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Determiners are generally considered a small, closed class of words. New determiners are not frequently added, as is the case with nouns, verbs, and the other large, open word classes. Even so, every once in a while a word can slip into a new role based on its evolved usage in a language. One such word in English is said. This study examines the distribution of said used as a determiner in English (for example in sentences such as, “I went to a restaurant for lunch, and said restaurant was way too crowded!”).

After gathering a collection of 41 naturally occurring examples of said construction from corpora, conversation, internet, and various other sources, this type of said was examined in an attempt to explain its distribution in English. This thesis will investigate said’s traditional usage, its new usage as a determiner, its place as a determiner among other referential expressions, and its infelicitous use with inferrable information. The findings show that said does have a unique place among referential expressions, and a distribution unlike any other determiner in English.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The English language has many grammatical forms available for a speaker to choose from, to convey anything the speaker desires to communicate to the hearer. Normally, a speaker will choose grammatical constructions that will result in the hearer putting forth the least amount of effort to understand. For example, if a speaker says, “I walked the dog this morning,” the hearer would understandably assume the speaker means his or her own dog. If, with no prior context, the speaker says, “I walked a dog this morning,” the hearer would naturally assume the dog did not belong to the speaker, and perhaps instead a friend or neighbor.

There are also numerous different expressions available for the speaker to use to refer back to something previously mentioned in a discourse. According to Prince 1992, information presented in a discourse can be considered either new or old to the hearer, as well as new or old to the discourse. Brand new information is considered Hearer New, Discourse New (HNDN). Once information has been introduced, the next time it is mentioned, it is considered Hearer Old, Discourse Old (HODO). The third status established by Prince is Hearer Old, Discourse New (HODN), which means that the speaker assumes the hearer knows the entity under discussion, and can access a mental representation of it without much extemporaneous effort.

A specific grammatical construction used to refer to old information is one which will be referred to as Said Construction, or SC. It is particularly interesting due both to the syntactic, discourse-based constraints on its occurrence, and its relatively new debut into mainstream communication. The following is an example of said construction, in standard spoken English:

1. “This morning I got in my car to come to work. I then went and put gas in said car and realized I would much rather be doing something else with the 7 minutes it takes to fill up my tank.” (K. Wolfe. Spoken conversation [class lecture] 2008)

Said Construction is a standard English grammatical construction, and it resembles certain expressions from Imperial age Latin. At that point in Latin, forms such as antedictus
(which translates to *aforesaid* or *aforementioned*) were used and passed into medieval Latin, which in turn passed into other European languages. Many Latin derived languages still use constructions similar to SC with similarly translated words, in order to convey formalism (Norberg, 1980). Traditionally, it was believed that the *said* in SC is synonymous with *aforesaid*, however, the present research will argue that in most modern uses of SC, this is not the case. In English, SC was originally used predominantly in written legal documentation, but is now considered archaic in that form of communication (Tiersma, 1999). Over the recent decades, SC has made its way out of formalism and into everyday contexts. The following examples show SC across various genres of discourse:

**Legal Documents:**

2. Increased water purification standards shall apply. All waterways shall be nationalised, the Landowner only owns the riverbed, and not the water and fish which come and go unless *said fish* are tagged with the [orig: owners] owner’s name, address and muzzled, fish and owner (Warner, 1992.)

**Written Literature:**

3. Sofia knew what all of Rome knew: the Turkish sultan, who paid well to assure that his younger brother and rival remained a captive in the Vatican, supplied *said brother* with all manner of indulgences intended to keep him weak and complacent (Poole, 2012).

**Letter to the Editor:**

4. I have found from my reading that any time reform of any kind meets with overwhelming resistance, it is because *said reform* interferes with the overall power position of the real people who run this country (Houston Chronicle, 2010).

**Magazine:**

5. For the past seven years, Darrell and I had been living in New York City, where "harvesting" a Christmas tree involved forking over an exorbitant sum for a scrawny sapling, then lugging *said sapling* up five flights of stairs to our itsy-bitsy apartment (Country Living Magazine, 2012).

**Spoken Discourse:**

6. Cooper: Yes. So if you had a mug shot -- and I'm not saying you do -- but if you had a mug, would you smile in *said mug* shot? I'm not sure if I would or not.

Sesay: Yes, I'm not sure that's the moment (Cooper, 2011).

---

1 A closer look will be taken at the differences in usage between *said* and *aforesaid* in Chapter 4.
The goal of this research is to investigate SC in various forms of communication in order to gain an understanding of the discourse constraints on this construction. Specifically, I will analyze SC’s distribution in English, determining when and where it is used as compared to other referential expressions. I will show that the usage of said varies from that of other determiners such as the, that, this, etc. While one might assume that said is in free variation with another determiner (perhaps that or the), we will see that this is not the case. This assumed free variation calls for a search for differences, and a new explanation for said’s true distribution.

I will show that said has a distribution unique from that of other determiners and referential expressions, but can be felicitously replaced by one or more determiners depending on the environment and the information status of the preceding information and following noun. I will also analyze the types of information said can introduce, whether old, new, or inferred, and which (if any) types of inferred information are felicitous.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

To develop a framework for the research presented in this thesis, it is essential to introduce the concepts of information status and definiteness.

**INFORMATION STATUS: CONCEPTS OF ‘OLD’ INFORMATION**

In English, that speakers generally introduce new information after given information has long been known, and this tendency is not limited to English. In the 1920’s and 30’s, the Prague school linguists introduced the idea of Communicative Dynamism, which asserts that sentences become more informative as they progress. In other words, given information is placed before new (Birner, 2012). In 1967, Halliday introduced the Given-New principle, which states that given information is placed near the beginning of a sentence, while new information usually appears at the end (Halliday, 1967). Chafe 1976 defines given information as “that knowledge which the speaker assumes to be in the consciousness of the addressee at the time of the utterance,” and new information, “what the speaker assumes he is introducing into the addressee’s consciousness by what he says.” Similar to the given-new principle was Kuno’s idea of old-new information, or the Information Flow Principle. Kuno stated that, “words in a sentence are arranged in such a way that those that represent old, predictable information come first, and those that represent new, unpredictable information last” (Kuno, 1978).

This idea was further developed in Prince (1981). Summarizing previous work, including that referenced above, Prince created a system for categorizing old and new information. She introduces three different levels of givenness. The first is “predictability,” which states that the speaker assumes that the hearer can predict that a certain linguistic item will occur in a specific position in a sentence. This is similar to the given-new information presented in Halliday (1967), and the Information Flow Principle presented by Kuno. The second level of givenness is saliency, (introduced in Chafe, 1976), which states that the speaker assumes that the audience has a particular item in his or her consciousness at the time
of the speaker’s utterance. The third type is shared knowledge - the speaker believes that the hearer knows or can infer something in particular from the speaker’s utterance. This is the given-new information presented in Clark and Haviland (1977), which calls given information that which the speaker “believes the listener already knows and accepts as true” and new information what the speaker “believers the listener does not yet know” (p. 4). Prince states that these three types of givenness are not mutually independent, but relate to each other depending on what the speaker believes to be true about the hearer, and what the hearer can then infer from his or her own assumptions.

