Chapter 9

Clause repetition as a tying technique in Greek conversation

Angeliki Alvanoudi
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki and James Cook University

This chapter targets a language in which bridging constructions are not grammaticalized, that is, Greek. It examines instances of same-speaker and cross-speaker clause repetition in informal Greek conversation. The analysis demonstrates that the basic function of clause repetition is to display connectedness between what the current speaker says or does and what the same or previous speaker said or did immediately before. It is argued that clause repetition displays some similarities with recapitulative linkage and it is hypothesized that recapitulative linkage constructions have emerged from repetition practices in conversation.

1 Introduction

Recapitulative linkage is a type of bridging construction in which the bridging clause repeats at least the predicate of the reference clause. Recapitulative linkage is not an integral part of the Greek grammar. Yet clause repetition is one of the cohesive or tying techniques employed in Greek conversation. It consists of a main or non-main clause that repeats a prior main or non-main clause, as in example (1), lines 4–6, and example (2), lines 1 and 3.

(1) 01 Pol: >> Eγó ton ékopsa.

                  'I stopped drinking coffee.'
     02   (1.3)
     03 Pol: Vévea éxodas kópsi to tsiγáro o kafés °ítane: (0.5)

                  'Of course compared to quitting smoking coffee was (0.5)'

04 Ale: >> ↑*De su*   *kostízi*   *pá[ra*   *polí.]*
            NEG 2SG.GEN cost.3SG.PRS very   much
            'It doesn't cost you very much.'

05 Pol: >>   *[De su*   *ko]stízi*
                              NEG 2SG.GEN cost.3SG.PRS
                              'It doesn't cost you'

06   >> °*pára polí.*=
        very   much
        'very much.'

(2) 01 Mar:>> *Ci áma íse*   *ce mónos su*   *ti   na*
             and if   COP.2SG.PRS and by   yourself what SBJV
      02   *kátsis*   *na   kánis.*=
             sit.2SG.PFV SBJV do.2SG
             'And if you are alone what are you supposed to do.='
      03 Our:>> =*Áma íse*   *mónos su*   *[ðen éçis*   *ce]*
             if   COP.2SG.PRS by   yourself NEG have.2SG.PRS and
             '=I think that if you are alone you are not'
      04 Vag: [°M: ne.]
                              'Mm yes.'
      05 Our: ti ðiáθesi pistévo tin íðja. ektós an íse me á[lus.]
             'in the mood. unless you are together with others.'
      06 Mar: [Ma]: ne.
                                'But of course.'

Clause repetition in Greek conversation shares some of the formal and discursive properties of recapitulative linkage constructions (cf. Guérin & Aiton 2019 [this volume]). First, recapitulative linkage involves repetition of at least the verb of the reference clause; not all elements accompanying the verb of the reference clause are necessarily repeated. Clause repetitions in Greek conversation involve repetition of at least the verb of the first saying and some of the elements accompanying the verb. Second, recapitulative linkage is a discourse strategy that achieves cohesion, by establishing thematic continuity or referential coherence (de Vries 2005), backgrounding the proposition of the reference clause and prefacing discourse-new information that is usually sequentially ordered (Guérin & Aiton 2019 [this volume]). As we will see in this chapter, the

basic function of clause repetition in Greek conversation is to display connectedness with the ongoing talk. Yet the two phenomena are not identical. Clause repetition in Greek conversation is a practice widely distributed between speaker and recipient, whereas recapitulative linkage occurs in same speaker's utterance.[1] Unlike bridging clauses that prototypically consist of clauses, which are morphologically, syntactically or intonationally marked as dependent on the reference clauses, repeated clauses in Greek conversation can be grammatically and pragmatically complete utterances. Moreover, recapitulative linkage usually expresses a temporal semantic relation that involves the transition between linked events. Clause repetition in Greek conversation does not express temporal sequentiality or any fixed semantic relationships; it carries different functions in different contexts.

The aim of the present study is to examine instances of clause repetition in two contexts: self-repetition (same-speaker) and repetition of prior turn at talk (cross-speaker) in Greek conversation, and demonstrate that the basic function of clause repetition is to display *connectedness* between what the current speaker says or does and what the same or previous speaker said or did immediately before. It is hypothesized that across languages there is a continuum between repetition as a generic linguistic practice and more or less conventionalized forms of bridging constructions. The outline of the chapter is as follows. In §2, I review previous studies on the forms and functions of repetition in conversation. In §3, I approach the cohesive function of repetition in conversation through the lens of conversation analysis. In §4, I analyse self-repetition (§4.2) and repetition of prior turn (§4.3) in naturally occurring conversations, focusing on the use of clause repetition as a tying technique. §5 contains a discussion of the findings.

2 The role of repetition in conversation

Repetition, in Brown's words (2000: 225), is "a grammatical, stylistic, poetic, and cognitive resource associated with attention." It constitutes part of everyday human conduct and is found in social life, rituals, events, conversation, and grammar (Johnstone 1994; Brown 2000; Wong 2000). In conversation, repetition distinguishes *self-repetition* and *repetition of a prior turn at talk* (Brown 2000). In terms of form, repetition can be exact or modified. Exact repetition involves the exact duplication of words, that is, a "perfect copy" of a first saying, while modified

---

[1]Valérie Guérin pointed out to me that this feature of recapitulative linkage may be an artefact of the data rather than a pattern found in conversation, given that previous studies on bridging constructions did not analyse data from talk-in-interaction.

repetition involves a modified replication of words through addition or omission, that is, a "near copy" of a first saying (Couper-Kuhlen 1996: 368, Brown 2000: 224). Repetition carries multiple functions that depend on the context of use of repeated elements. As Couper-Kuhlen (1996: 368) observes, "replication of form does not necessarily mean replication of function." A similar point is made by Johnstone (1994: 12), who claims that although the referential meaning of repeated elements remains the same, non-referential aspects of their meaning change, given that the context of use of repeated elements changes.

