9 Prosodic Reference and Reported Interaction

In this chapter we are concerned with the means by which interlocutors track referents in the context of reported prior interaction. All the data in this chapter comes from a dyadic conversation replete with conversational narratives containing lots of reported conversation. Most of the stories in this conversation are told by a single storyteller, Phyllis. Phyllis’s stories are notable for their highly elaborate prosodic marking. This elaborate use of prosody makes for very lively and engaging narration. In these stories prosody is recruited for more than just entertainment (though the stories are highly entertaining). Here prosody plays an important role in reference tracking.

In §9.1, I briefly outline some of the prior research on reported speech, particularly with regard to its conceptualization. In §9.2, I introduce the three methods that Murriny Patha speakers use to cue reported speech: quotative expressions, “ill-fitting” vocative expressions and “global” prosodic marking223 of passages of talk. In §9.3 we examine how global prosodic marking is recruited as a referential strategy to distinctively mark the voices of different reported interlocutors. In §9.4 we show how a different type of prosodic formatting, a “local” variety that is applied to individual words or syllables, is recruited to mark coreference and non-coreference between pairs of referential items.

We find that the two varieties of prosodic reference are different to any variety of reference examined thus far. The reason for this is that prosodic reference operates within the prosodic domain. The prosodic formatting is not applied to individual referential expressions such as noun phrases; but to pairs of noun phrases (in the case of local prosodic reference) and to pairs of turns at talk (in the case of global prosodic reference).

Because the prosodic formatting is applied to passages of talk that are larger than referential expressions, you would be forgiven for thinking that the preferences examined in the previous chapter would not be applicable. Yet if expressed without mention of reference forms, we still find that (at least) two preferences, Minimization and Specification, do apply within the prosodic domain:

MINIMIZATION: If possible, prefer fewer units of speech production.
SPECIFICATION: If possible, prefer specific referential information that maximizes the potential for achieving recognition.

223 The “global” vs. “local” distinction will be explained in §9.2.3.
The various referential strategies outlined in this chapter are *minimal*, because as we shall see the reporting of prior talk is pushed into the talk being reported, in such a way that fewer units of speech production are required to interpret the utterances in question as being actually reported speech. They are *specific* because the information required for successful reference is pushed into the prosodic domain.

Readers are encouraged to listen to the relevant sound files by following the appropriate links from Appendix B. In addition to the audio corresponding to conversational fragments, there are also some shorter audio excerpts that correspond to various illustrative diagrams (Figures 9.2, 9.3, 9.6, 9.9, 9.10 and 9.11).

### 9.1 Reference, footing and worlds of interaction

Linguists have shown an interest in reported speech for over 80 years. One area of research has been the syntax of quotative expressions, particularly the degree of syntactic dependence between the reporting structures and the reported talk. A major focus has been on “direct” and “indirect” reported speech (e.g., McGregor 1994; Rumsey 1990, 1994), and the intermediate varieties (“free indirect” speech or “quasi-direct” speech) that exhibit certain syntactic properties of each (McHale 1978).

The interpretative analysis of reported speech begins with the literary theory of the Bakhtin circle who introduced such notions as “polyphony” and the “layering of voices” (e.g., Bakhtin (1980) and Voloshinov (1971, 1973 [1929])). Polyphonic utterances typically involve a layering of the voices of the reporter and the reported (see also Günthner 1999).

Goffman’s (1981) concept of *footing* has been particularly influential in advancing the conceptualization of reported speech (e.g., Levinson 1988). *Footing* (which Goffman does not restrict to the reporting of speech) he defines as “the alignment of an individual to a particular utterance…” (Goffman 1981: 227). In Goffman’s terms, changes in *footing* involve the shift in alignment that speakers take towards themselves, in how they manage the production or the reception of utterances (ibid: 128).

More recently, conversation analysts and interactional linguists have turned their attention to reported speech (e.g., Holt and Clift eds. 2007). Particularly relevant to this chapter are the interactional prosodic analyses that move beyond the syntax of reporting structures (Couper-Kuhlen 1996, 1999; Günthner 1999; Klewitz & Couper-
Kuhlen 1999). Just as the quotative expressions have the capacity to cue the shifts in the footing associated with reported speech, so too does the marking of talk with a prosody that is characteristic of its prior speakers.

Tracking referents in reported speech can be a complex task for recipients of a story, particularly if the interaction being reported had more than two participants. Recipients must realize that reported passages of speech hail from some time or place (real or imaginary), other than the here-and-now. The reporting analogy may be extended to the world of reported interaction that is alien to the talk unfolding between the current conversationalists. We may thus distinguish the setting of the unfolding interaction from the storyworld setting (Günthner 1999) of the reported interaction. This storyworld has its own participant frame that is distinct from the participant frame of the unfolding interaction. Thus, interacting in the storyworld we find reported speakers, reported addressees and reported others. Recipients of unfolding talk must be cognizant of a storyteller’s shift in footing between the world of unfolding interaction and the storyworld of reported interaction, and make appropriate referential adjustments.\(^{224}\) For example, an utterance like “Tell him to go jump in the lake”, reports a shift in footing between the world of unfolding interaction and a world of imaginary interaction where the now-addressee becomes an imagined-speaker, who tells an imagined-addressee, “Go jump in the lake”. This is in fact the same shift in footing that is required irrespective of how syntactically dependent (e.g., “Tell him that he should go jump in the lake”) or independent (“Tell him, ‘Go jump in the lake’”) the reporting structure may be.

The deictic shift in footing that reported speech brings can itself be a cue for the reporting of prior speech. As we will see below, a noticeable misalignment in the participant frame can flag utterances as temporally and spatially alien, and thus necessarily reported speech.

---
\(^{224}\) Hanks (1990: 197) notes that in reported speech deictic shifters (pronouns, demonstratives, tense) become decentred. Thus “[i]f a deictic category is normally egocentric, picking a referent relative to the Spkr, then it is decentered whenever it is used so as to index, not the current utterer, but rather: (i) his or her interlocutor; (ii) some narrative personage identified in adjacent discourse; (iii) some other speaker, possibly himself or herself under different circumstances; (iv) any other non-ego-inclusive ground independently signaled or reconstructable in the utterance context.”
9.2 Indexical cues for reported speech

There are three indexical cues that Murriny Patha speakers use to signal that utterances should be interpreted as reported speech: quotative expressions such as speech verbs, “ill-fitting” vocative expressions and “global” prosodic marking.

9.2.1 Quotative expressions

As well as cuing an utterance as reported speech, quotative expressions frequently provide referential information as to who produced the utterance (as in *ngay warda ngemngeng*, “I then said”, Fragment 70). Once initial reference has been established, storytellers frequently desist with this cue, and adopt one or both of the other cues.

Fragment 70 Spiny Chitons (2004-08-08JB3b)
774  Phyl .hh *mange penintha* da*matha*;=ngay warda ngemngeng.
    mange =penintha damatha ngay warda ngem -ngeng
    action =3DU.MNSB really IS then IS$NFUT -say
    "Really it was their own doing", I then said.

9.2.2 “Ill-fitting” vocative expressions

The second indexical cue is a noticeable lack of fit between the addressee of the reported talk and the recipients of the unfolding talk. The interpretative shift in footing is normally cued by an attention-seeking address term (perhaps a kinterm or a name) that doesn’t fit any members of the current audience.

Fragment 71 Spiny Chitons (2004-08-08JB3b)
774  Phyl .hh *mange penintha* da*matha*;=ngay warda ngemngeng.
    "Really it was their own doing", I then said.
775   (0.13)
776  Eliz "Mm¿
777    (0.85)
778 → Phyl *kanggurl*; (. ) ku yitj nenangga ′ dh ′ athani thaminy ngoyya;
    "Granny ((paternal grandfather’s sister)), you didn’t show my
daughter’s son the right thing."
779    (1.7)
780  Phyl thambinyikotwathanam;
    "You made a mistake."
781    (2.5)
782  Eliz kittyi;
    Oh dear!

Fragment 71 is extracted from a dyadic conversation in which Phyllis is telling Elizabeth a story. Phyllis and Elizabeth are in a “mother-daughter” relationship so the kinterms that Phyllis would ordinarily call Elizabeth are wakal, “child” or newuy, “daughter”. In line 778, the vocative kinterm *kanggurl*, “paternal grandfather/paternal
grandfather’s sister”, cues a deictic shift in footing that marks the following talk (“You didn’t show my daughter’s son the right thing, you made a mistake”) as hailing from the storyworld. The kinterm *kanggurl* expresses a kinship relation that doesn’t fit the two interlocutors. Being a dyadic conversation, there is no-one else present who this kinterm actually does fit. Here, it is actually the normative practice of designing talk for our recipients that forces the “alien” interpretation. Thus, the principle of recipient design\(^{225}\) (Sacks et al. 1974: 727) has a corollary for the hearer: if a turn-as-cast doesn’t fit the hearer of the utterance, then the turn-as-cast was not designed for the hearer as recipient, but rather for some recipient other than the hearer.

