

ON THE PLACE OF LINGUISTIC RESOURCES IN THE ORGANIZATION OF TALK-IN-INTERACTION: 'SECOND PERSON' REFERENCE IN MULTI-PARTY CONVERSATION¹

Gene H. Lerner

"What we have to do is try to construct what a procedure might be for determining what it is that's being referred to when somebody says 'you'..."

Harvey Sacks
Lectures on Conversation (1992, vol 1, p. 333)

1. Introduction

Addressing a single recipient can encompass the use of what grammarians have characterized as 'second person' reference. In English, for the most part, this takes the form you (and its variants such as yours). The conventional view in linguistics holds that you provides a way to refer to the addressee of the speaker. A tacit assumption here, I think, is that the addressed recipient is already or automatically established, and so the use of you simply conforms to this state of affairs. This assumption is on the right track for two-party conversation (which may be what most linguists have in mind (cf. Levinson 1988)), since using a reference form that designates the addressee as referent will ordinarily only be referring to one person - the speaker's recipient - in two-party conversation.

However, in multi-party conversation, the use of you does not automatically resolve who is being referred to, since its use does not alone distinguish an addressed recipient from among the speaker's co-participants. Thus, you alone does not specify who is being referred to, because it cannot specify who is being addressed.

Though you does not specify who is being addressed, it can indicate that some one recipient is indeed an addressed recipient. That is, 'doing addressing' is here separated from the designation of just who is being addressed. Since

¹ I would like to thank Sandy Thompson and the editors of this special issue, Ceci Ford and Johannes Wagner, for their encouragement and helpful comments. A version of this report was given at the International Pragmatics Association meetings in Mexico City, July 1996. The transcription conventions used in this report were developed by Gail Jefferson and are described in the Appendix.

speakers can indicate that they are addressing a specific participant, but in a manner that does not itself reveal who that individual is, you might be dubbed - in interactional terms - a *recipient indicator*, but not a recipient designator.

This both poses a task and furnishes a resource for participants in multi-party conversation. Though you cannot alone specify who is being referred to or addressed, it can, in concert with other aspects of the talk and its circumstances, furnish resources for determining who is being addressed by establishing who is being referred to, and, conversely, it can furnish resources for determining who is being referred to by establishing who is being addressed. Since second person reference couples person reference with addressing, methods for establishing either referent or addressed recipient will resolve the other matter. This is one place where methods for person reference and methods for addressing converge as grammatical practice.

1.1. Other uses of you

Schegloff (in press) reminds us that you can also be used explicitly for addressed summoning (e.g. Hey, you!). I leave aside this use of you as a form of explicit addressing. Here, I examine how you - used for person reference - can, nevertheless, contribute to procedures for accomplishing addressing.

Of course, you can also sometimes be understood to refer to several participants at once. I have considered this usage elsewhere (Lerner 1993). For example, I have shown how you can be used for establishing and addressing an association of participants. Also, you is sometimes used to refer to some category of persons. This is the so-called generic or impersonal use of you (cf. Sacks 1975, 1992). Interestingly, Schegloff (1988) has shown how the impersonal you can also be deployed as a personal I. Additional uses of second person reference, at least in some languages, may also be possible (cf. Biq 1991). In this report, I will not consider the methods used to reflexively establish these uses. Here, I concentrate on the use of you to recognizably refer to a single participant.

Nevertheless, it is important to remember that which usage is being employed on a particular occasion can be ambiguous (at least in English), and can become problematic for participants themselves. For example, in the following instance (here from a two-party telephone call) a recipient's anticipated possible misunderstanding becomes a speaker's concern.

(1) [Heritage]

Ann: You do put on after Christmas, don't we

When Ann says you do put on ((weight)) after Christmas she treats this as potentially hearable as personally (and unkindly) addressed to her recipient, since she goes on to add, don't we. By adding, don't we Ann shows her recipient that the turn-initial you should not (now) be taken to refer only to her recipient.

