

Recipient design in reference choice: Negotiating knowledge, access, and sequential trajectories¹

Emma Betz

English Abstract

This conversation analytic study investigates third-person reference in everyday German. In using person reference, speakers may refer to a person to achieve recognition, or they may do more than referring (Auer 1984; Enfield 2007; Schegloff 1996a). Thus, a particular reference term in a specific context may convey additional information about the speaker, recipient, referent, or the relationship between them. Through reference and reference repair, speakers can indicate association/distance, convey affective stance, and mark the type of trouble encountered with a given referent (Golato 2013; Stivers 2007).

Speakers of German have a variety of forms available for nominal, in particular *name*, reference. This paper describes a particular type of third-person reference, the format 'definite article + person name' ('article+name', in short), e.g., *die monika*. By analyzing reference repair sequences, this study shows that 'article+name' is a recognitional form, presupposing that both speaker and recipient have independent epistemic access to the referent. Moreover, in specific contexts and contrasting with bare names, names preceded by articles can do more than referring. They index a stance towards the referent, that of 'tellability'. This paper documents one systematic environment for this use: story prefaces. In this context, the form projects and prefigures a telling. Speakers either identify the protagonist or the person whose viewpoint is taken, or they propose that there is tellable material about a shared referent available for topicalization. The next turn then provides an opportunity for co-participant alignment, in which case projected/proposed activities (e.g., gossiping) are properly launched or expanded, or for co-participant resistance to the conveyed stance of tellability. Resistance can in some instances be traced through changes in subsequent name reference forms, and the activities that were arguably projected do not get launched or expanded.

This study shows how recipient design, notably (assumed) epistemic accessibility, shapes the selection of reference forms. Additionally, it shows how interactants negotiate action trajectories beyond the current turn through reference formulation. These findings illustrate the reflexive relationship between grammar and interaction: The German nominal system encodes various reference forms morphosyntactically (e.g., demonstrative, indefinite, or definite articles preceding names, bare names). This, in turn, allows speakers to index additional interactional information when they engage in the social activity of referring to persons.

¹ This work reported in this paper was supported by a 2014 *University of Waterloo SSHRC Institutional Grant (SIG)*. Versions of the study were presented at the *Convention of the National Communication Association* (San Francisco), the *Conference of the International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis* (Waterloo), the *18. Arbeitstagung für Gesprächsforschung* (Mannheim), and at the University of Potsdam. I thank Arnulf Deppermann, Lorenza Mondada, Veronika Drake, and the participants at Margret Selting's *Kolloquium zur linguistischen Kommunikationsforschung* (Nov. 2014) for extensive comments on earlier drafts. Thanks also to Andrea Golato for sharing additional examples from her data and to Thomas Parker for editing my writing. All remaining errors are my own.

Keywords: Conversation Analysis, German, reference formulation, person reference, knowledge, access, reference repair, tellings, tellability, projection.

German Abstract

Die vorliegende konversationsanalytische Studie untersucht Personenreferenzen in alltäglichen deutschen Gesprächen. Wenn sich Sprecher auf nichtanwesende Personen beziehen, so machen sie diese Person durch die gewählte Referenzform für Rezipienten erkennbar und können darüber hinaus zusätzliche Informationen kommunizieren oder weitere Handlungen ausführen (Auer 1984; Enfield 2007; Schegloff 1996a). Eine spezifische Formulierung in einem bestimmten Kontext kann unterschiedliche Information über den Sprecher, Rezipienten, Referenten oder über die Beziehung zwischen den beteiligten Personen kommunizieren. In Referenzierungs- und Referenzreparatursequenzen können Sprecher Nähe bzw. Distanz sowie ihre affektive Positionierung zum Referenten anzeigen, und sie können mit der Referenzformulierung selbst oder der Aktion, die eine solche Formulierung enthält, diverse interaktionale Probleme anzeigen (Golato 2013; Stivers 2007).

Sprechern des Deutschen stehen verschiedene Formen für Nominalreferenz im Allgemeinen und für Bezugnahme mit Namen im Besonderen zur Verfügung. Die vorliegende Studie dokumentiert die Verwendung der Form 'definitiver Artikel + Personennamenname' (kurz 'Artikel+Name'), z.B. *die monika*, in Alltagsinteraktionen. Die Analyse von Reparatursequenzen, in denen diese Form mit artikellosen Namen kontrastiert, zeigt, dass die Form 'Artikel+Name' einen Typ von *recognitional* darstellt, d.h. ein Ausdruck, der dem Rezipienten eindeutige Identifizierung des intendierten Referenten ermöglicht. Seine Verwendung seitens des Sprechers unterstellt dem Adressaten, dass dieser unabhängig und lokal Zugang zum Referenten herstellen kann. Darüberhinaus kann die Form 'Artikel+Name' in spezifischen interaktionalen Umgebungen (und im Kontrast zu artikellosen Namen in diesen Kontexten) zusätzliche sequenzielle und handlungsspezifische Information kommunizieren. Diese Studie beschreibt einen solchen Kontext genauer: den Beginn von Erzählungen. Hier signalisiert die Form 'Artikel+Name' eine bestimmte Haltung dem Referenten gegenüber, nämlich die der Erzählwürdigkeit (*tellability*). Damit projiziert die Form Aspekte der eigentlichen Erzählung: Sie identifiziert entweder den Protagonisten oder die handelnde Person, deren Perspektive in der projizierten Geschichte eingenommen wird, oder sie kommuniziert, dass der Referent erzählwürdig ist, d.h., dass mit ihm thematisierbares Material verbunden ist. Im nächsten Turn eröffnet sich für Adressaten nun die Möglichkeit (und die Relevanz) des sequenziellen *alignment*. Zeigen Adressaten ihre Bereitschaft, den Rezipienten zu thematisieren, so werden die projizierten Aktivitäten (z.B. Lästertätigkeiten) gemeinsam begonnen oder ausgebaut. Zeigen Adressaten kein *alignment* mit der implizierten Erzählwürdigkeit des Referenten, z.B. durch kontrastive Namensformate in zweiter Position, so entwickeln sich projizierte Aktivitäten nicht oder nur minimal.

Die vorliegende Studie zeigt, das Adressatenzuschnitt, und spezifisch der dem Adressaten unterstellte Wissenszugang, die Formulierung von Personenreferenzen bestimmt. Zusätzlich dokumentiert diese Studie, dass Interaktionsteilnehmer durch Formen des Referenzierens Handlungsverläufe über den Turn hinaus projizieren und vorformen können. Diese Ergebnisse illustrieren die reflexive Beziehung zwi-

In this conversation, Karen is referring to a non-present third party, *Leif*. After having introduced Leif as a story-worthy person (line 1), thus launching a pre-telling, Karen puts the unfolding sequence on hold. She picks up her telling in line 3. Two aspects of her turn are noteworthy: First, Karen refers to the non-present third party four times, each time using his first name.³ This reference takes two different formats: 'bare' first name (*leif*, line 2) and 'article+name' (*der leif*, lines 1, 2, 3). Second, with the insertion in line 2, Karen offers a meta-comment on her own language use: This comment targets her choice of the initial reference form *der leif* (note the stress on the determiner), thus displaying an awareness that the reference forms carry different meaning in interaction. In other words, different forms (or formulations, in the sense of Schegloff 1972) allow for different inferences regarding referents, speakers, topic, and sequence.⁴ Moreover, by connecting her choice of reference to a specific aspect of the referent's character (or life), Karen provides a folk or participant's understanding of the social-interactive function of the form 'article+name'.

The choices interactants make in formulation and interpretation in conversation, that is, the 'machinery' behind real-time interaction, is largely routinized or automatized. This disattention to form when carrying out a communicative action in its pragmatically unmarked way is what enables interactants to process quickly and to communicate efficiently. Moreover, it allows interactants to recognize when something out of the ordinary is being done – or when something ordinary is being done in a manner outside the norm (cf. Enfield 2007:112-115). On the other hand, the fact that we 'see, but do not notice' (Garfinkel 1967; Heritage 1984) most of what transpires when we interact also prevents us from being able to intuitively abstract and formulate the basic regularities that govern interaction, for example the rules for the selection of lexical forms and grammatical patterns in action formation (e.g., Jefferson 1996; Golato 2003). This makes data excerpt 1 at the same time interesting and insufficient for use as a basis for explaining systematic language use.

Using Karen's observation as an inspiration or point of departure rather than as evidence, the present study describes the use and interactional function of the reference form 'article+name' in German. This study is based on a collection of such references produced by different speakers in a variety of everyday interactions. Using conversation analysis, it analyzes the sequential contexts in which names are systematically preceded by articles and also compares the use of such forms with the use of bare names by the same speakers. The paper will show that name references index what interactants know, what speakers assume about their co-participants' access to referents, and what particular stance interactants take towards a referent. Person reference forms can thus serve as a practice for projecting and managing tellings in interaction.

³ The referent had not been known to Karen's co-participant before this conversation but was introduced shortly before this excerpt.

⁴ For recent work on formulations in interaction as an analytic entry point to "interactional semantics", see the 2011 special issue in *Human Studies* (Deppermann 2011).

2. Methodology and data

Reference expressions are recipient-designed, that is, their meaning depends on the local sequence and activity context in which they are embedded and on the recipient for whom they are produced (Auer 1984; Ford/Fox 1996; Goodwin, 1979; Schegloff 1996b; see also Clark/Marshall 1981 and Clark/Wilkes-Gibbs 1986 for a cognitive social psychology view). This study views understanding (and referencing as part of displaying and negotiating understanding) as an essentially discursive matter (Deppermann/Reitemeier/Schmitt/Spranz-Fogasy 2010; Deppermann/Schmitt 2008). Using Conversation Analysis (CA) as methodology,⁵ this study also adopts an interactional linguistic view of grammar: Grammar is seen as embedded within the larger organization of social conduct. In this conceptualization of grammar, "the linguistic shape of an utterance is intertwined with the changing relationships among participants over interactional time" (Schegloff/Ochs/Thompson 1996:44). CA research has shown that the choice of reference forms, in particular, marks what a speaker knows and believes the recipient to know (Sacks/Schegloff 1979; Schegloff 1996b; Schegloff 1972). Reference forms can also convey additional information about the speaker, recipient, and referent, and thus the (changing) relations between any two in this set (cf. Stivers 2007). Thus, a speaker's choice of a reference form, and a next speaker's choice of a subsequent co-reference, regularly conveys crucial information about the relationships between interactants and absent third parties, the action underway, and the emerging sequence.

The main data for this study come from approximately seven hours of recordings of everyday interactions between adult speakers of German from a variety of geographical locations in Germany. All interactions in the author's corpus are non-elicited conversations between friends and relatives, collected in accordance with US and Canadian ethics guidelines concerning human participants in research. The recordings include telephone and face-to-face interaction at such occasions as family meals, chats and arrangement-making on the phone, and game nights. The collection made from these recordings was supplemented with examples from published work in interactional linguistics (notably from Auer 1981, 1983, 1984), from corpora in the "Archiv für gesprochenes Deutsch" of the *Institut für Deutsche Sprache* in Mannheim, Germany,⁶ and from fellow researchers.

