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Abstract

In the past several years, the social sciences have been articulating how emotion impacts cognition and social action. Linguists have underestimated the extent to which grammatical and discourse structures serve affective ends. A cross-linguistic analysis indicates that languages dedicate phonological, morpho-syntactic and discourse features to intensify and specify attitudes, moods, feelings and dispositions. These features provide an affective frame for propositions encoded. Such frames can be considered as part of the information expressed, as affective comments on the expressed propositions they address. These comments interface with gestural cues to provide interlocutors with critical information on which to base subsequent social actions.

INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we present a general framework for understanding affect in language. While the emphasis is on the grammatical and discourse organization of expressed affect, our framework draws on hypotheses put forward in theories of development and evolution. Our intention is to indicate processes that motivate verbal communication of affect and relate these processes to the pragmatics of affect across languages and speech communities.

We take affect to be a broader term than emotion, to include feelings, moods, dispositions, and attitudes associated with persons and/or situations. Our particular concern is with the conventional displaying of affect through linguistic means. We are not concerned with issues of speakers’ actual feeling states or the extent to which their affective expression is sincere. Such relations between inner states and outward expression are culturally variable and have been considered in the ethnographic literature.
on emotion (cf. among others Irvine, 1982; Lutz, 1985; Lutz and White, 1986: Rosaldo, 1980; Brenneis, 1987; E. Schieffelin, 1983; B. Schieffelin, 1986; Ochs, 1986; 1988. In this paper we indicate the enormous range of language forms that express affect across languages and speech communities. Our primary focus is on those linguistic features that key affect in everyday talk across a range of genres and social situations.

This paper will take the form of a number of general claims concerning functional and formal properties of affect in language. These claims are based on primary and secondary sources. Primary sources include transcripts of spontaneous speech in several languages and interviews with native speakers. The authors will rely in particular on their own in-depth ethnographic and linguistic research in Western Samoa (Ochs, 1986; 1988) and Papua New Guinea (B.B. Schieffelin, 1986; i.p.). Secondary sources on the linguistic structuring of affect are limited and dispersed and the contexts of use are usually not provided. Thus, the cross-linguistic component of this discussion is necessarily preliminary, laying out lines for future research on the expression of affect in language.

Social referencing in communication and development

Our approach centers on the notion of 'social referencing' as it has been considered in studies of the social development of children. A commonplace experience in the life of a human infant is an encounter with an entity that is novel to it. One problem for the child is to discover whether this entity is harmful or harmless, that is, something to be avoided or safely approached. Starting at approximately six months of age, infants in such situations begin to monitor the facial expressions of the significant others around them. For example, in American society, infants will turn to their mothers and search their faces for signs of positive or negative affect concerning the situation at hand. By 10–12 months of age, infants are able to use positive or negative affective information conveyed by the caregiver as a basis for their subsequent actions and dispositions towards the uncertain situation. Consequently, a child's understanding of novel entities develops through and is mediated by the facial expressions of others present. A number of developmental psychologists, including Klinkert (1978), Campos and Stenberg (1981), and Feinman (i.p.) refer to this process as social referencing. Klinkert et al. (1983) suggest that this type of monitoring and understanding of another's affective displays continues beyond the period of infancy and is crucial to the child's social and cognitive development. We concur with this conclusion and suggest further that social referencing plays an important role in language use and language acquisition. Just as interactants use facial expressions to signal how they feel about entities, speakers use language for the same purpose. Moreover, just as interactants seek out affective information from one another’s faces, so they seek out affective information from one another's language.

This position is strengthened by recent insights concerning the evolution of sophisticated communicative systems among mammals. These findings (McLean, 1978) indicate that the first vocalizations of mammals consisted of isolation or separation calls by young distressed infant mammals to their mothers. These vocalizations are linked to the development of the limbic lobe of the mammalian brain, which allows generation of emotional feelings and sociability among other functions. With respect to the concerns of this paper, it is important to note that audiovisual communication in primates is rooted in affective vocalization (Ploog, 1984). In humans, affective vocalization associated with the limbic system interacts with propositional speech associated with the expansion of the neocortex in humans, but the nature of that interaction is not clear. Izard (1984: 33) comments 'The central questions for the interested developmental psychologist are how do emotion-feeling processes and linguistic symbolic processes relate, and how does the addition of these great new capabilities affect the child?'

