

Sophia Fiedler

6 Thinking out loud? *Je me suis dit* ‘I said to myself’ and *j’étais là* ‘I was there’ in French talk-in-interaction

Abstract: In this article, I investigate two, so far little studied, constructions from oral French that introduce direct reported thought: *je me suis dit* ‘I said to myself’ and *j’étais là* ‘I was there’. Whereas many studies target direct reported speech, research on direct reported thought remains sparse. Direct reported speech has been shown to allow speakers to display their affective stance during storytellings. I argue that in French talk-in-interaction, speakers can also use direct reported thought to take a stance. Drawing on Conversation Analysis and Interactional Linguistics, I analyzed 10h47min of video recordings of coffee breaks among students. The sequential analysis encompasses speech as well as the speakers’ bodily conduct including gaze, gesture, posture, and facial expressions. I show that *j’étais là* is used to take an affective stance in the ongoing talk, while being reenacted verbally, prosodically and bodily. In contrast, *je me suis dit* is used to take a rational stance by making publicly available a conclusion or decision that accounts for previous actions. This rational stance is *not* accompanied by a bodily reenactment.

I thereby demonstrate that *je me suis dit* and *j’étais là*, when introducing direct reported thought, carry out distinct actions in talk-in-interaction. This result complements the growing body of research on a grammar-body-interface, and addresses a multimodal bifurcation in the rather novel research topic of direct reported thought.

1 Introduction

The French complement-taking predicate *penser* ‘(to) think’ semantically designates the process of inner speech. In my data, however, the past forms of *penser*, *j’ai pensé/je pensais* ‘I thought / I have thought’, are not used to introduce direct reported thought but for other actions, such as displaying a change in epistemic state (Jefferson 2004a). Instead, speakers resort to other lexical resources. In this

Acknowledgements: This study was carried out with the support of the Swiss National Science Foundation, grant no. 100012_178819. I thank Simona Pekarek Doehler and two anonymous reviewers for their comments on an earlier version of this paper. All remaining errors are mine.

paper I present two, so far little studied, constructions from oral French that are used to quote thought in naturally-occurring conversation: *je me suis dit* ‘I said to myself’ and *j’étais là* ‘I was there’ (Dostie 2020; Secova 2015). Both forms are used in tellings to project reported thought from a past event, as the following two examples illustrate:

- (1) LAU: *pis j’ai attendu pis je me suis dit bon ben: je verrai,*
so I waited and I said to myself good well I’ll see
(Pauscaf 10, 19min30)
- (2) ELI: *et je suis relevée j’ai vu tout noir j’étais là* ((imitates her frozen body posture during 1.1s))
and I came up again and I saw all black I was there ((posture))
(Pauscaf 20, 32min10)

Direct reported thought (DRT), together with direct reported speech (DRS), are powerful resources for speakers in everyday conversation to make co-participants “directly experience” the depicted events (Clark and Gerring 1990). Especially storytellings (Jefferson 1978; Stivers 2008) are laced with reported speech and thought, which are often delivered with expressive prosody, facial expressions, and gestures.

To mark DRT and DRS, speakers can – but need not – use quotative constructions. Research on English has shown that in addition to the standard quotatives, for instance constructions including *think* or *say*, speakers also use more colloquial forms such as *I was like* or *he goes* (Buchstaller 2001; Butters 1980; Fox Tree and Tomlinson, Jr. 2007; Romaine and Lange 1991; Schourup 1982; Streeck 2002 on English *like* and German *so*; Underhill 1988).

I argue that, although similar in their role as quotatives, *je me suis dit* ‘I said to myself’ and *j’étais là* ‘I was there’ carry out distinct actions. *Je me suis dit* accounts for a change in the course of action at the end of a reported rationalization process (Jefferson 2004a; Bangerter et al. 2011). Similar to what Golato (2002) describes for self-quotation to report past decisions, reported thought introduced by *je me suis dit* allows the speaker to make publicly available why a course of action, that has been previously described, was initiated or modified. Speakers mobilize fewer multimodal resources to deliver this conclusive thought. *J’étais là* is – within the reported situation – responsive to prior reported events or talk. What is reported is reenacted with multiple resources (see Dostie 2020; Secova 2015 for similar findings) as a spontaneous and *ad hoc* delivery of an affective stance towards preceding events. The main analytic concern of this article is how the respective actions manifest in interaction. The bodily conduct of the speaker (fewer vs. more

resources) is crucial for the analysis of *je me suis dit* + DRT and *j'étais là* + DRT as two functionally distributed items carrying out different actions in everyday talk: taking an affective or a rational stance.

In the following, I show that *j'étais là* and *je me suis dit* both introduce reported thought while carrying out different actions. The speaker's more pronounced embodied conduct when using *j'étais là* is crucial for how these different actions come to be designed and understood as distinct.

2 Background

During tellings, speakers enhance “direct experience” for recipients by resorting to multiple resources. One of these resources is what Yule and Mathis (1992) describe as staging. It “organizes the various elements of the speaker’s contribution into background and foreground positions” (Yule and Mathis 1992: 199).¹ An event can be placed into the foreground through a dramatization of reported events. The authors observe that this dramatization is done by means of a shift from a description or reporting with verbs like *ask* or *say* in the past tense to *be like* in the present tense (Yule and Mathis 1992: 204). Not having access to video data, their study could only describe linguistic and prosodic features of reported speech and thought.

More recent research has shown that such dramatization-processes are often achieved through bodily enactment (Fox and Robles 2010; Sidnell 2006; Streeck 2002). Prosody (Couper-Kuhlen 1996), linguistic means (especially through the choice of vocabulary), facial expressions (Peräkylä and Ruusuvuori 2012), and gestures form a network of resources to report events, speech, and thought in a meaningful way. I show that the enquoting devices *je me suis dit* and *j'étais là*, because they introduce different actions in conversation, also come with different degrees of bodily enactment.

Research on English quotatives has evidenced a systematic relation between the quotative and the quoted material (Fox Tree and Tomlinson 2007; Streeck 2002). Fox Tree and Tomlinson (2007) show in their experimental study that English *like* (compared to *say*) can be used to quote a variety of material sources such as talk, bodily conduct or sounds (Fox Tree and Tomlinson 2007: 86; cf. also Sidnell 2006).

¹ The technique of foregrounding a topic through highly enacted direct reported speech has also been called *depiction* by Clark and Gerring (1990) or *reenactment* by Sidnell (2006). Both authors describe their respective concepts as having the interactional goal of making co-participants re-experience what happened.

According to their results, the greater flexibility of *like* lies in its prioritization of marking approximation instead of a faithful reproduction (Fox Tree and Tomlinson 2007: 86). Streeck (2002) goes one step further by claiming that English *like* and German *so* are “body quotatives” making a “nonverbal behavior’ salient” (Streeck 2002: 581). Both observations are in line with Buchstaller and van Alphen’s (2012) claim that new quotatives (like *like* or *[to] go*) often have “non-reportative semantics” (Buchstaller and van Alphen 2012: xii) and express approximation instead of suggesting a faithful reproduction of prior talk. Similar results have been formulated by Dostie (2020) who argues that *j’étais là* cataphorically refers to the following quotation, which is characterized by a systematic bodily conduct of the speaker.

Sacks (1992a) points out that “[t]he sheer fact of doing quoting can be the expressing of a position” (Sacks 1992a: 309). His claim has been relevantly confirmed by Stivers (2008) and several others, who show that certain types of tellings, such as complaints, favor the use of DRS and DRT as a staging tool (Haakana 2007 on complaints; Holt 2000 also on amusing stories). Haakana (2007) explains that Finnish *minä/mä aattelin et* ‘I thought that’ is a tool for speakers to “[give] the current recipient access to what went on in the narrator’s mind at the specific point of the narrated interaction” (Haakana 2007: 153). He describes how DRT that is introduced with this construction is used to evaluate reported events thus “[guiding] the recipient in evaluating the story-in-progress” (Haakana 2007: 153). In my data, especially the *j’étais là* ‘I was there’-construction shows similar characteristics.² It is a means through which speakers take an affective stance towards prior talk or events.

