

Some supporting documents for presentation:
"Invoking Attitude, identity and text organisation"
Alexanne Don
Friday Seminars, Sydney University, August 19th, 2011.

Simon: opening paragraph.

1The concept of "task," has a rich history here. **2**Not only is there a common sense meaning of task as the job to be done, but it is a technical term in Bion's group psychology. **3**I have been one to see task as analogy - harking back to its roots in "tax" or an onerous tribute to be paid. **4**In Bion, it has more positive connotations, and being a work group in accomplishment of a task is not only healthy but morally good. **5**It is hard to mesh all this. **6**I set out to work at the warehouse this morning. **7**I will have a task, I suppose, or various ones. **8**I must unload some trucks. **9**I must aid the company in any legit way to help it make a profit. **10**I must fit myself into the sometimes odd social scheme there. **11**My goal, however, for this day is to have as pleasant and as delightful a day as I can -- to tell no lies, hurt no one on purpose, and be a good citizen while squeezing the best out of whatever situation I may encounter. **12**Out of this fluid plan for the day, one that will most likely materialize, which activities constitute 'tasks.'

- is it **hard** for the writer to mesh *all this*, i.e. all of the thoughts about the nature of 'task', (i.e. he should have written: "it is hard *for me* to mesh all this")

or

- is *meshing all this* objectively **hard**? For everyone, as a task?

- is *all this* too complex to integrate easily?

= **encapsulating** previous list as complex & **prospecting** the attempt to mesh all this to follow

[signals of logogenetic development of argument]

Sally

[capacity/tenacity]

targets

2I'm glad you answered Ray's question because it is obvious that I need information. [judgement: capacity: negative]

3I do feel 'under the microscope' as any new member is going to feel, and be, in any group (not just the Web).

4In my expectation to be targeted, I had anticipated curiosity, fear, jealousy, among others, but not suspicion, and particularly of my identity.... this is, in my experience, unique to the Web

5As for stating your suspicions or doubts, I value honesty in communication and would rather hear your fear, suspicion or doubt directly than to hear their echoes in all of our exchanges or in the poverty of our exchange.

6I usually find that exchanges between two people are largely superficial until they risk the truth [judgement: tenacity]of their feelings and thoughts toward each other.

7Ray got the brunt of my indignation because he was trying to be honest about his perceptions of me.

8New members in any group are the lifeblood [judgement: capacity]of the group...they are the new babies of that family [matching relation].

9They refresh the group dynamic. [judgement: capacity: positive: evoked via positive value give to refreshing]

10But like new babies they disrupt the pairings and interrelatedness of pairings in the family and force realignment [judgement: capacity: positive: of new babies and their ability to disrupt]of its habitual patterns.

11In some families the mutual love that they feel supports [judgement: capacity: positive]these radical shifts and changes with a minimum of negative feelings and consequences.

12In families with existing underlying hostilities or a scarcity of fulfilling interactions the baby is likely to be seen as a usurper of comfort and safety.

13It has not been entirely in jest that I have written two passages in posts to the effect that it is always the choice of a disrupted family to physically remove the intruder or at least to wish or fantasize this possibility.

14I do not state or imply that ND is a dysfunctional family[judgement: capacity: negative (deny)] but in many ways it is a closed system - this was my first observation from the comfort of my former observerhood.

15I even assumed that it had been a by-invitation-only group before the Tracy trauma until Simon set me straight.

16I have forgotten most of my Systems Theory but I remembered enough to understand why[judgement: capacity] there were fears among **the group** of its eventual self-absorption or withering demise.

17An open system is not defined by public archives and open subscription, **it** is defined by how a family responds to its new babies and external influences.

