100 mm
A5
1.0
1.1
1.25
1.4
1.6
1.8
2.0
2.2
2.5
2.8
3.2
3.6
4.0
ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ
abcdefghijklmnopqrstuvwxyz1234567890
ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ
abcdefghijklmnopqrstuvwxyz
1234567890
1.0 mm
1.5 mm
2.0 mm

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 320 397 FL 018 475

AUTHOR Cheshire, Jenny
TITLE Addressee-Oriented Features in Spoken Discourse.
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 16p.; In: York Papers in Linguistics 13. Selected papers from the Sociolinguistics Symposium; see FL 018 472.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Discourse Analysis; Foreign Countries; *Grammar; *Interpersonal Communication; Linguistic Theory; *Oral Language; *Sentence Structure

ABSTRACT

Three linguistic features used in spontaneous conversation to express emotional involvement (this, never, and all) are analyzed. "All" and "never" have referential functions; "this" has both referential and deictic functions. The focus of this analysis is on the way that speakers use these features to express emotional involvement and to orient the discussion toward the addressee by directly involving him in what is being said. It is also suggested that these three features can be markers of foregrounding in discourse, highlighting, or giving discourse prominence to that part of the utterance with which they enter into construction. It is concluded that while a sentence-based grammar can not account for the way in which these items are used in everyday discourse, when seen in the broader context, as part of a pattern of addressee-oriented features, their function may be more properly appreciated. (MSE)

ADDRESSEE-ORIENTED FEATURES IN SPOKEN DISCOURSE

Jenny Cheshire
(Birkbeck College, University of London)

1. Introduction

Several recent papers have analysed some linguistic features of English that express speakers' degree of commitment to the truth of what they are saying (see Stubbs, 1986; Coates, 1987, 1988; Holmes, 1987). The point has been made that despite the emphasis given in current linguistic theory to the expression of propositional thought, unqualified propositions are rarely heard in naturally occurring speech (see, for example, Coates, 1987: 113). A theory of natural language therefore needs to take account of a great deal more than the expression of propositions.

Lyons (1981) gives particular emphasis to the non-propositional aspect of language. He points out that it is crucial to incorporate in a theory of natural language the 'subjectivity of utterance': 'the locutionary agent's expression of himself in the act of utterance and the reflection of this in the phonological, grammatical and lexical structure of the utterance' (op. cit: 240). In particular, a theory of natural language meaning must account for the subjectivity of reference, deixis and modality (op. cit: 242). For Lyons, the 'self' is both logically and psychologically indistinguishable from 'the beliefs, attitudes and emotions of which it is the seat or location' (ibid). The work of Coates, Holmes and Stubbs on epistemic modality can be seen, within this perspective, as contributing to our understanding of the subjectivity of modality and as accounting for some of the linguistic resources that speakers of English use to express their beliefs and attitudes towards their utterances. However, there has been relatively little work to date on the linguistic resources that speakers use to express their emotional involvement in what they are saying, or that attempts to account for the subjectivity of reference or deixis.

This paper analyses three linguistic features (this, never and all) which are used in spontaneous conversation to express emotional involvement. All and never have a referential function, and this has both a referential and a deictic function; the paper is a preliminary attempt, therefore, at analysing the subjectivity of reference and deixis. The main focus, however, is on the way in which speakers use these features to express emotional involvement and to orient the discourse towards the addressee, by directly involving the addressee in what is being said. It will also be suggested that these three features can be markers of foregrounding in discourse, highlighting, or giving discourse prominence to, that part of the utterance with which they enter into construction.

2. Intensity

Labov (1984) uses the term 'intensity' to refer to the expression of emotional involvement in speech. There are, of course, many linguistic exponents of intensity. People express their emotional involvement in what they are saying by their use of intonation, stress, hesitations and pauses, as well as a range of lexical features. Some of these lexical features habitually occur outside clause structure, such as exclamations, interjections (My God! or Goodness!) and swearing. Within the clause structure of English, emotional involvement is perhaps most frequently expressed by intensifying adverbs (for example, really or very), many of which have now lost the lexical meaning that they once possessed.

York Papers in Linguistics 13 (1989) 49-63

Paper presented at the Sociolinguistics Symposium (7th, York, England, April 14-16, 1988).

There are other linguistic features, however, that are equally capable of expressing emotional involvement, though this function is often overlooked in linguistic analyses of English. This and the quantifiers all and never can be thought of as referring features, assigning definite or indefinite reference to the items with which they are in construction; but they can also express the emotional involvement of the speaker in what is being said, at the same time as orienting the discourse towards the addressee. They are of particular interest because the referential meaning that they indicate when they communicate intensity appears to be directly opposite to the referential meaning that they indicate when they do not communicate intensity. This in its non-intense uses assigns definite reference, but as a marker of intensity it assigns indefinite reference; all and never are traditionally analysed as assigning indefinite reference, but when they express intensity, they appear to assign definite reference. This semantic conflict serves a function in communication since, as we will see, it invites the addressee to become actively involved in interpreting the meaning of the items in the context in which they are used, and thereby to share, albeit vicariously, the emotional involvement of the speaker.