The kinterm *kanggurl* does capture the relationship between Elizabeth’s deceased son G and Phyllis.\(^{226}\) Since, *mange penintha damatha*, “Really it was their own doing” (line 774) had already been established as Phyllis’s own reported prior turn (Fragment 70), and lines 778-780 constitute the next sequential turn of reported interaction, then the best fit for *kanggurl* is that of G as reported speaker and Phyllis as reported addressee.

Thus “ill-fitting” vocative kinterms not only cue sections of talk as alien to the here-and-now, they also index the relationship between reported speaker and reported addressee, and provide helpful clues for the recipients of a story to work out who in the storyworld was actually speaking. This indexation of storyworld participants was achieved without a quotative expression (e.g., “G said to me”). The reporting of the prior talk (and all of the referential information required to make sense of it) is embedded into the reported talk itself. From the perspective of word selection, this is an extremely efficient use of referential resources. A monomorphemic word *kanggurl* is used to index two storyworld participants and to temporally locate the utterance as “not now”. Fewer words have been used (Minimization) to convey the necessary information required for Elizabeth’s recognition of the referent (Specification). Elizabeth’s reaction token *kitiyi*, “oh dear” (line 783) (Wilkinson & Kitzinger 2006), points to her comprehension of the story, rather than confusion about reference. As

\(^{225}\) This principle is not to be confused with the Sacks and Schegloff (1979) preference for recognitionals, which is in this thesis is renamed Targeted Recipient Design. See p. 66 for explanation.

\(^{226}\) The four “grand-parent” terms (*kanggurl*, *kawu*, *thamuny* and *mangga*) are reciprocal, so both “grandparents” and “grandchildren” address each other with the same kin-term. Thus G addresses his “grandmother”, Phyllis, as *kanggurl* (his classificatory father’s father’s sister) and Phyllis also addresses G as *kanggurl* (her classificatory brother’s son’s son).
we will see shortly, the indexical power of these ill-fitting address terms increases with prosodic marking and with it, the likelihood of them securing the recipients’ recognition of the referent.

9.2.3 Global prosodic marking

The third of the cues for indexing reported speech is the marking of passages of speech with distinctive prosodic and/or paralinguistic features, such that the talk is audibly different from the surrounding non-reported talk. When this happens, narrators of a story generally take on certain vocal characteristics of those reported interlocutors and cast these storyworld voices differently from how they cast their own storyteller’s voice. This kind of prosodic marking can be considered to be “global” in terms of its scope. Selting (1996: 234) contrasts “global” prosodic marking as “the use of a prosodic parameter like pitch or loudness for a stretch of talk or an entire turn-constructional unit; it usually entails more than one accent.” On the other hand:

‘Local’ refers to the use of a prosodic parameter in smaller segments of speech, like for instance the pitch movement in and shortly after an accented syllable or the use of increased loudness in an accented syllable to constitute an extra-prominent accent. (Ibid.)

Klewitz & Couper-Kuhlen (1999: 468) point out that “globally marked” reported speech normally consists of two or more prosodic or paralinguistic features bundled together. Phyllis uses a lot of global prosodic marking (pitch register, tempo, loudness and perceptually isochronous timing) and paralinguistic marking (creaky and excited voice quality) to report prior speech. The globally marked passages of reported talk sound different to her narrator’s voice.

Fragment 72 Spiny Chitons (2004-08-08jB03b)

717 Phyl ↓<Ku "w"yrdamnithara:rla::rl.>↓ ((rollentando))
The two men were laughing about that those ku-things. ((spiny chitons))
718 (0.45)
719 Phyl =>Mamba↓ (0.35) ku nanggalkwa pulatjtuwyu.↓" Alright, who is going to eat them?"
720 (0.8)

It is not only reported speech that is globally marked. The voice of a narrator may also be globally marked with characteristic prosody. The cue for interpreting changes in footing is that one passage of talk sounds perceptibly different from an

adjacent passage. In line 717 of Fragment 72, Phyllis, as narrator, provides commentary about two men in her story. The utterance is produced at a low pitch register (hence the paired downward arrows) and with a slow tempo (in fact, the tempo is *rallentando*, “slowing down”). The switch to reported speech (in line 719) is cued by a change in tempo to much quicker speech. Whereas the previous utterance had been produced at low register, this line is perceivable as higher, even though it is relatively neutral in terms of the speaker’s normal register range. It is also has an excited voice quality that makes it sound bright and chirpy.

Prosodically marked reported speech has special dramaturgical properties. Narrators may present a storyworld voice in a way that is characteristic of the style of the particular reported speaker, or perhaps present that voice in an exaggerated fashion that indexes their stance towards the person in question. In any case, using voice quality and prosody to cue reported interaction brings the storytelling to life.

### 9.3 Globally marked prosodic reference

In this section we will see how global prosodic marking is a referential practice, because the deictic information that might elsewhere be expressed by quotative expressions is incorporated into the reported speech itself. So effective is this method that multiple turns at talk can be reported unproblematically without any explanatory speech verbs.

All of the remaining fragments in this chapter hail from the same storytelling. In this story (which we have encountered previously in Fragment 55), rather than using the correct name *ku tjipmandji*, two young boys innocently refer to a species of mollusc, *Acanthopleura spinosa*, “spiny chitons”, with a rude name that they have overheard adults use dysphemistically. Fragment 73 begins some way into the narrative. The fragment reports a dialogue between a woman and a man (the daughter of the narrator, Phyllis, and the son of Elizabeth). In this exchange Phyllis animates the voices of the two reported interlocutors by ascribing to each participant different voice qualities and pitch registers.

**Fragment 73 Spiny Chitons (2004-08-08JB03b)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>579</td>
<td>Eliz țHa ha ha ha haț ah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580</td>
<td>Phyl țHa ha ha ha haț</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>581</td>
<td>(0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582</td>
<td>Eliz .hh (clap)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>583</td>
<td>(0.14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the beginning of the fragment, the two interlocutors, Phyllis and Elizabeth, are laughing about the two boys’ improper use of vocabulary. At line 588, this state of affairs is echoed in the prior interaction where two men are reported to have fallen down laughing at what the two boys had unwittingly said. Between lines 590 and 599, Phyllis goes on to report an exchange between one of the two men (Elizabeth’s son) and a woman (her own daughter).

The turn spanning lines 590 and 591 includes a same-turn self-initiated repair. Line 590 begins with a cut-off, *ku tha-. The truncated utterance sounds like the beginning of *ku thanggu, “what thing of the *ku-class?” (see §6.1.2.1). Although the repair solution has been reformulated so that it no longer contains the nominal classifier *ku (for animates), the replaced utterance that follows (⁺*thangguwanu *k̂ar’d̂u nanggalwa wurdanbun’guyetjitj ninthaya;⁺⁺, “Who told them that and

---

228 A “skinny neck” is someone who is always looking around, trying to get something – e.g., food, money, etc.
why?”) still expresses amazement at the two boys having learnt an improper name for the aforesaid molluscs, *ku tjipmandji*, which are of the *ku*-class. However more significantly, whereas the truncated utterance was produced at the speaker’s normal register, without any particular voice quality, it was subsequently replaced with a question that is globally marked with excited voice quality and high pitch register.\(^{229}\) This replacement suggests that the real trouble-source lies in the unmarked talk not being hearable as animating prior speech and thus being potentially ambiguous as to whose voice is being animated (i.e., Phyllis’s voice – as narrator, or someone else’s). Phyllis has thus replaced the unmarked talk with the prosodically marked talk, in order to cue the deictic shift in footing.

Phyllis reports the answer to the question with a turn spanning two intonation units (lines 593 and 595), both of which she marks globally with creaky voice. The creaky voice contrasts with the previous animated voice. The answer is audibly different to the turn that voiced the question. This is the voice of a second reported speaker (Phyllis’s daughter). In line 597, Phyllis reports a further question which has the mid-low terminal intonation that is characteristic of these “question-word” questions: †<angarrwa kuyu;>↑ “‘Where [were] the *ku*-things?’” (that is, “where were the molluscs?”). However, from a “global” perspective, the utterance sees a return to the use of high pitch register (although, this time it is produced slower). The match in relative register with the turn in 590-591 suggests that both of these reported questions were produced by the same reported speaker (Elizabeth’s son). The answer to this second question, “They were over there on the reef” (line 599), is noticeably contrasted by a drop in relative register, suggesting a further change of reported speaker (once again, Phyllis’s daughter).

Such phonetic detail brings the interaction to life. So much so, that it is possible to take liberties with the transcript and remove both Phyllis’s commentary\(^{230}\) and Elizabeth’s responses (in Fragment 74), thus portraying the reported interaction as though the voices depicted were the actual voices of the reported interlocutors.

---

\(^{229}\) The pitch drops to a normal register three syllables before the end of the turn, though the excited voice quality is maintained throughout the turn.