18I have been surprised that **no one** identified the presence of **an Active new member** as a possible source of some of the recent threads or other List activity.[token of judgement: capacity: negative: provoked via 'surprise': target: 'no-one' in the group]

19Think about the threads and discussions in terms of a new baby in a family and it may explain a lot. [judgement: capacity: positive provoked - of the effect of new baby on activity]

20I would like to talk about my impressions of many of these subjects but I have boring **reports** waiting for me that **I** must squeeze some interest from. [judgement: tenacity: positive: evoked]

21(One example is my assumption that **Ray**, as father or older brother, was assigning roles for the purpose of helping my older siblings feel safer, important and loved, but his **Dana** child saw the false security [judgement: capacity: provoked] in that approach and wanted an opportunity to work out the changes in a more lasting and productive **way**[appreciation: valuation] → [judgement: tenacity: evoked]).

22As for my veteran ways at listtalk, **I** am ignorant of the Bionic approach to group dynamic and **I** am ignorant of List operations and jargon[judgement: capacity: negative: inscribed] but **I** am not ignorant to life.[judgement: capacity: positive]

23From where I sit, Ray, **I** don't feel very veteran to the Web or to list protocol.

24(I have recently thought that it would have been wiser [judgement: capacity: negative via comparative] had I learned more about the Web before I got myself involved in such a powerful [judgement: capacity]**list**).

25In my first post **I** attempted [judgement: tenacity:+ve provoked]]to do four things:

1. to respond to Kaylene's plea for the group to wake up from its complacency - **one of her posts** stated so clearly to me her desire [affect: inclination]to shock herself and **the group** out of their sleep [judgement: tenacity: -ve: provoked] - one of the Muck posts, but I can't find the damn thing.

2. to introduce myself in terms of what moves me and what holds me, including many of my buttons.

3. to be **a baby that could** refresh the dynamic without unreasonable demands[judgement: capacity [could] +propriety[without unreasonable demands] evoked]

4. to learn and to teach, in that order.

26My only regret since I have been here is that, in knowing that I had to jump into the water, that **I** wasn't more careful [judgement: capacity: negative]where I landed - instead of landing beside Kaylene as I had planned, I landed on top of her.[judgement: capacity: negative: evoked: via inability to carry out plan/matching relation: contrast]

27**I** have never been a particularly graceful diver.[judgement: capacity: negative]

28But **someone** with her courtesy, honesty and courage[judgement: tenacity]did not deserve this and **my innocent intent** does little to change the fact.

29My behavior henceforth might. [judgement: tenacity:+ve provoked]]

30I am always disinclined to prove myself....I always assume that **how I act** is proof enough.

31It is hard for **me** to get past the conviction that WHO I am, no matter what the circumstance, will always be measured by how I treat others and how I respond to how I'm treated.

32Apart from Kaylene, I believe that **I** have treated people here with respect and on occasion have demanded the same

33I know there are **people here** who fear **me**, they have reason to, **I am not safe.** 34**I am as dangerous as anyone here** who is willing to be honest.

*judgement: veracity, propriety, capacity +ve : provoked. target [I];
via appreciation social valuation: harm-benefit -ve,
& target generic [[people here] anyone here] who is willing to be honest:
judgement veracity/tenacity -ve
comparison*

SIMON : Tenacity dispersion in sample text

sentence number	tenacity context	sub-type	target
1			
2			
3			
4			
5	It is hard to mesh all this	[judgement: tenacity: +ve:	[self][for anyone=

