh PLE::ASE HU:RRY

D) Repetición 34:7.8. 9 hh 'hh 34:5 NO: SE:, MI HERMANA :

34:6 NO SE QUÉ LE PASA . 34:8 YO NO SÉ. ...

Indicadores cuantitativos de peso= suma de indicadores cualitativos/ número de palabras

(*ethos* invariable)

escala: palabra=1 PALABRA=2 PALABRA=4 h=1 :=1 :=2 ()=1

Quantity of Illocutionary Force

Case	# of words	quantifiers w=1, W=2 <u>W</u> =4 h=1 :=1 :=2 ()=1	sumCL/#w	total
31	13	$10W+3\underline{W}+2:+5\underline{;}.3=20+12+2+10+3=45$	45/13	3.46
32	18	$18W+6h+2:+6()=32+6+2+6=46$	46/18	2.55
33	16	$16w=16$	16/16	1
34	32	$32W+9:+18h=64+9+18= 91$	91/32	2.84

TABLE 2

2(31)

1	C:	GO::D	[Exclamation]	<i>expressive</i>
2		MY WIFE JUST <u>SHOT</u> HERSELF	[Description]	<i>referential</i>
3		[.3]		
4		TWENTY TWO SIXTY (GRANT)	[Address]	<i>referential</i>
5		AVENUE		
6		<u>HURRY U::::P</u>	[Urgency Marker]	<i>conative</i>
7	CT:	What <u>h</u> appened?		<i>conative</i>

(32)

1	C:	hhh OH MY GO:D	[Exclamation]	<i>expressive</i>
2		I JUST GOT HOME	[Stance]	<i>referential</i>
3		AND MY WIFE SHOT HERSELF	[Description]	<i>referential</i>
4		hhh		<i>expressive</i>
5		( ) NINE FORTY THREE		
6		EAST (GREEN) RO:W	[Address]	<i>referential</i>

(33)

1	C:	=Uh yeah	[Acknowledgment]	<i>phatic</i>
---	----	----------	------------------	---------------

2 we have a little boy [On-Behalf-of] *referential*  
 3 who can't breathe [Description] *referential*  
 4 at sixty nine hundred  
 5 Marvin Lane [Address] *referential*

(34)

1 CT: 911 what's your *phatic-conative*  
 2 C: [ YES. [Acknowledgment] *phatic*  
 3 I NEED ] A AMBULANCE [Request] *conative*  
 4 CT: What is the problem ma am [Problem Query] *conative*  
 5 C: I DO:N'T KNOW::, MY SISTER: *expressive*  
 6 I DON'T KNOW WHAT'S WRONG WITH HER. *expressive*  
 7 'hh I'M AT HORSE SHOE INN hh 'hh hh hh} *referential expressive*  
 8 hh I DON'T KNOW THE ADDRESS hh 'hh OH: MY *expressive*  
 9 GO::D hh' hh PLE::ASE HU:RRY *conative*

-----

--

*italics* = Jakobson's functions of language added by me.

### PATHOS ILLOCUTIONARIES

Qualitative force indicators: volume, accent, extended syllables and repetition

A) volume 31: 1- 6 32:1-6 34:2-9

B) Accent 31:2 SHOT, 31:6 HURRY U:::::P

C) syllabic extension 31:1 GO::D 31:6 U:::::P, 32.1 GO:D

32:6 RO:W 34:5 DO:N'T KNOW:: 34:9 GO::D hh' hh PLE::ASE HU:RRY

D) Repetition 34:7.8. 9 hh 'hh 34:5 DO:N'T KNOW::, MY SISTER:

34:6 DON'T KNOW WHAT'S WRONG WITH HER. 34:8 I DON'T KNOW ...



