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To Coco, Markus, Maria, and Mikael
This thesis investigates formal and communicative aspects of apokoinou in Swedish naturally occurring talk-in-interaction. The empirical study is based on a corpus of 168 apokoinou utterances, drawn from a material of 31 hours of audio and video recordings of everyday as well as institutional activities. In contrast to the traditions of normative grammar and theoretically based approaches to language, where apokoinou and related phenomena have been excluded from grammatical description altogether or been treated as the products of various kinds of mistakes, apokoinou is here re-specified as a highly functional grammatical resource and method to accomplish local communicative projects in talk.

Apokoinou in Swedish talk is a heterogeneous phenomenon, ranging from a family of methods for grammatical construction to some more grammaticalized constructions. It is formally defined as the product of a construction method, where a segment that is final in a first possibly complete syntactic segment (the pivot) is retro-constructed as initial in the following second syntactic unit. The extension of the pivot segment is made by way of a doubling of syntactic constituents from the pre-pivot segment. From a strict and normative sentence-perspective, this doubling renders the final phase of the whole utterance as incoherent with the initial phase.

From a usage-based and communicative perspective, however, the retro-construction of the pivot is made with syntactic, prosodic and lexical resources that work to integrate the utterance within an interactationally coherent unit through a moment-by-moment temporally organized process. Apokoinou is used by participants as a method to accomplish two consecutive actions within one utterance, where the second action can change perspective on some local topical aspect, confirm or insist on some local topic or action, close and demarcate a local project, and resume turns or skip-connect to pending local communicative projects after interstitial activities. These are all recipient designed local communicative projects in the sense of being designed to fit within the ongoing wider communicative context and they are often interactionally achieved in and through minimal sequences.

These results have implications for grammatical theory. Among these are (i) that grammar must be seen as conditions on dynamic constructional processes, not only as static and fixed structures; (ii) that grammar is organized on a local level rather than on a maximally general level; (iii) that apokoinou should be included in a grammar of Swedish conversational language as one of the grammatical resources available for participants in Swedish talk.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACM</td>
<td>apokoinou construction method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>modal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f_0</td>
<td>fundamental frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>apokoinou utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRP</td>
<td>transition relevance place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td>verb first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYN-PCP</td>
<td>syntactic possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2</td>
<td>verb second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completion point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVO</td>
<td>subject, verb, object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCU</td>
<td>turn constructional unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiCTI</td>
<td>Linköping Corpus of Talk-in-Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRES</td>
<td>present tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF</td>
<td>perfect tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSLC</td>
<td>Göteborg Spoken Language Corpus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>definite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TALB</td>
<td>Talbanken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVL</td>
<td>adverbial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch.</td>
<td>chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>nominal phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
<td>verb phrase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 1
1 Introduction

1.1 Aims

The aim of this study is to investigate apokoinou as a group of grammatical and dialogical phenomena in Swedish talk-in-interaction. The dominant way of treating apokoinou-like phenomena within the various traditions of language study has been to exclude it from language altogether, especially in comprehensive grammar projects such as the Swedish Academy grammar (SAG, Teleman et al. 1999). When apokoinou has indeed been attended to, studies have for the most part been unsystematic and the phenomena have been treated as marginal from a systemic/structural point of view. Interestingly though, when researchers do take an interest in the phenomena, they study them within many different analytical frames, resulting in rather different descriptions and explanations. This fact indicates that apokoinou is a heterogeneous group of phenomena, something that the empirical investigation in this study confirms.

Classical, formal grammarians with an interest in deviant syntactic constructions have characterized apokoinou or apokoinou-like phenomena as an amalgam of two syntactic structures, but sometimes also as two separate structures where one is incomplete or cut-off. A more theoretical/normative line of linguistic analysis has simply called it a speech error. The present study, however, performed within the domain of dialogical grammar (Linell 2005a) and interactional linguistics (e.g. Ochs et al. 1996, Couper-Kuhlen and Selting 1996, Hakulinen and Selting 2005), will show instead that apokoinou is a participants’ method used to resolve various local tasks that may arise during the course of utterance and meaning production, as well as a method to give an utterance a certain, recognizable form.

---

1 See the discussion in Teleman (2000) and Anward (2000). One notable exception is the pioneer work of the Finnish reference grammar (Hakulinen et al. 2004:970f), where dialogical grammar is well represented in terms of phenomena such as apokoinou and increments (see below. Also see the German academic grammar (Eller et al. 1997), where 22 pages is devoted to various kinds of anacoluthon utterances, of which at least two can be analyzed as apokoinou (ibid.-460), one Extended partial recycling of the auxiliary ‘ist’ (ibid.), and one equivalent to the Swedish variant with a ‘då’-initiated post-P (Eng. then, Germ. dann), Also see Lindström (in prep.), an introduction to grammar in Swedish conversation, where an apokoinou utterance is commented in a section on repair (ch. 5, page 47).
The main contribution of this study will be a corpus-based empirical and functional analysis of apokoinou as a group of phenomena in Swedish talk-in-interaction. This has never been done before. The apokoinou phenomenon (and related phenomena) has been left out entirely in the larger reference grammars of Swedish, but it has nevertheless often attracted some attention in minor but significant studies, e.g. in a short paper by Linell (1980), and in the form of brief comments by Saari (1975, 1977) and Anward (1980). This leaves a systematic investigation to be done.

Another central aspect of the study that makes it a new contribution to the study of apokoinou in Swedish is the communicative perspective. Earlier studies have focused on local utterance planning from the point view of the individual speaker (Linell 1980) or construction-internal syntactic structure (Saari 1975, 1977, Hellberg 1985). This study deals with the phenomena within a general dialogic, interactional and communicative framework for language, communication and cognition (Linell 1998, 2005a) and views apokoinou as a phenomenon that emerges from participants’ involvement in local (and wider) communicative projects.

One of the main aims of the study is to demonstrate both the formal and functional sides of apokoinou. The various formal resources employed when used in interaction will be presented before the functional analysis. The categories and terms presented there are useful in the following functional analysis of how apokoinou is used within different communicative and interactional environments in talk. The order between the chapters, however, should not be taken to reflect a simple methodological choice of beginning with the forms and then analyzing them in their contexts. The relevant formal categories and the functions of apokoinou utterances in actual use in talk-in-interaction were categorized in a reflexive analytical process. The functional analysis has contributed to decisions on how to label and demarcate certain formal types from other apokoinou types (and related constructions), and the tentative formal types have often proved to be something to hold on to when trying to track down similar and different functions in the data.

Because of the disparate status of previous research on apokoinou-like phenomena, there is no consensus on what kind of phenomenon this exactly is. Is it a special kind of syntactic structure, a blending of structures?
resulting from various performance factors in on-line speech, a special kind of turn or turn constructional unit, a grammatical construction with its own prototypical constructional schema(s), or a more abstract construction method that makes use of various constructions and formal methods? Should we view apokoinou as a method of organizing and resolving communicative projects in talk-in-interaction? Or is apokoinou a heterogeneous set of phenomena that ranges from more formally fixed constructions to more abstract construction methods? One of the aims of this study is to suggest an answer to these questions based on an empirical investigation of a corpus collected from various activity types in talk-in-interaction.

The main empirical aims of the study may be summarized as follows:

(i) Investigate empirically the functions that apokoinou utterances have in their sequential and communicative environment as displayed by participants

(ii) Investigate empirically the formal methods (resources) that speakers use when building apokoinou utterances and achieving social action in talk-in-interaction

(iii) Define what apokoinou is as a phenomenon in talk and as a grammatical concept and how it relates to similar phenomena and concepts in talk and grammar

(iv) Formulate some wider implications for grammatical theory that can be drawn from the results of the study

In order to deal with the empirical data I have also developed an analytical framework to deal with apokoinou as a communicative practice in talk-in-interaction.

1.2 The apokoinou phenomenon

I will define the phenomenon of apokoinou formally as a syntactic construction method that retro-constructs a syntactic pivot that is syntactically and prosodically integrated in both previous and subsequent utterance segments, but where the beginning and end of the utterance unit are incoherent within the whole utterance, if viewed from a traditional sentential perspective. The pivot is the segment in and through which the structure is changed or, as it were, rotated.

Extract (1:1) below is drawn from a talk between a doctor and a first-time pregnant woman at a maternity health care center. The doctor explains
why the pregnancy (and/or the baby) calms down at the end of the pregnancy.

(1:1) **In the end**

L:LiCTI:B:64L-915[154].3 Talk between a pregnant woman and a gynecologist at a Swedish Maternity health care center (Mödravårdscentral, MVC). Participants: L=Gynecologist (f), K=Woman, Casa Kastholm 20-25 years. The gynecologist is doing an ultrasound examination of the fetus. They talk about why the child moves around less towards the end of the pregnancy.

1. L: *å sen så blir det också lugnare* in and then it also gets calmer in

2. *å sen så blir det trängre i magen,* in the end it gets narrower in the belly

The adverbial segment "*å sen så blir det också lugnare på slutet* (and then it also gets calmer in the end)" is a syntactic constituent in the initial segment "*å sen så blir det också lugnare på slutet* (and then it also gets calmer in the end)". This segment, henceforth called segment A, ends at the latest point where a traditional sentential unit ends (see figure 1:1 below).

Segment A

Segment B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>å sen så blir det också lugnare</th>
<th>på slutet blir det trängre i magen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and then it also gets calmer in the end</td>
<td>it gets narrower in the belly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1:1.** Segmentation schema of an apokoinou utterance

---

3 The initial letter L refers the university where the recording is made (here Linköping, see appendix 3). The next string of letters and number refers to the name of the recording. The number following the hyphen (-915) refers to the transcription line in the whole transcript of the recording (if one is available). The number following square brackets [154] refers to the number within the whole apokoinou database (also including the reference material, see ch. 4 below for a presentation of data, corpuses and materials).

4 **Quotations** from transcripts are written in Courier and are framed with double quotation marks, e.g. "*å sen så blir det också lugnare på slutet*". The mentioning of quotations without prosodic marking and the mentioning of utterance types (constructions) are framed with simple quotation marks, e.g. ‘på slutet’, ‘in the end’ or ‘de+e’. The translation of quotations and mentions is marked with italics within brackets, e.g. *(in the end)*.
However, the adverbial segment is also a syntactic constituent in the final segment “på slutet blir de tifårre i magen,” (in the end it gets narrower in the belly (uterus)). This segment, henceforth called segment B, begins at the earliest point where a traditional sentential unit begins. The adverbial in itself is constructed as a pivotal segment, a turning point or the center of a twist in the utterance. This turning point segment is usually called the pivot of this kind of utterance. The segments preceding and following the adverbial pivotal segment are incoherent within a traditional sentence analysis because of the doubling of obligatory syntactic constituents (here: finite verbs). These segments are henceforth called *pre-pivot phase* (pre-P) and *post-pivot phase* (post-P) respectively, even though they are not always constructed as functional units in talk (cf. Walker 2004).

The finite verb and subject ‘blir de’ (lit. gets it) are recycled after the pivot. The main topical element ‘tifårre’ (narrower) in the post-P, however, is not part of the recycling, but constitutes a lexical renewal. The segment ‘i magen’ (in the belly) is an extension of the post-P in comparison with the pre-P. These formal properties, together with the integrating prosodic packaging, are viewed as a bundle of formal methods for the building of apokoinous utterances. Together they are categorized as a formal configuration type called *extended partial recycling* (cf. 6.3.1.4 below).

But a formal description is not the same as a functional explanation. When viewed in its sequential environment, the syntactic twist around the pivot appears as a shift that emerges from a change of perspective within a local communicative project.

1. L: de spärrar inte så [mycke¿] 
   it doesn’t kick so much
2. K: [ nae ]
   no
3. L: nae;]
   no
4. (0.5)
5. K: men ä de att den ligger så, vatt
   but is it that it lies in a way that
   [den kä:nnar]
   it feels
6. L: [ nae] de }(.) (vi) (.) barn e ju tifårre olika
   no it } (we) (.) children are different too
   (0.5)
The pregnant woman has earlier in the talk (not in the transcript) displayed a concern for her baby. On line 1 she continues this line of talk and says that the baby does not kick very much and on lines 13–15 she says that she had expected to feel the baby move more than it does. The apokoinou turn on lines 17–18 is a response to these concerns. Initially the doctor tries to reassure the woman with medical information about how the baby’s activity usually calms down toward the end of the pregnancy. This is a generic statement about pregnancies, and conforms to doctors’ and midwives’
frequent appeals to normality (Bredmar, 1999). Having reached the adverbial, the doctor shifts perspective on the pivotal topic and produces an explanation why the baby calms down (it gets narrower in the uterus).5

The analysis above is a re-specification of apokoinou from a formal structure shift into a communicative shift. Instead of explaining the final product as an overlap and shift between two separate syntactic structures (segment A and segment B) (cf. Enkvist 1988, Enkvist & Björklund 1989), the doctor’s apokoinou utterance is explained as the outcome of an incremental method to solve the local communicative project of explaining some topical aspect in the initial part of the utterance within the wider communicative project of reassuring the worried pregnant woman. More specifically, two actions are accomplished consecutively within the same communicative unit, in this case the turn: first the reassuring and then the shift to an explanation.

1.3 Thesis overview
The study is divided into four main parts. Part 1 has four chapters, where chapters 1–3 contain an introduction to the study, some relevant theoretical background, and a chapter on previous research. Chapter 4 contains a presentation of the data used and how it was used, an overview of the basic material (recordings, transcripts), the nature of the analyzed corpus of pivot utterances, a short discussion of how the analysis was carried out (such as excerption procedures, choice of transcription categories, categorization of types etc.), and transcription conventions.

Part 2 contains three chapters concerned with formal aspects of apokoinou, such as a formal definition and how apokoinou relates to similar phenomena (ch. 5), an overview of a range of different formal types (ch. 6) and a framework for the analysis of apokoinou as a communicative practice in talk (ch.7). This framework is centred on the syntactic and prosodic resources that speakers use when building apokoinou utterances (ch. 7.2–7.3), and a wider presentation and demonstration of some analytic tools used in order to capture the phenomena of apokoinou, such as the notion of communicative project (ch. 7.4).

Part 3 contains four chapters. The first three of these are the main empirical chapters (8–10), where the main functions of apokoinou utterances (AU’s) are presented and demonstrated in their communicative and interactional environments and contexts. The main functions are:

5 For a more detailed communicative analysis of (1:1), see extract (8:1) below.
AjPs that are used in order to shift perspective on some topical aspect;
(ii) AUs where the second action is used to insist, confirm or focus on the first action;
(iii) AUs that are used to close a local project (and demarcate it from upcoming actions), resume turn progressions, and skip-connect to pending communicative projects.

The fourth chapter in part three (ch. 11) is concerned with some peripheral functions, such as
(iv) AUs that are used for clarifying a possibly vague reference to preceding talk;
(v) AUs that are used in order to specify a circumstance for a following topical segment;
(vi) AUs that are used in order to elaborate on topical segments that are introduced in the same utterance.

The fifth chapter in part three, chapter 12, contains a summary and discussion of various aspects of the communicative analyses of the main functions in chapters 8-10: their internal relations and their relation to the formal methods that speakers use to accomplish them.

Part 4 contains one chapter where various aspects of the study will be discussed. It contains summaries of some of the main results of the study, discussions of some general aspects of apokoinou in Swedish talk-in-interaction, some implications for grammatical theory, and some suggestions of further research.

Enclosed in appendices are a schematic overview of the recordings used and some information about them (App. 1), a list of analyzed extracts, examples from the literature, tables, and figures (App. 2), and a presentation and discussion in some relevant aspects of Swedish grammar from the point of view of apokoinou (App. 3). An index is enclosed after the references, which contains main notions and terms. The main apokoinou forms are included in the index, but not the main functional apokoinou categories. The whereabouts in the text of the latter can be found in the list of contents.
2 Theoretical background

2.1 Introduction

A basic assumption within interactional linguistics and dialogical grammar is that languages develop different types of methods to build utterances because speakers have communicative and cognitive needs of them in their linguistic practice (Linell 2005a:297). Dynamic grammatical patterns such as apokoinou have emerged from speakers’ need to resolve local tasks and problems at certain points within the temporally unfolding micro-situations of talk-in-interaction. When viewed as a dynamic grammatical pattern, apokoinou appears as a family of methods that speakers use to both build recognizable utterances in talk and to resolve communicative problems.

The ideas behind this perspective on grammar in talk are not entirely new. Early attempts to study syntactic patterns as process in conversational data were made by Fries (1952) and Du Bois (1975). Brazil (1982:277) argues for a view of syntax that is based on a linear “step-by-step model” rather than static hierarchical structuring.6 Regarding Swedish talk, this view on syntax is further developed by Löfström (1988:33). Later research has shown how syntax is incrementally produced with an interactional process, e.g. Gooch (1979) demonstrates how a speaker in interaction builds a grammatical unit in the shape of an incrementally produced utterance, in response to other participants’ activities during the utterance production. Lerner (2002) has shown how syntactic units are collaboratively constructed as co-constructions that are distributed on contributions made by more than one speaker. Also see Lerner (1991), Schegloff (1996:56), Auer (1996a), Steensig (2001a:39), and Linell (2005a:244ff) for similar views on grammatical patterning in talk.

The interactional and dynamic approach to grammatical patterns is a growing area of research and has been consolidated during the last fifteen years under the labels interactional linguistics and dialogical grammar. For introductions to the field in general, see Ochs et.al. (1996), Cooper-Kullen & Selting (1996), Ford et.al. (2002), Couper-Kullen & Ford (2004), Hakulinen & Selting (2005), and J. Lindström (2006b). For a combination of interactional linguistics and construction grammar, see Günther & Imo (2006). For introductions to research on grammar in Swedish talk-in-interaction see Nordberg et.al. (2003), Anward & Nordberg (2005), and

6 See Ono & Thompson (1995) for further references.
Engdahl & Londen (forthc.). For a general introduction to the field and a comprehensive account of grammar in Danish conversation, see Steensig (2001a).

The number of individual studies of dynamic grammatical patterns is increasing. Montzoni (2005) studies dislocations in Italian and Günthner (2006) studies pseudo-cleft constructions in German from interactional and dynamic perspectives (also see Linell 2004 for a minor study of ehrs in Swedish talk). Scheutz (2005) studies pivot constructions in German conversation, and Walker (2004, forthc.) studies pivots in English conversation. Lindström & Linell (forthc.) deals with the "x-and-x" construction in Swedish conversation and Wide (2002) investigates the communicative potential of and the syntactic-semantic diversity in the use of a particular tense-aspect construction in contemporary Icelandic talk (the "vera búinn að + inf. construction"). They all analyze the phenomena within their sequential environment in communicative contexts. These studies are explicit attempts to incorporate dialogic aspects of responsiveness and projectivity in an analysis of a grammatical pattern. For studies of apokoinou-related phenomena in Swedish, where some can be analyzed as grammatical patterns (or constructions), see chapter 3 below.

Interactional linguists and dialogical grammarians make use of fine-grained analysis of speakers' activities at both the single utterance level and the sequential level in the spirtt of conversation analysis (CA).7 The sequential ordering of actions in projectable action trajectories is seen as one of the central organizing principles in talk-in-interaction. Speakers jointly organize actions into sequences of turns, where individual turns are made to respond to previous contributions, contribute to the talk in some way, and shape the context for following contributions. These actions may be done consecutively in temporally ordered segments during the turn construction (j. Lindström 2006a), but can also be viewed more abstractly as simultaneous dimensions of all turns (Linell 2005a).

In other words, turns at talk and the segments they are built from (turn-constructional units or TCUs)8, are both designed to shape the communicative impact of prior actions and to construct contexts for following actions. The former action will be referred to as retro-construction in this study because of the retroactive nature of the communicative projects.

---

7 See Schegloff (2007), but also Huesley & Wolffin (1998) and ten Have (1999) for an introduction to the basic theoretical tools and methodological procedures of CA.

8 Apokoinou utterances can be hosted by whole turns, single TCUs, or several adjacent TCUs.
that are resolved using apokoinou, and how they respond to previous moves in the talk. The latter action will be referred to as *interactive projection* because of the way participants can use an actions possible trajectory to project or predict certain preferred following actions within a sequence of actions (cf. Auer 2005).\(^9\) When building utterances and turns at talk, speakers make use of mutually recognizable linguistic resources and organize them in projectable chunks of talk such as syntactic clauses, phrases and prosodic units. This will be referred to as *grammatical projection* (cf. Auer ibid.), because it concerns the possibility for participants to project or predict possible grammatical continuations of turns. In order to get actions and utterance units to work or fit within a communicative environment, speakers use prosodic means to tie units together prospectively (*prosodic projection*, cf. 7.3.1 below) or retrospectively (cf. 7.3.2 below) or demarcate them from each other.

Speakers use interactive, syntactic, and prosodic methods to resolve a wide range of communicative problems and tasks (projects) that arise during interaction and utterance production (Linell 2005a). Syntactic and prosodic methods are also used to give turns and utterances a mutually recognizable form (or predictable gestalt; Auer 1999b) that provide participants with the means for predicting possible continuations of action sequences and utterance continuations within the ongoing communicative project. Some of the smaller units used during the building process of an apokoinou utterance come close to what has been treated as grammatical constructions within the various variants of construction grammar (CxG) (cf. Goldberg 2006 for an overview). Constructions in CxG are limited to more fixed formal configurations (some of which can be described as abstract patterns using obligatory lexical elements and open slots) and such constructions are often used as building blocks during the apokoinou production process (see chapter 6 below for examples). The CxG framework for studies of grammar is to a large extent an attempt to make a complete inventory of grammatical constructions on the basis of actual language use in general, and therefore belongs to a usage-based tradition of language studies (Fried & Östman 2004:24). But the main emphasis in CxG seems to be to attain a full coverage of language facts on the basis of actual texts and utterances without losing a maximal generalization of formal

\(^9\) For a more detailed discussion of conversation analytic tools such as "turn", what turns are made of and how they are used by participants to organize conversational activities, see e.g. Sacks et al. (1974), Ford et al. (1996), Selting (1996, 2001, 2005). For related work on Swedish, see e.g. Lindström (2006a) and Bockgård (2007).
patterns. This is to be understood as opposed to generalizations on the basis of intuition or imagined utterances, as in a theoretical tradition of language studies. But the focus on maximal generalization have so far also left out particularizations of formal patterns in terms of practices of communicative action and processes of utterance production.

The theoretical framework of construction grammar is therefore usage based, but it has an interactional or communicative deficit. Construction grammar theory has begun to acknowledge the importance of including discourse functions within its formal matrices (cf. Östman 2005), but the way of doing and demonstrating analysis, however, usually does not incorporate communicative action in time as a general explanatory factor, but merely as a component in the generalized formal model when considered important enough in certain cases. Contexts are not made “systematically essential” (Linell 2005a:314) as within the dialogical framework outlined below.

Recently, attempts have been to incorporate relevant aspects of construction grammar into the field of interactional linguistics in a way that parallels many aspects of the present study of apokoinou. Günthner & Imo (2006) combine the method of conversation analysis with a theory of constructions as participants’ resources when achieving social action in talk-in-interaction. Actual utterances are used as data when describing prototypical patterns of formal configurations in apokoinou utterances, and the analyses are focused on the procedural practices of utterance production and how, on a detailed level, constructions are used as participants’ methods to intervene in the ongoing communicative activities. This study may differ in the sense that the phenomenon of apokoinou as such is characterized as a method to resolve local communicative projects rather than a construction in the sense of Günthner & Imo (perhaps with the exception of a few formally more fixed variants, see ch. 13.4 for a further discussion). It is recognized, however, that different constructions in the interactional sense of construction grammar are used when building apokoinou utterances.

2.2 A dialogical grammar

A unified theoretical account of the interplay between emergent dynamic syntactic patterns, grammatical methods of communicative action and the processes of formal configuration of naturally occurring utterances in time, which can be used in a study of apokoinou in talk-in-interaction, can be found within a dialogue approach to communication, cognition, language and grammar as outlined in the work of Linell (mainly in 1998, 2004, 2005a and
As far as grammar is concerned, this dialogical approach is close to interactional linguistics in the work of, for example, Ono & Thompson (1995), Steensig (2001a), Couper-Kuhlen & Ford (2004), Hakulinen & Schütz (2005), Auer (2005) and Günthner & Ino (2006).

A dialogic perspective on cognition, communication and language can on a general level be compared to a monologic view, where cognition is viewed as individual processing of information, communication as transfer of information, language as a code of signs which are combinations of fixed expressions with stable meanings, and language as a-temporal structures, forms and products. Within a dialogic perspective, in contrast, individuals that are engaged in thinking and talking are seen as being in dialogue with others and with contexts. The other matters in terms of being the previous speaker, the addressee with a perspective of his/her own, the present interpreter, and a possible next speaker that might respond. Contexts are made relevant in order to facilitate the understanding of what is going on right now, and comprise aspects of the external local situation, the co-text and speakers’ more abstract knowledge and assumptions.

Linguistic practices and thinking are not primarily processes within the mind of the individual, but processes among people that are embedded within a world of others and those contexts of the situation that are made relevant (cf. Drew 2005).

The dialogical consciousness is embedded within culture, while the culture can be said to be embodied within the individual speaker and communicative action. Conversation or talk-in-interaction is similarly an activity that is both embodied within a cultural community while at the same time being embodied in speakers and their physical possibilities and constraints (e.g. the function of the brain, the orientation of the body in the physical space, and the distribution of talk in time). It is reasonable to assume that language and grammar have been formed as a consequence of both cognitive constraints on information processing and communicative constraints on taking turns at talk.

2.3 Grammar as methods of social action

Grammatical phenomena like apokoinous have mainly been analyzed as a-temporal, formal, syntactic products. This places most of these studies in a theoretical (as opposed to empirical) and monologic tradition of language studies. The internal syntactic organization of these products, such as
double occurrences of obligatory constituents, have been explained as incorrect deviations from a normatively defined (rule-based), well-formed and abstract sentence structure, the use of which is governed by the speaker's "linguistic competence". However, if studied from a dialogical, usage-based perspective, where the aim is to study grammatical phenomena as social action (A. Lindström 1999) and ethno-methods of communicative action (Linell 2005a, 2005b:218) that are accomplished in time (cf. Auer et al. 1999), grammatical phenomena, including apokoinou, appear as *modes of social interaction*:

Grammar is not only a resource for interaction and not only an outcome of interaction, it is part of the essence of interaction itself. Or, to put it another way, grammar is inherently interactional. (Schegloff et al. 1996:38)

If we adopt such a perspective (to be further laid out in this study), apokoinou does not simply appear as a set of deviant structure types, but as a family of (well-functioning) methods to configure utterances in certain ways and to resolve local communicative projects at certain interactively relevant positions within the unfolding local communicative and cognitive activity.

It has been proposed that one of the key roles of grammar in talk-in-interaction is "to provide an orderliness to the shape of interactional turns and to facilitate the calibration of possible turn endings and turn-taking." (Schegloff et al. 1996:34). But grammar is also a condition for dynamic construction processes, i.e. conditions for the *procedural* aspects of utterance building such as the interplay of prosodic and syntactic methods of building utterances within a framework of interactive, syntactic and prosodic projection (cf. Auer 2005). Apokoinou is a way to actively give utterances some particular recognizable grammatical forms.

Apokoinou is also a way to take part in the practices of accomplishing meaning in interaction between participants in context, as will be shown in ch. 8-11 below. The apokoinou family of methods, with its formal and communicative aspects, has some particular functional potential to contribute to sense-making in interplay with interlocutors and contexts.

A dynamic grammatical construction method is designed to change the local micro situation in the unfolding interaction and utterance production (Linell 2005a:279). Some variants of apokoinou are e.g. methods to

---

10 See chapter 3 below for a comprehensive discussion.
retractively make relevant new aspects of an already introduced topic, both within shorter utterances and within longer (sometimes more monologically organized) utterances. When using dynamic grammatical construction methods in general, and when using apokoinou in particular, speakers are retroactively intervening in the shared social world, in the already established micro-situation, but also in the upcoming micro-situation since the current action is designed to influence other participants to take the new perspective on the topical aspect. Some aspects of this shared meaning world are foregrounded and some aspects backgrounded. On way of describing this process is to say that grammatical constructions in general and the utterances they are a part of are instructions to change conceptions about the situations and topics talked about (thoughts about them, feelings for them and decisions on what to do next) (Linell ibid.).

2.4 A dialogical perspective on utterance production

Utterances are linguistic expressions apart from being parts of communicative activities and projects. A grammatical method of building utterances is therefore always a method of giving the utterance a certain grammatical (morpho-syntactic and prosodic) form. This grammatical form can from one point of view be seen as emerging from a communicative action as a mere byproduct, as formulated in the emergent grammar hypothesis of Hopper (1987, 1988). But this idea leaves out the active use of grammatical (ethno)methods to act and to give form to utterances.

A conversational activity is built through an interactive process. Utterances are meaning creating actions that are sequentially ordered, and part of communicative projects and activities. This meaning creating process could be seen as a synchronization of two or more consciousnesses (creating a temporary intersubjectivity), while at the same time this process is the prerequisite or condition for the cognition of the individual mind. Linell (2005a:238ff) has formulated three general dialogical principles for the understanding of talk (and texts) that are highly relevant for the understanding of grammatical constructions and methods of utterance building. These are the principle of sequentiaity, the principle of interdependence of act and activity, and the principle of co-authoring.

Utterances are sequentially organized in several respects. They have responsive and initiatory (projective) qualities in the sense that an utterance is always some kind of response to the preceding activity, while at same time being an initiative that makes relevant (projects) certain following actions (Linell & Gustavsson 1987). Another way of accounting for this is to say
that all utterance production in talk-interaction is characterized by co-authoring in various ways. On the level of action sequences (from adjacency pairs to wider episodes, Linell 1998, 2005a:243) the addressee is present in each utterance that is part of a coordinated communicative project (Luckmann 1995), especially when the speaker takes the perspective of the other or changes the perspective in orientation to an addressee. On the level of the utterance, speakers often reuse or recycle parts of other speakers' utterances, or even cooperate in building syntactic units across turn boundaries (turn-sharing, Lerner 2002, co-constructions, Bockgård 2004).

Another aspect of the dialogic dimensions of utterance production is that actions are often performed with more or less functionally specialized grammatical constructions. One example is that speakers often use quotation constructions to organize multi-voiced utterances where different voices (other speakers’ or from an inner dialogue) are sequentially demarcated. One particular formal and functional variant of apokoinou (see 10.2.2 below) can be seen as a method to sequentially demarcate different voices within a single integrated TCU or an incrementally constructed turn, often within a sequence of quotations.

An aspect of the sequential organization of utterance production is the incremental method of building extended turns. The production of turns and TCUs is done stepwise on the basis of local decisions under way at certain positions during the production process, in orientation to the actions of the interlocutors. The resulting utterances are therefore emergent products of many, different, serially ordered decisions (Linell 2005a). The emergent utterances are the objects of “moment-to-moment recalibration, reorganization and recompletion.” (Schegloff 1996:56). Speakers have the constant possibility of reinterpreting the ongoing activity of talk, which in apokoinou utterances comes out as the retro-construction (Schegloff 1996:78) of syntactic segments as pivotal positions in the utterance (see ch. 1.2 above and ch. 5.1 below for a discussion of this defining apokoinou feature).

The dialogical qualities and dimensions of utterances in talk-interaction are reflected in the grammatical methods used to build them and the formal shape they receive during the construction process. One aspect of this is that speakers in conversation and talk-in-interaction in general use other kinds of text binding methods and operate on other kinds of units than in written language (Linell 2005a:249). Binding methods in talk are used and shaped within the piece-by-piece unfolding of the utterance in time and involves both prosodic and syntactic methods of projection, continuation and demarcation (a more detailed account of utterance
extension in Swedish talk-in-interaction is presented in ch. 6.3 below). In principle, this points in the direction of another kind of grammar for talk than for written language in terms of basic units and cohesive practices. This is especially true for extended turns where the short clausal unit often must be left behind in favor of other TCU types (ibid.).

The basic syntactic units differ from written language in the sense that turns at talk are organized in orientation to interactively sensitive positions or loci rather than to, e.g., rules for configuring well-formed hierarchical structures. Schegloff (1996) shows how the grammatical structure of a turn at talk is shaped in orientation to other participants activities within the transitional space. Steensig (2001a) develops Schegloff’s parsing model and describes various methods of turn construction in Danish conversation (grammatical, prosodical, pragmatic, repair based and visual), as well as interactionally relevant positions during the production of the turn where actions such as (pre)beginnings, (post)beginnings, prec/possible completions and post(possible) completions are performed. For similar but more linguistically oriented accounts of turn organization in German conversation, see Selting (2000) and Auer (2005). J. Lindström (2006a) develops the parsing models of Schegloff, Steensig, Selting and Auer to also comprise a description of grammatical segments that corresponds to the interactional topology of Swedish turns.

Within a more construction-oriented dialogical framework, Anward (2005) shows how linguistic units in talk (turns, TCUs) are constructed in terms of light initiating frames of a rather stereotypical character, such as ‘de+e’ (there’s), ‘å sen’ (and then) etc. These initiating frames are followed by one or several heavier, content-rich segments (a filler, often a predication). The unit is then often finished with a light closing frame such as ‘så att eh’ (so that eh) or ‘och eh’ (and uh). Apokoinou utterances can often be analyzed as condensed versions of such dynamic utterance patterns, with the peripheral phases as lighter frame elements and the pivot as the content-rich filler or as a part of it. (for a short discussion of apokoinou variants as constructions, see ch. 13.4 below).

2.5 Responsive and projective qualities of internal syntax

Within a monologic view on linguistic units, the main focus has been on the inner (hierarchical) structure of static syntactic units. Within a dialogic view the inner structure is viewed as emergent over time and produced piece-by-piece (internal syntax) and the relation between inner structure to formal aspects of the co-text (external syntax) becomes relevant as well. The
emergent internal syntax of a clause unit (such as hierarchical structuring and syntactic dependencies between words and phrases) is an important resource for responsive connections, for the speaker’s planning of the ongoing utterance, and for the projection of upcoming continuations and actions in a temporally ordered process. However, external syntax also matters. It is here defined as explicit relations between formal aspects of the utterance and its co-textual or communicative surrounding (previous and possible next turns). A strict definition of external syntax would be “construction specific conditions on the previous and/or [following] co-text, which must be possible to connect to formal features in the construction” (Linell 2005a:284, my transl.). This is usually most prominent at the beginnings and ends of TCUs and turns, where responsive/projective particles and constructions are placed. In both internal and external syntactic processes, prosodic methods of connecting and projecting are important.

Some more basic-level constructions (Michaelis & Lambrecht 1996:218) do not have such strict demands on their immediate co-textual surroundings, such as the basic nexus between subject and finite verb in the clause, or a declarative construction, even though they both probably originate from specific communicative and cognitive demands. The Swedish ‘x-and-x’ construction (Lindström & Linell, forthc.), on the other hand, has some specific demands on the previous and following discourse, such as the explicit mentioning of the “x”-word in one of the previous utterances, and a follow-up comment on the appropriateness of the word choice, exemplified in (2:1) below.

**(2:1) Last night and night**

Coffee conversation in a private home environment between four senior women (65–75 years). A is the hostess and B, D and D are her guests. They talk about a thunder storm that is claimed to have occurred the previous night.

1. D: Höorde du inte något nästa då? didn’t you hear this last night either then
2. B: har åskan gått nästa? there was thunder last night
3. C: ja; dom säjer de men jaha... [någe, ] yes they say that but I didn’t hear anything
4. D: [ dom säjer men de va xaka ja [nåja vi< ]= last night an’ night but it was I blank around
Theoretical background

6. B:  (>du har inte)=
    you didn't

7. D:  =e
    eleven (.) eleven o'clock

8. B:  =h
    he eller hört nåt.<
    heard anything either

The use of the 'x-and-x'-format "i natt å natt" (last night an' night) on line 5 initiates a modification of the appropriateness of the speaker’s own previous use of the word “night” on line 1.11 In this particular case, the modification is done in response to speaker B’s direct question on line 2 whether the thunder was actually heard during the night.

The use of 'x-and-x' on line 5 also projects a following move (by the same speaker) where the nature of the appropriateness of the previous use of "x" is explicitly addressed. In this case speaker D specifies that the thunder was heard around eleven o'clock the previous evening rather than during the night, a circumstance that accounts for the modification of the word choice (with 'x-and-x') at this particular sequential position. The follow-up comment probably also makes relevant (as a possible next move) a reconsideration (by B and C) of the initial question in light of the new and more precise time information.

Apokoinou is considered a family of methods for the building of utterances and the solving of local communicative tasks, rather than a family of grammatical constructions in a formally more restricted sense (such as nexus, declaratives or 'x-and-x'). Despite this, it is still relevant to discuss if some variants of apokoinou have an external syntax in a strict sense or if the relation to the surrounding talk is looser. I will return to this question when relevant for the analysis and in the closing discussion chapter.

2.6 Grammar as dialogue within situations and traditions

The dialogical piece-by-piece building of a concrete utterance in time is not preceded by a mentally constructed and readymade structures that is then realized or instantiated. That would imply an opposite, context insensitive theory of utterance production. This fact, however, does not mean that speakers do not orient to abstract patterns for the active construction of utterances while engaged in the utterance building activity. It is perfectly in

11 One should note that the Swedish word 'natt' means night rather than evening, and that 'i natt' can mean both last night and this upcoming night.
line with a dialogic view on grammar that speakers constantly orient to (are in dialogue with) both contextual factors in the immediate situation and a tradition of linguistic products (see systemic aspects, Linell 2005a:305). I argue, in line with Linell (ibid.), that (abstract) schemas for grammatical construction (such as the apokoinou method) all belong to situation transcending practices (ibid.) which are also dynamic, that is, potentially liable to change, but in a way that is less open for quick changes than the ongoing situated communicative actions and projects.

In one respect, the formal configuration of the individual utterance is designed on the spot within the communicative environment, in order to function within the here-and-now accomplished action(s) of solving local communicative projects, a process that makes the specific configuration the outcome of local decisions and management (cf. Ono & Thompson 1995).

In this sense, apokoinou utterances are concrete (locally emerging) configurations that speakers shape in interplay with co-participants and contexts that are actively made relevant there and then. At the same time, however, formal patterns are sedimented over time when speakers recurrently resolve similar local tasks in recurrent communicative environments. In this sense, apokoinou methods of building utterances are abstract (diachronically emergent) patterns that are consolidated when used in interplay with similar contexts and constantly changing when used in interplay with new or slightly differing communicative environments (interactively emergent).

Ono & Thompson (1995) use the notions of abstract prototype and constructional schema in order to account for how the varied and often messy syntax in concrete utterances is actually produced in orientation to more stable recognizable patterns (prototypes) that are situation-transcending. Recurrent utterance forms are instances of one or several abstract patterns oriented to by the speaker in order to resolve the recurrent problem at hand. A discussion of how participants’ orientations to abstract patterns as such can be demonstrated are presented in 13.3 below. Drawing in part on ideas by Langacker (1987, 1991), Ono & Thompson say that:

Ono & Thompson do not use the model explicitly to describe apokoinou-like phenomena as an abstract prototypical pattern in its own right (see ch. 3.3.2.2 for a further discussion of the model in direct relation to apokoinou).
But this model is interesting as a general theory for the use of syntactic patterns in conversation. The model combines a notion of abstract prototypes with the recognition that concrete utterances often are blends or hybrids between different schemas (cf. Linell 2005a). See Chapter 5.3 below for a more detailed discussion of utterance hybrids between apokoinou and other construction methods.

In order to do justice to the two dimensions of dialogue, I will make an analytical difference between the terms *apokoinou construction method* (ACM) and *apokoinou utterance* (AU). The former designates apokoinou as an abstract, pre-patterned form of social interaction. It is a participants’ method of engaging in certain local activities in conversational talk. The latter designates the emergent utterance which is the result of this engagement, in a specific situation.

The AUs are spoken utterances with specific functions that for the most part are *hybrid instances* of different methods and schemas, reflecting the fact that speakers orient to more than one activity at the same time, to the preceding and following talk, and to simultaneous actions by other participants. ACM’s, at the abstract level, do not have specific functions, but rather *functional potential* to be used meaningfully within interaction between participants and in interplay with contexts. The theory of functional potential (Linell 2003b) refers to a potentiality of a method of utterance building (such as apokoinou) or a formal resource (such as focal accent or retro-constructive syntax) to give rise to different meanings and functional interpretations in interplay with contexts in different types of communicative environments.12

2.7 Brief summary

To summarize briefly the theoretical background, grammar is seen as abstract dynamic schemas or patterns for the formal configuration of utterances moment-by-moment, and as methods to resolve local communicative projects that arise during the course of utterance production and interaction in talk. Grammatical *construction methods* in this sense have a more or less stable functional potential to resolve local communicative projects in concrete situations of use, and are oriented to as dynamic constructional schemas during utterance production when configuring

---

12 The theory of functional potentials is part of a more general theoretical framework of *meaning potential* (K. Norén & Linell 2007) that deals with linguistic units such as words and constructions.
recognizable utterance forms. Constructional schemas can be said to be in
dialogue with both situational contexts and situation transcending practices.
3 Previous research

3.1 Notions of apokoinou

There is a terminological confusion in the literature regarding the notions used to classify and describe (or dismiss) apokoinou construction methods or similar phenomena in modern language research. A first complication is that similar phenomena have been given a range of different labels, each tied to different theoretical perspectives and ways of analysis. A second complication is that some of the very same labels have been used to describe a range of rather different language phenomena apart from apokoinou.

The notion of anacoluthon in the tradition of classical grammar, and in the Swedish, English and German traditions in particular, has been described as “a ‘waste-basket category', into which everything that does not conform to the syntactical-grammatical norm is thrown without careful examination” (Scheutz 2002:3). Apart from apokoinou-like phenomena, all kinds of utterances that can be viewed as incomplete or incorrectly constructed from a normative perspective have ended up here. Examples are utterance break-offs followed (or not) by new beginnings (Boardman 1977:184ff, Hoffmann 1991:98), self-corrections in a wide sense (Rath 1975:2f, 1979:218ff), general changes in the syntactic production strategy under way (Helmig 1972, Sandig 1973:46, Hoffmann 1991:98, Schröder 1998:66), but also more clear-cut syntactic constructions such as pre- and post locations, extrapositions and dependent main clauses (cf. Scheutz 2002:3, Auer 2000a:15). None of these phenomena are apokoinou, in the sense of being constructed around a syntactic middle part (a koinon or pivot) as defined above in chapter 1.2 or below in chapter 5. Some scholars have tried to devote the notion anacoluthon to apokoinou phenomena only (Linell 1981, 1982, 1990), and even used the notion true anacoluthon to signal this specified definition (Enkvist 1988, Enkvist & Björklund 1989). However, even in these studies there is a range of rather different phenomena that is designated by the notions. This makes the notions difficult to use, even though the new definition is given a narrower scope.

Some German scholars (Sandig 1973:46, Schröder 1998:75) have used the notion apokoinou (or variants on this notational format) to refer to a special instance of the more general concept anacoluthon. The background

---

13 See 1.2 above for a short definition and chapter 5 below for a detailed definition of the notion.
of Sandig’s choice of notion was in part a contemporary discussion in the early 1970s within the study of German middle age poetry (also see Shröder 1984). The discussion was about the origin of a special syntactic pattern called “αποκοινυ” (i.e. ‘apo koimu’ in Ancient Greek) that occurred in some of the poems and in contemporary spoken German as well (as exemplified in example (3.7) below). The question was: Did the spoken pattern originate in literary (poetic) writing and then spread into spoken language, or did it originate in everyday talk? The poetic apokoinou was an apokoinou-like conventionalized stylistic tool, and as such not a deviant mistake, and Sandig (1973) makes a similar argument regarding the spoken apokoinou in everyday German. In general, the apokoinou notion has been viewed as more useful than the anacoluthon notion within the German tradition, and has been used widely within the German and Swedish research traditions well before and after Sandig. In recent years, the notion has been used to describe the form and function of apokoinou-like phenomena in spoken language (cf. Scheutz 1992) in their own right, not as deviations from normative rules of grammar. These facts, and especially that the notion has emerged within a usage-oriented tradition of language studies, is also the main reason why the notion has been chosen in this study. A third notion for apokoinou-like phenomena, pivots, was established within the conversation analytic tradition during the seventies (cf. Schegloff 1979:262, Scheutz 2002, Walker 2004, see below 3.2.1.2). But this choice of terminology was made without any recognition of the fact that similar linguistic phenomena had been analyzed before, probably a stand taken as a part of the research program of ethnomethodology to respecify language (and sociology in general) in terms of social interaction (Garfinkel 1967). The choice of the apokoinou notion in this study is not made in opposition to this program, but rather in recognition of the fact that empirically based language studies has a tradition beyond ethnomethodological conversation analysis.

---

14 See Gärtner (1970) for a comprehensive commentary on this discussion and references.
15 Gärtner, however, expresses a rather normative and critical attitude towards the use of the construction in spoken German (ibid. 1970:130).
17 Cf. e.g. Schegloff et al. (1996) for a broad theoretical background to the field of interaction and grammar.
3.2 Three formal models of analysis and explanation

In this section, I will divide research focusing on apokoinou-like phenomena (mostly treated under other labels) into three main formal models of analysis and explanation. The difference between them lies mainly in conflicting theories and hypotheses on how to explain complex syntactic constructions (like apokoinous) that deviate from written language norms in formal terms. It is often the case that the structural analysis, conducted in studies within each model, follows from the explanatory strategies of that model rather than the other way around, despite that such aspects of the description are not explicitly formulated. Instead, the explanatory strategy is most often something that has to be inferred from the way the analysis is presented. This is especially true for the tradition of classical grammar, where also decisions of exclusion of certain phenomena from the description altogether display theoretical positions. Therefore, the concept of formal models of analysis and explanation that is used below should not be taken as schools of analysis or language theory that are explicitly formulated by researchers, although there are cases where a study is explicitly demarcated against another model. The ‘models’ should rather be viewed as recurrent basic themes or ideas in previous research, each with their own concept-historical (genealogical) background. For the most part, only one model is used as the main strategy of analysis and explanation in each single study, but sometimes at least two are simultaneously present and the co-occurrence is often a potential source of conceptual obscurity.

3.2.1 Two-part incoherent structures

Definitions within the first model explain apokoinou-like phenomena as a combination of a broken-off or fragmented syntactic structure with a completed syntactic structure (cf. e.g. Zifonun et al. 1997:444 for an analogous definition of a “typischer Fall des Anakoluths” in traditional German grammar). The fragmental segment is analyzed either as (i) the initial segment before the pivot (or its conceptual equivalents), which is then continued with a complete sentence, creating a divided incoherent whole, or (ii) the final segment after the pivot, preceded by a complete sentence, thus creating another type of divided incoherent whole. The focus lies solely on the formal syntactical character of the linguistic unit and prosody is either disregarded entirely or taken as proof for the division into two units. If used as an explanatory theory of utterance production, these production processes will create two incoherently linked syntactic products. The majority of all
studies using anacolouthon as the main notion align with this model in one way or the other, drawing directly or indirectly on the etymology of the Greek word ‘an – akolouthos’ (not following, cf. 3.4.1 below.). This is probably also the theoretical model behind classical grammar, e.g. displayed in the exclusion of apokoinou-like phenomena from the Swedish Academy grammar (Teleman et al. 1999).

3.2.2 Overlapping or blended structures/constructions
Definitions within the second model explain apokoinou-like phenomena as (an often peculiar) overlap or blend of two abstract formal syntactic structures. The end segment of the first structure is shared with the initial segment of the second. The initial and the final segments of the whole are incongruent with each other. If used as an explanatory theory of utterance production, this production process will create one incoherent syntactic unit, but is explained and accepted as being really two (mentally) simultaneously present, coherent structures overlapping each other.

Saari (1975:80ff) analyzes anacoluthons (“anakoluter”) in a corpus of Swedish and Finland-Swedish sociolinguistic interviews. Saari treats anacoluthic utterances as breaks against an ideal sentence structure. All of Saari’s examples are not apokoinou-like with a syntactic pivot as defined in this study. Saari’s examples of utterances with doublings of objects and adverbials lack a pivot in this respect. Utterances with doubled subjects and subject+verb, however, do have pivots, although Saari does not identify this formal feature. Instead, Saari defines them as overlaps of two separate sentences where the speaker doubles a main constituent in a way that makes the end of the overall structure incoherent with the beginning (see example 3:1 below). This kind of anacoluthon is not, according to Saari, a logically incoherent combination of two sentences, where one is incomplete and the other one complete and correct (as in explanatory model 1 above).

18 Also compare with notions such as ‘vollständigen’ as opposed to ‘unvollständigen’ in German poetry and everyday talk, where the status of being ‘unfinished’ partly refers to the fact that only the first of the abstract finite structures in the whole construction forms a complete sentence, while the second finite goes in another direction (Gärtner 1970:128).

19 This is not the same as sentence blends in the sense of Fay (1981), or syntactic amalgams in the sense of Lakoff (1974), where no apokoinou utterances are exemplified, but it is in the same spirit of analysis.

20 The pivot segment in the following examples from the literature are shaded and the doubled constituents are sometimes underlined with a dotted line.
The subject-duplicating utterances should rather be viewed as intended by the speaker as one semantic whole, where the main content parts of the macro sentence (the pivots in this study) are shared between two nexus clauses that form two independent sentences. Saari explains the use of subject-doubling as a speakers' correction of a mistake made during the beginning of utterance production. This explanation are similar to many studies of apokoinou-like phenomena within the conversation analytical tradition (see below 3.3.1), but Saari does not analyze anacoluthic utterances in their interactional environment.

Enkvist (1988) orients explicitly to the overlap model when he defines the phenomenon of *true anacolutha* "as a blend of two overlapping structures" (1988:2). I have marked the overlapping part with shading in example (3:2) below:

(3:2) Enkvist (1988:2), overlapping structures

I have been _for the last year_ I have been doing that thing

True anacolutha like the one in (3:2) and other types are also analyzed by Enkvist in terms of a three part structure which makes it more in line with model three (see 3.2.3 below). Enkvist analyzes the shaded segment as a syntactic pivot in the sense that it is a syntactic part of both preceding and following utterance segments. However, the equivalent to this type of utterance in Swedish talk-in-interaction is not treated as a prototypical apokoinou in this study (see ch. 11.3 below). It is rather treated as a related method of initiating turns where the syntactic progression is interrupted before the finite verb with an adverbial, which then is followed by a recycling if the turn beginning before producing the verb and the subsequent elements of the utterance. The prosodic integration makes the unit more coherent than a syntactic break-off and the method therefore stands out as a recurrent, regular practice of initiating turns in Swedish talk-in-interaction, and perhaps in English as well although Enkvist do not do functional analyses.

Lambrecht's (1988) construction grammar approach to the *presentational amalgam construction* also fits within this model. Despite the fact that this construction (too) is better treated as an apokoinou-like or related construction method (see ch. 11.4 below), it has some formal features in
common with apokoinou. The PAC is described by Lambrecht as a construction that results when two clauses \((S_1 = \text{a presentational clause}, \text{and} \ S_2 = \text{a relative clause})\) “enter into construction with one another to form a global unit” \((1988:331)\). When this happens, a gap remains on the initial subject position in \(S_2\), forcing \(S_2\) to take the last noun phrase (NP) in \(S_1\) as the subject instead of the missing one. If analyzed within the analytical framework of the present study, this process could be called a *non-construction* and the shaded segment in example (3:3) below, “a friend in the Bay area”, could be categorized as an NP pivot.

(3:3) Lambrecht (1988:330), construction blending

\begin{quote}
I have \textbf{a friend in the Bay area} as a painter
\end{quote}

Lambrecht gives this phenomenon a discursive explanation: In order to express the single proposition of the whole construction with a minimum of syntactic paraphrasing, the speaker simultaneously codes “the lexical NP [..] as a presentational focus and as the topic of a proposition.” \((\text{ibid}:333)\). In some sense, this approach takes the overlap theory to also comprise a process of construction blending, i.e. an action on the part of the speaker and not (just) the result of a way of describing data grammatically. Two clauses are actively amalgamated (blended) on a shared NP to achieve discursive advantages within a narrow discourse range. Lambrecht, however, does not refer to a wider communicative explanation of how (i.e. prosodically), where (i.e. sequentially), or why speakers use this amalgamating construction in a discourse context.

Löfström (1988) analyzes apokoinou-like utterances, or *anacoluthic add-ons* (”anakolutiskt tillägg”, \textit{ibid}:35), in Swedish talk from a production process-oriented, formal point of view. within a general study of syntactic macrostructures that are produced across the borders of syntactically complete utterances. In (3:4) below, the border is analyzed when speaker A completes the utterance and B responds with a ‘yes’.

---

28 Apokoinou in Swedish talk-in-interaction

21 The presentational amalgam construction (PAC) has a lot in common with Swedish utterances such as ‘jag har Dahlstedt ligger på nattduksbordet’ \(\text{I have Dahlstedt is lying on the bedside table}\), i.e. the book by Dahlstedt \(\text{[..]}\), a construction (or method) that is not considered a case of apokoinou in this study. Also note that the description of PACs as amalgams is not the one preferred in reference grammars on English, e.g. (Quirk et al. 1985) where it is called *zero constructions*, thereby describing them as grammatical but asyndetic with a missing relative pronoun after the main NP. These studies do not, however, apply a dynamic and dialogical perspective on the utterance process where e.g. the prosodic design of the utterance would play a significant role.
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(3:4) Löfström (1988:33)

1. A: ... för vi har varit flera gånger där vet du
    because we have been several times you know
2. Else-Marie å jag
    Else-Marie and I
3. B: ja
    yes
4. A: har åkt bussen ner till Trelleborg
    have gone on the bus down to Trelleborg

Speaker A then reanalyzes the segment 'Else-Marie å jag' as the beginning of the next utterance on line 4 when adding the anacoluthic segment 'har åkt bussen ...' (have gone on the bus ...).22

Löfström also exemplifies with an apokoinou-like construction where the border is analyzed at the intersection between two speakers’ utterances when they cooperate to produce a syntactic combination of two utterances as in example (3:5) below.23

(3:5) Löfström (1988:81)

1. B: hm men nån handduk
    hm but some handkerchief
2. A: måste man ju ha
    must one have
3. B: tvätta sej med dkr
    wash oneself with dkr

Löfström defines these utterances as the use of one segment ('Else-Marie å jag' and 'måste man ju ha', Else-Marie and I and must one have) in two different overlapping (ibid:39) constructions. The first construction is syntactically complete. The second construction is the product of a change of syntactic strategy by the speaker(s), where the last segment in the first construction is

22 I.e. resulting in an increment, cf. Ford et al. (2002b), when viewed from the perspective of later research.

23 I.e. resulting in a co-construction, cf. Bockgård (2004), when viewed from the perspective of later research.
reanalyzed by the speaker as the beginning of the second construction. The function of the syntactic strategy-change and reanalysis is to describe the relation between two utterances (or parts of utterances) in talk.

The authors of the Finnish Academy grammar (Hakulinen et al. 2004) describe a collection of apokoinou and apokoinou-like utterances as overlap-constructions ("limittäisrakenteet", ibid.797) that are built up of two overlapping clauses. Hakulinen et al. are pioneers in including a wide range of apokoinou-like phenomena in a grammar project of this size and present examples of overlap-constructions that correspond to most of the formal apokoinou types that have been found in this study. They mainly categorize them in terms of the grammatical status of the overlapping segment in the two structures (like Saari 1975, see above, and Lindell 1980, see below). This way of categorizing is different from the way it is made in this study, but in line with their overall project of formal grammatical description. The overlapping segment (i.e. the pivot) can be an object that is common for both clauses; a segment of the predication of the first clause and base subject of the second; and the adverbial of both clauses (an adverbial alone, an adverbial clause, or an adverbial phrase). For the latter case, see example (36) below.

(36) Hakulinen et al. (2004:970), adverbial pivot

we were one-time Puronen's Matti with vent we first central-station-to and

we were once with Matti Puronen we went first to the central railway station and...

Other types are constructions where the same verb is used in both clauses, often the Finnish negation-verb 'ei' (approx. not), or the copula 'on' ('is' (as in example 3:7 below)), or constructions where the verb in the second clause specifies the verb in the first clause (as in example 3:8 below).

(37) Hakulinen et al. (2004:971), doubling of the same verb

that one is pretty talented is that one for the painting job

(38) Hakulinen et al. (2004:971), specifying verb in the post-P

this is a joint decision should this be

Example (36) corresponds to the asymmetric configurations in this study, example (3:7) to the symmetric configurations and example (3:8) to a hybrid
of both. Hakulinen et al. also include categories based on an attempt to analyze the utterance-internal functions, such as shifts of the modality or speech act from a question to an assertion. These utterances mainly analyze the use of the formal types in the previous examples and constitute functional types rather than formal types. One utterance is also presented in its conversational context, as to point to the relavance of an interactional analysis of the phenomenon. The prosody of the constructions is left uncommented.

3.2.3 Three-part structures

Definitions within the third model explain apokoinou-like phenomena in terms of three formally defined parts following one after another, without explanatory notions of unfinished or underlying abstract structures. A recurrent description is that the speaker performs a shift or change during the production of the middle part. This shift is described differently in different studies, e.g. as a shift in syntactic strategy (Linell 1980, 1981, Sandig 1973), a shift between two syntactic structures (Enkvist 1998), or a shift (Umsteig) between two syntactic constructions (Linell 1990:48, Zifonun et al. 1997:460). If used as an explanatory theory of utterance production, this production process will result in one coherent unit (although not always produced with one continuous prosodic contour). The rightward expansion that constructs the central syntactic segment (formally equivalent to the overlapped segment in model two above) is syntactically coherent and is explained as the result of utterance construction procedures (or utterance planning, Linell 1980, Zifonun et al. 1997) rather than as a product where structures or constructions overlap.

Sandig’s (1973) study shows traces of both model two and three when she uses an old grammar definition of apokoinou (or “αποκοινου” because Sandig uses the Ancient Greek word). The definition begins with the overlap theory in accordance with model two, but also identifies the position of the central segment between a preceding and a following segment – “Die charakteristische Stellung des Apo-koinu-Syntagma zwischen den Sätzen” (ibid:46) – as the central characteristic of apokoinou. Sandig does not explain in detail what is meant by “Sätzen” in this context (they could be either ‘clauses’ or ‘phrases’ or something else). However,
she identifies the temporal character of the production of the three parts; that the center forms a grammatical whole retrospectively and prospectively with the “voraußehgenden wie dem nachfolgenden Redeglied” (ibid.). Sandig explains the apokoinou as a specific type of anacoluthic phenomena within a more general group, which she defines as “Veränderung der syntaktischen Strategie im spontanen Sprechen” (ibid.).

The identification of pre- and post talk around a syntactically defined center, and the identification of a change of syntactic strategy during utterance production (presumably during the central “Apo-koinu-Syntagma”), makes Sandig a pioneer in the study of apokoinou-like phenomena in (German) language, even though a prosodic, communicative and interactive perspective is absent. She exemplifies with five utterances similar to the one in (3:9) below:

Gib mir das Buch da will ich haben
give me then the book there will I have

give me then the book there I want to have

They are all of the kind where the initial and final parts are different. In this study, I call the Swedish counterparts asymmetric (7.3.2) or Janus Heads after Franck (1985) as opposed to constructions where the initial information is recycled at the end.

Linell (1980, 1981) develops the analysis further along similar lines under the influence of Saari (1975). Linell makes an argument for the anacoluthon as a change of strategy during the course of the construction activity of simple sentences in talk (1981:177). Linell is explicitly critical of the overlap and/or blending theory and states that the speaker starts with one strategy/construction and then changes into another, ending up with a three-part formal structure (Initial periphery - Central part - Final periphery) (ibid., my transl.). Linell includes in his analysis many examples of utterances that would end up outside the scope of this study. Linell exemplifies with

25 This is something that Linell’s (1980) study shares with nearly all studies where apokoinou-like phenomena are explained as an instance of a wider category of structure, construction, and strategy shifts. These studies are often given the character of a catalog of different phenomena that usually ends up outside the boundaries of grammar (see especially Zifonun et al. 1997).
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various types of phenomena, where only one (main constituent doublings, “dubbleringar” ibid:178) constructs a syntactic pivot in the sense defined in ch. 5.1 below. In all the following examples (3:10−13), the speaker constructs a pivot by the means of constituent doubling, and different subtypes are categorized based on a grammatical categorization of the pivot. The doubled constituents are marked with a dotted line.

(3:10) Linell (1980:177), doubling of finite verbs

å den nick in den här Nynäsexpressen när alldeles breve här and then with PMT this here Nynäs Express-the just nearby here and then the Nynäs Express leaves just nearby (untranslatable to idiomatic English)

(3:11) Linell (1980:180), doubling of subjects (predicated by the same verb)

jag är övertygad om att dom sannolikt så annonserar dom sin i am convinced about that they probably so advertize they their centrifuge

(3:12) Linell (1980:180), doubling of adverbial elements

inte i år har ja inte (p) ännu tagit någon kontakt (p)

not in year have I not yet taken any contact yet


med honom vill jag sannerligen inte ha något att göra med with him I really don’t want anything to do with him

The categorization of the types is mainly of a grammatical nature (cf. Saari 1975 above), but Linell’s interest in prosody as a strategic resource in utterance production and planning is worth mentioning here. In another study (Linell 1981), Linell refers to some typical prosodic aspects of the apokoinou-like anacoluthon, such as the use of a pause before26 or after the central part (pivot), but he does not pursue the prosodic analysis farther than that. Explanations are concentrated to aspects of utterance planning strategies only. Interactive or communicative explanations are absent.

26 Some of the German literary scholars proposed a theory of apokoinou constructions that considered the pause placed before the koinu-segment as a typical feature of the construction, separating the true apokoinou (“echten αποκοινο”, Gärtner 1970:128) from the “Asyndeton”, i.e. “Konstruktionen mit asyndetisch angefügten Relativsätzen” (ibid.:122).

These theories were, however, not based on empirical analysis of talk, but to a great extent on intuitive readings aloud of written poetry (ibid.:129).
The prosodic analysis is taken a bit further in the use of the notion *prosodisk anakoluton* ("prosodisk anakolut"), Linell & Jönsson, 1986:12), as in example (3:14) below.

(3.14) Linell & Jönsson (1986:12), prosodic anakoluthon

jag började där vid bränschen (...) 
I started there at the end of the bridge ...

sakta men säkert
slowly but safe

kavade jag fram
I made my way forward

Linell & Jönsson use the notion to refer to an utterance that is segmented in three parts with pauses (here notated with the (...)-sign) and where it is impossible to group the middle segment to the preceding or the following segments based on syntax, prosody or the way the pausing is done.

As already mentioned, Enkvist (1988, and Enkvist & Björklund 1989) develops the analysis of *true anacolutha* in English talk along the same lines as Linell (1981), dividing the utterances into three consecutive parts (Initial Periphery - Center - Final Periphery), and propose similar grammatical categories. The phenomenon is explained as an individual speaker’s shift from one structure to another during the production of the center (pivot) of the anacoluthon utterance. Enkvist develops the formal analysis a bit further than Linell (ibid.) and proposes deeper analysis of the “degree of syntactic and semantic similarity that obtains between the initial and the final periphery” (Enkvist 1988:322), but has no suggestions for developing the analysis in a more functional or communicative direction.27

3.3 The pivot segment as a conversational resource

All studies within the formal models presented above focus mainly on the (utterance internal) grammatical characteristics of apokoinou utterances. In some studies, such as Linell (1980, 1981), there is also a focus on processes

27 Cf. also Auer (1992) in a discussion of syntactic expansion of utterances in conversation, where the apokoinou is given as an example of “problems par excellence for any attempts to syntactically ‘parse’ spontaneous language” (ibid.:44), i.e. segmentation into discrete syntactic units. The reason for this problem is, according to Auer, that the speaker “blends two syntactic patterns into one utterance” (ibid.).
previous research of utterance planning and/or interpretation during the production of the apokoinou utterance, in addition to the formal characteristics of the linguistic products that result from these processes.

Linell (ibid.) can be seen in some respects as a precursor for a dynamic perspective on the grammar of apokoinou utterances. However, regarding the 1981 study he has a lot in common with all the other studies cited so far. They share the view that the change in syntactic structure or strategy is made by the speaker alone. Even though speaker-external factors are sometimes allowed to contribute to these models, the focus is on the impact these external factors have on the isolated speaker, inspiring or forcing the speaker to change the utterance plan, to produce two clauses in overlap, or to merge two constructions into one. Lacking from these perspectives is the way participants in talk-in-interaction use apokoinou-like phenomena in interaction and in communicative activities. In the following sections, other studies will be addressed that explicitly place the phenomenon of apokoinou in its interactive and communicative environment and adopt a view on the syntactic pivot as a conversational resource rather than as a grammatically defined object.

3.3.1 Corrections and repairs

The first attempt to seriously deal with apokoinou-like phenomena in talk was made during the early days of conversation analysis, when a strong interest in correction or repair practices in conversation directed the focus of systematic study to utterances that departed from conventional grammatical structures and normative notions of well-formed language products.

3.3.1.1 Sacks on corrections and turn completions

Possible pioneers for the analysis of the internal syntax and construction dynamics of apokoinou-like utterances are Sandig (1973) (for German) and Saari (1975) and perhaps Linell (1981) (for Swedish and indirectly for English via Enkvist 1988). As pointed out by Walker (2004:166f), Sacks (1992a [1969]) is the pioneer of an interactionally or communicatively oriented way of analyzing apokoinou-like phenomena. In one of Sacks’ lectures on American English conversation, he is concerned with the mechanisms for the signaling and recognition of utterance completion. The problem posed for participants is to signal completion in such a way as to (i)
avoid that other speakers come in before completion, and (ii) avoid stops in
the turn taking flow after completion. Sacks presents the target utterance in
the analyzed sequence in example (3:15) below (underlinings mark focal
stress and belong to the original extract):

(3:15) Sacks (1992a [1969]:146)

oh well we wen' up there oh::

about thr- 'hh I'd say

about three weeks ago

we was up at Mariposa,

The utterance contains a pivot-like segment, as marked with the shading. Sacks describes the utterance as a “nice techinque with regard to the issue of
completion” (ibid:145). The argument is that “having begun a sentence and
having discovered in the course of it that you need two, you have a means for
getting to do two without possible completion having occurred.” (ibid:146,
my italics). The “technique” or “means” in question is not altogether easy
to pin down from Sacks’ analysis, but it is probably the possibility to initiate
(what later was to be called) repair. What he does say is that an initiation of
correction (presumably initiated with the cut-off element “thr-” and the
mitigating insertion “‘hh I’d say about” before resuming the main topic of
the turn) still keeps the speaker within the same “sentence”30. Sacks goes on
to say that

If you can produce such a correction as indicates that, from the correction on, now
the hearer needs to remonitor for completion, then what you can do is produce
almost a complete sentence and start a correction that allows you to do now
another complete sentence.

(Sacks 1992a[1969]:146)

Exactly why and where the hearer has to remonitor in the targeted utterance
is not clearly spelled out, but the analysis ends up connecting an apokoinou-
like construction very strongly to the activity of self-correction within the
same utterance, due to a discovered problem during the course of utterance
production regarding the utterance format. In the light of later research on
apokoinou-like phenomena, this connection is problematic if taken as a
general theory of pivots as a conversational resource. As a pioneer work on the
use of apokoinou-like phenomena (in conversational English), however, it
still stands. Although not referring explicitly to Sacks, Scheutz (2005:123)

29 Sacks does not give the phenomenon any label or category name in this lecture and to the
best of my knowledge not in any of his other lectures either.
30 The notion of sentence is rather obscure in this context, but can perhaps be equated with
utterance or what later in Sacks' work was to be called a turn.
Previous research describes utterances in his study of pivots in German conversation that are similar to Sacks' target utterance, and analyzes them as a (mainly two kinds of) repair procedures (see 3.3.2.5 below).

3.3.1.2 Schegloff on pivots and repair

Schegloff (1979) continues on Sacks’ line of analysis, when treating the phenomenon of “pivots” as a preferred locus of same-turn repair initiation. Schegloff’s analysis of pivots is more clearly framed within a theoretical discussion of repair phenomena in conversation. Where syntactic and prosodic break-offs, prosodic hitches and fragmentary units (etc.) are possibly problematic in themselves for a more traditional linguistic approach, Schegloff argues that precisely these phenomena are at the center of a syntax-for-conversation. They are not “errors [but] appear to be orderly” (ibid:262). There can, for example, be no total replacement of a word, “since the replacement cannot excise all traces of the word that was initially said or starting to be said” (ibid:263). The effect achieved is always also an interactive one. One orderly aspect of same-turn repair initiation is the systematic possibility to not continue “producing next a syntactically coherent next bit of talk”, but to initiate repair “at any point in the productional course of a turn (and, therefore, of a sentence in it)” (ibid:277).

As an example of this intra-sentential systematic possibility he offers two apokoinou-like utterances, where the central part (called the “pivot”) is analyzed as the point in the sentence (and turn) constructional progression where repair is initiated. The repair initiation on both pivots “interrupts that progress” (ibid.) but is ultimately aimed at (i) “the resumption of the turn-unit as projected before the repair initiation” and (ii) “the production of the turn-unit to completion”.

There are certain doubts regarding Schegloff’s classification of at least one of the utterances he exemplifies with, whether it actually has a prototypical syntactic pivot as defined in this study. However, the classification of the change of syntactic pattern in the pivot as an interruption of progress seems to be more problematic. It seems to be a rather traditional way of viewing apokoinou-like phenomena to see them as signs of problems or a problem in themselves (a syntactic disfluency, or something ‘not following’ in the spirit of anacoluthons),31 even if the ordered ways of handling the problems are upgraded to one of the corner stones in a theory of conversational syntax.

31 Also see Scheutz 2002 for a similar argument.
Disregarding these problematic aspects for a moment, to my knowledge Schegloff makes the first attempt to combine the analysis of apokoinou-like phenomena in their sequential and conversational environment with the categorization of something similar to a syntactic turning point (or pivot in the terminology of this thesis). These things taken one by one are of course done by others before Schegloff, as showed in the literature review above. I am also drawing on his idea of repairs as aiming towards “the resumption of the turn-unit to completion” when analyzing a variant of apokoinou utterances in my corpus, but I am not inclined to equate the apokoinou method with the repair method.

3.3.1.3 Pivots and repair in German and Scandinavian languages

There are a number of studies in the conversation analytic tradition in which apokoinou-like phenomena in other languages than English have been connected with repair. These studies are made on German talk and on talk in the Scandinavian languages Danish, Norwegian and Swedish.

Scheutz (2002, 2005) presents two repair-like categories in his study of pivots in German talk (see below in 3.3.2.5). Selting (2001:253) gives an account of the apokoinou construction in German as a special case of “self-interrupt”, even though another, more communicatively tuned, account is also presented (see below 3.3.2.3). Also see Uhmann (2001:400) for a brief comment on the pivot as “a form of self-repair which operates on the basis of sentential syntax”.

Apokoinou utterances in terms of repair phenomena have also been identified in Danish talk, as in example (3:6 below). Steensig (2001a:184) describes the shaded utterances as “akselkonstruktioner”, which is a translation from Schegloff’s notion pivot.

(3:16) Steensig (2001a:184), pivots as prospective repair

1. E: Jeg kan faktisk ... a thumbnail
   I can actually
   I can actually

2. ()

3. P: Ja du har ... på pak
   you you have also

4. E: [lape ind] over
   patch it over
   overlap

5. ()}
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The utterance on line 6 is described as a grammatical part of two different clauses: the final and projected adverbial in the clause ‘Jeg kan faktisk lappe ind over med min fjernbetjæning’ (I can actually overlap with my receiver), and the initial adverbial in the clause ‘med min fjernbetjæning kan jeg bryde ind på Carl’s’ (with my receiver I can break in on Carl’s). Steensig describes these types of utterances as something in between a forward-oriented repair and a backward-oriented repair. In (3.14), the repair presumably involves a forward-oriented (prospective) word search initiated with the lengthening of “me::” (with) at the beginning of the shared grammatical segment. The repair as such modifies the construction so far, but without treating it as problematic.

Svennevig (in prep.) has identified apokoinou-like utterances in Norwegian talk, as in example (3.17) below. The utterance is discussed within an analysis of a participant’s various methods of dealing with problems of referent identifiability.

(3.17) Svennevig (in prep.), repair in TCU post-expansion

1. K: og ja jeg vet ikke
   and yeah I don’t know

2. S: de spruter inn sånn—催化剂 call it
   they inject in this—catalyst they call it

3. K: (bj st) bbb
   yeah bbb

4. S: det er akk-sånn—[,] jeg har gjort det jeg og
   it’s ju—[,] I’ve done it myself
Svennevig describes his cases of apokoinou-like utterances as solutions to these problems, i.e. they are repairs that can be done in either pre-position or post-position to the repairable. The utterance in (3:17) is a case of the latter. The speaker first marks the projected indefinite NP as unfamiliar (using 'sånn', this), then produces the NP, which is immediately followed by a prosodically and syntactically integrated segment with reversed order of the finite verb and subject. The NP pivot is described as integrated in two different clauses: 'they inject this catalyst' and 'catalyst they call it'. The final modifying segment 'kaller de det' (they call it) is called a TCU post-expansion and analyzed as a repair of the signaled unfamiliarity of the NP.32

Also to be mentioned here is J. Lindström (in prep., ch. 5, page 47), who uses an apokoinou-like utterance to demonstrate one instance of grammatical repair resources in Swedish conversational language, such as modifications, structure shifts and expansions. The expansion is exemplified with an apokoinou-like utterance, but the speaker does a cut-off during the pre-P phase, which might bring the overall construction closer to an anacoluthon.

3.3.2 Widening the functional perspective

Both Sacks and Schegloff (and followers) put the main analytic focus on how apokoinou-like utterances are used in order to conceal a possible TRP and how the practice of repair plays a central role within this process. These are both important observations, but the mechanics of conversational organization do not exhaust the functional potential of apokoinou, as shown by the studies that are presented below. They are all moving away from the repair theory that influences the studies of Sacks and Schegloff, to a more open view of the functional potential of apokoinou in conversation.

3.3.2.1 Franck on double bind structures in German and Dutch

In her study of double bind structures in German and Dutch talk, Franck (1985) in some respects adds to the formalization of internal structure in apokoinou utterances, but her primary achievement is the development of an analysis of the range of possible uses of apokoinou in conversation. Formally, Franck makes a distinction between utterances where the speaker repeats and mirrors elements between the initial and the final segments of apokoinou-like utterances, and utterances where the speaker does not.