		evoked]	appreciation]
6	I set out to work at the warehouse this morning	“	
7	I will have a task, I suppose, or various ones	“	
8	I must unload some trucks	“	
9	I must aid the company in any legit way possible to help it make a profit	“	
10	I must fit myself into the sometimes odd social scheme there.	[judgement: tenacity: +ve: provoked]	self [I, myself]
11	My goal, however, for this day is to have as pleasant and as delightful a day as I can -- to tell no lies, hurt no one on purpose, and be a good citizen while squeezing the best out of whatever situation I may encounter.	[judgement: tenacity: +ve provoked] – [judgement: tenacity: +ve: provoked]	self [I, I]
12	paragraph		
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20	Attending a seminar would be viewed suspiciously as a waste of valuable company time while being part of the collection in the diner across the street is considered a promotion earned by keeping ones nose to the grindstone.	[judgement: tenacity: -ve] [judgement: tenacity: +ve]	[attributed to company] attending a seminar; being part of the collection in the diner across the road
paragraph			
21	Netd has often been "taken to task" for not sticking to its task.	[judgement: tenacity: -ve]	[attributed to unnamed] the group [netdynam]
22	Yet in many ways we are quite productive.	[judgement: tenacity: +ve]	the group [we]
23	If one considers the work of our members to be partially group product, we produce academic papers, we have an extensive web page to orient interested folks to our customs and history, we have a private IRC channel to meet in real time, and we produce a large data collection for use in psychological and socio-linguistic research.	[judgement: tenacity/ capacity: +ve: evoked]	the group [our members, we]
24	I know groups who accomplish, in some sort of objective sense, far less, yet would be held up as paragons of staying on task.	[judgement: tenacity: -ve] [judgement: tenacity: +ve provoked]	groups [who] this group [we]
paragraph			
25			
26			
27			
paragraph			
28			
29	I can still resolve to enjoy the day and squeeze the most out of the hours providence has provided.	[judgement: tenacity: +ve:	self [I]

SALLY: Capacity dispersion in sample text

sentence number	capacity context	sub-type	target
1			
2	I need information	[judgement: capacity: -ve]	self [I]
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
paragraph			
8	New members in any group are the lifeblood	[judgement: capacity: +ve]	new members of the group
9	They refresh the group dynamic.	[judgement: capacity: +ve: evoked]	new members of the group [they]
10	force realignment of its habitual patterns.	[judgement: capacity: +ve provoked]	they [new babies in a family]
11			
12			
13			
14	ND is a dysfunctional family	[judgement: capacity: -ve (denied)]	members of [this] group [ND]
15			
16	I remembered enough to understand why	[judgement: capacity: +ve provoked]	self [I]
17			
paragraph			
18	no one identified the presence of an Active new member as a possible source of some of the recent threads or other List activity	[judgement: capacity: -ve provoked via 'surprise']	members of this group [no-one]
19	the threads and discussions in terms of a new baby in a family and it may explain a lot.	[judgement: capacity: +ve provoked]	self [new babies in a family]
20			
21	his Dana child saw the false security in that approach	[judgement: capacity: +ve provoked]	group member as icon [Dana]
22	I am ignorant of the Bionic approach to group dynamic and I	[judgement: capacity: -ve:	self [I]

	am ignorant of List operations and jargonbut	inscribed] .[judgement: capacity: +ve	
23	I am not ignorant to life I don't feel very veteran to the Web or to list protocol.	[judgement: capacity: -ve: provoked]	self [I]
24	it would have been wiser had I learned more about the Web before I got myself involved in such a powerful list	[judgement: capacity: -ve: viacomparative] [judgement: capacity: +ve	self [I] the group [list]
paragraph			
25	.3 to be a baby that could refresh the dynamic without unreasonable demands	[judgement: capacity: +ve could: irrealis]	self [what I attempted to do]
26	I wasn't more careful]	[judgement: capacity: -ve	self [I]
27	I have never been a particularly graceful diver	.[judgement: capacity: -ve]	self [I]
28			
29			
paragraph			
30			
31			
32			
33	I am not safe.	[judgement: capacity: +ve: provoked]	self [I]
34	I am as dangerous as anyone here who	[judgement: capacity: +ve: provoked]	self [I]
paragraph			
35			
paragraph			
35a			
35b			
36c			

SALLY: Tenacity dispersion in sample text

sentence number	tenacity context	sub-type	target
1			
2			
3			
4			
5	superficial until they risk the truth of their feelings and thoughts towards each others	[judgement: tenacity: positive: evoked]	generic behaviour [exchanges between two people]
6			
7			
paragraph			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
paragraph			
18			
19			
20	I would like to talk about my impressions of many of these subjects but I have boring reports waiting for me that I must squeeze some interest from.	[judgement: tenacity: +ve: evoked]	self [I]
21	wanted work out the changes in a more lasting and productive way	[judgement: tenacity: +ve: provoked]	group member as icon [Dana]
22			
23			
24			
paragraph			
25	In my first post I attempted to do four things: 1. to respond to ... Kaylene's plea for the group to wake up from its complacency - one of her posts stated so clearly to me her desire to shock herself and the group out of their sleep	[judgement: tenacity: +ve evoked] [judgement: tenacity: -ve: provoked]	self [I] the group
26			
27			
28	someone with her courage	[judgement: tenacity: +ve: inscribed]	group member as icon [Kaylene]
29			
paragraph			
30			
31			
32			
33			

