



**UNIVERSITY  
OF TURKU**

This is a self-archived – parallel-published version of an original article. This version may differ from the original in pagination and typographic details. When using please cite the original.

**AUTHOR** Marja-Liisa Helasvuo & Karita Suomalainen

**TITLE** First and second person forms as resources for open reference and participation in Finnish everyday conversations

**YEAR** 2024

**DOI** <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.344.03hel>

**VERSION** Author accepted version

**CITATION** Helasvuo, M-L & Suomalainen, K. (2024). First and second person forms as resources for open reference and participation in Finnish everyday conversations. In Ewing, M.C. & Laury, R. (eds). (Non)referentiality in Conversation. (Pragmatics & Beyond New Series; Vol. 344). John Benjamins. pp. 35-55.  
<https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.344.03hel>

## Chapter 3

### **First and second person forms as resources for open reference and participation in Finnish everyday conversations**

Marja-Liisa Helasvuo & Karita Suomalainen

University of Turku

**Abstract:** Based on data from Finnish conversational interaction, this article explores the use of 1st and 2nd person forms in creating deictically non-specific, open reference. We focus on the linguistic and embodied features of turns that contain these open personal forms and examine their sequential positioning. We show that the 1st and 2nd person forms that receive a deictically open interpretation typically occur in assessments, accounts of personal experience, and imaginary descriptions. They function as deictic displacements, shifting the origo of the speech situation, and causing a change of footing in the discourse roles, thus modulating the participation framework of the speech situation.

**Keywords:** Finnish, everyday conversation, first person singular, open reference, person expressions, participation framework, second person singular, referential index, deixis

**Running head:** Resources for open reference and participation

## 1 Introduction

First and second person forms (e.g., personal pronouns, verbal person markers) are typically described as referring to speech act participants, to the speaker, and the addressee (Siewierska 2004: 1–2). It is well known, however, that second person forms can also be used more openly, so that they do not refer exclusively to the addressee, but rather, are less referentially specific (Kitagawa & Lehrer 1990; Kluge 2016; for an overview, see Suomalainen & Varjo 2020: 100). First person forms can also be used for creating non-specific reference (Helasvuo 2008; Zobel 2016; see also Kitagawa & Lehrer 1990: 741–742 on the “impersonal I”).

Our study explores the use of 1st and 2nd person forms in creating deictically non-specific reference—or, as we call it, *open reference*—in conversational interaction, focusing on how these forms modulate the participation framework and how the reference they create is interpreted intersubjectively by the participants. This interpretation is based not only on the immediate syntactic context but also on the larger sequential context, including the co-participants’ responses to the turns that contain the reference forms.

In previous studies, various terms have been used when referring to the deictically non-specific use of person forms; the terms used have

included, for example, “generic” (e.g., Jensen & Gregersen 2016) and “impersonal” (e.g., Kitagawa & Lehrer 1990), which imply that these forms point to referents that are outside of the immediate speech context. As our study shows, however, even the so-called generic expressions may find their referent(s) in the speech situation. In this sense, they are open to different interpretations and carry the potential not only to refer non-specifically to people in general but also point to specific referents in the immediate speech context (see also Laitinen 2006: 216; Varjo & Suomalainen 2018: 335–337; Suomalainen & Varjo 2020: 98–99, 115–116). Therefore, we have chosen to use the term “open reference” to describe the referential potential of the deictically non-specific use of personal forms.

Using data from everyday Finnish conversations, our study aims to provide answers to the following questions: (1) In what kind of sequential contexts do the deictically open 1st and 2nd person forms occur? Are they part of certain interactional practices? (2) Are there any special linguistic features and embodied conduct in the composition of turns that contain open 1st or 2nd person forms? (3) How do the open 1st and 2nd person reference forms modify the participation framework of the ongoing speech situation?

This article is organized as follows. We first discuss open reference forms as grammatical resources, placing the Finnish open reference forms into a cross-linguistic perspective (Section 2.1), and as interactional resources for creating reference and modulating the participation framework (Section 2.2). We then introduce the data and methods that we used (Section

3). In our analysis (Section 4), we focus on the interactional functions of the open reference forms as well as on the linguistic features and embodied conduct that accompany them. We also show how open reference forms can be used to modulate the participation framework. Section 5 presents our concluding discussion.

## **2 Theoretical Background**

In this section, we examine open reference forms as part of the person system in Finnish and compare them to similar forms in other languages. We also discuss 1st and 2nd person forms as referential indices used for modulating the participation framework.

### **2.1 Open Reference Forms in Grammar and Interaction**

In Finnish, the category of person is expressed through verbal person markers (suffixes), personal pronouns, and possessive suffixes. In the person system, 1st person singular forms primarily serve to refer to the speaker, and 2nd person singular forms refer to the addressee. 2nd person forms can, however, be used in reference to somebody other than the addressee (see Suomalainen 2020, Suomalainen & Varjo 2020; Uusitupa 2017), and similarly, 1st person forms can be used so that they do not index the speaker but are rather used more openly in reference to anybody or

humans in general (Helasvuo 2008). The Finnish person marking system does not make a formal distinction between the deictically specific and open 1st and 2nd person singular forms. Instead of formal coding, the interpretation of a certain form as being specific vs. open is based on the context.

In addition to the open use of 1st and 2nd person forms, Finnish has other means of creating an open reference. Among these, the most frequent is the so-called zero-person construction, which involves a third-person verb form that has no overt subject (see Laitinen 2006). The use of the zero person is a conventional way to construe generic statements concerning human beings, but in certain contexts, the zero person may also get a more specific interpretation; it can, for example, be used when the speakers talk about their own experiences or feelings (Laitinen 2006; Suomalainen & Varjo 2020).

Besides Finnish, the open usage of 2nd person forms has been recognized in a wide variety of languages (for Danish, see Nielsen et al. 2009; for English: Kitagawa & Lehrer 1990, Kamio 2001; for French: Williams & Compernelle 2009; for German: Bredel 2002, Kluge 2016, Auer & Stukenbrock 2018; for Mandarin, Biq 1991, Tao, this volume; for Swedish: Fremer 2000). There has been much less research interest concerning the use of 1st person forms for creating a deictically non-specific, open reference (for German: see Zobel 2016). Previous studies have shown that open personal expressions are used for certain interactional

goals; they can be used for construing involvement and inviting the addressee to join in the perspective that is being offered (Auer & Stukenbrock 2018; Jensen & Gregersen 2016; Nielsen et al. 2009; Stirling & Manderson 2011; Suomalainen & Varjo 2020).

