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In Linguistics 001 at Penn, students are assigned a final project, which should “explain something about how a piece of talk (or text) works”.

“More exactly: analyze the communicative effects of some aspects of one or more linguistic performances”.

Last fall, Jared Fenton submitted a project report “CM Punk, a Linguist, and Cicero walk into a bar...”
From Jared Fenton, “CM Punk, a Linguist, and Cicero walk into a bar…”  
[LING001 final project, Fall 2014]:

World Wrestling Entertainment (WWE) is a multi-billion dollar corporation dedicated to providing “sports entertainment” in the form of live, televised wrestling matches. WWE management predetermines the personality of every wrestler and the winner of every wrestling match. WWE is successful because of the excellent athletic ability of its wrestlers as well as their ability to “sell” the audience on their predetermined characters and storylines. Skill at delivering promos is therefore integral to success in WWE.

A promo is a monologue that attempts to convince the audience to buy into the wrestler’s current persona and interactions. The larger the audience pop (reaction) to a given promo, whether positive via cheers or negative via boos, the greater the indication that the audience is invested in the character that wrestler is portraying, and the more prestige that wrestler achieves in WWE.
Jared argued that the features of effective WWE promos are closely paralleled by features of Cicero’s rhetoric. In the service of this analogy, he contrasted CM Punk’s effective promo vs. John Cena with Batista’s ineffective Cena promo, comparing both to Cicero’s orations against Catiline.

This afternoon, I want to suggest a different parallel.
There is no such thing as “World Academic Entertainment” (WAE) 

... but if WAE existed, it would surely at this moment assign to a couple of its star performers exactly the storylines that Crane and Silverstein enacted today:

**BigData DigitalHumanities**  
*(the hot new challenger)*  

**vs.**  

**PoMo SocioSemiotic Entextualization**  
*(the reigning champion)*  

!!!
But despite their stark differences in style and in methods,

Crane and Silverstein are clearly engaged in the same sport.
From Boston – Gregory Crane:

**World Philology:** I treat philology as the systematic study of any textual sources where we have not be able to immerse ourselves in the original language. Philology is the process by which we struggle to capture the linguistic character of any sources where we have to develop our own understanding by interrogating the text. We may perform philology in this sense on the transcript of a film in Farsi as we might the Homeric Epics. We might even be in Tehran and studying Farsi but still apply philological analysis to enhance what we can learn by interacting with native speakers. Philology provides the methods with which we can cultivate our intellectual autonomy, examining the evidence for ourselves as we interpret what we learn from native speakers.
Crane continues:

World Philology is, in turn, only really practical because digital philology has, in turn, allowed us to begin developing World Editions, i.e., editions that are designed to make a source accessible to as many different communities as possible. World Editions are designed from the start to provide extensive support on their own and to make the texts that they represent as useful as possible as quickly as possible. But World Editions are also designed to become increasingly useful as they interact not only with other World Editions but also with the digital analogues to the print resources such as lexica, grammars, commentaries, encyclopedias, and atlases and as each component of this network including the original World Edition evolves with updates and expansions. No one group may control a World Edition but every contribution by any individual within any particular developmental thread should be identifiable, dated and credited, with recombinant versions generated according to various criteria.
From Chicago – Michael Silverstein:

What emerges from inscription of any sort – sedimentation in a graphic-visual or graphically encountered medium – is a text-artifact. It is a relatively perduuring semiotic array with objectual qualities that stimulates those who encounter it to serve as addressees (recipients) of a text, frequently, when in alphanumeric inscription, of a denotational text, a “saying something about someone(s) or something(s).” [...] Those of us who engage in fieldwork sediment or precipitate text-artifacts from encounters in which we observe or provoke cultural material we inscribe ourselves, making a record, as it were, to study and analyze in vitro rather than in vivo.

The ancestral figure of American anthropology, folkloristics, and linguistics, Franz Boas, thought of such work as being essentially a philology of the heretofore unlettered, a philology of the oppressed, as it were, in more Paolo Freirean terms. Boas advocated the publication and dissemination of primary documents developed in this fashion.
Silverstein continues:

[N]o amount of mere inscriptional collectanea, no massive data-bank of text-artifacts in either paper-printed or digitally searchable alphanumeric sort is of help in the kind of investigation I am reporting. Recall that one is trying to move from text-artifact to interactional text – what is/was happening in-and-by the moment of sedimentation – via a careful study of the metrical and deictic structures in at least one optimally conforming modeled denotational text apparent in the artifact. For this particular hermeneutic, one needs a socio-semiotic philology that interrogates text-artifacts for their sociocultural conditions of production—circulation—interpretation in some relevant framing circuits.
But today’s inheritors of the Boasian tradition enlist indigenous communities in interactive digital documentation of their languages and cultures.