Stance as a more general phenomenon can have several functions in everyday talk. According to Du Bois (2007), there are three frequent and easily distinguishable functions of stance: evaluation, positioning, and alignment (Du Bois 2007: 144). For each of these functions, as he points out, speakers need some point of reference towards which the stance can be taken, for instance, a prior turn. *Affective* stance, which has been the focus of a growing body of research, shares this feature (Goodwin, Cekaite, and Goodwin 2012; Ochs 1996; Selting 2012). Being defined by Ochs (1996: 410) as referring to “a mood, attitude, feeling, and disposition, as well as degrees of emotional intensity vis-à-vis some focus of concern”, it is the

2 Similar to what Haakana (2007) points out concerning Finnish *minä/mä attelin*, I also have examples where speakers leave open whether what is quoted has been said or not. I agree with Haakana’s analysis that, especially in complaint stories, this ambiguity can be used “to the speaker’s benefit: to give or imply a picture of the situation in which the speaker possibly resisted the antagonist by criticising him or her” (2007: 175). A further discussion of the matter lies, unfortunately, beyond the scope of this paper.

speaker's perceivable emotional attitude towards something specific that characterizes affective stance as an action. At the same time, to become interactionally relevant and visible to others, (affective) stance also needs to be "made publicly accessible" (Sorjonen and Peräkylä 2012: 5) by speakers. I observe, in line with Du Bois (2007) and many others, that participants display their affective stance by means of bodily and prosodic resources (e.g., Couper-Kuhlen 2012; Goodwin 2007; Goodwin, Cekaite, and Goodwin 2012; Haddington 2006; Kaukomaa, Peräkylä, and Ruusuvoori 2015; Streeck 2002).

These bodily features occur, however, *only* with *j'étais là*, not with *je me suis dit*. Indeed, as my analysis will show, *affective* stancetaking does not play a role when speakers introduce their reported thoughts with *je me suis dit*. Instead, speakers use this quotative to make publicly available an explanation or description that accounts for past actions of the speaker. The format [*je me suis dit* + DRT] allows the speaker to display a *rational* stance towards a certain matter instead of an *affective* one. This is why I call the sequences containing *je me suis dit* rationalizations: Speakers *describe* and do not depict the relevant scene (for a discussion see Clark and Gerring 1990).

Several features characterize this description which allows speakers to take a rational stance: They are "formed from articulated symbol systems, such as the discrete words and sentences of language" (Clark and Gerring 1990: 767) instead of "dense, or nonarticulated" (Clark and Gerring 1990: 767) ones, such as gestures or sounds; they are uttered with little emotional involvement; and they project a similarly non-affective reaction from the recipient. The sharing of an affective stance makes co-participants' reactions highly relevant, which has been evidenced particularly for storytellings (Stivers 2008; Voutilainen et al. 2014).

I show in my analyses that, after *j'étais là*, affiliative responses³ are usually delivered and if not, pursued by the speaker. With *je me suis dit*, recipients respond accordingly with much less or no emotional involvement, for instance by displaying understanding or confirming the speaker's rational stance. This short juxtaposition of affective and rational stance clarified that even though *j'étais là* and *je me suis dit* both introduce DRT, they carry out different kind of actions: They allow speakers to either take an affective or a rational stance.

In the following, I will first illustrate the methodology of Conversation Analysis and Interactional Linguistics. The qualitative analyses of six examples, three with *je me suis dit* and 3 with *j'étais là* will illustrate my initial claim of those constructions implementing different actions through DRT.

³ Concerning the concept of *affiliation*, I follow Steensig (2013: 1) who defines it in terms of: "Display empathy; Match, support, and endorse stance; Cooperate with action preference".

3 Methodology and data

In what follows, I investigate the *interactional* use of *je me suis dit* ‘I said to myself’ and *j’étais là* ‘I was there’. To do so, I use the methodology of Conversation Analysis (CA) (Sacks 1992a, 1992b; Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson 1974) and Interactional Linguistics (IL) (Couper-Kuhlen and Selting 2018). Taking an emic, data-driven perspective, my analyses are based on the sequentiality of turns-at-talk.

In everyday talk, interlocutors try to build actions in mutually recognizable ways; speakers design their turns to achieve that goal in order to be understood by others. They use specific grammatical formats to shape their turns accordingly. A verb like *dire* ‘to say’, for example, or any other transitive verb, is expected to have a direct object which can be a noun or a complement clause. One central idea in CA and IL is to not separate this grammatical projection from the real-time machinery of conversation “because grammatical accounts are intercalated with accounts of interactional trajectory, of the texture of activity, of the shape of sequences and the emergent upshot of the interactional episode” (Schegloff, Ochs and Thompson 1996: 21). Auer (2003) takes up on this interplay of temporality, grammar, and action in spontaneous talk and suggests in his (2003) seminal paper that grammar provides speakers with “sedimented and shared ways of organising projection in interaction” (Auer 2003: 1).

Je me suis dit and *j’étais là* both project reported thought while carrying out different actions. Grammatically, they are also distinctive. There is grammatical projection in the case of *je me suis dit* where the verb asks for a direct object. When this direct object takes the format of a clausal direct object (the complement clause), it can be syntactically even more bound to the matrix clause with the use of the complementizer *que* ‘that’.⁴ *J’étais là* cannot have a complementizer as it is already syntactically complete as [predicate + local/temporal adverbial]-construction. The data show that *là* ‘there’ has here lost its semantics of referring to a specific location or moment. The *là* ‘there’, one might argue, projects a specification, which is delivered as direct reported thought. Both forms are thus in need of a second “component”, be it a complement clause or a specification.

Projection also involves bodily conduct. As recent research on multimodality has shown, not only words but also body movements can be projected with linguistic devices (Keevallik 2018; Streeck 2002). Relevant to this study are therefore multimodal aspects of interaction such as gaze, facial expressions, gestures or posture which have been shown to be crucial in social interaction (Goodwin 1979,

⁴ I have, however, only 3 cases out of 45 where the complement clause is introduced with the complementizer.

1981; Kendon 2004 on gesture; Mondada 2014 on movement in space; Rossano 2012, 2013; Streeck 2014 on gaze; Maschler et al. 2020; Pekarek Doehler 2019 on the interrelation of grammar and multimodality). The analysis of multimodal conduct allows me to understand sequences where (re)enactment plays an important role.

I analyzed one corpus comprising 30 videotaped everyday conversations between students. It contains two parts, Pauscaf 1, recorded in 2013, and parts of Pauscaf 2, recorded in 2019. Both data sets were recorded in a university cafeteria in the French-speaking part of Switzerland. In the 10h47min of data, groups of 2 to 4 participants are recorded during their regular coffee breaks, totaling 33 males and 37 females (total: 70). Before the recording, all participants provided an informed consent for data collection and publication. The detailed explanation of data use did not reveal the specific purpose of interactional linguistic studies, thus keeping conversations as natural as possible. All recordings were transcribed according to the conversation analytic conventions elaborated by Jefferson (2004b). Additional embodied conduct was annotated following Mondada's (2018) conventions for multimodal transcription.

In the 10h47min of data I identified 47 instances of *je me suis dit* 'I said to myself' and 58 of *j'étais là* 'I was there'.

All occurrences were sequentially analyzed and coded with respect to syntactical, interactional, and multimodal features: presence or absence of the complementizer, sequential position, position in the turn, and the presence or absence of bodily conduct in the turn in which the notable construction occurs.

The analyses revealed that *je me suis dit* and *j'étais là* occur frequently in tellings. While *j'étais là* is responsive to a prior event, *je me suis dit* is not. Within the reported scene, *je me suis dit* does not introduce a response to a previously reported action but rather a conclusive thought presented as the logical consequence from what has been described. This matches the observation that *je me suis dit* introduces direct reported thought from monological situations while *j'étais là* is part of a reported dialogue.

On a morphological level the two forms are composed as follows

(3) *je* *me* *suis* *dit*
 1SG.NOM 1SG.REFL be.1SG.PR say.PST.PTCP
 'I said to myself'

(4) *j'* *étais* *là*
 1SG.NOM be.1SG.IPFV DEICT
 'I was there'

(3) is the first person analytic past of the reflexive form of *dire* ‘to say’ and semantically conveys a monologic, reflective speech event. By introducing thoughts with *je me suis dit* speakers make this past interior speech publicly available to their current interlocutor(s). In my data, what follows *je me suis dit* remains mostly prosodically flat, is delivered under one intonation contour with the construction itself, and without or with only little bodily enactment.