Using Jeffersonian transcription conventions, the data were closely transcribed to include such features as audible pauses, simultaneous talk, and characteristics of speech delivery, for example pitch and loudness of voice (Hepburn/Bolden 2013; Jefferson 1984, 1985; Schegloff 2007a:265-269). For each line of German data, three lines of transcript are provided: the German original, an interlinear English gloss, and an idiomatic English translation (Duranti 1997). Where capital letter abbreviations for syntactic and semantic features are used in the gloss, they follow Leipzig glossing rules (Comrie/Haspelmath/Bickel 2008), with additional

⁵ For a further description of CA, see, e.g., Heritage (1984), Drew (2005), and Lerner (2004).

⁶ E.g., from the *Pfeffer Spoken German Corpus*. Collected in 1961, it comprises approx. 400 12-minute interviews (mostly elicited narratives) of colloquial language. They were recorded in 60 locations in East and West Germany, Austria, and Switzerland. This corpus was added to obtain additional examples of reference selection in quoted discourse, which was part of the analysis, although it is not discussed in depth in this paper (but see extract 10).

abbreviations for turn-initial discourse markers (DM), response particles (RP), modal particles (MP), and turn-final tags (TAG). Embodied actions (eye-gaze, gesture, posture) are selectively included in the transcripts and appear as narrative descriptions above the original utterance (with asterisks marking their beginnings and ends vis-a-vis the talk). In all excerpts, speakers are identified with the first three letters of their pseudonyms in the transcripts (e.g., ANN) and with their full names in the analysis (e.g., Annette). For examples taken from the literature, the speaker initials used by the original authors are maintained. The lines containing the focus of analysis are marked with arrows (\Rightarrow), and the reference terms that are the focus of analysis are additionally bolded.

The collection for this study comprises 88 examples of 'article+name' forms used for reference to a non-present third party. 39 are from telephone and 49 from face-to-face interactions. All are from speakers who use both reference types. Additionally, 49 examples of bare names were added to the collection and analyzed.

3. Names used for person reference

Researchers adopting an interactional view of language have only more recently turned their attention to person references (Enfield/Stivers 2007; Schegloff 1996b; see also the 2007 Special Issue of *Discourse Studies* on reference). The majority of systematic conversation analytic work in this area investigates reference terms in English; fewer studies exist for other languages and cultures (Garde 2003; Hachohen/Schegloff 2006; Margutti 2007; Oh 2007; Sidnell 2005; see also the contributions by Brown, Enfield, Hanks, Levinson, and Sidnell to Enfield/Stivers 2007), including German (see Auer 1981, 1983, 1984; Ruoff 1995; Schwitalla 1995; Werner 1986). This section first describes some basic principles that have been shown to shape reference formulation in interaction, first described by Sacks and Schegloff (1979) for English, and broadly applicable to German as well (Auer 1981, 1984). It then illustrates the phenomenon and contextualizes it within existing work. Section 4 presents detailed analyses for the form 'article+name' and findings regarding its use.

3.1. Previous work: Person reference formulation using names

Reference in interaction is a matter of both selection between alternatives (e.g., lexical formulations, Brown 1958; Schegloff 1972) and turn design, and existing research has documented different principles shaping their use, including communicative, social, and formal principles (see Enfield 2013 for an overview). Proper names have been described as prototypical examples of recognitional reference forms (Sacks/Schegloff 1979; Schegloff 1996b; Downing 1996). They convey a speaker's assumptions about what the recipient knows, but also their expectations about what is currently accessible to the recipient (cf. Ariel 1990, 2008). What we know and what others believe us to know are essential to who we are and are intimately connected to matters of social face. Thus, recognitionals are preferred over non-recognitionals. Consider extract 2, in which a speaker upgrades from a descriptive term (a categorical reference) to a more specific name (see also Schegloff 1996b:478-79).

Extract 2: trip to syracuse [Schegloff 1996b:463]⁷

01 Charlie: hhhe:h heh .hhhh I wuz uh:m: (.) .hh I wen' ah:
 02 => (0.3) I spoke teh **the gi:r-** I spoke tih **karen.**

The interactional preference for *recognition* can perhaps be observed most clearly in the use of prosodic try-marking as an effort to secure successful reference recognition (Sacks/Schegloff 1979). Extract 3, in which all three attempts at recognition are try-marked, illustrates this practice.

Extract 3: mrs. holmes ford? [Sacks/Schegloff 1979:19]

01 A: well I was the only one other than than
 02 => **the** uhm tch **fords?**, uh **mrs. holmes ford?**
 03 => you know uh [**the the cellist?**]
 04 B: [oh yes. she's she]'s the cellist.
 05 A: yes
 06 B: ye[s
 07 A: [well she and her husband were there. ...

Extracts 2 and 3 illustrate that within the domain of recognitional person reference, the use of names is preferred over recognitional descriptors or descriptions. Extract 3 also makes visible a second preference in reference formulation, that of *minimization*: While all three attempts in extract 3 are minimal in the sense of Sacks/Schegloff (1979), that is, they are done "with a single reference form" (p. 16), the first is the shortest and thus arguably the most minimal in this context (see Levinson 2007). As a result of these two preferences, names are the default reference forms for initial referring to a person in English. They are doing "referring simpliciter" (Schegloff 2007b:436), that is, names are pragmatically unmarked in this context.

Reference forms are fitted to the actions being performed. There are thus additional dimensions that are important in the choices speakers make when referring, and in how recognition and minimization is achieved locally. These are connected to the speech situation in which a reference is used, that is, to information structure, topic, and activity. For example, minimization in reference formulation also depends on sequential information structure. If a referent is already contextually salient by prior talk or by availability (see Enfield 2013:448 for an example), pronouns become an option for most effective minimization in initial reference, while still satisfying the recognition requirement (cf. Kitzunger/Shaw/Toerien 2012). In terms of sequential information structure, we can distinguish between the *position* in which a referent is mentioned – initial vs. subsequent – and the *form* this reference takes – initial full nouns and subsequent pronouns, for example (Sacks/Schegloff 1979; Schegloff 1996b). While initial forms (e.g., proper names, other full NPs) typically appear in initial position, they may also be found in subsequent position. Unless they serve purposes of disambiguation (when several possible antecedents are available for a pronominal form), such uses are interactionally marked and serve particular tasks. They can, for instance, cast something as a new

⁷ In examples 2 and 3, capitalization of names was removed and bold print for emphasis was added.

departure (cf. Ford/Fox 1996; Polak 2004, quoted in Hacoen/Schegloff 2006) or as a "new spate of talk in which the referent will figure in a different way" (Schegloff 1996b:452), or mark primary rights to speakership at a particular juncture (cf. Heritage/Raymond 2005; Raymond/Heritage 2006, Stivers 2005). Moreover, locally initial forms (especially names) used in locally subsequent position have been shown cluster in disagreement contexts (Fox 1993). Thus, the choice of a complex over simple reference by a responding recipient in such environments conveys important information about the unfolding sequence and changing relationships between interactants. The use of such forms instructs recipients to inspect them for what additional interactional work they do (cf. Stivers 2007).

Cross-linguistic comparative research (e.g., Levinson 2007) has shown that reference patterns differ across cultures. Constraints on names as reference forms, and, more generally, the ranking of preferences for reference formulation, are culture-specific. For example, in the Mayan languages Tzeltal and Yucatec, unlike in English, reference by association ('my comadre', 'this one your elder sister') is preferred over reference by name (Hanks 2007; Brown 2007). Based on cross-linguistic research, and on the findings by Levinson (2007) and Brown (2007) in particular, Enfield (2013:442) presents a revised and expanded version of the basic preferences of recognition and minimization for informal, everyday interaction:

Summary of 'preference' type principles for reference to persons

- (i) Design the expression for the recipient
 - a. achieve recognition
 - b. invoke or display relationship proximity/type
- (ii) Minimize the expressive means
 - a. use a single referring expression
 - b. use a name rather than a description
 - c. use only one name from a binomial if possible
- (iii) Fit the expressive format to the action being performed
- (iv) Observe local cultural/institutional constraints
- (v) Associate the referent explicitly with one of the speech participants

This summary reflects considerations of recipient design and the influence of sequence, action, and projection on reference formulation.⁸ Early foundational work on person reference formulation focused on English. Studies on German (Auer 1981, 1983, 1984) confirm the operation of the basic preferences documented for English. This study expands research documenting cross-linguistic variation in how recognition and minimization are achieved locally. It does so by analyzing a (grammatical) resource speakers of German have available for pursuing recognition and for fitting reference expressions to the current action: the format 'article+name'.

⁸ Sacks and Schegloff's *recognition* would be reflected in "achieve recognition," and *minimization* would be reflected in "use a single referring expression." Levinson (2007) terms (ii) *economy* and labels (iv) *circumspection*.

3.2. The format 'article+name' in German interaction

The use of definite articles before person names in German interaction has not yet been explored in depth in interactional linguistic research but has received attention in dialectology and other areas of sociolinguistics (e.g., Bellmann 1990; Eichhoff 2000; Kolde 1992; Nübling 2014; Nübling et al 2013). Person names in spoken German can generally be preceded by articles. The types of person names that may take a definite article include first names (see extracts 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 16-17, 18, 19), last names (extracts 9, 12), combinations of first and last name (extracts 5, 9), title and last name (extract 6), nicknames (extract 7/14, 8), and first or last names combined with or extended through recognitional descriptors.

Extract 5: *rudi hieden* [REF.25: PF378, face-to-face]

- 01 S2: im fußball hab ich zum beispiel einen mann
in soccer have I for example a man
in soccer for example I produced a man,
- 02 => hervorgebracht, **den rudi hieden,** den ehemaligen:
brought forth ART.ACC ((name)) ART.ACC former
rudi hieden, the former:
- 03 (.) tormann, und war dann späterer nationaltormann
goalie and was then later.ADJ national goalie
(.) goalie, and (he) was then the later goalie for the
- 04 österrei- von österreichs wunderteam, (0.2)
austri- of austria.GEN wonder team
national austri- of austrias wonder team, (0.2)

Extract 6: *spessart* [REF.9: 201_Oregon2B_245, telephone]⁹

- *MAR clears throat*
- 01 OMA: nja morgn *fahrn mer* ja in- (.) in=n spessart,
DM tomorrow drive we MP in in.ART ((name))
*(well) tomorrow *we're going* (as you know) to- (.)
to the spessart,*
- 02 (0.4)
- (...)
- 08 => OMA: machmer ne busfahrt mit **der frau schober=**
make.we a bus trip with ART mrs. ((name))
we're going on a bus trip with mrs. Schober=
- 09 =von *dossenheim*,
of ((name))
=of *dossenheim*,
- 010 MAR: .hh ach so:
DM
.hh oh I see:

⁹ Note that *spessart* refers to a mountain range in Germany; *dossenheim* refers to a town.

Extract 7: *heiratswut* [REF.12: 151_Oregon1B_210, telephone]

01 => MAR: is die is die noch **mitm specki** zusammen?
 is she.DEM is she.DEM still with.the ((name)) together?
is she is she still together with tubby?

