7 Patterns of Anaphora

This chapter is concerned with anaphoric patterns. In particular we will explore the nature of defaults, that is, the unmarked choice of referential item for initial and subsequent references. A default or unmarked course of action is chosen when a situation is normal. It is critical that unmarked patterns exist in order for departures therefrom to be noticeable as marked. As Enfield (2007: 97) suggests, a plumber takes the unmarked course of action by choosing to wear overalls to work. Should he instead wear a dress, this action would draw attention to himself. A default course of action is a resource to be recruited for “doing ‘being ordinary’” (Sacks 1984).

From the perspective of person reference, a key to this notion of markedness is Schegloff’s (1996a) observation that particular reference forms normally occur in particular reference positions. Adhering to the practice of placing expected forms in expected positions is a way of not doing anything special through reference. Departing from the expected pattern by placing reference forms in positions where they don’t normally belong is a way of using the reference forms to do special work: changing topics, repairing problems, contrasting, complaining, disagreeing, soliciting responses from one’s interlocutors, etc.

In §7.1, I begin by listing the basic categories of referential expressions in Murriny Patha. I then discuss which forms are typically locally initial and which are typically locally subsequent. From there however, I further dissect these positions by introducing a global vs. local dichotomy. This distinction allows for a finer grained examination of reference establishment and reference re-activation. It also allows for the question of referential specificity (Levinson 2007) to be brought into an analysis of form and position.

In §7.2, I discuss two anaphoric patterns that can be considered “basic”. The “local” pattern is “basic” in the sense that it is pragmatically unmarked. This is the pattern of using locally initial forms in locally initial positions and locally subsequent forms in locally subsequent positions. The “global” pattern is “basic” in the sense that it reflects a normative practice by which reference is “globally” initiated using reference forms that are quite specific, and then maintained with reference forms that are less specific than those used for the very first mention. This global pattern (where the first mention is done with forms more specific than the forms that follow) is technically also unmarked pragmatically, in that it represents normative referential
behaviour. However, the situation is complicated by there being an anaphoric pattern that deviates from the unmarked local pattern, yet conforms to the global pattern. These cases are indeed pragmatically marked, but they are so for their local deviations, not for their global conformity (more on this point below). For the time being it will be simpler (since we are effectively talking about cross-cutting systems, neither of which has yet been explained) to speak of two “basic” patterns: an unmarked local pattern and a not necessarily unmarked global pattern.

In §7.3, I discuss the pragmatically marked inversions of form and position. I find that there are four pragmatically marked patterns in the corpus: (1) the use of locally initial forms in locally subsequent positions; (2) the use of locally subsequent reference forms in globally initial positions (that is, for the very first mention); (3) the use of locally subsequent reference forms in positions that are both locally initial and globally subsequent (that is, where reference to a person is re-activated following various topical junctures and local referential departures) and (4) the use of forms that are globally subsequent yet locally initial, in positions that are globally initial. Each of these marked inversions of form and position are recruited for interactional purposes over and above simply referring.

7.1 Reference forms and reference positions
As discussed in Chapter 5, Schegloff (1996a) points to the importance of distinguishing between the forms that are used for reference and the positions in which the forms actually surface. Schegloff (1996a: 450) defines a “locally initial” reference as “the first time in a spate of talk that some person is referred to”. This contrasts with “locally subsequent” references, which are the “subsequent occasions in that spate of talk in which that person is referred to” (ibid). Certain sorts of reference forms are typically used for locally initial reference and other forms for locally subsequent reference. In English full noun phrases are typically used for locally initial reference and other forms for locally subsequent reference. It is their regular occurrence in locally initial positions that makes them locally initial reference forms. English pronouns are typically used for locally subsequent reference. It is their regular occurrence in locally subsequent positions that makes them locally subsequent reference forms. In Murriny Patha conversation the demarcation between forms that are locally subsequent and forms that are locally initial is not quite as neat as it is in English. Murriny Patha has two

146 Schegloff does not define a “spate of talk”. 
sorts of pronouns, free pronouns and bound pronominals. The status of the free pronoun category is a little blurry. However, when one considers the additional dimension of “global” positioning, and the question of referential specificity, the underlying orderliness of the system emerges.

First however, let us examine the basic categories of reference forms.

7.1.1 The basic categories of reference forms
The vast majority of Murriny Patha person reference forms (but not all) fall within six major categories. The six categories are as follows: proper names, nicknames, “triangulations” (kinterms, inclusory constructions, elided progeny constructions), minimal descriptions, free pronouns and “verbal” cross-reference (on its own). Verbal cross-reference on its own (that is, any “verbal expression” – polysynthetic verbs, nerbs or nouns – unaccompanied by a co-referential noun phrase) is the prototypical locally subsequent reference category. The first five categories (proper names, nicknames, triangulation, free pronouns, and minimal descriptions) are reference forms that are typically locally-initial, though the free pronoun category is perhaps the least typical. All of these forms appear syntactically as noun phrases. None of these five categories of noun phrase needs to co-occur with a co-referential verbal expression. If an unaccompanied noun phrase is used for referring, then it constitutes something other than verbal cross-reference on its own. When any of them co-occur with a verbal expression, it is the combination of “noun phrase” plus information from the verbal expression that is recruited by speakers for locally initial reference. As such, the whole combination can be considered a locally initial reference “form”. These combinations constitute something more than verbal cross-reference on its own. In broad brushstrokes, the locally initial reference categories constitute something more or something other than verbal cross-reference on its own.

It should be pointed out that these categories are grouped in the ways that they are, not so much for formal reasons, but rather, for conversation analytic reasons. Names and nicknames belong to separate categories not because they are different sorts of reference forms (which they are), but because interlocutors treat these forms differently. Kinterms and inclusory constructions are grouped together within the

147 As we saw in §6.2, it is “coreferential denoting expressions” such as these that “functionally designate” the “functional domain of reference”. It is from the set expressed by the functional domain of reference that hearers pick out the referent that they believe the speaker has in mind.
same category of triangulations not because they are structurally similar (which they aren’t), but because interlocutors use these constructions in similar ways.

PERSONAL NAMES.
As Searle (1997 [1958]) points out, proper names provide a direct path to the person referred to. Their utility lies in their being recognitional forms that allow the speaker to avoid describing the referent. Aboriginal people at Wadeye have a number of personal names of both Aboriginal and European origin. There are a limited number of patrilineally inherited surnames, mostly derived from the names of notable men who lived at the time of (or just prior to) the establishment of the mission (see §3.3.3). As well as these, they generally have first names of European origin. Many of the European names derive from saints, popes or other key figures associated with the Catholic Church. Together, the European names and the patrilineal surnames constitute the binomial first-name-plus-last-name combinations that are used in dealings with officials. There are no binomials appearing in my corpus. It is not known whether Murriny Patha speakers actually use binomials when speaking Murriny Patha amongst themselves, about local Aboriginal people.

Aboriginal people in Wadeye tend to have more than one Aboriginal name. The forms that are most widely used are frequently of totemic origin. Many of these names correspond to the names of animal or plant totems specific to the “namebearer’s” clan. Others correspond to the names of significant places or important sites in the namebearer’s clan’s estate. There are also “big names” (Stanner 1937) that are seldom used and do not appear in my corpus. Apart from the big names, both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal names appear in the corpus, but the corpus is not yet large enough to determine whether certain forms are favoured in specific contexts. All personal names, Aboriginal or otherwise, are subject to a range of taboos. The myriad restrictions on naming the deceased and on naming particular kin will be discussed in Chapter 8. It is the applicability of restrictions to names that sets these reference forms apart from “nicknames”.

NICKNAMES.
Nicknames also provide a relatively direct pathway to the referent. Though surely not uncommon expressions, there are only a few genuine nicknames in my corpus. Genuine nicknames actually do describe the referent in some fashion. It is common
for nicknames to make fun of some aspect of the person’s physical characteristics (e.g., Tebala, “deaf one” (also “silly”), Pinggarl-ma, “knees-having” for a person with bad knees). Because nicknames are “in group” terms, when they are used in conversation, they are quite specific, highly recognitional reference forms. Clan names, totemic names, circumcision names and subsection names may also be added to this “nicknames” category. Like genuine nicknames, these very specific reference forms provide a direct pathway to the referent, yet they are not subject to the same sorts of restrictions as proper names. Readers are reminded that in Wadeye the subsection system is no longer functional. There are only a handful of individuals that are regularly referred to with a subsection name. As such, subsection names become very specific expressions (which is exactly what these terms are not in communities where functioning section/subsection systems operate).

**Triangulations.**

“Triangulations” are references to persons that are indirectly mediated via another person or persons. The most common of these are possessed kinterms, where the referent is expressed via a kinterm that is anchored to a propositus (e.g., yalngay, “my father”, thamuny nyinyi, “your maternal grandfather”, muluk pule pigunuka, “their great-grandfather”). This “triangulation” category also includes the “elided progeny” construction (see p. 116). In these constructions, the referent’s biological mother or father is named. Attached to the parent’s name is a possessive pronoun. The name thus functions as a propositus for an elided “son/daughter” kinterm (e.g., kumaynukunu, kumay=nukunu, man’s_name=3SMPos, “Kumay’s [son/daughter]”). This triangulation category also includes those inclusory constructions where a participant is expressed as the unspecified party (e.g., Merrnguyi peninginth, woman’s_name 3DU.F.NSIB, effectively: “Merrnguyi and her husband”, where the husband is the participant captured by the 3DU.F.NSIB pronoun that is not also captured by the name Merrnguyi, see §6.1.2.2.3.2).

---

148 Garde (2002: 204) describes the subsection names in Bininj Gun-wok conversation as “lower order recognitionals”.

149 Sometimes, rather than name the parent, the parent is expressed as a possessed kinterm, in which case the referent is effectively expressed via two propositi (see example 6.25, p. 117).
MINIMAL DESCRIPTIONS.

This category consists predominantly of short noun phrases. In conversation, most Murriny Patha noun phrases tend to be relatively short (see §6.1.2); e.g., *mamay ngalla*, “big child” and *wakal perrken’gu*, “two kids”. The vast majority of minimal descriptions include demonstratives and/or nominal classifiers (e.g., *kardu kanyi*, “this person”; *kardu patha*, “good/well person”). At their most minimal, these forms consist of bare nouns, bare nominal classifiers or bare demonstratives. Persons are regularly described in terms of the age grade that they belong to (e.g., *ngalantharr*, “old man”) or their physical characteristics (e.g., *pana ngen ngalla numi*, “that other fat one”).

FREE PRONOUNS.

Free pronouns generally inflect for the same semantic categories (person, number, gender and “siblinghood”) as their bound pronominal counterparts. The exception to this generalization is that verbal 3rd person singular subjects and direct objects are unmarked for gender, whereas the 3rd person singular free pronouns are marked for gender. Free pronouns that co-occur with accompanying verbal cross-reference (that is, coreferential free pronouns + verbal cross-reference, in combination) are typical locally initial reference “forms”.\(^{150}\)

However, the “local” status of free pronouns that do not co-occur with coreferential verbal expressions is not so straightforward. They do not correspond to something more than verbal cross-reference. Because free pronouns do occasionally surface in nominal (i.e., verbless) predications, the question of whether they should really be considered something other than verbal cross-reference is yet to be determined (and for which a larger corpus will be required to answer). Perhaps though, the question is moot. As we will see below, all pronouns – free, bound, and combinations thereof – are indubitable “globally subsequent” reference forms.

VERBAL CROSS-REFERENCE OR IMPLIED REFERENCE.

The category “verbal cross-reference” consists of polysynthetic verb forms, nerbs or nouns that are unaccompanied by any co-referential nominal expressions. This

\(^{150}\) For example:

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{pan} & -\text{ngi} & -\text{bat} & =\text{kanam} \\
3S.23.NFUT & -1S-DO & -hit & =3S.4.NFUT \\
\text{CSP} & -\text{DO} & -\text{COV} & =\text{SERCSP} \\
\text{“She was beating me”}\end{array}
\]
category is typically used for locally subsequent reference. These forms consist of those complex words that incorporate morphology that is generally associated with polysynthetic verbs (bound pronominals, number markers, incorporated body parts, etc.). These are the words that are recruited by speakers for both reference and predication at the same time. Also pertaining to this locally subsequent category of reference forms are implied references or “zeros”.

