



HAL
open science

The pronoun *se* in the context of syntactic and discursive ruptures of spoken texts

Outi Duvallon

► **To cite this version:**

Outi Duvallon. The pronoun *se* in the context of syntactic and discursive ruptures of spoken texts. Laury, Ritva. Minimal reference: The use of pronouns in Finnish and Estonian discourse, Finnish Literature Society, pp.163-189, 2005, *Studia Fennica Linguistica*. halshs-00674795

HAL Id: halshs-00674795

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-00674795>

Submitted on 28 Feb 2012

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Outi Duvallon

The pronoun *se* in the context of syntactic and discursive ruptures of spoken texts

1 Introduction

This paper proposes a syntactic approach to the use and interpretation of the Finnish pronoun *se* ‘it, s/he’ in spoken texts. The analysis is concentrated on a particular context of use in which the host construction of the pronoun is an utterance that suspends another ongoing verbal construction, as in example (1).¹ The pronoun *se* ‘it’ points to a referent whose lexical description is unachieved in the context previous to its occurrences:

(1)

--- nin näil on kuulemma valtavan s- hieno niinku *ei se mikään mökki o vaan se on semmonen hirsitupa + oikeen ja sit siel on kaikki mikroaaltouunista ja astianpesukoneest lähtien*

--- so I heard they have a very b- splendid uh *it's not at all any cottage but it is a timbered house + really* and then there is everything from a microwave oven and a dishwasher (Summer plans 079)

This example is different from a prototypical case of anaphora in which the pronoun is preceded by a full lexical antecedent. However, I will argue that the interpretation of the pronoun *se* ‘it’ takes place here essentially inside the linguistic context, i.e. by establishing a connexion between its host constructions and the sequence suspended.

In order to analyse this kind of use of the pronoun *se*, I take a viewpoint of production of verbal constructions in spoken discourse. My aim is to pay attention, on the one hand, to some characteristics of lexical naming processes and to show, on the other hand, that the pronoun *se* is an original referring expression: it can be used for picking out a referent with a minimum of descriptive content not only when lexical descriptions of the referent are already made, but also when they are still in progress or still being negotiated, and even when they are momentary unavailable.

This paper is organized as follows. I will first briefly present the pronoun *se* in light of the Finnish third person pronoun system. Secondly, I will define the basic notions of the syntactic framework adopted here. Then I will discuss some models by which lexical descriptions are built up in oral productions. Finally, I will analyze extracts of the type presented above from the perspective of the emergence of the linguistic context in which pronouns are used. The

first part of the paper examines sequences which have a clearly metalinguistic function and the second part presents an example of a non-metalinguistic parenthetical insert.

2 The pronoun *se* in the Finnish pronominal system

Finnish grammars have traditionally classified the pronoun *se* as a demonstrative pronoun, but many authors have also, more or less explicitly, integrated this pronoun into the category of personal pronouns (see for instance Penttilä 1963: 508–511; Saukkonen 1967; A. Hakulinen 1985, 1988; Hakulinen et al. 1994: 215). In the system of three demonstratives *tämä*, *tuo* and *se*, the first two have been described in terms of proximity, i.e. proximal or distal with regard to the speaker, whereas the pronoun *se* has been considered more neutral in relation to the distance and is said to have its referential landmark in the addressee. Compared with the other two forms, the pronoun *se* has thus been deemed less clearly demonstrative and particularly suited for “anaphoric” uses (cf. Setälä 1891: 76–77; Penttilä 1963: 510–514; Hakulinen 1985; Larjavaara 1985, 1990: 93–157, 2001).

More recently, Etelämäki (1996, in this volume), Laury (1997) and Seppänen (1998) have revisited the Finnish demonstrative system within interactional and conversational frameworks. Rejecting the static, distance-based view, these studies claim that demonstratives allow the speaker to assign different statuses to referents, to organize structures of interaction and to manage participant roles in conversation. According to Laury (1997: 59), by using the pronoun *se*, the speaker places the referent in the addressee’s social and cognitive sphere (cf. Itkonen 1966: 421). Seppänen (1998), who treats the use of third person pronouns as devices for referring to co-participants in conversation, suggests that the pronoun *se* invites the recipients to seek its interpretation source in the world of discourse even if the referent is present in the current speech situation (see also Etelämäki 1996: 62–66). In the most typical cases, the pronoun *se* seems to refer to referents that have already been introduced into discourse by other forms or that are otherwise already in the participants’ centre of attention (Laury 1997: 77–87). Thus the recent studies, as well as traditional descriptions, see the pronoun *se* primarily as an “anaphoric” pronoun.

Note that according to the classic theory of anaphora, the anaphoric status of third person pronouns results from the fact that these forms lack a lexical content (see e.g. Milner 1982: 20). In order to be interpreted, the third person pronouns should be related to lexical content

available in their linguistic context (Milner, op. cit.: 31).² Functionally oriented approaches have abandoned this purely textual conception in favour of a re-definition of anaphora as a procedure by which the speaker invites the hearer to sustain his attention on a referent previously introduced in focus of discourse (Ehlich 1982; see also Givón 1983; Chafe 1987; Ariel 1988; Gundel et al. 1993).

However, although the pronoun *se* typically serves as a tracking form, its use is not constrained by a previous lexical mention of the referent or by the presence of the referent in the situation of utterance. For instance Laury (1994, 1997: 125–128, in this volume) has examined the use of the pronoun *se* as a first mention pronoun (see also Fox 1987: 67–69; Ziv 1996). This kind of use, and more generally all cases in which the referential target of the pronoun is not explicitly and unequivocally given in its immediate context of use, draw attention to the role the host construction plays in the interpretation process. In fact, instructions carried by the host construction of the pronoun and the position of this construction in the larger linguistic context offer crucial criteria for the pronominal reference resolution.

By its inherent semantic properties, the pronoun *se* sets few restrictions on its potential referents. Like the other Finnish third person pronouns, it distinguishes between singular and plural number. However, Finnish lacks grammatical gender. Furthermore, in non-standard Finnish, the referent of the pronoun *se* can be human or non-human, animate or inanimate, a discrete entity or a propositional content. Note that the pronoun *hän* which is reserved in standard Finnish to refer to human referents is used in most varieties of spoken Finnish as a logophoric pronoun by which the speaker displays his identification with another individual referent's viewpoint (Laitinen 2002).

In sections 4.2 and 5, I will describe patterns by which the referential anchoring of the pronoun *se* can be defined in textual domains of the linguistic context.

3 Some preliminary considerations

3.1. The governing verb and reaction places opened by it

The framework of my syntactic analysis is the Pronominal Approach developed by Blanche-Benveniste et al. 1987 (see also Blanche-Benveniste 1997; for an application to Finnish, see

Tiainen-Duvallon 2002). In this theory, the syntactic description is grounded on the notion of the verb. Verbs are governing elements which are endowed with a constructional power, i.e. an ability to organise other elements around them. The syntactic slots a verb creates in its environment will be referred to as *rection places* (places de rection) in this paper.

The constructional power of a verb is taken to be an inseparable property from its lexical content (Blanche-Benveniste 1997: 99). In contrast, rection places opened by a verb can be identified without any lexical content, by using pronouns, and more generally, different kinds of pro-forms. In Finnish, among the latter, there are the “true” pronouns with the complete declension in cases, but also pro-adverbs (Airila 1940) such as locative demonstratives (e.g. *siellä* ‘there’) and temporal adverbs (e.g. *silloin* ‘then’).³

Pro-forms are indeed surer syntactic indicators than lexical forms of nouns (cf. also Helasvuo 2001: 34). First, pro-forms can present rectional features imposed by a verb regardless of the probability of lexical combinations. Secondly, pro-forms bring out differences in rectional features that nouns do not always show (cf. Tarvainen 1977: 43–44; Hakulinen & Karlsson 1979: 175):

(2)

Hän meni *sinne* ~ *Pariisiin*_{ILL} ~ *Venäjälle*_{ALL}.
‘He went *there(to)* ~ *to Paris* ~ *to Russia*.’

(3)

Hän ihastui *siihen*_{ILL} ~ *Pariisiin*_{ILL} ~ *Venäjään*_{ILL} ~ *ranskalaiseen*_{ILL} *keittiöön*_{ILL}.
‘He fell in love *with it* ~ *with Paris* ~ *with Russia* ~ *with French food*.’