\(^{230}\) It’s not entirely clear to me whether Na:···· yu; (“isn’t that right, yeah”), in line 597, should be taken as Phyllis’s commentary or as part of the reported exchange, given the absence of global prosodic marking.
Fragment 74 Reported “storyworld” dialogue, Spiny Chitons (2004-08-08)B03b

590 Man <-thangguwanu "k"ar"d"u nanggalwa
591 Wurdanbun'guyetiitji'ninthaya;+
"Who taught them that and why?"
592 (0.4)
593 Woman *ya kardu kardininthowalkthamarltha panarda dimurpurdi;+*=
"Ah the two skinny necks were looking around there on the edge
[of the reef],"
595 Woman =\textbackslash "Meninthordarrjupurlthakardi.*+'
"They uncovered them."
596 (1.2)
597 Man *<ngarrawa kuyu;+*=
"Where [were] the ku-things?"
598 (1.0)
599 Woman *Ya ku kem panguwardawangu ngarra kalpa;+
"They were over there on the reef."

Note that lines 592, 596 and 598 contain significant silences (0.4, 1.2, and 1.0 seconds respectively). Each of these silences intervene between turns that are globally marked with different bundles of prosodic features. The two turns marked with high relative register are both questions, whereas the two turns that aren’t marked with high relative register (though are prosodically marked with other features) are the corresponding answers to those questions. The narrator is thus not only distinctively using prosody to report question and answer sequences, she is also accentuating the inter-turn silences, thus demarcating the turns so as to give life to the very turn-taking process itself.

We can think of the use of global prosodic marking as a referential practice (Hanks 1990) because, indexically, it keys the deictic shift in footing required to make the talk interpretable as alien (i.e., it brings the participant frame that is native to the “storyworld” into the here-and-now). As with the ill-fitting vocative kinterms, global prosodic marking is referentially efficient because it pushes the reporting of talk into the reported talk itself, thus rendering quotative expressions obsolete. By losing quotative expressions, the referencing becomes more minimal. At the same time, the deictic information required for recognition of the storyworld participants is maintained. In this way we have an application of Minimization and Specification that is detached from reference forms.

9.3.1 The scope of prosodic formatting
If global marking is a referential practice, then it is not unreasonable to ask what “else in addition to referring is being done by the talk practice which has been employed?”
(Schegloff: 1996a: 439). In this section we will consider a passage that is heavily formatted with multiple layers of distinctive prosodic marking. The global marking is partly used to make useful referential distinctions, and partly used for dramatic effect. The passage contains a lengthy turn of very complex construction. In order to appreciate the role of prosody in this complex turn, we will need to examine in detail its complex design – from syntactic, pragmatic and prosodic perspectives.

In Fragment 75 Phyllis is telling Elizabeth the funny story about the two young boys and the molluscs. Here Phyllis reports a conversation between a boy, Antonio, and his “grandfather”, G, Elizabeth’s now deceased son. G and Antonio both address each other with the reciprocal kinterm *thamuny* (see Figure 9.1). Prior to this story, the two women had been reminiscing about when G passed away. Whilst this story is still a reminiscence about the deceased son, it is much more lighthearted and is no-doubt designed to lift Elizabeth’s spirits after a moment of sorrow. Phyllis’s elaborate use of prosody is central to injecting the story with humour and making Elizabeth
laugh. In the fragment, G asks one of the young boys what sort of things they saw on the reef.

**Fragment 75** Spiny Chitons (2004-08-08B03b)

605 Phyl <Awu benmatha kangiur ngay pangu wurdamna>wal>tiidamhat’a”.
   Oh my brother’s son’s son was there laughing at him so much his sides were aching.
   (0.6)

606 Eliz Mmm=

607 Phyl =:tha+mhu:-i:ny.+
   “Grandson”.
   (1.55)

608 Phyl +ku thang+gu kama:-i:+
   “What sort of ku-things might they be?”
   (1.4)

609 Phyl +:Kharda “da”+matha *tha*muny;+:*
   “Right here grandpa.”
   (1.3)

610 Phyl +:Ku terertniminya.+
   “[there are] lots and lots of them.”
   (0.26)

611 Phyl ma:fml]letetwurran ngarra kalpa:ya: manawardfa:;a:wu:;=
   “They were all sticking to the reef”, he said to him. Oh!

612 Eliz [[m-] Mmh: Mm: mh ha ha ha ha ha j ha
   (1.2)

613 Phyl *thamuny thamuny wangu.*
   [laughing] at his daughter’s son.
   (0.7)

614 Phyl +ya thamma:-ny4;+
   “Hey grandson.”
   (1.3)

615 Phyl +:thambinyikatwa;”+*
   “You made a mistake.”
   (1.3)

616 Phyl =ku be: pe:nintha “ku” wufrdamninthardarrerndernwarda pangu.1
   The two men had pains in their backs from laughing about those ku-things.

617 Eliz L Mmh: mh ha ha ha ha ha j
   (1.2)

618 Phyl =ku be: pe:nintha “ku” wufrdamninthardarrerndernwarda pangu.1

619 Eliz Mmh: mh ha ha ha ha ha j ha
   (1.2)

620 Phyl *thamuny thamuny wangu.*
   [laughing] at his daughter’s son.
   (0.7)

621 Phyl +ya thamma:-ny4;+
   “Hey grandson.”
   (1.3)

622 Phyl +:thambinyikatwa;”+*
   “You made a mistake.”
   (1.3)

Lines 612, 614 and the first part of line 616 (up to the end of the word *kalpaya*) constitute lines of reported speech. This is the animated voice of the young boy, Antonio, answering the question that his “grandfather” G asked him in line 610. However it is the lengthy turn that extends across lines 616 and 618 that I wish to consider. The turn is not easily divided into distinct Turn Constructional Units, or

---

231 How reference for the reported exchange is established will be discussed below where this same extract is re-presented as Fragment 78.
TCUs. Syntactically, the turn is comprised of distinct units. The speech verb *mamnawarda*, “he said to him”, occurs mid-way between two other syntactic units: *mamletetwurran ngarra kalpaya*, “They were sticking to the reef”, immediately prior; and *awu ku be penintha ku wurdaminthaderrernwarda pangu*, “Oh! the two men had pains in their backs from laughing about those *ku*-things”, immediately after.

Also pragmatically, the turn consists of three distinct units because each serves a distinct pragmatic function. The first is a unit of reported speech. The second is a quotative expression that reports the reported speech. The third is the narrator’s commentary about what the reported addressees (two men) did upon hearing what the young boy said.

Intonationally, the extended turn is cast as a complete entity – one that is not easily subdivided. All three syntactic/pragmatic units are produced without any pauses or gaps; indeed the first word of the final unit, *awu* (“Oh!”, line 616), is latched onto the previous unit (the framing speech verb *mamnawarda*), where there is a very slight pitch reset. The first two syntactic/pragmatic units both fall under the same rise-fall tune, but the third unit falls under a second rise-fall tune. Effectively, both tunes comprise a larger “supratune” that dips in the middle. As such it resembles a single large intonation unit, one that is not so easily subdivided. From an intonational perspective, the turn does not reach possible completion before reaching the word *pangu* (line 618), where the terminal intonation is fully falling.

Given that the conversation is dyadic, and that Phyllis has clearly established herself as the teller of the story, defence from incursion by would-be self-selectors hardly seems the likely motivation for producing this large floor holding turn. For further insight into its intended purpose, perhaps other prosodic features ought be considered.

---

232 TCUs, the building blocks of conversational turns, are generally regarded as being units of talk that are possibly complete from the perspective of syntax, pragmatics and intonation (Sacks et al. 1974) (cf. Ford, Fox & Thompson 1996; Ford & Thompson 1996). Ford, Fox & Thompson (1996) call into question the utility of the TCU. Rather, they find pragmatics, syntax, prosody and gesture all to be independent variables that, although often aligning, each have a bearing on how interlocutors design their turns.

233 Perhaps it’s fair to say that intonationally the unit comes to “local” completion at the end of the word *mamnawarda*, though it is not “globally” complete until the end of the word *pangu* (see Ford & Thompson 1996: 150). Note for instance Elizabeth’s *Mm* (line 617). Ford and Thompson note that these “small, non-floor-taking turns” may occur at points of “local” completion, where further talk is being projected.
A more detailed inspection reveals that global prosodic marking is to be found in the rhythmic use of isochronous timing.\textsuperscript{234} The extended turn has two rhythmic patterns: a slow pattern and a fast pattern. If we consider the talk as comprising rhythmic cells, where each of the stressed syllables constitutes a beat at the start of each cell, then the cells of the slow pattern are just under one second in duration (see Figure 9.2), whereas the cells of the fast pattern are approximately 0.4 seconds in duration (see Figure 9.3).

![Figure 9.2 Waveform of line 616 of Fragment 75 showing the slower isochronous timing.](image1)

![Figure 9.3 Waveform of lines 616 – 621 of Fragment 75 showing the faster isochronous timing.](image2)

The slow pattern is comprised of only three cells – that is, there are three slow beats at approximately one second apart. However, the third cell containing the word

\textsuperscript{234} This phenomenon is discussed in Couper-Kuhlen (1993) and Auer, Couper-Kuhlen & Muller (1999). See also Couper-Kuhlen (1999) and Klewitz & Couper-Kuhlen (1999) for cases of isochronous timing signalling reported speech.