32 The construction is an equivalent to the 'heter' (is called) construction that is identified in Swedish talk in this study, analyzed in ch. 9.2.
These major categories are called mirror image constructions and Janus heads respectively, as illustrated in Table 3.1 below.

**Table 3.1. Categories of Double Bind Structures in Franck (1985)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal categories</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Mirror image constructions (symmetrical)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Janus heads (asymmetrical)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Functional categories**

1. Answering two questions in one sentence (using b)
2. Same-turn initiated repair (using b)
3. Smooth transition from responsive confirmation to introduction of a speaker's own narrative (using a)

The formal differences between the two major types are then analyzed within the conversational environment of the utterance. The notion of double bind structure is based on the three-part internal utterance structure A-B-C, where the B-part has a double syntactic bind to both A and C, but where the alliance between A and C is logically excluded (Franck 1985:235). The mirror image construction subtype is a “symmetrical construction with B as its axis, where A and C are literally or at least semantically identical” (ibid:238), as in (3:18) below:

(3:18) Franck (1985:235)

Ich sag' zuerst, ich überhaupt nichts
I said first, I said I at all nothing
I said at first I said nothing at all

In the Janus head subtype “A and B are different clauses; so A-B and B-C say different things” (ibid:237), as in (3:19) below:

(3:19) Franck (1985:234)

Das war im Jahre 1907, bin ich geboren
It was y’know in the year 1907 I was born

The meaning differs in various degrees within the Janus head utterances. Franck states that when the lexical realization differs, but when the semantics is more or less the same between A and C, it can be difficult to choose between the subtype categories. However, Franck shows that the
main differences between the two subtypes have interactive relevance. The
asymmetrical Janus head construction is connected to the activity of answering
“two questions in one sentence” (ibid:240), maybe in order to handle a
possible “competition for speakership” (ibid.). Another use of the
asymmetrical subtype is same-turn initiated self-repair (cf. Sacks
1992a[1969], Schegloff 1979). When speakers begin the sentence in a certain
way, they might consider it possibly problematic in relation to co-
participants (i.e. face threatening). The speaker can then correct this on the
fly using a Janus head construction (Franck 1985:242). Franck also connects
one instance of the symmetric mirror image construction to a rearrangement
of the topic-comment structure of the turn (‘sentence’) in order to make a
smooth transition from an initial confirmation of the previous turn, to an
immediately following introduction of the speaker’s own narrative. When
beginning a turn, speakers both have to relate to whatever comes before,
and get to their own points in the current turn. Franck analyzes the
mirroring construction as a means to shorten the distance between
backward orienting and continuing “on a different track, without an explicit
cue for the lack of coherence” (ibid.).

3.3.2.2 Ono & Thompson on syntactic constructional schemas in English
conversation
Ono & Thompson (1995) make the first comprehensive attempt to combine
a theoretical account of dynamic syntactic patterns in conversation and an
analysis of apokoinou-like phenomena. Ono & Thompson (1995) do not
designate a notion for the apokoinou-like utterances they analyze, but treat
them as the outcome of local management of the realization of several abstract
schemas, not a realization of a constructional schema in its own right. I do
not agree on this particular point as an exhaustive account of apokoinou,
but there are several other interesting aspects of their treatment of the data
to be considered.

In their model of syntax in conversation, Ono & Thompson make a
difference between abstract dynamic patterns and so called messy
realizations. The messiness of syntax is viewed as the normal and (for the
participants) unproblematic outcome of cognitive, interactional and local
management concerns in talk.

In example (3:20) below, they segment the turns into intonational units,
one for each line in the transcript. The predicate nominal “what used to be
nice about Seattle,” is, according to Ono & Thompson, reinterpreted as
Previous research on the subject of the following clause “on the basis of a pseudo-cleft schema” (ibid.).

(3.28) Ono & Thompson (1995:250) Dinner 3

1. A: ... well see that’s what used to be nice about Seattle.
2. ... was that you—
3. no one ever went to Seattle, on their way to someone else.
4. ... somewhere— someplace else.
5. B: ... yeah

The utterance is initiated as a realization of one schema, but then reinterpreted in orientation to another. They argue that the syntax in this and similar apokoinou-like utterances “must be understood as a process, in which each syntactic ‘move’ makes sense in the local context in which it occurs.” (ibid:251). However, they do not demonstrate exactly what the reinterpretation orientates to in the local context. Moreover, the terminological variation regarding the action of ‘reinterpretation’ is a bit confusing. It is also called “re-design” (ibid:249), “re-analysis” (ibid:250), “reshaping” (ibid:252) and “re-take” (ibid:257). I take this terminological variation as evidence for the importance they assign to speakers’ possibility of changing the status of a previous speech segment (i) on-line, (ii) in retrospect, (iii) in orientation to an abstract dynamic schema, and (iv) while continuing the activity.

As already mentioned, Ono & Thompson are primarily treating apokoinou-like utterances as a process phenomenon that emerges in the moment of speech within the situated interactional event. This can be read as opposed to realizations of more stable and abstract schemas. That would mean that they do not view apokoinou as realizations of a constructional schema in its own right, but rather as the outcome of the realization of several, overlapping, schemas. This actually places Ono & Thompson within an interactional variant of the overlapping or blending model, where two constructions (or here: constructional schemas) are overlapped in order to construct an utterance. In combination with the lack of interactional analysis of the apokoinou utterances (other schemas receive more interactional attention), and despite their emphasis on interactional context elsewhere,

33 I prefer Schegloff’s (1996:78) notion ‘retro-construction’ for the equivalent action, although Schegloff use the notion in order to refer to an utterance where the speaker breaks off a turn beginning to insert a displacement marker ‘by the way’ before recycling the turn beginning unchanged.
this leaves their analysis of these particular apokoinou-like phenomena in a state of communicative insufficiency.

Despite this insufficiency, however, their general model of syntax in conversation as a dynamic moment-by-moment achievement, is very promising and is used as one of the theoretical prerequisites for the empirical analysis of apokoinou as grammatical processes and ethno-methods in this study (see ch. 2.6 above).

3.3.2 Auer and Selting on apokoinou in German conversation

To be mentioned here is also Auer’s (2000b) account in passing of the apokoinou construction as a means for speakers in German conversation to qualify the last item in a three-part list retrospectively, as illustrated in excerpt (3.21) below:

(3.21) Auer (2000b:183)
ich sprich UNdeutlich, (-) LISpel auch n=noch etwas, (-) und (-) ich sprich dann afte zu SCHNELL, (-)
{wenn ich beGEIStert bin, oder (-) ehm im element bin; (-)}
dann sprech ich zu SCHNELL,

I speak inarticulately,(-) also lisp a little, (-)
and (-) then I talk too fast, (-)
whenever I am enthusiastic about something, or (-) ehm get carried away; (-)
then I talk too fast.

The speaker uses the adding of a wenn-clause after the last item in the list, but before a recycling of the item. Auer says that “[t]he wenn-clause is here both final and initial.” (ibid.). The resulting utterance form corresponds to complex sentence level apokoinou types (cf. ch. 6.2.4 below).

Selting’s (2000) comments on the phenomenon of apokoinou in her study is fragments of units as oriented to by participants, and even though she includes apokoinou-like phenomena in a wide category of self-interruptions, she also somewhat modifies this position, saying that apokoinou constructions are “a special case of possible sentence in spoken language for constructing special turns in conversation” (ibid:255, my italics) and “special kinds of TCUs” (ibid:240). This would lend them a functional potential of being interactive and communicative resources in conversational talk, not just broken-off syntactic strategies. A closer analysis of this potential is not pursued by Selting. However, she makes some interesting remarks about the function of prosody in the apokoinou construction process, saying that prosodic cues such as pitch up-step at the
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beginning of the pivot could be viewed as contextualization cues for the apokoinou design: “The upstep subtly contextualizes the point at which reorganization of the syntactic construction begins” (ibid:240). This would mean that changes in the prosodic packaging of the utterance during the construction process is treated as evidence of the constructional reorientation that is typical of apokoinou. This view of prosody’s role in the design of apokoinou utterances contrasts with Walker’s (2004) account of a prototypical design process in pivot constructions (to be treated next).

3.3.2.4 Walker and Kitzinger on pivots at turn transitions

Walker (2004) presents results from an investigation of a corpus of 33 pivot in English everyday conversation. He basically relies on Sacks’ (1992a) treatment of a similar phenomenon (see above 3.3.1) as a technique to manage turn transition in conversation, but widens the scope of the analysis to examine in detail the phonetic methods used in order to construct pivot turns, as well as some uses of pivots in conversation. Another difference is that Walker does not connect pivots with repair. Walker’s formal definition of pivots is rather loose. Pivots “involve the production of talk such that the end of one TCU is also the beginning of another” (Walker 2004:165). The design of the overall study has some immediate advantages. Important is the claim that both grammatical and phonetic features make a pivot being both “a turn ending and a turn beginning” phenomenon.

Walker presents results from a phonetic analysis of whole pivot-utterances and shows that the phonetic design seems to be aimed to integrate the utterance and “conceal, rather than expose, the boundary between” the pivot-element(s) and the talk surrounding it. Walker also argues that pivots in general are a resource for managing the turn transition space and for building long turns. Pivots also seem to be generally used in sequential positions where speakers hold on to the turn; negotiate what’s talked about; ask a question and then give a candidate answer; do upgrades; do reports; do assessments or initiate new conversational topics.

However, the results from the interactive analysis are only hinted upon, and the overall study is mainly focused on the identification of features of phonetic design. Speakers use phonetic devices to handle three tasks that is aimed at integrating the pivot utterance at two crucial points during the course of production; the initial and finaly boundary of the pivot:

(i) Avoiding the signalling of transition relevance towards the end of the pivot.

Previous research 45

beginning of the pivot could be viewed as contextualization cues for the apokoinou design: “The upstep subtly contextualizes the point at which reorganization of the syntactic construction begins” (ibid:240). This would mean that changes in the prosodic packaging of the utterance during the construction process is treated as evidence of the constructional reorientation that is typical of apokoinou. This view of prosody’s role in the design of apokoinou utterances contrasts with Walker’s (2004) account of a prototypical design process in pivot constructions (to be treated next).

3.3.2.4 Walker and Kitzinger on pivots at turn transitions

Walker (2004) presents results from an investigation of a corpus of 33 pivot in English everyday conversation. He basically relies on Sacks’ (1992a) treatment of a similar phenomenon (see above 3.3.1) as a technique to manage turn transition in conversation, but widens the scope of the analysis to examine in detail the phonetic methods used in order to construct pivot turns, as well as some uses of pivots in conversation. Another difference is that Walker does not connect pivots with repair. Walker’s formal definition of pivots is rather loose. Pivots “involve the production of talk such that the end of one TCU is also the beginning of another” (Walker 2004:165). The design of the overall study has some immediate advantages. Important is the claim that both grammatical and phonetic features make a pivot being both “a turn ending and a turn beginning” phenomenon.

Walker presents results from a phonetic analysis of whole pivot-utterances and shows that the phonetic design seems to be aimed to integrate the utterance and “conceal, rather than expose, the boundary between” the pivot-element(s) and the talk surrounding it. Walker also argues that pivots in general are a resource for managing the turn transition space and for building long turns. Pivots also seem to be generally used in sequential positions where speakers hold on to the turn; negotiate what’s talked about; ask a question and then give a candidate answer; do upgrades; do reports; do assessments or initiate new conversational topics.

However, the results from the interactive analysis are only hinted upon, and the overall study is mainly focused on the identification of features of phonetic design. Speakers use phonetic devices to handle three tasks that is aimed at integrating the pivot utterance at two crucial points during the course of production; the initial and finaly boundary of the pivot:

(i) Avoiding the signalling of transition relevance towards the end of the pivot.
(ii) Marking the fittedness of the pivot to the pre-pivot, in order to allow leftwards interpretation of the pivot;

(iii) Marking the fittedness of the post-pivot to the pivot, in order to allow rightwards interpretation of the pivot. (ibid:172ff)

Walkers' basic idea behind speakers' solution to the first task is that speakers avoid slowing down, and avoid falls and rises that terminate low or high in the speakers pitch range, features that have been shown to signal transition relevance in English. The basic idea behind speakers' solution to the second and third tasks is that speakers avoid changes in articulation rate, changes in loudness, breaks in the phonation (pauses), and cut-offs, all features that might mark a disjunction between the pivot and the surrounding phases.

In comparison to Selting's brief comments on the possible role of prosodic changes as markers of a speakers reorientation (shift) during the production of an apokoinou utterance in German (see previous section), Walker's observations appear as either specific for English, or a consequence of restricting the corpus to only those utterances that meet the phonetic demands that are decided based on research on English conversation in general. At least there might be a risk in attributing a disjunctive function to phonetic changes as such, without analyzing the function of phonetic changes from the perspective of a functional analysis of a wider corpus of pivots. A model of prosody in apokoinou utterances in Swedish talk-in-interaction that allows for more phonetic variation is presented in 7.3 below.

Also drawing on Sacks (1992a[1969]) but moving even further away from the repair perspective, Kitzinger (2000) analyzes a single pivot construction (extract 3:22 below) in conversational talk, (the shading of the possible apokoinou phases is mine):

(3:22) Kitzinger (2000:186)

18. Linda: [...]: “it happened to me, (0.2) a few years ago”
19. CK: “it’s very (0.8) disturbing, (in a) way it’s...
20. Linda: “it’s (0.2) makes you very anxious (.) because you
21. then don’t know how you’re supposed to respond=

Linda has just revealed a very personal and overwhelming experience (not in the extract), when she is “using the pivot to get her across the possible transition space, [which] postpones her co-conversationalists’ opportunity to offer any acknowledgement or appraisal of the information she has
Previous research imparted” (ibid:186). It is a single case analysis with the advantage to demonstrate how the participants orient to certain aspects of the overarching activities in the talk, and how the speaker uses a pivot construction to locally manage a possible transition space in a critical sequential position (also see Betz 2006 for a similar approach to pivots in German talk, and Norén 2003 in Swedish talk).

3.3.2.5 Scheutz on Pivot constructions in German conversation

Scheutz (2002, 2005) presents the most comprehensive study so far of apokoinou in conversation, using a corpus of 300 pivot utterances. Scheutz identifies the same or similar formal categories as Franck (but also as Eskilvist (1988) on English), as seen in table 3:2 on the next page.

Scheutz draws on various aspects of previous research cited above, and an earlier study of apokoinoukonstruktionen (Scheutz 1992), and the functional analysis draws heavily on the repair framework inherited from Sacks and Schegloff, but also on the construction grammar tradition as seen in Lambrecht (1988).

In line with Franck (1985), Scheutz divides the main formal categories into one more symmetrical subgroup, and one less symmetrical subgroup (cf. Scheutz 2002).

Regarding the formal categories, Scheutz draws a sharp line between the true mirror image variants and the apokoinou variant. While the true mirror image variants display a semantic continuity all through the utterance, the asymmetric apokoinou variant does not. The apokoinou variant often display “prosodic characteristics (for example pauses, accelerations and decelerations in tempo) [that] could also signal a syntactic break-off” (ibid:110). Scheutz exemplifies with an utterance (from Schegloff 1979:276) that is produced with hesitation and repair signals, which indicate a high degree of prosodic disintegration. There seems to be, therefore, a syntactic disintegration as well. That would make it difficult to describe such cases as a type of regular syntactic structure. (Scheutz 2005:110)

---

34 The resulting utterance in (3:22) is, however, a cut-off version of a prototypical apokoinou as defined above (ch. 1.2) and below (ch. 5). Linda actually leaves the projected grammatical pattern after the repeated “it’s it’s (0.2)” segment, when continuing with “makes you very anxious”.

---
TABLE 3-2. CATEGORIES OF PIVOT CONSTRUCTIONS IN SCHEUTZ (2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Symmetrical subgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. True mirror-image constructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- completed and uncompleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Symmetrically less integrated mirror-image constructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- pauses before and/or after the pivot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Modified mirror-image constructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the final periphery changes aspects of the initial periphery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less symmetrical subgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Apokoinou constructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- category where the final periphery takes a new direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(equivalent in some respects to Franck’s Janus head category)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Focusing strategy (using c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Portioning of information (using c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Explanatory extension in final periphery (using c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Re-establishing an activity after problems in the pivot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(using b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Provide surrounding frames for quoted segments (using a, b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Repair regarding the initial periphery (using c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Shift of speech act (using c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Shift of attitude (using c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Shift of perspective on the pivot (using c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variants of the true mirror image group are very common in the German data and variants of the *apokoinou* variant (as defined by Scheutz) are very rare. As long as there is a semantic continuity between the initial and final phases, Scheutz classifies the utterance as a mirror image, even though there are many lexical differences between the phases. This is, therefore, a classification made on utterance-internal semantic grounds rather than on formal or functional grounds.

Regarding the functional categories, many resemblances with previous research can be found. To begin with, Scheutz draws on similar arguments regarding information dynamics and focus, as do Franck (1985) and Lambrecht (1988). Scheutz identifies a focusing strategy where speakers use pivots to produce *focused topical* elements, despite the fact that a focus is usually *not* placed on the topical (or thematic) element in the utterance.
unless this element is emphatically stressed. In German, the usual condition is that “topic and focus are in complementary distribution.” (ibid:118).

The focus in declarative utterances in German talk is usually marked by a high pitch accent, and appears in a position at the end of the mid-field, but before the sentence brace. The same holds for pivots in pivot utterances, where “most pivot elements have a high pitch accent – that is, they are focused” (Scheutz 2005:118). However, the topic in declarative utterances in German strictly occurs in initial position when unmarked. Scheutz concludes that

[the pivot construction combines these two positions: while the pivot element occupies the clause-final focus position in the initial part A-B, it simultaneously occupies the topic position of the front field in the final part B-C. […] That is, we have here a fusion of the unmarked focus position of the initial part and the topic position of the final part. This means we are dealing with focused topics […]]

(Scheutz 2005:118)

Scheutz also discusses the use of pivots to reconnect to a previous construction after problematical or heavy pivot elements (compare with Sacks 1992a [1969]). Furthermore, Scheutz primarily discusses two kinds of repair as a possible function of pivot utterances – repair regarding the periphery and repair regarding the pivot element. The pivot-repairs often deal with matters of formal problems in the pivot-element, mainly using true mirror images to resume the initial activity when the problem has been dealt with. The periphery-repairs are often concerned with matters of conversational appropriateness of utterances rather than formal errors, such as shifts of speech act, shifts of attitude, or shifts of perspective. Here the speakers use modified true mirror images to avoid unwanted interactional effects. A function not ascribed to apokoinou before is to provide surrounding frames for quoted segments in narratives using a mirroring construction.

The overall impression is that Scheutz is heavily indebted to, first, the tradition following Sacks and Schegloff (which he refers to) of connecting apokoinou-like phenomena to repair activities, and, second, to the construction grammar tradition of connecting apokoinou to strategies of focusing and information organization. Moreover, although contextualizing pivot utterances in short transcription extracts, Scheutz does not demonstrate their functions in a detailed interactional analysis. A sequential demonstration of how participants orient to ongoing activities when producing pivots is almost entirely left out, especially when discussing the focusing
strategies. Apokoinou utterances are analyzed as conversational phenomena, but not always demonstrated as such.

3.4 Two traditions of analysis: anacoluthon vs. apokoinou

Despite acknowledging the widespread differentiation regarding notions, theoretic framings and models of analysis among single studies on apokoinou-like phenomena, it might be useful to try and discern a more abstract and perhaps more stable pattern that goes beyond the varying local concerns in apokoinou(-related) studies. There is a close relation between the theoretical tools and categories that a particular research tradition gives us, and the phenomena that are likely to be discovered, uncovered or even constructed in the empirical work with the actual language data. Once this relation is recognized, two traditions of analysis of apokoinou-like phenomena become visible. These traditions are a variant of the discussion about theoretical versus usage-based language studies, and center around the use of the notions anacoluthon and apokoinou, both notions that originate from classical rhetoric. The theoretical landscape in modern language studies is of course far more diversified than a simple dichotomy might indicate, but these notions capture two perspectives or ideas about language that has stayed alive, although in different shapes and disguises.

3.4.1 Anacoluthon

The notion anacoluthon and its variants have already been mentioned. The notion can be traced back to the word anakolouthos in Ancient Greek, or - akolouthos (lit. ‘not - following’). The notion refers to a rhetorical figure of speech and its linguistic expression that deviates from an expected schema in terms of lacking elements (Lausberg 1998:415). Despite the fact that this was a rhetorical resource or tool used by speakers, the notion anacoluthon has ever since been used to categorize language phenomena that deviate from a norm, e.g. cut-off structures or changes in the structure midways, thereby explicitly drawing on the etymology of the Ancient Greek word. The normative grammar tradition is old and still going strong in some respects, especially where there is a need to formulate directives for proper language behavior of any kind (eg. for pedagogical, didactic or political purposes).
3.4.2 Apokoinou

When looking at language and language practices it is of course not possible to refrain from the use of theories, previous findings and more general conceptions of what a language phenomenon is or can be. But scholars and researchers using the notion *apokoinou* and its variants have tried to understand their object of inquiry from the point of view of the language practitioners themselves, rather than from a prefixed set of rules or normative ideas. The etymology of the apokoinou notion also goes back to a word in Ancient Greek, *apo koinu*, (lit. 'in common'), which refers to a rhetorical practice, a figure of speech or sentence form, which is centered around a part in the middle, which the preceding and following parts have in common. The notion apokoinou has traditionally been used to categorize a particular stylistic figure (construction) in literature and speech that comes in the form of a sentence with two verbs sharing the same subject, and the function to achieve special effects (Gärner 1970, Sandig 1973, and in some sense also Bjerre 1935). The spirit of the analysis has been to describe the phenomenon as something in use (*what, why and how* it is used) rather than as something deviant and problematic.

On a general level of abstraction, most single studies of apokoinou-like phenomena could be assigned to either one of these traditions, the deviance-based or the practice-based. The reason for this lies primarily in differences concerning methodology and epistemology, not in researchers' orientation to the etymology of Greek vocabulary. One exception from this general tendency is perhaps the studies based on repair theory (regardless of the notions used) since they could be a bit problematical to categorize within a simplified either-or representation. They take the participant's perspective in the analysis of language behavior, which place them in the practice-based tradition, but still end up connecting apokoinou-like constructions with disfluency and break-offs of various kinds, something that rather reminds us of central aspects of the deviance-based perspective (cf. Plejert 2004 for a similar argument on repair in English non-native and native conversation). A more useful way of applying the two traditions of analysis-model on apokoinou research might therefore be to look upon them as two poles on a more abstract scale of ideas – on which repair theory studies would have their place somewhere in the middle.
3.5 Brief discussion

Even though the study of apokoinou-like phenomena within the more conversation-oriented research traditions displays important insights into the functional character of apokoinou-like phenomena, only a few of the studies manage to escape the classic way of viewing them as *deviant* in the sense of logically incoherent structures and products in need of explanation and justification. All studies concerned with previously neglected or dismissed patterns of language and language use might have to accept the situation of grounding the new take on them in a deviation perspective. One way of compensating for this with regard to apokoinou-like phenomena is to shift focus from the structural aspects of apokoinou utterances (although these aspects remain the main tools of selection and demarcating from other grammatical phenomena), to a wider perspective on the communicative and cognitive aspects of utterance construction. Within such a wide framework of grammar in interaction, phenomena such as the ACM are viewed as having the functional potential to be both a method of shaping an utterance grammatically and a method to resolve local communicative projects.
4 Corpus, data and methodology

4.1 Corpus

When investigating spoken language use (and perhaps language in general) there are at least three main kinds of language data to depart from.

(i) **Recordings of language in use** made available for detailed analysis (audio- and video recordings).

(ii) **Notes on language use** written down in close connection to the situation of use.

(iii) **Constructed examples of language use** based on the researcher’s own competence as a language user (intuition).

When analyzing the communicative functions of the AUs, I have mainly used a corpus of type (i) above. This corpus is called Corpus A, and is presented below. In at least one instance I have also used some parts of a corpus of type (ii) above. This corpus is called Corpus B and will also be presented below. I have not used any data of type (iii). It is in principle possible that one can recall many formal aspects of an utterance from memory as far as syntax and lexis is concerned, but large parts of the prosody will be entirely left out from the description. The task gets even more difficult when moving to the communicative analysis, a difficulty that invented examples have in common with notes of language use. It is hard enough to analyze the communicative functions of apokoinou when one has access to records of the conversational environment of particular utterances. When one has no or only limited access to the preceding and following conversational context, it becomes a virtually impossible task, especially if contexts are viewed as part and parcel of the meaning of the construction method under study and not just a layer to be added in retrospect.

**Corpus A:** This is a corpus of apokoinou extracts drawn from audio and video recordings of mainly naturally occurring conversations (some are arranged or semi-arranged) in everyday as well as institutional settings. Initially, the recordings were screened for apokoinou-like utterances in a wide sense using previously made transcripts as support if available. The apokoinou candidates resulting from this process were then more closely scrutinized and the ones that met the criteria of apokoinou as defined in chapter 5 below were included in Corpus A. After a long process of...
including and excluding single apokoinou candidates, Corpus A now amounts to 169 extracts. Corpus A forms the basis for the empirical chapters 8–11. A list with the 128 communicative and formal analyzes are available in Appendix 2 together with 29 examples from the literature. A total of 102 different apokoinou utterances have been analyzed in the text (some are analyzed in different contexts).

The extracts that were excluded from Corpus A, but still met the criteria of being related to apokoinou and not simply mishearings etc., were saved as reference material for comparative analysis. The reference material amounts to approximately 100 extracts, and is primarily used in the discussion on related phenomena in chapter 5. The reference material has been screened for communicative functions but not systematically analyzed.

Corpus B: This is a corpus of AUs that are written down immediately when heard in the utterance situation (no recordings). Prosodic features, turn-taking and colloquial word variants are estimated in as much detail as possible, although this kind of data can never be as reliable as recorded and transcribed data. This corpus is only used in one specific case where the formal apokoinou variant does not occur in Corpus A, i.e. the recycling of negated pre-Ps (see 7.3.1.5). Corpus B amounts to 79 instances of written down apokoinou (written down examples of related constructions are excluded here). These instances are, in principle, all analyzable within the analytic framework that will be presented in the empirical chapters, although the communicative analysis suffers from a lack of available context.

4.2 Recordings
The empirical analysis is based on audio and video clips with apokoinou utterances (AUs) that have been drawn from 35 longer recordings comprising 31 hours and 8 minutes. All recordings are recordings of naturally occurring talk-in-interaction. 5 of the recordings are recordings of situations with certain topical agendas, but with low restrictions on turn taking organization. A total of 169 AUs were found in 31 of the recordings (more below on how these were identified). An overview of the recordings with schematic information about main activity types and audio/video media is presented in Appendix 2. There are also 9 utterances from Corpus B included in the communicative analysis, which means that the total number of analyzed utterances are 178 (cf. table 6:1 in chapter 6).

I have attempted to collect recordings of talk-in-interaction within a wide range of communicative activities within naturally occurring everyday talk
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(e.g. talk in the context of preparing dinner), and naturally occurring institutional talk (e.g. doctor patient interaction, court hearings or TV/radio shows, and focus groups or variants of focus groups). The question of how to categorize an activity, however, is a question of judgment from case to case, and sometimes also from episode to episode within the overall activity. The choice of recordings was initially limited to those that were already transcribed in detail, preferably in accordance with CA conventions. The transcriptions that were already in CA format have been preserved with some minor adjustments, and the transcriptions that were originally done using some other format has been changed into CA format. The corpus has, however, also been expanded to include recordings that were originally untranscribed. These recordings have not been transcribed in their entire length, only the excerpted 2 minute segments containing an AU.

An indispensable help when doing sequential analysis of talk-in-interaction is the use of transcripts. The conventions that I have used for transcribing spoken interaction into a written representation are enclosed at the end of this chapter. These conventions are based on the conventions widely used within CA, originally developed by Gail Jefferson, and compiled in Ochs et al. (1996). The main analysis is made when working with the video and audio recordings, but both the overview of wider communicative projects, and the detailed aspects of conversational grammar, would be virtually impossible without the help of a detailed written representation marked for those interactional features that are relevant for the analysis.

4.3 Methodological considerations

Apokoinou phenomena has been touched upon from different dialogically oriented perspectives (cf. Sacks 1992a[1969], Walker 2004, (forthc.), Linell 2005a, Scheutz 2005, see ch. 3 above). These studies have all in various degrees analyzed the meaning of apokoinou-like utterances within the dialogic processes of talk-in-interaction with an ambition to ground the analysis on the orientations of the participants themselves, in the spirit of ethnomethodological conversation analysis. The methodological framework of conversation analysis is useful when analyzing participants’ actions sequentially, the dynamic formal methods used to build utterances that carry and display these actions, and the concrete linguistic outcome of those actions and methods in terms of interactionally relevant units (see ch. 2 above for a theoretical discussion and ch. 7 below for a presentation of some relevant conversation analytic tools of analysis).
The combination of a corpus based study and a dialogical perspective on apokoinou have only been tried once before, in Scheutz’ (2005) study of pivot constructions in German conversation (see 3.3.2.5 above). Scheutz’ influence on my work is considerable, but our studies differ regarding formal types, the functions of apokoinou, and the way the interactional analyses are presented. The differences regarding apokoinou forms depend partly on language differences and partly on differences in how apokoinou is perceived as a grammatical phenomenon. Scheutz analyzes apokoinou as a process or method of doing certain social actions, but does not focus on the utterance-internal processes that build the actions in time. As mentioned earlier (3.3.2.5), our studies also differ in the way the interactional analysis are presented and demonstrated. Scheutz does not present the analysis of the sequential environment of pivot constructions in detail, how pivots in German fit within a sequential environment. Pivot constructions in Scheutz’ account therefore run the risk of appearing as a family of products with fixed construction-internal action structures rather than as utterances that are produced in orientation to a schematic, but dynamic pattern, in interaction with other participants.

As argued in the theoretical background (ch 2), all AUs are in my view best analyzed and explained as the outcome (products) of methods to handle the local management of communicative problems and tasks. Some of the methods are formally more unified (in some sense grammaticalized) than others, but I still see them as active moves to intervene in the communicative surrounding. Following e.g. Schegloff (1979:263) and Ono & Thompson (1995:215), I have tried to analyze these methods in a way that arises from the data and only use those abstractions (utterance phases, utterance building methods, utterance functions, communicative projects etc.) that are needed to account for the data at hand. In addition, I try to demonstrate the communicative analysis step by step, both within the wider sequential environment, and within the utterance in progress.

A question that follows from such methodological ambitions is of course how theoretical abstractions of relevant dimensions of apokoinou can be grounded in the often messy utterances that constitute the data. When analyzing the wider communicative functions of AUs I have tried to use a participant’s perspective as far as possible in order to secure a communicatively grounded validity of the analysis. This is both an epistemological choice (with more far-reaching theoretical consequences than will be discussed here) and a choice of analytic procedure. To take the perspective of the participants is to ground the analysis in the participants’ own
interpretations of the ordered activity they involve themselves in. Participants make such interpretations available (display them) to one another in ordered ways on a moment-by-moment temporal basis as they respond to previous actions and orient to simultaneous, incipient and relevant next actions. Utterances are built using “interactionally consequential construction types” (Schegloff 1996:64), and contexts are made to be “procedurally consequential” (Schegloff 1992a:196) for the way an utterance is designed. This should, however, be understood as a methodological ambition, not a claim that a pure phenomenological stance is possible to pursue. The aim of the study, the theoretical background chosen, the choice of data and various assumptions about communicative, cognitive and linguistic processes on behalf of the researcher will always influence the analysis. But it is possible to postulate a demand that it should be at least possible to account for a specific analysis with reference to identifiable and displayable moves made by participants in the stretch of data at hand, e.g. in the form of transcription extracts, thereby securing the possibility of interpersonal reliability.

A procedure that would have been interesting to pursue, but was rejected because of a need to limit the study, is to collect examples of corresponding social actions to the ones that are achieved with apokoinou in order to look for variations in how participants orient sequentially to particular actions and to variations regarding the construction methods chosen to build the utterances that accomplish these actions. Such a procedure could have given indications of preferred or dispreferred responses to actions that recruit apokoinou as a construction method and perhaps make it possible to decide more definitely the influence of the apokoinou method as such on the way participants perform the action.

As a consequence of this limitation of the study, the analyses of apokoinou functions will have to rely solely on the local contexts where the apokoinou methods are used, comparisons between these uses and contexts, and the abstractions (generalizations) that can be made from them. For the most part it is possible to look at the immediately preceding and following actions to see the communicative circumstances within which the AU is built and the kind of action it makes relevant. Sometimes, when there is no clear relation to the surrounding talk, I have relied on my intuition or on formal features in order to describe how the AUs relate to previous and following actions on the micro level.

The analytic framework of conversation analysis provides finely tuned tools to demonstrate how participants in talk-in-interaction design actions to
fit into and construct interactional sequences and activities, and how single utterances are co-authored by the current speaker in cooperation with other participants. This is highly relevant when AUs are made to function in a primarily sequential environment, e.g. as responses to inquiries or argumentative moves. Theoretical tools within CA such as act, activity, and sequence are designed to handle the analysis of actions that can be referred to as operations and changes within an interactional micro-situation (see ch. 2 above), such as the limited actions and operations performed by different phases within an AU (e.g. the operation of a post-\(P\) on a pre-\(P\) or pivot). I have chosen to use the notion of local communicative project (LCP, Linell 1998, 2005a) that partly builds on the same dialogical principles as the notion of sequence in CA. An LCP can be responsive to a speaker’s own action and utterances, or parts thereof, as is the case with e.g. self-initiated self-repair in CA. LCPs and CA analytical tools both require that the analysis of contributions to talk-in-interaction should pay attention to the preceding and following actions in order for the analysis to make sense, and both concepts require the co-authoring of a focused communicative event through at least two consecutive actions (not necessarily verbal) by two different participants. Another common background is the methodological practice of demonstrating the validity of the analyses on the basis of participants own interpretations of the ongoing activity. A detailed demonstration of how the theory of communicative projects can be appropriated for the functional analysis of apokoinou is provided in chapter 5.4 below.

Regardless of the analytical tools chosen, the task still remains to use the tools in concrete analyses of AUs within wider or narrower communicative contexts. It is worth mentioning again that my main strategy to secure the possibility of interpersonal reliability of the findings has been to hold on to the demand of being able to demonstrate the outcome of the analysis in concrete pieces of transcribed data. It must be possible to argue for an interpretation based on the participant’s actions on the micro level of talk, otherwise it must be dropped. A related strategy has been to look and re-look at many extracts to see similarities and differences among them, and then to present data and analyses for colleagues to comment on, and then reanalyze the data on the basis of these comments. Despite these strategies there will always be some range left for subjective interpretation when abstracting from a collection of heterogeneous utterances and the specific contexts they all emerge from. A one hundred percent interpersonal
reliability has therefore not been reached in all cases. Nevertheless, it is my hope that the subjective range is not too wide.

The methodological discussion could be conceived of as a simple choice between a formal and a communicative perspective. Either you start with a certain configuration of formal features (syntax, prosody, lexis) and subsequently identify their communicative functions, or you do it the other way around: start with a certain configuration of functional/interactional features and then track the formal means of their display in communication.

In this study, the syntactic pattern of the AU is the basic criteria for selecting utterances to include in the corpus. When this was done, I chose a functional perspective to explain the meaning of these utterances. The choice of methodology for this explanatory project is partly about a choice of a phenomenologically oriented epistemology where participants’ own methods of achieving social action are primary. Activities, actions, interaction and contexts are integrated and explanatory parts of grammar – not something to be added at the end of the analytic process.

4.4 A note on categorization procedures

A related problem with a traditional linguistic (formal) procedure of starting with the formal categories is the risk of working with ad hoc categories that have minor or no relevance to the participants as they engage in communicative activities. After all, participants engaging in communicative activities are orienting to a multimodal environment, using multimodal resources that result in the construction of complex linguistic surface products (at least complex for the analyst, participants never orient to the complexity of apokoinou utterances as such). If the communicative relevance is not included in the analysis of the formal products from the beginning, there are no reliable ways of distinguishing between forms that are functionally separate, or perhaps worse, phenomena that belong together run the risk of being analyzed as separate due to narrow formal criteria.

In a discussion of categorization, it is also worth commenting on the multifunctional character of most single AUs. One particular utterance often displays the traces of two (or more than two) different functions, e.g., perspective shifting and bridging to following talk, confirming/strengthening and project demarcating, topic developing and topic disambiguation, foregrounding/backgrounding and resuming an ongoing project, etc. This makes it difficult to categorize single AUs in terms of communicative function. But it is also difficult to categorize single AUs on the basis of linguistic form, because an AU is often a mix of several formal
methods (except perhaps for prototypical cases of full recyclings, cf. 6.1.1.1 below, which are relatively homogeneous from a formal point of view). Yet another difficulty is to assign single meanings to ACMs as abstract resources, since they rather have a functional potential to contribute to various meaning-making actions in interplay with different contexts.

Despite these categorization difficulties, it needs to be recognized that there are connections between functions and the formal resources employed to perform them. I have therefore chosen to identify relevant formats or bundles of formal features (lexical, morpho-syntactic and prosodic) on the basis of what participants do with them (see ch. 6 below). One central question in this study is the difference that these specific utterance formats make in specific conversational contexts (within the turn, in local action sequences, or in relation to specific activities). This will be addressed in more detail in ch. 12.

### 4.5 Transcription conventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Sign description</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;&quot;&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>period at end of a prosodic segment</td>
<td>drop to low from last syllable, often marking finality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;&quot;&quot;,</td>
<td>comma at end of a prosodic segment</td>
<td>minor rise from last syllable marking non-finality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;&quot;/&quot;</td>
<td>up side down question mark at the end of a prosodic segment</td>
<td>mid rise from last syllable (multi-functional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;&quot;?&quot;</td>
<td>question mark at end of a prosodic segment</td>
<td>high rise from last syllable (multi-functional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;&quot;;&quot;</td>
<td>semicolon at end of prosodic segment</td>
<td>last intonation (for the most part rising intonation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;&quot;/&quot;</td>
<td>sign surrounded by talk</td>
<td>pitch step-up during talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;&quot;v&quot;</td>
<td>arrow up preceding vowel</td>
<td>pitch step-up during talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;&quot;v&quot;</td>
<td>arrow down preceding vowel</td>
<td>local pitch drop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Prominence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Sign description</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;&quot;&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>underlining of whole syllable and/or a whole word (or other feature)</td>
<td>emphatic stress (together with a volume rise and/or vowel lengthening, and/or pitch peak) primary focal stress when co-present with a secondary arc within the same unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Volume, tempo, voice quality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td>Talk in capital letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+xxxx+</td>
<td>Plus signs surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>xx</em></td>
<td>Circle surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=xxxx=</td>
<td>Double circles surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;xx&lt;</td>
<td>Arrows pointing inwards surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;xx&gt;</td>
<td>Arrows pointing outwards surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx</td>
<td>One colon after speech segment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xX:</td>
<td>Several colons after speech segment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>xxxx</em></td>
<td>Star signs surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♪xxxxx♭</td>
<td>Music note surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#xxxxx#</td>
<td>Square signs surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Turn taking, TCUs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>Vertically aligned square brackets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[xxx]</td>
<td>Vertically aligned square brackets pointing rightwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxx]</td>
<td>End of overlapping talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx xx xx</td>
<td>Equal sign at end of a line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=xxx</td>
<td>Equal sign at the beginning of a line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxx=xxx</td>
<td>Equal sign within a line</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Varia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Underscored focal stress when co-present with a primary acc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Primary focal stress when being the only stress in unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>Much increased voice volume relative to speaker's own average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+xxxx+</td>
<td>Less increased voice volume relative to speaker's own average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>xx</em></td>
<td>Decreased voice volume relative to speaker's own average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=xxxx=</td>
<td>Whispering voice quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;xx&lt;</td>
<td>Increased speech tempo relative to speaker's own average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;xx&gt;</td>
<td>Decreased speech tempo relative to speaker's own average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx</td>
<td>Short lengthening of speech sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xX:</td>
<td>Longer lengthening of speech sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>xxxx</em></td>
<td>Creaky voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♪xxxxx♭</td>
<td>Singing, singing voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#xxxxx#</td>
<td>Other voice qualities (e.g. smile voice, and other displays of affection) and ways of production (e.g. staccato)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Turn taking, TCUs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
<td>Start of overlapping talk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Varia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hyphen at the end of a speech segment</td>
<td>Cut-off word or utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>double hyphens at end of a speech segment</td>
<td>Cut-off word or utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dot within parentheses</td>
<td>Micro pause (below 0.2 seconds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.2) (1.3)</td>
<td>Pauses within one tenth of a sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>double parentheses surrounding text</td>
<td>Transcriber's comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbol</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>eh, mh</code></td>
<td>a vowel or an m-letter followed by h, hesitation sounds (also 'ih' and 'ihh', often lengthened)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>pt</code></td>
<td>the letters p and t, smack sounds: e.g. tongue against the frontal roof of the mouth or lips parting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>(h)</code></td>
<td>the letter h within brackets, laughter (every parenthesis equals a voiced or voiceless thrust of air)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>hh</code></td>
<td>double h:s, short out-breath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>hh: </code></td>
<td>double h:s with lengthening colons, longer out-breath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>.hh</code></td>
<td>double h:s preceded by a dot, in-breath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>.xxxx</code></td>
<td>segment of talk preceded by a dot, talk on in-breath</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5.1 Introduction
A brief description of an apokoinou utterance was presented in chapter 1.2 above. In this chapter I will discuss in more detail the formal methods that are used to build a prototypical AU in Swedish talk-in-interaction. These methods are formulated against the background of previous research as presented in chapter 3 above, an examination of related construction methods as presented in 5.3 below in this chapter, and my own empirical study.

5.2 A prototypical apokoinou utterance
The prototypical methods that are used by speakers to build AUs and presented below are mainly of a formal nature, such as the syntactic and prosodic methods organizing the projection and progression of the developing utterance, the prosodic methods constructing utterance boundaries (beginnings, continuations and endings), and the methods used by the speaker to organize given and new information. The defining construction methods/features are summarized in table 5.1 below and then discussed in separate sections in the following chapter.

Most of the prototypical formal methods that will be discussed are involved when speakers assign structure to apokoinou utterances. These are in essential respects participants’ methods to build apokoinou utterances.

**Table 5.1. Defining construction methods of a prototypical apokoinou utterance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical methods/features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bringing the utterance to a possible syntactic completion on the pivot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of the post-P as syntactically parasite of the pivot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubling of obligatory syntactic constituents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retro-construction of a syntactic pivot (or theme-theme shift)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactic mismatch between pre-P &amp; post-P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prosodic methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prosodic design of the utterance as a coherent unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i.e no cut-offs and/or restarts)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, two of the objects of discussion, the formal mismatch between pre-P and post-P and the information dynamic theme-rheme shift, are perhaps better characterized as an outcome of the analyst's systematizing description.

5.2.1 Possible syntactic completion at the end-point of the pivot

The first defining feature of a prototypical pivot construction will be formulated in terms of both utterance-internal syntactic progression and overall interactional activities. The phenomenon linking the two dimensions is syntactic projection (Auer 2005). Beginning with the utterance-internal syntactic progression, the pre-P and pivotal segments of the apokoinou utterance prototypically construct a potentially closed syntactic unit that, however, is kept prosodically (and pragmatically) open, as exemplified in the following two extracts (5:1) and (5:2).

(5:1) Police report

L=LiCTI:A:51-1860[14] Main court proceeding in a criminal case (traffic misdemeanor). Participants: D=judge, Å=prosecutor, V=witness (car driver). Speaker V was driving a car that was hit by a truck in a traffic circle. The prosecutor interviews him in his capacity of witness to the event. In this extract, the prosecutor has asked V whether he noticed any signs from the truck driver that he intended to stop the truck after the accident.

1. Å. fanns de i [hans >körsätt som visa de<.]
and there was nothing in [this way of driving that indicated that]

2. V: [ ne] inte va ja kan ] we not what I could

3. [2.0]

4. Å. ha sett. have seen.

5. V: på de e [val] likadant< in police-report-the and it's probably the same in the police report

6. har han sagt han har givit te[ck:en att vi he has said that he signaled that we]

7. ska följa efter shall follow after should follow

8. [0.4]

9. V: <och ha> de ha ja'nte heller sett nånt, ([sic])
and eh I didn't see anything like that either
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(5:2) Madness

LÉTH (TT3:107) [5]. From ’Tryck till’ (Push it), a TV music show with four participants: one host, two panel members, and one guest. Speaker = John (m, panel member). In this context, J talks about his memories of the first time he saw a certain special effect in a music video and TV commercial.

1. J: (CONT. ORWHO TONE) I think that the first
   gången ja verkligen såg de va dels
   time I ever saw it was partly

2. black- black or white men så hade< Madness
   black- black or white but then had Madness

3. hh körde någon: eh tv-commercial
   hh ran some commercial

4. för sin samlingsplatta... hh såd k’d hade {...}
   for their collection-record and then did
   for their greatest hits collection hh and then did {...}

The first grey segments and the black segments highlight the pre-P and pivot segments, respectively. In (5:1) the segment ”å de e (väl) likadant i polisrapporten” (and it’s probably the same in the police report) is syntactically potentially closed. No further dependent syntactic elements are projected. In comparison, the segment ”men så hade Madness” (but then had Madness) in (5:2) is open − it still projects an object that has not yet been produced. At that point speaker J makes an inbreath and extends the subject NP with another verb, ”hh körde” (hh ran), instead. This might not seem to matter from a syntactic point of view − a syntactic pivot is constructed in both instances. However, an interactional analysis reveals that the difference in strategy change in the utterance is interactionally relevant.

In (5:2) the speaker uses the pre-P unit as a disjunctive rush out from the parenthetical pre-narrative about the Michael Jackson video Black or White. The syntactic openness of the segment ”men så hade Madness” apparently allows for a break in the utterance flow (an inbreath) before the speaker moves into the main segment of the narrative (the Madness commercial). In (5:1), by contrast, the speaker uses the pre-P as a tying device in order to develop the answer from the previous turn. The potentially closed syntactic unit ”å de e (väl) likadant i polisrapporten” (and it’s probably the same in the police report) motivates a tighter prosodic integration with the following
segment, because it is a relevant point of speaker transition. Speaker V is not
finished since the semantically and pragmatically projected action of
comparison is not yet completed.

If we represent the matter of possible syntactic completeness in more
conversational terms, the different strategies in (5:1) and (5:2) would seem
to have an impact on other participants’ possibilities to monitor for
completion and/or continuation. Whether a syntactic possible completion
point (henceforth called SYN-PCP) is reached or not after the pivot, is
probably important for the monitoring of local upcoming completions. If
the speaker enters into a post-P before a projected completion point is
realized, this makes the syntactic integration of the utterance tighter, as
compared to the case of bringing the utterance to a completion point and
only then going beyond.

This specification, however, does not rule out utterances with pivots that
have not reached a SYN-PCP from being analyzed as AUs. It only points
out that the difference between prototypical AUs with SYN-PCP on the
pivot, and a formal variant without SYN-PCP on the pivot can make a
functional difference in terms of unit integration and the consequences for
possible next actions.

5.2.2 Construction of the post-P as syntactically parasitic on the
pivot

The next prototypical formal feature specifies that the post-P segment must
be constructed as syntactically, prosodically, and pragmatically parasitic on
the immediately previous segment. Another way of saying this is that the
speaker must actively integrate the post-P in the ongoing turn or TCU. The
discussion of this feature draws in part on the relation between the
apokoinou method and the related V1-declarative construction (see 5.3.1.5
below), but also on the discussion of post-modifying tag-like constructions.
When continuing beyond the pivot, the speaker is not only orienting to
syntax as such, but also to preceding prosodic gestures in the utterance. As
will be shown in more detail (see 7.3 below), the continuing move is
(prototypically) done in a prosodically unexposed way, as the continuation
beyond the pivot usually lacks the characteristics of a new beginning. Couper-
Kuhlen (2004) has shown in an investigation of beginnings in English
conversation that phonetic features such as pitch peaks and pitch resets or
changes of tempo and/or intensity on turn initial elements are used a
prosodic resources to construct a new beginning. There are no
corresponding study of Swedish talk, but my data shows that the post-P lacks these features.

The post-P in extract (5:3) below, “*kan de ingå i.*” (*can it be part of*), illustrates how the post-P segment is made to be parasitic on the preceding pivot.

(5:3) The spoken language corpus
G:GSLC[W][84]. Everyday family conversation when preparing dinner. Participants: U=Ulla (49 years), hostess and responsible for the recording, C=Christina (48 years), friend of U on visit, K=Karin (6 years), U’s daughter, S=Sofie (18 years), U’s daughter. Talk about the recording. Christina asks Ulla what she will do with the recording.

1. U:             

2.  me de  hälter på me eh   with this here     it     is  PRT xx-    we   keep         on   with eh this    with this it is probably xx- we are working with eh this

3.  

The initial element “*kan*” (*can*) is syntactically and prosodically dependent on the preceding NP unless it is interpreted as a fragment or a question, which is highly unlikely in this sequential position. The whole utterance segment constituting the pivot construction is constructed as an answer to the initially posed question (line 2) what speaker U will do with the recording. The post-P segment is designed to address the question specifically. The turn up to the end of the pivot has only introduced a new rhematic segment (“*talspråkskorpuse*”), not specified how this new segment is relevant with regard to the previous question. It is the post-P segment that makes the whole construction relevant as an answer to the question, and it is therefore not tagged on as an independent TCU or a beginning of something new. It is used to close a question-answer sequence that was still open (pragmatically incomplete) at the end of the pivot. (See extract (10:21) for a more detailed communicative analysis of this sequence.)

In the following extract (5:4), the pivot-like segment “*Jonas Höglund,*” occupies a position in the turn that from a strictly formal point of view could be analyzed as the beginning of a second overlapping structure (as subject to the following second finite verb “*ser*” (*looks*)). The whole shaded segment would then be an apokoinou, but in actual fact it does not appear to be one. It is obvious when looking at the wider conversational context that the
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speaker, when continuing after the short pause on line 4, is not talking about the player Jonas Höglund and consequently does not retro-construct the immediately preceding name as a pivot.

(5.4) Jonas Höglund

Talk between commentators in a live broadcasted ice hockey game on TV. Participants: H=main commentator (Lasse Kinch), E=expert commentator (Leif Boork).

1. E: "näj" men and en l: I gärna inte så mycket att

2. "snacka om,"討論erar de att Nylander
talk about however think that Nylander
discuss, = on the other hand I think that Nylander

3. har försökt här tillsammans med Jonas Höglund,
has tried here together with Jonas Höglund,

4. (0.4) looks quite fresh and creative and

5. (0.4) Micke Nylander e ju en ovanlig spelare ((...))

Speaker E: rather speaks about the player Nylander. The segment "ser ganska pick ut på hittig ut;" (looks quite fresh and creative) is subject-less, but does not take the preceding element "Jonas Höglund" as the missing subject. It is pragmatically dependent on an earlier element in the turn ("Nylander" on line 2), thus rather being a VI-declarative that is part of a multiUnit account (cf. Mönnöj 2002). The utterance in (2) appears to be an AU, but the post-P candidate segment is not syntactically dependent on the immediately previous segment. In this case, this is partly displayed with the interjacent (0.4) pause and the lowering of the tempo on the post-P, even though such prosodic methods can not be uniquely tied to the action of 'un-doing' a possible incipient apokoinou.

5.2.3 Doubling of obligatory syntactic constituents

As already mentioned, a central formal aspect of doing a pivot is the method of doubling one or several syntactic constituents that are considered as obligatory within a traditional and normative sentence perspective. The normative perspective prescribes that a sentence without one verb would remain fragmental until one verb is produced. On the other hand, a sentence with two verbs has been considered anacoluthic because these verbs compete in
constructing a nexus relation with the subject and they compete in constructing a predicate together with objects, complements, or adverbial modifiers.

The first occurrence must be in the pre-P and the doubling of the first occurrence must be in the post-P. The constituents most commonly doubled are the finite verb (main verb as in figure 5.1 in section 5.2.4 below or an auxiliary), the verb together with an argument (subject/object), or just subjects/objects alone. Other doubled constituents are adverbials and pronominal subject elements, but also elements such as prepositions. This has also been observed by Saari (1975) and Linell (1981).

In the literature on apokoinou (or pivots) there has been a focus on the mirroring aspect of post-Ps, i.e. that the word order of the pre-P is reversed when the elements are recycled in the post-P. At least in Swedish, whether the order of the verb and argument is reversed or remains the same when doubling occurs, or whether linguistic material apart from these constituents is added, ignored or replaced in the post-P, is not of importance here, as long as the pivot segment is *extended with the second verb*. When the verb precedes the subject in the pre-P segment (i.e. 'inverted word-order' (see appendix 3), then that constituent order is preserved in the post-P, when not (i.e. 'straight word-order'), the constituent order will be reversed. This is, in turn, dependent on the kind of element preceding the predicate-argument segment in the pre-P. When preceded by an element (e.g. particles such as 'så' (so) or 'då' (then) or 'å så' (and then) that occupies the initial position in the syntactic structure (unit beginning), then the verb often comes as second and the predicated arguments follow, resulting in 'inverted word-order', as in (5:5) below (also see appendix 3).

(5:5) The old cat

Coffee conversation in a private home environment between four senior women (65-75 years). A is the hostess and B, D and D are her guests. Speaker B tells a story about an old cat.

1. B: ((...)) då (.) >åsså   sa  ja <. ga
    then            and-then   said    I     how     old            is  this   here

2. 
    *cat* said

U:SÅINF:43[68].
When not preceded by an element, the subject argument (if present) is produced as unit beginning, and the verb follows instead, resulting in ‘straight word-order’, as in (5:6) below.

(5:6) I thought

Coffee conversation in a private home environment between four senior women (65-75 years). A is the hostess and B, D and E are her guests. Speaker B tells a short story about when she had a meal earlier the same day.

1. B: ((...)) (.) /Ja tänkte de här e nog så lite/
   I thought it here is probably so little

2. /Ja tänkte ja *idag nu*./
   that I thought I today now

This word-order variation is of course not a specific condition for apokoinou utterances, but in line with general word-order rules for declarative sentences in Swedish. Therefore, for the time being, I do not treat these formal variations as functionally relevant. Some other additional features are, however, treated as functionally relevant, such as the choice between repeating the same verb (+subject/object argument), and using an altogether different verb. These variations have functional relevance, but are not defining features of prototypical apokoinou utterances or apokoinou construction methods as such. This can be compared to apokoinou in German conversation, where the reversed recycling type is considered as the most prototypical (true mirror image constructions, Franck 1985, Scheutz 2002, 2005).

5.2.4 Retro-construction of a syntactic pivot

A central idea within overlap and three-part model analyses of apokoinou (see ch. 3 above for a presentation of these models) is the occurrence of an utterance segment that is constructed as a syntactic center of the utterance, due to shift of syntactic structure. These observations are usually made from a purely structural point of view, and are therefore relevant in a formal description of apokoinou utterances in talk-in-interaction, but they do not explain the communicative function(s). As already presented in chapter 1.2 above, this central structural segment is called the pivot (cf. Schegloff 1979, Scheutz 2002, 2005, Walker 2004, 2007), and it is formally defined as the overlapping part between two syntactic segments (segments A & B, cf. 1.2) that share a syntactic part, as in (5:7) below:
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(5:7) Spoken language corpus

G:GSLC:W Everyday conversation in a private home environment when preparing for dinner. Speakers: U=Ulla (host), C=Christina (guest). Christina asks Ulla what she will do with the recording.

1. C: (h) (h) [h] (h) .inh:= [ (h) (h) ]
2. U: [h] a word [h] ja göra no and what shall I do

3. me de här de e vol li- v häller på me eh den with this bu[: ] he keep on with bu this
with this it is probably xx- not are working with ah this

4. här talpråkskorpuse kan de ingå i. here spoken language corpus can it be a part of

A pedagogical representation of the coloured utterance segment in (5:7) is given in figure 5:1 below. In this particular extract the pivot segment is a syntactic constituent in two different syntactic segments (it appears as noun-phrases in two preposition phrases), but has different status within segments A & B, being final in segment A and initial in segment B (see below).

A. vi håller på me eh den här talpråkskorpuse
B. den här talpråkskorpuse kan de ingå i.

Figure 5:1. Pedagogical representation of a pivot utterance as an overlap of two syntactic segments (a & b)

The syntactically shared segment of AUs is not restricted to NPs in preposition phrases, but can also be single nouns, adverbs and adverb phrases, as well as subjects, objects or adverbial in relation to both segments. Prototypically the pivot segment occupies the same syntactic position in both structures, but a change from e.g. predicative to subject is also rather common.

The syntactic pivot as a formal feature has been described as the outcome of doing syntactic structure shifts (Enkvist & Björklund 1989). As Linell (1981) points out, from an utterance planning perspective, the change of syntactic production strategy is either made during the production of the pivot, or as a retroactive change (retro-constructive in the terminology of Schegloff, 1996) when extending or continuing the utterance beyond the pivot. The latter model will be adopted in this study, because it is more
consistent with the incremental way of building utterances in general and in apokoinou, as presented in ch. 7.2–7.3 below. This study aims at respecifying the structural shift as a (retro)active move within the local communicative project(s) the speaker is presently involved in.

A different way of describing the construction of a syntactic pivot is in terms of information dynamics, i.e. the organization of the informational content (in a restricted formal sense) in utterances on the basis of its status as given (thematic) and new (rhematic) in relation to the preceding utterance(s). The organization and display of given and new information as well as informationally more empty and dense (light and heavy) segments can give a formal perspective on the internal processes in apokoinou utterances. The gist of this perspective is that the prototypical pivot segment in apokoinou utterances is characterized by a simultaneous or retrospective shift during the course of utterance production from the status of rhematic (locally new) to that of thematic (locally given).

As was touched upon above, the segment “den här talsspråketsorpnan” in extract (5:7) involves the introduction of a new referent which has not appeared in the discourse up to this point. It also constitutes the main content part of the turn, marked with primary focus, and is therefore highly rhematic. When extending the utterance beyond this rheme, the speaker introduces another rhematic segment in order to close the local project of answering the prior query. When doing this the segment previously produced as a rheme is used and respecified as the local theme (topic). The initial verb ‘kan’ (can) in the post-P relies on the newly introduced referent as given information when introducing more information that is new(er). This change is a necessary feature of all prototypical apokoinou constructions in the same way as the syntactic specification, but from a very different (formal) viewpoint.

Lambrecht (1988) and Scheutz (2002, 2005) both argue that this process of changing a rheme into a theme often interacts with the use of focus strategies to construct a merger of the preferred thematic element and focus positions in a turn into focused themes. According to Lambrecht and Scheutz, thematic segments are usually not the preferred segment in turns on which to place the main focus (accent), since these are often information light beginnings containing locally given information used as background for the main foregrounded content part of the turn/TCU. However, when a focused rheme is changed into a theme, the phenomenon of focused themes is brought into being. From the perspective of defining features of apokoinou, this is a feature of apokoinou constructions with focused and
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5.2.5 Syntactic mismatch between pre-P and post-P segments

Another way to define a prototypical apokoinou utterance is the non-congruent nature of the segments preceding and following the pivot segment. From a conventional normative sentence-syntactic point of view, these peripheral segments in the prototypical AU cannot function together within the same sentence unit. This is a consequence of the structure shift and the double use of obligatory constituents in the initial and final segments (see above 5.2.3), since a traditional simple sentence (or main clause) would contain only one finite verb, subject, direct object, etc.

For the sake of analytic economy, there is a point in labeling the different parts of the final product of the building process, even though the categories as such are not always functionally relevant (cf. Walker 2004 for a similar point). This has often been done with the help of a three-part segmentation, as in figure 5.2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-pivot segment</th>
<th>Pivot</th>
<th>Post-pivot segment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vi håller på me eh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are working with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.2 Pedagogical representation of a pivot utterance as a three-part structure

The beginning of the pre-P is analytically set at the earliest possible point at which a segment A could start, as shown using a representation with brackets, as in figure 5.3 below. The end of the pre-P is analytically set at the earliest possible syntactic beginning of segment B. The end of the pivot is set...
we are working with this corpus of spoken language can it be part of

![Pedagogical representation of a pivot utterance using brackets](image)

5.2.6 Prosodic design of the utterance as a coherent unit

The last feature specifies that a speaker of a prototypical AU builds the whole apokoinou utterance as a coherent unit, i.e. the speaker does not use prosodic cut-offs and/or restarts. This method of building an apokoinou has to do with the fact that participants do not treat prototypical pivots as broken off structures in their sequential position (i.e. as “unit fragments”, Selting 2001) or display restarting activities during the construction process.

The feature is partly formulated negatively as the absence of more obvious changes in the prosodic packaging of turns often has an integrating function, holding a unit together (i.e. partly creating the unit, cf. Couper-Kuhlen 2004). Pauses before and/or after the pivot segment (and elsewhere) are common and are not routinely analyzed as disintegrating or disjunctive resources, unless the prosodic chunks that follow the pause are specifically marked as disintegrated (e.g. through initial pitch peaks or if the post-P is pragmatically unrelated to the pivot candidate). For a detailed discussion of how speakers construct coherence prosodically, see chapter 7.3 below.

The specification of a feature that prescribes integrating practices rather than disjunctive has the consequence that a segment produced after a syntactically and prosodically closed turn must not be prosodically marked as a new turn unit if we are to analyze it as a continuation of or addition to the completed turn (i.e. an increment in the sense of Landqvist, 2004). The same holds for co-constructions. A co-construction is defined as a single macro construction produced jointly (in installments) by two participants (Bockgård 2004). The part produced by the second speaker is not marked prosodically as a new turn beginning. Apokoinou utterances produced as increments and co-constructions are therefore treated as produced in orientation to an apokoinou constructional schema in retrospect because of
5.3 Related phenomena

When engaging in social activities, participants seldom have the opportunity to orient to just one communicative task or project at a time, or, for that matter, to attend to all aspects of a project at the same time. Participants tend to deal with one task after another, and projects are embedded (nested, Linell 1998) within each other. This can create complex tasks, which in turn can produce complex emergent units in talk and (over time) complex emergent constructions. In the following section I will deal with some apokoinou-related phenomena, that are the products of the speakers' orientation to both (variants of) the apokoinou method of building utterances, and related methods and constructions. These phenomena have been used as an analytical background for the analysis and definition of apokoinou because they can be seen as constituting a sometimes rather fuzzy border around the apokoinou phenomena in terms of categorization, but also in terms of the way participants use them as methods in talk.

As discussed above in chapter 2.6, utterances and turns at talk are probably built formally in continuous orientation to prototypical dynamic schemas (constructional schema, Ono & Thompson 1995) that allow an actual utterance to depart from the prototype as the utterance unfolds moment-by-moment within changing communicative and sequential contexts. They refer to these differences as the messiness of instantiated constructional schemas. The notion of apokoinou-like phenomena is here used in reference to a family of similar constructions where many of them share the formal feature of having a syntactically defined central part. This criterion, together with the other formal criteria as presented above, can be analyzed as part of a prototypical apokoinou construction pattern (the apokoinou construction method, or ACM).

Apokoinou utterances often differ from the ACM in terms of e.g. prosodic packaging when embedded in different local activities. Apokoinou utterances are also often hybrids between apokoinou and related s. Within dialogical grammar and prototype theory this is usually referred to in terms of gradable category membership and fuzzy category edges (Taylor 1998:54f, Linell 2005a:313). One way of accounting for this hybridity is to say that the AUs in question are built in orientation to different construction methods, and sometimes even built in orientation to a hybrid construction method. From a dialogic perspective on utterance construction, this could also be
described in terms of different methods for building turns or segments of turns at talk, used when participants engage in different kinds of social activities. Turns can thus be built in orientation to more than one constructional schema simultaneously or consecutively during the incremental construction process of a turn or TCU. Both are an outcome of the speaker’s involvement in slightly different social activities. An investigation into the various hybrid variants of apokoinou and apokoinou-like phenomena with related construction methods as found in corpus A and B is be presented below in table 5.2 below.

Table 5.2 is divided in two groups of construction methods that are related to apokoinou in the sense that they can (and do) co-occur.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 5.2. SOME CONSTRUCTION METHODS IN SWEDISH TALK THAT RESEMBLE PROTOTYPICAL PIVOTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Contemporary construction types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Constructions with apparent pivots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increments after closed pivots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-constructed pivots (two speakers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post- or prelocated pivots (dislocations) (syn. disintegrated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagged on post-P segments (independent segment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Constructions without pivot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Non-repair activities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The telescopic tense construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False pivots - reinforcing finite verb doubling in final segment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Repair activities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress break-offs Prosodic and syntactic reparation + new recycling beginnings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Obsolete and more regional constructions types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Obsolete variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The double sentenced saying (“tvåsatsordstäv”, Bjere 1935)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The het-construction (“het-konstruktion”, Bjere 1935)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. More regional variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The emphatic post-positioned clause (“emfattisk annexsats”, Teleman 1996)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first group contains methods that are in use in contemporary conversational activities as found in the recordings used in this study. This group is further divided into types constructed in orientation to the ACM schema (using the apokoinou method of creating pivots), and types that are related in other respects, but where no pivot is produced. The second group contains types found in the literature that are presumably either obsolete or more regional construction types, since they are not found in the recordings. They do not make use of pivots but are compared with apokoinou by the authors or at least have major features in common with the ACM as defined here. They all share the quality of being complex syntactic resources designed for achieving specialized social tasks in a wide sense (cf. Schegloff 1979), compared to constructions with a much wider functional scope, such as main simple clause constructions, interrogatives or different tense constructions within these. They all also share the purpose of highlighting the ways in which a more prototypical ACM could be defined. The first group of phenomena has been the most important group in the process of defining the apokoinou phenomena.

5.3.1 Related phenomena with possible pivots

5.3.1.1 Closed utterances with extensions (increments) that formally retro-construct pivots

The pivot in an apokoinou ‘utterance can be retro-constructed when the speaker extends a possibly closed utterance with an incrementally added-on post-P segment. The incremental post-P is marked by the arrow in extract (5:8) below. An increment is here defined in line with Eriksson’s (2001) and Landqvist’s (2004) notion of turtillägg (lit. transl. turn add-on) in Swedish conversation as a way of adding on to a turn, which has been brought to full syntactic, prosodic and pragmatic completion at a point just prior to the add-on (cf. also Schegloff 1996 and Ford & Thompson 2002).

(5:8) Before we had men

UTT:SA:INF:51 [74]. Coffee conversation in a private home environment between four senior women (65−75 years). A is the hostess and B, D and D are her guests. They talk about the working conditions at a former psychiatric clinic for women (where they all have been working) and the changes that were brought about when men were admitted as well.

1. 
2. A: [ja .]
3. A: [.hh:] men >eh men< stark
   men but but the men were strong hh

   and I thought we had then before we had men
   and I thought we were well off then before we had the men

5. B: [mm] man
   that’s right

6. [0.2]

7. A: -> tyckte ja:
   thought I

8. D: .hh:::

9. B: att eh [då-]
   then eh then-

10. ?: [ ja]:
    yes

    then we could manage the women y

The segment on line 4 (pre-P & pivot) is produced as syntactically and prosodically possibly complete, while the add-on is a segment that generally combines syntactically with the completed preceding unit and is marked prosodically as unabrad (no pitch reset) to the previous and completed utterance, rather than continuously integrated within the previous prosodic contour, or exposed as a new beginning (see ch. 7.3.2 for a discussion of these prosodic options). There is plenty of verbal back channeling during the talk up to the point where A reaches the completion point at the end of line 6, but no immediate verbal response is made after it. Speaker A then extends the previous turn with the tag-like add-on "tyckte ja:" (I thought). The continuation only uses the segment "man hade [br↑] innan man hade män:," (we were well off then before we had men) in the previous segment as a syntactic beginning. The initial segment "[å ja] tyckte" (and I thought) is rather reused in a mirroring fashion, which makes the whole segment an apokoinou-like construction (as seen in figure 5:4 below, with a shaded pivot segment).

The main criterion distinguishing a prototypical apokoinou utterance from one that is constructed with a post-P increment is the degree of completeness marked on the pivot. This kind of atypical AU also comes
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Figure 5.4. Completed turn and increment segment in extract (5:8).

with various inserted material from other speakers between pivot and post-P. In these cases, the post-P is still used to add on to the previous own turn, disregarding or taking the intermediate response into account.

The character of the increment of being a delayed prosodically non-continuous addition is crucial here. Speakers do rather different things with an added post-P segment, compared with a post-P that is integrated within the prosodic contour. If, contra factually, the post-P in (5:8) had been produced as an integrated final unit, it would have been heard as putting more focus or emphasis on the topical aspect in the preceding pivot segment (cf. insisting uses of apokoinou, ch. 9 below). The retroactively integrated add-on in the actual (5:8) is more designed to offer another opportunity (or prompt) for others to take over the turn and respond.

There are intermediary cases where the prosodic marking of completion on the pivot is not as clear cut as in the sequence above. The distinguishing criteria used in those cases, is that the completion has to be fully realized syntactically, prosodically and sequentially (pragmatically) in order for the sequence to be analyzed as an apokoinou constructed with an increment instead of a more prototypical apokoinou where the post-P is integrated within the same prosodic contour.

The occurrence of prosodically continuous or almost continuous AU and AUs produced with a post-P increment has not been used analytically to rule out the increment AUs as an entirely different phenomenon. It is rather the case that increments and apokoinou are both methods of utterance building and communicative action, but in different ways. The method of producing units in talk in the shape of increments is a more general method than apokoinou, and is probably an interactional locus for the emergence of the apokoinou family of methods in the first place. The functions of post-Ps produced continuously and post-Ps produced as increments often differ, but the difference is not a necessary effect of the increment method, and they...
still have a lot in common. It is only if apokoinou is defined as a construction in a formally more limited sense (rather than a method) that the increment post-Ps fall outside the phenomenon, but that is not the case in this study.

5.3.1.2 Co-constructed apokoinou utterances

Another way of entering into pivot or post-P talk is to add on to another speaker’s talk during or immediately after it. This family of phenomena has been described as turn sharing and collaborative turn sequences in work on American English conversation (Lerner 2002, 2004) and co-constructed utterances (“sammkonstruktioner”) in work on Swedish conversation (Bockgård 2004:284).

In extract (5/9) below the emergency alarm call operator asks a question on line 10. The question is formatted as a declarative with a left out segment in final position — a slot leaving interrogative (Linell 2004).

(5/9) Upplandia
U:LC:HP0H01[17]. Phone call to an emergency alarm call center about a non-emergency ordering of an ambulance. Participants: O=operator (f), C=Caller (f) employed at the General Hospital:

1. C: då vill ja beställa en sån vid (.)
   then I'd like to order one of those around

2. O: ett eller två tiden;
   one or around two

3. O: [ f r å : n ]
   from

4. O: sjutti a? (seventy a)

5. C: ja?
   yes

6. [0.6]

7. O: i halv två tags.
   around half past one

8. C: ja, yes

---

I will sometimes use the verb 'talk' (as in 'post-P talk') instead of the notion 'segment' (e.g. in 'post-P segment') when focusing on the activity of talking as such rather than on the resulting formal products when the speaker continues beyond the pivot.
9. O: (1.4) and will go to eh:

10. C: (5.2) Västlandsbruk-Upplandia named it

11. O: (0.2)

12. O: (0.7)

13. C: <Smedvägen ett Västlands bruk>,

Speakers design the slot leaving interrogative syntactically and prosodically in order for some other speaker to fill in a relevant next. This is done on line 12 where the caller provides the missing segment (the destination for the ambulance). The segment is then extended with a "heter re," (is it called), used to (meta) comment on the more specific name of the destination ("Upplandia"), rather than the actual place referred to or the fact that the ambulance is going there. The comment retro-constructs the element "Upplandia" as a syntactic pivot that can be analyzed as a syntactic part in two different syntactic segments. In the initial segment A, it is used as a post-positioned apposition to the object "Västlandsbruk" within a prepositional phrase. In the final segment B it is used as the predication to the second finite verb "heter". The slot filling answer (luckifyllande svar, Bockgård 2004) is a prototypical feature of co-constructed utterances and the syntactic pivot is a feature of the prototypical AU. The simultaneous use of these two main methodical resources makes this an instance of a hybrid construction method – a co-constructed apokoinou. Having said this, it should also be mentioned that the filling-in utterance made by speaker C is an ordinary predication sentence with a heavy topicalized segment. The apokoinou-like character of the co-construction as a whole is achieved in interplay with the slot-leaving interrogative.

The relation between apokoinou utterances produced by one speaker and those produced by two (or more) speakers can be discussed in similar terms as with the increment post-Ps (see the previous section). The method of co-producing turns or units at talk is the more general method, which
creates special circumstances for those cases where a pivot is retroconstructed, but not necessarily special functions.

5.3.1.3 Post or pre-located pivots (dislocations)

A third method of constructing *apokoinou*-like utterances is to orient to the ACM constructional schema along with a method where a main content segment of a sentence unit is either placed in the *prosegment* and then referred to pronominally within the following TCU *core*, or placed in the *postsegment* after a pronominal reference within the preceding TCU core. The segment outside the TCU core (or sometimes the whole construction) is also referred to as a left- or right dislocation within a more traditional sentential perspective (e.g., Geluykens 1992, Monzoni 2005), but is here referred to as *pre- or post-located*, following Auer (2000a). In my data, the post-located segment can be retroactively constructed as an initial element in a continuation of the utterance that resembles the method of *apokoinou*.

In extract (5:10) below the guest in the program (speaker K) begins her turn with an announcement of an upcoming important addition to the ongoing discussion of ‘true and false mysticism’ in religion (it was the women who were attributed the practice of ‘false’ mysticism). The mentioning of the main element of this addition, the word "*extaserna*" (the ecstasies), is however delayed, using the format of a post-location, but not in a prototypical shape, since the prototypical post-located segment would be preceded by a full VP, such as ‘*är*’ (are). The format so far therefore projects more to come.

(5:10) The ecstasies

L:FR2[115]: From ‘Filosofiska rummet’ (*The Philosophical Room*), a weekly discussion program in Swedish radio on philosophical questions with 4 participants. P= Peter Sandberg (presenter), K=Katarina Stenqvist (philosopher of religion). The main topic is religious mysticism. In this extract, K brings in a feminist perspective on the main topic.