For instance the verb *mennä* ‘to go’ in (2) has in its construction a locative element which indicates the directional feature of “movement towards”. This feature is one of the three distinctions (“position”, “movement from” and “movement towards”) made on the dimension of “direction” in the Finnish case system (Siro 1960: 29–30; see the appendix). However, the verb *mennä* ‘to go’ does not impose on its locative complement the choice between the illative and the allative cases which belong to two different series of cases on the dimension of “quality” in the local case system. This choice depends on the nominal lexeme which realizes the locative rection place. Syntactically, the two lexical realizations *Pariisiin*_{ILL} ‘to Paris’ and *Venäjälle*_{ALL} ‘to Russia’ are equivalent to the proadverb *sinne* ‘there(to)’ which distinguishes only three forms indicating the features on the dimension of “direction”: *siellä* ‘there’ (position), *sieltä* ‘from there’ (movement from) and *sinne* ‘there(to)’ (movement towards).

The verb *ihastua* ‘to fall in love’ in (3) has in its construction an element in the illative case, and all realizations of this rection place are syntactically equivalent to the pronoun *se* in the illative case, *siihen*_{ILL} ‘with it’.

The syntactic equivalence between pro-forms and lexical realizations of rection places serves to distinguish elements that are constructed by a verb from elements that are not (see note 3), and it serves also to recognise idiomatic expressions in which the lexical element having an appearance of a complement is more or less set, like *huomioon*_{ILL} in *ottaa huomioon*_{ILL} ‘to take into consideration’ (?*ottaa siihen*_{ILL} ‘?to take into it’).

In brief, pro-forms function as grammatical tools in the syntactic description of units constructed by a verb. We can consider them basic forms compared with lexical forms of nouns. A pro-form is syntactically equivalent to a paradigm of different lexical realizations in a rection place opened by a verb. In addition, note that this equivalence between pro-forms and lexical forms is not limited to verbal constructions, but it concerns also constructions of other grammatical categories, like postpositions in Finnish.

3.2. The rection paradigms

In both oral and written productions, rection places are likely to receive multiple realizations. Put differently, we can expect to find in the spoken chain elements that do not combine to form syntagmatic units, but which instantiate the same rection place and form paradigmatic lists (cf. Blanche-Benveniste 1987: 137–142, 1990: 13–19). It is thus advisable to distinguish in the spoken chain two kinds of relations and respectively two axes of progression, the syntagmatic axis and the paradigmatic axis.

The idea of these two basic axes of language was formulated by F. de Saussure in his *Course in general linguistics* (1983[1916]), and we find it later also in the works of R. Jakobson (see for instance 1956). According to the former, linguistic production processes bring into play a double system of syntagmatic units and associative groupings:

Our memory holds in store all the various complex types of syntagma, of every kind and length. When a syntagma is brought into use, we call upon associative groups in order to make our choice. - - - In uttering the words *que vous dit-il?* (‘what does he say to you?’), we vary one element in a latent syntagmatic type of which other examples would be *que te dit-il?*, *que nous dit-il?* etc. (‘what does he say to you/us/them...?’ etc.). This is the process involved in our selection of the pronoun *vous* in *que vous dit-il?* In this process,

which involves eliminating mentally everything which does not lead to the desired differentiation at the point required, associative groupings and syntagmatic types are both involved. (Saussure 1983[1916]: 128–129.)

Utterances seem then to be constructed and perceived as combinations of different elements, selected from paradigmatic sets of possible alternatives.

The constituents of a context are in a status of *contiguity*, while in a substitution set signs are linked by various degrees of *similarity* which fluctuate between the equivalence of synonyms and the common core of antonyms. (Jakobson 1956: 61.)

To Saussure and Jakobson, syntagmatic relations of combination (or contexture) are realized in discourse, while associative or paradigmatic relations of selection (or substitution) belong only to the code, i.e. to an abstract system that constitutes a language, and are not realised in discourse.

However, empirical data show that lexical selection processes are not exclusively a matter of the speaker's memory (Blanche-Benveniste 1990: 14). Selection processes leave traces in the actual linguistic production and sometimes they occupy an important place in it. The syntagmatic advancement of an utterance can be stopped on a rection place that is instantiated several times. In fact, the introduction of lexical elements into rection places follows regular patterns in oral productions. By way of illustration, consider the following four examples.

The first realization of a rection place can be done with an element without any lexical content. In example (4), the locative complement of the verb *lentää* 'to fall' is announced by the element *sinne* 'thereto', a locative demonstrative indicating the directional feature of "movement towards". This demonstrative is followed by a pause and then it is repeated in front of a noun in the allative case, *tielle* 'road', which expresses the same directional feature ("movement towards") as the demonstrative:

(4)
minä lensin pylylleni *sinne* + *sinne tielle*_{ALL}
I fell on my behind *on the* + *on the road* (Hairdressing salon 105)

In Finnish, the autonomous pro-forms and the demonstrative determiners are morphologically identical. It could then be possible to analyze example (4) as a figure of right dislocation, with the first realization of the locative rection place made by a pro-form closely attached to the verb and a lexical realization of the same place being located in the periphery of the

construction. But we can also see here a repetition typical of oral productions at the beginning of a syntagmatic unit before the introduction of lexical elements (cf. Blanche-Benveniste 1987: 133).⁴ If these two analytical possibilities exist in theory, the interpretation of a particular occurrence is likely to be guided by prosodic features and the larger context of use, in particular by the presence or absence of a referential anchoring to the pro-form. The second analysis is a hypothesis on the suspension of the syntagmatic axis of the utterance. This hypothesis is visualised below in a figure that exploits the horizontal and vertical axes of the page (see Blanche-Benveniste 1990). When paradigmatic elements are placed one below the other in a vertical column, the syntagmatic axis emerges on the horizontal dimension:

minä	lensin	pyllylleni	sinne
I	fell	on my behind	on the
			sinne tielle _{ALL}
			on the road

In any case, whatever the syntactic analysis may be, we have here an example in which a rection place is announced by a non-lexical element before the lexical realization. Secondly, a rection place can be reinstated in order to increase the degree of lexical specification. In example (5), paradigmatic reiterations target the place of the valency complement of the verb *kiittää* ‘to thank’. This rection place is first realized by the noun phrase *kaikkia_{PAR} naisia_{PAR}* ‘all women’ in which the lexical head (*naisia* ‘women’) is a basic level categorization (cf. Rosch 1977; Cornish 1996: 33). After having completed the syntagmatic axis of the utterance (by the sequence *kuten tapana on* ‘as is customary’ encircled by the addressee’s responses *joo joo, niin*), the speaker re-edits the valency complement of the verb *kiittää* ‘to thank’. The elements *Hanna_{PAR}* ‘Hanna’, *äitiänsä_{PAR}* ‘his mother’ and *ketä_{PAR} kaikkiansa_{PAR}* ‘everybody’ form a list in which the noun phrases are, as in the first realization, in the partitive case which the verb *kiittää* ‘to thank’ imposes on its valency complement:

- (5)
 S1 ku se esipuheessaan kato kiittää *kaikkia_{PAR} naisia_{PAR}*
 because he in his preface you see thanks *all women*
 S2 joo joo
 oh
 S1 kuten tapana on
 as is customary
 S2 niin
 yes
 S1 *Hanna_{PAR} ja äitiänsä_{PAR} ja ketä_{PAR} kaikkiansa_{PAR}*

Hanna and his mother and everybody (Summer plans 079)

se	esipuheessaan	kato	kiittää	kaikkia ^{PAR}	naisia ^{PAR}	kuten	tapana	on
he	in his preface	you see	thanks	all	women	as	customary	is
					Hanna ^{PAR}			
					Hanna			
			ja		äitiänsä ^{PAR-POS}			
			and		his mother			
			ja		ketä ^{PAR} kaikkiansa ^{PAR-POS}			
			and		everybody			

The reiterations constitute an additive enumeration, explicitly marked by the element *ja* ‘and’, which specifies the designation made by the first realization. We can also note that the last realization *ketä kaikkiansa* ‘whom else ~ everybody’ closes the list by inviting at the same time to consider the listing as non-complete (cf. Jefferson 1990: 65–68).

