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1 Introduction

Leonard Bloomfield’s fieldwork on Menominee in the 1920’s and 30’s yielded a collection of narratives told by several Menominee speakers. In his 1927 “Literate and Illiterate Speech,” Bloomfield expresses surprise at the Menominee’s metalinguistic judgments about inter-speaker variation in the community. “The Menomini will say that one person speaks well and another badly,” he writes, “that such-and-such a form of speech is incorrect and sounds bad, and another too much like a shaman’s preaching or archaic” (89).

The criteria he discusses that are involved in speakers’ judgments of “good” and “bad” speech are primarily of pronunciation and grammar, such as confusion of short and long vowels and use of inappropriate inflections. However, because the features of good speech are determined within the community rather than by a standard provided by orthography, many factors will likely play into a speech community’s notion of “good” speech. Bloomfield thus sums the distinction between speakers to be a combination of sociocultural factors:

The nearest approach to an explanation of “good” and “bad” language seems to be this, that, by a cumulation of obvious superiorities, both of character and standing, as well as of language, some persons are felt to be better models of conduct and speech than others. Therefore, even in matters where the preference is not obvious, the forms which these same persons use are felt to have the better flavor. (93)

One factor in judging speaker competence, especially if storytelling is a big part of culture, may be how good the person is at narrating a story, more along the lines of pragmatic than grammatical competence. This study asks whether Menominee speakers varied along this dimension, whether some speakers were simply better at telling stories than others, and whether this factor correlated with the speaker assessments Bloomfield gathered.

Assessing what makes a good narrative is difficult; one relevant notion is coherence. Does the speaker jump around from one topic to another, making it difficult for the hearer to follow? To investigate this, we need a theoretical basis for measuring coherence in discourse. Centering Theory (Grosz, Joshi, and Weinstein 1995) provides the armature we need to investigate inter-speaker variation in narrative coherence. This theory uses an algorithm which takes into account the way in which entities are referred to in discourse and yields a measure of how coherently the speaker shifts back and forth from talking about different entities. The texts I analyze are from one of Bloomfield’s “best” and one of his “worst” speakers, Little-Jerome and White-Thunder, respectively. The analysis will investigate whether the two texts differ in coherence, and will suggest that judgments of narrative coherence are distinct from the judgments the Menominee community makes about good and bad speech.

In the following sections I will introduce Centering Theory and my analysis of two Menominee texts.

2 Centering Theory

Centering allows us to account for differences in perceived coherence between discourses on the basis of the form of referring of expressions and how discourse participants’ attentional state is shifted by discourse structure. The model was developed by Grosz, Joshi, and Weinstein (1995), drawing on earlier work by Joshi and Kuhn (1979), Joshi and Weinstein (1981), and Grosz and Sidner (Grosz 1997; Sidner 1979; Grosz & Sidner 1986). The version of Centering I will be using is the result of subsequent work by the original authors as well as others (e.g. Brennan, Friedman, and Pollard 1987; Walker, Joshi, and Prince 1998). First some necessary definitions will be presented.

2.1 Definitions

Each semantic entity that is part of a discourse is called a center. The set of centers in each utterance Ui is the set of forward-looking centers. The forward-looking centers for each utterance are ranked in terms of discourse salience (more will be said about this ranking later), and the most highly ranked forward-looking center in an utterance is the preferred center (Cp). The preferred center is a prediction as to what the next utterance will be about. Another special member of the set of forward-looking centers of an utterance is the backward-looking center (Cb): this roughly corresponds to what is generally referred to as the topic (Reinhart 1981; Horn 1986), or what the utterance most centrally concerns. It links the current utterance with the previous discourse. The backward-looking center of an utterance Ui is the highest-ranked center of the previous utterance Ui-1 that is also in the current utterance. Because the backward-looking center is extremely salient in Ui, the Pronoun Rule (sometimes called Rule 1) states that if there is a pronoun in an utterance, then the Ch of that utterance is also realized as a pronoun. (The Pronoun Rule is extended to apply also to null elements in Turan 1995.) The rule reflects the observation that salient entities need not be expressed as a full noun phrase, as these entities are already in the forefront of the hearer/reader’s attention, and their reference is easily determined without a great processing load.

