

11 Intersubjectivity and progressivity in person (and place) reference

John Heritage

In a discussion of methods for showing understanding in conversation, Harvey Sacks distinguished between demonstrating and claiming understanding by reference to the following:

Example (1) [Sacks 1992, Vol 2: 141]

A: Where are you staying?
B: Pacific Palisades.
A: -> Oh at the west side of town.

Sacks comments that the third turn in Example (1) DEMONSTRATES a grasp of the place reference 'Pacific Palisades' by re-referencing it in other words. In this way it shows a recognition of the location that is amenable to correction. It is, of course, the character of the re-referencing operation that shows whether the respondent has a correct grasp of the location or not, as Sacks indicates in Example (2), a variant of this sequence, which exhibits a failure of recognition.¹

Example (2) [Sacks 1992, Vol 2: 142]

A: Where are you staying?
B: Pacific Palisades.
A: -> Oh in the center of town.

By contrast, he suggests, the repeat of the place reference in Example (3) is more equivocal: It may CLAIM recognition of the location, but it does not demonstrate it in a fashion that is amenable to correction.

Example (3) [Sacks 1992, Vol 2: 141]

A: Where are you staying?
B: Pacific Palisades..
A: -> Oh Pacific Palisades.

¹ Pacific Palisades is on the western (Pacific Ocean) edge of Los Angeles.

Not the least significant feature of these sequences, however, is that all three are invented. Moreover, despite the plausibility of Examples (1) and (2), it is difficult to locate naturally occurring references to either persons or places that approximate them. They are, in fact, sequences that appear to occur very infrequently in normal interaction. Instead sequences in which person reference is accomplished ordinarily run off without any overt claim or demonstration of recognition from recipients. Rather, recipients advance sequence progressivity thereby tacitly claiming recognition. Thus in Example (4), a little flurry of person references passes unregistered as such. That the reference is understood can only be gleaned from Vera's agreement with Jenny (line 6) and subsequently in Jenny's overlapped response to Vera (line 9):

Example (4) [Rah 14:6]

1 Jen: E[hm ih i]t's a bit like eh u eh:m
 2 Ver: [Y e:h,]
 3 (0.3)
 4 Jen: -> Bella's kids you see Mike is good wih th'm
 5 isn't he <WHERE> ez you say:eh:
 6 Ver: => [Y e : s .]
 7 (0.3)
 8 Ver: -> eh Freddy dz'n [(bother) 'e tea:]ses [them you see in]stead of
 9 Jen: => [(Freddy takes)] [Y e : : : : :]
 10 (.)
 11 Ver: telling them tuh stop it when (.) when'e she wz
 12 screa:ming 'e-

That and how the referred-to persons are known to Jenny and Vera is treated as understood, and is tacitly managed through the onward movement of the sequence.

Similarly, in Example (5) a reference to 'Margot' a friend of Jane's with whom Edward is only slightly acquainted – passes without any form of acknowledgement from Edward:

Example (5) [Heritage 01:13:1]

1 Jan: How'r you.
 2 Edw: Fine?
 3 Jan: .h Uh:m I wz wond'RING IF: you'n Ilene w'd like t'come ovuh
 4 -> fer a (.) drink this evenin:g.h.u-juh:: (.) Margot has come
 5 fr'm Coventry.
 6 (.)
 7 Jan: .h And uh:: (0.2) Yihknow I thought thet ih-'d (.) be nice
 8 if we could get t'gethuh,

9 (0.2)
 10 (): .hh
 11 (0.2)
 12 Edw: => Yah. Okay well let me ask her just a moment it depe:nds upon
 13 what she's doing hang on.

Again we see that recognition is managed purely tacitly in the way that Edward moves to secure acceptance of Jane's invitation from his wife. It is particularly notable that Edward has passed on opportunities to claim recognition here since there was an expansion of the recognitional reference to 'Margot' 'embeddedly' accomplished when Jane adds that Margot has come 'fr'm Coventry'. At best, these sequences embody TACIT CLAIMS of recognition: OVERT DEMONSTRATIONS of recognition are nowhere to be found.

The notion that responses that advance sequence progressivity are the main vehicle through which tacit claims of recognition are registered is further supported by speaker conduct in the absence of sequence progressing responses. In contexts where such responses are absent, and despite the fact that any number of considerations could be the source of recipient difficulty, speakers commonly infer that an intendedly recognitional reference has gone awry.

In Example (6) Leslie reports that she plans to bring 'Missiz La:mp'. This report is not taken up, and Leslie treats this lack of sequential progressivity to indicate that there was trouble with the reference. She manages this with an artful expansion of the reference to her place of residence after which she continues on:

Example (6) [Holt C85:6:27]

1 Bod: [So- (.) I: .hhh George was here u-(.)some (of) the
 2 time so (1.1) it might be mo:re I don't [know.]
 3 Les: [Yes: I was
 4 going t'bring Missiz La:mp,
 5 -> (0.2)
 6 Les: from North Cadb'ry
 7 (.)
 8 Les: but she can't come becuz 'er husband's unexpectedly .hhh
 9 had t'go away so she's comin:g to the f:irst one after
 10 Christmas.
 11 Bod: Oh: () .

In Example (7), Mark fails to respond to Dee's announcement that her future son-in-law has sold his house (line 4). After Mark's click and a micropause (line 4), Dee pursues this with a specification of the location of the house that still fails to elicit uptake (line 6). She then expands yet again with a

specification of the location (line 7) that elicits acknowledgement of where the house is but not of the news. Thus, although reference may not necessarily be the problem, it is common that speakers turn to reference as a source of trouble.