The analysis is based on a corpus of spontaneous conversation between working-class adolescents, recorded in adventure playgrounds in the town of Reading, in Berkshire. One drawback of working with corpus data, of course, is that it is not clear to what extent the analysis can be generalised to other varieties of English. Adolescents' language, in particular, is often distinctive (see, for discussion, Nordberg, 1987); and working-class speakers may use distinctive grammatical forms (for an analysis of some nonstandard grammatical features used by the speakers who participated in this study, see Cheshire, 1982). The features analysed in this paper are listed in some dictionaries as occurring in colloquial English (see, for example, the Collins Cobuild English Language Dictionary), which suggests that the usage described here may be widespread. The aim of this paper, however, is not to identify core features of English but to describe the way in which speakers make use of their language system in everyday communication; and for this purpose the advantages of analysing language that has been recorded in real-life settings far outweigh the problems of generalisation.

This, all and never as they occur in the Reading corpus have three things in common: firstly, they are used to foreground certain parts of the utterance, giving them discourse prominence; secondly, they express the speaker's subjective involvement in what is being said; and thirdly, they are specifically oriented towards the addressee. I will discuss this in section 3, and all and never in section 4; section 5 then illustrates the way in which these three features combine with other addressee-oriented items to fulfill specific communicative functions in spoken discourse.

3. This

3.1. Demonstrative this

This is usually analysed as a demonstrative feature, with definite reference (see, for example, Quirk et al., 1985). Demonstrative this occurs in examples 1 and 2 below: it is stressed, and in each case it refers to items that are known to both the speaker and the addressee:

1. You can have **this** one...I don't want it..I don't like the spearmint ones (Jeff)
2. **This** town, mate..it's a dump.....there's nothing to do here (Benny)

Demonstrative this is a deictic term, encoding, with that, a distinction on a proximal and distal axis. Items qualified by this are near to the speaker, whereas items qualified by that are

further away. This in example 1 can be seen as a 'gestural' deictic, in that the referent is clearly visible to the participants in the conversation (it was a piece of chewing gum, held out in the speaker's hand). This in example 2 can then be seen as a 'symbolic' deictic, in that the addressee requires some knowledge of the time and place dimensions of the speech event in order to correctly interpret the utterance. Thus in example 2 the addressee needs to know that both the speaker and the addressee are in Reading, for this is the town that the speaker considers to be a dump. I was the addressee, and I did know where we were, of course. In both examples, using the deictic item this marks the referent as near to the speaker; and a contrasting sentence with that rather than this would index the referent as further away from the speaker. In example 2, for instance, the referent would have to be a town that was different from the one which we were in at the time (see Levinson, 1983: 65, for discussion of the distinction between gestural and symbolic deixis).

3.2. This as a marker of foregrounding

As Stein (in press) points out, it has long been recognised that spoken discourse is organised in terms of background and foreground, with different languages using different grammatical forms for these functions, depending on their linguistic structure. If examples 1 and 2 are contrasted with 3 and 4 below, it can be seen that in 3 and 4 this functions as a foregrounder, highlighting that part of the utterance with which it enters into construction:

3. My Uncle Derek went to see **this** lady about **this** job (Lynne)
4. I was in **this** lady's house, up there (Ronny)

Here, this is unstressed and appears to assign indefinite rather than definite reference, referring to an item that is neither known to the addressee, nor identifiable from the physical surroundings in which the speaker and the addressee are situated. In other words, this seems to function neither as a gestural deictic nor as a symbolic deictic; and rather than being in structural opposition with that, as in examples 1 and 2, it appears to be in opposition with the indefinite determiner a. Lynne and Ronny could have said, respectively:

3a. My uncle Derek went to see **a** lady about **a** job
4a. I was in **a** lady's house .

By using an unexpected determiner, Lynne and Ronny foreground the referents which this qualifies, giving them discourse prominence. Sometimes the highlighted referent is a central topic in the discourse that follows: example 4, for instance, occurs in the opening clauses of the mini-narrative in Extract A below, where the lady is central to Ronny's story (it is she who is naked in the bathroom of Ronny's friend's house).

Extract A :

1 **Do you know what happened to me** ?
2 I was in **this** lady' s house.. up there..**right**,
3 and her little girl.. **right**
4 she said take this up to my mum
5 so I was walking upstairs
6 she was in the bathroom
7 and I went in the door

8 and there she was
9 standing **completely** naked
10 **just** standing there

On other occasions, the items that are foregrounded by this are simply the first referents that are available. Example 3, for instance, occurs in the orientation section of a narrative (the narrative is given in full later, in section 5):

1. Oh..yeah..my brother..he went to work with my uncle..Derek
2. and..em.. anyway..my uncle Derek went in to see this lady about this job

Lady and job are, quite simply, the first nouns in these clauses that are not modified by a possessive and that are therefore available to be foregrounded by this. The topic of the narrative is an accident that befell Lynne's cousin while he was waiting for her uncle to finish talking to 'the lady'; and neither 'the lady' nor 'the job' are central to the story. In section 5 we will see that the function of this in utterances such as these is to attract the attention of the addressee in the orientation section of a narrative.