(4) is the first person imperfective form of *être* ‘to be’ combined with a deictic particle that usually refers to a location or moment. The interactional dimension of responsiveness is somehow reflected through the deictic particle. The data shows that speakers enact their state at a specific point (in time or space) that is deictically referred to with *là* ‘there’ for the co-participant to literally “see” it in the ongoing conversations. The construction thus invites co-participants to experience the reported situation with the speaker.

Based on the sequential analysis of 47 occurrences of *je me suis dit*, I identified 29 instances where speakers use the construction as a means to make available a rationalization process which can consist of a train of thought (assumptions, assertions, rhetorical questions) concerning the past, present, or even future with regards to the speech event (n=17), or decisions that had been taken in the past (n=12). In 14 cases, *je me suis dit* introduces an assessment that accounts for another reported action. The 5 remaining cases are either interrupted or reformulated during the reported thought.

Concerning the 58 occurrences of *j’étais là*, 53 introduce reported thought or speech. Of the remaining 4 cases, 2 are followed by a description of what the speaker did, and 2 have the literal meaning of being at a certain place.

The following sequential and multimodal analyses will illustrate that (i) *j’étais là* and *je me suis dit* project reported thought but that (ii) they project different actions, and (iii) that those actions are characterized by a diverging multimodal conduct of the speaker.

4 Analyses

4.1 *Je me suis dit* (‘I said to myself’): making publicly available a rational stance

This section examines the use of *je me suis dit* ‘I said to myself’ in everyday talk. The quoting device introduces reported thought that makes publicly available why a course of action was initiated or modified. The construction allows speakers to share decisions or conclusions, which are reported as rational trains of thought for

recipients to comprehend. The rational stancetaking is accompanied by little bodily conduct.

In excerpt 1, Cédric tells Camille how he has been shopping alone with his mother. While she was looking for something else, he spotted a package of cookies, so-called *mediants*. Cédric knows that Camille likes them, which made him buy a package for her.

Excerpt 1: *mediants* (Pauscaf 07, 00min59s)

01 CED: j'ai fait les courses seul avec ma mère,
I was shopping alone with my mother

02 et pis du coup elle elle voulait acheter un truc,
and then PART she she wanted to buy something

03 pis [j'ai vu ç-]
then I saw th-

04 CAM: [hmm,]

05 CED: pis je me souvefnais ↓bien que tu m'avais parlé de
then I remembered well that you had talked to me about
mediants, (.)
mediants

06 j'ai donc bien pensé,=
so I thought well

07 =parce que j'ai vu les *mediants* **je me suis dit**, %(0.4)
because I saw the mediants I said to myself

ced %extends r
hand->1.09

08 +*mediants*,
mediants

cam +gz at CED-->1.13

09 cam%ille,%\$
camille

ced \$turns head&gz right-->1.10

ced %points with index finger tw front%
(0.2)%(0.5)%\$

10 ced -->\$gz at CAM->1.17

ced %nods,purses lips%

11 CAM: ouais °d'accord°.=
yeah okay

12 CED: =ça va [°bien \$ensemb\$le.°]
that goes well together

13 CAM: [t'as \$fait \$] +le bon lien.
you made the right connection

cam -->+

ced -->\$gz left\$gz at CAM----->>>

14 CED: °hm.°

Je me suis dit introduces Cédric's sudden rationalization from the past. The storytelling in lines 01 to 03 forms the background for it by describing the circumstances in which the rationalization occurred. First, Cédric describes the situation in which he was when he had the idea of buying *mendiants* for Camille (lines 01 to 03): He has been shopping with his mother. After a continuer (Schegloff 1982) from Camille at line 04, he adds the motivation behind him buying the biscuits. After a cut-off at line 03, where he is about to describe his next action (of having seen something), he restarts his turn and says that he remembered Camille telling him about *mendiants* (line 05). This is followed by a positive assessment of his thoughts (line 06) and an account for line 07. Cédric's account, which is introduced with *parce que* 'because' (line 07), replaces his cut-off from line 03, only that this time he rewords it explicitly as an explanation. His account comprises the description of seeing the biscuits and then relating them (line 08) to Camille (line 09). While doing so, he extends his right hand – just after *je me suis dit* – towards Camille and points in her direction while saying her name (line 09). Seeing the biscuits is presented as the triggering event for him buying them. That Camille and the biscuits “go well together” is first bodily displayed during the pause, when Cédric nods and purses his lips, thus confirming his, already positively assessed, conclusion (line 10).

Camille shifts her gaze at Cédric after the short pause following *je me suis dit*, which enables her to observe her friend's bodily conduct. Cedric, who turned his head and gaze right at line 09, gazes back at Camille at the end of the pause thus projecting the end of his turn (Kendon 1973; Streeck 2014) and mobilizing her response (Stivers and Rossano 2010). She confirms the conclusion that Cédric has reached by aligning with his prior turn (line 11). Cédric then extends his turn confirming verbally his conclusive rational stance from lines 08 and 09.

Excerpt 1 illustrated that *je me suis dit* is used to introduce talk that is presented to the recipient as an actual past train of thought. Through the format of direct reported thought, Cédric makes his purported inner monologue and thus his rational stance available to Camille. Publicly displaying the reflection process that led the speaker to a specific conclusion – which potentially also affects the recipient – makes the co-participant's reaction conditionally relevant (Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson 1974). The speaker invites the recipient to follow the different rational steps during the reflection process. What is introduced with *je me suis dit* is only minimally enacted.

The next excerpt shows a conversation between two friends, Elinda and Ekti. They talk about a situation Elinda found herself in because she tried to help a friend by setting him up with a girl. Elinda's telling is, contrary to the previous example, emotionally charged because the friend was not amused about her helping even though he had asked explicitly for her help in the first place. Despite a higher

degree of affectivity in the telling, the turn initiated with *je me suis dit* is only moderately reenacted on a prosodic and bodily level.

Excerpt 2: bon c'est bon / okay that's it (Pauscaf 20, 11min28s)

01 ELI: >je voulais< essayer de: (0.3)\$(0.5)
I wanted to try to:
 eli \$gz at EKT-->1.02
 02 et pi au final+ j'étais là\$+ %ouais %bon::,
and then in the end I was like yeah okay
 eli -->\$gz left-->1.03
 eli %lifts eyebrows%
 ekt -->+gz at her cup +gz at ELI-->1.05
 03 \$écoute euh:: va chier quoi.
listen uh:: piss off PART
 eli ->\$gz at EKT-->1.06
 04 enf[+in: tu me saoules et] pi euh:,\$
PART you are annoying and then uh:
 eli -->\$gz down-->1.06
 05 EKT: [+non mais c'est clair.]
no but of course
 ekt -->+gz at her cake-->1.13
 06 ELI: °mrm° (0.2) \$°nt°
 eli -->\$gz alternately down&at EKT->1.09
 07 [limite ça me prenait] même trop de temps&
like it almost took me too much time
 08 EKT: [mais j'pense,]
but I think
 09 ELI: &de faire ce genre de trucs,\$
to do such kind of things
 eli -->\$gz down-->1.10
 10 pis **je me suis dit** euh:,\$
then I said to myself uh::
 eli -->\$gz at EKT-->1.12
 11 %bon c'est bon [hein,%\$]
okay that's it PART
 eli %shakes head 'no'----->%
 12 EKT: [.HH \$]
 eli -->\$gz down-->1.13
 13 +à mon avis %\$je pense qu'i- il te kiffait beaucoup,
in my opinion I think h- he was really into you
 ->+gz at ELI-->>
 eli %lifts fork with cake, eats cake,chews-->>
 eli -->\$

At line 02, Elinda introduces reported thought (or speech, see footnote 3) with *j'étais là* 'I was there'. She reports what she had imagined saying to her friend: that he should "piss off" (line 03). She then reformulates line 03 by downgrading its intensity (line 04). Elinda's first strong display of affective (negative) stance (on stancetaking cf. Englebretson 2007) from line 03 is responded to by Ekti with an affiliative reaction (line 5) – in overlap with Elinda's second negative assessment. Elinda then initiates, after a short pause and a click (line 06), an account for her being annoyed: The matchmaking also "took her too much time" (lines 07 and 09). At line 10, she utters her rational stance towards the described circumstances: she told herself that she was done with it.