2.2 Ranking and Transitions

The ranking of the set of CIs is thought to be language-specific, as different languages have different ways of realizing salience grammatically. One possible hierarchy, and the one that has been used for English (Brennan, Friedman, & Pollard 1987), is based on grammatical role: Subject > Object (Direct and Indirect) > Other.

The interaction between the Ch and the Cp gives us a measure of the smoothness of the transitions between the current utterance Ui and the previous utterance Ui-1, which in turn gives us an overall picture of coherence. The transitions in Centering Theory are defined in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transition from Ui-1 to Ui</th>
<th>( Cb(U_i) = Cb(U_{i-1}) ) OR no ( Cb(U_i) )</th>
<th>( Cb(U_i) \neq Cb(U_{i-1}) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue</td>
<td>Continue</td>
<td>Smooth-Shift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Rough-Shift</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The transitions are based on whether the Ch (“topic”) is the same from one utterance to the next, and whether the Ch of the current utterance is also the Cp of the current utterance (i.e. whether the topic of the current utterance is projected to be the topic of the subsequent utterance). When the transition is Continue, a particular entity is being talked about and will continue to be talked about in the following utterance. A Retain transition indicates that a new entity is projected to be the topic of the subsequent utterance; the speaker indicates that shift by realizing the Ch of the current utterance is a lower-ranked position. The two kinds of shift transitions indicate that the topic has changed between the previous and current utterance, but in a Smooth-Shift, we project that the speaker will continue talking about the new entity, while in a Rough-Shift, the topic is
projected to shift once again. The transitions are hypothesized to be ordered, such that Continue
transitions are preferred to Retain transitions, which are preferred to Smooth-Shifts, with Rough-
Shifts being the least preferred, i.e. least coherent.

The idea behind the above hierarchy is that the hearer/reader will be able to follow a
discourse with all Continue transitions with less processing effort than a discourse with all
Rough-Shifts. The reason being that the same entity remains in the forefront of attention
throughout the former situation. This should not, however, be thought of as indicating the ideal
discourse; a discourse with all Continue transitions would be incredibly dull. (John did X. Then
he did Y. He went to Z...) In normal discourse, Retains and Smooth-Shifts are also found,
though interestingly Rough-Shifts are virtually non-existent (Di Eugenio 1998, Hurewitz 1998).
The number of types of transitions, however, can be used to gauge coherence of discourse. In
fact, Miltsakaki and Kuikich (2000), using just a Centering algorithm, were able to predict with
a high degree of accuracy the scores given by teachers to student essays. This idea will be crucial in
our analysis of narrative coherence in Menominee.

2.3 Sample Analysis

The following analysis of a brief English sample, taken from Walker, Joshi, and Prince (1998),
will illustrate how Centering Theory works.

(1)  
Jeff helped Dick wash the car.
Ch: none
Cf: [Jeff, Dick, car]
Cp: [Jeff]
Transition: none (no Ch)

(2)  
He washed the windows as Dick waxed the car.
Ch: [Jeff]
Cf: [Jeff, windows, Dick, car]
Cp: [Jeff]
Transition: Continue

(3)  
He soaped a pane.  
Ch: [Jeff]
Cf: [Jeff, pane]
Cp: [Jeff]
Transition: Continue

In the first sentence, the subject is Jeff, and so we predict that Jeff will also be the preferred
center of the second sentence, which is the case; thus we have a Continue transition. In sentence
3, assuming that Jeff is the intended referent of the pronoun he, we again have a Continue
transition. If the intended referent were Dick, the sentence would be much more difficult to
understand; the hearer would require some overt disambiguation to be able to resolve the
reference in this way. This fact is reflected in Centering Theory because the transition would be a
Smooth-Shift, which is a less coherent transition than a Continue according to the transition
hierarchy discussed above.

In the next section, we will turn to two Menominee narratives and the Centering analysis.

3 Centering Analysis of Menominee Narratives

3.1 The Texts

Centering thus provides a concrete way of measuring coherence in discourse, and a means for
answering our questions about Menominee narratives. I examine two of Bloomfield’s texts, from
one of his best speakers, Little-Jerome, and one of his worst, White-Thunder, to see whether there
is significant variation in coherence (as presently defined) in their storytelling. Bloomfield writes
about these two:

Little-Jerome: “a true bilingual. He speaks both English and Menomini with racy
idiom, which he does not lose even when translating in either direction. He
contrasts strikingly with the men (usually somewhat younger) who speak little

White-Thunder: “his Menomini is atrocious. His vocabulary is small; his
inflections are often barbarous; he constructs sentences on a few threadbare
models. He may be said to speak no language tolerably” (1987:91).