Based on this prior work, Prince (1981) introduced the idea of a scale of “assumed familiarity,” in which information can be considered old based on context and/or inference from the information already given. She laid out her taxonomy of assumed familiarity with the following categories, as seen in Figure 1:


New information can be either “brand new” or “unused.” Brand new means that it is completely new in the discourse, and the hearer has to create a new mental representation of it. “Unused” means that it is new to the discourse, but the speaker believes the hearer has a representation of it in his or her mind already. For example, in the sentence “The Beatles were and are the greatest band of all time,” The Beatles are unused. They are new to the discourse, but I assume they are already in the hearer’s model.
On the right of the Assumed Familiarity chart is evoked information. This means that the information is already in the discourse model, whether by being explicitly stated by the speaker, or available from a non-linguistic context. Information that was explicitly stated (in other words, it was once “new”) is called Textually Evoked. Situationally Evoked information includes the discourse participants themselves, or other salient information from the context. Prince provides the following examples:

A. Pardon, would **you** have change of a quarter?

B. A guy I work with says **he** knows your sister (Prince, 1981, ex. 22a. & d.). In A, “you” is situationally evoked, and in B, “he” is textually evoked.

Inferrable information is that which the speaker assumes the hearer can logically infer from previous information in the discourse. The first type of inferrable is a Noncontaining inferrable. For example, mention of going to “a store” could evoke a later mention of “the clerk,” because a hearer could logically infer that stores have clerks. A Containing inferrable refers to information that belongs to a set. For example, if I said, “One of my aunts made me a quilt,” “one of my aunts” is a Containing inferrable from the set of “my aunts,” which presupposes I have more than one.

In 1992, Prince furthered these ideas with the notion that information can be new or old to both the hearer (Hearer New or Hearer Old) and the discourse (Discourse New or Discourse Old). She makes a three way distinction between discourse status, hearer status, and inferrable information. Hearer status has to do with what the speaker believes to be true about the hearer’s knowledge. For example, if I saw a fox in my yard, I would not say to a friend with no prior information, “I saw the/that fox in my yard today,” but I would instead use the indefinite determiner. However, if my friend and I had seen this specific fox together on another occasion, using the/that would be acceptable. In this case, *the/that fox* is hearer old according to Prince (1992), or “unused” according to Prince (1981). Hearer New (or using “a fox”) is the same as “Brand New,” from Prince 1981.

Entities that are new or old to the discourse are so based on whether or not they have been mentioned by the speaker in the present discourse. In both of the above fox examples, the fox is discourse new. If the conversation were to continue with, “It was eating my dog’s food,” *it* (obviously referring to the fox) would at that point be Discourse Old.

Inferred information is that which was not mentioned in the dialogue, but the speaker believes the hearer can infer it from what was already said. Consider the following sentences:
“I took a walk last night. The stars were spectacular.” In this case, I can felicitously use the definite determiner even though stars had not yet been mentioned in the discourse, because they are inferrable from mention of “night.”

With these three types of information in mind, Prince proposed that this can account for information that is Hearer New-Discourse New, Hearer New-Discourse Old, and Hearer Old-Discourse Old. She assumed that the combination of “Hearer New, Discourse Old” does not occur, which seems logical— it does not seem that something could be old to the discourse, but new to the hearer. However, in Birner (2006), the author showed that this status is indeed possible, if the information can be assumed through inference. Birner introduces three different types of inferences by which to classify inferrable information, and shows that this type of information fits the criteria to be classified as Discourse Old (Birner, 2006). Two of those types of inferrables will be discussed in this thesis. The first type of inferrable is a bridging inferrable, which links a new entity to information that has been previously evoked. Haviland and Clark (1974) provide the following example of a bridging inferrable:

“We checked the picnic supplies. The beer was warm” (p. 21).

The hearer will not necessarily evoke “beer” in his or her immediate mental representation of “picnic supplies,” but can draw an inference that beer is a picnic supply as soon as the beer is mentioned. Thus Birner classifies bridging inferrables as Discourse Old, Hearer New.

The next type of inferrable is an elaborating inferrable, which evokes a new entity immediately at the mention of a trigger word. In other words, the information is evoked even if it hasn’t been explicitly mentioned. For example, if a speaker said, “When I opened my textbook, the pages fell out,” “pages” would be an elaborating inferrable. The mention of “book” immediately triggers the mental representation of “pages,” although the pages have not been mentioned yet. Thus Birner classifies elaborating inferrables as Discourse Old, Hearer Old.2

---

2 The third type of inferrables, identity inferences, relate a currently evoked entity to a previous evocation of the same entity. This type of inferrable always represents Hearer Old, Discourse Old information.
**DEFINITENESS**

According to Ward and Birner (1995), “the use of a definite NP is said to require that its referent be known, given, or inferrable in context…” Indefinite determiners are used to introduce discourse and hearer new information, while definite determiners are used to bring up information that is already old to the discourse, or “familiar” (Heim, 1982). Other accounts of definiteness focus on the uniqueness of the item being mentioned, stating that it is definite if it can be uniquely identified by the addressee (Birner & Ward 1994; Gundel, Hedberg, & Zacharski, 1993; Hawkins, 1978).

However, Birner and Ward (1994) show that this is not always necessarily the case, and that a definite determiner can be felicitously used even with a referent that is not uniquely identifiable to the hearer, or even discourse old. In other words, none of the current proposed theories for definiteness can fully account for the complete distribution of the definite article. In one of their examples, they show that a speaker can say, “It’s hot in here. Could you please open the window?” even if there are multiple, equally salient windows. Or a speaker could encourage a hearer to take “the elevator” to a higher floor, even if there are multiple elevators available and ready for use (Birner & Ward, 1994, their examples 2a and 2b). Furthermore, the authors state that the use of the definite article can be used for mass nouns and sets of countable entities when mentioned in the form of a plural NP. For example, a speaker can say, “please pass the rolls” if there are several baskets of rolls present at the dinner table. (Birner & Ward, 1994 example 11). Thus they show that the referent need not be uniquely identifiable in either the singular or plural.

Gundel et al. (1993) paper, “Cognitive Status and the Form of Referring Expressions in Discourse” introduces a six-level givenness hierarchy based on cognitive status, shown in Figure 2. They explain the felicitous distribution of their six expressions, showing how each one is used when the necessary and sufficient cognitive status for use is met.

Gundel et al. (1993) defines each and gives the following examples:

“Type Identifiable: The addressee is able to access a representation of the type of object described by the expression” (p. 276). (Marked by use of indefinite $a$).

a. “I couldn’t sleep last night. A dog *(next door)* kept me awake” (p. 276).
**The Givenness Hierarchy:**

| focus > activated > familiar > uniquely identifiable > referential > type identifiable |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| {it}                            | {that N}                        |
| {this N}                        | {the N}                         |
| {indefinite this N}             | {a N}                           |


“Referential: The speaker intends to refer to a particular object or objects” (p. 277). (Marked by use of *this N*).

b. “I couldn’t sleep last night. This dog (next door) kept me awake” (p. 278).

“Uniquely identifiable: The addressee can identify the speaker’s intended referent on the basis of the nominal alone” (p. 278). (Marked by use of definite *the*).

c. “I couldn’t sleep last night. The dog (next door) kept me awake” (p. 278).

“Familiar: The addressee is able to uniquely identify the intended referent because he already has a representation of it in memory (in long-term memory if it has not been recently mentioned or perceived, or in short-term memory if it has)” (p. 278).

d. “I couldn’t sleep last night. That dog (next door) kept me awake” (p. 278).