Thirdly, the assignment of lexical elements can be made by opposing different designations. In (6), the noun phrases *niitä kortteja* ‘those post cards’ and *pieniä kirjeitä* ‘small letters’ realize the valency complement of the verb *olla* ‘to be’. The first realization is within the scope of the negative modality of the verb. Then the elements *vaan siis* ‘but PRT’ introduce into the same reaction place a second realization that is endowed with its own modality, i.e. it escapes the negative modality affecting the first realization:

(6)

((a season worker in a post office explains what her job entails))

se ei oo nyt *niitä kortteja* vaan siis + *pieniä kirjeitä*

this time it’s not *those post cards* but + *small letters* (Childhood friends 101)

se	ei oo	nyt		niitä ^{PAR}		kortteja ^{PAR}
it	is not	this time		those		post cards
			vaan siis		pieniä ^{PAR}	kirjeitä ^{PAR}
			but PRT		small	letters

The first noun is preceded by the demonstrative determiner *niitä* ‘those’ (plural form of the demonstrative *se*) that seems to function here as an invitation to the addressee to link information carried by the utterance with an already shared knowledge (cf. Vilkuna 1992: 134). The first realization *kortteja* ‘post cards’ is indeed introduced as a presupposed element with which the second realization *pieniä kirjeitä* ‘small letters’ is contrasted. Neither the second, nor the first is supposed to assume the designation alone, but these two realizations, by defining each other, constitute together the lexical description.

Finally, the overt negotiation about different naming possibilities is particularly obvious in examples of repairs. In (7), the speaker stops the syntagmatic axis of the utterance after having pronounced the verb *väitti* ‘said’, followed by the beginning of the element *et(tä)* ‘that’, and returns to a rectional element in the allative case (*sille*_{ALL} *poliisille*_{ALL} ‘to the policeman’) which has been realized already before the governing verb.⁵

(7)

vaikka hän sille *poliisille* väitti e- tai *kuulustelijalle* väitti että + hän oli juonu viinaa
 even though *to the policeman* he said tha- or *to the investigator* he said that + he had drunk alcohol (Hairdressing salon 105)

vaikka	hän	sille _{ALL}	poliisille _{ALL}	väitti	e-			
even though	he	to the	policeman	said	tha-			
			tai kuulustelijalle _{ALL}	väitti	että	hän oli	juonu	viinaa
			or to [the] investigator	said	that	he	had drunk	alcohol

The second realization *kuulustelijalle*_{ALL} ‘to [the] investigator’ that is introduced by the element *tai* ‘or’ proposes an alternative designation,⁶ after which the verb is reproduced and its construction is completed.

3.3. The instability of lexical descriptions

Repairs that take place with a delay show that lexical descriptions remain an object of negotiation even when a lexical designation has momentarily been made. On the other hand, paradigmatic lists with the contrastive effect evidence the fact that lexical realizations of a rection place do not reduce to the selection of a unique term among the paradigm of possible realizations (cf. Blanche-Benveniste 1987: 142). In paradigmatic developments anchored to a rection place, lexical designations are built up progressively. They may advance for example by specification, the first realization only announcing a rectional element by indicating its syntactic type or making a basic level categorization of the referent.

The introduction of lexical elements into rection places may then consist of an entire task during which a referent is constructed by using different descriptions depending on viewpoints from which the speaker picks out the referent or perspectives in which s/he places the referent (cf. for instance Blanche-Benveniste 1985; Apothéloz & Reichler-Béguelin 1995; Mondada & Dubois 1995). Even a simple lexical designation gets its value in relation to a paradigm of other potential designations (see also Schegloff 1996: 458, note 25).⁷ The instability of lexical

elements can also be explicitly stated by the speaker in metalinguistic sequences produced during the lexical selection process.

4 Metalinguistic sequences

The realization of reaction places is sometimes accompanied by sequences which do not constitute the main line of discourse, but rather make explicit linguistic production processes by providing comments on how to put propositional content into words. In this section, I will first examine three models by which a metalinguistic sequence can be inserted in the body of a frame construction. Then, I will formulate a hypothesis on the referential anchoring of the pronoun *se* used in metalinguistic sequences.

4.1. Three insertion models

It happens that instead of providing a reaction place with a lexical element, the speaker produces a verbal sequence which explicates the request or inaccessibility of a lexical description. In example (8), the verb *hyppiä* ‘to jump’ has in its construction a valency complement which is first instantiated by the element *niit* ‘those’. Although the form *niit* could function as an independent pronoun, the preceding linguistic context does not contain here any explicit interpretation source (cf. ex. (4)). Prosodic cues equally contribute to expect a syntagmatic continuation.⁸ So, we can see here a pro-element that is used as a determiner anticipating a lexical head of a noun phrase. After a pause and a hesitation sound *ö-* ‘uh’, the speaker pronounces however not a nominal element but a sequence which requests a lexical designation: *mitä ne nyt on* ‘what they PRT are ~ what are they called’:

(8)

S1 --- nythän se on hyppiny niit + ö- *mitä ne nyt on* +
 --- it’s true that now he has been jumping those + uh *what are they called* +

S2 laskuvarjo-
 parachute-

S1 niin niit laskuvarjohyppyi
 yes those parachute jumps (Summer plans 079)

nythän	se	on hyppiny	niit	ö-
now-PRT	he	has been jumping	those	uh

<i>mitä</i>	<i>ne</i>	<i>nyt on</i>
<i>what</i>	<i>they</i>	<i>PRT are</i>

In example (9), a metalinguistic sequence is integrated into the construction of the postposition *kanssa* ‘with’. The rection place opened by this postposition is realized at the first time by the noun in the genitive case *vaimonsa*_{GEN-POS} ‘his wife’. The first realization is followed by the element *ja* ‘and’, that gives cause for expecting to a second realization in the same syntactic place (note that the governing element, i.e. the postposition which follows its rectional element in the spoken chain, is still in suspense). But after a pause, the speaker produces the metalinguistic sequence *en mä tiää kuka se oli* ‘I don’t know who s/he was’ with which she declines to provide a lexical designation. After that, the syntagmatic axis is completed by the governing postposition:

(9)

Aaro oli siel vaimonsa ja + *en mä tiää kuka se oli* + kanssa

Aaro was there with his wife and *I don’t know who s/he was* (Three high school scholars 099)

Aaro	oli	siel	vaimonsa _{GEN-POS}
Aaro	was	there	his wife
		ja	
		and	
		<i>en mä tiää</i>	<i>kuka se oli</i>
		<i>NEG I [don’t] know</i>	<i>who s/he was</i>
			kanssa
			with

In these two cases, it looks as if the metalinguistic sequence takes provisionally the place of a noun or a noun phrase.⁹ Note that in (8) a lexical designation is suggested later on by the addressee (S2) who pronounces the beginning of a lexical element (*laskuvarjo-*, the first part of a compound word). The initial speaker approves it (*niin* ‘yes’) and then, by reiterating the determiner, she introduces it explicitly into the syntactic matrix of the frame construction:¹⁰

S1	nythän now-PRT	se he	on hyppiny has been jumping	niit _{PAR} those	ö- uh
S2					mitä ne nyt on what they PRT are laskuvarjo- parachute-
S1			niin yes	niit _{PAR} those	laskuvarjohyppy _{IPAR} parachute jumps

In (9), in contrast, the metalinguistic sequence is integrated into a reaction paradigm without adding any lexical designation subsequently.