02 TAN: ja:a
 RP
yea:ah

In certain varieties of German, a determiner before a person name is obligatory.¹⁰ In these varieties, names (including titles such as 'Mrs.', 'Mr.', 'Doctor') have to be preceded by a definite article or possessive. Reference grammars of spoken German tend to classify the use of names with/without articles as geographical or register variation (Durrell 2003; cf. Allerton 1987: 66-7), and recent research has shown that there exist geographically determined differences in acceptability judgements and in the use of articles before names (Eichhoff 2000; Werth 2014, 2015; cf. Nübling/Fahlbusch/Heuser 2012). These differences, as well as variability in use within regions have been seen as evidence for grammaticalization processes in German (e.g., Schmuck/Szczepaniak 2014; Werth 2014; cf. Szczepaniak 2011). This variability, however, may itself develop systematic pragmatic patterns. The present paper aims to uncover examples for such patterns by analyzing data from speakers who use both forms in interaction.

Interactional linguistic and conversation analytic research has shown that grammatical alternatives for implementing an action tend to be meaningful (e.g., Betz in press; Stivers, 2007; Fox/Thompson, 2010). It thus stands to reason that German speakers may use different forms for referring to absent third parties as an interactional resource, if indeed the forms occur in similar sequential environments and are available to the same speakers. There is some evidence in exiting research that the reference format 'definite article + person name' contrasts with bare names in spoken German and can convey additional pragmatic information: Results from interviews and questionnaires on the use of the format in different syntactic and action contexts (e.g., praising, complaining) suggest that it contrasts with bare names. Bellmann (1990) reports that the form is perceived to convey an affective stance toward a referent, typically a negative one. Based on this finding, Bellman describes the communicative function of the form 'article+name' more generally as conveying "expressivity" (1990:262-73). Werth (2014) documents the use of definite articles before person names in Northern German varieties. He including spoken-language data and outlines the following tendencies for usage: First, an information structuring use as a focusing device, in particular where speakers shift referents and topics. Werth describes this use as connected to the form's determiner function. Articles before names index an instruction to the recipient to make use of shared or world knowledge to identify the referent in question. This suggests that the definite article functions with names as it does with other types of noun phrases: It indexes accessibility, givenness, or common ground (cf. Clark/Marshall 1981; Fox 1993). Second, a socio-pragmatic function

¹⁰ This is the case in, e.g., *Berner Deutsch*, a Southern, High Alemannic variety of German (Reck 1994), and in *Siebenbürger Sächsisch*, a Romanian settlement variety of German (Betz 2008:113-14); see Allerton (1987:66-67) for examples of other languages or varieties of other languages that require a definite article before person names.

of the form, which enables its strategic use as both a distancing device (especially with negative assessments; cf. Bellmann 1990) and an indicator of closeness or familiarity (as with names of public persons). The present study expands this work by considering larger sequential context, in particular contexts in which reference is negotiated, and by including interactional data from a broad range of speakers.

The present study focuses on the use of first names, but the collection on which it is based also includes nicknames and last names (in references to persons for whom the first name is not typically used, e.g., politicians). Its goal is to show what the choice of reference term indexes about the speaker and the speaker's assumptions about the recipient. It is guided by the following questions:

- Can both 'bare name' and 'article+name' formats occur in the same sequential environments?
- Can the form 'article+name' be said to do 'more than referring' (cf. Schegloff 1996b) in certain environments? If so, what are these environments?
- What additional information can be conveyed by the form 'article+name'? What does it convey about the speaker's or recipient's stance, their relationship to the referent, or about the current action trajectory? In other words, in what way are the forms 'bare name' and 'article+name' recipient-designed in their specific contexts of use?

4. 'article+name' in two sequential contexts

This section presents two contexts in which reference to persons figures centrally. The examples given for each illustrate that speakers do interactional work through their choice of reference at specific points in the unfolding sequence. By analyzing who uses which form at what point in the sequence, and by tracing the subsequent reference forms chosen to refer to the same person by the same and/or other speakers, it will be argued that through reference formulation, speakers navigate epistemics (that is, they index the type of knowledge they attribute to a recipient) and shape larger sequences of action. Section 4.1 presents sequences in which reference is explicitly negotiated (reference repair), while section 4.2 describes the use of the format 'article + name' in (story) tellings.

Reference repair and story beginnings emerged as recurrent contexts for the format in focus and for the contrastive use of 'bare name' and 'article+name'. While the format 'article+name' is used in other contexts as well, the two contexts presented here emerged as common¹¹ and systematic: Reference negotiation sequences show basic features of the use of 'article+name', namely recognizability and accessibility; the beginnings of tellings show how the form 'article+name' can project and shape a larger activity.

In order to be able to argue that the choice of grammatical form is interactionally meaningful (that is, that the difference between 'bare name' and 'article+name' is relevant) for speakers, my collection only includes examples

¹¹ Almost half of my examples are in the context of story beginnings.

from speakers who use both reference formats.¹² Extract 8 (section 4.1 below), for example, displays the use of both forms by each of the two speakers: Ta uses two names preceded by definite articles in line 1 and a bare name in line 4. Speaker X uses a bare name in line 3 and a name preceded by a definite article in line 6.

4.1. Reference repair: Negotiating expectations and local access

Problems in formulating and understanding reference can provide one way to empirically uncover relevant dimensions of reference choice (cf. Golato 2013; Hahashi/Raymond/Sidnell 2013; Lerner et al. 2012; Sacks/Schegloff 1979). Examples 8 and 9 present instances in which reference is explicitly negotiated. In extract 8, two referents are introduced by Ta in line 1, and X indicates trouble in line 3. By repeating the name, X makes clear that the trouble indicated is not an acoustic problem, but rather one of access to the referent (cf. Golato 2013).

Extract 8: *ans werk 1822:1* [REF.65.66, taken from Auer 1984:638-639]¹³

01 => Ta.: also der: (0.2) **der micha** un **der:** (0.2) **kurt**=die
DM ART ART ((name)) and ART ((name)) them.DEM
well (0.2) micha and (0.2) kurt those (two)

sehn me- die sieht ma jetzt °unh-° [ziemlich viel
see we them.DEM sees one now incr- [pretty much
02 we see- those two one now sees °incr-° [pretty often
[
03 => X: [**micha?**
[((name))
[micha?

04 => Ta.: **micha;** (des) is dieser den du gut findest; (0.2)
((name)) that is this one who you good find
micha (that) is that/the(one) (that) you like; (0.2)

05 Ta.: den find ich inzwischen auch ganz gut,
he.DEM find I in the meantime also fairly well
him I've come to like pretty well too,

06 => X: ach **der amnesty**
RP ART ((nickname))
oh amnesty

In the repair resolution (line 4), Ta makes reference to shared experience involving the referent in question, and in line 6, X claims recognition of the referent (and thus resolution of the trouble). He does this by marking a change of epistemic state (with *ach*, Golato/Betz 2008, Golato 2010) and by subsequently demonstrating independent access: He offers an alternative name for the same referent (*der Amnesty*).

The data in example 9 is taken from an evening of card playing at Bernhard's and Sybille's house. Freddie and Irmgard are guests. Annette (Sybille's and Bern-

¹² In my own collection, I could not observe a clear regional bias.

¹³ Capitalization, translation and line numbering were adjusted to ensure that the example is in line with transcription and data presentation conventions used in this article.

hard's daughter) and her husband are currently visiting, and Uschi had just spent a few days at their house as well. The referent Uschi is first mentioned by Sybille, who in line 7 attempts to collaboratively complete her husband's utterance.¹⁴ In overlap with Sybille, however, Bernhard seizes speakership again and continues his utterance, using the same reference term, *die uschi*. There are a number of reference term in this excerpt; the focus is on those in lines 7, 8, and 10.

Extract 9: *die kinder*

[REF.81: DK52.41, face-to-face; see discussion in Golato 2013:39]

01 FRE: bernhard was ham denn die kinder die ganze woche gemacht.
 ((name)) what have MP the children the whole week done
bernhard what did the children do all week.
 (...)

*BER: gaze shift from FRE to SYB (sitting across from him)

06 BER: am <dien*stag>- ham sie .hh=
 on tuesday have they
 on <tues*day>- they('ve).hh=

07 => SYB: **die u[schi]** nach-
 =[ART ((first name)) to
 =[(took) u[schi to-
 []

08 => BER: =[.hh **[DIE USCHI]** NACH bremen gebracht,
 =[.hh [ART ((first name)) to ((city name)) brought,
 =[.hh [took USCHI TO bremen, to
 nach nach [düttlin]gen=
 to to [((city name))]=
 to to [düttlin]gen=
 []

09 => FRE: [wer's-]
 [who.is]
 [who's-]

FRE: gaze shift from SYB to BER

10 => FRE: =wer's denn ***uschi.***
 =who.is MP ((first name)).
 =who's uschi.

11 SYB: [die: die (volk),]
 [ART ART ((last name?)),]
 [(volk)]
 []

12 IRM: [ach, uschi war da?]
 [RP ((name)) was there]
 [oh, uschi was here?]

13 IRM: [ausm ausm rhein-]
 [from.the from.the ((region name))]
 [from.the from.the rhine-]
 []

14 SYB: [die uschi kowals]ky.
 [ART ((first name)) ((last name))
 [uschi kowals]ky.

¹⁴ Note that Bernhard turns his gaze to Sybille mid-turn (line 6), apparently eliciting help (Goodwin 1979; Streeck 1993).

- 15 FRE: °aha, °=
 RP
 (°I see, °)=
- 16 IRM: =ja?
 =yes?
 =really?
- 17 SYB: mhm.
 uhuh.
- *SYB: gaze shift to FRE, establishing mutual gaze
- 18 FRE: *ach wie schön.
 RP how beautiful
 *oh how nice.

After the initial mentioning of Uschi by Sybille and Bernhard, a co-referential term is used by Freddie in line 10: He initiates repair, and before Bernhard continues the telling underway, the participants engage in reference negotiation (lines 10-18). While Sybille and Bernhard treat the referent *Uschi* as known and unproblematic, Freddie does not seem to know or recognize the referent (see Golato 2013). His repair initiation clearly targets a problem in intersubjectivity, more specifically a problem in recipient design in line 8 (and line 7). Freddie's use of the modal particle *denn* supports this analysis. *Denn*-questions indicate that shared knowledge was made relevant in the previous turn but cannot be reconstructed by the current speaker (Deppermann 2009). The particle *denn* in this sequential context reflects an important aspect of the preceding reference: An 'article+name' reference indexes the expectation that the recipient independently knows and can access the referent in the current context.¹⁵

After alternative recognitionals are offered by Sybille in lines 11 and 14, Freddie provides a third position receipt¹⁶ in line 15 and an (unspecific) assessment of the reported action in which the referent Uschi figured prominently (line 18). Bernhard and Freddie use different forms to refer to the same referent; the use of these different forms coincides with differing epistemic stances. In all examples of this kind in my collection, that is, in all instances in which there are recognition problems with a referent presented in the format 'article+name' and in which the name is repeated in the repair initiation, the repeat is a bare form. Thus, while both forms are used as recognitionals in German, it seems that the use of the 'article+name' format requires that the speaker and recipient have access to the referent outside of the present conversation and can draw on this in the local context.

