

An Analysis of Nominal Reference Forms in English Conversational Stories*

Kyu-hyun Kim

This paper attempts to account for various uses of nominal reference forms in English conversational stories with special reference to the discourse-organizational and stance-marking functions. Focusing on references to persons introduced in conversational stories, I analyze cases in which a canonical distribution of reference forms is violated, e.g., cases in which a name is used when a pronoun is expected, by taking into account how the story is organized in terms of episodes and foreground/background distinction. I also attempt to explicate the interactional functions of reference forms like names, descriptive noun phrases, zero-anaphora, and demonstrative noun phrases by relating the organization of story-telling sequences to the speaker's stance toward the referent. The findings suggest that the uses of nominal reference forms often go beyond referring to a referent, and perform special interactional functions by conveying various types of non-referential information about the speaker's affective stance toward the referent and discourse structure in a given interactional context.

1. Introduction

This paper explicates how the speaker uses nominal reference forms such as full noun phrases, pronouns, zero-anaphora, and demonstrative noun phrases in referring to persons in conversational stories. The major goal of this paper is to examine the interactional motivations underlying the use of these reference forms by relating their functions to the particular discourse

* An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Pragmatics and Language Learning Conference held at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign in April, 1991. I am grateful to Professor Emanuel Schegloff for his insightful comments and take full responsibility for any problems that remain.

positions where they occur. Focus is on the examination of cases where the full NP or the pronoun is unexpectedly (or non-canonically) used, and on the explication of the discourse function of some of the reference forms closely associated with particular interactional contexts.

From the Conversation Analytic perspective (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson 1974), I attempt to provide a basis for systematically explicating recurrent referential practices through detailed analysis of transcribed conversational data. In analyzing the relationship between reference forms and discourse contexts, I also build on previous insights into the functional nature of nominal reference in conversation and narrative (Fox 1987; Grimes 1975; Labov and Waletzky 1967). Special reference is made to the *stance-marking function*¹ of nominal reference forms which indexes the speaker's discourse-organizational concerns and affective stance in various interactional and sequential environments (cf. Ochs and Schieffelin 1989).

In section 2, I analyze the cases where full NPs or pronouns are unexpectedly used, especially the cases where the former is used when the latter is expected, by relating their occurrences to the local reference domains organized in terms of episode and foreground/background boundaries. Section 3 is devoted to the analysis of the interactional functions of affectively loaded descriptive noun phrases and zero-anaphora with reference to the organization of the story-telling sequence. In section 4, I look briefly at the affective stance-marking function of demonstrative NPs containing general nouns.

2. Unexpected Uses of Nominal Reference Forms in Story

2.1. Locally Initial and Locally Subsequent Forms

Following Schegloff (lecture notes), full NPs can be roughly categorized into recognitionals (i.e., names), non-recognitionals (e.g., "this guy") (Sacks and Schegloff 1979), and category terms (e.g., "father"). These forms are termed *locally initial forms* in that they are usually used when the speaker introduces a certain referent in a local context. The local contexts are operationally defined as referring to domains of talk observably delineated

¹ Following Biber and Finegan (1989), "stance" is defined as referring to the speaker's various attitudes toward the propositional content of the message.

by some on-topicness or sequence boundary which is engendered by the operation of a turn-taking system. Within the local domain of talk, pronouns are termed *locally subsequent forms* in the sense that they are used to refer to a referent which was introduced in a prior context. These two types of canonical reference forms, then, are defined with reference to the usual place in a local domain in which they occur; locally initial forms are used in locally initial positions, and locally subsequent forms are used in locally subsequent positions. Fig. 1 below sums up the inter-relations between reference forms and reference positions:

<i>Locally initial position</i>	<i>Locally initial form</i> recognitionals (names) non-recognitionals category terms	<i>Locally subsequent form</i> ((Unexpected use)) pronouns
<i>Locally subsequent position</i>	((Unexpected use))	

Fig. 1. Reference to persons

If we examine conversation discourse, we find a number of non-canonical cases where our expectation regarding the form-position correlation is violated, i.e., where locally initial forms are used in locally subsequent positions, or locally subsequent forms are used in locally initial positions. In many cases, these unexpected uses can be explained as the speaker's attempt to disambiguate referents of the same sex (in the former) or to simply treat some referent as presupposed (in the latter). However, they are often functionally and interactionally motivated to fulfill a certain function beyond that of reference.² In the following discussion, I will attempt to ac-

² For instance, Fox (1987) reports a few cases where a locally initial form (e.g., a full NP) is used in a locally subsequent position in "disagreement" contexts. This point is illustrated in the fragment below:

- (SN-4: 4) (excerpted from Fox 1987)
- 70 S: You didn't come tuh talk tuh Kerin?
71 (0.4)
→ 72 M: No (0.2) Kerin: (0.3)
→ 73 M: Kerin 'n I (are) having a fight after
74 she went out with Keith

In line 72 M disagrees with S in response to S's question. Here we find that the referent "Kerin" is mentioned in S's question, and is then mentioned again in

count for various types of special work performed by unexpected uses of full NPs or pronouns by explicating the structure of the conversational stories in which they appear as well as the interactional motivations underlying their uses.

The segment of talk that I will examine in the following discussion is from the Auto Discussion data (hereafter AD data), which consists of video-taped multi-party backyard picnic conversations involving three couples. In this data, three male friends (Mike, Curt, and Gary) are the major participants in the interaction, and mostly talk about cars and car races.