In general, repetition is a mode of focusing the addressee's attention to something. This generic function of repetition can be particularized in different contexts of usage. For instance, speakers use repetition to achieve discourse cohesion (Goodwin & Goodwin 1987; Norrick 1987; Tannen 1987; 1989; Johnstone 1994; Tyler 1994; Sacks 1995; Brown 2000), and implement various social actions in talk-in-interaction, such as:

- Answering a question (Norrick 1987; Raymond 2003; Stivers & Hayashi 2010; Stivers 2011)

- Agreeing or disagreeing with prior speaker (Pomerantz 1984; Goodwin & Goodwin 1987; Norrick 1987; Tannen 1987)

- Claiming more agency with respect to the action they are implementing (Stivers 2005; Heritage & Raymond 2012; Lee 2012)

- Confirming an allusion (Schegloff 1996a)

- Registering receipt of a prior turn (Tannen 1989; Schegloff 1997; Kim 2002)

- Initiating repair (Schegloff et al. 1977; Sorjonen 1996; Kim 2002)

- Sustaining a particular topical focus (Tannen 1989; Kim 2002)

- Resuming a story (Wong 2000)

Repetition is also used for delivering recycled turn beginnings (Schegloff 1987) and dealing with interruption and overlapping talk (Norrick 1987; Johnstone 1994), and it can serve as a stylistic feature used for emphasis or clarification (Norrick 1987; Johnstone 1994). There is often an interrelation between the interactional functions of repetition and "its placement in the turn-taking metric" (Wong 2000: 411). For instance, self-repetitions may deal with overlapping talk, whereas repetitions of prior turn may initiate repair (Wong 2000). The cohesive function of repetition in conversation is the topic of the next section.

3 Repetition as a tying technique in conversation

Discourse cohesion is achieved through a variety of linguistic resources, such as repetition, reference, ellipsis or omission, substitution, conjunction, synonymy and collocation (Martin 2001). Cohesion is usually understood through the lens of systemic functional linguistics (Halliday 1973; Halliday & Hasan 1976), as a relation of dependence between the interpretation of some element and another element in discourse. This study, however, approaches cohesion from a conversation analytic perspective.

Speakers always deal with the problem of cohesion or connectedness with ongoing talk, when they design their turns, given that talk-in-interaction involves contingencies between prior, current and next turns. In talk-in-interaction, speakers take turns, which consist of turn-constructional units (TCUs), i.e., clauses, phrases and lexical items that constitute at least one action (Schegloff 2007: 3–4). Turns form sequences, that is, courses of actions implemented through talk. The unit of sequence organization is the adjacency pair, which is composed of two turns produced by different speakers, adjacently placed and relatively ordered as first pair part and second pair part (Schegloff 2007: 13). First pair parts initiate some exchange, such as a question, a request or an offer. Second pair parts respond to the action of the first pair parts: they deliver an answer to the question, a rejection or an acceptance of the request, or the offer. First pair parts project the relevance of specific second pair parts; they set powerful constraints on what the recipient should do, and on how the action accomplished by the recipient should be understood (Schegloff 2007: 21). Thus, next turns are understood by co-participants to display an understanding of the just prior turn, and to embody an action responsive to the just prior turn so understood (Schegloff 2007: 15). According to Drew (2012: 131), interaction consists of "contingently connected sequences of turns in which we each 'act', and in which the other's – our recipient's – response to our turn relies upon, and embodies, his/her understanding of what we were doing and what we meant to convey in our (prior) turn."

When speakers design their current turn, they need to display how their turn is connected with what came immediately before (Drew 2012: 134), namely how their turn is connected with the prior turn produced by a different speaker, or with the prior TCU within the same speaker's turn. For example, in the beginning of turns speakers may display whether their current turn takes a different stance from the prior turn produced by another speaker (Schegloff 1996b). In the beginning of non-initial TCUs within multi-unit turns, speakers may display whether the current TCU continues the project of the preceding TCU, or whether

the current TCU launches or projects another action (Mazeland 2012: 481). Repetition is one of the practices that speakers use to display connectedness with ongoing talk. Couper-Kuhlen & Selting (2017) describe repetition as a generic linguistic practice that "depends on the establishment of a relation of formal similarity between a set of forms in one (current) turn and another set of forms in a prior turn". In conversation, speakers use repetition as a "tying technique" (Sacks 1995) or "format tying" (following the terminology of Goodwin & Goodwin 1987 and Goodwin 1990) to create a relation between a current turn and a prior turn and, thus, achieve cohesion. According to Goodwin (1990: 177), format tying involves participants' strategic use of phonological, syntactic or semantic surface structures of prior turns for tying talk between turns; repetition is an instance of the format tying apparatus. The use of clause repetition as a tying technique in Greek conversation is analyzed in §4.

4 Clause repetition in Greek conversation

4.1 Data

The data analyzed in this study stem from 33 fully transcribed audio-recorded naturally occurring face-to-face conversations among friends and relatives from the Corpus of Spoken Greek of the Institute of Modern Greek Studies.[2] The total duration of the conversations examined is about 22 hours and 23 minutes, and the total number of words is 324,994.

Before moving to the analysis of the data, some basic information on the language profile is required. Modern Greek belongs to the Indo-European group of languages, and is spoken by about 13 million speakers, with approximately 10 million of them living in Greece, and the rest in Cyprus and parts of the Greek diaspora (detailed descriptions of the language can be found in Joseph & Phillipaki-Warburton 1987 and Mackridge 1985). Greek is a fusional, highly inflecting language, in which several grammatical categories are marked morphologically. For instance, nouns inflect for gender, number and case, and verbs inflect for person, number, tense, aspect, voice, and mood. Greek is a pro-drop language with a flexible word order.