3.3. Speaker involvement

The use of indefinite this can foreground part of an utterance, then; but at the same time, it expresses the speaker's subjective involvement in what he or she is saying. Stein (in press) points out that the marking of foregrounding in spoken discourse is accompanied by a simultaneous marking of intensity, though the converse is not necessarily the case:

'Intensity...is arguably the subjective evaluational correlate to the objective phenomenon of a subdivision of background and foreground'.

It is well known that speakers sometimes choose a proximal deictic rather than the corresponding distal one, in order to convey their subjective involvement in what they are saying. An example that is often given is the pair of sentences below, from Clark (1974):

5. He came through a hard time last year
6. He went through a hard time last year

In sentence 5, the verb came expresses proximity to the speaker, and therefore sympathy with the person who had the hard time, whereas in sentence 6 the verb go expresses distance from the speaker, and is neutral regarding the speaker's feelings. The use of this to assign indefinite reference, then, is a further example of a deictic item being used to indicate proximity to the speaker and subjective involvement.

Several writers have pointed to the difficulty that this use of proximal deictics poses for linguistic analysis (see the discussion of 'empathetic' deixis in Lyons (1977: 677), and the discussion of 'emotional' deixis in Lakoff (1972). One of the problems in analysing 'empathetic' or 'emotional' this is that it is necessary to account for why, and how, the same linguistic feature can be used to assign unambiguously both definite and indefinite reference (see, for discussion, Wald, 1983). However, although in section 3.2. I said that this appears to mark indefinite reference, and that this conflicts with its function as a definite demonstrative feature, it is only an analysis that focuses on the propositional content of utterances that needs to consider 'emotional' this as a marker of indefinite reference. If, instead, the analysis focuses on the communicative function that this fulfills in spoken discourse, it becomes clear that there is little difference, in fact, between 'definite' and 'indefinite' this.

Examples 3 and 4 both occur as part of stories about events that took place in the past - in Lynne's story, it is her cousin's accident; in Ronny's story, it is his adventure in someone's house. Both speakers clearly locate the events in past time, using past tense verb forms to do so; in other words, they clearly locate the events as distant from the time and place coordinates of the moment of speaking. By using the proximal deictic this, however, Lynne and Ronny are able to metaphorically situate themselves within the coordinates of the events that they are reporting, indicating that it is from this perspective that they are reporting the events that took place. By metaphorically situating themselves within the story world that they are creating, they express their subjective involvement in what they are reporting.

Using this in these examples can be seen as a similar strategy to using the narrative present; speakers shift the coordinates of the moment of speaking in order to locate themselves as being directly involved in the events that are being reported. Alternatively, the speakers could be said to be bringing the time and place coordinates of the discourse event forward, to merge with the moment of speaking. Whichever way we look at it, the effect is the same: by using so-called indefinite this, speakers shift the coordinates of their utterance; and in this way, they clearly express their subjective involvement in the story that they are telling.

'Indefinite' this, then, is like 'definite' this in that it functions as a symbolic deictic, marking the referent as close to the speaker's time and place coordinates. But it differs from 'definite' this in that the marking is metaphorical, reflecting a shift in the time and place dimensions of the speech event; it should, perhaps, be considered as a symbolic deictic whose symbolism is at a more abstract level than it is in examples such as 3 and 4, above. Both symbolic and metaphorical deixis differ from gestural deixis (as in examples 1 and 2) in that since the referent is not visible, the addressee needs to have sufficient knowledge of the time and place dimensions of the speech event to be able to correctly interpret the utterance in which the deictic occurs. With 'definite' this, the speaker and the addressee can be assumed to share this knowledge, as we saw in section 3.2; but with 'indefinite' this, the addressee cannot necessarily be assumed to share the discourse perspective of the speaker, which is, of course, a highly subjective perspective. It is for this reason, however, that 'emotional', 'metaphorical' this functions as an addressee-oriented feature of spoken discourse.

3.4. Addressee-orientation

In order to properly interpret this when it is used as a straightforward deictic, with definite reference, addressees have to be able to locate its referent as close to the speaker. As we saw in section 3.1, with gestural deictics addressees can actually see the referent (in example 1 it was a piece of chewing gum held in the speaker's hand); and with symbolic referents addressees need to know the time and place dimensions of the speech event, in order to be able to correctly interpret the deictics of the utterance. There were no problems of interpretation with example 2, where the place dimension was clearly evident. In example 4, however - Ronny's utterance - the addressee's task in interpreting the referent of deictic this is more difficult. This lady, in Ronny's utterance, is not visible to the addressees, nor is she known to them, nor has she been previously mentioned. The addressees are therefore presented with what Schiffrin (1986) terms a 'cognitive processing task'; and the only way in which they can provide an interpretation for the use of this in Ronny's utterance is to put themselves in the same position as the speaker, adopting the same discourse perspective. This applies equally to this in Lynne's utterance (example 3).