Verbal cross-reference can be construed as the verbal expression of an argument through the use of a bound pronominal (CSP, DO, IO, ED) and where applicable, the associated non-sibling number markers (-nintha, -ngintha, -neme, -ngime; see §6.1.1). Therefore the typical locally subsequent reference forms are anaphoric bound pronominals, in conjunction with their associated number markers (when appropriate), and “zeros” (that is, implied or morphologically unrealized references).

7.1.2 Local positions, global positions and the question of specificity
As mentioned above, there is a basic distinction between locally initial reference forms and locally subsequent reference forms. Verbal cross-reference (on its own) is the category normally used for locally subsequent reference, whereas any of the other five categories are (typically) locally initial reference forms. This is represented diagrammatically in Figure 7.1.

![Diagram of locally initial and locally subsequent reference forms.](image)

Figure 7.1 Locally initial and locally subsequent reference forms.

The practice of using any of the locally initial categories for locally initial reference and using verbal cross-reference for locally subsequent reference is unremarkable. As we will see shortly, conforming to this practice is a resource for not doing anything special. It is deviating from this ordinary pattern that provides resources for doing “pointed reference” (Schegloff 1996a).

The utility of considering form and position is amplified when the terms “initial” and “subsequent” are themselves considered from the perspective of their position.

---

151 That is, the contribution of a “verbal” expression towards marking a grammatical function of the clause.
Thus for example, when a person (who is neither a co-present interlocutor, nor visible in the vicinity) is mentioned in conversation for the very first time, such initial references can be thought of as “globally initial”. The referent then becomes part of the interlocutors’ shared common ground to be drawn upon later. If that person is re-introduced some time later, following intervening discussions concerning other people, then this re-reference can be thought of as globally subsequent, though locally initial (see Figure 7.2).¹⁵²

![Figure 7.2 Global and local reference positions.](image)

We thus have two distinct levels of positioning for which different sorts of organization come into play. Firstly there is the local level – the level of adjacency pairs – where varying the forms plays roles in topic management, displaying disagreement, etc. Secondly, there is the global level of positioning, where the global level of organization is more bound up with establishing and maintaining recognition of the referent. The extra layer of organization makes an analysis of form and position considerably more complex, though ultimately it makes for a richer analysis.

¹⁵² Globally initial references only apply to new referents introduced into the conversation. For persons currently present the term would be would be nonsensical. However, because of the difficulty in deciding how a “spate of talk” should be bounded, this “global” vs. “local” distinction is not unproblematic. The distinction is clearly scalar rather than absolute. We might ask, for instance, should the first reference after three a hour period be considered less global than the first reference after a week. Whilst an valid intellectual question, we are forced to retreat from such deliberations and consider the distinction as one that offers improved – albeit imperfect – tools for micro-analysis. Anything that was said prior to the commencement of the recording is simply unavailable for analysis. Because the decision as to where global becomes local would be an arbitrary one anyway, we may as well allow the confines of the transcript to relieve us of the guesswork. Thus, unless there is a good reason for suspecting otherwise, the first reference in the transcript to a particular person will be taken as the globally initial one, and all further references thereafter will be taken as globally subsequent.
Figure 7.2 shows that the two distinct positional dichotomies provide for three types of reference positions. Firstly, there is the globally initial reference position (where the very first mention is done). Obviously all references thereafter are globally subsequent, but only some of these are subsequent at a local level of organization. When the initial speaker makes further references to a just-mentioned person in the same turn, or when the next speaker re-refers to that person following speaker transition, such references are locally subsequent. The third type of reference position is where locally initial reference is made to a person that hasn’t been referred to for a while. These are the cases where reference is re-activated, or re-established, perhaps following various topical junctures where interlocutors have referred to other persons in the interim.

As Schegloff (1996a) points out, it is important to distinguish the forms that are used from the positions in which they are used. Because certain reference forms regularly surface in more than one reference position, where we have a three-way grouping of reference positions, we find in Murriny Patha conversation, a four-way grouping of reference forms for placement in those three types of positions (see Figure 7.3).

![Figure 7.3 Global and local reference forms.](image)

All locally initial references, bar the very first one, are globally subsequent. We tend to find that in Murriny Patha conversation, the absolutely first reference is

---

153 The justification for the grouping presented in Figure 7.3 is based, in part, on a tally of all globally initial references to non-co-present third persons, not within the current field of view and not including non-recognitional plural references. From a total of 56 globally initial references of this type, 21 were bare names, 2 were nicknames (3.6%), 13 were triangulations (23.3%), 7 were minimal descriptions (12.5%), 4 were free pronouns (7.15%) and 9 were verbal cross-references (16.1%).
normally done with a restricted set of reference forms – a subset of those categories typically used for re-activating reference. The forms most frequently used for globally initial reference to third persons are names, nicknames and triangular reference forms.

A globally subsequent reference is any reference that follows the first mention. The globally subsequent reference forms include the locally subsequent category of verbal cross-reference, but also include some of the forms that are typically used for locally initial references. Thus triangulations, minimal descriptions and free pronouns are regularly used for re-activating reference. In fact, triangulations are regularly used for both globally initial and globally subsequent reference (hence the overlap in Figure 7.3).

There are two “basic” anaphoric patterns in Murriny Patha conversation. The global pattern is for reference to be established with a globally initial reference form and then for all subsequent references to be made with less specific globally subsequent forms. The local pattern is for locally initial reference to be made with a locally initial reference form and locally subsequent reference to be made with locally subsequent reference forms. Because all globally initial reference forms are also locally initial forms, and because all locally subsequent reference forms are also globally subsequent forms, the global pattern subsumes the local pattern. However the two anaphoric patterns are not both equal from a pragmatic perspective. The local pattern is the pragmatically unmarked pattern. Adhering to the local pattern is a resource to be recruited for not doing anything special. Deviations from the unmarked local pattern are noticeable for their non-conformity and are examinable by recipients as to the reasons for the unexpected lack of fit. This is the case even when the global pattern is maintained (that is, when globally subsequent reference is made with a triangulation, a minimal description or a free pronoun – forms that are both locally initial and globally subsequent).

In actual fact, both patterns are inherently unmarked. Pragmatically marked deviations from the local pattern that still conform to the global pattern are marked for the local deviations, in spite of the fact that they conform to the global pattern. In §7.3.2.3 we will see a deviant global pattern that still conforms to the unmarked local pattern. We find that this example (where globally initial reference is made with a globally subsequent free pronoun) is also pragmatically marked. However it is marked for reasons of its global deviation, not for its local conformity. That a deviant case
turns out to be pragmatically marked adds weight to my claim that the global pattern is indeed normative.

Each of these anaphoric patterns conform to a basic principle that initial references (whether global or local) are typically done with a specific reference form, and that subsequent references are done with forms that are less specific. This basic principle can be explained by an optimization of the preferences for Specification and Generalization. Recall the two preferences presented in Chapter 5 (after Levinson’s (2007) Recognition and Economy):

**SPECIFICATION:** If possible, use specific reference forms that maximize the potential for achieving recognition.

**GENERALIZATION:** If possible, prefer general reference forms and don’t be overly specific about who you are referring to.

Initial reference forms (whether global or local) typically favour Specification, whereas subsequent reference forms (whether global or local) typically favour Generalization. Having established initial reference with a specific reference form, Specification is relaxed in favour of Generalization and subsequent reference is normally done with a form that is not overly specific. This optimization of preferences is reflected in the two basic anaphoric patterns for Murriny Patha. This can be seen in Figure 7.4, where each of the referential categories is placed on an cline with the most denotationally specific forms on the left and the denotationally vaguest, most general forms on the right.

![Figure 7.4 Global and local reference categories superimposed on a specificity scale.](image-url)
In Murriny Patha conversation, names and nicknames have the most restrictive denotata. At any one instance, there will only be a handful of persons to whom a name can be appropriately applied. Triangulations, particularly kinterms, are reasonably specific reference forms. However, due to the classificatory kinship system, there may still be dozens of people to whom a term like *kale*, “mother”, may be applied. For this reason, they are generally less specific than names.

At the other end of the scale, free pronouns and verbal cross-reference are the least specific categories. Fifty percent of the population satisfy the sense of the third person singular masculine free pronoun *nukunu*, “he”. Because third singular classifier subject pronominals do not mark gender, verbal cross-reference is the most general of the referential categories.

The tendency to use specific reference forms for globally initial reference and more general forms thereafter, conforms to the globally initial and globally subsequent grouping of categories proposed in Figure 7.4. The optimization of opposing preferences also helps to explain why proper names and nicknames are prototypically globally initial, and why free pronouns and verbal cross-reference are prototypically globally subsequent. It also helps to explain the regular occurrence of triangulations in both globally initial and globally subsequent positions.

### 7.2 The basic anaphoric patterns

I will begin by discussing the two basic anaphoric patterns. In §7.2.1, I will firstly discuss the pragmatically unmarked “local” pattern, including those local environments where globally initial reference is established. Then, in §7.2.2 I will discuss those cases conforming to the global patterning that do not also conform to the local patterning; that is, those global patterns where forms other than verbal cross reference or zeros surface in globally subsequent positions.

#### 7.2.1 The unmarked local anaphoric pattern

In this section we will consider the pragmatically unmarked local anaphoric pattern; namely, that of using locally initial reference forms in locally initial positions and locally subsequent forms in locally subsequent positions. Recall however that the
global pattern subsumes the local one. As far as I can determine, Fragment 28 is such an example.\textsuperscript{154}

**Fragment 28** Proper name for first mention

*Longbum Dinner (2004-09-12)B04*

1 Lucy *pedjetka* \(\text{k a n y i \ d a m a l t h a \text{byu} (0.3) o h,}\) \(\leftrightarrow\)name
   Pedjet (was) right here.

2 Eliz \["Pangu" \text{dangathaj}.
   That place there.

3 (1.4)

4 Eliz Purltjenya kardu \(\text{ngi- nyini >kanyi da wangu,}\)<
   banawatjhowarda \(0.6\ a\ u-;\)
   I think Purltjen was born around here.

6 (0.9)

7 Lucy Mika lala pongwatho nganamandjitharra:ya: karda:= \(\leftrightarrow\)verbal x-ref
   I carried the cycad fruit to him on my shoulder.

In line 1 of Fragment 28, Lucy uses a personal name to refer to the person about whom she is going to tell a story. The name of the main protagonist, *Pedjet*, is suffixed with the topicalizing particle *-ka*. The subsequent mention of this person is with the third singular masculine indirect object pronoun *-na* (part of the verb *nganamandjitharra*, line 7), as being the recipient of the cycad fruit. This use of the locally subsequent verbal cross-reference for a subsequent mention conforms to the unmarked “local” anaphoric pattern. It parallels the use of a free pronoun in English for locally subsequent reference. In Schegloff’s (1996a: 440) terms it is “reference simpliciter”, in that it is used for doing referring and nothing else.\textsuperscript{155}

In Fragment 29, a combination of reference forms is used for a first mention.

**Fragment 29** Verbal Cross-Ref + NomCl + proper name

*Longbum Dinner (2004-09-12)B04*

137 Mmnn \(<\text{Me: }\text{nga: ne} \text{ngekutthathani} \text{kardu:: } (2.0) \text{Kambi};\)

138 (0.8) ku thgli;
   You haven’t yet collected any for what’s her name \(2.0\) Kambi
   (0.8) any longbums.

139 (0.9)

\textsuperscript{154} Line 1 of Fragment 28 is the first line of the particular sound file. The man Pedjet was not mentioned in the preceding sound file. However, even if he was referred to between the respective recordings, the reference to him in line 1 is definitely a locally initial reference.