In the second type of cases, the metalinguistic sequence takes over from the categorization of a referent. The extract in example (10) (quoted already at the beginning of this paper) starts with a sequence that gives the impression of a syntactic and semantic incompleteness (*näil on kuulemma valtavan s- hieno* ‘I heard they have a very b- splendid’):

(10)

--- nin näil on kuulemma valtavan s- hieno niinku *ei se mikään mökki o vaan se on semmonen hirsitupa + oikeen* ja sit siel on kaikki mikroaaltouunista ja astianpesukoneest lähtien
--- so I heard they have a very b- splendid uh *it's not at all any cottage but it is a timbered house + really* and then there is everything from a microwave oven and a dishwasher (Summer plans 079)

näil _{ADE}	on	kuulemma	valtavan	s-
they	have	I heard	[a] very	b-
			hien _{NOM}	niinku
			splendid	PRT

The pronoun in the adessive case *näil_{ADE}* ‘they’ and the verb *on* seem to begin a possessive construction (*näil on...* ‘they have...’). We could then expect the valency complement to be realized by a noun phrase. After the verb, the element *kuulemma* ‘I heard’ (frozen form of the verb *kuulla* ‘to hear’) indicates that the speaker is reporting second hand information (cf. Kuiri 1984: 201, 207–209). Then the realization of the valency complement is started by the adjective phrase *valtavan s- hieno* ‘very b- splendid’ (the sound *s-* preceding the adjective *hieno* could be perceived in this context as a beginning of the adjective *suuri* ‘big’).¹¹ The particle *niinku* functions as a signal that the utterance will be continued.

Suojala (1989: 121–122) has observed that this particle is used in contexts in which the continuation involves a syntactic rupture, as in this example. Instead of providing directly a lexical head noun, the speaker produces two sequences in which the verb *olla* ‘to be’ is used first in the scope of the negative modality (*ei se mikään mökki o* ‘it’s not at all any cottage’) and then in the scope of the affirmative modality (*se on semmonen hirsitupa oikeen* ‘it is a

Within the metalinguistic sequence, the first realization of the valency complement of the verb *olla* ‘to be’ reiterates a lexeme used in the preceding context (line 1: ...*ettei solmita poliittisia virkapaketteja* ‘... that they don’t make any *packages* of political posts’). The first realization is within the scope of a modal adverb and the negative modality of the verb (*ehk-ei* ‘perhaps-NEG’). Then the element *mutta* ‘but’ introduces a second realization which is endowed with its own modality, i.e. the affirmative modality without any explicit mark, and accompanied by the adverb *kuitenkin* ‘anyway’.¹³

In these two examples, the metalinguistic sequences interrupt an ongoing syntactic construction before the speaker provides a nominal head of a noun phrase whose realization has been started by a modifier. Unlike example (6) (see section 3.2.) in which the opposition of different lexical descriptions is done directly in the main line of discourse, the naming process is carried out here by means of metalinguistic sequences. The nominal head nouns are not provided at all at the level of the frame constructions. However, note that in (10) the following construction which is introduced by the elements *ja sit* ‘and then’ begins with the pro-form *siel* ‘there’ which points to the referent whose lexical description is achieved in the metalinguistic sequences.

The last two examples contain a metalinguistic sequence whose form seems to be more or less lexicalised. This third type of metalinguistic sequences produces the effect of modalising a lexical choice in a rection place. In (12), the valency complement of the verb *saada* ‘to get, to obtain’ is realized by the noun phrase *joku puoltoist viikkoo sairaslomaa* ‘about one and a half weeks of sick leave’ in front of which is grafted an interrogative sequence (*o- o- oisko se nyt ollu* ‘w- w- would it PRT have been’):

(12)

sit se sai niinku + o- o- oisko se nyt ollu joku puoltoist viikkoo sairaslomaa

then he got uh + w- w- would it PRT have been about one and a half weeks of sick leave (Childhood friends 101)

sit	se	sai	niinku	o-															
then	he	got	PRT	w-															
				o-															
				w-															
				<i>oisko</i>	<i>se</i>	<i>nyt</i>	<i>ollu</i>	<i>joku</i>	<i>puoltoist</i> ^{NOM_ACC}	<i>viikkoo</i> ^{PAR}	<i>sairaslomaa</i> ^{PAR}								
				<i>would-Q</i>	<i>it</i>	<i>PRT</i>	<i>have been</i>	<i>about</i>	<i>one and a half</i>	<i>weeks of</i>	<i>sick leave</i>								

In (13), the locative complement of the verb *muuttaa* ‘to move’ is first instantiated by the element *jonneki* ‘to someplace’ (a pro-adverb corresponding to the indefinite pronoun *jokin* ‘some, a’ and expressing the directional feature of “movement towards”), and the

interrogative sequence *oliks se nyt* ‘was it PRT’ is inserted within the nominal syntagm, just before the proper noun *Tampereelle_{ALL}* ‘to Tampere’:

(13)

ne muuttaa jonneki + *oliks se nyt* Tampereelle_{ALL} tai jotain¹⁴

they will move to some(place) + *was it PRT* to Tampere or something (Women’s conversations 081)

ne	muuttaa	jonneki	<i>oliks</i>	<i>se</i>	<i>nyt</i>	Tampereelle _{ALL}
they	[will] move	to some(place)	<i>was-Q</i>	<i>it</i>	<i>PRT</i>	to Tampere

The metalinguistic sequences are formed by the verb *olla* ‘to be’ that is used in the past tense (past conditional in (12) and preterit in (13)) and endowed with the interrogative modality.

The verb is accompanied by the subject pronoun *se* ‘it’ and the particle *nyt* which makes the interrogation explicitly rhetoric (cf. (8) above; Hakulinen & Saari 1995: 490; Kurhila forthcoming).

In (12), we could hesitate over the analysis of the noun phrase *joku puoltoist viikkoo sairaslomaa* ‘about one and a half weeks of sick leave’: does it belong to the construction of the verb *olla* ‘to be’ or the verb *saada* ‘to get, to obtain’? The quantifier *puoltoist* ‘one and a half’ is in the nominative case and governs the form of the other elements in this noun phrase.¹⁵ It is preceded by the indefinite element *joku* ‘some’ that marks here the approximation of the numeral expression (*joku puoltoist viikkoo* ‘about one and a half weeks’). On the one hand, this noun phrase in the nominative case seems to realize the valency complement of the verb *olla* ‘to be’, but on the other hand, we could take it too as a realization of the valency complement of the verb *saada* ‘to get, to obtain’, since the accusative case of numeral expressions such as *puol(i)toist(a)* ‘one and a half’ is identical to the nominative case.¹⁶

Example (13) provides us with a clearer case favouring the second type of analysis. The noun phrase *Tampereelle_{ALL}* ‘to Tampere’ is in the allative case that expresses the same directional feature of “movement towards” than the indefinite element *jonneki* ‘to some(place)’. The noun phrase *Tampereelle_{ALL}* ‘to Tampere’ is then governed by the verb *muuttaa* ‘to move’, and not by the verb *olla* ‘to be’. Instead of having the status of a governing verb that selects its complements, the verb *olla* is used here as a support of modalities that target the lexical choice in a rection place opened by the governing verb in the frame construction (cf. sequences such as *sanotaan (nyt)* ‘let’s say’).

To sum up, the metalinguistic sequences may have different degrees of integration into the frame construction. They could be grafted in front of (see (12)) or within (see (13)) a nominal syntagm, and sometimes they seem to stand provisionally in the place of a noun in the frame construction (see (8) and (9)). In other cases, the syntactic rupture is more perceptible (see (10) and (11)). However, in all cases, the interpretations of the frame construction and the metalinguistic sequences are closely interdependent.

4.2. The referential anchoring of the pronoun *se*

In all the examples above, the metalinguistic sequences are formed round the verb *olla* ‘to be’ with the subject slot realized by the singular or plural pronoun *se* ‘it, s/he’ ~ *ne* ‘they’. In this section, I will formulate a hypothesis on the referential anchoring of these subject pronouns. We can suppose that the recipients make the first hypothesis on the referential interpretation of the pronoun *se* in relation to its preceding context, if there is any potential interpretation source (cf. Reichler-Béguelin 1988: 36–39; Zay 1995: 208). In the case of syntactic ruptures, it seems that the suspension of a construction and the insertion process give to the interrupted construction a particular saliency in the interpretation of referring expressions used in inserted sequences (cf. Zay 1995: 212).