Her conclusive rational stance is formatted as direct reported thought, addressed to herself in the past situation and stands in contrast to the emotionally charged telling preceding *je me suis dit*. What Elinda tells herself, *c'est bon* 'that's it' (line 11), is presented as a consequence resulting from the circumstances that she described in lines 01 to 09. The interjection *bon* 'okay' (line 11) between the quotative *je me suis dit* and the direct reported thought marks a break between her account of why she will stop helping her friend (lines 07 and 09) and her final decision that she makes publicly available through reported thought (line 11). In contrast to the emotional reported thought in lines 02 to 04, the account in lines 07 to 11 allows Elinda to share her rationalization for not helping her friend anymore. Just after *je me suis dit* Elinda gazes at her interlocutor thus inviting her co-participant's reaction (Kendon 1973; Streeck 2014). By starting to eat her cake just after Ekti has taken the floor, Elinda also momentarily disengages from further talk. Ekti has already tried to take the turn at line 08 but without success. At line 12, in overlap with Elinda's turn-ending, Ekti projects with her audible inhale her upcoming turn. Introduced with *à mon avis je pense* 'in my opinion I think', she prospectively mitigates her turn-to-come. She then delivers herself an explanation for Elinda's friend's behavior.

Once again, what is introduced by *je me suis dit* is barely reenacted. There is neither a change in voice quality nor a strong bodily expression of Elinda's stance even though she reports an emotional story. She only shakes her head slightly from left to right (line 11) thus emphasizing her stopping the matchmaking activity. Note also that Ekti's affiliation already comes in right after Elinda's display of a strong affective stance, which was introduced with *j'étais là* 'I was there' (line 02). From line 03, Elinda's talk is a more rational explanation of her stance, which she concludes with *je me suis dit*. Sequentially speaking, there is no need for more affiliation.

The last excerpt illustrates that *je me suis dit* 'I said to myself' can also introduce thought related to the ongoing conversation thus referring to a very recent thought. Liv and Oréane discuss whether the books in the cafeteria they are having their coffee in are fake or not.

Excerpt 3: une feinte / a fake (Pauscaf 19, 15min22s)

01 (1.0)
 02 ORE: tu crois qu'c'est des vrais livres, +=
do you think that these are real books
 liv +turns head l, gz at
 bookshelves-->1.07
 03 =ou dedans c'est de c'est des pages [blanches?]
or inside it's th it's white pages
 04 LIV: [°<<creaky>uh>]
 uh
 05 non c'est des vrais livres, \$(.)
no these are real books
 ore -->\$gz at LIV-->1.08
 06 j'ai regardé.
I took a look
 07 ORE: ((chuckles, (0.6)+(1.1)))
 liv -->+turns head, gz to ORE-->1.08
 08 LIV: °hi°+ fj'me suis \$dit aussif y a une \$feinte.
I also said to myself this is a fake
 liv -->+gz into space----->+turns head&
 gz r->1.10
 ore -->\$turns head r,
 gz at bookshelves----->\$gz at LIV->1.09
 09 (0.3)\$(0.7)
 ore -->\$turns head r, gz at bookshelves-->1.12
 10 ORE: mais %eux-là c'est des% feintes?
but they there it's fakes?
 ore %points 2x w head tw books%
 liv -->+gz at ORE-->1.11
 11 (0.2)+(1.0)
 liv -->+gz tw books at her left->1.14
 12 LIV: ça j'sais pas\$ °par contre°.
that I don't know though
 ore -->\$shifts head tw LIV-->>

Oréane initiates the sequence by asking whether Liv thinks (literally 'believes') that the books on the shelves on her left are real books or only have blank pages in them (lines 02 and 03). At the end of line 02, Liv turns her head right to look at the same books and then confirms her friend's initial supposition that the books are real. The turn-initial *non* 'no' also displays the turn's responsiveness to line 03, thus rejecting Oréane's second assumption. Liv then delivers an account for her non-mitigated response: She took a look herself to verify whether the books were real (line 06). This account in turn-extension may have been triggered by Oréane's preceding shifting her gaze to her co-participant (Stivers and Rossano 2010) just

after Liv's response (line 05). During the subsequent pause at line 07, Oréane chuckles and Liv shifts her gaze from the bookshelves to Oréane. As the latter does not project her taking the floor, Liv extends her turn again at line 08. Her short laughter displays alignment with her co-participant's chuckles (line 07). *Je me suis dit aussi* 'I also said to myself' then introduces an account for line 06, which provoked her friend's amusement, thus referring back to Oréane's initial question from lines 02 and 03.

In this example, *je me suis dit* occurs in post-gap turn-extension (Schegloff 2016; Stoenica and Pekarek Doehler 2020). With Liv's response at line 5, the question-answer sequence could be closed. That Liv extends her turn a second time may indicate that she understood her friend's chuckles not as a closing-implicative assessment (Schegloff and Sacks 1973 on closings in general) but as a mocking of her having actually verified if the books were real. Liv's turn, which is initiated with a soft laughter, aligns with the co-participant's chuckles. *Je me suis dit aussi* 'I also said to myself' initiates a conclusive rational stance while referring to the shared thought Liv and Oréane had: that the books were fake.

Similar to the preceding examples, the reported thought makes a past rational stance publicly available, displaying the reasons behind an action. In this case the reported thought is not reenacted at all. Prosodically it is pronounced under one intonation contour with *je me suis dit* and attached without pause. That there is neither a pause after the quotative (as in ex. 1) nor a disruptive item like *euh* 'uh' or *mais* 'but' (as in ex. 2) demonstrates that line 08 is delivered as one unit which does not foreground or background one part of the complex clause.

In the preceding analyses I have shown that *je me suis dit* introduces reported thought; it allows speakers to share a past train of thoughts with their interlocutors during the ongoing conversation. Speakers thus make publicly available their rational stance that provides an explanation for a reported action, decision or for a change of course of action in the past. Interactionally speaking, the pattern [*je me suis dit* + reported thought] initiates turn-closure. This means that speakers use the pattern towards the end of a multi-unit turn, after describing – often in great detail – the circumstances or events that led to their final rational stance. Delivering a personal reflection at the end of a multi-unit turn invites the co-participant to react to the shared train of thought. The reported thought is neither prosodically nor bodily reenacted. If gestures are used, they are gestures of “*ceiving* or *caption*” (Streeck 2009: 9, original emphasis), which Streeck describes as “a bodily form of conceiving, i.e. of conceptually structuring content to be articulated in speech” (Streeck 2009: 9). They are used “whenever speakers, without attending to the process and without wishing to depict anything, use their hands to give form to – i.e. construe – content” (Streeck 2009: 9). This specific multimodal configuration

of reported thought introduced with *je me suis dit* matches the speakers' display of a rational stance, which does not need dramatization or staging (see §2 *supra*).

This multimodal configuration contrasts with the affective stance that speakers convey with the pattern [*j'étais là* + reported thought], and which is also expressed bodily, for instance through facial expressions (Kaukomaa et al. 2015; Peräkylä and Ruusuvuori 2012; Ruusuvuori and Peräkylä 2009). In the next chapter, I analyze the quotative *j'étais là* 'I was there', which, in contrast to *je me suis dit*, projects bodily and prosodically reenacted thought in emotionally charged contexts.

4.2 *J'étais là* ('I was there'): displaying an affective stance

The following section describes the quotative *j'étais là* 'I was there', which introduces reported thought that is reenacted through notable bodily conduct. Speakers use the construction to display their affective stance, thus inviting their co-participants to affiliate with their telling during which they mostly take a negative stance or complain (Couper-Kuhlen 2012).

Mathilde reports how her mother is always too critical towards changes in society, or innovation – here concerning the women's strike, which Mathilde participated in.