\textsuperscript{155} As discussed in Chapter 6, polysynthetic verb forms have both predicating functions and referring functions, and these functions are not practicably isolatable. Thus technically, the fact that bound pronominals are part and parcel of a verbal predication means that these “locally subsequent forms” forms will always be used for “something else” in addition to referring, namely predication. Both Enfield (2007) and Haviland (2007) call into question the notion that reference forms (or re-reference forms) can ever be used for referring and nothing else. However, for the purpose of the present discussion, the point is that the form has been recruited for not doing anything special beyond referring.
In line 137 of Fragment 29, Manman complains to her sister Elizabeth that she didn’t collect any longbums\(^{156}\) for their daughter, Kambi\(^{157}\), who wasn’t able to come on the trip. The would-be beneficiary of the longbums is expressed in three places by the 3SFIO bound pronounal -nge, as part of the verb nengekuthathani, “you didn’t get any for her”, the nominal classifier kardu and her Aboriginal name Kambi. This is the first mention of Kambi in the recording and thus can be construed as a globally initial reference. Although there is a two-second pause between kardu and the name Kambi, the slightly rising intonation contour of kardu is noticeably hearable as incomplete.\(^{158}\) The bare nominal classifier kardu is frequently associated with word searches. Here the final vowel of the word is drawn out. After the pause, it is ultimately replaced by the name Kambi. The turn reaches a point of possible completion on production of this name. Manman thus uses the combination of the indirect object pronounal -nge, the nominal classifier kardu and the name Kambi in order to “do” a “first mention” – the combination constituting a locally (and globally) initial reference “form”, in locally (and globally) initial position. Elizabeth’s reply in line 140 also constitutes a locally initial reference form, consisting of a personal name plus modifiers – here used for locally initial reference. The line proposes co-present Lucy (aka Thanggirra) as being a better candidate for collecting longbums.\(^{159}\)

Fragment 30 illustrates some of the range of forms that may be employed for locally initial reference. In fact, all but one of the following locally initial references are also globally initial. In this fragment, Elizabeth is discussing when the wurltjirri

---

\(^{156}\) Ku thali, aka “longbums”, Telescopium telescopium, are tasty species of mollusc that live in the mangroves.

\(^{157}\) Because Elizabeth and Manman are sisters, they are both “mothers” of Elizabeth’s daughter Kambi.

\(^{158}\) These slightly rising contours have been classified by Du Bois et al. (1993) as “continuous”.

\(^{159}\) This form has two possible morphological analyses. In the first, -ka is the topicalizer: Thanggirra-nimin-ka, PRNAME-INTENS-TOP, “really it’s Thanggirra” [who is quick]. In the second, -ka is the surface realization of the incorporated body part -ngGa, “eye/face”, where the velar nasal of the nasal-stop cluster is deleted following the final nasal of the preceding intensifier, -nimin; i.e., Thanggirra-nimin-ngGa, PRNAME-INTENS-eye/face, “Thanggirra is really [quick] at looking [for longbums]”.
song repertory began. So doing, she introduces her father, Tjimarrarr, and her three sisters. Tjimarrarr, a Yek Nangu clansman, received the first wurltjirri song in a dream. In this dream, Tjimarrarr’s deceased daughter Kanel appears to him as a spirit with a group of kardu tidha, the totemic spirits of Yek Nangu clansmen. Kanel, now deceased, is herself a kardu tidha, because via patrilineal descent from Tjimarrarr, she was a Yek Nangu person. In the dream, the group of kardu tidha appear to Tjimarrarr, dancing the first of a series of songs that were later to be called wurltjirri. When Elizabeth mentions her father and her three sisters, she not only recounts the events, she also anchors the events in time by indicating who was alive and who was deceased.

Fragment 30 Range of possible first mentions

| Line | Speaker | Transcript | Reference
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Eliz</td>
<td>i nyinika 'wu- and that one....</td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Eliz</td>
<td>murndak wa’rda’ monganart yalngay, A long time ago my father got ((composed)) it ((the song)).</td>
<td>(0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Felix</td>
<td>we yu. Oh yeah.</td>
<td>(0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Eliz</td>
<td>tjilminy kardu mokardu k- manman+ka::-4; -minimal desc’, name</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Eliz</td>
<td>kanel &gt;kardu worda&lt; pandjimurrrhda’punni’. -name/triangulation</td>
<td>(1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Eliz</td>
<td>pumarnurt (mamba) da nanyu (0.2) kurdantigawangu xxx; -verb+ref</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In line 59, Elizabeth refers to her father for the first time with the self-anchored kinterm yalngay, “my father”, as well as with the subject of the verb manganart, “he/she got it/composed it”. The kinterm, in conjunction with the verb, can be considered as together constituting a globally initial reference “form” of the triangulation category, here used in globally initial position.

The next person to be mentioned was the sister that died as an infant. In line 63, she is referred to as tjilminy, “dead baby”, which is a kind of potentially recognitional

---

160 This particular discussion comes from an ethnomusicological session. The discussion was precipitated by a question from Prof. Allan Marett who asked which of the two song genres – wurltjirri or malgarrin – predated the other.
The next mentioned is her sister Manman (a co-present conversationalist) who is referred to by name. Her name is not here used for a first mention (and even if it were, because she is a co-present conversationalist, one wouldn’t wish to consider it globally initial), but is used for locally initial reference. Manman had been previously confirmed as already being married at the time of the event in question. Here her name serves as a placeholder in a list of sisters, chronologically determined by order of birth (from youngest to eldest). The third sister, Kanel, in spite of her being deceased, is mentioned for the first time by name in line 65. In this inclusory construction (a sort of triangulation), the name Kanel is to be construed as the solitary named member of a group of otherwise unnamed participants, expressed by the subject of the verb *pandjimurrkthapunni*, “they were dancing”. The subject of the verb should be conceived of as “Kanel’s mob”, or “Kanel et al.”

The sister Kanel had already died as a teenager. Following the necessary mortuary ceremonies, her spirit would have joined the other spirits of her fellow deceased clansmen, the *kardu tidha*. In line 65, Elizabeth speaks of Kanel’s appearance in her father, Tjimarrarr’s dream; in which she appears with a group of fellow *kardu tidha*, dancing to this new song that they are about to teach him (Tjimararr being the composer of most of the *wurltjirri* repertory). Line 65 should therefore be interpreted as something akin to “Kanel was a tidha at the time, she along with the other tidhas were dancing [*wurltjirri]*”. The third person plural classifier subject, *puma*, of the verb *pumarnurt*, “they woke him up” (line 67), stands in an anaphoric relation to “Kanel et al”. The verbal cross-reference in *pumarnurt* constitutes a locally subsequent reference form in locally subsequent position.

Of the forms used for globally initial reference, all are locally initial reference forms. The kinterm *yalngay* and the inclusory construction (Kanel et al.) are also globally initial reference forms (as is the name *Manman*, even though it is here used merely for locally initial reference). The descriptor *tjilminy* is not a globally initial

---

161 Later, in a further effort to establish the timing of this event, when all of the four sisters are listed in order, this deceased infant sister is subsequently named. This suggests that the reason that the baby is not named here has little to do with a death taboo (the other deceased sister Kanel is named). Rather, it is that the infant’s name would not have served as an adequate recognitional for the hearers because the baby didn’t live long enough for her name to be recognizable to people outside Elizabeth’s immediate family.

162 In his dream, Kanel and the other *kardu tidha* wake Tjimarrarr up from sleep in order to give him the song.
reference form, though it is certainly a locally initial form. For at least some of the present interlocutors, *tjilminy* is probably not here being used as a recognitional. Thus Specification is relaxed in favour of Generalization by using a term that is more general than a name.

In Fragment 31, a new participant that is visible to the co-present conversationalists is introduced with a minimal description and a possessive pronoun.

### Fragment 31 Minimal description and possessive pronoun

Longbumb Dinner (2004-09-12JB04)

704 Eliz i *nandji niyunu kanyi [yunganpirt].* ← minimal desc", poss" pron
yi *nandji=nigunu kanyi yungan-pirt*
and residue=35rPos PROX 3sS.32.NFUT-remove
This one has taken off her thing.

705 MC [M iːː CA; ]=
Mina ((personal name)).

706 Lucy =Mːː: hm;

707 (0.55)

708 Eliz Mutjingga xxxx nga!
Hey old woman, xxx

709 (1.2)

710 Carm He he ha ha.

711 (.)

712 Eliz (Yek karroga)=
((something people say when they’re stretching))

713 Carm =He he

714 (1.8)

715 Eliz *Wurranyeyngi wardagathu, l*
She came out naked.

716 JC [Ngarra] daragathu *yunganpirt.* ← verbal x-ref
She took it off coming out of the mangroves.

In line 704 of Fragment 31, noticing that the toddler, MC, had taken off her nappy, Elizabeth passes comment by referring to her in three ways. Firstly *nandji niyunu* is a possessive construction that is interpretable as “her thing” (that is, “her nappy”). Secondly she refers to her with the proximal demonstrative *kanyi*, “this/here” (a minimal description), and thirdly with *yungan*, the classifier subject of the verb *yunganpirt*, “he/she removed (something)”. The combination is used as a locally initial reference “form” in locally initial position. In line 708 she addresses the young girl as *mutjingga*, “old woman”, which is an affectionate way to address

---

163 The construction *nandji niyunu* consists of the residue class nominal classifier *nandji*, here functioning as a vague proform (see §6.1.2.1), encliticized by the 3s5rPos possessive pronoun =*nigunu* (here pronounced *niyunu*), “of hers” (see §6.1.2.2.3.2).

164 In all likelihood, the reference form would have been accompanied by gaze and/or pointing in the direction of the little girl. Unfortunately however, this detail cannot be recovered.
very young children. In line 715 Elizabeth makes a subsequent reference to the young girl with the verb *wurranyeyngi*, “he/she came out naked” – the young girl being expressed anaphorically by the third singular classifier-subject pronominal *wurran*. In line 716, the little girl’s mother JC also refers to her daughter using the same verb *yunganpirt*, the use of the verb being a second verbal cross-reference in locally subsequent position. When a referred-to third person is present or visible it is not necessary to choose reference forms that are as denotationally specific as names or nicknames. In these cases, context allows for a relaxation of specificity.

As mentioned in §7.1.1, the locally initial reference categories are those that consist of, or include, overt nominal expressions. These of course include free pronouns. However because this category is one of the least specific, free pronouns are typically not globally initial reference forms – at least, they are not the preferred forms for first mentions of third persons. Because globally initial references apply only to non-co-present, non-visible third persons, the free pronouns 1s, 2s and 1DU.INC are irrelevant from a “global” perspective. However, the remaining pronouns are not irrelevant, because each of them can be used for reference to non-present third persons.