Example (7) [Holt 5/88:2:4: 473–482]

- 1 Dee: =uh[we're ho[ping that h e: .hhhh (0.3) he:'s cz 'ee sold=
 2 Mar: [w- [hhhhh
 3 Dee: =iz own hou]:se
 4 Mar: .gnkplk (.) [ihYe::s::
 5 Dee: [JA:nd it which wz in Frimley:
 6 -> (0.4)
 7 Dee: .hh (.) uh:m::n (0.2) that's sort'v the Aldershot.
 8 (0.3)
 9 Dee: [()
 10 Mar: [eeYeh I know roughly where it [is:
 11 Dee: [where it is yes,

Relevantly here, Dee treats Mark's non-response as involving a difficulty with her reference to the house: With the initial mention of the house there is an implied claim that Mark will know where it is.

Finally, tacit claims of recognition that are managed by simply progressing the sequence may later be found to be faulty. In Example (8) Kat's proposal for a get together with four named friends is responded to with a question that singles out the fourth of these: 'Clive'. The question clearly embodies a tacit claim to recognize the person in question and it furthers the sequence:

Example (8) [Holt X(C):2-1-4:145–161]

- 1 Kat: I[thought maybe we c'd g- have a get together of,=
 2 Les: [.hh
 3 Kat: =Melissa 'n Brian 'n: (0.5) Sarah 'n that [bloke, (.)
 4 oh: (.) uh Clive?
 5 Les: -> [Oh is [he coming down f'Christmas?
 6 (1.1)
 7 Kat: Uh:m
 8 Les: It's Ma:rk now you know. The other one: n-ih-u[h
 9 Kat: [No no:
 10 I mean um (.) the one 'oo: who:-:
 11 Les: .hhh [OH now [CLIVE:VE. Clive MacArthur yes buh he's
 12 away mah- e-he's awa:y (.) e-Boxing Day an' Christmas
 13 Day apparently
 14 Kat: Is 'e
 15 (0.3)

- 16 Les: Yes. B't uh [yes I: uh think a (.) get together would
 17 be a good idea

However at line 8, Lesley volunteers a remark that Kat understands as indicating that she has not correctly recognized the 'Clive' in question, and it is only at line 11 that Lesley is able to demonstrate that she now recognizes the reference with a full expansion of the person reference 'Clive MacArthur'.

There is a sense in which the infrequency of cases like Example (1) is quite surprising. After all Example (1) is almost a paradigmatic case of speakers arriving at referential common ground (Clark 1992). Indeed a simple fourth turn 'yes' by the second speaker would be sufficient to instantiate a complete state of intersubjectivity between the speakers (Schegloff 1992). Moreover, cases like Example (8) indicate the difficulties that can arise when recognition is assumptively claimed rather than overtly demonstrated. In a social world where the security of intersubjective understanding was a prized outcome, and the security of referential common ground was a privileged objective, we would expect to find numerous sequences of the type that Sacks described.

But these sequences are thin on the ground, and Sacks was obliged to invent them to make his point. Instead the management of references to persons as recognitional and as intersubjectively secure is done embeddedly (Jefferson 1987) through the kind of sequence progression represented in Examples (4) and (5). These sequences exhibit the 'maxim of minimization', which Levinson (1987) argues is a generic feature of conversational practices favouring implicit over explicit methods of accomplishing conversational tasks.

In the context of reference, recognition is assumed unless some form of trouble is indicated. In other words, recognition is treated as the 'default' condition of recognitional person reference.

This paper considers this fact by asking when it is that recipients are moved to offer something like the third turn in Example (1). This requires an examination of the ways in which troubles with person reference are indicated and the dynamics of their resolution. To set the scene for this examination, I begin by introducing some existing literature, and then proceed to consider responses to person references that incorporate repairs to the method or content of the references involved.

11.1 Background

In their well-known 'Two Preferences' paper (1979, reprinted this volume), Sacks and Schegloff observe that two orders of organization inform references to persons. Firstly, there is an overriding preference for recognitional

reference. Without recognition, reference is fruitless. We can consider this preference for recognitional reference as a subset of a more general preference for intersubjectivity and common ground. Secondly, they observe, there is a preference for minimized reference. The two preferences are concurrently satisfied (in Western societies at least), by the use of proper names.

Sacks and Schegloff also note that although various preferences are often 'concurrently relevant, applicable and satisfied', there are occasions when this is not the case and that these occasions open up the possibility of examining 'separate preferences' as well as organizational methods of integrating them when they cannot be concurrently satisfied. In the case of reference to persons, it is the preference for minimization that is relaxed when the speaker encounters difficulties (either real or imagined) in the achievement of recognition.

In the context of repaired references to persons, these two preferences emerge in a broader form. Firstly, the preference for minimization expands into the organizational domain that Schegloff (1979b, 2006) describes under the heading of 'progressivity':

Among the most pervasively relevant features in the organization of talk-and-other-conduct-in-interaction is the relationship of adjacency or 'nextness'. ... Moving from some element to a hearably-next-one with nothing intervening is the embodiment of, and the measure of, progressivity. Should something intervene between some element and what is hearable as *a*/the next one due – should something violate or interfere with their contiguity, whether next sound, next word or next turn – it will be heard as qualifying the progressivity of the talk, and will be examined for its import, for what understanding should be accorded it. Each next element of such a progression can be inspected to find how it reaffirms the understanding-so-far of what has preceded, or favors one or more of the several such understandings that are being entertained, or how it requires reconfiguration of that understanding. (Schegloff, 2006)

Schegloff shows that the principle of progressivity operates at both the level of turn construction (Schegloff 1979b), and of sequence structure (Schegloff, 2006). Both levels will be pertinent to this discussion.