In this paper, we hope to offer some insight into the enigmatic relation of affect and linguistic symbolization. We propose that:

1. There are features in languages that speakers use to key affect to others.
2. Others use these features as a basis for constructing their own subsequent feelings, moods, dispositions and attitudes towards some uncertain information.

To state this in other words, we propose that beyond the function of communicating referential information, languages are responsive to the fundamental need of speakers to convey and assess feelings, moods, dispositions and attitudes. This need is as critical and as human as that of describing events. Interlocutors need to know not only what predication a speaker is making; they need to know as well the affective orientation the speaker is presenting with regard to that particular predication. The affective orientation provides critical cues to the interlocutor as to how that interlocutor should interpret and respond to the predication communicated. For example, interlocutors will respond differently if a speaker couches the predication in a positive or negative affective frame. Indeed, in some cases, the interlocutor will take the affective orientation as the point of departure for a subsequent topic. This happens, for example,
when someone makes a statement in a flippant or sarcastic manner and the response centers on the attitude presented rather than the propositional content of the response.

The idea of distinguishing a level of affective information within a communicative act is not novel in the field of linguistics. Sapir (1927) discussed the link between speech and personality traits. Buhler (1934) and Jakobson (1960) distinguished the emotive function from referential and conative functions of language. Lyons (1977) discussed a level of meaning he termed 'expressive'. And more recently, Irvine (1982: 32) has discussed an affective dimension of communication which 'would take in all levels of linguistic organization as well as nonverbal phenomena and the organization of discourse and interaction'. Our purpose here is not simply to reiterate that affect is a kind of information encoded in language. Rather, our purpose is to couch this fact in a functional perspective as part of a more general theory of human information processing and development. Affective features in language are members of a set of signs that regulate human behavior. They are crucial to the process of social referencing in which affective information is sought out and used to assess how one might construct a next interactional move.

**Linguistic approaches to affect in language**

There are two major channels used to convey affect—nonverbal and verbal. Nonverbal channels such as facial expression, gestures, body orientation and the like have been widely researched by social scientists (cf. among others, Bateson, 1972; Darwin, 1965; Ekman, 1984; Hinde, 1972; Eibl-Eibesfeldt, 1980). Our concern here is with the verbal channel, in particular, with the linguistic means available to language users to index particular kinds of affect. While there has been a virtual explosion of enthusiasm and research efforts in studying emotion in human information processing, we still know very little about the relationship between linguistic structure and emotion and even less about the role that language plays in mediating between cognitive and socio-emotional processes. We would like to know if affect cues from the verbal channel play the same roles as visual cues. How do affect cues from verbal and nonverbal channels interact in conveying affective information? Which parts of the linguistic system can serve affective functions? How does this vary cross-linguistically and across speech communities? These are among the many questions that need to be investigated.

In linguistic research on the expression of affect, there have been four major research orientations. The first grows out of the Prague functional-
affect, we turn now to linguistic resources used to express affect across languages. Linguistic resources for expressing affect include not only the lexicon but grammatical and discourse structures as well. Domains of grammar and discourse associated with affect are represented in Fig. 1.

Number/gender/animacy marking

- Russian, Polish: plural inflection for single referent – emphasis
- Russian: feminine gender of NP – more incriminatory, more emotional weight, e.g. (speaking to a man) dura ‘fool’
- Russian: animate marking for inanimate referent – humor, affection, negative or sarcastic effects

Other particles/affixes

- Japanese: sentence-final particles emphasize strength, zo, ze or softness associated with male/female demeanor
- ma, na – deictic particles, intensifiers a, la, fo’i – intensifiers e – intensifier, negative affect
- Kinyarwanda: diminutive/augmentative noun affixes to convey positive or negative affect, e.g. -gi- in i-gi-kobwa ‘my beloved girl’ we, ye, yehe, he – intensifying particles.
- Wolof: de, daal, waay, kat, kay – intensifiers
- Kaluli: suffixes on verbs, sentence particles, e.g. -lodo ‘sadness’ -life – intensifiers of negative directives
- -a-, -yu-, -baa; -bale, -sala: – emphasis, intensity
- -a, -e intimacy marker added to personal names, kinterms
- Classical Greek: me – clause initial or after initial item, emotional tone, also anticipatory adverbative
- Italian (Roman): a – negative affect, e.g. a0 ma che sei mato? ‘hey are you crazy?’
- etto, etta ‘sweet little’
- ino, ina ‘young, small’
- accio, accia ‘bad, nasty’
- accio, accia ‘somewhat positive but not too much’, e.g. caruccia ‘somewhat pretty’ (i’)
- ottio, ottia ‘jelly’ can be affectionate
- one augmentative, e.g. professoreone ‘very good medical doctor’
- Spanish (regional): -en, -ino, -ico, -illo, -ucio – diminutives, positive affect
- on, -aco, -azo – augmentatives, derogatory
- ucho, uello, uelvo – diminutives, derogatory
- uzo, ucho – derogatory
- re (que) (te), super–, -isimo, -isismo – adjectival intensifiers
- Nahual: honorific affixes on nouns, e.g. tez – diminutive, affectionate, not on 1st person pronouns