1. P:  **a:** Katarina  
yes Katarina
2. K:  **s:** ja skulle gärna göra de tillägget.  
**hh** yes I would like to make the addition that
3. när de gäller frågan om falsk mystI **eh** (0.3)  
when it concerns the question about true or false mysticism **eh** (0.3)

The notions of *prosegment*, *TCU core* and *postsegment* are based on the schematic segmentation of Swedish TCUs on the basis of interactually motivated positions, as formulated in Lindström (2006a:15).
4. om vi nu ser på dem senaste årtiondenas eh: if we now look at the latest decades' eh

5. genusperspektiv och feministiska frågor, _hh genus perspectives and feministic issues_

6. så har de visat att de som man då sån da then it has shown itself that it then then there it has turned out that those that one

7. traditionellt har han förd till den falska traditionally has classified to the false

8. mysticism _hh mysticism_ hh: _vijer sed_ shows itself

9. att de e dom kvinnliga mystiker som står that it is those female mystics that stand

10. varför då_ [varför då] while that (0.2) hh: while then- eh

11. P: _[varför då]_ why is that

Speaker K begins the target TCU at line 6 with a report of the historical treatment of 'false mysticism'. She then continues with a goafting segment "extaserna" that is prosodically disintegrated from the preceding background and co-referential with the initial "de" (it). The specification itself is then further built upon and used as a prosodically disintegrated pre-located segment to the TCU final "de" (that). The segment containing pivot+post-P talk displays features of a pre-locating construction. The whole construction progress resembles that of an apokoinou utterance with "extaserna" as a pivot loosely integrated in the preceding and following segments (cf. prosodic anacolutha, Linell & Jönsson 1986:12, example (3:14) above). The main feature contributing to the apokoinou-like character of the whole construction is the construction of a dislocated element as both post-positioned (with regard to the pre-P) and pre-positioned (with regard to the post-P). The main deviating feature from a prototypical ACM is the less prosodically (in-breaths before and after) and syntactically integrated pivot
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(it is not a constituent within the mid-field of a traditional sentence structure).

But a post-located NP element preceding a second finite verb is not, however, always to be analyzed as a possible pivot, as in the following extract (5:11).

(5:11) Remote control
L: LiCTI: TT3-1116[7]. From ‘Tryck till’ (Push It), a TV talk show about music. Participants: M=presenter (m), J= guest (m), Jo= guest (f), H= guest (m). Talk about a music video.
1. M: svänger me andra ord. (0.3) euh(m) #eh# ((#groaning))
   swings in other words (0.3) euh(m) eh
2. ja vet inte om ni- eh va de nån mer än
   I don’t know if you eh was there someone else that
3. va de nån mer än
   there someone else that
4. mittan i den här videon då ak [ ] s-
   the middle of this video PRT PRT s-
5. får dom ju fjärrkontrollen killarna<.
   they receive the remote control the guys
6. za: ppar, (0.3) å tjejerna förvandlas,
   zap (0.3) an’ the girls are transformed
7. H: mm:

The element “killarna” (the guys) is first constructed as a post-located full NP that takes the mid-field pronominal copy ‘dom’ as antecedent. The subject-less element ‘zappar’ (zap) are produced in a position where the preceding NP ‘killarna’ (the guys) can be interpreted as a pivotal subject. The segment ‘killarna (.) zappar (0.3) och...’ (the guys (.) zap (0.3) and ...) would then be a possible beginning of a segment B unit.

A better analysis, however, which is more in tune with the list-like wider project under way, would be to consider “får dom ju fjärrkontrollen killarna<.” (they receive the remote control the guys) as the first item in a three-part ordering of actions and events. The next element “za: ppar,” (zap), without an explicit subject, then becomes list-item 2, and finally “å tjejerna förvandlas,” (and the girls are transformed) list-item 3. The temporal placement of the elements shows some surface affinity with a less prototypical apokoinou. Without the terminal prosody on the pivot
candidate and the following pauses, the utterance would probably be a variant of apokoinou with a post-located NP pivot. The building of the utterance as a (non-apokoinou) list-like construction is mainly achieved prosodically.

Other linguistic unit types available for retrospective shifts from post- to pre-position are *sn*-clauses (*if*-clauses, cf. German *wenn*-clauses, Auer 2000b) and adverbial (sometimes tagged on) expressions such as 'alltså' (*you know*) (even though it should be noted that not all of them are used as methods to build prototypical AUs).

5.3.1.4 Tagged on post-P segments
A group of more clear-cut tags can also be used to build apokoinou-like utterances. Tags are specific phrasal units, such as 'vettu' (*you know*) and 'serru' (*see*), either integrated into TCUs or turns as closings of the prosodic unit, or added as a new unit after closure, and they have a number of variants and uses in Swedish talk-in-interaction. Two possible types of them are exemplified in (5:8) and (5:9) above, where the first, 'tycker ja' (*I think*) with variants, is frequently used to modify the preceding utterance (establishing speaker stance or position towards co-participants, Karlsson 2006). The second, 'heter det' (*is it called*), is used to do parenthetical meta comment on a preceding expression. The less dependent on the occurrence of particular lexical material in the preceding utterance, the more tag-like they become. The added segment "heter det" (*is it called*) in (5:9) behaves more like a tag in this respect, since it is very rare that a turn is built as a mirroring pivot with both initial "de heter" (*it is called*) and final "heter de" (*is it called*). The segment "tyckte ja" (*I thought*) in (5:8) behaves in a less tag-like fashion since it is constructed as a mirroring post-P. However, the initial occurrence is not obligatory for its use. As Karlsson (2006) shows, the meaning of 'tycker ja' is sensitive to turn final position, i.e. as an epistemic marker of interpersonal relations (and more). The use of post-modifying tags is therefore not necessarily connected to an initial use of the same or similar lexical unit in the turn or TCU, even if the product of the building process ends up having the same prototypical internal syntax as a full recycling (cf. 6.1.1.1 below) apokoinou utterance (cf. also the section on V1-declaratives below).

5.3.1.5 V1-declarative post-P segments
The next method in this overview of the apokoinou-related construction methods with a possible pivot is the verb first declarative ("V1-declarative", \textit{cf.})
Mörnsjö (2002). Utterances produced with declarative form in Swedish usually place the verb in second position. It is however possible to use verb first declaratives under some circumstances. Mörnsjö characterizes V1-declaratives in two ways, both from the perspective of normative grammar. They can on the one hand have an Obligatory Element Absent in the syntactic position in front of the finite verb (the OEA-type, ibid:55), as in (5:12) below. The missing or absent element is marked with an Ø. Speaker A and B are talking about cats.37

(5:12) Mörnsjö (2002:55)
1. A: Krafsar de på de här tapeterna och förstör dem så vet ja
   if they scratch on these wallpapers and destroy them then I don’t know
   inte vad jag gör med dem.
   what I will do with them
2. B: Nej.
3. A: Ø Säger åt dem på skarpen kanske
   will tell them very sharply maybe

On the other hand, the utterance can have all Obligatory Elements Present, but missing a “frame topic corresponding to då ‘then’ in front of the finite verb” (the OEP-type, ibid:89), as in (5:13) below.

(5:13) Mörnsjö (2002:89)
   but from way down there, it must be very expensive to fly home
2. B: Ja.
3. A: Ø Får man be konsulatet om hjälp.
   have to ask the consulate for help

Mörnsjö defines the terms “absent” and “missing” as “phonetically non-realized”, which is based on the theoretical assumption that they are actually there, but represented on an “underlying” level with regard to the hearable utterance. Apart from these theoretical assumptions, which I do not share.

37 The Swedish transcriptions below are cited from Mörnsjö, but the English translations are mine.
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with Mörnsjö, the study highlights the interesting occurrence of V1-declarative units of talk that are not necessarily syntactic extensions of preceding units.

In extract (5:14) below, speaker V comments on one of the teachers in his new school.

(5:14) Summer home

Talk while preparing dinner in home environment. Participants: U=mother, S=eldest daughter, V=son. V has begun a new school the same day. S begins her third year at the same upper high school and the same program V has just begun. Talk about one of V’s teachers.

1. V: de va ju cå "eh[:]:" de va nån som va=
   it was someone ah::: it was someone that was

2. S: [
   
3. V: =bra på matte sa nån som hade haft han.
   good at math said someone that had him

4. (0.3)

5. S: Lisa kanske.
   Lisa perhaps

6. (0.4)

7. U: va re en manli?
   was it a male

8. (0.4)

9. V: NÄ >HAR DE HÄR< DE VA EN NY LÄRARE som hade flyttat
   no here this there was a new teacher that had moved
   från sommaren hemme,
   from the summer home

10. (0.3)

11. V: .hh >kan ju inte va< hur (.) då li som helst¿
   .hh cannot be as bad as ever they said

12. dommen de: tror man ju aldrig på.
   but you never believe that

13. (0.4)

   .hh I think that it was her that chic eh chic lady that said
Speaker V uses a V1-declarative, rather than an apokoinou, but here the V1-declarative is preceded by a possible pivot. He places the (OEAs-type) V1-declarative at a point just after a heavy nominal segment (colored black) that is a syntactically possible predicative to the V1-segment. Such a connection would construct the V1 as a syntactic continuation of the prior TCU. Moreover, the NP predicative is in turn preceded by another subject-verb segment “de va” (it was), taking the NP segment as predicative. If it was not for the possibility in Swedish talk to construct V1-declaratives as conversational contributions in their own right, the beginning of the turn on line 12 would be open for an analysis as the post-P produced as an increment following after a nominal pivot element. However, the declarative is partly designed as a new unit after a full TRP, which rules this analysis out. Despite the fact that the utterance “>kan ju inte va< hu:r (.) dåli som helst=sa ...” (cannot be as ( .) bad as everyone said ...) is initiated with a subdued prosody (resumed pitch level, no accents), it is heard as a beginning of something new, partly with the increased articulation speed. When speaker V latches the quotation clause at the end, this is made clear. Nevertheless, the special conversational environment in (20), with a possible element in the preceding segment that could fill the initial gap in the V1 construction, is interesting from an explanatory viewpoint, since it differs from Mörnsjö’s study, who does not present any examples of utterances that are produced in such contexts.

5.3.1.6 Elliptically constructed parts

Whether elliptically constructed utterances are to be viewed as instances of an elliptic construction type is not altogether clear. But the speaker IS in extract (5:15) below at least relies on some kind of additional conventional practice when producing the turn on line 10. In order to be a full pragmatic contribution to the talk (which it is), this turn relies heavily on the information provided in M’s previous question. The clausal unit has no verb and is therefore formally elliptical, but it is not pragmatically elliptical. When continuing with a increment that recycles the verb and pronominal subject on line 14, speaker IS retro-constructs a syntactic pivot.
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(5:15) Weeping Willows

L:LiCTI:TT5[9]. From ‘Tryck till’ (Push it, a TV music show with four participants: one host, two panel members, and one guest. Speakers: M=Mårten (m, host), IS=Idde Schultz (f, guest). At the end of the show, M asks I if she will buy any of the music they have been listening to. G=gaze up, G=gaze at addressee.

1. M: hh:: Idde Schultz you were the guest of the day
2. IS: [mm:] ...
4. IS:                        [mm::¿ ]
5. M: =i tryck till? ( .) eh va säger du om
6. (0.2)
7. M: eller nån skiva som har banden;
8. (0.2)
9. M: [du säger] you saw
10. IS: [ ah:: ] m:: ja kanske Weeping Willows*
11. [ah::] ...
12. (0.4)
13. M: [mm::] ...
14. IS: [ah::] mm:: ja kanske ja köper (. ) den kommer
15. (0.4)
16. ja i alla fall < kolla upp>
I will at least check up on
The retro-construction is probably made in response to an absent third move in the sequence from M (line 13), and partly as a clarifying move. This apokoinou utterance will receive some further attention in the communicative analysis (see extract (11:2) below) even though the production design is not prototypical in the sense of being co-constructed, using elliptical methods and produced with a post-P increment.

5.3.2 Related phenomena without pivots

In the conversation-analytic literature, it is common to divide TCU and turn building methods into categories depending on whether they are methods of repair or not. The literature on repair shows a long list of linguistic forms and practices that have been placed on the (virtual) list of repair resources – among them some apokoinou-like methods (Sacks 1992a [1969], Schegloff 1979, also see above ch. 3.3.1). Clearly this is a consequence of the fact that repair methods share with complex syntactic methods in general some central formal features of their resulting products, such as breaks in an ideal flow of speech, changes/modifications of different aspects of the ongoing utterance while uttering it, or simply deviations from an ideal sentence schema. But complex syntactic products are not the outcome of repair activities as such. It is rather a fact that repair methods and complex syntactic construction methods are resolutions to different social tasks in different communicative environments, and can of course be drawn upon simultaneously, sequentially or entirely separately.

The remainder of this paragraph is therefore divided into methods that do not build utterances using repair, and method that do, respectively, even though the surface structure of the utterance has some central features in common. Speakers do not use any of these methods to construct a syntactic pivot, but they have other features in common with a prototypical apokoinou.

5.3.2.1 Non-repair activities

A group of apokoinou-related phenomena without pivots that do not prototypically do repair comprises Final finite verb doublings, telescopic tense constructions, and Recyclings without pivots.

5.3.2.1.1 Final finite verb doublings

In the following extract (5:16) the speaker T reinforces the ongoing utterance using a second finite verb in final position (shaded).

\[ \text{Final finite verb doublings} \]

In the following extract (5:16) the speaker T reinforces the ongoing utterance using a second finite verb in final position (shaded).
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L:LiCTI:A:51-904[11]. Main court proceeding in a criminal case. Participants: D=judge, T=prosecuted (truck driver). The judge is questioning the truck driver about how he perceived the events when his truck damaged a car in a traffic circle.

1. T: när jag passerat den andra vägen som då:
   when I have passed the other road then

2. och går fram i rundellen va;
   and goes straight ahead in the traffic circle s'know

3. (0.2)

4. D: mm=

5. T: =me min (frunt)
   with my (front)

6. (0.9)

7. T: <då slår ja blinkers vänster va,> (2.0)
   then I turn on the left blinker okay

8. ↓ gör ja i detta läge
   ↓ do I at this point

9. att ja gör detta. (.) då hör ja
   that I do (.) then I hear

10. nånting som kli
    something clinking

11. (1.5)

This final finite verb doubling method (cf. "förstärkande finalställd dubblering", Nordberg 2003:175ff) comes in the form of the verb 'göra' (do), which is always placed initially in the doubling segment, and which takes a main verb phrase in the previous segment as its antecedent (also see Lagré 2004). The low pitched segment "gör ja i detta läge." (do I at this point) is prosodically designed as a separate turn constructional unit (TCU) that is subordinated to the previous segment. Since the previous unit on line 7 has not been taken to a full TRP, the subduing prosody on the verb initial segment constructs it as a prosodic-syntactic continuation rather than a completely new TCU. The doubling of the subject and finite verb (main syntactic constituents) can therefore be analyzed as produced within a still
ongoing (cf. open, Anward 2003a) syntactic unit. This then, is a main characteristic shared with AUs. My claim, however, as opposed to Nordberg (ibid: 177f), is that no syntactic pivot can be analyzed in the center. The second göra-finite verb constructs the whole preceding segment as the syntactic beginning and informational theme.

This method has also been analyzed as an instance of the wider category appended finite doubling (Lindström & Karlsson 2005:115). In an earlier draft of the paper they call these constructions syntactic re-orientations or false pivots (Lindström & Karlsson 2003:5). The latter term captures the resemblance with apokoinou well.

5.3.2.1.2 Telescopic tense constructions with variants

Another apokoinou-related building method is the telescopic tense (”teleskopiskt tempus”, Nordberg 2003). Nordberg describes this as a method that doubles a verb phrase (VP) within a prosodically integrated unit, where both VPs share an utterance-initial subject (or agent), with an asyndetic subject deletion on the second VP. The second VP is produced with a different tense than the first (e.g. present → past) and/or a different modality or aspect.

In extract (5:17) below the midwife moves her attention from the mother to the child on line 6 and addresses the child:

(5:17) Sad
1. B: ((swallows)) så att då tar du måste med mej här. (0.4) so then you’ll take this. (me)
2. de e din ehm (0.6) regiss som du måste mej ti it’s your ehm (0.6) letter of referral that you’ll take
3. (dit) .hh kan ta den där (plastfickan där,) there he can take that plastic case PRT)
4. [ (child crying loudly in the background) ]
5. X: mm:

38 The doubling of both subject and object makes this usage of ”göra” (do) different from the usual verb doubling with ”göra” that often occurs after a topicalized main verb, as in ”svängde gjorde jag i det läget” (turned I did in that situation).
The question "#e du lessen, # börjar bli." (are you sad starting to be) starts with a simple present VP 'e du lessen' (are you sad), which is immediately followed by an inchoative VP 'börjar bli' (starting to be). The last segment 'börjar bli' (starting to be) is not a repair or correction of the initial question but a prosodically integrated add-on that modifies to temporal aspects of the child's affective display. Although not familiar with this particular utterance, Nordberg (ibid:179ff) describes similar utterances as a construction, designed to express a multi layered reference to and anchorage in time (but also to modality and/or aspect) within the same utterance.

5.3.2.1.3 Recyclings without pivots

In the following extract (5:18) the girl B tells her friend A about a friend they both know. The friend has a mother who sews all the clothes she wants (lines 1–6). Speaker A responds to this as news, "nå men gu:d" (oh my god), and asks if it really is the mother that sews all the clothes. B answers in overlap "ja allting allting." (yes everything everything).

(5:18) Sews everything
UTSA K99[224]. Arranged conversation with free topics between two women in their twenties. Talk about a friend who’s mother sews all her clothes.
1. B: ja hon har ju en mamma som sitter å syr
   yes she has a Mother that sits and sews
2. åt henne allting: så du hon bara eh ringer ner å for her everything (so) she just eh calls down and
3. säger att de: (.) >fö ja vill ha de (.) å då says that sew that because I want that and then
4. gör hon det hon illegår å sy 'och' syr she does that she loves to sew and sews
5. verklinen väldit nysigt för kläderna really very nice because the clothes
Speaker B’s answer is pragmatically complete in this sequential position. No continuation is prosodically or syntactically projected. It is syntactically parasitic on the question. As already said above, the traditional term for this phenomenon is ‘ellipsis’ when looking solely at the individual sentence or clause, but not when looking at the discourse, in this case the Q-A utterance pair. When continuing a second later, it is therefore not to finish something unfinished or specify something that is expressed vaguely.

The segment “allting allting” (everything everything) on line 9 could, if disregarding the preceding ‘ja’ (yes), be taken as filling in A’s previous turn (“ifyllnad”, Bockgård 2004). B then provides an extension “syr hennes mamma.” (sews her mother) that appears to be retro-constructing the previous segment into a co-constructed pivot “allting. / ja ↑ allting allting.”. It partially recycles and inverts the word order of the segment preceding the
co-constructed pivot, "hennes mamma som syr" (her mother that sews). The increment also insinuates on the fact that the mother sews everything, thereby (i) emphasizing the answer in face of a previous news receipt and inquiry (see 10.3.1 below), and (ii) providing another possibility for A to make further comments on the topic, which she does in line 13 (see 10.3.3 below). All in all, we are faced with some typical formal and functional features of apokoinou.

But the initiating 'ja' on line 9 prevents B’s response from being a prototypical filling-in on A’s preceding utterance. It is more of a freestanding response, where speaker B first confirms A’s question with a recycling of the last element in the question, and then extends the response with an increment that recycles A’s final utterance format (cf. Anward 2005, 2006). The recyclings on lines 9 and 11 do not in themselves support an analysis of the whole construction as a (co-constructed) apokoinou, but perhaps as something related without a prototypical pivot.

Another method with recycling (which is one of the prototypical apokoinou features), but without a pivot, is presented in (5:19) below.

(5:19) A snail
1. A:                      \[ ja: dels- \]         \[ ja dels \]
yes partly-                                   yes partly
2. de (.) å dels e de så tråkit \[ ja dels \]
that and partly it is so boring \[ ja dels \]
3. \[ en snigel \] (0.4) så tråkigt å stå å rensa
4. svampen tycke ja mycke roligare å plocka (.) ((...)))

Speaker A interrupts her utterance to comment on a snail, and when she continues she recycles the adverbial that preceded the inserted comment. The insertion is syntactically and topically independent of the surrounding talk. The partial recycling has a similar resuming function to the post-P recyclings in apokoinou constructions, but draws on a different construction method or conversational practice.39

39 Also see Duvallon & Routarinne (2005:56) for similar observations in Finnish talk (partial recyclings of initial frames after an insertion). They analyze them as a conversational practice.
5.3.2.2 Repair activities

Along the boundaries between apokoinou-like methods and related methods, there is one group of utterances in which repair rather than an orientation to the ACM constructional schema seems to be the main strategy of utterance building. Apokoinou utterances containing structural elements of repair activities that do not interfere with the syntactic three-part analysis of the construction are not included in this section. I will mainly focus on phenomena such as exposed forms of syntactic and prosodic break-offs of projected units in their sequential environment (cf. Selting 2001), where the repair activity blocks the analysis of an otherwise possible apokoinou utterance.

In the following extract (5:20), speaker B is overlapped by speaker D and stops in the middle of the word "ejen-" (as in actually), and then continues the turn in the next moment with the complete word "enteigen", this time using the completed word as the beginning of a new sentential unit. The way the new unit is produced (the adverbial "enteigen" (actually) is followed by a new finite verb "va" (was)) indicates that this was not the projected syntactic continuation of the previous unit that was interrupted, although there are no reasons to suspect that B changes her perspective on the local topic.

(5:20) Actually

U:SÅINF:51[72]. Coffee conversation in a private home environment between four senior women (65–75 years). A is the hostess and B, D and E are her guests. They once worked at the same mental hospital and they talk about good and less good memories from work.

1. A: så man såg iTe bara att de blev *eh::*.=
so you didn't just see that it became eh:

2. D: =näj¿ [nej.]
no no

3. A: [e]län [de utan min såg [så ] många=
[since you saw so many

4. D: [hh]

5. A: =som blev (0.6) [fräska] å fick å[ka hem]: å
that became (0.6) wall an' were allowed to go home an'

6. D: [ ja: ] [jaha¿
yes I see

7. D: .[ja:]
yes
The restart with “ejentligem” (actually), which is also prosodically displayed with an accent, is simply a way of resuming the turn progression after a cut-off word.

It would be wrong to rush into an analysis of the utterance in (5:19) as an instance of the ACM, where the pivot element would be the whole repair segment “ejentligem”. Instead the cut-off element, together with the accented first syllable of the next positioned element “ejentligem”, are strong indications that the speaker actually makes a new beginning, starting with the completed element. Speaker B is thereby not repairing the cut-off element as such but rather a potentially troublesome turn beginning.

Expressed in more conventional terms, this is a self-initiated same-turn self-repair (Schegloff et al. 1977), that contributes to the construction of a pivot segment in an apokoinou-like utterance. The cut-off and the prosodic re-beginning, however, form a prosodically disintegrated utterance that deviates from the ACM schema. These deviating features can be used as the basis for a categorization of the phenomenon as instances of the anacoluthon, if re-categorized as a possible grammatical and conversational practice of its own.40

5.3.2.3 More regional or older construction types

The main principle so far in mapping possible apokoinou-related construction types in Swedish has been their occurrence in my own data, thereby verifying to some extent their use in contemporary Swedish. Nordberg (2003) suggests when discussing the final finite verb doubling (cf. above), that there is probably a range of construction types to be used in Swedish dialects when speakers want to give more emphasis to what was uttered in the previous moment. However, I have not designed my corpus

40 There might be different opinions about using the notion of for a conversational practice, but cut-offs + restarts have enough recurring internal structure and functional potential to qualify as a phenomenon that fits the connotation of the notion that is chosen (see note 89 below).
to show syntactic variation across dialects, and previous research on Swedish dialects has in general not been focused on syntax, but there are single studies to be mentioned. Teleman (1996) has brought attention to one of the emphasizing constructions, the emphatic post-positioned clause (“emfatisk eftersats”, Teleman 1996:375), which is common in some dialects in Småland and Halland in the southern part of Sweden. Two variants are illustrated in (5:21) below.

(5:21a) Teleman (1996:375)
Han odlade potatis, så han gjorde
He grew potatoes, so he did
He grew potatoes, indeed he did

(5:21b) Teleman (1996:375)
Han var en bra trumpetare, så han var
He was a good trumpeter, so he was
He was a good trumpeter, indeed he was

The emphatic post-positioned clause has some formal features in common with an apokoinou utterance, and some that differ. First of all: the subject is recycled unchanged in both cases, together with the finite verb that is changed in (a) or not in (b). In variant (a), the verb ‘göra’ (do) is chosen in the annex clause because the verb in the first verb phrase is a main verb. In variant (b), the finite verb is an auxiliary which is then repeated. The word order is non-inverted in both cases (see appendix 3). A similar pattern can be seen in the case of final finite verb doublings (Nordberg 2003, see above), as both are instances of a more general pattern of verb choice in Swedish (cf. Teleman 1996:377, Teleman et al. 1999:III:§10:265f). This means that a pivot can only be analyzed in variant (b) above, since the emphatic post-positioned clause with ‘göra’ takes the first finite verb as an obligatory syntactic beginning. It is only in (b) the segment “en bra trumpetare” (a good trumpeter) is constructed as verb complement in the initial syntactic strategy, and then retro-constructed as pre-located object in the final syntactic strategy.

In sum, the (b)-variant has some features in common with a prototypical apokoinou utterance, even though no actual comments can be made here with regard to prosody.41 However, the post-P talk is not prototypical as it is ended instead of initiated with the second finite verb. The så-phrase is not syntactically integrated with the pivot candidate within the mid-field

41 The comma before the annex clause might be an exception, presumably symbolizing some sort of pause, but this can not be verified from the transcript alone.
segment, as is the case with the prototypical apokoinou utterances. This is not a case, then, of turn continuation using a second finite verb to change the direction of the utterance, but of a lexically (‘så’-framed) rather fixed tag-like construction doing similar things as some of the apokoinou types.

Considering the arguments of both Teleman (1996) and Nordberg (2003), it is plausible to view the choice of verb form in the final emphatic finite verb doubling clause as a product of one and the same general descriptive rule of verb choice in Swedish: Use ‘göra’ when the antecedent verb is a main verb, repeat the same verb when the antecedent is an auxiliary verb (Teleman et al. ibid.). Such a descriptive rule might capture the formal alternation between ‘göra’ (do) and the repetition of auxiliary verbs in syntactical post-positioned clauses (again: no prosodic dimension), but it does not explain the communicative import of the two choices. I am using this general relation in the Swedish language between main verbs and ‘göra’, and doubling of auxiliaries, as an argument when treating variants of the full recycling configuration as an apokoinou construction, while I do not treat the formal sister-construction (the final finite verb doubling with göra) as an apokoinou.

The last two apokoinou-related phenomena to be discussed here (exemplified in 5:22a-b below) are probably not older in the sense of having been around longer as resources in talk, but they have a longer descriptive history than the phenomena treated above.

(5:22a) Bjerre (1935:7)
De duger te försöka, sa sä kären, biet i sten
It will-do to try, said the old woman, bit in stone
It is enough to try, said the old woman when biting in stone

(5:22b) Bjerre (1935:16)
Vifell hade en son, heter Viking
Vifell had a son, who is called Viking
Vifell had a son, who has the name Viking

It is not my intention to make any suggestions as to whether they are still in use or not, but as in the case with the emphatic post-positioned clause they have not surfaced in my own corpus and my own intuitive impression is that they sound rather out of date as (formulaic) resources in present-day everyday talk. They are both treated in one and the same publication (Bjerre 1935) where they are analyzed as instances of the same kind of asyndetic relative constructions with a missing relative pronoun. In other words they are, with a term used above in chapter 3, explained within the frames of the
The term used for variant (a) roughly translates to **double claused saying** ("tvåsatsordstäv", ibid:3ff).\(^42\) The corpus of variant (a) instances is collected from written sources of dialects in southern Sweden, but the phenomenon is viewed by Bjerre as occurring in both written and spoken language, although not as alive and productive as the more general (and presumably more ACM-like) construction type “apo koinu”, with which Bjerre makes a comparison.\(^43\) Bjerre describes the double claused saying as two consecutive clauses in past tense, where the second lacks a subject and comes in two variants: Either a paratactic main clause (exemplified above) or as a temporal subordinated clause (begun with ‘när’ when) — but not a relative clause. The effect achieved with the paratactic apokoinou variant compared to the (non-apokoinou) temporal construction is a stronger sense of simultaneity between the two acts in the saying (ibid:14). Bjerre points to formal similarities with what he calls apokoinou constructions, since both are viewed as instances of constructions where the subject is only spelled out once and therefore shared between two verbs — the preceding reported speech verb ‘sa’ (said) and the following finite verb ‘bet’ (bit). The construction is of course tightly restricted by the constructional schema of the saying, with an obligatory reporting clause (‘said X’) and with a restriction to subject NPs only as ‘pivots’.

As a contrast to the restricted and unproductive form of the sayings, Bjerre views the wider category of apokoinou as something characteristic for the living (spoken and written) language, and explains it as **two coordinated sentences within the same construction**, as opposed to the asyndetically linked subordinated sentences discussed above. Where the variant (5:22a) of the double claused saying belongs to the first of these explanatory variants, the variant

---

\(^{42}\) This variant is simply called ‘ordstäv’ by Östman (2006) in his study of the phenomena in a Finland-Swedish dialect, where similar utterances are used in everyday situations for various communicative purposes, but his examples all have pronouns between the name and the following word that blocks an apokoinou-reading.

\(^{43}\) The comparison is made against a research background that probably is well known for the intended reader. Apart from referring to some German publications where the problem of apokoinou is discussed, Bjerre does not provide any actual examples of Swedish apokoinou. The term ‘productive’ refers to the quality of certain constructions to ‘produce’ many formally different instances, as opposed to ‘unproductive’ constructions that ‘produce’ more stereotype formal instances (such as proverbs).
Defining the phenomenon

(5:22b) belongs to the second variant of explanation. The term used translates to ‘het’-construction ("het-konstruktion", ibid:16ff). The ‘het’-construction has according to Bjerre nothing in common with apokoinou, apart from the fact that the second part of the construction ("named Viking") lacks a subject. It is explained as a rather late import from German, and is according to Bjerre a result of sloppy everyday language use, written as well as spoken (ibid:38f). With very few exceptions, the ‘het’-construction is linked to the use of the verb ‘heta’ (germ. heiz ≈ eng. having the name/ named), and is used to present the name of the preceding subject without an intermediary relative pronoun in an attributive, subordinated and parenthetical manner.

The ‘het’-construction might not be an example of a typical apokoinou in Bjerre’s definition, and the corpus of both variant (a) and (b) is collected from various written sources (including handwritten notes), but could nevertheless be viewed as a precursor to a rather common apokoinou variant in modern conversational Swedish, as exemplified in (5:23) below (my coloring of the pivot).

Och de hade en gnu heter det visst
And they had a gnu is the name of it i think

The utterance in (5:23) has been described as an instance of a telescopic combination ("teleskopkombination", Anward 1980:28), where the speaker uses a merging of two constructions around a minimal common denominator. The term probably designates the fact that the speaker is tuning the attention to one particular aspect of the utterance (the name of the animal) during the course of simple sentence production. Some communicative aspects of this apokoinou variant will be analyzed in chapter 9 below.

5.4 Discussion

In this chapter I have discussed in detail the defining formal criteria of apokoinou utterances as briefly presented in chapter 1.2. These criteria have been formulated partly on syntactic grounds and partly on the analysis of how related phenomena resemble and differ from a prototypical apokoinou.

When speakers construct apokoinou utterances in accordance with the prototypical apokoinou (as defined in section 5.2 above), then the utterances produced take many different shapes. The definition does not prescribe in
detail the kind of elements and segments a speaker can produce in the
different phases of the apokoinou utterance, only that the relation between
them and the way they are produced should not depart from the general
specifications made. Built into the notion of a abstract prototype is the fact
that concrete instantiations may deviate more or less from prototypical
exemplars. Within a normative and prescriptive view on utterance
production, that deviation would implicate an incorrect construction. Within
a prototype framework, a deviation only indicates the use of a formal
utterance variant within the same family of constructions or within another
family. A notable exception is when the concrete utterance is treated as
incorrect in that particular context by the speakers themselves, as in some cases
of repair (cf. Selting 2001). With an empirical approach to conversational
data, the apokoinou prototype(s) can only be regarded as an abstract
prototype, never an ideal method of utterance construction. Single
apokoinou utterances are always shaped and made to mean things (function)
in interplay with local contexts and other participants within ongoing local
communicative projects. Slight deviations from a prototypical apokoinou are
therefore more common than uncommon in the corpus as a whole (see
6 Apokoinou forms

This study is mainly an investigation of the functions of apokoinou in talk-in-interaction. Yet, it is difficult to discuss functions and how they are accomplished without investigating their relation to the formal methods and resources that speakers use to achieve them and without the possibility of drawing on some already established terms for the main formal variations. Therefore, I will use this chapter to define some formal types.

Although this chapter is placed before the functional analysis, it is important to note that the categorization of the forms and formal features is based on the various functional analyses presented in the following chapters. They constitute what will be shown to be relevant formal differences among the apokoinou utterances analyzed. The notion of a relevant difference is assessed on the basis of the different tasks utterances perform in their particular local communicative contexts, i.e. a formal difference that makes a functional difference.

The formal categories (or configurations of formal methods and resources) are divided into three groups. The third group differs since it contains more general construction methods that are not specific for apokoinou. All three groups are, however, defined as apokoinou forms, and utterances within all three groups will be analyzed communicatively in the following chapters 8–11.

(i) Prototypical formal configurations that are constructed with orientation to the prototypical constructional schema of the apokoinou, exposing a high degree of integrated conversational cohesion (intra-sentential syntax and prosodic grouping);

(ii) Less integrated formal configurations that are constructed with orientation to the prototypical constructional schema of the apokoinou, but exposing a lower degree of integrated conversational cohesion;

(iii) AU constructions as co-constructions and increments. AUs in (i) and (ii) are sometimes co-constructed by two speakers and post-Ps can sometimes be constructed as increments.
6.1 Prototypical formal configurations

Despite the variation of utterance shapes, all prototypical forms expose a syntactic coherence of the intra-sentential type. The three apokoinou phases pre-P, pivot and post-P are all intertwined in each other with constituency relations such as the finite verb-object relation or the subject-finite verb relation within a simple clause. Furthermore, all prototypical forms are prosodically grouped as a unit. This does not mean, however, that utterances produced with resources such as micro-pauses and sometimes longer pauses between constituents or between/within apokoinou phases are excluded from this category. The main prosodic criterion, as discussed in 5.2.6 above, is that the post-P (or any other segment/element) should not be marked as a restart or a new unit/action (e.g. with pitch reset). One consequence of this is that apokoinou utterances can be brought to a prosodic possible completion (e.g. final drop or non-modal voice on prosodic chunks) before entering post-P talk, as long as the beginning of the post-P is not marked as a new beginning (cf. also the discussions of various syntactic and prosodic projection processes in ch. 7 below).

As with apokoinou in German conversation, Swedish apokoinou utterances can be divided into two main formal groups: symmetrical (6.1.1) and asymmetrical (6.1.2). The prototypical apokoinou in German conversation is, according to Scheutz (2005), symmetrical (the True mirror image construction, called ‘Full recycling with reversal’ in this study). My analysis of apokoinou in Swedish differs from this in that both variants are treated as equally prototypical. Interestingly, in English conversation there seem to be no proper equivalent to the true mirror image construction in German and Swedish. Walker (2004, 2007) only exemplifies with asymmetrical utterances.

6.1.1 Formal symmetry

The first of the two main prototypical formal categories is characterized by the production of recycled linguistic material in the post-P segment. The recycling creates an utterance product with a certain formal symmetry, although there are other variants than the most symmetrical full recycling type. The linguistic material can be partially recycled, and the recycling post-P

44 Cf. Auer (2005) for a discussion of the relevance of the notion of constituency in conversational syntax. The construction-internal relations between syntactic constituents in grammatical constructions could also be described with the notion of syntactic dependency (cf. Nikula 1980; Taylor 1998).
segment can be produced with or without a following extension of the utterance unit beyond the recycling segment. In addition, it may be relevant to talk about a deletion of initial material when parts of the pre-P are systematically left out in the post-P. Responsive and modal particles are in principle dropped or treated as dispensable in the different sequential environments of the post-P (cf. Schegloff 2004 on dispensability). In some cases, it is perhaps relevant to talk about a replacement of material in combination with the recycling of certain light auxiliary verbs. In some repair-like constructions the speaker first re-uses the pre-P verb and then resolves an ambiguous pre-P or specifies a referentially vague, elliptic or just very light pre-P.

6.1.1.1 Full recycling of thematic pre-Ps

The main type of symmetrical formal configuration is characterized by a full formal repeat or recycling within the post-P of the subject and finite verb elements in the pre-P segment, and nothing more than that (cf. Lagré 2004 for similar examples). The pre-P is typically a collocation of a pronominal subject and a finite verb (often with variants of the finite verb form ‘vara’ (be)). The pivot is typically a (focused) noun phrase (NP). In the post-P, no additional material is added after the recycling segment within the limits of the apokoinou utterance unit. However, the turn can be continued with new units. The repeating segment in the post-P reuses the format of the pre-P, but the function differs between the repeated and the repeating segments. When initial, it is informationally and interactionally subordinated and thematic, e.g. referring to something already established among the participants. When final, it is still subordinated, but rhematic in the sense of adding a confirmative aspect to the pivot, which is the first and primary theme of the utterance. The apokoinou utterance in extract (6:1) below is constructed along those lines:

(6:1) Undemanding music
G:GSM:100[158]. Group discussion about different pieces of music within different genres
Participants: F=moderator (f); BM1-4=four upper high school students. Here they are discussing a song by a Swedish pop group (Kent).

1. F: mm¿
2. BM3: >men de e väldigt lätt smält musik >e re<.
   but it is very easy-digested music it is
3. BM2: mhm

6.1.1.1.1 Full recycling of thematic pre-Ps

The main type of symmetrical formal configuration is characterized by a full formal repeat or recycling within the post-P of the subject and finite verb elements in the pre-P segment, and nothing more than that (cf. Lagré 2004 for similar examples). The pre-P is typically a collocation of a pronominal subject and a finite verb (often with variants of the finite verb form ‘vara’ (be)). The pivot is typically a (focused) noun phrase (NP). In the post-P, no additional material is added after the recycling segment within the limits of the apokoinou utterance unit. However, the turn can be continued with new units. The repeating segment in the post-P reuses the format of the pre-P, but the function differs between the repeated and the repeating segments. When initial, it is informationally and interactionally subordinated and thematic, e.g. referring to something already established among the participants. When final, it is still subordinated, but rhematic in the sense of adding a confirmative aspect to the pivot, which is the first and primary theme of the utterance. The apokoinou utterance in extract (6:1) below is constructed along those lines:

(6:1) Undemanding music
G:GSM:100[158]. Group discussion about different pieces of music within different genres
Participants: F=moderator (f); BM1-4=four upper high school students. Here they are discussing a song by a Swedish pop group (Kent).

1. F: mm¿
2. BM3: >men de e väldigt lätt smält musik >e re<.
   but it is very easy-digested music it is
3. BM2: mhm
The initiation construction "de e" (it is) in the pre-P is fully repeated as ">e(re)" (is it) after the pivot NP (here in reversed Swedish word order), and using a colloquial form of the verb, thus creating a symmetrical utterance. As already mentioned, a typical aspect of apokoinou constructions in general is that unit initial elements such as "men" (but) on line 2 in (6:1), and intra-unit modal particles such as 'ju' and 'väl', are not recycled in the post-P segment (cf. Scheutz 2002). The apokoinou utterance in (6:1) is therefore categorized as a full recycling, even though the initial particle is left unrepeated.

Another aspect is that when the verb is a heavier verb phrase with an auxiliary and a main verb phrase, only the auxiliary and the subject switch places, as in (6:2) below. This word order is of course governed by general word order rules of Swedish; the finite verb is the second constituent of declarative clauses.

(6:2) Promoting ears

U&MK:TV. From 'Måndagsklubben' (The Monday Club), informal TV talk show. Participants: A=Presenter (f), C=co-presenter (m), Ad=co-presenter (m), R=guest, B=guest, Aud=audience. Here they are discussing plastic surgery.

1. A: [förstå' u å jO BA me ren där] människan MEN
   understand how it is to work with that person but

2. [DE E] I
   there's

3. C: [JA SKULLE VILJA HA SÅN DÄR, STÅ]
   I would like to have those there protruding

4. R: [h] (h) (h) (h) (h)
   ears like that I would like to have

5. [h] (h) (h) (h) (h)
   ears like that I would like to have

6. Aud: (h) (h) (h) (h) (h)

45 The notion of 'reversal' is only used to describe the relative in the word-order between the pre-P and post-P phases. It is not the same as 'inverted' word-order, which is a technical term within grammatical theory that describes the opposite to 'straight' word-order in Swedish where the subject always precedes the finite verb in declarative sentence structures (see appendix 3).
The segment "tänkte ja" is recycled and reversed as "ja tänkte" and the rest of the pre-P is recycled in its original word order. The verbs in these reversed true mirror image constructions (cf. Franck 1985, Scheutz 2005) are usually of a more functional character ('ska', 'skulle', 'är' — will, should, is) with low semantic density. In both (6:1) and (6:2) above the end-point of the apokoinou utterance and the end-point of the turn coincide, but there are also cases where the turn continues beyond the apokoinou utterance.

One sub-type of this general type is characterized by the repetition of the pronominal (or proper name) subject together with a past or present tense cognitive verb form ('sa ja', 'tänkte ja' — said I, thought I), typically around a pivot of reported speech or thought. This type is, however, treated as a syntactically less integrated construction. (See 6.2.3 below. Also see 10.2.2 for a communicative analysis).

6.1.1.2 Extended full recyclings: addition of more rhematic material

AUs with recycled material in the post-P are not always brought to completion after the recycling segment. A projected completion can almost always be renegotiasted within the transition area (cf. discussion in 7.3 below). The result of this is a division of the recycling category into the subcategories of full recyclings and extended full recyclings. They have been found to solve different communicative tasks, e.g. doing closing and demarcating work (cf. ch. 10.2) and turn resuming work, respectively (cf. ch. 10.3.1). In (6:3) below, the pivot is followed by the recycling segment "tänkte ja" (thought I) which in turn is followed by (extended with) the rhematic segment "*idag nu*" (today now).

(6:3) Not enough

USA/INF[4][9]: Coffee conversation in a private home environment between four senior women (65–75 years). A is the hostess and B, D and E are her guests. B renders an account for coming to the coffee party without being hungry: she had eaten the leftovers from yesterday's dinner before leaving home.

1. D: [ men men ad l:] [0.2] var de kvar. but then PRF [0.2] it was left over

2. (...) ja tänkte de här e nog< så lite så >de
I thought that this is probably so little that it

3. inte räck er tänkte ja *idag nu*.< not last thought I today now
The thematic part of the post-P is the second in order (the pivot was the first thematic segment) as in the prototypical case of the apokoinou. The recycling segment of an extended post-P may be used to link up to following moves that address aspects of the overarching communicative project that has not yet been dealt with in the pre-P+pivot segment (in this case when the thinking was done).

6.1.1.3 Partial recycling of pre-Ps

These utterances are characterized by a heavier pre-P and a post-P that only recycles a part of the pre-P. The post-P's are produced with the same kind of light verb and pronominal argument post-Ps as in 6.1.1.1–6.1.1.2, but with the difference that they only recycle parts of the pre-P, as in (6:4) below.

(6:4) Battery malfunction

U4L318P0420[32]: From a telephone call at an emergency alarm call center about a malfunction signal on the fire alarm. Participants: O=Alarm operator who makes the call, E=Employee at the place where the malfunction is, receiving the call. The alarm operator has called and asked about an automatic alarm that has been registered at the call center during the night.

1. (39.0)
2. E: de stämmer bra: de [hör= du]= yes that's true y'know
3. O: [ mm:hm ]
4. E: = de [står att de e ba]tteri
e it says that it is battery malfunction
5. O: [ de där kom- ] that came-

In this case, the post-P recycles the initial part of the pre-P in reversed form. AU's with partial recycling of initial segments in the pre-P are most common in the corpus, but final segments in heavy pre-Ps are also recycled.

6.1.1.4 Extended partial recyclings: Adding of thematic material

In extract (6:5) below, the recycling segment that follows the pivot, "blir de" (it becomes), only recycles the central part of the pre-P.
Apokoinou forms

In the end

Participants: L=Gynecologist (f), K=Woman, Cajsa Karlsson (20-25 years, having her first baby). They talk about how little the child moves around.

1. L: [ja::]

2. L: >å sen så blir de också lugnare på
    and then it also becomes calmer in

3. slutet blir de trängre i magen,
    the end it becomes narrower in the belly

4. K: =a:¿
    yes

The segment that is used by the speaker to comment on how things gets calmer in the belly “också lugnare” (also calmer) is not repeated, but the speaker instead adds highly thematic material to the recycling segment “trängre i magen” (narrower in the belly). See extract (8:1) for a communicative analysis of (6:5).

The extended partial recycling is done using a combination of three formal methods. One method is non-reversed recycling (“blir de” is repeated as “blir de”). A second method is deletion. The turn initial segment ‘å sen så’ is dispensable (cf. Schegloff 2004) in turn medial position, where there no longer is a need to establish a time relation between the overall activity in the turn and the preceding talk. A third method is renewal. The final segment ‘trängre i magen’ (narrower in the belly) replaces ‘också lugnare’ (also calmer).

Judging from the process of non-reversed word-order between the pre-P and post-P in (6:5), it would be a mistake to say that configurations with non-reversed recyclings (or Swedish apokoinou in general) prototypically involve a mirroring of the elements in the pre-P, if by mirroring is meant a complete reversal of word order in subject-verb nexus (cf. Franck 1985, Scheutz 2002). In (6:5) the recycled segment in the pre-P “blir de” (it becomes) is preceded by the temporal collocation ‘å sen så’ (and then). When elements such as this or response particles are placed initially in the inner (clausal) segment of Swedish utterances\textsuperscript{46}, the word order in the following clause unit

\textsuperscript{46} According to a schematic segmentation of Swedish turns and TCU’s based on various interactionally defined positions during the production of the unit, these TCU-initial
becomes grammatically inverted (i.e. the verb is placed before the subject in nexus, see appendix 3). This, in turn, results in a non-reversed post-P. There is no support in my data for splitting up a main recycling category into one where the constituents are reversed and one where the constituents are merely doubled with the same word order. Such a split does not have a functional relevance, except for the fact that particle-initiated apokoinou utterances are differently (or at least more overtly) linked to preceding actions or differently framed.

6.1.1.5 Variant: Recycling of the negation 'inte'
A recurrent formal variant in the non-recorded, written down, corpus of apokoinou (Corpus B) is the doubling of the negation 'inte' (not) after the negated segment. When recycling a negation, the negation seems to be obligatory in the post-P, indicating that the post-P is actively used to not alter the informational content of the polarity value of the preposition in the pre-P (cf. Heineman 2005), but merely to strengthen or insist on it.

Two main variants will be presented here. The first example (6:6) is a full recycling where the speaker seems to insist on an assertion about some piece of clothing.

(6:6) Tight
Corpus B:PL[28]. In a clothing store: The shop assistant comments on a certain piece of clothing:
1. E: de är inte de där ↑ at be not those tight ↓ is not those tight ones isn't it

The second example (6:7) is an extended recycling where the post-P disambiguates an elliptic turn beginning as well as shifts perspective on the pivotal topic.

(6:7) Small roads
Corpus B:PL[13]. Talk about the French as drivers in Bretagne:
1. A: dom köjer ju som galningar där they drive like crazy there
2. B: ja, ja skulle inte villa köra bil där yes, I wouldn't want to drive there

segments are usually placed right after the pre-beginning phase of the turn (cf. Lindström 2006a).
The pre-P and pivot segment “*nu, inte på dom där småvägarna*” (no not on those small roads) is an elliptic response to speaker B’s statement on line 2, that he would not drive on small roads in France because of the crazy French drivers. When continuing beyond the pivot NP “*dom där småvägarna*” (those small roads), speaker A recycles “*skulle inte ja*” (wouldn’t I) from B’s previous turn with reversed word order. It seems as if this is done in order to specify exactly what is (elliptically) negated in the initial segment. The more general statement ‘*köra bil där*’ (drive there) in B’s turn is narrowed down by A to ‘*dom där småvägarna skulle inte ja ge mig på*’ (I wouldn’t try those small roads). Apparently it is not possible in Swedish to treat the negation as dispensable (Schegloff 2004) in post-P position. The negation is rather treated as indispensable (ibid.) despite the fact that speaker A has already negated the upcoming activity in turn initial position. The utterance is then further extended with a mitigation of the narrowing move. The incrementally added segment ‘*i första taget*’ (to begin with) does not definitely exclude the possibility of driving there later.

I have not found prototypical versions of this formal variant in the recorded Corpus A, which is the sole reason for using this kind of less reliable Corpus B-data in this study (but see Lagré 2004 for examples from Swedish talk). However, it seems that the negation-recycling apokoinou is a distinct formal variant of the symmetrical, recycling apokoinou formal configuration. The collection is not very large, and it is therefore hard to say anything conclusive about the functional potential of the variant. Nevertheless, speakers seem to be able to use the negation-recycling construction when resolving explanatory shifts, downgradings of epistemic certainty, insisting on negative assessments (e.g. ‘I am not X’), resuming a communicative project in response to a query, and (most commonly) disambiguating elliptic turn beginnings in response to queries and assertions.

6.1.2 Formal asymmetry: New elements in post-P

The other main prototypical formal configuration is mainly characterized by the production of *new linguistic material* in the post-P segment, although there are elements of recycling in these utterances as well. This formal method
results in the creation of a two faced structure resembling the Janus Head symbol (a stylized head with two different faces facing two opposite directions, see cover image). The two directions are in this case an image of how two different consecutive actions are constructed around the pivot. One action is built with the *premiss* segment and the next is built with the *following* segment, leaving the pivot with two different faces or perspectives. Some elements, such as a pronominal subject, can be doubled, but those are single elements among otherwise new contributions to the utterance. Speakers are for the most part doing different things using these types, compared to the recycling cases, but there may also be functional similarities, and mixed configurations as in extracts (6:6) and (6:7) above.

An initial categorization of the asymmetrical forms is based on how they are initiated (rhetorical or thematic pre-Ps), and a second on how they are closed (*heter*-constructions or epistemic comments in the post-Ps).

### 6.1.2.1 Rhematic pre-P Janus head

The asymmetrical subtype *Rhematic pre-P Janus head* is typically initiated with a rather heavy pre-P segment, introducing thematic material before entering a focused pivot segment, as in (6:8) below.

(6:8) Nineteen seventy

UNO1-32[34]. From Nattöppet (Night Trough), debate program on Swedish TV. One presenter with a panel of guests. PE=presenter (m), G=right wing politician from the large city committee (Storstadskommunen) (m).

1. G: ((...)) Sverige har halkat Sweden slipping behind and Sweden has slipped Sweden is falling behind and Sweden has been falling

2. ↑allvarligt efter å ett nittonsevinti.hh har vi behind seriously since nineteen seventy .hh have we

3. raett från andra till ochtonde plats i OECDligan fallen from second to eighteenth place in the OECD league

4. >hade vi haft samma standard i dag .hh som ((...)) if we had had the same standard today .hh as ((...))

The pre-P "Sverige har halkat ↑allvarligt efter" is a modified repetition of the previous statement, where the focused element "↑allvarligt" is thematic, followed by another thematic and focused NP pivot. This construction type is mainly to be contrasted against the
following type in (6:9) below that has a much lighter and more thematic pre-P.

6.1.2.2 Thematic pre-P Janus head

In extract (6:9) the speaker initiates the apokoinou utterance with a thematic segment "vi gör de" ("we’ll do that"), that mainly replicates what has been said in the preceding sequence, as a background for the upcoming utterance.

(6:9) Dancing salsa
U:MKL-524[6] From 'Måndagsklubben'/The Monday Club. Informal TV talk show with five participants. C=Clas Malmberg (co-presenter), R=Regina Lund (guest), Aud=Audience. C responds to a request from a person in the audience that he should dance salsa with R.

1. Aud: [ME:DE R E G I:](we'll do that)
2. R: [på ämnet] on the subject
3. R: [?] (hint)
4. C: [men] 
5. R: [on the subject]
6. C: [sa sa]
7. A: [vilja se] I would like to see
8. C: [good]

The thematic pre-Ps often introduce and points forward to upcoming thematic segments in the pivot or post-P in a way that rhematic pre-Ps do not since they constitute full contributions of their own. Also included in this category are utterances initiated with the continuative beginner ‘de+e’ (there’s), as well as demarcating variants (also see 11.4 below for a communicative analysis of both variants of Thematic pre-P Janus heads).
6.1.2.3 Post-P meta comments (with ‘heter, står, säga’)

A formal variant of the post-Ps, using a special group of verbs (heter, står, säga), involves language functions and activities such as naming, writing, saying and so on. They are used to establish a shift from talk about the content of the pivot in its referential meaning, to a meta perspective on the pivot form. Two formal variants are exemplified below.

The first one in extract (6c10) below is more productive and formally more flexible in relation to the pivot antecedent. In this extract, the apokoinou utterance is initiated with a light, merely introducing segment “då va re” (and then there was) that can be compared to the Thematic pre-P Janus Head (6.1.2.2 above). The introducing segment is followed by breathing elements that might indicate a word search activity. The speaker then produces a name that is exposed as the one searched for, and this focused name is then further extended with a segment initiated by “hette han” (was be named).

(6c10) Alvar

Coffee conversation in a private home environment between four senior women (65–75 years). A is the hostess and B, D and D are her guests. This extract is part of a longer sequence with talk about various memories of difficulties for women to combine working and taking care of children. [End of schisming sequence.]

1. A: ...hrr ... a::, (.) #då sa (ja de att du)=
   hh:: yes::, (.) then I said that you

2. B: [ ‘hesitig’ ]

3. A: om:: ju hur de låter hamma här >sa ja<.
   hear how it sounds here at home.

4. B: [ ja:: ]
   yes

5. B: [ ja:: ]
   yes

6. B: Omm:: ¿o om::
   And then what

7. A: om:: omn (0.5) [som runt om/om rungde runt]
   him that (0.5) who phoned around

8. B: [ >ja Alvar< (.) Alvar P’ettersson=] >ja Alvar< (.) Alvar Pettersson
The new finite verb "hette" (is named) takes as its syntactic beginning only the proper name element, not the whole preceding utterance, thereby retro-constructing 'Alvar' as a syntactic pivot. By using this past tense form of 'heter' (is named), the speaker shifts focus to the name as a name in a meta-commenting way. In this particular extract, the meta focus shift is extended with a second thematic segment that fills in on the nature of Alvar's actions, information that was not provided before the apokoinou focus shift was made. The utterance produced is all in all a hybrid between a Thematic pre-P Janus Head and a Post-P meta comment.

Extract (6:11) exemplifies another variant of the Post-P meta comment. This variant does a similar thing (i.e meta commenting after an NP pivot), but makes use of an idiomatic expression 'höll ja på å säga', (was I about to say) and it is therefore less formally flexible.

(6:11) The firm USAINF/21-2475[6]. Coffee conversation in a private home environment between four senior women (65−75 years). A is the hostess and B, D and D are her guests. They talk about a common acquaintance, Morberg, who was a treasurer in a 'senior citizens' society.

1. B: [han va] kass"o:]] "vet du" it was the treasurer now
2. A: [ja] yes
3. B: [a da [va re] ju dälit me a::hh dälit "me:::" and then was it PRT bad with a::hh bad with
4. A: [om::] [om::]
5. B: f:i man höll ja på å säga d:e e väl bättre nu då? business about it on and say it is PRT better now then business was I about to say it is probably better now
6. (1.1)
This is the case with “va de” (“was it/it was”) in extract (6:12) below.\textsuperscript{47}

\begin{quote}
\textit{(6:12) The fifteenth of May} U\textsuperscript{SYV1}\19. From talk within a student counseling session. Participants: V=counselor L=client (20-24 years), P=client (20-24 years). Talk about different educational alternatives with different application dates.
\end{quote}

1. (1.2)

2. P: pt.hh >>för ja tänkte<< >elle ja så de nu<

3. Bergh’s had the fifteenth May was it

4. (0.2)

These post-Ps are comments on the epistemic status of some aspect of the pivot, although not aspects of its linguistic form. In extract (6:12) there is no shift to a meta perspective. The construction deals with the pivot within the same perspective as the pre-P.

\section*{6.2 Syntactically less integrated formal configurations}

Utterances within the group of \textit{Syntactically less integrated formal configurations} are constructed with orientation to the prototypical constructional schema of the apokoinou, but exhibits a lower degree of integrated conversational syntax than the categories in section 6.1 (cf. Norén 2005). The less integrated categories are:

- Syntactically open initial phases (pre-P+pivot segment)
- Repair activities within apokoinou phases
- Reported speech units framed by full recycling segments
- Apokoinou utterances with full-clause phases

\subsection*{6.2.1 Syntactically open initial phases (pre-P+pivot segment)}

Orienting towards a prototypical apokoinou involves bringing an utterance towards a projected SYN-PCP\textsuperscript{48} (syntactic possible completion point) and

\textsuperscript{47} The idiomatic translation of these types of post-Ps must be represented with reversed word order in English compared to Swedish. The consequence is that the English counterparts are not really possible to analyze as apokoinou utterances (also see appendix 3.)
then expanding it with a doubled constituent, typically a finite verb. The expansion is typically done at the first SYN-PCP in the apokoinou utterance, but in apokoinou utterances with heavy pre-Ps, it can also be done at the point of the second (or more rarely the third) SYN-PCP.

However, there is also a group of apokoinou utterances produced with a second finite verb before a projected SYN-PCP is reached. The syntactic progression of segment A (the pre-P + pivot segment) is ‘cut-off’ and left syntactically open. This description sounds like the anacoluthon phenomenon, defined as a cut-off structure or fragment in its sequential context (cf. Selting 2001). However, it is not an anacoluthon since the utterance as a whole is grouped together prosodically as one unit. In addition, the second finite verb is grouped together with the final element or segment in the ongoing utterance, a fact that underscores the cohesive nature of the whole construction. These syntactically cut-off but prosodically cohesive utterances are divided into two categories on the basis of the communicative work that is done with segment A.

6.2.1.1 Light pre-P and full NP pivot

The first type with a syntactically open first structure is characterized by light elements in the pre-P followed by a focused full NP pivot. The pre-P typically contains a light verb such as ‘vara’, ‘vill’, ‘tro’, (in, want, believe) in combination with a pronominal argument such as ‘de’, ‘si’, ‘vi’ (it, I, we). In an even lighter variant the pre-P contains only a pronominal subject, sometimes preceded by a response-particle, or even a single preposition.

In (6.13) below, segment A is left open at the point of “men så hade Madness” (but then had Madness). At the end of the pivot ‘Madness’, a continuation of the TCU is projected syntactically, prosodically and pragmatically.

(6.13) Madness

L:LiCTI:TT3-101[5]. From ‘Tryck till’ (Push It), a talk show on TV about music. Participants: M=presenter (m), J= guest (m), Jo= guest (f), H=guest (m). Talk about a music video with special effects.

1. J: ((CONT. OF LONG TURN)) ja tror första I think the first

2. gateja men vårtid (.) såg de va dels time I saw it was partly

6 Note that this is not to be confused with a transition relevance place (TRP). Had it been a TRP, the further expansion would be an increment.
3. Black- Black or white men så hade Madness

4. Ah körde någ: eh (0.3) te am
   Ah ran some eh tv-commercial

5. För sin samlingstreta dokumental: eh då hade ((...))
   for their collection-record and then had
   for their greatest hits collection

In this context, speaker J continues with the second light finite verb “körde” (did) after a short in-breath. Apart from the incomplete syntax, a first process of completion projection is activated using a primary focus on “Madness”, which simultaneously opens up for a continuation beyond the NP, which in this case is done with a second finite verb.

The target utterance involves aspects of repair on the surface. The change from a light copula ‘hade’ (had) to another light verb ‘körde’ (did) after an intermediate in-breath could indicate a replacement of the first with the second. But in the position in the turn where it is used, the function of the light pre-P is to start up the new TCU and introduce the main NP in the TCU. Only after the local task of beginning and introduction is accomplished, does speaker J go on with a light main verb ‘körde’ (did) that retroconstructs the previous NP as the syntactic beginning of the main activity, a report.

The first thematic element of the new TCU (“Madness”) is introduced with a light pre-segment that merely starts up the TCU. This is opposed to another formal type with an open structure configuration that is even less prototypical, as exemplified below.

6.2.1.2 Light (pronominal) elements in both pre-P and pivot

In (6.14) below, a rhematic element is not yet introduced when the speaker J moves on from an initiated cleft construction to a straight main clause construction. A possible (and communicatively relevant) continuation of ‘de ja vill’ (what I want) is ‘är att kunna ha...’ (is to be able to have...).

(6.14) New material
   L:LiCTI:TT5[10]. From ‘Tryck till’ (Push It), a talk show on TV about music. Participants: M=presenter (m), J= guest (m), Jo= guest (f), I=guest (f). Talk at the end of the show about what the guest will do the following week.
   1. M: *tack tack* .hh: eh: J
   thanks thanks: Ah eh: John Thelin: your weekend
The use of that strategy would have produced a cleft construction. Instead, the TCU is elaborated with the verb ‘kunna ha’ (be able to have) without the intermediate ‘är att’ (is to), a strategy that produces a main clause construction that begins with the segment “nu vill” (I want). The initial ‘de’ is left out from segment B and therefore forms a pre-P candidate.

To enter into post-P talk before a rhematic element of the TCU is introduced, would have implications for how the utterance can be continued and responded to. The type exemplified with (6:13) has some interesting functional potential that will be analyzed in the chapters below. The type in (6:14), however, is better described as an anadiplosis, a syntactic and prosodic projection process that is cut-off in its sequential context, or at least as a boundary case of apokoinou utterance. This type will not be analyzed communicatively in this study.
6.2.2 Repair activities within apokoinou phases

It is important to recognize that the apokoinou constructional schema is not in itself a source of repair, i.e. it does not imply something problematical that needs to be fixed (as a narrow definition of repair implicates), not even in the sense of acting as if something is being fixed when it is actually not (as a wider definition of repair implicates). But there repair activities can occur within an apokoinou phase. As a consequence of these activities, the conversational syntax will sometimes get slightly broken up. When repair results in a definitive utterance cut-off (with or without a new attempt to start a similar construction) the resulting product (even if similar at first glance) is not categorized as an apokoinou utterance or an orientation to the ACM (cf. ch. 5.3.2.2). The repair method of solving local communicative tasks often results in a “blend back to untroubled talk” (Schegloff 1979) with a (more or less) sustained utterance progression. I have called these actions resuming of a turn’s progression (in ch. 10.3.1). There are two main kinds of formal apokoinou configurations that co-occur with repair activities.

6.2.2.1 Repair in the pivot

Typically the repair activities occur in the pivot, with the usual elements of cut-off words and pauses (as in 6:15 below), but also hesitation words (eh) and vowel lengthenings (as in 6:16 below), resulting in a less integrated prosodic contour.

6:18 Weekly homework

GGS/CL-W[10]. From talk in a private home environment during preparing for dinner. Speakers: S=Sofie (oldest daughter), P=Pia (middle daughter). Also present: U= Ulla (mother). Pia has attended a new upper high school program the same day and her mother has been questioning her about which major subjects she will take and which teachers she will have. Pia is not visible on the video.

1. S: ne:j¿ no
2. (4.9) ((U and S are busy at the stove))
   we   got      like-here   weekly he-                homework         got       we
   we got like weekly he- (.) homework (.) we got
4. (1.7)
5. P: de kunde man ha >hon säger typ,<
   you could have that The says like
The utterance progression is maintained by means of repair in the first instance and then by way of an apokoinou post-P. Parts of the pivot are in effect erased, i.e. the post-P builds on ‘veckoläxor’ (weekly homework) rather than on all the material in the pivot. The typical post-P in such cases recycles the pre-P verb only (partial recycling) or the verb and pronominal subject (full recycling).

6.2.2.2 Repair in pre-P and pivot

Other variants of apokoinou utterances with repair activities, which also result in a less integrated prosodic contour, are built when the repair project is initiated in the pre-P and closed in the pivot. In (6:16) below the speaker Claes is starting a word search (he begins to recall a town name) in the segment "och hh: då de ii:: eh: (.)" using a stuttering-like repetition, a hesitation marker, and lengthening of vowels – all linguistic markers of repair activities.

(6:16) In Lund
U:UMKL:104[25]. From ‘Måndagsklubben’ (The Monday Club), an informal TV talk show. Participants: A=Presenter (f), C=co-presenter (m), Ad=co-presenter (m), R=guest, B=guest, Aud=audience. Speaker C does a private advertising for a music event in the city of Lund.

1. C: =ja va [nämligen] inbjuden å va konferencier
   I was you see invited to be the presenter

2. A:       [varsågod]
   go on

3. C: =på de där hh: Dalai Lama kommer ti Sverige
   on that Dalai Lama comes to Sweden
   on that Ah Dalai Lama comes to Sweden

4. () den den sextonde mej [] och [hh: ]=
   the the sixteenth May and
   the the sixteenth May and

5. A:       [mmhm,]

6. C: =då de ii:: eh: Lund [hh: ]= =
then it in eh Lund coming he to
then it’s in eh Lund will he come to

7. den sjuttonde () där finns de en (0.2) *eh*
   the seventeenth and there is it a
   on the seventeenth and there is a

8. väldit *eh:* en e= en e
   very eh: a very enthusiastic for Tibet som
   very eh: a real enthusiast for Tibet som

9. validit "eh:" en e= en e
   very eh: a very enthusiast for Tibet som
   very eh: a real enthusiast for Tibet som

10. =och de ii:: eh: (.)
   and it in eh (.)

11. *eh:* en e
    very eh: a very
The resolving of the problem is displayed in the pivot. When the speaker recollects the name of the city ("LUND"), he produces it with strong emphasis (increased intensity and pitch rise). The pre-P+pivot segment together constitute a self-initiated self-repair construction (cf. Schegloff et al. 1977). Together with the following elaboration on what was to take place in the town in question, the whole shaded utterance segment forms an apokinou utterance. In this case the post-P does not recycle material from the utterance beginning, but changes perspective, making the whole sequence into a less integrated variant of the "Thematic pre-P Janus head" type. It should be noted that the post-P could also be analyzed as the final part in a more symmetric apokinou utterance, where the elements "kommer ti" (comes to) on line 3 are recycled, and "han" on line 6 is a pronominalization of "Dalai Lama" on line 3.

### 6.2.3 Reported speech units framed by quotation clauses

One less syntactically integrated sub-type of the Full recycling type in chapter 6.1.1.1 is characterized by the reported speech units framed by quotation clauses. Formally, the second quotation clause recycles the subject (pronominal or a full NP-name), together with a past or present tense cognitive verb form ("sa ja", "tänkte ja" − said I, thought I). These clauses are typically framing a pivot with reported speech or thought. The post-P phase is typically initiated with the verb, in this case (extract 6.17 below) resulting in a non-reversed word order (but inverted in a grammatical sense, see appendix 3).

(6.17) At home

**USATNE317(a)**. Coffee conversation in a private home environment between four senior women (65–75 years). A is the hostess and B, D and E are her guests. Speaker A is telling about something she said many years ago.

1. A: .hh[:::] a::, (.) då  sa ja de att du hör = yes then said I it that you hear

2. B: [..nå]\]

3. A: = ju hur de låter hemma här >sa ja<. [ja: så:]= PRT how it sounds here at home I said yes so-

4. B: [ ..ari ]

   yes
The reported (quoting) segment is here syntactically integrated with the pre-P segment as part of a subordinating 'de att' (this that) construction (in (6:17)). The post-P is produced with increased articulation speed and without focus, indicating that the 'sa ja' (said I) in this case is used as a construction-like tag, hooked on to a quotation.

As was mentioned in 6.1.1.4 above, an alternative way of reusing material from the pre-P is to keep the internal ordering of the verb-subject elements, as in (6.18) below.

(6:18) The old cat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>[U:SÅINF:43[68]]</th>
<th>From another coffee conversation in a private home between four senior women (65–75 years). A is the hostess and B, D and D are her guests. Here speaker B initiates a second story to a previous story about an old cat.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>B: men du de va et som hade en blomstersaffär</td>
<td>but y'know there was one that had a flower shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>som hade en katt där .hh någonstans på Storbacken</td>
<td>that had a cat there. hh somewhere on Large Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>då (.) och (.) och (.) och (.) och (.)</td>
<td>then and then said I how old is this here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>kalten sa [ja].</td>
<td>cat I said</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>A:</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>B: tjugostreck år sa'én</td>
<td>twenty-six years she said</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In (6.18), the TCU is begun with a connective particle “åsså”, which thereby comes to occupy the front-field. This, in turn, results in a non-inverted post-P.

The pre-P quotation clause may also come as a less integrated separate syntactic and prosodic unit, as in (6.19) below, but it can still be argued that it is tied to the quotation segment with prosodic means. The pivot is heard as a projected semantic continuation of the turn, even though the pre-P is prosodically marked with a final intonational drop, and even though the pivot is marked with pitch-reset. Thus, the pre-P is prosodically exposed, as compared to when integrating the quotation clause and quote in the same
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prosodic contour, but still tied to the following quote through semantic projection.

(6:19) Begin working
USAINF51[79]. Drawn from the same coffee conversation with senior women as in (6:17) above. Part of a longer sequence with tellings of different memories. A (the hostess) tells about various difficulties she had to combine work with taking care of her children. Maria is her daughter who helped her taking care of the younger siblings.

   so then there went by f) one and a half years

2. D: ↑[så]:
   yeah

3. A: ↑[så] så Maria[.] det blev ina t t.jpg
   then said Maria
   then Maria said f) now mother you can

4. ↑[så] jobba så hon nu mamma får du nu
   start to work she said now I will look after
   now Maria said (.) now mother you can

5. B: ↑[så]:
   yeah

6. D: |h:ja[
   yes

7. A: ↑[så] debrörsna så hon[.] där fick[
   the little brothers she said f) then she got

8. B: | ja[| men[|]
   yes | but

Participants orient to this projection as they wait with responses until the quote is initiated or, as in 6:18, closed. The post-P in 6:19 follows smoothly, and is less tag-like than in the previous extract.

6.2.4 Complex sentence level apokoinou utterances

With excerpt (6:14) as the possible exception, all formal types above have the central feature of a pivot more or less integrated into the intra-sentential syntax of the preceding and following phases within the limits of simple syntactic units. There is, however, one group of apokoinou utterances that work with sententially complex syntactic units, i.e. where the post-P phase corresponds to a coordinate clause type (as defined in written language grammar). Typically, the post-P is initiated with the particle ‘så’ (then),
Apokoinou forms thereby constructing one out of three different types of relationships with the preceding TCUs or utterance segments within the apokoinou utterance (square brackets are clause limits).

- Conditional: \([X] \text{[if]} [Y] \text{[then]} [Z]\)
- Consequential: \([X] \text{[when]} [Z]\)
- Resuming: \([X \text{ ADVL} n] \text{[then]} [Z]\)

The apokoinou segments in these utterances are syntactically demarcated clauses, which might contribute to making them available for retro-construction as pivots.

6.2.4.1 ‘Så’-initiated post-Ps: Conditional relation

As can be seen in (6:20) below, this configuration is initiated with a declarative matrix clause and extended with a conditional clause: \(['X\text{ DECL}\] ['om' (if) \(Y\)]]. The conditional clause is then further extended with a new (‘så’-initiated) matrix clause \(['så' (then) \(Z\)].

(6:20) The words SÖFT17GR-637(107) From a group discussion at a conference on language and identity, C=panel chair M=panel member. In this excerpt they talk about the connection between social structures and the words that are borrowed into the Finnish and Swedish languages in Finland.

1. C: ((...)) men men <then> att but but (.) but I think that
2. de (.) de va en: troske bra poäng .hh eh (.) it (.) it was a very good point .hh eh (.)
3. du sa sa� sa att eh (1.4) pt eh: (.)] you said this that that eh (1.4) pt eh: (.)
4. du sa sa� sa att eh (1.4) pt eh: (.)] you said this that that eh (1.4) pt eh: (.)
5. du sa sa� sa att eh (1.4) pt eh: (.)] you said this that that eh (1.4) pt eh: (.)
6. du sa sa� sa att eh (1.4) pt eh: (.)] you said this that that eh (1.4) pt eh: (.)
7. du sa saх sa att eh (1.4) pt eh: (.)] you said this that that eh (1.4) pt eh: (.)
8. du sa saх sa att eh (1.4) pt eh: (.)] you said this that that eh (1.4) pt eh: (.)
9. du sa saх sa att eh (1.4) pt eh: (.)] you said this that that eh (1.4) pt eh: (.)
Apokoinou in Swedish Talk-in-Interaction

8. kommer i i i finlandsvenskan. [0.8] as enter into Finland Swedish (0.8) then

9. måste väl de anda va en skillnad mot eh that must still be different from

10. [.] måste att ha en upp-attning maybe to have one set of

11. gemensamma diskurspartiklar: common discourse particles

12. (1.0)

13. M: hh::[::]

The ‘så’-initiated clause ‘så måste de väl ändå va …’[then that must still be] retrospectively constructs the previous conditional segment as a syntactic clausal pivot, and the two matrix clauses come to function as pre- and post-Ps.

6.2.4.2 ‘Så’-initiated post-Ps: Consequential relation

As can be seen in extract (6:21) below, this configuration is initiated with a declarative matrix clause ‘a de blir ju så’ [yeah that’s how it gets], expanded with an adverbial temporal clause ‘när man bläddrar mycke i laget också’ (when you flip through the team a lot as well): [XDECL] [‘när’ (when) Z].

(6:21) Misunderstandings

1. H: #Sverige får inte kontroll på pucken.#  ((#strained)) Sweden can’t get in control of the puck.

2. =+Iginla+,

3. (1.0)

4. E: a de blir ju när man bläddrar mycket i laget yes it becomes not that when you flip through much in team-the yeah that’s how it gets when you flip through the team a lot
5. **misförstånd** să avs för andra

The temporal adverbial clause is then further expanded with a ‘så’-initiated consequential clause [‘så’ (then) Z]. The addition of the ‘så’-clause ‘så blir ja missförstånd’ (then misunderstandings arise) retro-constructs the preceding temporal ADVL ‘när man bläddrar mycket i laget också’ (when you flip through the team a lot as well) as a syntactic clause-pivot, and the two surrounding clauses thus come to function as pre- and post-Ps.