Secondly, there is the matter of intersubjectivity and the security of referential common ground. In circumstances where a speaker has repaired a reference to improve its likely recognizability, a recipient's re-referencing of the now-repaired person reference will unambiguously show (or fail to show) recognition of the person in question.

It is evident that there are circumstances in which the conjoint operation of the principles of intersubjectivity and progressivity will result in conflict. Speakers encountering a difficulty in the management of recognitional reference, and initiating same-turn repair in that context, must perforce disrupt the progressivity of the turn in progress. Here the very fact of repair means that the

principle of intersubjectivity (in the form of recognitional reference) has trumped the principle of progressivity.

Recipients may find themselves in a parallel dilemma. Encountering a repaired recognitional reference, recipients can choose to demonstrate recognition of it, thus maximizing the security of referential common ground. But, as Sacks' examples indicate, this can only be achieved by re-referencing the (now-recognized) referent using alternative linguistic resources, and inviting confirmation of the correctness of that re-referencing from the initial speaker. Security of referential common ground can only be bought by disrupting the progressivity of the sequence in progress. Absolute security of reference is incompatible with progressivity.

In sum, both speakers and recipients can find themselves in conversational contexts in which the two conversational principles are in conflict. We can investigate the playing out of the dilemmas for speakers and recipients that arise from this conflict in the two main theatres of interactional organization – turn and sequence – in which progressivity is manifested by looking at responses to self-repaired references to persons under conditions in which the operations of self-repair and within-turn progressivity vary in their intensity and extent. The initial theme we will pursue is that the resources by which speakers manage repaired references to persons strike a balance between progressivity and intersubjectivity and set the terms for the balance to be struck in recipient responses.

11.2 Calibrating the dilemma: formats for self-repair

As Hayashi (2005) has recently shown in an analysis dealing with referential problems in Japanese, speakers can manage issues of reference repair with varying degrees of disruption to the progressivity of a turn's talk. A minimal form of disruption in the data at hand is the revision or expansion of a person reference at, or just after, a turn-constructive unit boundary, in a form known as transition space repair (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks 1977).

A simple example of a transition space repair is to be found in Example (9). Here the speaker revises an initial turn-initial reference to 'Cyd' to a turn-final full name: 'Cyd Arnold'. Her recipient proceeds to inquire about the person in question:

Example (9) [Holt X(C) 1:1:1]

- 1 Mum: -> [Cyd rang this evening Cyd Arnold
2 (.)
3 Les: => How is she:?
4 (0.3)
5 Mum: Eh: ye:s she's (.) [she's quite |goo:d she said she's ...

Here two acquaintances are catching up on mutual friends. Carrie, who is at or near to the conclusion of a turn-constructional unit depicting a third-party's agreement with Skip's evaluation of 'Philip', breaks off to interpolate an additional turn-constructional unit (lines 4–5) devoted to explicating the reference to the third party 'Jo': 'uh:,hh she's Jo Adams now who was Jo Applegate'. After the recipient has acknowledged this expansion, Carrie proceeds to a direct reported speech elaboration of her previous 'Well: that's what Jo (.) ↓thought'. This elaboration clearly converges with the terms of Skip's evaluation of Philip as 'a gentleman' and indeed upgrades that with 'perfect'. An additional touch of authenticity is provided by Carrie's reported speech formulation of Skip's 'Philip' as Jo's 'Mister Hammond'.

11.3 Framing a person reference with an interpolation

Speakers may anticipate problems with the recognizability of a person and devote entire prefatory units of talk to securing their recognition (Hayashi 2005). Thus, in Example (14), the speaker, having initiated a story preface at lines 1–2, proceeds to frame the recognizability of one of its protagonists – 'Cathy' – as problematic. At line 5, she interpolates an entire turn-constructional unit to securing her recipient's recognition, including an expansion of the reference to 'Cathy' with 'Larry Taylor's ex-girlfriend', when there is no immediate uptake to the reference. Here the entire story that is prefigured at line 1 is put on hold pending recipient recognition of the protagonist:

Example (14) [Frankel TCI:9]

- 1 Shi: Ah'm not surprized. .hhh Listen, u- something very very:
 2 cute happened las'night et the Warehouse.
 3 (.)
 4 Ger: Wha[t
 5 Shi: -> [.hhhhh YihKNOW Cathy, (.) Larry Taylor's exgirlfrie[nd,]
 6 Ger: [Yee]ah.
 7 Shi: [.hhhhhhhh]=
 8 Ger: [°°M-hm?°°]=
 9 Shi: =Okay. Cathy came in las'night. ((sniff))

Only after securing recognition from her recipient, does the speaker proceed to begin the story itself at line 9.

And in Example (15), a reference to 'Missiz Cole' is expanded by reference to 'Philip Co:le' whose recognizability is made the object of overt question 'd' you'member Philip Co:le'. Having been thus framed as questionable, and again given no uptake, this reference in its turn is subsequently expanded with 'Carol's: (.) husba:nd?'

Table 11.1 *Dimensions of person reference repair initiation*

Repair position	Transition space 'Interpolated' additional TCU
Repair initiation form	Try-marking Declarative question ('you know X') Interrogative ('Do you remember X')

Example (15)

- 1 Les: Oh: uh:m: (0.6) ↓Old Missiz Co:le is very illl
 2 -> d' you'member Philip Co:le, Carol's: (.)
 3 -> husba:nd?
 4 Mum: [↑Oh lye:s?
 5 Mum: Ye-:s,
 6 (.)
 7 Les: She had a stroke in Cary last week.