By using this lady rather than simply a lady, therefore, Lynne and Ronny metaphorically invite

their addressees to enter into their universe of discourse. Lynne and Ronny merge the time and place coordinates of the discourse with the time and place coordinates of the moment of speaking, as we have seen; and if we assume that they do not intentionally wish to mislead their addressees, then we have to conclude that they are inviting their addressees to share in this merger. In Brown and Levinson's terms, using this is a positive politeness device: it suggests that the speaker and the addressee share common assumptions and experiences, even though, in fact, they may not (see Brown and Levinson, 1986).

'Indefinite' this, then, is like 'definite' this in that it is a symbolic deictic, requiring addressees to locate its referent as close to the speaker. Although I have been referring to this use as 'indefinite', in order to distinguish the use of this as a marker of foregrounding and of emotional involvement from its use as a demonstrative, it would be more accurate to say that the reference of this is always definite. The difference between the two uses of this is that the symbolism of this when it is a marker of foregrounding and of subjective involvement is at a more abstract level than when it is a straightforward deictic, as we saw in section 3.3. In both cases the referent is marked as proximal to the speaker, but when this is a marker of foregrounding the marking is metaphorical, and the addressee is invited to share the metaphorical interpretation. In other words, it is precisely because of the 'unmarked' deictic function of this that it is able to function as a very effective marker of foregrounding, and as a very effective addressee-oriented item.

4. Quantifiers as intensifiers

Quantifiers are frequently used to express intensity in spoken discourse; Labov (1984), for example, says that about half the intensifying features in his corpus of colloquial English are universal quantifiers. Like this, when quantifiers are used to express intensity their meaning often conflicts with the meaning that is assigned to them by sentence grammars.

4.1. Never as a marker of foregrounding

Sentence grammars usually see never as a member of a three-term series sometimes - ever - never. This analysis stems from Klima's classic analysis of negation in English (see Klima, 1964), where never is classed as an indeterminate, like no-one and neither. As an indeterminate, it is assumed to express 'universal temporal negation' (see Labov, 1973), with a meaning that can be paraphrased as 'not on any occasion'. Similarly, Quirk et al (1985) class never as a temporal adverb, parallel to sometimes and ever, giving as illustrative examples the sentences below:

7. He sometimes visits us
8. He doesn't ever visit us
9. He never visits us

(Quirk et al, 1985: 783).

In everyday discourse, however, never frequently occurs without the meaning of universal temporal negation. In examples 10 - 12, for instance, never does not refer to 'any occasion': in example 10 it refers to a specific point of past time (the moment when Lynne's cousin poked the stick in his eye), in example 11 it refers, similarly, to a specific point of past time, and in

example 12, it refers to a period of future time. In none of these examples, then, does never have the meaning of 'universal temporal negation'; the reference is no longer indefinite (to all possible periods of time), but definite (to a specified period or point of time).

10. He was lucky he **never** lost his eye (Lynne)
11. He **never** told me! If I'd have known he's have run, I'd have run...right git (Dave)
12. You'll **never** do it mate..not if you do it like that (Alec)

Here, then, never cannot be analysed as an indeterminate, for there is no corresponding non-negative sentence with sometimes. Furthermore, never sometimes co-occurs with ever, thereby failing to conform to the three-term pattern, and failing to meet the defining criteria of an indeterminate:

13. Well, you might go down there, mate, but I've **never ever** been there and I'm not going either (Benny)

This use of never has been a source of considerable confusion to linguists who try to analyse it within the framework of a sentence-based grammar (see, for example, Labov, 1973). As Labov (op. cit.) points out, never in examples such as 10 and 11 appears to be related to didn't plus a following preterite verb form, as in 10 a and 11a below, yet the rules by which the two forms can be related are not all easy to formalise:

10a. He was lucky he didn't lose his eye.
11a. He didn't tell me!

Similarly, Quirk et al (op. cit:601) give the following example of never used with future time reference:

14. You will never catch the train tonight

Their explanation for the occurrence of never with a non-universal meaning is that the presence of an adverbial referring to future time (tonight) 'rules out' the temporal meaning of never, so that never is a not a temporal adverb here, but a 'negative minimiser'. This explanation cannot account for most of the occurrences of never in my corpus, however. In example 12, for instance, there is no adverb that refers to future time; and in both examples 12 and 14, as well as in examples 10 and 11, the time reference of the utterance is indicated by other items (the preterite verb forms in 10 and 11, the adverbial tonight in 13, and the modal will in 12 and 14), as, of course, is normally the case in English (see Crystal, 1964).