Quantitative force= sum of qualitative indicators/ # words (*ethos* invariable)

scale: word=1 WORD=2 WORD=4 h=1 :=1 :=2 ()=1

Quantity of Illocutionary Force

Case	# of words	quantifiers w=1, W=2 <u>W</u> =4 h=1 :=1 :=2 ()=1	sum/#w	total
31	13	$10W+3\underline{W}+2:+5\underline{i}+.3=20+12+2+10+3=45$	45/13	3.46
32	18	$18W+6h+2:+6()=32+6+2+6=46$	46/18	2.55
33	16	$16w=16$	16/16	1
34	32	$32W+9:+18h=64+9+18= 91$	91/32	2.84

LOGOS ILLOCUTIONARIES 31: 2,4,5; 32: 3,5,6; 33: 2,3,4,5; 34:3,7.

If *logos* is defined by Sperber and Wilson's principle of relevance, its degree in these cases lies in determining most economically the who, what and where of the emergency. We can determine that the greatest intensity of *logos* illocutionary is displayed by caller 33, because there are no distracting utterances. The weakest *logos* is in caller 34, leaving the "who" (adult or child) and "where" (street number) incomplete while the "what" is not even stated. Callers 31 and 32 are equal by *logos* dimensions, the only difference being 31's higher degree of *pathos* .

ETHOS ILLOCUTIONARIES

As we mentioned above, this dimension corresponding to Grice's Principle of Cooperation remains constant and should not be confused with the conative function (in the same sense that the *pathos* illocutionary shouldn't be conflated with the aesthetic function).

In short, we can see here that caller 31 displays the highest illocutionary *pathos* by volume, emphasis and extended syllables (SHOT, HURRY U:::::P), while caller 33 displays the lowest. The latter, on the other hand, has a greater degree of *logos*, starting with a brief

phatic and concentrating all necessary information in a pure referential. *Ethos* illocutionary force is fixed and determined by convention concerning the 911 service.

It is worth emphasizing that in the example above, we have analyzed the *pathos* dimension in these interactions. Nothing has been stated in this case regarding the aesthetic function which is to be found in the constitutive potential of enunciation. Considering that the *pathos* dimension has been sufficiently explained, I will devote the rest of this paper to clarify the aesthetic both as a dimension of pragmatics and distinct from *pathos*, and as an object of analysis in which a pragmatic approach is key for its understanding.

\*13. The aesthetic function and qualitative illocutionaries in conversational analysis

We can now bring together *pathos* illocutionaries and the aesthetic function in an example of a recorded conversation between JFK and Governor Barnett in September 30, 1962 (transcribed by Deidre Boden 1990). It will enable us to distinguish a general and a particular level and examine the multifunctional and qualitative illocutionary force of utterances and of conversations. By general function I mean the conversation taken as a whole produced by its participants in common. By particular level I understand each participant's dominant tone. This case illustrates how conversational analysis can be used as a tool for detecting aesthetic constitutive power in its prosaic instance at work. It will enable us also to take a closer look upon the *pathos* and the aesthetic as differenced instances. The context was During the 1960s, Mississippi was a center of the CIVIL RIGHTS movement. Despite the 1954 Supreme Court decision making segregated schools illegal, the state did not quickly institute racial INTEGRATION. In 1962 a black student, James Meredith, attempted to attend the University of Mississippi law school. His admission was blocked, and during the subsequent violence, federal troops were sent to restore order. Violent incidents against blacks took place as the struggle for integration continued.

JFK: Y'see we don'- we got an hour t'go::: an' that's not u:h- we- we may not ha::ve an hour what with this-

Gov: [ Uh- this man ]  
this man has jus' died

JFK: Did he die?

Gov: Yes sir

JFK: [ Whi ]ch one? State police?