“Activated: The referent is represented in current short-term memory” (p. 278). The representations “may arise from immediate linguistic or extralinguistic context” (p. 278). For example, if the dog had been barking during the conversation, context would be provided for the statement in example e.

e. “I couldn’t sleep last night. That kept me awake” (p. 279)

“In Focus: The referent is not only in short-term memory, but is also at the current center of attention” (p. 279).

f. “My neighbor’s bull mastiff bit a girl on a bike. It’s the same dog that bit Mary Ben last summer” (p. 279).

Imagining Gundel et al. (1993) dog example in a real life context, the speaker would pick a referential expression based on how much he or she believes the hearer knows or

---

3 This is also termed the “false definite.” A further discussion and explanation for this will be provided in Chapter 4.
understands of the situation. He would not choose to say, “It kept me awake last night” if the
dog had not already been a topic of conversation in the dialogue. He would instead use “A
dog kept me awake last night,” or the false definite, “This dog kept me awake last night.” In
terms of Prince’s information status, this would be considered “Brand New.”

The following chapters will analyze said construction applying all of the concepts
presented in this chapter. We will see what constraints said requires in terms of information
status and definiteness, in order to be felicitously used as a referential expression. This
analysis will also explore the cognitive status of said as a referential expression, using the
information provided by Gundel et al. (1993). Finally, I will show through examples that said
has a unique distribution in English, with its own set of constraints determining the
environments in which it can occur.
CHAPTER 3

METHODS

The Corpus of Contemporary American English and the British National Corpus were searched for instances of "said" followed by a noun. The majority of results in the corpus searches had the formula of "X said _____ be ______", such as "Forecasts said rain is expected through the weekend.” There was approximately 1 instance of the type of said construction being examined in this analysis for every 500 examples of said N in the corpus results. The results of the search turned up approximately 10,000 results, 20 of which were SC. The examples of SC that appeared in the corpus search results appeared relatively evenly in the types of discourse established in Chapter 1, examples 1 through 6: news, literature, spoken discourse, magazine articles and stories, etc.

In the Corpus of Contemporary American English, examples of SC can be found dating back to the 17th century. The earliest forms of SC in the corpus were in written legal documents; however more current examples of SC are not restricted in the types of communication in which they occur. Additional examples of SC were collected from naturally occurring communication such as spoken conversation, magazines, television shows, commercials, blog entries and comments, Facebook (comments, statuses, etc), and humor websites, such as passiveaggressivenotes.com and buzzfeed.com. The majority of examples of SC from these areas were found in interactions between internet users, as opposed to the main body of the text itself. For example, commenters on blogs often used SC when citing information from within the main body of the blog post, as in example 7 below, which is from an NPR post entitled “The Complete Curmudgeon’s Guide to the Sound of Music.” In this post, the author cited several humorous moments from the classic Julie Andrews film, pointing out their absurdity in list form. Number 16 states simply:

"You look happy to meet me," sings a man to a plant.

Below the main body of the entry, several comments down in the comments section, a reader then states:
7. “Captain goes from curmudgeonly tightass who basically has nothing but scorn for Maria and the chaos she stands for, to a doting parent who is completely smitten with this Manic Pixie Dream Nun during the course of singing **said song** to **said plant**” (Holmes, 2013).

The relatively low number of naturally occurring examples attests to the rarity of SC. To confirm hypotheses made on the basis of the naturally occurring data, constructed examples were added and judgments obtained from native speakers. All naturally occurring examples are cited, whereas constructed examples are not.

Total collected data included 41 tokens. Thirty-six of these were “said construction” and five were “the said construction.” Of the 41, eleven tokens were found in corpora (from a variety of media) and the remaining were gathered from naturally occurring sources. Sixteen examples were taken from various websites or blogs, eight were gathered from Facebook, three were observed on television, two from written news, nine from books and magazines, and three were observed in spoken conversations. All tokens of **said construction** are listed in Appendix A, and all tokens of the **said construction** are listed in Appendix B.

All examples of SC like the one above were coded for information status in accordance with two frameworks: Birner (2006) (from Prince, 1981, 1992,) and Gundel et al. (1993). They were then analyzed for constraints and felicitous environments based on the examples as well as the rules governing definiteness presented in Ward and Birner (1995). Additionally, the examples were analyzed for the patterning of referential expressions in accordance with Gundel et al. (1993), and the use inferrables and implicatures, as addressed by Kehler and Ward (2006), and Birner (2006).
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS

INFORMATION STATUS

As we have seen, information in English discourse is structured according to a referred-to entity’s hearer status and discourse status. Information can be either new or old to the hearer, and new or old to the discourse. In a sentence, old information tends to be placed before new information. In SC, the entity mentioned after said must be discourse old. Take, for instance, the previous Christmas tree example:

8a. “For the past seven years, Darrell and I had been living in New York City, where ‘harvesting’ a Christmas tree involved forking over an exorbitant sum for a scrawny sapling, then lugging said sapling up five flights of stairs to our itsy-bitsy apartment” (Country Living Magazine, 2012).

The sapling in this example is hearer old, discourse old. It was previously explicitly mentioned in the discourse, and is therefore older than the information that follows- five flights of stairs and the itsy-bitsy apartment. The same example may even work without the mention of “a scrawny sapling”, but rather something similar, referring to the same entity. In the following example, if the initial mention of “sapling” is replaced with “tree”, said construction is still felicitous for many speakers.

8b. ?For the past seven years, Darrell and I had been living in New York City, where “harvesting” a Christmas tree involved forking over an exorbitant sum for a scrawny tree, then lugging said sapling up five flights of stairs to our itsy-bitsy apartment.

This is because one can generalize that a Christmas tree, mentioned towards the beginning of the sentence, is indeed a sapling. Not many people have room in their homes for fully established trees, nor would a large, old tree be able to be harvested for use as a Christmas decoration. This makes the sapling in the said construction discourse old, because it is established from the information preceding it (Birner, 2006).

4 In cases such as the one mentioned after example 5b, in which the needed referent is not explicit, judgments can vary about what is acceptable and what is not. Native speakers have been asked for opinions
Said construction cannot be used if a Christmas tree of some sort was not previously mentioned, or is not otherwise salient in the discourse. If this discourse started out by talking about Christmas traditions in general, such as putting up decorations or hanging stockings, the mention of said sapling is not felicitous.

8c. #For the past seven years, Darrell and I had been living in New York City, where Christmastime involved snowy walks in Central Park, baking batches of delicious cookies, and lugging said sapling up five flights of stairs to our itsy-bitsy apartment.

Although a Christmas tree is often associated with the season, said sapling is hearer new, discourse new in this example. It is not felicitous because it has not been previously evoked, and is not salient. “Sapling” would have to be introduced with an indefinite determiner, and would not work with the or said.

Furthermore, said construction is not permitted when referring to proper NP’s, unless the proper nouns in question belong to a set, indicating a type-subtype relationship.

9a. #My friend, Sarah, likes to run marathons. Yesterday, I went with said Sarah to pick out new running shoes.

9b. ?I know seven Sarahs. One of them likes to run marathons. Yesterday, I went with said Sarah to pick out new running shoes.