2. 2. Episode Boundary and Foreground/Background

One of the salient features of the referential practice in stories is that locally initial forms like recognitionals (i.e., names) usually occur at an episode boundary.³ This point is illustrated in example (1) below, which is excerpted from the AD data.

In this fragment, Mike, who saw a car race the night before, is telling his friends (Curt and Gary) a story about a fight between two car racers (DeWald and Keegan) that occurred following the race. The story is organized into two episodes (or sub-episodes). In the first episode, which extends from line 83 to 98, Mike describes how the conflict between the two racers was triggered during the car race; DeWald is described as the one who caused the trouble by interfering with Keegan's car. The second episode of the story, which starts in line 100, describes the fight scene following the car race. In this episode Mike describes how Keegan took charge against DeWald and subdued him. The arrows mark the point where each episode begins, and we can readily note that at each of the episode boundaries (i.e., lines 83 and 100) DeWald and Keegan are mentioned by recognitionals:

M's disagreeing answer in lines 72 and 73. As Fox notes, this instance shows a case where "a statement or question is made by one speaker, which is then disagreed with by the other participant, and the reference in both the statement/question and the disagreement are made with full NPs" (1987: 63).

³ While it is difficult to give an exact definition of "episode" boundary, such a boundary is observable when the speaker starts a story-telling event after a turn-by-turn talk, or when the speaker mentions or re-mentions a certain referent in such a way that projects a description of a new event that constitutes a move toward the upshot of the story.

- (1) (AD: 10)⁴
- 83 Mike: =This, De Wa: : ld spun ou: t. 'n he waited.
84 (0.5)
- 85 Mike: Al come around'n passed im Al wz leadin the feature,
86 (0.5)
- 87 Mike: en then the sekint-place guy,
88 (0.8)
- 89 Mike: en nen Keegan. En boy when Keeg'n come around
90 he come right up into im tried tuh put im imtuh th'wa: ll.
- 91 Curt: Yeh?
- 92 Mike: 'n 'e tried it about four different times finally Keegan
93 rapped im a good one in the a: ss'n then th-b-DeWald
94 wen o: ff.
95 (0.5)
- 96 Curt: Mm
[
- 97 Mike: But in ne meantime it'd cost Keegan three spo: ts' nnuh
98 feature.
- 99 Curt: Yeah?
- 100 Mike: So, boy when Keeg'n come in he- yihknow how he's
101 gotta temper anyway, he js: :: wa: :: : h sc// reamed iz
102 damn e: ngine yihknow,
- 103 Curt: Mm
104 (0.5)
- 105 Mike: setting there en 'e takes iz helmet off'n clunk it goes
106 on top a' the car he gets out'n goes up t'the trailer
107 'n gets a god damn iron ba: r? .hhh rraps that trailer

⁴The transcript notations are from Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson (1974) and Atkinson & Heritage (1984):

Underlining	Indicates stress (high pitch)	.	Falling intonation
// or [Indicates overlapping utterances	,	Continuing intonation
=	Indicates contiguous utterances	?	Rising intonation
:	Indicates sound stretch	hhh	Audible aspirations
-	Indicates cutoff	.hhh	Audible inhalations
(0.0)	Intervals between utterances	(())	Transcriber's remarks
()	Words unclear		

- 108 en away he starts t'go en evryboddy seh hey you don't
 109 need dat y'know, seh ye: h yer right'n 'e throws//
 110 that son 'vabitch down- .hhhhhhh
 111 Curt: Mm hm hm

In the following discussion, I examine this segment of talk in more detail by focusing upon unexpected uses of nominal reference forms. I first analyze the first episode of example (1), which contains a number of unexpected cases. For the sake of convenience, the first episode of the story is reintroduced below as example (1-1). The lines that contain unexpected uses of reference forms are marked with an arrow:

- (1-) (AD: 10)
 83 Mike: =This, De Wa: : ld spun ou: t. 'n he waited.
 84 (0.5)
 → 85 Mike: Al come around'n passed im Al wz leadin the feature,
 86 (0.5)
 87 Mike: en then the sekint-place guy,
 88 (0.8)
 → 89 Mike: en nen Keegan. En boy when Keeg'n come around
 → 90 he come right up into im tried tuh put im imtuh th'wa: ll.
 91 Curt: Yeh?
 → 92 Mike: 'n 'e tried it about four differen times finally Keegan
 → 93 rapped im a good one in the a: ss'n then th-b-DeWald
 94 wen o: ff.
 95 (0.5)
 96 Curt: Mm
 [
 → 97 Mike: But in ne meantime it'd cost Keegan three spo: ts'
 98 nnuh feature.
 99 Curt: Yeah?

First of all, we find that some of the referents are mentioned by recognitional repeatedly. For instance, in line 85, "Al" is referred to by a recognitional twice. The relevant part of the story is shown below:

- 83 Mike: =This, De Wa: : ld spun ou: t. 'n he waited.
 84 (0.5)

- 85 Mike: Al come around'n passed im Al wz leadin the feature,
 86 (0.5)
 87 Mike: en then the sekint- place guy,
 88 (0.8)

While the first recognitional "Al" is not unexpected because the character is introduced in a locally initial position, i.e., first time in the episode, the second "Al" is unexpected in that the use of a locally subsequent form, like a pronoun, would be canonically expected because the referent was mentioned in the immediately preceding utterance.

