

The *Like* Conspiracy: Avoiding Accountability

Aaron J. Dinkin, University of Toronto
ajd@post.harvard.edu

The linguistic **variable** is the core object of study in sociolinguistics:
 “a class of variants ordered along a continuous dimension” (Labov 1966:31)
 a set of “ways of doing or saying the same thing” (Chambers & Trudgill 1980:50)
 “in the derivation, the speaker reaches a decision-point” (Wallenberg 2013)
 Methodology is based around the **principle of accountability** (Labov 1972):
 a variant is studied **in relation to the variants it competes with** within one variable.
 This “places the paradigmatic relationship of the variable at the heart of the variationist enterprise” (Campbell-Kibler 2011).

But: **is** the variable always the correct unit of analysis?

Campbell-Kibler (2011) finds the **variant** to be the object of sociolinguistic evaluation:
 the social meanings of *-in*’ and *-ing* are **not just inverses** of each other,
 even though they exist as forms competing with each other within the variable (*ing*).
 Thus the principle of accountability is **not necessarily a good model** for social meaning!

Campbell-Kibler’s conclusion is very similar to the **Interface Principle** (Labov 1993):
 “Members of the speech community **evaluate the surface forms of language** but not
 more abstract structural features.”

In this model, *-in*’ and *-ing* themselves are **surface forms**, subject to social evaluation;
 that they are exponents of the same variable is just an “**abstract structural feature**”.
 Centering the **variable** as the unit of analysis may thus cause us to **miss generalizations**
 that would be clearer under a **variant-centered** analysis.

Like: a single variant that instantiates **several different variables** (cf. D’Arcy 2007);

at least 5 have been the subject of variationist analysis:

- **Quotative**: *I was like*, “*How are you doing?*”
covaries with *say*, *go*, etc.
- **Approximative adverb**: *I waited like 20 minutes*.
covaries with *about*
- **Comparative complementizer** (Brook 2014): *It seems like it’s going to rain*.
covaries with *that*, *as if*, *as though*
- **Discourse marker**: *Like*, *I don’t know what you want*.
clause-initial: covaries with *well*, *I mean*, etc.
- **Discourse particle**: *I’m, like, still waiting*.
clause-medial: covaries with *kind of*, etc.?

Standard variationist approach exemplified by Ferrara & Bell (1995):
 study factors affecting the choice between *like* and other variants **within one variable**;
 any other is “an altogether different variable which... **is not** the subject of this study”.

D’Arcy (2007) rebuts the “**like is just like**” myth:

a **popular belief** that vernacular *like* is a single linguistic unit,
debunked by the fact that *like* instantiates several distinct variables.

But the **existence** of this popular belief is **evidence for** Campbell-Kibler (2011)’s thesis:
 the **variant**, not the variable, is subject to sociolinguistic evaluation.
 Dismissing it as a “myth” overlooks this sociolinguistic fact!

These 5 functions of *like* are all **increasing in apparent time!**

(D’Arcy 2007, Brook 2014, López-Couso & Méndez-Naya 2012, and many other studies)

From a variable-centered standpoint, these must be **five different changes**,
 but it’s probably not just a coincidence!

Can there be a **single process** acting on the variant *like* and targeting it for change,
 across multiple structurally distinct variables?

Aaron (2010) suggests looking **outside the envelope of variation** to explain change:
 “excluding tokens which do not form part of the variable context” would “discard a
 tremendous amount of explanatory power”.

Variable **future temporal reference** in Spanish:

this is changing **toward the periphrastic variant**, away from the inflected future.

inflected (IF):	<i>contar-é</i>	‘I will tell’
periphrastic (PF):	<i>voy a contar</i>	‘I am going to tell’

Aaron argues: change **within** this variable context is **explained by** a change **outside it**:

IF is gaining a function of indicating **non-future epistemic modality**.

This analysis has the structure of a **chain shift**:

as IF gains a **new function**, its **old function** is taken over by a new variant, PF.

Thus a **single process of change** has effects both inside and outside the variable context.

Changes affecting *like* resemble “**conspiracy**” patterns from phonological change—

multiple, seemingly distinct changes all leading to the same targeted linguistic state:
 “modifications of the phonological pattern... implemented not by a single change,
 but by a number of phonologically quite different processes.” (Hock 1991)

Example: sound changes eliminating Indo-European onset *j from Greek (Crist 2001):

- metathesis: *anj > ain
- fortition: *j > t / p__ ; *j > zd / #__
- deletion: *j > 0 / V__V
- affrication: *tj > *ts > s / #__

These (and other changes!) have little in common **except** the result of eliminating onset j.

