

DECONSTRUCTING “MY SWEET LORD”: PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF AN ARGUMENT

ERIN BIDLAKE

Abstract

Adopting a pragmatic approach to discourse analysis, I undertake an analysis of one argument between two men using a constructionist framework. I select three interactional features for analysis: self-reference, other-reference, and metaphorical language. I demonstrate how the two men agree to cooperate “as a kind of rationality” (Mey 1993, p.71) in order to co-produce meaningful interaction, while simultaneously advancing their own agendas and weakening each other’s positions. From my analysis, four highly-intertwined themes emerge for discussion: constructions of the identity of the self, constructions of the identity of the other, affiliation, and disaffiliation.

Key words: *pragmatics, cooperation, argument, identity construction, metaphorical language*

1.0 Introduction

It takes two to tango, or so the saying goes. There are certain activities in which we can only engage with a willing, cooperative partner. Dancing the tango is one example, and arguing is another. Yet, in the case of arguing, an activity characterized by opposition and confrontation, how does this willingness to cooperate

manifest? How do two people engaged in a heated argument cooperate with one another in order to co-produce meaningful interaction, while simultaneously disaffiliating themselves from one another and weakening one another's positions? To answer these two research questions, I analyze one example of an argument between two people.

This paper is organized into six sections: (1) the introduction, where I present my research questions, (2) the methodology, where I introduce my analytic tools, (3) a description of the discourse setting, (4) the analysis, where I examine the selected interactional features, (5) the discussion, where I present the findings of my analysis, and (6) the conclusion, where I discuss the limitations of my analysis, and situate my discussion in the broader context.

2.0 Methodology

My analysis adopts a pragmatic approach to discourse analysis, and is situated within a constructionist framework. Constructionism explores the notion of social identity as a locally-situated performance. In this view, identity is constantly constructed, re-constructed, and deconstructed through social interaction. Constructionism operates in contrast to the practice of defining fixed notions of social identity on the basis of categories such as gender, class, and ethnicity. As Cameron explains:

Whereas sociolinguistics would say that the way I use language reflects or marks my identity as a particular kind of social subject—I talk like a white middle-class woman, because I am (already) a white middle-class woman—the critical account suggests language is one of the things that *constitutes* my identity as a particular kind of subject. Sociolinguistics says that how you act depends on who you are; critical theory says that who you are (and are taken to be) depends on how you act. (emphasis original, 1995, p.15-16)

Researchers working within the framework of constructionism (e.g. Cameron 1995; Schiffrin 1996) reject the notion that speakers unwittingly reproduce linguistic forms determined solely by their biological and social memberships. Instead, these researchers see social identity as realized in-situ. As Schiffrin notes:

We may act more or less middle-class, more or less female, and so on, depending on what we are doing and with whom. This view forces us to attend to speech activities, and to the interactions in which they are situated. (1996, p.199)

In this way, pragmatics and constructionism complement one another, as they both argue for the primacy of context. In his discussion of pragmatics, Robinson offers the following definition:

Both pragmaticians and discourse analysts study how people use words in context, analyzing how the ways people use words are shaped by what they know about the physical and social world in which they live, by their personalities, alone and in groups, and by what they know about the time and place in which the speaker spoke the words or the writer wrote them. (2006, p.42)

Pragmatics, by this definition, is the study of how people use language in context. This view of pragmatics places great importance on a thorough understanding of the discourse setting prior to any attempt at analysis.

My analysis focuses on three interactional features: self-reference, other-reference, and metaphorical language. In his discussion of reference, Grundy explains that “[t]he function of picking out an object in the world which matches a linguistic description is called referring” (2000, p.276). In any given situation there is a multitude of possible referring terms that can be applied to a given referent, whether the referent be yourself (self-reference) or another person (other-reference). For example, I can refer to my husband in the following ways:

my husband

Mish

the guy I live with

sweetie

Each of these referring terms carries a specific function in a given context. “Sweetie” contrasts with “Mish” in terms of familiarity (I would be more likely to opt for the former in informal settings, and the latter in formal settings), just as “my husband” and “the guy I live with” contrast in terms of intimacy (I would be more likely to opt for the former to indicate solidarity, and the latter to indicate discord). My choice to refer to my husband by any of these referring terms is heavily influenced by context. In my analysis, I look at how reference is used in one particular discourse setting, and attempt to analyze the specific functions of self- and other-reference in identity construction.

In Mey’s (1993) discussion of metaphorical language, he stresses the importance of metaphor in understanding how people view the world and relate to it. Mey refers to this process as “wording the world” (1993, p.300) and explains that:

The social consequences of this view of wording are that one cannot understand one’s partners in dialogue unless one has a good grasp of their word-and-world context (which includes, but is not limited to, making metaphors). That is, in order to understand another person’s wording, I have to participate in his or her contexts, to word the world with him or her. The pragmatic view of language (and, in general, of all social activity) demands thus a ‘sympathetic’ understanding, a practice of ‘co-wording in solidarity’ with the context of its users. (1993, p.303-304)

This view contends that for people to co-produce metaphorical language there must be some willingness to cooperate on both sides. For example, if I complain to my husband about our noisy neighbours, referring to them as “werewolves” because “they emerge howling at midnight” and he replies by adding “even when there isn’t a full

moon”, we have co-produced a metaphor whereby our neighbours are compared to werewolves. This metaphor is possible because we share “a ‘sympathetic’ understanding” of the world (and many sleep-disturbed nights).