Reduplication

- Wolof: lu bari ‘a lot’ vs lu bari-bari ‘a lot’

Phonology

Intonation:

- English: e.g. stylized low-rise as in I’m continuing

Voice quality:

- Tuvaluan: choppy speech – excited, used to report others’ speech monotone – planned, calm, used to report own speech
- Samoan: loudness, lengthening, stress, glottal stop – intensifier
- Kinyarwanda: vowel lengthening – intensify feeling

Sound repetition:

- alliteration
Sound symbolism:

English: /f/, /s/ e.g., flip, flap, sniff etc.
Italian: /sh/ can be intensifier/deintensifier e.g., stupido 'stupid', ti shpaka la testa 'I crack your head', ti disstruggo 'I'll destroy you', schiaff 'slaps'
Samoan: fronting – refinement, backing – earthiness

Lexicon

interjections
response cries; threat startles, revulsion sounds, strain grunts, pain cries, sexual moans, floor cues, etc.
descriptive terms vs personal names for humans:
- Tuvaluan: descriptive terms – sarcasm, treated like object
- Malagasy: personal names – wishing evil, nomen omen
- archaic terms – solemn tones or irony
respect vocabulary
praise names, e.g., ‘the one who does not hesitate to act’
nicknames, truncated names, gossip names, deviant forms of kin terms

Verb variants:
Spanish: ser vs estar e.g., es bonito ‘it’s pretty’ vs está bonito ‘how pretty it is’
graded sets:
Samoan: aua ‘don’t...’ sola ‘cut it out’!
Wolof: dàra, darra, tuss, gatt ‘nothing’... ‘absolutely nothing’

Word order
Hawaiian: proposed demonstrative conveys either positive or negative affect e.g., postposed demonstrative nei ‘affection’

Discourse structure

code-switching:
taboo words
dialects to intensify, e.g., use Prague dialect in literacy Czech
baby talk register to pets and lovers in certain societies
couples
repetition of own/other’s utterances

affective speech acts/activities:
teasing, begging, apologizing, oaths, praises, insults, compliments, assessments, complaints, accusations, blessings, joking, shaming, ridiculing, hortatives, laments, placations, etc.

Figure 1. Examples of linguistic expression of affect

Pragmatic properties of affect markers

1. Affect intensifiers and specifiers

The features listed in Fig. 1 serve two basic affective functions:
1. That of modulating the affective intensity of utterances (affect intensifiers; Besnier, 1989; Labov, 1984; Ochs, 1986)
2. That of specifying particular affective orientations of utterances, such as pleasant surprise, pity, or irritation (affect specifiers; Ochs, 1986)

Labov (1984) considers the use of perfect tense and quantifiers as affect intensifiers in English. These features are part of a larger category of grammatical structure that can augment or diminish the intensity of affect. This category includes such structures as word order, right and left dislocation, tense-aspect marking, emphatic particles and affixes, adverbs, reversals in nominal inflections for gender, number and animacy, reduplication, repetition, intonation and a variety of other prosodic devices. In our research, it appears that there are more linguistic structures functioning as affective intensifiers than as affective specifiers.

As affective specifiers, we would expect widespread use of the lexicon. Surprisingly, however, structures at all levels of grammar are resources for specifying affect. Common affect specifiers across languages include verb voice (e.g. the adversative passive in Japanese and Thai; the active voice to indicate negative affect in Malagasy), affixes (e.g. the elaborate nominal suffixes in Italian expressing positive and negative affect such as -ino, -etto, -accio, -uccio, -otto, -one; the extensive verbal suffixes in Kaluli expressing annoyance, sadness, surprise and support; in Japanese and Dyirbal, affixes that encode positive or negative orientations to a possible future event), particles (e.g., in Samoan, particles used to convey negative affect), determiners (e.g., in Samoan, the sympathy-marked determiner), conjunctions (e.g., the ‘if only’ conjunction in English to signal positive affect to some possible event or situation), intonation, and voice quality.