Excerpt 4: grève des femmes / women's strike (Pauscaf_02_17, 08min29s)

01 MAT: +c'est \$comme %la grève des% femmes,\$
it's like the women's strike
 mat \$gz at FRA-->1.06
 mat %points tw FRA with
 l index finger%

fra +gz at MAT-->1.03
 fra \$grabs his bottle->1.03

02 elle est là genre^euh ouais mais ça sert à %rien%,
she is there like uh yeah but that's useless
 mat %head fw%

03 vous allez rien chan\$ger:,+
you are not going to change anything
 fra -->\$opens bottle-->1.10
 fra \diamond nods slowly-->1.06
 mat +closes eyes-->1.05

04 FRA: [mhm,]

05 MAT: [*j'tais là*] \downarrow bon %super,+
I was there well super
 mat %lifts r h,drops it on table->1.06
 fra -->+gz at MAT-->1.11

06		si tout le monde% <<laughing>pense comME TOI◇ c'est\$	
		<i>if everyone thinks like you do it's</i>	
	mat	-->%	
	mat		-->\$gz down
			-->1.10
	fra		-->◇
07		CLAIR qu'on va rien chang°er°.>	
		<i>clear that we're not going to change anything</i>	
08		[.hh]	
09	FRA:	[ouais.=]	
		<i>yeah</i>	
10	MAT:	=cet\$ esprit de: défai↑tiste ça m'énervé.\$	
		<i>this defeatist attitude it gets on my nerves</i>	
	mat	-->\$	
	mat		-->\$
11		(0.4)+(0.6)	
	fra	-->+	

Mathilde has already given one example of her mother's attitude prior to this extract. At line 01, she gives a second example. While gazing at Frank, she briefly points towards him when referring to the crucial event: the women's strike. At line 02, Mathilde introduces her mother's reported speech with *elle est là genre* 'she is there like'. The quotative *elle est là* 'she is there' in combination with *genre* 'like' projects an approximation of the original speech. Note that Mathilde switches to (historical) present tense thus staging the reported talk as a foreground event (Yule and Mathis 1992). Her using the second person plural pronoun *vous* demonstrates a change in footing (Goffman 1981) thus indicating that Mathilde is enacting her mother. The mother's generalizing negative assessment is enacted with a change in voice quality and an exaggerated stress on *rien* 'nothing', and the second syllable of *changer* 'to change' as well as a head movement forward (lines 04 and 05).

Mathilde's mimicking activity displays her negative stance towards her mother's assessment. At line 05, after a nod and a continuer from Frank (lines 03–06), Mathilde verbally elaborates on her negative stance. Introduced with a morpho-phonologically reduced form of *j'étais là*, Mathilde comments on her mother's assessment by reporting her own past thought, starting with a response cry. *Bon super* 'well super' (line 05) ironically assesses the mother's stance positively. The configuration of [*j'étais là* + response cry] comes very close to what Fox and Robles (2010) describe concerning the format [*it's like* + enactment], often with response cries: It is used "to enact thoughts, feelings and attitudes which are internal and affect-laden assessments of a prior utterance or event" (Fox and Robles 2010: 715). Mathilde's in fact negative stance is further enhanced by her bodily conduct: She drops her hand on the table as if to express hopelessness towards the mother's

reactionary stance. Mathilde extends her turn at line 06 with an account, which is still directed to her mother:

Mathilde's gaze down in line 06 and 07 can be understood as part of the reenactment (cf. Sidnell 2006). When recounting her dispreferred response to the mother's stance, she gazes down – a conduct that has been proven to co-occur with dispreferred responses (Kendrick and Holler 2017). She closes the turn with an assessment (Goodwin and Goodwin 1992) that is produced with final falling intonation. Her gaze at Frank at the end of her strong stancetaking actively mobilizes Frank's response (Stivers and Rossano 2010), which follows after the pause (not in transcript).

In contrast to *je me suis dit*, the turn-constructural unit introduced with *j'étais là* is responsive to a prior action, here the mother's reported turn (on enacted dialogues consisting of multiple turns or sequences see Arita [2018]). French *j'étais là* also makes past thoughts available to the co-participant in the ongoing conversation. Instead of a rationalization, which is introduced with *je me suis dit*, speakers use *j'étais là* to display their strong affective stance thus inviting the recipient, through the activation of numerous, also bodily, resources to affiliate. The semantics of *j'étais là* emphasizes this difference in action-projection: The verb *être* 'to be' and the deictic particle *là* do not foreshadow, grammatically speaking, further talk because they form a grammatically complete clause. Neither does their semantics indicate the upcoming formulation of a thought. Instead, the verb *être* projects, together with the deictic particle *là*, in this specific sequential context of a telling, an (emotional or physical) state of the speaker at a specific time or place. This state is made accessible to the co-participant by the means of various (bodily) resources for depiction.

The above is further confirmed by the fact that, when the co-participant's stance towards the speaker's telling is not clearly displayed, speakers extend their tellings, thus pursuing a reaction. In the following excerpt, Frank describes how he tried to study at the university library. A fellow student who was sitting next to him behaved in a way so that Frank could not concentrate at all: Not only did his neighbor's elbow always reach into Frank's half of the table but he also made a lot of noise while constantly opening and closing his highlighters.

Excerpt 5: son coude / his elbow (Pauscaf_02_17, 10min32s)

- 01 FRA: mais il était comme ça.
but he was like that
- 02 (0.5)
- 03 FRA: pour écri- fin pour faire ses stabilos,
to wri- well to do his highlighters

21 (0.5)%(0.7)
 fra -->%depicts moving something to the right with both
 hands-->1.22

22 FRA: dér↑ive.*%
 move
 fra *smiles-->1.23
 fra -->%both hands on table-->1.25

23 (1.4)*\$(0.2)\$
 fra -->*
 fra -->\$gz at his bottle-->1.25
 mat \$shakes with laughter-->1.24

24 MAT: £HH.£\$
 mat -->\$

25 FRA: et pi:::s fi\$nalement il s'est ca\$\$sé °au bout d'un mo+ment°
and then in the end he took off after a while
 fra -->%reaches his bottle with l hand,holds it-->1.35
 fra -->\$gz at MAT----->\$
 mat -->+

26 donc^euh tant mieux.
so uh all the better

27 (1.2)
 ((8 lines omitted))

36 MAT: mais ouais mais t'aurais d- t'aurais dû dire quelque chose,
but yeah but you should have s you should have said something

37 (1.5)

38 FRA: [ouais.]
yeah

39 MAT: [t'aurais] dû dire excuse-↑moi: tes stabiflo:s tu peux faire
you should have said sorry your highlighters can you make

40 moins d'bruit?
less noise

41 (0.5)

42 FRA: ouais.
yeah

The excerpt begins with Frank reenacting the student's body posture with his elbows extended left and right thus depicting that the fellow student occupied too much space (line 01). Between lines 03 and 14 Frank first describes, then reenacts (lines 05–14) that the student also had highlighters in different colors, which he constantly opened and closed. He resumes the enacted scene with *donc* 'so', a repetition of the noise, and the gestures of the opening and closing of the highlighters (line 14).

During the last *click*, Frank already extends his left elbow to the side. This gesture is then verbalized in line 15 in which he repeats his complaint from line

01 about the fellow student's elbow position. Frank's repeated complaint is coupled with a gaze towards Mathilde, who is orienting towards Frank's story as amusing with an intense, bodily displayed laughter at lines 14 to 16.

Frank's reformulation (line 15) closes the side sequence (Jefferson 1972) about the highlighters and reinitiates the telling from line 01. He continues reenacting the scene by gesturing with his right elbow as if he was tapping someone next to him while recounting what happened (line 17–18). At line 18, introduced with a morpho-phonologically reduced form of *j'étais là*, he utters what he thought in that very moment of the described situation. That he did not say it out loud becomes clear through Mathilde's comment at lines 36 and 39. What he reports is initiated with *mais* 'but', here functioning as a discourse marker indicating a disruption between two parts of an utterance (Anscombe and Ducrot 1977). Reaching out his right hand, he points towards the spot where the fellow student sat (line 19) while reenacting how he pointed out to the fellow student that he has his place on the right side.

Frank's deictic gestures to his left and right demonstrate his changing between the roles of the fellow student and himself in the reenacted scene. In the lines depicting the body movements of the fellow student with *il était comme ça* 'he was like that' and *il avait son coude comme ça* 'he had his elbows like that' (lines 01 and 05), Frank reaches his elbow towards the left. In those lines where he reenacts himself he points towards his right to show (in the reenacted situation) the fellow student his place (lines 19–21, lines 21–22). He also uses his right hand to tap the fellow student's elbow (line 17).

These deictic gestures provide multimodal evidence for Frank being involved in a reenactment. It also emphasizes line 18 being responsive to some prior action in the sense that in the reported turn the speaker also bodily refers to his imaginary antagonist. Interestingly, Frank's bodily reenactment is not designed for his co-participant as a "listener". Instead, he keeps all spatial coordinates of his reenactment as they apparently were, thus demonstrating that he is really involved in his reenacting: When he wants his (imagined) neighbor to move, he points to the right (where the fellow student originally sat) while the fellow student's elbow is reaching to the left (FRA was sitting at his left). The situation is thus not adapted like a "play" with the two interactants sitting next to each other but is rather reenacted with the original spatial configuration.⁵ This could underpin the argument that, during a

5 This is not entirely in line with Clark and Gerring's (1990) description of depictions of another person's actions. According to the authors "the demonstrator usually takes that person's role, and the recipients experience them as if they were observing that person" (Clark and Gerring 1990: 768). The fact that Frank depicts the scene with the two participants (himself and the fellow

telling, speakers try to make the co-participant experience the reenacted situation from an omniscient perspective, not from an observing one.