In his research on couples’ talk examining relationship difficulties, Edwards describes how argumentative discourse can be categorized in three ways: “(1) particular, one-off occurrences or items; (2) instances of more generalized pattern; or (3) glossed by a description of the pattern itself” (1995, p.319). This categorization uses the notion of script formulations to draw attention to the often “recurring, predictable, sequential pattern” (1995, p.319) of arguments. Following from Edwards, and others who have studied the structure of argumentative discourse (e.g. Cohen 1987), my analysis looks at how recurring and sometimes predictable metaphorical language is co-produced in one particular discourse setting, and attempts to analyze the ways in which “a ‘sympathetic’ understanding” and “co-wording in solidarity” (Mey 1993, p.304) manifest in the midst of a heated argument.

3.0 Discourse setting

The discourse setting selected for my analysis of an argument is a seven-minute excerpt from an American news broadcast (Cavallero and Donohue 2007). The broadcast is CNN’s “Anderson Cooper 360°” and is based in New York City. There are three men present during the excerpt, which first aired on television on March 30, 2007. The excerpt begins as a traditional news interview, with the interviewer asking the questions and the interviewees responding. However, it quickly degrades into a heated argument between the two interviewees.

First to speak is interviewer Anderson Cooper, the show's lead anchor. Cooper is a popular American TV personality, who has won an Emmy Award for his work in journalism (CNN programs 2008).

Second to speak is interviewee Cosimo Cavallero, an artist of Italian heritage who resides in New York City. Cavallero is an award-winning film director and an installation artist, best known for using food in his artwork. In the past, he has covered the iconic 1960's supermodel Twiggy with melted cheese ("Twiggy in Cheese"), and decorated a four-poster bed with over 300 pounds of sliced ham ("Ham") (Cavallero 2007).

Third to speak is interviewee Bill Donohue, president of the Catholic League, the largest Catholic civil rights organization in the United States. Donohue is an extremely controversial figure, and has spoken out publicly against gays and lesbians, abortion, and anything he perceives to be a defilement of the church. He has called the movie 'Dogma' anti-Catholic and has spoken out against public figures such as musician Marilyn Manson (Catholic League 2008).

The three men are speaking via satellite, each of them in their own studio. Cavallero and Donohue have been brought together to speak about their roles in a controversial issue pertaining to the cancellation of an upcoming art exhibit. Cavallero had been about to exhibit his sculpture of a six foot tall, anatomically-correct, nude image of Jesus made from 200 pounds of milk chocolate ("My Sweet Lord"), when the exhibit was cancelled due to public outrage, instigated by Donohue and the Catholic League. The gallery, known as the Lab Gallery, is adjunct to the Roger Smith Hotel, a prestigious New York City hotel. Public pressure and the threat of a boycott caused the hotel executive board to force the Lab Gallery's artistic director, Matthew

Semler, to cancel the exhibit. Semler resigned from his position in protest and accused Donohue of issuing a Catholic fatwa (Daily News 2007). “Fatwa” is a term borrowed from the Islamic practice whereby a chosen Islamic scholar is summoned to provide an interpretation of an unclear issue pertaining to Islamic law (Merriam-Webster Online 2008). This term has been adopted by non-Muslims in the West, where it is often used synonymously with “hate speech” (Daily News 2007).

Objections to the sculpture are many. During the broadcast, Donohue names at least five offences caused by the sculpture of Jesus. First, it is made of chocolate, and there is some confusion over whether or not the public was meant to have eaten the sculpture. Second, Jesus is portrayed nude, without a loin cloth to cover his genitalia. Third, the exhibit was to be held during the Christian Holy Week, opening the day after Palm Sunday and running through until Easter Sunday. Fourth, the sculpture was to be displayed on street level, where children could easily access it. Fifth, the fact that a prestigious hotel like the Roger Smith Hotel would agree to participate in the exhibit of the offensive sculpture indicates that the exploitation of sacred images has gone beyond the artistic community and successfully infiltrated mainstream institutions.

In media statements Cavallero has responded to the various accusations by Donohue. Cavallero claims that his sculpture is not meant to offend, rather it is meant to be a beautiful representation of Jesus, not unlike similar sculptures made of marble or stone found in churches and art galleries around the world (Kadushin *et al.* 2007). Likewise, Cavallero claims that the decision to hold the exhibit during Holy Week was a coincidence, as it happened to be the only time the gallery had an opening (Pesce and Salamone 2007).

There are at least five institutions with vested interests in this broadcast and the larger debate, three of which are represented in the excerpt. Donohue represents the Catholic League, and is dedicated to protecting the religious and civil rights of Catholics, including the right not to have Catholic sensibilities assaulted. Cavallero represents the artistic community, and is arguing for an artist's right to freedom of expression. Cooper represents CNN, and is conducting the interview with Cavallero and Donohue in order to deliver the news to the public. Not present during this excerpt, but alluded to by Donohue, is Matthew Semler. Semler represents the Lab Gallery, and made his loyalties clear when he resigned from his position as artistic director of the gallery after the hotel management forced him to cancel the exhibit. Also absent is James Knowles. Knowles represents the Roger Smith Hotel, and was involved in making the decision to call off the exhibit when the hotel's reputation came into question. In a public statement, Knowles announced that "executives wished to affirm the dignity and responsibility of the hotel by canceling the exhibition" (Kadushin *et al.* 2007).