Isochronous rhythm does not feature very prominently in my Murriny Patha conversational data. It may be that the language is not as well suited to this kind of prosodic marking as English. Firstly, unlike English it is a syllable-timed language rather than a stress-timed language. Secondly, since in conversation polysynthetic verbs generally have just one stressed syllable (at most two), the Murriny Patha clause may be less amenable to rhythmic manipulation than the English clause, which being composed of generally shorter words, has more stressed syllables to play with, per unit of time.
mamnawarda, “he said to him”, does not reach its completion; it is terminated at 0.7 seconds. The next stressed beat is the word awu, “Oh”, which is the first beat of the first cell of the faster rhythmic pattern. Although the word mamnawarda is not truncated, its cell is (see example 9.1). This accounts for why the word awu is perceivable as latched onto the end of mamnawarda.

9.1 Lines 616 – 621 of Fragment 75 represented as rhythmic cells

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>slow pattern</th>
<th>mam/le/tewurr/ran</th>
<th>ngarra/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/kalpa:yaa:</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mamnawarda</td>
<td>← truncated cell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>fast pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/awu::</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/be::</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/wurdammintarda=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/rrernndernwarda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/pangu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/thamuny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/wangu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In longer polysynthetic verbs, the coverb generally attracts primary stress. In careful speech there may also be some secondary stress on the first syllable of the verb. Thus a verb like wurdamninthardarrernwarda could be expected to have the following stress pattern, wurdamninthardarrernwarda. However in the conversational data, it is unusual to find verbs bearing more than a single stressed syllable. This verb, as it occurs in line 618 has no perceivable stress on the first syllable, perhaps because there is a barely perceptible nominal classifier ku, “animate”, immediately preceding the verb. Even so, the first syllable wu and the stressed syllable rrern are 0.8 seconds apart, which is the equivalent of two (0.4 second) rhythmic cells. Similarly rrern and the first syllable of pangu (which is stressed) are 0.8 seconds apart. The entire verb is 1.6 seconds in duration, which is the equivalent of 4 cells. The only stressed syllable in the verb, rrern, does place a beat at what would be the start of the third cell. We can thus conceive of this word as fitting within the faster isochronous pattern, even though a few beats have been skipped.

The fast rhythmic pattern includes all of the speaker’s commentary about the two men having sore backs from laughing. This fast pattern continues into the next line (621) thamuny thamuny wangu, “at his daughter’s son”. The gap between pangu and thamuny (i.e., the gap in line 620) is 1.2 seconds, effectively three empty cells.

235 Technically Antonio is really G’s mo.fa.fa.so.da.so.da.so. However, through same-sex sibling merger G’s mo.fa.fa.so.da.so (Phyllis’s husband) equates with “brother”. Because a man treats his brother’s kin as his own, Antonio becomes G’s daughter’s son.
The syntactic unit, *thamuny thamuny wangu*, is an increment to the prior turn. It serves as an elaboration that explicates the source of the men’s amusement as being the young boy, Antonio (Figure 9.1).

The slow pattern includes both the reported speech and the speech verb *mamnawarda*, “he said to him”. This line of reported speech is itself a continuation of Antonio’s answer to his grandfather. The prior two lines (612, 614) are globally marked with excited voice quality and high pitch register. Thus the prosodic feature of slow isochronous rhythm has scope over both the reported speech and the utterance that reports the reported speech, thus echoing the verb’s association of the reported speaker, Antonio, with his reported utterance. On the other hand, the faster isochronous rhythm, by having scope over both the talk that outlines the actions of the men in laughing (line 618) and over the talk that indexes the root-cause of their actions (the young boy, line 621), associates their laughing with the source of their amusement. In this way, it also does referential disambiguation. Because the kinterm *thamuny* is reciprocal, it is otherwise ambiguous as to whether it is being used to index the grandfather or the grandson (see Figure 9.1).

The actions of the young boy (in speaking) and the two men (in laughing) are contrasted through the isochronous patterning. The two actions are in a cause and effect relationship: the two boys used the wrong name for the molluscs – the men laughed. The faster isochronous rhythm is also in a dependency relationship to the prior rhythm – it is only perceivable as faster because the prior rhythm is slower. It is perceptually dependent on the prior rhythm for effect. So what effect does it produce? In line 619 Elizabeth bursts out laughing. This laughter overlaps with the faster rhythmic turn. The onset of these laughter particles coincides with the fifth beat of the faster isochronous rhythm. The laughter overlaps the verb *wurdamninhardarrerndern*, “the two men had aching backs from laughing”. The onset of the laughter is prior to the coverb *-darrerndern*, which carries the lexical meaning, “to have an aching back from laughing”. Therefore Elizabeth’s laughter

---

236 Klewitz and Couper-Kuhlen (1996) also found that prosodic formatting sometimes extends beyond the confines of the talk being reported. This leaching into the surrounding talk takes the form of pre- and post-voicing. Effectively, the prosodic formatting flags a passage of talk as having report speech in its vicinity.

237 This slow rhythmic pattern exactly maps onto the first of the rise-fall tunes making up the larger intonation unit discussed previously.

238 The kinterm *thamuny* denotes “mo.fa”, “mo.fa.br”, “mo.fa.zi”, “fa.mo.br”, “man’s da.ch”, “woman’s br.da.ch” and “man’s so.da.ch”.

236 Klewitz and Couper-Kuhlen (1996) also found that prosodic formatting sometimes extends beyond the confines of the talk being reported. This leaching into the surrounding talk takes the form of pre- and post-voicing. Effectively, the prosodic formatting flags a passage of talk as having report speech in its vicinity.

237 This slow rhythmic pattern exactly maps onto the first of the rise-fall tunes making up the larger intonation unit discussed previously.

238 The kinterm *thamuny* denotes “mo.fa”, “mo.fa.br”, “mo.fa.zi”, “fa.mo.br”, “man’s da.ch”, “woman’s br.da.ch” and “man’s so.da.ch”.
cannot be triggered by the semantics of this verb because the meaning of the verb is not yet clear. Both women had already been laughing numerous times previously during the telling of this very funny story. This particular passage sets Elizabeth off laughing all over again. The onset of this stretch of laughter seems to have less to do with a punchline or with humorous content, than with the juxtaposition of actions and with dramatic delivery. This particular burst of laughter seems to have been triggered by Phyllis’s dramatic rhythmic portrayal of the cause-and-effect relationship between the participants’ actions, as indexed by the dependent nature of the contrastive prosodic patterning.

In the extended turn, pragmatics, syntax, intonation and isochronous timing all operate as independent variables, each being switched on and off (or becoming possibly complete) at different positions over the course of the turn. The prosodic formatting of the reported speech leaches into the surrounding talk. The contrastive formatting of the adjacent talk sets up a contrast between different reported participants and their actions. The scope of the global prosodic marking has a referential function in that it associates these participants with their actions. Yet global marking is clearly recruited for other purposes beyond referring.

The extended rhythmic turn that is prosodically cast as a large unit is certainly a floor-holding device. However, given the audience of just one person, protecting the turn from premature speaker change hardly seems a motivation for casting the turn in this fashion. On the other hand, the turn is large, it is rhythmical, it is dynamic, it commands attention. It has “stage-presence”. Phyllis has Elizabeth hanging onto every word and then laughing out loud, irrepressibly. Phyllis’s flair as a narrator is second to none. Her elaborate use of prosody turns the telling of this story into a theatrical performance, bringing the entire story to life. However, this is not a performance for just anybody – it is recipient-designed specifically for Elizabeth who was in need of cheering up after reminiscing about her deceased son. This is a storytelling with a need to entertain and it delivers in spectacular fashion.

To recap, in the portion of the fragment discussed here, global prosodic marking is used to define umbrellas that have scope over references to persons, and over descriptions of the deeds those persons are purported to have done. In this way, the different isochronous umbrellas associate participants with their actions, thus

239 In fact Phyllis has already revealed the rude word that the young boy had innocently used to refer to the molluscs. This produced a great deal of laughter.
addressing potential ambiguities relating to the general nature of the verbal cross-referencing. In this story, however, global prosodic marking is never recruited only for referring. Global marking injects a storytelling with a touch of realism that draws the audience into the storyworld, as if they too were witnessing the prior interaction unfold. In this fragment, its special dramaturgical qualities come to the fore where Phyllis masterfully uses contrastive patterning to enthrall her audience and bring good cheer.

Global prosodic reference assists the hearer in tracking referents by cueing shifts in footing between worlds of interaction. Interlocutors recounting prior interaction contrast the voices of the different storyworld participants from each other, as well as from their own storytellers’ voice. The various voices are made to sound different from each other because contrastive bundles of prosodic features are layered globally over the sections of talk (or portions thereof) attributable to those various participants.

In the next section, we will examine a different sort of prosodic reference that is also used in contexts of reported interaction. This prosodic reference makes use of a different type of prosodic formatting and has a different sort of referential function.

9.4 Locally marked prosodic reference
In the same story about the molluscs, and again in contexts of reported speech, certain local prosodic marking is recruited, not for cueing changes in footing, but rather for referential disambiguation. Referentially, Fragment 76 is very complex. The events centre around two pairs of male non-siblings – a pair of boys and a pair of men.

