

Eeva-Leena Seppänen

Ways of Referring to a Knowing Co-participant in Finnish Conversation

1. Introduction

Participation frameworks have been discussed extensively in recent years. The analysis of participation in conversation was started by Goffman ([1979] 1981) and is carried on by C. Goodwin (1979, 1981, 1984, 1987), M. H. Goodwin (1990), Hanks (1990), and Levinson (1988) among others. This paper aims to contribute to this discussion by presenting an analysis of a case in Finnish conversation. The aim of this paper is to provide a single-case analysis of how participation frameworks are created and managed in conversation through linguistic means.¹

Goffman's ([1979] 1981) main idea was that in a multi-party speech situation the notions of speaker and hearer are too crude to be useful. Instead, there is a need to describe the *footing* which each participant has in relation to a certain utterance, and thus find the participation framework for that moment of speech. "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" (Goffman 1981: 128, 137).²

¹ I would like to thank Charles Goodwin, Auli Hakulinen, Marja-Liisa Helasvuo, Elise Kärkkäinen and Marja-Leena Sorjonen for valuable comments on earlier versions of this paper. I am also grateful to the two anonymous referees of the SKY yearbook for detailed comments and suggestions.

² See Levinson (1988) and Hanks (1990, Chapter 4) for detailed discussions of Goffman's ideas.

Goffman himself concentrated more on other types of activities than speech, but he suggested that it is the linguistic matters that “open up the possibility of finding some structural basis for even the subtlest shifts in footing” (1981: 147). Thus he challenged linguists to look at speech situations in a new way, and to re-analyze the relationship between utterances and the contexts in which they are produced.

From a linguistic point of view, it is natural to start this work by challenging existing theories of the deictic elements of language. In his study of deixis in Mayan, Hanks (1990) emphasizes that pronouns are the main linguistic resources through which participation frameworks are created and maintained in conversation. According to Hanks (1990: 138, 142), pronouns bind together the current frame of situation and the narrated frame; the frames cannot be studied separately from one another, because each partly determines the other. Hanks states (1990: 148) that:

“person categories are different from participant roles, but they are always linked to these roles through reference or indexicality. Hence the use of these deictics tends to sustain an inventory of participant frames by focalizing them, engaging them as ground for further reference, or both.”

In this paper I will analyze the use of pronouns referring to participants in a specific type of speech situation: one of the participants tells a story in which a co-present person acts as a protagonist (cf. C. Goodwin 1981: 156-159, 1984; Lerner 1992). This kind of situation can be regarded as problematic for the participants because it seemingly violates the general conversational norm, formulated by Sacks, that “a speaker should, on producing the talk he does, orient to his recipient”. (Sacks [1971] 1992: 438.) One specification of that rule is that one should not “tell your recipients what you know they already know”. Saying things which the listener already knows is often regarded as a complainable event: if you tell someone a story you have told her/him before, it is likely that s/he will stop you

as soon as s/he recognizes the story and say: "You already told me that!"

However, people often find themselves in situations where they would like to tell a story to a group of listeners even though someone in the group is familiar with it. This happens very often to couples, and Sacks describes this as a feature of "spouse talk" ([1971] 1992: 437-443). However, as C. Goodwin (1981: 159) notes: "Such problems are not confined to spouses; they emerge whenever parties who have experienced an event together are jointly in a position to describe it to someone else." In these situations, the story has at least two kinds of recipients: the *knowing recipient* (see C. Goodwin 1979), who acts as a protagonist in the story and who is also a potential co-teller, and the *unknowing recipients*, to whom the story is new. The story must be designed in a way that makes it suitable for both types of recipients. In this kind of a situation the participation framework is more complex than in a prototypical situation of story-telling where the narrator is telling something which is new and unknown to all recipients.

The presence of a knowing recipient requires special orientation by all the participants, especially by the speaker and by the knowing recipient. Through detailed analyses of several complex participation frameworks, C. Goodwin has shown how delicate the methods are which participants have developed in order to deal with both knowing and unknowing recipients in conversation (see, for example, 1979, 1981: 149-166, 1984). The method I use is in principal similar to his: a detailed turn-by-turn analysis of an interesting and intricate piece of data. However, my aim is somewhat different: Goodwin focuses on the joint vocal behaviour of the teller and the recipients, and analyzes both vocal and non-vocal communicative behaviour, especially gaze, whereas I will focus mainly on the vocal behavior of the narrator. My main point is to understand the linguistic choices s/he makes.³ This understanding is best

³ As a matter of fact, Goodwin (1984) provides an analysis of a situation which is quite parallel to the one analyzed here. He analyzes a story which is

received through a turn-by-turn analysis of the complete situation and each participant's role in it.

In the story to be analyzed below, the narrator is explicitly, with specific linguistic items, referring to the knowing recipient and marking that the latter is somehow involved in the story. Finnish has several linguistic items available which can be used for this purpose. Some examples of them are given below to orient non-Finnish readers to the phenomenon.

(1) The first-person plural pronoun *me* 'we' can refer inclusively to both the speaker and to the knowing recipient. When the referents are first introduced, the knowing recipient needs to be identified in some way, for example, by name. For this purpose a construction such as *me X:n kanssa* is often used. This construction is glossed in English "we X(GEN) with", but in normal usage this construction will always be understood to involve only the speaker and the other named individual. In the example below, Mella begins to tell about the adventures she and Henna had when the two of them were hitch-hiking in Scotland. Henna is sitting beside her.

01 Mella : **me**-häl l:iftas -i -mme **Henna**-n
we-PRT hitch-hike-PST-PL1 lnameF-GEN

02 kanssa Lok Nessi-lle,
 with Loch Ness-ALL

01 Mella : **Henna and I** hitch-hiked to Loch Ness

told at a dinner-table when one couple is visiting another. The wife tells about a *faux pas* which her husband committed during a visit to their friends. Among other things, Goodwin analyzes in detail how the participants organize themselves in relation to each other through the telling, with special attention to how the telling-specific identities **teller**, **addressed recipient**, **nonaddressed recipient**, and **principal character** are made relevant, displayed, and differentiated from each other. He focuses on the actions of each participant in turn, and as his data are videotaped, it is possible for him to pay attention both to the vocal and the non-vocal behaviour of the participants.

(2) Addressing the knowing recipient with the second-person pronoun and/or a name:

- 01 Sanna : m:(h)uista-t-han **sä Raita** ku me
remember-SG2-PRT you lnameF when we
- 02 ol-t-i-i (0.5) m:- m- Mäkelä-n
be-PASS-PST-4. lname-GEN
- 03 Puu:stelli-ssa >ei-ku< mikä se-n nimi
tavern -INE NEG-PRT what it-GEN name
- 04 ol-i, Puumala-ssa.
be-PST placename-INE
- 01 Sanna : **you** r(h)emember **Raita** when we were (0.5)
02 in m:- m- Mäkelän Puustelli >or< what was
03 it called, in Puumala.