4.0 Analysis

In the following two subsections I present the three interactional features selected for my analysis: self-reference, other-reference, and metaphorical language. For the purpose of my analysis, I present only extracts taken from the complete transcription (included as Appendix A).

4.1 Self-reference and other-reference

Self-reference and other-reference terms are used by both Cavallero and Donohue in the construction of their own identities and in the construction of one

another's identities. They are likewise used to show affiliation and disaffiliation with each other and the institutions they claim to represent in the argument.

Donohue uses his position as the president of the Catholic League to strengthen his argument. He frequently makes use of self-referring terms to construct himself as representing a larger group united by their unanimous opposition to the sculpture. This group is understood to be Christians in general, and Catholics in particular, if not, in some cases, the general public as well. For example, there are ten instances of Donohue referring to himself as "we":

- 25-6 if **we** took an image of this artists's mother,
29-30 **we** have a lot of these loser artists, down in SoHo and around the country,
35 now **we** have the establishment kicking in,
118-9 and if **we**- and if **we** put a swastika out on on uh a stamp in the United States,
we could call that art.
162-3 you put your middle finger at the Catholic Church and **we** just broke it [didn't
we pal, yes **we** did.]
166-7 [**we** won, and you're out of a job.]

In reference to the groups he constructs himself as speaking on behalf of, Donohue also employs the possessive "my". There are two instances of Donohue referring to groups of people as "my":

- 109-10 if I don't pay attention to it then I- I- **my people** should ask me to be fired

124-6 I called up about five hundred of **my friends** in- running different Catholic
Protestant Jewish Muslim Hindu and nonsectarian organizations

Cavallero's use of self-referring terms attempts to invalidate Donohue's self-construction as the representative of all Catholics and all Christians, by constructing himself as part of the group that Donohue purports to represent. There are four instances of Cavallero referring to himself as "a Catholic" or "a Christian":

43-4 **I'm a Catholic**, and **I'm a Christian**, (.) and I think this gentleman uh doesn't
even represent th- the people (.) that are in his faith

62 no because **I'm a Christian** and I'm not [trying to,]

164-5 [I have a lot of believers (.) and **I'm a Christian** and,=]

Similarly, Cavallero attempts to extricate Donohue from his group by singling him out as the sole instigator of the opposition (e.g. "your rhetoric"). He does this by employing the pronoun "you" and the possessive pronoun "your". Although the English language does not distinguish between the singular "you" pronoun and the plural "you" pronoun (except, perhaps, through the use of "you all" to indicate the plural form), Cavallero makes it clear that his reference is to Donohue specifically by emphasizing the pronoun while repeatedly pointing at the camera (which can be interpreted as pointing at Donohue, since Cavallero would be facing a screen projecting a satellite image of Donohue). Additionally, Cavallero accuses Donohue of wrongfully claiming sole possession of Christ (e.g. "your Christ"). By self-constructing as a Christian and as a Catholic, Cavallero indicates that he, too, shares a

claim on Christ, thus emphasizing Donohue's unfair appropriation of what is meant to be shared by all:

73-5 [and] you've bamboozled an establishment, (.) you've put fear in people, (.) to
listen to your rhetoric, (.) and to believe just because the man has got his arms
extended, (.) and he's made in chocolate, it's your Christ, and its offensive
138-9 where you do think that an artist should exhibit his work, that you don't
infringe on.

When it seems as though Cavallero might be successful in invalidating (or at least weakening) Donohue's self-construction as the representative of all Catholics and all Christians, and in extricating Donohue from his group, Donohue widens the scope of his representation by affiliating himself with other groups and, thus, speaking on behalf of a larger majority. He does this on at least three occasions:

110-2 I am delighted with the response from **Jews, Muslims**, and **others**, not just Catholics, and **Protestants** with this. **people** are basically saying enough is enough.

113-4 **no one** believes it

124-6 I called up about five hundred of my friends in- running different Catholic **Protestant Jewish Muslim Hindu** and **nonsectarian** organizations

Like Donohue, Cavallero also attempts to affiliate himself with a larger group (the artistic community) in order to strengthen his argument. However, he does this less frequently than Donohue, perhaps because the artistic community is less formally

organized and lacks the institutional infrastructure of the Catholic League. There are two instances of Cavallero referring to himself and the artistic community as “we”, and at least two instances of him referring to artists in general, a group to which it is understood he belongs:

42-3 his assault is on the public (.) at large, **artists**, and freedom of speech,
88-9 apart from the Holy Week, **we** can do anything **we** want with the genitalia?
138-9 where do you think that **an artist** should exhibit **his** work, that you don't
infringe on.

To invalidate and discount Cavallero's affiliation with the artistic community, Donohue distinguishes between great artists and “loser” artists. Donohue makes it clear that Cavallero belongs to the latter group:

29-30 what bothers me, it's not even th- **the artist**, I mean we have a lot of these
loser artists,
92 **Leonardo, you're not**

Cavallero additionally draws support from beyond the artistic community by constructing himself as belonging to a group of people who are against Donohue's protest. He does this on at least four occasions, the first two of which serve double duty in that they invoke people whom Donohue claims to be on his side:

147 =there's **two priests** that have wanted to exhibit this in their church.