From this cross-linguistic research, it appears that linguistic structures more often specify a range of affective meanings than pinpoint a precise affective meaning. Thus, many structures simply encode ‘positive affect’ (which may cover happiness, excitement, love, sympathy) or ‘negative affect’ (which may cover sadness, worry, anger, disappointment). One implication of this finding is that affect tends to be specified syntagmatically through co-occurring or emergent features in talk, gesture, facial expression and other semiotic systems.

2. Affect keys

Linguistic features that intensify or specify affect function as ‘affect keys’ (cf. Hymes, 1972; Gumperz, 1977). Affect keys index that an affective frame or a process of affective intensification is in play. Affect keys may index anger, sarcasm, disappointment, sadness, pleasure, humor, or surprise, coarseness, and gentleness, among many other affective meanings.

Affect keys vary in their scope of influence within and across clauses. They may operate on:
Affect keys that operate on referents expressed through noun phrases abound in Yiddish, where curses and blessings key particular attitude towards an entity referred to by a noun phrase (cf. Matisoff's (1979) detailed study of psycho-ostensives in Yiddish):

(1a) **Ma‘ayn shiver, a krenk zol im arayn in di yasles** ...
    'My father-in-law, may a disease enter his gums ...'

(1b) **Ma‘ayn zun, zol er zayn gesunt un shkark, vet mir dos shikn aher.**
    'My son, may he be healthy and strong, will send it here to me.'

(1c) **Governor Reyg, zol er oysgemekt vern, git mayn zun dem profesor, a gesunt tsu im, keyn hesofe nit hayyoy.**
    'Governor Reagan, may he be erased, isn’t giving any raise this year to my son the professor, a health to him.'

As Matisoff points out, these expressions 'leave no doubt about the speaker's psychic attitudes toward the various parties to the action' (1979: 5). Equally lovely examples of affect keys that operate on referents abound in Turkish, as discussed by Tannen and Oztek (1977).

Affect keys that operate on a proposition are illustrated in examples (2a–2d) below:

(2a) **Dem kumendikhn zumer vel ikh, im yirtsn hashen, farbrengen afn breg-yam.**
    'I'll spend next summer at the seashore, if God wills it.' (Matisoff, 1979: 46)

(2b) **Terry: THAT'S NOT DAYDREAMING! ... darn it!**
    Frank:      
    [(laughter) ]
    (Tannen, 1986: 38)

(2c) **E: AW:::righ ty I don't know what Bt:me izit, I-I=**
    N:        
    [(allri-) ]
    E: = woke up et s:six this mornin g=**
    N:        
    [Oh: my G*od ]
    (Drew, 1984: 144)

(2d) **G: I thought () God dammit I thought I got in love with this broad you know,**
    (Jefferson, 1984: 350)

Example (3) illustrates affect keys that operate on a sequence of propositions:

(3a) **Forzami di ban, ongevorn di geshefta, a brokh, a kog, a yomer, a gevalt!**
    'Missed the train, ruined the business deal, what a calamity, what a debacle, what a kettle of fish, what a crock!' (Matisoff, 1979: 14)

Affect keys that operate on sequences of propositions are characteristic of narrative openers and closings. For example, in many languages, narratives often open with expressions such as 'I'm so excited' or 'I'm really upset' or 'Poor me' or 'Oh no!'. These utterances serve as an affective frame for the story that follows. Responses to 'How are you?' in a greeting sequence can also act as affect keys that frame a story or description that follows. For example, responses such as 'I'm a little down' or 'Not too good' may indicate to the hearer an affective orientation towards subsequent events described by the speaker.

Examples (3b) and (3c) illustrate how sympathy-marked first person pronouns in Samoan often preface a story. These pronouns (ka, ka ika) indicate to hearers how the speaker feels towards the events that follow and attempt to elicit that affect (sympathy) from hearers.

(3b) **F: Uhmm (PAUSE) a’o aa le mea ga ka**
    right emph ART thing that I-dear
    **popole ai le**
    lo’omakua le tagi
    worry PRO ART oldwoman ART cry
    'Uhmm (PAUSE) it's true that the thing poor me worried about was the old woman crying'

    **L: Kalofa e sh**
    pity emph emph
    'what a pity'

(3c) **F: Ka ika ia agagei (PAUSE)**
    I-dear emph just before
    'Poor me earlier today.'