Interestingly, when used for creating open reference, the 1st and 2nd person forms may nevertheless carry certain features from their deictically specific meaning (Helasvuo 2008; Kluge 2016; Laitinen 2006; Suomalainen 2018; Stirling & Manderson 2011; Zobel 2016), as we will show in Section 4 (below). This means that their referential scope may to some extent also cover the point of view of the speaker (in the case of 1st person singular) or invite participation from the recipient (in the case of 2nd person singular). For 2nd person forms, this procedure has been described by Sacks (1992, part 1: 163–168, 348–353), according to whom the English second person pronoun *you* is referentially ambiguous: when the recipients hear *you*, they go through a procedure to define how broad a scope the expression has in its context of use (for a further exploration of this procedure in Finnish, see Suomalainen 2018). In case the recipients do not interpret *you* to refer exclusively to them, *you* receives an ultimately open interpretation. As Sacks (1992, part 1: 350) puts it: “‘You’ as it expands and eventually meets ‘everyone’, excludes no one. It comes to mean ‘me’, indeed, also.

## 2.2 Reference and Participation

In previous studies, 1st and 2nd person forms have been described as *referential indices* (Silverstein 1976) or *shifters* (Jakobson 1971 [1957]).

The idea behind these terms is that 1st and 2nd person forms have a conventional meaning that indexes the interactional role of the participant being referred to: *I* indexes the role of the speaker, whereas *you* creates the role of the recipient (Goffman 1981: 47; Linell 2009: 69; see also Buber 1962 [1923]). In everyday interaction, the speaker is the one who utters *I*, and the recipient is the other, addressed party. However, 1st and 2nd person forms can also be understood as indicating discourse roles (Levinson 1988: 164; Siewierska 2004: 1; see also Ochs, Gonzales & Jacoby 1996); as such, they represent the roles of the interaction's two crucial parties: 'Self' and 'The Other' (cf. Linell 2009: 69, 77, 109–110; see also Buber 1962 [1923]). By indicating discourse roles, 1st and 2nd person forms do not always refer to physical entities "in this world", as we will show in our analysis in Section 4.

Indexing participant roles, 1st and 2nd person singular forms can be employed in the course of interaction to modulate the *participation framework*. The participation framework is a concept that was developed by Goffman (1981; for its application in linguistics, see Levinson 1988). Originally, Goffman (1981) used the idea of the participation framework to decompose the concept of *addressee* and to describe the different roles that so-called "hearers" have: there are both ratified participants (e.g., addressed

recipients and other “official hearers”) as well as unratified participants (e.g., over-hearers or eavesdroppers). The roles of the speaker were further analyzed using the concept of *production format* (Goffman 1981: 226). The concept of participation framework has been further developed within conversation analytic research so that it covers both the role of the speaker and that of an addressee, articulating all interactional, transitional positions that the interaction’s different parties take up and orient to on a moment-by-moment basis (see Goodwin & Goodwin 1990; for Finnish, see Seppänen 1996).

According to Goffman (1981: 128), the changes that take place within the participation framework are called *changes of footing*. Such changes can happen, for example, when a turn is addressed to a certain recipient and he or she is chosen as the next speaker. However, a change of footing can also be carried out within the turn of an individual speaker and in the form of reported speech through which the current speaker brings in another voice.

In this paper, we argue that the open use of 1st and 2nd person forms affects the participation framework and leads to changes of footing. Open personal expressions shift the perspective of the subject matter that is under discussion to that of a more abstract level, indicating a transfer outside of the here-and-now of the current speech situation. When the participants use the open 1st or 2nd person forms, they no longer refer directly to themselves as speakers, or to their interlocutors as hearers. In open use, they primarily come to index the participant role of ‘Self’ or ‘Other’ that is associated with

the person form in question, hence dissolving the referential relation to the participants who utter them, or to whom they are uttered.

### 3 Data and Methods

Our data come from the Arkisyn corpus of conversational Finnish compiled at the University of Turku. It currently contains data from 27 different conversations that in total comprise approximately 30 hours. For this current study, we extracted all 1st and 2nd person singular forms (personal pronouns, verbal person suffixes, and possessive suffixes) from seven conversations (8.5 hrs.). We also used additional data from another interaction (1.5 hrs.) that is not included in the Arkisyn corpus.

Table 1 shows the data that were selected from the Arkisyn corpus. It compares deictically specific and open personal forms in the data. This table shows that 2nd person forms are much more frequently used for open reference than are 1st person forms (11.3% vs. 0.04%, respectively). The additional data we have used is not included in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Deictically specific and open personal forms in the data.

Personal reference form	N of occurrences with deictically specific reference	N of occurrences with deictically open reference	N of all occurrences
SG1	4,874 (99.6%)	20 (0.04%)	4,894 (100%)
SG2	1,560 (88.7%)	199 (11.3%)	1,759 (100%)

The additional data (recording of one conversation (1,5 hours) from the Archive of Finnish and Finno-Ugric languages) contains 6 additional cases of deictically open singular 1st person. So, all in all, we have analyzed 26 cases of singular 1st person and 199 cases of singular 2nd person forms with deictically open reference. The analysis we present in Section 4 below is based on careful microanalysis of these data.

In our analysis, we utilized conversation analytic (Sidnell & Stivers eds. 2012) and interactional linguistic methods (Selting & Couper-Kuhlen eds. 2001; Couper-Kuhlen & Selting 2018). The conversation analytic approach provides us with tools to analyze how the interpretation of the personal reference form is created turn-by-turn, sensitive to the current interactional context, and in cooperation between the participants. Our analysis of linguistic practices in their contexts of use is based on interactional linguistics. We analyze the relationship between the linguistic forms that are used in these contexts and the paradigmatic and syntagmatic options that are available.

#### **4 Analysis**

In this section, we analyze the open use of 1st and 2nd person singular forms in our data. We devote particular attention to the sequential positioning of the target constructions as well as the linguistic practices and

bodily cues that are related to the composition of the turns that contain the target constructions (cf. Lerner, 1996: 285–291).