153-4 I believe that there's **people** in your organization that would like you to resign.

164-5 [I have a lot of **believers** (.) and I'm a Christian and,=]

168 =there's a lot of **people** like me who are opposed to what you're doing,=

In direct reference to one another, Cavallero and Donohue employ very different strategies. Donohue refers to Cavallero in somewhat condescending or patronizing terms. This manner of reference attempts to place Donohue in a position of superiority over Cavallero:

30-1 what bothers me is that **this guy** knows

58-9 [which is why **guys like you** wouldn't do this against Mohammed at Ramadan]

122-3 when these people are are are whining, claiming victim status, as **this guy** is doing,

163 [didn't we **pal**, yes, we did.]

Cavallero, in contrast, refers to Donohue with what seems to be mock politeness or formality. The contrast between Donohue's manner of reference and Cavallero's seems to work against Donohue's intentions. Cavallero's formality undermines Donohue's efforts to construct himself as superior, and results in constructing Cavallero as the more reasonable of the two, despite the slightly mocking tone:

41-2 you just heard **the gentleman** calling, artists losers, or me a loser,

44-5 **this gentleman** uh doesn't even represent th- the people

56 did you hear what th- **this gentle.hh.man** is saying

68 [I wanna ask] you a question uh **Mr. Donohue**,

131-2 I'd like to add, to **the gentleman** who referred to the swastika

4.2 Metaphorical language

Metaphorical language is used by both Cavallero and Donohue in the construction of their own identities and in the construction of one another's identities. It is likewise used to show affiliation and disaffiliation with each other and the institutions they claim to represent.

There are many examples of metaphorical language in this excerpt. Donohue, especially, employs this type of rhetoric to strengthen his argument. For example, there are two instances of Donohue contrasting financial bankruptcy with moral bankruptcy. In order to justify his desire to see Cavallero and the Roger Smith Hotel go bankrupt, he constructs them as being already bankrupt in terms of morality:

37-8 these people are morally bankrupt and I- my goal is to make him financially
bankrupt.

127-8 they're morally bankrupt, I want to see them financially bankrupt.

In some cases, these kinds of metaphors pass without comment. However, it becomes significant when Donohue and Cavallero engage in co-producing the metaphors. In this way, they are "wording the world" (Mey 1993, p.300) together. It seems as though, despite their separate goals and apparent dislike for one another, the two men willingly collaborate on these metaphors as far as necessary in order to

advance their separate agendas. The following is an analysis of four examples of co-produced metaphors: “the artist’s mother metaphor”, “the Taliban metaphor”, “the Nazi metaphor”, and “the garbage metaphor”.

4.2.1 The artist’s mother metaphor

(24-8)

BD well: of course asking the public to come in and eat Jesus with his genitals exposed during Holy Week I think would be self-explanatory. if we took an image of this artists’s mother, and made her out in chocolate, and with her genitals exposed of course to be uh equal, and then asked the public to eat her on Mother’s Day, yeah he might have a problem maybe he wouldn’t,

This metaphor, which compares the disrespectful sculpture of Jesus with an equally disrespectful rendering of the artist’s mother, emphasizes what Donohue perceives to be Cavallero’s great injury to the Catholic Church. This example is significant because Cavallero’s contribution is not a spoken one, but a material one, and occurs prior to the discourse setting. Nonetheless, Cavallero undeniably co-produces this metaphor by creating the chocolate sculpture of Jesus in the first place. Without this sculpture, Donohue has nothing with which to contrast his hypothetical rendering of the artist’s mother in order to construct the sculpture as being inappropriate, and thus advance his agenda.

4.2.2 The Taliban metaphor

(46-59)

BD [that that's] funny you- you said

I put out a fatwa, (.) right? =

CC [°mhmm°]

BD [=or th- or th-]that was th- the guy who ran th- the Lab↓, said I put out a fatwa? I put out a news release? so you're accusing me of being like the Taliban, is that right?

CC (.) who me? (.) you're not that intelligent.

BD oh.hh.hh.no, let me tell you something you're- you're lucky I'm not as mean because you might lose more than your head.

AC Co- Cosimo did you want people to eat this, w- was that part of this?

CC no:↓, did you hear what th- this gentle.hh.man is saying that I'd lose my head?

BD no I- you- you heard what I said, I said you- you're lucky I'm not like the Taliban cause you would lose more than your head, [which is why guys like you wouldn't do this against Mohammed at Ramadan.]

As with the previous example, the origin of this metaphor is outside the excerpt, both in terms of time and originator. Prior to this interview, Matthew Semler, of the Lab Gallery, accused Donohue of issuing a "Catholic fatwa" in a media statement. Donohue takes up this metaphor in the interview, first wrongly attributing the accusation to Cavallero, and then, after a self-initiated self-repair, attributes the accusation back to Semler. Yet, despite this repair, Donohue chooses to persist with the metaphor. Cavallero's response to Donohue's question, "so you're accusing me of

being like the Taliban, is that right?” is significant for several reasons. First, because Donohue’s address to Cavallero is the first occasion during the interview in which Cavallero and Donohue interact, and, in the moment of responding to this question, Cavallero must decide if he is willing to cooperate with Donohue. Second, because Cavallero *does* choose to cooperate with Donohue, but in an extremely unforthcoming way. Before his retort, “who me? (.) you’re not that intelligent.”, there is an audible pause, which may signal Cavallero’s reticence. Nevertheless, Cavallero *does* reply, and in such a way as to participate in the comparison of Donohue to the Taliban. As such, the third reason why this extract is significant is because it is the first example of a spoken co-produced metaphor within the discourse setting. Cavallero does not drop the ball. Instead he chooses to toss it back at Donohue, but not before advancing his own agenda, that of constructing his opposition as unintelligent. In turn, Donohue catches the ball and advances *his own* agenda, by referring to the kind of punishment Cavallero would receive if Donohue *was* a member of the Taliban.