6.2.4.3 ‘Så’-initiated post-Ps: Resuming relation

In (6:22) below, the last phase of the apokoinou utterance is initiated with a ‘så’ (then) that constructs a different connective relation than above.

(6:22) Generally speaking

L: LiCTI:B:64L-467[152]. Talk between a pregnant woman and a gynecologist at a Swedish Maternity health care centre (Mödravårdscentrum, MVC). L=Gynecologist (f), K=Woman, Cajsa Karlsson (20-25 years, having her first baby). Ultrasound examination. Talk about the woman’s uneasy attitude towards another cesarean section operation.

1. K: å: >så uppståt< dom att eh (.) hon

2. >skulle inte< kunna föda henne he:

3. ↑vanlig väg, för att hennes: [sva]ns]kota?=

4. L:                             [ ja ]

5. K: =va:

6. L: jaha (.) va de här?=

7. K: =[(fej) wrng]
Here the 'så'-segment is not a typical conjunction, but more of a resuming particle. It is produced after an intermediate adverbial segment, and basically marks the utterance (turn, TCU) as still in progress after an inserted pivot-segment that both come to function as a specifying move (it is about narrowness in the pelvis), and a generalizing move (it is about the general phenomenon of narrowness). The configuration typically comes with a light de-focused segment as pre-P, which is expanded with one or more adverbial segments of different types [X ADVL n] as pivot. The adverbial is retro-constructed as a pivot with a 'så'-initiated post-P segment that constitutes the main topic of the turn ['så' Z] (in this case that narrowness is an unusual condition).

6.3 AU's produced as increments and co-constructions

Increments and co-constructions are not easily placed within any of the above mentioned formal categories. In chapter 5 they were both treated as apokoinou-related phenomena with possible pivots. The production of increments and co-construction are generally used methods of utterance production that have the potential of operating on all formal apokoinou
types. Therefore, they are viewed as more general kinds of grammatical methods of engaging in communicative projects (also see 3.5.1.1–2) rather than grammatical constructions in a stricter sense. The degree of utterance integration on a more abstract level can vary in the apokoinou-like utterances that are products of these methods. Prosodically, they are always exposed as separate chunks (less integrated), but the increment and the second move in a co-constructed turn sequence are always marked as continuations (no pitch-reset), thereby constructing integration. Syntactically, the increment and the second move in a co-constructed turn sequence can add constituents within the sentence brace of the preceding unit (more integrated), or add elements (e.g. extrapolations, clauses) outside the sentence brace (less integrated).

The formal end-products of all three methods — the use of apokoinou utterances, incrementally added segments, or the continuation of someone else’s utterance — are the same if we disregard from the prosodic packaging. This indicates that these methods exploit aspects of the same emergent utterance syntax, and therefore belong to a wider family of phenomena that also includes apokoinou. The apokoinou utterances produced as increments and/or co-constructions differ from the rest because they are variants of the other types.

6.3.1 Increments
Apokoinou utterances can be prosodically and syntactically re-opened after a prosodic terminal on the previous unit (as shown in more detail in 7.3 below). Retro-constructions of pivots in the shape of increments come in three different sequential positions. The first is produced after a silent pause. The second is produced after an intermediate continuer by some other speaker. The third is produced after the onset of a new turn by some other speaker.

6.3.1.1 Increments after completion and silent pause
In extract (6:23) below speaker B produces a (reversed) full recycling of the segment “ja tyckte” after a focused and creaky closing of the previous turn unit and a short pause. Compared to the closing of the pivot, the post-P increment is more clearly marked as closed with a fall to low. In a sense, the increment segment belong to a group of V1-constructions that can be used by speakers to position themselves towards other participants regardless of
Before we had men

Coffee conversation in a private home environment between four senior women (65–75 years). A is the hostess and B, D and E are her guests. They once worked at the same mental hospital and they are sharing memories from this time.

1. **A**: [(ja .)]
   yes

2. **B**: [ _hh:: ] men >eh men< starka va
   but but strong were

3. **E**: ju kär limestone .hh [säl] tyckte man hade
   and I thought we had
   the men. Ah and I thought we had

4. **D**: [ mm ]

5. **B**: [ ]om man hade mänen
   it good then before we had men

6. **D**: [jupit e]
   right

7. **E**: [(0.2)]

8. **B**: tyckte ja
   thought I

9. **D**: _hh::illllll

6.3.1. Increment after an intermediate continuer

In extract (6:24) speaker C produces a (reversed) full recycling of the segment "ja får" after a 1.4 sec. pause and continuer from WO and a second pause. As in (6:23), the creaky increment in (6:24) is more clearly marked for closure than the unit it extends. Speaker C slows down his utterance towards the closing of the turn on line 6 and 7, which speaks in favor of a possible closure on the pivot (the focus on ‘månda’ is secondary rather than primary).
(6:24) On Monday
L: Conference talk at a social welfare office. Participants: WO= Welfare officer (f), C= Client (m). Talk about C’s unemployment.

1. WO: [>[de här me å tacka ne] 
   that thing with that thing with saying no

2. ti jobb eller tycker att *eh* sju att... to jobs or think that seven five and that

3. de e for lågt.

4. C: [JA] MEN INTE SÅ TA VÄT
   yes but yes it’s not like that I know

5. ATT JA FÅR UT MEN PÅ ÄNDA annan måste: that I can get more in other places and

6. att för ju att får här från Åbro bryggeri nu på
   I receive the answer here from Åbro breweries now on

7. I will
   (0.8)

8. (1.4)

9. MO: nothing
   (0.8)

10. (1.8)

11. C: [JA] MEN
    will

12. (1.8)

The obvious difference from the previous extract is that the continuer creates a different sequential environment for speaker C than was the case for speaker B. (See extract 9:17 for a more detailed communicative analysis of this increment.)

6.3.1.3 Increment after the onset of a turn competitive response
In the following extract (6:25), speaker P continues after a long 2.0 second pause and immediately after speaker U begins her response on line 5. P produces a full recycling that is continued, as compared with the case in (6:24). The continuation comes to function as a bridging move to the third and
(6.25) Agnes

GGSIL-W[02]. Talk while preparing dinner in home environment. Participants: U=Ulla (mother), P=Pia Wallenberg (daughter). Talk about one of Pia’s teachers in school.

1. F: vi har bara haft Agnes och så Åsa då på morrssamlingen
   we have only had Agnes and then Åsa there in the morning assembly

2. .hh så ha vi haft: mex vi ha bara haft det
   and then we had: not we have only had then

3. (1.2) Agnes
   (1.2) Agnes

4. (2.0)

5. U: "Aha [pese va e de för nån egentligen."
   Agnes who’s that really

6. P: [>ha vi haft. vi har haft Agnes, .hh] så så
   have we had. we have had Agnes and then

7. en annan (.) sån tant som är int visste va hon hette
   another one (.) like lady that I didn’t know the name of

6.3.2 Co-constructions

Apokoinou can also be produced in the shape of a macro-unit that is co-constructed by two participants. In extract (6.26) below, speakers A and C cooperate to construct the name “Almunge”.

(6.26) Almunge

USAINF[53][83]. Coffee conversation in a private home environment between four senior women (65–75 years). A is the hostess and B, D and D are her guests. A tells about a walk she once went for.

1. A: .hh då när vi gick en där Löv
   .hh then when we walked that Löv

2. (. ) eh då: eh [>när vi kom upp ti Rund-<]
   (. ) eh then eh when we came up to Rund-

3. C: [ var ↑gick ni ] ifrån.
   where did you start from

4. A: .hh: vi gick eh: vi gick ut till en: .hh:
   we walked we went out to
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Speaker A only produce the first two sound elements "A- Al:- l- hh::" before an out-breath. At this point in the utterance speaker C fills in the whole name of the place "[Almunge right]" in overlap with the out-breath. When C is almost finished with the whole name, A continues where she gave up and spells out the rest of the name "[munge]" in response to and overlap with C's fill-in. As a result, the proper name NP is a co-construction that is produced incrementally over three consecutive turns. The whole NP is then, after a confirmative response from C on line 11, retro-constructed as the syntactic beginning of a comment by A "heter de ja." (it it called). (Also see (10:16) below, where the pivot segment as a whole is co-constructed by two speakers in the shape of an NP that is extended by an apposition.)
Extract (6:27) below exemplifies yet another type of co-constructed apokoinou, where one speaker produces the pre-P and a second speaker produces the pivot and post-P segments. (A more detailed analysis of this extract was made in (5:9) above).

(6:27) Upplandia

U:LC:16:PO10:01[17]. Phone call to an emergency alarm call center about a non-emergency ordering of an ambulance. Participants: O=operator (f), C=Caller (f) employed at the General hospital.

1. C: då vill ja beställa <en sån vid> (.).
   Then I will order one of those around

2. O: ett eller två tiden;
   one or around two

3. O: från
   from

4. O: sjutti a?
   seventy a

5. C: ja?
   yes

6. (0.6)

7. O: i halv två tage.
   around half past one

8. C: ja?
   yes

9. (1.4)

10. O: och ska till: eh:
    and will be

11. (0.2)

12. C: Västlandsbruk Upplandia (0.9) heter re-
    Västlandsbruk Upplandia (0.9) is named

13. O: =mm:hm?

14. (0.7)

15. C: Smedvägen ett Västlands bruk,
    Smedvägen one Västlands bruk
Apokoinou forms

The emergency alarm call operator asks a question on line 10, formatted as a declarative with a left out segment in final position – a *slot-leaving interrogative* (Linell 2004), and speaker C fills-in the relevant next response on line 12. The segment is then extended with a "*heter re*,” (is it called), that retro-constructs the element "*Upplandia*,” as a syntactic pivot. The apokoinou-like character of the co-construction as a whole is achieved in interplay with the slot-leaving interrogative.

6.4 Overview of apokoinou forms

A simple overview of the apokoinou forms found in the data is presented in table 6:1 on the next page. The table is divided into three groups, comprising Recyclings, Janus heads and Syntactically less integrated forms. These groups are all distributed in three columns, where the first column from the left contains AUs with post-Ps produced as integrated extensions. The second column contains AUs where the post-P is produced as an increment. The third column contains AUs co-constructed by more than one speaker and the last column the total number of each apokoinou form. Note that 9 occurrences belong to Corpus B (recyclings of the negation ‘inte’ (not)).

The presentation of the number of occurrences does not say anything about the function of the phenomenon of apokoinou in Swedish talk as such. It is simply a way of describing the corpus from a formal point of view. I have not made any attempts to investigate how, exactly, the formal types are distributed on functional potentials (or vice versa) because of the multifunctionality of many apokoinou utterances. I have, however, tried to sketch the connections between main forms and main functional domains, but this is done elsewhere, in chapter 12, and made on qualitative grounds only. A systematic analysis of how the formal types are distributed on factors such as activity types, or dynamic discourse genres has also been excluded from this study, since the corpus is not designed for this kind of analysis.

The co-constructed apokoinou utterances are few but the three occurrences are all built using lexical renewal. Maybe this is connected to the fact that many symmetrical apokoinou is used for self-confirmations and insistence on the speakers own responses (see ch. 12). The second part of a co-construction is placed in a sequential position where such moves are impossible. To construct an apokoinou utterance as an increment, however, seems to be a more generally available method and is not connected to a particular type of formal method to retro-construct post-P, such as lexical
Table 6.1. Occurrences of apokoinou forms in Swedish talk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal type</th>
<th>Post-P Prod.</th>
<th>Pre-P Prod.</th>
<th>Pre-P Prod. as increment</th>
<th>Total #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECYCLINGS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full recyclings</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial recyclings</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended full recyclings</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial extended recyclings</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total #</strong></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JANUS HEADS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janus heads without lexical slots</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janus heads with lexical post-P slots for ‘heter’, ‘står’, and ‘så ja på å sige’</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janus heads with lexical post-P slots for ‘va de’, ‘a de’, ‘mor ja’ etc.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total #</strong></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Syntactically less integrated forms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling with ‘så’ constructions</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling of negation ‘inte’ (Corpus B)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubling of single syntactic constructions, e.g. ADVLs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Ps initiated with ‘så’ or ‘då’</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Ps initiated with ‘gör’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total #</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total #** 132  23  3  158

Recycling or renewal. However, as will be shown in chapter 9 below, there seems to be a functional distribution of apokoinou increments on post-Ps that are used to confirm, insist or focus on the previous move, rather than, say, resume an activity of some sort (also see ch. 12 for a further comment).

6.5 Brief summary and discussion

In this chapter I have presented the formal types of apokoinou as found in Corpus A and, in a limited respect, also Corpus B. These forms are
presented in table 6:1 above and are divided into three groups. The first two groups are the main formal types: recyclings (symmetrically produced apokoinou utterances), and Janus heads (asymmetrically produced apokoinou utterances). Utterances in these groups are most clearly produced in orientation to the constructional schema of apokoinou regarding the level of syntactic integration of the pivot in the preceding and following segments. The third group contains syntactically less integrated types in terms of the syntactic integration of the pivot in the surrounding utterance phases (e.g. ‘så’-initiated post-Ps on the clause level), or whether the pivot stands out as phase in the utterance (e.g. final doublings of single constituents or ‘göra’ (do)-constructions where the pivot becomes more fuzzy than in utterances with other finite verb forms in the post-P).

All types within all three groups, except for increments and co-constructions, can be produced as more or less integrated within a single prosodic contour. Some utterances are produced with continuous phonation, and some are produced with micro pauses, hesitation words, inbreaths etc. The main criteria for including utterances in the corpus have been that they conform to the formal syntactic and prosodic patterns of apokoinou (prototypical and less prototypical patterns), and that speakers do not display signs of cut-off + restart activities (i.e. anacoluthons).

If compared to the literature on apokoinou-like phenomena, some of the forms found in the present corpus of Swedish talk-in-interaction have been described in previous studies by Saari (1975) and Linell (1980), but from a more grammatical perspective. However, some of the formal variants in this study have not been described before, such as the ‘så’/‘då’ (then)-initiated post-P variants, and the epistemic post-P comment ‘va de’ (was it).

If comparing the forms presented in this chapter with the forms described in the literature on apokoinou-like phenomena in other languages, most of the forms in this study have equivalent constructions at least somewhere, perhaps with an exception for the ‘va de’ type. The negation-doubling type in final position also seems to be an exclusively Swedish phenomenon, but there might be a similar construction in Finnish, where the verb-like negation particle ‘ei’ (not) is recycled, although not in construction-final position. The basic categorization of the forms in symmetric and asymmetric forms was originally made on German and Dutch by Franck (1985) and then used in Scheutz (2005). The ‘så’-variant on complex clause level has an equivalent construction in Finnish and German. Full recyclings also occur in German and in Finnish (but not in English), and (extended) partial recyclings are found in Danish and German.
Janus heads without lexical slots occur in English and Finnish. The Janus head-variant with the ‘heter’ (as called) constructions in the post-P are found in Norwegian and German.

This inter-linguistic overview of forms is not exhaustive because systematic corpus based studies of apokoinou-like constructions in talk have only been made on German (Scheutz 2005), English (Walker 2004) and Swedish (this study). In addition, Walker’s study is mainly phonetic and interactional and thus not focused on identifying formal types. It is therefore too early to make systematic comparisons between languages.
7 Syntax, prosody, and communicative projects

7.1 Introduction
This chapter will be focused on syntax and prosody as the participants' formal resources for the building of apokoinou utterances and the main theoretic tools for analyzing and describing these resources in their communicative contexts. Syntax and prosody will be treated as different but interdependent methods for the active organization of apokoinou utterance production (cf. Selting 1996, Auer 1996b, Steensig 2001a, 2001b, Linell 2004, 2005a), rather than simply formal properties of static utterance products. Two key activities from the point of view of apokoinou utterance building will be addressed. The first is the participant's simultaneous organization of non-adductive and projective processes, i.e. how a participant's local linguistic decisions continuously change the meaning and impact of the preceding and change the context for following talk (cf. ch. 2 above on the dialogical dimensions of utterance production). The second key activity is the participant's joint organization of the active integrating and demarcating of apokoinou utterance phases in recognizable and interactively relevant linguistic units such as TCUs, turns and sequences.

This study is mainly centered on linguistic units and the resources used in order to construct them. However, speakers in face-to-face interaction are of course active within a multi-modal environment, where non-linguistic resources such as gaze, body posture, gestures and aspects of the participants' arrangements within the physical environment (cf. Goodwin 2000, Mondada 2006) are important, all of which may be made relevant by the participants.

Relevant features of the multi-modal methods and environment will be used when available for analysis. It should be noted, however, that only 68 out of the 169 apokoinou utterances in Corpus A (see ch. 4 above) are video recorded. In addition, in the sub-corpus of apokoinou video-clips, the apokoinou speaker is not always visible when uttering the apokoinou. In addition, 17 utterances are drawn from phone calls. These circumstances make it hard to do multi-modal analysis in a systematic way.49

49 However, the video has been used in single analyses even though the speaker is not visible, such as in the analysis of extract (8:2) below, where the speaker orients to events that are
7.2 Syntax

Syntax is used both prospectively and retrospectively by apokoinou speakers as a method to tie different actions together within recognizable coherent interactional units. Prospectively, syntax is used to project possible continuations as well as possible completions of the ongoing utterance. As Auer (2005) has argued, these projections are closely connected to and even emerge from participants' organization of action trajectories within sequences. Retrospectively, syntax is used as a method to renegotiate past and ongoing projections. When continuing beyond the pivot of an apokoinou utterance (AU), the speaker integrates the continuation within the emerging utterance in and through retro-constructing the previous segment/element as a syntactic beginning.

In the prototypical formal configurations, the pivot ends in a possible syntactic closure, which will then be overruled (so to speak) by the syntactic continuation into the post-P segment. In less prototypical configurations the pivot does not end in a possible syntactic closure, and the syntactic continuation beyond the pivot does not overrule a possible closing that has already occurred, but it still 'breaks' an ongoing projection process. In these cases, the possible syntactic closure is not overruled in retrospect, but rather prospectively. Within a traditional (theoretical and hierarchical) view of syntax this "break" will motivate an analysis of an anacoluthon (a syntactic break-off), but when studied empirically these 'break-offs' are not treated as broken off units by participants in their situated environments. Both the retrospective and the prospective methods of altering a projection process work to tie the whole construction together, rather than creating a boundary between (theoretically posited) syntactic units.

The syntactic relationship between the two first apokoinou phases is for the most part intra-sentential, i.e. the relation between pre-P and pivot is the kind of constituency relation one would find within a simple clause (finite verb-object, copula-predicative, finite verb-adverbial etc.). For the most part, this also holds for the relation between pivot and post-P, but the other way around (object-finite verb, predicative-copula, adverbial-finite verb etc.). However, in some cases these relations are of a kind that one would find between clauses in complex sentences. The pivot can be an adverbial clause that is retro-constructed as a pivot with a 'så' (then)-initiated post-P (see ch. 7.1.5). The conjunction must only use the final part (not the whole) of the visually available. Also see the analysis of (8:4), where the gaze of the speaker contributes to the analysis of the function of the apokoinou utterance.
Some of the syntactic resources used by participants when building apokoinou utterances are more formally restricted than the general syntactic processes discussed in the section above. These resources can be characterized in terms of constructions of a frame-plus-slot type such as the use of the light unit beginner 'de+e' (there's) in the pre-P, or the use of the commenting 'heter de' (is it called or is it named) in the post-P. The specific formal apokoinou variants that become the products of the use of these constructional resources were presented in more detail above in chapter 6. The point of mentioning them in this section is to discuss them as a special type of formal resource in the utterance building process.

Apokoinou utterances are for the most part retro-constructed with a recycled finite verb-form or a change of finite verb, both with the syntactic function of constructing a predicate with an NP or adverbial pivot. The lexical form of the second finite verb in the post-P can be fixed in different ways, when it comes to occupy a slot in a construction-like formal configuration. The recycling variants (see 6.1.1 above) recycle the same lexical form as was produced in the pre-P, sometimes with a small inflectional variation. The finite verb-forms as such vary; however, it is the formal recycling that creates a kind of relational slot in the construction. Some of the non-recycling variants such as the meta comments (6.1.2.3) and the epistemic comments (6.1.2.4) on the other hand, use a fixed verb-form in the post-P, such as the verb-forms 'hence' and 'var' (is called/be named, var), independently of the verb in the pre-P. Here the construction method is more lexicalized than in the recycling configurations.50

Another variant with a fixed lexical slot in a construction-like segment is when the pivot is retro-constructed with the particle 'så' (then) (or 'då' (then) after temporal adverbials) in combination with a second finite verb, as in 'så blir' and 'så e' (then becomes and then is). In these cases the second finite verb can be either literally recycled or changed. The 'så'-construction has been well described within the Swedish tradition of grammar research, e.g. from a functional grammatical perspective (Ekerot 1988) and from an interactional perspective as a linguistic device for resuming pending communicative projects (Ottesjö 2006). However, the functional potential of the 'så'-construction...}

---

50 I assume that the boundary between grammar and lexicalization is partly fuzzy (cf. Langacker 1987, Östman & Fred 2004).
construction to retro-construct a syntactic pivot has not been described before.

The lexically rather fixed construction ‘de+e’ (there’s), its variant ‘de va’ (there was) and variants of these, have been described as a generic unit ‘beginner’ in Swedish spoken language (Mortensen 1977) and Swedish conversational language (Forsskål, in prep.). In my corpus they are generally used as a method to initiate a new turn or turn unit (a ‘beginner’) while introducing or inserting a heavier pivot NP, but also to connect to an ongoing activity. Variants on the light ‘de+e’-construction (there’s) in the apokoinou corpus are ‘sen e de ju’ (then there’s MOD), ‘och då e de i’ (and then there’s in), ‘men de e ja’ (but there’s MOD) and ‘här e’ (here’s), and in past tense ‘de va’ (there was), ‘men de va asså’ (but there was y’know), and ‘de va som att’ (there was like). The particles placed in front of the constructions (e.g. ‘then’, ‘but’) often change the relation to preceding discourse from connecting to less connecting or disjunctive. A similar construction uses the verb ‘ha’ (have) instead of ‘är/var’ (is/was), like in ‘nu ha vi ju’ (now we have MOD) and ‘men så hade’ (but then it had).

I will not present all the construction-like resources and their variants that can be found within the corpus exhaustively. Instead, I will point to construction-like resources if they occur in the extracts that are analyzed communicatively in chapters 8–11.

7.3 Prosody

A speaker’s use of prosodic resources to construct apokoinou utterances is both similar to and different from the use of syntactic resources. As with the case of syntax, prosody can be used to integrate the utterance in the sense that the three apokoinou phases are tied together within a single communicative unit (see below 7.3.1 for a detailed discussion). They differ in the sense that their projective force is used differently (see below 7.3.2 for a detailed discussion).

A basic theoretical assumption about prosodic methods in this study, is that their function(s) depend on their immediate discourse environment. The function of a pitch rise is dynamic and therefore only analyzable against the background of what immediately precedes and follows in terms of morpho-syntax, prosody and local communicative projects. There are no (or at least very few) static meanings as such attached to a pitch rise, an focal stress, or a specific intonational contour. Perhaps it is relevant to talk about prosodic functions in terms of functional potentials, i.e. that prosodic resources, rather than having stable meanings, have a potential to function...
in certain ways when used in interplay with certain contexts. The idea of prosodic functional potentials is modeled on the theory about meaning potentials of lexical resources (K. Norén & Linell 2007) as well as on the theory of functional potential of grammatical constructions in talk-in-interaction (Linell 2005a). The gist of this framework has been formulated as follows: “linguistic resources provide language users with [...] resources to understand, say and mean specific things in particular usage events, and [...] this always involves an interplay with contextual factors” (K. Norén & Linell, 2007:1).

In terms of functional potentiality, prosody in apokoinous utterances is then a set of resources with the potential to be used as a method to actively integrate one or several actions within a recognizable utterance unit (prospectively and retrospectively), but also to actively mark and draw boundaries between actions.

Walkers’ (2004) study of pivot utterances in English conversation has shown that speakers actively use phonetic design51 to integrate the pivot phases at the borders between pre-P and pivot on the one hand, and pivot and post-P on the other.

Speakers in English conversation use phonetic design to handle the following tasks (reproduced from ch. 3 above):

(i) Avoiding the signalling of transition relevance towards the end of the pivot;
(ii) Marking the fittedness of the pivot to the pre-pivot, in order to allow leftwards interpretation of the pivot;
(iii) Marking the fittedness of the post-pivot to the pivot, in order to allow rightwards interpretation of the pivot. (ibid:172ff)

The first of these tasks is handled through the absence of pitch configurations which signal transition relevance (e.g. falls terminating low in the speaker’s range, or rises terminating above the middle of the speaker’s range); absence of final slowing down; and a “close temporal proximity of the post-pivot to the pivot” (ibid:173f).

The second of these tasks is handled through completely avoiding pitch disjunctions marking the boundary between the pre-pivot and the pivot,

51 The use of the notion prosodic in the present study is basically the same as Walker’s use of the notion phonetic.
changes in loudness, glottal or supraglottal occlusions (i.e. cut-offs), and changes in articulation rate (ibid:176ff).

When handling the third of the tasks, speakers avoid the same as above, but also silences and especially cut-offs “which might suggest self-repair” (ibid:179). In addition, speakers tend to conceal the boundary between pivot and post-pivot with “continued phonation across the join” of the two phases.

Most of the phonetic design-features presented by Walker also apply to the Swedish data of this study. However, on some points the studies differ, such as regarding the high demands of phonetic integration of a pivot into the surrounding phases, e.g. through continued phonation. Furthermore, rises terminating high in the speaker’s pitch range do not signal transition relevance across the corpus of apokoinou utterances in Swedish talk-in-interaction. This is mainly an impressionistic observation based on the data in this study, but it is supported by the study of boundary signaling and coherence signaling in prosodic grouping made by Hansson (2003:126ff), who mainly identifies final lengthening (apart from pauses and f 0 reset) as a cue for prosodic phrasing.52 Yet another difference is that Walker puts the main focus on the phonetic signaling of fittedness and the close temporal proximity between the pivot phases, where an analysis of the building of apokoinou utterances in Swedish talk must also consider the retroactive prosodic tasks that speakers achieve when continuing beyond pauses and intermediate activities (as will be discussed in the following sections).53 In one sense, prosody is here taken to have a wider operative range than phonetics, in the sense that a speaker use phonetics to tie together adjacent words and speech sounds, while speakers use prosody to tie together non-adjacent segments too, across interjacent activities and sequences. Two central aspects of prosody in apokoinou utterances will be discussed below.

7.3.1 Prosodic projection of continuation

One central aspect of prosody in apokoinou utterances is the functional potential of certain phonetic resources such as pitch, intensity and duration (in isolation or in interplay within bundles of features) to project unit closure and unit continuation during the speech segment that follows the

52 Also see Bruce (1998:142) for a similar point on prosodic phrasing in Swedish, but mainly based on laboratory speech.
53 The functional potential of prosody in Swedish conversation is well demonstrated by Ottesjö (2006:89ff) in her analysis of participants turn-initial devices for resuming communicative projects across interjacent activities.
current segment. A prosodic resource such as the pitch peak has been pointed out by Schegloff (1996:84) to project “designed possible completion at next grammatically possible completion” in American conversation. This projection perspective on prosody was originally set off as an alternative to a signal perspective, where prosody is viewed as a signaling device that signals the meaning or function of the current speech segment within which the prosodic gesture is used. According to this latter theory, prosodic contours such as the final drop to low or the final rise to high do not project an upcoming closure on following turn units, but rather incarnate the closing move in itself when used on grammatically complete segments. However, I will propose a theory of prosody in apokoinou utterances that allows for the co-existence of both perspectives. They are not complementary, but rather dependent on each other within the dynamic process of organizing utterance construction.

If we turn to the projection perspective first, prosodic projection has, compared to syntactic and interactional projection, a much more narrow scope. The use of, say, a subject in combination with a particular verb (such as ‘give’) in the beginning of an utterance could in principle project the possible production of a number of following arguments within the constructional schema associated with the use of this verb (i.e. constituency used as projection resource, cf. Auer 1995). However, the use of, say, pitch peaks or focal stress probably only operates within the immediately following utterance segment, and in apokoinou utterances this seems to be the case.54 Consequently, this would further support the argument that prosodic construction methods operate independently from grammatical construction methods, as Selting (1996) has argued. Another variant of this independency is when syntactically separated units are tied together within the boundaries of a prosodically integrated unit, e.g. with the use of rush-through, or when prosody is (partly) used by speakers to override a more long-term syntactic projection (cut-offs). In both cases, prosodic methods are used more or less independently of grammatical methods. However, although syntax and prosody are separate methods of unit construction, when dealing with longer utterances it is more adequate to speak of their general relation in terms of close interplay than in terms of independence (ibid.). It would probably be reasonable to say that in many cases prosodic methods operate

54 This kind of local projection can be compared to projection done with gestures and projection during the production of single words (cf. Auer 2005:33 in note 4).
against the background of incremental syntactic decisions on the part of the speaker, and have the functional potential of either seconding (Sacks et al. 1974) or overriding the grammatical projections that result from these decisions. Nevertheless, sometimes it is also reasonable to argue the other way around that grammatical methods operate against the background of dynamic prosodic decisions. For example, this is the case when the prosodic packaging of a segment, designed as a next grammatically possible completion, rather projects continuation than signal closure. Accordingly, when the speaker continues the utterance beyond this continuation-projecting segment, this continuation has been made relevant prosodically although the utterance was grammatically possibly complete.

The phonetic analysis of focus phenomena in the following extracts and in the study in general (as well as the phase boundary phenomena in 7.3.2 below) is predominantly based on listening, rather than instrumental acoustics. In general, the recordings are not suited for instrumental analysis. However, instrumental readings of amplitude and pitch and will be used in order to present visual support for an analysis when relevant, especially here where the issue is to discuss general or theoretical questions of prosodic phenomena that are argued to be valid for many (or all) instances of apokoinou utterances.

The use of short-term prosodic projection of continuation is common in apokoinou utterances. This occurs when a first or second focus in the apokoinou utterance is placed in the pivot. When the first primary focus in the utterance is placed in the pivot, this often results in an instantiation of the straightforward basic contour for shorter TCU's and prosodic units in Swedish, as exemplified in excerpt (7:1) below, drawn from talk between a doctor and a pregnant woman at a Maternity health care centre.

(7:1) Movable

L:LiCTI:B:64L-1104[155]. Talk between a pregnant woman and a gynecologist at a Swedish Maternity health care centre (Mödravårdscentral, MVC). Participants: L=Gynecologist (f), K=Woman. Case Karlsson (20-25 years, having her first baby). Ultrasound examination. Talk about where the fetus is positioned in the uterus.

1. K: nä¿ (.) har de fixe
   rat
   no (.) has it stabilized
   yes
   it
   is

2. [ sej¿   <ku
   erste¿o  "]
   itself could feel

3. L: [ja- (.). de er ru-]
   yes it is movable
   yes it is movable
The argument here, in line with Schegloff (1996), is that speaker L does not enter a possible completion zone until producing the focus on the element ‘bart’ at the end of the pivot ‘rückbart’.

When producing the focus, speaker L does not, however, only initiate a movement towards possible completion, but also projects a short-term continuation of the ongoing utterance unit beyond the focus. How long the final part of the utterance will be or what it will contain cannot be projected using prosodic means, but when continuing after the pivot, speaker L does so in a context where the prosodic gesture on the preceding pivot has made it a relevant (projected) but underspecified next move. It might be reasonable to say that the AU in (1) follows a pattern that can be found in many short utterances, where the focus-word is followed by a clitic prosodic coda.

The apokoinou utterance is initiated within the medium range of the speaker’s pitch range (≈100 Hz) and is then raised evenly until reaching the
highest level (≈250 Hz) on the second syllable in the pivot, i.e. [-bart] in ‘rackbart’ (movable). The pitch level of 250 Hz constitutes the highest pitch point in a two-part contour that already starts to move downwards from the highest pitch point. The downward movement is then followed through in the drop to low (≈70 Hz) on the final utterance segment ’e re’ (it is).

The resulting schematic prosodic contour is represented in figure 7:2 below.

Figure 7:2. Schematic prosodic contour of the apokoinou utterance in extract (7:1).

In utterances where the second focus is placed in the pivot, the analysis of course implies that the focus on the pivot is preceded by an earlier focused element in the apokoinou utterance that up to the point of the pivot was produced as a candidate ‘primary’ focus. A primary focus is here formally defined as a prosodic gesture produced with a bundle of phonetic features such as increased intensity, prolonged vowel duration or pitch rise/peak/drop on a vowel or whole syllable. A primary focus is functionally defined as (i) projecting continuation of the utterance until reaching the next point of possible syntactic closure, and (ii) projecting completion of the ongoing turn at the next possible syntactic point of completion (i.e. two sides of the same coin). Consequently, on the one hand, the production of a second ‘primary’ focus in the apokoinou pivot opens up for a possible continuation beyond the earliest possible projected syntactic completion after the focused element. On the other hand, a second ‘primary’ focus initiates a new prosodic declination towards a possible completion of the turn. This will be exemplified next.

In extract (7:2) below, the first primary focus on ”se” (then) initiates an intonational declination towards a possible completion, as seen on the pitch trace, and a grammatical projection of possible completion (that turns out to

55 The overlapping final segment of the previous turn is produced with low volume and does not seem to interfere with the registered pitch curve.
56 This analysis is partly based on a data session where I am indebted to comments from Susanna Karlsson.
be at the end of “florsocker”). The pitch drop on ‘seen’ does not break the declination. The pre-drop pitch level is resumed at the same Hz level (205) when continuing with ‘æ’.

(7:2) Meringue
USTL18
Everyday phone call. Participants: T=Caller (m, 20 years), S=Receiver (w, 20 years). The caller asks how to make meringue, and S instructs him how to proceed.

1. S: ([eh::] man vilja

2. spp... and then PT throw you down

3. florsocker hade *ja ti dom:* som ja gjorde icing sugar had I to those that I did

4. .hhh pt ä sen så vilja man igen, (. ) t- først and then you beat it up again (;) t- first

Figure 7.3: f0-trace of the apokoinou utterance in extract (7:2).

The use of the second primary focus on the initial part ‘flor’ in “florsocker” (kök zaga) renegotiates the completion projection of the first focus and initiates a new declination in the utterance towards another point of possible completion beyond the end of ‘florsocker’. As indicated by the f0-extraction in figure 7:3 above, the utterance pitch level declines until producing ‘florsocker’, when the pitch trace shows a rise in pitch from 177.
Hz to 229 Hz (if the intermediate creaky voice is disregarded). This peak is followed by a registered fall to low (89 Hz) on the segment leading up to the next possible syntactic completion point at the end of ‘dom’. The pitch range is rather narrow for the whole utterance, 46–236 Hz, and the fall to low after the pivot receives a lower f0-reading than can be heard. When listening to the segment ‘ja ti dom’ (I to these), the pitch level and declination are pretty much identical to the segment ‘så hiva’rer net’ (then you throw in) that precedes the pivot, but this impressionistic similarity in pitch level and declination does not, however, show up very clearly on the pitch trace because of the creaky voice on the ‘ja ti dom’ segment. As seen in figure 7.3 above, the pitch trace shows a registered fall to low during the production of this segment.

The registered pitch declination before the focused pivot and the falling creaky voice that immediately follows the focused pivot shows that two separate projection processes towards two consecutive possible completion points are produced one after the other. In addition, non-modal voice quality (phonation) such as creaky and breathy voice has been shown to signal and/or project closing in Finnish conversation (Ogden 2004) and can probably be shown to do similar work in Swedish in local contexts where the segment at hand is interactively and grammatically projected as a possible completion area.

The element ‘florsocker’ is the first projected possible grammatical completion point in the utterance, but it is not prosodically sanctioned as a TRP. Instead, the pitch rise and slight extra stress on the first syllable in “florsocker” open up for a continuation beyond that word. The suggestion is that the combination of stress and pitch rise constitutes a prosodic focus that is placed at this point in the utterance because of the projected possible completion projection on the very same segment. The focus on ‘florsocker’ neutralizes the completion (or signals non-completion) and simultaneously projects a continuation that paves the way for (in this case) a retroconstruction of a syntactic pivot with the second finite verb ‘hade’ (had).

To formulate a suggestion where prosody is allowed to project continuation beyond the current segment as well as signal non-completion on the current segment can of course be disputed. Nevertheless, this is not a general theory for prosodic projection in talk-in-interaction. It is mainly an analysis of the mechanics of the construction of apokoinou utterances and the interplay of syntax and prosody within this analysis. However, research on projection on a more general level of talk-in-interaction has shown that speakers mainly exploit syntax when projecting upcoming possible
completion points (for Swedish Bockgård (forthc.), for German Auer (2005)). The present analysis does not dispute these results in any way. On the contrary, it is against the background of syntax as the main projection device that it can be argued that prosody in some cases ‘deactivates’ the current grammatical projection of completion in the apokoinou utterance, while at the same time opens up for a continuation where the syntactic extension of the utterance is made in the immediate context of the renewed projection of continuation.

This analysis is also in line with Schegloff’s (1996) above mentioned observation that a speaker in American conversation can use prosodic resources (pitch peaks) to project completion at the next possible grammatical completion point. The same holds for German conversation (Auer 1996b). I would like to add to this observation the suggestion that a speaker in Swedish conversation who produces longer turns must use a prosodic resource such as pitch rise/peak/drop, increased intensity, or prolonged vowel duration (or combinations of these) in order to initiate a projection process of upcoming completion at the next possible grammatical completion point. It is only against the background of such an ongoing syntactic and prosodic projection process that a second focus can deactivate the current projection process and start a new one that postpones the possible point of completion. This can be illustrated in a simplified manner as in figure 7:4 below.

![Figure 7:4. Graphic representation of the postponing of projection of a next possible completion point in apokoinou utterances.](image)

Within this theory, the process of projecting a next possible completion point starts when producing the first focus, illustrated with the beginning of the first graphic curve. The dotted line on the first curve illustrates the prosodic and syntactic movement towards the projected, but canceled first possible completion point. The deactivation of the first projection as well as
the postponed projection towards a second possible completion starts when producing the second focus, illustrated with the beginning of the second curve. This second curve illustrates the prosodic and syntactic movement toward a second possible completion point. The two curves are supported both by a renewed syntactic projection and an even pitch declination toward a possible completion (even though the declination behind the second curve is mainly impressionistically analyzed, as discussed earlier in this section). The third curve illustrates the prosodic and syntactic movement towards a third possible completion point, starting with the slight upward movement on ‘dom’.

7.3.2 Prosodic signaling of continuation

When extending the utterance beyond the (candidate) pivot segment, speakers have the option of signaling the extension as a new unit or marking the extension as a continuation of the preceding and/or ongoing unit. A prosodic method of particular interest for the analysis of this point in the utterance is when the speaker chooses not to change the prosodic design of the ongoing utterance in a marked way, i.e. when the speaker refrains from noticeably changing the pitch level, tempo, intensity etc. The function of refraining from overt prosodic changes in apokoinou utterances is often unifying and integrating, at least at the borders between apokoinou phases. As already said in 5.2.6 above, the absence of prosodically marking a new beginning on the initial element of a prosodic unit (e.g. not using pitch rise and/or focus after a pause) will often make the initiated unit analyzable as a continuation of the previous unit, if co-occurring with syntactic methods of continuation. Integration is therefore not only a matter of using a specific prosodic method to actively integrate a unit (e.g. within a continuous intonational contour or rush-through), but sometimes also about the absence of actively closing and re-starting utterance units. Changes in tempo (e.g. rush-through), volume (e.g. lowering of volume on turn-initial segments) and pitch can all be used in order to actively integrate a unit, but also to demarcate between temporally separate actions. The absence of change, however, almost always works integrating.

The use of prosody as an integrating resource is especially important at the juncture between the apokoinou phases (the pivot and the post-Ps).

57 The postponing of completion projection is in this third case not done on a syntactic pivot, which points to a possible general scope of the theory beyond the special syntactic and prosodic environment of apokoinou utterances (see 7.3.3).
when creating integrated units, and the use of active prosodic continuation methods is central when creating subdued second units (see table 7.1 below). The analytic question is whether there is a cut-off and/or restart or not in the utterance, and the prosody is for the most part doing the work to discriminate between the cases. Three main cases can be described where the prosody creates different kinds of utterances. Only the first two of these can be analyzed as apokoinou or a variant of an apokoinou construction method.

### Table 7.1. The Role of Prosody Across Phase Boundaries in Apokoinou Utterances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prosody Across Unit Boundaries</th>
<th>First Unit (pre-P + pivot)</th>
<th>Second Unit (post-P)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrated continuous second</td>
<td>Open prosody (no clear terminal)</td>
<td>Prosody continues into the second unit. No prosodic boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated subdued second</td>
<td>Closed prosody</td>
<td>The boundary is not prosodically exposed (non-prominent), compensating for the closure of preceding unit. Subdued to previous unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demarcated second</td>
<td>Open prosody or Closed prosody with terminal</td>
<td>Prosodically exposed. New prosodic beginning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first case, the integrated continuous second in the table, is at hand when the first unit (here: the segment pre-P + pivot) is kept prosodically open through absence of a prosodic terminal. This is a common method of keeping a unit open in Swedish talk-in-interaction even if the syntax is possibly closed. The second unit (the post-P) is here constructed as a continuous prosodic extension of the first unit without an intermediate pause or prosodic changes. This is the prototypical prosodic method of doing an integrated apokoinou. Extract (7:1) and (7:2) above are both examples of the integrated second type, as is visualized with the pitch trace. In extract (7:3) the projected prosodic coda is produced on-time within a continuous prosodic contour. The break in the
pitch trace comes when the speaker reaches the retroflexive [r]-segment in ‘ruckbart’ (movable) because of the voiceless quality of this consonant. As shown in figure 7.5 to the right, the transition from the final segment [e] in ‘florsocker’ (icing sugar) to the segment [ade] in ‘hade’ (had) in extract (7:2) is made with continuous phonation on the same pitch level, within the same pitch contour.

In extract (7:3) below, the continuous transition from pivot to post-P is also visible on the pitch trace. The extract is drawn from a telephone call to a poison information centre. The syntactic border between pivot and post-P is located in between the words ‘stencilen’ and ‘ha’.

(7:3) The brochure
U:GIC16479-31[169]. Telephone call to the Poison information centre. K1=Poison informer (f), M=Caller (m, about 50 years). M is requesting information about a poison brochure.

1. M: {\ldots\ldots} där å å. hh å ni å hos å att ni there an an .hh .hh .hh you have
2. ska a- göra en n y: sån där va, hh å ni å hh å you will be making a new one of those right, .hh you have
3. ha stencilen ha stencilen ha stencilen ha stencilen ha stencilen ha stencilen ha stencilen ha stencilen ha stencilen had this brochure had this brochure had this brochure had this brochure had this brochure had this brochure had this brochure had this brochure had this brochure
4. <åtti::::::::> .hhhhhhhhh se x::: sj:: eighty:::::                      .hhhhhhhhhhh  si x ::::      seven::: eighty.hhhh  six seven
5. nä så där ((\ldots\ldots)) something like that

The pitch trace in figure 7.6 below shows no overt prosodic change at this point in the utterance. Instead there is a continuation of the overall prosodic declination. There is an even fall during the production of ‘ha’ (≈170 Hz →
145 Hz) that is integrating rather than a disjunctive prosodic boundary or break. It is a continuation of the overall prosodic declination in the utterance. The elements are produced as integrated within the same prosodic, linguistic and (ultimately) communicative unit.

The second case in table 7:1, the integrated subdued second, is at hand when the first unit is prosodically closed, e.g. with a terminal such as a pitch drop or non-modal voice quality. The speaker, however, still has the possibility to re-open the unit with an second unit increment that is retroactively integrated with the first unit. The increment is most often non-exposed in terms of being non-prominent (no pitch reset or focal stress, cf. Couper-Kuhlen, 2004). This, in combination with the syntax of the increment that is parasitic on the previous unit, makes the incremental second unit markedly subdued in relation to the previous, (potentially) closed unit. A noticeable subduing of the second unit contributes highly to undo the closure of the preceding unit (activity). Ultimately, the method of subduing the second unit is a linguistic resource to continue a possibly complete activity or communicative project (or create a parenthetic project), rather than starting up something completely new. This is a method of doing an integrated apokoinou that is less prototypical than the first case above.

Extract (7:4) below is an example of the method of an integrated subdued second. It is also drawn from a telephone call at a Poison information centre. The caller U asks about a stain remover of the general
The caller answers in overlap with IN’s extended multi-unit question “which Tabort?” (‘it is Biotek’). After a 0.3 second pause, speaker U extends her answer with an insisting move, “ostår de” (‘it says it’), produced with a subdued prosody.

One aspect of the prosodic quality is visible on the pitch trace in figure 7:7 below. Speaker C finishes the production of the pivot segment ‘Biotek’ with a fall that starts at the end of the prolonged vowel [i] (268Hz) and reaches the lowest registered point in the turn so far (188Hz) on the vowel [e]. The last segment of the pivot (a voiceless velar plosive [k] produced with a prolonged breathing sound, i.e. aspiration [kh]) receives no f0-reading because of its voiceless quality. In this context, the prolonged aspiration can be heard as a turn final sigh. Despite this, speaker IN does not respond to the possible turn completion at the end of U’s answer. Instead, there is a silent 0.3 second pause followed by speaker C’s production of a comment on the name ‘står de’ (‘is it written’). The comment is produced with a marked-
ly lower pitch (80Hz) than the last pitch reading, which together with the syntactic retro-construction of ‘Biotek’ as the nominal predicate constructs the new contribution as a non-exposed incremental continuation (or add-on) of the previous turn.

Another variant of the second case is extract (7:5), where the first unit is grammatically closed, but where the speaker leaves a silent slot (0.2 sec. on line 4) after the pivot where continuers from the other participants are relevant contributions. The prosodic ending is therefore not a terminal as in (7:4) above.

(7:5) Momo
L:LiCTI:SP1-770[120]. From the radio talk show ‘Spanarna’ (The Reporters). Participants S= Ingvar Storm (m, presenter), G=Jonas Gardell (m, reporter), H=Jonas Hallberg (m, reporter). Gardell reports on how clocks and time are increasingly permeating our society and everyday life, and exemplifies with a recent book.
   is it possible to master time then
2. G: = ja tro
   I believe y’know it was a book for some
   asså det fanns en bök förr några
   there was a book a couple of
   år sen som hette Momo,
   years ago that named Momo
   years ago with the name Momo
The pitch trace in figure 7.8 shows a slight rise at the end of the pivot 'Momo'.

Figure 7.8. f0-trace of the final segment in the apokoinou utterance in extract 7.5.

Speaker S then produces a continuer and confirmation of G’s correct choice of book-name, that is on time from a rhythmic point of view. When G continues, he makes a parenthetical comment ‘heter’en va’ (that’s what it’s called right) on the name of the book, that closes down the parenthetical sequence. Speaker G initiates this comment almost in overlap (latch) with S’s continuer, using a contour that is heard as a fall-rise, with a low pitch (104-73-91 Hz) in the speaker’s own pitch range and a medium intensity (74 dB). The latching, the absence of stress and pitch reset, and the fall-rise contour on G’s comment on the name all constitute evidence for an analysis of G’s turn as a subdued continuation of his previous turn rather than a start of something new.

The third case in table 7.1, the *demarkekted* round (which is not analyzed as a method for building apokoinou) is at hand when the first unit is closed with a prosodic terminal or kept open, but where the second unit, which syntactically is a possible post-P, is prosodically exposed as a new prosodic
beginning (a restart in my own terms). A prosodic beginning on the second unit is in my data most often made with the prosodic method of pitch peak in combination with a focal stress on the initial element of the new unit. The use of pitch reset in relation to the speaker's own F0 (co-produced with a less prominent stress or not) is not heard as sufficient to analyze it as a prosodic restart. A prosodic restart can be done after a pause or on-line with no intermediate pause.

The shaded utterance in extract (7:6) below exemplifies this variant.

(7:6) Was so glad
Ut:3INF:21:5-661[54]. Coffee conversation in a private home environment between four senior women (65−75 years). A is the hostess and B, D and D are her guests. The guests have just arrived when one of the guests (B) comments on the weather. The hostess responds to this comment on line 1.

1. A: [ja] tänkte att vi skulle sitta ut 
I made plans to sit outside but
2. B: ja,
3. D: = a:: [de trödde ja] 
yes that thought I was so glad for that PRI
yes that’s what I thought it was so glad for that
4. A: [ (man nu-) ]
but now
5. A: [ *ja:: [...
yes

Speaker D begins her utterance with a response particle and a short clause “a:: [de trödde ja]” (yes that’s what I thought), following up speaker A’s comment on line 1. Speaker A (the hostess) says on line 1 that she had plans for them to have their coffee outside in the garden. Speaker D agrees on line 3 that that’s what she thought as well. The agreement is closed with a fall to mid-low and a vowel duration on the last element “ja::”. After agreeing, speaker D continues to say that she was so glad for the opportunity to sit outside.

The instrumental analysis of the relevant F0-properties of the demarcated second variant can be seen in figure (7:9) below. When continuing beyond the turn initial agreement, speaker D uses a combination of pitch peak and increased intensity on the initial verb “vänta” (wait). If prosodically packaged in a different way, the initial verb could have been used for retro-construction
of the preceding nominal element ‘ja’ (I) (colloquial form for ‘jag’) as the subject of the continuation.
However, the combined pitch peak and the increased intensity interact to contribute to putting a focus on the first element of the continuation. The focus eliminates the retro-construction and constructs the turn continuation as a verb-first declarative construction (V1-declarative, cf. Mörnsjö 2002), i.e. a construction that can stand on its own in Swedish talk, “väl så glad för de [så,]” (see 5.3.1.5 above). The continuation, i.e. the (possible) apokoinou second unit, is prosodically demarcated from the (possible) apokoinou first unit, and prosodically constructed as the beginning of something new. Both syntax and prosody can be used as criteria for eliminating the utterance from being analyzed as an apokoinou utterance.
These demarcated seconds often co-occur with a preceding prosodic cut-off followed by a (possible) pivot and a recycling of the initial finite verb in the pre-P. The prosodic and syntactic method of cutting off an utterance midways and then produce an element that is constructed as a new beginning is also excluded from Corpus A, but included in the reference material (see above ch. 4.2). The resulting construction, a cut-off and/or restart, is regarded as an anacoluthon in accordance with the classic definition of the term as something ‘not following’.

7.3.3 Towards a general theory of prosody in Swedish talk-in-interaction?
The discussion of incremental prosodic renewal of possible completion projection and local continuation projection (section 7.3.1) can, together
with the discussion of speakers’ prosodic methods of constructing coherence within utterances and methods of demarcating the ongoing utterance from surrounding actions (section 7.3.2), point toward a general theory of prosody in Swedish talk-in-interaction. A general theory must of course be validated empirically on a large material that is not as restricted to apokoinou utterances. On the other hand, apokoinou utterances in Swedish conversation are part of a conversationalist’s regular toolbox for accomplishing local communicative tasks. The special syntactic environment (the retro-construction of a syntactic pivot) of the continuation beyond the second focus might provide a context in which theories of the use of prosodic resources can be tested. My guess is that the dynamically occasioned syntactic retro-construction of a pivot exploits regular prosodic processes in turn construction and not processes that are exclusive to the special syntactic circumstances of apokoinou. Until a more comprehensive study of the phenomenon has been done, however, this will remain a qualified guess.

7.4 Communicative projects

7.4.1 Introduction

Prosody and syntax are methods of utterance building, but also methods of intervening in the communicative micro-situation (cf. ch. 2.3 above). Participants in conversation use prosody and syntax to organize utterance production and action trajectories when solving (local) communicative projects (Linell 1998, 2005a). Auer (1995) argues that the projection of possible actions (via sequential organization) and possible utterance continuations (primarily via syntactic organization) works in similar ways and that syntactic patterns of organizing utterance projection are often sedimented from ways of organizing action projection and action trajectories in interaction. But they are also intertwined in a reflexive relationship in ongoing interaction and this constitutes one of the main keys to an understanding of how temporally organized conversational interaction is possible.

7.4.2 Social action and communicative projects

The general idea of projects as an analytical tool is that participants are constantly involved in joint activities that have more far reaching implications than the individual action, or here: the individual utterance or utterance unit, the speech act (cf. Luckmann 1995, 2002, and followers, e.g.
Günthner & Knoblauch 1995, Linell 1998, 2005a). The notion of social action rests on the fact that meaning is a joint accomplishment over time rather than the expression of single speakers’ autonomous intentions and that utterances respond to and have an impact on the social world of co-conversationalists (participants). Social actions are organized in terms of communicative projects, which are sometimes planned and sometimes not and achieved over time; things can happen during the course of their production that occasion the speaker to alter them, and they involve other participants in their achievement. One central question when used in the analysis of apokoinou is to what degree communicative projects are conscious or deliberately planned. I would guess that the apokoinou utterances are not planned and conscious for the most part (perhaps apart from variants such as the ‘höll ja på å säga’ (was I about to say) type).

Communicative projects can be staged in interactionally organized episodes with explicit beginning and closing phases, but also abandoned for insertion of parenthetic projects, and then resumed. They can be interrupted and never returned to, or negotiated. They have different scope in terms of temporal length but also in terms of the way they engage few or many participants (local versus wider projects). The remainder of this chapter will be a discussion of how participants use the apokoinou method and the apokoinou construction to organize their activities in terms of local and wider communicative projects.

7.4.3 Local communicative projects
The description of a prototypical grammatical construction in talk involves more than the identification and description of various utterance-internal formal methods. A grammatical construction method in talk is not a configuration of formal resources alone, but also the association of these “with some kind of communicative, semantic-functional potential” (Linell 2004:9). When a speaker configures the utterance as described in 5.2 and 7.2–7.3 above, this is always a result of at least two processes, which are really two sides of the same process:

(i) Engaging in some local activity or “local communicative project” (LCP, Linell 1998, 2005a:512), such as shifting perspective, moving from one local phase in the utterance to a next, framing some temporary action, confirming or emphasizing something just prior or developing some unit of talk.
(ii) Orienting to one (or several related) abstract “constructional schemas” (Ono & Thompson, 1995), with the potential of solving the above-mentioned projects in talk, and using certain configurations of formal means to do so.

The shifting, moving, framing, confirming and emphasizing projects mentioned in (i) are designed to solve small-scale communicative tasks in interplay with contexts and interaction with other participants, via an orientation to mutually recognizable patterns (schemas) of linguistic and paralinguistic components. Following Linell, I will use the concept of LCP to account for the activities of small-scale tasks. Originally the concept was intended for local projects that are achieved within an exchange between at least two participants, constructing at least a minimal sequence of initiative and response (see e.g. Ottesjö 2006 for the use of the concept in such a way). This also works well with many of the apokoinou utterances in my corpus. However, with some of them it does not. Many apokoinou utterances deal with a local task within a turn or TCU, without explicit verbal responses from other participants. But these local projects are still communicative (and dialogical) in the sense that they are designed to be heard and understood by one or several addressees. When working with those cases, I will operationalize the concept on an interactionally more local level (micro level), but still place and explain what is done within a wider communicative context.

7.4.4 Resumed wider communicative projects

Prototypically, the whole apokoinou utterance is organized as a limited local communicative project, concerned with some local special task, which is performed within the frames of one or more wider or overarching communicative project. It is always embedded within some wider local activity. Even if the post-P segment is produced with full lexical renewal altogether and even if the perspective change is sharper, all actions within the apokoinou utterance are for the most part performed within a wider coherent meaning frame (generally speaking). A speaker orients to the apokoinou schema in order to solve the local task smoothly and coherently before resuming or leaving the wider project.

As a comparison, it can be noted that apokoinou-like utterances with post-P segments that display a lack of syntactic dependency or with prosodic cut-offs and restarts are also instances where the speakers (in collaboration with fellow speakers) are changing or operating with local
communicative projects. But these changes are made without orienting to the dynamic pattern of the ACM.

The communicative feature of embeddedness is therefore not a demarcating or defining feature for ACMs as are the ‘syntactic pivot’-criteria. It is rather something that the apokoinou shares with all of the related construction methods. But it is a necessary feature of apokoinou in the sense that all instances of concrete apokoinou utterances share the quality of dealing with some local task in order for the participants to be able to go on with other activities.

A clear case of this can be seen in the following extract (7:7). It is drawn from a radio talk show where three reporters have been assigned the task to report on some recent trend in society. The rules of the show say that each trend must be accounted for with three concrete examples. Speaker A is reporting on a trend (‘the average upgraded to become the perfect’), and exemplifies it with a, at the time, recent Swedish novel ‘Händelser vid vatten’ (Events by the water).

(7:7) Kerstin Ekman

L3/II:TFS684-1287][38]. From the radio talk show ‘Spanarna’ (The Reporters). Participants: S=Ingvar Storm (presenter), G=Jonas Gardell, A=Lars Anrell and S=Susanne Ljung as reporters.

1. A: [ och ] eh:: .hh:: [*eh:] dom va var= and oh: [eh:] they are were
2. S: [ mm:] 
3. G: [(åtta)]
eight
4. A: =rätt sa mstämmia att de här va (.) jä =right say that this was (.) really new
5. Å fräscht.
are fresh
6. (.)
7. S: [där-=] am' with that--
8. A: [ s:s:yt med] somalad
9. S: denna tär säger du att också detta e ett that you say that this too in an
When the name of the novel is first introduced on line 16, it is mentioned as the third example of a trend. When finishing the production of the name segment, however, speaker A immediately switches perspective on it, and
makes a meta comment on the name *as a name* rather than as an example of a trend.

In terms of communicative projects, speaker A is engaged in the *wider communicative project* of reporting the third example of the ‘average as perfect’-trend. Within this wider project he embeds a disclaimer regarding the exact name of the novel. There are of course a number of possible reasons for making such disclaimers and it is not within the scope of the present analysis to pin down exactly which one(s), even if it were possible. It is enough to say that the disclaimer is an embedded *local communicative project* that orients to the other participants’ relevant (possible) actions (such as, for example, putting the name into question), and solves a potential problem of losing progression in the wider communicative task under way. A simple way of illustrating this can be seen in figure (7:10) below:

**Figure 7:10.** Graphic representation of an embedded local communicative project within a wider project

The interface between the local disclaimer (in this particular sequence) and the conversational contexts within which it is produced by A is however not a straightforward one. The immediate conversational context for the apokoinou in (7:7) is A’s own pre-announcement for continuing with his report (line 13) and the go-ahead responses on lines 14-15. Speaker A can then go on to initiate something that is already announced (interactively projected) and hence the interactional space is secured for some time. Within this wider project of going on with the report, yet another more local project is carried out that coincides with the turn segment on line 16, 17 and 19. During this segment A introduces the new topic (the writer and her novel) and provides some relevant information about it (the novel has recently received an award again). The information provides the basic and simple reason why the novel is a relevant topic in relation to the overall project that is concerned with recent trends. The apokoinou in (7:7) is of course produced within at least both of these (wider) contexts (i.e. initiating third report + introducing and accounting for a new topic). The use of the apokoinou solves the task of keeping up the progression of the newly
introduced report/topic and displaying uncertainty regarding the name. Interestingly, the disclaimer is treated by S as a way of requesting some decision or response, as he provides an acknowledgement of the name choice on line 18. It is a rather minimal response, indicating that S is orienting towards the strong possibility that A is about to continue with his ongoing business, and not topicalize the name as such.

To summarize the analysis of (7:7), the local communicative project solves the task of introducing the introduction of a main referent in a new topic as well as downgrading the speaker’s claim of certainty regarding the exact name of the referent, and the project is solved in interaction with the other participants before resuming the wider topic/report introduction project. The apokoinou is used as a method to organize the participants’ joint orientation to these projects. On a more abstract level the whole sequence can be represented as a specific type of embedded local communicative project as illustrated in figure 1 above.59

7.4.5 Non-resumed wider communicative projects

The way of organizing the local and wider projects in Figure 1, with the embedded local apokoinou project within a wider, resumed communicative project is however not an accurate representation of all apokoinou utterances in my corpus. The notion of communicative project as used here is not prescriptive in the sense that participants would have to return to an ongoing wider project in order for both projects to be analyzed as instances of wider and local projects respectively. The action of initiating and closing a delimited local communicative project operates on a moment-by-moment basis. When it is over and done with, in most cases it has been made relevant to continue with (already) ongoing business. But whether the participants decide to return or not is a matter of ongoing negotiation in each case. In the following extract (7:8), speaker J is analyzing generational differences in the use of birth controls among college students. When speaker J reaches the end of his turn on line 11, he stops (perhaps due to some incipient coughing). A moment later he continues where he left off, but in the meantime speaker BR has begun her turn with an inbreath and lip smack ("nh! pt"), which may signal that she is on the verge of initiating a longer turn. This might be one reason for J not to persist on the right to his (non-finished) turn.

59 For another analysis of the same extract, see extract 9:2.
Three parents discuss the predefined topic 'information on sex matters for children'. Talbanken, recorded in 1968. Participants: J (m), BR (f), IR (f).

Talk about birth control and early pregnancies.

1. J: [mm:hm¿] ja de ha konstit [mm:hm¿] ja de ha konstit [mm:hm¿] ja de ha konstit [mm:hm¿] ja de ha konstit [mm:hm¿]

2. J: >man kan säga i å me att eh [pt preventivme]dina= you could say that because the birth controls

3. BR?: [ (hawking) ]

4. J: >blitt bättre så har ju (G.3) problems have been better then (0.3) the problem has

5. [konstit in i ett annat] liger [konstit in i ett annat] liger

6. BR: [ <de e klart ja*> ] [ja]:¿ [ <de e klart ja*> ] [ja]:¿

7. (0.3)

8. IR: [ < oatt fa jä> ] [ < oatt fa jä> ]

9. J: >barn< skrämd <EARlier> IT was scary this

10. BR: .hh:: pt [ NU HA VI JU ASSÅ ]= [ NU HA VI JU ASSÅ ]=

11. J: =dom nog (från-) them probably from- them [från-]

12. IR: [ mm¿ ]

13. BR: .hhh pt [ NU HA VI JU ASSÅ ]= [ NU HA VI JU ASSÅ ]=

14. J: [från-] making their debut it was

15. BR: =STUDENTproaktiv[ t t ]en känner man ju] the student's proactivity we all know

16. J: [||cough||] [||cough||]
Facing that he no longer has the floor, he produces the next relevant element in the unfolding syntactic progression, "debutera" (making their debut), in a piece by piece manner, displaying it as something he had to think hard before finally recalling. Then he immediately changes the perspective on 'debutera' and comments on the fact that this was the thing he was about to say when he stopped, using a colloquial variant of 'var det' (was it).

The apokoinou speaker in (7:8) handles the task of commenting on the expression 'debutera' after some kind of problem in the turn progression (a word search, the incipient coughing, the loss of the turn, or all of them). The task is solved within a local communicative project with very limited range. In doing so he draws on the possibilities of retroconstructing a syntactic pivot provided by the ACM schema, and consequently ends up constructing an apokoinou utterance.

60 I haven't found any study of words produced piece by piece. The interpretation that speaker J displays that he had to think carefully before finally finding and uttering the right expression is my own and it is based on how the whole utterance is staged and the fact that he uses a certain format of apokoinou.
The apokoinou in (7:8) is different in several ways compared to (7:7) above, e.g. the prosodic packaging, the negotiation of speakership, the local work that the apokoinou does etc. The difference I am interested in here, however, is the way the participants handle the various projects involved.

The wider ongoing project that the apokoinou is produced within is not resumed after solving the local task of commenting on the expression. From the data we can not know whether speaker J had any intentions of taking his comparison between generations any further. In fact, both IR and BR treat his action as possibly complete already when he reaches "skrämdom nog" (probably scared them) on line 9 and 11. The continuation beyond this point "från- (0.2) de" (from making their debut) is apparently not necessary for treating the ongoing comparison project as pragmatically potentially complete in this sequential position. A related analysis is that the continuation is somehow projected from the topical surrounding and read off by BR.

Two contributing factors could be that the turn up to this point is constructed in orientation to another ACM schema (a «partial recycling») and that it is brought to a possible syntactic and pragmatic completion point on the element 'nog' (probably). The other apokoinou schema is realized within the boundaries of the pre-P in (7:8). The pre-P segment can be represented as an apokoinou as in figure 7:7 below. The post-P is a partial recycling of the finite verb, here used as a turn resuming device after some hesitation in the pivot (cf. 10.3.1.2). IR probably orients to the completion of this apokoinou when producing backup on line 12, as does BR when she starts her turn on line 13.

Figure 7:11. The pre-P in (7:8) represented as an apokoinou.

The local task of commenting on the expression 'debutera' (for whatever communicative purpose) is not embedded within a wider project that is resumed after its accomplishment, as was done in extract (7:7) above. A simple illustration of this can be seen in figure 7:12 below.
Of course we could say that another speaker (BR) is resuming and developing (taking over) the overall (much wider) topical project of discussing the sexual behavior of young people in general, but this move is initiated before J comments and is therefore not a response to the comment in any displayed way.

To summarize the analysis of extract (7:8), the speakers engage in a local communicative project that solves the local task of commenting on a previous expression (the communicative function is not analyzed further here). The wider (comparison) project is not resumed, partly as a result of the negotiation of speakership with the other participants (J could have persisted as turn holder but resigns from that right, partly in orientation to BR’s incipient turn beginning.) It would not make sense to say that the accomplishment of the local project of epistemic commenting as such is made in cooperation with the other speakers (as in extract (7:7) above). After all it is the lack of uptake that constructs it as an end to a project rather than as a project contained within the wider one. As things turn out, the apokoinou is rather used to organize the ending of the wider comparison-project. On a more abstract level this can be represented as a way of finishing a local communicative project as illustrated in figure 7:12.

7.4.6 LCP as an open and general category
The feature of LCP embedding (or nesting, Linell 2005a) is important for a majority of the apokoinou utterances in the corpus. All apokoinou utterances are embedded within some wider communicative context, irrespective of whether some ongoing, wider project is resumed or not. First, it should be pointed out that the notion of local communicative project is a participant’s category, in the sense that participants use local projects in
order to solve any kind of interactional or communicative task in talk that might arise within a specific interactional environment. Second, it should be pointed out that it is an open and general category in the sense that communicative projects are not restricted to certain kinds of projects, e.g., such projects that are embedded within other (resumed) projects, or actions that coincide with the ending of the wider project. LCPs are of course also used to initiate actions and activities, initiate closings of actions/activities, correct problems, or any other local task that emerges from the preceding local interactional environment. In the end it might not be wise to apply the types of LCPs found in relation to the use of apokoinou to other data or investigations of other types of phenomena. In fact, it is the very open-endedness of the LCP as a theoretical and operational concept that makes it useful when dealing with the ACM. A local communicative project is a method rather than a product with a certain form.

The apokoinou constructional schema is a method used by participants in talk to organize certain tasks or problems during ongoing projects/activities. Exactly what is being organized is closely related to the local activities in the immediately preceding talk (the communicative environment). This is a quality inherited from the general organizational method of local communicative projects. However, the actions done by participants when using some variant of apokoinou are organized as local communicative projects, but are not as functionally open-ended as the more general method. In the chapters 8-11 I will show how certain local actions made with apokoinou recur in the corpus as a whole, but also how some of them co-occur in concrete apokoinou utterances.

7.5 Summary
In this chapter, I have presented some tools and concepts to be used in an analytical framework for the empirical investigation of apokoinou in Swedish talk-in-interaction. This framework is centered on the way apokoinou utterances come to be, as participants use syntax, prosody, and lexical resources to resolve local communicative projects in interaction with others and contexts. Syntax and prosody are viewed as separate, but interdependent methods for the incremental production of interactionally relevant units in talk (TCUs, turns and minimal sequences). Speakers build these units during an ongoing process of local syntactic and prosodic decisions, centered on prospective projection of relevant continuations, and retrospective management of the impact of previous decisions. The syntactic pivot in the apokoinou utterance is a product of both processes,
since the projected possible syntactic completion on the pivot is deactivated prosodically using a prosodic design (focal stress, pitch peaks) that projects continuation beyond the pivot and since the point of possible syntactic completion is postponed. When continuing within the same prosodic contour, the speaker retro-constructs the pivot as the beginning of a new syntactic unit, using an integrated continuous second, i.e., a unit where the prosody is continuous (although not necessarily with continuous phonation) across the phase borders, and the syntax parasitic on the previous unit.

In cases where speakers bring the pivot to a prosodic completion, these completions are regarded as open cases until the next unit is initiated. Then, speakers have the possibility to start a new unit (TCU or turn), or integrate the next contribution with the previous unit retroactively using an integrated subdued second, i.e., a unit that is marked prosodically as belonging to the previous one (absence of pitch peaks and focal stress) and with a syntax that is parasitic on the previous unit.

These methods of building apokoinou utterances typically contribute to resolve various tasks or problems within the limits of the ongoing utterance. These tasks and problems are interactionally achieved, both in terms of being recipient designed utterances (local communicative projects) or in terms of being resolved within minimal or extended sequences (wider communicative projects).
8 Perspective shifts

8.1 Introduction
In this chapter I will deal with a group of phenomena previously explained as syntactic structure shifts (e.g., Enkvist 1988, Enkvist & Björklund 1989), and re-specify them as grammatical construction methods used to resolve local communicative perspective shifts. Where similar utterances have been formally described and explained as shifts between two overlapping linguistic units, the apokoinou construction method and its utterance products will be dialogically and dynamically described and explained in terms of an outcome of perspective shifts made by participants within the local communicative environment in talk-in-interaction. A perspective shift is not a necessarily a ‘shift in point of view’ but a shift in the way a topical aspect is displayed linguistically and treated interactionally by participants. When participants resolve these projects, they orient a group of related constructional patterns (i.e. types of formal configurations), which mainly result in apokoinou utterances with asymmetric renewal (Janus heads) and utterances produced with å-initiated post-Ps, but also cases with less asymmetric extended partial recyclings (cf. 8:1) and NP doublings (cf. 8:13). The analyses presented below are based on apokoinou utterances that are produced with single prosodic contours or as post-P increments (cf. ch. 6 for an overview of prototypical formal types and less syntactically integrated variants of these types).

8.2 Explanatory shifts
Initially, two kinds of perspective shifts will be analyzed that involve a dimension of explanation. The first is mainly characterized as a *causal explanation* of a local topic presented in the pre-P and pivot segment. The second is rather about *explaining the meaning* of a particular element (e.g. a word) in the pivot.

8.2.1 Causal explanation of initial action
In extract (8:1) below (fragments of which have been discussed in previous chapters) the shift of perspective on the pivotal element during the production of the apokoinou is about explaining something. As already mentioned in chapter 1.2, this extract is drawn from talk in an institutional setting, between a gynecologist and a pregnant woman at a Swedish
In the end
L: LiCTI:B:64L-915[154]. Talk between a pregnant woman and a gynecologist during an ultrasound examination at a Swedish maternity health care center (mödravårdscentral, MVC). Participants: L=Gynecologist (f), K=Woman, Cajsa Karlsson (20-25 years, having her first baby). They talk about how little the child moves around.

1. K: fast de e ett väldit lugnt barn
   but it's a very calm child

2. (...)
3. L: nhah
   okay
4. (...)
5. K: (>för de:e,<) 
   because it

6. (...)
7. L: de sparkar inte så [mycket]
   it doesn't kick so much
8. K: [ nej ]
    no
9. L: nej[
    no
10. (...)
11. K: men de att den ligger sätt
    but is it lies in a way that
12. [det känn] 
    it feels
13. L: [ nej de ](...) vi: ]:i barn e ju [mycket olika
    no it (two) (the) children are different too
14. (...)
15. L: så när viessa (e) ligger v(h)issa e ju
    so while some (are) calm others are
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16. K: a¿
yes

17. L: lite mera, vien kan ska ju känna att de
     lite mer, men du skulle fundera att si
     att det är mycket, och why you should feel that it
     is little more, but you should feel that it
18.     är (0.4) gång
     moves (0.4) once in a
19.     emellanåt.
     while

20. K: [ja] a fjä va're sen inte
     yes and you're now but not
21.     sådana som jag trodde att ja
     so often as I thought that I
22.     skulle känna
     would feel

23. L: ja,
     yes

24. L: ja sen så blir det också lugnare
     and then it gets it also calmer in
     och den blir den
     and then it also gets calmer in

25.     med och så blir de trängre i magen,
     and then it gets narrower in the belly (uterus)

26. K: a¿
yes

27. (1.1)

28. K: ja känna nästan mest [ ]
     I almost feel the most ( )

29. L: [ja]¿
     yes

30. (0.6)

31. L: här ser du stora kroppspulsadern (som slår fint.)
     here you see the aorta (that beats fine)

32. K: ja
     yes

33. (0.5)
On lines 20–22 the pregnant woman K says that she does not feel the baby kicking as often as she had expected to. In response to this (lines 24–25) the gynecologist L says that (in general) things become calmer at the end (of the pregnancy), ”å sen så blir de också lugnare på slutet” (and then it also gets calmer towards the end). At this point the turn is brought to a pragmatic and syntactic possible completion. The syntax does not project any continuation and the action of consoling the woman with some information could also be complete at this point. Prosodically, however, the turn remains open. The syntax is possibly complete, but prosodically there is no fall to low to second it. Instead, there is a primary stress on the last word that possibly postpones the syntactic projection of upcoming completion (cf. 7.3 above).

Syntactically, the gynecologist then continues from the final adverbial ”på slutet” (at the end), with the segment ”blir de trångare i magen.” (it becomes more narrow in the uterus). From a formal perspective, speaker L does a shift between two different syntactic structures that overlap on the pivotal
adverbial. Communicatively, however, the second action within the apokoinou utterance provides an explanation of the claim made in the first. The increased narrowness of the uterus at the end of the pregnancy is used to support a statement that otherwise might appear as (only) a reassuring strategy or a subjective prediction. The gynecologist produces the explanatory apokoinou as a way of reassuring the woman that lack of movements from the baby is something that you would expect at the end of a pregnancy from a physiological and medical (professional) point of view. It has a natural physical explanation (compare below with upgrades of evidential support, section 8.3.3). From this (communicative) perspective, the speaker L is using the apokoinou as constructional schema for an explanatory change of perspective during the production of her utterance.