We start our analysis by describing the sequential contexts in which open 1st and 2nd person singular forms occur and their interactional functions (Section 4.1). We then investigate the implementation and functions of certain linguistic and embodied features that co-occur with open 1st and 2nd person forms, after which we discuss what effect these features have in relation to deictic shifts that happen when open personal expressions are used (Section 4.2). Finally, we discuss how the use of open personal expressions modulates the participation framework (Section 4.3).

#### 4.1 Sequential Contexts and Interactional Functions

As we mentioned earlier in Section 2, the Finnish person marking system does not make a formal distinction between the open and deictically specific 1st and 2nd person singular forms; instead, the open interpretation is primarily based on the context of use. As for this context, the sequential features are especially important; these features include the interactional practices and the action and activity type in which the person form occurs.

It has been shown that deictically specific 2nd person forms are common in the first turns of adjacency pairs, such as questions or requests as well as in turns that describe or evaluate the addressee or their actions (Suomalainen 2018; 2020: 50). Deictically specific 2nd person forms typically select somebody else as the next speaker; as a response, these turns

receive a second turn in which the addressed recipient orients to the use of 2nd person singular form, for example, by using 1st person singular forms. This is demonstrated by the following example in which 1st and 2nd person singular forms are deictically specific, occurring in a question-answer adjacency pair. The 2nd person forms (verbal person suffix and pronoun) occur in Salla's turn (line 1: *haluut sä* 'do you want') in which she poses a question to the recipient, Janna, who is also addressed by name.

(1) SG123

01 Salla: *haluut sä Janna nyt kirjottaa siihen*  
 want-2SG 2SG Janna now write-INF DEM-ILL  
 do you want Janna now write to that

02 *mun kave[ri]kirjaan* ].  
 1SG-GEN friendship.book-ILL  
 friendship book of mine.

03 Janna: *[voim mä ] kirjottaa,*  
 can-1SG 1SG write-INF  
 sure I can write it,

04 Salla: *>hyvä, <\**  
 good  
 great,

*\*goes to get the friendship book*

In her turn, Salla uses the 1st person singular pronoun form to refer to something she possesses (line 2: *mun kaverikirjaan* 'to my friendship book'). As a response, Janna provides an answer to Salla's question by using the 1st person singular forms (verbal person suffix and pronoun; *voim mä* 'I can') when referring to her own action (line 3).

In contrast to deictically specific 1st and 2nd person singular forms, the open person forms are not typically found in adjacency pairs in which

the first turn projects a specific type of second turn. Instead, the 1st and 2nd person forms used for open reference in our data are commonly found in lengthy narrative sequences that involve actions such as assessments, accounts of personal experience, and descriptions of states of affairs. Quite often, the personal experiences or states of affairs that are discussed are of a hypothetical or imagined nature or otherwise expand beyond the here-and-now of the speech situation, which, for the participants, makes the open interpretation natural.

Different open personal expressions frequently occur in the same sequential contexts and form clusters (for Danish, see Nielsen, Fosgerau & Jensen 2009: 125, and for Mandarin, see Tao, this volume). In our data, the open 1st person singular forms almost always co-occur with the open 2nd person forms or the so-called zero-person construction, which is a construction that creates open reference that is formed with 3rd person forms. The open 2nd person forms show more varied clustering as they may co-occur not only with the open first person forms or the zero-person construction, but also, they may form their own clusters (see Suomalainen & Varjo 2020).

Example 2 below demonstrates, in a typical sequential context, the co-occurrence and clustering of open 1st and 2nd person singular forms. It is taken from a conversation involving three young adults—Toini, Kaisa, and Masa—who know each other through their church activities. Before the excerpt that is shown in the example, one of the participants, Toini, has told

the others that it has been hard lately for her to participate in church meetings because she has gone through some difficult phases in her life and has not felt like talking about this with others in the congregation. In the excerpt shown below, Toini moves from the description of her personal experience to a more general evaluation of the situation.

(2) SG440

01 Toini: *[ov vähäv vaikee sillei:] tullas seurakuntaaj*  
 be-3SG a.bit difficult like come-INF congregation-ILL  
 it's a bit difficult to come to the congregation and

02 *ja ollas <sillee et> hei mä haluun olla*  
 and be-INF like COMP PTC 1SG want-1SG be-INF  
 and be like hey I wanna be

03 *yks(h)[in he niin, .hhhh*  
 alone PTC  
 alone, .hhhh

04 Kaisa: *[nii, niin nii] joo.*  
 PTC PTC PTC PTC  
 yeah yeah yeah I see.

05 Toini: *[se ov vähäv vaikee*  
 DEM be-3SG little difficult  
 it's like a bit difficult

*seurassa sillei,*  
 company-INE like.that  
 in company,

06 (1.2)

07 Kaisa: *niim mä tiän se on oikeestikkik #ku#.*  
 PTC 1SG know-1SG DEM be-3SG really-CLT when  
 yeah, I know it's really (like that).

08 *(0.8) #va-,# (0.2) tai sillee et vois olla et*  
 dif- or like COMP could-3SG be-INF COMP  
 dif- (0.2) I mean it could be that

- 09            *jos meet jonnekki iham muuhun ku*  
 if go-2SG somewhere totally another-ILL than  
 if you go to
- 10            *omaa seuraku[ntaan ni sit voi ollakki*  
 own-ILL congregation-ILL PTC then can-3SG be-INF-CLT  
 a congregation other than your own then (one) can be
- 11 Toini:                            *[nii.*  
     PTC  
     Yeah
- 12 Kaisa:    *(.) saa ollakki enemär <raahas>*  
                   get-3SG be-INF-CLT more            peace-INE  
                   one can have more peace
- 13            *°mut sit° kuitenkin kaikki tulee kys#leej ja#;*  
 but then still everybody come-3SG ask-INF and  
 but then still, everybody comes and asks and;
- 14            (0.2)
- 15 Toini:    *mmmmmm?*  
                   PTC  
                   mm?
- 16            (0.2)

In Example 2, Toini's first turn (lines 1–3) elaborates her feelings by presenting an imaginary situation in which a person participates in a church meeting but says to everybody that he or she wants to be alone. This situation is framed by a zero-person formulation *ov vähäv vaikee sillei: tullas seurakuntaaj ja ollas <sillee et>* 'It's a bit difficult to come to the congregation and be like' (lines 1–2). The zero-person construction is often used in tellings of personal experience to introduce a topic that is later illustrated, for example, with the use of open 2nd person singular forms

(Varjo & Suomalainen 2018: 355). In Example 2, the zero-person construction is followed by the use of open 1st person singular (pronoun and verbal suffix): *hei **m**ü haluun olla yks(h)[in he niin*, ‘hey, I wanna be alone’ (lines 2–3). The utterance in which the open 1st person singular occurs is presented as direct reported speech, the source of which, however, remains open, or at least implicit, due to the preceding use of zero-person forms.

