REGULATIONS ON USE

Stephen C. Levinson and Asifa Majid

This website and the materials herewith supplied have been developed by members of the Language and Cognition Department of the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics (formerly the Cognitive Anthropology Research Group). In a number of cases materials were designed in collaboration with staff from other MPI departments.

Proper citation and attribution
Any use of the materials should be acknowledged in publications, presentations and other public materials. Entries have been developed by different individuals. Please cite authors as indicated on the webpage and front page of the pdf entry. Use of associated stimuli should also be cited by acknowledging the field manual entry. Intellectual property rights are hereby asserted.

Creative Commons license
This material is provided under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike license (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0). This means you are free to share (copy, redistribute) the material in any medium or format, and you are free to adapt (remix, transform, build upon) the material, under the following terms: you must give appropriate credit in the form of a citation to the original material; you may not use the material for commercial purposes; and if you adapt the material, you must distribute your contribution under the same license as the original.

Background
The field manuals were originally intended as working documents for internal use only. They were supplemented by verbal instructions and additional guidelines in many cases. If you have questions about using the materials, or comments on the viability in various field situations, feel free to get in touch with the authors.

Contact
Email us via library@mpi.nl
Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics
P.O. Box 310, 6500 AH, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

INITIAL REFERENCES TO PERSONS AND PLACES
P. Brown, S. C. Levinson & G. Senft

Projects	Multimodal Interaction Project, Space Project
Task	This task has two parts: (i) video-taped elicitation of the range of possibilities for referring to persons and places, and (ii) observations of (first) references to persons and places in video-taped natural interaction. For (i) fieldworkers may do both person and place reference, or only one of these; in either case (ii) should be done, as the data will be expected to contribute to collections of instances of person and/or place reference in natural conversation.
Goal of subproject	To establish the repertoires of referential terms (and other practices) used for referring to persons and to places in particular languages and cultures, and provide examples of situated use of these kinds of referential practices in natural conversation. This data will form the basis for cross-language comparison, and for formulating hypotheses about general principles underlying the deployment of such referential terms in natural language usage.

Background

Initial references to persons

It might be thought that reference to persons is a relatively straightforward matter, but actually this is a topic of considerable complexity. We therefore have a relatively detailed Background section; for further details the Reference section should be consulted before going to the field.

Introducing a new person into discourse is not just a matter of establishing accurate reference, it is also a matter of placing the referent into a socially-construed status for the purposes of the talk at hand. There is a range of possibilities for referring to persons in conversation, including names, titles, kinship relation, role descriptions, descriptive characterizations, gesture, gaze, or other forms of visible behaviour. This range of possibilities is variable across cultures. We not only find different customs and habits for (addressing and) referring to persons, but also culture-specific constraints and taboos that regulate the selection of appropriate forms of reference and address in particular contexts. Yet there are also possibly universal patterns in how such reference is organised. Schegloff et al. (1979, 1996) have proposed two simultaneously applicable preference rules, one for 'minimization' (i.e., use of a single, short reference form), one for use of a 'recognitional' (i.e., a form that will allow the recipient to recognise the referent as someone they know). Cultural naming patterns can perhaps be seen as evolved precisely to handle both preferences simultaneously. Yet these two preferences are potentially incompatible, if, say, we know people under different names or roles. In that case, the preference for recognitionals remains very strong. One solution is to use a recognitional, e.g., a name, with a 'try-marked intonation', indicating that the speaker is unsure whether recognition under this minimal form can be achieved. In English conversation, this engenders a sequence like:

A   ... well I was the only one other than the uhm tch Fords? Uh, Mrs Holmes
         Ford? You know uh// the cellist

B   Oh yes. She's she's the cellist ...

where the preference for use of a minimal recognitional is successively relaxed until recognition is achieved. From a cross-cultural perspective, what is especially interesting here is how such preferences, if universal, interact with culturally-specific preferences of the kind 'don't name your spouse'/'don't name dead persons'/'don't name in-laws'.