4.2.3 The Nazi metaphor

(118-20)

BD uh that’s right, and if we- and if we put a swastika out on on a uh on a stamp in the United States, we could call that art. it was an art exhibition. I don’t think Jews would go for that.

(131-2)

CC yes I do uh hopefully, and I’d like to add, to the gentlemen who referred to the swastika uh: he’s: actually acting like, a Nazi (.) [and I=]

This metaphor is another significant example of how the two men co-produce a metaphor to advance their separate agendas. Donohue introduces a metaphor whereby he contrasts how an artistic rendering of the swastika would be considered offensive to Jewish people, just as Cavallero's chocolate sculpture of Jesus is offensive to Christians. This serves to advance Donohue's agenda, that of constructing the sculpture as inappropriate. Yet, only ten lines later, Cavallero returns to the image of the swastika and extends it to construct Donohue as acting like a Nazi, which serves to advance Cavallero's agenda, that of constructing Donohue as inappropriate.

4.2.4 The garbage metaphor

(92-4)

BD alright, first of all Leonardo, you're not (.) but quite frankly, where should you
uh have this- this displayed? in New Jersey is where New Yorkers put their
garbage. it's a big sanitation dump. that's where you should put it.

(106-8)

BD if in fact it was at some dump in SoHo, I probably wouldn't pay too much
attention, but the fact that [the Roger Smith Hotel=]

CC [°some dump in SoHo?°]

(138-47)

CC =no excuse me, where you do think that an artist should exhibit his work, that you don't infringe on.

BD well, you know, go to some dump down in [SoHo where nobody=]

CC [a dump?]

BD =will pay attention.

CC is there a church down in SoHo that's a dump [too? because no let me tell you something,=]

BD [oh:: you'd like to get into, yeah, yeah,]

CC =there's two priests that have wanted to exhibit this in their church.

This metaphor is significant because Donohue works very hard to establish it before Cavallero joins in. Donohue advances his own agenda by constructing the sculpture as garbage or as belonging in a dump three times before Cavallero catches the ball and tosses it back. Yet, Cavallero *does* toss it back by questioning whether a church can be constructed as a dump, thus successfully advancing *his own* agenda by introducing the fact that he has received offers from priests to exhibit his sculpture, which Donohue constructs as “garbage”, in their church.

5.0 Discussion

I began my analysis with the following two research questions: If cooperation is a necessary condition for engaging in certain activities, in the case of arguing, an activity characterized by opposition and confrontation, how does this willingness to cooperate manifest? How do two people engaged in a heated argument cooperate with one another in order to co-produce a meaningful interaction, while simultaneously disaffiliating themselves with one another and weakening one another's positions? To answer these questions, I undertook the analysis of three interactional features: self-reference, other-reference, and metaphorical language. Emerging from my analysis are

four highly-intertwined themes: constructions of the identity of the self, constructions of the identity of the other, affiliation, and disaffiliation.

Before turning to my research questions, it would be helpful to address one additional question: What is cooperation? Grundy summarizes the pragmatist Paul Grice's Cooperative Principle as "make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged" (2000, p.74). Yet, although the Cooperative Principle provides a good general rule for *how* to cooperate, it fails to account for *why* two people who clearly dislike one another would *want* to cooperate. To answer this question, Mey suggests that one way to view cooperation is "as a kind of rationality ('without cooperation communication wouldn't be possible, hence we had better cooperate')" (1993, p.71). He goes on to explain that this issue:

is one of moral philosophy and practical politics: Can people who have conflicting interests, and sometimes in fact are at battle with one another (such as Palestinians and Israelis, Iraqis and Americans, Sunnites and Shiites, Serbs, Croats and Muslims in former Yugoslavia, and so on) really be supposed to adopt cooperative behaviour as the basis for conversational, and in general, communicative behaviour? (1993, p.71)

Turning now to my research questions, in the case of Cavallero and Donohue, cooperation does seem to manifest, as Mey suggests, "as a kind of rationality" (1993, p.71), but more than that, cooperation seems to occur on both sides as a means to a particular end. Both men cooperate insofar as cooperation serves to advance their separate agendas. As I illustrate in my analysis of self-reference and other-reference, throughout their interactions, Cavallero and Donohue are constantly engaged in an angry game of tug-of-war. Donohue uses self-referring terms like "we" and "my people" to construct himself as belonging to a larger group of dissent. Cavallero uses self-referring terms like "Catholic" to invalidate Donohue's group. He further uses

other-referring terms like “your rhetoric” to extricate Donohue from his group. Donohue, in turn, widens the scope of his group by affiliating himself with other groups such as “Jewish Muslim Hindu”. Cavallero, for his part, uses self-referring terms like “we” and “artists” to construct himself as belonging to a larger group of opposition. Donohue, to counter this, uses other-referring terms like “loser artists” to invalidate Cavallero’s group. Cavallero, in response, widens the scope of his group and further invalidates Donohue’s group by affiliating himself with groups such as “people in your organization”. Throughout this tug-of-war, Cavallero uses other-referring terms like “this gentleman” to signify mock politeness to Donohue, while Donohue uses other-referring terms like “pal” to signify condescension. The two men keep to their scripts faithfully, barely wavering from their roles.