In example (8), the suspension of the frame construction is preceded by the element *niit* ‘those’ which instantiates the valency complement of the verb *hyppiä* ‘to jump’:

- (8)
 S1 --- nyhän se on hyppiny niit + ö- mitä ne nyt on +
 --- it’s true that now he has been jumping those + uh what are they called
 S2 laskuvarjo-
 parachute-
 S1 niin niit laskuvarjohyppyi
 yes those parachute jumps (Summer plans 079)

This form announces a realization of the valency complement in the plural. In addition, the governing verb itself attributes to its valency complement the semantic property of “something that can be jumped” (cf. Cornish 1996: 30–31). It is this rection place, announced in the frame construction, but still being without any lexical element, that offers the most immediately available referential anchoring to the subject pronoun *ne* ‘they’ of the metalinguistic sequence *mitä ne nyt on* ‘what they PRT are ~ what are they called’. Note that the pronoun *ne* is here interpretable in its linguistic context without any previous lexical

designation of the referent (during the telephone conversation from which this example is extracted) and before the subsequent lexical designation. Indeed, as we have already seen above, the addressee (S2) comes to aid – in spite of the rhetorical nature of the question – by suggesting a designation (*laskuvarjo*- ‘parachute’). In so doing, she shows indirectly that she has localised the referential anchoring of the pronoun *ne* ‘they’.

In (9), the reference resolution is equally done without relying on any lexical designation of the referent. The pronoun *se* is used in the sequence *en mä tiää kuka se oli* ‘I don’t know who *s/he* was’ which is inserted within the construction of the postposition *kanssa* ‘with’. The pronoun finds its referential anchoring in the reaction place governed by this postposition. It points to a referent whose designation is to be expected after the first realization of the reactional element of the postposition (*vaimonsa* ‘his wife’) followed by the element *ja* ‘and’, but which the speaker is unable to name (according to the very host sequence of the pronoun):

(9)

Aaro oli siel vaimonsa ja + en mä tiää kuka se oli + kanssa

Aaro was there with his wife and + I don’t know who *s/he* was (Three high school scholars 099)

The first realization *vaimonsa* ‘his wife’ actualizes a semantic field and in this way, it also orients the expectations for the second realization. In the metalinguistic sequence, the interrogative pronoun *kuka* ‘who’ which realizes the valence complement of the verb *olla* ‘to be’ indicates that the referent of the subject pronoun is human. In view of the semantic field opened by the first lexical realization, the referent’s sex is probably also female, but neither this property nor the property [+human] is displayed by the Finnish pronoun *se*.

In examples (10) and (11), the interruption of the frame construction takes place after an adjectival modifier, before the apparition of the lexical head of the noun phrase. The subject pronouns of the metalinguistic sequences, *se* ‘it’ and *ne* ‘they’, find their referential anchoring in the reaction slot whose realization has been started in the frame construction, but not achieved: in the place of the valency complement in the possessive construction *näil on...* ‘they have...’ of (10) and in the place of the valency complement of the verb *tehdä* ‘to make’ in (11):

(10)

- - - nin näil on kuulemma valtavan s- hieno niinku ei se mikään mökki o vaan se on semmonen hirsitupa + oikeen

- - - so I heard they have a very b- splendid uh *it*’s not at all any cottage but *it* is a timbered house really (Summer plans 079)

(11)

--- kyllä tosiasiassa tehdään poliittisia + ehkei *ne* ole paketteja mutta jonkun sortin sopimuksia kuitenkin
--- in reality they make political + perhaps *they* are not packages but some kinds of contracts anyway
(Professional life)

These referential anchorings are confirmed by the compatibility between the propositional content of the frame construction and the categorization of the referent accomplished in the metalinguistic sequences (cf. Zay 1995: 212):

<i>näil</i> _{ADE} <i>on</i> <i>kuulemma</i> <i>valtavan</i> <i>s-</i> <i>they</i> <i>have</i> <i>I heard</i> <i>[a] very</i> <i>b-</i> <i>hien</i> _{NOM} <i>niinku</i> <i>splendid</i> <i>PRT</i>
<i>ei</i> <i>se</i> <i>mikään</i> <i>mökki</i> <i>o</i> <i>NEG</i> <i>it</i> <i>any</i> <i>cottage</i> <i>is [not]</i> <i>vaan</i> <i>se</i> <i>on</i> <i>semmonen</i> <i>hirsitupa</i> <i>oikeen</i> <i>but</i> <i>it</i> <i>is</i> <i>a</i> <i>timbered house</i> <i>really</i>
<i>näil on valtavan hieno hirsitupa</i> 'they have a very splendid timbered house'

<i>kyllä</i> <i>tosiasiassa</i> <i>tehdään</i> _{PASS} <i>poliittisia</i> <i>PRT</i> <i>in reality</i> <i>they make</i> <i>political</i>
<i>ehkei</i> <i>ne</i> <i>ole</i> <i>paketteja</i> <i>perhaps-NEG</i> <i>they</i> <i>are [not]</i> <i>packages</i> <i>mutta</i> <i>jonkun sortin</i> <i>sopimuksia</i> <i>kuitenkin</i> <i>but</i> <i>some kinds of</i> <i>contracts</i> <i>anyway</i>
<i>tosiasiassa tehdään poliittisia sopimuksia</i> 'in reality they make political contracts'

We can propose the same kind of analysis on the referential anchoring of the pronouns *se* in examples (12) and (13) in which the metalinguistic sequences are grafted on a realization of a reaction place with the effect of modalizing the lexical choice. In (13), the referential target of the pronoun *se* 'it' is the locative reaction place of the verb *muuttaa* 'to move' that has been instantiated by the element *jonneki* 'to some(place)' before the use of the pronoun:

(13)

ne *muuttaa* *jonneki* + *oliks* *se* *nyt* *Tampereelle*_{ALL} *tai* *jotain*
they *will move to some(place)* + *was it* *PRT* *to Tampere or something* (Women's conversations 081)

In (12), the referential anchoring of the pronoun *se* 'it' is provided by the place of the valency complement of the verb *saada* 'to get, to obtain'. Note that the insertion of the metalinguistic

sequence happens before any element instantiates the valency complement in the frame construction:

(12)

sit se sai niinku + o- o- oisko se nyt ollu joku puoltoist viikkoo sairaslomaa

then he got uh + w- w- would it PRT have been about one and a half weeks of sick leave (Childhood friends 101)

The verb *saada* ‘to get, to obtain’ itself creates an expectation for a valency complement, and in addition, the following particle *niinku* serves as a signal that the utterance will be continued (cf. example (10) in section 4.1.). The identification of the rection place offering the referential anchoring to the pronoun *se* is based here on the knowledge we have on the complementation of the governing verb.

To sum up, in all of the examples, the host construction of the pronoun *se* is a metalinguistic sequence that is integrated into another verbal construction or that suspends an ongoing verbal construction. The referential anchoring of the pronoun is provided by the frame construction, and to be precise, by a rection slot which is expected and whose realization has eventually begun, but which is still devoid of full lexical content. The analyses have tried to show that a governing element and a beginning of a syntagm that instantiates a rection slot (and sometimes even the governing element alone) are enough to provide referential anchoring for the pronoun *se* which is used in sequences creating a syntactic and discursive rupture in the text.

In the examples above, the pronoun *se ~ ne* ‘it, s/he ~ they’ could hardly be described as a “substitute of a noun”. On the contrary, it serves to point to a referent that has not yet been named, in order to question its possible designations, to accomplish its categorization or a lexical description in an attributive construction, or to modalize a lexical choice. We have seen, too, that in certain cases the pronoun *se* can be interpreted in its linguistic context without any previous or subsequent lexical mention of the referent. It could be possible, of course, to replace in these examples the pronoun *se ~ ne* by a semantically non-specific noun phrase, as in (8) by *ne jutut* ‘these things’: *mitä ne jutut on* ‘what are these things (called)’. Nevertheless, it seems to me that the interpretation of the analysed occurrences of the pronoun *se* does not involve this kind of non-specific designations. The recourse to non-specific noun phrases is another strategy, and a real one exploited by speakers, but also a more marked one compared to the use of the pronominal pointers.¹⁷

5 An example of parenthetical inserts

In the final example, the host construction of the pronoun *se* ‘it, s/he’ is slightly different from the preceding ones. The metalinguistic sequences analysed above which break in during a lexical selection process are a particular case of the syntactic and discursive heterogeneity of spoken texts: being inserted into the body of a frame construction, they are likely to provide or serve to introduce a lexical description the frame construction is devoid of.

