Self-Association in Murriny Patha Talk-in-Interaction

Joe Blythe[a]
[a] Australian National University and the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics,

Online publication date: 07 December 2010

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Self-Association in Murriny Patha Talk-in-Interaction*

JOE BLYTHE

Australian National University and the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics

When referring to persons in talk-in-interaction, interlocutors recruit the particular referential expressions that best satisfy both cultural and interactional contingencies, as well as the speaker's own personal objectives. Regular referring practices reveal cultural preferences for choosing particular classes of reference forms for engaging in particular types of activities.

When speakers of the northern Australian language Murriny Patha refer to each other, they display a clear preference for associating the referent to the current conversation's participants. This preference for Association is normally achieved through the use of triangular reference forms such as kinterms. Triangulations are reference forms that link the person being spoken about to another specified person (e.g. Bill's doctor). Triangulations are frequently used to associate the referent to the current speaker (e.g. my father), to an addressed recipient (your uncle) or co-present other (this bloke's cousin).

Murriny Patha speakers regularly associate key persons to themselves when making authoritative claims about items of business and important events. They frequently draw on kinship links when attempting to bolster their epistemic position. When speakers demonstrate their relatedness to the event's protagonists, they ground their contribution to the discussion as being informed by appropriate genealogical connections (effectively, 'I happen to know something about that. He was after all my own uncle').

Keywords: Person Reference; Aboriginal Talk-in-Interaction; Kinship; Epistemic Authority

© 2010 The Australian Linguistic Society

1. Introduction[1]

When participants in talk-in-interaction refer to non-present third persons, they choose the reference forms most likely to fulfil their own personal objectives, address the interactional contingencies of the unfolding discussion, and satisfy relevant cultural protocols. Reference forms may be classified according to their structural properties. On account of these properties, certain classes of forms are differentially weighted towards satisfying various personal objectives, and interactional or cultural contingencies. Every time they refer to someone, speakers must choose the reference forms most likely to satisfy the personal, interactional and cultural requirements applicable for the particular occasion of reference.

When speakers of the Aboriginal language Murriny Patha converse with each other, they frequently use reference forms that associate non-present persons to themselves. They tend to do this *self-association* when positioning themselves as being authoritative, or at least knowledgeable, about the business at hand. This process of recruiting reference forms for self-association is but one specialization of what has been attested elsewhere as a conversational preference for *associating non-present persons to the current conversation's participants* (Brown 2007; Stivers 2007).

In earlier research on English talk-in-interaction, Sacks and Schegloff (1979) noted that the vast majority of person-references can be satisfied by two preferences: *Minimization* and *Recipient Design*. Minimization is the preference for using single (as opposed to multiple) reference forms, whereas Recipient Design is the preference for using 'recognitionals'—reference forms that invite the recipient to recognize someone that they know, that they suppose the speaker also supposes them to know (Sacks 1992: vol 2, 445; Schegloff 1996: 459). More often than not, both preferences are simultaneously satisfied by the production of a first name, names being the 'prototypical and ideal recognitionals in part because they are minimized reference forms ...' (Sacks & Schegloff 1979: 18). Sacks and Schegloff revealed that when the preference for using recognitional expressions comes into conflict with the preference for using single (as opposed to multiple) reference forms, the latter preference is relaxed in favour of the former.[2]

More recently, cross-linguistic studies of talk-in-interaction in minority and endangered languages have revealed two new preferences: *Association* (Brown 2007)

---

[1] Abbreviations used in this paper: ANAPH = anaphoric demonstrative, br = brother, DAUC = 'daucal' (dual/paucal), DIST = distal, DU = dual, DUB = dubitative, EMPH = Emphatic, EX = exclusive of the addressee, EXIST = existential, F = feminine, fa = father, FOC = focus, FPP = first pair part (of an adjacency pair), INTENS = intensifier, IO = indirect object, LOC = locative, M = masculine, mo = mother, NFUT = non-future, NSIB = non-sibling, OIR = other initiation of repair, PAUC = paucal, PART = particle, PL = plural, POS = possessive, PROX = proximal, PST = past, PSTIMP = past imperfective, REDUP = reduplication, RR = reflexive/reciprocal, S = subject, s = singular, SPP = second pair part (of an adjacency pair), TOP = Topicalizer, TS = trouble source, zi = sister. 1, 2 or 3 = first, second or third person. Subsequent numbers between 8 and 38 indicate verb class. For example, 3sS.23.NFUT would be a fusional morpheme glossed as 'third singular subject, class 23, non-future'.

[2] Further on these two preferences (Minimization and Recipient Design/Recognition) see Hacohen and Schegloff (2006), Schegloff (1996, 2007a), Levinson (1987, 2007) and Blythe (2009).

and *Circumspection* (Levinson 2007) (see below). Whilst the universal applicability of these preferences to talk-in-interaction remains to be decided (Stivers *et al.* 2007), both preferences surface in conversational Murriny Patha (Blythe 2009). Murriny Patha is a regional lingua franca spoken in the vicinity of Wadeye, the Northern Territory of Australia's largest Aboriginal community, by over 2,500 people.

This paper reports field research into talk-in-interaction conducted in Wadeye in the Murriny Patha language. The corpus that informs this study is comprised of nearly an hour of transcribed talk-in-interaction. The audio recordings were made in Wadeye, NT, between 2004 and 2007, by the author. The transcriptions are predominantly of natural conversation, though also included are three short discussions about traditional Murriny Patha song, recorded as an outcome of multidisciplinary musicological research. Due to the relatively modest size of the corpus, all findings presented here should be considered to be of a preliminary nature.[3]

2. Types of Murriny Patha Referential Expressions

Murriny Patha is a polysynthetic headmarking language that exhibits both fusional and agglutinating morphology. Because both free and bound pronominal series make pervasive use of fusional non-sibling number markers (e.g. *-nintha*, 'dual, masculine, non-sibling'), Murriny Patha verbal expressions regularly mark 'siblinghood' (as well as person, gender and number). Morphologically, Murriny Patha verbs range in complexity from the relatively simple (e.g. *mam*, 3sS.say/do.NFUT, 'he/she said/did [it]') through to the exceedingly complex (e.g. *wurdam-ngintha-dhawi-weparl-warda-gathu*, 3sS.30.NFUT-DU.F.NSIB-mouth-be_level-then-towards, 'then the two non-siblings, at least one of whom was female, spoke out in unison'). These verbal expressions are best thought of as complex words that are used for both referring to persons (and/or things) and for saying something about the actions or states that those persons/things are involved in.[4]

Broadly speaking, in talk-in-interaction, the expressions that Murriny Patha speakers use for referring to persons can be grouped into six basic types:

- *personal names*;
- *nicknames*;
- *minimal descriptions*;
- *verbal cross-reference*;
- *free pronouns*; and
- *triangulations*.

---

[3] Although expansion of the corpus (with video recordings) is currently underway, the new material has not yet been parsed and translated to the standard required for inclusion in the present study.

[4] Due to semantic interdependence between the various bound pronoun series and the fusional number marking morphemes, bound pronouns cannot be considered to be argument affixes, which they can in certain other Australian polysynthetic languages (cf. Baker 2002; Evans 2002). As such, the entire verb complex should be thought of as a multifunctional word that is jointly used for both reference and predication at the same time. See Blythe (2009) for details.