In terms of communicative projects, the gynecologist is at first orienting to the wider (ongoing) communicative project of reassuring and consoling the pregnant woman, saying that it will be calmer in the uterus towards the end. “De blir de tyngre på sluten”. The downgrading of risks and the emphasizing of normality is an ongoing communicative project that characterizes this kind of communicative activity (Bredmar 1999, Bredmar & Linell 1999). But the woman has in the preceding turn expressed concerns about the lack of fetal movements, so the overarching project is in this case also locally occasioned.

In the midst of this consoling activity L shifts to a more local project of giving an explanation of why it gets calmer towards the end — because then there is less space in the uterus. “På sluten blir de tyngre i magen.”

The local communicative project of explaining is resolved as a part of (as opposed to being a parenthesis) the wider project of giving support and reassurance to the pregnant woman that her pregnancy proceeds as expected.

In extract (8:2) below, the shift of perspective on the pivotal element during the production of the apokoinou is also about explaining something. The extract is drawn from the highly institutionalized activity of live sports commentary. Speaker M (the main commentator of an ice hockey game) starts to talk on line 3 after a twenty-minute break between two playing periods in the game. The main commentator M begins with some information about the upcoming game: which period it is, the teams involved, the score and that the game begins with a power play situation. Compared to extract (1), the interactional format of this particular communicative activity is much less conversational. There are sequences in the activity that are more dialogically organized, like when the two comm-
(8.2) Fifty-eight seconds

U: IHR:153[49]. Live commentary of an ice hockey game on TV. Participants: M= Lasse Kinch (main commentator), E=Leif Boork (expert commentator). Extract from a sequence in the beginning of a playing period where M gives some initial information before the game starts with the face-off\(^61\), followed by live commentary and comments on the ongoing game.

1. [Pause between period 1.2, 20 min. The pause ends with commercials]

2. M: <DA >GS FÖR DEN: EH ANDRA> PERIODEN, Kanada alltså has numeral
   vart för andra perioden with Canada

3. in one-nil-definition Sverige har numerätt Sweden has numeral
   i ett noll-ledd in a one-nil lead Sweden has power

4. Over-position in another fifty-eight seconds play for another fifty-eight seconds

5. ska Sean >DO novan< sitta utvisad. will Sean Donovan remain in the penalty box

6. (=face-off on ice)

7. (2.5)

8. M: Primeau inne för Kanada, vid teckningen mot Falk;
   Primeau inn for Canada at the face-off against Falk

9. (2.4) altid, (1.0) svårt (0.3) att göra mål i
   always (1.0) hard (0.3) to score in

10. början av period när man har en) man mer:
    the beginning of a period when you have one) man more

11. eftersom, (1.0) alla (. ) spelare e (. )
    because (1.0) all (. ) players are (. )

12. relativt utvilade röd e valf (. ) lite lättaer
    fairly refreshed it's MOD-PRT (. ) a little easier

13. att försvara se Leif va;
    to defend yourselves isn't it Leif

14. (. )

\(^61\) The ‘face-off’ is the term for the recurring moments in an ice hockey game when the referee starts the play by means of dropping the puck between two awaiting players. The face-off is used to start the game at the beginning of all three periods as well as after all breaks in the game.
Perspective shifts 185

tators discuss and evaluate the game, but here the activity is less interpersonally interactive.

This does not mean, however, that it is monological in nature. The TV viewers are oriented to in the sense that M provides the viewer with general information about the game. After a twenty-minute break in the game, he is faced with the task of quickly summarizing the status of the game within the few seconds between the end of the commercials and the start of the live game down on the ice (the face-off, see line 7 and note 61).

After the initial general information M moves on to a more specific background for the upcoming game – one of the teams has more players on the ice for fifty-eight more seconds “Sverige har numerärt överlägsenhet” (Sweden has power play for another fifty-eight seconds). When this has been said, M goes on to explain in more detail what this entails, i.e. that a specific player in the other team will continue to serve a penalty, “Ska Sean Donovan vila” (will Sean Donovan remain in the penalty box).

Syntactically, the explanation is made with the use of a syntactic continuation of the first information chunk, but the continuation only takes the last pivotal adverbial phrase “för ytterligare femtioåtta sekunder” (for another fifty-eight seconds) as its syntactic beginning. From a formal perspective, the speaker M does a recognizable retro-construction of a syntactic pivot when continuing beyond the adverbial segment. Communicatively the continuation solves the local communicative project of explaining exactly why Sweden begins the period in power play. The explanation also shifts the perspective from Sweden as the advantageous part of the situation, to Canada as the team in the disadvantageous position. In the next sequential position, the commentator continues within this frame when he starts the commentary on line 9 by mentioning a Canadian player.

The choice of construction method emerges within the wider communicative project of providing the viewers with enough information to be able to grasp the essentials of the upcoming game. From this (communicative) perspective, the speaker M uses the constructional schema of apokoinou to accomplish an explanatory change or twist of perspective.

The timing aspect in this extract is also central. The informing phase of the commentators’ work in the beginning of the period is sensitive to the events on the ice. M has to adjust his actions to the point when he has to change his mode of talk into a commentary (in order to guide the viewers). Preferably, M will be finished with other business before beginning commenting, or facing the obligation to cut himself off. One side of this is
that he simply has to hurry up before face-off. But there is more involved than just doing completion before face-off. The shift on the syntactic pivot is about beginning the explanation in due time before face-off, while the 0.4 pause in the post-P is doing something else. The pause rather delays the closing long enough not to be finished too early (after all, it is televised entertainment, and silence could break the spell). When the main part of the turn is produced, the remaining segment can be tuned in to the exact movements of the referee’s hand that holds the puck (see the image to the right in figure 8.1 below).

Figure 8.1. To the left: View of the broadcasted scene at the moment before face-off. To the right: A close-in on the position of the referee holding the puck between the awaiting two players.

The construction and completion of the target segment could therefore be said to be finely tuned to occur at the exact moment of dropping the puck on the ice, not too late and not too early. Both commentator and viewers, as seen in the left image in figure 8.1 below, share the view of the referee holding and dropping the puck.

The dovetailing of the apokoinou utterance to the moment of the dropping could be seen as a way of creating a communicatively shared vision and a shared focus on essential events.

Extract (8:3) below is drawn from a weekly radio talk show on Swedish radio called ‘Spanarna’ (The Reporters). The three guests in the show are individually responsible for the presentation of something trendy and up-to-
the-minute in society that they have observed during the week. Each presentation must be done with at least three arguments to support it. The other guests have the right to interrupt, ask questions, and act as opponents during the presentation. Speaker A’s report this week is about a new trend in society that she claims to be a more general protest against the politically correct (henceforth PC).

(B.1) Two years after
LaCTI$^{14}$.[18]. From the radio talk show ‘Spanarna’ (The Reporters). Participants: S=Ingvar Storm (m, presenter), G=Jonas Gardell (m, reporter), H=Jonas Hallberg (m, reporter), A=Amalia Adamo (f, reporter). A presents her report on a new protest against the politically correct.

[ Silence]
1. A: ja, jag har spanat något som e:
   yes, I have observed something...

2. lite småtrevligt och de e alltså en protest
   a little bit nice and that is then a protest

3. mot de politiskt korrekt.
   against the politically correct

4. vara PC:
   be PC

5. ha en DN och att... att
   have a DN and to

6. vara korrekt.
   be correct

7. brotta tändare och
   bridge-resister

8. och korrekt.
   and correct

9. A: =kläder
   clothing

10. G: [pt hh:::]

11. R: riktigt sant.
   really true

---

55 A refers to the politics of the social-liberal party (Folkpartiet) in Sweden, who at the time were against the building of a bridge between Sweden and Denmark because of the possible negative impact a bridge would have on the environment.
12. DN is rather like two years

13. DN is rather like two years

14. (0.4)

15. A: jaså men det är - yes but that's-

16. G: ja men det är - yes but that's-

17. A: ja men det är - yes but that's-

18. (0.4)

19. G: PC is a bit trendy PC is a bit trendy

20. A: (0.2)

21. S: [nås inte nu längre.] no not anymore

22. A: [nås inte nu längre.] no not anymore

23. (0.4)

24. S: de är det dä politisk korrekt that one's that thing politically correct

25. [de är det när man säger saker och ting som - now that's when you say things that are

26. A: [ja: (.) ja: (.) jä: (.) näm: de en sån hår- yes (.) yes (.) no-but it's one of those-

27. (.) >[för liten< ] f- eh (.) to small f eh

28. S: [för liten< ] f- eh (.) to small f eh

29. S: förvänta sig.] expect
In an attempt to explain the meaning of the concept PC, she exemplifies with the attitude of Sweden's largest newspaper, Dagens Nyheter, or DN (lines 4−5). Before she gets any further in her telling, G immediately objects to this categorization of DN, and claims instead that DN is not PC, but just a few years behind with everything (lines 10−16). This would, according to G, constitute the opposite of being politically correct, since his definition of the concept is more of something being trendy (line 19). This new interpretation of the PC concept is however not accepted by the other participants, and a collective negotiation of the meaning of the concept is initiated (lines 22−32).

G delivers the first part of his characterization of DN in the shape of a completed turn "[...] DN e< (.) snarare. hh: >lisom< (0.2) <tvåälter>." (DN is rather like two years behind). It is prosodically completed with a drop to low, Adamo interprets it as complete when she begins her response on line 15 after a 0.4 pause, and it is pragmatically complete in this particular sequential position because G's turn is a possibly complete contribution to the argument he is making. He has said what DN is not (line 11), and then said what he thinks it is instead (line 12−13). In addition, the turn is syntactically complete. But when A makes an attempt to respond, G intercepts her, and extends his argument with an increment "[så kom dom me allting]." (then they came with everything).

Syntactically, this extension takes as a syntactic beginning only the final predication in the finished turn "... <tvåälter>." (two years behind), and retro-constructs it as an initial adverbial to the extension, this time with a slightly different meaning (after two years...). Communicatively, the extension gives a (specifying) explanation of the meaning conveyed by the previous closed turn. The fact that they (DN) came with everything two years after (everybody else) is an active way of expressing something in the past, compared to the initial static present tense construction that DN is two years behind. Even though there is a perspective shift from present to past tense and state to action by way of the shift of finite verb forms, I would say that an explanation is the communicatively most relevant analysis. Doing things two years after everybody else is the causal reason why DN ended up being two years behind (as a general characterization). The extension is not a new
argument, it does not add any new aspect to the argumentation, but is rather used to shift perspective on and explain an argument already made. There is also a dimension of emphasizing the point in order to continue or reopen the local communicative project of arguing (cf. ch 10.3.2). Compared to the more specialized confirming or insisting functions that will be dealt with in chapter 9, the dimension of emphasizing in (8:3) is less repetitive or recycling and (perhaps therefore?) more oriented to continuation. The explanatory post-P increment is probably locally occasioned by the incipient opposing response by Adamo after the pause. When G initiates his alternative way of interpreting DN on line 10, he initiates a local argumentative project that is prolonged over two turn shifts (lines 16 and 19). It is reasonable to think that A’s responsive moves on lines 15 and 17 contribute to the prolongation of the project. The intercepting increment in the syntactic shape of a post-P is a method of handling the local task of continuing or reopening a project that others have already tried to close by means of an opposing uptake. This analysis of ‘så’ as a continuer or reopener of local communicative projects is consistent with the findings of Ottesjö (2006), even though Ottesjö focuses on much wider communicative projects.

8.2.2 Explanation of a word or a referent in the pivot

Extract (8:4) below is drawn from Tryck till (Push it), a TV talk show centered on music videos.

(8:4) Ryder Cup

L:CTI:TT3:730[4]. From ‘Tryck till’ (Push it), a TV music show with four persons in the studio. Participants: M=Mårten, (m, presenter), J=John Eje Thelin (m, panel member), H=Henrik Schyffert (m, guest). Mårten and Henrik have been talking about golf for a while when Mårten asks him about a golf match between USA and Europe.

you also play golf

2. H: (n)ä

3. (0.4)

4. M: (n)ä du berättade att du inte gjorde(n)
   no you said that you didn’t do that

5. du har [sl(t)at] att
   you have finished
6. H: [ sign ]
7. M: [aaj }
8. M: för ditt handikapp gick va uppåt cut your handicap just went up
9. [ is stället för uråt som [för oss andra= instead of down like for the rest of us
10. H: [a ah de: e [[råt[ja= yeah ah it’s worthless I
11. J: [ (h) (h) [h=
that play golf?
13. H: = [ha]
14. J: = [b] [(h) (h)] []
15. M: =som- som spelar[golf] that play golf
17. M: =som- som spelar[gi] that play golf
18. H: = (h) (h) ] [j
19. M: [mm ]
20. H: [sign ]
21. M: [sign ]
22. M: [ha va signar de inför en sån grej]
23. w- what feel you in-front one such thing
24. som till exempel Ryder Cup’s finns that is example Ryder Cup it
25. as for example Ryder Cup it
is it a very large prestigious tournament that is called (.) Europe's
tournament that is called (.) Europe's
e is it a very large prestigious tournament that is called (.) Europe's
e is it a very large prestigious tournament that is called (.) Europe's
e is it a very large prestigious tournament that is called (.) Europe's
e is it a very large prestigious tournament that is called (.) Europe's
e is it a very large prestigious tournament that is called (.) Europe's
e is it a very large prestigious tournament that is called (.) Europe's
e is it a very large prestigious tournament that is called (.) Europe's
e is it a very large prestigious tournament that is called (.) Europe's
e is it a very large prestigious tournament that is called (.) Europe's
e is it a very large prestigious tournament that is called (.) Europe's
e is it a very large prestigious tournament that is called (.) Europe's
e is it a very large prestigious tournament that is called (.) Europe's
e is it a very large prestigious tournament that is called (.) Europe's
e is it a very large prestigious tournament that is called (.) Europe's
e is it a very large prestigious tournament that is called (.) Europe's
e is it a very large prestigious tournament that is called (.) Europe's
e is it a very large prestigious tournament that is called (.) Europe's
e is it a very large prestigious tournament that is called (.) Europe's
e is it a very large prestigious tournament that is called (.) Europe's
e is it a very large prestigious tournament that is called (.) Europe's
e is it a very large prestigious tournament that is called (.) Europe's
e is it a very large prestigious tournament that is called (.) Europe's
e is it a very large prestigious tournament that is called (.) Europe's
e is it a very large prestigious tournament that is called (.) Europe's
e is it a very large prestigious tournament that is called (.) Europe's
e is it a very large prestigious tournament that is called (.) Europe's

The guests in the show are to watch new music videos and then predict whether the songs are going to be hits or failures and argue for their judgment. After giving the motivation, the guest has to push one out of two buttons with different sound effects, representing the choice.

In one of the more conversational side-phases of the show, the presenter M and the guest H talk about golf and that H thought golf was so boring that he actually quit playing a while ago. When M goes on to ask H another golf-question, he does so against the backdrop of H's long and negative talk on golf. M leaves the subtopic of H's own play and asks him (line 22) what he feels about an ongoing golf tournament between USA and Europe, called Ryder Cup, "hh v- va känner du inför en sån grej som till exempel +Ryder Cup+ (what do you feel about such a thing as for example Ryder Cup).

At this point, the turn is brought to a possible syntactic and pragmatic completion. It is a closed interrogative structure, but the high rise on the end syllable is not heard as accomplishing the questioning effect that would complete the act of introducing a new subtopic this sequential position. It is rather heard as a pitch focus that opens up for a continuation beyond the final NP (cf. ch. 7.3). Within this local prosodic context, H decides to continue by means of a syntactic extension after a minimal hesitation on "e". The last NP unit of the previous TCU, "+Ryder Cup+", is used as the syntactic beginning to "e finns de ju en väldigt (+) stor prestigefylld (.) European turnerings som heter (.) Euro
tournament that is called). The whole segment (segment B as defined in ch. 5) takes the form of an interweaving of clauses (Engdahl & Ejerhed 1982:10, cf. satfläta, Teleman et al. 1999:IV:419ff) with a topicalized initial NP and the finite verb in final position. The post-P is initiated with a second finite verb that meta comments on the previous proper name NP, and there are no signs of pitch reset on the post-P that would construct the extension as a restart or new beginning. Speaker M returns completely to the pitch level of the turn before the emphatic “Ryder Cup”. The minimal element “e” (shorter than the normal hesitation marker eh) ties the NP to the following retro-constructive extension. The speaker produces it as a prosodic down-step towards the previous pitch level (it is not a glide). The construction of the extension beyond “Ryder Cup” as a syntactic continuation is made more salient using the prosodic method of returning to the pitch level and declination level of the turn before the pivot.

Communicatively, M shifts from introducing the name ‘Ryder Cup’, to explaining that the name refers to a golf tournament. It is obvious when looking at the following talk that H is not the recipient of the explanation since he is well aware of that meaning (lines excluded from extract). The explanation is a parenthetical local project within the new subtopic, directed to the viewers in case there are some among them that are not as familiar with golf as M and H. The further elaboration on the tournament (not the meaning of the name), beginning with “där (.) Euro...bästa spelare...”, is an effective way of closing down the parenthetical project and moving on.

To account for the addressee shift of the explanation one will have to analyze the video, and especially the gaze of M. When M begins to ask H his question, he is still primarily engaged in talk with H. M’s gaze is directed in the direction of H (who is out of picture, see figure 8.2 below). But when reaching “till exempel” just before the pivot, M redirects his gaze into the camera, and keeps it there all through the whole explanatory apokoinous utterance (see figure 8.3 below). The whole segment from “till exempel” on line 24 to “US↑A as* bästa spelare.” at the end of the next TCU on line 28, is directed to the camera (TV viewers) by means of gaze. Another consequence of the gaze shift is that it projects further talk into the camera at the end of the pivot. It therefore blocks the TRP in relation to H that is otherwise projected by means of syntax, prosody and pragmatics as mentioned above.
8.3 Stance shifts

Another kind of shift is when the speaker shifts stance towards a given topical aspect during the utterance at hand. These shifts mainly involve changes in how strong or weak, or general or personal, an assertive action is made. Ultimately, these shifts seem to be practices concerned with the local management of stance towards and responsibility for the expressed assertion and the possible interactive consequences of too strong or too weak an assertion in a particular sequential position.

8.3.1 Upgrading subjective or personal stance

Extract (8:5) below is drawn from an everyday telephone conversation between a young man and woman.

(8:5) Meringue
U=STI-1[83] Everyday phone call. Participants: T=Caller (m, 20 years), S=Receiver (f, 20 years). The caller asks how to make meringue, and S instructs him how to proceed.

1. S: hej de o Sara? hello it’s Sara
2. T: ja du:: (0.4) <m:arä> [::> yes hey you (0.4) the meringues
3. S:                              [mm:
4. T:    =man ska inte <hae::::> hjorthornssalt you shouldn’t have ammonium carbonate
5. å: po- potatismjöl om man vill ha dom an’ potato flour if you want them
perspektivsniffer

6. soppa (va):
chewy right

7. S: ...:hh nh:e mh, å inte ättika: e ha ja eh
hh no an' mätt vinjark o'han e ha

8. avstånd håller, .:hh:
used either .:hh:

9. T: men eksh de harta de e ha bpp
but eh oh the best that's just eggs

10. å e loker 'l stort [sett],
and sugar generally speaking

11. S: {(-h)}
[ehh, man vipsar
ahh... you beat up

12. aggriarne va, (...) .:.hh 'em så ha hva're haêu::):
and shhh i'll throw you down
the eggshells y'know (...) ah then you throw up

13. flöj-frodker hada 'ju ti dom::' som ja gejce
icing sugar had I to those that I did
icing sugar I used for those that I did

14. .:.hh pt å sen så vipsar man igen, (...) t- först
hh patriotic then you beat it up again (...) t- first

15. till ett hår skum å sen ha haller sa:

to a hard foam an' then when you pour down

16. flöj-socker at blir dom ja .:.hh vjke igen
the icing sugar then they become soft again y'know

17. ja va de kanske går me vanligt socker också:
I know it might work with ordinary sugar as well

18. pt .:.hh ejh å sen får man vipsa upp de=
pt .:.hh again then you'll have to beat it up

19. T: {(-h)}

20. S: vipsa (-.h) pt till torst skum,
again (-.h) pt to a dry foam

21. T: neh, j men, (...) }

22. S: [.pt .:.hh å se- eijh å man behöv- du behöver inte
pt .:.hh the- the you need you don't need)

23. ha vassbad över de, men {(...)}

to have a waterbath over it but (...)
The caller T is calling S to ask her about the best way to make meringue. The receiver of the call, S, answers with an identification of herself. Speaker T immediately (line 2) asks about the meringue, without presenting himself, which strongly suggests that they have been over the subject recently before. After agreeing on which ingredients are inappropriate (lines 4–8), T goes on to mention some usable candidates (sugar and eggs, lines 9–10), indicating that he has some knowledge of the matter, and specifying what kind of advice he wants. Speaker S then immediately begins a sequence of instructive actions on line 11. She obviously interprets T’s candidate mention as a request for procedural advice. She instructs him to whip the egg whites first, and then throw down the icing sugar “å skall vi börja med den som vi har” (and then you throw in icing sugar). The second instructive action is at this point delivered as a straightforward directive to throw down the sugar. But during or just after the production of the word “å skall vi börja med den som vi har” (and then you throw in icing sugar), S shifts her perspective on this ingredient and says that this is what she used, “å skall vi börja med den som jag gjorde” (and then you throw in icing sugar). From a formal perspective, S retro-constructs a syntactic pivot when continuing beyond “å skall vi börja med den som”. The extension is initiated with a second finite verb, and the prosody surrounding the micro pause before the pivot does not indicate any break or restart. Communicatively, S temporarily shifts stance towards the ingredient ‘icing sugar’ and towards the procedure of using sugar when making meringue. The utterance begins with a stance towards the procedure as a generic fact (i.e. as the usual way of doing it), but then the perspective changes into something that seems to be just a personal choice made on a specific earlier occasion when T was also present. One of S’s main tools for shifting between the generic and the personal are the shifts from the generic ‘man’ (one) in the segment preceding the pre-P, to a less generic ‘dum’ (you) in the pre-P, to the subjective ‘ja’ (I) in the post-P, and then back to the generic ‘man’ after the post-P (cf. Linell & K. Norén (2004) for a dialogic perspective on the use of pronouns in sequences). The apokoinou method is used to integrate the parenthetical shift from ‘you’ to ‘I’ within the same utterance unit. When subjectivizing and particularizing the use of sugar, S is also giving T more options, given that icing sugar is a more specific kind of sugar. This is, however, only indicated, especially compared to four lines later (line 17) when it is spelled out explicitly in a move that from a sequential point of
view can be regarded as an inserted comment that is partly made relevant by the previous indication.

When analyzing this shift I have called it a shift to a subjective or personal stance, because it is the marked case and the second action within the apokoinou. An alternative description would be to say that the more general assertion is downgraded. However, the objective stance in the beginning of the directive is unmarked, i.e. due to the lack of modalizing particles or verbs, I have interpreted it as more assertive and more objectively displayed. When S is shifting perspective, she uses ‘ja’ (I) twice and even makes the second ‘ja’ prosodically prominent. The second apokoinou action is also the one that is operating on the first and placed in final position, i.e. the position that from a communicative perspective is most consequential for following actions. However, there is also a question of description levels. The act of up- or downgrading X is a more general process in interaction. A way of dealing with both levels is to say that the shift of stance to a more subjective kind involves a downgrading of the general assertion.

In terms of communicative projects, there are two relevant projects to address. The first is the wider instructive project, within which the instructive action to throw down sugar is the second (with several actions to follow). Then there is the local communicative project of shifting to the subjective stance. This project is handled syntactically on line and is grammatically and prosodically designed as parenthetical in relation to the wider project. The stance shift is not given the status of a third instructional action. It is constructed as a parenthetical comment on instruction number two before resuming the wider project with an in breath, a smack sound and a resuming utterance “Ahhh pt. and then you beat it again”, with the generic ‘man’ (you).

A related, but more conventionalized, method of shifting to a more subjective (or less assertive) stance can be seen in extract (8:6) below. The extract is drawn from a discussion between three doctors who have been given a predefined topic, ‘euthanasia’, by some researchers. The doctors discuss different variants of legitimate death help that might already be in use within established medical practice (the recording was made in 1968), such as giving doses of morphine that are lethal in the long run to children with skeleton cancer (lines 1–24). On line 25, speaker D shifts topic to another aspect of medical practice, which is that doctors’ decisions sometimes are based on strategies to watch their backs (lines 25–35).
Much more disgusting
LU:TALB:DOC[248]. Four doctors discuss euthanasia. Participants: A (m, southern Swedish accent), B (m, moderator, Finland-Swedish accent), D (f). Talbanken, recorded in 1968. The overall topic in the sequence is about different kinds of practices that can be compared with death help, which are already (1968) in use within the practice of child medicine.

1. A: MEN DÄR kommer momentet med primum non nocere =
   but there comes the moment with non nocere

2. D: [de] =

3. A: =och de e ju precis samma vid .hh: en JA:]
   and it’s exactly the same [with, A:]

4. D: =) att sycke?]
   ) an’ sick

5. A: =.hh=

   yes but we’ve gotten way past that a long time ago

7. D: [ NATURLIGT]

8. [0.2]

9. A: NEJ MEN NATURLIGTvis e de precis samma sak med låt
   no but naturally it is the same thing with let

10. oss säg ett barn med eh: osteogen sarcom med
    as say a child with eh: osteogenic sarcoma with

11. utbredda skelettmetastaser .hh de e ju klart
    disseminated skeleton metastasis .hh it’s clear

12. att ja indirekt tar livet av detta barn genom
    that I indirectly take the life from this child through

13. att ge smärtstillande middel i så hög dos så att ja
    giving pain killers in such high doses that I

14. för länge sen överställer den .hh terapeutiska
    long ago exceeded the .hh therapeutic

15. barnet blir mer å mer
    the child gets more and more

16. refraktärt emot mor[fin.]
    refractory against morphine

17. B: [*men!*]
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19.

A: men hade ju ih ä så får e de ju ingen
but there’s olik so there is no

20.

skillnad på pediatri och [och ]
difference in pediatrics and

21.

B: [nej;]
no

22.

A: [medicin] [.hh:] 
adult medicine hh

23.

B: [nej;]
no

24. D: [men man] kommer väl in på
but you are coming into on

25. en mycket [äcklitare] D föll [a] p(a) några
one much disgusting every held I on say

26. för vår [egen del:] bekvämnare, (. ) hh::
for our own sake more troublesome hh:

27. ställningstagande de [e] ju så mycket som (de) [he] p(a) säga
its so much that

28. gäller att ha ryggen fri
is about watching your back

29. (0.4)

30. D: så att säga va;
so to speak right

31. (. )

32. D: för så många.
for so many

33. (. )

34. D: hh *stav oss*.
hh of us

When opening the new topic D uses the word “äcklitare” (disgusting) that a few moments later in the turn she replaces with the segment ”för vår
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egen del: besvärligare,” [for our own sake more troublesome]. Before doing the actual repair, however, she comments on the choice of word with a fixed idiomatic verb phrase “höll j(a) p(å) säga” [was I about to say]. The phrase is partly built by a second finite verb that only takes the preceding segment “en mycke ‘äckliare’” [a much more disgusting] as its syntactic beginning, thereby retro-constructing a recognizable syntactic pivot. If seen as a self-initiated self repair, the repair sequence is initiated already when uttering ‘äckliare’ with creaky voice, which in this context can be heard as signaling that the word is slightly outside the professional role within which D initiates the utterance. The phrasal continuation with a smile voice takes the edge of the inappropriacy (in this context) of using the word ‘disgusting’, displaying for the other participants that D is aware of this. The phrase ‘höll ja på å säga’ [was I about to say] is used to explicitly close the temporary shift of role into a more personal stance towards the new topic. This closing move makes possible a return back to the professional identity of a doctor in the following utterance.

The turn is not brought to a possible completion before doing the phrasal meta-comment. This, together with the fact that the post-P is a fixed phrase, is something that makes this extract a bit different (formally less prototypical) from most of the other extracts in this chapter and the ones to follow. But it can still be argued that the apokoinou method of retro-constructing a syntactic pivot resolves a local communicative project of assessing an upcoming point of view, and then, within the same construction, partly withdrawing from the assessment with a subjectivizing move. The initial assertion that the stance to be mentioned later is disgusting is dramatized into something incidental, perhaps just a mistake made by D herself in the moment of speaking. The subjective upgrade is in this particular case used as a self-repair initiator, but not all instances of the variant are.

It seems as if the subjective stance is something participants shift into, rather than shift from, during the apokoinou utterance. There is only one utterance in the corpus that could support the opposite view (cf. 8:9 below).

63 This phrase has in Swedish conversational language a rather fixed morpho-syntactic, lexical and prosodic form and functional potential. It seems to be a construction containing the lexical elements ‘höll ja på å säga’ (the ‘å’ is left out in one instance), with no difference in word order, and with a parenthetical prosodically (level intonation, only secondary stress and no pausing during production), and tied to it a functional potential of withdrawing from a previous assertion without entirely negating it (cf. the X&X-construction, Linell and Lindström, forthc.).
8.3.2 Upgrading epistemic support

Another way of shifting stance towards a topical aspect is to upgrade the support for an assertion that has already been made within the same utterance. This method partly overlaps with the phenomena to be treated in chapter 9 below, but when analyzed as shifts, they also have a dimension of perspective shift that is not really there in the insisting recyclings. The extract (8:7) below is drawn from a talk between a student counselor and two young men. They are all located in front of a computer screen where they are using the web to search for information about some education programs. In this particular sequence, the participants discuss the last possible day for sending in applications to one of the education programs they have been looking at.

(8:7) The fifteenth of May

(U:SYV:1:9). Student counseling talk at a public office for young people. Participants: V = Student counselor (m), L = Lars (m, 20-24 years), P = Peter (m, 20-24 years). Talk about different education alternatives with different application dates.

1. L: [men i viss takt] sörder om [m res] but then the last application date is it

2. P: [PT .hh:::] [de e ren femtonde pt hh:::] it’s the fifteenth

3. alltihopa eller;

4. all of them or

5. V: [de] [men måste vi [holla, m] we’ve got to check that

6. (0.4)

7. L: [res[;]]

8. V: [de] e inte alls säkert att [de femtonde] it’s not certain at all that it is the fifteenth

9. (1.2)

10. P: pt.hh >>för ja tänkte<< >elle ja så pt.hh >>because I thought<< >or I saw that now<

11. "Berghs hade ren femtonde maj was it"

12. (0.2)
On line 2, speaker P suggests that the fifteenth is the last application date for all the programs they have looked at. Speaker C’s (the counselor’s) response is negative and he goes on to say that this must be checked (line 5). At this point it is uncertain what it is that has to be checked (the proper date, that it concerns all programs, or both). Speaker V then goes on to clarify the date as his main concern in the next turn (line 8). In sum, C has questioned the certainty of the fifteenth as being the correct date and has called for a further check on this to validate the information. At this point in the sequential development of the argument P replicates (line 10) that he saw it just now (probably on the computer screen), and that the application date for the school Berghs was the fifteenth (‘Berghs hade den femtonde maj’). When saying this, P has withdrawn from the topic ‘all programs’, and narrowed it down to just this single school, i.e. he provides validation for only part of the information that was to be checked, and it is done in the shape of a report of what he just saw (an ‘interactional evidential’ in the spirit of Clift (2006)).

At this point in the utterance production P extends his validation with “va re.”, a colloquial variant of ‘var det’ (was it). Syntactically, the extension with a second finite verb only takes the date ‘den femtonde maj’.

Clift (2006) focuses on reported speech as ‘interactional evidentials’, while P’s mention of what he saw on the screen is rather some kind of reported activity, used to provide evidential support for his knowledge.
(the fifteenth of May) as a syntactic beginning, thereby retro-constructing a syntactic pivot. The accent on “fem” (five) opens up for a continuation beyond “maj” (May) that is a possible syntactic completion point. Speaker P finishes the utterance with an intonation that is almost try-marked, and the response from V in the following turn contributes to construct P’s move as a request for confirmation.

Communicatively the continuation is used to do a perspective shift from the ongoing concern of checking and providing evidence for the date Peter argues for, to a more local upgrading of the epistemic stance towards the fifteenth as the correct application date to Berghs. P starts with a focus on “Berghs” because he narrows the topic from speaking about all the schools in the previous turn. He moves the focus to the date through placing the primary accent in the turn on “fem”, and continuing the turn beyond “femtonde maj” with another finite verb “va”. This continuation retro-constructs “femtonde maj” as thematic for the following talk (foregrounding) and the school Berghs is backgrounded within the overall argumentative communicative project that is about the right application date.

It is useful to handle this epistemic upgrade in terms of a local communicative project, done within the wider communicative project of arguing. The certainty of a previous statement has been questioned, evidence has been called for, and Peter uses the apokoinou as a method to resolve the local communicative task of providing partial evidence and immediately upgrade the epistemic stance towards this evidence. Apparently, the method, in combination with the try-marking prosody, is effective. V agrees immediately with P on line 13, and L is following suit on line 14. In subsequent turns, as an account for his initial skepticism towards P’s suggestion, V claims that he was actually responding to the assertion about all the programs (including university programs), while P was primarily talking about the Berghs school. The immediate sequence of actions that the apokoinou is made to align with is the previous opposing argument by V, the counter-argument by P, the apokoinou self-confirmation by P, and then the closing accepting responses by V and L.

The alignment to the wider argumentative project illustrates the multifunctionality of apokoinou utterances. To say that P is upgrading the epistemic stance on the date in response to V’s previous skepticism could also be described as a method of insisting on or strengthening an assertion already made. As will be shown in chapter 9, the act of insisting does not necessarily entail a shift of perspective, but in this particular utterance, it does.
8.3.3 Upgrading evidential support

In talk-in-interaction, the stance modalities evidential and epistemic are closely connected as can be seen in extract (8:7) above (target lines re-produced below).

1. P: pt hh >>för ja tänkte<< >elle ja såg de nu<<
   pt hh >>because I thought<< >or I saw that now<<

2. "Berghs hade sex femtonde Maj va re".
   Berghs had the fifteenth May it was

Speaker P is first giving evidence for his knowledge with a reference to personal visual experience "elle ja såg de nu" (or I saw that just now). Then he goes on to claim once again that he knows the right date, "Berghs hade sex femtonde Maj," (Berghs had the fifteenth of May). After this he upgrades his epistemic stance towards the date with "va re" (it was), reinforcing the epistemic assertion that it is really the correct date in the world outside the immediate talk.

In extract (8:7) above the apokoinou method was used to achieve the epistemic upgrade, but not the evidential move that was done with the segment 'elle ja såg de nu'. In extract (8:8) below, however, the speaker uses apokoinou to upgrade the evidential support for his statement within the same utterance. The extract is drawn from a telephone call to the poison information central, where the caller is asking for an information document on how to deal with poison emergencies.

(8:8) Dated

U:UGIC:16479-32[170], Telephone call to a poison information call center. Participants: K1=Informer (f), M=Caller (m). The caller asks for an information document on poisonous substances to be used in his teaching.

1. K1:                         [    j            ↑
   ja.]

2. (0.2) för ja troste vi har de- >de får
   (0.2) 'cause I don’t think that we have that- it will

3. nog bli< fle   t↓   tt[ttt]ja ska
   probably have to more-4 pages in that case I will

4. st till[ttt]ja har
   book here

5. M:      [ .hh ] ja [d-] >de har f^nets en<<
   hh It’s been a
6. K1: [ () ]

7. M: "ja oh: då- ja talade efter året med någon yttre: I talked last year with somebody

8. där "å", hh å någon att ni ska there are "some" hh are then she said that you will

9. a- och någon där va, hh ni har a-make a new one of those right hh you have

10. harft "den" ha plugga ha funnit sen a document have been found since

11. atti: > hh: "nej" något "som" eighty something eight seven something that there

12. något där men hh ja har snort: is a dated year but I have called

13. va- nästan varannat å å [frågat om den]= almost every other year an or asked if it

14. K1: [ m:() ]

15. M: "forforfarande gäller å de har man sagt< men still is valid and they have confirmed that but

16. hh efter året så man att nu e den på (0.2) hh last year they said that now it's on its

17. va[gg att-] way to

18. K1: [ () ] ja > det (.) de e inte en plansch yes yes it's not a poster

19. [ utan de e en stencil i A fyra ] but a document in A-four

20. M: [ hh nå, hh inte en planse utan de ha vart en ] hh no hh not a poster but it has been a

21. en en A fyra (0.2) stencill a a A-four (0.2) document

22. K1: [ () ] yes
The caller and the operator on the help line have been engaged in a discussion whether the document actually exists or not. The target lines (10–12) are produced when M is in the middle of persuading the operator that it does exist, and that he has been calling every other year to make sure it is still up to date. He says that “den här stencilen ha funnits sen åtti::: sex sju: nåt sånt där” (this document has been around since eighty hh six seven something like that). To give further support for this (perhaps rather vaguely expressed) fact, he then goes on to provide evidence for the statement – the document has a date written on it, “ett år” (is dated year). The continuation is a syntactic extension where the finite verb ‘ett år’ (a) is used to only take the preceding year reference “ett år” and comments “nåt sånt där” (something like that) after producing it. The prosodically and lexically displayed uncertainty about the right dating of the document can be said to occasion a local need to immediately upgrade the evidential support for the dating he produced.

It is also possible to view the local shift within the overall communicative project of persuading the operator that the request is legitimate and therefore should be treated seriously. M rushes into the post-

---

65 There is another apokoinou in the local co-text (lines 9–11) which I have ignored in this discussion.
P through increased speed, offbeat. He is in a hurry to show that the exact date was not the relevant thing in the present ongoing activity, but rather that he has detailed knowledge about the document and what is written on it. He is a serious questioner and has good reasons for calling again this year and checking out if the document is still valid, because they said last year that they would update it. He is, in a way, presenting himself as an expert on a document that the operator perhaps should know about (being a representative for the poison centre), but apparently does not.

A group of apokoinous-like utterances use tag-like post-Ps, such as ‘törek ja’ (think I), ‘tycker ja’ (believe I), ‘sa han’ (said he), or ‘säger dom’ (says they) (these translations are unidiomatic verb first glossings, cf. the discussion in appendix 3). They are formally an-prototypical, but the actions they are used to achieve are reminiscent of prototypical apokoinous functions in the sense that they are syntactically and prosodically integrated with the preceding utterance and that they retro-construct a syntactic pivot. A collection of utterances with variants of ‘sa han’ (said he) will be discussed in the next chapter, and an example of the variant ‘säger dom’ (says they) will be discussed below.

Extract (8:9) below is drawn from a weekly radio discussion program on philosophical questions, ‘Filosofiska rummet’ (The Philosophical Room). This week the main topic of the program is religious mysticism in large religions such as Christianity, Buddhism, and Islam. In connection with the extract below speaker K has been talking about the founding fathers of big religions (such as Jesus and Mohammed), and the high demands they put on religious practitioners (they often criticized the religious tradition for not being true enough and then presented something new to replace it).

(8:9) Reflections

L:FR2[114]. From ‘Filosofiska rummet’ (The Philosophical Room) on Swedish radio, a weekly discussion program on philosophical questions with four participants: P= Peter Sandberg (m, presenter), A= Anton Geels (m, guest, psychologist of religion), K= Katarina Stenqvist (f, philosopher of religion). The overall topic is religious mysticism. The local topic is about how images of god are treated in different religions.

1. K: [...] de finns ju en tanke om (0.4) f-

2. eh falsk å sann mystik eller falsk å sann

3. religion

4. P: [ mm: ]
5. P: mm:. pt .hh +men de finns ju >menar< (.) krav
   mm:. pt .hh but there's this 'I mean' (.) the demands
6. e höga de (. ) å de ska'nte finnas några
   are high there () an' there shouldn't be any
7. bilder å inga ord för och å allt sånt där
   images an' no words for all these things
8. le bara fältigp. (.hh) å en buddhistmunk lär ha-
   are just vanity. hh an' a Buddhist monk is supposed to have
9. X: [ m:ttttttt .hh:: ]
10. P: =sagt till sina lärjungar att om du möter
7. Budda på vägen så dö ho-
11. Buddha on the Road then kill
12. (0.6)
13. A: ja=
14. P: =Anton
15. A: ja, .hh ja de a ju inte vilka buddister som
16. .hh that's not just any Buddhists
17. \[^{\text{16}}\]
18. A: =gör det att provovara och som eh .hh å där
19. and there's that what you see and
20. detta då va, .hh å de a all man särte:
21. hear that is impressions of sight and hearing-
Speaker P then picks up the ‘high demand’ topic in K’s previous turn and says (lines 5–8) that one expression of this is the prohibition of pictures or words representing God. As an example of this prohibition he tells a story (lines 8–11) and finishes it with a rather provocative quote from a Buddhist monk, who is reputed to have said that if one of his disciples should ever meet Buddha on the road, he should kill him.

In response to this story, A points out (lines 15–18) that these are Zen Buddhists who love to provoke, and goes on to explain (lines 19–25) the
For a Zen Buddhist, A says, the things we hear and see are only a reflection of our own mind. It has nothing to do with the essential being of Buddha. The (unexpressed) implication of this explanation would probably be that since you should not make images of God you must kill/destroy even a mentally reflected image of Buddha.

When A comes to the end of the syntactic unit on line 24 (ending with "medvetande" (mind), that turn has been brought to a possible complex TRP, syntactically grounded on the stressed initial finite verb "s" (is). No continuation is syntactically or pragmatically projected after the production of the report that starts with "[they are seeing and]..." on line 20 and ends with "[are mind]" on line 24. Prosodically, the final segment "medvetande," does not project a syntactic continuation within the same contour, but the segment is not ended with a terminal, thereby possibly projecting some kind of continuation of the turn. When continuing with another finite verb "säger dom" (they say) after a micro pause, the speaker A is in fact doing a syntactic extension of the turn anyway. Syntactically, this extension retro-constructs the core part of the explanatory report as the syntactic beginning (pivot), thereby excluding the preceding initiating construction "... och det att...". Prosodically, the extension is produced with lower volume, falling pitch, without a pitch accent and slightly compressed, all resources that have been shown elsewhere to signal finality on similar construction types in Swedish conversation (cf. Karlsson 2006, especially ch. 6.5).

Communicatively the continuation shifts perspective on the reported topic and retro-constructs it as something that is said by the Zen-Buddhists themselves. The explanation, initiated with the light beginning ". och det att..." (and there's that) on line 20, is produced in a way that gives the impression that A is doing his own interpretation of the Zen world of thought. A is so to speak talking in his own voice even though he is authoring the Zen-Buddhist way of thinking (to speak in terms of Goffman’s production format theory, 1981). When adding "säger dom," (they say), A can be said to move one step down on the responsibility scale, in attributing the previous way of thinking to another authority in a more explicit way. It is not presented as his own interpretation any more, but just as much a

---

66 This interpretation holds irrespective whether the beginner is used as a variant of the lexicalized construction 'de+e' (there's, cf. Forskål, forthc) or as a syntactic configuration of constituents.
quotation of the Zen Buddhists themselves. In Goffman’s terms, A the author retro-constructs himself as A the animator. Compared to (8) above, it is another kind of upgrade of evidential stance, this time towards the reported way of thinking. The reported topic is reframed as a less subjective assertion (cf. 8.3.1 above), to something with a higher degree of evidential status.

In terms of communicative projects, A uses the apokoinou-like method to resolve the local communicative project of upgrading the evidential stance towards the report within the wider communicative project of explaining the Zen way of thinking, which, (to take this one step further) is used to argue for his take on the provocative quotation. When A shifts to an authority outside the talk, he restructures the participation framework and uses this restructuring as an argumentative resource within the argumentative project.

8.3.4 Discussion of stance shifts

At least two things about stance shifts can be discussed. The first is the relationship between subjective upgradings (8.3.1) and epistemic downgradings. It is hard to separate them analytically and the basic reason why is that both processes always co-occur in my data. Utterances initiated with a (strong) assertive stance toward the local topic and then downgraded are always shifted into a more subjective stance. It is in principle possible to downgrade an epistemic assertion with a non-subjectivizing move using apokoinou, but there are no examples of such downgradings in my corpus. So why categorize them as upgradings rather than downgradings? The answer is that there is a point to be made in highlighting the fact that these utterances are all subjectivized. The downgrading of epistemic stance seems to be a more general category with many possible ways of doing it and the categorization is intended to display the empirical finding that only one practice is used.

The second thing that can be discussed is that the phenomenon of evidential downgrading does not seem to appear in my corpus. While epistemic downgrades often are done by way of upgrading the subjective stance with a range of various resources, the downgrading of evidential stance does not occur at all. One possible explanation why is simply that the interactional need to resolve the local communicative project to make the evidential support to some local assertion assertor requires special circumstances, and these do not arise in my data in connection with the use of apokoinou. This could be compared with relevance downgrades below, which are very unusual as well. A situation, within which the interactional motivation arises for a speaker to present him/herself as less relevant in relation to the
ongoing activity, does not seem occur in connection with the use of apokoinou.

8.4 Relevance shifts

In this group of apokoinou utterances, the participants seem to be doing some kind of relevance shift when doing the twist around the pivotal element. The term relevance is used here to account for the ways in which participants contextualize or frame an utterance in relation to an overall or wider communicative project. An upgrading of relevance is tying the ongoing utterance closer to, or making it more in line with, an ongoing wider activity or communicative project. A downgrading is consequently to move away from the wider communicative project.

8.4.1 Relevance upgradings

Extract (8:10) below is drawn from a conversation in a social welfare office between a client (K) and a visiting researcher (FO). The talk takes place right after a conference between the client and his social welfare officer. On lines 1–6 FO asks about some specific issues that K before the meeting had considered particularly problematic (his financial situation, the dentist, and the driver’s license).

(8:10) Up to them
L1:CTI(265). A researcher interviews a client at a Swedish social welfare office. Participants: FO=Researcher (f). K=Client (m). Talk about whether K took the opportunity or not to discuss all the things that he said he wanted to discuss in the meeting with the officer.

1.  
2. FO: ja du a- (...) eh de som du säga innan här då
3. att du ville ta upp me henne- (...) å prata om:
4. de här nu uppstålet å tandlakarn å f- å körkort
5. så så där<.hh: tycker' u liksom att du fått
6. de sagt de ru vilken ha sagt 'å sådär'.

say what you wanted to say and the like
8. K: ja: för att ju inte annat ja kan tillhöja som
    
yo. Tha: ingenting else I can add that

9. ah:: (b) man kan men ja ther:u va ja
    
that you can know you are what I

10. manar, [[ja (d) e klart] ja kanske missa=
     
well of course Maybe forgot

11. FO: 

12. K: 
    
nothing but ah

13. (1.6)

14. K: pt. bhr:: (1.0) ja ja fick ju de sagt som ja
    
yes I got it said that I

15. 

16. FO: 

17. K: 

18. inte en å< 
     
not one dime in all cases

19. (1.9)

20. K: 
    
you don't count on that

21. (0.9)

22. FO: du räkna inte me de.
    
you don't count on that

23. (0.3)

24. K: 
    
will probably be necessary to see another doctor

25. [ blir väl åc upp]se ska ny lakare
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K answers rather vaguely in the following turn (lines 8–12), and the answer is left unattended by FO. The following pause of 1.6 seconds probably prompts K to provide a more focused answer on line 14, this time acknowledged by FO with a continuers. Instead of continuing with talk about the problematic issues, K then rushes into a pessimistic comment on his chances of receiving money from the welfare office. He has presented the reasons why he thinks he is entitled to a payment, but now it is up to them (line 17). For K, although probably urgent in themselves, the issues were apparently also used as arguments to get money from the welfare.

Up to this point K has been acting in response to FO’s question. Even though at first acting as if he tries to avoid a straightforward answer, he reverts (line 14) and gives a fairly straight answer "ja ja fik ju de sagt en ja skulle" (yeay yeah I got to say what I had planned). At this point, however, K starts to shift perspective on the conference. Instead of focusing on whether he got the opportunity to bring forward all the important issues, he shifts his focus with the phrase "men [...] sen e re ju upp ti s" (but then it’s up to them). At this point in the utterance, K has brought the turn to a possible syntactic closure. No further syntactic elements are projected. However, there is no fall to low and a prosodic accent on the last syllable that can be heard as projecting a continuation.
beyond this possible closure. Pragmatically, however, it is still rather vague where he is going. When he continues to specify this, it is done by way of a 'så'-initiated syntactic extension of the final turn segment that excludes the turn beginning. The post-P extension is initiated with "så får ja väl inte ..." (then I wont get ...), that retro-constructs the prior segment "e re ju upp ti d↑om" (if it's up to them) as a syntactic pivot. The pivot is constructed as the antecedent in the conditional 'if-then' construction and the protasis to the following consequent, which is constructed as the apodosis.67

There are no audible signs of a restart or a break-off at the pivot borders, so the prosodic configuration supports an interpretation of the pivot as connecting syntactically, prosodically and communicatively to both the pre-P segment and the post-P segment. The pre-P is finished with a cliffhanger-like 'men' (but) that projects a negatively polarized continuation. FO's minimal response might be heard as responding to this projection, but is mainly placed in connection to the TRP after 'skulle' (should). The accent on "se" (then) implies a restart, but the element is pragmatically and syntactically parasitic on the previous turn. The prosody at the border between pivot and post-P shows no real signs of demarcation. The pitch accent on "d↑om" together with a slightly raised pitch rather continues the projection of the turn towards another possible completion (opens up the door to the post-P segment). A stronger accent and a higher pitch rise would be needed to implement (or second) a closure after an additional TCU. The possible TRP after "d↑om" is thereby blocked. This is an example of a salient coordination between the prosodic and the syntactic utterance building methods since "så" retro-constructs "e re ju upp ti d↑om" as a pivot while the prosody blocks the previously projected TRP (cf. the discussion in 7.3).

Apart from being a method of giving the utterance a recognizable form with a syntactic pivot and an integrating prosodic contour, the apokoinou also solves a local communicative project of upgrading the relevance of the ongoing utterance in relation to K's overall communicative project. It seems that K and FO are pursuing two different communicative projects involving two different perspectives on the conference topic. FO is interested in the communicative activity that the conference represents and what was going on there, while K is interested in the financial outcome of

67 The pivot has a reminiscent feature of a syntactic blend in the sense that the untranslatable modal particle 'ju' only belongs to Segment A, not Segment B. Furthermore, Segment B does not translate very well to English. There will have to be an 'if'-element inserted before the pivot in order for Segment B to be a possible 'sentence' in English.
the conference and the consequences of a negative answer for his future actions. The use of the apokoinou construction on lines 14-18 emerges from K’s shift of perspective on this topic. When K produces the first segment “ja ja f*** ju de sagt som ja skulle men [(.) sen] e re upp ti dom” (yes yeah I got to say what I should but then it’s up to them) he mainly orients towards FO’s perspective. During the end of the segment, he begins to shift towards his own perspective (the financial outcome). When he continues with “så får ja väl inte en *spännande* alla f**a**) (then I won’t get a dime anyway) he topicalizes his own perspective.

From K’s point of view, the on-line shift from FO’s project to his own can be described as *upgrading the relevance* of the answer. The problematic issues he brought up during the conference were partly means to the end of getting some money. The shift gives the impression that the issues as such were not as relevant an aspect of the conference as the financial aspect and especially the decision made by ‘them’, here probably representing the whole social welfare office.

The shift is primarily a local shift within the utterance, but it is subsequently constructed as the topical base for the following interactional sequence. K and FO cooperate in being sorry for (almost pitying) the fact that K will now be forced to see a new doctor that can give him a prolonged notification of illness. After some discussion on this new topic (from line 22 and onward), FO resumes the topic of the conference with a question on how it was to see the officer (omitted).

Extract (8:11) below is drawn from an everyday family conversation in home environment. The participants are in the kitchen preparing a meal. U, the adult woman who lives in the house, talks to C, a female friend on a visit, about the video recording that is being made during their talk. C asks specifically what U will do with the recording (line 1). After a sequence with joint joking and laughter, U finally comes round to answering the question (lines 14–16). She begins with a repetition of C’s question, and then she goes on with “vi håller på me eh den här talSpråkCorpusen”, (we are working with this spoken language corpus).

At this point in the turn production the answer is not very specific in relation to the question. It does not deal explicitly with the issue of what U will do with the recording. However, in this sequential position in the talk, it is accepted as a sufficient and pragmatically possibly complete answer.

---

88 Note that the turn on line 20 is analyzed as a post-P in another apokoinou in extract (10:9) below.
(B11) The spoken language corpus
GGSLC\(\text{\[94\]}\). Everyday family conversation while preparing dinner. Participants: U=Ulla (49 years), hostess and responsible for the recording, C=Christina (48 years), friend of U on visit, K=Karin (6 years), U:s daughter, S=Sofi (18 years), U:s daughter. Talk about the recording. Christina asks Ulla what she will do with the recording.

1. C: what are you gonna do with that then hm: hm (.)
2. U: (stroking hair: dramatic) you maybe
3. C: what's your name Ulla is your name
4. C: what are you gonna do with this
5. U: (stroking hair) my name is
6. C: here something
7. U: Ulla an' dadadadada
8. C: in comes
9. K: = Kalle an' jja (h)eter (U)lla
10. U: ( turns away from C)
11. S: ( laughs)
12. C: = (h) (h) (h) (h) ..hh:: (h) (h) 
13. U: no and what shall I do with this it is probably we are working with this
14. C: (soft thud)
The syntax supports the analysis that U has brought the turn to a possible TRP, but not the prosody. No further syntactic elements are projected, but a primary focus accent on the pivot opens up the turn for a possible continuation beyond the pivot (cf. ch. 7.3), and there is no fall to low on the last syllable.

In this prosodic context, U extends her turn with another finite verb, and thereby retro-constructs the final NP in the previous turn segment as a syntactic pivot with a post-P segment "den här tal sprayed korpusen (.) kan de ingå i." (this spoken language corpus can it be a part of). The pitch accent on "korpusen" projects a continuation and blocks a projected possible TRP. The segments '...korpusen' and 'kan de...' are produced as separate phonetic segments without assimilation of the [n] and [k] sounds, but without pausing in between.

Communicatively the apokoinou is a method to resolve the local communicative project of upgrading the relevance of the ongoing utterance in relation to the wider communicative project of question-answer initiated earlier by C. The utterance-initial perspective on the corpus topic focuses on the general activity of putting together a corpus with spoken language data. When shifting perspective on the corpus topic, U gets slightly more specific regarding the role of the recording in relation to the corpus that the recording can become a part of the corpus. Speaker U can be heard as withholding the answer, because the topic as such is rather sensitive. As a researcher, U does not want to reveal too much about the purpose of the recording in order to
prevent C from monitoring her conversational behavior. Since the original question, and the repeated version, was focused on the second of these perspectives, the shift can be viewed as a locally managed upgrade of the relevance in relation to how the question was formulated, and a way to handle the sensitivity of the topic. (This sequence is also analyzed in extract 10:21.)

8.4.2 Relevance downgradings

Interestingly enough, there are no clear examples of relevance downgradings in the data. The following extract (8:12) comes close, but may not be altogether prototypical in relation to the apokoinou constructional schema.

(8:12) Lund

U:MKL-121[26] From ‘Måndagsklubben’ (The Monday Club). Informal TV talk show with five participants in the studio in front of an audience. Participants: A=Anna (f, presenter), C=Claes Malmberg (m, co-presenter), AD=Ada Malmberg (m, co-presenter), Aud=Audience. Claes has just completed pushing for an upcoming event he was invited to participate in, but had to turn down. Anna then asks some questions about the event.

   which date did you say that it was

2. C: [Ekdal]
   Ekdal

   sixteenth of May so it was

4. C: [Ekdal]
   Ekdal

5. A: [ Ekdal ] Sixtende maj [i:: ]
   sixteenth of May in

6. C: [.N:\]

7. I Lund [jak] kommer fan inte håg exakt-
    in Lund I can’t bloody remember exactly

8. A: [ m. ]

9. C: [Ekdal] stallet heter namn de[ e: Lund ]
   what place-name is called but it is Lund

10. A: [e: Lund ] men de får man-
   but one can find
The excerpt is drawn from a TV talk show. The talk is about a variety of topics drawn from newspaper clippings brought by the presenter and the guests. When the apokoinou is produced, the co-presenter C has just completed pushing for an upcoming event he was invited to participate in, but had to turn down. The main presenter A follows up with some questions about the event.

A asks two clarifying questions, one about the date (line 1) and one about the place of the event (line 5). The second question recycles C’s answer to the first question as the topical and syntactical base for a slot filling question, “sextonde maj i::” (sixteenth of May in::). C then fills the slot with the name of the town where the event is taking place (“Lund”), repeating the preposition “i” (in), and A closes down the sequence with a short “m.”

Even though A thereby treats the given information as sufficient, C goes on and tries to provide additional information on the name of the exact place in Lund, “ja kommer fan inte hag exakt va stället hette men< de [e: LU]ND” (I can’t bloody remember exactly what the place is called but it’s Lund).

At this point in the turn production, C has reached a syntactic and
pragmatic possible point of completion, but makes a prosodic rush through into an extension of the turn “én stör stad så du bara-” (if not that large a city so you just-). Probably occasioned by A’s simultaneous talk on line 10. The extension is syntactic to the extent that it retroconstructs the final NP ‘Lund’ as syntactic beginning, thereby making it a recognizable syntactic pivot for a shift between two overlapping structures.

Communicatively, however, the extension is also a product of a shift of perspective on the local topic aspect ‘Lund’ and a downgrading of the relevance of finding the exact name of the place in Lund. C’s search for the name of the place in Lund is downgraded as not so relevant for the immediate purposes of the talk at this sequential position, a choice probably made in orientation to the assumptions that so few of the TV viewers are in Lund anyway. C has already provided enough information to answer Anna’s question on line 5. Of course, Claes might have his own agenda with the Lund topic, but he obviously considers it unnecessary to pursue the name search any further.

Another way of analyzing the AC in (12), is to view C’s extension of the turn after the initial answer “i Lund” as a way to anticipate a third question from A. A’s questions on lines 1 and 5 have been co-constructed as ‘which date?’ and ‘in which town?’, and they are then treated by C as the first two slots in a three-part list where the third (anticipated) slot is ‘which place in Lund?’.

In the pre-P, speaker C makes relevant that this slot in the unfolding three-part list is about the local place in Lund. Nevertheless, contrary to this, he produces an account for why he does not produce it (he does not remember the name), and goes on to downgrade the relevance of having to provide information about a specific place in a small town like Lund.

Speaker C raises the volume of his voice on the pivot and the beginning of the pre-P, partly in order to postpone the projection of the turn towards another completion point (opening up for continuation), and partly because A makes a simultaneous comment. When continuing, speaker C makes a joke about the size of Lund. The prosody and syntax leading up to the pivot project something in the position of the pivot, so there is no break-off analyzed between pre-P and pivot despite the volume rise. Moreover, the prosody between pivot and post-P is continuous both pitch-wise and

---

If narrowed down to ‘men de e Lund eén så stor stad’, the construction would be an example of the topic elaborating method following light introductions treated in chapter 11.6.2. But the relevant preceding context for the shift is wider than that.
8.5 Foregrounding and backgrounding shifts

The notions of foregrounding and backgrounding in this section are used to highlight a common feature in many apokoinou utterances, especially extracts where shifts are done. These functions can be found in several of the already analyzed extracts above, and I will begin the analysis of foregrounding and backgrounding shifts with three of these, before moving on to a more detailed analysis of extracts in the main part of this section.

In extract (8:1) above (target lines reproduced below) the experience aspect (feeling of calm) is backgrounded and the physiological perspective on the size of the belly (less space) is foregrounded.

1. L: >å sen så blir det också lugnare< and then it also gets calmer in
2. and then it also gets calmer in

In extract (8:2) above (target lines reproduced below) the Swedish perspective of power play is backgrounded and the Canadian perspective on the situation with the player in the penalty box is foregrounded.

1. (.....) i en wollen-<dning Sveriges har numerat> in a one-nil-lead Sweden has numeral
2. över:<läge i ytterligare femtioåtta sekunder> in an additional fifty-eight seconds
3. ska Sean >DO Novan< sitta utvisad. shall Sean Donovan remain in the penalty box

Finally, in extract (8:8) above (target lines reproduced below) the two aspects (i) ‘you have had this document’ and (ii) ‘this document has existed since X’ are both backgrounded and the more objective dating of the document is foregrounded.

1. a- göra en nyt i sån där va, hh ni har a- make a new one of those right hh you have
As shown with these four short analyses, the functional potential of the apokoinou method to foreground and background different aspects of topics is not tied to a particular set of apokoinou utterances, but is a communicative function in many utterances among which the (main?) local communicative projects differ (extract 8:1-2: explanatory, extract 8: upgrading evidential stance). The extracts 8:13–16 below are chosen to exemplify utterances where the fore- and backgrounderg function is the most salient function of the retro-constructing move. It is perhaps not incidental that the utterances chosen all have light post-Ps with a presentational function of introducing the pivot (also see ch. 11.4). However, apokoinou is about not only presenting pivots, but also mainly about what is done with the twist around the pivot, and that is what I will focus on in the following extracts. I will also try to show that the actions of fore- and backgrounding are consequential for the actions that follow the apokoinou utterance.

Below I will focus on two extracts, where the first is more in line with the four analyses above (fore- and backgrounding), and where the second is slightly different, dealing more exclusively with the local project of backgrounding.

Extract (8:13) is drawn from a coffee conversation with four senior women talking about shared memories. In this sequence, they have been talking about horses and carriages and how they were used in the towns during the nineteen thirties. They talk about men who came in from the countryside with horse and carriage to sweep the streets or to sell goods and products in the marketplace.

Within this topical context participant A launches a story (line 7 onwards) that ends up being about her father and the horse he used to transport goods to sell at the market.
Coffee conversation in a private home environment between four senior women (65−75 years). A is the hostess and B, D and E are her guests. A tells a story about a horse her father kept in a stable (temporarily) when he was in town to sell his goods at the market. (NB! The segment beginning with "pa...hade" (line 11) is a prosodic start of a new unit, not a syntactic extension of "vet ja".)

1. A: [+ja de va: ju en] yes there was a

2. B: [ja de va: ju en...] yes there was

3. A: [en kärra där & sopawa] a carriage

4. B: [ja de va: ju en...] yes there was

5. A: [då] back then you saw

6. B: [ja] yes

7. A: [ja de va: ju en...] yes there was a

8. B: [segons] that is all we know

9. A: [en bar som kom & hade huvudena i stallen] that they came and kept the horses in the stable

10. B: [ju] experienced a lot you know

11. C: [head shake]

12. B: [s]

13. A: [bar på & haves] a garden

14. B: [ju] know a (0.2) a garden

15. A: [ja] yes that was a long time ago that

16. A: [ja de va: ju en...]}
The story opening begins with a phase where A introduces a stable (indefinite form) where they (the people who came in to town) kept their horses "de [va ju en- en ställa så här som dom kom å hade hästen] " (there was a stable like this that they came and kept the horses in). At this point in the utterance, A has brought the turn to a possible syntactic completion. Prosodically and pragmatically, however, more is projected. The accent on "hästen" opens up the possibility of a continuation beyond the projected syntactic completion, which is done with a doubling of the word 'ställ' (a stable) to 'stalle' (the stable). The last element in the utterance (and structural unit) so far, 'i', is also prosodically tied to the following word 'stalle'. Note that this is a case of NP doubling rather than the more common method of finite verb doubling. The pragmatic function of the segment is that of a story initiation that projects a longer discourse unit.

When continuing, A extends the final segment of the utterance so far with a syntactic doubling of 'ställ' (a stable), this time in definite form 'stalle' (the stable). A uses the apokoinou method to retro-construct a recognizable syntactic pivot that forms the initial segment of a second syntactic projection unit "dom kom å hade hästerna i stalle här på Blomsterstalden >vet ja<" (they came and kept the horses in the stable here in the stable in Flower street).

One notable circumstance for the production of the apokoinou in (8:15), is that it is partly produced in overlap with speaker B, who comments on...
their previous talk (lines 8 and 10), addressing speaker C (B turns towards C, away from A). Speaker C responds with a nod (line 11) and B closes the side-sequence with a ‘m’ (line 12). The simultaneous side-sequence by B and C creates a competition between A and B about the attention of the audience (i.e., listener C). Speaker A looks primarily towards B during her telling, but makes a quick glance towards C during B’s overlap (when she says “så” (PRT-like) on line 9). Compare with section 9.3.2 below, where extracts are analyzed in which speakers insist on topical aspects (partly) in response to overlapping talk, but using the full recycling format.

However, speaker A also uses the apokoinou method to resolve the local communicative project of foregrounding certain topical aspects of the incipient narrative and backgrounding others. Initially, the segment ‘where they came and kept the horses’ is foregrounded when A relativizes the initial segment with the indefinite stable, “de [va ju en en m1↓↓↑↓↓ a kär sum dom kom å hade hästerna i” (there was a stable like this that they came and kept the horses). The indefinite stable is left behind (so to speak) and the people with the horses are put in a communicatively foregrounded final position. When continuing using the apokoinou method, however, the whole previous segment is backgrounded, and the specific stable on Flower Street is foregrounded. When continuing the story, A then uses the stable in Flower Street as the relevant narrative background to the main story about her father (lines 13–21) who used this specific stable for his horse.

To summarize, A uses apokoinou as a method to give the utterance a recognizable form (syntactic doubling + syntactic pivot). This is done in order to resolve the local communicative project of foregrounding a certain topical aspect (and backgounding other aspects), in order to provide (online) a background for the wider communicative project of telling a story about her father, his horse and a specific stable where he kept the horse. The need for a foregrounding move might partly arise because of the overlapping talk during the pre-P and pivot phases of the utterance.

In extract (8:14) below, apokoinou is used as a method to resolve a related but different type of local communicative task, and the form given to the utterance is a reflection of this difference. The extract is drawn from a discussion between three parents who have been given a predefined topic, ‘information for children about sex matters’ (recorded in 1968). In this particular sequence, they are talking about (possibly) different behaviors in different age groups among teenagers regarding everyday sexual activity.
Perspective shifts

(8:14) Student promiscuity
LU: TALB: PAR
Three parents discuss the predefined topic ‘information for children about sex matters’. Talbanken, recorded in 1968. Participants: J (m), BR (f), IR (f). In this extract, they talk about the impact of effective birth control on teenagers’ sexual activities. They are comparing the behavior in different age groups such as upper high school (sw. ‘gymnasium’) pupils and university students.

1. J: [mm:mm] .hh ja de ha' kommit i mnemonic. it has come
2. J: i- man kan säga att du att eh
   so you could say that of eh
3. [pt preventive] det finns blott håll bättre nå har ju
   pt the contraceptives have been better then y'know
4. BR: [ (hawkking) ]
5. J: =((0.3) problem) [kommit i ett annat] låg
   ((0.3) the problem has reached a different stage)
6. BR: [ <de = klart ja> ] [jali]
   that’s clear yet
7. J: ((0.3)
8. J: tidigare så skyltju detta (0.2) "mm:" earlier then frightened y’know this (0.2) oh:
9. BR: [ ((hm...) (hango) nå [ifrån-])
    with easy to have a child (or: be pregnant) probably frightened from)
10. IR: [ catt [förm till ja] ] [miği]
    to have a child yet
11. BR: hh: pt [nu har vi] "gymnasie (1.1)"
    now hav- have we sw. ‘gymnasium’ thus
12. J: [ (de du [EAA va're.]) ]
    making their debut was it
13. BR: = STUDENT promiscuity [kunnat]
    student: promiscuity
14. J: [ = ] [ = ] [ ] [coughing]
15. BR: = [men men hur' e] me se gymnasie (1.1)=
    but how it is with the upper high school
16. J: [ #oh:::# ] [ (#recovering from coughing)]
17. BR: =l vet de de vet man inte just den här life that that you don't know particularly this

18. åldersgruppen. age group

19. (0.7)

20. BR: riktigt ja vet att de finns *eh* som (.) när exactly I think that there are eh like (.)

21. vi (0.7) gick i skolan *båda grupperna men bara we (0.7) went to school both groups but only

22. de att eh den eh:mh:* (.) säkert proportionerna that eh the eh:mh:: (.) surely the proportions

23. är väldit förskjutna= are very displaced

BR basically says (lines 11−16) that the behavior of the university student group is rather well known, while the behavior of the upper high school student group is not (generally and to herself). BR begins her turn with competing with J for the turn in overlap, something that would account for the raised volume, “.hh:: pt [NU HARR VI JO ANSA] STUDENTpromiskuit[EN]ten [...].” (now we have y know the student promiscuity). The pitch accent on “ten” projects a possible continuation beyond this segment. At this point in the utterance it seems as if BR is going to develop the local topic of university students’ promiscuous sexual behavior. But when continuing, she only extends the final NP “STUDENTpromiskuit[EN]ten” (the student promiscuity) with a short remark that this is known “känner man ju till” (is very well known) and then goes on to talk about the upper high school students. The extension retro-constructs a recognizable syntactic pivot on the NP and a second grammatical projection unit that overlaps with the first “STUDENTpromiskuit[EN]ten känner man ju till” (the student promiscuity is very well known).

Communicatively the apokoinou is used to background the local topic of student promiscuity, without really foregrounding something else within the boundaries of the construction. It seems as if apokoinou can be used as a method to comment (on-line and parenthetically) on an element in order to withdraw it from a topically foregrounded position in the utterance. In terms of communicative projects, BR uses the apokoinou construction in (15) as a (well-known) contrast within a wider communicative project, where
she is arguing for the need to have a closer look to the (unknown) upper
high school group. The syntactic extension that creates the pivot initiates a
backgrounding process that is finally established when the turn continues after
the apokoinou.

The backgrounding is sequentially consequential, since the extension also
closes down the local topic of student promiscuity, in order to continue with
talk about the college students (similar local projects will be presented in ch.
10.2).

8.6 Summary
In this chapter I have re-specified apokoinou as a participant’s method to (i)
give an utterance a certain recognizable grammatical form with a pivot
segment in order to (ii) locally manage a perspective shift on a topic or topical
aspect within a local communicative project. This dual nature is common to
grammatical constructions when conceived as methods or procedures (cf.
Anward 1980, Linell 2005a). Apokoinou utterances have been found to be
both communicative practices and methods of displaying these practices
within recognizable linguistic constructions or discourse processes (the twist
around a syntactic pivot within a TCU, a turn, or several TCUs within a
turn, or within a minimal 3-part turn sequence). The notion of topical aspect
has been used to describe a local aspect of a wider topic, which is treated
and oriented to within a demarcated turn or discourse segment. The notion
of perspective shift has been used to describe a change in the way a topic aspect
is oriented to by the participants during an utterance or discourse segment,
displayed with various types of upgrades and downgrades or foregroundings
and backgroundings of topical aspects.

When continuing beyond a syntactic pivotal element, the speaker can
make a causal explanation of some topical aspect of the initial action
expressed in the pre-P+pivot segment, or explain the meaning of some
word or expression in the pivot. Participants can also upgrade or downgrade
their subjective or personal stance toward some topical aspect in the initial
utterance segment or within the preceding context of talk. A topic that is
initially presented as general or objective can be changed into something
more personal or subjective within the same construction or minimal
interactional exchange. Related methods are upgrades of the participants’
epistemic and evidential stance towards a topic aspect. The assertion of a
topical aspect is upgraded (reinforced), or an assertion is given (more)
evidential support.

Participants can also shift their perspective on some topical aspect in
order to accommodate the relevance of their ongoing utterance to a wider communicative project or frame and/or to upcoming actions. A less abstract, equally widespread, finding is that participants twist and turn topical aspects in terms of foregrounding and/or backgrounding different aspects. Depending on the wider communicative project and the way a topic is staged during utterance production, different needs arise to locate certain topical aspects as a background for upcoming topics or topical aspects.

These local tasks are, as shown, managed and resolved online, within ongoing local communicative projects, without the otherwise necessary interactional work of closing and beginning something new. The projected possible completion point on the pivot is deactivated (or concealed, cf. Walker 2004) with accents and/or pitch movements and a new grammatical projection unit is initiated the moment before a syntactic pivot is retroconstructed. Concealing possible completion points has been argued to be the main interactional function of pivots in conversation within the Sacksian tradition of ethnomethodological conversation analysis (cf. ch. 3). In one sense it is true that most perspective shifting apokoinou utterances with a continuous prosody involve a dimension of rushing past TRPs in order not to jeopardize the right to the turn (cf. Sacks 1992a[1969], Norén 2003. Sometimes, this function is used as a defining criterion of pivots in the first place (Walker 2004). But as my analysis has shown, apokoinou is a more general method of communicative action than that, especially considering that one of the utterances can be produced with a pause preceding the retroconstructing second verb (extract 8:11) that would be avoided at all costs if the concealment theory were the only explanation. We should also remind ourselves that apokoinou utterances are sometimes produced in interactional contexts in which the addressees are unable to respond (the sports commentary in extract 8:2).

The findings of this study are in principle equivalent to Walker’s (2004) in that there seem to be no discernable constraints on the wider conversational contexts within which apokoinou utterances (or pivots in Walker’s terms) appear. They are produced in a wide range of activity types (arguing, narrating, reporting, assessing etc.) in connection with a wide range of dialogical unit types (episodes, turns, TCUs) and in different phases within these activities and units. The particular actions performed, the particular (detailed) linguistic means used and the particular conversational circumstances differ more often than being constant. From this, Walker draws the conclusion that the local functions of pivots are almost entirely dependent on the local interactional circumstances. Consequently, it is not
possible to find any semantic-functional structure in the construction as such, only in its environment.

I agree with this in some respects but not in others. Participants’ involvements in communicative activities do create the relevant contexts with which single apokoinou utterances interact to create situated meanings. But when looking at the corpus at hand, which seems to be more broadly excerpted than Walker’s (see ch. 4.2 above), there are particular local actions that operate within a narrow topical range that recur and resemble one another enough to form different functional categories, such as the insisting and focusing uses. These narrow topical operations are always done within more or less wide interactive activities or communicative projects, and this chapter has partly been about describing how apokoinou is used in order to adjust the utterance under way to fit various aspects of these wider projects.

As discussed briefly in ch. 4.4, a type of communicative shift is not assigned to a specific set of apokoinou utterances that has that and only that function, thereby excluding other analyses. The functions that have been described and demonstrated co-occur with other local projects or tasks: single apokoinou instances have been found to be multifunctional. More than one thing is usually done during the production of an apokoinou utterance, sometimes within, but more often across the functional boundaries that are set up in between the chapters 8, 9, 10 and 11. An explanatory shift as described in chapter 8.2.2 sometimes also displays processes of back- and foregrounding as shown in 8.5. An upgrade of communicative relevance as described in 8.4.1 is sometimes also a way of resuming an ongoing communicative project, a function mainly treated in chapter 10.3.1 below, and so on.