Any form selected for person reference has psycholinguistic consequences. Names are well known to be hard to retrieve, and constitute the first domain to be impaired in senility. This is presumably because, as the philosophers point out, names like John or Paris have no semantics, only reference - there is thus no indirect access through a semantic network. Kin terms on the other hand are relational predicates, requiring computation of A's relation to B (usually by one of competing routes), and are thus nominals with unusally complex semantics - the acquisition of a complex kinterm system is probably not complete till late childhood. Descriptive terms open up a Pandora's box - how to select, from infinite alternates, a description which is just the description under which the addressee will recognise the referent. This raises all the issues both of categorization familiar from other domains, and 'recipient design'. Thus person reference, though one of the most frequent, central kinds of reference, is a highly complex, and variable domain, with many psycholinguistic ramifications.

The psycholinguistics ties into discourse issues. There are special sequences, as in the try-marked names example above, collaborative name-searches, special pro-forms (as in 'what's his name'), and so forth. There is also of course the issue of reference tracking of multiple persons through discourse; different forms of reference to different persons within a conversation help the listener(s) to track these multiple referents. Moreover, if speakers use a specific form of initial reference to a person who is not present in the conversation, the form chosen indicates how the speaker classifies this non-present person with respect to the relationship and position he or she may have with their interlocutor in this conversation; these forms of reference allow for inferences about what is being taken to be common ground for the interactants. What is especially of interest for the important issue of verbal reference in general is to explore whether the conversational maxim 'say as little as possible and as much as necessary' - usually taken to be the basis for all kinds of reference - also holds for these forms of initial references to persons, given the fact that we can observe a broad range of culture-specific forms used in these situations.

Initial reference to places
As mentioned in the field manual entry, "Landscape terms and place names elicitation guide" (Bohnemeyer, Burenhult, Enfield & Levinson, this volume, p 75-79), landscape terms reflect the relationship between geographic reality and human cognition. Toponyms refer to places that usually play a marked role in the life of the speech community; they embody a knowledge structure that figures prominently in the spatial conceptualization of the community's environment. Previous research has shown that we find cross-cultural variation with respect to landscape categorisation and the conceptualisation of landscape features and with respect to what is actually named. Further, most of the issues mentioned above with respect to person reference are applicable to place reference as well – choice of referential expression requires 'membership categorisation' of the addressee, and reflects the speaker's assessment of the

addressee's knowledge and social group for the purposes of the talk at this point. Again, proposed universals of reference to places (e.g., Schegloff, 1971) have yet to be assessed with data from languages other than English.

NOTE: Reference to persons may routinely be done by referring to places (e.g., 'John from London', or 'my-uncle up the hill'), and vice versa ('the woods behind Joe's house').

Research questions
1. What is the range of ways to refer to persons and to places in the language and culture under study?
2. Are some of these preferred/normal when a person or place is first mentioned in a conversation? Are some restricted to second or later reference to persons/places that have already been introduced in the conversation?
3. What kinds of elaborations do you find when the interlocutor indicates failure to identify a referent? How are first references expanded, elaborated, spelled out?
4. To what extent are the principles governing initial reference to persons/places the same across cultures and languages? Is there evidence of a preference for minimal reference (the least needed in the context, to this interlocutor) in first references to persons or places, or for 'recognitionals' (in English, usually personal names; in other societies perhaps kinship terms)?

Tasks
These tasks are presented as elicitation guides; upon completion you should have detailed answers to each of the questions and should be able to understand references to persons and places in conversation. Classical interviewing is recommended (at least three consultants). The researcher should videotape elicitation sessions; this is especially crucial for place reference since the places labelled must be identified on a map of the local area.

(i) Establishing the repertoire for reference to persons
Special elicitation necessary for referring-to-persons subproject (a few hours of videotaped elicitation), to establish the entire repertoire of possibilities, including different modalities (e.g., pointing to someone's house to refer to him).

1. What is the repertoire for reference to persons?
  e.g., it may include:
  - kin terms (in many societies these are the default, when possible, especially in address);
  - other relationship labels (e.g., "friend", "namesake", "youngest child").
  - forms for generic reference and address: (e.g., "people of Tauwema", "missionaries", "honorable Mrs.", "young girl", "woman" "men and women" [in public address]; special greeting address forms)
  - personal names, (recognitionals par excellence)
  - first + last name (e.g., in public settings)
  - nicknames, endearments, diminutives (for intimates, children), insult names
  - titles, honorifics: (e.g., "Mr. President", "Former Judge", "Late honorable Mrs.")