In Example 2, the open 1st person singular forms have a twofold function. On the one hand, the imaginary line in a hypothetical dialogue, produced from the 1st person perspective, is used to demonstrate the feelings of the speaker or whoever goes to the congregation and does not feel like talking to others there. On the other hand, the use of the 1st person singular introduces a “new” voice in the situation in question and thus makes Toini’s turn become polyphonic. With the 1st person singular form, it is possible to give an individual voice to a generic, yet very personal, experience.

In Example 2, the introduction of a new voice calls for mutual negotiation of the ongoing referential framework, as the use of an open personal expression provides a potentially relatable perspective to the situation at hand for the other participants. In her response, which consists of agreeing response particles (lines 3–4: *nii niin nii joo*), Kaisa displays that she recognizes the experience that is being talked about and affiliates with the previous speaker (see Sorjonen 2001: 133).

After having shown recognition of the experience that Toini was describing (lines 3–4), Kaisa explicitly states that she knows what Toini is talking about (line 7: *niim mä tiän* ‘yeah I know’; see Couper-Kuhlen 2012: 122–126 and Mikesell 2017: 281 on the English *I know*; cf. Vatanen 2018: 204) and then goes on to present her perspective on the matter (*se on oikeestikkik #ku#* ‘it’s really (like that)’). After this, however, she slightly changes the direction of her turn, indicated by the particle *tai* ‘I mean’ (Sorjonen & Laakso 2005) and starts to describe a hypothetical situation, where a person goes to a congregation that is not her usual one. It is in this context that the use of open 2nd person singular verbal suffix occurs (lines 9–10: *jos meet jonnekki iham muuhun ku omaan seurakuntaan* ‘if you go to a congregation other than your own’). Similar to the open 1st person singular form in line 2, the open 2nd person singular form illustrates the situation that is being discussed, and, with it, Kaisa demonstrates a certain way of acting. Interestingly, the open 2nd person singular is followed by zero-person forms *voi ollakki* ‘(one) can be’ (line 10) and *saa ollakki enemmä <raahas>* ‘(one) can have more peace’ (line 12). The change to the zero person might be motivated by the perspective change: Kaisa moves from describing a way of acting to elaborating an individual’s inner feelings, a context in which zero-person construction is more common than the open 2nd person singular (Suomalainen & Varjo 2020).

Similar to the open 1st person form earlier in Example 2 (line 2), the use of open 2nd person singular in the example has a twofold function: The

2nd person forms paint a picture of an objectified agent who performs the described action, but, at the same time, the 2nd person singular also addresses the other participants and thus invites them to recognize the described situation. Here, the display of recognition from the other participants' side comes from Toini and immediately follows the introduction of the 2nd person form, even though this display is rather minimal (line 11: *ni*).

Comparing the use of open 1st and 2nd person singular forms in this extract, we can see that they are both part of a sequence in which participants intersubjectively evaluate a specific yet hypothetical experience. The open 1st and 2nd person singular forms are used in rather similar parts of the sequence, namely in passages in which the hypothetical experience is exemplified. However, the local contexts of occurrence are different; the open 1st person singular form in Example 2 occurs in a context where an individual's inner feelings are described, whereas the open 2nd person singular illustrates a presumably shared way of acting.

#### 4.2 Linguistic Features and Embodied Conduct

In our data, we have identified several linguistic features that are often present in conjunction with the open 1st and 2nd person singular forms and add to the interpretation of these forms as not (only) referring to the current speaker or the interlocutor. These include the presence of markers of reported speech or dialogue (e.g., *olla sillee* 'be like,' Ex. 2 above: lines 2–

3) or other indexical elements that indicate a change of footing, often into an imaginary or hypothetical situation and spatio-temporal frame. In addition, there might be some embodied markers of spatio-temporal shifts in turns with open 1st and 2nd person singular forms, such as illustrative hand movements or enacted voice.

A common verbal means of indicating a change to an imagined situation is the presence of an *if-then* frame. It is used to create a hypothetical world, such as in Example 2 (lines 9–10, 11–12). The *if-then* frame indicates a deictic shift in which the origo (i.e., the situation's vantage point) is no longer in the here-and-now of the speech situation but is instead in an imaginary or at least irrealis spatio-temporal domain. However, verbal elements are not the only way to create such shifts in our data; the use of open 1st and 2nd person singular forms is often accompanied by illustrative embodied action, such as enacted prosody (e.g., voice modulation), or narrative kinesic movements. These features are illustrated with Example 3, which comes from a conversation between sisters Jaana and Tuula.

Before the excerpt that is shown below, the participants had been discussing a mutual acquaintance who has retired because of a serious illness: sclerosis. Jaana has told Tuula how their friend's family treats her, which involves not showing any understanding of her condition. Then Jaana moves the discussion to a more general level.