Another important thing to note is that the analyses of communicative practices in individual apokoinou utterances have not been meant to be exhaustive. The aim has rather been to present and explain the main communicative functions of the apokoinou utterances in the corpus as a whole, not to account for everything that is going on in the individual instances. These notes are equally important for shifts as for the phenomena to be treated in the following empirical chapters.
9 Confirming, insisting and focusing

9.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I will deal with utterances where apokoinou is used as a method to confirm, insist on, or focus local topics, topical aspects, and actions. These utterances do not shift perspective on the topical aspect, as was the case in chapter 8. Instead, the perspective on (or the framing of) the topical aspect is maintained. This does not mean, however, that the actions of confirming, insisting, or focusing perform the same action for a second time. Such a view would not be consistent with the temporal organization of interaction and actions. To make an assessment and then to emphasize the assessment are two temporally separated and different actions. The apokoinou method simply ties them together within the same syntactic and prosodic macro-frame (mainly within an integrated prosodic contour that may be continuous or not, but they can also be produced as increments).

This group of apokoinou methods recruits other formal variants than the shifts. Where the shifts only recruit variants of Janus heads with rhematic or thematic pre-Ps, actions of confirming, insisting and focusing are mainly achieved with the use of two other, rather different formal variants. The first is the Janus head type of utterance with 'heter de' or 'va de' post-Ps. The second is a group of symmetric re-cyclings, i.e. when all or a part of the linguistic material in the beginning of the construction is used again in the final part (see ch. 6.1.1.1 above, and Lagré 2004 for a similar functional analysis of the form). These two apokoinou variants have in common that speakers use them to emphasize some aspect of the ongoing local communicative project.

The functions that speakers give these emphasizing actions in the individual cases vary depending on the relation between the local communicative project of the utterance and the immediate wider communicative context. The first part of the chapter (section 9.2) will deal with emphasizing apokoinou that confirm expressions, assessments, and assertions in a parenthetical manner. A need for an action appears during the course of utterance production, and this need is handled and resolved parenthetically within the ongoing project using apokoinou.

The second part of the chapter (section 9.3) will deal with emphasizing apokoinou that insist on inquiries, arguments and pursued responses in a more retrospective and prospective manner. The need for action is more overtly
negotiated within the communicative context. The apokoinou utterance is sensitive to a certain position within the local organization of temporally ordered actions. The speaker responds to a certain preceding action or anticipates a certain projected, possible upcoming action by another participant.

The third part of this chapter (9.4) will deal with emphasizing apokoinou, which speakers use to focus on some segment of a narrative episode. The meaning of the apokoinou is here highly related to the position of the utterance within the phase structure of the narrative episode at hand, rather than to preceding and following moves by other participants.

9.2 Parenthetical confirmations

This section will deal with apokoinou utterances are used for the confirming of expressions, assessments, and assertions in a parenthetical manner, i.e. they resolves a demarcated task locally before moving on with the wider ongoing project. A need for a confirming action appears during the course of utterance production, and this need is handled and resolved parenthetically within the ongoing project using apokoinou.

9.2.1 The confirming of expressions

Speakers use apokoinou to locally manage actions such as searching, finding, and confirming certain expressions. The investigation of my corpus has shown that participants orient to expressions in two different ways. The first is to confirm that the expression chosen for some specific activity or phenomenon was the right or correct choice in relation to the activity at hand. The second is about confirming the production of an utterance that was preceded by (i) hesitation and (ii) repair.

9.2.1.1 Establish the correct expression (le mot juste)

In extract (9:1) below, the operator (O) at an emergency alarm call center has called a company to check up on an automatic malfunction signal that was sent out from the company during the night. The employee that receives the call (E) leaves the phone to check the control board (lines 2−8) and is gone for 39 seconds. When E returns to the phone he confirms that there was a “signal sent out (line 9) and goes on to specify what kind of malfunction it is “"it says its [står att de e ba]ttery malfunction it says"" (it says that it's battery malfunction it says).
Battery malfunction

Telephone call to an emergency alarm call centre. Malfunction signal on fire alarm. Participants: O=Alarm call operator (the caller), E=Employee at the place where the malfunction signal comes from (the receiver). The alarm call operator has called and asked about an automatic alarm that has been registered at the centre during the night.

1. O: vi har försökt att få någon att ringa upp men inte fått någon att ringa upp. 
2. E: ja, det har vi också. 
3. O: ska jag ringa upp till dem som sitter alldeles där? 
4. E: ja, och kan du vänta ett ögonblick? 
5. O: ja, jag kommer ihåg att ringa upp. 
6. E: ja, och kan du vänta ett ögonblick? 
8. E: det stämmer bra. 
10. E: det stämmer bra. 
12. E: det stämmer bra. 
15. O: det stämmer bra.
The recycling of the subject and finite verb "står e." (it says or it is written) is focusing on the expression battery malfunction that is indicated on the control board beside the lighting lamp, and establishes it as the right expression in order to describe the problem that the operator made inquiries about.

The importance of establishing the correct description of the reason for the alarm can be seen in the interaction that follows the apokoinou utterance. Speaker O never actually responds to the information given by E with the apokoinou, since she is already on her way to inform E about when the alarm was registered at the centre. After acknowledging this, E returns to the battery malfunction and specifies why this is actually relevant news—it means that it is not so serious. In the absence of a response to the battery malfunction information in the first instance, E goes on to formulate the consequences himself.

Extract (9:2) below is drawn from the radio talk show 'Spanarna' (The Reporters). One of the guest reporters has just been given the go ahead from the presenter to begin his presentation of the third evidence for this week's report on recent trends in society. A begins his presentation with the introduction of an author, and a novel she has written, "de e Kerstin Ekman (.) å hennes roman >Händelser vid vattnet" (it is Kerstin Ekman and her novel Events by the water).

(9:2) Kerstin Ekman
L:LiCTI:SP4-1267[138]. From a radio talk show 'Spanarna' (The Reporters). Participants: S=Ingvar Storm (m, presenter), A=Lasse Anrell, (m, reporter) and L=Susanne Ljung (f, reporter). A's report is about Things that the Swedes previously have considered boring and 'lagom' (average), are now more and more elevated as perfect and first-rate, a theme he also finds in a novel by the Swedish author Kerstin Ekman.

1. S: där med >så säger du att också detta e ett with that you say that this too is an
2. exempel på att lagom e perfekt example of the fact that moderately is perfect
Confirming, insisting, and focusing

The turn is at this point syntactically, but not prosodically and pragmatically, possibly completed. The accent on “vatten” renews the grammatical projection process towards another possible completion point, and the presentation has only just begun. When A continues in this local context, the syntactic extension only takes the preceding NP “Händelser vid vatten” as the syntactic beginning of a new unit, thereby retro-constructing a syntactic pivot. Communicatively A shifts epistemic stance to the pivot and comments (parenthetically) on the name of the book “Händelser vid vatten” (“I think it’s called”). The book is initially introduced as a novel by a particular author, thus focusing on the referent in itself. The shift retro-
constructs the pivot segment as the name of a novel, thus focusing on the expression as such. However, in this case the name identifies the referent rather effectively. The result is a meta comment that confirms the name, expression and referent as the correct one, designed in a modalizing way that makes an acknowledgement relevant from other participants. This is done on line 10, "(mm:)", by S.

As mentioned in the previous analysis of the same extract (see extract 7:7), this can be analyzed as a local, parenthetical project that is embedded within a wider communicative project, where speaker A is about to begin a new presentation of evidence. Compared to extract (9:1) above, the local project of establishing the correct expression is accomplished by way of an inserted minimal pair sequence. The confirming apokoinou action and the acknowledgement by S resolve the local communicative project of establishing a common understanding of the upcoming referential topic when initiating a presentation of evidence.

9.2.1.2 Confirming an expression after hesitation

In extract (9:3) and (9:4) below the speaker hesitates slightly before continuing with the introduction of a name in the beginning of a narrative episode. The name in (9:3) refers to a kind of verbal bingo game and the name in (9:4) refers to a geographic location.

The format or sequence in both cases, as in other cases in the corpus, is a hesitation followed by a short pause "eh: (0.6)", then the production of name, a confirming (reto-constructing) comment in a colloquial format of ‘heter det’ (is it called), followed by an acknowledgement by another participant.

9.3 Bullshit bingo

UMKL:310(26) From ‘Måndagsklubben’ (The Monday Club). Informal TV talk show with five participants in front of an audience in a studio. Participants: A=Anna (f, presenter), C=Claes Malmberg (m, co-presenter), AA=Adam Alsing (m, co-presenter), R=Regina Lund (f, guest). AA introduces a new kind of bingo game.

1. AA: vi kanske ska börja me nån slags bingo vi "hurkå" maybe we should start with some kind of bingo too

2. (0.8)

3. A: ja:[ia]

4. R: [ja]
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5. C: [ja kan vi göra.]
   yeah can we do

6. A: [va ska vi ha då för typ av bingo]
   what kind of bingo shall we have

7. R: [ska man inte vinna nånting]
   can’t you win something

8. hår.
   here

9. AA: men de finns här eh: är man här
   but it’s such here when you have
   but there is these when when you have

10. [sen. men. (.) men finns såna här
    meetings with
    with companies there are these

11. och [ej:] bullshit bingo heter det pt. (.)
    bullshit bingo is named it
    oh: (oh) bullshit bingo it is called

12. C: =”saha”=
    I see

13. AA: =väl men har nöte >me såna här nya< (.)
    ok To have meetings with these new

14. IT företag >såna här> s-, (.)
    IT companies these then-

15. [så (.). så (.). så] står så här >ti=
    then (.). then (.). then it says like this

16. C: [ja de kan ja förstå]
    yes I can understand that

17. AA: =exempel band brev [ej:] kritisk=
    example broadband. hh eh: critical

18. C: [ ne]

19. AA: =massa å >såna här> såna företag[ord]
    mass an’ these nice corporate words

In (9:3) above, the described format is used within a local communicative context where the speaker is involved in the business of establishing a story,
where the expression before which he hesitates and pauses is the name of the activity he is telling about. The whole sequence of hesitation, pause, expression-production, confirming ‘heter’-comment and acknowledgement is a special format or pattern used by the storyteller as a method of introducing a central topic in the beginning of a narrative episode. In (9:4) below, the acknowledgement is delayed because speaker D rushes into a specification of the location of the place referred to in the pivot.

(9:4) Långa Högsby

A: ... and that (2.3) so it is

D: ... no but that (2.3) so it is

C: yea

D: ... no but that (2.3) so it is

C: you had been down in Skåne you said

D: yea you say

4. C: had you been down in Skåne you said

5. [0.4]

6. D: yea you say eh: - last Saturday I went

7. ... down to Långa Högsby named is
down to Långa Högsby is it called

8. ... that is down at Storösund

9. C: you

10. [0.5]

There are various ways of analyzing this variant of confirming a name/expression. One way is to say that the speaker actually displays difficulties in remembering the right name, a process that locally occasions a confirmation when the name/expression is produced, and thus displayed as remembered. This analysis, however, is difficult to verify. There is no doubt
that speakers sometimes have trouble with remembering expressions, and that these troubles in such cases are handled in an orderly way (cf. repair). But there is no way to really know if the cognitive work of remembering is involved (cf. Drew 2005 for a similar account of the supposedly cognitive state of 'confusion'). To avoid such speculations, it is useful to look at the interactional environment of the activity at hand, as done above.

In extract (9:5) below, however, this same pattern is probably used to do both, i.e. repair a temporary loss of memory and introduce a central topic in an upcoming narrative episode. Speaker A displays difficulties in remembering the name of a place "vi åkte ut till eh: hh:: pt .hh "eh:* hh ](...) [*eh]:* Al:- Al:- hh::<::"

(we went out to eh: hh:: pt .hh "eh:* hh ](...) [*eh]:* Al:- Al:- hh::<::") Speaker C collaborates with a completion of the initiated word and a tag question "Almunge va¿" (Almunge right).

1. A: .hh då när vi gick en däre promenaden. .hh
2. (.) eh då eh [när vi kom upp ti Rund-] (.) eh [when we came up to Rund-]
3. C: [ var \[ühl? ni \] ifrán, where did you start from
4. A: .hh:: vi åkte ut till eh: hh:: pt .hh
5. C: på andra siden av [ ] on the other side of ( )
6. A: *eh:* Al:- Al:-
7. C: [Al-\[munge va¿] Almunge right
8. A: [m u\[nge] Almunge right
Before C has completed the word, A fills in the missing part of her first attempt "[munge]." After an acknowledgement from C (line 10), A extends the filling-in with the confirming meta comment "heter det ja." (it is called yes) in the shape of an increment, which is then followed by a closing acknowledgement by B (line 13). Apart from the co-constructed name/expression, the format resembles the sequence above: hesitation, (filled) pause, (co-constructed) expression-production, 'heter'-comment, and a closing acknowledgement. The confirming comment is produced in the format of apokoinou (the name is retro-constructed as a syntactic beginning of a new unit). Communicatively, it is used as a method to resolve the local communicative project of confirming the collaborative production of the correct name. From a wider point of view, it is used as a method of solving the communicative project of a collaborative introduction of a central topic in the beginning of a narrative episode. Once the new topic is interactively established, A resumes the pending narrative project (line 14).  

9.2.1.3 Confirming an expression after self-repair

A related way of using apokoinou to confirm the correct expression at hand, is when the speaker does a self-initiated self-repair during the production of an utterance. In extract (9:6) below, participant P mentions that she got homework from a teacher they have been talking about earlier. When producing the word "veckoläxor" (probably a candidate to a first segment of 'veckoläxor', weekly homework), P cuts herself off and produces "läxor?"  

70 The continuation on line 14 is also analyzable as the apokoinou method of resuming a pending local topic (cf. 10.3.2 below).
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\(\text{(homework)}\), which would be the correct continuation of the word ‘vecko’
\(\text{(weekly)}\).

\(\text{Weekly homework}\)

G:GSLC:W[103]. Everyday family conversation when preparing dinner. Participants: U=Ulla
(mother), P=Pia (teenage daughter), S=Sofie (eldest teenage daughter).

1. U: [a:] långa kjolar tycker han nog inte o
yes long skirts he probably doesn’t think are
3. \(\text{[D.R]}\)
4. U: å ändå e han ingen tjuke om man säger nå: on
4. [om] till he’s not old so to speak
5. ja fastat de hela rätt,
I have got it all right
unpleasant
7. U: [han s’ote] gtrevli.
bh is not unpleasant
8. S: nej;
no
9. \(\text{[4.9] \{U and S are busy at the stove\}}\)
10. P: vi fick s’är veckoläxor? (.) fi-c
5. \(\text{got weekly homework \{\text{we got}}\)
11. \(\text{[1.7]}\)
12. P: de kunde man ha: >hon säger typ,<
you could have that she says like
13. U: har’s fått ett sch vara så man kan få se de
have you got a schedule so one can see it
14. P: +yeah ma::n+ [>de har jäklet
yeah man I have

After producing the correct second half of the expression ‘veckoläxor’, P
goes on to produce the retro-constructing full recycling post-P comment
\(\text{fi-c vi.}\) This comment confirms that the repair is the correct
expression, but it is not a matter of insisting as would have been the case if, e.g., the utterance had been preceded by some dispute whether P got weekly homework or not.1

A more overt repair that locally occasions an apokoinou confirmation can be seen in extract (9.7) below. On line 7, speaker A initiates a new topic or narrative about her doings the following day. She has to go up early, because she is going to a meeting.

(9.7) District meeting

USAINF4499 Coffee conversation in a private home environment between four senior women (65−75 years). A is the hostess and B, D and D are her guests. Speaker A tells about what she will do the next day.

1. D: I detta va läka
   Daughter was a doctor

2. [på Karol]inska. at Karolinka

3. B: [ på 'tir'] on Tu.

   okay he might be there on Tuesday then

5. [C.4]

6. D: neheh::hhh:::

7. A: [i maar] om räkte ja opp tidit da ska vi
   tomorrow I must get up early then we will

8. ska () till [0.6] Knut () ska va saj ja tante
   go to (0.6) Knut (0.6) I was going to

9. neja [ Knutby < Trädviken] (aka vi,]
   no Knutby Trädviken we'll go

10. C: [neij du sa till-] ("Träd"viken"
    no you said to-

1 The post-P comment can also be argued to resume the utterance progression after the resolving of a moshik with the production of the utterance (cf. ch. 10.4.2 below), but it does not seem as if P was about to continue the turn beyond the confirming comment.
When getting close to introducing the name of a place (a small village or the area around it), A pauses twice and produces a cut off name “åka (.) till (0.6) Knu-” (go (.) to (0.6) Kn-). She then gives the name she was about to say “Knutby”, only to replace it with the correct one, “Trädviken”. At this point, the utterance is syntactically possibly complete, but “Trädviken” is produced with a pitch accent that is heard as projecting continuation. A then extends the utterances with a recycling of “(.) vi,” thereby confirming that “Trädviken” really is the place (or the correct name of it) where she is going the following day.

The confirmation is also produced in a context where speaker C has attempted to do other-repair in overlap. When A self-initiates her self-repair with “(.) vi (.) så (.) jag (.) tänkte så (.) jag” (I was about to say), this is immediately responded to by C with a cut-off other-repair, “[::ej du sa (.) till-]” (no:: you said to-), produced during the continuation of A’s turn. C’s other-repair is collaborative (both segments are negatively polarized) in the sense that she tries to help A with A’s own repair, and it projects a syntactic continuation with the correct place that would complete the other-repair (which is produced after a micro-pause in overlap with A’s post-P). This projection creates a local context where A first produces the correct place and then immediately extends that name with a confirmation, all within the same prosodic contour. One possible interpretation is that A uses apokoinou to confirm that she came up with the correct place herself, in a local context where C is about to do the work for her.72

72 This confirmation comes close to insisting in response to another participant’s move (cf. 9.3 below), but the collaborative spirit of C’s response makes such an analysis less probable.
9.2.2 The confirming of assessments

The second kind of topic or action that participants tend to emphasize and confirm by the use of apokoinou is assessments. Extract (9:8) below is drawn from a group discussion between three teenagers and a moderator. Initially, they have all listened to a number of different kinds of music pieces, from Mozart to modern pop, and then they discuss the pieces one by one. On line 7, BM3 is characterizing a pop song with the Swedish band Kent as very undemanding, and extends the (positive) assessment with a full recycling of the subject and finite verb in reversed order ‘de e’ ‘e re’.

(9:8) Undemanding music

GtGSM-100[E88]. Group discussion about different pieces of music within difference genres. Participants: F=moderator (f). BM1−4=four upper high school students (16-18 years, m). In this extract they are talking about a song by the Swedish pop group Kent.
1. BM1 så att man: man ser, (0.5) så blir en upptäckket so that you you see (0.5) then the visual impression
2. e (0.2) kanske viktigt också ementigen e re je (0.2) maybe important too actually it is
3. ju dumt att de e så men (0.5) de spelar in stupid that it is like that but (0.5) it matters
4. "faktiskt". really
5. (0.6)
6. F: mm;
7. BM3: men de e väl sålett att man kan re but it’s a very easy-digested music it is
8. BM2: mhm
9. BM3 "man" liksom::
you somehow::
10. (0.4)
11. BM2 alla kan ju [lyssna på] när här musik!
Everyone can listen to this kind of music

The whole turn is placed within an environment of general agreement on how to characterize the song. After a longer detour (about 40 lines) with talk about another band (Jumper), BM3 brings the talk back on topic with the
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apokoinou utterance on line 7, although the utterance probably refers to the kind of pop music represented by both of the bands. The turn is initiated with a skip-connecting turn-initial ‘men’ that does the main work of resuming the talk about the song with Kent. In this particular sequential environment, the retro-constructing post-P is mainly used in order to confirm and strengthen the assessment and make it more salient as a topic for the following talk. BM2 accepts this with a continuer on line 8 and a further elaboration of BM3's assessment on line 11.

In extract (9:9) below, speaker BM3 gives his opinion of a song with another Swedish band (Arvingarna) that belongs to the Swedish modern folk tradition of dance music for an elderly audience.

(9:9) Typically Swedish

G:GSM-1052163 Group discussion about different pieces of music within different genres.
Participants: F=moderator (f), BM1–4=four upper high school students (16-18 years, m). In this extract they are talking about a song with the Swedish dance band ‘Arvingarna’.

1. BM1 [ de blir ] it becomes
2. s[lentriin al]lting ti : ] alting e samma; routine everything to the same
3. BM2 [ deضرب ( ) ] it does ( )
4. BM3 a yeah
5. BM2 "a (just de)" [ PGR E SE] PÅ= yeah (that's right) this is it
6. BM3 [ av al[t]t- ] of all
7. BM2 =ENGEL[SE] så a ru ( ) också, English so you’re ( ) too
8. BM3 [ alting ( ) på] everything ( ) to
9. BM1: a av- taen så tycker jeg att de här är yes also-then I think that this is

The skip-connecting function of ‘men de e’ segment is also reminiscent of the use of the construction ‘men att’ as described by Lindström & Londen (2004). Also compare with the analyses in chapter 10.3.2, where speakers use apokoinou as the main method to resume communicative projects.
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10. liksom lite mer ihopstickrat,
    sort of a little more pieced together

11. (0.3)

12. BM2: " "

13. BM1: de andra >a lissom:: (0.6) "ja"
    the others are sort of (0.6) yes

14. (0.3)

15. BM3: dom är typiskt svenska och jag menar
    they are typically Swedish I mean

16. de [från] ju inga andra som har: (.)=
    there are no others that have (.)

17. ?: | aha |
    aha

18. BM3: =såna här dansband egentligen,
    these dance bands really

19. (0.4)

20. BM3: såna här rena dansband som Sverige har;
    these pure dance bands that Sweden has

The wider communicative frame is slightly argumentative in the sense that
the three boys often compete to give the best descriptions of different
songs. However, in (9), BM3 does not orient explicitly to or comment
BM1’s previous (rather negative) assessment on lines 1–10. BM3’s
assessment on line 15 addresses another aspect of the song, the origin of the
genre, rather than modifies or argues against the previous descriptions of it.
BM3’s turn initial apokoinou utterance on line 15 is therefore more of a
second assessment (Pomerantz 1984:59), rather than an opposing argument, or
actually the sixth assessment within a wider communicative project of
assessing songs.

Because of the lack of opposition between the participants in this
particular sequential position, the apokoinou in (9:9) has been analyzed as
resolving the local communicative project of confirming the previous
assessment made within the same TCU. In this process, the speaker uses a
(reversed) fall recycling apokoinou, partly to initiate talk on another
9.2.3 The confirming of assertions

A related function of apokoinou utterances is the local, parenthetical, confirmation of assertions about various events, actions or states of affairs, which are produced outside narrative episodes (cf. section 9.4 below for an analysis of confirmed assertions within narratives). The actions of assessing and asserting are difficult to separate, except for the fact that the former can be viewed as a special instance of the latter. The reason for separating them in this study is that they differ in interactional organization in the data. It seems as if the action of confirming an assessment is predominantly staged within one and the same prosodic unit (as shown in section 9.2.3 above), and that the confirming of an assertion is closely tied to the format of increments, i.e. when the post-P is produced as a prosodically subdued add-on after a possible completion of the previous turn.

In extract (9:10) speaker A, a harbour supervisor, has shown the pier for a new member of the boat society (speaker B). They walk back along the pier, talking about how A can get in contact with B after the meeting because B has lost his mobile phone, when A comments on one of the boat places that they pass by.

(9:10) Empty

U:SG:BP[90]. The supervisor of a harbor for small boats shows the pier and boat place to a new member of the boat society. Participants: A=harbor supervisor, B=new member of the society. While walking back along the pier, speaker A comments on another place at the pier that ought to be empty.

1. B: a på mobi eh (.) starts to yes on mobile eh (.) but now I lost
   2. min mobiltelefon igår men ja får min[ ]
      my mobile yesterday but I get my-
   3. A:                                    [a:]
      yes
   4. B: de- (.) de finns telefonvarare på ren
      there- (.) there’s an answering machine on it
   5. ändå för att <ja får mitt nya simkort på>
      anyway ‘cuz I get my new sim-card on
   6. (.) a typ Thurs[ ] eller nåt.
      (.) well like Thurs[ ] or something
7. (0.4)
8. A: ja
9. (0.6)
10. B: så att de bara ringa in där,
    so it's just to call in there
11. (0.4)
12. A: (ja)
    yes
13. B: (för) hemma har ja ingen telefonsvarare.
    'cuz at home I don't have any answering machine
14. A: nej
    no
15. (1.7)
16. A: (för mej att) ja: ha:r >prec< för mej att
    got a feeling that I've really got a feeling that
17. den här förtitrea här den ska: va got a feeling that
    this here fortythree here it should be empty
18. (2.0)
19. A: ska: va:
    should it be
20. (3.3)
21. A: dom har sålt sin båt,
    they have sold their boat
22. (3.9)
23. A: så att eh:
    so that eh:
24. (0.5)
25. A: (lights cigarette lighter)
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While passing by the occupied boat place, A comments on the fact that it should really be empty since the owners of the rented berths have sold their boat, "den ska va tom" (it should be empty). This comment does not project a syntactic continuation and is also brought to a possible prosodic closure with the final drop, despite the fact that the drop is not articulated enough to be instrumentally registered (see pitch graph below). Speaker B, however, treats the comment as projecting some elaboration or closure of the new topic, since he refrains from speaking.

After a 2.0 second pause during which they keep on walking, A extends the turn with a full reversed recycling of the pre-P, "ska ren va:" (should it be). The extension is produced with a pitch contour that is both heard and analyzed instrumentally as a continuation of the previous utterance, as can be seen in the following f0-trace...

Figure 9.1 f0-trace of the apokoinou utterance in extract [9:10].

The continuation is prosodically parasitic on the pitch movement on the previous utterance (subdued), rather than constructed with pitch reset (cf. the discussion in ch. 7.2 above), and the final drop brings the increment to a full stop. The combination of subdued initiation and drop to low closure signals that the extension is a confirmation of the assertion that was previously made, rather than a progressive or forward-looking V1-contribution. The time distance to the next contribution by A (line 12) supports this as well.
is long enough (5.3 secs) to block an analysis of A’s increment as a progressive link to upcoming talk, especially in comparison to cases when increments (and post-Ps in general) are immediately extended with further talk (cf. extended full recyclings, 6.1.1.2 and the resumptive use of these in ch. 10.3).

This does not prevent an analysis of A’s turns after the apokoinou as a focused communicative project, where he takes the opportunity to teach the new member some rules of conduct within their boat society. Among these rules (communicated by A after line 28) is the restriction to one boat for each boat place. If members want to keep two boats at the pier, they must pay rent for two boats. A also goes on to tell B some rules of social behavior at the pier. The apokoinou utterance can be said to resolve the local, parenthetical project of confirming an initial assertive statement within the wider communicative project of teaching B some rules of the boat society. The reason for using an increment instead of a more integrated post-P might be that the wider (teaching) project has not been planned beforehand, but made up incrementally along the way. The need to confirm or emphasize the previous assertion arises after the closing of it, in collaboration with B’s treatment of the assertion as a non-finished project.

9.3 Insisting in response to other participants’ moves

Some local communicative projects are more overtly sequentially organized than the ones treated so far in the chapter. The apokoinou utterances in the following sections are responses to various moves by other participants in the surround of the AU. The apokoinou speaker insists on various assertive statements in response to another participant’s previous, overlapping, intermediate or upcoming actions. To insist means, in this context, to take a stronger stand in relation to the wider communicative context than when a speaker confirms a previous act. The insisting apokoinou is less parenthetical in the sense that it is used as a method to respond to the communicative moves of others, such as inquiries, opposing arguments (previous or upcoming), disaligning moves (in overlap or not), or displays of mishearings.

9.3.1 Insisting in response to a previous move

9.3.1.1 Insisting in response to an inquiry

The action of insisting on some action when using apokoinou is sensitive to what has been going on in the preceding discourse. The analysis has shown
that the act of insisting is sometimes preceded by an inquiry from another participant. The insisting is then done in response to the inquiry.

In extract (9:11) below the poison informer (I) asks for the amount of rat poison that the caller (C) might have drunk by mistake (line 2).

(9:11) Large amount
UGC:16:32:00:22[76]. Phone call to a poison information call center. Participants: I=Informer (f), C=Caller (f). The caller is afraid that she has drunk a large amount of rat poison.

1. I: nå¿ för de har ganska stor be†ytelesse för no 'tac it has a rather great significance for

2. en del eh (.v.s för de se) om för nå¿ föröpl.¿ some of them (.) what kind¿ quantity are we talking about

3. förresten, by the way

4. C: pt.hh ja den e ‡mängd e re* hh yes it is rather large quantity is it

5. (0.3)

6. I: hur mycke e de då, how much is that it!

C answers that the amount is rather large and insists on this using the full recycling apokoinou construction: ‘den e’ − ‘e re’. It is possible to analyze an insisting move on at least two levels. The most obvious from the extract is also the most local. C is responding to the preceding inquiry and insists that the amount is large in order to present herself as certain about the information the operator asks for. The less obvious is less local in the sense that C also orients to a wider communicative project. In the talk preceding the extract, speaker I has asked C if she knows the name of the product. That is actually the first thing she asks. C says that she has no idea and that she cannot find out. At this point P says that this is very important (line 1), and then goes on to ask the question about the quantity of poison. When C does the recycling apokoinou in this sequential position, she orients to the fact that her credibility is at stake. She insists on the rather large quantity, thereby trying to restore some of her credibility within the wider communicative project of getting advice from the poison informer. At least she knows just about how much she drank (although the subsequent talk reveals that she does not).
In extract (9:12) below the pregnant woman K asks the doctor L if the head of the fetus is stabilized in her pelvis (lines 6–7).

(9:12) Movable

L: LiCTI:B:64L-1104[155]. Talk between a pregnant woman and a gynecologist at a Swedish Maternity health care centre (Mödravårdscentral, MVC). Participants: L=Gynecologist (f), K=Woman, Cajsa Karlsson (20-25 years, having her first baby). Ultrasound examination. Talk about where the fetus is positioned in the uterus.

1. K: så att hh:eh ((noise)) eh:: now when we
2. undersöker dej. >så tycker ja< then I think that it
3. känns bra<:((de har inte<) suppnat.sej=
4. K: [ men:]
5. L: =njösting (perifrån:)
6. K: så:(( de har inte<) suppnat
7. K: simisk you feel
8. [ ja:-]) de är ru- l:] jk de e [ruckbart] är ru
9. men då e [hu-,
10. K: [ ej ] yes
11. L: =kan ha kunnit in i bäckenet=
12. K: =ej

L responds saying that the head is movable (‘ruckbart’, possible to move a little), and extends the answer with an insisting full recycling: “‚rub bard’, (‘yes’). Considering that the answer is initiated with a ‘yes’ (positive polarity, cf.
Heinemann 2005), L can be heard as saying that the head is almost stabilized and then she goes on to say that the head is in the pelvis (where it should be) and that the pelvis does not feel too tight. When insisting, L starts a calming-down project in response to the inquiry by the woman. The calming-down project is staged in three steps (although not in a list format): (i) the head is movable, (ii) the head is in the right place, and (iii) the pelvis is open enough for delivery. The pregnant woman constructs her inquiry interactively as displaying concern for the wellbeing of the baby and she uses the apokoinou as a method to insist on the first in a series of arguments that responds to this concern.

Speaker L is also responding to more immediate events in the context. L’s answer to K’s question is produced in overlap, and L is not in the clear until halfway through the pivot. Speaker L probably also respond to the possible risk of not being heard initially, which occasions the need for a post-P full recycling repair (cf. Nöstén 2003, and section 9.3.2 below for analyses of similar cases).

Extract (9:13) is drawn from the same talk as extract (9:1) above. Apart from being an example of expression confirmation (see 9.2.1) it is also a case where the insisting action is a response to a previous inquiry or request.

(9:13) Battery malfunction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Alarm operator who makes the call</td>
<td>“ja. a du: vem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Employee at the place where the malfunction signal came from, receiving the call</td>
<td>“[mm] [hh]:: ja de gäller yes it’s about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Alarm operator who makes the call</td>
<td>“en fejl:signal på brændalarmet i Brevia a malfunction alarm on the fire alarm in Brevia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Employee at the place where the malfunction signal came from, receiving the call</td>
<td>“vi har försökt å få ta[gg] i någon yes we have been trying to get hold of somebody yet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

74 Reassurance (or calming down) is an overall communicative project in MVC talk (Bredmar & Linell 1999, Bredmar 1999).
The caller O states her reason for calling on lines 2–3 and line 6. Her call is about a malfunction signal on the fire alarm system in Brevia (a building), and her call center has been trying to get hold of somebody in this building. After dealing with an inserted communicative project of excusing himself for leaving the phone and O’s acceptance of this (lines 7–12), E leaves the phone for some time to go and have a look. When getting back on the phone he first confirms what O already has said “a de stämmer bra: de hörrö du?” (yeah that’s true y’know) (line 14), and then he delivers the
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information about the exact type of problem with an expression-confirming apokoinou (line 16).

The whole insisting business is a response to the earlier inquiry/request by O. However, it is an indirect initiative because O never actually states it explicitly. It is enough for her just to mention the alarm type at the center in order for E to interpret it as a request for checking it up and reporting the result of the check. Extract (9:13) above demonstrates that the initiating action does not have to be in immediate connection to the responding insisting move. It is sensitive to the sequential organization of actions and inserted (side) sequences in the sense that the insisting move can skip-connect (cf. Mazeland & Huiskes 2001:155) to an inquiry made before intermediate activities. The skip-connecting move as such, however, is a function of apokoinou treated in chapter 10.3 below.

9.3.1.2 Insisting in response to a opposing argument

The extract (9:14) below is drawn from a talk between a student counselor and two young men (see also extract 8:7 above). They seek information about the last application date for an education program. On line 1, P suggests that the fifteenth is the correct application date. The counselor V disagrees with this on lines 4 and 7.

(9:14) The fifteenth of May

U:SYV1:1[39]
Student counseling talk at a public office for young people. Participants: V = Student counselor (m), L = Lars (m, 20-24 years), P = Peter (m, 20-24 years). Talk about different education alternatives with different application dates.

1. P: [ PT :bhrrrilllle ] (de e rem fem|tonds pt lde......... there’s the fifteenth

2. allt|ge eller;
all of that or

3. (2.5)

4. V: NÅ de måste vi kolla,
we’ve got to check it

5. (0.4)

6. L: "m|t;z"

7. V: [de] e inte alle s|kert att de e fem|tonds
it’s not certain at all that it is the fifteenth

8. (1.2)
In response to the disagreement, P replicates that he saw it just now (probably on the computer screen), and that the application date for the school Berghs was on the fifteenth "Berghs hade ren femtonde maj va re." (Berghs had the fifteenth of May was it). Previously in this study, the last comment "va re" was analyzed as a shift of perspective into an upgrade of the epistemic certainty of the statement/assertion in a communicative context where this has been openly challenged (cf. Upgrading epistemic stance, 7.3.3). It is also possible, however, to describe the action as insisting within an argumentative frame. The insisting doubling of the finite verb 'va re' (was it, not recycling this time) is not oriented towards a preceding inquiry, but towards a preceding opposing argument.

9.3.2 Insisting in response to overlap

Extract (9:15) below is drawn from the group discussion on music (also see extract 9:8 and 9:9 above). In this particular extract, they have been talking about different aspects of a Beatles song for about 75 lines, when the moderator F asks them if they can describe the music (line 1).

(9:15) Simple music
G GSM-361 [159]. Group discussion about different pieces of music within different genres. Participants: F=moderator (f). BM1-4=upper high school students (16-18 years, m). In this extract they are talking about a Beatles song.

1. F: [men] kan ni beskriva musiken (> <)
   but can you describe the music ?

2. [0.4] ["]

3. BM1?: ah:::

4. F: [.h][b::]
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5. BM2: [de e] [så här]
   it’s like this

6. BM1: [ de e ] ju [ve kan ja så-<]
   there’s [there can I say]

7. BM2: [ G L A] :D
   cheerful

8. oftast.
   mostly

9. (.)

10. BM4: [ mm:. ]

11. BM2: [man blir] glädför,=
    you become cheerful

12. BM1: [ en ju ] [enkel musik] [*e re*.
    it is simple music is it

13. BM2: [va,(.)*å*]   [ a:: ]
    what (.) å                       yes

14. BM1: men de som e så slående [de e på (sätt nå att)
    but what’s so striking that I in (way a some that)

15. (.): dom har lyckats: "eh få sån melodi: å::"
    (.): they have succeeded eh getting that melody an’

16. (.4) [kan inte] tror jag hän slötsng (0.3) fått=
    (.4) maybe drawn an’ something (0.3) getting

17. BM2: [ ja:: ]
    yes

18. BM1: =en väldigt fin: eh kombina[tion där ((...))
    a very nice eh combination there ((...))

BM2 starts (in competition with BM1) to characterize the music as “GLAD:OFTAST” (cheerful mostly, lines 7–8) and continues with the cut-off reformulation that “MAN BLIR GLÄFD FÖR,” (one becomes cheerful because, line 11). BM1 then cuts in and says that “DE E JU [ENKEL MUSIK] [*E RE*]” (it is simple music it is). BM1’s utterance is produced in the shape of a full reversed recycling (see the glossing) within one coherent prosodic contour. The turn is almost produced in the dialogic grammatical shape of a latched
co-construction (a filling-in, cf. Bockgård 2004), because it continues the syntactic projection in the turn before.

In one sense, the insisting apokoinou post-P is a response to F’s request on line 1 for a description of the music. BM2 delivers a first and a second response to this request on lines 7−8 and 9. Although BM1’s response is only the third response to the request, it is possible to analyze the apokoinou as (partly) insisting on the response to this request. (cf. 8.3.1 above).

However, a closer explanation is also at hand. BM3’s description of the music as simple is produced in overlap from the pivot and onwards. BM2’s previous contribution ‘one becomes cheerful because—’ projects more to come, and when BM1 cuts in with the apokoinou, BM2 reacts and produces three minimal responses in overlap, “va, å” “ja” “(.) å” (what (.) å). The first one “va,” (what) is a possible display of surprise (or the like) at BM3’s cutting in. The second one “å(•)” is merely a creaky vowel sound.75 The third one “ja(•)” (yes) appear to be a minimal confirmation of BM2’s description in the pre-P-pivot segment. At least the first and third responses constitute actions that are made in overlap with BM1’s description and at least the first two might occasion the insisting move in the post-P (cf. Norén 2003 and extract 9:12 above). BM1’s apokoinou is made in competition with BM2, who, after all, was the turn holder before BM1 cut him off (or filled-in) in the midst of his unfinished turn. To summarize, the speakers use apokoinou as a method to resolve the local communicative project of handling talk in overlap (insisting), and this project is accomplished within the more general communicative project of dealing with F’s request or inquiry.

Extract (9:16) below is drawn from the TV talk show Måndagsklubben (also see extract 12 in ch. 8.4.2 above), a show where the participants discuss various topics found in newspaper clippings.

(9:16) Protruding ears

UÅMK[33]. From ‘Måndagsklubben’ (The Monday Club). Informal TV talk show with five participants in the studio in front of an audience. Participants: A=Anna (f, presenter), C=Claes Malmberg (m, co-presenter), AD=Adam Alsing (m, co-presenter), B=Blues (m, guest, music artist), R=Regina Lund (f, guest, actor, artist), Aud=Audience. Talk about plastic surgery.

1. AD: "va skulle ville ha stora [fötter eh (.) stora = I would like to have larger feet eh (.) large"

75 It is close to a creaky version of a mid-high, back vowel [å], as in ‘raw’ [åw].
2. A: [visa se korna från döda= turned out to come from dead
3. AD: =fötter; stor-- feet ; large-
5. A: =Adam
6. B: #oh::eh::.# ((#embarrassed sound))
7. A: #>ADAM<# ((#reproaching voice))
8. Aud: (h) [h]
9. AD: (h) [h] [ (h) (h) (h) [ (h) ] (h) [h] (h)=
10. ((10 lines of general laughter omitted))
11. A: [förstår’u å jO me ren dkr) mânniskan MEN understand how it is to work with that person but
12. C: [>JA SKULLE VILJA HA SÅNA DÄR< stå= I would like to have those there protruding
13. R: =Ö:: >SKULLE JA VILJA= would I like to have
14. Aud: (h) [h] (h) [h] (h)=
15. C: [å så EN LITEN BA jo= an’ then a little banjo like that
16. R: =o= o= o= o==
17. Aud: (h) [h] (h) [h] (h) [h]

In a sequence with talk about plastic surgery, speaker C is reporting his wish for a changed body part (protruding ears, lines 13–15). This wish contrasts with AD’s previous wish (shaded lines 1–3), where he wishes for an enlargement of his feet and, although this is not said explicitly, perhaps of his penis. The responses from A, B and the audience on lines 5–9 show that
AD’s *slot leaving assertion* on line 3 is interpreted as something equivocal. The term *slot leaving assertion* means that AD ostensively leaves out a word and marks the exclusion prosodically when cutting off the utterance, “*stora fötter; stora--*” (large feet large--). This is a method for projecting a specific continuation in the slot that is created with the exclusion (cf. *slot leaving question*, Linell (2003b), where a specific or at least a highly restricted type of answer is projected in the slot following a question). AD draws jokingly on some popular belief that men with large feet also have large penises. Speaker C’s turn on lines 13–15 is produced in the shape of a reversed full recycling apokoinou turn. To the best of my knowledge, there is no popular belief connecting protruding ears with anything equivocal. I therefore interpret C’s wish as contrasting by way of being merely silly. The apokoinou can be seen as a move that *insists* on doing plastic surgery on a body part without equivocal associations, *in response* to AD’s equivocal allusion. C makes fun of, mocks or even ridicules AD’s wish and this is strengthened with the use of an insisting apokoinou. This is of course taken one step further on line 15 where C introduces a banjo and singing, thereby portraying a person with protruding ears who sings and plays the banjo.

But as in (9:16) above, there is also a closer explanation at hand. During C’s utterance, R starts to laugh in the middle of the pivot. When doing the post-P, C manages to keep the turn until R stops laughing, and until he can finish the turn in the clear, without having to add any extra rhematic segment to the turn. As in (9:15), apokoinou is used to resolve the local communicative project of handling overlapping verbal activities, this time within the wider communicative project of providing a contrast within the topic of plastic surgery.

### 9.3.3 Insisting in response to intermediate moves

#### 9.3.3.1 Insisting in response to a disaligning move

Another communicative context that contributes to occasion insisting apokoinou-like actions can be seen in the following extract (9:17). It is drawn from an institutional talk between a social welfare officer (WO) and a client (C). The main talk is about the unemployment of the client and how he deals (and avoids dealing) with this problem. The asymmetric social roles of the participants regarding power over the situation and its outcome is clearly displayed through the interactional roles (WO is asking the questions and C answers), and C frequently displays defensiveness (anger, frustration) when WO criticizes his behavior or arguments.
L: On Monday
C: Talk or conference at a social welfare office. Participants: WO=Welfare Officer (f), C=Client (m). Talk about C's unemployment.
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2. tänkt på ingenting man dock de olikaste som jag hade
3. grundläggande saker å nu tog eh du upptäcker
4. ja
5. (1.3)
6. C: ja -
7. WO: att ha med och ta med det
8. att jobba eller tycker att samt att du
9. det är för liksom
10. C: Ja men
11. WO: att
12. att jag får se någon vård-år
13. (1.4)
14. WO: menning
15. (1.8)
16. C: tack
17. I will
On lines 7–9, WO criticizes C for what she thinks is a negative attitude toward low paid jobs. C immediately defends himself (in overlap) with the argument that he is certain that he will get more money elsewhere (lines 11–12). C raises his voice in the beginning of the turn, but returns to normal when continuing with an example of an employer with a higher pay, "ja får ju svara här från Åbro bryggeri nu på måndag" (I will get an answer here from Åbro breweries now on Monday). At the end of this turn segment, there is a long 1.4 sec. pause, after which WO responds minimally "mmhm¿". Then there is another fairly long 0.8 sec pause, followed by a creaky comment by C, "*får ja*" (I will get). The increment is produced with a subduing initial pitch and is a reversed full recycling of the utterance initial "*ja får ju*" (I will get, modal particles such as 'ju' are hard to translate and are almost never recycled) that retro-constructs the turn final segment in the previous turn segment as a syntactic pivot.

Communicatively, the increment responds to the minimal (and possibly disbelieving) uptake from WO on the information about Åbro breweries. There are a number of methods that WO could have used to display a supportive attitude towards Åbro as a possible job option. Instead, the minimal response works as a disaligning continuator that creates an interactive context within which C insists on the fact that he will get an answer from Åbro on Monday. The incremental post-P recycling insists in response to a preceding disaligning contribution by WO.

9.3.3.2 Insisting in response to a display of mishearing

A related interactive context can be seen in extract (9:18) below. This is a situation where an interpreter (IN) interprets simultaneously in a doctor-patient conversation where the doctors (D and C) are Swedish and the child patient (2 years old) and the child's father are Spanish.
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I:LiCTI:GL:G10[189]. Interpreted doctor-patient conversation (Swedish-Spanish). The child has had problems with a foot that is turning inwards. This is a check-up appointment. Participants: D=Doctor (m, Swedish), P=Patient (child, 1.5-2 years, Spanish), F=Father of the patient (Spanish), IN=Interpreter (f, Swedish), C=Doctor Candidate (m, Swedish). In this extract, the doctor has examined the foot of the child and comments on the fact that it is also flat underneath, besides being turned inward.

1. D: lite på att fot på den sidan också.
   a little flat foot on this side too

2. IN: [el pie-] pied
   the flat foot is

3. un poco plano a ese lado.
   a little flat on this side

4. D: (]

5. D: de i, lo bjuder vi på.
   I said that you didn’t dare to translate that

6. (0.8)

7. D: pt. bh:: de vaga’ru inte översätta’.
   pt. bh:: you didn’t dare to translate that

8. (1.0)

9. C: (hh)hr:::

10. D: bh::[;]

11. IN: [ ja] hörde faktiskt inte [5‘]
   I actually didn’t hear ()

12. C?: (hh)hr:: (hh)hh hh bh

13. D: [ja sa att vi bjuder på att det var pl:: a la w].
   I said that it’s on us that it was flat I said

14. IN: #ja
   I see

15. (2.6)

16. D: [ja sa att det var att (0.3) [noted]
   all thing you should mention that (0.3) the foot

On line 1, D says that the patient’s foot, apart from turning inwards, which is the reason for the visit, is also flat underneath. After being interpreted on
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lines 2–5, D continues and comments, this time jokingly, the flat foot is their treat ("de: (.) bju:der vi på.", that one's on us, line 5), i.e. it is nothing to worry about. This comment probably also retro-constructs the first comment as a joke even though this was not overtly displayed. The comment is however followed by a 0.8 second silent pause (line 6). The doctor treats the silence as if the interpreter did not dare to interpret the comment (line 7). At this point, the doctor candidate C utters a short laugh (line 9), as if to sanction and increase the cheerfulness that D initiated with the joke, and the interpreter immediately gives an account for being silent: 'I actually didn't hear' (line 11). Now the candidate really starts to laugh and the doctor repeats the unheard utterance together with the preceding utterance that was heard and interpreted, "ja sa att vi bju:der på att det var platta " (I said that it's on us that it was flat I said).

The full reversed recycling is here used to insist on a reported utterance in response to speaker I's preceding display of mishearing, and (probably) partly because of C's laughter. None of the participants develop the repair-like sequence any further than this. When speaker IN acknowledges that she heard D's insisting repetition (line 16), there is a long pause, and after the pause D continues with the business that he was involved in before the jokes. The reversed recycling therefore also functions to mark the whole joking sequence as a parenthetical communicative project that is now over and done with (after some minimal response) and something that can be left behind when continuing the talk or task at hand. The doctor produces the post-P with sotto voce ("sa ja", 'said I'), possibly in an attempt to insist on the earlier joke as unimportant. To summarize, apokoinou is used as a method by the doctor to resolve the local communicative project of insisting on what he said earlier, in response to speaker IN's display of mishearing, and within the wider (parenthetical) communicative project of joking about the child's foot.

9.3.4 Insisting in response to upcoming moves

Another variant of the insisting apokoinou is when the opposing argument is projected rather than responded to. In extract (9:19) below, also drawn from the TV show Måndagsklubben, one of the guests in the show (R) says that she voted for a music artist twice during a recent televised music contest, "[ ja ]rö:stade på Pontare två gå:nger rö:sta [ja.]". (I voted for Pontare twice I voted.)
(9:19) Voted twice
U:MKL-382[29]. From 'Måndagsklubben' (The Monday Club). Informal TV talk show with five participants in the studio in front of an audience. Participants: A=Anna (f, presenter), C=Claes Malmberg (m, co-presenter), Ad=Adam Alsing (m, co-presenter), R=Regina Lund (f, guest, artist). Talk about the Swedish qualification rounds for the Eurovision song contest.

1. AD: "Ö Pontare Pontare är han en äldre än"
   "Pontare Pontare to be is larger than"

2. Glömen.
   "The Monday Club"

3. (P:4)

4. A: "han är större än"
   "he is larger than"

   R: "Ja, röstade på Pontare två gånger"
   "I voted for Pontare twice"

5. AD: [ ansåg ]
   "I think"

6. AD: "Fattigt, (h) [h] (h) [h]
   physically"

7. A: [ vem ]
   "who"


9. R: "Ja, jag röstade på Pontare två gånger"
   "I voted for Pontare twice I voted"

10. (P:4)

11. R: [ ha:llå::::::::::::::::[:,:]]
   "hello: "

12. C: "Ringde du två gånger?"
   "Did you call twice?"

13. R: [ ja ]
   "called"

14. "Två gånger"
   "twice"

15. C: "Det här är en skandal nu, jag tycker ja"
   "this is a scandal now, I think"

16. AD: [ fusk ]
   "cheating"
R's reversed partial recycling 'rösta ja' (I voted) can be seen as prompting or at least making relevant a possible oppositional argument from the other participants, on the grounds that it is morally questionable to call in twice and vote. On the other hand, the behavior of B and C in the next sequential slot can also be seen as partly occasioned by R's insisting move. B produces a drawn out hell (line 11) that can be analyzed as a lexical-prosodic method or practice (in Swedish talk) for challenging or problemizing the previous action or some aspect of it. C performs the same kind of action (line 12), partly in overlap with B, but uses the method of repeating R's assertion in interrogative form and a faster tempo followed by a marked inbreath. This interpretation builds on the existence of a communicative practice of insisting, where the method of (partial) and reversed recycling is used as a recognizable format. The other participants treat R's utterance as a kind of challenge, when they respond in the next sequential position. They do not just question the moral conduct of R, but perform a minor drama during the next couple of turns (lines 11–20). It is of course difficult so say if the AU actually occasions this drama, but the others' reactions seem to indicate that they interpret R's claim on lines 9–10 as a challenge. Speaker R uses the AU post-P to confirm or even persist in the challenge, and the responses from B and C show that this challenge is accepted.

9.4 Focusing within narrative sequences

Full and partial recycling apokoinou utterances with functions that are related to the confirming and insisting functions discussed above, also occur in narrative episodes. It seems as if the function of AUs within a narrative episode is closely tied to the position of the AU within the phase structure of the narrative. There are at least two functional variants. The first is the
method to focus or highlight a narrative topic when initiating a new story; the second is to focus or highlight the narrative peak.

9.4.1 Focusing a topic when establishing a narrative episode

In extract (9:20) below, drawn from one of the coffee conversations, speaker A initiates a story on line 10.

(9:20) Go biking

USAINF(42)[56]. Coffee conversation in a private home environment between four senior women (65–75 years). A is the hostess and B, D and E are her guests. They talk about how to get to one of the shopping centers - walking or going by bike.

1. D: :å ... en får man .. kan man gå å ... att ... att ... att ... att 
2. A/C: [med]
3. D: ... gå de .. sen får man ... kan man gå 
4. [D.2]
5. A: got ..[hisl]
7. [D.4]
8. A: ja ... de är, de är .. ja ... 
9. C: ['mns]:hm'
23. A: å blommar (>e rom ju<) billiga på också. = ((#3))
   are flowers are they cheap for too

24. C: =mm:mm¿

25. (0.4)

26. A: (å utav) frukten å.                             ((#4))
   (and of) fruit as well

The story is launched in response to D's short previous telling about how
she takes the bus to a place near the food market Halléns and then walks the
short way to Halléns (a second story, cf. Sacks 1992b[1970]). A then begins her
own telling about how to get to Halléns. She says that she usually goes by
bike there in the autumns, because they have many nice things (the rest of
the turn disappears in D's overlap). D then slightly changes the topic to be
about different cheap goods at Halléns, and they both develop the price
discussion for about 20 lines, which are not in the transcript. Then (on line
36) A resumes the abandoned telling about how she goes by bike to Halléns.

The full recycling apokoinou construction is used to emphasize a
narrative topic when initiating a narrative episode. The extract demonstrates
how apokoinou is responsive in the sense that it is used to contrast a new
topic against a preceding one (going by bus/walking). This also
demonstrates that apokoinou can be initiatory in the sense that it is used to
highlight or mark a topic as central for the upcoming narrative episode.
Speaker A's story about biking is temporarily delayed by the price-
discussion, but when they have closed that discussion she resumes the
biking-story and even develops it into a much wider topic about going by
bike to different places.

Extract (9:21) below is drawn from another coffee conversation than
(19). Speaker B says that the Red Cross has something going on at a
particular address. After the completion of the place adverbial “på
Träskogatan” (on Clog Street), speaker B has reached a (second) syntactic
possible completion, but the pitch accent on “Träskogatan” blocks the
TRP and projects a continuation beyond that segment. The speaker then
extends the utterance with a pronominalized full recycling “har dom
(nånting)” (they've got something) of the initial phase that retro-constructs the
place adverbial as a syntactic pivot.
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(9:21) On Clog Street

USÅINF:41[88]. Coffee conversation in a private home environment between four senior women (65-70 years). A is the hostess and B, C and D are her guests. They talk about what B once did when her husband passed away.

1. B: [tänk att (.) när ja var ensam så
   think that (.) when I became alone then
2. börja ja [ me på Röda Korsse. ]
   I started too at the Red Cross
3. A: [alla möjliga sorter.] all possible kinds
4. [D.8]
5. C: [ja[:¿
   you
6. B: [.hh] på Röda Korsse har ju nånting på Träskogatan
   at the Red Cross have something on Clog Street
   hh at the Red Cross have something on Clog Street
7. har dom (nånting).
   they have something
8. [D.2]
9. B: [.hh] man får gå [ ]
   you can go ( )
10. D: [jan på Träskogatan[:¿]
    I see on Clog Street
11. B: [ja] där får-
    yes there can
12. C: [na men =
    no but
13. B: = man [gibba. ]
    you work
14. C: =dom har ju de här bortä.
    they have that over here
15. [D.3]

Communicatively, speaker B resolves the local communicative project of focusing the address where the Red Cross has something going on. This focus
Apokoinou in Swedish talk-in-interaction initiates a drawn out introductory phase (30 lines) of a story that is established during the episode that follows. The story is about what B did at the Red Cross (then located at another address) when her husband passed away some years ago. (The peak of this narrative is analyzed below in extract 9:22).

9.4.2 Focusing a narrative peak

Another function of the emphasizing apokoinou is when it is used to highlight or mark the peak of a story.

Extract (9:22) is drawn from the same narrative episode as (9:21) above. Speaker B has just come around, after a lengthy introductory phase, to telling her friends about the needlework she started to do at the time her husband passed away.

(9:22) Baby blankets

U:SA INF:41[62]. Coffee conversation in a private home environment between four senior women (65-70 years old). A is the hostess and B, D and D are her guests. B tells about when she went to the Red Cross many years ago to do needlework.

1. B: [ja måste gå ut .. ] I have to go out.

2. A: [va¿=] what

3. B: [å då gick ja dit å sydde sörr. an' then I went there and sewed]

4. [ja gick [dit] å sydde .. ] I went there and sewed

5. C: [ mfr. ]

6. A: [ja?ar. gjorde ru det ja[h[k]] I see that’s what you did I see

7. B: [ å ((#1))]

8. [sydde, Hanna har eh.. hh ja baby-blankets and stuff like that we sewed]

9. [å sånt där osydde vi..] and stuff like that we sewed

10. "Baby blankets"
On line 3-4 B starts the utterance but is overlapped by A’s supportive response (line 6). B resumes the turn after a short break in the turn production during B’s response, and says that she was sewing baby blankets and similar things (‘stuff like that’). At this point in the utterance, the syntax does not project any continuation beyond the segment ‘stuff like that’, but B still goes on and extends the turn with a partial recycling of the turn initial subject and finite verb phrase (although with a change of pronoun): ‘ja gick dit å sydde’ – ‘sydde vi’ (I went there and sewed – we sewed). This recycling retro-constructs the preceding heavy NP as the syntactic foundation of a new projection unit.

Communicatively, the recycling post-P is placed after a segment in a narrative episode where the narrator B finally gets around to telling the point of the story after a rather long introductory phase with at least one side sequence. The apokoinou is used as a method by B to resolve the local communicative project of putting special focus on the first item in a list of things that she used to sew at the time. B uses the list format as a method to deliver the peak of the narrative about her sewing activities.  

---

77 This can also be described as an instance of a perhaps more general functional potential of the apokoinou method to frame, highlight or expose first items in lists or temporally ordered events and actions (cf. 10.2.1 below).
The following extract (9:23) is drawn from a conversation between two women in their twenties. A has been building a story about when she played back a homemade tape with a recording of one of her friends singing.

1. A: ja tycker de [.] [å sen] så skulle ja spela= yeah I think it [.] an’ then I was going to play
2. B: [ja:] yes
3. A: upp de för Lasse Granqvist och eh: Peter it back for Lasse Granqvist and eh: Peter
4. Kindvall’s Kindvall’s
5. [0.3]
6. B: ja yes
7. A: va- wasn’t among other things
8. [0.4]
9. A: börn kvällen då för va- because it was the other night then because wa- [.] I had saved it then
10. för jag tyckte de va så bra, because I thought it was so good
11. B: mm yes
12. A: du förstår det var ist till förstår-u and you understand it was plague understand-you
13. han som sjunger så bra i verkligheten. = and who sings so well in reality
14. B: mm yes
15. A: det inte inte klock på band[spelarn.] it sounded like crazy on The tape recorder
On line 12 she goes straight to the assessment of what they heard on the tape “. . . du förstår de va (.) ja du förstår ut,” (a non-idiomatic translation is “you see it was awful see you” [i.e. you see]). A does not insist on the assessment in orientation to some inquiry or to a preceding or anticipated opposition, but rather to a segment of the narrative that in retrospect can be considered as the peak or high point of the episode. After the peak, A gives an account for why she thought it would be better (“an’ he who sings so well in reality,” line 13), and a follow up contrasting comment on the recording experience (“it sounded like crazy on the tape recorder,” line 15). The final contrast between reality and recording is used as closing after the delivery of the assessing peak.

9.5 Summary

In this chapter, I have studied apokoinou utterances that are used to resolve the local communicative project of confirming, insisting on, or focusing some aspect of the ongoing utterance or the final part of a possibly complete previous utterance. Confirmations of assessments that are not produced as a move within a minimal or extended sequence tend to be produced within integrated prosodic contours. Confirmations of assertions and statements within the corresponding interactive environment tend to be produced in the shape of increments. These are variations within the corpus that might not stand if studied more comprehensively within another set of data, but they are at least tentative results.

When participants insist on some previous act within the ongoing turn, they insist in response to some previous, simultaneous or anticipated action by (an)other participant(s). They occupy the position of second pair parts to inquiries or opposing arguments. They respond to actions by others that are produced in overlap with the apokoinou utterance. They also respond to actions by others that are produced as responses to intermediate actions (or noticeably absent actions) between the pivot and the post-P segment, and to explicit other-initiated self-repairs regarding some problem of speech perception. And, finally, they respond to anticipated relevant next moves that are possible opposing arguments to the ongoing argument or action.

When participants use apokoinou utterances similar to the ones described above within narrative episodes, the ACs tend to receive functions that are closely tied to the phase structure of the narrative rather than to the immediate communicative surrounding. ACs in these environments are used in order to focus some aspect of the narrative that (i) is saliently developed as the main topic in the narrative (names of significant places, persons or
activities), or (ii) is subsequently treated as the peak of the story or as the initiating part of the peak.

The main formal method used when confirming, insisting, or focusing is the full or partial recycling in various shapes, either as prosodically integrated or produced as increments. When speakers do not want to change the perspective on the topical aspect, but rather elaborate on it within the same perspective frame, they probably need a format where nothing new is added from an informational point of view. Interactionally, however, the elaboration is of course another kind of action than the one that is elaborated.
10 Closing, resuming and skip-connecting

10.1 Introduction
In the two previous chapters, I have focused on how speakers use apokoinou to change perspective on, confirm, insist upon, or focus topical aspects and actions. In this chapter, I will explore how apokoinou is used as a method to resolve the local communicative project of

(i) closing an action that is followed (often immediately) by other projects within a sequence of serially organized communicative projects (analyzed in 10.2)

(ii) resuming the progression of a turn (analyzed in 10.3.1)

(iii) skip-connecting to an previous (wider or more local) activity after some intermediate action(s) (analyzed in 10.3.2)

Speakers use the apokoinou method to resolve the local communicative project of closing and demarcating different kinds of actions against possible following actions, and then leave them behind in order to continue with upcoming and sometimes even projected actions, often within serially organized wider communicative projects such as list constructions or reported dialogue. Speakers also use apokoinou as a method to resume and continue the progression of a turn after accomplishing some intermediate action, such as a self-initiated self-repair or a self-initiated word search. Another variant of this function is when speakers use apokoinou to skip-connect to a pending communicative project, such as a question-answer project where the intermediate activity can be an extended sequence of actions.

10.2 Closing actions
In certain environments, speakers face the need to resolve the local communicative project of closing, and thereby demarcating, some local matter. Speakers do this within the same prosodic contour, or with the use of a recycling increment, two more general methods of turn construction that are used in different ways.
10.2.1 Closing list items or temporally ordered events

When used in relation to list constructions or in other local activities where speakers organize actions in series of different kinds, such as the temporal ordering of reported dialogue, the apokoinou utterance tends to appear in the first slot of the activity. It seems as if a device is needed to close the first slot and demarcate it from the (possible) upcoming slots, and that apokoinou is a well suited method to resolve this local project.

In extract (10:1) below speaker B has just initiated the topic needlework (line 1) when she starts on a list (line 6) where she enumerates the bedspreads she has sewn for her grandchildren; three, then four and now a fifth.

(10:1) Three USAINF-42/00. Coffee conversation in a private home environment between four senior women (65-70 years). A is the hostess and B, D and E are her guests. On line 1, B begins to talk about needlework after a longer sequence during which all of them have talked about different men.

1. B: nu ska vi tala om handarbete.
    now we will talk about needlework
2. C: ja;
   yes
3. B: ja kan ja tala om förstået att ja häller
    then I can tell you that I’m working
4. på åh ha virkat ett överväkåt att mitt=
    on I’ve crocheted a bedspread for my
5. A: [(h):~(h)]
6. B: och kanja ha virkat ha ja-
    and I’ve crocheted three have I
   grändchild. Ah an’ I’ve crocheted three have I
7. C: [va:] what
8. B: och han ha virkat f f i r e
    and I’ve crocheted four
9. C: [(”har lite sockerkaka“)] {reaches for the
    having some sponge cake}
10. B: på å virkar ett FE
    crocheting a fifth
When finished with the item 'tre' (three), B partially recycles the segment "har ja virkat" (have I crocheted) and thereby retro-constructs the list-item as a pivot. The format used is the same as in most of the insisting AUs (full reversed recycling, cf. 9.3 above), but here there is no interactive reason to insist, especially since the number three is replaced in the next TCU with the number four. B does not have to persuade the others that it is actually three (and not two or four), and no one has asked her how many bedspreads she has made. The main topic of the narrative under way is also well established on lines 1−2. The relevant wider communicative project to focus on is rather the list construction initiated with the item 'three' (numbered 1−3 in the extract). Within this wider communicative project the apokoinou is used as a method to locally manage the closing of the first list item 'three' and simultaneously demarcating it from the second item 'fyra' (four), and the leaving of the first item behind in order to move on the second item. The list as a whole can be analyzed as the peak of the narrative, and the apokoinou is used to focus the first step towards the story peak.

One relevant aspect might also be that the list starts on the item 'three', a number that usually is the closing number in the schematic pattern of a three-part list. This might create the need to use a more salient format when introducing it as a possible first item in a list. It can also be noted that the replacement of 'three' with 'four' in the next TCU is not heard as a self-initiated self-repair, but rather as an online counting exercise, where speaker B seems to go through the bedspreads from memory one by one while talking about them. The first two are finished and the third is still (so to speak) in production.

Extract (10:2) below is drawn from the radio talk show ‘Spanarna’ (The Reporters). Speaker A is suggesting a new trend in society that technology is used to replace real experience, e.g. artificial fires on TV or artificial sex.
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(10:2) The technology
L-LICTI:SP2-672 [125]. From the radio talk show ‘Spanarna’ (The Reporters). Participants: S=Ingvar Storm (m, presenter); J=Jonas Gardell (m, reporter), H=Jonas Hallberg (m, reporter), A=Amelia Adamo (f, reporter).

1. A: [ kravfritt umgänge](demand-free interaction)

2. G: kravfritt umgänge på alla [sätt.](demand-free interaction in every way)

3. A: [ nej ]

4. S: [we re kravfria som i lösenordet.](is it demand-free that is the password)

5. A: [nej ja]

6. S: [e om att de sa förrat e lösenordet, think that what you said before is the password

7. (...) ja tror att de sa att att I think that is that

8. de e möjlighet att att it is possible that that technology it’s possible ’cause that technology

9. G: [ ja ]

10. A: [kommer först tror ja](comes first I think 'an then there are

11. H: [ cyber =

12. A: [cyber](clever people that invent

13. H: = space

14. S: [men men ]

15. G: [ ja ]

16. A: [he different fires an sort like]
S proposes that the artificial substitutes are mainly about a need for social interaction without demands (‘kravfritt urmånga’, demand-free interaction, lines 1–2). Speaker A first responds to S’s proposal with a ‘no’-initiated utterance and then connects back to an argument already made by G. A argues instead that the basic technological inventions come first and that the various uses of the technology are secondary. The reversed partial recycling of ‘ja tror – tror ja’ (‘I think – think I’) is therefore partly used to insist on an opposing argument (cf. 9.3.1.2 above) or rather establish a first opposing argument (in what is to become a series of two arguments) by exploiting the insisting potential of apokoinou.

But apart from insisting on a new take on the overall topic, A is also using apokoinou in a more prospective manner to (i) close off the first part of the argument (the invention of technology), and (ii) demarcate the first event from a relevant next (here: the invention of uses), and (iii) to exit or leave the first event behind in order to be able to move on to a relevant next move. The word ‘först’ (‘first’) is stressed on line 10, which projects a second item in a list. The apokoinou is partly used to separate the first sub-argument from the projected next and also move from the first to the next. The post-P is produced faster than the surrounding talk, which deemphasizes and constructs it as a bridge between the phases in a temporal ordering of events.

The following extract (10:3) has been analyzed in the previous chapter (extract 9:16) as an instance of how the reversed full recycling method is used to insist on a response to a previous contrasting action. It is also necessary, however, to look at it from the perspective of the subsequent actions it makes relevant. Apokoinou, like most utterances in interaction, both responds to actions in the preceding talk and alters the context for subsequent contributions.

As in the case in extract (10:1) and (10:2) above, the apokoinou in (10:3) is used as an exit device. It closes, and prepares for leaving a ‘first’ slot in what is to become an utterance pair when continuing with the next action. The ‘second’ slot in (10:3) is when speaker C goes on to describe some fitting attributes for a person with protruding ears “å så EN LITEN BANJO:♪ dudulu ♪” (‘an’ then a little banjo like that ♪ dudulu ♪). The apokoinou method is both used to insist on a contrasting body part and to close down the contrast in order to leave it and go on to a next possible step in the wider communicative project.
(10.3) Protruding ears

U:MKL[33]. From ‘Måndagsklubben’ (The Monday Club). Informal TV talk show with five participants in front of an audience. Participants: A=Anna (f, presenter), C=Claes Malmberg (m, co-presenter), AD=Adam Alsing (m, co-presenter), B=Blues (m, guest, music artist), R=Regina Lund (f, guest, actor, artist), Aud=Audience. Talk about plastic surgery.

1. A: [förstå'nu a j28ha ne ren dar] männskan MEN understand how it is to work with that person but

2. C: [DE E ( ) ] there’s

3. R: [I would want have those there protruding I would like to have protruding]

4. R: =Ö:: ↑RON ↑>SKULLE JA VILJA HA.

ears like that would I like to have

5. C: [A så EN LITEN BAN][j0 [sä]♫:dudulu:= an' then a little banjo like that

6. Aud: (h)(h)(h)(h)(h)(h)

7. C: (h)(h)(h)(h)(h)(h)

8. R: ==(h)::::: =
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10.2.2 Closing reported utterance segments

A related phenomenon, especially common in narrative sequences in the mundane conversations in the material, is the use of apokoinou to display or organize reported speech. In this context, apokoinou is mainly used as a method to close a single or first reported utterance and demarcate it from the following (or surrounding) talk by the same speaker. Studies of the corpus have shown that apokoinou is used by participants as a method to:

(i) close a first reported utterance in a turn (i.e. a reported utterance immediately followed by one or more reported utterances)

(ii) close a single reported utterance (i.e. a reported utterance immediately followed by other activities, such as comments, explanations and new narratives).

The main format used is the production of an initial quotation clause, followed by the quotation itself, and then a final recycled quotation clause with the apokoinou method of retro-constructing a syntactic pivot. This could very well be categorized as a subtype to the more general category of closing an item in a list or sequence of argumentative moves, but deserves to be individually treated due to the formal unity (the use of ‘NP said – said NP’ or ‘NP thought – thought NP’ phrases). It should be noted, however, that this is a special use of apokoinou that is less prototypical in the sense that the syntactic integration of the peripheral apokoinou phases with the pivot is rather loose. Quotation clauses such as the initial ‘hon+sa’ (she said) and the final ‘sa+hon’ (said she) are to some extent constructions that are used as a whole in a similar fashion as the most common uses of the initiative collocation ‘de+e’ (there’s) (cf. Forsskål, in prep.). This is to treat them mainly as chunks without relations of syntactic constituency (or dependency) between the parts. The alternative is to treat them as syntactically built segments, mostly because speakers reverse the initial word-order when they use them after reported speech segments, but the possible constructional quality of these segments is also recognized.

In extract (10:4) below, drawn from one of the coffee conversations with senior women, speaker A is in the middle of a story about how she once combined her work with being a mother when her children were small. Her daughter once asked her (line 1) not to go to work in the evenings (because
she did not want to be alone at home). After some continuers by B and D, A develops the story (line 5), but marks the development as the beginning of a new phase in the narrative through the use of pitch step-up, "[så då gi ck de ] (.) ett å't halvt år." (so then one and a half years went by).

(10.b) Begin working

Conversation in a private home environment between four senior women (65−75 years). A is the hostess and B, D and D are her guests. A tells about some difficulties she had with combining taking care of children and working. Maria is her daughter who helped her taking care of the younger siblings.

1. A: [snälla mamma ] jo [inte please mother don't] work

2. B: [nu ] na [now]

3. (D.B)

4. D: [ ] ja[h]ai.

5. A: [så då gi ck de ] (.) ett å't halvt år. so then it went by (.) one and a half years

6. D: [ja] yes

7. A: [så] då gi ck de ] (.) ett å't halvt år. so then it went by (.) one and a half years

8. D: [ja] yes

9. A: [så] då gi ck de ] (.) ett å't halvt år. so then it went by (.) one and a half years

10. D: [ja] yes

11. A: [små brorsna ] sa hon.] the little brothers she said

12. B: [ ] ja[j]i [yes]

13. D: [ ] yes
The next narrative move is to produce the contrastive reported utterance from her daughter, "å sa Maria mumm får du börja jobba\textsuperscript{sa hon} (and then Maria said (.) now mother can you begin to work said she). The reported utterance is closed with a recycling 'sa NP' (said NP). The recycling also demarcates the reported utterance from the following next reported utterance, also by the daughter, "nu ska ja se efter så} brödererna\textsuperscript{sa hon}" (now I will look after the little brothers she said). In sum, the apokoinou is used to demarcate the first reported utterance in a turn from the immediately following utterance spoken by the same character in the story (the daughter).

When used in this way, the 'said NP' format has a projective dimension. It seems as if the reversed recycling of the quotation clause points to the possibility that the following talk is also a quotation or a comment on the closed quotation (see extracts 10:6, 10:7 and 10:8 below) by way of being placed initially, and it is used both to demarcate the preceding quotation and bridge to a possible next. This study can not, however, provide evidence for a case of conditional relevance between framed reported quotations and certain relevant nexts. The proposal above is merely based on the retrospective observation that when a quotation is produced with surrounding (reversed and recycled) quotation clauses, this is always the first in a local sequence of reported quotations in a similar fashion as described above in relation to lists and temporally staged events.

The apokoinou can also be used to close and demarcate the first reported utterance in a turn from an utterance spoken by another character in the story (a kind of fictional turn taking). In extract (10:5) below, also from a coffee conversation, speaker B has just initiated a story about an old cat when she uses the reported speech format to recreate her conversation with the owner of a flower shop.

\textbf{(10:5) The old cat}


1. C: 
   \[\text{hur länge}\] for how long

2. kan en katt leva. 
   can a cat live

3. A: \[\text{ja såg att de va nåt i tidningen hon va=}\]
   I saw that there was something in the newspaper she was
The shop owner had an old cat sitting outside the shop and B quotes herself asking the shop owner how old her cat was, "åsså sa ja hur gammal e den här katten > sa [ja]." The reported utterance is framed with an initial quotation phrase 'åsså sa ja' (then I said) that is preceded by the particle 'åsså' (then). This particle causes an inverted word order (see appendix 3) in the following nexus 'åsså sa ja' ('then I said'), and a final (recycled but non-reversed) quotation phrase 'sa ja' ('said I'). This reported utterance is then followed by the answer from the other person (end of line 12). As in extract (4) above, the recycling of the
quotation phrase apparently prepares for the production of another reported utterance. The participants seem to take one utterance at a time before moving on to the next. Participant A produces a short continuers ‘ja’ (yes) right after B has initiated the post-P so as to achieve a collaborative closure of the first part of the story. This extract shows how the ‘said NP’ post-P format has a potential of bridging into the next utterance unit (here another quotation).