This example shows what is at stake in using different available reference forms: *Local accessibility* of the referent matters in the choice of form (see Ariel 1990, 2008). This accessibility may or may not be sufficiently provided for by the predication in line 8 and the association of the referent with *die kinder*/ 'the

¹⁵ This illustrates a basic information structuring principle for noun phrase reference: Given or inferrable referents are referred to with definite noun phrases (or pronouns), while unknown or not inferrable referents are introduced with indefinite noun phrases (Clark/Marshall 1981).

¹⁶ It is unclear whether Freddie actually recognized the referent; the token *aha* seems to treat the preceding as new information. Line 18 does not resolve this ambiguity, as Freddie does not display independent access to the referent. However, he returns to the main sequence in line 18, thus collaborating in closing the reference negotiation.

children' (line 1). The fact that providing the last name (line 14) seems to eventually enable Freddie to identify the referent (line 15) shows that the referent is known to Freddie, but not accessible in line 10. A look back to extract 8 shows a similar pattern: X's repair initiation is done with a bare form, while both in Ta's initial reference (line 1) and in X's display of independent access (line 6), an article precedes the name. Local accessibility for X may additionally be difficult, because the name Ta chooses (*Micha*) may not be the one most readily available to X for the referent in question. In sum, we can note for examples 8 and 9 that the asymmetry in reference form (lines 7/8, 10 in extract 9; lines 1, 3 in extract 8) represents an asymmetry in local access.

The following extract adds a further dimension to this analysis. Unlike extracts 8 and 9, it is not taken from an explicit reference negotiation, and what is at stake here is the intended recipient's (lack of) independent access to the referent. The excerpt is taken from a corpus of semi-structured narrative interviews (see footnote 6). In this conversation, S2 reports on an assignment he was given by the leader of the youth organization in which he is active (line 1). After S2's apparent lack of enthusiasm about taking on the assignment by himself (line 2), his co-participant is quoted as suggesting that another member of the youth organization (*dieter*) join S2 (line 4). This first mentioning of Dieter is in line 4 and takes the shape 'article+name'; it appears in the (reported) exchange between S2 and his youth organization leader, both of which, as we learn in line 5, independently know Dieter.

Extract 10: *alleine* [REF.3_PFO27; face-to-face] [# = reported discourse]

01 S2: #GEH du doch dahin.#
go you MP there
#WHY don't you GO there.#

02 ich sag, #<ja: alleine>#
I say DP alone
I say, #<(we:ll/yea:h but) alone>#

03 (0.8)

04 => #JA nehm den ↓dieter mit.=#
DP take ART ((first name)) with
#(WELL) take ↓dieter with you.=#

05 => S2: =er kannte dieter auch wohl, nicht, weil der
he knew ((first name)) also MP TAG because he.DEM
=he also knew dieter, right, because he((=dieter))

06 ja hier (.) betriebs- (.) äh=sprecher ist
MP here factory.GEN uh speaker is
(you know) is (.) labor- (.) uh=spokesperson

07 von der homag.
of the ((business name))
for homag here.

08 S2: ja. wir beid- er hat ja einen wagen der dieter¹⁷ ...
 RP we both he has MP a car ART ((first name))
 (so). the two of u- he has a car (of course) dieter did

Lines 5-6 constitute an insertion to the telling; it is designed to give the co-present interlocutor background information about one of the protagonists of the telling. This shift between different types of actions (subsidiary vs. main line) and levels of text organization (reenacted reported vs. direct speech) entails a shift in reciprocity. The talk reported in line 4 was designed for S2; S2's talk in lines 5-6, by contrast, is produced for the co-present interviewer, who does not know the referent Dieter. This is reflected in the choice of reference terms: S2 uses a recognitional in line 5, but it is a bare name.¹⁸ It thus seems that, in order to use an 'article + name' reference form, the speaker must presuppose that the recipient has independent epistemic access to the referent. In examples 8 and 9, the referent cannot be identified immediately, that is, an accessibility/activation problem is first negotiated. However, independent knowledge is eventually claimed (extract 9) and/or displayed (extract 8). In extract 10, a shift in reciprocity is reflected in (among other design features) a shift in reference form. These examples show that the choice of reference form is clearly connected to recipient design, and specifically to a speaker's perception of and presuppositions about recipients' (differing) knowledge states.

In the following example, however, the use of different referent forms are not a matter of epistemic considerations in recipient design. There is no indication that the difference reference forms are designed for different speakers. Rather, this excerpt suggests that matters of sequential or topical development may be crucial in determining the choice of reference form: In extract 11, a bare name is used in line 1 and a 'article+name' in line 2, by the same speaker, identifying the same referent.

Extract 11: *blamiert* [REF.95, taken from Altmann 1981:89]¹⁹

01 => S1: und **hans** meinte, wir sollten den kurs SI zweistündig
 and ((name)) said we should the course SI two.hourly
 and hans said we should plan for a two-hour SI

02 => ansetzen. übrigens **der hans.** der hat sich
 plan by the way ART ((name)) he.DEM has REFL
 course. by the way hans. he embarrassed himself

¹⁷ See Werth (2014) and Kolde (1995) for syntactic and information-structuring considerations regarding the use of articles before names in syntactic rightward expansions that specify a referent. Werth discusses North German varieties, Kolde Standard German. Another context in which articles are obligatory before names in German is with attributive adjectives, as in, e.g., *die kleine wiebke* 'little wiebke' (example from author's collection; cf. Kolde 1995).

¹⁸ The use of reference terms in reported and reenacted speech is much more complex than this, of course. A preliminary analysis of reference choice in my data suggests that participants use the two formats to index and trace the voices/stances of author, animator, and principal (Goffmann 1981). This matter will have to be taken up elsewhere.

¹⁹ Capitalization was adjusted and speaker initials, line numbering, and a translation were added. The precise source of this data excerpt is not specified in Altmann (1981). He uses recorded and transcribed interaction, field notes, and also invented examples or modified excerpts from recorded interaction. The findings that can be drawn from this example are therefore necessarily limited.

- 03 bei der letzten fachbereichsversammlung
 at the last department meeting
 terribly at the last department meeting.
- 04 schrecklich blaumiert. er dachte das neue
 horribly embarrassed he thought the new
 he thought the new
- 05 hochschulrahmengesetz gilt in bayern nicht.
 higher education act applies in bavaria not
 higher education act doesn't apply to bavaria.

This turn in line 1 potentially closes the previous topic, and a new sequence and topic (arguably touched off associatively by the mentioning of the referent Hans additionally marked as a departure by *übrigens*, Altmann 1981:89) is begun in line 2. Interactionally, lines 2-4 constitute a story preface, consisting of the identification of the protagonist (line 2), the setting (line 3) and the gist or upshot of the story – all projecting the story proper. The beginnings of (story) telling sequences are a recurrent environment for the use of 'article+name' references in my data. Using further excerpts from my collection, I will describe two function of 'article+name' references in this context in section 4.2. I will show that this form serves to either identify/project a protagonist or to projecting a tellable.

4.2. Negotiating the beginnings of tellings: Identifying and projecting

The uses I describe in the following sections (4.2.1 and 4.2.2) are context-specific, but they share their placement at the beginnings of (story) telling sequences. *Small stories*, stories, and tellings (re)construct events that contains a notable (unexpected, unusual) or entertaining element (Georgakopoulou 2007; Quasthoff 1980), that is, something 'tellable'. The beginnings of (story) tellings in particular are crucial sequential junctures, because one task at such beginnings is to negotiate alignment of a participant as recipient (e.g., Jefferson 1978). That is, prospective tellers have to ensure that they have an audience for their telling (somebody who has not yet heard it, somebody who is interested), and they can do this, for example, by projecting early what kind of story will be told and/or who the story will be about. In responses to pre-announcements, recipients may block the proposed sequential trajectory by displaying prior knowledge or acknowledge a proposed telling as news and thus provide a go-ahead (Terasaki 2004[1976]). Interactionally legitimate *tellability* establishes the grounds for telling something in the first place.

4.2.1. Identifying the protagonist of a telling

In the following examples, asymmetries in reference form cannot be attributed to unequal access to a referent. In examples 12 and 13, both (or all) speakers seem to have equal or independent access to the referent in question; the choice of one reference form over the other thus arguably conveys other interactionally relevant in-

formation. In extract 12, we join Oma and Markus's discussing of large-scale fires in Florida. Markus lives in the US and has just described the typical vegetation and landscape of Florida to Oma (who lives in Germany). This description comes to a possible close in line 1. In line 2, Oma inquires whether then-president Bill Clinton has already returned from a state visit to China. Oma's question proposes a shift in topic, but not a disjunctive one: Her question displays the expectation that the US president would visit the site of a major natural disaster in his country.

Extract 12: *clinton & gore*

[REF.31/32_Oregon_1A_4:30, tel.; see discussion in Betz et al. 2013]

- 01 MAR: palmen auch noch, und so alles tropisch. .hh
 palm trees as well and so/MP everything tropical
palm trees as well, and so everything (is) tropical. .hh
- 02 => OMA: is **der clinton** schon zurück?
 is ART ((last name)) already back?
has clinton returned yet?
- 03 (0.5)
- 04 OMA: von china.
 from ((country name))
from china.
- 05 => MAR: nee: **clinton** is noch in china.
 RP ((first name)) is still in ((country name))
no: clinton is still in china.
- 06 (1.1)
- 07 => MAR: **der GO:re** war da. und hat das angeguckt. h
 ART ((last name)) was there and has it.DEM looked at
GO:re was there. and had a look at it. H
- 08 MAR: .hhh ((0.5 sec))
- 09 MAR: <d[a: hat der-]
 there has ART/he.DEM
 <the:[re has (the/he)-]
 []
- 10 OMA: [wer is das. der] t-vertreter oder wie,=
 [who is it.DEM ART] representative or how
 [who is that. his] t-representative or what,=
- 11 MAR: =der- ahJA de:r der vizepräsident.
 the DM the the vice president
 =the- well(YES) the: the vice president.
- 12 OMA: vizepräsident. [°mhm,°]
 vice president [RP]
 vice president. [°mhm,°]
 []
- 13 MAR: [ja:.]
 [RP]
 [ye:s.]

- 14 MAR: der ist da hingeflo:gen und hat das halt mal
 he.DEM is there to.flown and has that MP MP
 he flew out there and visited (the place),
- 15 besucht, .hh naja, geholfen hat das den leuten
 visited DM helped has that the people
 .hh well, that didn't really do anything
- 16 auch nix. kh[hehe
 also nothing [
 for the people (either).kh[hehe
 [
- 17 OMA: [naja: ...
 [DM
 [we:ll ...