Each of these person reference types has properties that makes it appropriate for use on particular reference occasions. *Personal names* are quite specific reference forms that are used regularly as recognitionals for initial references to persons. The same is true of *nicknames* (which mostly describe the referent's physical ailments, e.g. *Pinggarlma*, 'bad knees'; *Tepala*, 'deaf one'). Nicknames are recognitionals that are not subject to the many taboos that render the use of a name inappropriate (see below). *Minimal descriptions* are precisely that—short simple descriptions that are possibly recognizable though are not necessarily recognitional in design (e.g. *kardu ngalantharr*, '[the/an] old man', *wakal perrken'gu*, 'two children'). Non-initial references to persons are normally done with *verbal cross-reference* alone (that is, with a verb form unaccompanied by any nominal reference forms).[5] *Free pronouns* are mostly used for re-activating reference. That is, they are typically used for re-mentions of a person following topical shifts in which yet other persons are referred to in the interim.[6] *Triangulations* (a class of reference forms that include possessed kinterms) are referential expressions that link the person being spoken about (the referent) to another specified person (e.g. *my uncle*, where the referent is linked to the speaker, or *John's bank manager*, where the referent is linked to a person named *John*). Triangulations are the reference forms that allow Murriny Patha speakers to associate one person to another.

3. Associating Non-Present Persons to the Present Conversationalists

In Murriny Patha conversation, it is quite common for speakers to associate non-present persons to one or more of the current conversation's participants. This preference for *Association* to the present conversationalists has also been identified in Tzeltal conversation (Brown 2007). As with Tzeltal speakers, Murriny Patha speakers usually choose kinterms to create the link. Like most traditionally oriented Aboriginal groups in Australia, the Murriny Patha have an extensive classificatory kinship system (Falkenberg & Falkenberg 1981; Falkenberg 1962; Stanner 1936; Blythe 2010) that allows every individual to relate to every other using a kinterm. That is, all individuals may be related, either as blood relatives, by marriage and/or through classificatory kinship relations. In the case of kinterms, it is the *propositus* relation that enables these expressions to *triangulate*. The propositus is the person to whom the kinterm is anchored, or through whom the term is reckoned (Merlan 1989: 227). The propositus may be first person (the current speaker), as in *my uncle*, second person, as in *your brother* or third person, as in *John's cousin*.

---

[5] The tendency to use *verbal cross-reference* alone (or implied 'zero' references) for 'locally subsequent' references to persons makes this reference type the interactional counterpart to using pronouns for 'locally subsequent' reference in English conversations. As such, verbal cross-reference is the unmarked form for use in 'locally subsequent reference positions' (Schegloff 1996: 450; Blythe 2009). Placing these forms in non-subsequent reference positions allows speakers to do '"pointed" reference' (Schegloff 1996: 455)—that is, to perform special activities *by* referring to them.

[6] Thus free pronouns are typically used for person references that are 'locally initial', though 'globally subsequent' (Blythe 2009).

Kinterms are not the only expressions that allow speakers to triangulate. Any referential expression that links the person being spoken about to another individual or individuals can be thought of as a *triangulation*.[7] In Murriny Patha talk-in-interaction the class of triangulations include *inclusory constructions* (Singer 2001) (which do not concern us for this paper) and *elided progeny constructions*. Elided progeny constructions are specialized kin-based instantiations of the Murriny Patha possessive construction.

Possession (whether alienable or inalienable) is maximally expressed with a formula of the type given in example (1); where a cross-referencing possessive pronoun, encliticized to a possession group, agrees in number and gender with the possessor.

1. | **Possession group** | | X-ref poss^{v} pronoun |
     | possessed | possessor | |
     | [*muluk* | *Thanggirra* |] = *nigurnu* |
     | [son | woman's_name |] = 3sFPos |
     | 'Thanggirra's son' | | |

2. | [*muluk* | Ø |] = *nigurnu* |
     |---|---|---|
     | [son | Ø |] = 3sFPos |
     | 'her son' | | |

3. | [Ø | *Thanggirra* |] = *nigurnu* |
     |---|---|---|
     | [Ø | woman's_name |] = 3sFPos |
     | 'Thanggirra's [son/daughter]' | | (an elided progeny construction) |

In conversation, however, it is far more common for speakers to elide either the possessor, as in example (2), or the possessed, as in example (3). The *elided progeny construction* is a special case of the latter formulation that is used only for reference to the biological child of the overtly expressed possessor. In these constructions, the gender of the person being spoken about must be inferred from context, but the gender of the parent is overtly expressed.

Whilst triangulations needn't require a kin-based manner of association, the majority of triangulations do draw on genealogical links, in some fashion. For this reason, the forms that are used for associating non-present persons to the present conversationalists are those that locate the discussion within a genealogical setting. Because the size of the speech community is small enough that virtually all adults know each other's genealogies, to at least some degree, all kin-based triangulations are potentially recognizable, even if they aren't necessarily designed as being recognitional.[8]

---

[7] Triangulations should not be confused with tri-relational kinterms (McConvell 1982; McConvell & Obata 2006) which have not been attested in Murriny Patha discourse.

[8] Only the addressee-associated triangulations (e.g. *your uncle*, *your mechanic*) are necessarily recognitional in design. Such forms make explicit that the referent is known to the recipient, and that the speaker knows the referent to be known by the recipient.

In Murriny Patha talk-in-interaction, it is quite common for speakers to introduce a new referent using a recognitional triangulation, such that the referent is associated to co-present conversationalists; as in line 113 of Fragment 1 where Phyllis associates a new referent to three co-present granddaughters of Elizabeth.[9]

Fragment 1:   On the Flat (2005-07-05JB01)

107	Eliz	Mangala°la°	ka̲nardang	ka̲rdaya.
		mangalala	*kanam-rang*	*karda-ya*
		man's name	3sS.be.nFut-get shot/speared	Prox-Dub
		`Mangalala was shot here.`		

108   (1.6)
109 JC   xxxxxx xxxx¿
110   (0.3)
111 Eliz Mm.
112   (1.8)

113	Phyl	Mu¿ (.) muluk pule pigunuka ngarrangu kanardang,	← first mention
		mu [*muluk pule*] = *pigunu-ka* *ngarra-wangu* *kanam-rang*	
		Oh! [great-grandfather] = 3PL-Top where-direction 3sS.be.nFut-get shot/speared	
		`Oh, `**`their great-grandfather`**`, which way did he get speared?`	

114   (1.1)

115	Phyl	(pilampi.)
		pilampi
		salt flat
		`(salt flat).`

116   (0.34)

117	Eliz	Nyinika	kanyungu,
		nyini-ka	*kanyi-wangu*
		Anaph-Top	Prox-direction
		`That was this way.`	

Alternatively, once the conversationalists' recognition of the referent has been established, it is quite common for the recipient of a prior reference to associate the same referent to themselves, as in line 54 of Fragment 2, or to their addressee, as in line 195 of Fragment 3.