Rather than seeing the non-universal sense of never as exceptional, and attempting to analyse it as a separate item from universal never, never can be seen as foregrounding that part of the utterance that comes within its scope, intensifying the force of the negation. Thus, in examples 10-12, the speakers have given discourse prominence, or emphasis, to the part of the utterance that comes within the scope of never, so that, for instance, the difference between 10 and 10a is that in 10, Lynne highlights the possibility of the eye having been lost. And in example 14, using the universal temporal negator similarly intensifies the negation of the proposition, in contrast with the less forcefully negated 14a:

14 a. You won't catch the train tonight

Even where never is an indeterminate, one of the three-term series sometimes -ever-never, it can still be seen as foregrounding the part of the utterance that falls within its scope, so that 9a, for instance, contrasts with the more forcefully negated 9:

9. He never visits us
9a. He doesn't visit us

Given an appropriate context, in other words, 9a can still have universal reference, even though the universal quantifier does not appear.

Seeing never simply as the negative member of a three-term series, as in the analyses of Klima and Quirk et al., misses the important function that never fulfills in English, as a marker of foregrounding, highlighting the negation of that part of the utterance that falls within its scope. Using a universal temporal negator to strengthen the force of negation is, of course, a common phenomenon in European languages, and it has been a favoured strategy in the history of English. Modern English no, for example, derives from Old English na, which itself derives from ne + a, 'not ever' (Jespersen, 1917: 18). Similarly, Modern English not derives from ne + a + wiht, 'not ever anything' (Traugott, 1972: 94). In present-day English not has lost its function of reinforcing, or foregrounding, the negation of the utterance in which it occurs; and the universal negator is now serving this function, as before.

4.2. All as a marker of foregrounding

A similar conflict exists between the meaning that sentence grammars assign to the quantifier all, and the meaning that all expresses when it is used in everyday discourse. Like never, all is usually considered to be a universal quantifier, with a meaning that can be paraphrased as 'the whole of', or 'every one'. There is a vast literature on the meanings of all and other English quantifiers (see, for example, Ioup, 1975; McCawley, 1977; Vendler, 1967); within this literature there is a preoccupation with the analysis of the scope of the quantifiers, particularly when they are modifiers of nouns, as in example 15:

15. All of the arrows didn't hit their targets (from Levinson, 1983: 123)

Such problems, however, rarely arise when analysing utterances from everyday language. A problem that does arise, on the other hand, is that all frequently occurs with a meaning that cannot be paraphrased as 'the whole of'. Examples 16- 18 below illustrate this:

16. My mum was **all** crying (Lynne)
17. He was dressed **all** smart (Benny)
18. He was being **all** big-headed (Sharon)

Again, the use of all with a 'marked', non- universal meaning allows discourse prominence to be given to the adjectival forms with which it enters into construction (crying, smart and big-headed, respectively). Similarly, in example 19 , the word all does not imply that Nobby's brother's entire hand was injured, or that his entire head was bleeding (this would, presumably, be physically impossible); again, all appears to simply foreground that part of the utterance with which it is in construction:

19. My brother had **all** his hand bashed up..**all** his head was bleeding (Nobby)

In example 20 there is the sense of quantification (' a large number of boxes' or ' a great deal of grease'); but this sense is certainly less than universal and, again, all appears to foreground that part of the utterance with which it is in construction:

20. There's **all** boxes and that..there's **all** grease (Debbie)

Finally, consider examples 21and 22:

21. You gotta make **all** new friends (Nobby)
22. And I got..I got **all** the bollockings for it..and there was him, laughing! (Dave)

Here it is possible that the sense of universal quantification is intended. In example 21, Nobby was explaining why he didn't want to move away from the road he lives in , despite the fact that there is nothing to do in the area. He may mean that if he moved, every friend that he would have, would have to be a new one; or he may simply be foregrounding his point that he would have to make new friends, in order to clearly express his reluctance to move away. Similarly, in example 22, Dave is referring to a shoplifting episode during which he was caught but his friend escaped. It may be the case that Dave was the only boy who got into trouble for the shoplifting episode; or he may simply be foregrounding the words within the scope of all , to emphasise the unfairness of what happened. It is pointless, however, to attempt to give a strict interpretation of the meaning of the quantifier; for in everyday discourse it is rarely important to communicate whether or not strict universality applies. It is far more important that Nobby communicates his reluctance to move away from his road, and that Dave communicates his feeling of having been treated unfairly, than it is for either of them to communicate unambiguously the truth value of what they are saying.

Both all and never, then, occur in English as universal quantifiers; and it is this use that has been given very detailed treatment in sentence grammars. But they also occur in everyday conversation with more restricted meanings, with a sense that appears to be less than, and sometimes directly opposite to, the meaning of universal quantification, and that as a result gives discourse prominence to that part of the utterance that falls within their scope.

There are clear parallels here with the use of this as a marker of foregrounding; in each case a single item appears to be used in English to assign both definite and indefinite reference. It seems that whenever a feature appears to have two contradictory meanings, we should be alerted to the possibility that the two apparently distinct senses are related, with one or both of them being available for foregrounding and for the expression of intensity.

4.5. Speaker involvement

Using a universal quantifier with a sense that is less than universal is, of course, an example of overstatement; and overstatement is a strategy which is very commonly used for intensifying the force of an utterance. Many of the more common English intensifiers are relatively empty of lexical content today, but have their origins in overstatement; consider, for example, adjectives such as awful, horrible, wonderful, or great.