Only once she has secured Mum's recognition of the family does Lesley proceed to an account of Mrs. Cole's illness (line 7).

In summary, Table 11.1 provides an overview of the resources with which speakers can index the severity of their concern with adequate recognitional reference.

Moving from top to bottom within each set provides greater opportunities for the recipient to respond to a repaired person reference ('repair position'), and more overt pressure to so respond ('repair initiation form').

11.4 Recognitional hitches and the management of recipient recognition

Thus far we have treated repairs to person reference as entirely a speaker-initiated affair. But what is the contribution of recipients to this process? A first thing to note is that, having been invited to acknowledge recognition of a reference through some version of a polar interrogative, recipients ordinarily do so and in this way align with the speaker's treatment of a prior reference as problematic. However, they manage this alignment in minimal fashion and in two ways. Firstly, they minimize the disruption to sequential progressivity by acknowledging recognition of the referent in slight overlap with the repair's production [Examples (12), (14) and (15)] or in unmarked next position [Examples (11) and (13)] (Jefferson 1983, 1986; Schegloff 2000b).

Secondly, the acknowledgements themselves are minimized.² As in the cases above, they consist of (variants of) 'yes'. They rarely contain turn components that acknowledge any momentary prior recognition problem (as, e.g., 'oh yes' might), nor are they expanded into the kinds of alternative reference forms that would display, rather than merely claim, recognition. With these acknowledgements, reference recognition continues to be treated as a default.

We now turn to cases where recipient recognition becomes more problematic or marked. Here it is relevant to distinguish between repaired person references that involve two tries as recognition in contrast to those that involve three or more tries. While every repaired person reference involves an expansion or second try, these cases may vary in terms of whether the recipient has already failed to exhibit recognition of the referent. In cases involving three or more tries, it is almost always the case that some such failure has occurred.

Thus we can isolate a large class of cases in which an initial failure at recognitional reference is followed, after an expansion of the recognitional reference, by a claim of recognition that is unproblematically presented and accepted, as in Example (16) – see also Examples (14) and (15):

Example (16) [Sacks and Schegloff this volume]

- 1 A: Ya still in the real estate business, Lawrence
 2 B: 1-> Wha e' uh No my dear heart uh, ya know Max
 3 Rickler h
 4 (0.5)
 5 B: 2-> with whom I've been 'ssociated since I've been out here in
 6 Brentwood [has had a series of um (0.7) bad experiences..
 7 A: => [Yeah

In Example (17) a designedly allusive reference to a third party as 'ihYour friend 'n mi:ne', which is then – and in the absence of uptake – further expanded with the allusive 'mMister: R:', is also responded to with an oh-prefaced acknowledgement in which the oh-preface minimally indexes prior trouble in achieving recognition (Heritage 1984b):

Example (17) [Field Xmas 85:1:4:1]

- 1 Les: °Oh:° hh Yi-m- You [know I-I- I'm boiling about
 2 something hhhheh [heh hhhh

² Sacks and Schegloff (this volume) note that a nod is also sufficient to acknowledge recognition of a try-marked reference. Nodding takes acknowledgement of recognitional reference out of the vocal channel altogether, and is thus a method of responding to speakers' bids for recognition while minimizing any disruption to sequential progressivity. Because this chapter uses mainly telephone conversational data, this dimension of acknowledgement is not explored here further, but see Stivers (2005b).

- 3 Joy: [Wha::t.
 4 Les: Well that sa|:le. (0.2) at- at (.) the vicarage.
 5 (0.6)
 6 Joy Oh |ye|:s,
 7 Les: [t
 8 (0.6)
 9 Les: 1-> u (.) ihYour friend 'n mi:ne wz the:re
 10 (0.2)
 11 (): (h(h hh)
 12 Les: 2-> [mMister: R:,
 13 Joy: => (Oh ye:s hheh)

And in Example (18) a try-marked person reference is pursued with '(Y'know who) I'm talking about?' (line 8). Here the overlapping claim of recognition at line 9 ('Oh yeah.' is acknowledged by the speaker with a confirmatory 'Yeah.' (line 10) before she proceeds with her account. Here the topic is embellished insurance claims:

Example (18) [SN4:11-12]]

- 1 Sher: Yihknow when it- (.) came from thee:: I think (a) air
 2 conditioning system it drips on the front of the ca:rs?
 3 (.)
 4 Sher: if you park inna certain place?=
 5 ?Rut: =[mm hmm]
 6 Sher: -> =[.hhhh] (.) Peter. (0.2) Greffset?
 7 (0.5)
 8 Sher: -> [(Y'know who) I'm talking about?
 9 Kar: => [Oh yeah.
 10 Sher: Yeah..hh He collected a fo:rtune fer that. He
 11 claimed all k(h)i:nds of damages.

In all these cases, speakers encountering evidence of recipients' difficulties in achieving recognition from a person reference expand these references and sacrifice the preference for progressivity. However, the recipient responses that are mandated by these expansions are brief claims of recognition: 'Yes' or 'Oh yes'. They thus confine the element of recipient expansion mandated by the speaker to a minimum and, in this way, respect the preference for progressivity.