Gov: Tha's the State Police

JFK: Yea:h, well you see we gotta get order up there an' that's what we thou::ght we were gonna ha:ve=

Gov: [ Mitsuh ]  
=Pre::s'dent PLEA::SE why don't you uh- can't you give an order up there to remo::ve Mer' dith

JFK: [HOW ] CAN I REMO::VE HIM  
GOVernor when there's a- a ri::ot in the street an' he may step out of that building an' something ha::pen to him? I can't remove him under tho::se conditions. (1.0)

Gov: U:::h- but-but- but we can-

JFK: [[ Y'go- ] let's get o::rder [up there an' then we can do something about Meredith

Gov: [ we can ] sur::rou::ound it with plenty 'v offi::cials

JFK: Well we've got to get somebuddy up there now to get order, and stop the firing and the shooting. Then we- you and I will ta::lk on the phone about Meredith (2.0)  
But firs' we gotta get or::der

Gov: [[ A::rright ] I'll- I'll ca:ll an' tell'em to get every- every official they ca::n?

#### PATHOS ILLOCUTIONARIES:

##### A) syllabic extension

JFK: go:::, ha:ve, thou::ght, ri::ot, tho::se conditions, o::rder

Gov: Pre::s'dent, PLEA::SE, remo::ve, U:::h, sur::rou::ound, offi::cials A::right, ca::n

##### B) volume acting also as accent

JFK: HOW CAN I REMO::VE HIM GOVernor

Gov: PLEA::SE

##### C) Repetition

JFK: 1. gotta get order...2. an' that's....were gonna have, 3. let's get or::der, 4. to get order, 5. gotta get o::rder (these repetitions are emphatic)

Gov: but-but-but, I'll I'll every-every (in this case repetition is expressive: stuttering, and can be interpreted as subtracting illocutionary force)

### LOGOS ILLOCUTIONARIES

JFK: HOW->when->an'->an'?

### ETHOS ILLOCUTIONARIES

JFK: GOVernor

Gov: Mitsuh Pre::s'dent

---

What we have here is a simple conversation where the governor is trying to convince JFK to give the order of removing James Meredith, the first black to attend the University of Mississippi, away from the campus because of a riot against racial integration. On the general level, the conversation is conative, each participant trying to convince the other to act in certain way. On the particular level, Barnett displays a mild hesitating exhortative ( PLEASE, can't you give an order) while JFK uses the same term but shifts it to a stronger commanding and repetitive conative ("get order"). The expressive function is manifested in Barnett's stuttering that indicates uneasiness and lack of self confidence, compliance ("I'll call and"), disagreement ("but") , momentary stupefaction ("uh"), while JFK attests impatience and takes longer turns. The phatic is presented in repetition of terms: die, State Police, order and remove. We have referential utterances (to the dead police and riot) and metalinguistic in re-redefining the dead man as a "State police". Another strategic metalinguistic turn occurs when Barnett tries to translate JFK's rhetorical question "HOW CAN I REMOVE HIM" , into a literal code and answers: "we can surround it with plenty of officials". JFK's is obviously a rhetorical question because: 1) it is followed by "Governor" which traps Barnett between the sentence (*ethos*), 2) goes on into the longest sequence which is in fact a justification for not removing Meredith (*logos*) and 3) is the highest

volume utterance in the whole sequence echoing Barnett's PLEA::SE (*pathos*). Barnett's attempt to reply is invalidated by JFK's interruption and overlapping speech. The conversation centers around the idea of "order" in both its meanings: Barnett wants JFK to give an order as command, while JFK wants Barnett to get order as calm in the streets. While Barnett presents his petition preceded by the negative "can't" and interrogatives weakening the illocutionary force of his request even further, JFK repeats "get order" exactly in the same form 4 times, the last an exact replica of the first "gotta get order" saturating by repetition, closing a rhythmic cycle and thus strengthening its force of *pathos*. It is obvious who holds leadership from this conversational fragment.

Parret's "passional intensity" is signaled here by the extended syllables, repetition and volume. While Barnett's three dimensional force is weak, JFK has strategically deployed, in a single conversational turn, the three illocutionary dimensions with a great degree of force. When he utters "Governor", he is explicitly reminding his status and thus brings *ethos* as a qualifying illocutionary force to the fore, followed by *logos* describing the situation as a justification for his decision. Finally, by raising the volume of voice, he has increased quantitative degree of force as well as qualified it as an illocutionary *pathos*, having loudness puncture the ordinary volume of conversation.