Just after the vocative *mais mec* 'but man', Mathilde starts gazing at Frank. After a brief gaze at her cookie at lines 19 and 20 she reestablishes mutual gaze in line 20 just before Frank's turn-closure in line 22. He completes his clause first in an embodied manner (Keevallik 2018) and then, at line 22 verbally with *dériver* 'move' – an imperative directed to the fellow student. After a 1.6 second pause, Mathilde responds with laughter only, even though the turn-final falling intonation at line 23 and Frank's gaze shift from Mathilde to his bottle indicate his moving towards turn-closure thus leaving the floor for his co-participant to self-select (Auer 2021; Sidnell 2006). After Mathilde's short laughter, Frank extends his turn thus continuing his telling. He adds that finally the fellow student left. After another short side sequence Mathilde finally reacts, but in a disaffiliative way. By telling Frank that he should have said something (lines 36–40), she displays her understanding of Frank's stance introduced with *j'étais là* as something that has never been said, thus treating it as reported thought.

This excerpt illustrates that the speaker's bodily conduct contributes in a meaningful way to the reenactment in order to depict a reported situation. It became particularly clear that the speaker does not adapt to the co-participant's perspective but invites her to change footing in order to experience the speaker's situation from an omniscient perspective.

Excerpt 5 also evidenced that recipients may orient to *j'étais là* as quoting thought instead of speech. The fact that Mathilde could infer that Frank's reaction towards the fellow student's behavior remained unspoken shows that recipients constitute meaning based on sequential, bodily, and linguistic information emerging through turns-at-talk.

In the next excerpt, *j'étais là* reports a thought that is displayed as having just occurred a few seconds before, during the preceding turn (lines 07–12). Excerpt 6 also illustrates that the reported negative stance can be delicate to utter in the original situation. Two friends, Elinda and Ekti, are talking about people who feel insecure about their sexual orientation. Ekti is very skeptical towards the phenomenon while Elinda tries to find an explanation for it. During her explaining she takes more and more the side of people who are not sure about their sexual orientation until gliding into a joking-activity where she makes Ekti believe that Elinda herself has always known that she loves women.

student) not turning towards each other while speaking but away may demand more effort from the recipient in order to being able to re-experience the speaker's situation.

Excerpt 6: peur / fear (Pauscaf 20, 40min45s)

01 ELI: \$moi j'ai toujours su\$ ce que j'aimais^hein,
I have always known what I loved huh
 eli \$turns head left-->1.02
 ekt \$gz at ELI-->1.07

02 °mais\$ b(h)on.°%
but yeah
 eli -->\$head turned tw EKT-->>
 ekt %stops manipulating packaging,freezes
 her hand and arm movements-->1.07

03 ah(h)↑↑AN,
 ((laughter))

04 +fje me suis jamais posée de question^hein,f=
I have never questioned myself huh
 eli +gz at EKT-->1.10

05 EKT: =*que [t' ◊aimais quoi.*◊]
that you loved what
 ekt *moves head straight-->1.06

06 ELI: [les ◊femmes bien *◊] sûr.
women of course
 eli ◊opens eyes,lifts eyebrows◊
 ekt -->*

07 >non je plais(h)an\$te.<%
no I'm joking
 ekt \$closes eyes-->1.09
 ekt -->%

08 [.hih *↑HIN,]
 ((laughter))

09 EKT: [.h non s *j'ai eu peur\$ là,\$>j'tais là<*]
no s I got scared there I was there
 ekt *puts packaging on the table----->*
 ekt -->\$gz at
 ELI->\$gz down-->1.10

10 qu'est-ce qu'elle me \$di(h)i(h)i(h)t,+ .HHS
what is she telling me
 ekt -->\$gz at ELI----->\$gz down->1.13
 eli -->+

11 (0.2)%(0.2)
 ekt %wipes twice over table with r hand-->1.13

12 EKT: [(c'est clair)]
it's clear

13 ELI: [ftu sais\$ que je suis] en couple% avec \$un homme?f °hi^hi°=
you know that I'm in a relationship with a man
 ekt -->%
 ekt -->\$gz at ELI-->1.14

- 14 EKT: =mais non mais p't-être qu't'étais \$bi,
but no but maybe you were bi
 ekt -->\$
- 15 chais [pas moi. par ton]&
I dunno because of your
- 16 ELI: [non c'était- NON.]
no that was no
-

Prior to this extract, Elinda says that many people have a phase of insecurity concerning their sexual orientation. At line 01, she emphasizes that she has always known what she loved, thus inferring that she had not had this phase. During this turn, she turns her head left, which can be interpreted as a signal of discomfort (cf. Pekarek Doehler 2019 for a similar observation and Rossano 2012 on gaze aversion in dispreferred responses). At line 02, Elinda projects with *mais bon* 'but yeah' and her turning of the head back towards Ekti a potential closure. Ekti only reacts bodily: She stops manipulating the packaging of her cake and freezes her arm and hand movements thus conveying augmented attention and the suspension of any further action (line 2).

Elinda then extends her turn: first with a short, high-pitched laughter (line 03), then by reformulating line 01 by saying that she had never questioned herself about her sexuality (line 04). During this turn, Elinda gazes at Ekti. The repetition is immediately followed by Ekti's question for more information, which evidences her being now insecure about Elinda's sexual orientation herself. Ekti's question is accompanied by her moving her head upright, which signals her increased attention. In overlap with Ekti's question, Elinda already specifies what she loves: "women of course" (line 06). At the same time, she lifts her eyebrows, opens her eyes wide, and smiles. At line 07, Elinda then reveals her making fun of Ekti. In overlap with Elinda's laughter, Ekti informs her friend that she "got scared" thus inferring a negative – or at least skeptical – stance towards homosexuality. Ekti also expresses her relief bodily: She releases the tension in her torso and arms and drops the packaging that she was holding in her hands during Elinda's turn.

With *j'étais là*, Ekti reports what she had thought during the prior turn while depicting her stance first embodied (lines 02, 05 and 09). Her negative stance is then displayed verbally through a rhetorical direct question during which Ekti gazes down (lines 09 and 10). Through this negative stance, which is verbally and bodily displayed, she conveys that her thought, if she had said it and if Elinda actually had been lesbian, would have been a potentially face-threatening act (Brown and Levinson 1987). However, as Elinda reveals her joking-activity and both participants laugh, the situation remains non-problematic. Elinda's rhetorical

question at line 13 and her vehement reaction to Ekti's assumption of her being maybe bisexual (lines 14–15) clarifies the improbability of her loving women.

The three excerpts show that *j'étais là* introduces DRT to display a strong affective stance. Analyses of the sequentiality of turns-at-talk and the participants' multimodal conduct demonstrated the following: (i) Turns introduced with *j'étais là* are responsive to a preceding action, (ii) *j'étais là* projects an affective stance, which is delivered as a package of bodily and prosodically reenacted DRT, and (iii) the affective stancetaking is enacted as spontaneous, emotional, and non-hedged reaction to the beforehand described situation, thus giving the co-participant the possibility to re-experience the reenacted situation. Excerpt six is slightly different because the reported thought introduced with *j'étais là* conveys even more: As the rhetorical question concerns a present party (Elinda) and her previous actions, the affective stancetaking indicates that the discovered matter – if it had been true – would have led to consequences for their mutual trust and friendship.

5 Conclusion

Direct reported thought has remained fairly understudied in contrast to reported speech (but see Jefferson 2004a). In this article, I have presented two, so far unanalyzed quotatives in French everyday talk that speakers use to report thought. Drawing on Conversation Analysis and Interactional Linguistics, I have scrutinized their interactional functioning, demonstrating that *je me suis dit* 'I said to myself' and *j'étais là* 'I was there' are used to construct different actions in conversation. I identified *je me suis dit* and *j'étais là* to be distributed accordingly and to have different functions in talk-in-interaction.