Oma's turn in line 2 displays a formal preference for a confirming answer. When this is not forthcoming, she extends her turn with a phrasal increment (line 4). This receives a disconfirmation and correction from Markus (line 5-7). In this example it cannot be said that Markus's subsequent, bare reference *clinton* (line 5) indexes his lack of access to the referent. Oma's reference in line 2 seems unproblematic, at least as far as accessibility on the part of Markus is concerned – it is arguably Markus who has more immediate access to current events in his country of residence and to names of politicians currently in office. What Markus and Oma are negotiating here is a different aspect of the unfolding sequence: the beginning, or the possibility, of a telling. Oma's turn in line 2 not only seeks information, it also displaying the expectation that the president would visit the site of the disaster. In other words, it displays the expectation that there is something potentially tellable involving Clinton and Florida. Markus's disconfirmation (line 5) is thus also a rejection of a topic proffer, and the account he provides further orients to this. The use of Markus's bare reference form in response to Oma's 'article+name' form may implicitly negotiate tellability: His stance towards the newsworthiness of Clinton in this context is different from the stance Oma takes. This asymmetry in stance is reflected in an asymmetry in reference forms, and Markus's immediately following reference supports this analysis: He introduces a new referent with 'article+name' (line 7), and after a brief reference repair,²⁰ which is closed in lines 12-13, a telling about Gore's visit ensues. Thus, Markus discards Clinton as a tellable and contrastively proposes Gore instead.

Extract 13 is also from the beginning of a story telling. Two referents are introduced in the story preface (lines 5-6). We join a conversation between siblings Kirsten and Heiner. Kirsten complained about a persistent toothache earlier in the conversation. Heiner is currently completing his degree in dentistry and has just agreed to replace one of Kirsten's fillings during her next visit (line 1). Touched off by the topic of the preceding talk, Heiner initiates a new topic on a previously unmentioned person in lines 5-6.

²⁰ See Golato (2013) for a discussion of this example and these types of reference repairs in general.

Extract 13: *zahnarzttermin* [REF.35.36_Termin bei RKC5 [31:25], tel.; see discussion in Edenstrom 2009]

- 01 HEI: ja:. †kann ich machen. kein problem.
 RP can I do no problem
 ye:s. I †can do that. no problem.
- 02 KIR: hehm:h.
 hehm:h.
- 03 HEI: heh=
 heh=
- 04 KIR: =.hh Okay. na[ja,al-]
 okay DM DM
 =.hh Okay. we[ll, s-]
 []
- 05 => HEI: [ne bei]m christian ja? der christian
 [DM with.ART ((name))TAG ART ((name))
 [(wit]h) christian, right? christian
- 06 => hatte doch ä::hnen termin bei renate. vor kurzem.
 had MP ART appointment with ((name)) before short
 had a::=uhn appointment with renate. a little while
 ago.
- 07 KIR: mhm?
 mhm?
- 08 HEI: und da hat sie: jesacht er brauch drei: füllungen.
 and there has she said he needs three fillings
 and she: told him then that he needed three: fillings.
- 09 =>hat sie ihm dann< die gemacht die schön einfach
 has she him then those done that nice easy
 =>she then fixed those that were nice (and) easy
- 10 zu machen waren.
 to do were
 to do.

Heiner's turn in lines 5-6 is produced in overlap with a second closing-implicative move by Kirsten (line 4) and is syntactically expanded (line 6). This expansion marks a sequential boundary (Edenstrom 2009): Heiner is launching into a story-telling of his son Christian's recent dentist experience. In this turn, two referents are introduced: Christian and Renate, both of which are well, and independently, known to both speakers.²¹ Heiner chooses different reference formats for introducing them into the conversation, however. The choice of different forms in this example seems to prefigure the different status of the available characters *within the upcoming story* (similar to example 12), that is, it functions as a focusing device. The reference forms can thus be said to be forward-looking: In conjunction with other features of the turn, for example the linear organization of its elements, they provide the recipient with information about the organization of the unfolding se-

²¹ Renate is Heiner's ex-wife. As is clear from the present excerpt, she is also a dentist.

quential trajectory (i.e., Who will be at the center of this telling I propose to deliver? or Whose perspective will be privileged in this story?). After line 8, the story proposed by Heiner (and to which Kristin aligns as story recipient in line 7) unfolds into one about Renate's incompetence as a dentist. Heiner takes Christian's perspective here, as Renate is indirectly positioned as incompetent through Christian's experience (or rather ordeal) as her patient (lines 8-10).

The following section returns to an earlier data extract and then discusses three further extracts in which the format 'article+name' is used to implicitly project or prefigure a tellable in conversation. The function outlined below (in 4.2.2, 4.2.3) may be viewed as a more generalized account of the function outlined above (in 4.2.1).

4.2.2. Projecting and prefiguring a tellable: alignment

In extract 14 *heiratswut* (see also extract 7), Markus is asking Tanja about the relationship situation of an already mentioned mutual acquaintance (*Eva*; referred to using the pronoun *die*, line 1). Specifically, he inquires whether she is still dating a person nicknamed *Specki* ('Tubby'). *Specki* had not been mentioned yet.

Extract 14: *heiratswut*

[REF.12: 151_Oregon1B_210; see discussion in Betz/Golato 2008]

01 => MAR: is die is die noch **mitm specki** zusammen?
 is she.DEM is she.DEM still with.the ((name)) together?
is she is she still together with tubby?

02 TAN: ja:a
 RP
yea:ah

03 MAR: he he he [he
 hu hu hu [hu
 [

04 TAN: [ha he he
 [ha hu hu

05 TAN: die heiraten ja nächsts jahr,
 they.DEM marry MP next year
they are getting married (you know) next year,

06 MAR: .h ↑Achja [he
 RP [
.h ↑Ah uh huh [hu

Markus's proposed understanding is confirmed by Tanja in line 2. Tanja's affirmative answer is interesting in its production: It is drawn out and produced with slight smile voice. It implies a certain purposeful hesitation, as if Tanja is deliberately withholding information at this point, thus conveying that there might be more tellable material (see Betz/Golato 2008: 88-90). By offering a further opportunity for inquiry implicitly, Tanja displays that she understood Markus's turn, specifically his use of the reference term, as a request for a telling. The crucial analytic claim here is that the reference term transforms a yes/no-interrogative into a

request for a telling that expands on and accounts for a positive/negative answer.²² She thus seems to seek alignment between her own and Markus's (affective) stance on the referent. If we were to verbalize what seems to be communicated here, the following may be a useful approximation of line 2: "You are implying an assessment of Specki, and I am too. I wonder if we are thinking the same thing." Instead of asking in the next turn, however, Markus begins to laugh, and Tanja joins in. It seems that the interactants share enough background information about the referents to find this state of affairs funny. Through the laughter, they display a shared (negative) stance toward Eva and Specki and/or their relationship without ever expressing it in words.²³

This paper argues that the potential for a shared (although never explicitly expressed) negative stance toward Specki – that is, the potential for something tellable concerning Specki – is already conveyed through the person reference in line 1. With the reference form 'article+name', Markus displays his presupposition that the referent Specki is independently and locally accessible for Tanja (that is, it can be easily activated, e.g., via relating it to the preceding *die*, line 1). Moreover, Markus instructs his co-participant to bring this independent knowledge/experience with Specki (and possibly prior exchanges between Tanja and Markus) to bear on her response to Markus's question. By implicitly offering a referent for topicalization with the form 'article+name' and by additionally conveying his affective stance regarding the referent through choosing a nickname (which has independent descriptive content), Markus can be said to mark his availability for a socially delicate action: gossiping. In other words, the reference format offers a resource for shaping the direction of the larger sequence.

Consider now extracts 15-17, taken from a game playing interaction between four participants, Siggi and Klara, who are the hosts, and Tim and Erna, who are guests for the evening. The four participants are playing *ligretto*, a card game in which speed is crucial.²⁴ Throughout this extract, Tim and Erna are distributing cards. The extract is preceded by a sequence of teasing between siblings Siggi and Erna about their respective game playing abilities; with the preface *das beste war/ 'the best thing was'* (line 2), Klara initiates a new sequence. With *weißte des noch?/ 'remember'* (line 3), she elicits Siggi's recognition of the event she is about to recount, thus displaying that her reference *wir/ 'we'* (line 2) included Siggi and inviting her husband's participation as co-teller of the story. Siggi claims a lack of access to the event in line 4, thereby also disaligning with Klara's proposed course of action.

²² A similar observation can be made for Oma's turn in line 2 of extract 12 *clinton & gore*. Thanks to Arnulf Deppermann for prompting me to formulate this more explicitly.

²³ Markus's reaction (not in transcript) to Tanja's announcement of the impending wedding of Eva and Specki makes this even clearer: After his *achja* (line 6), Markus and Tanja share another sequence of laughter.

²⁴ *Ligretto* is a proprietary German version of what is known in many English-speaking countries as *Nerts*, *Dutch Blitz*, or *Peanut*.

Extract 15: *gediegenes kaffeetrinken* [REF.103: KC0038_min.19, face-to-face]

01 (1.6)

02 KLA: des beste *w-war als wir das mal im (wirtshaus/wirtsham)
the best was when we that MP in.the restaurant
*the best thing *w-was when we were playing that*

03 (mal/da) gespielt haben. †°weißte des noch?°†
(MP/there) played have know.you that still
(once/there) in a restaurant. °remember?°

04 SIG: nein ((no gaze shift to KLA))
RP
no

05 KLA: wir ham *des zu viert in der kneipe gespielt,
we have that as four in the pub played
*we played *it four of us in the bar,*

06 und des war so gediegene:s kaffee: trinken, oder
and that was MP stylish coffee drinking or
and it was like having co:ffee in sty:le, or

07 gediegene kaff[ee trink-
stylish coffee drink
coff[ee in sty-

08 SIG: [*SIG: gaze to KLA* **KLA-SIG: mutual gaze
[ä:h *da war ich nicht **dabei.=ehrllich.
[there was I not with honestly
[u:h *I wasn't there** (with you).=I swear.

Siggi's *nein/ 'no'* (line 4) is understood by Klara as a problem of remembering, and Klara's turn in lines 5-7 evidences this: She begins her story, with Erna as her main story recipient, by detailing the setting of the event (thus also invoking additional details that may prompt remembering on Siggi's part). *Wir/ 'we'* and *zu viert/ 'four of us'* (line 5) still includes Siggi as present at this event, and this is what Siggi presently takes issue with (line 8). His correction also recasts line 4 as not a problem of remembering on Siggi's part but a problem of expectation on Klara's. This briefly puts Klara's story on hold: She rejects Siggi's correction by connecting further shared experience to the event (extract 15, line 9). As part of this, she introduces two referents while addressing Siggi. Both are introduced with bare name forms. These references are unproblematic for Siggi, as evidenced by his subsequent reference to them (*mit denen/ 'with them'*, line 11).

Extract 16: *ligretto* (continuation of extract 15)

08 SIG: [*SIG: gaze to KLA* **KLA-SIG: mutual gaze
[ä:h *da war ich nicht **dabei.=ehrllich.
[there was I not with honestly
[u:h *I wasn't there** (with you).=I swear.