[See Basic Oral Language Documentation in Papua New Guinea]
And Greg Crane’s *Perseus system* was a first attempt to move digitally from “text artifact” to “interactional text”:
Cicero’s *Oratio in Catilinam Prima in Senatu Habita*:

[Background from Wikipedia]

Running for the consulship for a second time after having lost the first time, Catiline was an advocate for the poor, calling for the cancellation of debts and land redistribution. [...]

Catiline lost again. Anticipating the bad news, the conspirators had already begun to assemble an army, made up mostly of Sulla's veteran soldiers. The nucleus of conspirators was also joined by some senators. The plan was to initiate an insurrection in all of Italy, put Rome to the torch and to kill as many senators as they could. [...]

On November 8, Cicero called for a meeting of the Senate [...] Catiline attended as well.

*Readers have been entextualizing this oration for 2,000 years.*...
Cicero Denounces Catiline, fresco by Cesare Maccari, 1882-1888.
“Interactional text” of In Catilinam:

M. Tullius Cicero, Against Catiline
Albert Clark, Albert Curtis Clark, Ed.

The Language of the Past and the Future of Ancient Studies

**Latin Word Study Tool**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>usque</th>
<th>all the way, right on, without interruption, continuously, even (Show lexicon entry in Lewis &amp; Short Elem. Lewis) (search)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>usque †</td>
<td>adv indeclform</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† This form has been selected using statistical methods as the most likely one in this context. It may or may not be the correct form. (More info)

Word Frequency Statistics (more statistics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words in Corpus</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Max/10k</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Min/10k</th>
<th>Corpus Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90,438</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M. Tullius Cicero, Against Catiline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When, O Catiline, do you mean to cease abusing our patience? In the name of heaven, Catilina, how long do you propose to exploit our patience?
quam diu etiam furor iste tuus nos eludet?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>quam</th>
<th>diu</th>
<th>etiam</th>
<th>furor</th>
<th>iste</th>
<th>tuus</th>
<th>nos</th>
<th>eludet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>how much</td>
<td>a long time</td>
<td>still</td>
<td>madness</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>your</td>
<td>us</td>
<td>will stop playing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How long is that madness of yours still to mock us?  
Do you really suppose that your lunatic activities are going to escape our retaliation for evermore?

quem ad finem sese effrenata iactabit audacia?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>quem</th>
<th>ad</th>
<th>finem</th>
<th>sese</th>
<th>effrenata</th>
<th>iactabit</th>
<th>audacia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>which</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>limit</td>
<td>itself</td>
<td>unbridled</td>
<td>will throw around</td>
<td>audacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When is there to be an end of that unbridled audacity of yours, swaggering about as it does now?  
Are there to be no limits to this audacious, uncontrollable swaggering?
Similarly, Silverstein explains (non-interactively):

Mr McGuff uses a temporal adverbial clause completely parallel to the very opening phraseology in part I. He says, “Now at-this-(place/time) I-would-arrive; now long-since it-must-have-been-kindled the fire; [from] the ends-of my-hair icicles (are-)sticking-out-from (in all directions).” Along with the simultaneous and continuative form ‘they(-are)-hanging-from it’ (i-Ł-X-vk’wá-iu-l-k-Ł), he formulates what I have termed an ‘evidential passive’, [a-]u-gwíłx-iX wa-túł ‘it [sc., the fire] must-have-been-kindled’. Such a form is generally used when, in the presence of sensorily available evidence, the speaker infers that someone must have done something to someone or something, such that the evidence is the index of this prior agentive action. It is the passive verb form of that inferentially prior action, used together with a characteristic deictic suffix -iX that independently occurs on verbs of positionality.
So let’s close with another text-artifact, where to understand

“what is/was happening in-and-by the moment of sedimentation [...] one needs a socio-semiotic philology that interrogates text-artifacts for their sociocultural conditions of production—circulation—interpretation in some relevant framing circuits.”

[-Michael Silverstein]
CM Punk *In Cenam*:
It’s not so clear anymore
who is the favorite and who is the underdog,

... but the promos are succeeding
in bringing the audience into the building!