

Deixis and the Interactional Construction of Context

Simona Pekarek

1. Introduction

Natural languages provide speakers with options and with constraints upon these options. A substantial body of research has shown that what motivates speakers' choices of linguistic forms are not only linguistic constraints but also social and interactional constraints of various types (Goffman 1974) and, furthermore, that these choices are part of the very means by which speakers encode or 'indicate' dimensions of the context of talk (Gumperz 1982).

Much less attention has however been paid to the ways in which speakers' choices of linguistic forms not only reflect properties of the context but also *contribute to creating* the interactionally relevant dimensions of context. This is the idea that I will explore in the present paper by examining speakers' deictic use of the French pronominal forms 'on'/'nous' [*we*] and 'je' [*I*] in a segment of face-to-face interaction. My purpose, thereby, is twofold. First, I aim to illustrate that the motivations and the functions of speakers' coding options are crucially related to the structure of the activities accomplished in the process of talk. And second, I want to argue that a contextualized analysis may provide a rich complement to evidence drawn from the study of the use of forms in isolated utterances or utterance pairs, in that it allows us to interpret forms of reference beyond their purely referential functionality as part of the means by which talk is constructed as a social activity.

2. Indexicality, Context and Social Interaction

Since the pioneering work of Bar-Hillel (1954), Benveniste (1966 [1956]), Bühler (1964 [1935]) and Jakobson (1971 [1957]), the meanings and functions of deictical expressions have been seen as intrinsically linked to situational contexts. Person deictics, in particular, have received extended attention regarding their social functions, mainly with regard to terms of address (i.e. the tu-vous distinction; e.g. Brown/Gilman 1960) and other deference indexes. Most importantly, the dialogical relation between interlocutors at a given moment in space and time is understood as the basis of deixis (Fillmore 1975). Given these grounds, it is somewhat surprising that research tends to focus on either monological evidence or utterance pairs extracted from their larger interactional contexts. It is also notable that while research has provided many important insights into the situational dependency of the use of deictical expressions (i.e. their indexical relation to context), very little attention has been paid to their possible contribution to the

creation and modification of such interactionally relevant contexts. As Hausendorf (1995) has persuasively argued recently, this seems primarily due to the prevalent reliance on a fundamentally static notion of context.

With the recently growing interest in the various ways grammar and interaction are interrelated, the use of forms in discourse starts to be more systematically approached from a perspective that sees context (i.e. the participants' understanding of the relevant context) as being continuously accomplished by the participants. Findings by authors such as Hausendorf (1995) on deictical expressions in particular, and Fox/Ford (1996), Goodwin (1996), Schiffrin (1992) as well as, much earlier, Sacks (1992) and Schegloff (1972) on referential expression in general indicate that speakers' choices of referential expressions not only index contextual dimensions of a communicative event but also contribute to the very organization of that event.

Drawing from this line of research, I will argue that, if, as Silverstein (1976) has put it, "indexical modes (...) link speech to the wider system of social life" (p. 53), they link it by that very fact to the social interactional courses of which social life is made and, therefore, to the microscopic steps in the process of its ongoing constitution. Such a point of view starts from the assumption that the social agent lives in a recursive relationship to the structures that surround him or her: social actions are creative of contexts and sensitive to contexts (Garfinkel 1967). According to this position, participants do not come into an interaction with a ready-made understanding of the situational context that remains unchanged throughout their encounter, but continuously recreate an understanding through their very interaction (Garfinkel 1967, Goffman 1974, Gumperz 1982, Sacks 1992). This relies on a concept of context which defines it not as static, given once and for all, but as a dynamic object continuously made mutually manifest¹.

Such an understanding of context is a theoretically and methodologically consequential position that, as has been persuasively illustrated recently (see the papers assembled in Ochs/Schegloff/Thompson 1996), radically affects the way we conceptualize the relation between referential expressions and discourse activities and, more generally, between linguistic structure and interactional dynamics.

¹ It also implies a representational notion of context (context = the interactant's understanding of the relevant parameters of their encounter), and, in this specific point, meets positions proposing a representational notion of referents that blurs the distinction between anaphora and deixis (cf. Brown/Yule 1983). Following such a notion of context, and viewing language use as pervasively indexical, the present discussion of deixis may be relevant to some crucial aspects of referential processes in general.