Free pronouns generally inflect for the same grammatical categories as verbal pronominals (and, when appropriate, non-sibling number markers). The exceptions to this generalization are third singular subjects and third singular direct objects (the latter being morphologically unrealized in verbs). Thus apart from these (albeit significant) third singular exceptions, free pronouns are generally not more specific than verbal cross-reference. Where (non-third singular) free pronouns co-occur with verbal pronominals, in terms of specificity, the free pronouns are redundant. For this reason, free pronouns are a referential category for which the need to separate Minimization from Generalization becomes readily apparent. The free-pronoun-plus-verb combination is denotationally as general (non-specific) as a verb on its own, yet the combination is less minimal because the proterms are effectively duplicated.¹⁶⁵ In pronoun plus verb combinations, Minimization is relaxed while Generalization is not. For this reason, locally initial reference to third persons is seldom done with a free-pronoun-plus-verb combination. If non-minimal reference forms are to be used, one

¹⁶⁵ For example: *nan’gunginth*$ *tjini-ningintha-dha*

\[
\begin{array}{c}
2DU.F.NSIB & 2S.Sit.PST\text{IMP}+DU.F.NSIB-PST \\
\Rightarrow 2DU.F.NSIB & 2DU.F.NSIB.SS.Sit.PST\text{IMP}-PST \\
\end{array}
\]

“You two non-siblings, at least one of whom is female, were [there].”
of the more specific locally initial categories is usually chosen. For this reason, it is rare to find non-present participants introduced with a free pronoun.\textsuperscript{166}

However, first and second person non-singular free pronouns (excluding 1DU.INC) are regularly used for globally initial reference to particular non-present third persons. Specifically, second person and first person exclusive dual feminine non-sibling free pronouns are frequently used for globally initial reference to a spouse.\textsuperscript{167}

Fragment 32 Initial mention as dual, subsequent mention as singular
Longbum Dinner (2004-09-12JB04)
74 Eliz \textit{Ngan’gungintha} (kal) \textit{ngunungamginthardurr} thunggu ← initial ref to husband
\textit{ngan’gungintha} !! \textit{ngunungam-ggintha-rdurr} thunggu
1DU.EX.F.NSIB 1SS.go.NFUT-DU.F.NSIB-depart fire
75 \textit{bannurdurl’tharra:thu} thunggu ngalla nyiniyu*. ← subs ref to husband
\textit{ban} -nu -rurdur -tharra -gathu thunggu ngalla nyini-yu
3SS.17.NFUT -DTRANS-insert -moving -toward rifle big that-PART
We two (1du.f.nsb) set off. He/she put [bullets] into that big rifle as he came along this way.

In Fragment 32, Elizabeth makes a minor contribution towards a story that someone else was telling. In line 74, she makes a dual feminine non-sibling self-reference by using the non-minimal free-pronoun-plus-verb combination, \textit{ngan’gungintha} \textit{ngunungamginthardurr}, “I and someone else (1DU.EX.F.NSIB) set off”. The default interpretation for globally initial dual feminine non-sibling references is for husband and wife combinations.\textsuperscript{168} In this case, Elizabeth is referring to herself and her late husband. She subsequently re-refers to her husband, singularly, using the 3\textsuperscript{rd} singular verb \textit{bannurdurditharragathu}, “he put [bullets] into it as he came along this way”. This locally subsequent reference to the husband is made using a locally subsequent reference form (the verb). It is a locally subsequent reference because he had been just previously referred to as one of the two participants expressed in the prior dual feminine non-sibling reference. This strategy of using non-singular free pronouns to introduce non-present third persons is regularly employed when the person in question is a close deceased kinsman, and therefore should not be mentioned by name (as is the case in this fragment).

\textsuperscript{166} Fragment 50 contains one of these rare instances.
\textsuperscript{167} See Kitzinger (2005a, b) and Land & Kitzinger (2005) on the invocation of coupledom using a locally initial \textit{we}.
\textsuperscript{168} Support for this claim is furnished by Fragment 82, where a speaker uses a 1DU.EX.F.NSIB pronominal combination for globally initial reference to her husband, even though her recently mentioned deceased son was also a possible candidate for inclusion (as an anaphor) in that particular pronominal combination.
One environment where singular free pronouns surface in locally initial positions is when they are used to set up contrasts between various participants; or, to contrast the actions of, or state of affairs pertaining to, such participants. Thus Manman, in line 744 of Fragment 33, refers to herself with the free pronoun ngay (topicalized with the particle -ka). Thus her state of affairs (not being there) is contrasted with those of the old man about whom she was telling a story (who was having a good time). The contrast is set up through the free pronoun and the anaphoric demonstrative nyini, “that one previously mentioned”. The conversation had just previously digressed so although nyini is a globally subsequent reference form (a minimal descriptor), like ngayka, here nyini is also a locally initial reference form (an overt nominal), in locally initial position. As well as being contrastive, the demonstrative is locally implicated in managing a return to matters discussed previously. Manman is subsequently referred to (addressed) by Elizabeth (in line 747) with the verb thunadha, “you (singular) were going”, a locally subsequent reference form in locally subsequent position.

Fragment 33 Free pronoun for contrast
Longburn Dinner (2004-09-12|B04)
742 Eliz (Damngiyerrdim.)
I’m itchy.)
743 (5.4)
744→ Mmm Denadharriyekthokardi nyini, ngayka makardu wardofwa.
That [old man] was having a good time. I wasn't there at the time.
745 Lucy [(Awju wurdawa).
No no!]
746 (2.9)
747 Eliz Ngarra wangu thunadha.
Where were you going?

Another environment where free pronouns surface in globally initial position is in certain inclusory constructions (Singer 2001), namely in those collocations consisting of a personal name and a third person dual feminine non-sibling pronoun. These collocations are usually used to refer to husband and wife couples.

Fragment 34 Inclusory construction
Totems (2006-07-01|B02a)
55 Phyl *(kordu pana) manangga wakal dangathe*. hxxx ((ingressed))
At the time I still had no kids.
56 (1.4)
57 UnId xxx
58 (.)
In line 59 of Fragment 34 Phyllis introduces the husband and wife couple with the inclusory collocation, *Merrnguyi peningintha* (effectively: “two non-siblings at least one of whom is female and whose name is Merrnguyi”). In this construction (which was previously discussed as example 6.5), only one of the two participants, Merrnguyi, is expressed overtly and the other, the husband, is included by the pronoun. Following a silence (line 60), the collocation is repeated\(^{169}\) – though this time, is conjoined with the verb *nganin’guriwakthangime*, “I was following a group of non-siblings at least one of whom was female”. Once conjoined to the verb, *Merrnguyi peningintha* (the husband and wife combination) itself becomes the specifying element in a further inclusory construction where the group being expressed by the verb is paucal feminine non-siblings. The sum total gives an inferable reading, “I was following Merrnguyi and her husband, and the others” (presumably their family). In line 65, Phyllis makes a locally subsequent reference to the family with the locally subsequent verb form *parranengangkardadhangimepurne*, “they were showing me” (their totemic sites). Here the third person paucal feminine non-sibling subject of the verb *parranengangkardadhangimepurne* is anaphoric with the prior paucal inclusory combination.

Inclusory constructions belong to the category of triangulations, because they are a means for referring to a group of people by means of another (albeit included)

\(^{169}\) This transcript contains numerous silences of several seconds or more. Many of these are not treated as problematic. There are occasional inter-turn silences that are as long as five or six seconds that do not get treated as lapses. Gardner & Mushin (2007a) report similar findings in Garrwa mixed language conversations. Because there is no video footage, it is difficult to know what the conversationalists were doing during these silences. This portion of the recording has a clattering noise that sounds like a tobacco tin being opened. Probably either Phyllis or Elizabeth was preparing tobacco for smoking or chewing. The repeat of the collocation may therefore be a restart by a speaker preoccupied with some tobacco related activity, or it may reflect a second attempt to gain the recipiency of another who is engaged in a tobacco related activity. Either way, the repeat is likely to be a redoing of the initial reference.
person. As a triangulation, *Merrnguyi peningintha* is not merely a locally initial reference form, it is also a globally initial reference form, here used for globally initial reference.

We have thus far examined the unmarked local pattern of anaphora using locally initial reference forms in locally initial positions and locally subsequent verbal cross-reference in locally subsequent positions. In the next section we will examine the second of the “basic” anaphoric patterns where globally initial reference is established with a globally initial form (a name, a nickname or a triangulation) and subsequent reference is done with a globally subsequent reference form. In particular, we will consider the use of globally subsequent forms, other than verbal cross-reference or zeros.

### 7.2.2 The global anaphoric pattern

The global patterns that do not also conform to the local pattern (in having globally subsequent reference done with verbal cross-reference) may be examined for local deviations from the unmarked local ordering. However, we will not attempt such an analysis here. In this section we will simply observe that the regular global pattern is for the first mention to be done with a specific reference form and for globally subsequent reference to be done with more general forms. Below in §7.3.2.2 we will then re-examine some of the fragments presented here from a local perspective. We will thus see that the same passages can be considered from both global and local perspectives.

In Fragment 35 globally initial reference is made with a name – a prototypical globally initial reference form – and subsequent references are done with a variety of forms from various globally subsequent categories.

**Fragment 35**

Globally initial reference with a name and various forms subsequently

Sorrow (2004-08-08)B03b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Discourse</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>Phyl</td>
<td>Ngarra Regina menge’dha’ngini;=nandji 1tra-1</td>
<td>I was saying to Regina, “that-”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Eliz</td>
<td>[Amu:]; mere nyini:, No not that one.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>Phyl</td>
<td>mu nu m i d a l</td>
<td>Oh, someone else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>Eliz</td>
<td>(numi) Yejnmeni nu. (to another) to Yenmeni.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

170 In this respect, it would be reasonable (though I haven’t done so) to include within the category of triangulations those 2nd person and 1st exclusive free pronouns used for initial reference to a spouse (as in Fragment 32). These particular pronouns do link third persons to a specified other, and regularly surface in globally initial positions.
In line 236 of Fragment 35, Elizabeth corrects a point of fact relating to Phyllis’s recall of certain events (see Fragment 41 for analysis thereof). So doing, she makes globally initial reference, by name, to a son of hers whose health is not good. Because the name Yenmeni (line 236) was produced in overlap, a repair is initiated (line 238). The recycled name produced under repair (line 240) is effectively “the initial mention ‘for another first time’” (Schegloff 1996a: 455). In line 243 Elizabeth goes on to re-refer to him with a verb (ngininginthadha, “we two non-siblings at least one of whom was female [Elizabeth] were staying” [at Ngardinitji]).

In line 250, Phyllis, inquiring as to the state of Yenmeni’s health at the time, goes on to refer to him with the classifier subject (kardi) of the stative verb kardidha “he/she was” and describe him as being physically fit (kardu patha, “good/well person”). Having been informed (line 252), she then subsequently re-refers to him with the anaphoric pronoun nyini (line 254), “that person previously mentioned”, a

---

171 Murray Patha speakers tend not to ask direct questions. This has been remarked upon elsewhere in Aboriginal Australia (e.g., Eades 1991). Here, in the manner of a tag question, Phyllis proffers a candidate state of affairs (Yenmeni having been well) for Elizabeth’s confirmation; a confirmation that Elizabeth supplies in line 252.
minimal description and globally subsequent reference form. Note that the personal name used for the globally initial mention is maximally specific, whereas the verbal cross-references and minimal description are far less specific than the name.

In the next fragment globally initial reference is established with a name but the person is not re-mentioned for a further 30 seconds as the conversationalists talk about someone else. Therefore, the next globally subsequent reference is also a locally initial reference. This is done with a triangulation.

Fragment 36 Globally initial name, globally subsequent/locally initial triangulation
Longburn Dinner (2004-09-12)B04
181 Mmmn Niyunu kardu ninggeningge+pathamamanangintha wurrinidha:ya::, She was always very jealous.
182 (0.6)
183 → Mmmn *hm Tjuka* ni+yunuwanimin::, It was Joe [that] she [was] really [jealous of].
184 (3.0)
185 Lucy Pannyidharrmuyegarl. She dropped something on your lower leg.
((19 lines removed))
204 Mmmn =>kardu ngay pakpok+mema’dh’a~ngardiyu:: I couldn’t handle her I was too young.
205 (0.4)
206 Eliz *Pakpokmardadanga’dh’a:. She didn’t have the guts [to fight].
207 (2.6)
208 → Carm Mamba *k’aka ngayyu. Right, [where was] my uncle?
209 (1.6)
210 Mmmn A:wu, >kanyi puningibattha’k’ardi<,=kardu:, Nukunu ku yerr~warlyen nura::arradhadini. No, she was beating me here. He was already going away to fish on the king tide.