In my analysis of the metaphorical language, I illustrate how the men further deign to cooperate by engaging in what Mey calls “wording the world” (1993, p.300) together. That is, the men engage in the co-production of intricate metaphors, which span many speaking turns and rely on a shared understanding of the world. Further complicating matters, the origins of two of the metaphors (“the artist’s mother metaphor” and “the Taliban metaphor”) occur outside the discourse setting. Yet, the men deftly engage in co-producing these metaphors together, each for their own purposes. Donohue manipulates the metaphors to emphasize the inappropriateness of the sculpture (“the artist’s mother metaphor” and “the Nazi metaphor”), and to denigrate the sculpture (“the garbage metaphor”). Cavallero manipulates the metaphors to denigrate Donohue (“the Taliban metaphor”), to emphasize the inappropriateness of Donohue’s actions (“the Nazi metaphor”), and to invalidate

Donohue's representation of all Catholics ("the garbage metaphor"). In this discourse setting, a single metaphor stretches to serve two separate agendas.

Indeed, as they say, it *does* take two to tango, and these men willingly cooperate in the execution of this intricate dance, at once self-constructing themselves as speaking on behalf of the majority, constructing the other as inappropriate, and negotiating their affiliations and disaffiliations with one another's groups. As Edwards (1995) found, such negotiations often occur as script formulations, in "recurring, predictable, sequential pattern[s]" (p.319) even throughout this relatively short (seven-minute) interaction.

6.0 Conclusion

The limitations in my analysis are many. For reasons of scope, my analysis is limited to three interactional features. Attention to other features such as turn-taking, floor-holding, and face-saving would doubtlessly serve to enrich my discussion. Moreover, my analysis concentrates exclusively on Cavallero and Donohue, and neglects to account for Cooper's interactions. Cooper's role in the discourse setting is certainly an important one. He begins the excerpt in the role of the interviewer, but eventually is forced into the role of the mediator. Attention to his interactions in the discourse setting would further enrich my discussion.

Additionally, the generalizability of my findings to other discourse settings is limited. My aim to analyze an example of an argument between two people resulted in an analysis of an argument between Cavallero and Donohue. Without going beyond this discourse setting and analyzing other examples of arguments, I have no way of knowing whether these interactional features would manifest similarly in other

contexts. However, where I feel my analysis has been modestly successful is in its discussion of the possible manifestations of cooperation in a context characterized by opposition and confrontation: the argument.

References

Cameron, D., 1995. *Verbal hygiene*. London: Routledge.

Catholic League, 2008. *Catholic league: for religious and civil rights*. Available from: <http://www.catholicleague.org> [Accessed 25 March 2008].

Cavallero, C., 2007. *Biography*. Available from: <http://www.cosimocavallero.com/biography.htm> [Accessed 10 May 2007].

Cavallero, C. and Donohue, B., 2007. Interview. In: *Anderson Cooper 360°*. TV, CNN. 2007 March 30.

CNN Programs, 2008. *Anderson Cooper*. Available from: http://www.cnn.com/CNN/anchors_reporters/cooper.anderson.html [Accessed 25 March 2008].

Cohen, R., 1987. Analyzing the structure of argumentative discourse. *Computational linguistics*, 13 (1-2), 11-24.

Daily News, 2007. Sweet Jesus exhibit exorcised. *Daily news*, 31 March. Available from: http://www.nydailynews.com/news/2007/03/30/2007-03-30_sweet_jesus_exhibit_exorcised.html [Accessed 11 May 2007].

Edwards, D., 1995. Two to tango: script formulations, dispositions, and rhetorical symmetry in relationship troubles talk. *Research on language and social interaction*, 28 (4), 319-350.

Grundy, P., 2000. *Doing pragmatics*. 2nd ed. London: Arnold.

Kadushin, P., Pesce, N. and Saul, M., 2007. No room at the inn. *Daily news*, 31 March. Available from: http://www.nydailynews.com/news/2007/03/31/2007-03-31_no_room_at_the_inn-1.html [Accessed 10 May 2007].

Merriam-Webster Online, 2008. Definition of “fatwa”. Available from: <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/fatwa> [Accessed 25 March 2008].

Mey, J., 1993. *Pragmatics: an introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Pesce, N. and Salamone, G., 2007. Choc full o' anger. *Daily news*, 31 March. Available from: http://www.nydailynews.com/news/2007/03/30/2007-03-30_choc_full_o_anger_.html [Accessed 10 May 2007].

Robinson, D., 2006. *Introduction to performative pragmatics*. New York: Routledge.

Schiffrin, D., 1996. Narrative as self-portrait: sociolinguistic constructions of identity. *Language in society*, 25, 167-203.