This section presents an insert which can be called *parenthesis* (cf. Ravila 1945; Duvallon & Routarinne forthcoming). Even if they are semantically related, the frame construction and the parenthetical insert remain syntactically non-integrated and seem to have distinct cognitive goals and more or less independent planning processes as well (see Berrendonner 1993; Zay 1995; Mondada & Zay 1999).

The example below illustrates one more way the referential target of the pronoun *se* can be defined in textual domains of the linguistic context. As we have seen, the pronoun *se* is not always interpretable at the very moment it appears in the text. Among the contexts propitious to deferred interpretation, there is the one in which the parenthetical insert containing the pronoun is interpolated within a noun phrase, between the lexical head and a relative clause that completes it. Consider example (14):

(14)

mä: ajattelin tehdä tietokoneella tämmösen + aa nelosen *se oli kai Naavan Sakarin idea* mikä toimis lippuna ja + ohjelmana + saman tien mikä taitetaan näin ja + täällä sitten lukee blaa blaa - - -
I thought of doing by computer an + A4 size page like this *it was perhaps Sakari Naava's idea* which could serve as a ticket and + a program + at the same time which is fold up like this and + then here is the text blah blah - - -
(Neighbourhood association 089, 090)

As already noted, it is probable that an initial hypothesis on the referential anchoring of the pronoun *se* is formulated in relation to the preceding context, provided that it contains an interpretation source (cf. Reichler-Béguelin 1988: 36–39; Zay 1995: 208). In example (14), the pronoun *se* is used in the sequence *se oli kai Naavan Sakarin idea* ‘it was perhaps Sakari Naava’s idea’. The preceding context contains the noun phrase *tämmösen aa nelosen* ‘an A4 size page like this’ which offers to the pronoun *se* the most immediately available interpretation source. However, the host construction and in particular the realization of the valency complement (*Naavan Sakarin idea* ‘Sakari Naava’s idea’) are likely to orient the

interpretation of the subject pronoun *se* towards a propositional content, and not a discrete entity.

From the viewpoint of the linear advancement of the text, the interpretation of the pronoun *se* remains more or less uncertain when its host construction is achieved, since the propositional content of the preceding sequence *mä: ajattelin tehdä...* ‘I thought of doing...’ is not very compatible with the predication ‘to be someone else’s idea’ (?‘it [“*that I thought of doing something*”] was perhaps S. N.’s idea’).¹⁸ Next the speaker produces two relative clauses (*mikä toimis lippuna ja + ohjelmana + saman tien* ‘which could serve as a ticket and + a program + at the same time’ and *mikä taitetaan näin* ‘which is fold up like this’) which complete syntactically the noun phrase *tämmösen aa nelosen* ‘an A4 size page like this’. The pronoun *se* and its host construction are thus encased within a noun phrase:

mä: ajattelin tehdä	tietokoneella	<i>tämmösen aa nelosen</i>
I thought of doing	by computer	<i>an A4 size page like this</i>
	<i>se oli kai</i>	Naavan Sakarin idea
	it was perhaps	Sakari Naava’s idea
	<i>mikä toimis</i>	<i>lippuna</i>
	<i>which could serve as</i>	<i>a ticket</i>
		<i>ja ohjelmana saman tien</i>
		<i>and a program at the same time</i>
	<i>mikä taitetaan näin</i>	
	<i>which is fold up like this</i>	

Finally, the pronoun *se* ‘it’ finds its interpretation source in this complex noun phrase (in italics above) which is constructed around the parenthetical insert. Put differently, the pronoun picks out a referent whose lexical content is still being formulated in the frame construction. It is in fact this “resumptive” pronoun (Maillard 1974) that creates the referent and introduces it in the text, even though it is not possible to exactly determine the limits of the reference (cf. Zay 1995: 208, 213–214).

Unlike the examples in the preceding section, the host construction of the pronoun does not participate here directly to the process of lexical designation of the referent, but it proposes rather supplementary information about the propositional content that is being formulated in the frame construction. It seems to me that the resolution of that kind of passages consists in putting in relation two different perspectives on a scene described, rather than seeing in the text a progressive accumulation of information. The frame construction and the insert form separate textual domains, the first one enclosing the second one. The interpretation of the

pronoun *se* necessitates figuring out this textual organisation and could not be achieved before the whole constructional figure has been finished.

6 Conclusion

The pronoun *se* is not solely a tracking form used to refer to referents already introduced in the interlocutors' centre of attention. It serves also to capture referents whose existence is only expectable on the bases of the linguistic context. In the context of syntactic and discursive ruptures examined above, the pronoun *se* points to referents which are still being introduced in the utterance within which the host construction of the pronoun shelters. The pronoun *se* allows constructing the reference in cases in which lexical designations are momentarily unavailable or must be negotiated. On the other hand, it also enables a referential act to target a lexical content still in progress within another textual domain.

I have tried to show, on the one hand, that semantic information conveyed by the host construction and the position of this host construction in the larger linguistic context play an undeniable role in the determination of the referential anchoring of a pronoun. In the context of syntactic ruptures, the insertion process itself seems to make out of the frame construction, and not only of elements already realized, but also of rection slots left in suspense, a particularly salient interpretation domain for pronouns used in inserted sequences. On the other hand, I have wanted to underline the fact that reference resolution is not always possible at the very moment a pronoun appears in the text. The categorization or the lexical content of a referent can be confirmed only later on. Moreover, pronouns can find their referential anchoring even without any lexical designation of the referent in the preceding or subsequent context.

Uses that speakers make of different types of referring expressions in oral productions lead me to see the pronoun *se* as an original referring form which is not necessarily identical with a lexical content identified in the linguistic context. In comparison with lexical descriptions whose value is determined in relation to the whole paradigm of other potential lexical representations and which could, in principle, at any moment, be changed over other designations depending on different points of view and perspectives, the pronoun *se*, with its minimal descriptive content, is a more stable referring expression. I propose that pro-forms such as the pronoun *se* be considered not only as surer syntactic indicators than lexical forms

of nouns (Blanche-Benveniste et al. 1987: 237), but also as unmarked referring expressions, as neutral designations and, so to say, controllers of lexical descriptions of referents.

References

- Airila, Martti. 1940. Pronominit. *Virittäjä* 44: 301–314.
- Apothéloz, Denis and Marie-José Reichler-Béguelin. 1995. Construction de la référence et stratégies de désignation. *TRANEL* 23: 227–271.
- Ariel, Mira. 1988. Referring and accessibility. *Journal of Linguistics* 24: 65–87.
- Berrendonner, Alain. 1993. Périodes. In H. Parret (ed.) *Temps et discours*. Louvain: Presses universitaires de Louvain.
- Blanche-Benveniste, Claire. 1985. La dénomination dans le français parlé: une interprétation pour les « répétitions » et les « hésitations ». *Recherches sur le français parlé* 6: 109–130.
- Blanche-Benveniste, Claire. 1987. Syntaxe, choix de lexique, et lieux de bafouillage. *DRLAV* 36–37: 123–157.
- Blanche-Benveniste, Claire. 1990. Un modèle d'analyse syntaxique « en grilles » pour les productions orales. *Anuario de Psicología* 47: 11–28.
- Blanche-Benveniste, Claire. 1997. L'approche pronominale et référenciation. In F. Cordier and J.-E. Tyvaert (eds) *La place de l'image dans la cognition. Le pronom et son rôle dans la référenciation*. Reims: Presses Universitaires de Reims.
- Blanche-Benveniste, Claire, José Deulofeu, Jean Stefanini and Karel van den Eynde. 1987. *Pronom et Syntaxe. L'approche pronominale et son application au français*. Paris: SELAF.
- Chafe, Wallace. 1987. Cognitive constraints on information flow. In R. S. Tomlin (ed.) *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Cornish, Francis. 1996. 'Antecedentless' anaphors: deixis, anaphora, or what? Some evidence from English and French. *Journal of Linguistics* 32: 19–41.
- Duvallon, Outi. 2003. L'ordre sujet-complément-verbe dans les textes oraux en finnois. *Études finno-ougriennes* 35: 131–160.
- Duvallon, Outi. 2004. Observations sur les déterminants dans les productions orales. In J. Härmä and U. Tuomarla (eds.) *Actes du 6^e colloque franco-finlandais de linguistique contrastive*. Publications du Département des Langues Romanes de l'Université de Helsinki 15, Helsinki.