(3) Referring to the knowing recipient by name (in the third person):

- 01 Raija : No.(.) N:yt ku **Ta:rja** tul -i
well now when lnameF come-PST-3
- 02 >millo-s se tul-i< jo
when-PRT she come-PST-3 already
- 03 perjantai-n kot:i-i
Friday -ESS home-ILL
- 01 Raija : Well. (.) N:ow when **Ta:rja** came home
02 >when did she come< on Friday already

(4) Referring to the knowing recipient by the third-person pronoun *hän* or *se* 'he/she':⁴

⁴ *Hän* is the standard third-person singular pronoun in written texts, *se* in the spoken vernacular. In written texts, *hän* only refers to human beings, and *se* only to non-human entities. In the spoken language, *se* can refer both to human and non-human entities, whereas *hän* is mainly used in reported speech.

01 Noora : **s(h)e** pud(h)ot-ti t(h)ommo-se-n
 he drop-PST-3 that kind -ACC

02 l(h)ampu-n pöydä-l- heh heh .hh
 lamp -ACC table-ALL

01 Noora : **h(h)e** dr(h)opped that k(h)ind of
 02 a l(h)amp on the table heh heh .hh

(5) Referring to the knowing recipient by a proximal demonstrative pronoun *tää* (<*tämä*) 'this one':

01 Noora : =**tää** k(h)aat(h)-o äiti-n
 this spill-PST-3 mother-GEN

02 a(h)inoa-ll(h)e pellava-l(h)iina-ll(h)e
 only -ALL linen tablecloth -ALL

03 k(h)ah(h)vi-n
 coffee -ACC

01 Noora : =**this one here** sp(h)ill(h)ed the
 02 c(h)offee on mother's o(h)nly linen
 03 t(h)ablecl(h)oth

(6) Referring to the knowing recipient by a distal demonstrative pronoun *tuo* 'that one':

01 Noora : .hh hehe se l(h)ipsaht-i po[hja-lle heh
 it slip-PST-3 ground-ALL

02 Leena : [ai tippu
 oh fall-PST-3

03 käde-s[tä
 hand -ELA

04 Veijo : [mitä
 what

05 Noora : .heeh heh heh [.heeh

06 Veijo : [toheloi-k-s **tuo**,
 make mess-Q-PRT that

07 () : (.)

08 () : [joo::.
yes

09 () : [haha ha[ha

10 Veijo : [hyvä.
good

01 Noora : .hh hehe it sl(h)ipped to the gro[und heh
02 Leena : [oh you

03 [dropped it

04 Veijo : [what

05 Noora : .heeh heh heh [.heeh

06 Veijo : [did **that one** make a mess,
07 (.)

08 () : [yea::h

09 () : [haha ha[ha

10 Veijo : [good.

When a narrator uses one of these items in her/his story, it is always a matter of choice: why does s/he use one variant rather than another one? It can be assumed that the choice of the referring item is crucial in constituting a particular kind of local conversational structure. More specifically, through the choice of the referring item, the knowing recipient can be constituted either as a recipient or as a co-teller, and simultaneously also the role of the other participants is formulated. The choice of the pronominal item can also have consequences for the way in which the story will be built up - whose point of view is presented and which events will be focused on, whether the narrator will tell it alone or together with the other participants, and what kind of second stories (cf. Sacks [1968] 1992: 3-16) will follow.

In this paper I shall present an analysis of a conversational sequence in which the knowing recipient is referred to in several different ways, and discuss the effects these different means have in that particular conversation. Through the analysis of pronouns, I shall also analyze how shifting from one speech

activity type to another changes the participation framework of the speech situation (cf. M. H. Goodwin 1990: 239-257). I shall concentrate on the interaction of the two story-tellers and only touch upon the contributions by the unknowing recipients.

2. The Phenomenon

The data for this study come from a conversation during a birthday party with a group of young people, six young women and one man, Veijo, who are having dinner together.⁵ In the course of the evening, they have been telling several funny stories about what happened when somebody met the parents of his/her girlfriend / boyfriend for the first time. The narrating episode that will be discussed here is the fifth story in this series of stories. Noora is the narrator and her boyfriend, Veijo, is the principal character of the story.

The sequence, which is presented below, consists of the telling of two stories (one about spilling coffee on a tablecloth and the other about dropping a lamp) and their evaluation.

- 01 Veijo : [ä:: näytt-i-hän se-ki: kyllä (.) ehkä
ä:: it also seemed surely (.) maybe
- 02 Raita : [ˈheh hehˈ
- 03 Veijo : se minu-n esiintymine aika railakas-ta
that my behaviour quite wild
- 04 ˈtom[mos-taˈ PAITsi] et ʔoli< (.)
ˈyou knowˈ Except that it ʔwa< (.)
- 05 Noora : [nii taikka<]
 yes or<

⁵ Unfortunately, the conversation is not on videotape. Even though video would make possible a richer analysis, there is still a great deal to be found in simple audiotaped data. Lack of the visual from a video only restricts the characteristics of conversation one can focus on.

- 06 Veijo : [mu-st se ei kyl ol-lu [eka
I think it wasn't the first
- 07 Mella : [nohh
so hh
- 08 Noora : [↑ol-i
it ↑was
- 09 ensi-depyytti ku kaikki aina
the first debut 'cause everybody always
- > puhuu **su -n** ensi-de'pyyti-stä'. =**tää**
talks about **your** first 'debut'. =**this one**
- 11 k(h)a[at(h)-o äiti-n a(h)inoa-ll(h)e
here sp(h)ill(h)ed the c(h)offee on
- 12 (Leena): [('kuinka')
('how')
- 13 Noora : pellava-l(h)iina-ll(h)e k(h)ah(h) [vi-n
mother's o(h)nly linen t(h)ablecl(h)oth
- 14 Sanna : [.ihh]
- 15 Noora : [he he he [he he
- 16 Sanna : [.ihhh [.ihhh]
- 17 (Leena): [hih hih [hih
- 18 Raita : [hä hä hä [hä hä
- 19 Veijo : [eipäs: >jotain<
oh no: >something<
- 20 vää[räs: e: eihä tää nii ollu ku tota ni]
wrong: e: it wasn't so but well eh
- 21 Raita : [TAI si? .hh tota noi käsi tärist(h)ä]
well I GUEss your hand was shaking
- 22 Raita : hehe[he