Once we encounter sustained efforts (i.e., three or more tries) to achieve recipient recognition, we also start to see recipients doing more than a minimal 'Yes' or 'Oh yes' to acknowledge recognition of a person reference. In these cases, speakers clearly are abandoning the preference for progressivity and

indexing a prioritization of intersubjectivity over turn and sequence progressivity. Under such circumstances they license, or even mandate, recipients to do the same. Thus, in Example (19), Ann has three attempts at recognitional reference for a person at a party. As the third of these is under way, her recipient acknowledges recognition with 'Oh Yes' and then expands her turn with a characterization of the person in question:

Example (19) [SBL 2:2:4 (Sacks and Schegloff this volume)]

- 1 Ann: ... well I was the only one other than .hhh thee uhm
 2 1 -> (0.7) mtch Fo: rds.
 3 2 -> Uh Missiz Holmes Ford?
 4 (0.8)
 5 3 -> You know the- [the cellist?
 6 Bev: => [Oh yes. She's- she's (a/the) cellist.
 7 Ann: Ye:s.
 8 Bev: Ye[s
 9 Ann: [Well she and her husband were there ...

A very similar case is the following, which involves reference to a place name:

Example (20) [SF:2:11]

- 1 B: Whaddy- you go over t'yer parents () (0.2) Thursday?
 2 M: 1-> .hhhhhh Uh: I'm going dow:n to: San Jua:n.
 3 (1.0)
 4 B: Going down to San Jua:n.
 5 M: 2-> Yihknow where the k- (.) swallows are?
 6 (0.8)
 7 B: Oh:::
 8 M: 3-> Capistrano
 9 B: => Oh yah. Sa:n Juan Capistrano. With yer family?

It is noticeable that the recipients in both these cases fail to provide clear EVIDENCE of recognition of the referent that, as Sacks suggested, would normally have to involve some expansion or transformation of the reference. In both Examples (19) and (20), the recipients expand their turns with repetitions of reference forms and thus CLAIM, but do NOT DEMONSTRATE, recognition of the reference. Thus across all the referential repairs discussed so far in this paper, not one has embodied the kind of 'Pacific Palisades' to 'The west side of town' transformation that, Sacks argued would demonstrate recognition of a referent.

11.5 The salience of recognition and of its demonstration

In a number of cases assembled for this paper the speaker of an intendedly recognitional reference abandons the pursuit of recognition in the interest of progressing the activity of which the reference is a part. This occurs in Example (21). Here, the speaker, Lottie, starts with an intendedly recognitional reference ('Doctor Nelson') and, after an initial move towards a non-recognitional reference, expands it in pursuit of recognition with 'yihknow from uh Glendale?'

Example (21) [NB IV:14:10]

- 1 Lot: So I'm goin up uh hhh Mondee too:. An' uh,
 2 Emm: W-w uh how [long is 'e gonna be gone.
 3 Lot: [Yihknow.
 4 Lot: hhhh God I don't know, he doesn' know either I mean, hhh if it-
 5 -> uh, we talk'tuh Doctor Nelson
 6 -> yihknow this, s-doct-
 7 -> yihknow from uh Glendale?
 8 (0.2)
 9 Lot: -> This friend'v a:rs,=
 10 Emm: => =Mm[hm,
 11 Lot: [He's a big s- one a' the biggest surgeons there in uh,
 12 hhh I think Saint Joseph's uh hospit'l.

Encountering no uptake from her recipient at line 8, Lottie abandons her pursuit of recognitional reference, and substitutes a 'place holder' non-recognitional reference 'This friend'v a:rs,', thereby treating recognitional reference as inessential for her conversational project.

Correspondingly, recipients can make the same move thereby curtailing futile efforts by speakers to expand recognitional reference:

Example (22) [Holt 6:SO:88:1:08]

- 1 Les: =.h h h h and she's on tablets. not uhm: radio
 2 treatment.
 3 Les: .hh[hhh
 4 Joy: [Oh I do [hope
 5 Les: [or radium: treatment.hhhh[h . hhhhhh
 6 Joy: [I wz talking to:
 7 -> uhm: .tch .hh Helen Southerby (.) n: nex't door but one here.
 8 -> D'you know Helen Souterby
 9 Les: => hNo:. But I do know the name.hhhhh
 10 Joy: -> ngOh she: :-: ohh poor dear .tch .hh back in um: (0.5)

11 wuh-Easter. (0.2) Ye:s Easter she .hh developed a lum:p
12 in her neck 'n

Here the speaker seeks recognition for the newly introduced 'Helen Southerby' with the expansion 'n:nex'door but one here'. However the recipient manages to discourage any further search for a recognitional formula while simultaneously encouraging the continuation of talk by claiming to 'know the name', thereby treating full recognitional reference as inessential to the speaker's conversational project.

Of course there are circumstances in which speakers can not have, nor can they permit their recipients to have, the luxury of abandoning recognitional reference. Under such circumstances speakers will launch, and recipients will be launched on, a search for the elusive transformations and expansions that unequivocally demonstrate recognition. In Example (23), for example, Ron has called his sometimes friend Gina. Gina's mother, Marsha, picks up the phone. At line 2, Ron misrecognizes Marsha as Gina and, without further attempts on either side to clarify identities, the parties negotiate a message to be left for Gina (line 15). At line 16, Ron asks Marsha who she is, and she responds with a non-recognitional self-identification 'her mo:m'. In his subsequent pursuit of her name (line 19), Ron clearly indicates that he knows her ('I ferget yer name.') and reinforces this claim by offering her his own and inviting its recognition: 'This is Ron Merc'ahno "d'you remember me?" (line 21). Here is a sequential context in which the kind of expanded or transformative person reference that shows recognition has become virtually obligatory:

Example (23) [MTRAC 60:1:1:1]