In example 9a above, Sarah is Hearer New, Discourse New. In the second sentence of this example, Sarah is old to both the hearer and the discourse. However, it does not seem permissible to use said construction when referring back to that NP, possibly because Sarah is a proper noun. A speaker would more likely pick the pronominal form, her. However, it should be noted that there seems to be intermediate acceptability if we use “friend” in said construction instead of “Sarah”, as in example 9d below. Certain referential expressions other than said are permissible here as well; however, use of “the” is not.

10a. Yesterday, I went with that Sarah to pick out new running shoes.

---

5 Additional example using a proper noun:

#Canada is one of three nations in North America. Said Canada is the northernmost of the three.

Ok: Said nation is the northernmost of the three.

Also Ok: Said country is the northernmost of the three

As we will discuss later in chapter 4, this is because said is a determiner, a class of words not permissible for use with proper nouns.
10b. Yesterday, I went with this Sarah to pick out new running shoes.
10c. #Yesterday, I went with the Sarah to pick out new running shoes.
10d. ?My friend, Sarah, likes to run marathons. Yesterday, I went with said friend to pick out new running shoes.

In example 9b, it is more acceptable (though not perfect) to refer to her using SC, although judgments among speakers may vary. Perhaps its potential acceptability is because she has been established as belonging to a set, called “girls the speaker knows named Sarah”, and she is being picked out as one specific Sarah with whom the speaker spent his or her day yesterday. Furthermore, by establishing the idea of “seven Sarahs”, her name is functioning as a common noun and not a proper noun. This increases the acceptability of said construction. It would also be the case that a determiner would be used in 9b, such as:

11a. Yesterday, I went with that Sarah to pick out new running shoes.
11b. My friend, Sarah, likes to run marathons. She runs said marathons in Nike shoes.

However, since the idea of running does not necessarily evoke “marathons,” we cannot use said unless the marathons have already been explicitly mentioned.

11c. #My friend, Sarah, likes to run. She runs said marathons in Nike shoes.
11d. #My friend, Sarah, likes to run races. She runs said marathons in Nike shoes.
11e. ?My friend, Sarah, likes to run races. She runs the marathons in Nike shoes.

Taking an example from the popular television show Myth Busters, we notice a similar pattern. In this particular episode, the Myth Busters team is in the process of building a fiberglass shark, and the narrator is keeping the television audience up to date on their progress.

12a. Adam: “I think the structural stuff is pretty well there; all we have to do here is mount the head on.”

Narrator: “And with said head in place, Adam powers up the jaws” (Ark tv, 2010).
The head of the shark was hearer old, discourse old when used in SC, making it felicitous. If the first speaker had failed to mention the head, SC would not have been permissible:

12b. Adam: I think the structural stuff is pretty well there, all we have to do here is mount on some last minute parts.
   #Narrator: And with said head in place, Adam powers up the jaws.

While use of “the” would have been felicitous, use of another referential expression such as “this” would not have been:

12c. Adam: I think the structural stuff is pretty well there, all we have to do here is mount on some last minute parts.
   Narrator: And with the head in place, Adam powers up the jaws.

12d. Adam: I think the structural stuff is pretty well there, all we have to do here is mount on some last minute parts.
   ?Narrator: And with this/that head in place, Adam powers up the jaws.6

This shows that SC cannot be deictic, although other definite determiners can.

REFERENTIAL EXPRESSIONS

In all of the older examples of SC in the corpus (anywhere from the 1600’s to the early 1900’s) the definite determiner was used before the construction. Furthermore, the majority of these older examples were related to law--be it contracts, court reports, or proclamations. These two types of said construction (with and without use of the) may initially seem to be used the same way, but said is actually functioning as two different parts of speech. It is an adjective in The said N, and a determiner in said N. Even though said functions differently in these two constructions, the early uses of said construction, using the definite determiner, give us a clue about the usage of said construction in more modern English. According to Ward and Birner (1995), “the use of a definite NP is said to require that its referent be known, given, or inferable in context.” This matches the constraints in which we can use said, in SC.

In the said ______, because of its position and for other reasons detailed below, said is an adjective, traditionally considered to be an equivalent form or abbreviation of aforesaid or

6 The difference in behavior between “this” and “that” will be discussed in the following section.
This does not seem to be the case in said ______. In this construction, said has changed its distribution and is being used as a determiner. In the following examples, it is clear that aforementioned is not an acceptable substitute in SC, whereas a determiner such as the or that is.

13a. “Imagine realizing a childhood dream of finding a hidden trapdoor or secret passageway in your own home. Now imagine that joy being tempered by the discovery that someone else is using said secret entrance to get into your house and eat your sweets. That was the situation one Imgur user found himself in this week, and why he is currently staying with a friend.” (Champion, 2013).

Aforementioned is not a felicitous replacement for said, as shown by this example.

13b. # Imagine realizing a childhood dream of finding a hidden trapdoor or secret passageway in your own home. Now imagine that joy being tempered by the discovery that someone else is using aforementioned secret entrance to get into your house and eat your sweets. That was the situation one Imgur user found himself in this week, and why he is currently staying with a friend.

That is a much more acceptable replacement:

13c. Imagine realizing a childhood dream of finding a hidden trapdoor or secret passageway in your own home. Now imagine that joy being tempered by the discovery that someone else is using that secret entrance to get into your house and eat your sweets. That was the situation one Imgur user found himself in this week, and why he is currently staying with a friend.

Further proof that said functions as an adjective within “the said N “and a determiner in “said N” can be provided through the substitution of other adjectives. In the next section, we will see how other determiners can substitute for said in certain environments. To further prove said’s different roles in these two similar constructions, we see that no adjective can be felicitously used in its place in SC, but can in the said N. The first example is said used in SC as a determiner:

14a. “One greasy brunch doesn’t cut it anymore. Just getting up to go to said brunch is too much work and your whole Sunday is spent on the couch

---

7 The said _____ can also be used in a concealed partitive construction. The following example from passiveaggressivenotes.com has an implied “of”, and provides an example of this partitive construction:

Hey Sillies! I noticed you guys keep forgetting to pick up your dog’s poopies so I took it upon myself to bring by some baggies. I assumed you’re all out because why else wouldn’t you clean up after your dogs? Oh! I also helped out by dropping all the said poop conveniently in front of your door, for easier clean up. You’re welcome! (Beth & DJ Shaggy, 2007)

In this case, without “the”, it is not a partitive.
chugging water and Advil, knowing your college self is disappointed in your adult self” (Kbweinstein, 2013).

It is inaccurate to consider said an adjective in this construction. This is made clear if a different adjective is substituted:

14b. # Just getting up to go to delicious brunch is too much work…

However, if the older version of SC is applied (by adding the definite determiner), it is clear that said is being used as an adjective.

14c. Just getting up to go to the said brunch is too much work…
14d. Just getting up to go to the delicious brunch is too much work…

A further example confirms this, and also demonstrates the fact that adjectival said is infelicitous with any determiner besides the (see example 15d):

15a. I bought a plate at the souvenir shop. Said plate was broken by the time I got home.
15b. #I bought a plate at the souvenir shop. Fragile plate was broken by the time I got home.
15c. I bought a plate at the souvenir shop. That fragile plate was broken by the time I got home.
15d. #I bought a plate at the souvenir shop. That said plate was broken by the time I got home.