    **L: Ko’a e alofa kele**
    just ? love much
    'Oh, you’re full of love.'

    **F: to’or.**
    Yes
    'yes.'

Examples (3b) and (3c) along with (2c) illustrate that affect keys can operate not only within the turn of a single speaker, but across speakers' turns as well. In (3a) and (3b), one speaker provides an affect frame for the sequence of clauses produced by the previous speaker. In (2c), one speaker keys affect for a proposition expressed by the previous speaker.

Certain response cries (Goffman, 1981) may also function as affect operators on sequences of propositions. For example, those response cries characterized as 'floor cues' function in this manner. Cries, such as 'Good
God!" uttered while reading a newspaper, encourage listeners to ask for information that will clarify the cry (Goffman, 1981: 106).

Affect keys abound in highly formal or ritual events as well as in the informal contexts illustrated thus far. Affect keys often serve as boundary markers that initiate or terminate events with a certain affective tone, such as solemnity or joyfulness. In ritual events, affect keys are often formulaic and highly salient.

3. Keys as affective comments

Another way to treat the relation between an affect key and the informational construction it modifies is to consider the affect key as a comment and the construction as its topic. In (1a), the affective expression a krenk zol im arayn in di yasles ‘may a disease enter his gums’ constitutes an affective comment on the referent expressed in the NP mayn shver ‘my father-in-law’. In (2a), im yirts hashem ‘if God wills it’ is an affective comment on the topic dem kevendikin zum er ikh farbrenen afn breg-yam ‘I’ll spend next summer at the seashore’. In (2b) ‘darn it’ is an affective comment on the clausal topic ‘that’s not daydreaming’. In (3a), a brokh, a kog, a yomer, a gevalt ‘what a calamity, what a debacle, what a kettle of fish, what a crock’ are affective comments on the sequence forzam di ban, ongevorn di geshefin ‘missed the train, ruined the business deal’. Similarly, in (3c) speaker L’s utterance ko’a e alofa kele ‘Oh, you’re full of love’ is an affective comment on an entire narrative sequence.

This way of looking at affect indicates that topic-comment is not a unitary relation. While preserving the notion that ‘topic’ constitutes old information and a center of attention or leitmotif (Givón, 1979) and ‘comment’ constitutes newer information about that topic, we suggest that any one clause may evidence a plurality of topic-comment relations. Here we have identified a kind of topic-comment relation in which a referent, proposition or propositional sequence may constitute the topic of affective new information. Such affective topic-comment relations may co-occur with other types of topic-comment relations, which have yet to be linearized in the literature. In certain cases, the topics of affective and non-affective comments are the same, as in (1a), (1b), and (1c). In other cases, the topics differ, as in examples (2a)-(3c). For example, in (2d) ‘I constitutes the topic of the comment ‘thought God dammit I got in love with this broad you know’, whereas the proposition expressed as ‘I got in love with this broad you know’ appears to be the topic addressed by the affective comment ‘God dammit’.

4. Ordering of affect keys

Affect keys may appear in three positions with respect to constructions they modify: antecedently, concurrently and subsequently.

Initiators

Let us call ‘affect initiators’ those affect keys that appear before the referents, propositions, or sequences of propositions they modify. This ordering is visualized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>referent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KEY proposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sequence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initiators provide an affective frame for interpreting and evaluating information expressed in a construction that follows. Interjections, hortatives and other formulaic expressions are frequently used as initiators as are address terms, adjectives, adverbs and determiners. Example (4) shows an interjection in Kaluli (Papua New Guinea) used as an initiator:

(4) Heyo! Ge ga andoma
    sorry you woman none
    ‘SORRY! You have no woman!’

Concurrents

Affect keys that appear simultaneously with the expression of the referent, proposition or sequence of propositions they modify we call ‘affect concurrents’. This relation is represented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>referent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KEY proposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sequence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The category of affect concurrents draws on possibly the widest range of phonological, morphological, syntactic, and lexical constructions. A common way of expressing an affective key concurrently in many languages is through intonation, voice quality, or other phonological devices such as sound symbolism. Other frequently used concurrents are affect particles and verbal and nominal affixes. As noted earlier, these elements may act as affect intensifiers or they may specify a particular type of affect. For example, example (5), taken from Kaluli, includes an affect suffix (-io:do:) on the verb that specifies how the speaker feels about the proposition expressed.
(5) Hana:nolo:do:
go 2P FUT AFFECT SUFFIX
‘Sadly enough you’re going’

Further affect contemporaries include such morphological and syntactic phenomena as tense-aspect marking, nominal inflections for gender, animacy and number, determiners, quantifiers, adverbials, conjunctions, verb voice, mood and word order. For example, in Black English Vernacular and certain other dialects of English, the particle done serves as a marker of perfect aspect and/or as an affect intensifier as illustrated in (6) below.