1 Mar: [Ye:h- Hello?
2 Ron: eHello uh: Gina?
3 (0.2)
4 Ron: Is Gina there?
5 ()
6 Mar: nNo Gina: 's not he:re.
7 (0.3)
8 Mar: C'n I take a message?
9 (0.2)
10 Ron: Ye:uh. Uh:: (0.7) eHez she mo:ve:d.
11 ()
12 Mar: No:.
13
14 Ron: °Oh: (0{ }).°
15 Mar: [hhh She's working tihday: <Right now.
16 Ron: Okay. 'hh Ah:: tell'er Ro:n ca:lled, ah:: this uthis

17 is Who is th[is.
18 Mar: [whh This is: her mo:m.=
19 ???: =[nye:
20 Ron: =[Yes:. I-I fer I ferget yer name. () .
21 Mar: Hm:?
22 Ron: I ferget yer name. This is Ron Merc'ahno °d'you remember me?°
23 (0.3)
24 Mar: 'hh Oh fer heaven sa:ke Ro:n Yeh this's Marsha. 'hh
25 Ron: Marsha right. °([])°
26 Mar: [Yer writing fer television.
27 ???: r:: [uh::r
28 Ron: [y:Ye:ah.
29 Mar: The writing fer television Ron.
30 Ron: Ye:ah.
31 Mar: hh[h
32 Ron: [Ro:n: Ron writing fer t(h)el[ev(h) isio(h)n]
33 Mar: [hh - hh - hh-]hh 'hhhhhhh
34 Ron: [()]
35 Mar: [Yeah I do remember you.
36 Ron: (An' I:: got)- I ran intuh Gina awhi:le ba:ck.

At line 24 Marsha volunteers a fully emphasized claim of recognition 'hh Oh fer heaven sa:ke Ro:n Yeh' and her own name 'Yeh this's Marsha'. She then supplements this with an expansion that evidences recognition 'Yer writing fer television.' and, upon Ron's acceptance of that, converts that expansion into a version of a proper name 'The writing fer television Ron' (line 29), which, in turn, Ron acknowledges with signs of amusement (line 32).

Similarly, in Example (24), Dave has called Pete to propose that they go on a fishing trip. Evidently, the proposal cannot be addressed unless Pete has some grasp of the destination, and Dave is launched into an effort to describe its location. It is not until Pete's 'transformative' re-referencing of the location of 'Pilgrim Lake' that this matter is settled, albeit approximately.

Example (24) [Northridge 2:3]

1 Dave: -> Like yih know whereah:: Pilgrim Lake is i(ts)-=
2 -> =that's on the other si:de u'th Grapevine=
3 -> =yihknow this side of the Grapevine
4 Pete: => Oh the's jus' up to Bakersfield.

Absent this transformative activity, and the matter of recipient recognition can become questionable. In Example (25) Jay undertakes to tell Tom where he used to live in Naples. Right across the fragment Jay is evidently looking for Tom's recognition of the various place names he mentions. He begins

with a reference to the 'San Carlo op'ra house' and solicits recognition of the location with 'Correct?', but does not receive uptake. His next turn is occupied with getting recognition by reference to a new place name the 'Palazzo Rayaleh'. Here he gets a minimal acknowledgement token and, after a further attempt to solicit recognition (accomplished by the translation to the Royal Palace) a repeat: the Royal Palace. And here we see the equivocality of repeating as a display of recognition in an environment of prior trouble. The repeat is certainly not enough for Jay for, in overlap with it, he re-solicits recognition once again with 'Right?'

Example (25) [Adato:6:4-6 simplified]

- 1 Jay: Uh you- you were in Naples right? --uh:: I'll tell y'where I
 2 usetuh live.
 3 ... (14 lines omitted) ...
 4 Jay: R:right across the street from the Galleria is the San Carlo
 5 op'ra house. Correct?
 6 (1.4)
 7 Jay: Just a little bit away from the San Carlo op'ra house, about
 8 a half a block, is- the the pah- Pallazzo Raya[leh.
 9 Tom: [Uh huh,
 10 Jay: -> The Royal Palace.
 11 Tom: -> The Royal Pa[lace.
 12 Jay: -> [Ri:ght?
 13 (0.4)
 14 Jay: Across the street, f'm the Royal Palace, is this big church.
 15 Ri:ght?
 16 (0.8)
 17 Tom: [()-
 18 Jay: [You remember now?
 19 ... (12 lines omitted)
 20 Jay: Right across th'stree' f'm th'Palazzo Reyaleh is this bi:g
 21 church.
 22 (0.8)
 23 Jay: 'n then beyond the big church are like liddle alleys. Ee
 24 Vicoli di Napoli.
 25 Tom: -> Yeah. Small alleys.
 26 Jay: -> Small all[eyes,
 27 Tom: -> [Oh what small all[eyes.
 28 Jay: [Now that's where I usetuh live.

The difficulties of lines 1-20 become resolved, though somewhat equivocally, in lines 25-29. Jay's 'n then beyond the church' gets confirmation

through a claim of recognition 'Yeah' and then what must be one of the most minimal displays of recognition - a synonymous lexical replacement in which Jay's 'liddle' is replaced by Tom with 'small'. Subsequently, following Jay's repeat of 'small alleys', Tom's more elaborated claim of recognition with 'Oh what small alleys', appears to be just enough to permit Jay to complete the sequence with 'Now that's where I usetuh live'.

In Examples (24)-(26), recipient demonstrations of recognition are mandated by the activities launched by speakers. However, in at least one environment, re-referencing is an activity that is actively pursued by recipients. In this environment recipients misapprehend person or place formulations and, after they have been corrected, work to show that the misapprehension is now put to rest. This is clearly the case as shown in Example (8). As previously noted, Lesley's line 8 indicates a mis-recognition of the 'Clive' who Kat had referred to at line 4. At this point, her full naming of the 'Clive' in question (at line 11) is effectively mandated by this misapprehension.