In Fragment 36, Manman begins to recount a story about the battles she used to have with her classificatory sister and co-wife of their joint husband, Joe. In line 181, Manman begins by stating that “she” (the sister) was always really jealous. She goes on to elaborate in line 183 by stating that it was Joe, their shared husband, about whom the sister was jealous. She refers to him here with the topicalized name Joe (Tju-ka, Joe-TOP), but then goes on to talk about a fight with the sister. In line 208, Carmelita enquires as to Joe’s whereabouts while Manman was being beaten up. This reference to Joe is made with a triangulation – a self-anchored kinterm – kaka ngay, “my uncle”. This reference is both locally initial and globally subsequent. The chosen triangulation is simultaneously a locally initial reference form in locally initial
position, and a globally subsequent reference form in globally subsequent position. As a globally subsequent reference form, it conforms to the expected pattern that such forms should be lower on the specificity cline (recall Figure 7.4) than the globally initial forms. There are likely to be a number of people that Carmelita calls uncle – considerably more than she is likely to know named Joe (myself included).

The principle that globally initial reference is made with specific reference forms and that subsequently specificity is relaxed, is not restricted to reference to persons. In Fragment 37, globally initial reference to a species of mollusc is made with the name. Globally subsequent references are made with a proterm and with “zeros”.

**Fragment 37** Globally initial reference to molluscs by name, then with zeros and proterms

Longbun Dinner (2004-09-12)[B04]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Mmmn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>&quot;Me: nnga: nengekuthathani kardu:, (2.0) Kambi;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>(0.8) ku thali;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Eliz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Thanggiraniminka ngarra pirtpirtka;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Really it’s Thanggirra who is quick [at getting longbums].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

((299 lines removed)) ((6 minutes, 8 seconds))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>Mmmn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440</td>
<td>Ku me: thaningekuthathani, (.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>→ proterm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td>Eliz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443</td>
<td>Karra ngay weyida thurdanngi&quot;dh&quot;ukthuktji:m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>Oh no! You’re not sending me [to look for them]?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445</td>
<td>Lucy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446</td>
<td>Why don’t you cook some/these?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>448</td>
<td>JC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449</td>
<td>No later.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>MC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451</td>
<td>Thalamba, me: thaningekuttharra manda panaya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452</td>
<td>→ zero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453</td>
<td>Thalamba, why don’t you collect [them] for her there nearby.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a turn spanning lines 137 and 138, Manman complains to her sister that she hasn’t collected any “longbums” for Kambi. She refers to longbums by their Murriny Patha name, ku thali. Elizabeth deflects the complaint by nominating Thanggirra as a person quicker at getting longbums. In this verbless construction longbums are not overtly expressed. This is reference by implication – a “zero”. Zeros are categorically grouped with verbal cross-reference in being prototypically subsequent reference “forms” (both locally and globally subsequent).
Several minutes later, in line 439, Manman reissues the complaint by recycling the verb form (more or less). This globally subsequent reference is made with the bare nominal classifier *ku*, for animates. As pointed out in §6.1.2.1, bare nominal classifiers regularly serve as vague proforms. This can be thought of as a “categorial pronoun” and thus a globally subsequent reference form. Further implied references are made to the molluscs in lines 442 and 448.

The data in this fragment conforms to the global pattern whereby globally initial references are typically done with specific reference forms and then subsequently specificity is relaxed in favour of more general reference forms. Proterms are non-specific because they have particularly broad denotata. Note that “zeros” are maximally general. Because “zeros” correspond to the absence of a denoting expression, they have no denotata and no sense. In these cases *longbums* are inferred purely from context.

As stated previously, the global pattern reflects a frequent tendency for initial reference to be done with specific reference forms. Only those that also conform to the local pattern should be taken as unmarked. Globally subsequent reference forms that are also locally initial can also be considered from a local perspective; that is, for the local import of form and position (see §7.3.2.2).

### 7.3 The pragmatically marked anaphoric patterns.

In this section, we will examine some of the interactional work that speakers do when they employ marked anaphoric patterns – those patterns that diverge from the use of locally initial forms initially and locally subsequent forms subsequently. Because all globally initial reference forms are also locally initial forms, all initial-for-subsequent “substitutions” fall under the “local” banner.

#### 7.3.1 Locally initial reference forms in locally subsequent position

In this section we examine the pragmatically marked pattern of using locally initial reference forms in locally subsequent positions. We have already encountered Fragment 38 as the second half of Fragment 36 (§7.2.2), where we looked at the passage from a global perspective. Here we consider the same globally subsequent references from a local perspective.

---

172 For further expansion on the recycling of this verb, see the discussion relating to this same passage represented as Fragment 48, p. 195.
Fragment 38 Free pronoun used for disambiguation
Longbum Dinner (2004-09-12)B04
204  Mmmn =kardu ngay pøpkakmema’dh’a+wargariyu.:? I couldn’t handle her I was too young.
205   (0.4)
206  Eliz  Pokpakmadanga’dh’a.
     She didn’t have the guts [to fight].
207   (2.6)
208  Carm  Mamba ”k’aka ngayiyu.
     Right, [where was] my uncle?
209   (1.6)
210  Mmmn A:wu, >kanyi puningibattha’k’ardi<,=kardu:, Nukunu ← free pronoun +
     ku yerrwalyen nura::arradhadini. ← verbal x-ref
     No, she was beating me here. He was already going away to fish
     on the king tide.
212  UnId  EhFh.l
213  Lucy  "Yu\"yukuy yukuy.
     Yeah yeah.

In Fragment 38, Manman is recounting the story about being beaten up by her
classificatory sister and co-wife of their shared husband Joe. In line 208, Carmelita
enquires as to the whereabouts of Joe, whilst Manman was being beaten up by his
other wife. Carmelita refers to Joe as kaka ngay, “my uncle”, a locally initial (and
globally subsequent) “triangular” reference form, in locally initial position. In lines
210 and 211, Manman explains that her sister had beaten her close to where the
conversation was recorded, whereas Joe was away getting seafood that had been
brought in by the king tide. The Murriny Patha classifier subject pronominals do not
mark gender in the third person singular. This story deals with two third person
singular referents, the sister and Joe. In this extended turn, there are two third singular
verbs, puningibatthakardi, “she/he was beating me” and nurawardarradhadini,
“she/he was already going”. Both the sister and Joe had each been previously
mentioned so if Manman were to refer to each of these individuals using locally
subsequent forms, there would be ambiguity as to who was there and who went away.
Manman thus refers to her husband with the additional free pronoun, nukunu, “he”
which marks his gender as masculine. This locally initial reference form in locally
subsequent position is here recruited for something beyond simply referring – namely,
disambiguation. Note that only one locally initial reference form is required to do the
necessary disambiguation. That it was the sister who was doing the beating was
recoverable by context, because she had already been established as being “here”
(kanyi, line 149), which contrasts with Joe’s being away on the king tide.
Recall from §5.3.2 that in English conversations Fox (1987) found locally initial reference forms tend to occur at sequence boundaries. Such forms tend to mark prior sequences as closed and open new sequences. Even though conversational storytelling is not necessarily organized in terms of adjacency pairs, we still find that locally initial reference forms occur at topical junctures in the narration, much like the topical junctures that occur between conversational sequences. Murriny Patha has a dedicated discourse marker, **bere**, that marks transitions between topics and activities.\(^{173}\) As such, it functions similarly to the English discourse markers *Okay, all right* and has certain parallels with some of the usages of *right* that Gardner identifies in Australian English (Gardner 2005, 2007). However, changes in either topic or activity are frequently marked by speakers using locally initial reference forms (overt nominals) to refer to people who have been previously mentioned, perhaps in conjunction with **bere**.

**Fragment 39 Bere + free pronoun marks later events**

*Longburn Dinner (2004-09-12)B04*

247 Lucy Efth.1

248 Mmmm  \textit{karduka nyini weyida thrrannginthayu}.< \textit{→-inclusory const} 
She said, "Did you go with that person?"

249 (.)

250 Lucy Yu Yu.
Yeah, yeah

251 (5.5)

252 Mmmm Puninging$\kamnumthakardi$ panarda.
She beat me there while nobody else was around.

253 (2.0)

254 Mmmm \textit{Nukunu}k\textit{a} kud\textit{angunuk}\textit{a} \textit{→-free pronoun}
Right. As for him, after hunting....

255 (1.9)

256 Lucy Manda.
[He came up] close.

257 (0.6)

258 Mmmm Manda.
[He came up] close.

259 (1.7)

260 Mmmm Thanggudha $\mamnga$.
"What's wrong?", he said to me.

261 (0.6)

262 Mmmm Ah $tju$ pun\textit{ingibot$\thg$:rdi}.
"She beat me with a stick."

\(^{173}\) **Bere** is frequently translated by Murriny Patha speakers as “finish”. A systematic interactional analysis of **bere** and its many derivatives (**berematha**, **berengatha**, **berengany**)) has not yet been undertaken. Frequently the alveolar approximant in this word is often either deleted or barely perceptible, e.g., \([\text{b}\dot{\varepsilon}::]\), as it is in line 254.
In Fragment 39, Manman is again recounting battles with her classificatory sister and co-wife of their husband, Joe. In line 248 Manman reports her sister’s question *karduka nyini weyida thurrannginthayu?*, “Did you go with that person?”. *Karduka nyini*, “that person previously mentioned”, is a reference to their joint husband, Joe. Manman does not report an answer to the question, though feasibly, Lucy’s *Yu yu* (“yeah yeah”, line 250) may have been a story-consociate’s contribution in answering the reported question on Manman’s behalf. Manman then reports the subsequent beating (line 252). In line 254, Manman begins to talk about what happened later when Joe returned from hunting to find her beaten up. The very drawn-out *bere* marks the transition to the narration of subsequent events. Significantly, the subsequent mention of Joe is with a topicalized free pronoun, *nukunuka*, “as for him”. Because the free pronoun is an overt nominal (of the most general kind), it is a locally initial reference form. The combination of *bere* (here pronounced [bɛː:]) and *nukunuka* are jointly implicated in marking the prior episode, relating to the beating, as over; and marking the transition to subsequent events.

As we saw earlier in §7.2.1, free pronouns are used to contrast referents in locally initial positions. Free pronouns are also employed contrastively in locally subsequent positions (e.g., Fragment 40).

### Fragment 40 Free pronoun for contrast

**Totems (2006-07-01)B02a**

154  Mmm tju thuniningibatthathardi pangumani::; ma"k"arduka;  
    you were hitting me there, I wasn't ...
155     (2.7)
156  Mmm nan warda.  
    Whatyoucallit at the time [i.e., a fully grown woman].
157     (6.2)
158  Phyl Eh;;  
    Yeah
159
160  Mmm mere nu*"g*ärn nyinyi kanyi;=nyinyi kardu thardidha wu,-  
    This man here isn’t yours, you were [from]....

---

174 *Karduka nyini weyida thurrannginthayu* is an inclusory construction (Singer 2001). Joe is expressed in two places – through the nominal expression *kardu nyini* “that person previously mentioned”, and as one of the two participants expressed in the verb *thurrannginthayu*, “you two nonsiblings at least one of whom is female went”.

175 In Aboriginal narratives, storytellers frequently use the iconicity of sustained high intonation to portray events taking place over an extended period of time (Baker 2008; Bishop 2002; Carroll 1995; Heath 1984; Sharpe 1972, inter alia.). Given that here the high intoned drawl is placed on a word marking a shift from the reporting of one event to another, and is similarly placed on the word *kudhangunuka* (*ku-dhangunuka*, animate-after that-ToP => “after hunting”) it may be that case that the drawl iconically conveys that it was quite some time before her husband, Joe, returned from hunting.
In Fragment 40, Manman is berating the spirit of her deceased classificatory sister for beating her up and trying to steal her husband. In line 154, she accuses the sister of beating her. She does so with locally subsequent verb form *thuningibatthathardi*, “you were beating me”. However in a turn spanning lines 160 and 162, she sets up a contrast: firstly by saying, “this man here isn’t yours”, then by adding, “you were [from] over that way”. In the second TCU of the turn (which stalls midway whilst Manman performs a word-search), she addresses the sister with the second person singular free pronoun *nyinyi*, the “human” nominal classifier *kardu*, and the co-referential verb *thardidha*, “you were”. This non-minimal free pronoun plus classifier plus verb combination, here used in locally initial position, help to contrast the husband as being a local and the “sister” as being an alien. Support for this contrast is provided by Elizabeth in line 164, who produces the sought-after area name that had just previously eluded Manman.