- 23 Leena : [nii[:
ye::s
- 24 Veijo : [ei-ks tää ol-lu se juttu siis
wasn't this the story uh
- 25 (.) minä tarkota-n nyt si-tä että ku<
(.) I mean now the one that when<
- 26 () : .h(h) [hä
- > Noora : [ei sä te-i-t molemmat sama-l
no you did both things on the
- > Noora : [visiiti-l vaik sä [e-t si-tä u [sko.
same visit although you don't believe it.
- 29 Sanna : [ih[(h) [.(h) [
- 30 () : [hahaha [
- 31 Veijo : [e-n
no I
- 32 usko.
don't.
- 33 Sanna : .h(h)h [ha .hh
- 34 Noora : [mei-än perhe muista-a se-n
our family remembers it
- > elä[västi.=kaikki muu-t] paitsi sinä.
clearly.=everybody else except you.
- 36 () : [hi hi hi hi hih]
- 37 Sanna : no kerto-k(h)aa f>mimmone< se toin[enf
well t(h)ell us fwhat the other onef
- 38 (Leena): [no:
well:
- 39 Sanna : o(h)l-i. .h(h)
w(h)as like. .h(h)

- > Noora : s(h)e pud(h)ot-ti t(h)ommo-se-n l(h)ampu-n
h(h)e dr(h)opped that k(h)ind of a
- 41 [pöydä-l- heh][heh .hh [tai to-n
l(h)amp on the tab- heh heh .hh or the
- 42 (Henna) : [hmhm hehe] []
- 43 Sanna : [↑↑ha [↑↑ha
- 44 Noora : sisä-kalu-n
inside piece
- 45 Leena : ehheh [hehheh heh [he heh .hhh
- 46 () : [ha ha ha [ha
- 47 Veijo : [n(h)ous-i-n vain ni
I just g(h)ot up and so
- 48 pää kolaht-i lamppu-un ja [toi ritilä
(my) head hit the lamp and that grating
- 49 () : [mh h(h)
- 50 Veijo : tippu ja .h kaat[u maito-muki
fell down and .h the milk mug turned over
- 51 Sanna : [↑.h(h) .ehh
- 52 Raita : ahha ha[h ha hah hah
- 53 Veijo : [ˈlat-ˈ ɛmaito-muki kaatu
ˈflo-ˈ ɛthe milk mug turned over
- 54 maa-ɛ
on the groundɛ
- 55 Sanna : hi hi .h[h .hh(h)h .h(h)h]
- 56 Veijo : [pö- ɛpöydä-lleɛ j(h)a m(h)aito]
ta- ɛon the tableɛ a(h)nd the
- 57 v(h)alu (.) [tota ni (.) l(h)attia-lle
m(h)ilk was sp(h)illed (.) eh (.) on the
- 58 Sanna : [tha ha ha .ahh

- 59 Veijo : kissa-n p(h)äälle.
fl(h)oor on the cat.
- 60 Raita : ah hah ha ha ha [ha ha
- 61 (Mella) : [ha ha=
- 62 Veijo : =.h k(h)issa [s(h)ingaht-i
=.h the c(h)at fl(h)ew
- 63 Sanna : [.h(h)h
- 64 ((nauravat 1.2))
((they laugh 1.2))
- > Noora : **fsä** yrit-i-t [selvästi
fyou clearly tried to
- 66 Sanna : [.h(h)
- 67 Noora : [tappa-aɸ si-t(h)ä h(h)]
killɸ h(h)er h(h)
- 68 Sanna : [↑fei oof]t(h)ot [t(h)a h(h)]
↑ɸcan't beɸ t(h)rue h(h)
- 69 () : [eeh hehheh
- 70 Leena : [no mitä
well what
- 71 tei-än isä ja äiti sano.
did your father and mother say.
- 72 Mella : nauro.=
(they) laughed.=
- 73 Raita : =ei [se mitä(h)än [heh
=never mi(h)nd heh
- 74 () : [joo ei s(h)e [mitä-
yeah n(h)ever min-
- 75 Noora : [ftä-lle
fthis

- 76 o-n naure-ttu kyl [tä-lle en(h)si
surely has been laughed at this f(h)irst
- 77 (Sanna) : [.h(h)h(h)]
- 78 Noora : vis(h)iiti-lle ai(h)ka h(h)uole-ll[(h)a
v(h)isit qui(h)te tho(h)rou(h)ghly
- 79 () : [he heh
- 80 heh heh heh [.hh
- 81 Sanna : [.h(h)h[(h)h
- 82 Noora : [ei mut se ei ol-lu
no but it wasn't the
- > ensi-vi< (.) 'siis' **sää** e-t jää-ny
first vi< (.) 'I mean' **you** didn't stay
- 84 mei-lle ensi-visiiti-l
at our place on the first visit
- 85 [yö-ks (--)]
overnight
- 86 Leena : [koita to-ta rä] [kä-ä.
try that cheese.⁶
- 87 Veijo : [e-n mä [oo ↑SAno-nu
I haven't ↑SAid
- 88 Leena : [räkä-ä.
cheese.

⁶ Actually, Leena does not say *cheese*. The Finnish word *räkä* means literally 'snot'. The use of this word (lines 86 and 88) is a word-play. The group is having dinner, and among the dishes there is cheese which is seasoned with shrimps; it is called "shrimp-cheese". A *shrimp* is in Swedish *räka*, and the Swedish word can be seen on the package. (All products in Finland have the text both in Finnish and in Swedish; Swedish is the other official language in Finland.) The word *räka*, if pronounced in a Finnish way, sounds very similar to the Finnish word *räkä*. This word-play has been discussed at the beginning of the tape.

- 105 Leena: [ä(h) -
m(h) -
- 106 ääiti sa-i [syyttä-ä omaa
fmother could only blame her own
- 107 (): [((tyrskähtää))
(bursts in laughter)
- 108 Leena: type[r(h)yyt(h)-tä-änf
stup(h)idit(h)yf
- 109 [((nauravat))
(they laugh)
- 110 Noora: pir(h)ua-kos k(h)atto
why the d(h)evil did she l(h)ay
- 111 n(h)i[i(h)n h(h)uo(h)nos(h)t(h)i
(the table) s(h)o p(h)oorly
- 112 [((nauravat))
(they laugh)
- 113 Mella: [.hhhh ohh[oijaa,
.hhhh ohhoijaa,
- 114 Sanna: [↑ii nyt mä ↑kuol[(h)e(h)-n
↑ii now I'm gonna ↑d(h)ie
- 115 [((nau[ravat))
(they laugh)
- 116 Noora: [fet
fso
- 117 aatel-kaa si-tä ku mee-tte
think of this when you make
- 118 ↓depyyte-i[-llef.
↓debutsf.
- 119 (): [e(h)h
- 120 [hi hi
- 121 Henna: [nii:[.:
ye::s