paragraph

35	There is more... but the damn reports await	[judgement: tenacity: +ve evoked]	[self] via reference to extra-textual RW
----	---	---	---

paragraph

35a

35b

36c

Example 3: intertextual reference dependency 101**[gen02.12/rob]**

Date: Mon, 4 Feb 2002 09:14:19 +1100

From: Rob W-- <email>

Subject: Why the joke isn't funny

It ain't the hate. If jokes weren't largely about aggression, why call it a "punchline"? It's the lack of wit - where wit is partly in the structure of the joke, partly in the parting of the veil at the end of the joke to reveal, or better, imply, the true nature of the hate.

I don't think the joke's about hating Osama. It doesn't argue his hatefulness or even assert it - it's just assumed from the beginning of the joke. Try substituting Hitler, Arafat or Farrakhan for Osama and see how much the joke is changed. The question is, what's wrong with young David? In relation to hatred, who whom?

I read the beginning of the joke as establishing a problem - why does a Jewish boy want to send a valentine to Osama? Would God mind? Of course not - God is love, the God of those namby-pamby peace-marchin', tree-huggin, feminist- marryin' jews who think Arik Sharon is a war criminal.

But if you even thought of asking the true G*d for permission to send a valentine the next seven generations of your offspring would get boils and bad breath.

The tension in the joke stays hidden, which is one reason the joke fails. It's a political joke about the hatred of the G*d-fearing for the god-loving.

Rob

=====

co-text for inscriptions	class	target	comment
It ain't the hate. If jokes weren't largely about aggression , why call it a "punchline"?	general noun general noun	ambig [joke?] ambig [jokes?]	denied conjecture
It's the lack of wit - where wit is partly in the structure of the joke, partly in the parting of the veil at the end of the joke to reveal, or better, imply, the true nature of the hate.	nominal general noun	the joke ambig	
I don't think the joke's about hating Osama. It doesn't argue his hatefulness or even assert it - it's just assumed from the beginning of the joke. Try substituting Hitler, Arafat or Farrakhan for Osama and see how much the joke is changed.	nominal nominal	Osama Osama	denied denied
The question is, what's wrong with young David? In relation to hatred, who whom?	attribute	David	conjecture
I read the beginning of the joke as establishing a problem -why does a Jewish boy want to send a valentine to Osama? Would God mind?	nominal	why, etc	prospection: conjecture
Of course not - God is love , the God of those namby-pamby peace-marchin', tree-huggin,	nominal attribute	God jews	identifying

feminist- marryin' jews who think Arik Sharon is a war criminal.	nominal	Arik Sharon	attributed: identifying
But if you even thought of asking the true G*d for permission to send a valentine the next seven generations of your offspring would get boils and bad breath.	nominal process: irrealis	G*d the true G*d	focus + marker/comparison
The tension in the joke stays hidden, which is one reason the joke fails.	process	the joke	
It's a political joke about the hatred of the G*d-fearing for the god-loving.	nominal	affector: G*d-fearing target: god-loving	

SOME CONTEXT ~

[gen02.4/dan]

Date: Sat, 2 Feb 2002 08:14:05 -0500

From: D-- M H-- <email>

Subject: Excuse me but I couldn't resist!

Little David comes home from first grade and tells his father that they learned about the history of Valentine's Day.

"Since Valentine's day is for a Christian saint and we're Jewish," he asks, "will God get mad at me for giving someone a valentine?"

David's father thinks a bit, then says "No, I don't think God would get mad. Who do you want to give a valentine to?"

"Osama Bin Laden," David says.

Why Osama Bin Laden," his father asks in shock.