The universal quantifiers are often analysed in terms of scalar implicatures: that is to say, they are seen as a member of an implicational scale, so that an utterance containing one item from the scale entails the items lower down on the scale. Examples of a few such scales are given

below, from Levinson (1983:134):

‹ all, most, many, some, few ›
‹ always, often, sometimes ›
‹ excellent, good ›

If someone says : this is excellent wine, they conversationally implicate this is good wine; if they say all the pets we have had have been a nuisance, this conversationally implicates some of the pets we have had have been a nuisance, and so on. Thus in examples 16-22 above, the speakers who used the universal quantifiers where the quantification involved was less than universal were not, in fact, making a cognitive contradiction; they were simply indulging in overstatement.

Using overstatement is a frequent way of expressing subjective involvement; for by choosing a word that communicates the highest point on a scale, the strength of a speaker's feelings can be very effectively communicated. Scalar implicatures are helpful in explaining why this is not a contradiction in terms, since they draw attention to the fact that universal quantifiers are at the high point of a scale, and that they conversationally implicate lower points on their scales.

4.4. Addressee-orientation

Again, the function of all and never as addressee-oriented items is directly related to the expression of speaker involvement. Items at the highest point on a scale conversationally implicate the lower points on the scale, but it is up to the addressee to determine whether or not the highest point on the scale can in fact apply. In some cases, a universal meaning is possible; this was so for all in example 21, as we saw in section 4.2, and for never in example 9 (reproduced below). In other cases, the linguistic context makes it clear that universality cannot apply, as in example 11, where the past tense verb form and the surrounding context clearly specify a moment of past time. And on other occasions, as in example 19, addressees have to use their knowledge of the world to decide on the degree of quantification that is entailed:

21. You gotta make **all** new friends (Nobby)
9. He never visits us
11. He **never** told me! If I'd have known he's have run, I'd have run...right git (Dave)
19. My brother had **all** his hand bashed up..**all** his head was bleeding (Nobby)

In every case, speakers who use a universal quantifier indicate to their addressees that the intended scope of the quantifier is the widest possible within the linguistic and non-linguistic context in which it is used. As with this as a marker of foregrounding, using a universal quantifier communicates the subjective, emotional involvement of the speaker in the utterance whilst at the same time opening a processing task to the addressees, inviting them to identify the widest possible scope for the quantifier and thereby involving them directly in the creation of the universe of discourse.

Again, universal quantifiers can be seen as positive politeness devices. Brown and Levinson (1978: 122) see hedges such as sort of and kind of as positive politeness devices, because they leave it to the addressee to figure out the precise meaning of the word that they qualify. If a speaker says John's sort of nice, she is indicating that nice is a metephor, and it is up to the addressee to decide exactly how to interpret it. Using sort of in this way implies that

there is some common ground between the speaker and the addressee, and the speaker calls upon the addressee to use their common knowledge in order to interpret her attitude. In the same wey, using a universal quantifier implies a common knowledge of the world and calls on the addressee to use this knowledge to determine the widest possible limits of universality that can apply. Like this, the universal quantifiers are metaphors, creating a joint focus of attention for the speaker and the addressee.

5. Addressee-oriented features in discourse

So far I have considered this, all and never in isolation, in order to show that a sentence-based grammar with its preoccupation with the expression of propositional thought cannot account for the way in which these items are used in everyday face-to-face discourse, where they express subjective involvement and orient the discourse towards their addressee. The function of quantifiers and intensifier this as addressee-oriented items, however, cannot be properly appreciated unless their use is seen within a wider context, as part of a pattern of addressee-oriented features in spoken discourse.

Extract B, below, is a narrative from the Reading corpus, where Lynne has the floor and the other people who are present listen. The addressee-oriented features are in bold type. They cluster in two places: in the opening sections of the narrative, and at the end. This is a very frequent pattern in the narrative sections of the recordings, and it serves a communicative function, as we will see.

Extract B:

Lynne: Well..I never have been in hospital to stay..not even one night
Mandy: Your brother has though Lynne..remember his eye
Lynne.
1. **Oh**..**yeah**..my brother..he went to work with my uncle..Derek..
2. and..em...**anyway**..my uncle Derek went in to see **this** lady about **this** job
3. and there were my cousin and my brother..
4. was playing with **these** sticks outside..
5. playing swords or summat..
6. and my cousin accidentally put them in his eye..
7. and his eye was hanging out
8. and he nearly lost it
9. he was lucky he still had his eye
10. because the lady who bandaged it up for him
11. and the doctor..said to my mum
12. he was **ever so** snotty with her
13. he said that he was lucky he **never** lost his eye..you know
14. my mum was **all** crying
15. she was so upset

If a speaker is to take the floor and keep it for long enough to tell a narrative, it is necessary to attract the attention and the interest of the addressees in the opening sections of the narrative. This is not necessarily an easy task, since the main interest of the story usually occurs later in the narrative. Often the opening clauses form an orientation section to the narrative (see Labov,1972), which merely sets out the main participants and their whereabouts, and which does not necessarily have a great deal of intrinsic interest for the

addressees. Using this in the orientation section, as Lynne does, expresses her subjective involvement in what is being said, and, we can assume, creates an anticipatory interest on the part of the addressees in the story that is to be told. Furthermore, the combination of addressee-oriented items that occurs in the orientation section is likely to secure the attention of the addressees and to make the task of keeping the floor that much easier. Using 'metaphorical' this in the opening sections of narratives can be seen, therefore, as just one of a cluster of addressee-oriented items that enables the narrative to get underway.