This unexpected use of recognitional can be accounted for by referring to the distinction between *foreground* and *background*. As many studies show, the foregrounded part usually coincides with a description of the actual sequential events where a change in the order of any two clauses signals a change in the order of the actual events, while the background parts do not reflect the sequentiality of actual events (Hopper 1979; Hopper and Thompson 1980; Labov 1972; Labov and Waletzky 1967). Following this definition, we can readily note that the utterance containing the second "Al" ("Al wz leadin the feature,") in line 85 is not sequentially ordered with respect to the surrounding clauses,⁵ while the preceding utterance containing the first "Al" ("Al come around'n passed im") is sequentially ordered in relation to other clauses in lines 83 and 87, reflecting the actual order in which the real-world event occurred.

The association of the unexpected use of recognitionals with the change of context from foreground to background is also observed in line 89, where "Keegan" is mentioned by a recognitional twice:

- 85 Mike: Al come around'n passed im Al wz leadin the feature,
 86 (0.5)
 87 Mike: en then the sekint-place guy,
 88 (0.8)

⁵ This utterance also can be treated as backgrounded following Hopper and Thompson (1980), who define background as "that part of a discourse which does not immediately and crucially contribute to the speaker's goal, but which merely assists, amplifies, or comments on it" (1980: 280). Furthermore, the ING verb form marking progressive aspect ("leading"), which marks incomplete actions, is often associated with background (Hopper and Thompson, 1980: 286).

- 89 Mike: en nen Keegan. En boy when Keeg'n come around
 90 he come right up into im tried tuh put im imtuh th'wa: ll.

As I observed above, the first utterance in line 89 (“en nen Keegan”) is a part of the preceding foregrounded portion of the story in terms of sequentiality which reflects the actual order in which the cars were observed to be passing in the visual field of the speaker; DeWald’s car comes first, and Al passes him. Then the second place racer comes around, who is followed by Keegan.

As for the second recognitional referring to “Keegan” in the same line (“En boy when Keeg’n come around”), we can readily note that it occurs in the subordinate clause, e.g., the preposed WHEN-clause, where the speaker repeats and reformulates the preceding utterance (“en nen Keegan”) in such a way that he uses it as a frame for the following important message regarding the first contact between DeWald and Keegan.⁶ The WHEN-clause, in this respect, can be treated as background in the sense of Givon (1984), who defines background portions of the discourse as “satellites, side-trips, supportive portions of the description/episode/communication (1984: 288),” which often contain presupposed, shared information relating to the already transacted part of the discourse.⁷

⁶ Grimes (1975) calls this type of preposed WHEN-clause *anaphoric linkage*, i.e., a linkage that indicates a break in discourse and initiates a new segment of talk. It is further to be noted that the preposed WHEN-clause has a salient discourse-organizing role (cf. Ford, 1993) providing a setting in which “Keegan”, who turns out to be a good guy opposing “DeWald”, the villain, is introduced in the context of *complicating action* (cf. Labov and Waletzky 1967; Labov 1979). This point is also supported by the presence of the exclamative “boy” before the WHEN-clause, which conveys the speaker’s stance of expressing surprise and projects some big event.

⁷ We find in line 97 of example (1-1) another instance where “Keegan” is mentioned by a recognitional in a locally subsequent positon:

- 92 Mike: 'n 'e tried it about four differen times finally Keegan
 93 rapped im a good one in the a: ss'n then th-b-DeWald
 94 wen o: ff.
 95 (0.5)
 96 Curt: Mm
 [
 → 97 MikeL But in ne meantime it'd cost Keegan three spo: ts' nnuh
 98 feature.

It is worth noting that, while a shift from foreground to background triggers a referential shift, such a shift affects “Keegan”⁸ and “Al”, but not “DeWald”. That is, we find that “DeWald” is continuously referred to by pronouns throughout the episode (lines 83, 90, and 92) after he was first introduced in the episode-initial position. One striking instance for such a continuous reference to “DeWald” is observed in line 90:

89 Mike: ... En boy when Keeg'n come around
 → 90 he come right up into im tried tuh put im imtuh th'wa: ll.

It is to be noted that the pronoun in the subject position in line 90 (“he”) refers to “DeWald”, not “keegan”, even though the grammatical position consideration initially forces us to treat the pronoun as referring to “Keegan”, who is the agent in the same grammatical position of subject in the immediately preceding WHEN-clause (“when Keeg'n come around”).

This unexpected use of the pronoun can be explicated with reference to the manner in which the episode is organized and developed from the viewpoint of the central character of the episode, who happens to be “DeWald”, not “Keegan”. That is, this first part of the story, which is initiated by the introduction of “DeWald” (line 83), is organized from DeWald’s perspective, which is shared by the story-teller, in terms of what he did to another character “Keegan”. This observation suggests that the central character with whom the speaker shares perspective serves as a continuous reference point, thus not likely to be conditioned by the foreground/background distinction.⁹

We can readily note that Mike’s utterance in line 97 constitutes a backgrounded portion of the story that follows the foregrounded part; as the use of the past perfect tense suggests (“it’d cost”), it is not sequentially ordered with respect to the preceding and following utterances, but only makes a situational comment.

⁸ We find that “Keegan” is again referred to by a recognitional in a locally subsequent position in line 92 (“finally Keegan rapped in a good one”), which occurs in a foregrounded part following the backgrounded part of the episode (“n’e tried it about four differen times”).

⁹ While it may be argued in relation to example (1-1) that the relationship between the use of recognitionals for minor characters and the foreground-background distinction is due to the presence of several characters of the same gender in the episode, the same observation holds in the fragment below, where the major and the minor characters are different in gender:

3. Organization of Story and Affect Display

In the preceding section I have examined some of the unexpected uses of recognitionals and pronouns in the first episode of the story through the analysis of example (1-1). In this section, I examine further the functions of reference forms, particularly those of recognitionals, descriptive referential terms, and zero anaphora, used in the first episode as well as in the second episode of the story. Special attention is paid to the functions of nominal reference forms that display the speaker's affective stance toward the referent, which has implications for the organization of story.