It will not be possible to consider the application of conversation analytic findings about reference to persons without knowing a considerable amount about naming practices in our field locations. Here are some reminders of what we will need to know.

A checklist of queries about naming practices

1. Are personal names a form class in any way?
cf., English: Bill, ??The Bill, ??A Bill, ??three Bills, ??a little Bill, ??Bills
If they lack distinguishing distribution, what more general class do they fall into (e.g., Mohawk names are verbs). Do they have semantic transparency (e.g., Mohawk *Karonhian'onhha?* = 'She watches the sky'; Tzeltal *Tʒa'pat* 'Shit-back')

2. How uniquely referring are personal names?
In effect, how many other Bills are there likely to be in a local community? How many names can an individual have (e.g., one given by the father, one by the mother)? Is disambiguation (which Bill?) achieved by using more than one name, by Nicknames, by epithets, by place of residence, or how?

3. What information is encoded in a personal name?
e.g., by virtue of inheritance of naming rights? For examples Jones encodes that the bearer is son/daughter of dad Jones, who in turn was son of Jones. Rossel Yidika encodes that Yidika's father belongs, not to Yidika's matriclan, but to another particular matriclan.

4. Are there special names used for children before maturity, dropped thereafter?
In some societies children progress through a systematic succession of names, the last becoming the adult name (see e.g., Rosaldo, 1984).

5. If multiple systems exist, which names take precedence in which contexts?
Colonial adminstrations have often tried to enforce patronyms or other fixed naming patterns in order to fix identities for social control (schooling, voting, etc.) – if these 'superimposed systems' coexist with traditional naming systems, which names take precedence in which contexts?

6. What are all the alternate forms of a name/name-substitute in play at any time?
- Consider: {Bill, William, Billy, Willy, William Jones, Jones, Mr Jones, Jones the neighbour, the neighbour, old Grumps}
- Abbreviating (FN=first name, LN=last name), is their some kind of ranking of 3rd person reference giving honour/deference/respect of the kind:
  NickN > FNabbrev > FN > LN > FN+LN > Title+LN > Title
- What is the frame of a maximal name, as in e.g., Professor Stephen Curtis Levinson? For one Borneo system (Kadayan), the frame is (Maxwell 1984):
  Honorific+Courtesy-Title+Personal-Name+Filian-Relator+Haj+Father's-Name
- Nicknames may be of special interest – there may be a range, from derogatory to neutral, for the same individual.

7. Pre-emptive titles
It can be expected that if a kinterm applies, it will pre-empt personal names. This may also hold for chiefly titles, occupational titles (e.g., "Teacher"), political titles, etc. Where kinship is distant and not transparent to the addressee, names may supercede. How disambiguating are kinterms? For example, how many alternate male kinterms are there in

play (in Rossel = c. 20, in Tzeltal = c. 10). – this gives a measure of how individuating a kinterm is.

8. Taboos on naming

It is essential to understand in what circumstances the use of a personal name is tabooed. Typical circumstances are the reference to *affines* in certain kin classes, or very commonly, reference to one's *spouse*, or reference to *dead persons*. All kinds of reasons may be involved in withholding naming – including e.g., feuds between families. Of special interest in these circumstances is how reference is then achieved – there may be conventional euphemisms ('that man' for my husband), or there may be oblique reference to places (e.g. 'that girl' said while pointing), or there may be indirect kinship connections ('my uncle's nephew'). Can general principles be adduced? We will be especially interested in how such a Preference for Not-Naming interacts with a Preference for Naming in other circumstances.

9. Are there special conventions for referring to persons who stand in a special relationship to one another other than a kinship relation?

For example, both Rossels and Tzeltal Mayans refer to people who have the same name as their own as 'my namesake', or in Latin American societies persons may refer to their 'Godfather', taking precedence over kinship or other terms.

10. In all of this, distinguish of course address (vocative usage to 2nd persons) versus reference (to 3rd persons).

Additional questions concerning usage practices to keep in mind when examining person reference in conversational data:

11. Does the kin term system as standardly elicited correspond to actual usage of kin terms in conversation? How much flexibility is there in usage? (e.g., reckoning through the mother's line <u>as if</u> it were the father's line)?