Lynne's task in taking the floor is made easier by her friend Mandy's invitation to tell the story; nevertheless, in the orientation section of her narrative (clauses 1 - 5), she uses six addressee-oriented features, including three occurrences of the intensifier this (for discussion of oh in discourse, see Schiffrin, 1986).

In extract A (repeated below, from section 3), Ronny has a more difficult task. He tells his story immediately after another speaker has finished telling a story on the same general theme of naked ladies. There are several speakers with similar tales to tell, all eager to take the floor, so Ronny needs to use a number of strategies in order to gain his turn.

Extract A (Ronny):

1 **Do you know what happened to me ?**
2 I was in **this** lady' s house.. up there..**right**,
3 and her little girl.. **right**
4 she said take this up to my mum
5 so I was walking upstairs
6 she was in the bathroom
7 and I went in the door
8 and there she was
9 standing completely naked
10 **just** standing there

Ronny's first strategy in engaging his addressee's interest is to use a question - clearly an addressee-oriented form. He also checks that the adressees have followed the details of his orientation clauses, using the word right, with fall-rise intonation - another addressee-oriented item. He uses this to foreground the first available noun, in clause 2. The referent that is marked by this plays a central role in the story; this therefore plays a triple role here: it foregrounds a referent about which more information is forthcoming, it marks the emotional involvement of the speaker in the story that is to be told, thereby indicating to the addressee that the story is one that will be worth listening to; and it orients the discourse towards the addressee, metaphorically implying a shared experience, and therefore involving the addressee in the creation of the universe of discourse.

Note that in both Ronny's and Lynne's narratives, there are no addressee-oriented items in the clauses which report the main action. It seems that by the time speakers get to this part of the story, they can assume that they have secured the interest and the attention of their addressees, and they do not need to encumber their account of the action with items that no longer have a communicative function. Addressee-oriented items reappear, however, in the evaluation sections of the narratives. In Lynne's narrative, this is clauses 9-15; in Ronny's narrative. this is clause10 (see Lee, 1987), for an analysis of just). Ronny also uses an intensifier, completely, to mark the climax of his story, in clause 9. Again, there is a

communicative reason for their occurrence. At the end of a narrative speakers need to demonstrate that the story was worth telling, to avoid, as Labov (1972) has pointed out, the withering response "so what?" By using an item which expresses the speaker's subjective involvement in the story in the evaluative sections of the narrative, speakers express their emotional stake in the story, and justify its telling. Since, as I have claimed here, these items are also addressee-oriented features, the addressee is invited to help create the universe of discourse, and is more likely, therefore, to be sympathetic to the point of its having been told. Furthermore, the speaker will have satisfied the politeness requirements of the situation, by attending to the positive face of the addressees, in recognition of having monopolised the floor.

It is not only in narratives that addressee-oriented features serve an important function. Extract C is an argument that took place between Benny and Nobby. Benny is complaining about the area where the two boys live, saying that there is nothing to do there. Nobby is saying that nevertheless it would be hard to move and make new friends. Although they are arguing, each speaker uses linguistic features which take account of the other person. For example, Nobby marks his contribution as a preliminary to an argument with the formula poke your nose in clause 1; Benny takes up the argument, but softens the force of his statement with a tag question, in clause 2. Nobby's final comment makes his point strongly, with repetition (it wouldn't be the same, in clauses 6 and 8) and with quantifiers that express his subjective involvement (so much in clause 7 and the quantifier all in clause 9); and he orients his utterance towards his adressee with a cluster of linguistic features, including the quantifier all and the tag question ain't you.

Extract D: Nobby and Benny:

Nobby: 1. I've lived in Cumberland Road for ten years ..so...eleven years..**so poke your nose**
Benny: 2. **Yeah**..it's rubbish though.. round here, **isn't it**?
Benny :3. **You ain't** got **nothing** to do..some nights
Jenny: Why.. what's wrong with it ? Looks allright to me
Nobby: 4. **Yeah**..but when **you** leaves now..
5. if **you** leave now..
6. it wouldn't be the same..
7. 'cos **you**'ve got used to the area **so much**..
8. it wouldn't be the same...
9. 'cos **you** gotta make **all** new friends..**ain't you**?