In a parallel case, Example (26), a story is being told about an automobile escape in which the precise position of the protagonist within the car is critical for an appreciation of the story's details. The story recipient volunteers an understanding of this position (line 1/3) and is duly corrected (line 5):

Example (26) (Goodwin:G84:M:3)

- 1 G: => He w'z o:n the opposite side a'the driver ri:ght?
 2 (.)
 3 G: °with iz::°
 4 (0.4)
 5 M: -> No he w- (.) e-he w'z on the sa-:me side ez
 6 the driver [r
 7 G: => [Oh on nuh ba:ck seat?=
 8 M: =Yeah in d'ba:ck seat

Given that there is only one location within a car that a passenger can be sitting that is on the 'same side as the driver', the recipient ('G') can simply re-reference this location to display that his prior misapprehension is now resolved.

It has already been suggested that the kind of re-referencing described by Sacks is vanishingly rare in contexts of ordinary reference to persons, and in contexts where those references are repaired. The upshot of the examples presented in this section is that there are circumstances in which the recipient's recognition of a person reference becomes the entire focus of a sequence. This can arise either through a speaker's repeated efforts at self-repair (e.g., Examples (19), (20), (24)), as a product of a recipient's stated misapprehension, Example (8) and (26), or by other pathways. However they

Examples (31) and (32):

Example (31) [Rah:2:7]

- 1 Jen: David's ho:me?
 2 (0.5)
 3 Ida: -> Yooer [Da[vid.
 4 Jen: [Ye:s m[m
 5 Ida: [Oh:.
 6 (.)
 7 Ida: An'- is he a'†ri:ght?=-

Example (32) [W:PC:1:MJ(1):34]

- 1 M: Whe:re wz tha::t.
 2 (.)
 3 M: In th'stree:t, in your a:venue:.
 4 J: Nex'door:.
 5 M: -> Neh-iss door[:. The other si::de.
 6 J: [Ye:s.

In both these cases, the recipient's clarification formulates the speaker's reference as having been unclear and offers a solution to the problem. Here then recipients take responsibility for adequate reference, albeit at the cost of sequence progressivity.

Relatedly, speakers who interrupt the progressivity of a turn sufficiently will, in contexts where this is possible, engender recipient activities that are geared to expediting the sequence. In Example (33), Ann encounters difficulties in the place reference for an employment agency 'Reed'. After her hesitation before completing the phrase 'Sussex Street' (line 2) and her apparent initiation of repair on this location formulation, her interlocutor moves to reassure her as to recognizability of the location (lines 4 and 6).

Example (33) [Owen:8B15(A):3]

- 1 Ann: -> I: (.) went to: Re:ed. Which is in: Sussex:
 2 (0.4)
 3 Ann: -> Is i[t Sussex Stree[t,
 4 Bet: -> [Oh I know [Ye:s::
 5 Ann: [Ye:h,
 6 Bet: [Ye:s I know weh you mean,
 7 Ann: And uh, I thought

And in Example (34) a full-blown interruption of progressivity occurs as the speaker goes into the search for a name.

Example (34) [SBL:1:1:12:23]

- 1 A: Uh she asked me to stop by, she brought a chest
 2 of drawers from um
 3 (4.0)
 4 A: What's that gal's name? Just went back to Michigan.
 5 (1.0)
 6 A: Hilda, um
 7 B: -> Oh I know who you mean,
 8 (1.0)
 9 B: Grady-Grady.
 10 A: Yeah. Hilda Grady.

In all of these cases, speakers and recipients struggle jointly with the competing principles of recognitional reference and progressivity to achieve outcomes that permit the activities that the sequences are implementing to be carried to their conclusion.

11.7 Other recipient expansions of recognitional references

This chapter has documented the extent to which intendedly recognitional references to persons and places are 'noddled through' in the interest of progressing the business of the sequences of which they are a part. It has also offered some evidence that departures from this pattern, that involve recipients in re-referencing persons and locations, are mainly done 'for cause': they follow repeated efforts by speakers to get recipient uptake, or when recipients themselves have exhibited some form of misapprehension. It is for these reasons that cases like Example (1), imagined by Sacks, are so very rare.

However, such cases do occur. In Example (35), a reference to 'Missiz Baker' is responded to with the alternative, and more specific, 'Di:a:nne, °Baker.°'

Example (35) [Holt 5/88:1:2:174-180]

- 1 Les: i[Yes: .hh An' I met Missiz Baker 'n we had [lunch together
 2 which wz very ni: [ce, .hhh
 3 Joy: -> [Oh did you with Di:a:nne, °Ba[ker.°
 4 Les: [ih-†ye:s 'n
 5 then: she wz going an' I suddenly re'mbered she'd paid f'the
 6 lo:t fortunately I managed to [catch her.

Here the expanded person reference (line 3) is appended to a turn component ('Oh did you') that otherwise invites an expansion of the informing to which Lesley seems to be committed, and which would otherwise embody an embedded claim to recognize the reference to 'Missiz Baker'. However, the potentially

'disambiguating', but otherwise redundant, addition of 'Di:anne, Baker' is most likely designed to index a failure of recipient design (Schegloff 1972; Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974) on Lesley's part. The replacement of 'Missiz' with 'Dianne' is a vehicle through which Joyce can indicate that for her, as well as Lesley, 'Missiz Baker' is more appropriately referred to as 'Dianne Baker'.