3. 1. Recognitionals and Descriptive Noun Phrases

While it was observed that "DeWald", as the central character of the first episode, is continuously mentioned by pronouns throughout example (1-1), we find that he is suddenly referred to by a recognitional in line 93:

92 Mike: 'n 'e tried it about four different times finally Keegan
 → 93 rapped im a good one in the a: ss'n then th-b-DeWald
 94 wen o: ff.

What we can note about this context is that the recognitional occurs in a

(PC, 118)

1 Vic: She was about this big. I'm not kidding you about dis big
 2 'n she say-
 3 ((thumping around))
 → 4 Vic: En she came ovuh tuh Walkuh an' Walkuh had a spot on his
 5 pants man ah dunno coffee aw miwk uh sumpn she siz oh you
 6 got-a: : hehh hh: : m awready mah mind man...

In the context preceding this segment of the story, "she" has been established as the central character who serves as the major reference point in the story. That is, the speaker tells the story by assuming the perspective of the central character, who has been referred to by pronouns. On the other hand, the minor character, "Walkuh", who is the speaker's male friend, is referred to by a recognitional twice in line 4. Examination of the context shows that first recognitional occurs in the foregrounded part of the story where she approaches "Walkuh" ("En she came ovuh tuh Walkuh"), while the second one occurs when the speaker provides background information about a spot in walkuh's pants ("an, walkuh had a spot on his pants").

portion of the episode where Mike weaves his evaluation of the character “DeWald” while providing a wrap-up statement about the episode. This observation can be taken to point to the use of recognitionals (as opposed to pronouns) within the context of evaluation.¹⁰

It is interesting, in this respect, that the recognitional “DeWald” in line 93 is preceded by Mike’s self-repair (“th-b-DeWald”). Here the abandoned phrase “th-b” can be viewed as marking the onset of the descriptive term “the bastard”, which expresses the speaker’s particular negative affective stance toward DeWald.¹¹

¹⁰ The association of recognitionals with evaluation is congruent with Bolinger (1979), who uses the term *reidentification* to refer to the unexpected use of a full NP where a pronoun is expected. He claims that in such cases speakers make an assertion about the referent’s inherent nature, rather than talk about a description of a specific event. This point is further supported by the fragment below:

(GTC 3: 32)

- 1 Ther: An’ that’s puzzling?
 → 2 Ken: No, that’s Pete-Pat McG(hh)ee hehhh
 3 Ther: Is that puzzling?
 4 Ken: Yes, that(hh)t i(hh)s puzzling hehh
 → 5 Roger: So Pat McGee is (a) puzzle.

In lines 2 and 5, the referent “Pat McGee” is referred to by recognitionals. Given that this talk constitutes an assessment context where the speakers evaluate what kind of person McGee is on the basis of the preceding talk, there is a sense in which the unexpected use of recognitionals has much to do with the expression of the speaker’s stance and subjectivity, which are conveyed through generic statements concerning the referent’s inherent nature or characteristic behaviors as opposed to through the objective description of an event (also see line 11 in example (3)). In this respect, the use of a locally initial form in a locally subsequent position, as opposed to the use of a pronoun, can be brought to bear upon Lyons’s (1982) distinction between the *experiential and historic* modes of description, with the former being characterized by the greater subjectivity associated with the speaker’s subjective commentary or the description of the speaker’s experience, and the latter by the relative objectivity of the straightforward narration of events.

¹¹ In subsequent talk following this story, Mike refers to DeWald by the same evaluative term “bastard”. His negative stance toward DeWald is also conveyed here by the use of another derogatory term, “ass”, in line 93. The self-repair from the explicitly negative descriptor to the recognitional (“th-b-DeWald”) may be motivated by the speaker’s attempt to be not so explicit in expressing his negative stance toward the referent, because the speaker has not yet finished his story. In-

A similar pattern is also observed in the closing section of the second episode of example (1), where Mike describes the fight scene involving DeWald and Keegan.¹² The second episode is reintroduced below as example (1-2). In this episode, Mike describes how Keegan, who is now presented as the central character, reacted to DeWald after the car race. Mike uses another derogatory descriptive term for “DeWald” in line 110 (“that son’vabitch”), where he wraps up the whole story:

- (1-2) (AD: 10)
- 100 Mike: So, boy when Keeg’n come in he-yihknow how he’s
 101 gotta temper anyway, he js: :: wa: ::: h sc// reamed iz
 102 damn e: ngine yihknow,
 103 Curt: Mm
 104 (0.5)
- 105 Mike: setting there en ’e takes iz helmet off’n clunk it goes
 106 on top a’ the car he gets out’n goes up t’the trailer
 107 ’n gets a god damn iron ba: r? .hhh raps that trailer
 108 en away he starts t’go en evryboddy seh hey you don’t
 109 need dat y’know, seh ye: h yer right’n ’e throws//
 → 110 that son’vabitch down- .hhhhhhh
 111 Curt: Mm hm hm

It is important to note that this derogatory descriptive term occurs in what Labov and Waletzky (1967) call the *resolution* section where the speaker imbues the final state of the description of events with his evaluation. That is, the derogatory stance marker occurs when Mike provides the upshot of the whole story, the outcome of the fight *per se*, and at the same time exits

deed, as the following discussion will show, Mike produces later another negative descriptive term “that son’vabitch” when he wraps up the whole story. This observation suggests a close relationship between the speaker’s explicit expression of affect and the final resolution part of the story.