In Brown and Levinson's terms, Benny and Nobby are attending to each other's positive face in a number of different ways, despite the fact that they are arguing. The possible overstatement of the quantifier all in clause 9 implies that what Nobby is saying might not be literally true, so the threat to Benny's face is minimised; and by using tag questions in clauses 2 and 9, each speaker appeals to shared assumptions, attending to his addressee's positive face whilst at the same time strengthening the likelyhood of his argument being accepted.

6. Conclusion

This paper has focused on the expression of non-propositional meaning in everyday spoken discourse. It is worth stressing that the meaning that is assigned to this and to the quantifiers all and never by sentence-based grammars takes no account of the meaning that these items express in everyday language and, as we have seen, even appears to directly conflict with their everyday meaning. Nevertheless, the analytical insights of sentence-based grammars do not necessarily

have to be abandoned. Instead, it is necessary to take account of the way in which speakers express their emotional involvement in what they are saying; to take account, that is, of the subjectivity of utterance. It is equally necessary to take account of the fact that in face-to-face communication speakers are continually orienting their discourse towards their addressees, in order to serve specific communicative functions. These two fundamental aspects of spoken discourse are served by using this, all and never as metaphors; and this in turn necessarily involves the addressee in actively participating in the interpretation of the metaphor. The ability to use and interpret metaphors, of course, is a general cognitive ability, not just a language-specific ability, for it represents our ability to reason analogically (see Levinson, 1983:159). Equally, the systematic use of addressee-oriented items in spoken language reflects general social principles of cooperative activity between individuals, not just a language-specific ability (again, see Levinson, op.cit: 97). By focusing our analyses on the subjectivity of utterance and on the interactive features of spoken language, it may be possible to situate language behaviour within the wider perspective of general cognitive behaviour and general social behaviour. We may, in this way, achieve a more integrated and more worthwhile description and explanation of language structure and language use.

References

Brown, P. and Levinson, S. (1986) Politeness Cambridge: CUP

Cheshire, J. (1982) Variation in an English dialect: a sociolinguistic study Cambridge:CUP

Clark, E. (1974) 'Normal states and evaluative viewpoints' Language 50: 316-332

Coates, J. (1987) 'Epistemic modality and spoken discourse' Transactions of the Philiological Society: 110-131

Coates, J. (1988) 'Modal meaning: the semantic - pragmatic interface'. Paper presented at the Linguistics Association of Great Britain Autumn meeting, University of Exeter. To appear in Brown, G. (ed) Practical Semantics

Crystal, D. (1964) 'Specification and English tenses' Journal of Linguistics: 1-34

Collins Cobuild English Language Dictionary (1987) London: Collins

Holmes, J. (1988) 'Hedging, fencing and other conversational gambits: an analysis of gender differences in New Zealand speech' In A. Pauwels (ed) Women and Language in New Zealand Society Sydney: Australian Professional Publications

Ioup, G. (1975) 'Some universals for quantifier scope' In Kimball, J.P. (ed) Syntax and Semantics Vol. 4 New York: Academic Press

Jespersen, O (1917) Negation in English and other languages Copenhagen: Andr. Fred Høst and Son.

Klima, E. (1964) 'Negation in English' In Fodor, J.A. and Katz, J.J. (eds) The structure of language: readings in the philosophy of language New Jersey: Englewood Cliffs: 246-323

Labov, W. (1972) 'The transformation of experience in narrative syntax'. In Language in the Inner City Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press: 354-397

Labov, W. (1973) 'Where do grammars stop?' In Shuy, R. (ed) Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press

Labov. W. (1984) 'Intensity' In Schiffrin, D. (ed) Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press

Lakoff, R. (1974) 'Remarks on this and that' Proceedings of the Tenth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society: 345-356

Lee, D. (1987) 'The semantics of just' Journal of Pragmatics: 377-398
Levinson, S. (1983) Pragmatics Cambridge CUP
Lyons, J. (1977) Semantics Cambridge CUP
Lyons, J. (1981) Language, meaning and context London Fontana
McCawley, J. (1977) 'Lexicographic notes on English quantifiers'. Proceedings of the Tenth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society 13: 372-383
Nordberg, B. (1987) 'The use of onomatopoeia in the conversational style of adolescents' In Lilius, P. and Saari, M. (eds) The Nordic languages and Modern Linguistics 6 Helsinki: Helsinki University Press
Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. and Svartvik, J. (1985) A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language London: Longman
Schiffrin, D. (1986) Discourse markers Cambridge CUP
Stein, D. (in press) Natural and social factors in syntactic change Berlin: De Gruyter
Stubbs, M. (1986) ' "A matter of prolonged fieldwork": Notes towards a modal grammar of English' Applied Linguistics 17: 1-25
Traugott, E.C. (1972) A History of English Syntax New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston
Vendler, Z. (1967) 'Each and every, any and all' In Vendler, Z. (ed) Linguistics in Philosophy Ithica. Cornell University Press
Wald, B. (1983) 'Referents and topic within and across discourse units: Observations from current vernacular English'. In Klein-Andreu, F. (ed) Discourse perspectives on syntax New York: Academic Press:93-118