Fragment 76 Spiny Chitons (2004-08-08J803b)
515 Phyl thu:-ryke:-am:;
     “Thuykem” ((Personal name)).
     (1.0)
516 Phyl Wul-gum.e:-an:; (0.35) than’guriwaknintha;=be ku warda “k’anyire
517 mamintha.
     "Old woman, you follow the two male non-siblings, there’s stuff
518 of the ku-class around here", the two male non-siblings said.
     (1.23)
520 Phyl wakal:::, (0.7) nan n’ig’unu; (0.3) kalanyaga:::t; (. ) antoniya pana.
     Young fellow(s), what’s her name’s, Kalanyat’s [and] that
     Antonio.
     (2.5)
521 Phyl -Hha:-r ku terert nan’guminthayu barmninthongardu.+=
     Hey you two blokes, the two boys saw lots of “ku” things.
     (2.3)
524 Phyl -rthanggugwao.+ (. ) ku murriny wiye nyinda manganninthartyu,
     “What kind of “ku” things?” They got that kind with a rude name.
     (1.5)
In the turn spanning lines 515-518, Phyllis uses reported speech to launch into a story. This turn is exceedingly complex: referentially, interactionally, prosodically and pragmatically. “Thuykem, wulgumen, thanguriwaknintha. Be ku warda kanyire” mamnintha. – “Thuykem, old woman, follow the two male non-siblings. There is stuff of the ku-class around here’, the two male non-siblings said.” This intriguing introduction marks the start of the story about the two boys and the molluscs.\textsuperscript{240} The personal name, Thuykem, is not Elizabeth’s name so the misfit between audience and addressee flags the turn as reporting prior talk. This is confirmed by the framing speech verb mamnintha (line 518), “the two male non-siblings said”. The imperative verb than’guriwaknintha, “follow the two male non-siblings”, suggests that there are two male participants that the reported addressee is being instructed to follow. Clearly these two participants are not the same two males as those expressed by the speech verb mamnintha (because the verb is not reflexive). That makes four male participants introduced in this initial turn at talk. The two verbs than’guriwaknintha and mamnintha are typical locally subsequent reference forms, though here they are used in globally initial position. Using polysynthetic verbs for first-mentions effectively flags these participants as persons of interest, and invites Elizabeth to work out who is being spoken about. That these people are “first-mentioned” in this vague way raises the possibility that their names should not be mentioned, and that she should consider who might fall into this avoidance category.\textsuperscript{241}

Elizabeth has two problems to deal with and a number of clues. The first problem is to identify the two pairs of males. Global prosodic marking won’t help to address this problem. Her second problem is with interpreting the subject of the verb than’guriwaknintha, as there is no telling from the verbal morphosyntax whether one person is being addressed or two.\textsuperscript{242} It is here that the local prosodic marking provides

\textsuperscript{240} Part of the intrigue lies in the ambiguous reference to “stuff of the ku-class” (recall from Table 6 the very wide range of denotata for ku) not only projects a story as forthcoming, but also projects the direction that the story will take. This vague reference is interpretable in a number of ways: as the men announcing their intention to go hunting for animals or fish, as a warning that the young boys may run into trouble from some dangerous animals, or perhaps that the boys might find things that could be problematic for them to talk about. This humorous story deals precisely with problematic referencing to things of this nominal “ku” class.

\textsuperscript{241} Given that the recognitional inversion of form and position draws on a “prior knowledge association” to invite the recipient to recognize the referent (see §8.5), the use of this form also invites the inference that perhaps the form is employed as an avoidance recognitional.

\textsuperscript{242} There are no clues in the verb than’guriwaknintha since the morphologically “singular” classifier subject tha is technically both singular and dual. If the subject referent were dual masculine non-sibling, then the number marker specifying the direct object would take precedence over the subject
the clue. There are two vocative expressions used as summonses, *Thuykem* (line 515), a woman’s name, and *wulgumen* (line 517), “old woman”. The local prosodic similarity of these expressions is iconic and so tells her that each term addresses the same person, and not two different people.

We will firstly deal with the identity of the two pairs of males. Line 520 is an elaboration on the two males that *Thuykem* was instructed to follow in line 517. These are same two boys that innocently referred to the aforementioned molluscs with the rude name. Phyllis has difficulty producing line 520. Because she has forgotten one of the boys’ names, she refers to him as *wakal*, “child”, which is unmarked for gender; though in this case, *wakal* can only be a male child because the verb *than’guriwaknintha* (line 517) clearly states that two male non-brothers must be followed. The drawn-out final lateral of *wakal* with its slightly rising, “continuous” contour is hearable as incomplete (Du Bois et al. 1993). As such, it projects further talk. This and the subsequent 0.7 second pause are hearable as hesitation phenomena associated with a word search. The word *nan* is a word-search-word. However, here *nan* is not searching for the name of the little boy. Phyllis has also momentarily forgotten the name of his mother as well. Here *nan niyurnu*, “what’s her name’s” completes the referential expression that stalled before the pause – effectively, *wakal nan niyurnu*, “what’s her name’s child”. *Kalanygat* is the name of the mother. *Kalanygat* is thus a self-repair, effectively replacing the word-search word *nan*. The elaboration thus reads: “Kalanygat’s son”. In terms of Phyllis and Elizabeth’s shared common ground (Clark 1993, 1996; Enfield 2006), this is a reasonably specific identification of the second boy (Bobby, see Figure 9.4). The other boy, her own daughter’s son, she refers to by name – *Antania pana*, “that Antonio” (Figure 9.4).

The two address terms in lines 515 and 517 give clues as to the reported speakers. *Thuykem* is Elizabeth’s daughter-in-law, the wife of her deceased son, G (see Figure 9.4). Because the preceding talk had been a reminiscence about this deceased son, he is topically salient. He is therefore likely to be one of the two male reported speakers expressed by the speech verb *mamnintha* in line 518. As Elizabeth’s deceased son, his name should not be mentioned in her presence.

---

specifying number marker, in competition for slot 9 in the verbal template. This would leave the subject specifying number marker -nintha with no remaining slots in the template. The semantic number of the verbal subject would thus remain underspecified as to whether or one or two participants are being expressed (see §6.1.3.4, particularly example 6.48, p. 133).
The second address term *wulgumen* suggests that the relationship between the reported speaker and reported addressee is familiar. *Wulgumen*, “old woman” is a borrowing from either Aboriginal English or Kriol (or from an earlier pidgin). In Murriny Patha society senior women are treated with respect and reverence and thus *wulgumen* can be an honorific. Honorifics such as *wulgumen* are frequently used as endearing vocatives to address people who are actually younger than senior women (they are frequently used to address very young girls). At the time, *Thuykem* was not an old woman, so the use of *wulgumen* as a term of address underscores a reasonable degree of familiarity.

Is Phyllis quoting a single speaker saying both *Thuykem* and *wulgumen*? Or is she quoting separate speakers? The dual masculine speech verb, *mamnintha*, suggests that two men produced the talk in lines 515 and 517. Hence, the one second gap (line 516) should be interpreted as prosodically marking the change of reported speaker, since we’ve already seen (in Fragment 73) that Phyllis uses sizeable gaps to prosodically mark speaker change. Given his topical salience (as the topic of a prior reminiscence) one of the reported speakers must be G. Because Phyllis hasn’t elaborated on the identity of the second speaker, we can speculate that there may be a good reason why she doesn’t – perhaps she can’t mention him by name. It later transpires that the
second reported speaker is the man B in Figure 9.4, the husband of the aforementioned Kalanygat and the father of the young boy Bobby. As husband of Phyllis's sister-in-law, B is Phyllis’s classificatory brother. As her opposite-sex sibling, his name is restricted. Although she doesn’t mention him by name, the references to his son and his wife suggest that he might have been there. In the next fragment, Phyllis supplies further clues as to the identity of these two men. From what we’ve been able to piece together, we can diagrammatically represent the reported interaction in Figure 9.5.

Figure 9.5 The reported interaction in Fragment 76. The two men (G and B) are the reported speakers, the two boys are “reported others”.

Elizabeth’s second problem is deciding whether or not Thuykem (line 515) and wulgumen (line 517) are being used to address the same person or two different people. It is demonstrable that Phyllis has used prosody to cue a co-referential reading. Even though the two terms of address are not globally marked as being different in any way from the surrounding talk (i.e., in terms of register, loudness, tempo or voice quality etc.), the two utterances are nonetheless cast in a similar fashion, with attention-grabbing pitch-peaks on syllables that don’t ordinarily attract stress. Both of these words normally bear stress on the first syllable (Thúykem, wúlgumen). As such, it is the first syllables that would be expected to have higher fundamental frequencies and higher intensities than the second syllables. Both of these address terms are attention-grabbing because of the noticeable shifts in peak-
pitch to their next-to-right syllables. These shifts in pitch make the utterances hearable as mimicking summonses for the reported addressee’s attention.

However, the two forms have much more in common prosodically than mere shifts in peak pitch. Impressionistically, the two words “sound the same”. This is perhaps surprising because segmentally, the two words are quite dissimilar – *Thuykem* is disyllabic and *wulgumen* is trisyllabic. *Thuykem* has two voiceless stops and *wulgumen* is voiced throughout. In spite of these differences, acoustic analyses (Table 12) show that it is no accident that the two words sound the same.