"Well," David says, "I thought that if a little American Jewish boy could have enough love to give Osama a valentine, he might start to think that maybe we're not all bad, and maybe start loving people a little bit. And if other kids saw what I did and sent valentines to Osama, he'd love everyone a lot. And then he'd start going all over the place to tell everyone how much he loved them and how he didn't hate anyone anymore."

His father's heart swells and he looks at his boy with new found pride. "David, that's the most wonderful thing I've ever heard."

"I know," David says, "and once that gets him out in the open, the Marines could blow the crap out of that motherf#cker!"

=====

[gen02.5/simon]

Date: Sat, 2 Feb 2002 05:48:37 -0800
From: Simon <email>
Subject: Re: Excuse me but I couldn't resist!

Dan:
You write

>Excuse me but I couldn't resist!

Try harder.

Simon
=====

[gen02.6/san]

Date: Sun, 3 Feb 2002 17:42:38 +0800
From: sandra <email>
Subject: Re: Excuse me but I couldn't resist!

on 2/2/02 9:14 PM, D-- M H-- at <email> wrote:

Dan, unsurprisingly, I don't find this at all
funny.
Starting from here:

> "Well," David says, "I thought that if a little
American
> Jewish boy could have enough love to give Osama a
> valentine, he might start to think that maybe
we're not
> all bad, and maybe start loving people a little
bit. And
> if other kids saw what I did and sent valentines
to
> Osama, he'd love everyone a lot. And then he'd
start
> going all over the place to tell everyone how
much he
> loved them and how he didn't hate anyone
anymore."

You see, I don't think the problem is that the
individual called Osama bin Laden doesn't know how
to love people.

>
> "I know," David says, "and once that gets him out
in the
> open, the Marines could blow the crap out of that
> motherf#cker!"

I detect a considerable amount of aggression, you could call it hate, in that punchline. I don't think bin Laden's the only one with an emotional problem.

Sandra

Date: Mon, 4 Feb 2002 09:14:19 +1100
From: Rob W-- <email>
Subject: Why the joke isn't funny

It ain't the hate. If jokes weren't largely about aggression, why call it a "punchline"? It's the lack of wit - where wit is partly in the structure of the joke, partly in the parting of the veil at the end of the joke to reveal, or better, imply, the true nature of the hate.

I don't think the joke's about hating Osama. It doesn't argue his hatefulness or even assert it - it's just assumed from the beginning of the joke. Try substituting Hitler, Arafat or Farrakhan for Osama and see how much the joke is changed. The question is, what's wrong with young David? In relation to hatred, who whom?

I read the beginning of the joke as establishing a problem -

why does a Jewish boy want to send a valentine to Osama?

Would God mind? Of course not - God is love, the God of those namby-pamby peace-marchin', tree-huggin, feminist- marryin' jews who think Arik Sharon is a war criminal.

But if you even thought of asking the true G*d for permission to send a valentine the next seven

generations of your offspring would get boils and bad breath.

The tension in the joke stays hidden, which is one reason the joke fails. It's a political joke about the hatred of the G*d-fearing for the god-loving.

Rob

=====

I [THESIS]

preview: contradict1) **It** ain't the hate.

=

warrant (elaborate)

2) If jokes weren't largely about aggression, why call it a "punchline"?

+

claim (extend)

3) It's the lack of wit - where wit is partly in the structure of the joke, partly in the parting of the veil at the end of the joke to reveal, or better, imply, the true nature of the hate.

+

II [ARGUMENT]

claim (+gap via deny)

4) I don't think the joke's about hating Osama.

+

evidence1 (deny)

5) It doesn't argue his hatefulness or even assert it -

=

warrant (counter)

it's just assumed from the beginning of the joke.

+

evidence2

6) Try substituting Hitler, Arafat or Farrakhan for Osama and see how much the joke is changed.

+

re-claim: problem (via knowledge gap +neg evaluation)

7) The question is, what's wrong with young **David**? 7a) In relation to hatred, who whom?