It is also worth noting how second person usage compares to so-called 'third person' usage. In contrast to 'second person', 'third person' proterms are

ordinarily not used as address terms at all, but as terms of reference. In fact, the use of he, she and they to refer to one or more co-participants ordinarily excludes those participants as possible addressed recipients. Relatedly, Heritage & Greatbatch (1991) have shown, for news interviews, that the use of a third person proterm, by an interviewee to refer to another interviewee, sustains the fundamental structure of the interview, while the use of you can lead to direct exchanges of disagreement between interviewees. For additional considerations of proterm usage, see Levinson (1988) and Watson (1987).²

In this report, I examine how you is employed as a resource in the conjoined tasks of person reference and establishing an addressed recipient. Moreover, I will focus on how this is accomplished when selection of next speaker is at stake (i.e. when a 'current speaker selects next speaker' technique is being employed). It is within this sequential environment that I will describe the interactional relationship of second person reference to addressing.

1.2. *Selecting you to speak next*

In multi-party conversation, establishing who the addressed recipient is can be consequential for subsequent action - e.g. for determining who should properly speak next.³ Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson (1974) have shown that a current speaker can select a co-participant to speak next by employing a technique that couples the production of an adjacency pair, first pair part (i.e. a sequence initiating action such as a question) with a form of address that shows who is being specifically addressed, and therefore who should properly respond to the initiating action.

Since you combines the action of person reference with a form that can indicate a single participant is being addressed, it can be used by speakers as an element of practices for selecting next speaker. It is, in part, in terms of practices for selecting next speaker that one can come to terms with second person

² Name use provides another relevant comparison. Names are ordinarily used for addressing (including addressed summoning) or reference, but not both concurrently. In saying that naming can be used for reference or addressing, I am not asserting that the usage is always clear to recipients. For example, a turn's beginning can be a particularly ambiguous site for name use. This can be seen in the following excerpt.

[GTS]
Dan: Well Roger uh
Roger: Hm?
Dan: introduced a kind of topic, when he uh responded
to Ken

Here Roger takes the production of his name to be a possible address term, but as Dan's turn emerges it becomes clear that he is referring to Roger and not addressing him.

³ For the most part, I will leave aside the complicating factor that at times a single party to the talk can be constituted by more than one participant (cf. Lerner 1993; Schegloff 1995).

reference as an element of, and resource for grammatical practice.

In the first part of this report, I examine how the referent of you can be established independently of establishing who is being addressed, thus providing speakers with a 'reference-based' method for selecting next speaker. Then, in the second part of the report, I show how explicit methods for establishing who is addressed recipient (such as speaker gaze) can be used as an 'addressing-based' method for establishing who among the speaker's co-participants you refers to. Of course, these two types of methods (reference-based and addressing-based) can both operate within the same turn (e.g. one can gaze at a recipient, while asking a question that only applies to them); however, my interest here is to show that these two types of methods need not operate concurrently.

2. Referring to *you*

Establishing who is being addressed in multi-party conversation is a specially relevant task when it is done as part of a 'current speaker selects next speaker' technique, since determining who has been addressed is needed to determine who can properly speak next. Since you can be employed to *do* referring using a format which indicates that the speaker is addressing a specific participant, the immediate interactional question for co-participants is not 'has someone uniquely been selected to speak next' but 'who has been selected'.

Sometimes the addressed recipient of a speaker can be established through a determination of who is being referred to even when no explicit addressing device is employed. If the reference to a participant indicated by you is made clear from the specifics of the situation, identities, and particularities of content and context, then the addressed recipient can be established through the resolution of the reference. In these cases there is some way to connect or link a particular person to you through some element of a turn's talk or the action it implements.

This can be seen at line 1 in Excerpt (2), in which Shane's initiating action (a question) recognizably refers to Vivian, thereby addressing her, and thus selecting her to speak next.