Approximately 130 instances of clause repetition were found in the data examined: 73 self-repetitions and 57 repetitions of a prior turn. In terms of form, the large majority of clause repetitions are modified. Most of the modified repetitions involve a change in intonation that contributes to the change in meaning

---

[2]Conversations have been transcribed according to the conventions of conversation analysis. A list of transcription symbols is in the Appendix.

expressed by the repeated clause. Modified repetitions often involve addition or omission whereby speakers go beyond the initial version of the clause or omit something in the repeated clause. In terms of function, most clause repetitions are used as tying techniques. However, variation is found within each category of repetition. Unlike repetitions of prior turn at talk, which are routinely used as tying techniques implementing various actions, self-repetitions do not always have a cohesive function.

Following Wong's 2000 terminology, I refer to the antecedent of the repetition as first saying, and the repetition of the whole clause or part of the clause (at least of the verb) as second saying. I avoid using the terms *reference clause* and *bridging clause* (cf. Guérin & Aiton 2019 [this volume]), since the phenomenon examined here is not a typical bridging construction (cf. §1). First saying and second saying are codified in the excerpts below as FS and SS respectively. Although clause repetition may occur in various turns in each excerpt, special focus is given only to certain usages (marked with bold face). The turns in which these usages occur are followed by glossing.

4.2 Self-repetition

28 out of the 73 self-repetitions found in the data have a cohesive function, as shown in examples (3) to (5). In the lines preceding (3), participants argue about whether Greek taxi drivers drive safely or not. In lines 1–2, Thanos implies that they do not know how to drive through the form of a rhetorical question, and Petros disagrees in lines 3 and 5–8. He uses the negative particle *óçi* 'no' to express his disagreement with the previous speaker, in turn-initial position. In the next TCU, he offers an account for his disagreement: he claims that there are certain standards (*ipárxun meriká stádars* 'there are certain standards'), uttering the noun with emphasis due to increased loudness or higher pitch. The speaker seeks confirmation of understanding by the recipient, and offers another account for his disagreement in the next TCU. He starts the TCU with the discourse particle *ðilaðí* 'that is', and repeats the clause from the previous TCU (*>ipárxun meriká< stádars* 'there are certain standards'). The second saying is modified. The speaker utters part of the clause in a rushed way, with no emphasis on the noun. By repeating the clause, the speaker shows that the current TCU continues the project of the prior one. In this case, clause repetition links different TCUs within the same speaker's turn, and displays connectedness with ongoing talk.

(3) 01 Tha: =e <u>ti</u>: e
    02   [moré. <u>pço</u>s kséri na   oðiɣái?]
                     '=eh what eh hey. Who knows how to drive?'

03 Pet: FS>> *[[Oçi. aplá] θélo   na   po   óti ipá]rxun*
no   just want.1SG.PRS SBJV tell.1SG.PFV CONJ COP.3PL.PRS

'No. I just want to say that there are'
04 Nef: [(.............)]
05 Pet: FS>> *meriká   stádars >vre peðí mu.<*
certain.NEUT.ACC.PL standards PART child my

'certain standards hey you man.'
06   SS>> *katálaves?   ðilaðí, >ipárxun*
understand.2SG.PST that.is COP.3PL.PRS

07   *meriká<*
certain.NEUT.ACC.PL

'Do you understand? That is, there are certain'
08   *stáda[rs, ta opía i taksiðᴢ̑íðes ðen da sévode.]*

'standards that taxi drivers do not respect.'
09 Tha: [Eh ↑ ti? pça íne ta- ↑ emís ta   ká]nume

'what? What are the- we make'
10   ta stádar.

'the standards'

In (4), participants talk about carnival celebrations in the city of Patra in
Greece. In lines 1–2, Vagelis informs his co-participants about volunteers form-
ing groups for the carnival parade (*kánune:::grup*, 'they form groups') and in line
4, Maria interrupts Vagelis before his turn reaches possible completion. In line
8, Vagelis continues the turn that was interrupted. He repeats an almost perfect
copy (*kánune grup*, 'they form groups') of his previous clausal TCU (in line 2): the
only difference between the first and second saying is the vowel lengthening in
the first saying. The turn continues the action of informing that was suspended.
The speaker uses clause repetition in turn-initial position. As Schegloff (1987: 72)
argues, turn beginnings are "sequence-structurally important places" in conver-
sation, because they project the turn type or shape, and the relation between the
current turn and the prior one. The repeated clause prefacing the turn in line 8
conveys that what follows is part of the speaker's prior activity, and connects
the same speaker's previous and current turn.

(4) 01 Vag: =Ci éxun ðicéoma na katevúne ó:li, ósi θélune,
'And they all have the right to participate, whoever wants
to participate,'

```
02      FS >>  .hh kánu[ne:]:    [:grup,]
               .hh make.3PL.PRS  group
               '.hh they form groups,'
03 Our:            [((giggle))]
04 Mar:                        [.h Fad]ázese na min íçes ce ðiçéoma
                               ((laughing...........................................

                                'Imagine  if  you  didn't  even  have  the
               right'
05             na katévis séna karnaváli.
               ........................................))
               'to participate in the carnival.'
06 Our:        ((gig[gle.............))]
07 Mar:            [((she laughs][..............))]
08 Vag: SS >>              [kánune]   grup, ci  éçi:
                           make.3PL.PRS group and have.3SG.PRS
                           'they form groups, and it is'
09             e- ci éxun polí pláka:. jatí [parusiázune po]lí protótipa
               'eh- and they are very funny. Because they present very in-
               novative'
10  Mar?:                                 [°A::(h)        ]
11  Vag:       ármata::: me tin [   epi]cerótita,=
               'floats related to current affairs,'
12  Our:                       [°(Ne)]
               'Yes.'
```

In (5), in line 3, Katia suggests that she and her co-participants cook something. She uses a negative question in the subjunctive (>*ðen báme na majirépsume?*< 'Shall we go and cook?' or 'Why don't we cook?'), that expects a positive answer. Before recipients respond, and without an expected micro-pause after the delivery of the question, Katia initiates a new sequence by asking Eirini if she wants to eat (line 3), and does a subtopic shift. This sequence is closed down in line 8. In line 11, Katia returns to the initial action that was suspended: she uses the discourse marker *lipón* 'so' to express exhortation, and repeats the clausal TCU that she initially employed, in line 3, to implement the suggestion. The repeated clause is modified (*na páme na majirépsume?* 'shall we go and cook?'): the speaker uses the subjunctive without negation, utters the verb *páme* with emphasis, and does not deliver the clause in a rushed way. The speaker repeats the clausal TCU in the same turn (lines 12, 14) with modifications (*ðen báme stin*

guzína na majirépsume? 'shall we go in the kitchen and cook?'). She uses the negative polar question format, and refers to the kitchen, where the activity will take place. In lines 13, 15–16, Eirini and Zoi accept the suggestion. In this excerpt, clause repetition links the same speaker's current and prior turn.