Activities that follow a single reported utterance are of course not other quotations, but actions such as comments on some aspect of the reported utterance. On lines 12, 14 and 16 in extract (10:6) below, speaker A says that one of the patients on her ward used to tell her to come and lie beside him in his bed at night, “du ska väl ligg- (.) ligga hänne [: dänna me]” (aren’t you gonna lie- (.) lie beside [here] (.) beside there with me). When finished with the quotation and the post-P ‘said-NP’ phrase, speaker A immediately comments on the dialect the man spoke with.

(10:6) Lie beside

Coffee conversation in a private home environment between four senior women who all worked at the same mental hospital. A is the hostess and B, D and D are her guests. A tells about one of the male patients.

   hh but this old man hh he
   hh but this old man hh he
3. D: nah[::]
   no
4. A: [se]=
   so
5. B: =ja:.=
   yes
6. A: =ja.= ja den honom att håh att däck *sh*
   I took him last so that Then oh
7. (.) han skulle få lite tijd [på se]
   (.) he would get some time

The post-P is partly occasioned by the self-initiated self-repair on line 16, when A changes from one demonstrative form ‘hänne’ meaning beside-her (line 14) to another demonstrative form ‘dänna’ meaning beside-here. Both forms belong to an old Swedish regional dialect, ‘gammelmål’. 
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8. D: [ja:] yes
9. ja [ja:] yes
10. A: [ja] every evening PET
11. B: [ja] de väl bra! de yes I suppose that’s good
12. A: [ja:] han att de ska väl ligga PET he said that he supposed you should lie
13. D: [ja] yes
14. A: [hän:] beside here
15. D: [ja:] yes
16. A: [hän:] han så han [för] han vaPET beside there he said and thought that
17. D: [ja] [ja] yes
18. A: [hän va /// han va ute från*::* he said he wasn’t going
19. Roskarleby so he spoke old dialect

When commenting, she uses a syntactic continuation of the reported phrase, "å [- trodde] han va /// han va ute från*::* Roskarleby so he spoke old dialect" (and thought he wasn’t going to Roskarleby so he spoke old dialect). The ‘said NP’ post-P format is here used as a closing device, an exit device, and a bridging device into next activities.

In extract (10:7) below the apokoino u-framed (single) reported utterance is closed and demarcated from the immediately following explanation of why the utterance was originally made (lines 6–7), "för hon (.) tyckte de va så hemst." (because she thought that it was so awful).
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(10:7) Don’t work

U:SÅINF:51[167]. Coffee conversation in a private home environment between four senior women who all worked at the same mental hospital. A is the hostess and B, D and D are her guests. A tells about some difficulties she had with combining taking care of children and working:

1. [0.8]

2. A: (>få se nu<) (.:) s å va han
   let me see now (.:) yes (.:) sixtythree (.:) then he 

3. (.:) han va bara nå månader då först
   he was only nine months then I tried

4. ja ([first,] .:h men (0.5) på hög Maria
   first then begged Maria

   at first hh but (0.5) then Maria begged

5. B: [ ja:] yes

6. A: >mamma jo< (.) för hon (.) tyckte
   mother work not and she because she believed
   mother don’t work she said ’cuz she thought

7. de va så hemst.
   that it was so horrible

8. B: [=hai:] [ just. ]
   yes right

   .hh ’cuz then they called when they

10. behä[:hmm.]

11. B: [ja,] [just de. ]
    yes that’s right

In sum, the apokoinou recycling of quotation phrases is not only used to mark or display an utterance as reported, but also to close and demarcate a first reported utterance in a turn from immediately following activities, such as another quote from the same or other character in a narrative, a comment on the quote itself (e.g. the dialect), or an explanation why the quoted utterance was produced in the first place.
10.2.3 Closing a local project that is treated as open

A recurrent use of apokoinou post-Ps that are produced as increments, seems to be to close off a local project that is treated as open by the other participants. In technical terms, the increment provides another TRP in pursuit of a response, and the recycling format makes sure that nothing new is added to the closed project except for a confirmative exit move. In extract (10.8) below, speaker B, a former mental nurse, first comments on how strong the male mental patients were (lines 4–5), and then she goes on to positively assess the time before they had men at all in the mental wards where they worked.

(10.8) Before we had men
Coffee conversation in a private home environment between four senior women (65–75 years). A is the hostess and B, D and E are her guests. They once worked at the same mental hospital and they talk about the time before and after they had men in their ward.

1. D: [<“yes, just do”>] yes that’s right
2. (0.2)
3. A: [(yes )]
4. A: [ (yes )]
5. [s ja:] thought one had good then before we had men
and I thought we were well off then before we had men
6. D: [men] that’s right
7. (0.2)
8. A: thought
9. D: [yes]
10. B: [att-eh] that’s right
11. 7: [ja]: yes
B gets support from D twice during her turn, first a continuier "mm" and then a more topically oriented response "just de" (that’s right) on line 6. The continuier is placed after the inbreath that follows the telling about the strong men on line 4. The more topical response is placed in the beginning of the turn continuation but too early to be a response to the continuation. It is rather an upgraded response to the previous telling of the strength of the men.

The turn continuation about the good times before they had men is completed with a creaky and prolonged nasal, "[å ja tyckte man hade på för] (and I thought we were well off then before we had men). The turn is brought to a complex TRP, but B gets no immediate response to the good before we had men topic. Instead of waiting for a response, after a (0.2) pause, B recycles the initial segment of the utterance in reversed form, "tyckte ja." (thought I), this time with a more distinct fall to low. The recycling does not add anything to the topic, but is rather used as an exit device to close off the well off before we had men topic in order to evoke a response to it at a new TRP, perhaps some recognition or just a continuier.

After the closing recycling is done, D immediately starts an in breath and both C and D produce ‘yes’ responses on lines 13 and 14.

In extract (10:9) below, speaker K does a similar thing when he first asserts that the social welfare office probably won’t give him any money, and then goes on to reassert that he won’t get it, in the shape of an increment. The recycling design of the increment retro-constructs the 1.9 second pause on line 7 as an officially absent (Schegloff 1968:1083) response from FO. The increment recycles a part of the pre-P with a marked drop to low pitch on the whole segment to make it more final that the previous turn. The recycling increment is used as if to create a more salient context for a response that would construct the ongoing project as a sufficient contribution in this particular sequential position.

This sequence is also analyzed in 8.4.1 above (extract 8:10), where the preceding apokoinou in the same utterance is analyzed as a relevance upgrade.
(10:9) Not a dime

An interview with a client at a Swedish social welfare office. Participants: FO=Interviewer (f). K=Client (m). Talk on whether K took the opportunity to discuss all the things he said that he wanted to discuss in the meeting with the officer.

1. (1.6)

2. K: pt .hh:: (1.0) ja ja f
   ↑
   ick ju     de sagt som ja
   pt .hh:: (1.0) yes I got to say what

3. skulle men=
   should but

4. FO:     8
   ↑
   '['in']

5. K:     [gen]         s re ju    upp ti c'em så far ja val
      ↓
      lett in it PRT-MOD up to then then have I PRT-MOD
      then (if) it's up to them then I won't get

6. inte en #spånn >i alla f
   ↑
   all<#((#stacc))
   not one dime in all cases
   a dime anyway

7. (1.9)

8. K:     [se
      ↓
      en re ju val     ante.
      get I PRT-MOD not
      I won't get

9. (0.9)

10. FO: du rä
      (0.3)
      ne de.
      you don't count on that

11. (0.3)

As in (10:8) above, the increment does not add anything to the ongoing topic or action, but closes it off. Only after this is done, FO produce a response to the rather strong assertion, this time also after a rather long pause (0.9 seconds).

The apokoinou utterances in extracts (10:8) and (10:9) above (together with extract (9:5) in chapter 9.2.1.2 and (9:10) in chapter 9.2.4), are good examples of interactional environments where the apokoinou methods of utterance building might have emerged over time as an abstract grammatical pattern for the building of apokoinou utterances within a single integrated contour (cf. Hopper 1987, 1988, Bybee 2002, Wode 2002, Kuvalik 2003, Couper-Kuhlen & Thompson 2005, for a similar view of the emergence of
grammatical forms, resources and constructions, but not explicitly about grammatical methods. In particular, these utterances put the spotlight on the fact that it is the beginning and accomplishment of the post-P segment that is the core action in apokoinou as a method of grammatical construction and the resolving of local communicative projects.

10.3 Resuming and skip-connecting actions

Sometimes speakers use apokoinou as a method to continue a communicative project that has been delayed for some reason. In these cases, speakers use apokoinou to continue communicative projects in two different ways and in two different positions in the talk:

(i.) Speakers *resume turn progression* after heavy pivots or inserted parenthetical activities during the production of a turn (e.g. turn internal specifications, lists, conditional arguments, comparisons, repair etc.)

(ii.) Speakers *skip-connect to pending communicative projects* after intermediate side sequences in the interaction (e.g. resumed answer projects or resumed narrative projects after joint intermediate activities)

10.3.1 Resuming turn progression

Speakers use apokoinou as a method to resume the production of a turn after heavy pivots or inserted parenthetical activities during the production of a turn. These actions are all accomplished within one and the same turn by the same speaker, except for one different case that will be discussed at the end of this section. As already mentioned above, the analysis of the corpus shows that the participants use apokoinou as a method to resolve the local communicative project of resuming the turn progression after:

(i.) *heavy pivots* with parenthetical activities such as specifications, lists, conditional arguments, de-generalizing comments, comparisons and explanations

(ii.) *repair-like activities* such as word repairs, word searches, hesitations and disambiguations

When the ongoing turn runs into some local problem or task that needs to be resolved, the apokoinou is used as a method to resume the turn progression when the project is resolved. Various local tasks create the
context for a turn resumptive action. The apokoinou is used to resume the progression of the turn in order to continue with business, move on with other business or simply create a transition relevance place (TRP).

10.3.1.1 Resuming turn progression after heavy pivots

Extract (10:10) below is drawn from a radio talk show, ‘Filosofiska rummet’ (The Philosophical Room), with discussions of philosophical issues. Speaker K reports on a feminist view on religious mysticism.

(10:10) The ecstasies

L:FR2(115). From ‘Filosofiska rummet’ (The Philosophical Room), a weekly discussion program in Swedish radio on philosophical questions with 4 participants. P= Peter Sandberg (presenter), K=Katarina Stenqvist (philosopher of religion). The main topic is religious mysticism. In this extract, K brings in a feminist perspective on the main topic.

1. P: a:¿ Katarina
2. K:  .hh JO: ja skulle gärna vilja göra de tillägget .hh yes I would like to make the addition that
3. när de gäller frågan sann-falsk mystik eh (0.3) when it concerns the question about true or false mysticism eh (0.3)
4. om vi nu ser på den närmaste ärtnondenahs eh: if we now look at the latest decades eh
5. perspektiv & feministiska frågor, .hh perspectives & feministic issues
6. så har de visat mej att de som man än de then has it shown itself that it that you then then it has been clear that those that one
7. traditionally has handigt till den falska traditionally has classified to the false
8. mystiken .hh exta en .hh:: vi .hh shows itself .hh:: show mysticism that the ecstasies .hh:: shows itself .hh:: shows
9. att de e dom kvaliga .hh .hh:: men det att de e dom kvaliga .hh .hh:: men det stands .hh:: men the stands stands .hh:: men stands .hh:: men stands
10. för det (0.2) .hh:: mens .hh:: "eh" for that (0.2) .hh:: while .hh:: while .hh:: while .hh:: while
Speaker K argues for a connection between the two facts that (i) ecstatic religious experiences have been labeled as false mysticism in the religious tradition, and (ii) that women have had these experiences. This argument is presented with an apokoinou twist around a heavy pivot, which ends in a post-positioned element “extaserna” (the ecstasies).

After the production of the post-positioned pivotal NP construction, K extends it with a recycling of the pre-P finite verb “har de vi haft sej att ...” (it has been clear that ...), however this time in present tense “visar sej att ...” (show that ...), that also has a more progressive function (hence the difference in translation). The recycling resumes the turn progression after a heavy pivot with a complex internal syntactic structure.

Extract (10:11) is drawn from the TV talk show 'Måndagsklubben' (The Monday Club). Speaker AD is initiating a story on line 1 about a visit to a bar (named 'Baren', The Bar), where he went on the Tuesday in the week before the show to party with work mates.
AD reports that he was drunk at the bar, and that this was filmed as part of the TV documentary ‘Baren’ that was recorded in the bar at the time. These events were then shown as part of broadcast episodes of the TV-documentary each day for the rest of the week and A reports that he was very ashamed.

The peak of the story is presented in the shape of an apokoinou that is twisted around an inserted four-part list construction “i visades den här jävla sekvensen.”

The extension does something more than emphasizing the pre-P and pivot list, it also adds an upgrade of the affective stance towards the showing of the events. The upgrade occasions general laughter by the audience. It can therefore be suggested that the apokoinou recycling in this

81 ‘Baren’ was a documentary soap opera on how to run a bar in the centre of Stockholm.
Closing, resuming, and skip-connecting

extract is used to resume the turn progression after the inserted list production in order to go for an upgrade of the affective stance (probably in pursuit of laughter).

The following extract (10:12) is drawn from a general discussion at a language conference. A panel of four persons sits in front of an audience. One of the panel members, speaker A, is talking about the importance of using the proper scientific terms when teaching students at the university. On line 4 speaker A says that you cannot (as a teacher in phonetics) enter the classroom and talk about speech sounds in a colloquial way, an utterance that occasions general laughter.

(10:12) As old as me

SOFTEX:GR-26[197] From a group discussion at a conference on language and identity. Participants: Four panel members and single members of the audience. A=chair (m), Au=audience, Li=single member of the audience.

1. A: om man e lingvist så måste man använda
   "if you are a linguist then you have to use"

2. phonem... man kan inte (.). man eller eller phonemar you can't (.). you or or

3. something else you can't enter

4. as old as me

5. A: om man e lingvist så måste man använda
   "if you are a linguist then you have to use"

6. phonem... you can't (.). you or or

7. something else you can't enter

8. as old as me

9. A: om man e lingvist så måste man använda
   "if you are a linguist then you have to use"

10. something else you can't enter

11. as old as me

12. A: om man e lingvist så måste man använda
   "if you are a linguist then you have to use"

13. something else you can't enter

14. as old as me

15. A: om man e lingvist så måste man använda
   "if you are a linguist then you have to use"

16. something else you can't enter

17. as old as me

18. A: om man e lingvist så måste man använda
   "if you are a linguist then you have to use"

19. something else you can't enter

20. as old as me
11. • men alla falla, hh: EH: (0.2) BUT THERE but anyway • BUT THERE
12. finns en aspekt på de här som där (...) ordförstået is an aspect of that there (...) the vocabulary
13. vi viser vilken kompetens man har. demonstrates what competence you have
14. Li: hh: ([/sneezing])
15. Li: mm

Speaker A goes on to explain why, “för att (.) då (.) låter man” (0.2) “(cuz (.) then (.) you sound (.)”). He then cuts himself off and says that you can talk about the sounds colloquially if you are as old as I am and people know about it. At this point in the turn, after the production of the conditional if-segment, A extends the turn with a ‘så’-initiated post-P, “så kan man (0.5) >naturligtvis gå in å säga ...” (then of course you can enter and say ...). The post-P recycles the initial phrase “kan man” and retro-constructs a syntactic pivot. The apokoinou recycling is used to resume the progression of the turn production after providing a conditional circumstance for the argument under way. The resumption is done here in order to go on and make an additional joke (in the form of a fictional reported utterance, lines 9–11).

In the following extract (10:13), drawn from the same language conference, the inserted action is more about narrowing the scope of the incipient argument: “at least one ...”. M starts the comment on the language of the elderly in a general and hesitating way “men hos (.) äldre personer så (0.5) så (0.2) är (.)” (but with eh (.) elderly people then (0.5) then (0.2) is).
Finally, she provides a segment that narrows down the topic to only one word category, "åtminstone en sån här kategori ord som kommer in" (at least one of these word categories that enters). This segment is surrounded by two light finite finite verbs "is". The second one is a recycling of the first and is used to resume the turn progression after the heavy narrowing segment, in order to finish the argument.

In extract (10:14) below, drawn from the radio talk show 'Spanarna' (The Reporters), the turn is resumed after a heavy comparative segment that widens the perspective on the main drug topic. The focus in the beginning of the construction is on the glorification of the hashish culture. During the pivot, however, G is widening his perspective to also include acid in his argument and then also the whole rave party culture (lines 9−13). This is done as a parenthetically constructed expansion and exemplification.
Rave party culture

L: #ja men# om man ska skriva om droger så ((#strained))
yes but if you’re gonna write about drugs then
måste man ta ett <#rejä::lt av[#stånd# å]> ((#ironic))
you must take a #real stand against it‘ an‘

G:                               [.hh:::: >f]ast
but

S=Ingvar Storm (m, presenter), J=Jonas Gardell (m, reporter) and L=Susanne Ljung (f, reporter). Talk about the attitude toward drugs in Swedish media and culture.

1. L: #ja men# om man ska skriva om droger så ((#strained))
yes but if you’re gonna write about drugs then
måste man ta ett <#rejä::lt av[#stånd# å]> ((#ironic))
you must take a #real stand against it‘ an‘

2. de e sagt att de a de oc dkr (.) nu: nu:
  it’s true hat it’s a cop (.) now now

3. L: [.] [hh::]

4. de e sagt att de a de oc dkr (.) nu: nu:
  it’s true hat it’s a cop (.) now now

5. L: [.] [hh::]

6. G: >stötte ja till mikrofonen men de:sem
I knocked against the microphone but it was:

7. de de e myktligt detta att hh ah någotting
it is extrive this that something

8. e så opp: uppenbart att #eh:: if som som just
  is so obvious this that particularly
  it’s so obvious this that eh: that that particularly
  de e sa
it’s so obvious this that eh: that that particularly

9. förarligandet av #resa hh inte bara hasch
  glorification of certain not just hasch
  it is so obvious this that eh: that that particularly
  förhärligandet av vissa .hh >inte bara hasch
  it is so obvious this that eh: that that particularly
  utan  också dom  här< a
  but also these acid an’ an’
  it is so obvious this that eh: that that particularly
  utan  också dom  här< a
  but also these acid an’ an’
  it is so obvious this that eh: that that particularly

10. hele ravepartykulturen med sitt [smi
    the whole rave party culture with their smiley mark
    sparsa dom bstr ct a a pt.hh wh hh net]
    the whole rave party culture with their smiley mark

11. hele ravepartykulturen med sitt [smi
    the whole rave party culture with their smiley mark

12. [.hh::]

13. S: d:- [>förhär[ligad<]
d:- glorified

14. "eh ve va:" [hh] å
  and so on y know: hh is very drugy (0.4)

15. G: =>å så vidare vac ah e ju: valdigt drpg- (0.4)
    and so on y know: hh is very drugy (0.4)
    och så oc: hh är mycket druga
    and so on y know: hh is very drugy (0.4)
At the end of the pivotal widening segment, G takes an inbreath, and extends the turn with another finite verbs that initiates a second focus on the whole rave party culture as drug oriented.'hh is very drug- (0.4) eh ve ve:: (h) glorified drug oriented' (the word 'glorified' is suggested by S, and the word 'drug oriented' is suggested by L during G's turn, which in a way makes this a co-constructed post-P). There are other things done in this sequence than resuming (such as confirming the glorification of drug use), but the heavy (widening) pivot, extended with a light recycled auxiliary, still conforms enough to the pattern I am describing in this section.

Another locally occasioned reason to resume a turn can be seen in (10:15) below. Here the caller to the poison information help line (C) says that she will cut down a poisonous plant and then she goes on to give the reason why, “eftersom allt även bladerna va giftit” (because everything even the leaves was poisonous).

(10:15) Poisonous leaves

1. IN: GIC:16493-77[171]. Phone call to a poison information call center. IN=Informer (f), C=Caller (f). The caller asks what to do with a plant that grows in her backyard.

   1. C: ... ryckte i blommerna, (0.4) pt .hh och när pull the flowers i pt .hh and when

   2. ja kom dit så syntes de inte att hon hade I arrived there it didn't show that she had

   3. nånting i mun, (1.5) eh: och eh:*::* då ryckte something in her mouth (1.5) eh: and eh::: then

   4. ja snatched away the flowers she was holding

   5. (0.4)

   6. IN: mm::[¿]
7. C: [nyu] tänkte ja gå å ta bort< alla blommer. 
now I thought to go there and remove all the flowers
8. [na:] men gick em ta-pa: ja [y] ka-pa ren (;) but then is it | ren | na
8. kli: but then there > I have to cut it ()
9. efterom altt even blt: det var giftt because everything even leaves was poisonous
then, because everything even the leaves was poisonous
10. så .[må ja ka-pa (när man em ...)] must I cut (when you are)
then kli: I have to cut | when you are |
11. IN: [ja] jst de: om hon änter av de yes that's right if she eats from them
12. [om] tycker alla delar [verkar intressanta], (if) thinks that all the parts seem interesting

At this point the informer (IN) interprets the turn as finished (begins a turn in the next moment, line 11), but C still extends the turn with an overlapped recycling of the initial subject and finite verb "så .hh: må ja ka-pa ..." (then .hh: I have to cut ...). The continuing verb-subject segment in the Swedish original utterance 'må(ste) ja' ('must I') is inverted (see appendix 3), but non-reversed, which makes it syntactically dependent on the previous segment. This is not the case with the idiomatic English translation 'I have to...'. I am analyzing this extension as a resumption of the turn progression after an inserted (explanatory) activity.

Unlike the previous extracts, the speaker in the following extract (10:16) is going back to an ongoing inquiry project after an intermediate detour that involves a discourse process (change of speaker). Extract (10:16) is drawn from the TV music show Tryck till (Push it), The topic preceding the apokoinou is actively finished by the presenter M on line 4. M then goes on to ask H a question about something different.


5. [hej]: Henrik: eh [när]a little

6. va: handen med [what happens with Whale]

7. [0.3]

8. M: Sweden's [the best rock band in Sweden]

9. [0.3]

10. M: mhm:

11. [0.7] Henrik: lightly with hands

12. [0.1]

13. [0.6]

14. [grunge] (don't know what it is)
M changes the topic rather abruptly and prompts Henrik to talk about the rock band (\textit{Whale}) he is playing with and what is happening with it. The prompt (or plainly \\textit{initiative}) is inserted in the talk as a conversational move that probably was on the presenter's pre-set agenda, with no topical connection to the preceding talk. The initiative is constructed with the main NP \textit{Whale} in final position: \textit{Henrik eh: tell a little what's happening with Whale}. When responding to M's initiative, H's initial act is not to address the initiative as such, but to begin with a positive assessment of his own band Whale: \textit{Sveriges bästa rockband,} (the best rock band in Sweden). The assessment is constructed as a grammatical extension of the previous NP, an apposition, thereby creating the co-constructed NP unit \textit{Whale (0.3) Sveriges bästa rockband,} (Whale (0.3) the best rock band in Sweden).

H uses several methods to construct the assessment as an extension of the previous unit. One is the positioning of the assessment in turn initial position (a position which is also, by the way, the locus for continuing previous actions). Another is the prosodic packaging of the assessing TCU \textit{Sveriges bästa rockband,}. It is produced on time, with a level tone contour, and separated from the following TCUs with a micro pause and a hesitation marker. But this does not make the utterance into an apokoinou. It is when continuing beyond the apposition that H retro-constructs the head noun plus the appositional assessment as a pivotal syntactic beginning. From this point forwards, H's utterance is a more 'on target' (more relevant) response to M's initiative.

The method of apokoinou is used here to resolve the local communicative project of \textit{meaning or returning} to the ongoing interactional sequence of initiative-response after an intermediate co-constructed assessment. The assessment is a parenthetical local communicative project used to resolve the local task of bragging (jokingly) before (re)turning to the responsive business of reporting the band's upcoming activities. The intermediate action is different from the intermediate activities in extract (10.8) above. The assessment is more parenthetical and more local, clearly done within a much narrower boundary than within an interactional sequence. But still, it is distributed (co-constructed) over two turns and therefore perhaps ends up somewhere in between resumptions of wider projects and resumptions of turns.
10.3.1.2 Resuming turn progression after repair

A related variant of the resuming construction is occasioned by repair activities during turn construction. As with the heavy pivots above, when the turn under way runs into some local task that needs to be resolved, the spokoinou is used as a method to resume the turn progression when the task has been done. Here the task to be resolved is more problem-like than above. To specify, produce a list or explain does not (necessarily) mean that there is some problem to be solved. In the following extracts, however, problems do arise, and are oriented to as such, during the turn production. The problem concerns word choice, word recollection, hesitation and vague referents.

In extract (10:17) below speaker A is talking to her daughter about the good supply of certain edible mushrooms (kantarell, chanterelles) in the area around their house. On line 15 speaker A starts to tells about a method she has been using in order to make the chanterelles grow around their house: she throws out the peelings from cleaning and sorting them out, "å ja har ju hållt id slängt ut kantareller- (0.2) eller (.) tvätt- >vr ska ja säja nåt a(nset)" (and I have always thrown out the chanterelles- (0.2) or () wash- >what shall I say< the peelings).

(10:17) The peelings

G:G:CB:BA:580[87]. From an everyday conversation between mother and daughter in a private home environment. A=Beata (mother), B=Karin (daughter, 10-15 years). Talk about mushrooms that grow around the house.

   then I found xx- (.) chanterelles there

2. (1.4)

3. A: å sen (0.6) så titta ja å leta vartenda å:
   then (0.6) I looked  and searched every year an'

4. ja hitta inga,
   I found none

5. (1.8)

6. A: >de va< ja hitta väl kanske ett paar:
   there was I found maybe a couple

7. eller tre år.
   or three years

8. (0.7)
9. A: då i början
then at the beginning

10. (1.2)

11. A: men nu så i år så växer de
but now this year they grow

12. där faktiskt.
there actually

13. (0.6)

14. A: å ja har ju alltid slängt ut kantarell- (0.2)
and I have always thrown out chanterelle-

15. eller [ ] växer de ska ja säga peeling-
or wash what do I say the peelings

16. (0.3)

17. B: m::hm¿

have I thrown out

19. (2.1)

20. A: här i (0.3) bara för att de skulle börja växa där.
here in: (0.3) only ’cuz it should start to grow there.

However, this telling is not produced in a straightforward way. When reaching the word ‘kantarell’ she cuts herself off and self-initiates a repair sequence where she first tries the word ‘wash’, but cuts herself off again and comments on her difficulty in finding the right thing to say. Finally she produces the potentially right word with a try-marking prosody “re:nset?” (the peelings). After receiving a confirmation on the right word choice from her daughter (line 17), A continues with an syntactic extension of the word found, “ha ja slängt ut.” (have I thrown out) in the shape of an increment (line 18). This extension takes the preceding word as a pivotal syntactic beginning.
The apokoinou extension has some dimension of confirming the right choice of expression, as discussed in the section (9.2.1) above. But the format is different (no ‘heter’-construction) and the expression-confirming move is already done by A’s daughter when A does the recycling extension. An analysis more to the point, I think, is to say that A uses apokoinou to resume the turn incrementally after completing the repair sequence together with her daughter. This is done in order to continue the telling with a comment on where she threw the remains, and why.

The following extract (10:18) is similar, but the word search is not accomplished as overtly as in (10:17). Speaker C is announcing an upcoming event in the city of Lund, where Dalai Lama will come on a visit.

(10:18) In Lund
U:MKL-104[25]. From ‘Måndagsklubben’ (The Monday Club). Informal TV talk show with 5 participants in the studio in front of an audience. Participants: A=Anna (f, presenter), C=Clas Malmberg (m, co-presenter). C announces an event with Dalai Lama.

1. C: =ja tänkte ja skulle göra lite reklam
   I thought that I should do some PR
2. hör =ja de ha ja lovats=
   here ‘cuz I’ve promised that
3. A: =ja=
   yes
4. C: =ja va [nämigen] insjöden å va konferens=
   I was you not invited to be the presenter
5. A: =versågod=
   go on
6. C: =ja de ska .hh Dalai Lama kommer ti Sverige
   on it that Dalai Lama comes to Sweden
   on that hh Dalai Lama comes to Sweden
7. =den den sextonde maj och .hh: =
   the the sixteenth May and
   the the sixteenth of May and hh:
8. A: =mhm=
9. C: =da de ii: eh Lund (.) kommer han ti
   then is it in eh Lund coming he to
   then it’s in eh Lund will he come to

When C comes to the point in the turn where he has projected a possible mention of the place where Dalai Lama will be on the sixteenth of May, he hesitates "... och då är det..." (... and then it's in...). Then he produces the city name "LUND" with emphasis (pitch peak, raised volume and primary stress). After a micro pause C extends the pivotal city name with the recycling and expanding segment "kommer han till den sjuotonde..." (will he come to on the seventeenth).

Considering that C changes the date, it is a short step to analyzing the extension as a repair of the date. A couple of turns later the participants actually agree that the right date is the sixteenth, but the change can still be a repair at this stage in the talk. Therefore, I would like to argue for an analysis where C is resuming the turn progression after the accomplishment of the short search for the name of the city, as well as doing a post-P repair of the date. Both are made in order to continue with the announcement of the event.

In extract (10:19) below, speaker M, a senior woman, is about to leave after a visit to her friend E. She utters a preliminary goodbye to E on line 4. Speaker E then responds with a summons (line 5) followed by a question about when M will come back (lines 7−9).

(10:19) You, you, you
USAHY.952[07]. Talk during a visit from a care giver in the Swedish home help services.
Participants: VB=Care giver, E=Care taker, M=Friend of E. M is about to leave E after a visit and stands in the doorway.

1. VB bara kvinnor + herre + de bli inga=

2. M: [He-] [E] [slasie? ]

3. VB: =roligt, a

4. E: [jet] yes
The format of the question is changed or repaired during the utterance with an apokoinou-like method. After a short hesitating segment with three repetitions of the word 'du' (you), "du (. . .) du (. . .) du", E continues the turn with a recycling of the finite verb 'kommer' (come). During the repetition segment, E is reorganizing the turn beginning or resetting the turn, using the pronoun 'du' as pivotal syntactic beginning. This results in a more assertive and less try-marked (interrogative) syntax in Swedish (but not in English). The recycling is probably used by speaker E to resume the turn progression once she has decided how to go on with the turn. She resumes the turn and finishes the utterance in a more assertive format, but still about a B-event, i.e. it implies a question to M. The second and third 'du' are not prosodically displayed as restarts per se, e.g. using focal accent and pitch reset, and the contour of the segment "[du kommer tillbaks i
"då kommer du..." is not translatable into idiomatic modern English, cf. "then coming are you..."; cf. the discussion in appendix 3.)

The following extract (10:20) is drawn from a conversation between three doctors talking about euthanasia (recorded in 1968). In this sequence, speaker A comments on an article by the writer Clarence that has been mentioned before.

(10:20) Clarence articles

Participants: A (m), B (m, moderator), D (f). Talk about an article written by a writer named Clarence.
1. A: [å katolikerna har ju hemst] on the Catholics have an awful
   lot of ideas about the business of
2. B: [ m:mm:h[m] ]
3. D: [ ja] ha
5. D: [*mm::7*]
6. (2.4)
8. B: mm[m::]
9. A: [p t men] aha. [p t lippar allt på] [p t to] their lying always Clarence-poss
   lippar allt på they always lie Clarence’s
7. D: [ ]
10. A: [ ehh artikel] lippar allt på de planet tycker ja
7. D: [ ]
11. A: [e h artikel] lippar allt på de planet tycker ja
   att man ha svårt å [p hh toaster] at
   att man ha svårt å have a hard time to think, an ’sort of’
A is about to make an assessment about Clarence’s articles, but begins the turn without spelling out exactly what he is referring to, “pt men ahh. pt de ligger alti” (but ehm pt they always lie). Before going on to say what they always are, A inserts a slightly hesitating clarification of the referent to ‘they’, which is the full NP “Clarence eh artiklar” (Clarence’s eh articles). After this A immediately goes on and extends the full NP with a recycling of the segment ‘always lie’ that retroconstructs it as a possible syntactic pivot.

The usual way of analyzing the segment ‘but they always lie Clarence’s articles’ would be to say that it is a post-positioned construction (right dislocation). Other data than those presented here have shown that post-positioned constructions make available the final NP for an apokoinou extension, which is the case here. A is using the apokoinou method to resume the turn production after a possibly disambiguating inserted full NP in order to go on and make his assessment of Clarence’s articles; he finds the philosophical jargon a bit hard to understand.

This utterance is probably closer to an anacoluthon (a syntactic cut-off + restart) than to an apokoinou, but it is very much integrated prosodically at the crucial points during the production: the borders between the pre-P and pivot and between pivot and pre-P (cf. ch. 7.3 above). If it had been produced with, say, a micro pause before the pivot, the anacoluthon would have been a better analysis, but the prosody must be taken into serious account when analyzing methods of construction in talk, not just the syntax.

10.3.2 Skip-connecting to pending communicative projects

Speakers sometimes skip-connect to pending communicative projects after intermediate side sequences in the interaction. The notion of skip-connecting (cf. Mazeland & Huiskes 2001:155, Boe 2003, Ottesjö forthcoming) is used to

83 Also see Local (1994) for back-connecting devices.
capture how speakers use apokoinou to connect to a pending communicative project in a way that retro-constructs the intermediate activity as parenthetical or at least not sequentially consequential for the action under way. When moving on, this is done in immediate connection to the sequential position before the (skipped) parenthetical activity. Communicative projects are oriented to by participants on different (simultaneous and nested) levels and are always achieved dialogically. This means (among other things) that they are sequentially organized in at least two contributions, or that they are co-authored in Bakhtin’s sense (but not necessarily co-produced) with other participants (Linell 2005a). The activities of initiating, deviating from, and then returning to a communicative project are therefore always sequentially organized, and therefore an achievement by more than one participant (cf. Schegloff 2007 on the sequential organization of talk, and 7.5 above for a more detailed discussion of communicative projects).

Extract (10:21) below is drawn from a family conversation in a situation where Ulla (U) is talking to Christina (C), a visiting friend, about the video recording that is being made during their talk. C asks specifically what U will do with the recording (line 1).

(10:21) The spoken language corpus

Everyday family conversation while preparing dinner. Participants: U=Ulla (49 years), hostess and responsible for the recording, C=Christina (48 years), friend of U on visit, K=Karin (6 years), U’s daughter, S=Sofie (18 years), U’s daughter. Talk about the recording. Christina asks Ulla what she will do with the recording.

1. C: va ska du göra med det sen då hm: hm (.)
2. U: what are you gonna do with that then hm: hm (.)
3. U: what’s your name Ulla is your name
4. C: (H)(H)(H)(H) (h)(h) (h) .hh:
5. C: what are you gonna do with this
6. U: my name is

See also extr. (8:11) above, where this AU is analyzed as a shift of perspective that upgrades the relevance of the utterance during its production.
Closing, resuming, and skip-connecting

7. C: = h(ä)r ("frunnting")*  
here something

Ulla an' dededededa

9. C: ] in kommer]  
in comes

10. Kalle å ja (h)eter [Ullas]=  
Kalle an' my name is Ulla

11. U: ] (laughing)]  
[turns away from C]

12. S: ] (laughing)]  

13. C: = [h] [h] [h] [h] .hh::= ] (h) (h)  

14. U:  
[NG] Å VA] ZA SÖRA  
and what shall I do

15. ME DE hår de e väl  li- vi häller på ma nh ]  
with this hear it is OK-good we  
we keep on with eh this

16. Den talSpråks[korpuse] hän de inga a  
this spoken-language-corpus this can it included in  
corpus of spoken language can it be a part of

17. (0.6) ((soft thud))  

18. C: talSpråk=  
[slot leaving interrogative]

19. R: = mamma den [bar visat ]=  
mother it appears to

20. U: [t]Språkem.] [(filling-in the slot)]

21. R: = trilli[la] i boken den här.+ ]  
have fallen to the floor this one

22. U: [de{ finns en }tSpråkem]Språkem.]  
there's a spoken language corpus

23. C:  
[jaria] ja ja ]  
yes yes yes
C finishes her question with some hesitation markers "hm, hm (.)", after which she poses another question "vä heteru?" (what's your name). Even though C immediately provides the answer herself, "Ulla heteru" (Ulla is your name), the hesitation and question have displayed a temporary memory lapse regarding her friend's name that occasions a drawn out sequence of mild mocking and joking (lines 3–12). Finally, in the middle of C's laughter on line 14, U skips back to the question with a "nej" (no) and a repetition of the question "hva heteru? (what's your name)" on line 16, which is met with another repetition of the question on line 18. At this point U has reached the third point in the talk where an answer to C's inquiry is relevant. The first position is occupied with the parenthetical question-answer side play about the name. The second one is ignored by U who instead continues to mock C (line 6). Now (on line 15), U has re-asked the question in C's place, thereby making it sequentially relevant to provide an answer in the following segment of the turn. U does precisely this, but not in a straightforward manner. She begins her answer by saying "vi håller på att dela den här talspråkskorpusen", (we are working with this spoken language corpus). After a micro pause, U extends the turn with an apokoinou post-P, where she specifies the relation between the recording (the topic of C's initial query, referred to with "de" (it)) and the corpus: "kan den ingå i."

Communicatively, the post-P orients to the fact that the first part of the answer is too general in relation to the original (and repeated) query. It addresses the general circumstances within which the recording will be used, not what U will do with it, and therefore the question is left unanswered. The post-P ties the answer more closely with the query (upgrades the relevance of the answer) – what the recording will be used for (becoming part of a larger corpus of recordings). This upgrading move also involves a skip-connecting to the pending answer-project. The apokoinou is therefore used as a method to resume or re-orient to the perspective on the recording that was originally displayed in the query. The main resource for resuming the answer project as such is of course the turn initial repetition of the question, but the apokoinou post-P completes the local task of resuming and completing the communicative project of inquiry-response.

---

A formal aspect of this is how the recording is referred to. In the question format, the recording is addressed with a specific reference, although indexical, de dä(r) (that), de här (this), which is missing from the first part of the answer.
A related but somewhat differently staged skip-connecting move can be seen in the following extract (10:22). The extract is drawn from one of the coffee conversations with four senior women. In this particular extract they have been talking about picking mushrooms for some time, when the hostess Ada (A) starts to tell a story about a walk she took recently.

(10:22) We went out to Almunge

---

1. D: ja;
2. C: ja
3. D: ja ha? (.) ja:;
4. A: ... då när vi gick en där Lövstapromenaden.
   .hh då when we walked that Lövsta path
5. .: eh då: eh [.här vi kom upp ti Rund-<] (.) eh short eh when we came up to Rund-
6. C: | var: | vi: | ifrån, where did you start from
    [ ]
7. A: .hh:: vi gick eh: vi: åkte ut till eh: hh:: we went we went out to
   .hh:: we went we went out to eh:: hh::
8. .hh: *eh:* hh
    pt. eh eh hh
9. C: på andra sidan av [ ] on the other side of [ )
10. A: [ ]
11. [ ]
12. C: [Almunge va¿ Almunge right]
13. A: [m u]

---
In the middle of initiating the story (lines 4–5), speaker C cuts in (line 6) and asks (in overlap) from where they started to walk (line 6). Speaker A starts to respond to the question "vi gick vi" (we walked). However, she starts over again with another construction (an anacoluthon), the progression of which is delayed with a search for the name of the place "vi gick vi" (we walked).

At this point the other participants join in to cooperate with A to resolve the (parenthetical) task of identifying the correct name of the place A was going to, 'Almunge' (lines 12–17). When this is jointly constructed, resolved and confirmed, A goes on to modify the answer incrementally (line 18), "vi gick vi ifrån" (we walked from). The increment extends the pivotal element 'Almunge' syntactically and retro-constructs it as the syntactic beginning of the increment. This is not a shift in perspective simply because the apokoinou post-P resumes the initial perspective on the place. In sum, A uses an increment post-P to resume the initial project of answering the question from where did you start walking?, a project that was cut off and left behind on lines 8–9 in favor of a side sequence of joint word search.

86 The name is confirmed with the meta comment on line 16. See extract (9:5) for a closer analysis of the meta comment as a local confirmation of the right expression.
The caller (C) requests information about some unknown berries in her backyard, which are reminiscent of ‘vinbär’ (currants).

(10:23) Mountain currants

Mountain currants

Mountain currants

Mountain currants

Mountain currants

Mountain currants

Mountain currants

Mountain currants

Mountain currants

Mountain currants

Mountain currants

Mountain currants

Mountain currants

Mountain currants

Mountain currants

Mountain currants

Mountain currants

Mountain currants

Mountain currants
The informer's (IN's) first suggestion (not shown in the transcript) is that it might be 'måbär' (mountain currants), and then they engage in a discussion on how the berries and leaves found in the backyard look and how similar and different they are as compared to ordinary currants (this ends on line 7).

The description of the plant is done with the normal currant as the comparative reference. Mountain currants is not as red as the normal currants, the leaves look the same but are smaller etc. On line 9, the discussion of the plants is slightly interrupted by the caller's child, which occasions a three-part sequence where the caller tells the (reluctant) child to be quiet (lines 9–13). When the side-sequence is resolved, the informer reintroduces her initial suggestion mountain currants on line 15, now made against the firm background of a detailed description, "[för de] finns ju må:bär" ('cuz there's mountain currants). Immediately after the reintroduction, she formulates the biological relation between mountain currants and currants, "må:bär e ju släkt me v" (mountain currants are related to currants), using the auxiliary 'e' (is) when retro-constructing the name of the berry as a pivot (a Janus head configuration).

From one point of view, the biological relation would probably have to be spelled out, since these berries do not have similar names in Swedish. But the communicative reason for the formulation is twofold. On the one hand IN resumes the activity of informing after a side-sequence. On the other hand the informer is in some sense developing and emphasizing the resemblance of the berries as a departure for the upcoming information
delivery on lines 18–19 that the berries are not dangerous. The apokoinou method resolves the local communicative project of first skip-connecting to an ongoing project of comparing currants to mountain currants, and then to provide the relevant information for the upcoming information delivery — both within the same prosodic contour and syntactically intertwined on the pivot.

10.4 Summary
In this chapter was first shown that apokoinou is a method for closing local communicative projects and demarcating them from upcoming actions and activities. This seems to be an especially valuable resource when the speaker is involved in narrative activities, where the temporal ordering of reports (including reported utterances) has a central role, and in activities where it is important to separate actions from each other, such as list constructions. The main formal method used when closing and demarcating is the family of recyclings, especially the full or partial recycling variant (with reversal), probably. Another variant of the recycling post-P, is when it is produced in the shape of an increment. These are used as a speaker's method to exit a communicative project that is treated as open by other speakers at a first TRP, and thereby provide another TRP for responses or continuers. The full and partial recycling post-P operates minimally on the topical content of the closed/demarcated project.

Apokoinou was then shown to also be a method of resuming a turn’s progress that is delayed by some local turn internal activity, e.g. a heavy pivot or repair-like activities. During turn production the need often arises to resolve some local task (not necessarily a problematic one) before being able to develop or complete the action that was under way. The formal methods used are different variants of full, partial and extended recyclings but also the recycling of light and/or auxiliary verbs such as ‘be’, ‘have’ and ‘come’. These are transitional and progressive in nature and they do not carry much semantic weight that might operate on the topic underway.

Another variant of the continuing function is the skip-connecting to previous (pending) communicative projects, e.g. when the preferred response to a query is delayed by another local activity that leaves the wider project hanging until the need arises to continue it and produce a response that mainly orient to the project in the position before the intermediate activity. The formal methods used when skip-connecting to pending projects are mostly variants with lexical renewal (no or limited lexical recycling). The Janus head forms offer the possibility to shift between
projects online and thereby embed a more parenthetical (local) project within an already ongoing (wider) project.87

87 Note that the concept of 'embedded' refers to a retrospective phenomenon. It is only after a resumption or return to a previous project is accomplished that the abandoned project can be analyzed as more local, parenthetical or embedded.
11 Peripheral functions

11.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I will demonstrate how apokoinou and apokoinou-like utterances can have functions that are less (proto)typical in the sense that participants achieve them with formal configurations that deviate in different respects from the prototypical format of apokoinou as described in chapter 5 above. These include clarifications of potentially vague references, specifying of relevant circumstances for upcoming topics, and elaborations of topics just introduced. Speakers clarify referents at the end of the apokoinou utterance, while specifications and elaborations might arise early in the production of a TCU or turn. Such tasks can of course be solved using other methods, such as prosodic cut-offs and/or restarts (i.e. anacoluthons) or using other repair strategies. However, the dynamic grammatical schema of apokoinou offers speakers a method of utterance building that resolves these tasks during the course of utterance production in an interactionally and constructionally smooth way.

11.2 Resolving vagueness in unit closing

A clarification is defined here as an action that resolves a possible vagueness in the beginning of an utterance unit regarding a choice between two or more referential options in relation to the preceding talk. The possible vagueness has emerged because of speakers’ use of deictic, vague, or elliptic methods in the beginning of the utterance, and the resolving of the vagueness is done in the post-P extension. The resolving of such a vagueness can of course be done in many ways (e.g. using repair), but here only those instances where speakers use the method and format of apokoinou for this purpose will be addressed. The utterances with a more clear-cut clarifying dimension are all characterized by possible syntactic completion on the pivot. At that point in the utterance, the produced action often works as a full contribution in its sequential position, despite being extended with an apokoinou post-P, but there are also disambiguating utterances without this feature.

The social action of clarification comes close to what is called repair in conversation-analytic and related literature (cf. Schegloff et al. 1977). A problem with the notion of repair, especially as it has been used on self-initiated self-repair, is that it presupposes two things. The first thing
presupposed is some kind of speech production problem that occasions an editing move by the speaker or some other participant. The second thing presupposed (cf. Plejert 2004 for a similar critique) is that the speech disfluency is treated as the speaker’s display of dealing with some interactional local problem or task during utterance production. This is not the case here, since there is no display of speech disfluency.

This is perhaps best illustrated with a comparison with the apokoinou utterances that are used in order to resume the turn after repair (cf. ch. 10.3.1.2 above), where problems in the flow of speech occasion the need to resume the ongoing turn progression in the constructional format of recycling apokoinou. When viewed from the perspective of social action, the online disambiguations treated in this chapter do similar things as repair. The main difference is that instead of achieving the action of repair through the procedure of identifying and correcting a trouble source, and displaying (making recognizable) this procedure in a series of separate, but sequentially organized actions, the speakers here use the constructional schema of apokoinou to move straightforwardly and seamlessly, without the usual formal display of separate actions, to the version that is displayed as communicatively relevant for subsequent talk.

A good example of this can be seen in extract (11:1) below. It is drawn from the TV talk show The Monday Club. A member of the audience makes a request (in two steps) for participant C to dance salsa with R (lines 1 and 6), and C responds to this request on line 9.

**Dancing salsa**

U:MKL-524[30]. From ‘Måndagsklubben’ (The Monday Club). Informal TV talk show with five participants in the studio in front of an audience. Participants: A=Anna (f, presenter), C=Claes Malmberg (m, co-presenter), R=Regina Lund (f, guest, actor, artist), Aud=Audience. Talk about dancing salsa at the end of the show.

1. Aud: S A L S A (request 1)
2.  (11 lines omitted)
3.  
4.  
5.  
6.  
7.  
8.  
9.  
10.  
11.  
12.  
13.  
14.  
15.  

**(11:1) Dancing salsa**

U:MKL-524[30]. From ‘Måndagsklubben’ (The Monday Club). Informal TV talk show with five participants in the studio in front of an audience. Participants: A=Anna (f, presenter), C=Claes Malmberg (m, co-presenter), R=Regina Lund (f, guest, actor, artist), Aud=Audience. Talk about dancing salsa at the end of the show.

1. Aud: S A L S A (request 1)
2.  (11 lines omitted)
3.  
4.  
5.  
6.  
7.  
8.  
9.  
10.  
11.  
12.  
13.  
14.  
15.  

A good example of this can be seen in extract (11:1) below. It is drawn from the TV talk show The Monday Club. A member of the audience makes a request (in two steps) for participant C to dance salsa with R (lines 1 and 6), and C responds to this request on line 9.
C's response is produced in overlap with R with an initial repeat of the second request "with Regina:: we will do that at the end shall we?"

Prosodically, however, there are no signs of closure on "slutet". A continuation is highly projected and is initiated with a second finite verb that takes the preceding adverbial phrase 'i slutet' as its syntactic beginning "vi gör de i slutet ska vi dansa sa salsa [ja å Regina.]

The continuation specifies the initial 'de' (that) to be about dancing salsa and the 'vi' (we) to be 'jag och Regina' (me and Regina) as the persons involved in the dancing.

Why clarify this at this point? One answer could be that R has offered C to improvise freely on the topic of salsa (lines 12, 14 and 16). She produces this offer in direct response to the first request from the audience member, but before the second request is finished. This means that she is not yet
included in the activity when she says “[du kan] improvisera fri|tt} (. ) [på ämne<]” (you can improvise freely on the subject). The second audience request is produced in overlap with R’s offer (line 15) and C’s clarifying apokoinou probably resolves the project of choosing exactly which of the proposed activities he is responding to: improvising freely on the salsa topic as suggested by R, or dancing salsa with R as suggested by the member of the audience.

This AU shows that the action of clarifying the reference to two possible options in the preceding talk can be achieved using a prototype apokoinou configuration, in this case a variant of the asymmetric Janus head type with the method of linguistic renewal that does the disambiguating work.

The next example is formally less prototypical with a broken up prosodic contour, a distribution of obligatory constituents on the turns of two speakers (an ellipse), and a post-P produced as an increment. Extract (11:2) below is drawn from one of the TV shows in the Push it material. The presenter of the show (M) asks one of the guests (IS) at the end of the show if she will buy any of the music they have been listening to during the show (lines 4, 5, 7 and 9).

(11:2) Weeping Willows

Lituritemat from “Tryck till” (Push it), a TV talk show about music with four participants: one host, two panel members, and one guest. Participants: M=Mårten (host), IS=Idde Schultz (guest). At the end of the show, M asks I if she will buy any of the music they have been listening to during the show.

1. M: | hh:: Idde Schultz, du [va dag]ans gäst=
   Ah: Idde Schultz you were the guest of the day
2. IS: | [mm::]
   in Push it(.) eh what do you say about
4. IS: | eh::: videorna >här nu rå<. (.) kommer du
   eh::: the videos now then (. ) will you
5. M: =ga å köpa nån av (.) skivorna
   go and buy any of
6. IS: | [mm::]
7. M: eller nån skiva me com här banden;
   or any record with these bands
When IS answers the question she uses a format that is elliptic from a sentential perspective, but not from a pragmatic perspective: “eh no yes maybe Weeping Willows.” (eh no yes maybe Weeping Willows). The subject and finite verb are available in the question and are therefore not necessary to spell out. Speaker IS’s answer is brought to a prosodic completion with a low to fall on the last syllable. She also closes her lips after finishing the turn and gazes straight at M so as to display closure. M’s continuer on line 13, however, is not produced until after the 0.3 pause on line 12. M therefore does not treat speaker IS’s previous answer as sufficient in this sequential position.

Then IS re-opens the turn with a continuing increment on line 14. The increment begins with a hesitation marker, a pause and then an extended partial recycling “ehm (0.4) maybe I buy, (ehm (0.4) maybe I’ll buy).” The ‘ja’ element in the pre-P on line 10 is not a pronominal subject ‘I’, but the response particle ‘yes’, so the only recycled lexical element is the adverbial ‘kanske’ (maybe). The post-P is extended with ‘ja köper’ (I’ll buy), a segment that makes explicit what was not explicitly expressed in the beginning of the utterance.

A possible communicative reason for doing the extension at this point, is that IS’s main project in this extract is about answering a multi-unit question. M’s preceding question is staged in three steps. The initial question
is brought to a possible complex TRP (lines 4–5). This completed move is then followed by two consecutive increments, first on line 7 and then on line 9. The second increment “du såg” (you saw) is in overlap with IS’s turn beginning, but IS initiates her turn with a hesitation marker and this should not pose any problem for hearing the increment. The three steps perform a step-by-step narrowing of the question, from “will you buy any of these records?”, to “[will you buy] any of the records with these bands?”, to “[will you buy any of the records with the bands] that you saw?”. The brackets indicate the presupposed information in each increment. Note that the original phrase ‘will you buy’ gets more and more suppressed, presupposed and temporally distant for each step in the question. It is possible that speaker IS uses the method of apokoinou to resolve the local communicative project of choosing exactly which aspect of the question she is answering, when facing a question where the original interrogative phrase is backgrounded twice before she begins the main part of her answer. This move therefore also has dimensions of a skip-connecting to the original interrogative move by M (cf. ch. 10.3.2 above).

The next example also deviates from the prototypical formal apokoinou configuration in the sense that the speaker produces the pivotal adverbial before the object, i.e. the object is left hanging in the utterance until it is provided in the post-P. Extract (11:3) below is drawn from a meeting in a sewing society in which four senior women talk about nature drugs.

(11:3) Headache
1. A: tror [ja man] taj ruttojuurta på M=
   think that if you take ruttojuurta (eng. butterbur) on m-

2. [T]: [ ‘m’m’ ]

3. A: =måna rou ^=[ (an’ lörda) jo rutto- jo] detes
   =måna rou ^t^= ( [an’ lörda] you take-yes that’s

4. E: [ (an’ Sa-) yes rutto-]
   [what is rutto-]

5. [0. 3]

6. A: [va’re da] (.) den här (0.5) petasites hh: des+
   was it this (7this (0.5) petasites hh: yes

7. mh (1.1) butterbur.
   mh (1.1) butterbur.
In this particular sequence they talk about a nature drug that is spoken of using three different words for the plant it is based on: 'ruttojuurta' (Fin.), 'pestrot' (Swe.), and 'petasites' (Latin for butterbur or sweet coldfoot). On lines 1–8 speaker A identifies the drug as being made of the plant 'ruttojuurta' (line 1), which is Finnish for the plant 'petasites' (line 6) or 'pestrot' (line 7). Then speaker E agrees on the identification (line 8), but goes on to question if anybody actually takes this drug: "men:: ve m går nu å:: t[ar sånt] (but who would go and take that stuff). After a comment from A on the problem of eating too much 'pestrot' and an agreement from E, A goes on to announce that she takes 'petasites', "ja brukar ta när ja har huvuvärk" (I usually take when I have headache). When doing this, speaker A responds to the previous questioning move by E and specifies (see 11.3 below) the circumstances under which she takes 'petasites', "ja brukar ta när ja har huvuvärk" (I usually take when I have headache). At this point
in the turn, however, A has not mentioned the drug explicitly by name or referred to it with a pronoun, which means that the object of the clause is left hanging. The specification is inserted in the turn before the production of the object. When A continues with a ‘så’-initiated (inverted) partially recycling post-P “så ta jà petasites” (PART I take petasites), she makes a clarification about the identity of the exact substance.88

One possible communicative reason for doing the second specification is that three different terms have been used in the preceding talk when referring to the drug in question, ‘ruttojuurta’, ‘petasites’ and ‘pestrot’. The speakers are not explicit about it (and might not know the difference) but the name ‘petasites’ is the Latin name of the species to which the plant ‘ruttojuurta’ or ‘pestrot’ belong. Speaker A might use apokoinou to resolve the local communicative project of choosing between three words (or names of the plant) that are available from the preceding talk, i.e. a kind of clarifying move. The fact that the term ‘pestrot’ occurred in between the apokoinou utterance and her own choice of word ‘petasites’ might have influenced the accessibility of the referent ‘petasites’ in this particular case.

11.3 Specifying relevant topic circumstances

The apokoinou method also provides speakers with the online possibility (in some local contexts within the turn) to break off the syntactic progression in the utterance before a possible syntactic completion, and insert an element or segment that specifies a relevant circumstance (and sometimes also rearranges the background or frame) for the upcoming main topic in the utterance unit. The inserted elements (always adverbials) are then retro-constructed as pivots. When the adverbial pivot is produced, the post-P recycles the finite verb and/or the subject in the pre-P in order to frame and focus the pivotal element, but also to resume the utterance progression. Similar utterances have been described in spoken English by Enkvist (1988) as belonging to the same group of phenomena as a ‘prototypical apokoinou’ as defined in this study (although explained as structure shifts, see above ch. 3, example 3:1). However, these utterances are here treated as less prototypical because they never reach a possible TRP before they are extended with a post-P.

Extract (11:4) below is drawn from the same TV talk show Push it, but from another episode. Speaker J is involved in a lengthy comment on a

88 The first specification, when A specifies the circumstance under which she takes the drug, is done with a formal method that will be discussed below in section 11.3.
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video where some special effect is used, and compares this effect with a similar effect in a TV commercial for a new record with the band Madness.

1. 

2. 

3. 

4. 

5. 

6. 

7. 

8. 

9. 

On line 5, when J has introduced the commercial in the previous TCU, he continues with a description of the contents of the commercial “...”and then they had...” Instead of going straight for “...one of those series of faces...”, speaker J inserts an adverbial, “at the bottom” (at the bottom), i.e. at the bottom of the screen. This segment bridges extra information that from a formal perspective breaks the syntactic progression, but which is produced as prosodically integrated in the ongoing TCU, despite the fact that it is spoken more slowly than the
fast, introductory, thematic pre-P. J then recycles the TCU beginning with a ‘så’-initiated post-P “så hade rom” (then they had).

The apokoinou recycling retro-constructs the adverbial “så hade rom” (at the bottom) as a specific circumstance for the rest of the TCU: the special effect in the commercial was placed at the bottom of the TV screen. When doing this, J displays a detailed knowledge of the commercial he is talking about. This move has a dimension of ascertaining some extra crediblity to J’s description (cf. upgrading evidential stance, ch. 8.3.4 above). This is also a more formalized version of a foregrounding shift, where an adverbial is inserted at a position where it is given a dominant role for the continuation of the utterance when retro-constructed as a pivot (cf. ch. 8.5 above).

The next extract (11:5) is drawn from a board meeting at a nursery school. In this sequence the board members talk about how to make parents take an interest in the running of the school, both for economic and social reasons. Speaker N tries to specify a kind of event that might make the parents more interested in visiting the party (lines 1–6).

(11:5) Hat party:
HSAMM1 1485[48]. From a board meeting at a nursery school. Participants: 4 women and 1 man. N=Niklas (m), L=Lisa. Talk about economy and how to make money on an upcoming spring party.

1. N: (å dehär) (0.4) att man sku sälja då liksom (an’ this) (0.4) that you should sell then sort’of
2. å (0.3) få liksom opp (0.8) föräldrarna (0.3) get sort’of up (0.8) the parents
3. "lik’som då (0.4) eller (;) eller om de e sort’of then (0.4) or (;) or if there’s
4. någå barn (;) *teater eller nå[n]ting*=
   any child (;) theater or anything
5. L: [ mm ]
6. N: =som (1.1) på de vise.
   that (1.1) in such a way
7. [0.3]
8. L: .hh den här vårfesten ha ju vari lite just en
   .hh this spring party has been a little just en
9. sån (0.6) >asså att vi ha försökt ha:
   that (0.6) that is to say that we have tried to have there was
10. _ju en gång va de ha hattfest_. (0.4) > _en_
   once there was a hat party (th. 6) an’ then

11. ha de varié aps;
   it has been mostly

12. Hi: jaig

13. L: _..h: men i- i fjol va de ju da gckek kombination_ #3
   _th: but an- ar last year there was then also a combination_

14. me ett slag barasar.
   with a kind of bazaar

15. (0.3)

16. L: _..h: men i- i fjol va de ju da gckek kombination_ #3
   _th: but an- ar last year there was then also a combination_

17. (.j "mka\(\text{kr}^{\text{s}}\) .
   (...) people

Speaker L then says that the annual spring party has been that type of event (line 8). Then she exemplifies with three earlier spring parties, one ‘hattfest’ (hat party), one ‘apsi’ (presumably a monkey party), and one ‘basar’ (bazaar) (marked 1#, #2 and 3# in the transcript). The first item in this list of earlier parties is produced with the method and format of apokoinou (cf. ch. 10.2.1 above). As with the utterance in extract (11:4), a contextualizing adverbial is inserted before the object in the sentence structure “> _ju en gång va de ha hattfest_.” (there was once there was a hat party). It is used to construct a new syntactic and pragmatic beginning to the following utterance that emphasizes the temporary nature of the party theme (they had a hat party only once).

The communicative consequences, however, are different compared to (11:4). Here the adverbial is inserted as a contextualizing cue for the upcoming segment “> _ju en gång va de hattfest_.” (hat party) as the first item in a list of parties. The pivotal element ‘one time’ (or ‘once’) projects descriptions of other parties, at other times, to come. The contextualizing element is inserted before the main topic of the TCU (‘hattfest’). It is preceded by a light subject+finite verb segment and followed by an extended full recycling that retro-constructs the adverbial as a pivot, and the post-P extension is the contextualized list item.
A similar pattern can be seen in extract (11:6) below. It is drawn from a conversation between a gynecologist and a pregnant woman. The woman has just finished a story about her sister who had to have two Caesarean section operations because of her narrow pelvis, presumably because she is worried about her own delivery.

(11:6) Once

L: =>å de ha vi snittat många i mycke onödan. [för trängsel] snittat många i mycke onödan.

K: [mm:] snittat många i mycke onödan. [för trängsel] snittat många i mycke onödan.

L: =can it be a certain measure and PRT can you X-ray? can it be a certain measure an’ then you can X-ray.

K: [mm:] can it be a certain measure and PRT can you X-ray? can it be a certain measure an’ then you can X-ray.

The doctor then presents her arguments that the medical facts supporting the diagnosis of ‘trängsel’ (i.e. a pelvis too narrow for normal delivery) are very unreliable. She says that many women have had unnecessary Caesarean sections and goes on to explain how this came to be (lines 4–9). She constructs the explanation with the method and format of apokoinou where a contextualizing adverbial ‘ena gången’ (once) is inserted before an
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upcoming predication in the utterance. The adverbial is followed by a ‘så’-initiated partial extended recycling of the pre-P that only takes the adverbial as its syntactic beginning. The adverbial constructs or contextualizes the upcoming predication as (at least) the first item in a contrast (or at this early stage, it may be projected as a list). The apokoinou utterance is then followed by a second contrastive item in what turns out to be a contrastive pair, “...” så kan man röntga<...>

 Speaker L hesitates and takes a long inbreath in the middle of the pivot. This inbreath is not produced as a marker of hesitation or production problem. Speaker L rather chooses to take an inbreath after a long segment of talk at a point where the projection of further talk is at its maximum, i.e. in the middle of an adverbial phrase. If there had been more signs of hesitation or problem, I would have considered an analysis of this extract as an example of how apokoinou is used to resume the turn progression after inserted activities in the pivot (cf. 10.3.2.2 above). This sounds more as if L is gasping for air, although at a position in the turn where she has secured her speakership.

In the following extract (11:7), the context emphasizing apokoinou is used in a similar way, although here the speaker uses a different apokoinou format.

(11:7) Psychoanalysis

L:CTI SP4-605[135]. From the radio talk show ‘Spanarna’ (The Reporters) with four participants in the studio: One presenter and three guests or reporters. Speakers in this extract: S=Ingvar Storm (m, presenter), G=Jonas Gardell (m, reporter). Speaker G presents his report about a new house-trend and some explanations for this new trend.

1. G: men för utom det så kan man röntga...then except that (.) then (.) we can röntga...

2. G: vi då eh...can then eh...try to analyse...eh eh eh...

3. G: =va bero...what does this depend on what kind of...

4. S:...hursommer som kommer här...how this depends on what kind of...

5. S:...hursommer som kommer där...how this depends on what kind of...
The extract is drawn from the radio talk show 'Spanarna' ('The Reporters') where speaker G is in the middle of presenting his report about a new house-trend in movies. G initiates an explanation of the house-trend using a shift to a general psychoanalytic frame of interpretation for the upcoming topic, in which the house symbolizes 'the self'. The introduction of this frame of interpretation into the talk is initiated using the method and format of apokoinou where an adverbial segment 'i all psykoanalys' is placed before a projected predication, "the house is in all psychoanalysis". The adverbial is then continued with a 'så'-initiated post-P that retro-constructs a Janus head type of apokoinou utterance on the adverbial, "then the house stands for the self".

The inserted adverbial pivot shift specifies the relevant frame of interpretation for the report. Speaker J's whole argument on the symbolic connection between 'houses' and 'the self' builds on the symbolic character of houses within the psychoanalytic framework. The use of a Janus Head makes this utterance more of a perspective shift than (11:4), (11:5) and (11:6). The speaker replaces 'is' with 'stands for' which changes the role of the house within psychoanalytic theory. When doing the post-P, speaker G contextualizes the house differently from how
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it was projected in the TCU beginning. As with the recycling variants above, the Janus head also frames the pivot with double finite verbs, which makes it stand out more (cf. foregrounding shifts, 8.5 above). The change of frame for the upcoming explanation of the house trend is emphasized using syntactic focus (the prosodically focused elements are the main topical NPs ‘huset’ and ‘jaget’).

These extracts all have in common that an adverbial expressing an interactionally relevant specification or circumstance is inserted. This insertion breaks the progression of a verb phrase, where the segment before the break strongly projects a certain kind of preferred continuation. The segment ‘hade dom’ (they had) in (11:4) projects an object, ‘de va’ (it was) in (11:5) and ‘huset e’ (the house is) in (11:7) project a predicative, and ‘så de kan’ (so it can) in (11:6) projects a main verb in the infinitive. Syntactic breaks and cut-offs are in general categorized as anacoluthons, but when the production method does not involve a *prosodic display* of a cut-off, apokoinou solves the local communicative project of both constructing the break and then overcoming the break smoothly.

A general formal feature in all apokoinou utterances is that the post-P frames the pivot with a doubling of one or several syntactic constituents. Here the adverbial pivot is framed by a lexical recycling of the finite verb and/or subject. This framing makes the pivot segment stand out more clearly in relation to the continuation of the utterance, i.e. it is a form of syntactic focus. The syntactic focus is used to highlight the inserted relevant topical circumstance before reaching the point in the utterance where the initially projected continuation was to be produced. What the relevant circumstance in varies of course from utterance to utterance: displaying detailed knowledge about commercials (11:4), list projections (11:5), contrast projection (11:6) and a new frame of topic interpretation (11:7), are examples of the possibilities. The focusing strategy and its communicative functions overlap with some of the functional potentials presented above, such as *insisting* on topical aspects, *relevance upgradings*, *foregrounding*/backgrounding of topical aspects, and *resuming of turn progression*, as indicated in the analyses.

As already mentioned, utterances where the speaker inserts a relevant circumstance for an upcoming topic come close to the phenomenon of anacoluthon.

89 Rather than being used as a waste-basket category, as in classical grammar, the notion of *anacoluthon* can be re-specified as a construction with a certain grammatical pattern (a syntactic...


possible syntactic completion and a specifying adverbial element is inserted at a syntactic position in Swedish utterances where adverbials are not placed in the prototypical case. The reason to still keep these utterances within this study is therefore mainly prosodic. The prosodic contour is not broken off, as in a prototypical anacoluthon, but kept integrated at relevant points in the utterance (the apokoinou phase boundaries). This is in accordance with e.g. Selting (2005), who treats prosody as the primary method of constructing interactionally relevant units in conversation, and syntax as the secondary.

These utterances also deviate from a more prototypical apokoinou in the sense that the point where the adverbial pivot is brought to an end, does not constitute a point where the activity or local communicative project has been brought far enough to construct a possible action or contribution to the talk, in that sequential position. The utterance therefore projects more to come also if disregarding the prosody, which does project continuation beyond the pivot as in most apokoinou utterances. However, if compared to a prototypical apokoinou as defined in 5.2 above, it is close enough to be considered a variant of apokoinou, rather than just a related phenomenon (cf. ch. 5.3). All the features of apokoinou are present except for the syntactic break-off before the pivot and the absence of a possible syntactic completion on the pivot. These utterances are built with prosodic integration at crucial points during the utterance (especially pivot phase boundaries), and they appear as a recurrent practice to solve a specific task during utterance building. These are strong arguments for treating them as built in orientation to an apokoinou-like grammatical pattern and as constituting a communicative practice of their own.

11.4 Topic elaboration after unit beginners

Another practice that I have treated as a less typical function is at hand when the speaker first initiates an utterance unit with a light beginner like 'de+e', (there's), then introduces a focused NP, and then develops the NP with a second finite verb. Lambrecht (1988) calls the English counterpart construction presentational amalgam construction. I will not follow Lambrecht in treating this construction as a merger of two structures. Instead, I analyze it as a method and practice of its own, used to elaborate on topics that are already introduced into the talk with a light beginner (cf. Forskåhl, in prep., for a similar analysis of the phenomenon in Finland-Swedish). A relevant
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point to make is that the collocation ‘de+e’ (there’s) that occurs in extract (11:8) and (11:9) is the by far most common collocation of all in Swedish spoken language and that ‘de+va’ (there was) that occurs in (11:10) comes as number four on the list (Allwood 2000:267). The more disjunctive beginner ‘men så hade’ (but then had, see below in extract 11:11) is not registered in the top list.

As already indicated, I have found two variants of the practice in my data. The analysis will show that they are used to do related but different things in relation to the ongoing wider communicative project, something that affects the function of the apokoinou. The first connects more to the preceding and ongoing local activities (the previous turn), and the second is more disjunctive in relation to the preceding activities.

11.4.1 Topic elaboration following light introductory segments

Extract (11:8) below is drawn from a group discussion between a moderator and three teenagers. The moderator has played a number of songs in the beginning of the session and then she asks questions about the songs. In this particular extract they talk about a Mozart symphony. The moderator first asks if the music is nice (line 1). The first three responses to this question from BM3 and BM1 are rather vague.

(11:8) People that meditate

GGM-548[161] Group discussion about different pieces of music within different genres. Participants: F=moderator (f), BM1−4=upper high school students (16-18 years, m). In this extract they are talking about a symphony by Mozart (#40).

1. F ä dä h är musik då. is this nice music then

2. (0.4)

3. BM1 "a:: jo:: i" yes right (.) yes it

4. BM3 ja de [e- ] yes it’s

5. BM1 ["na]:::*

6. BM2 ahh:: ((heavy out-breath))

7. BM3 jo de e >fruktan< gräppnande musik. yes it's severely relaxing music
BM1: yes it is people who meditate

BM2: yes

BM3: there's sort of-

BM1: much use it sort of

BM4: yes

BM1: °°(å) komma i:°°

BM3: there's something better

BM1: is first more positive and BM3 joins in (lines 3 and 4). BM1 then overlaps with a doubtful "*na:::*

BM1: de [e [fo]lk som mediterar[

BM1: de [e [fo]lk som mediterar[

BM3: om man (>lyssnar på den här sortens) musik å

BM1: sitter framför den öppna spisen eller nånting

BM1: right (.) that's totally awesome ((...))

BM1: is first more positive and BM3 joins in (lines 3 and 4). BM1 then overlaps with a doubtful "*na:::*

BM1: de[e [fo]lk som mediterar[

BM3: om man (>lyssnar på den här sortens) musik å

BM1: sitter framför den öppna spisen eller nånting

BM1: right (.) that's totally awesome ((...))
completed with a final prosodic drop, when he starts to say something but cuts himself off, "[de] e liksom-]" (there's sort of). BM1 might respond to BM3's cut off turn start when he continues the NP with a second finite verb, using a Janus head post-P "använder'e liksom<. At least he recycles BM3's construction 'liksom' (sort of). BM2 also produces the response token 'yes' during the first word of the pivot (line 9) and BM4 another 'yes' during the last word of the pivot (line 12).

If used in response to the simultaneous utterances during the pivot, the apokoinou format can be viewed as a method to conceal the transition from the pivot to the post-P phase when the speaker elaborates on an introduced rhematic topic. A grammatical alternative could have been to use a relativizing construction that puts the speaker at risk of being exposed to competing attempts for the turn. This analysis is much in line with the view on apokoinou and apokoinou-like utterances (pivots) held by Sacks (1992a [1969]), Schegloff (1979) and Walker (1994), who all argue for a turn holding function within the transition space, and Nevén (2003) and Betz (2006) who both argue for pivots as a possible method for handling turn overlap.

In the next extract (11:9) the elaboration of the newly introduced topic in the turn also works as a local activity change. The extract is drawn from one of the coffee conversations with the elderly women. Speaker A and B (together with D) involved in an argument on where the nearest Red Cross branch was located some years ago (lines 7−10). Speaker A argues that the nearest Red Cross for B must be the one located in Fence Street (lines 7−8). Speaker B then replies that there was no Red Cross in Fence Street at the time when she lost her husband, and A accepts B's argument.

((11:9) Immediately
US/ANF/426(4). Coffee conversation in a private home environment between four senior women (65−75 years). A is the hostess and B, D and D are her guests. Speaker B continues an ongoing report on what she did at the local Red Cross.

1 D1: | Gärsgårdsgatan har dom ju annars de e Fence Street they have by the way that's
2 ju mycke närmare de för mig].|
much closer for me
3 B: | ja tyckte dom va-värka så ja Ithought that they se- seemed like I
don't know
4 "inte ja", dont know
5 (.)
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6 B: dom (hade “ju-“) 
they had y’know

7 A: (>jamen de o ju) mycke närmare för dej på
yes that’s much closer for you on

8 Går (på) Storgatan.
Eمان Street

9 B: ( ja; men de) hade ron inte sår.
yes they didn’t have that y’know

10 A: ne(Thej. ne(Thej.)
I see I see

11 B: [ de va me] ja vart en[na]a
it was immediately I became alone there
there

12 it was immediately I became alone there

13 A: [mj] [ a]
mm yes

14 B: här bara el[ler]
here or

15 A: [ val]
not

16 D?: [men] hon gick [ditt å sydde.]
but she went there and sewed

17 B: [ja varte på ditt hh]
I have to go out oh

18 A: =vaj= 
what

19 B: =å då gick ja dit å sydde sörrö.
and then I went there and sewed y’know

B’s next turn on line 11, together with the format used, supports the analysis that it is (at least initially) a continuation of the preceding argument sequence. The turn is not marked for anything else than a further development of the preceding activity. B explains when she used to go to the Red Cross, “[de va mes]nas ja vart ensan där” (then we)
immediately I became alone there [i.e. became a widow] and it works as a reminder for A of the time period B is referring to. However, after initiating the turn with the light beginner and the heavy NP with its relative clause, B shifts project. When continuing beyond the NP, speaker B uses a second finite verb to elaborate on the NP, and the utterance turns into a framing of upcoming reported thoughts. The reported thoughts are a way of establishing a story about why she went to the Red Cross. She went sewing there when her husband had passed away.