(3) SG437

01 Jaana: *et ku kauheen monis perheis on sillai että:*, (0.4)

COMP as awfully many-INE family-PL-INE be.3SG so COMP  
in very many families, it is such that,

- 02 *et sillo et jos tulee niinku joku tämmönen tauti.*  
COMP when COMP if com-3SG like some DEM-ADJ disease  
if (one) gets some kind of disease.
- 03 *(0.2) ni, (0.2) .hh ta#i:# joku tämmönen tilanne. .hhhh nin, (0.2)*  
so or some DEM-ADJ situation so  
so .hh or is in some kind of a situation. .hhhh
- 04 *se ettei voida niinku su:htautuu sillai*  
DEM COMP-NEG can-CONNEX-PASS like behave-INF so  
that they cannot handle (it) so that
- 05 *että et nyt on näin, (.) voidaan asia*  
COMP COMP now be.3SG like.this can-PASS thing  
now it is so, (.) we can (deal with) this
- 06 *mä voim \*niinkun, (0.2) sulle pilkkoa*  
1SG can-1SG like 2SG-ALL chop-INF  
I can like chop up for you  
**\*moves hands above Tuula's plate and illustrates  
chopping up food**
- 07 *esimerki/ks ruuan,*  
for.example food-ACC  
for example, food,
- 08 Tuula: *[mm;*  
PTC  
mhm;
- 09 Jaana: *.hh enkä ole olet- (.) s:illai että; .hhhh*  
NEG-1SG-CLT be-CONNEX be like.that COMP  
and I'm not like; .hhhh
- 10 Jaana: *\*@sun nyt vaan täytyy olla kunnos*  
2SG-GEN now just must-3SG be-INF shape-INE  
you just have to be in shape  
**\*makes a fist with her hand and shakes it in rhythm  
with her speech**
- 11 *sun täytyy@ olla, (\*)*  
2SG-GEN must-3SG be-INF

you have to be, (.)  
-----\*

In Example 3, Jaana first sets up a frame that is referring to a situation that happens ‘in many families’ (*monis perheis*, line 1). She then construes an imaginary situation with an *if* construction (lines 2–3) within which she describes actions in general terms by using passive constructions (lines 4 and 5). In this imaginary situation, she then sets an imagined speaker who is presenting his/her speech by using 1st person singular references (pronoun and verbal suffix); the imagined speaker offers to chop food for the sick person (line 6). She contrasts this with a situation where the imagined speaker just tells the sick person to behave (lines 8–9). With the 2nd person forms, Jaana construes an imaginary addressee for the talk (lines 6, 10–11), thus creating a dialogue between ‘I’ and ‘you,’ ‘Self’ and ‘Other’ (Linell 2009).

In Example 3, it is clear that when using the 1st and 2nd person forms, Jaana is not speaking about herself or her family because no one in her family is sick. Instead, Jaana is reporting – and reproducing – someone else’s speech. Her turns are thus polyphonic, which is also signaled by the several uses of *että* (lines 1, 2, 4, 5, 9) which in this context indicate that the current speaker is not the author of the words she is about to produce (see Laury and Seppänen 2008; see also Keevallik 2008). In addition, Jaana uses enacted prosody (marked with @-signs: lines 10–11) in conjunction with open reference forms. She also makes use of embodied actions to indicate

that she is not herself talking but is instead giving voice to somebody else. In Goffman's words (1981), Jaana acts as an *animator*, as someone who merely produces the utterance, while the *principal* whose view Jaana's 1st person singular forms represent is to be found somewhere else. Jaana accompanies her talk (line 6) with an illustration of chopping food (Figure 1); she holds both of her hands above the plate of her co-participant, Tuula, and enacts a chopping gesture.



Figure 1. Illustrative embodied action in Example 3, line 6.

In Example 3, the multimodal elements that are in connection with the use of 1st and 2nd person forms are enacted, not happening in the real world but rather in the imagined world. As such, they represent what Stukenbrock (2014) described as the multimodally-created *Deixis am Phantasma* of face-to-face interaction (see also Auer & Stukenbrock 2018). The concept of

*Deixis am Phantasma* ('imagination-oriented deixis') was originally presented by Bühler (1965 [1934]) to describe deictic expressions that refer or point to non-present entities that can only be accessed in imagination. Stukenbrock (2014: 71) proposes that in face-to-face interaction, such expressions are deictic displacements that shift the origo of the speech situation away from the participants' actual space of perception to that of an imaginary spatio-temporal domain within which the speakers can orient their interlocutors' attention to physically absent entities.

Bühler (1965 [1934]) distinguishes between different types of *Deixis am Phantasma*: two main types (*Hauptfälle*) and a third, intermediate type. In Bühler's first main type of *Deixis am Phantasma*, the speaker refers to physically absent objects as if they were present. In the second type, the speaker displaces himself/herself in imagination to a place outside of the speech situation. The third type is defined as an intermediate case between remaining "here," in the speech situation, and going "there," to the imagined word outside of the speech situation. (See also Stukenbrock 2014: 72–73, 89.) As Stukenbrock (2014: 77) notes, typical examples of the *Deixis am Phantasma* are imagined spaces created while telling a story. This is also the case in Example 3 that is presented above: The imagined situation that is being referred to and enacted upon is purely hypothetical, but it is made accessible with the help of open personal expressions. The use of 1st and 2nd person singular forms invites the actual conversational participants, Tuula and Jaana, to see the situation as if they were experiencing it directly

from the imaginary actors' point of view, first from the position of the speaker (1st person forms) and then that of the recipient (2nd person forms). Had Jaana used, for example, third person forms or the Finnish passive construction instead, the situation would not be presented as directly accessible for the participants in the same manner, but rather, they would be observing it from outside.

The use of open 1st and 2nd person forms implements deictic displacements along the dimensions of time, place, and person. They do this by blending the here-and-now vantage point of the speech situation with the vantage point in the imagined reality that they are used to describing. In Bühler's (1965 [1934]) terms, the use of open 1st and 2nd person singular forms in our data represent the intermediate case of simultaneously remaining "here," in the speech situation, and going "there," to the imagined world. In Example 3, by producing the description of the situation in the 1st person singular form, the speaker, Jaana, projects herself into the narrated 'Other' whose vantage point she takes, and supports this by embodied action enacted from the vantage point of the narrated 'Other' (see Figure 1; cf. Stukenbrock 2014: 83).

#### 4.3 Modulating the Participation Framework

With the help of different referentially open personal constructions, the participants can modulate the deictic field of the ongoing interaction. They can use them to shift the perspective from the immediate speech situation to

a more abstract level or to make a transfer to another imaginary world outside the here-and-now of the speech situation, as demonstrated in Section 4.2. Furthermore, open 1st and 2nd person forms can also be utilized to induce a change of footing in the participation framework (Goffman 1981) and give rise to new or multiple voices and perspectives in the course of the interaction.