(5) 01 Kat: <u>Pí</u>nasa.

'I am hungry.'

02 (1.1)

03 Kat:FS>> *>Ðen báme   na   majirépsume?<*

NEG   go.1PL.PRS SBJV cook.1PL.PFV

'Shall we go and cook?'

04 *=Rináci   θa   fa::s?=*

Eirini.DIM FUT eat.2SG.PFV

'Eirini will you eat?'

05 Eir: =<u>O</u>çi. alá θa voiθí[so ↑sti majirikí sa:s.]=

'No. but I will help you with the cooking.'

06 Kat: [<jatí ðe θa fa:s?>   ]=

'Why won't you eat?'

07 Eir: =[.h ↑jatí <u>é</u>faɣa   sí]mera:. ðe boró álo. éxo <u>ská</u>:si.
((noise starts))

'.h because I ate today. I cannot eat any more. I am full.'

08 Kat: =[avɣá me patá<u>:</u>(tes).]

'eggs with potatoes.'

09 Eir: >ce θa jíno< xo<u>dró</u>. .h o- θa voi<u>θ</u>iso ómos sti majirikí sas.
((laughing..))

'and I will get fat. .h o- but I will help with your cooking.'

10 (.)

11 Kat:SS>> *Lipón. na   <u>pá</u>me na   majirépsume?*

so   SBJV <u>go.</u>1PL SBJV cook.1PL.PFV

'So. Shall we go and cook?'
          ((noise ends))

12 SS+>> *θé[lete?   =ðen báme stin guzí]na*

want.2PL.PRS NEG   go.1PL in   kitchen(F).ACC.SG

'Do you want? Shall we go in the kitchen'

13 Zoi: [Ade. <u>pá</u>me. páme.   ]

'Come on. let's go. let's go.'

14 Kat:SS+>> *na   majirépsu[me?]*

SBJV cook.1PL.PFV

'and cook?'

15 Eir: [Ne.] =<u>pá</u>me stin guzí[na.]

                    'Yes. Let's go in the kitchen.'

16 Zoi: [Pá]me.

                             'Let's go.'

In the examples examined above, self-repetition is a tying technique that establishes contiguity between current and prior units or turns. Moreover, in (3) and (4), the repeated clause is followed by discourse-new information. Yet cohesion is not the only function associated with self-repetition. 45 of the self-repetitions found in the data have a non-cohesive function: they deal with overlapping talk, pursue a response, initiate and deliver repair, and add emphasis. These functions are illustrated with examples (6) to (8). In (6), in line 2, Yorgos asks Sotiris a question. His first TCU (*Aftó ðil<u>ó</u>nete?* 'Is this announced?') overlaps with the talk by Sotiris (line 1), and Yorgos repeats the question (*aftó ðilónete::?* 'is this announced?'), in line 3. The second saying differs from the first saying, as the verb *ðilónete::* is delivered with vowel prolongation and no emphasis. Sotiris answers Yorgos' question in lines 4–5 (*To ma<u>θ</u>énis °siníθos.* 'Usually you find out about it.'). His first TCU overlaps with Yorgos's prior turn, and Sotiris repeats the answer in the next TCU (*>siníθos< to maθénis.* 'Usually you find out about it.'). The second saying is modified. The order of clause constituents is different, as the adverb precedes the verb phrase, plus the adverb is delivered in a rushed way, and the verb with no emphasis. In this excerpt, clause repetitions compensate for recipient's possible trouble in hearing and understanding, and do not have a cohesive function.

(6) 01 Sot: [(benun) <u>ð</u>i<u>á</u>fori.   ]

                'Various people come.'

    02 Yor: FS >> ***[Aftó   ðil<u>ó</u>nete?]***

                this.NEUT.NOM.SG announce.3SG.PASS.PRS

                'Is this announced?'

    03   SS >> ***aftó ðilónete:[:?   pos to maθénis?]***

                this announce.3SG.PASS.PRS <u>how</u> it learn.2SG.PRS

                'Is this announced? How do you find out about it?'

    04 Sot: FS >>   ***[To ma<u>θ</u>énis   °siní]θos.***

                  it   learn.2SG.PRS   usually

                  'Usually you find out about it'

    05   SS >> ***>siníθos< to maθénis.°***

                usually   it learn.2SG.PRS

                'Usually you find out about it.'

In example (7), in lines 2–3, Thanasis makes a statement (*°Esí ti ɣnórises af-tín.* 'You met her.') that operates as a confirmation-seeking question, and in line 5, Telis initiates repair to resolve trouble in understanding Thanasis's turn due to overlapping talk. In line 6, Thanasis completes the repair by repeating the clause that he used in his prior turn (*°Ti ɣnórises.* 'You met her'). Telis answers the question in line 7. Thanasis's second saying is modified: the speaker utters the verb without emphasis, omits the second and third person singular pronouns, while keeping the clitic pronoun *ti* (such omissions are common in Greek conversation). The speaker uses clause repetition to offset the recipient's problem in understanding or hearing.