Je me suis dit 'I said to myself' occurs during explanations or tellings about a logical and consequential train of thought that reveals the rationalization behind a decision or change in a course of action and allows speakers to account for this change. It displays the purported conclusive thought as a rational stancetaking that is displayed as neutral and not affect-laden. The telling that makes available how the speaker came to this decision or conclusion allows the co-participant to comprehend this train of thought. There is a significant absence of embodied conduct, which conveys the descriptive nature of the rational stance.

J'étais là 'I was there' often occurs in emotionally charged tellings. The construction depicts *ad hoc* reactions to a preceding stretch of talk or behavior. The construction allows speakers to display their expressive, affective reaction to a preceding action. It is thus a strong tool to simplify understanding, or even to

enable it, “by an emotional experience of interpersonal involvement” (Tannen 2007: 46). Crucial to the present study is that with *j’étais là* speakers activate numerous resources, prosody, gesture, facial expressions, and gaze, thus augmenting their chances to achieve this “interpersonal involvement”. Of course, the bodily and prosodic enactment is not part of the past thought but belongs to the reporting in the here-and-now of the ongoing conversation as a staging tool. This bodily enactment to achieve affective involvement has not been observed with *je me suis dit*, where rational stancetaking is the main activity.

The analysis revealed that, similar to direct reported speech, direct reported thought can be used by speakers to take an affective or rational stance in interaction. In French, the actions of affective and rational stancetaking are tied to grammatical and bodily features. In my data, speakers resort to a specific linguistic device, *j’étais là*, to take an affective stance, and only when doing so do they activate multimodal resources. When taking a rational stance, they activate fewer multimodal resources and resort to *je me suis dit*. This result, that multimodal resources can be a decisive analytical factor when delimiting and describing actions, is in line with what has been demonstrated by a growing body of research on the grammar-body interface in everyday talk (Pekarek Doehler 2019; Stoenica and Pekarek Doehler 2020; Streeck 2002). Most importantly, Goodwin’s extensive work underpins this interwovenness of embodied practices and the organization of everyday talk (Goodwin 1981, 2007). Goodwin convincingly argues that participants design, carry out, and coordinate actions not only by the means of linguistic resources but also through posture, gesture, and gaze which “mutually elaborate each other to create a whole that is both greater than, and different from, any of its constituent parts” (Streeck, Goodwin, and LeBaron 2011: 2).

With its multimodal approach to interaction, this study also extends the understanding of the interactional use of reenactments (Sidnell 2006; Thompson and Suzuki 2014) to the more specific domain of direct reported thought.

Appendix

Transcription conventions for verbal conduct following Jefferson (2004b)

[start of overlap
]	end of overlap
=	latching (no pause, no overlap)
(.)	micro-pause, less than 0.2 seconds
(0.7)	measured pause in seconds and tenths of seconds

wo-	truncated word
wo:rd	syllable lengthening
?	rising final intonation
.	falling final intonation
,	continuing intonation
<u>word</u>	accentuation
°word°	softer than surrounding speech
WORD	louder than surrounding speech
↑word	marked high rise in pitch (refers to the next syllable)
↓word	marked fall in pitch (refers to the next syllable)
.h	in-breath
h.	out-breath
((laughter))	transcriber's comment
£word£	smiling voice
w(h)ord	speech with in- or out-breaths from laughter
<<laughing> word>	paralinguistic feature with a reach

Transcription conventions for embodied conduct following Mondada (2018)

+ +	Indicates start and end of gaze of speaker A.
§ §	Indicates start and end of gestures (e.g., pointing) or posture of speaker A.
◇ ◇	Indicates start and end of head movement (e.g., nodding) of speaker A.
\$ \$	Indicates start and end of gaze of speaker B.
% %	Indicates start and end of gesture or posture of speaker B.
* *	Indicates start and end of a head movement of speaker B.
+---->l.05	Continuation of the described embodied conduct until line 05 of transcript.
----->+	End of the described embodied conduct.
+----->	Continuation of the described embodied conduct until end of excerpt.
#1	Reference to the figure depicting the embodied conduct

Abbreviations

AUX	Auxiliary
DEICT	Deictic
IPFV	Imperfective

PRS	Present tense
PTCP	Past Participle
REFL	Reflexive
SG	Singular

References

- Anscombe, Jean-Claude & Oswald Ducrot. 1977. Deux *mais* en français? *Lingua* 43. 23–40. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841\(77\)90046-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841(77)90046-8)
- Arita, Yuki. 2018. Enactment in Japanese talk-in-interaction: Interrelationship between there-and-then and here-and-now sequential organizations. *Journal of Pragmatics* 123. 78–101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2017.10.016>
- Auer, Peter. 2003. Projection in interaction and projection in grammar. *InLiSt* 33. 1–43.
- Auer, Peter. 2017. Gaze, addressee selection and turn-taking in three-party interaction. *InLiSt* 60. 1–32.
- Auer, Peter. 2021. Turn-allocation and gaze: A multimodal revision of the “current-speaker-selects-next” rule of the turn-taking system of conversation analysis. *Discourse Studies* 23. 117–40.
- Bangerter, Adrian, Eric Mayor & Simona Pekarek Doehler. 2011. Reported speech in conversational storytelling during nursing shift handover meetings. *Discourse Processes* 48(3). 183–214. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0163853X.2010.519765>
- Brown, Penelope & Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some universals of language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Buchstaller, Isabelle. 2001. *He goes* and *I’m like*: The new quotatives re-visited. Paper presented at New Ways of Analyzing Variation 30 (NWAVE), North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina, 11–14 October 2001.
- Buchstaller, Isabelle & Ingrid van Alphen. 2012. Introductory remarks on new and old quotatives. In Ingrid van Alphen & Isabelle Buchstaller (eds.), *Quotatives: Cross-linguistic and Cross-disciplinary Perspectives*, XI–XXX. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Butters, Ronald R. 1980. Narrative go ‘say’. *American Speech* 55(4). 304–307.
- Clark, Herbert H. & Richard J. Gerring. 1990. Quotations as demonstrations. *Language* 66(4). 764–805.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth. 1996. The prosody of repetition: on quoting and mimicry. In Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen & Margret Selting (eds.), *Prosody in conversation. Interactional Studies*, 366–405. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth. 2012. On affectivity and preference in responses to rejection. *Text & Talk* 32(4). 453–475. <https://doi.org/10.1515/text-2012-0022>
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth & Margret Selting. 2018. *Interactional Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Deppermann, Arnulf. 2015. Wissen im Gespräch: Voraussetzungen und Produkt, Gegenstand und Ressource. *InLiSt* 57. 1–31.
- Dingemanse, Mark. 2020. Between sound and speech: Liminal signs in interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 53(1). 188–196. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2020.1712967>
- Dostie, Gaétane. 2020. Deixis à l’imaginaire et périphrases en *être* et *faire* préfaçant une scène recréée (*j’étais comme, t’es là, j’ai fait* . . .). In Federica Diémoz, Gaétane Dostie, Pascale Hadermann & Florence Lefevre (eds.), *Le français innovant*, 83–106. Bern: Peter Lang.