- 122 Sanna: [ei mut siis tää lamppu o-n mu-st
no but well I think this lamp is
- 123 nyt fjotain ai:[van£ fan[t(h)ast- he heh
now fsomething really£ fant(h)ast- he heh
- 124 (): [hih [
- 125 (): [ehh heh [hah hah
- 126 (): [m: [mm:]
- 127 (): [j(h)oo
y(h)ea
- 128 Sanna: .h(h)h[hh
- 129 Noora: [nii mut se: et viel<
yea but the fact that one indeed
- > pitä-ä kissa-n pääl.=sä selvästi e-t
has to pour it on the cat.=you clearly
- 131 Noora: pitä-n(h)y [s(h)iit
didn't l(h)ike h(h)er
- 132 Veijo: [syytö-hä m(h)ie sii-(h)e
w(h)ell I w(h)as innocent of
- 133 ol-(h)i-n
that
- 134 Sanna: hi hi hi
- 135 (0.3)
- 136 (): .hh[ihhh]hh
- 137 Henna: [voi ei.]
oh no.
- 138 Mella: h(h)a[l(h)u- .h kissa] parka?
d(h)id- .h poor cat?

- 139 (): [(voi: kauhea)]
(oh my God)
- 140 (.)
- 141 (): eh he he [he
- 142 Henna: [mut onne-ks se ol-i ↓ma:ito-o.
but luckily it was ↓mi:lk.

During this sequence, the narrator Noora addresses Veijo, the protagonist, by the second-person pronoun *sä* (< *sinä* 'you') nine times (lines 10, 27, 28, 35, 65, 83, 91, 95 and 130). She refers to Veijo by a proximate demonstrative pronoun *tää* (< *tämä* 'this one') twice (lines 10 and 102), and once with the pronoun *se* (line 40), which is a third-person singular pronoun in colloquial Finnish, but is also a demonstrative pronoun.

In this section, I would like to discuss the following questions: What is the contribution of this variation to the interpretation of the story? What function does each pronoun have which could not be performed by the others?

In this sequence, there are two stories which are told in intertwined fragments. First, Veijo begins to relate something about his own behaviour during his first visit to Noora's parents (lines 1-4). Then in line 4, he begins to hesitate about whether it really was his first visit or not. This is relevant, because the topic of the conversation has for a long time been "funny things that happened on the first visit to your girl- or boyfriend's home". The hesitation gives Noora an opportunity to come in with her story which is not, as it appears, the same as the one that Veijo had in mind. Noora begins a story about how Veijo spilled coffee on the tablecloth.

(7)

08 Noora : ↑ol-i ensi-depyytti ku
be-PST-3 first debut since
it ↑was the first debut 'cause

story about dropping a lamp and pouring milk on the cat thus elicits lines 40 through 81.

Then in line 82, Noora starts the argument again about whether this happened during the first visit or not, and in line 90 she moves on to tell the story about spilling the coffee which she had been trying to tell earlier. She tells her story and evaluates it together with the other girls in lines 90-121. Then Sanna returns to the lamp story once again, and they comment on it for a while (lines 122-142).

To sum up, this sequence presents a case where two people, a couple, have experienced something together and they have to decide how to share between them the right to tell about it to others. In this case the solution is that they correct each other and compete for the right to tell by claiming that one remembers better than the other how everything happened (cf. Sacks 1992: 443, and Lerner 1992). Thus, instead of one story being told jointly, or two separate, consecutive stories, there are two stories mixed together, interrupted by arguments.

3. The Analysis

With the variation of the pronouns, Noora is involved in four types of activities. She (i) separates the knowing and the unknowing recipients, (ii) marks the speech activity type as either narrative or argumentative, (iii) turns from the here-and-now to the narrated world, and (iv) occasionally accepts the knowing recipient's right to tell what happened by offering an understanding of his story as she might upon hearing it for the first time, as one of the recipients. In the following pages, each of these activities will be analyzed separately.

3.1. Distinguishing between Knowing and Unknowing Recipients

As the second- and third-person pronouns give the referent a different participation status, the shift between them carries with it a change of footing. Thus, for example, when Noora changes the pronoun from *sä* 'you' to *tää* 'this one' or *se* 'he', she also changes the alignment she has towards the recipients. For Noora, there are two kinds of recipients: the knowing recipient Veijo and the girls, who do not know the events. In this section, I will discuss the ways in which this distinction is realized in conversation.

Noora's strategy in dealing with the two types of recipients is to make it very clear which party she is talking to. In fragments where the pronoun is *sä* 'you', Veijo is the addressed recipient, and the others are in a way excluded from the conversation, thus becoming mere overhearers for the moment. The overhearers can display an orientation to this kind of participation framework, as in the example below:

(8)

- 82 Noora : ei mut se ei ol-lu
 NEG but it NEG-3 be-PST
no but it wasn't the
- 83 ensi-vi< (.) 'siis' sää e-t jää-ny
 first vi- so you NEG-2 stay-PST
 first vi< (.) 'I mean' you didn't stay
- 84 mei-lle ensi-visiiti-l
 we -ALL first visit -ALL
 with us on the first visit
- 85 [yö-ks (--)]
 night-TRA
 overnight (--)
- > Leena : [koita to-ta rä] [kä-ä.
 try-IMP-2 that-PART "shrimp-cheese"-PART
 try that cheese.

- 87 Veijo : [e-n mä
NEG-1 I
I haven't
- 88 Veijo : [oo ↑Sano-nu että se [ei ol-lu<
be say-PSTPPP that it NEG-3 be-PST
↑SAid that it wasn't<
- >Leena : [räkä-ä. [
"shrimp-cheese"-PART
cheese.
- 90 Noora : [EI, (.) mut ensi
NEG but first
NO, (.) but on
- 91 visiiti-l sä kaado-i-t se-n
visit -ADE you spill-PST-2 it-ACC
the first visit **you** spilled the
- 92 ↑kahvi-n, (.) mei-'ä äiti-n (.) ainoa-lle
coffee-ACC we-GEN mother-GEN only-ALL
↑coffee, (.) on my mother's(.) only
- 93 pellava-liina-lle.
linen tablecloth-ALL
linen tablecloth.

In the segment above, overlapping Noora's turn in which she addresses Veijo, Leena displays that she belongs to the overhearers by starting to talk about the food (lines 86 and 89).

When the pronoun is *tää* 'this one' or *se* 'he', Noora explicitly designs her turn for the other girls and refers to Veijo in a way which does not invite him to join in and tell the story from his point of view. In other words, Veijo is made into an overhearer. By changing the pronoun, Noora linguistically turns towards Veijo or away from him.