(2) [Chicken Dinner]

- 1 -> Shane: Did you cook this all the way through?
- 2 (0.7) ((V finishes taking butter and looks over at S's plate))
- 3 Vivian: ↑Ye:s.

How is this accomplished? Shane is seated between Vivian and another participant (Nancy). Here, speaker gaze is not used to demonstrate who you addresses. If anything, Vivian may see Shane turn slightly away from her and toward Nancy as he says cook at line 1. (He does a slight, but sharp head turn toward Nancy.) In this instance, the person referred to by you can be located through the content of the question and the shared knowledge of the participants - and thereby next speaker selection is achieved. Shane and Vivian are hosting

the dinner, while Nancy and Michael are guests. The use of you along with the turn-initial deployment of did shows that a current selects next technique is being initiated (question + second person reference form), but to determine just who is being addressed co-participants must turn elsewhere. All present know-in-common that Vivian prepared the meal. (Shane is the only other participant that could have conceivably aided in food preparation, but he is the one asking the complaining question.) Thus, for all present, Vivian is unambiguously bound to the act of cooking. Shane's question provides an interactionally consequential basis for how what is known is momentarily formed up - i.e. for how what is known is known for the task at hand. In this case, it is known for determining who is being addressed and therein, consequentially, for determining who should properly speak next. The employment of you indicates that she is being addressed, since it is clear that she is its referent.

2.1. Sequential positioning

Who you refers to, and thus addresses, can sometimes be found through the sequential positioning of a turn. A turn that shows itself to be responsive to a just prior action and/or turn, can concomitantly show that it is being addressed to that turn's producer. This can be seen at line 2 in the following excerpt. (Again, in this instance gaze direction does not seem to be a factor in accomplishing addressing.)

(3) [Chicken Dinner]

- | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------------------------------|
| 1 | Shane: | I can't get this thing mashed |
| 2 | -> Nancy: | You do that too to your potatoes? |
| 3 | Shane: | Yeah |

Here, Nancy ties her talk to the prior turn by naming the object (the potato) referred to indexically in the prior turn, and by referring indexically to the action (mashing) indicated there. In this case, you coupled with the pro-predicate do that and your coupled with potatoes - produced in the next turn - make clear that it is Shane who is being referred to, since he has referred to himself in that prior turn. The form of the reference (you) maintains the same referent as the prior turn, and at the same time this form also indicates that he (Shane) is the speakers' addressed recipient. Interestingly, this method of grammatically tying one turn to a just prior turn operates here, even though the action accomplished through the prior turn - announcing a trouble or complaining - is disattended in the response.⁴

Since Nancy's turn is also composed as an initiating action (a request for

⁴ Sacks (1992, Vol. I, pp. 150) provides a discussion of 'Second Speaker Rules' for tying a subsequent utterance to a prior utterance. This includes a description of a 'Verb Followed by Pro-verb Rule' and a discussion of the demonstrative pronoun that.

confirmation produced with rising intonation), it forms a method for selecting Shane to speak next to confirm or reject her proposal. Here, you can rely on its sequential position to show (through tying techniques) who is being referred to, and thereby who is being addressed. The placement of one utterance after a prior utterance, and the composition of that subsequent utterance to show itself to be responsive to the prior, provides a method for establishing who you refers to.

Not only is it possible for a turn to be composed so as to response to a just prior turn, and thus be seen to specially address that turn's speaker (through second person reference), but a different participant can be selected by designing a turn that specifically eliminates last speaker as next speaker. The 'home' for this method seems to be in three-party conversations, where elimination of one recipient as a proper next speaker can make clear that the other recipient is being addressed (even when speaker gaze is not available to either recipient as in the following excerpt). Excerpt (4) begins with an appreciation by Curt of a prior joke by Mike, and a round of laughter. Gary, at line 12, then composes a turn that selects Curt as next speaker by producing a request for another joke that includes a form of second person reference (yours).