Fragment 2:   Wurltjirri (2005-07-15JB04b)

52	Rita	= > mindilbitj	nganggganimin<	ka̲rrim	yam-	wulmitjin > wangu < ,
		mindilbitj	*ngangga-nimin*	*karrim*	*yam-*	*wulmitjin-wangu*
		cemetary	there-Intens	3sS.stand. Exist	repairable	old mission-direction

---

[9] The man *Mangalala* mentioned in line 107 is not the same person as the three girls' great-grandfather referred to in line 113. In this case, the noticeable similarity in the fate of the former man to that of the latter (both were either speared or shot in the vicinity) prompts Phyllis's enquiry as to exact location of the latter's demise.

```
                   He [Piyelam] is [buried] right there in the cemetary, at the old mission.
53                 (0.34)
54    →    Felix   piyelam  yalngayya.
                   piyelam      yalngay-ya
                   man's.name   my.father-PART
                   Piyelam [was] my father.
55         Rita    Yu::.
                   yeah.
```

Fragment 3: On the Flat (2005-07-05JB01)

```
194   JC   niy↑urnu da    kardu,  (.) nangari.
           nigunu    da         kardu nangari
           3sF       place/time human subsection
           That's her now, Nangari ((who was in the belly)).
194        (0.18)
195   Phyl  Yu nangari  kanggurl nyinyinukunuya.     ← elided progeny construction
            yu   nangari   [Ø  kanggurl = nyinyi     ] = nukunu-ya
            yes  subsection [Ø  fa.fa = 2sPOS         ] = 3sMPOS-PART
            Yeah Nangari [is] your father's father's [daughter].
```

Whilst it can be difficult to pinpoint the speaker's exact motivations for making such associative references, certain explanations may be ruled out. In Fragment 1, the recognitional triangulation *muluk pule pugunuka* was not the only option available to Phyllis to use as a recognitional. She might easily have referred to the girls' grandfather by name, but she didn't. We may thus rule out name-avoidance as driving the use of this form.[10] In Fragments 2 and 3, the conversationalists' recognition had already been secured. In each fragment the associative triangulations provide additional information about the kinship links that connect the referent with the present conversationalists. This information is not necessarily required for understanding what sort of events have transpired. Rather, it seems that there is importance placed on acknowledging the connections that exist between the present interlocutors and those being spoken about.

   Although the corpus that informs the study is not large, the findings to date suggest that interlocutor-associated references are made quite frequently. Of the 53 initial references to non-present Aboriginal individuals in the corpus, 20 (37.7%) were associated to the present conversationalists with a kin-based triangulation, either with the initial reference (15.1%) or with a subsequent reference (22.6%). But is this proportion sufficient for claiming that what we are observing is a conversational preference, rather than a noted tendency? If Association is a bona fide preference, then

---

[10] The man had been dead long enough that any taboos on the use of his name would have long passed. Indeed, his name has become the three girls' surname.

there ought to be an expectation by conversationalists that speakers should make such associative references when the occasion to do so arises. We might therefore expect that a speaker's failure to make such associations to be noticeable to co-present participants as a failure. Fragment 4 suggests that co-participants do indeed (at least sometimes) notice the absence of appropriate associations. Moreover, the failure to make an appropriate association is a conversational problem that is potentially repairable.

Fragment 4: On the Flat (2005-07-05JB01)

```
45   Phyl   Aa:.  ↑karduyida puddanayitjthapurniya.
            Aa      kardu-yida  puddana-yitj-tha = purni-ya
            Oh!    human-??   3PLS.30.PSTIMP-tell story-Pst = 3PLS.go. PSTIMP-DUB
            Oh! They used to tell the story.
46          (0.6)
47   Eliz   Mm.
48   Phyl   Da  nukunuka    minggi    yileyile    mamngarrungime.
            Da      nukunu-ka minggi       Yile-REDUP   mam-ngarru-ngime
            place/time 3SM-TOP  woman's.name Father-REDUP  3sS.say.nFut-1DAUC.exIO-PAUC.F.NSIB
            Minggi's own father told us.
49          (1.5)
50   Phyl   Pana. (.)  marip, (0.28)    kanggurlanggurlya.          ← TS
            pana            marip           kanggurl-Redup-ya
            that.you.know   woman's.name   fa.fa-REDUP-DUB
            That paternal grandfather of Marip.
51          (0.45)
52   Phyl   thunggu   mawu⌈mawu   kardanugathu    nuradhadi⌉ni.
            thunggu     mawumawu    karda-nu-gathu   nura-dha = dini
            fire        rifle/shotgun here-DAT-towards 3sS.go.PSTIMP-PST = 3sS.sit.PSTIMP
            He came this way for a rifle.
53   UnId            ⌊mmh hm ha ha ha ha              ⌋
54          (1.0)
55   Eliz   tha↑miny    ↓nga:y,                ← OIR
            thamuny        = ngay
            mo.fa          = 1sPOS
            my maternal grandfather.
56          (0.2)
57   Phyl   i   thamuny      ↑nyi⌈nyi↓yu.⌉     ← RS
            i       thamuny        = nyinyi
            yeah    mo.fa          = 2sPOS
            Yeah your maternal grandfather.
58   UnId                     ⌊Mmha ha.⌋
```

In Fragment 4, Phyllis is recounting the story of a battle. In a two part turn spanning lines 50 and 52, she announces that a particular person came this way looking for a rifle. Her initial recognitional reference to this man is with a kin-based

triangulation, *pana Marip kangurlangurlya*, 'that biological father's father of Marip'.[11] Although the man in question was deceased long before many of those present were born, the 'recognitional' demonstrative *pana* (Himmelmann 1996) invites recipients of the story to locate the person within a genealogical network. The person Marip is not present. In line 55, in an insert sequence in the storytelling, Elizabeth proposes an alternative kin-based formulation with herself as propositus, *thaminy ngay*, 'my maternal grandfather'.

This alternative construal is presented as a candidate formulation to be confirmed as being the same person, or contradicted for being someone else. The reference form has an unusual intonation pattern. The word *thamuny* (here pronounced *thaminy*), 'maternal grandfather', ordinarily attracts stress on the first syllable. In this case, the stress pattern has been tweaked by placing the pitch peak on the adjacent syllable. This high-pitched second syllable contrasts in terms of relative pitch to the word *ngay* which falls, and then rises slightly, giving the intonation unit a slightly rising terminal contour. This 'tweaking' draws the hearer's attention to the referential item and thus to the candidate-referent being proposed (the maternal grandfather).

Because this kinterm-based referential item is the first pair part in an insertion sequence that immediately follows a prior referential item of the same type, attention is brought not only to the prosodically marked item and its referent, but to the prior one, and its referent as well. This juxtaposition of similarly fashioned constructions problematizes the prior referential item, challenging the storyteller to ascertain whether the participants referred to in both referential formulations are one and the same. This repair initiation locates a problem with the choice of Marip as propositus for the kinterm.