(6) ... and done got the nerve to lie to me ... talkin' 'bout he went to the office.
(Labov, 1984: 47)

In Russian and other Slavic languages, animate marking in noun phrases referring to inanimate referents may convey a variety of affective dispositions, including humor, affection, or sarcasm (Stankiewicz, 1964). In Russian, the reversal of masculine and feminine gender-marking carries more emotional intensity than their unmarked counterparts. Similarly, the use of plural marking for singular referents is strongly emotive (Stankiewicz, 1964: 243).

The use of verb voice to convey affect concurrently with the expression of a proposition is found in a number of languages, most notably Thai, Japanese, and Malagasy. As noted earlier, in Thai and Japanese, the passive voice is typically associated with unpleasant or adversative dispositions towards an event. Indeed, in Thai, propositions of a positive nature (from the speaker’s point of view) are not acceptable in the passive voice (Kwachka et al., 1973; Noss, 1964). Thus, a statement such as ‘The teacher praised her’ is unacceptable in the passive except if it is meant as ironic, i.e. that the teacher spoke badly about the girl. In Malagasy, passive and circumstantial voices are the norm, and active voice is viewed as overly direct, confrontative, and rude (Keenan (Ochs), 1976).

Terminators

The third ordering of keys and the constructions they modify consists of a construction followed by an affective key. We call keys in this position ‘affect terminators’:

revert
proposition KEY
sequence

Affect terminators draw on the same pool of linguistic resources as affect initiators, i.e. interjections, formulaic expressions, hortatives, address terms, adverbs, adjectives, and so on. Additionally, they may use certain linguistic features that function as contemporaries such as sentential particles. Illustrations of affect terminators appear in examples (1a–1c), (2a–2c), and (3a–3c).

Given the multifunctionality of language (Duranti, 1987), it is important to note that any one affect marker in context can serve not only as an initiator, a concurrent, or a terminator but in more than one of these positions at the same time. A key that provides affective information concurrently about a referent or a proposition may additionally help to key how a speaker or others feel about antecedent or subsequent propositions. Consider example (3b), taken from Samoan, which illustrates the use of the sympathy-marked first person clitic pronoun (ka ‘poor me’). In this context, the affect construction serves as a concurrent, keying sympathy for the first person referent (a concurrent) and at the same time, the construction serves as an initiator, helping to set up an affective frame for the subsequent proposition and others that comprise the narrative told.

Affect initiators and affect terminators can be produced by the same speaker who refers to the topic referent, proposition, or sequence of propositions (that is, they can be self-produced), or they can be produced by some other interlocutor (that is, they can be other-produced). Examples (1a–1c), (2a, 2b), and (3a) illustrate self-produced terminators. Examples (2c), (3b), and (3c) illustrate other-produced terminators. In example (2b), Frank’s laughter also functions as an other-produced affective terminator, framing the talk that precedes it.

Coda

The perspective on linguistic expression of affect that we have adopted here is rooted in the notion of social referencing, whereby interactants seek out affective information from significant others in their social environment to better understand and respond to uncertain information. Social referencing is a critical process not only in infancy but throughout the lifespan of all members of society. Social referencing makes possible cooperation and communication in all spheres of social life. Interpretations of political actions and subsequent political moves are based as much on the affective manner in which those actions are performed as on the actions themselves. Political strategists try to analyze whether a move is bluff or a real threat and formulate policy based on their assessments. In many societies, friendships and other intimate relationships also depend on individuals’ abilities to seek out, recognize, and respond appropriately to their partners’ feelings about a given situation. In all
societies, members must be attentive to the affective keys provided by others. These keys often define social contexts and are the basis for successful participation in those contexts.

Languages of the world are responsive to this fundamental human need to express and assess affect. Further, they are responsive at all levels of linguistic structure. One cannot argue for a clean division of labor between areas of grammar assigned to logical and affective functions. One cannot argue, for example, that syntax exclusively serves logical functions while affective functions are carried out by intonation and the lexicon. Affect permeates the entire linguistic system. Almost any aspect of the linguistic system that is variable is a candidate for expressing affect. In other words, language has a heart as well as a mind of its own.
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