Schegloff (1996a: 453-458) (following Fox 1987: 62-64) reported that in disagreement contexts, locally initial reference forms regularly surface in locally subsequent position. In Fragment 41, which we have encountered previously as Fragment 35, we find the use of a “disagreeing” demonstrative used in locally subsequent position. In this case, the demonstrative *nyini* is complicit in other-correcting a point of fact.

**Fragment 41** The “disagreeing” demonstrative
Sorrow (2004-08-08)B03b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>Phyl yu. &gt;pangu warra thurdarlarngime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>(0.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>→ Phyl Ngarra Regina menge’dha’ngini;=nandji tra-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Eliz [Awu:J]; mere nyini;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>Phyl mu nu f m i d a 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>→ Eliz (numi) Yenmeninu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>→ Phyl Ahí</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In line 233 of Fragment 41, Phyllis begins to recount something she said to someone who she believed was a woman named Regina. However, Elizabeth cuts her off mid-turn. *Awu mere nyini*, “no not that one”, is an “other-initiation” of repair\(^{176}\) that specifically locates a problem – not with the formulation of reference, but with the referent itself. The correction, in line 236, proposes that it was to another person, *Yenmeni*, that Phyllis had been speaking. Although in the transcript the correction appears on a separate line from the repair initiation, the intonation of the word *nyini* – that falls and then rises very slightly – gives this intonation unit a “continuous” contour. This, coupled with the fact that Elizabeth doesn’t wait for Phyllis to complete her turn (the correction begins in overlap with Phyllis’s turn, line 235), show that both the “other-initiation” and the “other-correction” are performed in the “next” turn to the trouble-source turn (Schegloff et al. 1977). Whilst the anaphoric demonstrative *nyini* is a globally subsequent reference form, as a minimal description, it is also a locally initial reference form because it departs from the unmarked locally subsequent category of forms; namely, verbal cross-reference and zeros. The placement of the demonstrative in this locally subsequent position, not only locates the repairable, it problematizes the referent. This is evidenced by Phyllis’s very quick acknowledgement of the problem – *mu numida* (line 235), “oh, someone else” (*mu* being a kind of change-of-state token (Heritage 1984)). The acknowledgement produced in overlap with Elizabeth’s turn actually begins prior to her proposal of a different person, Yenmeni.

The fragment goes on to show a further use of locally reference initial forms in locally subsequent positions; specifically, the recycling of a name in repair. The alternative candidate proposed by Elizabeth in line 236 is expressed with a proper

\(^{176}\) From a technical point of view, the sequence under consideration is not a typical repair (Schegloff 2000; Schegloff et al. 1977) because the trouble-source does not relate to a problem of speaking, hearing or understanding. Rather, the hearer of the trouble-source turn other-corrects a point of fact (relating to the speaker’s recall of the event in question). In spite of this, this correction sequence patterns similarly to repair sequences where a participant other than the speaker initiates and repairs a problem.
name, a typical locally initial reference form. However, because Elizabeth’s
correction was produced in overlap, Phyllis has difficulty making out the name. In
line 238, she other-initiates a repair, Ah. Elizabeth treats this open class repair
initiator (Drew 1997) as relating to a hearing problem. The repair solution in line 240
is a recycling of the name, Yenmeni. In Schegloff’s (1996a: 455) terms, this recycling
of the overlapped name can be considered “not [as] a remention, but as the initial
mention, for ‘another first time’”.

Recycling however, is not just a feature of repair. Both Fox (1987: 62-63) and
Schegloff (1996a: 455-456) noted that in the context of disagreements, the recipient
of a turn-at-talk containing a locally initial reference form often recycles that original
locally initial formulation of the reference, using it in locally subsequent position
(e.g., Fragments 9 and 10). However, in addition to doing disagreement, the use of the
recycled form may also be implicated in formulating a complaint; that is, when the
recipient sees the person referred to as responsible for a complainable action. This can
be seen in Fragment 42 where Mark recycles the name Kerin and uses it to frame a
complaint about something that Kerin did.

Fragment 42 After Schegloff (1996a: 454-455), with different analysis
1 Mark: I know whutcha mean. Me too. <That’s why I came here d’night. I
come to talk to Ruthie about borrowing her notes for (. ) econ.
2
3 (0.8)
4 Sheri: You didn’t come t’ talk t’ Kerin? ← initial reference
5 Mark: No, Kerin: (. ) Kerin ‘n I ‘r having a fight. ← form is recycled
6 ( . )
7 Mark: After-sh’ went out with Keith (the night be’fore.) ← complaint

Fragment 43 Recycling of pronoun in context of a complaint
Longbum Dinner (2004-09-12B04)
219 Mmm nyinda:thu ngunawurldeng; (1.0) ngunawgrlakdhangini:::~; ( . )
220 ngungurrkurrktha pangu:::~; (0.4) tjinaang.
From there I crawled. I crawled on my stomach. I laid down
there. On the promontary.
221 (3.1)
222 → Eliz Yi niyunuka ʰngɑ*rra dinidha.
And as for her, where was she?
223 (0.6)
224 → Mmm <Ah niyunuka parndiwrk ʰnurdawurdarrangardinʰiʰ.>
Ah she’d already taken off.
225 (1.0)
226 Eliz Kitiyi::=
Oh no!
227 Lucy =Mm.
In Fragment 43, Manman is again recounting the story of her being beaten up by her jealous classificatory sister. In Line 222, Elizabeth inquires as to the whereabouts of the said sister while Manman was crawling away – *Yi niyunuka ngarra dinidha*, “And as for her, where was she?”. The “form” used to refer to the sister consists of the topicalized pronoun *niyunuka* (*nigu-nu-ka_, 3SF-Top) and the verb *dinidha*, “he/she was going”. In line 224, Manman recycles the topicalized pronoun as part of her reference to the sister, *Ah niyunuka parndiwarrik nurawardarradhadini*, “Ah, as for her, she’d already taken off”. In this line, the sister is expressed in three places: by the recycled, topicalized pronoun, *niyunuka*; as the subject of the verb *parndiwarrik*, “he/she departed”; and as the subject of the verb *nurawardarradhadini* (here pronounced *nurdawurdarranardini*), “he/she was already going”. The combination of the free pronoun plus the doubly-serialized verbs constitute coreferential denoting expressions, the use of which departs from the unmarked use of verbal cross-reference in locally subsequent position.

Here the use of the recycled free pronoun in locally subsequent position cannot be explained in terms of disagreement, though it certainly seems implicated in portraying the sister’s actions as complainable. Certainly Elizabeth’s affiliative interjection *kitiyi*, “Oh no!” (line 226) and Lucy’s acknowledgement token (*Mm*, line 227) suggest that line 224 was perceived as a complaint and that these two interlocutors are in agreement on the sister’s behaviour being complainable. Schegloff (1996a: 455) suggests that “[the] ‘mis-match’ of position and usage is a practice for doing what might be called complex (or perhaps ‘pointed’) reference, in contrast to simple reference.” By recycling the locally initial form in locally subsequent position, the speaker presents the referent as being in some way “out of the ordinary”. This “standout” presentation of the referent may structurally parallel either the referent’s behaviour as being out of the ordinary, or the states of affairs in which the referent is implicated as being out of the ordinary. Thus far, attested sequences have only carried negative connotations. However, further research may reveal the same pattern to be

---

177 *Nurawardarradhadini* is itself a serial verb construction, where the serial verb =*dini* gives a progressive aspectual reading (*nura-wardarra-ha=dini*, 3SS.7-go.PstMP-already-Pst=3SS.1-sit.PstMP).

178 According to Du Bois’ (ms.), a recipient’s repetition of words and linguistic structure creates resonance which is harnessed in “dialogic syntax”.

179 *Kitiyi* was translated by my consultants in Wadeye as “Oh no!” or “Oh goodness”. Although my Wadeye informants did not agree with this translation, one consultant from Kununurra suggested “Mongrel!” All attestations occur as a response to less than favourable outcomes.
involved in portraying a referent as being remarkable, though remarkable in a positive way.

In sum, we have seen in Murriny Patha conversation that locally initial reference forms are used in locally subsequent positions for a variety of interaction purposes, over and above simply referring. Particularly we see free pronouns used in locally subsequent positions for contrasting different individuals, or the states of affairs pertaining to those individuals. We see anaphoric demonstratives used in disagreement contexts. We also see locally initial forms recycled both in repairs and in framing complaints.

7.3.2 Subsequent reference forms in initial reference positions
We now consider three different anaphoric patterns that are the converse of the patterns just examined; namely, the use of subsequent reference forms in initial reference positions.

7.3.2.1 Locally subsequent reference forms in globally initial positions
We will first consider the cases where locally subsequent reference forms surface in globally initial position. In Murriny Patha conversation, this anaphoric pattern is perhaps more common that its English counterpart: where locally subsequent pronouns surface in globally initial position. Recall Schegloff’s (1996a: 451) remarks that when a pronoun is used to introduce a new referent, the speaker effectively treats the referent as being potentially “‘on the mind’” of his interlocutors, or that the referent may thus be “readily be ‘activated’”. He recalls the day that President Kennedy was assassinated. Unacquainted people would ask each other, “‘Is he still alive?’”, without making any previous reference to just who it was that might not be alive (ibid.). In spite of this, these references were invariably understood. Levinson (2007) gives a more recent example where in 2003, the then U.S. Administrator in Iraq, Paul Bremmer, called a press conference to announce the capture of Saddam Hussein. Bremmer began the press conference by referring to the former-dictator for the first time with a pronoun: “Ladies and Gentlemen, we got him”.

We also find this pattern in Murriny Patha conversation. When a speaker introduces a new referent with a verbal cross-reference, the referent is usually treated
as though it should be salient enough to be readily activated in the minds of hearers.\textsuperscript{180}
Fragment 44 comes from one of the musicological research sessions. The room is very crowded and there is a considerable amount of overlap. Prompted by a musicologist’s enquiry as to which of the two performance genres, wurltjirri and malgarrin, predated the other, the interlocutors are discussing the timing of each of the genres’ inceptions. In this fragment Elizabeth makes initial reference to the composer of malgarrin using a verbal cross-reference.

Prior to encountering this particular excerpt, the inception of wurltjirri had already been discussed at length. By the time we reach line 213 of this fragment, the topic of discussion shifts to the timing of malgarrin. The composer Mulindjin was a very prominent figure in the history of the community (see Furlan (2005) and §3.1).

After firstly indicating how tall she was when Mulundjin received the first malgarrin song in a dream (line 215), Elizabeth then attempts to locate the event after the birth of his two daughters. In an overlapped turn spanning lines 218 and 220, she produces

\textsuperscript{180} We have already seen a prime example in Fragment 1 (p. 10), where Phyllis made globally initial reference to a deceased man with the bare nominal classifier \textit{ku} (a kind of pro-form, ordinarily used for locally subsequent reference). In the example, the targeted recipient was able to identify the referent.
an utterance that encounters difficulties in its production. The turn consists of a grammatically incomplete TCU that stalls and then is subsequently replaced under self-repair by a differently formulated TCU. The drawn out conjunction yi: (“and”) and 0.8 second silence follow the production of a woman’s name, Kanburnin – suggesting that Elizabeth is engaged in a word-search for a second name that may be conjoined to the first. Following the silence, Elizabeth self-repairs in the same turn by replacing the previous incomplete TCU with a second formulation, wakal perrken’gu kandjinkuwadhadini, “he/she had two children who were full siblings”. Because the drawn-out yi: and 0.8 second silence are hearable as word-search phenomena, for the recipients of this utterance, the woman’s name Kanburnin becomes interpretable as one of the two children that this unnamed person had had; and that Elizabeth’s difficulties were actually in recalling the name of Kanburnin’s sibling. Kanburnin is the eldest of Mulindjin’s two daughters.