In this way, Noora uses the choice of the pronoun as a resource for making the participation framework suitable for her purposes; the others mainly adapt themselves to the roles she offers them. The possibility for clear marking is due to one

basic choice which Noora has made: she has designed her story so that it is about Veijo, not about her own feelings or about something that has happened to both of them. In other words, she has produced a third-person narrative instead of using a first-person plural form.⁸ When the focus is on Veijo, it is possible for Noora to vary between the second-person and third-person pronouns and thus manipulate the participation framework; if she had chosen the first-person form for the story, this kind of variation would not have been so readily available.

3.2. Marking the Speech Activity Type

Occasionally, a change of footing occurs simultaneously with a change in the speech activity type. In such cases the choice of the pronoun has to be supported by other linguistic means. The examples below illustrate this.

In examples (9), (10), and (11), where Noora refers to Veijo by a third-person pronoun, she is telling a story; the utterances are reports of past events, and they are in the past tense, which is the main tense for narratives.

(9)

-> Noora : =tää k(h)a[at(h)-o äiti-n
 this spill-PST-3 mother-GEN
 =**this one here** sp(h)ill(h)ed

11 (Leena): [(`kuinka`)
 how
 (`how`)

12 Noora : a(h)inoa-ll(h)e pellava-
 only -ALL linen
 the c(h)offee on mother's

⁸ C. Goodwin (1981: 156-159) presents an analysis of a contrasting example: the story is told in first-person plural, and the knowing recipient keeps trying to interrupt with his version of the story.

13 Noora : l(h)iina -l(h)l(h)e k(h)ah(h)vi-n
 tablecloth -ALL coffee -ACC
 o(h)nly linen t(h)ablecl(h)oth

(10)

-> Noora : **tää** nykä-s s(h)e-n hihhi
 this pull-PST-3 it-ACC
 this one pulled i(h)t off hihhi

103 n(h)äin [hihi hihi
 thus
 l(h)ike this hihi hihi

(11)

-> Noora : **s(h)e** pud(h)ot-ti t(h)ommoise-n
 he drop-PST-3 that kind-ACC
h(h)e dr(h)opped that k(h)ind of

41 l(h)ampu-n [pöydä-l- heh]
 lamp-ACC table-ALL
 a l(h)amp on the table- heh

42 (Henna) : [hmhm hehe]

43 heh .hh tai to-n sisä-kalu-n
 or that-ACC inside-object-ACC
 heh .hh or the inside piece

It is interesting to compare the above examples (9), (10) and (11) to examples (12), (13), and (14). Here Noora refers to Veijo with a second-person pronoun, and the examples are not in the narrative mode. Judging by the actual content, they could be regarded as reports of events. They are, however, addressed to Veijo, to whom they are in fact no news.

(12)

08 Noora : ↑ol-i ensi-depyytti ku
 be-PST-3 first debut since
 it ↑was the first debut 'cause

-> kaikki aina puhuu **su -n** ensi-
 everyone always talk-3 you-GEN first
 everybody always talks about **your** first

10 de'pyyti-stä'
 debut -ELA
 'debut'.

(13)

-> Noora : ei **sä** te-i-t molemmat sama-l
 NEG you do-PST-2 both same-ADE
no **you** did both things on the same

-> Noora : [visiiti-l vaik **sä** [e-t si-tä
 visit-ADE though you NEG-SG2 it-PART
 visit although **you** don't

29 Sanna : [ih[(h) .h(h)

30 () : [hahaha

31 Noora : u [sko.
 believe
 believe it.

32 Veijo : [e-n usko.
 NEG-1 believe
no I don't.

33 Sanna : .h(h)h [ha .hh

34 Noora : [mei-än perhe muista-a se-n
 we-GEN family remember-3 it-ACC
our family remembers it

-> elävästi.=kaikki muu-t paitsi **sinä**.
 vividly everyone else-PL except you
clearly.=everybody else except **you**.

(14)

82 Noora : ei mut se ei ol-lu
 NEG but it NEG-3 be-PST
no but it wasn't the

- > ensi-vi< (.) 'siis' **sää** e-t jää-ny
 first vi- so you NEG-2 stay-PST
 first vi< (.) 'I mean' **you** didn't stay
- 84 mei-lle ensi-visiiti-l
 we -ALL first visit -ALL
 with us on the first visit
- 85 [yö-ks (--)]
 night-TRA
 overnight (--)
- 86 Leena : [koita to-ta rä] [kä-ä.
 try-IMP-2 that-PART "shrimp-cheese"-PART
 try that cheese.
- 87 Veijo : [e-n mä
 NEG-1 I
 I haven't
- 88 Veijo : [oo ↑Sano-nu että se [ei ol-lu<
 be say-PPC that it NEG-3 be-PST
 ↑SAid that it wasn't<
- >Leena : [räkä-ä. [
 "shrimp-cheese"-PART
 cheese.
- 90 Noora : [EI, (.) mut ensi
 NEG but first
 NO, (.) but on
- > visiiti-l **sä** kaado-i-t se-n
 visit -ADE you spill-PST-2 it-ACC
 the first visit **you** spilled the
- 92 ↑kahvi-n, (.) mei-'ä äiti-n (.) ainoa-lle
 coffee-ACC we-GEN mother-GEN only-ALL
 ↑coffee, (.) on my mother's(.) only
- 93 pellava-liina-lle.
 linen tablecloth-ALL
 linen tablecloth.

In examples (12), (13) and (14), we find several linguistic devices that are used to mark a change in the speech activity type. In examples (12) and (13), the tense changes from the past to the present (in lines 8 and 27, verbs are in the past tense, whereas in lines 9 and 28-34 they are in the present tense), and in example (14) Veijo's contribution (lines 87-88) is in the perfect tense. Noora also uses items such as *ei* 'no' (line 27), *ei mut* 'no but' (line 82) and *vaik sä et sitä usko* 'although you don't believe it' (lines 28 and 31) to deny something that Veijo has previously said. In addition, the verb-initial word order of Noora's utterance in example (12) is contrastive; this contrastiveness is further marked with very high intonation in the beginning of the utterance. The second-person pronoun works together with these other elements in marking the utterances as argumentative.⁹ This marking indicates a change in speech activity.

Argument as a participation structure is very different from story-telling. While a story expands the participation framework so that recipients have the opportunity to participate in the story-telling and evaluate the events in the story, an argument typically restricts participation in the sequence to a small set of participants, often only to two speakers (cf. M. H. Goodwin 1990: 241, 244).

The change in speech activity type does not need to be abrupt. This is illustrated in the following pair of examples. Both examples are attempts at initiating the story about the spilling of the coffee. At first, Noora begins by saying:

(15)

08 Noora : ↑ol-i ensi-depyytti ku
 be-PST-3 first debut since
 it ↑was the first debut 'cause

⁹ The terms "argumentative" and "argument" are not used here in a text-analytic sense, but rather as descriptions of a speech activity in which speakers argue over something.