- 09 => KLA: geste- doch. da waren **monika** und **michi** zu *besuch.
yester RP there were ((name)) and ((name)) to visit
yeste- yes you were. (it was when) monika and michi
were *visiting.
- KLA: gaze down (-1.14)*
- 10 ERN: nja?
RP
nyeah?
- 11 SIG: und da ham wir mit denen des [ligre]tto ge[spielt?]
and there have we with them.DEM ART ((name)) played]
and (that's when) we played [ligre]tto wi[th them?]
[] []
- 12 KLA: [und-] [ja.]=
[and] [RP]
[and-] [yes.]=
- 13 ERN: =und des is-
and that is
=and that is-
- KLA: gaze to SIG,* KLA: gaze from**
no mutual gaze SIG to ERN
- 14 [da flippen die ↑leute *immer to]ta**:l aus.
[there flip the people always totally out
[(playing that) ↑people *always get a]**ll crazy.

Parallel to Siggi's epistemic backdown (lines 11), Erna prompts a continuation of the story, first with *nja?* (line 10) and then by formulating an understanding of what the point of the story will be (lines 13-14): that playing the game led to behavior that contrasted with *gediegene:s kaffee: trinken/ 'co:ffee in sty:le,'* (line 6). This extract is continued in extract 17 below. In extract 17, we observe that there are two competing lines of action (lines 13-14 and line 15). This makes Klara's turn (line 15) initially ambiguous: Is it a resumption of the story telling or a continuation of the repair sequence in which Klara and Siggi negotiate the remembering of a shared event? Klara's gaze orientation (to Siggi at the end of her turn), as well as her use of *doch* to appeal to a common view (Lütten 1979) and thus indirectly to a shared experience, suggest the latter. However, in her response to Erna and continuation of the story telling (line 16), Klara refers back to *die Monika* (line 15) with *die/ 'she'*, and this suggests that line 15 in fact occupies a sequential pivot position between insertion and main sequence.

Extract 17: hysterikerin (continuation of extract 16)

- 13 ERN: =und des is-
and that is
=and that is-

amples of alignment (and affiliation), however. Examples of disalignment are discussed next.

4.2.3. Projecting and prefiguring a tellable: disalignment

The last two excerpts in this section show instances in which recipients do not align with a speaker who proposes a referent for topicalization. In the following excerpt, Annette, her husband David, and her parents Bernhard and Sybille are talking about Bernhard and Sybille's neighbors, specifically the neighbor's son. Uschi does not know these neighbors. After the reference repair in lines 1-5 is resolved, Bernhard moves to a new topic, the neighbor's daughter, Annika (line 7). His turns in lines 7 and 9, and his wife Sybille's gesturing in line 10 are directed at Annette.

Extract 18: *aus amerika* [REF.55: AG_FS51.21_51.50, face-to-face; see discussions in Betz/Golato 2008:14 and Golato 2010:51]

- 1 USC: sin des nachbarn.
are they.DEM neighbors
are those neighbors.
- 2 SYB: *SYB points to neighbors' house*
m*hm.*
RP
mhm.
- 3 ANN: *ANN points to neighbors' house*
*°da dr[üben.°
there over
*°over th[ere.°
[
[*B points to neighbors' house*
4 BER: [gegen*über.*
[across
[across from (there/us)
- 5 USC: ACHso.
RP
OH I see.
- 6 (0.2)
- 7 => BER: aber >wenn de **die< annika** siehst, kriechste en schreck.
but when you ART ((name)) see get.you a fright
but >when you see< annika, you'll be shocked.
- 8 (0.6)
- 9 BER: hast schon gesehn?
have already seen
have you already seen (her)?

- *SYB holds hands about a foot apart and moves them up and down twice, blowing up her cheeks**
- 10 ANN: *.h des- wir ham* jetzt(.)vorhin fest[gestellt dass-]
 that we have now earlier noticed that-]
 .h tha- we just (.)now rea[lized that-]
- 11 SYB: [(das) ritter sport
 [(ART) ((brand name))²⁶
 [(the) ritter sport
- 12 SYB: modell [(.) (ja)
 model [RP/TAG
 type built [(.) (yes)
 [
 [*ANN: gaze shift to SYB*
- 13 ANN: [dass *[se::hr] viele* deutsche:[.hh]
 [that [very] many germans []
 [that *[a lo::t] of* ge:rmans [.hh]
 [] []
- 14 USC: [hhm] []
- 15 SYB: [hhe he]
 [hhe he]
- 16 ANN: auch kinder ↑unglaublich fett sind.
 also children unbelievably fat are
 including children are ↑unbelievably fat.
- 17 SYB: [* (ja:)
 [RP
 [* (ye:s)
 [
 [*DAV shakes head **DAV nods
- 18 ANN: [*aber auch viele **fra:uen (.) sind unglaub[lich (dick)].
 [but also many women are unbelievably (big)
 [*but also many **wo:men (.) are incred[ibly (big)].
 []
- 19 BER: [schwappt
 [spills
 [all
- *waving hand from right to left*
- 20 BER: alles rüber von *amerika*
 all across from ((country name))
 (of that) spills over from *america*
- 21 (0.2)
- 22 DAV: .CHE=[hhhh ((half laugh, half snort))
 []
- 23 ANN: [ja aber [°was° denn]
 [RP but [what MP]
 [yes but [°what° (does)]
 []
- 24 USC: [mhm:: hmm h]h
 [mhm:: hmm h]h

²⁶ *Ritter Sport* is a German chocolate brand, and their chocolate bars are square. By saying (and also conveying gesturally, line 10) that the referent is a *ritter sport modell*, Sybille suggests that Annika is as wide as she is tall (i.e., very overweight).

Bernhard's turn in line 7 proposes news about Annika. The formulation *kriechstest du schrecklich* 'you'll be shocked' (line 7) suggests the type of news available for topicalization: something unexpected and shocking or frightening. The addressed person and intended recipient of the proposed news/telling, Annette, does not respond in line 6. Bernhard's next turn is a more explicit probe into Annette's status as potential story recipient: He offers an understanding of what may motivate her lack of alignment. Annette responds in line 10, in overlap with Sybille's descriptive gesture of Annika's body shape. Sybille's gesture in line 10, and her description in lines 11-12, indicates her availability as co-teller of a story about Annika, and it displays her understanding of the type of story Bernhard projected: an negative evaluation of Annika, that is, a gossiping activity. Annette's turn in line 10, although formatted as responsive (*des/* 'that') does not provide a go-ahead for the proposed telling, and instead reports a noticing. This noticing associatively takes up the topic (being overweight) but not the action Bernhard and Sybille proposed. Annette's turn in lines 13 and 16 continues this competing action trajectory rather than joining in Sybille's negative assessment of Annette (line 11-12, 15). Annette thus resists the proposed gossiping about Annika and contrastively proposes the more general phenomenon of increased obesity in Germany (without explicit reference to Annika) as a topic. Talk after line 24 continues with Bernhard, and then also Annette and Sybille, formulating factors that may contribute to a recent rise in obesity in Germany. Thus, Annette's direction of the topic, rather than Bernhard's, is continued here. In sum, in excerpt 18, a speaker proposes tellable material about a referent with the form 'article+name'. Additionally, a particular stance toward the referent is indexed lexically and gesturally, and this specifies the kind of telling activity that is proposed here: gossiping. The addressee takes up the proposed topic, but develops it in a different direction, and she provides no affiliation with a proposed negative stance towards the recipient Annika, thereby rejecting the proposed gossiping activity.

In extract 18, a lack in alignment and affiliation is traceable in Annette's actions following the presentation of a tellable. In the next extract, a recipient's lack in alignment is additionally visible in his use of a contrastive co-referential term. In extract 19 below (which is similar to extract 12 *clinton & gore*), a recipient of a request for a telling provides only minimal uptake before shifting to self-focused matters. In this example, resistance by a co-participant to align with a proposed topic is reflected in his second-position use of a bare name, which contrasts with the 'article+name' format. The excerpt is taken from a phone conversation between friends; the analytic focus is in line 5. Lines 1-3 close the previous sequence.

Extract 19: *besser*

[REF.21: 046_Ingo2A, tel.; see discussion in Betz 2008:48-51]

1 MAR: MA(n) – MAL schau:n: NE?
 MP MP see TAG
 we'll- we'll see: okay?

2 (0.5)

- 3 XAV: <̥:kee>=
okay
<̥:kay>=
- 4 MAR: =okee.
okay
=okay.
- 5 => MAR: so. wie ge[hts denn (dem/em) raffa>e]l gehts=
DM. how goes.it MP ART.DAT ((name)) goes.it
so. how['s raffa>e]l is=
[]
[<alles kla:r>]
[all clear]
[<allri:ght (then)>]
- 7 MAR: =wieder besser.=ne,
again better TAG
=better again.=right,
- 8 (0.9)
- 9 XAV: raffael is fit dra:uf. (.) sieht gut a::us
((name)) is fit on top looks good
raffael is in good sha:pe. (.) is looking good
- 10 XAV: .hhhh
.hhhh
- 11 XAV: ä=obwohl ich ja hier im augnblick (.)
although I MP here at.the moment
uh=although I am (/it's me who is) at the moment (.)
- 12 ziemlich viel erfolg habe; so:=äh eh <bei den frauen.>
quite much success have MP uh uh with the women
quite popular; like:=uh uh <with the ladies.>

Betz (2008) analyzes Manuel's turn in lines 5 and 7 as a syntactic pivot construction, in which the speaker performs a shift in action from a wh-question (*wie geht's denn dem/em raffael/* 'how's raffael') to a confirmable declarative (*dem/em raffael geht's wieder besser.=ne,/* 'raffael is better again.=right,'). Such complex structural shifts within one unit are systematically used to deal with problems in alignment, affiliation, and reciprocity (Betz 2008). In this context, the speaker recovers overlapped information and resists a competing move by his co-participant: While Manuel provides Xaver with a ticket to a telling, thus moving to new new action (*so*, Barske/Golato 2010) and topic (line 5), Xaver initiates conversation closing (line 6). Thus, Manuel's topic proffer (the well-being of a common acquaintance) is placed in a precarious sequential position. Note that *wieder/* 'again' and *besser/* 'better' (line 7) display the assumption that there is previous knowledge on Xaver's part that Raffael was not doing well. The particle *denn* (line 5) also refers to shared knowledge and makes relevant elaboration on the part of the recipient (Deppermann 2009). In line 9, Xaver indeed responds to Manuel's inquiry rather than pursuing closing, but his response only offers limited elaboration. In lines 11-12, he then shifts to an announcement about himself, thus effectively rejecting the proposed topic. I argue that this rejection of proposed tellabili-

ty is already projected in the reference Xaver uses in line 9: With the bare name *raffael*, Xaver discards the person Raffael as newsworthy and contrastively proposes himself (and events from his life) for topicalization instead.

4.3. Summary

Section 4 identified and analyzed two systematic contexts in which the person reference format 'article+name' is used recurrently and contrast with 'bare name' forms. Through choices in reference formulation at distinct sequential points and in specific action contexts, speakers navigate epistemics (that is, they index the type of knowledge they attribute to a recipient) and shape larger sequences of action. This study has found that 'article+name' formats

- convey epistemic stance (section 4.1, extracts 8 and 9),
- identify the protagonist of an upcoming telling (section 4.2.1, extracts 11-13),
- project a tellable and thus prefigure a telling (sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.3, extracts 14, 15-17, 18, 19).