(4) [Auto Discussion]

- 1 Curt: Oh(hhh)huhh huhh ho [the red'n yellow [arch(h)]eh=
 2 Gary: [heh! [eh-eh-]=
 3 Gary: =a[h! ah! ah! ah! [ah! ah!
 4 Curt: =[u h : : a:: [::ma::nshh=
 5 Cam: [Ao:::w=
 6 Curt: =((flabby[razzberry))
 7 Gary: [ah! ah! [ah! ah!
 8 Mike: [huuh [heh ha
 9 Curt: [hehh=
 10 Cam: [heh-heh ha!=
 11 Curt: =heh! 'h[hhh
 12 -> Gary: [Now tell yer:s=
 13 Curt: =A]ri[ght I'm nna (tellyuh this one.)
 14 Gary: [Cu:rt,

In this instance, it is not so much the positioning of one turn as a response to a prior turn that provides the resources for resolving who is being referred to by yours at line 12, as it is that Gary has designed his turn as a request for a next joke just after the completion of a prior joke *sequence*. Here yours not only shows that one of Gary's co-participants is being addressed, but the possessive form (which can be understood as 'now tell your joke(s)') specifically excludes the teller of the prior joke as addressed recipient, since it is composed as a request for an additional joke from a different teller. This leaves only one proper recipient (Curt). Gary does go on to address Curt by name, but it is not by reference to this address term that Curt begins to speak.

The sequential positioning of one turn as responsive to a prior turn, or one action (e.g. a request for another telling) as responsive to a prior action sequence

can furnish one of the most powerful aspects of context for participants' procedures for determining who is being referred to, and thereby who is being addressed. And when the achievement of addressing is coupled with a sequence-initiating action in the course of a turn at talk, this furnishes a technique by which one participant can select a particular co-participant to speak next - and regularly enough they do speak next.

2.2. Visible action

In Excerpts (2), (3) and (4), recipients could find who was being referred to in the design, placement and details of the talk. However, visible aspects of the interaction, including participants' visible actions, and participants' social relationships to material objects, can also be used to determine who is being addressed by you. That is, particular participants can be connected to actions and objects and thus can be referred to (and addressed) through those connections.

In the following excerpt, the visibly recognizable action bound to one of the participants (Shane) shows the other participants (as well as indicates to Shane himself) that he is the party being addressed by Michael at line 1. Excerpt (2) also concerned the social relationship of a participant to a material object (Vivian as the meal/potato preparer). However, here I am concerned with the visible relationship of a participant to a material object. I consider this a social relationship and not, for example, a spatial relationship, since it is not so much the spatial position of the object as it is the object's social position in a recognizable course of action that seems to be relevant here.

In this excerpt, Michael produces the utterance at line 1 as Shane is cutting a pat of butter from the stick of butter on a serving dish.

(5) [Chicken Dinner]

- | | | |
|----|-------------|---|
| 1 | -> Michael: | L'mme have that butter when yer <u>through</u> there, |
| 2 | | (3.3) |
| 3 | | ((clank - M sets down wine bottle)) |
| 4 | | (1.8) |
| 5 | Michael: | (°Do ya have ?°) |
| 6 | | (0.8) |
| 7 | Vivian: | ↑ <u>h</u> u:hh |
| 8 | | (0.3) |
| 9 | Shane: | °Goo[d.° |
| 10 | Michael: | [<u>B</u> utter please, |
| 11 | | (0.2) |
| 12 | Shane: | Good. |
| 13 | Vivian: | Sha:ne, |
| 14 | Michael: | (HOW LONG DO YA GOTTA WAIT?) |