12. What social constraints are there on using a term to refer to a person (e.g., kinship connection, politeness, honorifics, specificity, taboos)? Some speech communities have special language varieties to refer to particular categories of relatives – the Papuan language Kalam, for example, is famous for having such a variety, an in-law avoidance register called "Pandanus language". What cultural idiosyncrasies are there in this domain for the community under study? Particular usages that mark social status, taboos, politeness, can be very revealing about how the people themselves construe their social relationships for the purposes of the current interaction. For example, is there:
- avoidance of labelling the dead?
- avoidance of labelling sensitive relations: (e.g. * 'my-husband')?
- taking the perspective of the other ('your brother-in-law' vs. 'my brother', for the same referent)?
- exploitation/joking uses?

13. Are claims in the literature about preference for person reference (e.g., preference for minimization, for recognitionals) valid in the speech community under study? What counts as a recognitional? Are recognitionals the preferred form of person reference? N.B., distinguish a referential that uniquely brings an individual into mind, in all their (relevant in the context) specificity, vs. a uniquely referring term for someone whom the

interlocutor doesn't know (e.g., 'Mr. Smith the bank manager') When are descriptive phrases used instead of a recognitional?

14. Are ambiguous terms (like, e.g., "my uncle" that can be used to refer to a number of different people) disambiguated in conversation? How?

15. How do speakers display their 'stance' toward the referent (e.g., affiliative or disaffiliative), by choosing among alternative possibilities, referring to someone as, for example, 'your-brother-in-law' vs. 'my-brother' vs. 'our uncle', in a situation where all are possible, or using insult names, joke names, nicknames?

16. Are other modalities used to refer to persons (e.g., pointing to someone's house to refer to him or her)?

ii. Establishing the repertoire for reference to places:
Special elicitation necessary for <u>referring to places</u> subproject: you should do videotaped elicitation aimed at understanding the place naming system, the use of place names, and their meaning and importance for the speech community. Researchers should feel free to elicit and videotape conversations about place names in their field sites.

The same set of issues relevant to person reference apply, adapted to places -
a speaker has to categorise the addressee as a 'member' of some category before referring to a place at a particular level of granularity (e.g., 'here' vs. 'Nijmegen' vs. 'Gelderland' vs. 'Holland' vs. 'Europe'…). What is the repertoire of devices for referring to places in the language/culture under study? What place names and place descriptors are used for referring to the locally relevant places? A first step will involve carrying out the interview listed under "Landscape terms and place elicitation guide". This should produce a comprehensive list of locally relevant place names, with their geographical location identified on a map. In addition, we would want to know:

- Are there cultural idiosyncracies in referring to places?
- Are there 'sacred' or tabooed places that cannot be named? How are they referred to?
- Can you refer to places indirectly, e.g., via a person to a place, or vice versa)?
- Do place names go with stories that emphasise their importance (as a specific landmark, for example)?
- How do people refer to habitations?
- How do speakers use deixis in referring to places?
- When are descriptions used instead of place names?

Analysis
Collecting natural conversation and making a 'collection' of initial person/place references
While still in the field, researchers should document, for each conversation in which you will look at person/place reference, the exact referent of each first-reference (verbal, gestural, or other) to a person or place. For person reference, our initial focus is on documenting reference to non-present third persons (not speaker or addressee), in naturally-occurring conversation. Having collected some natural conversation (see "Building a corpus of multimodal interaction in your field site"), look at all <u>first</u> references to persons that involve a <u>content word</u> (not simply cross-referencing markers, zero morphemes, or pronouns). Look also for first references done purely by gaze, or by

pointing, or other nonverbal means. Be sure to document exactly who the referent is, and what his/her relationship to the speaker is, as well as the speaker's relationship to the addressee. You need to keep a good record of all persons referred to in the conversations you will analyse; be sure you know their relationships to speaker and addressee, and other relevant information about them. For first reference to places, be careful to document exactly where the place is in relation to the location of the conversation; locate it on a map, and with a compass figure out where it is in relation to place of speaking. Also, capture all gestures indicating places (gaze, pointing, lip-pointing, etc.) – so be sure hands and faces are clear in the video.

In preparing the collection, researchers should be aware that although any number of examples will be useful, we would prefer to have at least a hundred examples (ideally several hundred) of all types of person reference and again for all types of place reference.