Confirmation is provided in the next turn (line 57) (*i*, 'yeah') and the alternative formulation is ratified by its repetition, thus completing the repair. Given that it was possible to associate the referent to co-present conversationalists, and that Phyllis actually chose the optimal referential category with which to do so (a triangulation), the failure to comply with the preference was not only noticeable, but problematic and in need of repair. If it were merely a case of her requiring clarification as to who Phyllis had in mind, Elizabeth could have presented the name of her long-dead grandfather for her confirmation. Rather, Elizabeth's association of the referent to herself underscores her descendency from the man in question, a kinship link that under present circumstances ought to have been acknowledged. The fragment demonstrates that if the propositus may be anchored to a co-present conversationalist, speakers are expected to do so. It is this demonstrated expectation that points to Association being a *bona fide* conversational preference.

---

[11] In Murriny Patha, the reduplication of nominals marks either plurality or intensification. Reduplicated kinterms either denote more than one member of the specified kin-relation, or a single, biological (as opposed to classificatory) kinsman, as is the case here.

4. Self-Association and Epistemic Authority

Brown (2007) and Haviland (2007) suggest that in the Mayan languages Tzeltal and Tzotzil, respectively, if both current speaker and addressee can be associated to the referent then the addressee is the preferred option, even when the speaker is genealogically closer to the referent than the addressee. In Murriny Patha talk-in-interaction, it seems that speakers do not preferentially associate to the addressee, nor does the question of self vs. other relate to genealogical proximity to the referent. Rather, the basis for deciding how to construe associative references seems to be linked to the activity the speaker is currently engaged in (cf. Stivers 2007). Space does not permit discussion of the motivation for addressee-association here.[12] However, speakers regularly associate the referent to themselves when they want to present themselves as having knowledge about certain people or events.

Fragment 5:   Longbum Dinner (2004-09-12JB04)

```
1  Lucy  pe̲djetka    ⌈k a n yi   d a m a⌉tha↑yu (0.3)      xxx
         pedjet-ka        kanyi    damatha-yu               xxx
         man's name-Top PROX     really-??                  xxx
         Pedjet was right here.

2  Eliz             ⌊°Pangu° dangatha⌋
                     pangu    dangatha
                     DIST     proper
                     That place there.

3         (1.4)

4  Eliz  Purltjenya     kardu ngi- ↑nyini   >kanyi      da      wangu, <
         purltjen-ya         kardu ngi- nyini  kanyi    da       wangu
         man's name-DUB   human repairable ANAPH PROX  place/time direction

5         banawa̲tjthawarda (0.6)    a- u-;
          bana-watj-tha-warda               a- u-
          3sS.18.PSTIMP-be born-PST-       poor thing
            then
          I think Purltjen was born around here, poor thing.

6  (0.9)

7  Lucy  Mika      lala     panguwathu   ngananame̲andjidharra:ya::    karda; =      ←TS
         mi-ka   lala       pangu-wathu  ngana-na-mandji-dharra-ya              karda
         veg-Top cycad fruit DIST-direction 1sS.PSTIMP-3sIO-carry.on. shoulder-moving- here
                                                    PART
          I was carrying cycad fruit over there to him on my shoulder.

8  Eliz  = Eh? =                                                               ←OIR

9  Lucy  =Ngarra   tha̲miny ngay.                                              ←RS
          ngarra     thamuny=ngay
          LOC        mo.fa=1sPOS
          to my maternal grandfather.
```

---

[12] Though addressee-association is certainly implicated in inviting the recipient to recognize the referent. See Blythe (2009) for details.

```
10          (1.1)
11 Lucy     ngunanakudha.
            nguna-na-ku-dha
            1sS.go.PstImp-3smIO-throw-Pst
            I was throwing [down the cycad fruit] for him/to him.
12          (1.6)
```

In line 1 of Fragment 5, Lucy begins to tell a story. She uses a name, *Pedjet*, to introduce an old man who has been deceased for many years, announcing he had been 'right here'. In the following line, Elizabeth mentions another old man, Purltjen, as having been born in the area. In line 7, Lucy goes on to say *Mika lala ngananamandjitharraya karda*, 'I carried cycad fruit **to him** on my shoulder'.

In line 8, Elizabeth produces an open class repair initiator, *Eh?*. Lucy treats the repair initiator as pertaining to a problem of potentially ambiguous reference. Two males have just been named—it is not clear which of the two had been the recipient of the cycad fruit.

In line 9, Lucy repairs the problem by conveying recipiency with the preposition *ngarra* and a self-anchored kinterm *thaminy ngay* (line 9), 'to my grandfather' (in this case, fa.mo.br). The grandfather in question was the same Pedjet that she had mentioned previously in line 1. In order to repair the problem, Lucy could alternatively have repeated the name *Pedjet*, but she hasn't done that. Instead she anchors the kinterm to herself. In her next turn she continues the story using the first person verb *ngunanakudha*, 'I was throwing [down the cycad fruit] for him/to him', thus reiterating that she had actually been in the area and participated in the events being recounted.

It so happens that Pedjet's biological son was a co-present recipient of this particular storytelling. Lucy might also have chosen this son as propositus for the kin term *yile*, 'father' but she hasn't done that either. That Pedjet was the father of this co-present son was certainly not news to the other conversationalists. However, by associating the referent to herself, rather than to the son, she makes a claim on the referent, as kin, that bolsters her already strong credentials to be telling the story about the man in question. If it were the case that this self-associative reference was improperly construed,[13] then Pedjet's son might have presented a self-anchored candidate reformulation (e.g. *yalngay*, 'my father') in the space available following the reference (line 10), in a manner reminiscent of the preceding fragment. That he instead remains a taciturn recipient of the storytelling suggests that at least the construal of this reference is unproblematic for the story recipients.

Self-association is not merely a tactic employed by speakers with first-hand experience of events being discussed. Speakers with relatively weak epistemic authority also self-associate as part of their demonstrations that they know something about, if not the actual events, then at least about the persons involved.

---

[13] That is, on account of possibly preferential association to the addressee, or of the closer genetic distance of the referent to one of the story recipients.

Fragment 6: Longbum Dinner (2004-09-12JB04)

289   MnMn   Aa   Bere   nu- (0.4)   tju   nungamethurrwarde.
              Aa   Bere   nu-   *tju   nungam-methurr-warda*
              Um   right   repairable   striker   3sS.go.NFut-give_beating-then
              Ah right he- (0.4) then he gave her a hiding.

290   (1.7)

291   Eliz   Punibatthawarda;
              puni-bat-tha-warda
              3sS.23.PstImp-hit-Pst-then
              He was beating her?

292   (0.17)

293   MnMn   Tju punibattha:rdi; (0.3)   tju   ↑ma↓ngeya.
              tju   puni-bat-tha = kardi   *tju   mange-ya*
              striker   3sS.23.PstImp-hit-Pst-3sS.be.PstImp   striker   hand-Dub
              He was beating her (0.3) with his hands/fists.

294   (2.8)

295   Lucy   Mm.

296   (0.6)

297   Eliz   bangamkamumuyyana:::m   ↑ku   parl.
              Bangam-ngkamuymuy = kanam   *ku   parl*
              3sS.14.NFut-hit_face-Pst = 3sS.be.NFut   animate   torpid
              He was hitting her in the face till she was nearly dead

298   UnId   xxx   ⌜xxx⌝   xxx [0.3]

299   Lucy   ⌊M m⌋,

300 → Carm   Eh. (1.2)   °Kakan ngay   mange   ngallayu°.
              Eh   kaka   = ngay   mange   ngalla-yu
              yeah   mo.br   = 1sPos   hand   large-??
              Yeah. (1.2) My uncle had big hands (he was very powerful).