After Michael's request, Shane does a visual search of the table, apparently

looking for something, and then seems to ask Vivian about something - possibly concerning the object of his search - as an 'aside'. Hence, the butter is not passed, nor is Michael's request acknowledged. Michael again asks for the butter, and then at line 13 Vivian prompts Shane by name to comply with Michael's request. Thus, we can see that she has taken Michael's request to have been addressed to Shane. It is Shane's use of the butter dish as a feature of a course of action - and at line 10 his continuing 'object-in-use' possession of the butter dish even when not actually engaged manually in using it - that provides a basis to see (literally) who you is. Note, that in this instance, the implicated second action may not necessarily take place in the talk alone, and so the issue of next speaker selection is more complex.⁵ However, what I am specifically illustrating here is how visible action can specify who you is - though in this case the addressed recipient is being selected to produce a responding action that may not take the form of a turn at talk.

In the following excerpt (which includes another pass of the same butter dish), Vivian's co-participants also use the position of the butter dish and its connection to one of the participants to determine who the request is addressed to. However, in this case, the determination of who is connected to the object requires specific recipient action.

(6) [Chicken Dinner: simplified]

- | | | |
|---|---------|--------------------------|
| 1 | | (2.8) |
| 2 | Vivian: | C'n you pass the butter, |
| 3 | | (3.1) |

All of Vivian's co-participants are looking at their own plates and are engaged in eating when she makes her request. At line 1, Vivian looks up from her own plate, searches for the butter and then on spotting it near one of the participants (Michael) issues her request as she glances toward the butter, and thereby toward him. Just after that, all three of Vivian's co-participants look up and without looking toward her, locate the site of the butter. Whether they are attempting to comply with her request, or whether they are attempting to determine if they have been asked to comply, or whether they are attempting to determine that they may be needed to assist in the transfer, the location of the

⁵ Indeed, the responding action may not take place in the talk at all. Even though the format design of a turn provides the possibility of a response in the talk (and thus furnishes its addressed recipient with an option to reply), it is possible to comply with the action (a request) that has been realized through that turn format without speaking, and without noticeably being seen to have not spoken. This possibility can be seen in the following excerpt.

[Chicken Dinner]

- | | |
|--------|---|
| Shane: | Most wishful <u>thjnk</u> in=here hand me some a'dat
fuckin budder will you?
(0.6)((Michael passes butter dish to Shane)) |
| Shane: | °Oh::yeah°
(1.1) |

requested object materially demonstrates to them just who had been addressed. I believe it is clear to all present that Michael is the addressed recipient, since he is interposed between all of the other participants (who are to his right) and the butter plate (which is to his left), and therefore he is best situated to satisfy Vivian's request. Here the request, in implicating a next action, limits those who can easily comply to a single participant, and thus resolves after the completion of her utterance, that she was addressing a single party and who you turned out to be.

Locating an object in the setting and determining its placement relative to all the participants - seen under the relevance of the request for subsequent recipient action - constitutes a speaker-initiated recipient procedure for achieving addressing. Here, you is not tied to prior talk, but to the configuration of the setting. In this way, at least, one can think of a setting as methodically available to participants for inspection through the appropriation of a material object to a social task. It is in this sort of way that a material object is locally constituted as a social object.

3. Addressing you

In the prior section, I have described how features of the talk and its circumstances can make clear who is being uniquely referred to, and thereby who is being addressed. In these cases, the connection between initiating action and referent was not specifically related to explicit addressing practices. However, this does not exhaust the work that you does - as a form of reference - either in terms of person reference or speaker selection. In this section, I examine how, conversely, the use of you can be bound up with explicit next speaker selection practices, even when the reference is not directly resolvable through a connection between initiating action and referent. Here, we will see that the employment of the recipient indicator you - in a turn that does not otherwise make clear who is being referred to - can be accompanied by explicit addressing practices that make clear who is being addressed. Moreover I will show that the use of you can actually occasion recipient action to determine who is being addressed, and therein who is being referred to.