The Greek *j conspiracy is quite parallel to *like* in its variationist structure: several variables in different variable contexts, with one variant in common, all changing in a parallel direction to bring about a target state of the language. Crist (2001) gives an Optimality Theory account of conspiracies: caused by **top-down change** in constraints on preferred phonological **output**, which affects **multiple phonetic variables** as a single causal process. This is a change in the **structural system in which variation is embedded**, **not** principally a change in the variables themselves.

D'Arcy (2012) gives another example of change in the **embedding system** as an explanation for changes within an envelope of variation: The **range of discourse functions** of quotatives has broadened over the past 125 years—from reporting literal speech **only**, to thoughts, attitudes, non-verbal sounds, etc.—and **with that change in function** has come changes in the choice of variants used. That change in **discursive practice** (cf. Coupland 2014) toward **broader use** of quotatives could not itself be discovered by a study **within** the variable context!

Different functions of *like* **share discourse function** of signaling “**vague literality**”:

- discourse particle: marks “non-identical relationship between utterance and thought”, utterance **possibly not to be taken literally** (Andersen 2001)
- comparative complementizer: *that* is favored by literal clauses, *as if* by metaphorical; but *like* “is **not sensitive to the literality** of the subordinate clause” (Brook 2014)
- quotative: *like* is compatible with **both** quotation of speech **and** paraphrase of thought:
I said, “Gross.” *I was like, “Gross.”* *I thought, “Gross.”*
Be like is **ambiguous** regarding literality of quotation (cf. Buchstaller 2013).
- approximative: Siegel (2002) claims *like* is compatible with **both** exact and approximate quantities.

So **perhaps** the changes toward *like* are motivated as a change toward **vague literality** as a **discourse practice**—targeting the **variant** that indexes it, across **multiple variables**. Thus changes in **multiple variables** are united as results of a **single top-down change**.

The **point of this paper**: underlining the value of **variant-centered analysis** to **complement** variable-centered. The sociolinguistic work a variant does **isn't dependent on** the variables producing it; keeping analyses within the envelope of variation can miss the forest for the trees. *Like* seems ripe for such an analysis.

Acknowledgements

Thanks are due to the students in my winter 2014 “Deconstructing the Linguistic Variable” seminar at the University of Toronto: Hannah Coulter, Shayna Gardiner, Ruth Maddeaux, Marisa Brook, LeAnn Brown, Claire Childs, and Derek Denis, whose stimulating discussions in class spurred much of the thought behind this paper.

References:

- Aaron, Jessi Elana (2010). “Pushing the envelope: Looking beyond the variable context”. *Language Variation and Change* 22:1–36.
- Andersen, Gisle (2001). *Pragmatic Markers and Sociolinguistic Variation: A Relevance-Theoretic Approach to the Language of Adolescents*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Brook, Marisa (2014). “Comparative complementizers in Canadian English: Insights from early fiction”. *Penn Working Papers in Linguistics* 20.2:1–10.
- Buchstaller, Isabelle (2013). *Quotatives: New Trends and Sociolinguistic Implications*. Wiley/Blackwell, Malden, Mass.
- Campbell-Kibler, Kathryn (2011). “The sociolinguistic variant as a carrier of social meaning”. *Language Variation and Change* 22:423–441.
- Chambers, Jack & Peter Trudgill (1980). *Dialectology*, 2d ed. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Coupland, Nikolas (2014). “Sociolinguistic change, vernacularization, and British broadcast media”. In Jannis Androutsopoulos (ed.), *Mediatization and Sociolinguistic Change*: 67–96. De Gruyter, Berlin.
- Crist, Sean Jacob (2001). *Conspiracy in Historical Phonology*. PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- D'Arcy, Alexandra (2007). “*Like* and language ideology: Disentangling fact from fiction”. *American Speech* 82.4:386–419.
- D'Arcy, Alexandra (2012). “The diachrony of quotation: Evidence from New Zealand English”. *Language Variation and Change* 24:343–369.
- Ferrara, Kathleen & Barbara Bell (1995). “Sociolinguistic variation and discourse function of constructed dialogue introducers: The case of *be + like*.” *American Speech* 70.3:265–290.
- Hock, Hans Heinrich (1991). *Principles of Historical Linguistics*. Mouton/de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Labov, William (1966). “The linguistic variable as a structural unit.” *Washington Linguistics Review* 3:4–22.
- Labov, William (1972). *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.
- Labov, William (1993). “The unobservability of structure and its linguistic consequences.” Paper presented at N.W.A.V.E. 22, Ottawa.
- López-Couso, María José & Belén Méndez-Naya (2012). “On the use of *as if*, *as though*, and *like* in Present-Day English complementation structures”. *Journal of English Linguistics* 40.2:172–195.
- Siegel, Muffy (2002). “*Like*: The discourse particle and semantics.” *Journal of Semantics* 19:35–71.
- Wallenberg, Joel C. (2013). “A unified theory of stable variation, syntactic optionality, and syntactic change”. Paper presented at DiGS 15, Ottawa.