Example 4 illustrates the use of referentially open personal forms to modulate the participation framework. In the excerpt that is shown in this example, the participants are discussing an upcoming music festival. Some of them have participated in the festival in previous years, and they share their experiences of attending the festival. Prior to the excerpt Ina and Mikaela have complained about how crowded the festival is and how much planning it requires to attend the festival, to which another participant, Alma, has responded by stating that such planning is stressful and unnecessary. She goes on to suggest that the festival should be about hanging out together and feeling the music:

(4) D134

23 Alma: *ku se >pitäis<, mennä sillee niinku,*  
 because DEM must-COND.3SG go-INF like.this like  
 because it/one should go like,

24 (0.2)  $\uparrow$ <*hengailee*, $\uparrow$   
 hang.out-INF  
 hang out,

25 Mikaela: [*nii-i*,  
 PTC  
 right,

- 26 Onni: [*@pitää olla semmonen flou [siin hommas@.*  
 must-3SG be-INF DEM.ADJ flow DEM.INE job-INE  
 should have like a flow in that deal.
- 27 Alma: [*↑fiilistelee,↑*  
 have.good.vibes-INF  
 have good vibes,
- 28 Mikaela: *nii mut [sit-*  
 PTC but  
 yeah but
- 29 Alma: [*eikä m[itä stressii mennä sinne.*  
 NEG-CLTnothing.PAR stress-PARGO-INF there  
 and no stress going there.
- 30 Ina: [*>mut et sä oikee pysty<*  
 but NEG-2SG2SG really be.capable.of  
 but you cannot really
- 31 *hengailee > jos [et sä] < pääse minnekää*  
 hang.out-INF if NEG.2SG 2SG get.CONNEG anywhere  
 hang out if you don't get in anywhere
- 32 Mikaela: [*e:i. ]*  
 NEG.3SG  
 no.
- 33 Ina: [*°kuuntelee°, ]*  
 listen-INF  
 to listen (to the music),
- 34 Mikaela: [*mut jos et sä pääse] jos sä haluat et,*  
 but if NEG.2SG 2SG get.CONNEG if 2SG want.2SG COMP  
 but if you don't get in, if you want to,
- 35 *@mä haluisin ehkä nähä vähä tätä*  
 1SG want.COND.1SG maybe see-INF a.little DEM.PAR  
 I would maybe like to see a little bit of this
- 36 *ja vähä tätä@,=*  
 and a.little DEM.PAR  
 and a little bit of that,

- 37            =*mut sit jos sä (.) meet johonki. (0.2) ni sit*  
               but then if 2SG go.2SG some.ILL        PTC then  
               but then, if you go somewhere, then
- 38            *sä näät sitä vähä jostai*  
               2SG see.2SG DEM.PAR a.little some-ELA  
               you see a little bit of it from somewhere
- 39            *ja sit sä oot sillee*  
               and then 2SG be.2SG like  
               and then you are like
- 40            *et äh mä haluun nähä sitä toistaki,*  
               COMP    1SG want.1SG see.INF DEM.PAR other.ELA.CLT  
               I want to see the other one also,
- 41            (0.2)

In lines 23–24, 27 and 29, Alma presents a general claim regarding how one should behave at the festival. In their responses, Ina and Mikaela do not align with Alma’s claim. In line 28, Mikaela tries to start a disaligning turn (starting with *nii mut* ‘yeah but’), but is cut-off by Alma (line 29) who continues with her claim. In line 30, Ina responds to Alma in overlap. Ina’s turn (lines 30–31, 33) begins with the particle *mut* ‘but’ that indicates an alternative perspective; in her turn, Ina states that it is quite difficult to “hang out” if the crowd at the festival makes it impossible to access the music performances. Mikaela agrees with Ina (l. 32), and after Ina has finished the turn, Mikaela produces an account for her earlier claim (not shown here) of why it is necessary to prepare for the festival by scheduling.

Both Ina’s and Mikaela’s turns are disagreeing and even disaffiliating with Almas preceding turn, and accounting for the claims that the participants have presented earlier about the festival. Both Ina and Mikaela

have said that they have attended the festival before, so their accounts are based on personal experiences. However, these experiences are presented with the open 2nd person singular forms (lines 30–34, 37–39), which indicates that the experiences they are talking about could potentially be recognized by the other participants. It may also be worth noting that Example 4 comes from an argumentative context, and this may have an effect on the use of open 2nd person singular forms. Here they are used to strengthen the individual participant’s claims: the use of open 2nd person singular invites the participants to personally identify with the described experience and thus notice the truthfulness of it.

While Ina’s turn contains only 2nd person singular forms, Mikaela alternates between 1st and 2nd person. In line 34, Mikaela starts an *jos* ‘if’ clause with the 2nd person singular; however, at the end of line 34, she introduces a complement clause with the complementizer *että*, and continues with a clause in the 1st person singular form (line 35), which is marked as reported speech or thought by modulating the voice quality (marked with the @-sign). With the 1st person singular, Mikaela presents the inner thoughts of the person attending the festival. In line 37, she switches back to the 2nd person singular when describing the imagined actions of the person who is attending the festival. The imagined actions are set in an ‘if—then’ frame. In line 40, Mikaela again switches to the 1st person singular to express the inner thoughts of the one who is attending the festival. This expression is framed as reported thought or speech with the

expression *sä oot sillee et* ‘you are like’ (line 39; for the use of the complementizer *että* for bringing in another voice, see Laury & Seppänen 2008).

In Example 4, the deictic origo is set in an imagined world amid which the participants are invited to share the experiences described by the 2nd person forms and to reflect the thoughts of an imaginary speaker who is referred to by the 1st person forms. The 2nd person singular forms are used to portray the described situation as being mutually accessible and potentially intersubjectively shared among the participants, while the 1st person singular forms give a voice to somebody who is experiencing the described situation and indicate that the one who is talking is just an animator (cf. Goffman 1981). Consequently, the participation framework is modulated so that the 1st person singular does not index the actual speaker but rather an imaginary speaker or a generalized ‘Self’ (cf. Linell 2009: 96, 116–117). In the same manner, the 2nd person singular does not refer to one specific recipient but rather to a shared human experience to which the participants can recognize and potentially relate (see Tao, this volume, on “limited generality” of second person expressions in Mandarin).