3.1. Speaker gaze

Referring to a person as a recipient can indicate that a single participant is being addressed without designating specifically who is being referred to, while e.g., an accompanying gaze can demonstrate just who that person is, by showing who is being explicitly addressed.⁶ This can be seen at line 6 in Excerpt (7). Prior to

⁶ Of course, explicitly addressing someone by name can also resolve who you refers to, as in the following excerpt.

[Chicken Dinner]

Vivian: Michael yih want s'more wine?

the excerpt displayed, Vivian has introduced the topic of a movie she has seen, and she then attempts to identify one of its actors. A long series of exchanges concerning the identities of the actors ensues.

Excerpt (7) begins late in the exchange with Michael first confirming that one actor (Herry Hamlin) was a member of the cast, then at line 4, he disagrees with Vivian's original proposal (Chris Sheridan wasn't in that). After Michael disagrees with Vivian, a response from her (e.g. backing down or reasserting her position) could be relevant. At line 5, with Michael continuing to gaze at Vivian, Nancy and Shane both turn their heads from left to right (i.e. from Michael to Vivian), and then Shane asks, Did you see the movie? at line 6.

(7) [Chicken Dinner]

- 1 Michael: Ah;strikah:n er sump'n like that I don't Ye(h)ah riht.
 2 'hh en Herry Hamlin.
 3 (0.4)
 4 Michael: Chris Sheridan wasn'in that, ((shakes head))
 5 (0.7)
 6 -> Shane: Didju see the movie?
 7 Vivian: ↑Ye_{ah} I ↑saw it it looked exac'ly ↑li_{ke} ↓im.

The form of the question shows that a single party is being addressed, but the use of you in itself does not indicate who is being referred to. It could be addressed to the just prior speaker (Michael) or to the prior speaker's addressed recipient (Vivian). The visibility of the direction of Shane's gaze is crucial to the determination by his co-participants that his question is addressed to Vivian. If he had instead looked to Michael, then the question would not have been heard to be addressed to Vivian, but to Michael, perhaps in defense of Vivian. (Note, that Vivian introduced the topic by stating, I was watching this movie Making Love and Michael has not explicitly said that he has seen it.) Here, Vivian, the intended recipient of Shane's question, as well as Michael and Nancy, can see that Shane is directing his (addressed) question to her. (This is so, since Vivian is seated on the floor at the far right of a coffee table, with Shane on her left, and Nancy and then Michael to his left. When directing their gaze to Vivian, they can see that Shane is turned away from them, and is facing Vivian.) Gaze can be a weak or troublesome addressing device when used alone, since an intended recipient and/or other participants may not notice who a speaker's gaze is directed to - or that it is directed toward a particular participant. However, it can be 'enhanced' as an addressing method when combined with the recipient indicator you (as part of an initiating action), since you can makes clear that someone has been selected to speak next.

3.2. Locating speaker gaze

The use of you in Excerpt (7) shows that a current selects next technique has indeed been employed - whether or not other participants see just who has been selected. In fact, the use of you can, on occasion, demonstrate to co-participants that someone has been selected, but where recipients only subsequently determine just who has been addressed by locating, e.g., the recipient of the speaker's gaze. This can be seen in the following excerpt at line 12.

(8) [Chicken Dinner]

- | | | |
|----|------------|--|
| 1 | | (1.5) |
| 2 | Nancy: | Let's <u>watch</u> Rocky Thre <u>e</u> . |
| 3 | | (0.7) |
| 4 | Shane: | Y <u>h</u> eahh. |
| 5 | | (0.8) |
| 6 | Michael: | °M gunna be s:[i]ck.° |
| 7 | Shane: | [Um (.) <u>a</u> lways up f'th <u>a</u> :t |
| 8 | Michael: | 'M gunna be s <u>i</u> ck. |
| 9 | Shane: | h <u>u</u> h ha h[oh haa-aa-heh |
| 10 | (Vivian): | [mm-h <u>m</u> -mm-hm-mm. |
| 11 | | (1.6) |
| 12 | -> Vivian: | Have you been <u>watching</u> it a lot? |
| 13 | | (1.2) |
| 14 | Shane: | N <u>e</u> r-n <u>a</u> hwuh- (.) Well |
| 15 | | (.) |