(7) 01 Chr: [Ne:,] mu ta pe [>°eména.° mu <u>ta</u> pe.<   ]
                  'Yes, he told me. He told me.'
     02 Th: FS >>   **[°Esí   ti   [ɣnó]ri]ses**
                                    2SG.NOM 3SG.F.ACC meet.2SG.PST
     03   **aftín.**
                                    3SG.F.ACC
                                    'You met her.'
     04 Tel: [°(Ne,)]
                                                       '(Yes,)'
     05 Tel: Eh?=
     06 Th: SS >> **=°Ti   ɣnó[rises]   .**
                  3SG.F.ACC meet.2SG.PST
                  'You met her.'
     07 Tel: [.hh   ] >O̲çi, alá mu ne san na din gzéro.
                              '.hh No, but it feels like I know her.'

In example (8), clause repetition is a practice for pursuing the recipient's response (Pomerantz 1984). In line 4, Linos asks Mara when she and the others will leave (*Mára, póte févjete (...)* 'Mara, when are you leaving (...)'). His turn overlaps with Mara's answer (line 5) to Roza's question. Mara does not respond, and Linos repeats his question in line 6 (>*P̲óte θa fíjete.*< 'When are you leaving?'), with modifications. He delivers the turn in a rushed way, with emphasis on the interrogative word, and he uses future tense. His question receives no answer, and Linos delivers the same question again in line 8 (>*P̲óte θa fíjete esís?*< 'When are you leaving?'), with a few modifications. He repeats what he said in his previous turn, adds the second person plural pronoun, and uses rising intonation. Mara ignores him, and Linos reacts with frustration in line 11. His turn functions as a summons (Schegloff 1968) that aims to secure Mara's attention and availability.

Mara responds to the summons by displaying her attentiveness in line 12. Linos repeats his question in line 13 (>*Póte tha fíjete esís.*< 'When are you leaving.'), with emphasis on the interrogative word and the second person plural pronoun, and falling intonation. Mara answers the question in line 15. In this excerpt, the speaker asks a question that anticipates a response by the recipient but the recipient does not respond. The speaker pursues an articulated response by repeating the clause that he used to implement his question, and thus uses repetition as an attention-getting device.

(8) 01 Mar: <u>Pé</u>mpti íne anixtá. ci i Kalirói éç faγoθí na páme.

          'It is open on Thursday. and Kaliroi insists that we go.'
     02   stin aγorá na psonís[i: blú]za.=

          'to the market, she wants to buy a T-shirt.'
     03 Roz: [<u>Sí</u>mera?]

               'Today?'
     04 Lin: FS >>   =***Mára, póte [févjete(.....)]***
                     Mara   when leave.2PL.PRS

          'Mara, when are you leaving (...)'
     05 Mar: [ðen ↑báo sí]:mera.=

                    'I am not going today.'
     06 Lin: SS >>   *=>Pó[te θa   fijete<]*
                     when   FUT leave.2PL.PFV

          'When are you leaving?'
     07 Mar: [↑Alá: áma]vγo na psoníso ap ti má:na,=

                'But if I go shopping for mum,'
     08 Lin: SS+ >> *=>**<u>Pó</u>te θa   fijete   es[ís?<]***
                     when   FUT leave.2PL.PFV 2PL.NOM

          'When are you leaving?'
     09 Mar: [pu] <u>θél</u>

                         'she wants'
     10   patá[es,   <u>θél</u>]

          'potatoes, she wants'
     11 Lin: [>Re su mi↑lá o re Dalára.<]

          'Hey I am talking to you.'
     12 Mar: [Ne.   ]

          'Yes.'
     13 Lin: SS+ >> *[><u>Pó</u>te θa] fijete   e<u>sís</u>.<*
                     when   FUT leave.2PL.PFV 2PL.NOM

          'When are you leaving?'

14		(0.8)
15	Mar:	ð̲e̲n gzéro, S̲á:vato?
		'I don't know, on Saturday?'
		(.)
16	Lin:	A̲::̲ >tha fíjete S̲ávato.<
		'Ah:: you are leaving on Saturday.'

Finally, self-repetition operates as a stylistic feature used for emphasis. In example (9), participants assess positively a movie they watched. In lines 4–5, Yannis refers to a scene of action that he found exciting, and he uses the interrogative clause *zi i péθane?* 'is he alive or dead?' to express the audience's suspense during the screening. In line 6, he repeats the clause twice with non-falling intonation (*zi i péθane,* 'is he alive or dead') in order to intensify the suspense. This self-repetition is semantically based and iconically motivated (cf. Norrick 1987); it indicates the speaker's emotional involvement, and has a clear emphatic function.

(9) 01 Yan: =[To pos kata]férni [i tenía xorís na] simví [<↑tí̲po]ta,>
'The movie creates such a suspense when nothing is happening,'

02 Ama: =[Polí oréo.]   [Polí̲ oréo.   ]
'Very nice. Very nice.'

03 Nik: [(Foveró.)]
'Fantastic.'

04 Yan: FS >>   *esí   na   se   étsi.   zi   i*
2SG.NOM SBJV COP.2SG.PRS like.that live.3SG.PRS or
'you are wondering. Is he alive or'

05   *péθane?*
die.3SG.PST
'dead?'

06   SS/SS+>> *zi   i   péθane,   [zi   i   pé]θane,*
live.3SG.PRS or die.3SG.PST live.3SG.PRS or die.3SG.PST
'is he alive or dead, is he alive or dead'

07   *.hh ce:*
hh and
'.hh and'

08 Nik: [(Oréo.)   ]
'(Nice.)'

We now turn to repetitions that build on the prior turn produced by a different speaker.

4.3 Repetition of a prior turn at talk

In next turns, speakers display how their current turn is connected with the prior turn produced by another speaker. Clause repetition is among the resources that speakers employ to display this connectedness. In all 57 instances of repetition of a prior turn at talk found in the data, speakers repeat clauses from prior turns produced by different speakers in order to embody their understanding of what the previous speakers did, and implement actions that respond to the just prior turn. In these cases, clause repetition is a practice that connects speaker's current turn with prior talk.