Personal pronominals are also unable to be used felicitously with said, which is not the case with other uniquely identifying adjectives. This is particularly apparent in superlative adjectives. For example, one can refer to “Dan’s favorite film” but not “Dan’s said film.” Similarly, it is not uncommon to hear about “her oldest daughter” but never “her said daughter.” This means that said as an adjective can only co-occur with “the,” further supporting the notion that said construction and the said construction are completely different. Said by itself is a determiner, whereas it is an adjective when preceded by the (but not other referential expressions.)

We will now demonstrate the similarities and differences between said and other determiners. Specifically, we will look at situations in which said can serve the same discourse function as other determiners. To understand the specifics of said’s unique distribution, it is important to first consider Gundel et al. (1993), which establishes a hierarchy for referential expressions used in discourse based on the environments in which they can be used, according to the assumed knowledge of the addressee by the hearer.
The entities to the right of the hierarchy are less restricted in the environments in which they can be used. In other words, they have a wider distribution than the entities to the left. To explain these referential expressions, the following example of SC will be used as a reference (See Figure 2).

I6a. Rachel: “Having a kitty with a cold who wants to snuggle is adorable. Getting sneezed on by said kitty is less so.” (Facebook status, 2013)

Said vs. “a”

In Gundel et al. (1993) givenness hierarchy, the entities farther to the right on the scale are less known in the discourse. A type identifiable object, marked by the indefinite determiner a, is the most general. Use of a means that the speaker assumes that the addressee can only access a mental representation of the type of entity in discussion. In the Facebook kitty example, it is clear that the speaker is not assuming the addressee knows exactly which cat she is talking about. By using a, she is assuming that the addressee knows what a kitty is, and can therefore activate a mental representation of one in his or her mind: “Having a kitty with a cold who wants to snuggle is adorable…” As has already been established, said needs to refer to a discourse old entity, so using it in a type-identifiable context where a would be a natural choice would not be felicitous. The necessary and sufficient conditions for use are not met. This means that type identifiable objects have a wider distribution than said, and said would therefore be higher on the hierarchy.

Said vs. “this N”

The next item to the left is called Referential, and it can be used in either definite or indefinite expressions: a or this. Its use conveys that the speaker assumes that the addressee can both activate a type representation of the entity as well as a more specific representation of the actual referent (or construct a new representation by the time the sentence has been processed.) The speaker in the Facebook example would probably not have used this to talk about her own cat, not because it’s not felicitous, but because it isn’t the most natural choice when addressing hearers who most likely already know she has a cat. However, it would be a more likely choice if used to refer to a cat belonging to a friend or neighbor. “My friend has this kitty who has a cold…”

It should be noted that this type of this is considered a “false definite,” and is often times used to introduce new information. Since said can only refer to entities that are
discourse old, it would not be felicitous to use “said” in this spot on the hierarchy. Consider the following:

#My friend has said kitty who has a cold and wants to snuggle.
With this information, it is clear that *said* occupies a cognitive status higher status than “referential.”

**Said vs. “the N”**

A Uniquely Identifiable entity is one the speaker thinks the addressee can identify based only on its name and definite status. At this level, the addressee should be able to activate a mental representation of the exact kitty in question, and not just a type representation of a general cat. It is represented by “*the N,*” as in, “The kitty has a cold again.” However, according to Hawkins (1978), identifiability does not have to be based on previous familiarity if enough descriptive content is encoded in the nominal itself. This allows for sentences like ‘The kitty I took care of last week has a cold again’ without a problem. According to Ward and Birner (1995), this is because the hearer need only be able to individuate the referent from all other referents in the discourse, and not necessarily in a tangible, real-life situation. Therefore, it wouldn’t matter if the hearer was activating the correct kitty (for instance, calico instead of grey), as long as the hearer could distinguish the kitty from any other referents in the discourse (Ward & Birner, 1995).

Occasionally, SC can fit into this category, however it usually fits better into one of the categories a little bit farther to the left on the hierarchy. In other words, sometimes *said* can function the same as *the* in a discourse, but sometimes it can’t. Anytime there is information that has not already been explicitly mentioned, *said* is not felicitous. The following example demonstrates a case in which *the* is felicitous, but *said* is not. This shows that *the* and *said* have different cognitive statuses, and that *said*’s status would be located higher on the hierarchy.  

8 There are, however, examples for *the* vs. *said* in which *said* is more acceptable than *the.* Consider the following:

a. I have seven wristwatches. I thought one of them was a Rolex. When I took said wristwatch to the watchmaker he told me it was a fake.

b. # I have seven wristwatches. I thought one of them was a Rolex. When I took the wristwatch to the watchmaker, he told me it was a fake.
17a. It was a good decision to put Susan in charge of dessert, because the cheesecake was phenomenal.

17b. #It was a good decision to put Susan in charge of dessert, because said cheesecake was phenomenal.

**Said vs. “that N”**

The next level in the givenness hierarchy is Familiar. According to Gundel et al. (1993), this means that the addressee has a representation of the exact entity in his or her memory, and can therefore identify the referent. In other words, it is either discourse old or new, but hearer old, and is expressed by the demonstrative determiner *that*. In many cases of SC, it seems *said* fits the cognitive status of Familiar. In the current example, it is most felicitous out of Gundel et al. (1993) referential expressions: “Having a kitty with a cold who wants to snuggle is adorable. Getting sneezed on by that kitty is less so.”

Even so, proper usage of *said* depends on whether or not the entity directly after it is discourse old. In Gundel et al. (1993) example, “I couldn’t sleep last night. That dog kept me awake” (p. 278), the addressee should already have a representation of the referent in his or her memory, either long or short. However, for use with *said*, the referent must be in the addressee’s short-term memory. With no immediate, prior reference, it would be infelicitous to say, “I couldn’t sleep last night. Said dog kept me awake.” However, with a mention of the dog in the discourse, it would be permissible. “My neighbor got a new dog, and it is so obnoxious. I couldn’t even sleep last night. Said dog kept me awake.” Once again, *said* occupies a higher cognitive status, placing it farther to the left on the hierarchy.

**Said vs. That/This/ThisN**

The next referential expression is called Activated. This means that the hearer has the referent stored in his or her current short term memory. These representation can come from either long-term memory, the immediate conversation, or extralinguistic contexts. Sufficient determiners for Activated status include *that* and *this*, as well as the use of *this* followed by a

---

A speaker would not likely use “the wristwatch” to refer to the one he or she thought was a Rolex. In this case, *said* works well, but *the* is not as acceptable. A speaker, if not using *said*, might instead pick *it*, or *that* *wristwatch*. Either of these alternative expressions individuate that particular watch from the other six more so than using *the*, which does not necessarily distinguish one from any of the others.

9 We will further discuss *said* and *the* in a later section.
noun. Activated is also the status used for all pronominal forms and speech participants. Use of *that* in Activated is more specific than in Familiar (*that N*), because it can have a deictic quality to it. For example, if the speaker had posted a photo of her cat on Facebook, with a caption that said something akin to “This kitty has a cold”, the immediate context provided by the photo would deem it Activated. In all of the examples of SC gathered for this research, no tokens triggered *said* from an extralinguistic context such as a photo. All tokens of SC were used to refer to something either recently mentioned, or generalizable from other information in the discourse. In other words, *said* has to refer to something Discourse Old. This is what contributes to its uniqueness, and removes the possibility of its use in free variation with any other determiner. On the hierarchy, *said* would have to be either considered an Activated referential expression, or located in a category directly next to Activated to account for their similar, though unique usages.