Appendix A

- 1 AC but today the exhibit was canceled after a big outcry by (.) Catholics. the
2 Catholic League called the sculpture, which is anatomically correct, an- (.)
3 hate speech. that's what they called it. the artist, Cosimo Cavallero, (.) sees it
4 differently of course and he's been getting threats for it, (.) a few minutes ago
5 I talked with him and to Bill Donohue, president of the Catholic League.
6 ((music)) Cosimo, I- I want to start by asking you what your intention was:
7 with, with this, this piece of art.
- 8 CC uh: my intention was to uh: celebrate uh: (.) this: body of Christ and: in a
9 sweet uh: delicious tasteful way.
- 10 AC wh- why use chocolate.
- 11 CC uh: because: it's: uh: a substance that I like, (.) and uh: it's sweet (.) and: uh: I
12 felt that the body of Christ th- s- the meaning of Christ (.) is uh: about the
13 sweetness,
- 14 AC w- were you trying to shock? I mean to uh: to cause attention uh often- usually
15 uh when when Christ is shown uh: he- he's wearing some form of clothing,
16 this is a naked Christ. which has also uh c- caused some concern.
- 17 CC uh no more than th- th- the religion the way they use it. I mean, I was just
18 using it as an iconic figure. I mean that I- my intention was to shock people, (.)
19 n- uh no. I was- my intention was to uh: have them uh: taste? th- and feel what
20 they're looking at, in their mouth.
- 21 AC B- Bill, you you've ca- called this exhibit hate speech, you've said it's quote,
22 one of the worst assaults on Christian sensibilities ever. wh- what specifically
23 offends you about it.

- 24 BD well: of course asking the public to come in and eat Jesus with his genitals
25 exposed during Holy Week I think would be self-explanatory. if we took an
26 image of this artists's mother, and made her out in chocolate, and with her
27 genitals exposed of course to be uh equal, and then asked the public to eat her
28 on Mother's Day, yeah he might have a problem maybe he wouldn't, but you
29 know what bothers me, it's not even th- the artist, I mean we have a lot of
30 these loser artists, down in SoHo and around the country, what bothers me is
31 that this guy knows who's the artist in residence the owner the president and
32 see-ee-oh ((CEO)) of an establishmentarian site, the Roger Smith Hotel, forty-
33 seventh and Lexington in the heart of [midtown Manhattan=]
- 34 CC [°I'm a loser°]
- 35 BD =that's what bothers me cause now we have the establishment kicking in, (.)
36 and:, you know, and to- to put this out during Holy Week, on street level when
37 kids can walk in off the street, these people are morally bankrupt and I- my
38 goal is to make him financially bankrupt.
- 39 AC Cosimo, d- do you understand the the outrage this has caused? I mean do you
40 think it's o- overreaction d- do you get it?
- 41 CC yeah I get it I think it's an overreaction I- you just heard the gentleman calling,
42 artists losers, or me a loser, (.) um:: I think what he's- his assault is on the
43 public (.) at large, artists, and freedom of speech, (.) and every Catholic. I'm a
44 Catholic, and I'm a Christian, (.) and I think this gentleman uh doesn't even
45 represent th- the people (.) that are in his faith. (.) [uh:::]
- 46 BD [that that's] funny you- you
47 said I put out a fatwa, (.) right?=
48 CC [°mhmm°]

- 49 BD [=or th- or th-] that was th- the guy who ran th- the Lab↓, said I put out a
50 fatwa? I put out a news release? so you're accusing me of being like the
51 Taliban, is that right?
- 52 CC (.) who me? (.) you're not that intelligent.
- 53 BD oh.hh.hh.no, let me tell you something you're- you're lucky I'm not as mean
54 because you might lose more than your head.
- 55 AC Co- Cosimo did you want people to eat this, w- was that part of this?
- 56 CC no:↓, did you hear what th- this gentle.hh.man is saying that I'd lose my head?
- 57 BD no I- you- you heard what I said, I said you- you're lucky I'm not like the
58 Taliban cause you would lose more than your head, [which is why guys like
59 you wouldn't do this against Mohammed at Ramadan.]
- 60 CC [right therefore there I-
61 I- I- th- that's]
62 no because I'm a Christian and I'm not [trying to,]
- 63 BD [oh you're Christian please.] don't lie
64 about it, all right? [don't lie about it.]
- 65 CC [I'm not] n- I'm not lying about it.
- 66 BD [yes you are.]
- 67 AC [D- D- David,]
- 68 CC [I wanna ask] you a question uh Mr. Donohue,
69 BD yes.
70 CC where do you think I should exhibit this cause y- you've bamboozled an ar- an
71 art gallery,
72 BD [°right°]