3. The Data and the Initial Problem

The data I will examine consist of a transcribed audiotaped classroom French second language lesson in a Swiss high school. The students' first language is Swiss-German, they are 18 to 19 years old and have reached a very advanced level of French. They have had the present French teacher for more than 3 years. The analysis will focus on the following sequence of discussion relating to the (im-)possibilities of communication in the classroom:

(example 1:)

- 1 T: bon maintenant je vous pose une question très précise↓
so now I ask you a very precise question↓
- 2 essayons eh d'analyser la communication telle qu'elle se fait
let's try uh to analyse the communication as it happens
- 3 maintenant essayez de mettre ensemble tous les éléments . (...)
now try to assemble all the elements . (...)
- (....)
- 14 B: il me manque les arguments .. et c'est .. un thème ehm duquel on ne
I don't have any arguments .. and it's .. a topic uhm one
- 15 peut pas≠ ou: bien MOI je ne peux pas discuter très longtemps..
can't ≠or: ME I cannot talk about very long ..
- 16 T: vous me dites pourquoi↑
will you tell me why ↑
- 17 B: je ne sais pas maintenant je ne peux pas (3s) (classe: rires)
I don't know now I can't (3s) (class: laughter)
- 18 C: d'une part je suis un peu fatigué et (classe: rires)
on the one hand I 'm a bit tired and (class: laughter)
- 19 C: d'autre part eh le sujet m'ennuie un peu↓
on the other hand uh the subject bores me ↓
- 20 T: vous pourrez expliquer pourquoi ça vous ennue
can you explain why it bores you
- 21 C: parce que je ne suis pas très intéressé au: parce qu'on écoute
because I'm not very interested in: because w e always listen
- 22 toujours la même chose . dans l'école↓ . . les médias↑ je pense↓
to the same thing . at school↓ . . the media↑ I think↓
- 23 parce que↑ . [c'est pas des]
because↑ . [it's not]
- 24 T: [attention on parle pas] . oui . actuellement on
[attention w e aren't talking] . yes. at the moment w e

- 25 parle pas tellement/ maintenant *je* parle pas de médias
aren't talking so much/ now I'm not talking about the media
-
- 26 hein↑ . *je* parle de communi [cation↑]
am I↑ . I'm talking about communi [cation↑]
-
- 27 C: [jä mais] mais je pense que nous avons
[yeah but] but I think we've been
-
- 28 assez parlé avec vous des de la communication . . et c'est
talking enough about communication with you . . and it's
-
- 29 presque toujours la même chose↓
almost always the same thing ↓
-

As a preliminary, an explanation of some French terms of person reference is in order. As this is a very complex subject, I will limit myself strictly to the distinctions relevant to the present data. 'Je' means *I*. 'Nous' is the first person plural pronoun which, like the English *we*, can be used inclusively, i.e. including the addressee, and exclusively, i.e. excluding the addressee. 'On' is a hybrid form, abundantly discussed in literature (cf. Riegel et al. 1994, Freyne 1992). It is used exclusively in subject position and its basic value is the one of an impersonal pronoun, referring either to one or several persons which the speaker does not want to or is not able to identify precisely, or to people in general. Depending on its context, however, 'on' can move on a continuum between ± definite and ± indefinite. In spoken French, 'on' is very frequently used in place of the first person plural pronoun 'nous' (English *we*) with no specific connotational charge, carrying either an inclusive or an exclusive value.

With these distinctions in mind, let us turn to lines 24 to 26 in the above transcript which will serve to introduce, on empirical grounds, the problem addressed here. The teacher's turn shows two instances of what has become called self-initiated self-repair in conversation analysis (Schegloff/ Jefferson/ Sacks 1977). The second case (l. 25) involves a recoding of person reference whereby the speaker shifts the origo of the discourse activity from a collective source ('on' = *we*, teacher and students) to an individualized source ('je' = *I*, the teacher). Dwight L. Bolinger once wrote: "What speakers avoid doing is as important as what they do" (Bolinger 1953, quoted in Schegloff/ Jefferson/ Sacks 1977). In this sense, what interests me here is why the teacher might choose not to use the collective inclusive referential expression 'on'.