Answers to polar questions are a common interactional context in which repetitions of prior turn occur, as shown in examples (10) and (11). In this sequential position, repetition connects the speaker's current turn with prior talk and allows the speaker to claim more agency with respect to the action she is implementing (cf. Heritage & Raymond 2012). In (10), in lines 3–4, Roza asks Mara a question (*Ce ðe- ci íne tóso jelío epiçírima?* 'And not- and is it such a ridiculous argument?'). In line 5, Mara replies with the confirmation particle *ne* 'yes', and repeats the clause that Roza used in her prior turn (*íne jelío epiçírima* 'it is a ridiculous argument'), with modifications. She omits the adverb and adds emphasis on the adjective.

```
(10)  01 Mar:        t̲étça práɣmata.
                     'such things.'
      02             [aftó to len< diá:fori.        ]
                     'many people say this.'
      03 Roz: FS >>  [Ce ðe- ci íne        tó]so jelío
                     and NEG and COP.3SG.PRS so    ridiculous
                     'And not- and is it such a ridiculous'
      04      FS >>  [epiçírima?                 ]
                     argument(NEUT).NOM.SG
                     'argument?'
      05 Mar: SS >>  [Ne íne        jelío       epi]çírima,
                     yes COP.3SG.PRS ridiculous argument(NEUT).NOM.SG
                     'Yes it is a ridiculous argument,'
      06             [alá (…)]
                     'but (…)'
      07 Roz:        [↑Pé:de] çiliáðes Evr̲éi ↓ítan léi:, ecí pu ðúlevan,
                     'Five thousands Jews are said to have been working there,'
```

In example (11), Ourania replies (lines 3–4) to Chrysanthi's polar question (lines 1–2). The question is implemented via the interrogative clause *Itan- efiméreve to ˚Xadᷓzikósta?* 'Was- was the Hatzikosta hospital open?', and the answer is implemented via repetition of the clause with falling intonation (*Efiméreve to Xatzikósta.* 'The Hatzikosta hospital was open.').[3] The clause repetition in this excerpt is modified: the speaker adds emphasis on the verb, and uses falling intonation that turns the clause into a statement.

(11) 01 Chr: FS >> *Itan-*
　　　　　　　　　COP.3SG.PST
　　　　　　　　　'Was-'
　　　　02　　　　*efi[méreve　　　to　　　　　˚Xadᷓzikósta?]*
　　　　　　　　　be.on.duty.3SG.PST DEF.NEUT.NOM.SG Hatzikosta
　　　　　　　　　'was the Hatzikosta hospital open?'
　　　　03 Our: SS >>　*[.h Efiméreve　　　　　　　　　]*
　　　　　　　　　.h be.on.duty.3SG.PST
　　　　04　　　　*to　　　　　Xadᷓzikósta.*
　　　　　　　　　DEF.NEUT.NOM.SG Hatzikosta
　　　　　　　　　'The Hatzikosta hospital was open.'

Clause repetitions are also found in agreement or disagreement with a prior turn. In example (12), lines 1–2, Aleka assesses the neighborhood (*Aplós íne períerji i perioçí.* 'It's just a weird neighborhood.'), and in lines 3–4, Polychronis agrees with the assessment (*Ine períerji i perioçí.* 'It's a weird neighborhood.'). He repeats the copula clause that Aleka used in her previous turn, with emphasis on the adjective, and he omits the adverb. This slightly modified repetition is a practice for implementing an agreement with the prior turn from an "independent agentive position" (Thompson et al. 2015: 285).

(12) 01 Ale: FS >> *=Aplós íne　　　períerji　　　i*
　　　　　　　　　just   COP.3SG.PRS weird.F.NOM.SG DEF.F.NOM.SG
　　　　　　　　　'It's just a weird'
　　　　02　　　　*[perioçí.　　　]*
　　　　　　　　　area(F).NOM.SG
　　　　　　　　　'neighborhood.'
　　　　03 Pol: SS >>　*[Ine　　　perí]erji*
　　　　　　　　　COP.3SG.PRS weird.F.NOM.SG

---

[3]A declarative or subjunctive main clause in Greek can be turned into a polar question through rising intonation toward the end of the utterance.

04   SS >>   ***i   perioçí.   *** *jaftó.*
                   DEF.F.NOM.SG area(F).NOM.SG this
                   'It's a weird neighborhood. That's why.'

In example (13), clause repetition is a practice for disagreeing with the previous speaker. In line 3, Aleka makes a claim (*ta: ta riθímzi* ↑*tóra mɲa xará.* 'he keeps things- things in moderation very well.'), and in line 5, Polychronis contradicts the claim (°*ð̞e ta riθmízi.* 'He doesn't keep things in moderation)'). Polychronis utters the negated proposition expressed in the previous claim, by repeating the clause that Aleka used, omitting the adverbs and adding the negative particle before the clause.

(13)   01 Ale: ↑O̞çi. cítakse. ð̞ilað̞í, ta çi riθmísi ta práɣmata se sçési
                      'No. Look. That is, he has kept things in moderation com-
                      pared to'
       02   me to: pos ítan >(ótan eɣó)< to- to ɣnórisa,
                      'how things were (when) I met him,'
       03   FS >>   ***ta: ta   riθímzi   *** ↑***tóra mɲa xará.***
                      them them regulate.3SG.PRS now   very well
                      'he keeps things- things in moderation very well.'
       04   (1.2)
       05 Pol: SS >> °***(ð̞e ta   riθmízi.)***
                      NEG them regulate.3SG.PRS
                      'He doesn't keep things in moderation.'

Clause repetition is also used in next turns that confirm what the previous speaker said (14), receive information given by the previous speaker (15), or deliver repair within a story telling (16). In (14), participants are engaged in conversational arguing (Muntigl & Turnbull 1998). In the lines preceding the excerpt, Nionios claims that he and his peers never cooked when they were teenagers. Yannis contradicts the previous claim (lines 1–2), and asserts that he and his peers cooked (*emís to káname.* 'we did it.'). In line 4, Nionios initially confirms Yannis's claim by repeating the clause that Yannis used in his previous turn (*To káname:.* 'we did it'). The second saying that implements the confirmation is modified: the first person plural pronoun is omitted. In the next TCU, Nionios delivers a counterclaim that does not directly contradict nor challenge the addressee's claim.