The first address term, the name *Thuykem*, has a marked intonation pattern (see Figure 9.6) consisting of two pitch-glides – an upward glide followed by a downward
glide. The first syllable of Thuykem consists of a diphthong, which being a long syllable, is well suited to bearing a pitch-glide as a suprasegment. By contrast, only the final syllable of the trisyllabic word wulgumen bears a downward pitch-glide. Because each word ends with a downward pitch-glide, it is possible to compare these final syllables along the same parameters. If we compare where the long first syllable in Thuykem starts and then stops, with various mean measurements for the first and second syllables of wulgumen, we can begin to see why the two words sound so similar. Comparing the beginning of the upward pitch-glide of Thuykem, (that is, the minimum pitch of the first syllable) to the mean pitch of the first syllable of wulgumen, we get 135 Hz and 128 Hz respectively. Comparing the maximum pitch of the first syllable of Thuykem to the mean pitch of the second syllable of wulgumen, we get 156 Hz and 153 Hz respectively. In terms of upward pitch movement, these values make for a very close match on an absolute scale. Comparing the two downward pitch-glides (the last syllables of each word) in terms of mean pitch, we get 133Hz vs. 127Hz, which match each other very closely.

The duration of the initial pitch-glide in Thuykem (0.23 sec) is a close match to the duration of the first two syllables of wulgumen (0.25 sec). These words also match very closely in terms of their total duration: 0.66 seconds vs 0.75 seconds. With regards to intensity, the first syllable of Thuykem (61.6dB) almost exactly matches the mean intensity of syllables one and two of wulgumen (61.7dB).

Thus, in terms of absolute pitch, duration and intensity these words are very similar, even though they are segmentally dissimilar. In each word, we see a prosodic mutation in the service of discourse prominence, where each word summons the attention of the reported addressee. Moreover, wulgumen prosodically assimilates the preceding word Thuykem. I suggest that the function of this prosodic assimilation is referential. Recall that the verb than’guriwaknintha, “follow the two male non-siblings”, was ambiguous as to whether the second person subject should be interpreted as singular or dual. My consultants assured me that there was only one addressee, because they knew the story. I’m suggesting the narrator deals with the ambiguity inherent in the verb by making these two address terms sound the same. She makes them sound the same, because they are in fact addressing the same person.
In order to make this point clear to her audience she needs some other mechanism, beyond the verbal morphosyntax, to force this interpretation.\footnote{The phenomenon has parallels with Cruttenden’s \textit{tonal harmony}, where the intonation patterns of parenthetical appositive NPs harmonize (Cruttenden 1997: 71). Thus in the example below, the fall-rise tone of \textit{butcher} assimilates to the fall-rise tone of \textit{Green}. By definition, appositive NPs are necessarily co-referential. 
Mr ‘Green/ the ‘butcher/’s become the new chairman of the Parent-‘Teachers Association.}

To recap: similar local prosodic marking of two referential forms can be used iconically to mark the referents of those forms as one and the same.

From the same narrative we will now examine two further examples that demonstrate distinctive prosodic marking being recruited for referential purposes. These two, with the previous example, have in common that various referential items either assimilate with or dissipilate from each other prosodically; and, that in each case the prosodic marking seems to be recruited for disambiguation. It seems then that what we have is a genuine referring strategy for which we can isolate a pair of governing principles.

**Locally Marked Prosodic Reference**

1. Coreference between two or more referential items may be signalled by locally marking prosodic features in an assimilatory fashion.
2. Non-coreference between referential items may be signalled by locally marking prosodic features in a dissimilatory fashion.

Fragment 77, which continues the same story from exactly where we left it at the end of Fragment 76, demonstrates how certain kinterms can be prosodically marked to signal both coreference and non-coreference. In Fragment 76 there were two male reported speakers, G and B, addressing one female reported addressee (recall Figure 9.5). In that fragment, the function of the Locally Marked Prosodic Reference was signalling to the recipient of the story that there was only one reported addressee and not two, and that each man was addressing her personally. However in Fragment 77, one reported speaker (\textit{Kalinygawurkpurk}, Phyllis’s own daughter) addresses two male reported addressees (the same two men, G and B). (See Figure 9.7 and Figure 9.8).
Figure 9.7 The reported interaction in Fragment 77. The two reported addressees are the men who were previously the reported speakers in Fragment 76.

Fragment 77 Spiny Chitons (2004-08-08) [B03b]

524 Phyl +thangguguwa... (-.) $ku murriny wiye nyindan manganninthartyu,  
What kind of $ku-things? They got that kind with a rude name.
525 (1.5)
526 Phyl *Aa::~*thi*
527 (0.95)
528 Phyl +derdi~4; (0.37) $kalinygawurrkpurrkathu dimkay.
"Daddy", Kalinygawurrkpurrk called out.
529 (1.6)
530 Phyl derdi~4;
"Daddy."
531 (0.6)
532 Phyl kaka~4;
"Uncle."
533 (0.9)
534 Phyl *nan'gudharrpunintha pernintha nyinda;*
"Ask those two male non-siblings,"
535 (0.1)
536 Phyl Thanggu "g'u ngarro kalpa damninthangkarduyu.
‘what sort of $ku-things were you two male non-siblings looking for on the reef.’"
537 (1.9)
538 Phyl 'Ya pernintha thanggu thangkugu damninthangka~rdu;=perentintha
539 wurdamnintha'dh'ayi+weparlwarda:thu *naj"  
"You two male non-siblings, what- what $ku-things did you two male non-siblings see?" The two male non-siblings spoke at the same time, didn’t they?
In lines 528, 530 and 532 of Fragment 77, *Kalinygawurrukpurrk* calls out three vocative kinterms. Each kinterm is prosodically marked to sound like a call for someone’s attention. Two of these kinterms are the same same (*dedi*, “father”) and the other is different (*kaka*, “mother’s brother”). Since Kalinygawurrukpurrk is the only person calling out, it is unlikely that the same person will be related to her both as “father” and “uncle”. This tells us that there must be more than one addressee. The issue is whether *dedi* is here being used to address the same person or two different people. Lines 534 and 536 instruct the reported addressees to go and ask the same two boys encountered previously, what it was they had seen on the reef. Again, because object number markers out-rank subject number markers in competition for number

---

244 For each of these words, the stress is normally on the first syllable. As such, the first syllables would be expected to have higher maximum pitch and higher intensity than the second syllables. However, here we see a deviation from that pattern.

245 Unlike Gooniyandi (McGregor 1984), Murriny Patha has no syntactically “indirect” reported speech. Indeed the paucity of indirect speech in Australian languages has been remarked upon by Rumsey (1990: 357) (cf. McGregor 1994). Rather than rendering the reported talk in the third person, as would be the norm for English (“Ask the two males what they saw on the reef.”), this imperative construction renders the (doubly embedded) reported talk directly, i.e., “Ask the two males, ‘What did you two males see on the reef?’”.
marking slots, the verb *nan’gudharrpunintha* is underspecified for subject number. The question is then, how many reported addressees are there – one “father” and one “uncle”, or two “fathers” and one “uncle”? There are in fact two reported addressees (G and B). I claim that this can be deduced from the phonetics of the two tokens of *dedi*. The second token of *dedi* is phonetically designed as a repeat of the first token. This can be seen on both absolute and relative scales. Firstly we will consider the absolute scale.

In their interactional prosodic study of repeated turns in sequence closing environments, Curl, Local & Walker (2004) performed acoustic analyses of repeated turns. The first element of these “doubles” consists of an initial speaker’s recognizable move towards topic closure. When this turn fails to initiate anything more substantial than minimal uptake from its recipient, the initial speaker repeats the closing move, with the same words (and in fact with the same syllables). It is thus a “redoing” of the prior turn. They found that, consistently, the repeated element in the double is lower in pitch than the initial element. If we compare the two instances of *dedi* (see Figure 9.9 and Table 13), for each syllable, the second one (line 530) has lower maximum pitches than the equivalent syllables in the prior (line 528) version (181Hz vs. 209Hz for the first syllables and 197Hz vs. 226Hz for the second syllables).

They also found that the pitch range for the second element of the double, relative to the first, is typically compressed. This too is true of the second instance of the word *dedi* (197Hz – 106Hz = 91Hz) relative to the first (226Hz – 90Hz =136Hz). Finally, they found that the repeated element in the double is systematically shorter in duration than the first. Again the duration of the second *dedi* is shorter (0.52 sec vs. 0.69 sec). Thus these acoustic measurements of overall pitch, pitch range, and duration are entirely consistent with the phonetic features described by Curl et al. (2004) for their repetitions, and so support an interpretation of the *dedi* in line 534 being a “redoing” of the prior *dedi*, in line 530.

---

246 Because of same-sex sibling merger, the Murriny Patha ego addresses and refers to both “father” and “father’s” brother with the same kin-terms *yile* or *dedi*. By contrast, the equivalent of “uncle”, *kaka*, is used only for ego’s “mother’s” brother, and not for ego’s “father’s” brother.