¹² We can readily note that, as in the case of the preposed WHEN-clause in line 89, the preposed WHEN-clause in line 100 initiates a new segment of talk, this time a new episode, which is again preceded by the exclamative “boy” that projects the upcoming main point of the story in an affectively loaded manner. This observation shows that the WHEN-clause plays a significant discourse-organizational role by way of wrapping up the preceding episode, and providing information essential to the projected upshot of the story (cf. footnote (6)).

from the story with laughter in which the interlocutor (Curt) collaboratively participates (lines 110 and 111). Given that a story usually ends with the interlocutors' collaborative production of assessment or a second story, and that the transition from a story to a turn-by-turn talk is often achieved on the basis of the interlocutors' highest level of affective orientation to the story (Jefferson 1978; Goodwin and Goodwin 1987), we find that the use of the negative descriptive term for "DeWald", who is presented as the "villain" as opposed to the "good guy" ("Keegan"), constitutes a part of the speaker's assessment strategy, which invites the interlocutor's collaboration with the negative evaluation of the character.

3.2. Zero-Anaphora

Now, if we examine closely the second episode presented in example (1-2), we find two instances of zero-anaphora used for "Keegan"; "Keegan" is referred to by zero-anaphora in line 107 (".hhh rraps that trailer") and line 109 ("seh ye: h yer right"):

- 105 Mike: setting there en 'e takes iz helmet off'n clunk it goes
 106 on top a' the car he gets out'n goes up t' the trailer
 → 107 'n gets a god damn iron ba: r? .hhh rraps that trailer
 108 en away he starts t' go en evryboddy seh hey you don't
 → 109 need dat y'know, seh ye: h yer right'n 'e throws//
 110 that son'vabitch down- .hhhhhhh
 111 Curt: Mm hm hm

In accounting for this practice, we should first note that "Keegan", who is now the central character, is presented as being involved in a single continuous sequential event. Mike here describes a series of actions initiated by Keegan toward DeWald, which occurred continuously and rapidly in succession in contrast to the first episode, where he described sequentially organized events involving several characters. In this sense, we find that the zero-anaphora, as a more continuous reference mode than the pronoun, is motivated by the high degree of topic continuity of the event and of the referent (Givon 1983).

It should be pointed out, however, that the use of zero-anaphora is motivated not only by the way in which the event is described as a topically

continuous one, but also by special interactional concerns, which have implications for the organization of the story. If we examine the episode in (1-2) in detail, we can note that the zero-anaphora in line 107 (“.hhh rraps that trailer”) occurs after a try-marker, i.e., an utterance with an upward intonational contour inviting the interlocutor’s acknowledgment (“gets a god damn iron ba: r?”) (Sacks and Schegloff 1979). The occurrence of the zero-marked subject following the try-marker suggests that the speaker uses the zero-marking to highlight the sequentiality of the event and to enhance the interlocutors’ co-participation in the on-going description.

In a similar vein, the zero-marking in line 109 (“seh ye: h yer right”) occurs as a part of the quoted dialogue; it is situated in a direct speech where Keegan responds to the preceding utterance (“everybody seh hey you don’t need dat y’know”). Given the finding that a direct quotation often invites the interlocutor’s involvement in the story (Tannen 1989; Mayes 1990), the use of zero-anaphora here seems to be designed to further the effect of the vivid, on-going description of the dialogue, and to upgrade the interlocutors’ co-participation in the story-telling activity.

It is important to note that, from a discourse-organizational point of view, these two instances of zero-anaphora occur where the speaker makes the major point of the story. That is, this is a place in the story-telling sequence where the speaker presents the upshot of the story, up to which all the preceding portions of the story have led, i.e., the fight scene *per se*. These observations suggest that, while the use of zero-anaphora may be motivated at the utterance level to highlight the sequentiality of the event being described, it may also be motivated at the discourse-organizational level by the interactional need to invite the interlocutors’ involvement and co-participation in the course of leading the interlocutors to appreciate the upshot of the story.¹³

As a whole, the preceding discussion suggests that various uses of full

¹³ Zero-anaphora is sometimes used to highlight the sequential description of an event in such a way that it continues some preceding description of the event by crossing over utterances which display backgrounded features. The example provided below is a case in point, where Gary talks about an event in which a snowmobile turned out to be very fast even with a heavy person on it. The zero-marking is used in line 7 (“Took im fer a ride”) after Gary provides some background information about the referent “Bill” in lines 1, 2, and 6, describing how heavy he is:

NPs like recognitionals or descriptive referential terms can be explicated with reference to the speaker's expression of a particular affective stance toward a referent in certain places in the story, as well as with reference to the speaker's discourse-organizational concerns, such as marking a boundary between episodes or between the foreground and the background. Locally subsequent forms like pronouns, in contrast, may mark the referent as the central character whose perspective the speaker takes on when relating the episode. The preceding discussion also points to the highly continuous reference mode marked by the use of zero-anaphora, whose interlocutor-involving function may be closely intertwined with the interactional context where the speaker invites the interlocutor's appreciation of the upshot of the story.

4. Demonstrative Noun Phrases

In this section, I briefly examine the discourse functions of demonstrative noun phrases containing a *general noun* (Halliday and Hasan 1976), such as "that guy" or "this guy", in story-telling contexts. By examining the contexts where these forms are used as locally subsequent places, I look at the interactional work performed by demonstrative NPs that would not be achieved by the use of pronouns, the canonical type of locally subsequent form.