**Said vs. It**

The final level on the hierarchy is In Focus. In Focus items have to currently be salient in the discourse, and the center of attention. The form necessary and sufficient for In Focus referential status is pronominals, including “*it*”. Many examples from blogs or other internet sites provide perfect examples for environments in which *said* is felicitous, but *it* is not. These examples usually instantiate the original referent in the body of the text/blog post, and then *said* is used much later (in a comment, for example), to refer back to the original referent. Take the following example:

   Commenter: Captain goes from curmudgeonly tightass who basically has nothing but scorn for Maria and the chaos she stands for to a doting parent who is completely smitten with this Manic Pixie Dream Nun during the course of singing **said** song to **said** plant (Holmes, 2013).

18b. #"You look happy to meet me," sings a man to a plant.
   Commenter: Captain goes from curmudgeonly tightass who basically has nothing but scorn for Maria and the chaos she stands for to a doting parent who is completely smitten with this Manic Pixie Dream Nun during the course of singing **it** to **it**.

The items in 18b are no longer salient or the center of attention, since they were referenced long before the comment was made subscript. Furthermore, since *said* is a
determiner and not a pronominal, it is not always mutually substitutable with it, and can therefore not be considered In Focus.

A further restriction of said vs. it is that said can never occur with a null head noun. This can be demonstrated by returning to the Facebook kitty example.

“Having a kitty with a cold who wants to snuggle is adorable. Getting sneezed on by it is less so.”

# "Having a kitty with a cold who wants to snuggle is adorable. Getting sneezed on by said is less so."

Said does not meet the necessary and sufficient cognitive status for usage as an In Focus entity, meaning it has a wider distribution and is therefore lower on the hierarchy.

INFERRABLES, TYPES AND ENTAILMENT

Clearly, said fits into some places in Gundel et al.’s hierarchy better than others. For example, in all of my data, it can never replace the determiner in a Type Identifiable or Referential NP, but can frequently do so in a Familiar or Activated one, and occasionally one that is In Focus. Additionally, more than one referential expression can be used in place of said in many instances. This leads one to believe that the answer is not as easy as free variation or substitution. One possible reason for this has to do with inferred information. Recall the two different types of inferrables introduced in chapter 2: bridging (backwards), and elaborating (forwards). According to Keenan, Potts, Golding, and Jennings (1990), “If the inference is drawn in order to establish coherence between the present piece of text and the preceding text, then it is a bridging inference. If an inference is not needed for coherence, but is simply drawn to embellish the textual information, then it is an elaborative inference” (pp. 378-379).

In bridging inferrables, the inference is drawn in order to establish coherence between the newly mentioned entity and the old information leading up to it (Birner, 2006). For example:

19a. “Mary took the picnic supplies out of the trunk. The beer was warm” (Birner 2006; Haviland & Clark, 1974).

In this example, the inference moves backwards from beer to picnic supplies, and is not made until the mention of beer. In other words, after the mention of beer, a bridge is built back to the previously mentioned entity.
An elaborating inferrable moves forward instead of backward, evoking the inference at the mention of a trigger word.

20a. “We heard the Minnesota Orchestra last night. That conductor was very good.” (Gundel et al., 1993, example 15)

All orchestras have conductors, so the inference of the existence of a conductor can be drawn before it is mentioned. The inference is not needed for coherence, but it adds to the information already presented (Birner, 2006).

If SC is implemented in each of those types of inferrables, the result is not felicitous. SC cannot form a bridging inferrable:

19b. #Mary took the picnic supplies out of the trunk. Said beer was warm.

Nor can it form an elaborating inferrable:

20b. #We heard the Minnesota Orchestra last night. Said conductor was very good.

The following example illustrates SC being used to refer to information that had not already been explicitly mentioned in the discourse, however it is not inferred either.

21a. “Where's the best place to buy skis? From me! The good doctor could sell you a pair right now if the eBay police hadn't blacklisted him. Not that Flake would buy boards over the Internet. Doing so robs one of the pleasure of bending and flexing skis one hasn't paid for. Said ritual, of course, should be performed at a specialty ski shop” (Flake, 2004).

At the mention of “ritual,” a connection can be drawn to “bending and flexing skis one hasn’t paid for,” however this is the ritual itself, and is not inferred. What is clear, however, is that if said is going to refer to information that has not been specifically mentioned, a type/subtype or entailment relationship must be present. This distinction further separates the use of said from other referential expressions and definites, as other expressions can be used with inferrables. The following examples contrast an infelicitous bridging inferrable (19b) with said being used felicitously in a type/subtype relationship (19c).

19b. #Mary took the picnic supplies out of the trunk. Said beer was warm.
(infelicitous bridging inferrable)

19c. Mary took beer, veggies, chips, and dip out of the trunk. Said picnic supplies were warm.

The second occurring term must be the generalizing term. SC can only work if the “said ____” entity is the superordinate of the item in the original NP. In the following
example, the hyponym is evoked first, and then the superordinate is placed to the right of *said*.

22a. I gave my mother a rose on mother’s day. Said flower began wilting immediately.

If the entities are placed the other way around, with the subtype following *said*, it is a less felicitous sentence.

22b. #I gave my mother a flower on mother’s day. Said rose began wilting immediately.

Interestingly, however, if *said* is replaced with *that*, both sentences are fine and acceptable:

22c. I gave my mother a flower on mother’s day. That rose began wilting immediately.

22d. I gave my mother a rose on mother’s day. That flower began wilting immediately.

Returning to Gundel et al. (1993), this addresses the concern about free variation among *said* and determiners. It is clear that *that* is often acceptable, but what about *the*? If entities in SC are definite, *the* should be felicitous. However, examples can be found in which this is not the case. The following examples show a type/subtype relationship using *said*, but do not permit the use of *the* in the same environment. However, other determiners such as *that* or *this* work with varying levels of acceptability in the same environment.

23a. perfectly acceptable) I bought a bunch of Gouda yesterday because it was on sale. Now I can’t stop eating *said* cheese.

23b. perfectly acceptable) I bought a bunch of Gouda yesterday because it was on sale. Now I can’t stop eating *it*.

23c. intermediate acceptability) I bought a bunch of Gouda yesterday because it was on sale. Now I can’t stop eating *that* cheese.

23d. lower acceptability) I bought a bunch of Gouda yesterday because it was on sale. Now I can’t stop eating *the* cheese.

This makes sense in terms of entailment- *Gouda* entails *cheese*, however, *cheese* does not entail *Gouda*. By mentioning *Gouda*, one activates *cheese*. However, this does not work the other way around. SC does not work if the type precedes the subtype:

23e. #I bought a bunch of cheese yesterday because it was on sale. Now I can’t stop eating *said* Gouda.

Interestingly, the acceptability of above examples A-D completely reverses if order of the entities is switched. For example, in 23d above, using *the* had low acceptability, but it
has high acceptability if the introduction of each NP is switched (e.g. mention of *cheese* first and *Gouda* second):

23d’ - High acceptability) I bought a bunch of cheese yesterday because it was on sale. Now I can’t stop eating the Gouda.¹⁰

In 23d’, we see that Gouda is only one type of cheese out of many that I bought. Although Gouda itself has not been explicitly mentioned, it is still Discourse Old because of the already-mentioned cheese. When compared with 23e, the difference in acceptability between *the* and *said* is clear. This further shows that *said* is unacceptable when used with inferrables, and also that *said* must refer to an old, already evoked entity. From these examples, we can see that *the* and *said* are not in free variation after all, and in fact can form minimal pairs, depending on the order of information (specifically, the order of the introduction of type and subtype.) The following examples further illustrate these minimal pairs:

24a. #I bought four bottles of wine at Trader Joe’s. *Said merlot* was great.
24b. I bought four bottles of wine at Trader Joe’s. *The merlot* was great.
24c. bought two bottles of merlot, a chardonnay, and a Riesling at Trader Joe’s. *Said wine* was great.
24d. ?I bought two bottles of merlot, a chardonnay and a Riesling at Trader Joe’s. *The wine* was great.