- Duvallon, Outi and Sara Routarinne. forthcoming. Parenthesis as a resource in the grammar of conversation. In A. Hakulinen and M. Selting (eds.), *Syntax and Lexis in Conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ehlich, Konrad. 1982. Anaphora and Deixis: Same, Similar, or Different? In R. J. Jarvella and W. Klein (eds.) *Speech, Place, and Action*. Chichester: John Wiley & Son Ltd.
- Etelämäki, Marja. 1996. *Keskustelu tarkoitteesta kuvataiteen oppitunnilla – ja pronominit tuo, se, tämä*. Pro gradu -tutkielma. Helsingin yliopiston suomen kielen laitos.
- Fox, Barbara. 1987. *Discourse structure and anaphora*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Givón, Talmy (ed.). 1983. *Topic continuity in discourse: A quantitative cross-language study*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Goodwin, Charles. 1987. Forgetfulness as an Interactive Resource. *Social Psychology Quarterly* Vol. 50, No. 2: 115–131.
- Gundel, Jeanette, Nancy Hedberg and Ron Zacharski. 1993. Cognitive status and the form of referring expressions in discourse. *Language* 69/2: 274–307.
- Hakulinen, Auli. 1985. On cohesive devices in Finnish. In E. Sözer (ed.) *Text connexity, text coherence: aspects, methods, results*. Hamburg: Buske.
- Hakulinen, Auli. 1988. Miten nainen liikkuu Veijo Meren romaaneissa. In L. Laitinen (ed.) *Iso suomen kielioppi*. Helsinki: Yliopistopaino.
- Hakulinen, Auli. 2001[1976]. Liitepartikkelin *-han/-hän* syntaksia ja pragmatiikkaa. In L. Laitinen et al. (eds.) *Auli Hakulinen: Lukemisto. Kirjoituksia kolmelta vuosikymmeneltä*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura.
- Hakulinen, Auli and Fred Karlsson. 1979. *Nykysuomen lauseoppia*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura.
- Hakulinen, Auli et al. 1994. *Kieli ja sen kieliopit. Opetuksen suuntaviivoja*. Helsinki: Edita.
- Hakulinen, Auli and Mirja Saari. 1995. Temporaaalisesta adverbista diskurssipartikkeliksi. *Virittäjä* 99: 481–500.
- Hakulinen, Auli et al. 2004. *Iso suomen kielioppi*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura.
- Helasvuo, Marja-Liisa. 2001. *Syntax in the making: the emergence of syntactic units in Finnish conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Itkonen, Terho. 1966. Tutkimus suomen asyndetonista. *Virittäjä* 70: 402–423.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1956. Two Aspects of Language and Two Types of Aphasic Disturbances. In Roman Jakobson and Morris Halle, *Fundamentals of Language*. The Hague: Mouton.

- Jefferson, Gail. 1990. List-Construction as a Task and Resource. In G. Psathas (ed.) *Interaction Competence*. Washington, D. C.: Interactional Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis and University of America Press.
- Juvonen, Päivi. 2000. *Grammaticalizing the definite article. A study of definite adnominal determiners in a genre of spoken Finnish*. Doctoral dissertation. Stockholm University, Department of Linguistics.
- Kuiri, Kaija. 1984. *Referointi Kainuun ja Pohjois-Karjalan murteissa*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura.
- Kurhila, Salla. forthcoming. The particle *nyt* 'now' in word search sequences. Unpublished manuscript.
- Laitinen, Lea. 2002. From logophoric pronoun to discourse particle: A case study of Finnish and Saami. In I. Wischer and G. Diewald (eds.) *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Larjavaara, Matti. 1985. Suomen demonstratiivisysteemin rakenne. *Sananjalka* 27: 15–31.
- Larjavaara, Matti. 1990. *Suomen deiksis*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura.
- Larjavaara, Matti. 2001. Tämä, tuo vai se? *Kielikello* 4/2001: 17–22.
- Laury, Ritva. 1994. *Se* ensimmäinnän pronominin puhutussa suomessa. *Virittäjä* 98: 449–453.
- Laury, Ritva. 1997. *Demonstratives in Interaction. The emergence of a definite article in Finnish*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Local, John. 1992. Continuing and restarting. In P. Auer and A. Di Luzio (eds.) *The contextualization of Language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Local, John and John Kelly. 1986. Projection and 'silences': Notes on phonetic and conversational structure. *Human Studies* 9: 185–204.
- Maillard, Michel. 1974. Essai de typologie des substituts diaphoriques. *Langue française* 21: 55–71.
- Milner, J.-C. 1982. *Ordres et raisons de la langue*. Paris: Seuil.
- Mondada, Lorenza and Danièle Dubois. 1995. Construction des objets de discours et catégorisation: une approche des processus de référenciation. *TRANEL* 23: 273–302.
- Mondada, Lorenza and Françoise Zay. 1999. Parenthèses et processus de configuration thématique: vers une redéfinition de la notion de topic. In J. Verschueren (ed.) *Pragmatics in 1998. Selected Papers from the 6th International Pragmatics Conference*. Vol 2. Antwerp : IprA.

- Ogden, Richard. 2001. Turn-holding, turn-yielding and laryngeal activity in Finnish talk-in-interaction. In K. Kohler and A. Simpson (eds.) *Journal of the International Phonetic Association* 31: 139–152.
- Onikki-Rantajääskö, Tiina. 2001. *Sarjoja – nykysuomen paikallissijaiset olotilanilmaukset kielen analogisuuden ilmentäjinä*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura.
- Penttilä, Aarni. 1963. *Suomen kielioppi*. Porvoo: WSOY.
- Ravila, Paavo. 1945. Lauseeseen liittyneet irralliset ainekset. *Virittäjä* 49: 1–16.
- Reichler-Béguelin, Marie-José. 1988. Anaphore, cataphore et mémoire discursive. *Pratiques* 57: 15–43.
- Rosch, Eleanor. 1977. Classification of real-world objects: Origins and representations in cognition. In P. N. Johnson-Laird and P. C. Wason (eds.) *Thinking. Readings in Cognitive Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Salo, Juha. 2000. *Joku gradu – sanojen joku ja jokin merkitys puheessa*. Pro gradu -tutkielma. Helsingin yliopiston suomen kielen laitos.
- Saukkonen, Pauli. 1967. Persoonapronominien *hän : se, he : ne* distinktiivinen oppositio. *Virittäjä* 71: 286–292.
- Saussure, Ferdinand de. 1983[1916]. *Course in general linguistics*. London: Duckworth.
- Schegloff, Emanuel. 1996. Some Practices for Referring to Persons in Talk-in-Interaction: A Partial Sketch of a Systematics. In B. A. Fox (ed.) *Studies in anaphora*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Schegloff, Emanuel, Gail Jefferson and Harvey Sacks. 1977. The preference for self-correction in the organisation of repair in conversation. *Language* 53/2: 361–382.
- Seppänen, Eeva-Leena. 1998. *Läsnäolon pronominit*. Tämä, tuo, se ja hän viittaamassa keskustelun osallistujiaan. Helsinki: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura.
- Setälä, Emil Nestor. 1891. *Suomen kielen lauseoppi*³. Helsinki: K. E. Holm’in kustannuksella.
- Siro, Paavo. 1964. *Suomen kielen lauseoppi*. Helsinki: Tietosanakirja OY.
- Sorjonen, Marja-Leena. 2002. Word order and interaction. Paper presented at the EuroConference on Linguistic Structures and their Deployment in the Organisation of Conversation, Interactional Linguistics, Helsinki 6–11 September, 2002.
- Suojala, Marja. 1989. Varaukset. In A. Hakulinen (ed.) *Suomalaisen keskustelun keinoja I*. Kieli 4. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopiston suomen kielen laitos.
- Tarvainen, Kalevi. 1977. *Dependenssikielioppi*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Tiainen-Duvallon, Outi. 2002. *Le pronom anaphorique et l'architecture de l'oral en finnois et en français*. Thèse de doctorat non publiée. École pratique des hautes études, Paris.