When the open first-and second-person singular forms are used, the changes in the participation framework could be described as the *layering of voices-effect* (Stukenbrock 2014: 87, 89): The participants’ voices and perspectives mix with those of the actors in the imagined spatio-temporal frame. The 1st and 2nd person singular forms invite the participants to

recognize the described situation by making it accessible from the perspective of the ongoing speech situation.

## **5 Conclusions**

In this study, we have focused on the open use of 1st and 2nd person singular forms. We have investigated these forms' sequential and (inter)actional contexts, turn-composition, as well as the linguistic and embodied features that occur in connection with them and how they modulate the participation framework.

In our data, those 1st and 2nd person singular forms which receive a deictically open interpretation typically occur in actions such as assessments, accounts of personal experience, and descriptions of hypothetical or imaginary states of affairs. In these contexts of use, 1st and 2nd person forms are used to illustrate or exemplify something that is being discussed in their context of occurrence. The composition of turns with open 1st and 2nd person forms is characterized by certain verbal and embodied conduct, such as hypothetical 'if-then' frames, markers of reported speech or dialogue, and multimodal deictic elements (e.g., enacted prosody or modulation of voice) that function as deictic displacements; this shifts the origo of the speech situation away from the participants' actual space of perception to that of an imaginary spatio-temporal frame where the

described phenomena can be seen as if they were real. As such, the use of open 1st and 2nd person forms modulates the participation framework of the speech situation.

Furthermore, the participation framework can be modulated through a change of footing in the discourse roles. When used as open reference forms (i.e., non-deictically), the open 1st person singular form does not refer to the current speaker but rather to a generalized 'Self.' This gives voice to a generalized but at the same time, individualized and identifiable experience, which makes the current speaker the animator of the "voice" of this experience. The open 2nd person singular form identifies a certain experience or situation and invites the participants of the speech situation to recognize it. It is used to establish beliefs and experiences that are construed as mutual and potentially shared.

The intersubjectivity of referent co-construction is a crucial part of participants' movement between real and imagined spatio-temporal frames. Our analysis demonstrates how the open personal expressions that are produced by one speaker are interpreted and responded to by other participants. Open personal expressions tend to occur in contexts in which the participants are sharing their knowledge and experiences with others, making the matters under discussion accessible to and recognizable by others. We could say, then, that by using 1st and 2nd person forms to create open reference, the participants construe the situation as something that is shared between the participants. Our findings support the idea that person

forms are not only used for creating a reference but also to implement specific social actions (also see chapters by Ewing and Tao, this volume).

As referring expressions, open 1st and 2nd person forms do not designate an individual referent but they are rather used to describe experiences or states of affairs; in that sense one could say that they are not highly referential. However, compared to other open or generic person expressions, the experiences and states of affairs open 1st and 2nd person forms refer to are quite unique and often also personal, even if they are presented as generalizable, which signals a relatively high specificity. Our results indicate that there is no clear distinction between so-called *general* and *specific* reference (cf. Tao, this volume, on “limited generality”). Instead, these two attributes coexist in our data, as the speakers use open 1st and 2nd person forms to describe and create generalized, yet identifiable, experiences or states of affairs that are presented from the perspective of an individual.

## References

- Auer, Peter, and Anja Stukenbrock. 2018. “When ‘You’ Means ‘I’: The German 2<sup>nd</sup> Ps.Sg. Pronoun *du* Between Genericity and Subjectivity.” *Open Linguistics* 4: 280–309.

- Arkisyn: A morphosyntactically Coded Database of Conversational Finnish. Database compiled at the University of Turku, with material from the Conversation Analysis Archive at the University of Helsinki and the Syntax Archives at the University of Turku. Department of Finnish and Finno-Ugric Languages, University of Turku.
- Biq, Yung-O. 1991. "The Multiple Uses of the Second Person Singular Pronoun in Conversational Mandarin." *Journal of Pragmatics* 16: 307–321.
- Bredel, Ursula. 2002. "'You Can Say *You* to Yourself': Establishing Perspectives with Personal Pronouns." In *Perspectives and Perspectivation in Discourse*, ed. by Carl Friedrich Graumann, and Werner Kallmeyer, 167–180. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Buber, Martin. 1962 [1923]. *I and Thou*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Bühler, Karl. 1965 [1934]. *Sprachtheorie. Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Stuttgart: Gustav Fischer Verlag.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth. 2012. "Exploring Affiliation in the Reception of Conversational Complaint Stories." In *Emotion in Interaction*, ed. by Anssi Peräkylä, and Marja-Leena Sorjonen, 113–146. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth, and Selting, Margret. 2018. *Interactional Linguistics: Studying Language in Social Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Fremer, Maria. 2000. "Va e du då. Generiskt du hos ungdomar och vuxna talare [Generic use of "du" in adolescent and adult speech]." In *Ungdom, språk og identitet: Rapport fra et nettverksmøte* [Youth, Language, and Identity: A Report From a Network Meeting], ed. by Ulla-Britt Kotsinas, Anna-Brita Stenström, and Eli-Marie Drange, 133–147. Copenhagen: Nordisk Ministerråd.
- Goffman, Erving. 1981. *Forms of Talk*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Goodwin, Charles, and Marjorie Harness Goodwin 1990: "Context, Activity and Participation." In *The contextualization of language*, ed. by Peter Auer, and Aldo di Luzio, 77–99. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Helasvuo, Marja-Liisa. 2008. "Minä ja muut: Puhujaviitteisyys ja konteksti [Speaker Reference and Contextual Interpretation]." *Virittäjä* 112: 186–206.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1971 [1957]. "Shifters, Verbal categories and the Russian Verb." In *Selected writings of Roman Jakobson 2*, 130–147. The Hague: Mouton.
- Jensen, Torben Juel, and Frans Gregersen. 2016. "What Do(es) You Mean? The Pragmatics of Generic Second Person Pronouns in Modern Spoken Danish." *Pragmatics* 26: 417–446.
- Kamio, Akio. 2001. "English Generic *We*, *You*, and *They*: An Analysis in Terms of Territory of Information." *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 1111–1124.