The two narratives analyzed are folk stories of Menominee culture. They feature only a
few characters, which are humans and animals. White-Thunder’s narrative, “Tales of the Ancient
Time,” is a collection of a few stories. Each vignette is treated as a separate discourse segment
for the analysis. Little-Jerome’s narrative, “Me’napus and the Tree-Cat,” describes a single episode.

3.2 Centering Assumptions and Ranking

For the purposes of the Centering Analysis, direct speech (dialogue) is ignored. This is because
Centering Theory as laid out here cannot adequately deal with frequent speaker shifts; the
dialogue comes out to be less coherent than it actually seems to be. Presumably speakers use
various prosodic devices to signal to their listeners that different speakers are being quoted.

Determining the ranking is the most interesting and difficult part of doing a Centering
analysis on a new language. While the ranking most commonly used for English is based on
grammatical role, other factors have been found to influence ranking in other languages, such as
topic marking for Japanese (Kameyama 1986) and surface word order in German (Rambow 1993).
Ranking for a given language is usually determined by assessing the effects of including or
excluding particular features in the analysis of carefully selected passages. Common sense is of
course paramount: if a passage seems coherent but the analysis yields several rough-shifts, then
the ranking should be reconsidered. For the present study, determining ranking is critical, as we
must avoid circularity in determining coherence. We don’t want to say that Text A is more
coherent than Text B on the basis of a ranking developed by looking only at Text A. The procedure I
used was to try out different rankings based on factors I thought might play a role, and to analyze
both texts, looking crucially at whether one text simply failed to be as coherent in general across
different rankings. Below we will look at some of the factors considered.

The basic ranking used is grammatical role, if no other factors are relevant. Thus,
following work on other languages, subjects are ranked above direct objects. The ranking of other
roles does not turn out to have an effect on the analysis.

One fact about Menominee affecting ranking is that it makes a morphological distinction
between proximate and obviative, the former used for the “topic of discourse, the person nearest
the speaker’s point of view, or the person earlier spoken of and already known” (Bloomfield
1962:38). Only one animate third person entity is proximate in any given context; all others are
marked with the obviative. One of the key phenomena we are interested in is thus grammatically
encoded in the language. I therefore rank proximate Chs above obviative ones, as speakers may
take more freedom with grammatical role of entities because the proximate/obviative marking
will disambiguate.

Animacy is another factor considered in determining ranking. I did not find precedent in
other work in Centering for counting animate and inanimate entities as distinct, but both texts
were found to be maximally coherent under the following ranking: human >> animal >>
inanimate. (While a different ranking would have influenced coherence of each text individually,
it would not significantly alter the differential measure of coherence between them.) Some
inanimate entities are grammatically animate in Menominee, such as osaakiquamexon
‘dumpling,’ and while it would be interesting to see where these entities fall on the hierarchy, the
present analysis unfortunately does not bear on that issue.

Pronouns are rare in the texts; most noun phrases are null. Disambiguation is not usually
difficult, however, as the verb bears marking of both subject and object. Null noun phrases are
thus treated as pronouns, following Turan’s (1995) analysis for Turkish.

A summary of the ranking used is thus:

subject >> direct object
proximate >> obviative
human >> animal >> inanimate

3.3 Results and Discussion

3.3.1 Comparing Little-Jerome and White-Thunder

The results of the Centering Analysis are shown in Table 2 below. Both texts are highly coherent,
as they overwhelmingly consist of Continue transitions. White-Thunder’s narrative is in fact more
coherent by these standards than Little-Jerome’s. Both passages have more Continues than
Retains, and more Retains than Smooth-Shifts, and neither has any Rough-Shifts, following
nicely the transition ordering mentioned in section 2.2. The percentage of Retain transitions in
each narrative is not significantly different (\( \_{=2.12} \), \( _{=0.5} \)), and the percentages of Continue and
Smooth-Shift transitions, while significantly different from each other (\( _{=4.08}, _{2.99} \)), are still quite close and significance disappears at \( _{=0.2} \). The analysis shows, then,
that the Menominee’s judgments of goodness of speech are not tied to factors captured in a
Centering analysis. Both speakers were equally adept at manipulating sentence structure to reflect
shifts in topic, and achieved a high level of coherence with respect to their choices of referential
expression.