248 Either there was no uptake at all, or there was just a continuer, e.g., *ah huh*. 
Figure 9.9 Pitch-trace and intensity of the kinterms dedi (lines 528 and 530) and kaka (line 532), in Fragment 77.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dedi (line 528)</th>
<th>Dedi (line 530)</th>
<th>Kaka (line 532)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pitch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>creak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>59.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 Acoustic analyses of the kinterms dedi (lines 528 and 530) and kaka (line 532), in Fragment 77.

However for the recipient of this story, there is perhaps more than one way of interpreting this redoing. Phyllis could be reporting Kalinygawurrkpurrk’s having twice summoned the attention of her (classificatory) father. In which case, the redone dedi should be construed as a second summons, produced in pursuit of a more adequate response (Davidson 1984; Pomeranz 1984b).249 The other possibility is that Kalinygawurrkpurrk only produced a single dedi as a summons. The redone dedi

249 The following fragment comes from a telephone interview on the radio show Sunday Night Safran. In lines 1-3, the interviewer JS, announces his guest, JR, and then issues him a summons (line 3). When no response from JR is forthcoming (lines 4-6), the summons is reissued at line 7. The reissued summons has a considerably narrower pitch range than the prior version and has a much lower register. The podcast (safran_2007_07_29.mp3) containing this fragment may be downloaded from http://www.abc.net.au/triplej/safran/podcast/safran.xml.

1  JS  ↓<html>we have↓</html> (0.7) ↓John Ron↓<i>son</i>↓ (0.5) author↓ (0.35) and filmmaker↓
2  ↓ (0.36)
3  JS  ↓joining us from↓ Lon↓<i>don</i>; (0.13) Hello ↑John:n;  ← Summons
4  ↓ (2.6)
5  FB  ↓John’s at Starbucks;  
6  ↓ (0.3)
7  JS  ↓Hello John↓;↓  ← Reissued summons
8  JR  ↓(See↓ uh) well; wanting to get to Starbucks and Ti↓
9  FB  ↓Ha ha  
10 JR  ↓Ha ha ha.
11 JR  ↓ya called jist a- jist as I was headin’ ou:t;
would then be construable as Phyllis’s re-reporting of her daughter’s solitary
summons. Both of these interpretations are entirely consistent with there being only
one person for whom this kinterm *dedi* actually fits. That is, each *dedi* must be
construed as addressing the same person, and not two separate men who happen to be
brothers; because regardless of how the redoing is conceived of, it’s been phonetically
designed to be hearable as a second version of something that came before, rather
than a new version of something altogether different.

Although on absolute scales, the second instance of *dedi* is phonetically different
from the first (i.e., lower register, narrower pitch range and shorter duration), which
makes it sound different from the previous version, on relative scales the two *dedis*
show prosodic similarity. With respect to each other, the same syllables are higher
and louder. However, on the same relative scales, the kinterm *kaka* is prosodically
cast as significantly different.

![Spectrogram showing creak in *kaka* (line 532) of Fragment 77.](image)

Both *dedis* have first syllables of higher intensity than their second syllables,
while the second syllable of *kaka* has higher intensity than its first. Both *dedis* have
second syllables with higher fundamental frequencies (perceivable as higher pitch)
than their first syllables. The second syllable of *kaka* is perceivable as lower in pitch
than its first syllable. Thus, with respect to loudness (the perceivable correlate of

---

250 The fundamental frequency was traceable for the second syllable of *kaka* but not for the first. There
is significant creak in the first syllable (and also briefly at the beginning of the second syllable, see
Figure 9.10). Due to this creak, the speaker’s vocal chords would have been moving too slowly to
secure a reliable pitch trace. I thus played a recording of this word to 6 linguists and asked each of them
which of the two syllables had the highest or lowest pitch. Four of them thought the second syllable
was lower than the first, one thought they were of equal pitch, and the other abstained. Speculatively, it
intensity) and pitch (the perceivable correlate of fundamental frequency), the two tokens of *dedi* show similarity in how their first syllables relate to their second syllables. However, by these same relative scales, the two *dedis* are differently cast from the kinterm *kaka*. The phonetic difference is further accentuated by the presence of significant creak in the first syllable of *kaka* (see Figure 9.10). Thus, in terms of Locally Marked Prosodic Reference, the differences between *kaka* and *dedi* reinforce the referential constraint made by the singular quotative speech verb *dimkay* (line 532) that the two terms of address should be construed as being produced by a single reported speaker, summoning the attention of two separate reported addressees; and *not* the scenario that we saw in Fragment 76, where two separate reported speakers used different vocative expressions to summon a single reported addressee.

On the other hand, even though the two tokens of *dedi* were prosodically cast so as to sound different from each other in terms of absolute register, in terms of relative pitch, they were prosodically cast as the same. This prosodic assimilation (in relative terms) reinforces the referential interpretation; that the second *dedi*, as a redoing of the first *dedi*, is to be construed as necessarily addressing the same person, rather than the alternative possibility where the reported speaker Kalinygawurrkpurrk might be individually addressing separate classificatory “fathers”. Locally Marked Prosodic Reference constrains the number of possible readings, thus amplifying the deictic power of the ill-fitting kinterms. Again, embedding the person referencing that explicates the reported speech into the reported speech itself, allows the narrator to do more referencing with fewer words.

Although the main points to be gleaned from this section relate to prosodic assimilation cuing co-reference and dissimilation cueing non-coreference, we should also consider the contribution of this referential practice towards making the relevant persons identifiable. Recall that the narrator, Phyllis, could not name the two men, G and B, in Elizabeth’s presence. The use of kinterms as terms of address, in the context of reported speech, indexes the relationship between the reported speaker and the reported addressee. Because Elizabeth knows that the reported speaker Kalinygawurrkpurrk is Phyllis’s own daughter, she also knows that Kalinygawurrkpurrk used to be in a “daughter” relationship to her deceased son and used to address him with the kinterms *yile* or *dedi*, “father” (see Figure 9.8). Using

---

*may be that hearers orient to the second syllable’s falling pitch contour, in judging it to be lower in pitch than the first.*
this kinterm as a vocative expression, not only indexes G as a likely reported addressee for the reported interaction in this Fragment 77, it also supports the prior indexing of G as one of the two reported speakers who was previously addressing his wife Thuykem, in Fragment 76. Similarly, Kalinygawurrkpurrk is in a “niece” relationship to B (Figure 9.8). Her use of kaka, “mother’s brother”, as an address term indexes this relationship and cues him as a likely candidate for being the other reported speaker in Fragment 76.

Other clues are the mention of B’s son Bobby through the use of a kinterm anchored from his wife (line 520 of Fragment 76, and that the two reported speakers in Fragment 76 were able to address the person Thuykem in such a familiar way. The context tells Elizabeth that the second man was a good friend of G, and that Phyllis shouldn’t say his name. As Phyllis’s opposite-sex sibling, B fits on both counts. All of these clues zoom in on B as being the second reported speaker in Fragment 76 and the second reported addressee in Fragment 77.

The third fragment in this story to exhibit the phenomenon I’m calling Locally Marked Prosodic Reference is one that we have previously encountered in Fragment 75. In this fragment (repeated here as Fragment 78), Elizabeth’s son G does as Kalinygawurrkpurrk had suggested (Fragment 77) and asks one of the two boys what sort of things of the ku-class they had found on the reef. The fragment reports the dialogue between G and his classificatory daughter’s son, Antonio. Because G and Antonio stood in a classificatory “maternal grandparent” relationship, they address each other with the reciprocal kinterm thamuny (in this case “mother’s father” vs. “man’s daughter’s son”, see Figure 9.1).

**Fragment 78 Spiny Chitons (2004-08-08)B03b**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Phyl</th>
<th>Eliz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>Phyl</td>
<td>&quot;Oh my brother’s son’s son was there laughing at him so much his sides were aching.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>606</td>
<td>(0.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 607  | Eliz | Mhm_=
| 608  | Phyl | "Grandson."
| 609  | (1.55) | |
| 610  | Phyl | "What sort of ku-things might they be?"
| 611  | (1.4) | |
| 612  | Phyl | "Right here grandpa."
| 613  | (1.3) | |
The problem for the recipient of this story is keeping track of which line of talk hails from the grandfather and which hails from the grandson. Because the kinterm *thamuny* is reciprocal, the issue is who were the reported speakers and who were the reported addressees. Both global and local prosodic marking provide clues. Firstly we will consider the global marking.

The immediately prior reported interaction had been between Elizabeth’s son, G, and Phyllis’s own daughter, Kalinygawurrkurkar. In line 605, Phyllis refers to G with the self-anchored kinterm, *kanggurl ngay*, “my grandson” (br.so.so). As a topically salient participant who has already been instructed to ask the young boys what they had found, in terms of the story’s coherent unfolding, he is the most likely person to have produced the kinterm *thamuny* in line 608. Moreover, this kinterm and the subsequent question, “What sort of *ku*-things might they be?”, are both produced with breathy voice and with an excited, singsong voice quality, characterizable by exaggerated pitch excursions. This reported turn sounds like an adult speaking to a child. The utterance is hearable as mimicking the “grandfather’s” question to the “grandson”.