Similar issues of recipient design also inhabit a related case. Here three men in a backyard picnic have been engaged in an extensive discussion about rebuilding and racing cars. Among the three, Mike is the acknowledged 'car expert' while Gary is without question the least knowledgeable. In the datum below, Gary re-introduces a reference to 'Marlon Little' that had failed to attract the attention of the others some four minutes previously:

Example (36) [Auto Discussion: 772]

- 1 Gary: Nah this Marlon Little's been building, roadsters,
 2 in th'str- considered street roadsters he builds.
 3 Curt: Nh.
 4 Gary: B'tche aftuh ra:ce 'em o{n the tra:ck}s ([]).
 5 Curt: -> [Oh Little.] [Little. Ou:t
 6 -> et uh:m
 7 Mike: -> Yah right up, Por' [Clin' Road.
 8 Curt: -> [on Por'Clin' Road.
 9 Curt: Ye:h.

While Gary's use of 'this' in the phrase 'this Marlon Little' is likely designed as back-referring, that is, to index that he is reintroducing this topic, the use of this reference form is vulnerable, at this distance from his – previously disregarded – reference,³ to the hearing that he considers 'Marlon Little' as

³ Gary's original introduction of 'Marlon Liddle', offered in connection with Curt's search for a spare part for an old 'Model T' Ford, was overwhelmed by Mike's reference to an acquaintance with two Cords (a rare and valuable 'classic car'):

- Mike: [Lemme ask] a guy at work. He's gotta bunch a' old
 clu[nkers].
 Gary: [Y'know Marlon Liddle?
 (0.2)
 Mike: Well I can't say they're ol' clunkers eez gotta Co:rd?
 (0.1)
 Mike: Two Co:rdz,
 (1.0)
 Mike: [And
 Curt: [Not original,
 (0.7)
 Mike: Oh yes. Very origi(h)nal

unknown to his recipients. In the context of the relative expertise of the participants, it is probably unacceptable that Gary knows of a car builder/racer who is unknown to the others, and both Mike and Curt are at pains to indicate that they are aware of, and recognize, the person in question. They do so by expanded references to Little that explicate their independent knowledge of his whereabouts and, by extension, his activities.

Cases such as Examples (35) and (36), which are quite rare in the data to hand, serve to reinforce the proposal that, in a default context in which unproblematic references to persons are nodded through, expanded re-referencing is also only done 'for cause'.

11.8 Recognition as default

This chapter offers evidence from repair sequences involving person reference that speakers operate under the default assumption that recognitional references are recognizable and recognized. It is this assumption that permits the maximization of within-turn and within-sequence progressivity that pervades not only the implementation of ordinary social interaction, but also most of the departures from 'perfect progressivity' described in this chapter. It is also this assumption that underwrites the absence of the kinds of sequences that Sacks offered as demonstrations of understanding in conversation. The balance between progressivity and intersubjectivity that the preference for recognitional reference embodies is one that is strongly biased towards progressivity, but it ultimately rests entirely on the hidden work that speakers do to ensure that their references to persons are recognizable without the need for repair.

Thus contemplating the following sequence from Stivers' chapter, it is evident that 'Aunt Alene' is the form of recognitional reference that would maximize progressivity.

Example (37) HS 5 7-23-03 T1

- 1 MOM: So- what are you grinnin' (cuz you picked)
 2 [()]
 3 NIC: [Cuz yer s:ister been on the phone all mo: rnin' an'
 4 I told'er-
 5 MOM: [Which o:ne.
 6 NIC: Aunt Ale:ne? ['I got a cramp in my ne:(h) ck 'n I gotta g(h)o.'
 7 MOM: [hehhehhehhehheh
 8 NIC: So=
 9 MOM: =[whut did she [want.
 10 NIC: [Sh:e wanted=tuh=w=uh:
 11 everything.

In this case, as Stivers argues, there are compelling reasons for Nicole to depart from this reference form, but she – and we – may not depart from it too frequently. For the cost of this would be not only the erosion of progressivity, manifested here in Mom's initiation of repair on the reference to 'yer s:ister' (line 5) and Nicole's repair (line 6), but also the loss of the default against which the special effects of this form of reference can be registered.

12 Repairing person reference in a small Caribbean community

Jack Sidnell

12.1 Introduction: trouble and repair in person reference

There are various kinds of trouble that may beset practices for referring to persons in conversation. The reference can fail because it was not heard, or because the form used has more than one possible referent. Alternatively, it may fail because the form used is unfamiliar to the recipient. It seems reasonable to suppose that these problems will not arise with the same frequency in every community. In a community that uses bare names to achieve recognitional reference but has only a few of these shared between many individuals, problems are likely to arise due to the failure of a given name to provide for unique reference. In a community where people are known by many different names, problems may more frequently result from the fact that the name used is not the one by which the recipient knows the person to whom reference is being made. In this chapter, I examine troubles encountered in the course of making recognitional reference to persons in a small Caribbean community. An analysis of the various practices involved in the repair and resolution of such problems leads to two conclusions:

- (1) Repairs are intricately recipient-designed with subsequent recognitional forms selected to solve particular, context-specific, interactional problems.
- (2) Although person reference and other initiated repair are essentially generic organizations of talk-in-interaction, they are nevertheless adapted to particular local circumstances (such as the local onomastic system) and are thus locally inflected.

Speakers routinely initiate repair of the person referring form using one of several available repair initiators (OIRs) when they encounter troubles in recognizing references to persons.¹ In North American and British English the

¹ These used to be called 'next turn repair initiators' or NTRIs (see Schegloff et al. 1977). However, subsequent research showed that the specification of 'next turn' is a contingent outcome rather than a defining characteristic of the practice (see Schegloff 2000; Wong 2000).