09 kaikki aina puhuu su -n ensi-
 everyone always talk-3 you-GEN first
 everybody always talks about your first

-> de'pyyti-stä'.=tää k(h)a[at(h)-o
 debut -ELA this spill-PST-3
 'debut'.=this one here sp(h)ill(h)ed

11 (Leena) : [('kuinka')
 how
 ('how')

12 Noora : äiti-n a(h)inoa-ll(h)e pellava-
 mother-GEN only -ALL linen
 the c(h)offee on mother's o(h)nly linen

13 Noora : l(h)iina -l(h)l(h)e k(h)ah(h)vi-n
 tablecloth -ALL coffee -ACC
 t(h)ablecl(h)oth

When she begins the story for a second time, she says:

(16)

90 Noora : [EI, (.) mut ensi
 NEG but first
 NO, (.) but on

-> visiiti-l sä kaado-i-t se-n
 visit -ADE you spill-PST-2 it-ACC
 the first visit you spilled the

92 ↑kahvi-n, (.) mei-'ä äiti-n (.) ainoa-lle
 coffee-ACC we-GEN mother-GEN only-ALL
 ↑coffee, (.) on my mother's(.) only

93 pellava-liina[-lle.
 linen tablecloth-ALL
 linen tablecloth.

94 Sanna : [ä(h)ä .h[h .hi

-> Noora : [>su-1 ol-i< (.)
 you-ADE be-PST
 >you had< (.)

the second version Noora begins her story again, this time in an argumentative mode (lines 90-93). She prolongs the argument, which was going on in lines 82-89, by choosing a pronoun which still keeps Veijo as her addressed recipient, by using an argumentative preface *ei* 'no' and by changing the word *kahvin* 'coffee' into the form *sen kahvin* 'the coffee' which indicates that the referent is known.¹⁰

The content of this utterance *ei, (.) mut ensivisiitil sä kaadoit sen kahvin meiän äitin ainoalle pellavaliinalle* - 'no but on the first visit you spilled the coffee on my mother's only linen tablecloth' is narrative in the same way as in example (15) where the utterance functions as a beginning of a story and leads on to the details. The entire utterance has two faces: its form is argumentative, linking back to the on-going debate and thus making the turn locally relevant; but the content consists of a narrated event and the utterance projects for continuation and thus gives the speaker an opportunity to continue with the story. The change in speech activity type is made gradually. This design seems to be effective for the beginning of a story; the other participants assume the role of story recipients which Noora is offering them, and they show their appreciation for the story (lines 89-91, 94-98, 101-105).

¹⁰ This point is lost in translation. In example (15) Noora says *kahvi-n* (ACC), which means 'the particular cup of coffee you were drinking then'; the form stands in contrast to partitive form *kahvi-a* (PART), which could be just any (amount of) coffee. In example (16) *se-n kahvi-n* (PRONOUN-ACC coffee-ACC) does not merely indicate that the referent is known. For Veijo it is a reminder of the situation, 'the coffee that you remember', and thereby a prolongation of the argument. For the girls it refers to the fact that the same coffee has been mentioned earlier in this discussion.

The pronoun *se* is the same pronoun as the one that Noora uses to refer to Veijo in example (11), but it is used here as a kind of definite article. For the article-like use of *se* see Laury (1995).

12 Noora : äiti-n a(h)inoa-ll(h)e pellava-
 mother-GEN only -ALL linen
 the c(h)offee on mother's o(h)nly linen

13 Noora : l(h)iina -l(h)l(h)e k(h)ah(h)vi-n
 tablecloth -ALL coffee -ACC
 t(h)ablecl(h)oth

(18)

94 Sanna : [ä(h)ä .h[h .hi

95 Noora : [>su-l ol-i< (.)
 you-ADE be-PST
 >you had< (.)

96 ↑tässä ol-i lautasliina ↑typerästi
 here be-PST napkin stupidly
 ↑there was a napkin here ↑stupidly

97 Noora : kyllä laite-ttu kahvi -kup[i-n ja
 surely set-PPPC coffee cup-GEN and
 enough set between the cup and

98 Sanna : [.ih(h)

99 Noora : ta- (.) tassi-n fväliinf
 saucer-GEN between
 the sa-(.) the saucer

100 Leena: ni[in-pä nii[n joo.
 well-PRT well yes
 very well yeah.

101 (): [j(h)o(h)o [
 yes
 y(h)es

-> Noora : [**tää** nykä-s s(h)e-n
 this pull-PST-3 it-ACC
this one pulled i(h)t off

103 hihhi n(h)äin hihi hihi
 thus
 hihhi l(h)ike this hihi hihi

(19)

37 Sanna : no kerto-k(h)aa f>mimmone< se toin[en_f
 well tell-IMP-PL2 what kind it other
 well t(h)ell us fwhat the other one_f

38 (Leena) : [no:
 PRT
 well

39 Sanna : o(h)l-i. .h(h)
 be-PST-3
 w(h)as like. .h(h)

-> Noora : s(h)e pud(h)ot-ti t(h)ommose-n
 he drop-PST-3 that kind-ACC
 h(h)e dr(h)opped that k(h)ind of

41 l(h)ampu-n [pöydä-l- heh]
 lamp-ACC table-ALL
 a l(h)amp on the table- heh

42 (Henna) : [hmhm hehe]

43 heh .hh tai to-n sisä-kalu-n
 or that-ACC inside-object-ACC
 heh .hh or the inside piece

Were Veijo absent, Noora probably would mention his name and afterwards constantly refer to him with the third-person singular pronoun *se* ('he', literally 'it'). Yet she once refers to him with the pronoun *se* and twice with the pronoun *tää* (<*tämä* 'this' or 'this one'). How can we account for the use of *tää* here?

According to Laury (1995: 84), speakers use *tämä* to present to their addressees referents which they consider to be in their own sphere, while *se* is reserved for those referents which the speaker considers to be in the addressee's current sphere. (See also Laury, this volume.) After having just spoken to Veijo in a mode which gives Veijo the role of an addressed recipient and excludes the other participants to the role of mere

overhearers (see the previous chapter), it is natural that Noora considers Veijo as belonging to her sphere. Furthermore, when referring to the participants of an on-going conversation, *tämä* is mainly used to refer to a participant who has been the speaker of the previous turn or of some other recent turn (Seppänen 1995: 77). Thus the reference is identifiable to the other participants through Veijo's former participant roles, as a speaker and as Noora's addressed recipient. By using the pronoun *tää* 'this one' Noora pays attention to the roles Veijo has as a participant in the world of the situation where the story is being told.