Step 1: Identify and transcribe instances of first reference to persons/places in natural conversation (in at least three conversational extracts, with different speakers). These instances (your 'collection') can be extracted in ELAN files, or in Word files, or simply marked in the transcript. Transcripts should be accurate, and you should be sure to establish exactly who is being referred to, and what is the relationship of the referent to the conversational participants.

Step 2: For each collection, make a collection of different types of reference. Categorisations must be made regarding the prevalence of one type of behaviour over others (e.g., the use of person or place names over descriptions), the organization and ordering of behaviours (e.g., what do speakers try first and what do they try second?), etc. In making categorizations we should be sorting by:
- Type of reference (name, kinterm, role description, etc.)
- Whether the reference is designed to be known or recognised by others (e.g., Joe, vs. 'the man who lives down the street')
- Whether a reference occurs on its own or with multiple instances together ('Do you know Mary who works at the Post Office?' As opposed to: 'Do you know Mary? . . . the girl who works at the post office?')
- How recipients and speakers respond when a reference to a person/place is not understood.

Step 3: Once collections have been categorised, a series of MI meeting slots will be reserved for presentation of these analyses to colleagues. The categories should be presented, with multiple examples of each (including the media files), and with full support of the analysis using appropriate evidence. As these meetings continue, members of the subproject may sharpen their analysis, and we expect that generalizations will emerge from comparison of person and place reference across languages.

Outcome
The intended result that we are hoping to obtain from each researcher is a concise descriptive report specifying the repertoire of referential terms for persons and for places in the community under study. Comprehensive lists of the personal names, kinship terms, and place names used in the community (identified on a map) should be included. The results will be compared and discussed within the subproject; they will be the

necessary background for interpreting situated examples of person and place reference in natural conversation in the local language.

We would also ask researchers to write a detailed descriptive paper, outlining your analysis of the full set of examples, along with multiple supporting examples where possible. This is for inclusion in edited volumes on each subproject, which would aim to be a descriptive reference source (e.g., a set of comprehensive surveys of person reference across a number of languages, directly comparable; this has never been done), and a first step toward generalizations and theoretical advances in this domain.

References

Allerton, D. J. (1996). Proper names and definite descriptions with the same reference: A pragmatic choice for language users. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 25, 621-633.

Baron, A. M. (1998). Tying Techniques in Thai: The practices of personal Reference. *Crossroads of Language, Interaction and Culture,* 1, 59-69.

Low, S. M. & Lawrence-Zúniga D. (2003). *The Anthropology of Space and Place: Locating Culture.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Mithun, M. (1984). Principles of naming in Mohawk. In E. Tooker & H. Conklin (eds) *Naming Systems.* The American Ethnological Society.

Maxwell, A. (1984). Kadayan personal names and naming. In E. Tooker & H. Conklin (eds) *Naming Systems.* The American Ethnological Society.

Rosaldo, R. 1984. Ilongot naming: The play of associations. In E. Tooker & H. Conklin (eds) *Naming Systems.* The American Ethnological Society.

Murphy, G. L. (1992). Comprehension and Memory of Personal Reference: The Use of Social Information in Language Processing. *Discourse Processes,* 15, 337-356.

Nash, D. & Simpson, J. (1981). "No-Name" in Central Australia. *Papers from the Parasession Chicago Linguistic Society 1981.* 165-177. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Sacks, H. & Schegloff, E. (1979). Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversation and their interactions. In G. Psathas (ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology.* Irvington Publ., NY.

Schegloff, E. (1971). Notes on a conversational practice: Formulating place. In P. P. Giglioli (ed.), *Language and social context.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Press.

Schegloff, E. (1996). Some practices for referring to persons in talk-in-interaction: A partial systematics. In Barbara Fox, ed., *Studies in anaphora*, pp. 437-85.

Schegloff, E. (n.d). On granularity. *Annual Review of Sociology.*

Wrobel, U. R. (2001). Sign language Reference: Space and Person. *Institut für Phonetik und sprachliche Kommunikation der Universität München, Forschungsberichte* 2001, 37: 25-50.

See also the references to relevant literature presented in the entry "Landscape terms and place names elicitation guide" (Bohnemeyer, Burenhult, Enfield & Levinson, this volume, p 75-79)