- (AD: 36)
- | | | |
|-----|-------|--|
| 1 | Gary: | Well 'e took <u>Bi//ll</u> (Silvio). a good friend a' mine, |
| 2 | | he weighs about two hunnerd'n s : |
| 3 | | ((Background noise)) |
| 4 | | (0.5) |
| 5 | | ((Background noise)) |
| 6 | Gary: | <u>two</u> hunnerd'n (ty) five pounds I think 'e weighs. |
| → 7 | | Took im fer a <u>ride</u> on that'n Bill said that he wz et |
| 8 | | <u>least</u> goin <u>eighty</u> miles'n <u>hour</u> . With the <u>two</u> of 'em |
| 9 | | on it. |

The zero-marking in line 7 continues the previously halted line of talk in line 1 ("Well 'e took Bi//ll (Silvio)"), thus creating a context where the speaker shows that he is resuming the main line of the story (cf. Schegloff 1987; Fox 1985). It is also noteworthy that the zero-anaphora occurs in the context where the speaker invites the interlocutors' collaboration and involvement while leading to the upshot of the episode.

In explicating the use of this type of demonstrative NPs, I examine story-telling sequences from the Group Therapy Session data (hereafter GTS), which are loosely structured group therapy conversations in the course of which teenage participants produce a series of stories.

Example (2) below illustrates a story-telling sequence where several demonstrative NPs are found. In this fragment, two of the participants, Jim and Ken, are telling the other participants about events involving “McGee”, a person they personally know:

(2) (GTS 4: 17)

- 1 Jim: Like yesterday it was dead at State Beach, we were
 2 d-all down to State Beach, I didn't go to school the
 3 other day, neither did he. We were all down at State
 4 Beach so he puts on his little-it was dead down there,
 5 so he n-he was gonna live it up so he put on this little
 6 leopard bathing suit he bought for a buck you know
 7 this little teeny leopard bathing suit. He's walkin up
 8 an' down the beach with heh one of those things on,
 9 (): ((sigh))
 → 10 Jim: That'guy's just radical.
 11 Ken: Well-
 → 12 Jim: That guy will do anything for a laugh.
 → 13 Ken: That guy used to g- // Pat McGee used to think that
 14 it was the funniest thing in the world to get up at four
 15 inna morning, and yell, come into my room and yell
 16 ((loud whisper)) “Ken! Ken! You're late you're late
 17 you're late!” I'd jump up outta bed you know thinkin
 18 my alarm// clock didn't go off, run out and wake
 19 everybody up an' we had another half hour to sleep,
 20 you know?
 21 Jim: ahhhh ((sniff))
 22 Jim: heh heh heh hahh!
 23 Roger: hhh hhhh hehhhehhh

From lines 1 to 8, Jim relates an episode describing the unique character of the referent “McGee”. In lines 10 and 12, Jim uses a demonstrative NP “That guy” to refer to “McGee” in the context of assessing the preceding

story. The demonstrative NP is situated in an assessment context where Jim produces an affectively loaded statement concerning what kind of person McGee is, which is further highlighted by such intensifiers as “just (radical)” and “anything (for a laugh)” (cf. Labov 1984).

It is worth noting, in this respect, that in line 13 Ken also uses the demonstrative NP “That guy” for McGee, though he initiates self-repair and replaces the demonstrative NP with a recognitional (“That guy used to g-//Pat McGee used to...”). The interactional motivation for the shift from “that guy” to “Pat McGee” can be accounted for by relating the self-repair to the organization of the story-telling sequence. Ken’s self-repair occurs just at the point where he initiates another episode about McGee as a *second story* following Jim’s *first story* (Jefferson 1978), thus terminating the on-going assessment talk. Given the association of recognitionals with an episode-initial position (see section 2) and the association of demonstrative NPs with an assessment context, we find that the self-repair correlates with the shift of context from assessment to new story. That is, the shift to the recognitional “Pat McGee” can be treated as motivated by Ken’s attempt to initiate a new episode, with the initial use of the demonstrative NP “that guy” resulting from the trailing-off of the on-going assessment activities. This observation, again, suggests the association of demonstrative NPs with assessment contexts where the speaker imbues his/her utterances with affective evaluation of the referent concerned.

While it is beyond the scope of this paper to compare different forms of demonstratives (i.e. *this* and *that*) in terms of interactional functions,¹⁴ we can briefly note that the use of “this guy” shares the affect-marking, evaluative function of “that guy” examined above (cf. Lakoff 1974). In example (3) below, for instance, Ken uses the demonstrative NP “this guy” in line 7 to refer to “McGee”, who was introduced earlier, in a highly affectively loaded way, thus highlighting again the unique character of McGee:

¹⁴ The differences in interactional functions between “this” and “that” could be explicated in future research by considering how their spatial meanings are metaphorically extended to refer to the speaker’s attitude toward the referent, particularly in terms of turn-taking organization (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson 1974), territoriality of information (Kamio 1991), or the involvement/detachment distinction (Chafe 1982). For a discussion of differences between “this” and “that” in general, see Lakoff (1974) and Strauss (1993).

(3) (GTS 4: 27)

- 1 Ther: So you sh--there's a lotta strange behavior going on
 2 (which you can't)quite explain and' which (you don't)
 3 quite understand. // Maybe-
 4 Ken: No I don't un-I don't// understand it at all! heh hhh
 5 Ther: (Maybe you're impressed.)
 6 Ken: It--it'd be very- it'd be very hard to uh to really relate
 → 7 what this guy is really like! You can't-y-it-it's beyond
 8 imagination to think of uh-
 9 Jim: That'd be a real challenge for a psychiatrist.
 10 Ken: Yeah!
 11 Jim: Pat McGee.