Table 2. Percentages of Centering transition types in two narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Little-Jerome (Text 85)</th>
<th>White-Thunder (Text 51)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONTINUE</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smooth Shift</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rough Shift</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Issues in Centering

As no other Centering analyses have been done on Menominee to date, it is useful to consider
theoretical and practical issues that arise when dealing with a language so different from English.
This section will consider, as an example, one such concern.

A question for Centering Theory is whether information about reference that is encoded
grammatically in ways other than pronouns/full NPs/nulls has the same status as these referential
forms. For example, in languages like Menominee, both the subject and direct object are marked
on the verb, perhaps requiring less of the hearer in terms of attending to grammatical role of null
elements. A further, even finer, distinction in Menominee is the proximate/obviative one
mentioned earlier. These verbal inflections may render unnecessary reliance on other factors. The

following excerpt from White-Thunder’s “Tales from the Ancient Time,” marked to illustrate the
Centering analysis, illustrates the role of the proximate/obviative distinction. (All referring
expressions are underlined, with nulls marked with an index, and the forward- and backward-
looking centers have Cp and Ch next to them, respectively.)

a inwi\textquotesingle
i n \textunderscore Cp Ch ak\textquotesingle ns-k\textquotesingle y\textquotesingle s\textquotesingle m\textquotesingle k\textquotesingle ur an\textquotesingle i\textquotesingle m\textquotesingle h n \textunderscore Cp Ch k\textquotesingle ta-neq\textquotesingle r\textquotesingle k\textquotesingle ur; then that greatly-he(OBV) laughs.at.him that in.intention-he(OBV) kills.him

Then he who was intending to slay him, laughed aloud at him:

CONTINUE

b keqts\textquotesingle i\textquotesingle h n \textunderscore Cp Ch us\textquotesingle h\textquotesingle a p\textquotesingle min\textquotesingle k\textquotesingle in;

near [precision] he(OBV). looks.at.him.from.theres+QUOT

from close by that other was observing him;

CONTINUE

c kn\textquotesingle teh \textunderscore Cp Ch g\textquotesingle und\textquotesingle w\textquotesingle nan.

not however he. sees.him(Obv)+Neg

but he did not see the other.

CONTINUE

d um\textquotesingle s n \textunderscore Cp Ch t\textquotesingle o\textquotesingle no\textquotesingle t\textquotesingle ha\textquotesingle w\textquotesingle at\textquotesingle sin,

here [precision] he\textquotesingle r\textquotesingle e\textquotesingle s.him(Obv)

The instant he heard him,

e inwi\textquotesingle i\textquotesingle n \textunderscore Cp Ch is\textquotesingle \textquotesingle k\textquotesingle a\textquotesingle a\textquotesingle n\textquotesingle et im\textquotesingle s n ip\textquotesingle t\textquotesingle h\textquotesingle i\textquotesingle h n \textunderscore Cp Ch k\textquotesingle o\textquotesingle k\textquotesingle k\textquotesingle t\textquotesingle.

then [precision] thither-he.jumps over.yonder.in.the.water [Obv] he.dives

he leapt, and dived into the water.

Without the proximate/obviative distinction, the above segment would be virtually
incomprehensible, and would require a good amount of context to be ultimately deciphered. The
other factors used in Centering, e.g. grammatical role, are no help here, and in fact predict
incorrect reference assignment if taken alone. Note that in line c, where without the
proximate/obviative markings Centering would predict the subject to remain the Cp, Bloomfield’s
translation reads “the other,” signalling a shift in reference. Clearly, a Centering analysis must
pay close attention to the particular grammatical devices used by languages in determining
ranking.

4 Conclusion

The above analysis shows that narratives produced by one of Leonard Bloomfield’s “best” and
“worst” speakers do not differ in coherence as measured by transition types in Centering Theory.
This suggests that the Menominee dissociated different kinds of linguistic competence (roughly,
pragmatic/narrative competence from phonological/morphological/syntactic competence) when
making judgments about speakers’ abilities.
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