In examples (17) and (18), where Noora uses the pronoun *tää* 'this one', she is just turning from argument to narrative. In (17), the previous utterance (lines 8-10: *oli ensidepyytti ku kaikki aina puhuu sun ensidepyytistä* 'it was the first debut because everybody always talks about your first debut') is part of an argument. Noora claims the right to tell the story because she thinks she remembers the facts better than does Veijo. Immediately after making that claim, Noora turns to the story (line 10). In (18), Noora starts out in line 95 in the argumentative mode, using the second-person pronoun (*sul oli* 'you had'), but switches back to the narrative mode by replacing the personal pronoun with the demonstrative *tässä* 'here'. In what follows, she uses *tää* 'this one' to refer to Veijo (line 102). In both cases, Noora takes the initiative to change the point of view from the here-and-now to the narrated world, in the middle of her own turn.

In example (19), where Noora uses *se* 's/he', the sequential position of the utterance is different. Noora is responding to Sanna, who has asked both Veijo and Noora to tell them "the other story" (line 37). Sanna has already interrupted the argument and indicated a transition to the narrated world. When Noora begins, the audience is prepared to hear a story; she has moved to the narrated world without any effort of her own.

As I see it, *tää* ('this one') falls between *sä* ('you') and *se* ('s/he'). *Sä* only refers to someone who is present in the time of telling; *se* mainly refers to someone who belongs to the narrated time of action, and *tää* can refer to both. In other words, *tää* can act as a subject in narrative clauses or utterances. In fact, this is how Noora is using it: *tää kaato* 'this one spilled' and *tää nykäs* 'this one pulled it off'. In this way *tää* refers to the protagonist of the narrated world. At the same time, however, it indicates that the person referred to is present in the here-and-now, a participant in the world of the situation in which the story is being told. Thus, the pronoun *tää* 'this one' provides a means to orient the audience to a shift in footing from the here-and-now to the narrated world, because *tää* can be used to refer to both these worlds. If, on the other hand, the change of footing has already taken place in co-operation with other participants, it is possible to use the pronoun *se*, which places the referent only in the narrated world and ignores the here-and-now.

3.4. *Sä* in Displaying Understanding of the Story

In addition to argumentative sequences, Noora uses the second-person pronoun *sä* when she offers an appreciation of Veijo's story. According to Sacks ([1971] 1992: 422), a common feature of the sequential organization of storytelling is that stories told in conversation have, on their completion, a recipient or a series of recipients offering an appreciation of the story. In other words, after a story has been told, a sequential position occurs that enables the recipients to display their understanding of it and/or to affiliate to it by showing its particular relevance to them. (Cf. also Sacks 1978: 261.) I will argue here that, in this sequential position, *sä* has a different effect on the participation framework of the moment than in the argumentative sequences: here the effect is that Noora avoids taking the position of a co-teller of the story and displays her

orientation as a story recipient. Examples (20) and (21) illustrate this:

(20)

62 Veijo : =.h k(h)issa [s(h)ing^haht-i
 cat fly-PST-3
 =.h the c(h)at fl(h)ew

63 Sanna : [.h(h)h

64 ((nauravat 1.2))
 ((they laugh 1.2))

-> Noora : **£sä** yrit-i-t [selvästi
 you try-PST-2 clearly
 £you clearly tried to

66 Sanna : [.h(h)

67 Noora : [tappa-a£ si-t(h)ä h(h)]
 kill-INF it-PART
 kill£ h(h)er h(h)

68 Sanna : [↑£ei oo£]t(h)ot[t(h)a h(h)
 NEG-3 be true
 ↑£can't be£ t(h)rue h(h)

69 () : [eeh hehheh

70 Leena : [no mitä
 well what
 well what

71 tei-än isä ja äiti sano.
 youPL-GEN father and mother say-PST-3
 did your father and mother say.

In example (20), Veijo has finished his story, the dropping of the lamp, in line 62. This has caused the recipients to burst out laughing, and Noora's subsequent utterance (line 65), which contains the second person pronoun, is the first comment on the story. Noora is accusing Veijo of causing harm to the cat; but the accusation is too absurd to be taken seriously, and it is

produced with a smiling voice. Noora's utterance offers an appreciation of Veijo's story by escalating the humour in it.

The situation in example (21) is quite similar to that in (20):

(21)

121 Sanna: ei mut siis tää lamppu o-n mu-st nyt
NEG but well this lamp be-3 I-ELA now
no but well I think this lamp is now

122 fjotain ai:[vanɛ fan[t(h)ast- he heh
something really fantastic
ɛsomething reallyɛ fant(h)ast- he heh

123 (): [hih [

124 (): [ehh heh [hah hah

125 (): [m: [mm:]

126 (): [j(h)oo
yeah
y(h)ea

127 Sanna: .h(h)h[hh

128 Noora: [nii mut se: et viel<
yeah but it that even
yea but the fact that one indeed

-> pitä-ä k_issa-n pääl.=s_a selvästi e-t
must-3 cat-GEN over you clearly NEG-2
has to pour it on the cat.=you clearly

130 Noora: pitä-n(h)y [s(h)iit
like-PST it
didn't l(h)ike h(h)er

131 Veijo: [syytö-hä m(h)ie sii-(h)e
innocent-PRT I it-ILL
w(h)ell I w(h)as innocent of

- 132 ol-(h) i-n
 be-PST-1
 that
- 133 Sanna: hi hi hi
- 134 (0.3)
- 135 (): .hh[↑ihhh]hh
- 136 Henna: [voi ei.]
 oh NEG
 oh no.
- 137 Mella: h(h)a[l(h)u- .h kissa] parka?
 want- cat poor
 d(h)id- .h poor cat?

Example (21) is in a situation where, after Noora's story has been dealt with, Sanna returns to Veijo's story and produces an evaluation of it (lines 122-123). Noora escalates the evaluation in her turn (lines 129-131), and repeats her previous accusation to Veijo for bad intentions towards the cat, laughing while she speaks.

Noora's utterances are interpretations of Veijo's intentions towards the cat. Because Noora has been present at the time of action in Veijo's story, it would have been possible for her to make the interpretation while she was watching the dropping of the lamp. Thus, if she had said "he clearly tried to kill her" and "he clearly didn't like her", she would have been reporting to the other girls an interpretation which she made at the time she was witnessing the events; that is, she would have assumed another narrator voice beside Veijo's. Now when she says "you tried" and "you didn't like her", she is offering an understanding of his story as a recipient; the second-person pronoun works as a device for marking the utterance as an interpretation which Noora has made on the basis of what she has just heard, not what she had witnessed herself. She thus

takes her place as one among the recipients and accepts Veijo as the narrator.

The second person pronoun *sä* 'you' in this sequential position is interpreted by the participants in a different way than it is when it is used to contradict or to develop some other kind of argumentative statement. Noora's addressing Veijo does not prevent the other girls from dealing with the story and offering their own understandings of it, as can be seen in lines 68-71 and 134-138 in the examples. Here the second-person pronoun does not have the effect of making the non-addressed recipients as mere overhearers, as it did in the argumentative sequences. Instead, it shows that at this point Noora does not act as a co-teller of Veijo's story, but rather, she acts as one of the recipients by producing a turn which offers an appreciation of the story like the other girls' turns do - they are all together dealing with Veijo's story and offering understandings of it.