We can readily note that the mysteriously unique character of McGee is affectively highlighted by various *contextualization cues* (Gumperz 1982) such as high stress (“really like!”) and the intensifier “really”, as well as by the saliently evaluative nature of the context in general.¹⁵

The examination of the GTS data in general strongly suggests that the use of demonstrative NPs like “that guy” or “this guy” is indeed associated

¹⁵ This type of affective stance-marking function is also observed where demonstrative NPs like “this guy” are used as what Sacks and Schegloff (1979) call “non-recognitional” (cf. Figure 1), a locally initial form which is used where identification of a referent is presented by the speaker as not being crucial in any respect to the talk. The fragment below is a case in point, where Ken is talking about a classmate with a severe daydreaming habit, who is introduced by a non-recognitional in line 1 (“Uh: this guy”):

(GTS 5: 25)

- 1 Ken: Uh: this guy, you could yell “Hey Jo: hn, hey Jo: : hn, hey
 2 Joh-” ’n you c’d go over an’ tap him on the shoulder.
 3 Roger: So he’s gotta // good imagination.
 4 Ken: That’s the only way you c’n snap him out of it.

In lines 1 and 2, Ken vividly describes how hard it is to make “John” stop daydreaming, implying that even yelling or tapping might not work. Here Ken’s use of the demonstrative NP “this guy” is situated in an affectively tuned evaluative context where the allegedly unique daydreaming habit of his classmate is highlighted. We find that the speaker’s affective stance toward his classmate is further emphasized through various contextualization cues such as the high pitch with which the demonstrative is uttered (“this guy”) and the direct quotation that follows (“Hey Jo: hn, hey Jo: : hn, hey Joh-”).

closely with the assessment context where the speaker expresses his/her affective stance toward the referent. In many cases, the character being referred to is in a sense described and defined in light of the speaker's particular affect toward him/her. It is clear that this kind of interactional function, conveying non-referential information regarding the speaker's emotional attitude toward the referent, cannot be achieved by the use of pronouns. Expressions of affect often serve to invite the hearer's collaboration with the speaker, thus contributing to building camaraderie between speakers as illustrated in examples (2) and (3) (also see the fragments in footnotes (10) and (15)).

These observations are congruent with Lakoff (1974), who discusses some of the uses of demonstratives as *emotional deixis*, which functions to establish emotional closeness between speakers.¹⁶ Furthermore, as Halliday and Hasan (1976) observe, we can point out that this type of affect-marking function of demonstrative NPs may partly derive from the nature of general nouns such as "guy", whose function is noted to have much to do with "the expression of interpersonal meaning, of a particular attitude on the part of the speaker" (1976: 276).

5. Conclusions

Various uses of nominal reference forms in story-telling contexts can be explicated with reference to the speaker's discourse-organizational and stance-marking strategies. In cases where a locally initial form is used in a locally subsequent position, the speaker often expresses his/her affective

¹⁶ Actually, we find several instances of demonstratives in the examples examined above, which all seem to indicate the speaker's affective evaluation of the referent in various ways. For instance, from example (1):

(Excerpted from example (1))

- 83 Mike: =This, De Wa: : ld spun ou: t. 'n he waited. ⇐ *Beginning of the story*
 : : :
 109 Mike: ... 'e throws//
 → 110 that son'vabitch down-.hhhhhhh ⇐ *End of the story*

Here we find that demonstratives are used at the points where the speaker begins as well as ends the story, which certainly would constitute interactionally significant places where the speaker may display or assert his affect (also see the fragments in footnotes (10) and (15)).

stance toward the referents, as well as his/her discourse-organizational concerns, by way of evoking an episode boundary or a foreground/background boundary. In cases where locally subsequent forms like pronouns are used, the speaker shows his/her particular co-alignment with the referent by signaling that the referent is the central character with whom he/she shares perspective. This contrasts with recognitionals or descriptive noun phrases, which convey with varying degrees of explicitness the speaker's evaluation of the referent in the resolution section of the story. Zero-anaphora is sometimes used when the speaker describes a series of continuous actions at some high point of the story in such a way as to invite the interlocutors' involvement through various discourse strategies. It was also noted with reference to demonstrative NPs that they often serve as a stance-marker expressing the speaker's affect in evaluating a referent in an assessment context.

These findings suggest that the special effect that the speaker achieves through various uses of nominal reference forms goes beyond the canonical referential function of referring to some person or of disambiguating referents of the same sex. The use of reference forms is often motivated by the speaker's discourse concerns and stance in the course of variably aligning with the referent in question. Such an expression of a speaker stance toward a referent also relates to the current interactional framework in which the speaker variably aligns himself/herself with the interlocutor (Goffman 1979). In this respect, various aspects of referential practice can be analyzed in terms of the speaker's action of maintaining or triggering a shift in *footing*¹⁷ (Goffman 1979; Levinson 1988).