*Said* is only felicitous when used with an expression denoting the (already mentioned) type, not the subtype. However, *the* works better for the subtype. In examples 24c and 24d, the mention of the various subtypes of wine establishes that wine is under discussion, however, in examples 24a and 24b, the mention of the type wine does not activate any particular subtype- in this case, merlot.

**A NEW LEVEL ON THE HIERARCHY?**

Based on these analyses, it seems that the Gundel at al. hierarchy for referential expressions may benefit from an additional level accounting for SC and its unique distribution. *Said* would fit best between Activated and Familiar; it cannot be Familiar because it has a narrower distribution, in part because of the fact that it must refer to only old

¹⁰ A speaker could even continue, distinguishing subtypes: “Now I can’t stop eating the Gouda, but the cheddar is nothing to write home about.”
discourse entities. “Familiar” can instantiate a discourse new item. It very closely resembles Activated, in that the referent is represented in the addressee’s current, short-term memory. However, said’s distribution is slightly wider than those of Activated expressions, because Activated representations may have been retrieved from long-term memory, or immediate linguistic or extralinguistic contexts. Said does not refer to representations retrieved from long-term memory; the necessary and sufficient conditions for use require a referent in current, short-term memory or extralinguistic contexts.

Because of this requirement, this new hierarchical level could be called “Under Discussion,” as it always involves an entity that has been either mentioned in the discourse relatively recently, or can be evoked through the mention of a more specific form of that entity (such as Gouda evoking cheese.) Figure 3 is a chart of the new givenness hierarchy I am suggesting. This accounts for said’s unique distribution, while maintaining the integrity of the other levels in the hierarchy.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This research has shown the unique environments in which *said* can be used as a referential expression. We have seen that it has a cognitive status unique from other referential expressions, and that it therefore may deserve its own position on the hierarchy of referential expressions. We have also seen its information status and definiteness constraints, providing a better understanding of proper use.

An interesting area of potential future research is an examination to see if this construction is used in languages other than English. For example, Spanish has a “dicho” construction:

Vamos a hablar de Cáceres: dicha ciudad fue construida en 25BC.

(And now we come to Caceres: said city was built in 25 BC.)

Whether or not the constraints of *Dicho construction* are similar to those of *said construction* in English has yet to be determined. Finally, another area of interest is the use of SC to convey humor or sarcasm- an informal survey of approximately 30 native English speakers showed that most believe SC is most commonly used to convey humor. All of these different areas of research will provide a better understanding of the usage and distribution of *said construction* in modern English.
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APPENDIX A

“SAID CONSTRUCTION”
Websites/Blogs

And while ice is an afterthought for most folks, people who are serious about their beverages, alcoholic and otherwise, know that ice matters. After all, as it melts, it flavors what you're drinking, whether said beverage is vodka or water. (Gonzalez, 2014)

There are a lot of reasons to make shakshuka, an Israeli Tunisian dish of eggs poached in a spicy tomato sauce: It sounds like the name of a comic book hero. Or some kind of fierce, long-forgotten martial art. Or perhaps something that said comic book hero would yell as they practiced this elaborate martial art, mid-leap with their fist in the air. (Smitten Kitchen, 2010)

Imagine realising a childhood dream of finding a hidden trapdoor or secret passageway in your own home. Now imagine that joy being tempered by the discovery that someone else is using said secret entrance to get into your house and eat your sweets. That was the situation one Imgur user found himself in this week, and why he is currently staying with a friend. (Champion, 2013)

63. Toddler will ask for dinner. Explain to toddler that dinner ended hours ago. (Honest Toddler, 2014)

64. Toddler will cry that he/she is hungry. Explain to toddler that he/she should have eaten said dinner. (Honest Toddler, 2014)

In text body: 16. "You look happy to meet me," sings a man to a plant.

Commenter: Captain goes from curmudgeonly tightass who basically has nothing but scorn for Maria and the chaos she stands for to a doting parent who is completely smitten with this Manic Pixie Dream Nun during the course of singing said song to said plant. (Holmes, 2013)

Walt Disney Studios has released new images from the set of Into the Woods and we are too impatient to wait until December to see the film, so we’re packing up and moving to said woods immediately. (Disney, 2014)

It seems to me that with many things in life, everyone is given a different view or a different vantage point based on what they have 1. experienced, 2. seen, 3. heard about, all of said 3 vantage points occur at various times in their lives multiple times in their lives… (Wankel, 2014)

And is it just me or has the Hudson River Park become quite the hotspot for bare-chested tanners? During a recent run through said park I almost forgot I was in the US. (Dalbow, 2103)

If you’re really looking for reasons not to go… The traffic between Boulder and Denver sucks. And the people who drive the cars that create said traffic? Certifiably insane. (Dejah420, 2008)

The winning chicken recipe is surprisingly — and delightfully! — easy to make.
The man responsible for said recipe is Thomas Keller, probably the best American chef of our time. (Byrne, 2013).

#8. Hangovers last all day. One greasy brunch doesn’t cut it anymore. Just getting up to go to said brunch is too much work and your whole Sunday is spent on the couch chugging water and Advil, knowing your college self is disappointed in your adult self. (Kbweinstein, 2013)

14. When your friends want to gossip about, y’know, doing adult bedroom activities with other adults, you use very vague terms to describe said acts. (Main, 2013)

To the individual whom stole the hotpockets! They did not belong to you! By consuming said hotpockets, you have committed a theft! This shall not be tolerated!(Beth & DJ Shaggy, 2007)

Now, taking pictures of this process was tricky for me for two reasons. First, I’m not used to taking photos of someone else’s hands doing the prep and cooking. I’m used to balancing the camera with one hand while I try to do whatever I’m doing with the other hand, all the while trying not to drop said camera in the food. (Ree, 2014)

You all have heard me wax poetic about my love of egg drop soup, and how I ordered it every single Saturday of my childhood at our family’s favorite neighborhood Chinese restaurant. Well, what does a picky eater order to go with her egg drop soup for said Saturdays upon Saturdays of childhood? Fried rice, of course. (Give Me Some Oven, 2014)

Facebook

Katie: My Playwriting Professor has a BA in Philosophy, an MA in Theology, an MFA in Creative Writing, and a PhD in Communications with an emphasis in Media Studies. Oh good gracious.