(14) 01 Yan: FS >>   *O͟çi. ja͟ti   ðen do káname   emís. =**emís to káname**.*
                     no   why NEG it do.1PL.PST 1PL   1PL   it do.1PL.PST

                     'No. Why didn't we do the same? We did it.'
     02   =eɣó ðe ma[jí]reva?=

                     'Wasn't I the one cooking?'
03 Nio: [T-]
     04   SS >>   ***To k͟áname͟***:*. saf͟ós   to káname*
                     it do.1PL.PST certainly it do.1PL.PST

                     'We did it. We certainly did it'
     05   allá:: ðen do kánan óla ta peðjá::.

                     'but not all kids were doing the same thing.'

In example (15), line 2, Erato asks Yorgos if he switched the kitchen stove off, assuming that the food is ready, and in lines 4–5, Yorgos replies that he didn't because the food is not ready (*majiré°vete (akóma).* 'the food is (still) cooking.'). In line 6, Erato proposes the possible end of the sequence by claiming information receipt. Her turn is composed by three TCUs. The first TCU consists of the free-standing particle *α*, uttered with emphasis, which marks a change from not-knowing to now-knowing (similar to the English particle *oh*, Heritage 1984). In the second TCU, the speaker reuses elements from Yorgos's prior turn to express receipt of information. She repeats the adverb *tóra* 'now' and the clause that delivers the informing *majirévete °akómi.* ('it is still cooking.'), with no emphasis on the verb. In the third TCU, the speaker accepts the information via the positive token particle *ne* 'yes'.

(15) 01 Yor: ti [fajitá íçe,   ]

                    'What kind of food they served,'
     02 Era: [Eklises to má]ti?

                      'Did you switch the stove off?'
     03   (.)
     04 Yor: SS >> *O͟çi. ðe   >xriázete   **tóra:**,*
                    no   NEG need.3SG.PASS.PRS now

                    'No. I don't need to switch it off now,'
     05   ***majiré°vete   (akóma)**.<=*
                    cook.3SG.PASS.PRS still

                    'the food is still cooking.'
     06 Era: SS >> *=[A͟. >**tóra majiréve][te   akó]mi**. ne.<*
                    part now   cook.3SG.PASS.PRS still   yes

                    'Ah. now it's still cooking. yes.'

07 Sot: =[°(..........................)]
08 Yor: [°Ne   ]
                                     'Yes'

In example (16), Polychronis tells a story about a funny incident (lines 1–3, 5). He refers to the protagonists in the story via first person plural verbs *ksecinísame* 'we started', *na páme* 'to go', *ð̲e vríkame* 'we didn't find', *jirnáɣame* 'we were wandering around', and the pronoun *mas* 'us'. The collectivity introduced includes the speaker and one of the co-participants. Aleka's participation in the story events establishes her as a story consociate that shares knowledge of the story events (Lerner 1992). Story consociates can participate in the course of story delivery by continuing the story or by repairing aspects of the story and its delivery, such as trouble in the event sequencing of the story, in the delivery of the story, in story elaboration, and in the facts of the story (Lerner 1992). In line 2, Polychronis reports with uncertainty that he, Aleka and the others went to Zythos restaurant (*°ksecinísame na páme sto Zíθo°* 'were we going to Zithos?'). In lines 6–7, Aleka repairs trouble in this fact of the story. She starts her turn with the negative particle *o̲çi* 'no' that expresses her disagreement with what Polychronis said immediately before. She delivers the repair by repeating a clause that Polychronis used to refer to the specific fact of the story (*ksecinísame, h na- na páme* 'we were going'), and she adds the phrase *ja kafé* 'for coffee'.

(16)   01 Pol: = >Ce mas proécipse cólas< jatí ja̲lú ksecinísame,
                     'And it just happened to us because we started heading to
                     another place,'
       02   FS >>   °**ksecinísame na   páme** *sto Zíθo?°*
                     begin.1PL.PST SBJV go.1PL to Zitho(M).ACC.SG
                     'were we going to Zithos?'
       03 Pol: p̲ú ítane. [ð̲e] vríkame trapézi °ecí péra >ce metá,°<
                     'where was it? We didn't find a table over there and after-
                     wards,'
       04 Ale: [Ne]
                         'Yes.'
       05 Pol: (.) k̲ápos jirnáɣame, (ékane-) íçe po̲lí krío °ecíni [ti méra,]
                     'we were wandering around, it was- it was a very cold
                     day,'
       06 Ale: [O̲çi.   ]
                                                            'No.'

07	SS >>	***ksecinísame***, *h **na- na páme ja kafé**.*
		begin.1PL.PST h SBJV SBJV go.1PL for coffee
		'were we going for coffee.'

In the examples examined in this section, repetition of a prior turn at talk is a practice for responding to what the previous speaker did immediately before. Therefore, it displays the relevance between first and second pair part, and the fit between current and prior turn, and it operates as a tying technique.

4.4 Summary

To recapitulate, the analysis of clause repetitions in Greek conversation shows that the basic function of clause repetition is cohesive. Speakers often repeat clauses to display the connectedness between their current unit/turn and prior talk. Being an instance of format tying, clause repetition is deployed in various sequential contexts to carry out different social actions that respond to the just prior turn, such as answer, agreement/disagreement, confirmation, receipt of information, and repair. Moreover, the analysis demonstrates that the sequential position of clause repetition shapes the interactional functions of repetition. Self-repetition achieves cohesion in conversation as well as other interactional tasks, such as dealing with overlapping talk, pursuing a response, initiating and delivering repair and adding emphasis. On the other hand, repetition of a prior turn is routinely associated with a cohesive function. Thus, *who repeats* seems to be important for *what repetition does*. Overall, the findings reported in this study align with the findings reported by previous studies on the functions of repetition in conversation (discussed in §2).