One plausible interpretation of the referential recoding might consist in stating that the speaker undertakes a self-correction, thereby adjusting his statement on the level of its propositional content: he himself is not talking about the media, but about communication. There are however two interconnected problems that arise with such an interpretation:

- It is based on an analysis of a sequence in isolation (as opposed to one that takes into account its larger discourse context) which leads us to treat as a monological sequence something which in fact is part of an interactional activity².
- Due to the very exclusion of the larger discourse context, the interpretation cannot but treat the role of the deictical expressions in terms of a purely referential functionality (cf. Silverstein 1976), and thereby limit the function of the repair to the propositional content.

In what follows, I will propose an alternative interpretation by complementing a content-based account with an exploration of what is *done* by the change of deictic expressions and how this doing relates to the more general referential strategies pursued by the parties at talk.

4. Referential Strategies and Discourse Activities

4.1. The Teacher's Referential Codings

The teacher's discourse shows a functional relationship between his use of the inclusive 'nous' or 'on' and the type of activity he is performing. This is the case for instance in the very beginning of the discussion (l. 1-3), where the teacher explicitly encodes the reciprocal positions to be held by himself and by the students in the course of the accomplishment of the actual classroom task. He follows a decentering axis leading from the first person singular 'je', to the first person plural inclusive of the students and encoded in the morpho-syntax of the verb 'essayer' ('essayons' = *let's try*) and finally to the second person plural centred on the students ('essayez' = *try*). By these very means, the teacher defines himself as being responsible for proposing the task at hand (l. 1), while charging the students with accomplishing it (l. 3). However, in between this rigid definition of the asymmetrical reciprocal positionings, the teacher inserts a terrain of solidarity, encoded in his *let's try to assemble....* (l. 2). The inclusive use of the first person plural projects teacher and students for an instant on equal ground, creating a collective perspective

² The internal structure of the sequence is a first indicator of its fundamentally dialogic nature, which will be further developed under point 4.3. The speaker organizes his talk, by means such as syntactic incompleteness of the clauses and word interruption (l. 24/25), so as to accomplish his change from 'on' to 'je' without losing control over the turn at talk (cf. Sacks/ Schegloff/ Jefferson 1974). It is only after this that he solicits the tacit agreement of his interlocutors (by his 'hein', accompanied by rising intonation, l. 26) before reinforcing the attribution of the responsibility for the discourse to himself by repetition of 'je'. See Pekarek (in press) for a detailed discussion.

on the task at hand, and thereby mitigating the teacher's control activity just at the moment when the asymmetry between them is particularly relevant³.

The following sequence provides another example of this:

(example 2:)

alors nous allons regarder quelque:s quelques sujets plus précis vous
so we are going to have a look at so:me some more specific subjects you
allez choisir ce que vous voulez à discuter . communication entre
are going to choose what you want to talk about . communication between
élèves et professeur communication entre homme et femme
students and teacher communication between man and woman
communication entre suisses et étrangers communication entre
communication between Swiss and foreigners communication between
suisses alémaniques et suisses romands . . eh: j'aimerais savoir où sont
German speaking and French speaking Swiss . . uh: I'd like to know where
les difficultés où sont les problèmes où: sont: où est l'intérêt
the difficulties lie where the problems are whe:re are: where the interest is
. . . prenons peut-être tout d'abord la question la plus actuelle↑
. . . let's maybe first take the most topical question↑
la communication entre élèves et professeur↓ (8s) Hansjürg
communication between students and teacher↓ (8s) (name of student)

³ Note that although this utterance corresponds to what is often identified as an indirect speech act, there are two substantial reasons — one empirical and the other theoretical — for which an approach in terms of speech acts does not seem satisfactory for addressing the questions raised by the present data. First of all, the concrete problems addressed here pose themselves in terms where one specific occurrence of a form takes its function not by virtue of its relation to abstract patterns of speech regularities, but from the concrete patterns of oppositions occurring within a slot of talk (cf. point 4.3 infra). These patterns are not limited to one specific speech act type, but need to be accounted for across different occurrences (*we aren't talking about (...); let's try to assemble; we are going to have a look at (...); we always listen to the same thing*), and in opposition to other coding devices (*I am not talking about communication; when I talk to another student...*). Second, a position that considers linguistic forms under their aspect as ready-made instructional or interpretive markers, views hardly compatible with a perspective that sees these forms as functionally tied to *locally* instantiated social (and socio-cognitive) activities. In the present case, we are concerned not with type level representations that rely on the opposition between standard propositional meaning and departure from it, but with highly context sensitive tokens of language in use.