Speaker B uses the apokoinou Janus Head variant with a light beginner and an elaborated NP to solve the local communicative project of both commenting on the immediately preceding argumentative activity and establishing a story. The apokoinou construction therefore both emerges from the local communicative surround and from an orientation to a recognizable apokoinou constructional schema in the sense of Ono & Thompson (1995), but partly in opposition to their treatment of apokoinou utterances per se, cf. 3.3.2.2 above.

11.4.2 Topic elaboration following light demarcating segments

A variant of the beginning and elaborating practice described above is when the initial light beginner does demarcating work in relation to preceding talk and actions. (This function can be contrasted to the extracts treated in chapter 10.2, where the demarcating work is mainly done against subsequent actions.)

Extract (11:10) is drawn from a long monological turn by a participant in a TV talk show on music. The show is about playing music videos and then evaluating them as potential hits or failures. Speaker J is telling about the first time he saw one of the special effects used in the video.

(11:10) Madness

From ‘Tryck till’ (Push it), a TV music show with four participants: one host, two panel members, and one guest. Speaker J=John Eje Thelin (m, panel member). In this extract, J tells about his memories of the first times he saw a certain special effect in a music video and TV commercial.

1. ((...)) ja kommer ihåg första gången man
   (I remember the first time...
2. (0.3) ja tror första gången ja verklien<
   (0.3) I think that the first time I ever
3. (0.3) ja tror första gången ja verklien<
First he refers to a video by Michael Jackson on line 4, but then he quickly leaves this topical aspect and tells about a TV commercial for one of Madness’s records instead. Leaving one topical aspect and introducing a new one are actions done simultaneously with the method of apokoinou. Speaker J puts an end to the topical aspect of the Jackson video with the construction “>men så hade< Madness” (but then had), followed by an NP “Madness”. The NP is followed by an inbreath and then a second finite verb that elaborates on the NP and actually says something about it. The Janus Head format makes possible the combination of a backward-directed demarcation, the introduction of a new NP, and then an elaboration of the introduced NP within the same construction. J does not use the apokoinou method in order to secure the turn. Here the function is a more local way of relating and separating two arguments within a monologic turn with low risk of losing his speakership.

11.5 Summary
In conclusion, this chapter has shown that participants can use apokoinou variants as a method to achieve peripheral projects. Speakers can refer to the referent of vague referring constructions in the pre-Ps when there are
several available referent choices in the preceding talk. Speakers specify a local relevant circumstance for an upcoming topic in a turn or TCU. Speakers elaborate new local topics after light turn or TCU beginnings. These actions do not constitute prototypical apokoinou functions, but are apokoinou-like in the sense that they are achieved while producing the utterance without doing a cut-off and restart and through retro-constructing a pivot or a pivot-like segment. Speakers who insert relevant circumstances for upcoming topics, however, make use of a syntactic break within an integrated prosodic unit.

The resolving of ambiguities (between available discourse referents in the previous talk) in unit closing is mainly done after a possible completion point, after the pivot has been produced. The action so far could constitute a contribution to the talk but is extended with an extended recycling post-P that specifies some aspect of the pre-P that is potentially vague or elliptically expressed in relation to the preceding talk. In extract (11:1), a full NP is provided in construction final position as a compensation for the semantically light deictic referent used in the initial construction strategy, and because there is a possible vagueness as to which one of two requests the speaker is responding. In extract (11:2), the final placement of the finite verb orients to the initial elliptic construction, and a possible vagueness regarding which aspect of the preceding question the speaker is responding to. In extract (11:3), the object is provided in construction-final position because it was left out in the initial construction strategy and because there is a possible vagueness regarding which substance the speaker is referring to.

The insertion of a specifying topic circumstance during turn or TCU beginnings is made before a possible completion point (syntactically as well as pragmatically). The action so far cannot constitute a contribution of its own to the talk and the extension as such beyond the pivot is therefore projected. The inserted adverbial segment is then retro-constructed as a pivot followed by an extended recycling. In (11:4), the inserted adverbial specifies some details about the topic that might give the description some extra credibility. In (11:5), the inserted specification is used to construct the upcoming topic as the first item in a list. In (11:6) the specification constructs the upcoming topic as the first part of a contrast. And in (11:7), the inserted specification constructs a relevant frame of interpretation for an upcoming argument.

Topoi elaborations after light unit beginnings are either used to continue or demarcate against the ongoing communicative project. In the continuing cases they have been found to go straightforwardly to an elaboration of the topic in order to handle an attempt from another speaker to take the turn (extract
11:8). In extract (11:9) the method is used to make a shift between continuing an ongoing project (specifying the time frame for the topic of the previous talk) and the initiation of a story that took place during this period of time.

The practice of elaborating topics following light beginners does not use the method of constructing pivots on adverbials (only NPs), but still has a great deal in common with disambiguations and insertion of relevant circumstances. A thematic and light pre-P is used to either connect to preceding activities or demarcate against them. Irrespective of how it relates to the preceding activities, the light pre-P also introduces a focused thematic NP, which is then elaborated as the main topic of the utterance.
12 Discussion of main functions and forms

12.1 Introduction
In this chapter, I will summarize and discuss various aspects of the functions that were presented in the chapters 8–11 above. After a summary of the three main functional groups (or domains) of apokoinou (and some peripheral functions), I will discuss the similarities and differences between the functions in general, but also whether some functions are more related than others. Many of the single analyses of apokoinou utterances (AUs) in these chapters point to the fact that some of the functions can co-occur, while others never do. A central question will be if there is an iconic dimension to the connection between the functions of AUs and the schematic patterns of the apokoinou formal type that are recruited by speakers to achieve the various communicative tasks.

The functions of apokoinou utterances in their sequential and communicative environments can be summarized as follows. The three main prototypical groups or domains of functions are the following:

(i) perspective shifts on some topical aspect;
(ii) confirming, insisting or focusing on some expression or action;
(iii) closing (demarcating and leaving) local projects within serially organized activities, resuming a turn’s progression or shift-connecting to a pending communicative project.

12.2 Main functions
In and through using apokoinou utterances, participants in Swedish talk-in-interaction can change their perspective on some topical aspect during the production of the utterance. These functions constitute the first of the three main functional domains of apokoinou. To achieve the local communicative projects of shifting perspective, speakers use the apokoinou method of retro-constructing a syntactic pivot using lexical renewal. The main types of on-line changes are explanatory shifts (causal explanations and explanations of words or referents in the pivot); stance shifts (various upgrades and downgrades of displayed personal, epistemic and evidential stance towards an action, event or utterance); relevance shifts (upgradings of the relevance of the ongoing local project in relation to a wider project); and for- and
backgrounding shifts (various aspects of the ongoing utterance are brought to the front or to the back in terms of sequential consequentiality). These projects are for the most part achieved using the formal method of renewing the linguistic material when continuing beyond the pivot (resulting in varying configurations of the Janus head formal type, see below in this section). The perspective shifts usually bring forward new aspects of the unfolding or emerging topic that are consequential for the subsequent utterance building process and subsequent actions within the communicative situation.

Participants also use the apokoinou method to confirm, insist, and focus on some local expression or action. These functions constitute the second of the three main functional domains of apokoinou. To achieve the local communicative projects of confirming, insisting and focusing, speakers mainly use symmetric methods of recycling, but sometimes also the specific asymmetric variant of Janus heads with ‘heter’ (is called) post-Ps. These actions have been divided into three sub-groups based on the way they are embedded in the sequential environment; parenthetical management of expressions, assessments and assertions, responsive management of inquiries, arguments, overlapping talk, intermediate responses, and anticipated responses, and focusing moves within narrative episodes. Participants use certain formal types (e.g. Janus heads with ‘heter’ (is called) post-Ps) to establish and confirm the right expression in order to describe or handle some aspect of a wider communicative project. Participants confirm expressions after some locally occasioned activity, such as a hesitation or a self repair. Participants also confirm own assessments and assertions. These are mainly parenthetical projects that are handled, solved and closed interactively before moving on with a wider (temporarily pending) communicative project.

The insisting uses of apokoinou, however, are less parenthetical and more integrated within a wider communicative project, such as a question-answer sequence or an argumentative or narrative activity. They have, in a sense, more obvious retrospective and prospective relations to the surrounding talk of others. When responding to others’ inquiries, arguments, disaligning moves or displays of mishearings, participants use apokoinou to insist on their own answer, their own argument, and their own way of doing or saying something. Participants insist, not only because they want to solve a local problem and then move on, but also because they want their perspective on the unfolding activity in general to be consequential for next and following actions. To confirm that a specific expression is the right one at a certain
point in the talk is also a local project that is consequential for next and following actions (e.g. within a narrative), but the solving of these problems is self-initiated, and not responses to previous moves in a focused communicative activity. Recycling apokoinous used within narrative sequences are not confirming in a parenthetical way or responsive to previous initiatives perse, but mainly oriented to their position within the narrative activity, such as focusing a central name or referent in the initial phases of the story or highlighting the peak of the story.

The third main functional domain of the apokoinou method is a group of methods that speakers use to organize wider communicative projects rather than topical aspects — to close (demarcate and leave behind) a first action in a series of following actions, or resume and skip-connect to delayed projects. First of all, apokoinou utterances tend to show up as parts of wider communicative projects built up of certain types of serialized actions and local projects (e.g. two-part or three-part lists, temporally ordered events and reported dialogues). In those cases participants use apokoinou as a method to close, demarcate, and leave the first contribution to these serialized projects. There are no occurrences of apokoinou in second or third position. In some sense this is also a method to frame local projects, especially considering that the form used is the full recycling construction, where the pre-P and post-P can be said to frame the pivotal segment. However, it should be noted that the post-P recycling is produced on-line in a position where it rather closes the local communicative project (the list-item or event). When closing the project with a full recycling, this move creates a framing in retrospect that is prospectively oriented. It demarcates the project from next actions (“this was one thing, and now...”) and creates the possibility for moving on to next matters. In some cases this possibility is acted upon in the shape of a next item in a list, a next event in a temporally ordered event-sequence or a next utterance in a reported dialogue.

Secondly, apokoinou is used as a method to resume a turn’s progression after heavy pivots or after inserted self-initiated same-turn repair segments. These repairs do not result in extended turn sequences, as is the case when participants resume wider projects. The object of repair can be a search for a name or a search for a way to continue the utterance in general. Included in the analysis was also an utterance on the border between apokoinou and anacoluthon, where the pivot is a projection breaking (but prosodically integrated) clarification of a previous indexical in the utterance, and this clarification is then followed by a resuming recycling. Examples of heavy
that are followed by resuming post-Ps within the same utterance are heavy NPs that follow heavy pre-Ps, a list-construction, a conditional if-clause, an explanatory segment, and a co-constructed appositional NP. The criterion seems to be that the pivotal segment is heavily extended or produced with a complex inner syntax. In such cases, participants use partial recyclings of verb phrases (both full and auxiliary types) and ‘så’-constructions in order to reactivate the initial perspective on the pivotal segment or the action that was initiated in the beginning of the turn or TCU but not finished.

Apokoinou is also used to skip-connect to and continue wider (pending) communicative projects after some intermediate, parenthetical activity. Examples of wider projects that a speaker skip-connects to are (i) a question-answer sequence where the answer is delayed by a longer side-sequence with jokes, (ii) an (institutional) advice-giving activity that is temporarily stalled by a side-sequence, and (iii) an answer that is held up by a collaborative search-sequence for a name. When continuing, the speaker skips the intermediate sequence of actions interactionally, i.e. the continuation is first and foremost a response to the initiative move that preceded the intermediate sequence. The forms used are mainly Janus heads, but there is also a case of partial recycling.

12.3 Peripheral functions

The last-mentioned utterance in the previous section should perhaps be placed among the less prototypical functions. These functions are methods to clarify, specify, and elaborate topics and topical aspects of turns and TCUs during the production of the utterance. These actions are done in an apokoinou-like way, which is reflected formally in the sense that these utterances are built using most of the prototypical formal methods, but where some of the methods deviate, resulting in less prototypical configurations of different sorts. The clarifying methods produce utterances that are brought to a possible completion on the pivot, but where the format up to this point is elliptical. The specifying methods produce utterances that are not brought to a possible completion on the pivot, and the projection process is somewhat (but not completely) broken when inserting a specifying adverbial at an unusual place in the utterance. However, the prosodic contour is still integrated in a way that partly overrides the syntactic deviances from a prototypical apokoinou schema. The elaborating methods, finally, are all initiated with light beginners that come close to initiative constructions (prefabricated collocations without
Discussion of main functions and forms

inner syntax) that are used as a whole (Forsskål in prep.). Utterances produced in orientation to the prototypical apokoinou schema come with an inner syntax in the peripheral apokoinou segments, and it can be argued that light beginners such as ‘de+e’ are assigned inner syntax in certain sequential positions, and that the auxiliary verb in such cases is doubled in an apokoinou-like fashion when the (possible) pivot is extended with a post-P.

12.4 Prototypical forms

The grammatical form of the apokoinou utterances in the corpus is sometimes more clear-cut and sometimes more fuzzy. The clear-cut forms are the ones that can be grouped together based on a consistent internal syntax as a whole, or at least based on a pattern where a significant position is occupied by recurring lexical elements or constructions. The fuzzy forms are characterized by the use of several formal methods at once, and they are sometimes hard to differentiate on a strictly formal level. The method of lexical recycling is not a formal category as such, but a speaker’s way of organizing the linguistic material within an apokoinou utterance (for various functional purposes). It can be used in order to completely mirror the pre-P, just recycle reversed parts of the pre-P, or recycle without reversal. The method of lexical renewal is similarly a speaker’s way to add verbal content to the post-P that was not there in the pre-P (also for various functional purposes). The method can be used for extending the pivot with new material entirely, inserting material before an added segment, or simply adding material after a recycled segment. Single apokoinou utterances are often built using both methods at the same time, in different combinations, which means that it is difficult to base a classification of apokoinou types on the formal structure of the whole utterance.

The two main categories of prototypical apokoinou forms in my analysis, the symmetrical and the asymmetrical, are therefore the result of an analytical effort to bring together utterances that share more than just formal features, but also perform similar things in communication. The symmetrical group, using the recycling method in various communicative ways, contains one rather clear-cut category, the Full recyclings:

1. BM3: >men de + e väldigt lättsmält musik >e re<
   but it is very easy-digested music it is
   but it is very undemanding music it is

90 Unless specified, the following examples of forms are all reproduced from the more detailed presentations in chapter 6.
The speaker extends the pivot with a segment that shares the linguistic elements with the pre-P, but they are produced in reversed order in the post-P (due to general word-order constraints in Swedish). The Partial recycling (as exemplified next) pick out only a part of the pre-P and use this part to extend the pivot:

1. E: 
   
   de [står att de e ba]tteri f
   
   it says that it is battery malfunction says it

The other categories are combinations of recycling and renewal methods. The Extended full recyclings are utterances where the speaker adds new linguistic material to a full recycling:

1. ja tänkte de här e nog< så lite så >de
   I thought that this is probably so little that it

2. inte räcker tänkte ja *idag nu*.<
   won’t be enough I thought today now

Finally, the Extended partial recycling are combinations of partial and extended recyclings that often occur in longer turns with a broken up prosodic contour. In the following utterance (drawn from extract 10:16), only the auxiliary ‘e’ (is) is recycled from the pre-P, and the rest of the utterance is linguistic additions:

1. M: =.hh men eh (.)
   but with eh (.)

2. så (0.5) så (0.2) e (.)
   then (0.5) then (0.2) is (.)

3. hår kategori ord som kommer in (0.2) e ny
   here category word that comes in new-words

4. (0.3) <som i tala>. (.) myntas. (.)
   that in speech (.) are created (.)

5. A:                                       [ ()noda]
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In some cases formally similar utterances come close to the asymmetrical Janus head type. The following utterance has been categorized as a Janus head because of the communicative use of the method (a perspective shift):

1. L: 
   *så sen så blir de också lugnare.* and then it becomes calmer

2. *([^}{])=men som=.* but that

Utterances with symmetrical configurations use lexical renewal in certain ways, but not in a functionally significant way. In this main category, it is the various variants of the recycling method that do the main communicative work.

Utterances with asymmetrical configurations are similarly using recycling methods to some extent, but not in a functionally significant way. In this category, it is the method of linguistic renewal itself that does the main communicative work, as exemplified in the previous example above. Asymmetric Janus heads also come with lighter and/or thematic pre-Ps, as in the following utterance:

1. C: 
   *me Regi:: vi gör de i slutet ska vi dansa.* with Regina:: we will do that at the end shall we do

2. *salsa <-> ja och Regina.* the salsa me and Regina

Another category of asymmetric AUs are utterances with lexically fixed post-Ps, such as Post-P meta comments, constructed with the verbs ‘hetta’, ‘stå’ and ‘säga’. In the case below, speaker A uses the ‘hetta’ post-P construction to comment on the name of a person after a light (but still extended) variant of the ‘de+e’ beginner. This ‘hetta’ post-P is then extended with the main predication of the utterance ‘han som (0.5) ringde runt’ (him who (0.5) phoned around).
There are also other kinds of fixed post-Ps, e.g. in the shape of Post-P epistemic comments, constructed with variants of the verb ‘vara’ (he):  

As shown with the above examples, speakers mainly produce prototypical apokoinou forms within continuous prosodic contours, either with continuous phonation at the phase boundaries (cf. Walker 2004) or with short interjacent pauses, hesitation markers or inbreaths. The main prosodic criteria for analyzing the AU form as prototypical have been that the speaker should not break off and then restart the turn, or bring the turn to full completion before producing the post-P. This allows for pauses, hesitation markers or inbreaths as long as the speaker does not break off the utterance or initiate explicit repair.

12.5 Syntactically less integrated forms

There is also a group of formal methods that is used to build syntactically less integrated formal configurations. A first group of syntactically less integrated formal configurations are:

(i) AUs with elliptic pre-Ps
(ii) AUs with light and construction-like pre-Ps used as unit beginners
(iii) AUs that are produced within a single prosodic contour, but with an adverbial pivot that breaks the syntactic projection
(iv) AUs that are produced within a single prosodic contour, but where Segment A (pre-P+pivot) is syntactically open, i.e. where the post-P breaks the syntactic projection

Speakers construct these utterances in orientation to the prototypical constructional schema of apokoinou and the basic methods of recycling and
renewal, but they end up having a lower degree of syntactic integration than the utterances presented above.

These AUs are for the most part used to achieve more peripheral functions in talk, as demonstrated in chapter 11 and as summarized in 12.4 above. They are often prosodically integrated, but deviate syntactically from the prototypical pattern. Apart from the first group of less integrated AUs, there is also a second group of formal configurations where, on certain crucial points, the syntax fits the prototypical pattern of apokoinou, but where the prosodic contour is broken up on two or more TCUs.

(i) AUs with repair activities during the production of pre-Ps or pivots
(ii) AUs where the post-P is produced as an increment
(iii) AUs that are produced as co-constructions

AUs where the speaker initiates repair during the pre-P or pivot phases (e.g. word searches) often result in broken up contours and even inserted sequences where other participants join in and resolve the repair together with the initial speaker. After the repair has been accomplished, the initial speaker resumes the non-finished turn, sometimes with a confirming (closing) comment and sometimes with a prospective auxiliary that connects to continuing talk.

AUs that are produced as co-constructions are too few in my corpus to be analyzed systematically. Post-Ps produced as increments, however, are more common and display some formal and functional consistency. Speakers produce three kinds of post-P increments: (i) increment post-Ps after completion and silent pause, (ii) increment post-Ps after completion and an intermediate continuer, and (iii) increment post-Ps after completion and an intermediate turn competitive response. In principle, all formal apokoinou types can be built this way, but post-Ps used by speakers to recycle the segment [subject+finite verb] in reversed form are the most common increment variant.

AUs produced as increments have been placed in a separate group. They have the incremental, step-by-step, production in common with other apokoinou utterances, but the interactional processes involved are different, creating other functional possibilities than if produced within a TCU or a turn that is not brought to a completion. Speakers use apokoinou post-P increments to confirm, insist on, or focus on the previous move, either in response to a noticeably absent response, or in response to intermediate disaligning actions. Speakers also use increment post-Ps to resume an
activity that was brought to a possible completion, also here in response to absent or disaligning responses.

12.6 Discussion

All forms presented in chapter 6 (more or less prototypical) and all functions presented in chapter 8–11 (more or less central), belong to the family of apokoinou. The utterances that carry them have a family resemblance, which means that they differ in some functional and formal respects but share a sufficient number of a set of prototypical formal features to keep them within the family. The three main functional domains (see section 12.2), however, are all based on analyses of communicative practices where speakers have been found to mainly recruit a prototypical formal configuration. When presenting analyses, I have primarily used extracts with prototypical configurations. This does not mean, however, that the local communicative projects of (e.g.) shifting perspective, confirming or resuming cannot be resolved using a less prototypical configuration. In fact, the analysis of the corpus shows that all local communicative projects are resolved using a range of more or less prototypical configurations. The main criterion that separates main functions from peripheral functions, such as the resolving of clarifying, specifying, and elaborating communicative projects, is that the latter projects are never found to be resolved using a prototypical configuration. These AUs always deviate in some crucial respect from the defining features presented in chapter 5 above, such as not being brought to a possible completion on the pivot or having a broken up formal syntax in segment A.

The main functions sometimes co-occur (and sometimes not) in single apokoinou utterances, both within and across the three functional domains. The boundaries between the functions are fuzzy and the main reason is that speakers often seem to orient to the same variant of the apokoinou constructional schema (i.e. the same apokoinou form). The communicative projects of shifting perspective and skip-connecting to pending wider projects belong together in this respect, because speakers tend to use various asymmetrical methods to resolve them. The communicative projects of confirming, insisting, focusing, closing and resuming a turn’s progression belong together, because speakers tend to use various symmetric methods to resolve them. However, whether it is relevant to analyze co-occurrence or not depends on the local context in which the project is resolved. It is not the case that the use of a certain form, say a full recycling construction, imposes a bundle of specified functions (meanings) upon the participants at the moment of use. The
forms, however, have functional potentials that speakers may exploit, more or less, in interplay with the communicative contexts and other participants in each case.

One analytical difference between the first functional domain with perspective shifts, and the second domain with confirming, insisting and focusing, is that AUs in the first domain typically alter the way a topical aspect is framed or contextualized, while AUs in the second domain typically does not, or at least not in the same way. When a speaker uses a recycling variant to confirm, insist on, or focus some aspect of the pivot talk (in these data: assertions in general and particularly assessments), these actions do not operate on the informational content of the pivot per se, but mainly on the communicative status of the utterance within a wider sequential context. When speakers resolve the local project of shifting perspective, they are certainly altering the communicative status of the utterance in various ways (cf. especially the foregrounding and backgrounding dimension of shifts), but speakers also perform a local shift within the utterance. Speakers use ‘va de’ (‘was it’) post-Ps as methods to shift from talk about a referent (in the pre-P and pivot) to talk explicitly about the certainty of the assertion made (in the post-P). This kind of local shift is not made when using the recycling configuration.

However, there are also utterances in which these two domains overlap and where it might be difficult to draw a line between the categories. One example of this multifunctionality of single AUs is the interactional achievement of a confirmation of a name choice through the use of the post-P variants of ‘heter’ (‘is called’), e.g. ‘heter det’ (‘is it called’). These utterances were analyzed above as one among several methods that speakers use to establish or confirm an expression in talk (ch. 9.2.1). The method of confirming expressions is normally achieved within the action sequence first mention of expression, self-confirmation, and receipt by another participant,91 and the sequence as a whole may alter the communicative impact of a name in a certain sequential environment. It secures the introduction of a name communicatively before moving on to next business. In a way, the ‘heter’-construction is a method of upgrading the epistemic certainty of the name as the correct one, as in the cases with ‘va de’ (‘was it’) post-Ps. As with the

---

91 The action sequence of confirmations that follows repair or hesitation activities might differ in the sense that they also contain an inserted display of uncertainty or an inserted sequence where the repair is achieved interactionally before moving on, although the basic sequence is mainly the same.
'va de'-constructions, it is not a cognitive certainty (a change of mind) but a communicative certainty that the participants agree upon.

Although placed in chapter 9 with the other confirmations, the apokoinou method using the ‘heter’ (is called) construction in the post-P is also an example of a perspective shift within the utterance. Speakers use ‘heter’ (is called) post-Ps as methods to shift from talk about a person or referent that the name refers to (in the pre-P and pivot) to talk explicitly about the expression per se (in the post-P), i.e. a kind of meta-comment. As mentioned above, this kind of local meta-shift is not made when using the recycling configurations, but the different formal configurations still share parts of a functional potential of confirming expression.

Another pairing of functions that deserves to be mentioned is the domain of confirming, insisting, and focusing functions on the one hand, and the domain of closing, demarcating, and leaving on the other. As with the AUSs in the discussion above, these AUSs also share the feature of being produced with variants of the same formal method, here variants of recycling (full recyclings and partial recyclings). Based on the functional analysis, it is now fairly safe to conclude that these forms have a functional potential to resolve and complete parenthetical communicative projects. In some communicative environments, speakers mainly exploit the potential of confirming topical aspects of the pivotal segment, or insisting on topical aspects in response to previous moves within a wider sequence. In other communicative environments, however, speakers mainly exploit the potential of organizing the local communicative project prospectively, i.e. when closing, demarcating and leaving the ongoing local project in order to continue to upcoming activities in the talk, e.g. second list items, second reported utterances, or second events in temporally ordered actions in general. It is the basic constructional schema of the full or partial recycling that provide speakers with these options, probably because of the possibility to use auxiliary verbs as light closers with little or no impact on the topical content of previous or following actions.

The basic idea behind the internal ordering of the domains in this text, was that the described functions display a progress from shifts between local communicative projects, over parenthetical strengthenings of projects, to the closing and resuming of projects (see table 12.1 below). As shown in the table, the analysis has demonstrated that there seems to be a general tendency in the data that the first two functional domains are homogenous regarding the forms used while the third domain is not.
TABLE 12.1. MAIN FUNCTIONS AND FORMS OF APOKOINOU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main functions</th>
<th>Main forms used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shifts between projects: perspective shifts on topical aspects</td>
<td>Janus head variants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenthetic handling of expressions or actions: confirming expressions</td>
<td>Janus heads with ‘tote’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conferring assertions and assessments</td>
<td>Partial recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESISTING IN RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS AND ARGUMENTS</td>
<td>Full and Partial recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focusing within narrative episodes</td>
<td>Partial recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing local communicative projects: closing, demarcating and leaving local projects within serially organized activities</td>
<td>Full and Partial recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resuming a turn’s progression</td>
<td>Extended partial recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skip-connecting to pending communicative projects</td>
<td>Janus head variants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first functional domain recruits asymmetric forms only (Janus head variants), and the second domain mainly recruits symmetric forms with light post-Ps (Full and Partial recycling). The third domain recruits symmetric forms with light post-Ps to close and demarcate projects (Full and Partial recycling), symmetric forms with heavier segments in both pre- and post-Ps to resume a turn’s progression (Extended partial recycling), and asymmetric forms to skip-connect to pending projects across inserted or interstitial sequences (Janus head variants).

In conclusion, there is a strong tendency towards an iconic relation between function and form in the data that centres on the difference between symmetric and asymmetric forms. These results are in line with the results presented by Franck (1985) on double-binds and Scheutz (2005) on pivots in German.92 There are some exceptions from this tendency, e.g. that the local project of confirming expressions are resolved using both, mainly due to the multi-functional potential of the forms used.

92 Scheutz category Modified mirror images equals the Janus head category in Franck’s study and in this study. He analyses these utterances as semantically symmetrical, despite the fact that they are often built using lexical renewal rather than lexical recycling.
13 Discussion

13.1 Introduction

The method of apokoinou is essentially about speakers' accomplishment of two sequentially ordered actions within one integrated utterance. These actions are carried out without cut-offs and without any initiation of syntactically or prosodically new units. The final utterance segment of the first action is retro-constructed as a syntactic pivot when the speaker continues with the second action. When continuing, the speaker only uses the pivot to build the first segment of the second action. From a sentence-syntactic point of view, the end part of the whole, resulting apokoinou structure does not cohere with the beginning part. Apokoinou is a participant's method with a functional potential to accomplish many different actions, such as shifting perspective on some topical aspect, confirming, insisting or focusing on some topical aspect or action, closing, demarcating and leaving local actions or projects, but also resuming turns or skip-connecting to pending activities after some interstitial activity. Thus, the apokoinou method often combines continuations with shifts within one utterance, while accomplishing parenthetical actions in the wider communicative context.

In this chapter, I will discuss some more general results of the study. This will be done through explicitly addressing the aims of the study as formulated in chapter 1.1 above, as well as discussing some other results that were mentioned briefly in the introduction above. In short, the main empirical aims of the study have been to investigate the following two aspects of apokoinou:

(i) the functions of apokoinou utterances in their sequential and communicative environments in talk-in-interaction;
(ii) the formal methods (resources) speakers use when they build apokoinou utterances and use them to accomplish social action in talk-in-interaction.

The main results of these investigations have already been summarized and discussed in chapter 12 above. The aim has also been to develop and discuss analytical and theoretical aspects of apokoinou. The following three main points were formulated in interplay with the empirical analysis:
I will discuss the aims (iii-v) and other results of the study in the following sections. Then I will close the discussion with some suggestions of possible areas of further research.

13.2 Defining the phenomenon (revisited)

As pointed out in chapter 3, apokoinou utterances have been suggested to belong to a group of errors or changes in the planning of utterance production, to be asyndetical structure breaks, structure shifts, or products of structure overlaps or structure blends. In this study, however, the structure shifts prevalent in most previous analyses of apokoinou, have been re-specified as participants’ methods to accomplish semantic-pragmatic shifts and actions in order to resolve various local communicative projects. These projects are communicative in the sense that they are recipient designed and/or achieved in interaction with other participants. Speakers in talk-in-interaction sometimes accomplish the shifts while holding on to a turn or an extended turn, thereby blocking or concealing a TRP that might put the speaker at risk of losing speakership, but this function does not exhaust the functional potential of apokoinou. This is partly done through the retro-construction of a syntactic pivot during the production of an utterance (a TCU, a turn, a turn extended with an increment, or in some cases a co-constructed turn). Consequently, apokoinou utterances can be described in terms of three-part sequentially ordered structures with a segment preceding the pivot (pre-P) and a segment following the pivot (post-P). Speakers use prosody to block (prospectively) possible TRPs during the production of the utterance, but also to neutralize (retrospectively) completions that have already been accomplished.

Apokoinou utterances are built using a bundle of methods that are used to give the utterances a certain grammatical form. The most obvious features of these methods are
(i) to continue an utterance that is syntactically potentially closed through retro-constructing a syntactic pivot;

(ii) to construct the pivot with a doubling of a syntactic constituent, thereby creating a mismatch between pre-P and post-P from a traditional sentential perspective;

(iii) to integrate the utterance prosodically at the pivot phase boundaries using a combination of prospectively oriented continuous prosody in the transition from pivot to post-P and retrospectively oriented subdued prosody on the post-P (that makes the post-P prosodically parasitic on the previous segments);

(iv) the use of certain lexical resources and pre-formulated constructions in the pre-P and post-P phases

The grammatical forms that emerge as the products of these formal methods are not realizations or instantiations of static structures, but utterances that are built in real time step-by-step (turns, single TCUs or series of TCUs). Speakers continuously integrate these utterances through a succession of local syntactic and prosodic decisions during an incremental process, in interplay with other participants and those aspects of the context that they make relevant there and then in the situation of talk.

A growing number of researchers have begun to pay attention to the question of how to demonstrate the reality of constructions as a participants’ phenomenon, i.e. how to present evidence for the assumption that speakers possess grammatical knowledge of them (cf. Günther & Imo 2006a:2, Günther 2006:59). One way of demonstrating the reality of constructions for participants has been to use co-constructed utterances as interactional evidence. At least two speakers create a co-construction through at least two consecutive moves. First, a speaker A produces an utterance or the beginning of an utterance. Then, a speaker B extends that utterance syntactically from some point during the first utterance. The extension may be done in overlap but can also be done in the clear (cf. Lerner (2002, 2004) for English and Bockgård (2004) for Swedish).

Günther (2006:81f) argues that speakers display their knowledge about a constructional schema when extending an utterance in such a way that the final and overall syntactic product (extended utterance segment + extension) agrees with the schema of a particular construction type. In her case, the co-
constructed schema belongs to pseudo-cleft constructions in German conversation. Ono & Thompson (1995) makes a corresponding point on the role of co-constructions for the analysis of syntax in conversation, and Couper-Kuhlen & Thompson (2005) a similar point regarding extra-positions as a participant’s method in English conversation.

Speakers rarely co-construct apokoinou utterances in the corpus of this study. In addition, the few cases that have been found are poor evidence for the interactional reality of an apokoinou schema, because the extension of the first utterance is made at the end-point of the pre-P phase (cf. example 3:5 in chapter 3). Speaker B extends the first utterance with a segment that is later retro-constructed as a pivot by the same speaker (also see ch. 5.2.6 above for a short remark). There is also one example of a co-constructed pivot segment (discussed in 10:19), but in this case, speaker B rather orients to a constructional schema of appositions than to apokoinou. Better evidence would have been if speaker B had produced a post-P extension only.

What can be an alternative interactional evidence procedure for the interactional reality of grammatical methods such as apokoinou? Instead of searching for positive evidence in the observable conduct of participants, it is, I think, possible to partly rely on negative evidence. In this corpus, participants never make apokoinou utterances as such the object of repair, either other-initiated or self-initiated. This implies strongly that it is an accepted and functional way of doing communicative action and that participants possess communicative and grammatical knowledge of the method.

13.3 A framework for analyzing apokoinou in talk

An analytical framework has been designed to deal with apokoinou as a method of building utterances and resolving communicative projects in talk-in-interaction. This framework was presented in detail in chapter 7, and is here summarized in the light of the results of the empirical analysis. It mainly builds on established knowledge about turn construction practices in talk-in-interaction and the status of turns and turn constructional units as recipient designed meaning units within contexts of talk. However, the framework also suggests some specific theoretical aspects of the way speakers design pivots and post-Ps prosodically, based on the empirical findings of this study. The framework in general is centered on the procedural aspects of building apokoinou utterances, such as speakers’ use of syntactic, lexical, constructional, and prosodic resources, and the way these
resources are made to fit within the communicative environment in terms of communicative projects. Speakers design apokoinou utterances in response to certain communicative needs that arise at certain points during the interaction and utterance production, in orientation to activities of other participants before, during, and after the utterance under way, and in orientation to relevant aspects of ongoing activities (in the talk or in the situation at large).

As argued in chapter 7.2 and 7.3 (and demonstrated in chapters 8–11), when speakers build apokoinou utterances to resolve communicative projects in Swedish talk, they use a combination of syntactic, lexical, and prosodic methods. These building methods are mainly organized around the simultaneous processes of projecting possible continuations of the utterance and retro-constructing the impact of previous actions. Both processes are at work all through the building process, and are constantly achieved by participants. Among a participant’s main resources for creating and monitoring projection are

- the direction (trajectory) of the action sequence under way;
- the possible continuations of the syntactic configuration of the utterance under way;
- the short-term prosodic projection of continuation or completion beyond the utterance segment under way.

Among a participant’s main resources for negotiating the impact of previous actions are

- the display of interpretations of previous actions through responses;
- reorientations of the syntactic configuration of the utterance under way;
- the prosodic realization or concealing of completion on the ongoing utterance segment.

During the production of an apokoinous utterance, speakers typically project a possible syntactic and prosodic completion on the pivot. However, during the production of the pivot (mainly towards the end of the pivot), this completion point is typically concealed or blocked with the use of a focally stressed unit. A pitch rise terminating mid-high or high in the speaker’s
range does not seem to signal completion in these data, as compared to the results presented by Walker (2004) on English conversation, where such rises on the pivot are categorized as a possible resource for the signaling of completion on the pivot. In the present data, the focal stress and pitch rise postpone the possible completion to a later point in the utterance (projection of continuation), and the speaker then continues the utterance by retro-constructing a post-P. The post-P that reorients the syntactic configuration of the utterance is therefore typically produced in a context where a continuation is projected prosodically but not syntactically.

Speakers use three main strategies to retro-construct a pivot, which all belong to the constructional schema of apokoinou. The first is the syntactic operation of using only a part of the previous utterance (the pivot) as the syntactic foundation for the post-P continuation. The second is to integrate the post-P within the same prosodic contour as the pre-P and pivot. This is either done with the use of continuous phonation or with the method of marking the beginning of the post-P with a subdued prosody that connects to the pivot rather than starting something new (i.e., through a pitch level that continues the declination movement on the pivot, absence of pitch reset, absence of focal stress etc.). This means that the pivot can be followed by pauses, hesitations and inbreaths, as long as the speaker uses a continuing prosodic design of the post-P that follows. The third strategy is to integrate a continuation retrospectively, outside the previous contour, but with the same kind of subdued prosody as above (that connects to the pivot rather than starts something new).

When building apokoinou utterances, speakers often make use of different kinds of lexical and constructional resources to meet the particular needs of the task at hand. Speakers use prefabricated constructions to initiate units (TCUs and turns), such as variants of the 'de+e' (there's) construction. Speakers also use post-P's of different sorts to resolve parenthetical projects that arise during utterance production, such as variants of the 'heter' (is called) construction to confirm a name or expression. Speakers also use variants of the 'sa X' (said X) construction to close (frame) quotations at certain points in the talk. Another lexical construction is the use of one of the conjunction particles 'så' or 'då' (approx. then) to initiate post-Ps after adverbial clauses. These resources, and others of the same sort, belong to different formal variants of apokoinou as presented in detail in chapter 6 above.

As argued above and in chapter 7.4 (and demonstrated in chapters 8–11), speakers use the apokoinou method to achieve various actions that
Discussion

are made to fit within the sequential and communicative environment. Some actions are primarily made in response to previous moves by other speakers, and some are primarily made to fit within a following series of actions. Other actions are designed to accomplish parenthetical actions within some ongoing activity, and some are designed to shift between actions or shift back to pending activities after intermediate business. These actions all have in common that they use apokoinou as a method to resolve some local communicative project within or in relation to some wider communicative project. The local communicative projects accomplished with apokoinou often shape the communicative impact of ongoing actions in retrospect, but they also reshape the context for following actions by the same speaker or others.

13.4 Apokoinou as abstract utterance patterns or schemas

Apokoinou in Swedish talk-in-interaction has appeared as a family of participants’ methods of grammatical utterance building and local communicative action, rather than as a limited set of constructions with fixed formal configurations. These methods are loosely tied to an abstract, dynamic constructional schema (Ono & Thompson 1995) that allows for various changes during the construction process. When speakers retro-construct pivots, they generally use formal methods that are either fully recycling the pre-P, fully renewing the pre-P, or hybrids of these methods.

The abstract apokoinou schema as such does not leave slots for specific lexical or construction-like resources. During the production of individual apokoinou utterances, however, speakers often use various construction-like building blocks to resolve specific local projects (as exemplified in the previous section). These constructions and lexical resources do not belong to the abstract schema as such, but rather to the specific formal apokoinou variants found in my data (as presented in chapter 6). The constructional schemas of the formal apokoinou types are designed to be dialogical in the sense that they have retroactive and projective dimensions, i.e. their instantiations fit into sequences of communicative actions. They have the potential to accomplish specific retroactive changes (interventions) in the sense-making of the ongoing interaction, and a potential to influence possible continuations and extensions of the ongoing utterance, as well as possible relevant actions in the subsequent interaction.

When the pattern is more fixed as a whole, as in the case of some full recyclings with reduced and schematic pre-Ps and post-Ps (cf. e.g. ch. 10.2.2 above), there are probably good reasons for calling the abstract
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constructional schema a *construction* (cf. Scheutz 2005) or a *grammatical construction* (cf. Linell 2004). The notion of construction should not be understood in the strict and communicatively unspecified linguistic meaning as a pairing of linguistic form with specific meanings (cf. *constructions* in Construction Grammar, e.g. Goldberg 1995:1ff, 2006). The notion rather comprises both the (ethno)methodological and the grammatical (formal) dimensions as two sides of the same procedural phenomena.

In most other cases there are either no fixed lexical slots or only lexical slots in the post-P phase. This motivates an analysis of AU's as products of the *use of a method* that sometimes make use of constructions and sometimes not. Construction methods and constructions are both assumed to have an interactional or semantic-pragmatic side. The semantic-pragmatic side of grammatical constructions and methods is constituted by functional potentials, rather than by fixed meanings. They contribute to sense-making in interplay with other linguistic and contextual factors, in the speaker's interaction with other participants, and with contexts. As discussed in chapter 12 above, the function of recycling apokoinou variants is dependent on the local communicative context in many different ways. When used in response to queries or arguments in the preceding local sequential context, i.e. in 'second pair-part position', they are used to insist on the response. When not occurring in second pair-part position, they are rather used to confirm the speaker's own assertions and assessments. When occurring in extended sequences such as lists or other serially organized actions, they are constructed as initial moves and the apokoinou post-Ps are closing devices that enable speakers to move on to the next action in the sequence. The abstract constructional schema of symmetric apokoinous has the functional potential to mean all these different things in interplay with the local sequential position and other participants' actions.

The different abstract utterance patterns (ACMs) are not only oriented to in synchronically defined situations of talk, but are also situation transcending in the sense that they are grammatical sedimentations of participants' solutions of recurrent communicative problems. Perspective shifts and skip-connecting moves are habitually handled by utterances using linguistic renewal methods, and confirming, insisting, and resuming actions by utterances using recycling methods. These sedimentations are relatively robust patterns that nevertheless are subject to change over time. The process within which dialogical and dynamic constructions and patterns are sedimented and changed has been called *emergence* (Hopper 1987), or, in a wider sense, *dialogue within the tradition* ("traditionsdialog", Linell 2005a). This
process should be held apart conceptually from the situated processes within which utterances unfold in real time in specific usage events (dialogue within situations, “situation dialogue”, Linell, ibid.). However, when operationalized in an analysis of apokoinou in talk-in-interaction, it must be recognized that these processes are rather two interconnected sides of the sense-making processes and actions in talk, and that their internal relationship is reflexive. Participants orient to situation-transcending methods and patterns in order to resolve local communicative projects that emerge within the situation of speech, and vice versa, situation-transcending methods and patterns emerge and change over time as sedimentations of participants’ resolutions of recurrent communicative problems. It is the situation transcending, abstract side of apokoinou (ACMs) that has a functional potential (see above). ACMs cannot be tied to specific functions and meanings. Only actual apokoinou utterances (AUs) have functions and meanings.

13.5 Do apokoinou utterances have an external syntax?
The notion of a dialogically and dynamically defined apokoinou construction method is in need of some further comments. It has been proposed that grammatical constructions have (or, at least, can have) retrospective and prospective dimensions since the utterances instantiating the constructions are interlocked with utterances in the surrounding talk. What aspects of the context do apokoinou utterances respond to and/or make relevant in terms of previous and next actions? In addition, are there more explicit (strict) formal relations between apokoinou utterances and the surrounding co-text? In other words, do they have an external syntax in the strict sense of Linell (2005a)? Examples of other phenomena that have been analyzed as dialogical constructions are the ‘\&...\&’ construction, (see ch. 2.5 for a demonstration of the construction), and the cleft construction (cf. Günthner 2006), i.e. linguistic phenomena with a rather fixed syntactic and/or lexical internal structure, and with explicit demands on the formal design and content of previous utterances. Apokoinou utterances do not have such explicit demands on the formal shape of surrounding utterances, but speakers use some of the apokoinou formal types (variants of full recyclings and perhaps Janus heads with fixed post-Ps) to respond to certain actions in the preceding talk, to make relevant responses from co-participants and sometimes also to initiate lists or temporally ordered actions. These relations of apokoinou to the surrounding talk are subject to general processes of conditional relevance within action sequences in talk as
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demonstrated within conversation analysis (cf. Scheglof 1996). They can be described as a kind of external syntax, but in a less strict sense than the one referred to above.

As already mentioned above, some formal types, such as the full recyclings, often occur in specific sequential positions and resolve specific local tasks in these positions (e.g. insisting on some action). They have sequential dependencies, an external syntax in the sense that some specific circumstance in the preceding interactional context seems to be one of the conditions for their use and for their formal configuruation. Other formal apokoinou types, such as the Janus head variants, resolve projects within a more narrow (parenthetical) interactional range (e.g. establishing and confirming the right expression) and do not have utterance-external conditions on their use and form in the sense required to ascribe them an external syntax as defined above. Nevertheless, they operate on names and epistemic assertions that are produced during the production of the ongoing utterance.

13.6 A tension between continuative and parenthetical projects

Apokoinou can be included within a larger class of continuative construction methods in Swedish talk-in-interaction. Apart from the basic incremental way to continue utterances after possible completions, there are turns and TCUs initiated with ‘att’ (that, as a conjunction) (cf. Anward 2003b), ‘så’ (so, Ottesjö 2006) or the collocations ‘men att’ (but that, Lindström & Londen 2004) and ‘så att’ (so that), that connect backwards and resume an ongoing communicative project. There are also turns and TCUs initiated with ‘och’ (and), which constructs the segment as part of a wider ongoing project, e.g. an institutional agenda (cf. and-prefaced questions in English, Heritage & Sojtonen 1994), or turns initiated with ‘ja’ and ‘nej’ (yes and no) (cf. turn-initial ‘nej’ in Danish, Heinemann 2003). When used in unit initial positions these constructions are all methods to respond to (cf. Linell 2003a) or continue ongoing activities and communicative projects, but still highly independent contributions in a way that makes them different from apokoinou. One of the defining criteria of apokoinou (see ch. 5 above) is that the continuation beyond the pivotal segment must be integrated syntactically and prosodically (in one way or the other) with the preceding utterance unit, a criterion that makes it non-independent, or ‘parasitic’.

Considering the non-independence of the continuing post-P phase in apokoinou utterances, is apokoinou a family of continuatives too or should...
it be described differently? This study shows that speakers use apokoinou to continue within the ongoing or extended utterance in order to do various things. The apokoinou method of retro-constructing a pivot is a way of continuing beyond a SYN-PCP after concealing or blocking the TRP by the use of prosody. Speakers use prosody to signal non-completion on the pivot end, to prospectively project continuation beyond the pivot end, and to retrospectively signal continuation or extension on the post-P beginning. Speakers do not simply continue utterances randomly, but do it in order to resolve local projects within the same utterance unit (TCU, turn, or extended turn). They continue to shift perspective, to confirm, insist or focus, to close, demarcate, and to move on to other business. They continue to resume or back-skip to pending activities, and sometimes also to clarify a vague reference, to specify stuff, elaborate on stuff, and so on. An empirically grounded view of the apokoinou method of building utterances is therefore to recognize the continuative work that is done when (for various communicative reasons) the speaker extends the utterance beyond the pivot. Although apokoinou utterances can be described as continuative on the utterance level, the same utterance (or the local project it achieves) can also be accounted for as parenthetical within the wider communicative context. As already mentioned, confirmations of expressions serve as good examples of this double nature of apokoinou. They are syntactic and prosodic continuations of parts of an ongoing utterance (often referring expression or a name), and deal with this by way of a perspective shift, a confirmation that the expression was the right choice. This local confirmation project is closed and left behind immediately after it is resolved (often jointly since the self-confirmation is often followed by a receipt token). Therefore, many apokoinou utterances can be described in terms of a tension between an utterance-continuative dimension and a tendency to resolve parenthetical local projects within a wider communicative context.

In some cases, this tension also works the other way around. Utterances where the apokoinou method is primarily used as a continuative method to resume a pending activity or connect to upcoming actions within the wider communicative context can also be viewed as parenthetical and small-scale operations within the micro-situation of the ongoing utterance. One such small-scale operation would be to close an interstitial activity online, and then to proceed to other or next business.
13.7 Implications for a theory of grammar in talk

A dialogical grammar must take into account that the basic grammatical units are fuzzy and constantly exposed to the possibility of transformation and retroactive change. Many utterances in talk-in-interaction are produced incrementally in the sense that an utterance is first brought to a possible completion, but only to be extended by the same speaker (or sometimes by another speaker). The ongoing syntactic unit can be expanded with a short add-on or increment, and it can be continued with a longer and more rhematic segment.93

One theoretical consequence of this constant possibility to extend a possibly complete utterance is that the traditional notion of the clearly demarcated ‘sentence’ as the basic grammatical unit does not hold for conversational language (Linell 2005a:308f, 2005b:174ff). This is especially relevant for methods/constructions such as apokoinou, where a demand on well formed and sequentially demarcated utterance units produces the theoretical consequence that the final linguistic product of the apokoinou method of construction is regarded as deviant or simply incorrect (see ch. 3 for a more detailed discussion of how this theoretical problem has been dealt with in previous research on apokoinou-like phenomena). The product should instead be viewed as the result of a construction process with several consecutive decisions taken within the (joint) activity of resolving local communicative tasks or projects.94

The phenomenon of apokoinou also shows that grammar in talk must be seen as conditions on dynamic constructional processes, not only as static and fixed structures. Abstract grammatical constructional schemas and patterns should be taken as methods rather than structures (Linell 2005b:218). They are not methods to build an utterance linguistically in time (e.g. retro-constructing syntactic pivots in the case of apokoinou) and methods to resolve a local communicative task or problem.

Apokoinou utterances are not just temporary and sometimes messy utterances (everybody can agree on the fact that many of them are not full-fledged integrated single sentences from a formal point of view). They are a group or a family of methods to achieve something in talk, resolve communicative tasks, something that should be attended to in the grammar of conversational language. The shapes and meanings of utterances are

93 These terms correspond to ‘utvidgning’ and ‘fortsättning’ respectively, following Landqvist’s (2004) categorization of increments (“turtillägg”) in Swedish conversation.
94 The detailed procedural aspects of this process were discussed in chapter 7.
negotiated and reconstructed both within the dynamics of situational contexts and within the dynamics of the socio-cultural tradition, over time. Speakers use linguistic construction methods within communicative projects on different levels. These projects hook on to each other and are part of wider projects that are under constant development (cf. ch. 11 in Linell 1998, and ch. 7.4 above). The organizing principles of grammar are actions and activities rather than propositions and predications. Speakers use linguistic actions to intervene in the world, even if these interventions sometimes only lead to minor changes in the immediate micro-situation, as in the case of many apokoinou utterances.

The phenomenon of apokoinou also illustrates that grammar is much less systematic and integrated than is usually assumed within structuralist, generativist, and construction grammar theories. Utterances and their types of constructions are organized locally rather on a maximally general level. The units of grammar (words, phrases, clauses and other constructions) are more limited and can be combined more flexibly than has usually been assumed. This is illustrated with the different kinds of units that occur in the apokoinou phases of pre-P, pivot, and post-P. The choice of unit or action in the beginning or middle of the apokoinou utterance can also be consequential for the choice of unit and action in the following phase and/or phases (see e.g. AUs with repair in the pivot, which creates the need for a resuming post-P auxiliary verb, or post-Ps that orient to overlapping talk).

Grammar in the sense of conditions on dynamic constructional processes (methods) must often compete with communicative needs that lead to departures from the prototypical patterns (Ono & Thompson 1995). The interplay between potential and the dynamics of contexts and situations also leads to fuzzy boundaries between grammatical construction methods rather than a certain fixed set of methods. Grammatical constructions and constructional methods in the sense of prototypes do not have static meanings that are pre-formed and therefore always present or made relevant when the construction is used. The meanings and functions of constructions must rather be seen as potentials to give rise to different, concrete, situated interpretations (meanings of use) in specific situations, in interplay with contexts and other participants. Different contexts are assumed to exploit different aspects of the functional potential of a constructional method.

The phenomenon of apokoinou also demonstrates that contexts are not something that only occasionally should be considered in descriptions of linguistic phenomena. Contexts are “systematically essential” (Linell
ibid:314). Relevant contexts for single apokoinou utterances (and TCUs and turns in general) are e.g. responsive and projective relations to previous and possible next contributions, relations to the actions and contributions of other participants, and relations to wider activities and activity types (traditions of use).

On a general theoretic level, the apokoinou phenomenon exemplifies many of the points made in the section(s) above about the essentials of a socio-culturally anchored theory of dialogical grammar (Linell 2005a). Most of them are in (critical) dialogue with several explanatory assumptions about language within traditional and mainstream linguistics, and argue that grammatical structure must be explained in terms of dialogical (interactional) processes rather than in terms of, for example, constituent structures, constituent categories, or distinctive features of grammatical nodes and their internal relations. Although necessary, these are all merely descriptions of linguistic products. They are themselves in need of explanation, and are not explanations in their own right. A theory of dialogical grammar, grounded on the analysis of phenomena in talk such as apokoinou, can provide such explanations and is therefore proposed as a unified theoretical framework for the description of both situation-transcending aspects and situated communicative aspects of grammatical constructions and grammatical construction methods in talk-in-interaction.

On a more concrete level, one of the main concrete implications of the results of this study is that that apokoinou should be included in a grammar of Swedish conversational language as one of the grammatical resources available for participants in Swedish talk.

13.8 Further research
This study points to the relevance of further study of the relation between the use of apokoinou (its functions and formal types) and activity types. This could be done both on a more general level (such as institutional talk vs. mundane conversation), and on a more local and dynamic level (such as argumentative and narrative talk). The data in Corpus B indicates that the existing function of apokoinou occur in short interchanges that are embedded in other kind of (more practically oriented) activities, such as service encounters between a bus driver and a passenger, or between a member of the staff in a food store and a customer. The data of this study, however, cannot verify or dismiss such hypotheses.

This study also shows that a relevant project for future research would be a comparison of the use of apokoinou within Germanic languages such
as the Scandinavian languages, German and English (also see 6.1 above for a short comment). These results could then be compared with non-Germanic languages such as Finnish (or other languages where data is available or can be made available). A fruitful starting point for a comparison is the simple fact that some formal variants do not show up in all languages. This may be due to differences in basic word order rules and the presence or non-presence of various related methods of utterance construction.

Another possible area of further studies might be grammaticalization studies, i.e. diachronic studies of the relation between various apokoinous types and functions and certain interactional loci where they might have emerged over time and perhaps been conventionalized, such as points in the sequential organization of talk where utterances are extended with increments. Finally, another area of research that may come to mind as a continuation of this study is a further and more general study of prosody as a method of utterance construction in Swedish talk-in-interaction. There is both a need to study the role of prosody for how participants cooperate to bring turns to completion, and a need to study its role for how participants cooperate to extend turns incrementally beyond possible points of completion.
Appendix I. The recordings

This appendix contains an overview of the 35 recordings of Swedish talk-in-interaction that are used as the main material in this study. They comprise 31 hours and 8 minutes. 168 apokoinou utterances were found in 31 of the recordings. The 4 recordings where no apokoinou utterances were found are placed at the bottom of the table and are shaded.

Only schematic information about the recordings is provided in the table below and is commented on in the following list. Other relevant aspects of each recording (or part of the recording) than provided in the table are discussed in connection with the analyses of single apokoinou utterances.

(i) The first letter in the code refers to the university where the recordings were made (e.g., the L in LB:U refers to Linköping; see the list below the table).

(ii) The abbreviation in the third column refers to the initials of the person that is responsible for each recording (e.g., PL refers to Per Linell, see the list below the table). These persons authorized the use of the recordings in this study.

(iii) The fourth column refers to the main activity type in each recording (although there are many different local or dynamic activities behind all these more general labels).

(iv) The sixth column contains basic information about the participation framework, i.e. whether it is mainly organized in dyads between two participants or mainly organized in polyads between more than two participants (multipart).

(v) Participants in all recordings are for the most part engaged in face-to-face interaction, except for the phone calls in recording 12, 13, and 15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Main activity</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Audio or video</th>
<th>Length (min)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L:LiCTI:BP</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Talk between midwife and pregnant woman at a maternity health care center.</td>
<td>1 dyad aud</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L:LiCTI:BP</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Talk between doctor and pregnant woman at a maternity health care center.</td>
<td>6 dyad aud</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L:LiCTI:BP</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Court hearing about a traffic accident.</td>
<td>5 dyad aud</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L:LiCTI:BP</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Focus group talk: Farmers talk about genetically modified food.</td>
<td>1 polyad aud</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L:LiCTI:BP</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Talk between a social welfare officer or researcher and a client.</td>
<td>9 dyad aud</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L:LiCTI:BP</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Talk about music – Lyssan.</td>
<td>6 polyad vid</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L:LiCTI:BP</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Everyday talk between two young women having coffee.</td>
<td>1 polyad vid</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L:LiCTI:BP</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Talk between two men when showing a boat pier to a new member in a boat society.</td>
<td>1 dyad aud</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L:LiCTI:BP</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Talk between two young girls from Eskilstuna about everyday matters.</td>
<td>5 dyad aud</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L:LiCTI:BP</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Phone calls to a medical emergency call center (Larmcentralen, LC).</td>
<td>5 dyad aud</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L:LiCTI:BP</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Phone calls to a poison information center (Giftinformationsscentralen, GIC).</td>
<td>5 polyad vid</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L:LiCTI:BP</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Everyday talk between three or four senior women having coffee.</td>
<td>9 polyad aud</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L:LiCTI:BP</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Everyday telephone conversation.</td>
<td>1 dyad aud</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L:LiCTI:BP</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Talk between a social welfare officer or researcher and a client.</td>
<td>3 polyad aud</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L:LiCTI:BP</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Radio talk show – Ekonomiska klubben.</td>
<td>3 polyad aud</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L:LiCTI:BP</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Talk between commentators during live TV broadcasting of an ice hockey game.</td>
<td>6 polyad aud</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L:LiCTI:BP</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Radio talk show on political topics – Nånting.</td>
<td>8 polyad aud</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L:LiCTI:BP</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>TV talk show – Karin m.fl.</td>
<td>1 polyad vid</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L:LiCTI:BP</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>TV talk show – Måndagsklubben.</td>
<td>1 polyad aud</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Polyad</td>
<td>Aud</td>
<td>Vid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>G:GSM:LN</td>
<td>Focus group talk between a moderator and four upper high school male students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>G:GSLC:BN</td>
<td>Everyday talk between a mother and her young daughter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>LU:TALB:JE</td>
<td>Talk between four doctors about information on sexual matters to teenagers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>S:OFTI:DB</td>
<td>Talk during a group discussion at an academic conference on language and talk-in-interaction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>H:SAM:V1</td>
<td>Everyday talk during a men's dinner party.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>U:SG:BS</td>
<td>Everyday talk between a man and a woman while watching a game of boule.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>L:LiCTI:APH</td>
<td>Talk between a speech therapist and an aphasic patient.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>L:LiCTI:PL</td>
<td>Police interrogation between a male police officer and a male teenager about a minor theft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abbr.** First letter(s) in the code
- NK: Natascha Korolija, Linköping University
- BN: Bengt Nordberg, Uppsala University
- AL: Anna Lindström, Örebro University
- NL: Niklas Norén, Linköping University
- LCH: Lars-Christer Hydén, Linköping University
- JAN: Jan Anward, Linköping University

**Persons responsible for the recordings**
- DB: Diana Bravo, Stockholm University
Appendix II. Examples, extracts, tables, and figures

In this appendix, four tables contain the following:

(i) a list of all 29 examples from the literature that are presented and discussed in chapters 3 and 5.

(ii) a list of all the extracts from corpus A and B that are presented and discussed in the study. 122 analyses have been made of 96 different apokoinou utterances from Corpus A, 2 analyses have been made of utterances from Corpus B. 6 analyses have been made of utterances from the reference material.

(iii) a list of tables.

(iv) a list of figures.

Examples from the literature (in order of appearance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>Saari (1975:82)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:2</td>
<td>Edebois (1988:2)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:3</td>
<td>Lambrecht (1998:319)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:5</td>
<td>Löfström (1998:81)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:6</td>
<td>Hakulinen et al. (2004:970)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:7</td>
<td>Hakulinen et al. (2004:971)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:8</td>
<td>Hakulinen et al. (2004:971)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:9</td>
<td>Sandig (1973:46)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:10</td>
<td>Linell (1980): Two finite verbs</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:11</td>
<td>Linell (1980): Two subjects</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:12</td>
<td>Linell (1980): Two adverbials</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:13</td>
<td>Linell (1980): Two prep.</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:14</td>
<td>Linell &amp; Jönsson (1986:12)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15</td>
<td>Sacks (1992a [1969]:146)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:16</td>
<td>Steensig (2001a:184)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:17</td>
<td>Svennevåg (in prep.)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:18</td>
<td>Franck (1985:325)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:19</td>
<td>Franck (1985:324)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Excerpts (in alphabetical order)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Recording Code</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5:19</td>
<td>A snail (ref. material)</td>
<td>G:GSLC-BK</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:20</td>
<td>Actually (ref. material)</td>
<td>U:SÅINF:51</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:25</td>
<td>Almunge</td>
<td>U:SÅINF:53</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:3</td>
<td>Almunge</td>
<td>U:SÅINF:53</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:10</td>
<td>Alzheimer</td>
<td>U:SÅINF:51</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:12</td>
<td>As old as me</td>
<td>S:OFT17</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:11</td>
<td>Ashamed</td>
<td>U:MKL</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:17</td>
<td>At home</td>
<td>U:SÅINF:51</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:22</td>
<td>Baby blankets</td>
<td>U:SÅINF:41</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:4</td>
<td>Battery malfunction</td>
<td>U:LC:18:PO42</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:1</td>
<td>Battery malfunction</td>
<td>U:LC:18:PO42</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:8</td>
<td>Before we had men</td>
<td>U:SÅINF:51</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:23</td>
<td>Before we had men</td>
<td>U:SÅINF:51</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:19</td>
<td>Begin working</td>
<td>U:SÅINF:51</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:4</td>
<td>Begin working</td>
<td>U:SÅINF:51</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:2</td>
<td>Bioreck</td>
<td>U:GIC:16495</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:16</td>
<td>Blinkers left (ref. material)</td>
<td>L:LiCTI:A:5-1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:3</td>
<td>Bullshit hinges</td>
<td>U:MKL</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:20</td>
<td>Clarence articles</td>
<td>LU:TALB:DOC</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:9</td>
<td>Dancing salsa</td>
<td>U:MKL</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:1</td>
<td>Dancing salsa</td>
<td>U:MKL</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:8</td>
<td>Dated</td>
<td>U:GIC:16479</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:8</td>
<td>Debut</td>
<td>LU:TALB:PAR</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:7</td>
<td>District meeting</td>
<td>U:SÅINF:41</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:7</td>
<td>Don't work</td>
<td>U:SÅINF:51</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:10</td>
<td>Empty</td>
<td>U:SG:BP</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:2</td>
<td>Fifty-eight seconds</td>
<td>U:HR</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:18</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>L:LiCTI:GL:G10</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Phrase</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:22</td>
<td>Generally speaking</td>
<td>L:LiCTI:B:64L 152 129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:20</td>
<td>Go biking</td>
<td>U:SAINF:42 58 269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:5</td>
<td>Hat party</td>
<td>H:SAAM:1M 149 330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:3</td>
<td>Headache</td>
<td>H:SAAM:V2 145 326</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:8</td>
<td>How it sounds</td>
<td>U:SAINF:351 76 290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:6</td>
<td>I thought</td>
<td>U:SAINF:41 59 72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:9</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>U:SAINF:42 61 339</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:16</td>
<td>In Lund</td>
<td>U:MKL 25 123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:18</td>
<td>In Lund</td>
<td>U:MKL 25 307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>In the end</td>
<td>L:LiCTI:B:64L 154 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:5</td>
<td>In the end</td>
<td>L:LiCTI:B:64L 154 111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:1</td>
<td>In the end</td>
<td>L:LiCTI:B:64L 154 180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:4</td>
<td>Jonas Höglund</td>
<td>U:HR 201 70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:7</td>
<td>Kerstin Ekman</td>
<td>L:LiCTI:SP4 138 166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:2</td>
<td>Kerstin Ekman</td>
<td>L:LiCTI:SP4 138 236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:4</td>
<td>Länga Högby</td>
<td>U:SAINF:21 255 240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:11</td>
<td>Large amount</td>
<td>U:GIC:16500 178 253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:1</td>
<td>Last night and night</td>
<td>U:SAINF:21 X1 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:6</td>
<td>Lie beside</td>
<td>U:SAINF:51 75 287</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:12</td>
<td>Lund</td>
<td>U:MKL 26 219</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:2</td>
<td>Madness</td>
<td>L:LiCTI:TT3 5 67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:13</td>
<td>Madness</td>
<td>L:LiCTI:TT3 5 119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:10</td>
<td>Madness</td>
<td>L:LiCTI:TT3 5 341</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:2</td>
<td>Meringue</td>
<td>U:STE:13 183 151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:5</td>
<td>Meringue</td>
<td>U:STE:13 183 194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:21</td>
<td>Misunderstandings</td>
<td>U:HR 51 128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:5</td>
<td>Momo</td>
<td>L:LiCTI:SP1 120 139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:4</td>
<td>Morphing</td>
<td>L:LiCTI:TT3 6 329</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:23</td>
<td>Mountain currants</td>
<td>U:GIC:16512 180 317</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:1</td>
<td>Movable</td>
<td>L:LiCTI:B:64L 155 148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:12</td>
<td>Movable</td>
<td>L:LiCTI:B:64L 155 254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:6</td>
<td>Much more disgusting</td>
<td>L:U:LI:ALB:DOC 248 198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:13</td>
<td>Neologisms</td>
<td>S:OF17 108 298</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:14</td>
<td>New material</td>
<td>L:LI:CTI:TT5 10 120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:8</td>
<td>Nineteen seventy</td>
<td>U:NO1 34 114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:9</td>
<td>Not a dime</td>
<td>L:LiCTI:E 215 292</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:3</td>
<td>Not enough</td>
<td>U:SAINF:41 59 109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:21</td>
<td>On Clog Street</td>
<td>U:SAINF:41 88 271</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:24</td>
<td>On Monday</td>
<td>L:LiCTI:E 211 133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:17</td>
<td>On Monday</td>
<td>L:LiCTI:E 211 263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:6</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>L:LiCTI:B:64L 153 332</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:8</td>
<td>People that meditate</td>
<td>G:GSM 161 337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15</td>
<td>Poisonous leaves</td>
<td>U:GIC:16493 171 301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>Apokoinou in Swedish talk-in-interaction</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Police report L:LiCTI:A:51 14 66</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Promoting ears U:MKL 53 282</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.16</td>
<td>Promoting ears U:MKL 33 282</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>Psychoanalysis L:LiCTI:SP4 333</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>Rave party culture L:LiCTI:SP4 300</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>Reflections L:FR2 207</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>Sad (ref. material) L:LiCTI:BU3 94</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>Sews everything (ref. material) U:ESK:K99 95</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>Simple music G:GSM 258</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>Small roads Corpus:B:PL 13 112</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>Student promiscuity L:FR2 227</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>Summer home (ref. material) G:GSLC:W 89</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>The brochure U:GIC:16479 156</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>The ecstatics L:FR2 84</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>The ecstatics L:FR2 294</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>The fifteenth of May USYV:1 118</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>The fifteenth of May G:GSLC:W 201</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>The fifteenth of May USYV:1 257</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>The old cat G:GSLC:W 71</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>The old cat G:GSLC:W 283</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>The peelings G:GSLC:W 305</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>The plague G:GSLC:W 274</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>The spoken language corpus G:GSLC:W 69</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>The spoken language corpus G:GSLC:W 73</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>The spoken language corpus G:GSLC:W 217</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.22</td>
<td>The spoken language corpus G:GSLC:W 312</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>The stable G:GSLC:W 224</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>The technology (ref. material) L:LiCTI:A:51 280</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>The words G:GSLC:W 278</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>Tight Corpus:B:PL 112</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>Two years after L:LiCTI:SP4 187</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>Typically Swedish G:GSLC:W 247</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Undemanding music G:GSLC:W 107</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>Undemanding music G:GSLC:W 246</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>Up to them G:GSLC:W 212</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>Upplandia U:LC:16PO10 82</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>Upplandia U:LC:16PO10 156</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix II: Examples, extracts, figures, and tables

### Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Categories of Double bind structures in Franck (1985)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories of Pivot constructions in Scheutz (2003)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining construction methods of a prototypical apokoinou utterance</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some construction methods in Swedish talk that resemble prototypical pivots</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occurrences of apokoinou forms in Swedish talk</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of prosody across phase boundaries in apokoinou utterances</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main functions and forms of apokoinou</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Segmentation schema of an apokoinou utterance</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical representation of a pivot utterance as an overlap of two syntactic segments (a &amp; b)</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical representation of a pivot utterance using brackets</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed turn and increment segment in extract (5:8)</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f0-trace of the apokoinou utterance in extract 7:1</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schematic prosodic contour of the apokoinou utterance in extract 7:1</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f0-trace of the apokoinou utterance in extract (7:2)</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic representation of the renewal of projection of a next possible completion point in apokoinou utterances</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition from pivot to post-P in extract (7:2)</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f0-trace of the initial part the apokoinou utterance in</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
extract (7:3)

7:7 f-trace of the apokoinou utterance in extract (7:4) 159
7:8 f-trace of the final segment in the apokoinou utterance in extract (7:5) 160
7:9 f-trace of the final segment in the apokoinou utterance in extract (7:6). 162
7:10 Graphic representation of an embedded local communicative project within a wider project 168
7:11 The pre-P in (7:8) represented as an apokoinou 172
7:12 Graphic representation of a wider communicative project that ends with a local communicative project 173
Appendix III. Notes on Swedish grammar

This appendix contains some basic information regarding the syntax of Swedish that are relevant for the analysis of apokoinou. Included are also the general inflectional patterns of Swedish verbs, nouns, and adjectives, and a comment on some frequent modal particles in Swedish talk, provided to facilitate the understanding of the English translations of the Swedish transcripts into English. The appendix closes with a short discussion of the consequences of some of these grammatical features for the analysis of apokoinou.

1. Basic characteristics of Swedish syntax

(i) Swedish is a V2 language, i.e. the finite verb occupies the second position in declarative main clauses.

(ii) More precisely, Swedish has the word order XVSO in declarative main clauses (cf. Anward 2003b:66). The X position, the so-called basis position (Sw. “fundament” or “satsbas”), can be filled by any constituent. Sentence adverbials occur after the verb and before the object position. Other adverbials follow the object position.

(iii) Swedish clauses often use inverted word order, with the verb in the initial position before the subject, to indicate questions, conditionals, and consecutives. Inverted word order also occurs when the basis position is occupied by a particle, an adverbial or any object of the verb (point (ii) above).

(iv) In Swedish wh-questions, a wh-phrase occupies the initial X position. In yes-no-questions, imperatives, conditionals, and consecutives the initial X position is absent.

(v) Swedish has no subject agreement on verbs, and the subject is obligatorily present except in some imperatives (directives) and some so-called V1-declaratives (point (v) below), which have no subjects.
In conversational language, some declaratives have initial finite verbs (V1-declaratives, Mörnsjö 2002). These, however, only appear in certain sequential contexts, mainly as continuative (responsive) utterances within narratives or multi-utterance arguments.

2. Basic inflection patterns of some Swedish word categories

(i) Swedish verbs are inflected for finiteness (finite and infinite), mood (on finite forms only; indicative, which is a semantically neutral mood, imperative, and subjunctive), tense (on finite forms in indicative only; present and past), and diathesis or voice (active and passive, where the active is unmarked and the passive marked with suffix -s).

(ii) Swedish nouns are inflected for number (singular and plural), gender (non-neuter ("utrum") and neuter), definiteness (definite and indefinite), and case (nominative and genitive, where the nominative is unmarked and the genitive marked with the suffix -s). Definiteness is often doubly represented with endings on the noun and pre-positioned articles ('den', 'de(t)', 'de/dom') or collocations of determiners such as the demonstrative 'den här' ('it here' =this) or 'den där' ('it there' =that).

(iii) Swedish adjectives are inflected in agreement with the number, gender and definiteness of the noun they modify. Comparative and superlative forms are formed either with suffixes or by using 'mer' (more) and 'mest' (most).

3. Comment on the Swedish modal particles ‘ju’ and ‘väl’

Some sentence adverbials in Swedish, such as the modal particles ‘ju’ and ‘väl’ in utterance internal position, are often impossible to translate into idiomatic English without using tag constructions in utterance final position (such as ‘y’know or ‘isn’t it’). The utterance-final position has different sequential implications than the utterance-internal position, which might render the translation difficult to understand without lengthy explanations. The solution adopted here has in most cases been simply to drop these particles in the idiomatic translations of Swedish utterances.

4. Discussion

The basic character of Swedish clausal syntax and the inflectional pattern of particularly the verbs have some consequences for the analysis of how
Apokoinou utterances are built as compared to other languages. One consequence of being a rigid V2-language with an obligatory slot preceding the verb is that verb-initial and subject-less clauses (V1-clauses) are not a regular resource in the Swedish language if compared with languages with a rich verbal inflection such as Finnish. However, V1-utterances in declarative form are systematically used by speakers (cf. Mörnsjö 2002) as a resource to initiate utterances, if clearly demarcated from previous segments of talk and if prosodically marked as new beginnings. If not clearly demarcated and marked as new beginnings, and if preceded by an element that can be made to occupy the ‘missing’ clausal basis position of the V1-construction, such constructions have been analyzed (in this study) as a syntactic extension of the preceding unit (also see Lindström & Karlsson 2003), who analyze such extensions as belonging to a wider group of V1-add-ons in Swedish talk. The retro-construction of an initial element that holds the final position in a previous syntactic and prosodic unit, also works across pauses or other types of breaks in the continuous phonation of the utterance.

As the slot preceding the verb is obligatory (except for clear cases of V1-declaratives and yes/no questions), the variety of elements that can occur in this pre-verbal slot is large. When not occupied by the subject, this results in a clause construction with inverted word order, which is an especially noticeable difference with respect to English, which is a rigid SVO language. In standard English varieties (and especially written varieties), the inverted word order is only used in interrogative clauses and is therefore not available as a general resource when retro-constructing pivots. Another consequence of the use of inverted word order in Swedish is the more practical difficulty of translating some inverted apokoinou post-Ps idiomatically without losing the syntactic pattern of the apokoinou schema.
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