=

III [ARGUMENT]

claim/warrant (elaborate)

8) I read the beginning of the joke as establishing a problem -

=

situation (elaborate)

9) **why** does a **Jewish** boy want to send a valentine to Osama?

+

problem (extend) 10) Would God mind?

=

problem-response1 11) Of course not -

=

problem-response1 (elaborate data/backing/grounds for response)

11a) God is love, the God of those namby-pamby peace-marchin', tree-huggin, feminist-marryin' jews who think Arik Sharon is a war criminal.

+

problem-response2 (extend +counter +neg evaluation = original problem, i.e. What's wrong with D?)

12) **But if** you even thought of asking the true **G*d** for permission to send a valentine the next seven generations of your offspring would get boils and bad breath.

=

IV [REINFORCEMENT]

claim

13) The tension in the joke stays hidden, which is one reason the joke fails.

+

extend claim

14) It's a political joke about the hatred of the **G*d**- fearing for the **god**-loving.

Main generic stages of [gen02.12/rob]

FUNCTIONAL STAGE	LOGICO-SEMANTIC LINK	EXPANSION	PART	TEXT
THESIS	Preview: contradict		1.i	1)It ain't the hate .
	Warrant (elaborate)	=	1.i.i	2) If jokes weren't largely about <u>aggression</u> , why call it a "punchline"?
	Claim (extend)	+	1.ii	3) It's the lack of wit - where wit is partly in the structure of <u>the</u> joke, partly in the parting of the veil at the end of the joke to reveal, or better, imply, the true nature of <u>the hate</u> .
ARGUMENT 1	Claim (+ gap via deny)	+	2.i	4) I don't think <u>the joke's</u> about <u>hating</u> Osama.
	Evidence1 (deny)	+	2.ii	5) <u>It doesn't</u> argue his <u>hatefulness</u> or even assert <u>it</u> -
	Warrant (counter)	=		<u>it's</u> just assumed from the beginning of <u>the joke</u> .
	Evidence2	+	2.iii	6)Try substituting Hitler, Arafat or Farrakhan for Osama and see how much <u>the joke</u> is changed.
	Re-Claim: Problem (via knowledge gap + negative evaluation)	+	2.iv	7) The question is , what's wrong with young David? 7a)In relation to <u>hatred</u> , who whom?
ARGUMENT 2	Claim/warrant (elaborate)	=	3.i	8)I read the beginning of <u>the joke</u> as establishing a problem –
	Situation (elaborate)	=	3.i.i	9)why does a Jewish boy want to send a valentine to Osama?
	Problem (extend)	+	3.i.ii	10)Would God mind?
	Problem-response1	=	3.ii	11)Of course not –
	Problem-response1 (elaborate/date/backing: grounds for response)	=	3.ii.i	11a)God is love, the God of those namby-pamby peace-marchin', tree-huggin, feminist- marryin' jews who think Arik Sharon is a war criminal.
	Problem-response2 (extend +counter +neg evaluation = original problem, i.e. What's wrong with D?)	+	3.iii	12) But if you even thought of asking the true G*d for permission to send a valentine the next seven generations of your offspring would get boils and bad breath.
REINFORCEMENT	Claim	=	4.i	13)The tension in <u>the joke</u> stays hidden, which is one reason <u>the joke</u> fails.
	extend Claim	+	4.ii	14)It's a political <u>joke</u> about <u>the hatred</u> of the G*d -fearing for the god-loving .

...presuming reference.. Martin (1992: 102) remarks "signals that the identity of the participant in question [can] be recovered from the context". The writer has signalled that there was no need to re-contextualise his contribution with a formal or overt Framer—the post opens as if he were making an immediate real-time response. This is achieved through reference to the hate in the opening statement, while at the same time, the contribution to which it responds is nowhere overtly referenced—either by naming, referring to an Addressee, or by any quoting of the post(s) to which it responds. The 'identity' referred to, 'the hate', and the other topic—referred to in the subject line, 'the joke'—or referents from the same semantic domain—are repeated throughout the text (underlined in figures). This post also features some Markers which signal differences between the two ideological positions being outlined—between 'God-fearing' versus 'God-loving' Jews. Such Markers call on the assumed knowledge of audience members in order to interpret fully the argument being presented. The argument is ostensibly about the conventions of the joke genre, but actually targets those who carry the "hate".