The third function can be seen as a more generalized account of the second. Speakers can project a telling by indicating that they have something tellable to offer about a referent, or that they assume the co-participant to have something tellable to offer about a referent. This projecting of tellability often includes the indexing of an affective stance towards the referent, via reference choices or other means.

In responding to actions that contain 'article+name' formats, recipients can align or disalign with the epistemic stance conveyed, by e.g., resisting knowledge/access attributed to them (see extracts 8 and 9). At the beginnings of potential tellings, they can also align with or resist with a stance of tellability, and thus endorse or resist a proposed topic or course of action (for the latter, see extract 12, 18, 19).

5. Conclusion

The present study investigates how interactants refer to third parties in every-day German. It describes a particular type of third-person reference form, the format 'article+name' (e.g., *die uschi* '(the) uschi'), and analyzes its use in specific interactional contexts. The study confirms a basic finding of previous work on the use of reference terms in different languages: We can distinguish pragmatically marked and unmarked reference formulation. That is, reference can do either 'simply referring to a person/persons' to achieve recognition or 'more than referring' (cf. Brown 1958; Enfield 2007; Ervin-Tripp 1972; Levinson 2000; Schegloff 1996b). The latter may include: indexing association with a person, indicating distance, conveying epistemic or affective stance, rendering someone as a member of a certain category of persons. In addition to indicating *who* is referred to, a particular form of reference in a specific context may convey something else about the speaker, the recipient, the referent, or the relationship between either of them (cf. Stivers 2007).

Speakers of German have a variety of forms available to do nominal, in particular name, reference. This paper shows that the use of articles before person names in initial position conveys a speaker's presuppositions regarding the recipient, communicates information about a speaker's epistemic stance towards a referent, and can project activities. In subsequent position, the choice between using a pronoun, a bare name, or a name preceded by an article becomes an important resource for recipients, because it allows them to align with or resist a first speaker's epistemic presuppositions or proposed course of action. More specifically, the following specific findings emerged from the present study:

(1) The form 'article+name' is a *recognitional* reference form. It is used when speakers have, and also presuppose their recipient to have, independent knowledge of a referent (that is, knowledge of/experience with the referent outside of the current interaction) and can *access* this referent. The form instructs recipients to draw on their knowledge/experience to recognize the recipient locally, that is, speakers presuppose that recipients can activate the form. This dimension becomes visible when epistemic asymmetries emerge, that is, when recognition of a recipient initially fails and interactants initiate reference repair (extracts 8, 9). Thus, initial 'article+name' forms provide an opportunity in the next turn for alignment with or repair of the epistemic stance implied.

(2) At the beginning of (potential) telling sequences, names preceded by a definite article can be said to do more than referring. They index *tellability* in connection with a referent and thus offer material for topicalization. 'Article+name' forms can combine with other elements (e.g., gestures, nicknames; extracts 14, 18) to additionally convey a particular stance toward a referent. They thereby instruct recipients to connect the unfolding turn or projected talk to their independent knowledge of a referent and determine the specific nature of the proposed attitude or stance. Again, these reference forms provide an opportunity for *alignment* with the action in the next turn, in which case projected activities get properly launched or expanded (extract 14; extracts 15-17). Second aligning moves may be accompanied by affiliation with an evaluative stance conveyed. Recipients may also *resist* the proposed course of action. Extract 12 *clinton & gore* and 19 *besser* are clear instance of resistance to a conveyed assumption of tellability. In this case, activities that were arguably projected (stories, gossiping) do not get launched or expanded.

(3) In some examples, the form 'article+name' seems to play a crucial role in action formation, that is, in making a speaker's action recognizable in the first place. In examples 12, 14, and 19, the turns containing an 'art+name' reference are formatted as yes/no-interrogatives. Their analysis showed that the reference term can transform a yes/no-interrogative addressed to a specific recipient into a request for a telling that expands on and accounts for a positive/negative answer.

This paper has argued that function of the reference form 'article+name' cannot be isolated from its action context and specific sequential position. In certain activity contexts, the form serves as a pragmatic instruction for recipients, alerting them that 'more than referring' is being done. Most generally, the form projects tellability and thus a telling or story. 'Article+name' can project which referent (of several available ones) will be the focus of an upcoming telling. In combination with other elements, it can also invite participation in a negative assessment of a referent, thus effectively licensing gossip. All of these uses are context-specific,

but they share their placement in telling sequences. Tellability is a crucial dimension in play at the beginnings of tellings²⁷ – or rather, of potential tellings, since their emergence is a negotiated matter. The form instructs a co-participant that there is material about the referent that can be made the topic of conversation.²⁸ What exactly the essence of this tellable material is needs to be worked out by co-participants from other clues in the interaction, and from their independent access to the referent. All of this is in play when interactants negotiate the direction of the talk. The study shows that the negotiation of reference choice, and of recipient design more generally, is future-oriented and intimately tied to the negotiation and launching of larger action trajectories (cf. Deppermann 2015).

6. References

- Ariel, Mira (1990): *Accessing Noun Phrase Antecedents*. London: Routledge.
- Ariel, Mira (2008): *Pragmatics and Grammar*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Allerton, Derek J. (1987): The linguistic and sociolinguistic status of proper names. What are they, and who do they belong to? In: *Journal of Pragmatics* 11, 61-92.
- Altmann, Hans (1981): *Formen der 'Herausstellung' im Deutschen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Auer, Peter (1981): Zur indexikalitätsmarkierenden Funktion der demonstrativen Artikelform in deutschen Konversationen. In: Hindelang, Götz / Zillig, Werner (eds.), *Sprache: Verstehen und Handeln. Akten des 15. Linguistischen Kolloquiums Münster 1980*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 301-310.
- Auer, Peter (1983): Überlegungen zur Bedeutung der Namen aus einer 'realistischen' Sichtweise. In: Faust, Manfred et al. (eds.), *Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, Sprachtypologie und Textlinguistik (Festschrift für Peter Hartmann)*. Tübingen: Narr, 173-186.
- Auer, Peter (1984): Referential problems in conversation. In: *Journal of Pragmatics* 8, 627-648.
- Barske, Tobias / Golato, Andrea (2010). German so: Managing sequence and action. *Text & Talk* 30(3), 245-266.
- Bellmann, Günther (1990): *Pronomen und Korrektur*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Betz, Emma (2008): *Grammar and Interaction: Pivots in German Conversation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Betz, Emma (in press): Indexing epistemic access through different confirmation formats: Uses of responsive (das) stimmt in German interaction. In: *Journal of Pragmatics*. doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2015.03.018

²⁷ The use of 'article+name' in other parts of tellings awaits further analysis, as does a systematic comparison (and resulting statistical estimate) of different reference forms used at story beginnings (to identify a protagonist or propose a story about a person known in common) in the author's data. The specific collection for this study was guided by reference form, not by sequential context.

²⁸ This is, in a way, in line with what Karen's intuitive explanation in excerpt 1 suggests: If someone is a story-worthy person, his or her behavior is unusual, extravagant, interesting, at least with reference to the current topic. The use of an article before the name indexes and projects more talk about the referent. Note, however, that I am not arguing that the format 'definite article + person name' serves as a membership categorization device, although many forms of reference are intimately connected to membership categorization (cf. Schegloff 2007b).

- Betz, Emma / Golato, Andrea (2008): Remembering relevant information and withholding relevant next actions: The German token *achja*. In: *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 41(1), 58-98.
- Betz, Emma / Taleghani-Nikazm, Carmen / Drake, Veronika / Golato, Andrea (2013): Third-position repeats in German: The case of repair- and request-for-information sequences. In: *Gesprächsforschung* 14, 133-166.
- Brown, Roger (1958): How shall a thing be called? In: *Psychological Review* 65, 14-21.
- Brown, Penelope (2007): Principles of person reference in Tzeltal conversation. In: Enfield, Nick J. / Stivers, Tanya (eds.): *Person Reference in Interaction: Linguistic, Cultural and Social Perspectives*. Cambridge: CUP, 172-202.
- Clark, Herbert H. / Wilkes-Gibbs, Deanna (1986): Referring as a collaborative process. In: *Cognition* 22, 1-39.
- Clark, Herbert H. / Marshall, Catherine R. (1981): Definite reference and mutual knowledge. In: Joshe, Aravind / Webber, Bonnie / Sag, Ivan (eds.), *Elements of Discourse Understanding*. Cambridge: CUP, 10-63.
- Comrie, Bernard / Haspelmath, Martin / Bickel, Balthasar (2008): Leipzig Glossing Rules: Conventions for interlinear morpheme-by-morpheme glosses, revised February 2008. Retrieved May 30, 2008; from <http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php>
- Deppermann, Arnulf / Reitemeier, Ulrich / Schmitt, Reinhold / Spranz-Fogasy, Thomas (eds.) (2010): *Verstehen in professionellen Handlungsfeldern*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Deppermann, Arnulf / Schmitt, Reinhold (2008): Verstehensdokumentationen: Zur Phänomenologie von Verstehen in der Interaktion. In: *Deutsche Sprache* 36(3), 220-245.
- Deppermann, Arnulf (2009): Verstehensdefizit als Antwortverpflichtung: Interaktionale Eigenschaften der Modalpartikel *denn* in Fragen. In: Günthner, Susanne / Bückler, Jörg (eds.), *Grammatik im Gespräch. Konstruktionen der Selbst- und Fremdpositionierung*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 23-56.
- Deppermann, Arnulf (2011): The study of formulations as a key to an interactional semantics. In: *Human Studies* 34(2), 115-128.
- Deppermann, Arnulf (2015): When recipient design fails: Egocentric turn-design of instructions in driving school lessons leading to breakdowns of intersubjectivity. In: *Gesprächsforschung* 16, 63-101.
- Downing, Pamela A (1996): Proper names as a referential option in English Conversation. In: Fox, Barbara A. (eds.), *Studies in Anaphora*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 95-144.
- Drew, Paul (2005): Conversation analysis. In: Fitch, Kristine / Sanders, Robert E. (eds.), *Handbook of Language and Social Interaction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 71-102.
- Duranti, Alessandro (1997): *Linguistic Anthropology*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Durrell, Martin (2003): *Using German. A Guide to Contemporary Usage* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: CUP.
- Edenstrom, Juliane (2009): *Word Order in Spoken German. Syntactic Right-Expansions as an Interactionally Constructed Phenomenon*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