Because he was such an important character and because malgarrin was a topic of the discussion, Elizabeth here treats Mulindjin as sufficiently accessible for her interlocutors to be referred to with a locally subsequent reference form (the verb kandjinkuwadhadini, “he had two who were siblings”) in globally initial position. In line 222, Felix treats Elizabeth’s utterance as unproblematic by confirming (yukuy, “that’s right”) that Mulindjin’s daughters had indeed already been born when Mulindjin received the first malgarrin song in a dream.

Using locally subsequent reference forms for a first mention is a high risk strategy that may fail. In Fragment 45, a verbal cross-reference in globally initial position introduces a new participant that is not so readily accessed. In this case, it is a minor character in a story. Elaborations ensue.

Fragment 45 Longburn Dinner (2004-09-12JB04)
159 Eliz >Yauw!< (0.4) "mi" nyinirda kambinyipakkurroun; (1.2) nginarr ngaythangunu. 
160 Hey! There is diarrhoea spilling out from my cousin's child. (1.1) 
161 Eliz >Kumperar warra punnidha bematha:athu warda 
162 → pirrimpunjardputj.< 
163 They went in front. After that, he/she loaded them up [on the truck]. ((Alternatively: After that, they were loaded up [on the truck].)) (1.3) 
164 Eliz Bape. 
165 Bape. ((A man’s name.)) (1.4)
167  →  Eliz yi nganggardayu (0.5) kanampunwu,  
And he left them there.  
168  (1.0)  
169  Lucy Nandji we (0.8) parraniwirndurt.  
They picked up that paperbark.

Fragment 45 sees a brief return to a narrative that Lucy had been telling a couple of minutes earlier, about how a group of people built a bark shelter for an old man that had been camping near where the conversation was taking place. Elizabeth (after commenting about a child with diarrhoea) in the turn spanning lines 162 and 163, refers to the builders of the shelter. She does so with the verbal expression *kumparra warra punnidha*, “they went in front”, and with the transitive verb *pirrimpunmardaputj*, “He/she loaded them up [onto a truck]”. Transitive verbs with non-third singular objects overtly express two arguments. They are used for simultaneous reference to a subject referent and an object referent.

Following the 1.3 second pause (line 164), in line 165 Elizabeth elaborates on the person that picked the people up by producing his name, *Bape*. This man Bape had not been previously mentioned. The verb *pirrimpunmardaputj* in line 163 would appear to constitute the first mention of this man, though perhaps this should not be so readily assumed. The group of people that Bape picked up had been referred to previously, before the story became sidetracked. If this verbal cross-reference to Bape, in globally initial position, is an appeal to his salience, it appears to have not been successful. Having produced the name of the man, his relevance to the talk so far remains under-explained. In the manner of a transition space self-repair, Elizabeth elaborates further by stating that he was the one that left them there (line 167). Rather than speculate about why Elizabeth makes initial reference to a person in a manner so unlikely to succeed, this repair sequence can be examined for the results that it produces; namely, getting Lucy to recommence telling a story that had previously stalled. Perhaps then, this globally initial reference to Bape with a locally subsequent verb form is not what it seems.

---

181 It is not at all clear how Elizabeth may have supposed her recipients to know who she was talking about. It may have been that the truck in question was the very one that Father Docherty brought to Port Keats on the lugger from Darwin in 1935. Bape may have been one of the very few Aboriginal people that knew how to drive this truck. As such, he may have regularly been entrusted with this responsibility.
In the verb *pirrimpunmardaputj*, the builders of the shelter are expressed via the 3rd person plural direct object pronominal -*wun*, which following the nasal, /m/, surfaces in this verb as -*pun* (see example 7.1). However, there is an alternative reading for this verb: “They were loaded up [onto a truck]”. Transitive verbs with 3rd person singular subjects and overtly expressed (non-zero) direct object arguments are used in “impersonal” constructions. In these constructions, experiencers are expressed by the direct object series of pronominals whereas the third singular subject is a “dummy” (see Walsh (1987) and §6.1.3.2 of this dissertation).

Elizabeth’s turn spanning lines 162 and 163 may have been an attempt to coax Lucy into recommencing her telling of the story that had previously stalled. Speculatively, the third singular subject of the verb may not have been initially intended as a reference to Bape. That is, Elizabeth may have produced an “impersonal verb”, purely for the subsequent mention of the builders of the shelter, as though it were a passive. Given the lack of uptake from Lucy (line 164), Elizabeth may have taken advantage of the inherent ambiguity and retroactively construed the dummy subject of the impersonal verb as a repairable reference to the driver of the truck. Thus, having produced an initial reference doomed to failure, a subsequent elaboration would immediately be warranted. With still no further uptake (line 166), there is further warrant for elaboration as to how exactly Bape figures in this story (line 167). This third turn does succeed in procuring Lucy’s participation. In line 169, she continues telling the story.

The character Bape is largely incidental to the story at hand. He is not subsequently rementioned and by this stage the story has largely run its course. In which case, this elaboration on the driver – a minor character – might have been a ruse – produced so as to re-occasion (twice) the continuation of the story. In this way, the refashioned coaxes disguised as repairs present the story as continuable. Elizabeth thus effects the continuation of the story, without herself taking on the role of its primary teller. This suggestion is somewhat speculative because there is no way of knowing what Elizabeth had in mind in producing such an ambiguous reference.
However, genuinely vague and ambiguous references may themselves be interactional resources to be recruited for specific purposes. In this case, the ambiguity provides occasion for multiple story prompts.

In sum, locally subsequent reference forms are those that are maximally general and quite badly disposed towards specifying the referent. When speakers use locally subsequent reference forms for the first mention they treat the referent as being sufficiently salient that their interlocutors shouldn’t need further specification. It is a high risk strategy that can fail. This is probably why the pattern is not used more frequently than it is. Its usage, however, is not insignificant. We will consider the practice further in due course.

### 7.3.2.2 Locally subsequent reference forms in positions that are locally initial but globally subsequent

Fox (1987) shows that English pronouns (locally subsequent reference forms) are regularly used in locally initial positions to tie talk to prior sequences of talk, even when there is intervening material that doesn’t directly relate to the matters previously at hand. In Fox’s terms, using an anaphoric referential item to reconnect with prior sequences constitutes a “return pop”, whereby the intervening material is “popped over”. Any sequences occurring in the popped over material are effectively closed off by the anaphoric item. English speakers frequently use pronouns to anaphorically tie current sequences to sequences of talk that are relatively recent, or to sequences that occurred quite some distance previously.

### Fragment 46 “Return pop” (Fox 1987: 33)

1. C Hey. Where c’n I get a::, uh, ‘member the old twenny three Model T
2. spring,
3. (0.5)
4. C Backspring ‘t came up like that,
6. M {Ye:h} I thi[nk- I know
7. whatchu mean.
8. C Wh’r c’n I get o:ne.
9. (1.2)
10. G Just use a regular one.
11. (0.7)
12. C Mmm I’d like to get a, high one if I cou:ld.
13. (0.7)
14. G I know uh-
15. → M {Lemme ask} a guy at work. He’s got a bunch a’ old clunKers
16. G {Y’know
17. Marlon Liddle?
18. (0.2)
19. M Well I can’t say they’re old clunkers he’s got a Co:rd?
In Fragment 46, C requests some information about a spring for his car (line 8) to which M produces an offer *(let me ask a guy at work*, line 15). Into this offer he incorporates a multi-part announcement that is spread over turns 15, 19 and 21. C displays appreciation of M’s announcement through a series of appreciation inserts (for which the first pair parts occur at lines 24, 26 and 28). At line 31, C re-references M’s “guy at work” by using the pronoun *his* (in *What’s his name*?). With this “return pop pronominalization”, C displays an understanding that although the request/offer pair is complete, the matter with which it deals is certainly not closed. “The pronoun helps to produce a feeling of ‘continuing’ something that is still going on (Fox 1987: 28).”

The return pop structure is a method for doing globally subsequent, locally initial reference. In the above fragment we see a globally subsequent instance of the pattern we looked at in the preceding section; namely, that of using a locally subsequent reference form for locally initial reference.

We saw in Fragment 45 how Elizabeth used the verbs *punnidha* and *pirrinpummandaputj* to refer to the builders of a bark shelter. The speaker uses these locally subsequent forms in locally initial position to treat the prior story (which had digressed) as unfinished – as something that can be resumed from where it previously left off. The utterance containing these two verbs is represented here as Fragment 47.

---

**Fragment 47** Locally subsequent verb forms as return pops  
Longburn Dinner (2004-09-12JB04)

```
13 Lucy Yinganapyptharra piru nganggathu (0.3) pndjelalka yalngay
14   kanyi danga"dha" ma puddininamune:rt.1
      | Right here my father put down the stringybark for him that he
      | carried on his head. They left it for him and went off another
      | way.
15 Mmmn
16 (0.5)
17 → Lucy Parraningwup.
      They were making a shelter for him.
```
In Fragment 47, Lucy makes (non-recognitional) reference to the builders of the shelter in lines 14 and 17 (puddinamunegart, “they went away from him in the other direction” and parraninawup, “they were making a shelter for him”). Because the story centred around the recipient of the shelter rather than the builders, these builders are not subsequently mentioned for quite some time (2 minutes, 48 seconds). In line 162 and 163, Elizabeth reopens the story by making locally initial (and globally subsequent) reference to the builders of the shelter using locally subsequent verb forms. The subsequent verbal mentions punnidha and pirrinpunnardaputj constitute return pops – the intervening material is “popped over”. The talk is here tied to the prior story and the intervening material is closed off.

Fox (1987: 38-40) found that using a pronoun for a return pop (that is, using a locally subsequent reference form in locally initial position) can be used to reopen earlier sequences that were previously closed. In Fox’s analysis, the use of such forms triggers a reinterpretation of the talk so far. Previously closed sequences:

sequence 1 (closed) sequence 2

become retroactively interpretable as momentarily interrupted sequences that are effectively still open:

sequence 1 (not closed) interruption sequence 1 (continued)

Fox also found that repetition of certain words from the earlier sequence (usually from a first pair part) can assist in tying the reopened sequence to the prior, previously closed sequence. We can see such repetition in Fragment 48 (which we have previously encountered as Fragment 37).

Fragment 48 Verb forms recycled as “return pops”
Longbumb Dinner (2004-09-12JBO4)

137 Mmm <Me: ngga: neengkekuthathani kordu:, (2.0) Kambi; ← complaint
138 (0.8) ku thali;>
You haven’t yet collected any for what’s her name (2.0) Kambi
(0.8) any longbums.
In line 137 of Fragment 48, Manman complains to Elizabeth that she had neglected to save any longbums for their daughter Kambi. In line 140, Elizabeth deflects the complaint by proposing that another woman, Thanggirra, collect them. Six minutes later, Manman again complains to Elizabeth that there are no longbums for Kambi: *ku me thaningekutthathani*, “you didn’t collect any *ku*-things for her” (line 439), using a close copy of the prior verb, *nengekutthathani*, that she had previously used in line 137. Elizabeth counters Manman’s complaint with a complaint of her own (line 442). The similarity in the form of the verb, along with the recycled verbal negator *mere* (here pronounced *me:*), help to tie the unresolved matter of the longbums to the prior complaint. Even though considerable time had passed and numerous sequences had intervened, the would-be recipient of the longbums is recoverable, even though the “locally subsequent” verb only vaguely specifies Kambi as the person she is talking about.