- Du Bois, John W. 2007. The stance triangle. In Robert Englebretson (ed.), *Stancetaking in discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction*, 139–182. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Englebretson, Robert (ed.). 2007. *Stancetaking in discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Fox, Barbara A. & Jessica Robles. 2010. It's like *mmm*: Enactments with *it's like*. *Discourse Studies* 12. 715–738.
- Fox Tree, Jean E. & John M. Tomlinson, Jr. 2007. The rise of *like* in spontaneous quotations. *Discourse Processes* 45(1). 85–102. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01638530701739280>
- Goffman, Erving. 1981. *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Golato, A. 2002. Self-quotation in German. Reporting on past decisions. In Tom Güldemann & Manfred von Roncador (eds.), *Reported Discourse: A meeting ground for different linguistic domains*, 49–70. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Goodwin, Charles. 1979. The interactive construction of a sentence in natural conversation. In George Psathas (ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology*, 97–121. New York: Irvington Publishers.
- Goodwin, Charles. 1981. *Conversational organization: Interaction between speakers and hearers*. New York: Academic Press.
- Goodwin, Charles. 2007. Participation, stance and affect in the organization of activities. *Discourse & Society* 18(1). 53–73.
- Goodwin, Charles & Marjorie H. Goodwin. 1992. Assessments and the construction of context. In Alessandro Duranti & Charles Goodwin (eds.), *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*, 147–192. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodwin, Marjorie H. 1980. Processes of mutual monitoring implicated in the production of description sequences. *Sociological Inquiry* 50. 303–317.
- Goodwin, Marjorie H., Asta Cekaite & Charles Goodwin. 2012. Emotion as stance. In Marja-Leena Sorjonen & Anssi Peräkylä (eds.), *Emotion in Interaction*, 16–41. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goodwin, Marjorie H. & Charles Goodwin. 2001. Emotion within situated activity. In Alessandro Duranti (ed.), *Linguistic anthropology: A reader*, 239–257. Malden, MA, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Haakana, Markku. 2007. Reported thought in complaint stories. In Rebecca Clift & Elizabeth Holt (eds.), *Reporting talk. Reported speech in interaction*, 150–178. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haddington, Pentti. 2006. The organization of gaze and assessments as resources for stance taking. *Text & Talk* 26(3). 281–328. <https://doi.org/10.1515/TEXT.2006.012>
- Holt, Elizabeth. 2000. Reporting and reacting: Concurrent responses to reported speech. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 33(4), 425–454. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327973RLSI3304_04
- Jefferson, Gail. 1972. Side sequences. In David Sudnow (ed.), *Studies in social interaction*, 295–338. New York: The Free Press.
- Jefferson, Gail. 1978. Sequential aspects of storytelling in conversation. In Jim N. Schenkein (ed.), *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction*, 213–248. Academic Press: New York.
- Jefferson, Gail. 2004a. “At first I thought”: A normalizing device for extraordinary events. In Gene H. Lerner (ed.), *Conversation analysis. Studies from the first generation*, 131–167. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Jefferson, Gail. 2004b. Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In Gene H. Lerner (ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation*, 13–31. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.125>

- Kaukoma, Timo, Anssi Peräkylä & Johanna Ruusuvuori. 2015. How listeners use facial expression to shift the emotional stance of the speaker's utterance. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 48. 319–341.
- Keevallik, Leelo. 2018. What does embodied interaction tell us about grammar? *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 51(1). 1–21.
- Kendon, Adam. 1973. The role of visible behavior in the organization of social interaction. In Mario von Cranach & Ian Vine (eds.), *Social communication and movement: Studies of interaction and expression in man and chimpanzee*, 29–74. New York: Academic Press.
- Kendon, Adam. 2004. *Gesture. Visible action as utterance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kendrick, Robin H. & Judith Holler. 2017. Gaze direction signals response preference in conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 50(1). 12–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2017.1262120>
- Maschler, Yael, Simona Pekarek Doehler, Jan Lindström & Leelo Keevallik (eds.). 2020. *Emergent syntax for conversation: Clausal patterns and the organization of action*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Mondada, Lorenza. 2014. Bodies in action: Multimodal analysis of walking and talking. *Language and Dialogue* 4. 357–403.
- Mondada, Lorenza. 2018. *Conventions for multimodal transcription*. https://franzoesistik.philhist.unibas.ch/fileadmin/user_upload/franzoesistik/home/Personen/Mondada/Unterordner/Mondada_conv_multimodality.pdf (accessed 31 January 2021).
- Ochs, Elinor. 1996. Linguistic resources for socializing humanity. In John J. Gumperz & Stephen C. Levinson (eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity*, 407–437. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pekarek Doehler, Simona. 2019. At the interface of grammar and the body: *Chais pas* (“dunno”) as a resource for dealing with lack of recipient response. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 52(4). 365–387. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2019.1657276>
- Peräkylä, Anssi & Johanna Ruusuvuori. 2012. Facial expression and interactional regulation of emotion. In Marja-Leena Sorjonen & Anssi Peräkylä (eds.), *Emotion in interaction*, 64–91. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Romaine, Suzanne & Deborah Lange. 1991. The use of *like* as a marker of reported speech and thought: A case of grammaticalization in progress. *American Speech* 66(3). 227–279.
- Rossano, Federico. 2012. *Gaze behavior in face-to-face interaction*. Nijmegen, Netherlands: Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics dissertation.
- Rossano, Federico. 2013. Gaze in conversation. In Jack Sidnell & Tanya Stivers (eds.), *The handbook of Conversation Analysis*, 308–329. Malden & Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ruusuvuori, Johanna & Anssi Peräkylä. 2009. Facial and verbal expressions in assessing stories and topics. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 42. 377–394.
- Sacks, Harvey. 1992a. Lectures on conversation, Vol. II. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sacks, Harvey. 1992b. Lectures on conversation, Vol. I. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel A. Schegloff & Gail Jefferson. 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 59(4). 696–735.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1982. Discourse as an interactional achievement: Some uses of ‘uh huh’ and other things that come between sentences. In Deborah Tannen (ed.), *Analyzing discourse: Text and talk*, 71–93. Georgetown University Roundtable on languages and linguistics. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2016. Increments. In Jeffrey D. Robinson (ed.), *Accountability in social interaction*, 239–263. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

- Schegloff, Emanuel A., Elinor Ochs & Sandra A. Thompson. 1996. Introduction: Interaction and grammar. In Elinor Ochs, Emanuel A. Schegloff & Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), *Interaction and grammar*, 1–51. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. & Harvey Sacks. 1973. Opening up closings. *Semiotica* 8. 289–327.
- Schourup, Lawrence C. 1982. Common discourse particles in English conversation. *Working Papers in Linguistics* 28. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University.
- Secova, Maria. 2015. Discours direct chez les jeunes : nouvelles structures, nouvelles fonctions. *Langage et société* 151. 131–151.
- Selting, Margret. 2012. Complaint stories and subsequent complaint stories with affect displays. *Journal of Pragmatics* 44(4). 387–415.
- Sidnell, Jack. 2006. Coordinating gesture, talk, and gaze in reenactments. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 39(4). 377–409. <https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327973rlsi3904>
- Sorjonen, Marja-Leena & Anssi Peräkylä. 2012. Introduction: Emotion in interaction. In Marja-Leena Sorjonen & Anssi Peräkylä (eds.), *Emotion in interaction*, 3–15. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stivers, Tanya. 2008. Stance, alignment, and affiliation during storytelling: When nodding is a token of affiliation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 41(1). 31–57. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351810701691123>
- Stivers, Tanya & Federico Rossano. 2010. Mobilizing response. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 43(1). 3–31.
- Stoenica, Ioana-Maria & Simona Pekarek Doehler. 2020. Relative-clause increments and the management of reference. A multimodal analysis of French talk-in-interaction. In Yael Maschler, Simona Pekarek Doehler, Jan Lindström & Leelo Keevallik (eds.), *Emergent syntax for conversation: Clausal patterns and the organization of action*, 303–330. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slsi.32.11sto>
- Streeck, Jürgen. 2002. Grammars, words, and embodied meanings: On the uses and evolution of *so* and *like*. *Journal of Communication* 52(3). 581–596. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2002.tb02563.x>
- Streeck, Jürgen. 2009. *Gesturecraft: The manu-facture of meaning*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Streeck, Jürgen. 2014. Mutual gaze and recognition: Revisiting Kendon's 'Gaze direction in two-person interaction'. In Mandana Seyfeddinipur & Marianne Gullberg (eds.), *From gesture in conversation to gesture as visible utterance: Essays in honor of Adam Kendon*, 35–55. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Streeck, Jürgen, Charles Goodwin & Curtis LeBaron. 2011. Embodied interaction in the material world: An introduction. In Jürgen Streeck, Charles Goodwin & Curtis LeBaron (eds.), *Embodied interaction. Language and body in the material world*, 1–28. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tannen, Deborah. 2007 [1989]. *Talking voices*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thompson, Sandra A. & Ryoko Suzuki. 2014. Reenactments in conversation: Gaze and reciprocity. *Discourse Studies* 16. 816–46.
- Underhill, Robert. 1988. *Like* is, like, focus. *American Speech* 63(3). 234–246.
- Voutilainen, Liisa, Pentti Henttonen, Mikko Kahri, Maari Kivioja, Niklas Ravaja, Mikko Sams & Anssi Peräkylä. 2014. Affective stance, ambivalence, and psychophysiological responses during conversational storytelling. *Journal of Pragmatics* 68. 1–24.
- Yule, George & Terrie Mathis. 1992. The role of staging and constructed dialogue in establishing speaker's topic. *Linguistics* 30. 199–215.