303   MyCr   (7.6)

304   MnMn   tjuka   tju   ↑marrarldju,
              tju-ka   tju   mararl-yu
              Striker-Top   striker   Billygoat plum-??
              With a stick from a Billy Goat Plum tree,

305   (0.6)

306   MnMn   ngenangkawupthangardi   ngayyu.
              ngena-ngkawup-tha = ngardi   ngay-yu
              1sS.21.PstImp-block_with_fighting_stick-Pst = 1sS.be.PstImp 1sS-??
              I was blocking [her] attacks.

Fragment 6 is extracted from a conversational narrative. In a piece of collaborative storytelling, Manman is recounting a story she tells quite frequently about a series of battles between herself and her jealous classificatory sister. Manman and the sister were both co-wives of their late husband. Whilst their husband was away, the jealous sister beat up Manman with a wooden club. When he returned and saw Manman badly beaten, he became angry and beat the jealous wife with his hands/fists (line 293). In collaboration with Manman's telling of the story, Elizabeth adds (line 297)

that he was hitting her in the face until she could no longer move. At line 300, Carmelita (who was probably not yet born at the time of the events being discussed) makes a minimal contribution to the telling by confirming that the late-husband, who she refers to as her *kaka* (mo.br), did indeed have large hands; which is a way of saying that he was very powerfully built. After a pause in the telling (line 303), Manman recommences the story (lines 304 and 306) by moving on to subsequent battles with the same sister.

As a recipient of a story about events that she cannot possibly have witnessed, Carmelita's contribution to the telling comes from a position of weak epistemic authority. Nonetheless, her contribution is framed as one that is knowledgeable. The little that she is in a position to contribute (an assessment of his physical attributes) is packaged as a self-association through the use of the kin-based triangulation *kakan ngay*, 'my uncle'. Carmelita might just as easily have referred to the man by name, or with an addressee-associated construction (e.g. *nanggun nyinyi*, 'your husband'); but she didn't. Instead, the self-association is tied to a contribution that shows she knows something, if not about the actual events, then at least about one of the participants—'I know he was strong because he was my uncle'. The contribution has the effect of ratifying the telling of the story for being consistent with her memory of the man in question.

Speakers' self-associations are regularly tied to claims for epistemic authority and thus may be seen as part of the bid for knowledgability. Because they are visible as part of a claim for authority, the deployment of self-association invites scrutiny of the claim's veracity. In the next two fragments, a group of Murriny Patha people are discussing a *djanba* song which has just been played, and for which a group of researchers will shortly elicit the song text. In the song text given in example (4), a man asks his wife, 'Tidha,[14] what's the place where there is smoke visible in the distance?' The woman then replies, 'That's Ninbingi where the clouds are forming'.

4.   The song-text (djanba 59)

H: '*Tidha thanggurda warda panguwathuyu werrpi kingawatkurranya?*'
      'Tidha, what's that place over there where there is smoke visible from a long way off?'

W: '*Daka ninbingika pangurdaya ngarra kalakkalak kanambepkemya.*'
      'That over there is Ninbingi, where the clouds are forming.'

Fragment 7: Ninbingi (2005-07-15JB01a)

```
27 Felix °daka        Ninbingika    pangurdaya  ⌈ngarra kalakkalak°⌉  ((singing))
         daka         ninbingi-ka   pangu-rda-ya  ngarra kalakkalak
         place/time-TOP place name-TOP DIST-LOC-DUB  LOC    cloud
            Ninbingi is the place where the clouds ...

28 Lucy                                          ⌊yal↑ngayyathu.  ⌋←claim, triangulation
                      yalngay-gathu
                      my father-Foc
```

---

[14] *Tidha* is a totemic moniker for people of the Murriny Patha patriclan *Yek Nangu*.

```
                                         It was my father.
29 Felix  = kanambepkem.        ((singing))
          kanam-wep = kem
          3sS.be.EXIST-be clouds forming = 3sS.sit.EXIST
          are forming.
30 Eliz   yakay          yile          nyinyi;              ←OIR, triangulation
          yakay          yile          = nyinyi
          surprise token father        = 2sPos
          Your father?!!
31 Felix  ((Singing))
32 Lucy   pinggarlmarde;                                    ←RS, nickname
          pinggarl-ma-rde
          knee-COM-FOC?
          It was Pinggarlma ((nickname: knees-having)).
33        (0.36)
34 Eliz   (h)a(h)wu.                                        ←disagreement token
          awu
          no
          N(h)o!! ((very breathy, like a growl))
35        (0.45)
36 Felix  Yeah.
37 Lucy   (w⌈ayini-)
38 Eliz    ⌊kandilmunya  kandilmun- (0.2)deneninthanumardadharrpudha;←counter-claim
          kandilmun-ya          kandilmun      dene-ngintha-marda-dharrpu-dha
          woman's name-DUB woman's name   3sS.21.RR.PSTIMP-DU.F.NSIB-abdomen-ask-PST
          Kandilmun Kandilmun and someone else [her husband] asked each other
39        da            kurlurlurl    pangu⌈yu.⌉            ←counter-claim continued
          da                          kurlurlurl    pangu-yu
          place/time                  place name    DIST-??
          at kurlurlurl.
40 Felix                               ⌊da ⌋nidharrpuwadiniya.
                                      dani-dharrpu-dha-wa = dini-ya
                                      3sS.21.RR.PSTIMP-ask-PST-EMPH = 3sS.sit. PSTIMP-DUB
                                      He/she was asking.
41        (0.22)
42 Eliz   °nu°kunuwathu    mamnge          xxx              ←counter-claim continued
          nukunu-gathu     mam-nge         xxx
          3sm-Foc          3sS.say/do.NFUT-3sFIO  xxx
          It was him who said it to her.
43 Lucy   Aa               yu          yu      djiwa;
          Aa               yu          yu      dji-wa
          Oh!              yeah        yeah    there-EMPH
          Ah yeah yeah, that's how it was.
```

In Fragment 7, whilst Felix sings the song, Lucy uses the self-anchored kinterm
yalngay ('my father', line 28) to make the claim that it was her father that asked the

question of his wife. In line 30, Elizabeth displays her astonishment with this claim by prefacing the recycled kinterm (*yile nyinyi*, 'your father') with the reaction token (Wilkinson & Kitzinger 2006) *yakay*, which marks surprise. Schegloff (1996) finds that recipients of an initial reference frequently recycle those initial reference forms in framing a disagreement. Here the recycled kinterm locates a problem, thus other-initiating a repair sequence. Schegloff (2007b: 102–104, 151) also notes that insertion expansion repair sequences can pre-figure disagreements.[15]

Lucy treats this other-initiation of repair not as challenging her claim, but as pointing to the reference being insufficiently specific. Thus in line 32 she upgrades the reference by providing the nickname *Pinggarlma*, effectively specifying the person in question as not her own biological father, but one of his two brothers.