Following an intervening question and answer sequence (lines 444 - 446), Manman again recycles the verb form (more or less), by proposing that another woman, Thalamba, go and collect longbums for Kambi. There is no audible reply to this proposal and the sequence lapses. Again, the “locally subsequent” verb plus negator, *mere thaningekuttharra* (“*why* don’t you go around collecting [them] for

---

182 There is a change in classifier subject pronominal from the class 9, *ne*, to the class 4, *thani*. As far as I can tell, this particular change of classifier subject doesn’t (greatly) change the semantics.
her”), pops over the intervening material, resurfacing in locally initial position, thus closing off the business of the intermediate sequence and reopening (to no avail) the as yet unresolved question of who will collect longbums for Kambi.\footnote{Recall that this same passage was discussed earlier as Fragment 37, p. 179, with regards to the longbums. The repetition of of the verb forms and negator also help to tie the bare nominal classifier ku and the zeros to ku thali, “longbums”.}

Recipients of a prior reference can also use this return pop structure by recycling words from prior talk so as to tie a subsequent reference to the preceding one.

**Fragment 49 Recycled verb as return pop**

**Longbum Dinner (2004-09-12)B04**

341 Mmmn thurdanngiy:tiitj.
   “You taught me ((to fight)).”
   (0.35)
342 Lucy Yuyuy.
   That’s right.
   (0.3)
343 Lucy Namnge warda.
   You said to her.
   (0.6)
347→ Mmmn Bangarnarridhagduk pana ‘nga’naka pangin kandjiufrriini.1
   bangam-rdarri-dhagduk pana nganaka pangin kandji=wurrini
   1S.14.NFUT-back-hit.with.firewood that.you.know isn’t it? back 3S.22.PSTMP=3S.6.go.PSTMP
   I hit her there, on the back [of the neck] you know?, with a piece of firewood.
348 Lucy l M m::j:
349 (1.3)
350 Eliz Da kumbeil jnerrenengkawup nerrenewurrdha,]
   At Kumbel they blocked each other’s attacks with fighting
   sticks and dragged each other around.
351 MC l xxx (1.2) xxx (b e)jbi:.
352 Mmmn Ngerrenawurrhdanga1.
   We fought each other dragging each other around.
353 Eliz l N ejrrenewurrohanarde.
   You two sisters fought each other dragging yourselves around.

((61 lines removed)) ((64 seconds))

361→ Eliz |Da ngaarra midjin kanyi nungudji- (. ) Ba:- (0.3) Putkit wadarra
   [bimnunggutputju.|]
   At the mission in Port Keats the two sisters were separated
   from each other.
366→ MC |x x x x x x x x x |
367 Lucy He::
   yeah.
368 (0.1)
369→ MC *Mami.
   Mummy
370→ Eliz |Bangarnarridhagduk pangin ngaarra wurdiniwidhowurrinil].
   bangam-rdarri-dhagduk pangin ngaarra wurdini-wi-dha=wurrini
   3S.14.NFUT-back-hit.with.firewood back RelPro 3S.29.PSTMP=swell-PST= =3S.6.go.PSTMP
   She hit her with some firewood on the back and she swelled up.
371→ MC l Mami (0.4) baby (0.8) over here (0.1) mami bajby Yeah.
In Fragment 49, Manman is again recounting the battles with her classificatory sister. In line 347, Manman announces that she hit the sister on the back with a piece of firewood. A minute later, at the conclusion of the story, Elizabeth recapitulates in line 420 by jumping back in time, reiterating that Manman had beaten the sister across the back with a piece of firewood and that her back had swelled up. So doing, Elizabeth recycles the word "panggin," "back," the serial verb "wurrini," "as she went along," and the verb "bangarnarridhagduk." Because many of the "classifier subject" paradigms have syncretisms between 1st and 3rd person, Elizabeth is able to completely recycle the form of the verb that Manman had used in line 347, even though the semantics differ ("I struck him/her on the back with a piece of firewood" in line 347 vs. "she/he struck him/her on the back with a piece of firewood" in line 420). This return pop structure sees the locally subsequent verb form with its additional material recycled in a position that is both globally subsequent but locally initial; thus making what was mentioned previously resonate with what is mentioned subsequently – hence tying the previous reference to the subsequent reference.

In effect, the return pop pronominalization is a use of locally subsequent reference forms in positions that are globally subsequent yet locally initial, such that the latter talk is tied to the earlier talk in way that treats the business of the earlier talk as potentially unfinished, or at least continuable. The likelihood of this return pop structure succeeding is increased when portions of the prior talk are recycled in these globally subsequent/locally initial positions, because such recycling flags the sections of talk as being topically linked.

### 7.3.2.3 Globally subsequent reference forms in globally initial positions

Our final pragmatically marked pattern is one that deviates from the "basic" global pattern, yet conforms to the local pattern. That it too is pragmatically marked, shows the global pattern to be itself inherently unmarked. Such deviations are exceedingly rare in the corpus. The example that we will consider is one where globally initial reference is made with a free pronoun – a form that is normally used...
for locally initial, yet globally subsequent reference. Its use here in globally initial position makes it a deviant case.

We have already encountered part of Fragment 50 previously, in Fragment 36.

Fragment 50  Globally subsequent pronoun in globally initial position
Longburn Dinner (2004-09-12)B04
169 Lucy Nandji we (0.8) pgrroniwirndurt.
  They picked up that paperbark.
  (0.3)
170 MC xxx
171 (0.8)
172 Lucy xxx
173 (0.7)
174 Eliz hhh
175 (0.8)
176 MC xxx xxx xxx
177 (0.2)
178 Lucy We kanyiwangu.
  [There is] paperbark around here.
  (0.9)
179 → Mmmn Niyunu kardu ninggeninggeŋpathamanangintha wurrindiŋha:yaa:,
  She was always very jealous.
  (0.6)
180 Mmmn *hm Tjuka* ni+yunuwanimin:,
  It was Joe [that] she [was] really [jealous of].
  (3.0)
181 Lucy Pannyidharrmuyegar1.
  She dropped something on your lower leg.
  (.)
182 Mmmn Yu. *tawu:* tju puniŋbatthaŋwurrini.
  Yeah... No! She used to hit [me] with a stick.
  (.)
183 Lucy Ba yu- yu.
  Oh yeah that's right.
  (.)
184 Mmmn hhh=
185 Eliz =Munak ngayya.
  My sister.
  (0.3)
186 Lucy Mm:.  

Taking advantage of the fact that Lucy’s earlier story had essentially run its course (lines 169-179), Manman launches into a story that she has certainly told before (in fact, tells reasonably often). In line 183, Manman makes globally initial reference to her jealous classificatory sister, with whom she had all the battles discussed previously. So doing, she recruits the 3rd person feminine singular free pronoun, niyunu, the third person feminine singular ethical dative -ngintha (as part of
the nerb *kardu ninggeningg pepathananganintha*, “she [is/was/will be?] very consumed by jealousy”), and the 3rd singular subject of the verb *wurrinidha*, “she/he was going”. In this case, the free pronoun itself is denotationally redundant, as even the gender of the referent is specified in the nerb by the ethical dative. The combination of expressions is as general is it would be if Manman were to have used the nerb and verb on their own. Here Minimization (if possible, prefer single or minimal reference forms) is relaxed for no appreciable gains in Specification. In this respect, the form is pragmatically marked.

However, the form is also marked from the perspective of its position. Since the free pronoun co-occurs with accompanying verbal cross-reference, the combination can be considered as belonging to the “free pronoun” category, and thus can be considered a globally subsequent reference “form”, here used in globally initial position. We saw in §7.3.2.1 that when speakers use a locally subsequent reference form for globally initial reference, the speaker treats the referent as being sufficiently salient for their interlocutors to recognize. It seems that here we have a parallel usage played out on the global scale. Let’s see how the fragment unfolds.

In line 183, Manman proceeds with the story by producing an elaboration (of sorts). She does not exactly specify the person who was jealous, but rather names the person that was the target of the jealousy – Joe, the joint-husband of Manman and her classificatory sister. From there Manman pauses (line 184). We are not served by the lack of video footage here, so it is difficult to know what (if anything) happens during the three seconds of silence. The slightly rising “continuous” contour of Manman’s prior utterance (line 183) is possibly projective of further talk, but three seconds of silence is perhaps long enough to suggest that a further turn may not be forthcoming (from Manman, that is). In any case, by possibly waiting for her interlocutors’ response (if that is what she was doing), or by at least not elaborating further on who exactly it was that was jealous, we can say for certain that Manman treats her interlocutors as already having enough information to identify the referent. In other words, she treats the classificatory sister as sufficiently salient that the recipients of her story should know who she is referring to.

In line 185 Lucy attempts to make a collaborative contribution towards the telling the story – *panyidharrmuyegarl*, “She/he dropped something on your lower leg”. The utterance suggests that she does know who Manman is referring to. In line 187,
Manman initially agrees with (or perhaps supports) Lucy’s contribution (Yu, “yeah”), then corrects her on a point of fact, “No, she/he [she] used to hit [me] with a stick”; which Lucy acknowledges (line 189) as being the correct version of events. In line 192, Elizabeth provides a specific identification of the jealous sister by referring to her with a self-anchored kinterm munak ngay(ya) “my sister”. Because Manman and Elizabeth are biological sisters, the jealous co-wife of Joe was also Elizabeth’s classificatory sister. Lucy’s acknowledgment token in line 194 further reveals the question of the jealous woman’s identity to be a non-issue.

In this fragment we see distinct parallels with Fragment 44, where locally subsequent verbal cross-reference was used in globally initial position for reference to a particularly salient person. Both referential categories, free pronouns and verbal cross-reference, are particularly badly disposed towards specifying the individuals in question. From the perspective of specificity, free pronouns and verbal cross-reference are almost on a par in being maximally general. Yet in each case, these denotationally general forms occurring in marked globally initial positions, seem to be recruited for urging recipients to attempt an identification – in spite of the dearth of helpful information. In this case and in another we will consider below (Fragment 76), denotationally general (locally or globally) subsequent reference forms are placed in globally initial positions at the very first line of a story. As such, storytellers seem to use the technique like a baited hook for reeling in an audience.

That the placement of a globally subsequent reference form in globally initial position turns out to be a marked practice, can be taken as evidence for the global pattern being inherently unmarked – which in turn, can be taken as evidence for the basic global pattern representing truly normative referential practice.

### 7.4 Conclusion

Conversation analysis tends to concentrate on micro-analysis of very short passages of talk-in-interaction. As such, it largely concerns itself with the organization of talk at a very local level. Clearly however, this is not the only level of organization that is relevant to how things get done in conversation. Here, within the specific domain of person reference, we can see two distinct levels of organization – the global and the local. Each of these are relevant in different, though not unrelated ways to how reference to persons is done, and to what else gets done by referring to persons.
In this chapter, I have examined the uptake of reference, particularly by looking at whether reference is established for the very first time, or re-established some time later. The global vs. local distinction makes for a fuller analysis of form and position; allowing the conversation analyst to both zoom in for the local details, and to pan back for the global patternings. This revised view of initialization has been expanded by considering the question of referential specificity. This allows the question of referential semantics (à la Levinson) to be brought into an analysis of form and position (à la Schegloff).

Importantly, we see that the tendency for initial reference to be done with forms that are more specific than those that follow gets played out at both the global and the local level. This state of affairs is well captured by an optimization of the naturally opposed conversational preferences, Specification and Generalization. Specification is the preference that pushes for greater restriction of denotata, making for greater specificity and fewer potential referents – thus maximizing the potential for achieving recognition. Generalization is the opposing preference that prefers reference forms that are not more specific than is absolutely necessary. Once initial reference is established (be it global or local), this preference selects for greater generality in subsequent positions. Each category of reference forms is differentially weighted towards satisfying one or other of these two preferences. Some categories are well disposed towards Specification and others are well disposed towards Generalization. Yet others occupy the middle ground – able to satisfy either preference, yet perhaps not with the efficacy of either of the specialist categories.

In the next chapter we will investigate how these preferences, and the remaining preferences identified in Chapter 5, work together as a system of referential design. Particularly, we will see how each of the six referential categories identified in this chapter are well disposed towards satisfying more than one conversational preference. Ultimately the reference forms that speakers choose for a given situation, reflect the most appropriate mix of preferences to suit their own personal objectives, as well as any relevant interactional and cultural contingencies.