In this sequence again, the 'je' [I] distributing the task and the 'vous' [you] responsible for its accomplishment are counterbalanced by two inclusive first person plural references: the first within a definition of the task at hand (*we are going to...*) and the second, encoded in the morphosyntax of the verb 'prendre' ('prenons'), within a directive act. What becomes particularly apparent here is that the inclusive use is a way of masking — but not eliminating — the asymmetry of the reciprocal positionings: after having proposed to the students free choice as to what type of communication they want to talk about, the teacher closes his turn by making himself that choice.

In both of the quoted cases, the function of the first person plural inclusive reference is complex. If, by choosing an expression signalling shared group identity, the speaker introduces a link to his interlocutors, he also reduces his own responsibility and leads the addressees into an obligation pattern, as Mühlhäusler/Harré (1992, 178) have pointed out. However, as the collective references are placed in task distributing and directive activities produced by the one in the institutionally dominant position, their effect consists in attenuating the power of these very activities⁴. This point provides support for the notion that the motivations for speakers' coding options cannot be reduced to the informational level of talk but interact with the structure of the activities accomplished by talk (Ford/Fox 1996, Goodwin 1996, Pekarek 1997 and 'in press'). Clearly, the teacher's choices of deictic expressions appear to be a means by which he regulates a come-and-go between the affirmation of a dominant position and the diminution of the asymmetry according to his communicative objectives (defining the task, asking questions, making the students speak, etc.).

4.2. The Students' Referential Codings

The teacher's systematically inclusive use of 'nous' and 'on' sharply contrasts with the students' persistently exclusive use of these same expressions. A student's turn immediately following the repair sequence persuasively illustrates this point (l. 27/28). On one hand, the student responds to the teacher's repair section by implicitly confirming the correctness of the teacher's initial (!) statement according to which they (i.e. teacher and students) are talking about communication at that moment in class. On the other hand, by his very way of putting into words what in fact is a criticism addressed to the teacher, the student openly contrasts the class (exclusive use of 'nous') with the teacher ('vous'). This is not an isolated moment, as the following example, taken from the same lesson, illustrates. Here, the 'on' takes a generalized value (cf. pt. 3 supra) referring to any member of the collective of students

⁴ This is a procedure that has also been identified for other types of asymmetrical situations, such as interviews for instance (Pekarek 1993).

('on' = *you/one*, as a student), which the speaker is part of, and addressed to 'a teacher', who stands for the category teachers and is excluded from the group designated by 'on':

(example 3)

comme élève on ne peut pas parler franchement avec un professeur↑
as a student you can't talk frankly to a teacher↑

parce que on doit toujours eh penser s'il peut: être fâché ou
because you always have to uh consider whether he can be angry or

s'il peut être . . si on dit quelque chose qu'on ne . . pense pas comme ça↑
whether he can be . . if you say something you don't . . mean like that↑

. . c'est quand je parle avec un: un autre élève . je peux aussi dire
. . it's when I talk to a: a another student . I can also say

des choses qui sont un peu: . qui ne sont pas très clairs
things that are a little: . that are not very clear

What is particularly interesting about this example is the consistency with which the 'on', relating to the collective of students, confronts the category 'teacher' as long as there is some criticism of the latter involved, whereas the individual 'je' overtakes as soon as the teacher ceases to be the object of criticism.

The two quoted examples indicate that the students' systematic use of the exclusive 'on' is functionally tied to their institutional positionings as students as well as to the type of activity they accomplish: this use serves to dissimulate the antagonistic individual speaker, placed at the lower end of an asymmetrical relation, behind a collective and eventually to avoid possible sanctions for that individual, emanating from the one legitimately placed at the upper end of the asymmetry.

The examination of the teacher's and the students' coding options shows thus that the same linguistic forms are used by the two parties for opposed communicative ends. Their choices of person reference amongst the semantically and syntactically available — though not equivalent — options (in the present case 'je', inclusive 'nous/'on' and exclusive 'nous/'on') depend on and contribute to establishing the structure of the actions performed by talk (such as to criticize, to direct or to define a task) as well as the interactional positionings of the participants. This observation is consistent with findings by Ford/Fox (1996) and Goodwin (1996) in indicating that formal choices are functionally tied to a larger interactional and/or institutional context of which they contribute to activate, in a dynamic and variable fashion, the contextual relevances. With this in mind, let us return to the repair section with which we have started the analysis.