...relies on the assumed knowledge and involved readership of the audience. Unless the reader has read the post in which the joke appeared, and indeed the intervening posts contributed in reaction to it, the relevance of the argument may not be at all apparent.

...indicates an assumed axiological alignment with readers, or at least constructs a readership that understands the writer's ideological stance. By this means also it constructs an "out-group" consisting of those who do not agree with him—the meta-targets of the argument, *the G*d-fearing*—and those who do not understand what he is talking about—e.g. the casual reader, the non-group member. Taking this one step further, such "contractions" of meaning and reliance on assumed knowledge suggest the writer's stance is one of high [contact: familiarity], and this tenor of the text creates by default an audience consisting of long-time list members.

Markers, which in turn cue the development of the rhetorical positioning of the text.

...also depends on negation: *ain't*, *weren't*, *lack of*, *I don't think*, *doesn't*, *of course not*, instances of which all appear in the first half of the text (parts 1.i – 3.ii). This series of denials both sets up a problem or a gap in knowledge, and then fills it in the final sections of the text. This is done when the writer first takes on the persona (becoming the *Animator*) of the negatively targeted group, and then turns or shifts focus to Reinforce his Thesis that the joke:

- lacks wit,
 - by stating that it:
 - hides the tension essential for any joke
- → fails

Select Bibliography

Allen, Graham (2000) *Intertextuality*. London: Routledge.

Caffi, Claudia & Richard W. Janney (1994) "Toward a pragmatics of emotive communication", in *Journal of Pragmatics* 22: 325-373

Don, A. 2007: *A framework for the investigation of interactive norms and the construction of textual identity in written discourse communities: the case of an email discussion list*. (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Birmingham. [available: http://www.grammatics.com/lexi_con/lexis-text/thesis/donacPhD.html]

Genette, Gérard (1997) *Palimpsests: literature in the second degree*. University of Nebraska Press.

Goffman, E. (1981) *Forms of Talk*. Oxford: Blackwell

Gregory, M. (1985) "Towards Communication Linguistics: A Framework", in Benson, J. & W. Greaves (eds) *Systemic Perspectives on Discourse, Vol.1: Selected Papers from the 9th International Systemics Workshop*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Hood, S. & J.R. Martin (2007) "Invoking Attitude: the play of graduation in appraising discourse," in Hasan, R, Matthiessen, C. & Jonathan Webster (eds) *Continuing discourse on Language: A functional perspective. Volume 2*. London: Equinox.

Lemke, J. L. (1995) "Intertextuality and text semantics", in Fries, P. and Michael Gregory (eds) *Discourse in Society: Systemic Functional Perspectives*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.

Martin, J. R. (1992) *English Text: System and Structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins

Martin, J. R. & P. R. R. White (2005) *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. London: Palgrave.

Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2007) "The 'architecture' of language according to systemic functional theory: developments since the 1970s," in Hasan, R, Matthiessen, C. & Jonathan Webster (eds) *Continuing discourse on Language: A functional perspective. Volume 2*. London: Equinox.

Sinclair, John McH. (1993) "Written Discourse Structure", in Sinclair, J. McH., M. Hoey & G. Fox (eds) *Techniques of Description*. London: Routledge.

Slembrouk, Stef (2011) "Intertextuality" in Zienkowski, J., Östman, J-O & Jef Verschueren (eds) *Discursive Pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Thompson, G. & J. Zhou (2000) "Evaluation and organization in text: the structuring role of evaluative disjuncts", in Hunston, S. & G. Thompson (eds) *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Wigboldus, D., Spears, R. & G. Semin (1999) "Categorization, content and the context of communicative behaviour", in Ellemers, N., Spears, R. & B. Doosje (eds) *Social Identity*. Oxford & Malden: Blackwell.

Williams, R. (1998) The dynamics of shaming in an email discussion group. unpublished paper.