Vilkuna, Maria. 1992. *Referenssi ja määräisyys suomenkielisten tekstien tulkinnassa*. Suomi 163. Helsinki: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura.

Zay, Françoise. 1995. Notes sur l'interprétation des expressions référentielles dans les parenthèses. *TRANEL* 23: 203–223.

Ziv, Yael. 1996. Pronominal reference to inferred antecedents. In L. Tasmowski and W. De Mulder (eds.) *Coherence and Anaphora. Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 10. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Appendix

Transcription symbols and other notations

+ pause (length non specified)

sa- truncated word

a: lengthening

NEG negation

PRT particle

Q interrogative particle

sen_{CASE} grammatical indications: NOM nominative, GEN genitive, PAR partitive, ADE adessive, ILL illative, ALL allative; PASS (impersonal) passive, POS possessive suffix

[the] in the translation line, a grammatical element absent from the original production or placed elsewhere in it

Corpus

Summer plans 079: telephone conversation

Childhood friends 101: telephone conversation

Neighbourhood association 089, 090: face-to-face conversation

Hairdressing salon 105: face-to-face conversation

Women's conversations 081: telephone conversation

Three high school scholars 099: face-to-face conversation

Professional life: radio conversation

Local case system in Finnish (cf. Onikki-Rantajääskö 2001: 14).

The dimension of DIRECTION→	Static cases	Dynamic cases	
	“position”	“movement from”	“movement towards”
The dimension of QUALITY↓			
Intern cases	INESSIVE talossa ‘in a/the house’	ELATIVE talosta ‘from a/the house’	ILLATIVE taloon ‘into a/the house’
Extern cases	ADESSIVE pöydällä ‘on a/the table’	ABLATIVE pöydältä ‘from a/the table’	ALLATIVE pöydälle ‘onto a/the table’

¹ All examples are drawn from a corpus of conversational data. I have use in this study audiotaped data provided by the department of Finnish at the University of Helsinki (number of tape is indicated) and my personal collection (without number). The transcriptions are adapted for a syntactic approach and contain only some prosodic indications, e.g. the places of pauses, marked by the symbol “+”. When necessary, prosodic patterns are commented in the text. See the appendix for a description of data, transcription symbols and other notations used in this paper.

² The linguistic segment that is supposed to confer a descriptive content on a pronoun is called *antecedent*.

³ Note that the term *rection* is used here to speak about two kinds of elements: verb-specific valency elements and non-verb-specific elements, as temporal and spatial complements, which are however concerned by the modalities of the verb and which can be identified by pro-forms. The term *rectional element* contrasts with the term *associated element* that is reserved to speak about elements that are not constructed by a verb (cf. *clausal complement* in the more traditional terminology).

⁴ For the discussion about the status of locative demonstratives, see Laury 1997: 128–145. In *Iso suomen kielioppi* (Hakulinen et al. forthcoming) the syntagmatic units formed by a locative demonstrative and a noun in a local case as *sinne tielle* ‘on the road’ are called *fixed apposition construction* (*kiinteä appositionrakenne*).

⁵ This word order is sometimes used in sequences which contain information supposed to be already known (see for instance Sorjonen 2002; Duvallon 2003).

⁶ Only the lexical head of the noun phrase is reproduced, but not the determiner. A careful reader may have noticed a difference in the figures of this example and example (6) in which the second realization equally contains no demonstrative determiner. In the analysis of (6), I have placed the editing terms *vaan siis* in front of the empty column of the determiner, while in the analysis of (7), the editing element *tai* is placed after the column of the determiner. This difference reflects an intuition based interpretation that in (6) the re-edition concerns the whole noun phrase, but in (7) only the lexical head noun. I would like to emphasize that figures representing syntactic organization of utterances are rather robust. The grammatical status of Finnish demonstrative determiners is a question that could not be treated here (see Laury 1997; Juvonen 2000; Larjavaara 2001).

⁷ My remarks on lexical naming processes are limited to a syntactic approach.

⁸ For more information about prosodic cues used in the turn-holding, such as a level intonation and a pause initiated by glottal closure, see for instance Local 1992; Local & Kelly 1986; Ogden 2001. I thank Sara Routarinne for these references.

⁹ In figures I have separated the metalinguistic sequences from the frame constructions in order to indicate the passage from the main discourse to the metalanguage, but on the other hand, the metalinguistic sequences are aligned with the syntactic slot of the frame construction they seem to occupy.

¹⁰ According to Schegloff *et al.* 1977, repairs in conversation are organised in the way that the initial speaker has the privilege of resolving a problem that arises in the production of an utterance. The particle *nyt* used in word search sequences is indeed a mark of the rhetorical nature of these sequences (cf. Hakulinen & Saari 1995: 490–491). In example (8), the immediate participation of the addressee in the lexical selection process may be related to the fact that the whole utterance calls for a shared knowledge: on the one hand, in the head of the frame construction, there is the enclitic particle *-hAn* which marks that the utterance contains information supposed to be already known by the addressee (A. Hakulinen 2001[1976]), and on the other hand, the determiner *niit*, whose

use seems to go hand in hand with the particle, invites the addressee to link the propositional content of the utterance with an already shared knowledge (Vilkuna 1992: 133–135; Duvallon forthcoming). (Cf. Goodwin 1987, who pays attention to the role that apparent hesitations play in the management of participant roles in speech situations in which the access to information conveyed in discourse is shared by several participants.)

¹¹ It is well known that adjectives may sometimes be used as nouns. In example (10), this interpretation is not very satisfactory.

¹² The demonstrative adjective *semmonen* that means literally ‘that kind of’ can serve as a mark of a lexical approximation. It is used as a kind of indefinite article in order to introduce a lexical description or a categorization of a referent (note that Finnish lacks the category of indefinite article; see Juvonen in this volume).

¹³ In Finnish, two elements can serve as contrastive markers: *vaan* and *mutta* ‘but’. The element *vaan* seems to be used in contexts in which the contrasting relation involves only the negative and the affirmative modalities and in which the negative modality is expressed before the affirmative one. In example (11), in addition to the negative modality, the first sequence contains an expression of the epistemic modality (the adverb *ehk(ei)*) and the contrastive marker is *mutta*.

¹⁴ Like the locative demonstratives (cf. section 3.2.), the element *jonneki(n)* can be used as an autonomous form (with the meaning ‘somewhere’). On the other hand, it is also used as a kind of determiner before nouns. When it is followed by a proper noun as in (13), the element *jonneki(n)* produces a special type of approximation effect: the proposed lexical element that refers to a specific referent is to be taken as an example. In fact, three different elements contribute here to that kind of interpretation: firstly, the element *jonneki*, then the metalinguistic sequence that puts the lexical realization into the scope of the interrogative modality and finally the sequence *tai jotain* ‘or something’, added at the end (cf. Salo 2000: 54–57, 76–83).

¹⁵ As other numerals in the nominative case, it is followed by an element in the partitive case. The element *puoltoist* ‘one and a half’ quantifies first the noun *viikkoo_{PAR}* ‘week’, then the elements *puoltoist viikkoo* ‘one and a half weeks’ function as a quantifier of the noun *sairaslomaa_{PAR}* ‘sick leave’:

[[*puoltoist_{NOM}* [*viikkoo_{PAR}*]] *sairaslomaa_{PAR}*]
‘one and a half weeks of sick leave’

¹⁶ The indefinite element *joku* could serve as a counterargument: formally, it is in the nominative case (cf. the accusative case *jonkun*). But it seems to me that this element can remain invariable in particular in front of numerals.

¹⁷ Note that the other Finnish demonstratives *tämä* ‘that’ and *tuo* ‘this’ can be used, too, in metalinguistic sequences. The hypothesis formulated above on the interpretation of the pronoun *se* could be applied also to these forms, but in addition we should take in consideration the specific demonstrative features of these forms, for instance the fact that their referential origo is in the speaker (see for example Laury 1997: 59; cf. also the description of the Finnish demonstratives by Etelämäki in this volume).

¹⁸ When we look at the insert from the point of view of the achieved production, we can see however that the parenthesis serves to repair an interpretation to which the beginning of the sequence eventually gives rise, i.e. the interpretation that the speaker is the responsible of the idea she is presenting.