While the findings in this paper are mostly of a preliminary nature, they suggest that, in English conversational stories, nominal reference forms subsuming locally initial and locally subsequent forms are often employed as devices whereby the speaker signals a change in footing in such a way that the interlocutor is variably tuned and clued to the speaker's discourse-organizational concerns or affect. Indeed, we find that the English nominal

¹⁷ Goffman (1979) gives a definition of "footing" as follows: "A change in footing implies a change in the alignment we take up to ourselves and the others present as expressed in the way we manage the production or reception of an utterance. A change in our footing is another way of talking about a change in our frame for events (1979: 10)."

reference constitutes one of the grammatical domains in which non-referential and discourse- or speaker-relevant information is conveyed (cf. Besnier 1990; Ochs and Schieffelin 1989). From a cross-cultural perspective, the oppositionally distinctive function of indexing different speaker stances among various types of locally initial forms and locally subsequent forms in English may be comparable to the uses of some of the particles in topic-prominent languages like Korean or Japanese, where they also function as stance-markers that convey non-referential, speaker-relevant information that often negotiates the discourse relevance of the current proposition (cf. Kim 1993).

In conclusion, I hope that I have shown one way in which functional and interactional perspectives can enrich the linguistic analysis of nominal reference forms. The findings in this study should be further refined and validated in future research through detailed analysis of more conversational data of a wider variety. Such a line of research could lead to a cross-linguistically informative analysis of referential practice in conversations in general, and will shed light on the nature of various linguistic phenomena associated with reference forms by explicating systematicity and orderly organization in mundane talk.

References

- Besnier, N. (1990) 'Language and Affect,' *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19, 419-451.
- Biber, D. and E. Finegan (1989) 'Styles of Stance in English: Lexical and Grammatical Marking of Evidentiality and Affect,' *Text* 9.1, 93-124.
- Bolinger, D. (1979) 'Pronouns in Discourse,' In T. Givon, ed., *Syntax and Semantics, Volume 12: Discourse and Syntax*. N. Y.: Academic Press.
- Chafe, W. (1982) 'Integration and Involvement in Speaking, Writing, and Oral Literature,' In D. Tannen, ed., *Spoken and Written Language: Exploring Orality and Literacy*, Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.
- Ford, C. (1993) *Grammar in Interaction: Adverbial Clauses in American English Conversations*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fox, B. (1985) 'On the Creation of Discourse by Grammar,' In S. Delancy and R. S. Tomlin, eds., *Proceedings of the First Annual Meeting of the Pacific Linguistics Conference*, University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore-

gon.

- Fox, B. (1987) *Discourse Structure and Anaphora: Written and Conversational English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Givon, T. (1983) 'Topic Continuity in Discourse: an Introduction,' In T. Givon, ed., *Topic Continuity in Discourse: A Quantitative Cross-Linguistic Study*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Givon, T. (1984) *Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction*, Volume I. John Benjamins: Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Goffman, E. (1979) 'Footing,' *Semiotica* 25, 1-29.
- Goodwin, C. and M. H. Goodwin (1987) 'Concurrent Operations on Talk: Notes on the Interactive Organization of Assessments,' *IPRA Papers in Pragmatics* 1, 1-54.
- Grimes, J. (1975) *The Thread of Discourse*, The Hague: Mouton.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982) *Language and Social Identity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K., and R. Hasan (1976) *Cohesion in English*, London: Longman.
- Hopper, P. (1979) 'Aspect and Foregrounding in Discourse,' In T. Givon ed., *Syntax and Semantics, Volume 12: Discourse and Syntax*, N. Y.: Academic Press.
- Hopper, P. and S. Thompson (1980) 'Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse,' *Language* 56, 251-299.
- Jefferson, G. (1978) 'Sequential Aspects of Storytelling in Conversation,' In J. N. Schenkein, ed., *Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction*, N. Y.: Academic Press.
- Kamio, A. (1991) 'Cleft Sentences and the Territory of Information,' In C. Georgopoulos and R. Ishihara, eds., *Interdisciplinary Approaches to Language: Essays in Honor of S.-Y. Kuroda*, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Kim, K.-H. (1993) 'Topicality in Korean Conversation: Conversation Analytic Perspective,' In P. Clancy, ed., *Japanses/Korean Linguistics*, Volume 2, Center for the Study of Language and Information, Stanford University.
- Labov, W. (1979) 'The Transformation of Experience in Narrative Syntax,' In W. Labov, ed., *Language In The Inner City*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Labov, W. (1984) 'Intensity,' In D. Schiffrin, ed., *Meaning, Form, and Use in Context: Linguistic Applications* (Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1984), Washington D. C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Labov, W. and J. Waletzky (1967) 'Narrative analysis: Oral Versions of Personal Experience,' In June Helm, ed., *Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts*, University of Washington Press.
- Levinson, S. (1988) 'Putting Linguistics on a Proper Footing: Explorations in Goffman's Concepts of Participation,' In P. Drew and A. Wootton, eds., *Erving Goffman: Exploring The Interaction Order*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Lyons, J. (1977) *Semantics 2*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mayes, P. (1990) 'Quotation in spoken English,' *Studies in Language* 14.2, 325-363.
- Ochs, E. and B. Schieffelin (1989) 'Language has a Heart,' *Text* 9.1, 7-25.
- Sacks, H. and E. Schegloff (1979) 'Two Preferences in the Organization of Reference to Persons in Conversation and Their Interaction,' In G. Psathas, ed., *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology*, N. Y.: Irvington.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. and G. Jefferson (1974) 'A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation,' *Language* 50, 699-735.
- Schegloff, E. (1987) 'Recycled Turn Beginnings: A Precise Repair Mechanism in Conversation's Turn-Taking Organization,' In G. Button and J. R. E. Lee, eds., *Talk and Social Organization*, Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Strauss, S. (1993) 'Paper on "This", "That", and "It",' *Proceedings from the Annual Conferences, Chicago Linguistic Society* 29.
- Tannen, D. (1989) *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Department of East Asian Languages & Literatures
University of California, Irvine
Irvine, CA 92717
U.S.A.