Justin: So he’ll be able to communicate the assignment via Social Media, Email, Text, and Twitter, give you the biblical and ethical reason for finishing said assignment, and do it all using Shakespearean English (Facebook, May 18, 2014)

Emily: Bright, green, FOLIAAAAGE! And purple, pink, and white blossoms. And yellow flowers! (back handspring, no, running round-off back handspring)

Craig: Going to need video evidence of said stunt or I am not buying it. (Facebook, April 9, 2014)

Grace: Within a half hour of waking up, I fed two hungry girls, changed and washed the sheets on a very wet bed (curtesy of our 2.5 yr old), plopped said toddler into the bathtub (because he was soaking), noticed some brown logs that were not part of his bath toy collection, pulled Cyrus out, sanitized the tub, and am in the process if sanitizing all of the bath toys. Oy vey. To say that I am thrilled for the rest of this day is an understatement. (Facebook, February 7, 2014)

Alisha: What would you do/say in this circumstance? "Your employer realized that they hadn't been paying you for your raise they had given you, let's say last year. They then said the calculations would be made by corporate to figure out exactly how much you had earned and you will then receive back pay for X
amount of months. THEN when said calculations are finalized and approved you are told you will not be getting your hard earned money since they don't have it to give it (at the beginning of the fiscal year, no less)." What would you do?? (Facebook, 2013)

- [A comment in response to an article posted about education reform]
  Gail: I'm reminded of one of my favorite lines in Dead Poet's Society, where Robin Williams' character is decrying the measuring of poetry- about said textbook: "perforate it and put it on a roll" (Dead Poet’s Society: 0:22:30)

- Rachel: Having a kitty with a cold who wants to snuggle is adorable. Getting sneezed on by said kitty is less so. (Facebook, 2013)

- Amanda: Your life overwhelms me with its awesome.

- Ana: You’re one of the ingredients that make up said awesomeness. (Facebook, 2014)

- Carrie: So I overhear AJ playing a game with a horse… what has she named said horse? Shadowfax. She is the coolest kid. (Facebook, 2013)

Television

Adam: “I think the structural stuff is pretty well there, all we have to do here is mount the head on.”

Narrator: “And with said head in place, Adam powers up the jaws” (Ark tv, 2010)

“I am handing out pieces of paper on which you will draw one human butt. What I do with said drawings is noone's business but my own” (Daniels, Ellickson, Gervias, & Kirk, 2013).

“So speaking of Amber um trying to get a job, I slept with Jasmine the other day… Oops.. And I was hoping that maybe you've done the same thing with Seth and could advise me on said situation… Has that ever happened?” (Katims, Watson, & Massin, 2011)

News

I have found from my reading that any time reform of any kind meets with overwhelming resistance, it is because said reform interferes with the overall power position of the real people who run this country. (Houston Chronicle, 2010)

Good morning to you all. A rainy Sunday in London yesterday, it was nothing compared with what was going on in Rihanna's fancy hotel suite. She was in town to perform on the "X Factor" and Rhi Rhi reportedly wanted to fight the chill with a hot bath and then reportedly forgot she wanted said bath, flooding her suite at the swanky Savoy Hotel. According to guests, she and her entourage were incredibly apologetic when told the people in the rooms under her would need, yes... Umbrella, Ella, Ella. (ABC, Good Morning America Headline news, 2011 [111128])
I do allow myself to keep a list of things to be done when it's not writing time. I write them down so that I remember to do them sometime, just not now. So far, today's list is: measure for rug, order rug, buy small vacuum, vacuum living room with said vacuum, develop workout plan, execute said workout plan, return Tupperware to Jamie, buy a box of the Good Earth Original tea, buy red shoes for Emily's wedding, and set the DVR to record Top Chef. (Niequist, 2010)

Sofia knew what all of Rome knew: the Turkish sultan, who paid well to assure that his younger brother and rival remained a captive in the Vatican, supplied said brother with all manner of indulgences intended to keep him weak and complacent. (Poole, 2012)

For the past seven years, Darrell and I had been living in New York City, where "harvesting" a Christmas tree involved forking over an exorbitant sum for a scrawny sapling, then lugging said sapling up five flights of stairs to our itsy-bitsy apartment. (Country Living Magazine, 2012)

Where's the best place to buy skis? From me! The good doctor could sell you a pair right now if the eBay police hadn't blacklisted him. Not that Flake would buy boards over the Internet. Doing so robs one of the pleasure of bending and flexing skis one hasn't paid for. Said ritual, of course, should be performed at a specialty ski shop. (Flake, 2004)

Increased water purification standards shall apply. All waterways shall be nationalised, the Landowner only owns the riverbed, and not the water and fish which come and go unless said fish are tagged with the owner's name, address and muzzled, fish and owner. (Warner, 1992)

“This morning I got in my car… I then went and put gas in said car and realized that I would much rather be doing something else with the 7 minutes it takes to get gas.” (K. Wolfe, 2008)

Cooper: Yes. So if you had a mug shot -- and I'm not saying you do -- but if you had a mug, would you smile in said mug shot? I'm not sure if I would or not.

Sesay: Yes, I'm not sure that's the moment. (CNN, 2011 [110615])

“being the wife of said big cookie expert, um, how many times have you had the big cookie experience?” (Vesperman, 2009)
APPENDIX B

THE SAID CONSTRUCTION
Websites/Blogs

Hey Sillies! I noticed you guys keep forgetting to pick up your dog’s poopies so I took it upon myself to bring by some baggies. I assumed you’re all out because why else wouldn’t you clean up after your dogs? Oh! I also helped out by dropping all the said poop conveniently in front of your door, for easier clean up. You’re welcome! (Beth & DJ Shaggy, 2007)

Books/Magazines/Periodicals

(A lawsuit of April 1629 between Vermuyden and the commoners attests how the people of Torksey…)

“came unto the workmen and beat and terrified them, threatening to kill them, if they would not leave their work, threw some of them in the river and kept them under water with long poles, and at several other times, upon the Knelling of a Bell, came to the said works in riotous and warlike manner, divided themselves into companies, to take the workmen and filled up the ditches and drains, made to carry away the water, burned up the working tools and other materials of the Relator and his workmen, and set up poles in the form of gallows, to terrifie the workmen and threatened to break their arms and legs, and beat and hurt many of them and made others flee away, whom they pursued to a town with such terror and threats, that they were forced to guard the town.” (Purseglove, 1988)

From a statement to this Meeting of the Desertion of the Militia men or non appearance; which they consider as Disgracefull to the Inhabitants of Islay and the more particularly as the said Militia Regt. is under the Command of the Heir apparent to the Estate of Islay. They hereby resolve to use every mean in their power to Detect the Deserters now presented upon a list… (Gordon, 1983)

Forest landowners could not even erect fences or hedges unless they were low enough to allow the deer to enter and leave, consequently crops were often destroyed by them. In 1365 Edward III granted John of Appleby an annuity of 20 marks for good service ‘and in recompense, of the loss which he sustains year by year by the King's deer in respect of his land in Bernwood Forest, then lying uncultivated on account of the said deer. (Cox, 1905)

Sir John reserved the right to become a partner at the end of the first three years term for a quarter share of all mines and ores, then opened, got, or sold, … or … at the end of six years also to commence as a partner for one quarter share … or … at the end of nine years to commence as a partner for the same … or … at the end of 12 years the same, and at 15 years ditto. Providing, that is, that he signified his intentions of commencing his partnership one month before the commencement of any of the sub-terms, and beforehand to pay a full one-quarter share of the cost of digging and winning and carrying on the said works. There were hopes that the "farmers" would at last have some recompense for their repairs and improvements, thus enabling them to repay some of the money advanced to them. Or simply to " … suffer the farmers to continue the said works according to Covenants of their Lease … " (Holland, 1988)