- Eichhoff, Jürgen (2000): Wortatlas der deutschen Umgangssprachen (Vol. 4). Bern/München: Saur.
- Enfield, Nick J. (2013): Reference in Conversation. In: Stivers, Tanya / Sidnell, Jack (eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell, 433-454.
- Enfield, Nick J. (2007): Meanings of the unmarked: why 'default' person reference does more than just refer. In: Enfield, Nick J. / Stivers, Tanya (eds.), *Person Reference in Interaction: Linguistic, Cultural and Social Perspectives*. Cambridge: CUP, 97-120.
- Enfield, Nick J. / Stivers, Tanya (2007): *Person Reference in Interaction: Linguistic, Cultural and Social Perspectives*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Ervin-Tripp, Susan (1972): On sociolinguistic rules: Alternation and co-occurrence. In: John J. Gumperz / Hymes, Dell (eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. London: Blackwell, 150-213.
- Ford, Cecilia E. / Fox, Barbara A. (1996): Interactional motivations for reference formulation: He had. This guy had, a beautiful, thirty-two o:lds. In: Fox, Barbara A. (ed.), *Studies in Anaphora*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 145-168.
- Fox, Barbara A. (1993): *Discourse Structure and Anaphora*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Fox, Barbara A. / Thompson, Sandra (2010): Responses to wh-questions in English conversation. In: *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 43(2), 133-156.
- Garde, Murray (2003): *Social Deixis in Bininj Kun-wok Conversation*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. University of Queensland.
- Garfinkel, Harold (1967): *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Engelwood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Georgakopoulou, Alexandra (2007): *Small Stories, Interaction and Identities*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Goffman, Erving (1981): *Forms of Talk*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Golato, Andrea (2003): Studying compliment responses: A comparison of DCTs and recordings of naturally occurring talk. In: *Applied Linguistics* 24, 90-121.
- Golato, Andrea (2010): Marking understanding versus receipting information in talk: Achso. and ach in German interaction. In: *Discourse Studies* 12(2), 147-176.
- Golato, Andrea (2013): Reparaturen von Personenreferenzen. In: *Deutsche Sprache* 41(1), 31-51.
- Golato, Andrea / Betz, Emma (2008): German ach and achso in repair uptake: A resource to sustain or remove epistemic asymmetry. In: *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 27, 7-37.
- Goodwin, Charles (1979): The interactive construction of a sentence in natural conversation. In: George Psathas (ed.), *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology*. New York: Irvington Publishers, 97-121.
- Hacohen, Gonen / Schegloff, Emanuel A. (2006): On the preference for minimization in referring to persons: Evidence from Hebrew Conversation. In: *Journal of Pragmatics* 38, 1305-1312.
- Hanks, William F. (2007): Person reference in Yucatec Maya conversation. In: Enfield, Nick J. / Stivers, Tanya (eds.), *Person Reference in Interaction: Linguistic, Cultural and Social Perspectives*. Cambridge: CUP, 149-171.

- Hayashi, M. / Raymond, G. / Sidnell, J. (2013): *Conversational Repair and Human Understanding*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Hepburn, Alexa / Bolden, Galina (2013): The conversation analytic approach to transcription. In: Stivers, Tanya / Sidnell, Jack (eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell, 57-76.
- Heritage, John (1984): *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Heritage, John / Raymond, Geoffrey (2005). The terms of agreement: Indexing epistemic authority and subordination in assessment sequences. In: *Social Psychology Quarterly* 68, 15-38.
- Jefferson, Gail (1978): Sequential aspects of storytelling in conversation. In: Schenkein, J. (ed.): *Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction*. New York: Academic, 219-248.
- Jefferson, Gail (1984): On the organization of laughter in talk about troubles. In: Atkinson, John / Heritage, John (eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: CUP, 346-369.
- Jefferson, Gail (1985): An exercise in the transcription and analysis of laughter. In: Van Dijk, Teun (ed.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. London: Academic, 25-34.
- Jefferson, Gail (1996): On the Poetics of Ordinary Talk. In: *Text and Performance Quarterly* 16, 11-61.
- Kitzinger, Celia / Shaw, Rebecca / Toerien, Merran (2012): Referring to persons without using a full-form reference: Locally initial indexicals in action. In: *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45(2), 116-132.
- Kolde, Gottfried (1992): Zur Referenzsemantik von Eigennamen im gegenwärtigen Deutschen. In: *Deutsche Sprache* 2/92, 139-152.
- Kolde, Gottfried (1995): Grammatik der Eigennamen. In: Eichler, Ernst et al. (eds.), *Namenforschung: Ein internationales Handbuch zur Onomastik*. New York: de Gruyter, 400-408.
- Lerner, Gene (2004): *Conversation Analysis: Papers from the First Generation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Lerner, Gene H. / Bolden, Galina / Hepburn, Alexa / Mandelbaum, Jenny (2012): Reference recalibration repairs: Adjusting the precision of formulations for the task at hand. In: *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45(2), 191-212.
- Levinson, Stephen C. (2000): *Presumptive Meanings: The theory of generalized conversational implicature*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Levinson, Stephen (2007): Optimizing person reference: Perspectives from usage on Rossel Island. In: Enfield, Nick J. / Stivers, Tanya (eds.), *Person Reference in Interaction: Linguistic, Cultural and Social Perspectives*. Cambridge: CUP, 29-72.
- Lütten, Jutta (1979): Die Rolle der Partikeln doch, eben und ja als Konsensus-Konstitutiva in gesprochener Sprache. In: Weydt, H. (ed.), *Die Partikeln der deutschen Sprache*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 30-38.
- Margutti, Piera (2007): Two uses of third-person references in family gatherings displaying family ties: teasing and clarifications. In: *Discourse Studies* 9, 623-651.
- Nübling, Damaris (2014): Die Kaiser Wilhelm - der Peterle - das Merkel. Genus als Endstadium einer Grammatikalisierung – und als Quelle von Re- und De-

- grammatikalisierungen. In: Jahrbuch 2013 der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur Mainz, 127-146.
- Nübling, Damaris / Fahlbusch, Fabian / Heuser, Rita (2012): Namen. Eine Einführung in die Onomastik. Tübingen: Narr.
- Nübling, Damaris / Busley, Simone / Drenda, Juliane (2013): Dat Anna und s Eva – Neutrale Frauenrufnamen in deutschen Dialekten und im Luxemburgischen zwischen pragmatischer und semantischer Genuszuweisung. In: Zeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik 80(2), 152-196.
- Oh, Sun-Young (2007): Overt reference to speaker and recipient in Korean. In: Discourse Studies 9, 462-492.
- Polak-Yitzhaki, Hilla (2004): The functions of subject personal pronouns (attached, overt and proclitic) in spoken Israeli Hebrew. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Hebrew Language Department, University of Haifa, Israel (in Hebrew).
- Quasthoff, Uta M. (1980): Erzählen in Gesprächen. Tübingen: Narr.
- Raymond, Geoffrey / Heritage, John (2006): The epistemics of social relations: Owning grandchildren. In: Language in Society 35(5), 677-705.
- Ruoff, Arno (1995): Stilistische Funktionen der Namen in mündlichen Erzählungen. In Eichler, Ernst et al. (eds.), Namenforschung: Ein internationales Handbuch zur Onomastik. New York: De Gruyter, 551-556.
- Reck, Martin (1994): Sprachstrukturelle Unterschiede zwischen dem Stadt-Berndeutsch und der deutschen Standardsprache. Unveröffentlichte Magisterarbeit: Universität Bern, Schweiz.
- Sacks, Harvey / Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1979): Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversation and their interaction. In: Psathas, George (ed.), Everyday Language. Studies in Ethnomethodology. New York: Irvington Publishers, 15-21.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1972): Notes on a Conversational Practice: Formulating Place. In: David N. Sudnow (ed.), Studies in Social Interaction. New York: MacMillan, The Free Press, 75-119.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1996a): Confirming allusion. Towards an empirical account of action. In: The American Journal of Sociology 102(1), 161-216.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1996b): Some practices for referring to persons in talk-in-interaction: A partial sketch of a systematics. In: Fox, Barbara A. (ed.), Studies in Anaphora. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 437-485.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. (2007a): Sequence Organization in Interaction. A Primer in Conversation Analysis. Cambridge: CUP.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. (2007b): Categories in action: Person-reference and membership categorization. In: Discourse Studies 9, 433-461.
- Schegloff / Emanuel A. / Ochs, Elinor / Thompson, Sandra A. (1996): Introduction. In: Elinor Ochs / Emanuel A. Schegloff / Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), Interaction and Grammar. Cambridge: CUP, 1-51.
- Schmuck, Miriam / Szczepaniak, Renata (2014): Der Gebrauch des Definitartikels vor Familien- und Rufnamen im Frühneuhochdeutschen aus grammatikalisierungstheoretischer Perspektive. In: Debus, Friedhelm / Heuser, Rita / Nübling, Damaris (eds.), Linguistik der Familiennamen. Hildesheim: Olms, 97-138.
- Schwitalla, Johannes (1995): Namen in Gesprächen. In Eichler, E. et al. (eds.), Namenforschung: Ein internationales Handbuch zur Onomastik. Berlin: De Gruyter, 498-504.

- Sidnell, Jack (2005): *Talk and Practical Epistemology. The Social life of Knowledge in a Caribbean community.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Sidnell, Jack (2007): *Repairing person reference in a small Caribbean community: Generic organization, local inflection.* In: Enfield, Nick J. / Stivers, Tanya (eds.), *Person Reference in Interaction: Linguistic, Cultural, and Social Perspectives.* Cambridge: CUP, 281-308.
- Stivers, Tanya (2005): *Modified repeats: One method for asserting primary rights from second position.* In: *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 38(2), 131-58.
- Stivers, Tanya (2007): *Alternative recognitionals in person reference.* In: Enfield, Nick J. / Stivers, Tanya (eds.), *Person Reference in Interaction: Linguistic, Cultural, and Social Perspectives.* Cambridge: CUP, 73-96.
- Streeck, Jürgen (1993): *Gesture as communication I: Its coordination with gaze and speech.* In: *Communication Monographs* 60(4), 275-299.
- Szczepaniak, Renata (2011): *Grammatikalisierung im Deutschen.* Tübingen: Narr.
- Terasaki, Alene (2004 [1976]): *Pre-announcement sequences in conversation.* In: Lerner, G. (ed.), *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation.* Benjamins: Amsterdam, 171-223.
- Werner, Otmar (1986): *Eigennamen im Dialog.* In: Hundsnurscher, Franz / Weigand, Edda (eds.), *Dialoganalyse.* Tübingen: Niemeyer, 297-315.
- Werth, Alexander (2014): *Die Funktion des Artikels bei Personennamen im norddeutschen Sprachraum.* In: Debus, Friedhelm / Heuser, Rita / Nübling, Damaris (eds.), *Linguistik der Familiennamen.* Hildesheim: Olms, 139-174.
- Werth, Alexander (2015): *Kasusmarkierung bei Personennamen in deutschen Regionalsprachen.* In: Lenz, Alexandra / Patocka, Franz (eds.), *Syntaktische Variation – areallinguistische Perspektiven.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Emma Betz, PhD,
Department of Germanic and Slavic Studies
University of Waterloo
Modern Languages 220, 200 University Ave. West
Waterloo, Ontario, N2L 3G1
Canada

embetz@uwaterloo.ca

Veröffentlicht am 3.8.2015

© Copyright by GESPRÄCHSFORSCHUNG. Alle Rechte vorbehalten.