4.3. The Immediate Discourse Context of the Repair Sequence

What happens immediately before the repair section pertains to what I have just described as a collective criticism strategy employed by the students: after some criticism being put forward from the individual standpoints of the students' 'je', to which the teacher responds with curiosity (l. 16, 20), student C directly attacks the teacher's choice of the topic of discussion from the position of a collective 'on', excluding the teacher (l. 21 to 23). The very occurrence of the teacher's twofold repair in what follows as well as its overlap with student C's previous turn manifest the disconcerting effect of the student's collective criticism on the teacher. These elements concur to indicate that the student's use of a collective exclusive 'on' at the very moment of a criticism contributes to *change* the contextual relevances for the teacher. This observation confirms that the repair sequence and the formulation of reference are fundamentally interactional activities (see note 2): they are *reactions* to a contextual change accomplished by immediately preceding talk and need to be interpreted as such.

In fact, we have seen that the teacher uses an inclusive, solidarity marking 'on' or 'nous' (*we* = students and teacher) in order to mitigate the power of his control activities. Now, such a use would *not* be functional as a reaction to a criticism, addressed to the teacher himself and reinforced through reference to a collective source. On the contrary, it is the affirmation of the individual 'je' — the teacher in his dominant position who, in addition, has the legitimate right to insist '*I am talking about communication*' — that responds as a defence to the 'collective' attack⁵.

This is how the question of what is *not* chosen becomes relevant, and how what is or is not chosen is related, as a part of locally accomplished activities, to general communicative strategies pursued by the parties at talk. The recoding leading from the use of 'on' to 'je' is reactive to preceding talk and builds upon an opposition that is coherent with these larger strategies.

5. Discussion

The analysis has illustrated that the repair of the referential coding in example 1 is not limited to a correction of the propositional content of the utterance but is functionally tied to the larger referential strategies of teacher and students by which the social group of the class is moulded into different interac-

⁵ Note with regard to what has been said above (note 3) that an interpretation in terms of speech acts would not allow to account for the repair as part of locally accomplished strategies, building on the opposition between the three referential forms 'je, inclusive 'on/nous' and exclusive 'on/nous', and reflected in the speakers' choices amongst these forms.

tionally relevant shapes (students; student and teacher, teacher alone). What seems particularly interesting about the present case is however not so much the definition of a limited number of motivations for the choices of deictic personal pronouns and their communicative functions (e.g. mitigation of control or reinforcement of criticism), beyond the 'standard' function relying on the tu-vous distinction. It is rather the following observations:

- The analysis provides empirical evidence supporting the notion that what motivates choices among the possibilities offered by the linguistic system is not a pure indexical or referential functionality. These choices are also functionally embedded in the *action structure* of discourse, the aims pursued by the participants and their interactional positionings.
- The consistency with which these choices are made suggests that besides their local effects, it is their *structures of opposition* within a segment of talk that contribute to determining their communicative functions.
- These choices appear to be *creative* in that they contribute to dynamically establishing the participants' understanding of the social interactional context, to making these understandings mutually manifest and thereby to regulate the social co-ordination of their actions.

These findings suggest that a more encompassing understanding of the motivations and the interactional effects of speakers' coding options might be reached by investigating these options not only from the aspect of their dependency of context but also from the aspect of their contribution to the creation of interactionally relevant contexts.

6. Concluding Remarks

I wish to conclude this paper by alluding to some more general questions that arise from the analysis with regard to the relationship between text and context as well as the one between grammar and interaction.

The various ways in which the use of forms appears to be dependent on a dynamically evolving action structure of talk indicate that we can assume neither a stable relation between forms and functions, nor a static relation between text and context (cf. Fox 1994, Schiffrin 1994). This not only hints at the limits of context-free (and co-text-free) characterizations of linguistic forms; it also suggests the need for models that allow for a dynamic notion of context and can account for linguistic tokens not merely in terms of direct or stable reflections of communicative events but as part of speakers' strategically deployed and locally accomplished syntactic choices.

This also suggests an interactionally based notion of indexicality along the lines proposed by Goodwin (1996) who views formal choices as part of the indexes by which interlocutors manifest to each other their orientation towards interactionally established and maintained frames for interpretation

(i.e. contexts). To adopt such a point of view means to follow a perspective which considers language as action, and as pervasively indexical, not only in terms of the reference of deictic expressions, but above all in terms of a continuous modulation of context, of its continuous production through a discourse-action in constant accomplishment (Garfinkel 1967). This offers an interesting basis for exploring speakers' syntactic choices not only in terms of information management and other processing dimensions but also with regard to their contribution to interactional organization.