"HOW CAN I REMOVE HIM" is both exclamatory expressive, and operates as aesthetic function in the form of a declarative "Meredith remains" even on the temporary basis implied by subsequent sentences that postpone a decision in this regard. Meredith's nonverbal constitutive act of going to register to the University of Mississippi was a kinesic utterance of enormous political significance in such a traditionally racist state. It was a non verbal utterance, constitutive of blacks' right to study at UM and, as such aesthetic. The constitutive power of this act is proved by the rioters' reaction trying to silence this utterance. Meredith's non verbal performative, supported by JFK's verbal statement (who

decided to remove the rioters instead of the rioted),<sup>1</sup> constituted with this act, among many others, a new factual reality of blacks attending erstwhile segregated universities in the south of the United States.

Speeches and acts like the signing of the Peace Treaty between Israelis and Palestinians in September 13, 1993 is another instance of deploying the aesthetic function as a constitutive of a new political order in the importance of form strictly regulated by protocol. At the same time, Rabin's repetition of "we have come", "there is a time" and of the word "Amen" are instances of *pathos* illocutionary in his speech.

#### \*REFERENCES

Arendt, Hannah. 1982. *Lectures on Kant's Political Philosophy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Austin, J.L. 1962. *How To Do Things With Words*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Bakhtin, M.M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination*. Holquist M. ed. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Boden, Deidre. 1990. "People Are Talking" in Howard S. Becker and Michal M. McCall (eds.) *Symbolic Interaction and Cultural Studies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Doubleday.

Jakobson, Roman. 1963. *Essais de Linguistique Générale*. Paris: Minuit.

Kant, Immanuel. [1790]. *Critique of Judgment* trans. James Creed Meredith. Electronic version from the American Philosophical Association Gopher.

---

<sup>1</sup> If Kennedy would have coldly replied "Okay, Governor, have Meredith removed from the campus", it would lose the force of pathos, but not its aesthetic function as constitutive, in this case of another defeat in the cause of African Americans.

- Leech, G. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mandoki, Katya. 1994. *Prosaica; introducción a la estética de lo cotidiano*. Mexico: Grijalbo.
- Morris, Charles. 1938. *Foundations of the Theory of Signs*. In O. Neurath, R. Carnap & C. Morris (eds.) *Toward an International Encyclopedia of Unified Science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Malinowski, B. 1953 "The problem of Meaning in Primitive Language" Appendix in C.K. Ogden and I.A. Richards, *The Meaning of Meaning*. New York: K. Paul, Trench and Trubner.
- Parret, Herman. 1993, *The Aesthetics of Communication; pragmatics and beyond*. Stuart Rennie (trans.) Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1993. "Reflection on the Quantification in the Study of Conversation". *Research on Language and Social Interaction*. 26:1; 99- 128.
- Searle, John. 1969. *Speech Acts; an essay in the philosophy of language*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- 1976. "A classification of illocutionary acts" *Language in Society* 5: 1-23.
- et al. 1992. *(On) Searle on Conversation*. Herman Parret and Jef Trager, G. L. 1958. "Paralanguage: A First Aproximation". *Studies in Linguistics*, 13:1,2. 1-10.
- Vanderveken, D. 1985. "What is an illocutionary force" in M. Dascal (ed.) *Dialogue; An Interdisciplinary Approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.**
- 1990. ***Meaning and speech acts. Vol. 1, Principles of Language Use*. Cambridge, New York & Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.**
- Verschueren (comp.) Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Sebeok, Thomas. 1963. "Communication in Animals and in Men; Three Reviews " *Language* 39: 448-466.

Zimmerman, Don H. 1992 "The interactional organization of calls for emergency assistance" in Drew, Paul and Heritage, John (eds.) *Talk at work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 418-469.