When Vivian begins her turn at line 12, all four of the participants are occupied with eating. As Vivian begins to speak, she turns her head to the left and looks at Shane, who is busy scooping up a forkful of food. (She continues to hold this position through the end of line 14.) Nancy looks up sharply toward Vivian at it and Michael does the same. Michael begins his move an instant after Nancy, but finishes his (shorter) head raise at virtually the same moment as Nancy. In the meantime, Shane finishes a bite of food from his fork and then turns toward Vivian during the silence at line 13.

In this instance, you shows that the question is being addressed to a single party, thus selecting that party to speak next. Yet, all three of Vivian's co-participants could warrantably take it that they were possibly being referred to by you. However, when Nancy and Michael look up they can see - in and as Vivian's gaze direction - that the question was visibly directed to Shane. Shane then sees this as he too turns to Vivian, and then he begins to answer at line 14. (Also, it should be noted that the audible direction of Vivian's utterance may well be available to, at least, Shane, and may be somewhat available to the other participants. However, the microphone arrangement used in this recording does not make voice direction easily available for analyst inspection.) So, in this instance the use of you provides an occasion for the speaker's co-participants to determine who has been addressed and especially if they, in particular, have been selected to speak next.

5. Concluding remarks

This investigation is part of an ongoing effort to describe social-sequential aspects of grammar in talk-in-interaction (e.g., Ford 1993; Fox & Jasperson in press; Lerner 1991; Lerner & Takagi 1995; Ochs, Schegloff & Thompson in press; Clancy, Thompson, Suzuki & Tao 1996). In this regard, the explication of how second person reference operates as a resource in establishing an addressed recipient in multi-party conversation can be taken as an effort to respecify an aspect of grammar as a resource for practical action - i.e. as a constituent of a grammar for interaction.⁷ Further, this report shows that these practices are consequential for the organization of talk in interaction (apart from matters of understanding) when you is used as part of a current speaker technique for selecting a particular party to produce a next speaking turn (or even some other action).

Crucially, the recipient indicator you is a device with dual, interlocking reference and addressing functions, while accomplishing neither on its own. It can be doubly bound to a specific participant. That is, the employment of you is a resource for speakers and their co-participants to solve the problem of either who is being addressed, or who is being referred to - or both. On the one hand, if the person referred to by you is clear from the particularities of the talk and the circumstances of its production, then who is being addressed is also thereby established. On the other hand, if the addressed recipient is clear (e.g., through gaze direction) then the reference can be resolved by co-participants through inspection of the addressing technique. A speaker can show who they are addressing by glancing toward a particular person. Through this, you can be seen to be referring to them. Moreover, mutual gaze or reciprocity can be established through the use of you. Since you is designed for an addressed recipient, it can indicate that there is an addressed recipient even when explicit addressing by speaker gaze has not been noticed. And as a consequence of this indication, recipients may glance at speaker to determine who has been selected to speak next.

References

- Biq, Yung-O. (1991) The multiple uses of the second person singular pronoun *ni* in conversational Mandarin. *Journal of Pragmatics* 16: 07-321.
- Clancy, Patricia, Sandra Thompson, Ryoko Suzuki & Hongyin Tao (1996) The conversational use of reactive tokens in three Pacific Rim languages. *Journal of Pragmatics* 26(3): 355-387..

⁷ In this view, one might consider two-party conversation as an occasion where the very fact that it is a two-party conversation provides participants with an ever-ready circumstantial resource for resolving who you could refer to - though the grounds for that resource can occasionally be undermined, and trouble can ensue, as when a party on one end of a telephone call asks a question of someone else at their location, but is taken by their telephone 'partner' to be addressed to them.