Symbols Used in Transcripts:

A, B, C	students	[]	overlap
T	teacher	↑	rising intonation
. . .	short pauses	↓	falling intonation
(3s)	pause (nb. of seconds)	THE	heavy stress
oui:	stretching of a sound	()	transcriber's comments
/	interruption of a word	xx	unidentifiable sequence

References

- Bar-Hillel, Yehoshua (1954). "Indexical Expressions." *Mind* 63: 359-379.
- Benveniste, Emile (1966 [1956]). "La nature des pronoms." *Problèmes de linguistique générale*, vol. 1. Paris: Galimard, 251-258.
- Brown, Roger and Arthur Gilman (1960). "Pronouns of Power and Solidarity," in T. Sebeok, ed., *Style in Language*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press, 253-276.
- Brown, Gillian and George Yule (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bühler, Karl (1990 [1934]). *Theory of Language: the Representational Function of Language* (translated by D. F. Goodwin). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Fillmore, Charles J. (1975). *Santa Cruz Lectures on Deixis*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- Ford, Cecilia and Barbara Fox (1996). "Interactional Motivations for Reference Formulation: «He had. This guy had, a beautiful, thirty-two O:lds»,» in B. Fox, ed., *Studies in Anaphora*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: Benjamins, 145-168.
- Fox, Barbara (1994). "Contextualization, Indexicality, and the Distributed Nature of Grammar." *Language Sciences* 16/1: 1-37.
- Freyne, Michael J. (1990). "The Strange Case of *on*," in P. Mühlhäusler and R. Harré, eds.
- Garfinkel, Harold (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall.
- Goffman, Erving (1974). *Frame Analysis*. New York: Harper & Row.

- Goodwin, Charles (1996). "Transparent Vision," in E. Ochs, E. Schegloff and S. Thompson, eds., 370-404.
- Gumperz, John (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hausendorf, Heiko (1995). "Deixis and Orality: explaining games in face-to-face interaction," in U. Quasthoff, ed., *Aspects of Oral Communication*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 181-197.
- Jakobson, Roman (1971 [1957]). "Shifters, verbal categories, and the Russian verb," in R. Jakobson, *Selected Writings*, vol. 2. The Hague: Mouton, 130-147.
- Mühlhäusler, Peter and Rom Harré (1990). *Pronouns and People: The Linguistic Construction of Social and Personal Identity*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Ochs, Elinor, Emanuel A. Schegloff and Sandra A. Thompson (eds., 1996). *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pekarek, Simona (1993). "Gestion des rôles dans l'interview semi-directive de recherche: activités de guidage et travail relationnel de l'intervieweur." *Bulletin CILA* 55: 85-103.
- Pekarek, Simona (1997). "Referential choices and the process of social coordination of talk." Paper presented at the 42nd Annual Conference of the International Linguistic Association (ILA), Georgetown University, 7-8 March 1997.
- Pekarek, Simona (in press). "on parle pas tellement maintenant je parle pas de médias hein»: pronoms déictiques et dynamiques de l'interaction." *ARBA* 1998, Bâle, Séminaire des Langues et Littératures Romanes.
- Riegel, Martin et al. (1994). *Grammaire méthodique du français*. Paris: PUF.
- Sacks, Harvey (1992). *Lectures on Conversation*. Oxford, Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel A. Schegloff and Gail Jefferson (1974). "A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-taking for Conversation." *Language* 50: 696-735.
- Schegloff, Emmanuel A. (1972). "Notes on a Conversational Practice: Formulating Place". in D. Sudnow, ed., *Studies in social interaction*. New York: Free Press, London: Macmillan, 75-119.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A., Harvey Sacks and Gail Jefferson (1977). "The Preference for Self Correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation." *Language* 53/2: 361-382.
- Schiffrin Deborah (1994). "The Textual and Contextual Basis of Discourse." *Semiotica* 102 1/2: 101-124.
- Schiffrin, Deborah 1992. "Anaphoric then: Aspectual, Textual, and Epistemic Meaning." *Linguistics* 30-4: 753-792.
- Silverstein, Michael (1976). "Shifters, Linguistic Categories and Cultural Description," in K.H. Basso and H.A. Selby, eds., *Meaning in Anthropology*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.