In line 34, Elizabeth strongly displays her disagreement with Lucy's claim by producing the gravelly disagreement token *(h)a(h)wu.*, 'N(h)o!!'. Then, in a turn spanning lines 38, 39 and 42, she makes a counter-claim—that it was a woman called *Kandilmun* and her husband that had had this particular exchange. In the face of this alternative version of events, Lucy (line 43) backs down from her initial claim.

In Lucy's initial reference she associates the referent to herself in making an authoritative claim about the referent and the event. In challenging the veracity of Lucy's claim, Elizabeth recycles the reference form but reverses the polarity of the association (from self to other), thus problematizing not only the reference, but the association to self. The challenge to the claim is packaged as an astonished repair initiation. This other-initiation provides the opportunity for a backdown or for mitigation of the prior claim. Regardless of whether Lucy actually perceives the repair initiation as a challenge to her version of the events, she deals with the repair initiator by treating the problem as one of potential ambiguity. Here the method employed for making an authoritative claim actually backfires and provides the tools with which to challenge the claim.

Support for self-association being seen as a marker of epistemic authority can be found in the vigour with which Elizabeth attacks Lucy's claim, and with it her self-association. Some speakers of Aboriginal English would say that Elizabeth, in line 34, has 'growled' Lucy. The verb *growl* (or the Kriol *gralim*) (Lee 2004) is used transitively when someone chastises or scolds another person or animal, often whilst literally growling, as is the case here.

---

[15] As this example from Schegloff (2007b: 102) illustrates. Note also the recycling of 'sound happy'.

```
1   Bee   = [W h y]  whhat'sa mattuh with y Yih sou[nd HA:PPY,] hh   ← FPP_base
2   Ava                                    [ Nothing.  ]
3   Ava   u- I sound hap[py?]                                       ← FPP_insert
4   Bee              [Yee]uh.                                       ← SPP_insert
5         (0.3)
6   Ava   No:,                                                      ← SPP_base
```

In addition to Association, there are sometimes other preferences that contribute in driving the selection of a self-associative reference form. However, this additional level of complication needn't detract from self-association being linked to bids for epistemic authority.

5. Circumspection and Self-Association

The recognizability of a reference is critically important when new referents are introduced into conversation. The small population of Wadeye ensures that virtually all adults are potentially recognizable. For introducing new referents, personal names would appear to be the default reference forms (which is consistent with talk-in-interaction conducted in more mainstream languages). Their being the default is borne out (in part) by the frequency of their usage. From the one-hour corpus of talk-in-interaction, of the 53 recognitional references to non-present third persons, 36% were done with a bare personal name—more than any other referential category.[16] Yet 36% is not a particularly high figure for claiming a default class. The relatively low percentage is due in part to the numerous naming taboos that exist in Wadeye.

The taboos include restrictions on naming the deceased, on naming certain affinals, on naming opposite-sex siblings and close opposite-sex cousins. Even same-sex siblings practise a non-obligatory form of name avoidance in that they preferably address each other with a nickname, rather than by name. In their application, each taboo extends to the namesakes (and even to the place-namesakes) of the avoidable person. Thus, for one reason or another, every participant in conversation needs to avoid producing (or hearing) a whole raft of personal names—either as an outcome of restrictions that apply to themselves, or restrictions that apply to their interlocutors. However, if no constraints apply to a particular name, then interlocutors will readily use that name as a recognitional. On this basis, names can be considered the unmarked (or default) form for recognitional reference.

At this point it is necessary to introduce a further preference *Circumspection*, which emerges from Levinson's (2007) work on Yélî Dnye, the language of Rossel Island: *If possible, observe culturally and/or situationally specific constraints on reference and avoid the default reference form* (after Levinson 2007). In Wadeye, as on Rossel Island, Circumspection amounts to a culturally specific preference for not using certain names in certain situations. In Murriny Patha talk-in-interaction, Circumspection, the preference for not using certain names, conspires with Association, the preference for triangulating via co-present conversationalists, in making triangulations the optimal forms for use as 'avoidance recognitionals'. Any class of reference form that is used in such a way that the recipients' recognition of the referent is actively solicited,

---

[16] Cf. 26% for triangulations, 15% for minimal descriptions, 4% for nicknames, 7.5% for free pronouns, 13.2% for verbal cross-reference.

apart from the person's name, can be considered an avoidance recognitional.[17] In Fragment 8 we will see two very complex triangulations recruited for use as avoidance recognitionals. The participants are discussing the same djanba song encountered just previously.

Fragment 8: Ninbingi (2005-07-15JB01a)

```
9     Eliz  Tidha                thanggurda warda            panguyu.
            tidha                thanggurda warda            pangu-yu
            Spirit of Yek Nangu person  what place? now      DIST-??
            'Tidha ((totemic name)), what's that place called?'
10          (0.14)
11    Lucy  Yukuy       thanggarda   ⌈(pangu).⌉
            yukuy       thanggurda   pangu
            place/time-TOP  what place?  DIST
            Thats right, 'what's that place'?
12  → Mary                         ⌊m e n g e  ⌋dhawa⌈:;⌉
                                    me-nge-dha-wa
                                    3sS.say.PstImp-3sIO-Pst-EMPH
                                    [He]/she was saying to her.
13    Eliz                               ⌊Me ⌋⌈ngedha(pirri)⌉=
                                    me-nge-dha-pirri
                                    3sS.say.PstImp-3sIO-Pst =3sS.stand.PstImp
                                    [He]/she was saying to her ...
14    Felix                                    ⌊Rwr- wrr-    ⌋((disfluent))
15  → Eliz  =nu⌈kunuwathu      =tjarriwurdi   (niyur°n°u)ya.⌉
            nukunu-gathu      Tjarriwurdi =   niyurnu-ya
            3SM-FOC           woman's.name =3SFPOS-PART
            It was him [who was saying it], Tjarriwurdi's [son].
16  → Mary  ⌊menge°dha°    nukunuwathuya;=          pipin⌋ngay     nigurnu;=
            me-nge-dha     nukunu-gathu-ya          [pipin=ngay   ]=nigurnu
            3sS.say.PstImp-3sIO-Pst 3sm-FOC-DUB     [fa.zi=1sPos  ]= 3sFPOS
            It was him who was saying to her, my aunt's [son].
17  →       =puwarli ngay       nyiniya.=
            pugarli=ngay       nyini-ya
            cousin=1sPos       ANAPH-DUB
            That one [is] my cousin.
18  → Eliz  =Kandilmunya.
            kandilmun-ya
            woman's name-DUB
```

---

[17] Avoidance recognitionals may be thought of as a specialization of Stivers' (2007) 'alternative recognitionals' which are recognitional reference forms that depart from the unmarked forms for recognitionals (names). In these cases, the departures are driven by the need to avoid a particular name. For both speaker and hearers alike, there is an assumption that the form is being utilized on account of a naming restriction.

```
          Kandilmun ((woman's name)).
19        (0.3)
20  Felix Yeah yeah be-       benguny     tje ngandjinngem    mam         xxx =
          yeah yeah be-       berenguny   tje ngandjin = ngem mam         xxx
                    repairable OK         ear 1sS.have.NFUT = 3sS/say.NFUT xxx
                                              1sS.sit.NFUT

          (Yeah yeah, OK OK, I know, He/she said [it].
21  Felix  = nginipunywa;              u,
           nginipuny-wa                u
           similar-Emph                ??
           That's how it was.
```