After a story has been told, the difference between the knowing and the unknowing recipients is smaller than in the beginning. Noora and Veijo still have a special position in the participation framework, but all the recipients have some kind of access to the events since they have heard the report. All are able to evaluate them according to what they have heard.

4. Conclusions

To sum up, the pronouns *sä* 'you', *tää* 'this one', and *se* 'she/he', which refer to the co-participating protagonist of a story, may be interpreted in this conversation in the following ways:

(i) The second-person singular pronoun *sä* 'you' occurs as a means of building an argumentative sequence (examples 12, 13, and 14); **or** as a means for the knowing recipient to relax her position as a knowing recipient and offer an appreciation of the story here and now (examples 20 and 21). In any case, it indicates that the person referred to is relevant at the time of telling rather than at the time of the events of the story.

(ii) The demonstrative pronoun *tää* 'this one' occurs when the speaker is making a transition from the here-and-now to the narrated world; it indicates that the person referred to belongs to both. As the speaker is orienting to this transition, she manipulates her choice of pronouns for the unknowing recipients. Thus, the pronoun *tää* marks the referent as being a ratified participant without being an addressee.

(iii) The third-person singular pronoun *se* 's/he' indicates that the speaker is orienting to the narrated world and is ignoring the here-and-now.

From these interpretations, I would like to draw the following wider conclusions: the choice of a pronoun is an important resource for creating the participation framework and defining the roles in it. Through the choice of pronoun the speaker can mark a change in the speech activity and a movement between different layers of time and place. The same pronoun can receive very different interpretations according to the sequential position of the turn in which it occurs; the use of pronouns needs to be studied in accordance with a turn-by-turn analysis of what is happening in the conversation.

Appendix 1: Transcription Conventions

- . Falling intonation
 - , Falling intonation weaker than that indicated by a period
 - ? Rising intonation
- If the intonation is level, there is no symbol.

Marked rising and falling shifts in intonation are indicated by upward (↑) and downward (↓) pointing arrows immediately prior to the rise or fall.

Emphasis is indicated by underlining.

Capital letters indicate an utterance, or a part thereof, that is spoken louder than the surrounding talk.

- ◦ Degree signs indicate a passage of talk which is quieter than the surrounding talk.
- : Lengthening of the sound
- < An angle bracket indicates a halting, abrupt cutoff.
- h The letter h (or several of them) indicates an audible aspiration.
- .h A period + the letter h (or several of them) indicates an audible inhalation.
- (h) A parenthesized h indicates that the word is pronounced with laugh.
- £ £ Smile voice.
- > < Talk inside is done with a faster pace than the surrounding talk.
- (0.5) Silences timed in tenths of a second.
- (.) A micropause less than two tenths of a second.
- = No silence between two adjacent utterances.
- [Utterances starting simultaneously are linked together with a single left-hand bracket. The same sign also indicates the beginning of overlapping talk.
-] The point where overlapping utterances stop overlapping is marked with a single right-hand bracket.
- () Items enclosed within single parentheses are in doubt.
- (()) Double parentheses are used to enclose a comment by the transcriptionist, e.g. ((laughter))

Appendix 2: Form Glosses

N.B. The following forms have been treated as unmarked forms, not indicated in the glossing: nominative case, active voice, present tense, singular.

Abbreviations used in the glosses:

- 1 first person ending
- 2 second person ending
- 3 third person ending
- 4 passive person ending

Case endings:

ACC accusative; ADE adessive; ALL allative; ELA elative; ESS essive; GEN genitive; ILL illative; INE inessive; PAR partitive; TRA translative.

Other abbreviations:

IMP imperative; INF infinitive; NEG negation; PASS passive; PL plural; PPC past participle; PPPC passive past participle; PRT particle; PST past tense; Q interrogative; InameF 1st name, female; Lname last name.

References

- Goffman, Erving ([1979] 1981) *Footing*. In *Forms of talk*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Goodwin, Charles (1979) The Interactive Construction of a Sentence in Natural Conversation. In G. Psathas (ed.), *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnometodology*. New York: Erlbaum. 97-121.
- (1981) *Conversational Organization: Interaction between Speakers and Hearers*. New York: Academic Press.
- (1984) Notes on Story Structure and the Organization of Participation. In Atkinson and Heritage (eds.), *Structures of Social Action. Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 225-246.
- (1987) Forgetfulness as an Interactive Resource. *Social Psychology Quarterly*. Vol. 50, No. 2, 115-131.
- Goodwin, Marjorie Harness (1990) *He-said-she-said: Talk as Social Organization Among Black Children*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Hanks, William (1990) *Referential Practice. Language and lived space among the Maya*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Helasvuo, Marja-Liisa (1991) Who said what? A Study of Tense Variation in Spoken Finnish Narrative. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Conference on Finnish Studies in North America*. Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Labov, William (1972) *Language in the Inner City. Studies in the Black English Vernacular*. 4th edition. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Laury, Ritva (1995) The Interactional Dynamics of Demonstratives: The Emergence of the Definite Article *Se* in Spoken Finnish. PhD Dissertation, University of California Santa Barbara. Fothcoming as: Ritva Laury. *Demonstratives in Interaction: The Emergence of a Definite Article in Finnish*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lerner, G. H. (1992) Assisted Storytelling: Deploying Shared Knowledge as a Practical Matter. *Qualitative Sociology* 15:3. 247-271.
- Levinson, Stephen C. (1988) Putting Linguistics on a Proper Footing. Explorations in Goffman's Concepts of Participation. In Paul Drew and

- Anthony Wootton (eds.), *Erving Goffman. Exploring the Interaction Order*. Cambridge: Polity Press. 161-293.
- Sacks, Harvey [1971] (1992) *Lectures on Conversation*. Volume II. Ed. by Gail Jefferson. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- (1978) Some Technical Considerations of a Dirty Joke. In J. N. Schenkein (ed.) *Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction*. New York: Academic Press. 249-269.
- Seppänen, Eeva-Leena (1995) Pronominit *tämä, tuo, se* ja *hän* viittaamassa keskustelun osallistujaan. [The Finnish pronouns *tämä, tuo, se* and *hän* as devices for referring to a co-participant in conversation.] Unpublished Licentiate Thesis, University of Helsinki, Department of Finnish Language.

Eeva-Leena Seppänen
 Dept. of Finnish
 P.O. Box 25 (Franzeninkatu 13)
 00014 University of Helsinki
 Finland
 E-mail: seppanen@ling.helsinki.fi