The first two TCUs (lines 612 and 614) that form part of the “grandson” Antonio’s answer, also have an excited voice quality, though it is somewhat

---

251 This interaction was discussed in Fragment 73 and Fragment 74.
252 Lines 534 and 536 of Fragment 77.
differently manifest. These turns both have creaky rather than breathy voice. Although the peak pitch is not particularly high, the pitch range is narrower than the prior talk (gone is the singsong intonation), making the lines perceivable as having the high register one might associate with a child. The third (syntactic) unit of Antonio’s reply (line 616) sees a shift to the isochronous timing that was already discussed in relation to Fragment 75. The thamuny, in line 623, sees a return to the singsong intonation that we saw in lines 608 and 610, which was attributable to the “grandfather”, G. This singsong intonation is sufficient to flag the following TCU, thambinyikatwa, “you made a mistake”, as also hailing from G (even though thambinyikatwa bears none of the other prosodic characteristics previously attributed to him). Thus, the global marking of reported speech adds further precision to the deictic clues provided by these vocative kinterms, which would otherwise be ambiguous due to their reciprocity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>thamuny in line 608 (“daughter’s son”)</th>
<th>thamuny in line 623 (“daughter’s son”)</th>
<th>thamuny in line 612 (“mother’s father”)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pitch</td>
<td>Pitch</td>
<td>Pitch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>61.14</td>
<td>68.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 thamuny in lines 608, 623 (“daughter’s son”) vs thamuny in 612 (“mother’s father”) and of Fragment 78.

As well as being prosodically similar on a global level, the two “daughter’s son” thamunys (i.e., those in lines 608 and 623 that hail from the grandfather G and address the grandson Antonio) show local similarities (see Figure 9.11 and Table 14). In terms of duration, the words are closely matched. Similarly in terms of mean pitch, each syllable is very close (147Hz vs. 153Hz for the first and 174Hz vs. 172Hz for the second). In terms of absolute register, this is a nearly perfect match. In each, the second syllable has higher pitch than the first. Additionally in each word, as the downward pitch glides in the second syllables are drawn out, there is some audible creak. As a result of the creak the pitch trace wavers (see Figure 9.11).

Klewitz and Couper-Kuhlen (1999: 474) also note that the particular “prosodic formatting of a voice may well ‘evolve’ during the stretch of the speech being reported. When this happens, the left- and righthand boundaries may end up being different…”.
Figure 9.11 Acoustic analyses of *thamuny* in lines 608, 623 ("daughter's son") vs *thamuny* in 612 ("mother's father") and of Fragment 78.

---

284
By contrast the duration of the “mother’s father” *thamuny* (i.e., the address term in line 612 that hails from the grandson) is significantly shorter than the other two. The mean pitch of the second syllable does not match with either of the others. Whereas the two *thamunys* hailing from the grandfather had some creak in the second syllable, this *thamuny* has such strong creak in the first syllable that the fundamental frequency is untraceable. Nonetheless, as a result of the creak the first syllable is strongly perceivable as higher in pitch than the second, which was the opposite of the pattern for the two “daughter’s son” *thamunys*. In terms of local prosodic marking, this “mother’s father” *thamuny* is the polar opposite of the “daughter’s son” *thamunys*. So in this fragment, Locally Marked Prosodic Reference echoes the deictic cues provided by the global prosodic marking, in that the talk directed toward the grandson bears hallmarks of sameness, whereas the talk directed towards the grandfather bears hallmarks of difference.254

In sum, Locally Marked Prosodic Reference can be thought of as a pair of contrastive principles that draw on the prosodic iconicity of pairs of similarly and differently marked referential items. The first principle states that coreference between a pair of referential items may be signaled by locally marking prosodic features in an assimilatory fashion. The second principle states that non-coreference between referential items may be signaled by locally marking prosodic features in a dissimilatory fashion. As we’ve seen, the existence of global marking does not preclude the use of local marking, nor vice versa. Nor, on the other hand, does the use of an absolute prosodic scale preclude a relative prosodic scale from also being recruited for referential purposes. In fact, we find that speakers simultaneously use different prosodic parameters (the global and the local, in case of Fragment 78; and the relative and the absolute, in the case of Fragment 77) to drive home the same message – these two are the same and this other one is different.

---

254 Sceptics might wish to point to the *thamuny* in line 612 being a turn final element, and on this basis, argue that it can’t be expected to be prosodically the same as the other two – each of which constitute the best part of their own intonation units. Be that as it may, Phyllis demonstrates that she has the skills to match multiple prosodic features across words that are several turns distant (this fragment) and across words of dissimilar segmental shapes (Fragment 76). She also matches words on a relative scale when the absolute scale is already employed to mark subsequent words as redoings of prior versions (Fragment 77). Having marked pairs of expressions as the same, she also uses the exact same parameters to mark different expressions as not the same (Fragment 77 and Fragment 78). The point being, that if she wants to mark this *thamuny* as the same or different from the others, then she is clever enough to know how to do it, turn-final or otherwise.
9.5 Conclusion

In conversation, when narrators tell a story where the participants are known by all present, they generally provide the information that their recipients require to recognize who is being spoken about. Interlocutors design talk for their recipients so that they can adequately identify the people they need to identify and hence, follow the gist of the story. If the story reports prior dialogue, recipients usually need to understand not only what was said, but also who said it and to whom. One way of providing this information is by framing the reported speech with a quotative expression, e.g., “John said to me”.

Other ways of conveying this information do not rely on appending extra words next to the reported speech. Narrators can use global prosodic marking to mimic the speech of reported interlocutors, and to mimic the sequences of turns in the interaction being reported. Alternatively, narrators can use address terms that don’t fit any of the co-present conversationalists and use the lack of fit to cue the talk as temporally and referentially alien to the unfolding interaction. In this regard, vocative kinterms are particular effective because rather than indexing a single person (like a name does), they index the relationship between the speaker and their addressee. These two methods render quotative expressions redundant. Once initial reference has been established, quotative expressions are frequently dispensed with and subsequent indexation of reported interlocutors is done using more minimal referential strategies. Global prosodic marking and ill-fitting vocatives are referential strategies that satisfy Minimization (which is here construed as using fewer linguistic units) without sacrificing Specification (here construed as using specific referential information). This is because fewer words are required to convey the deictic information required for successful reference.

These two methods for cueing reported speech transport the reported talk, its deictic frame and the storyworld itself into the world of unfolding interaction, as though it were happening live. The characteristic prosody and realistic use of address terms present the reported interaction as though the voices of actual people are currently engaged in conversation. This makes for lively, engaging and dramatic storytelling – much like a radio play. Minimization has a direct application to this dramatic delivery. Phyllis’s storytelling is vibrant partly because she wastes little time
with explanatory quotative expressions. The storytelling is fast and punchy, and very “now”! Whilst quotative expressions do bring the reported talk into the here-and-now, framing speech verbs also remind the hearer that the talk being reported took place previously. On the other hand, prosodic marking presents the talk as if it were taking place in front of the audience for them to witness.

Fragments 76, 77 and 78 each contain reported interaction where the attention of reported addressees is being summoned. Prosodically, each of the vocative expressions – “Thuykem!”, “Old woman!”, “Daddy!”, “Uncle!”, “Grandson!” – depart from their expected first-syllable stress patterns. Each sounds as though someone is calling out from a short distance away. Locally marked prosodic reference amplifies the indexical power of these ill-fitting vocatives, “tuning” them in such as way as to mark them as either same or different – “These ones sound the same because they are being used to address the same person, whereas that other one sounds different because it is being used to address someone else”.

With prosodic reference, we find that speakers use much more of their talk for referring than mere referential expressions. With global prosodic reference, it isn’t noun phrases or pronominal affixes that are being recruited for referring, but entire reported turns at talk. It is contrastive oppositions between how these turns sound – high vs. low, creaky vs. breathy, childlike vs. adultlike – that conveys who is saying what. With locally marked prosodic reference, it is not so much noun phrases that are recruited for reference, but pairs of noun phrases. Similar sounding pairs are used to mark coreference, different sounding pairs can mark non-coreference. As we saw in Fragment 78, it is not even necessary for the individual items in these pairs to occur within the same turn at talk. This is person referencing that isn’t particularly tied to individual expressions. Just as the prosodic domain is above the level of segments, prosodic reference takes place above the level of referential expressions.

Even though the domain of application is to passages of talk larger than individual expressions, we nonetheless find that referential principles such as Specification and Minimization still apply. Because prosodic reference is not tied to individual expressions, it doesn’t particularly require recognitional expressions for achieving recognition. This makes it extremely useful if the “basic sort for recognitionals” (Sacks & Schegloff 1979: 17) – names – need to be avoided, as the
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255 In this story about the molluscs, Phyllis reports over 40 turns at talk, by seven different reported speakers. To do this she uses only twelve quotative expressions.
Murriny Patha name taboos require. Prosodic person reference allows speakers to pack “extra” referencing into their talk, without having to produce extra words. This is referencing that is highly efficient. It maximizes the likelihood of achieving recognition, whilst minimizing the expressive means – person reference with a short, sharp punch.