- 73 CC [and] you've bamboozled an establishment, (.) you've put fear in people, (.) to
74 listen to your rhetoric, (.) and to believe just because the man has got his arms
75 extended, (.) and he's made in chocolate, it's your Christ, and its offensive
76 [and by the way=]
- 77 BD [that's right]
- 78 CC =and- excuse me I gotta talk to you for a minute you keep quiet
- 79 BD [and and you- you want the public to eat him with his genitals exposed right?]
- 80 AC [w- w- wait let Co- let-]
- 81 CC [now you go to the Catholic Church you go you go you go to the Catholic
82 Church,=]
- 83 AC let Cosimo finish his point.
- 84 CC =you go to the Catholic Church and you're gonna see statues from
85 Michelangelo, (.) that are nude (.) are you going to clothe them? for th- the uh
86 the Holy Week?
- 87 BD ok, [you are,]
- 88 CC [and] are you're telling me that, a- a- apart from the Holy Week, we can do
89 anything we want with the genitalia? what are you talking about?
- 90 BD [the,]
- 91 AC [OK] let Bill answer.
- 92 BD alright, first of all Leonardo, you're not (.) but quite frankly, where should you
93 uh have this- this displayed? in New Jersey is where New Yorkers put their
94 garbage. it's a big sanitation dump. that's where you should put it.
- 95 AC Bill, let me read you something that that D- David Crow, the former special
96 assistant to President Bush, who worked in the office of faith-based
97 community initiative said, in reference to your protest, he said quote, instead

- 98 of getting all amped up over this art, (.) Christians should be spending time
99 facing the real and very challenging Jesus found in the Gospels,=
100 BD °correct°
101 AC =and encouraging others to do the same. are are you making are you making a
102 bigger deal out of this than it than it deserves?
103 BD [no::, no, no, no,]
104 AC [and doesn't] this in fact, give this more attention than it ever would have
105 received otherwise?
106 BD if in fact it was at some dump in SoHo, I probably wouldn't pay too much
107 attention, but the fact that [the Roger Smith Hotel=]
108 CC [°some dump in SoHo?°]
109 BD =right here in New York city is doing this thing? no. if I don't pay attention to
110 it then I- I- my people should ask me to be fired. by the way, I am delighted
111 with the response from Jews, Muslims, and others, not just Catholics, and
112 Protestants with this. people are basically saying enough is enough. this is
113 absolutely revolting, and what you're saying sir is totally disingenuous, no one
114 believes it I don't even think you believe it.
115 AC but, Bill doesn't? doesn't? I- I mean, don't people have a right to express
116 themselves? and art- isn't that what art is about? aren't artists supposed to
117 provoke thought?
118 BD uh that's right, and if we- and if we put a swastika out on on a uh on a stamp
119 in the United States, we could call that art. it was an art exhibition. I don't
120 think Jews would go for that. just because art is art doesn't mean th- that it's a
121 right that's absolute. art can be insult- insulting and it can be offensive. and
122 when these people are are are whining, claiming victim status, as this guy is

123 doing, because of my exercise of my First Amendment right of freedom of
124 speech, I didn't call the cops to come in and censor this, I'm simply saying, I
125 called up about five hundred of my friends in- running different Catholic
126 Protestant Jewish Muslim Hindu and nonsectarian organizations to boycott,
127 the Roger Smith Hotel, they're morally bankrupt, I want to see them
128 financially bankrupt.

129 AC uh Cosimo, uh:: I wanna give you the final thought. (.) wh- wh- do you plan t-
130 t- to display this elsewhere?

131 CC yes I do uh hopefully, and I'd like to add, to the gentlemen who referred to the
132 swastika uh: he's: actually acting like, a Nazi (.) [and I=]

133 BD [((laughter))]

134 CC =I would like to ask one question, where do you suggest, that I exhibit this
135 because you basically pulled it out of a gallery for me, [so where do you think,
136 where=]

137 BD [no, I- I- I told you]

138 CC =no excuse me, where you do think that an artist should exhibit his work, that
139 you don't infringe on.

140 BD well, you know, go to some dump down in [SoHo where nobody=]

141 CC [a dump?]

142 BD =will pay attention.

143 CC is there a church down in SoHo that's a dump [too? because no let me tell you
144 something,=]

145 BD [oh:: you'd like to get into,
146 yeah, yeah,]

147 CC =there's two priests that have wanted to exhibit this in their church.

- 148 BD is that right?
- 149 CC yeah [absolutely.]
- 150 BD [give me their names,]
- 151 CC I will not, because you're a [bully]
- 152 BD [((laughter))]
- 153 CC and you know what? I believe that there's people in your organization that
- 154 would like you to resign.
- 155 BD is that right?
- 156 CC absolutely. and you you you g-=
- 157 BD [well, how come I haven't heard from them?]
- 158 CC [=and I got to tell you something] there's more filth that comes out of your
- 159 mouth
- 160 BD is that right?
- 161 CC yeah.
- 162 BD look you lost:, you know what? you put your middle finger at the Catholic
- 163 Church and we just broke it [didn't we pal, yes we did.]
- 164 CC [no:, you're wrong:] you're wrong: [I have a lot of
- 165 believers (.) and I'm a Christian and,=]
- 166 BD [we won, and
- 167 you're out of a job.]
- 168 CC =there's a lot of people like me who are opposed to what you're doing,=
- 169 BD yeah but I got [a job and you don't.]
- 170 CC [=because you made,] you made- I got a job and you don't?=-
- 171 BD [yeah I got a job and you don't.]

- 172 CC [=you're acting like a five-year-old,] you're ta- acting like a five-year-old, and
173 I feel [sorry for you.]
174 AC [alright,=]
175 BD [I-,]
176 AC [=well, we're] going to,

About the author

Erin Bidlake is in year three of the Integrated PhD program in Education and Applied Linguistics in the School of Education, Communication, and Language Sciences at Newcastle University. Any questions or comments on this paper are welcome and can be sent to: e.e.bidlake@newcastle.uk.ac.