Ford, Cecilia E. (1993) *Grammar in interaction: Adverbial clauses in American English conversations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fox, Barbara and Robert Jasperson (in press) A syntactic exploration of repair in English conversation. In P. Davis (ed.), *Descriptive and Theoretical Modes in the Alternative Linguistics*.

Heritage, John & D. Greatbatch (1991) On the institutional character of institutional talk: The case of news interview interaction. In D. Boden & D. Zimmerman (eds.), *Talk and Social Structure*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, pp. 93-137.

Lerner, Gene H. (1991) On the syntax of sentences-in-progress. *Language In Society* 20.3: 441-458.

Lerner, Gene H. (1993) Collectivities in action: Establishing the relevance of conjoined participation in conversation. *Text* 13.2: 213-245.

Lerner, Gene H. & Tomoyo Takagi (1995) On the place of linguistic resources in conversation: A co-investigation of English and Japanese grammatical practices. Paper presented at the Symposium on Conversation, Linguistics Society of America, Summer Institute. Albuquerque, NM.

Levinson, Stephen (1988) Putting linguistics on a proper footing: Explorations in Goffman's concepts of participation. In P. Drew. & A. Wootton (eds.), *Erving Goffman: Exploring the Interaction Order*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, pp. 161-227.

Ochs, Elinor, Emanuel A. Schegloff & Sandra Thompson (eds.) (in press). *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, Harvey (1975) Everyone has to lie. In M. Sanches & B.G. Blount (eds.), *Sociocultural Dimensions of Language Use*. New York: Academic Press, pp.57-80.

Sacks, Harvey (1992) *Lectures On Conversation*. 2 volumes. Edited by G. Jefferson, with Introductions by E.A. Schegloff. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel A. Schegloff & Gail Jefferson (1974) A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50: 696-735.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1988) Description in the Social Sciences I: Talk-in-Interaction. *IPRA Papers in Pragmatics* 2.1: 1-24.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1995) Parties and joint talk: Two ways in which numbers are significant for talk-in-interaction. In P. Ten Have and G. Psathas (eds.), *Situated Order: Studies in the Social Organization of Talk and Embodied Activities*. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (In press) Some practices for referring to persons in talk-in-interaction: A partial sketch of a systematics. In B. Fox (ed.), *Studies in Anaphora*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Watson, D. Rodney (1987) Interdisciplinary considerations in the analysis of pro-terms. In G. Button & J.R.E. Lee (eds.), *Talk and Social Organization*, pp. 261-289.

Appendix

Transcription conventions

sump'n	The spelling of words roughly indicates the manner of their production, and therefore may depart from standard orthography.
->	Arrows point to the lines of transcripts relevant to the point being made in the text.
()	Empty parentheses indicate talk too obscure to transcribe. Letters inside such parentheses indicate the transcribers' best estimate of what is being said.
[Left-side brackets indicate where overlapping talk begins, while right-side brackets indicate where overlapping talk ends.
((Points))	Words in double parentheses indicate transcriber's comments, not transcriptions.
(0.5)	Numbers in parentheses indicate periods of silence, in tenths of seconds.
(.)	Dot in parentheses indicates a 'micropause' of 0.2 seconds or less.
:::	Colons indicate a lengthening of the sound just preceding them, proportional to the number of colons.
Beau-	A hyphen indicates an abrupt cut-off of the sound in progress.
<u>Always</u>	Underlining indicates stress or emphasis.
=	Equal signs indicate a 'latched' relationship - no silence at all between them.
HOW LONG	Upper case letters indicate marked increase in amplitude.
°Good°	Degree signs indicate marked reduced amplitude.
↑ ↓	Up arrows and down arrows indicate marked pitch rise or fall.
? , .	These 'punctuation marks' indicate rising, continuing and falling pitch, respectively.