In this fragment there is considerable overlap as there were a lot of people in the same room (six Murriny Patha consultants and four academics engaged in musicological research). In line 9, Elizabeth produces part of the first line of the song—a line of reported speech, 'Tidha, what's that place called?'. In line 12 Mary explicates that it was the husband that was speaking to his wife—*mengedhapirri*, '[he]/she was saying to her'.[18] In lines 13, 15 Elizabeth produces a complex reference form consisting of a verbal cross-reference (*mengedhapirri*, '[he]/she was saying to her'), a free pronoun (*nukunuwathu*, 'it was him') and a triangulation (*tjarriwurdi-niyurnuya*). The triangulation is an elided progeny construction in which the named propositus is a (non-present) woman named *Tjarriwurdi*.[19] The man in question is a classificatory brother of the speaker and hence, a person she should not mention by name. Thus, the entire combination is recruited for use as an avoidance recognitional. Note that in line 18, Elizabeth displays no problem with naming the man's wife.

In lines 16 and 17, in overlap with Elizabeth, Mary also produces a complex reference to the same man. The reference is an elaboration on her previous reference to the husband (line 12). Her version also includes an elided progeny construction in which the same woman *Tjarriwurdi* is chosen as propositus for the elided kinterm [son/daughter]. In this case, the husband's mother is expressed as a self-anchored kinterm *pipin ngay*, 'my aunt' (thus, 'my aunt's [son]', rather than '*Tjarriwurdi's* [son]').[20] We thus have a triangulation embedded within a triangulation, and as a result, an association of the referent to the speaker, by way of the referent's mother.

Note however that Mary's complex reference includes an extra reference form, the self anchored kinterm, *puwarli ngay nyiniya*, 'that cousin of mine'. This extra reference form is one that explains the motivation for the speaker's circumspection. Like opposite-sex siblings, close opposite-sex cousins should also not be named

---

[18] Subjects of Murriny Patha verbs are unmarked for gender. That the subject is understood to be male is a result of a contrast with the explicitly feminine reference to the wife, done with the 3sFIO -*nge*.

[19] As such, Elizabeth is not here associating the referent to any of the present interlocutors.

[20] [Ø *pipin* = *ngay*] = *niyurnu*
      [Ø fa.zi = 1sPOS] = 3sFPOS
      'my aunt's [son/daughter]'

overtly. In terms of speech production, the avoidance of the name has come at quite some cost.[21] The production of this extra reference form is unlikely to increase the likelihood of securing her recipients' recognition of the referent because this is genealogically redundant information. A son or daughter of one's aunt is necessarily one's cousin.[22]

The gains appear to be in favour of Association. Here Mary twice associates the referent to herself; firstly, indirectly—by way of her aunt, then secondly, directly—by choosing herself as propositus for the kinterm *puwarli*, 'cousin' (mo.br.so, fa.zi.so). Note that her initial (embedded) triangulation was produced in overlap with Elizabeth's line 15, whereas this extra reference is produced in the clear. Here Mary does more than merely restate the associative reference for the benefit of any hearers that might have missed it. She also amplifies the self-association by taking a more direct pathway to the referent.

The recording was made for the purpose of musicological research. Elizabeth was an accomplished singer and was generally regarded by Murriny Patha people and researchers alike, as an undisputed authority on the djanba repertory. However in this fragment, Mary shows that she too has knowledge about this particular song. She underscores the point by drawing on a kinship association to one of the persons concerned. Effectively, she demonstrates that she knows what she knows (at least in part) because the man in question was her own cousin, and not a distant cousin either. He was the actual son of her own aunt.

Her knowledge of the song and the information surrounding its composition is evidenced by the accordance of her statement with that of Elizabeth. Mary seeks to validate her knowledge of the facts through a genealogical relation to one of the persons partaking in the dialogue reported in the song, as though the kinship link should somehow constitute the necessary proof. The Murriny Patha kinship system not only provides a framework on which reference to all persons may be constructed, but it also seems to be a yardstick by which a speaker's credibility can be measured. In line 20 Felix acknowledges the information that the two women provide to be correct. He certainly does not take issue with either woman's version of the events.

6. Conclusion

The preference for Association, as applied in the context of Murriny Patha talk-in-interaction, reflects a very Aboriginal way of speaking in which kinship is placed front and centre. In its application, the preference serves the function of grounding

---

[21] The production of this extra reference form effectively amounts to a relaxation of the preference for Minimization. The question is, however, 'In favour of what has Minimization been relaxed?'.
[22] Strictly speaking, it isn't completely redundant information. In addition to fa.zi, *pipi* can also denote the avoidable *nginarr* variety of 'aunts' (sp.mo, mo.mo.br.da), whose children are second cousins (*nanggun*, mo.mo.br.da.so and *purrima*, mo.mo.br.da.so). However, marriageability of these kin would not have triggered the name avoidance required for a close opposite-sex cousin (*pugarli*).

466 J. Blythe

the discussion as being informed by the genealogical setting in which the inter-locutors find themselves.

The extensive classificatory kinship system and the relatively small speech community ensure (at least for the present) that kinterms and other kin-based triangulations are always available for reference to individuals of Aboriginal extraction. As a result of this, it is likely that for any conversation, each individual may be associated, as kin, to the present conversationalists. The corpus demonstrates that conversationalists do regularly associate non-present referents to the present interlocutors, sometimes to several of the interlocutors. This regularity is not the only evidence suggesting the existence of a preference for Association. Fragment 4 (in which the selection of a non-present person as propositus for a kin-based triangulation was deemed to be a repairable problem) suggests that Association is actually a cultural expectation, and that failure to meet that expectation, when the opportunity to do so arises, is potentially noticeable to co-participants as a conversational shortcoming.

When a referent may be associated to more than one member of the conversing group, triangulations are not preferably construed through the addressee (as has been suggested for certain Mayan languages), nor is the decision (as to self, addressee or other) made according to conversationalists' genetic distance from the referent. Rather, these decisions are linked to the activity the speaker is currently engaged in. Self-association seems to be a strategy for positioning oneself as being authoritative, or at least knowledgeable, about the business at hand. The regular occurrence of self-associations in claims for epistemic authority suggests that linking a referent to the self is visible as part of the bid for enhancing that authority. This is partially evidenced in Fragment 7 by the vigour of Elizabeth's attack on Lucy's (unfounded) claim for knowledgability.

We observe self-associative references surfacing in contexts both where the speaker's epistemic position is relatively strong (e.g. in having been physically present at the events in question) as well as in contexts where the speaker's epistemic position is comparatively weak. In the former cases self-association can be seen as bolstering the speaker's position, sometimes to the point of bragging. In the latter cases, self-associating seems to be a mechanism for demonstrating the speaker's not being completely ignorant about the matters being discussed. We also observe that even when the interactional waters are muddied by the name-avoidance (i.e. when Circumspection demands the selection of an 'avoidance recognitional'), self-association can still be associated with bids for enhanced epistemic authority.