- Keevallik, Leelo. 2008. "Conjunction and Sequenced Actions: The Estonian Complementizer and Evidential Particle *Et*." In *Crosslinguistic Studies of Clause Combining: The multifunctionality of conjunctions*, ed. by Ritva Laury, 125–152. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kitagawa, Chisato, and Adrienne Lehrer. 1990. "Impersonal Uses of Personal Pronouns." *Journal of Pragmatics* 14: 739–759.
- Kluge, Bettina. 2016. "Generic Uses of the Second Person Singular – How Speakers Deal with Referential Ambiguity and Misunderstandings." *Pragmatics* 26 (3): 501–522.
- Laitinen, Lea. 2006. "Zero Person in Finnish: A Grammatical Resource for Construing Human Reference." In *Grammar from the Human Perspective: Case, Space and Person in Finnish*, ed. by Marja-Liisa Helasvuo, and Lyle Campbell, 209–231. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Laury, Ritva, and Eeva-Leena Seppänen. 2008. "Clause Combining, Interaction, Evidentiality, Participation Structure, and the Conjunction-Particle Continuum: The Finnish *Että*." In *Crosslinguistic Studies of Clause Combining: The Multifunctionality of Conjunctions*, ed. by Ritva Laury, 153–178. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Levinson, Stephen. 1988. "Putting Linguistics on a Proper Footing: Explorations in Goffman's Concept of Participation." In *Erving Goffman: Exploring the Interaction Order*, ed. by Paul Drew, and Anthony Wootton, 161–227. Oxford: Polity Press.

- Linell, Per. 2009. *Rethinking Language, Mind and World Dialogically: Interactional and Contextual Theories of Human Sense-Making*.  
Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Mikesell, Lisa, Galina Bolden, Jenny Mandelbaum, Jeffrey Robinson,  
Tanya Romaniuk, Alexa Bolaños-Carpio, Darcey Searles, Wan Wei,  
Stephen M. DiDomenico, and Beth Angell. 2017. "At the Intersection  
of Epistemics and Action: Responding with *I Know*." *Research on  
Language and Social Interaction* 50 (3): 268–285.
- Nielsen, Søren Beck, Christina Fogtmann Fosgerau, and Torben Juel Jensen.  
2009. "From Community to Conversation – and Back: Exploring the  
Interpersonal Potentials of Two Generic Pronouns in Danish." *Acta  
Linguistica Hafniensia: International Journal of Linguistics* 41: 116–  
142.
- Ochs, Elinor, Patrick Gonzales, and Sally Jacoby. 1996. "'When I Come  
Down I'm in the Domain State': Grammar and Graphic Representation  
in the Interpretive Activity of Physicists." In *Interaction and  
Grammar*, ed. by. Elinor Ochs, Emanuel Schegloff, and Sandra  
Thompson, 328–369. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University  
Press.
- Sacks, Harvey. 1992. *Lectures on Conversation*. Vol. 1 & 2. Oxford: Basil  
Blackwell.
- Selting, Margret, and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen (eds.). 2001. *Studies in  
Interactional Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Seppänen, Eeva-Leena. 1996. "Ways of Referring to a Knowing Co-Participant in Finnish Conversation." *SKY Yearbook of the Linguistic Association of Finland*: 135–176.
- Sidnell, Jack, and Tanya Stivers (eds.). 2012. *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Siewierska, Anna. 2004. *Person*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Silverstein, Michael. 1976. "Shifters, Linguistic Categories, and Cultural Description." In *Meaning in anthropology*, ed. by Keith H. Basso, and Henry A. Selby, 11–55. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Sorjonen, Marja-Leena. 2001. *Responding in Conversation: A Study of Response Particles in Finnish*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sorjonen, Marja-Leena, and Minna Laakso. 2005. "Katko vai *eiku*? Itsekorjauksen aloitustavat ja vuorovaikutustehtävät [Cut-off, the Particle *eiku* and Other Practices for Initiating Self-Repair, and the Interactional Functions of Self-Repair]." *Virittäjä* 109: 244–271.
- Stukenbrock, Anja. 2014. "Pointing to an 'Empty' Space: Deixis as Phantasma in Face-to-Face Interaction." *Journal of Pragmatics* 74: 70–93.
- Suomalainen, Karita. 2018. *Sinä*, konteksti ja monitulkintaisuus: Yksikön 2. persoonan viittaukset arkikeskustelussa [*Sinä* 'You', Context, and Ambiguity: Second-Person Singular Reference in Everyday Finnish Conversation]." *Virittäjä* 122 (3): 320–355.

- Suomalainen, Karita. 2020. *Kuka sinä on? Tutkimus yksikön 2. persoonan käytöstä ja käytön variaatiosta suomenkielisissä arkikeskusteluissa* [Who is 'You'? On the Use of Second Person Singular in Finnish Everyday Conversations]. *Annales Universitatis Turkuensis C* 499. Turku: University of Turku.
- Suomalainen, Karita, and Mikael Varjo. 2020. "When Personal is Interpersonal: Organizing Interaction with Deictically Open Personal Constructions in Finnish Everyday Conversation." *Journal of Pragmatics* 168: 98–118.
- Stirling, Lesley, and Lenore Manderson. 2011. "About *You*: Empathy, Objectivity and Authority." *Journal of Pragmatics* 43: 1581–1602.
- Uusitupa, Milla. 2017. *Rajakarjalaismurteiden avoimet persoonaviittaukset* [Open person constructions in Border Karelian dialects]. Dissertations in Education, Humanities, and Theology 117. Joensuu: University of Eastern Finland.
- Varjo, Mikael. 2019. "It Takes All Kinds to Make a Zero: Employing Multiple Correspondence Analysis to Categorize an Open Personal Construction in Conversational Finnish." *Corpus Linguistics Research* 5, 55–87.
- Varjo, Mikael, and Karita Suomalainen. 2018. "From Zero to 'You' and Back: A Mixed Methods Study Comparing the Use of Two Open Personal Constructions in Finnish." *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 41 (3): 333–366.

- Vatanen, Anna. 2018. "Resisting an Action in Conversation by Pointing out Epistemic incongruence: *Mä tiedän* 'I know' responses in Finnish." *Journal of Pragmatics* 123: 192–208.
- Williams, Lawrence, and Rémi van Compernelle. 2009. "On Versus Tu And Vous: Pronouns with Indefinite Reference in Synchronous Electronic French Discourse." *Language Sciences* 31: 409–427.
- Zobel, Sarah. 2016. "A Pragmatic Analysis of German Impersonally Used First Person Singular 'Ich'." *Pragmatics* 26 (3): 379–416.