The practice of self-associating to bolster one's epistemic position, although certainly not unique to Aboriginal discourse, does reflect an Aboriginal conception of self in which the individual is not autonomous, but rather is defined by reference to other members of a social grouping: whether as a node within a family tree, a member of a clan associated with a particular clan-estate, a member of a ceremonial group, a member of a family/mob/gang or football team. As such, speakers seek to ground their epistemic authority within these sorts of social structures. The individual's position within the

relevant social structures grants them certain rights and responsibilities to speak about country, songs, totems, etc. The practice of self-associating uses these socially determined rights and responsibilities to build a foundation on which one's epistemic position can be established. Presumably positioning oneself as a credible authority relies, at least in part, on there being some substance to the manner of association.

References

Baker B 2002 'How referential is agreement? The interpretation of polysynthetic dis-agreement morphology in Ngalakgan' in N Evans & H-J Sasse (eds) *Problems of Polysynthesis* Berlin: Akademie Verlag. pp. 51–85.

Blythe J 2009 *Doing referring in Murriny Patha conversation* Unpublished thesis, University of Sydney.

Blythe J 2010 'Kinship structure vs. kinterm usage: a conversationally grounded re-assessment of the Murriny Patha kinship lexicon' Paper presented at Australian National University.

Brown P 2007 'Principles of person reference in Tzeltal conversation' in NJ Enfield & T Stivers (eds) *Person Reference in Interaction: linguistic, cultural and social perspectives* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 172–202.

Evans N 2002 'The true status of grammatical object affixes: evidence from Bininj Gun-wok' in N Evans & H-J Sasse (eds) *Problems of Polysynthesis* Berlin: Akademie Verlag. pp. 15–50.

Falkenberg A & J Falkenberg 1981 *The Affinal Relationship System: a new approach to kinship and marriage among the Australian Aborigines at Port Keats* Oslo Studies in Social Anthropology No. 1 Oslo: Universitetsforlaget Oslo.

Falkenberg J 1962 *Kin and Totem: group relations of Australian Aborigines in the Port Keats district* Oslo: University Press Oslo.

Hacohen G & EA Schegloff 2006 'On the preference for minimization in referring to persons: evidence from Hebrew conversation' *Journal of Pragmatics* 38: 1305–1312.

Haviland JB 2007 'Person reference in Tzotzil gossip: referring dupliciter' in NJ Enfield & T Stivers (eds) *Person Reference in Interaction: linguistic, cultural and social perspectives* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 226–252.

Himmelmann NP 1996 'Demonstratives in narrative discourse: a taxonomy of universal uses' in BA Fox (ed.) *Studies in Anaphora* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lee J 2004 *Kriol–Ingglish Dikshenri: Kriol–English Dictionary* SIL Darwin Available at: http://www1.aiatsis.gov.au/ASEDA/docs/0739-Kriol/index.1.html.

Levinson SC 1987 'Minimization and conversational inference' in J Verschueren & M Bertuccelli-Papi (eds) *The Pragmatic Perspective: selected papers from the 1985 International Pragmatics Conference* Amsterdam: John Benjamins. pp. 61–129.

Levinson SC 2007 'Optimizing person reference—evidence from repair on Rossel Island' in NJ Enfield & T Stivers (eds) *Person Reference in Interaction: linguistic, cultural and social perspectives* Language Culture and Cognition (7th edition) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 29–72.

McConvell P 1982 'Neutralisation and degrees of respect in Gurindji' in J Heath, F Merlan & A Rumsey (eds) *Languages of Kinship in Aboriginal Australia* Sydney: University of Sydney.

McConvell P & K Obata 2006 'A higher order of kinship semantics: trirelational kinterms and kin' Paper presented at *The Third Oxford–Kobe Linguistics Seminar: the linguistics of endangered languages* Available at: Kobe wiki.pacific-credo.fr/images/6/65/Kobe_poster_final.pdf.

Merlan F 1989 'Jawoyn relationship terms: interactional dimensions of Australian kin classification' *Anthropological Linguistics* 31(3–4): 227–263.

Sacks H 1992 *Lectures on Conversation (Vols 1 and 2)* Oxford: Blackwell.

Sacks H & EA Schegloff 1979 'Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversation and their interaction' in G Psathas (ed.) *Everyday Language: studies in ethnomethodology* New York: Irvington. pp. 15–21.

Schegloff EA 1996 'Some practices for referring to persons in talk-in-interaction' in BA Fox (ed.) *Studies in Anaphora* Typological Studies in Language. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. pp. 437–485.

Schegloff EA 2007a 'Conveying who you are: the presentation of self, strictly speaking' in NJ Enfield & T Stivers (eds) *Person Reference in Interaction: linguistic, cultural and social perspectives* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 123–148.

Schegloff EA 2007b *Sequence Organization in Interaction: Volume 1: A Primer in Conversation Analysis* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Singer R 2001 'The inclusory construction in Australian languages' *Melbourne Papers in Linguistics and Applied Linguistics* 1(2): 81–96.

Stanner WEH 1936 'Murinbata kinship and totemism' *Oceania* 7(2): 186–216.

Stivers T 2007 'Alternative recognitionals in person reference' in NJ Enfield & T Stivers (eds) *Person Reference in Interaction: linguistic, cultural and social perspectives* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 73–96.

Stivers T, NJ Enfield & SC Levinson 2007 'Person reference in interaction' in NJ Enfield & T Stivers (eds) *Person Reference in Interaction: linguistic, cultural, and social perspectives* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 1–20.

Wilkinson S & C Kitzinger 2006 'Surprise as an interactional achievement: reaction tokens in conversation' *Social Psychology Quarterly* 69(2): 150–182.

Appendix: Key to Transcription

⌈,⌊,⌉,⌋	Overlapping speech.
(0.9)	Silence (i.e., 0.9 seconds).
(.)	0.1 seconds of silence.
(text)	Difficult to discern text. Bracketing indicates either a best guess at transcription or text alleged by consultants that is perhaps dubious.
((text))	Transcriber's notes.
-	An abrupt cut off, usually a glottal stop.
=	Latching between different speakers; or, disjoined transcription of the same of the turn after a point of possible completion.
xxx xx	Indiscernible speech.
hh	Audible aspiration.
.hh	Audible inhalation.
(h)	Word internal laughter particle; or, a breathy syllable.
°Text°	Utterance is softer than surrounding talk.
Str<u>e</u>ss	Stress is marked by underlining.
:	Colons (without underlining or adjacent underlining) indicate lengthening or drawl.
↓, ↑	Marked shift to higher or lower pitch.
:∼↓	A downward pitch-glide.
:∼↑	An upward pitch-glide.
?	Fully rising terminal intonation.
.	Fully falling terminal intonation.
¿	Mid-high rising terminal intonation.
;	Mid-low falling terminal intonation.

Appendix (*Continued*)

,	Slightly rising terminal intonation.
_	Flat terminal intonation (neither rises nor falls).
x:	Rising-falling intonation.
x:	Falling-rising intonation.
←, →	Point of interest relevant to discussion.
Bold ←	Particular point of interest.