5 From repetition to bridging constructions: Language diversity as a continuum

Although clause repetition and recapitulative linkage differ in substantial ways (cf. §1), they display certain analogies: like recapitulative linkage, clause repetition in Greek conversation involves repetition of at least the verb of the first saying and some of the elements accompanying the verb, and achieves cohesion. Moreover, both recapitulative linkage and repetition practices are discourse practices. I suggest that these analogies point to a *continuum* extending from clause repetition at one extreme to recapitulative linkage at the other extreme. In languages situated at the one extreme of the continuum clause repetition has not

been conventionalized, while in languages situated at the other extreme of the continuum clause repetition has grammaticalized into recapitulative linkage.

It is possible that recapitulative linkage constructions have emerged from repetition practices in talk-in-interaction. The hypothesis about the discourse origin of recapitulative linkage aligns with research that examines how discourse or interaction shapes grammar (Givón 1979; Hopper & Thompson 1980; Schegloff et al. 1996; Couper-Kuhlen & Selting 2001). In Bybee's words (2006: 730), "grammar cannot be thought of as pure abstract structure that underlies language use"; grammar emerges in language use and it is "epiphenomenal to the ongoing creation of new combinations of forms in interactive encounters" (Hopper 2011: 26). As a number of studies (Couper-Kuhlen 2011; Gipper 2011; Blythe 2013) demonstrate, discourse contexts motivate the grammaticalization of specific constructions. For instance, Couper-Kuhlen (2011) argues that certain grammatical constructions, such as left dislocation, concession and extraposition, have emerged from the sequential routines of mundane conversational interaction, whereby a succession of (cross-speaker) actions has been "collapsed into" a single speaker's turn. This integrated construction can be said to grammaticalize from the conversational routine. For example, Geluykens (1992), cited in Couper-Kuhlen (2011), suggests that left dislocation, in which a noun phrase is positioned initially and a reinforcing pronoun stands proxy for it in the relevant position in the sentence, has emerged from the recognition search sequence. This sequence consists of three moves in which the speaker introduces a new referent, the hearer acknowledges recognition of the referent, and the speaker elaborates upon the referent. According to Couper-Kuhlen (2011: 429), left dislocation is found in English conversation both in its independent and integrated form (layering, cf. Hopper 1991). In its independent form, the two component parts accomplish two different actions, i.e., they establish referents and elaborate upon them. In its integrated form, the two component parts are coalesced with no intervening turn or pause separating them, and they deliver one single action, that is, they are specialized for listing and contrast.

In line with these views, I suggest that recapitulative linkage emerged from conversational routines: at some point, in certain languages, repetition practices aiming at cohesion were conventionalized and became part of grammar, that is, they grammaticalized into specific resources or patterns with a productive formal representation and a consistent and predictable semantic contribution (cf. Guérin & Aiton 2019 [this volume]). Although it is difficult to provide diachronic evidence for such a hypothesis, given that we lack records of talk-in-interaction in languages with bridging constructions, we have access to some synchronic evidence that point to the discourse origin of recapitulative linkage constructions.

The first type of evidence comes from languages in which repetition is conventionalized to some extent. For example, in Tojolabal Mayan conversation, repetition has become the default backchannel response to turns delivered by other speakers (Brody 1986: 260–261). As Brown (2000: 224) claims, "this conversational practice makes Mayan conversations strike the outside observer as extraordinarily repetitive, drawing attention to the fact that tolerance for repetition in speech is *culturally*, as well as contextually, quite variable" (emphasis added). Clause repetition is a rather common conversational practice among speakers in certain languages. Due to its frequency (Bybee 2003) and cultural salience, clause repetition crystallizes into specific grammatical constructions in these languages.[4]

The second type of evidence comes from languages that employ recapitulative linkage constructions. Guillaume (2011: 112–113) reports that languages vary in terms of the functions of recapitulative linkage. Most languages use recapitulative linkage to achieve coherence in context of high thematic continuity, that is, within individual paragraphs. Yet some languages employ additional recapitulative linkage constructions specialized for major thematic breaks, that is, between distinct paragraphs. Thus, languages develop formally distinct types of recapitulative linkage for carrying out different tasks in discourse. This variation further discloses the interactionally motivated and emerging nature of recapitulative linkage. More specifically, it shows that the development of recapitulative linkage constructions involves the emergence of new forms that coexist and interact with the older forms (layering, Hopper 1991), and the specialization of meanings attached to the forms in particular discourse contexts. Both layering and specialization are distinctive characteristics of grammaticalization (Hopper & Traugott 1993).

The third type of evidence for the discourse origin of recapitulative linkage can be found in universal abstract principles governing linguistic practices in talk-interaction: nextness and progressivity (Schegloff 2006). Nextness is a relation between current and immediately following position. The production of talk is a succession of next elements, such as words, parts of words or sounds. As Schegloff (2006: 86) argues, "absent any provision to the contrary, any turn will be heard as addressed to the just prior, that is, the one it is next after". Progressivity refers to the sequential progress of interaction. Recipients orient to each next element as "a next piece in the developing trajectory of what the speaker is saying or

---

[4]Jarkey (2019 [this volume]) shows that summary linkage in White Hmong (Hmong-Mien, Laos) is limited to first person narratives and reported speech; this finding further points to the conventionalization of linkage constructions.

doing" (Schegloff 2006: 86). These two principles operate in clause repetition and bridging constructions: (a) repeats establish a relation between current and prior turn or TCU (nextness); (b) in reusing prior sayings, repeats disrupt the linguistic progressivity in talk-in-interaction, and, thus, they are examinable for their pragmatic import. That is, universal principles governing talk-in-interaction can function as constraints on "what systems can evolve", and "selectors" generating structures (Evans & Levinson 2009: 446).

By bringing together findings from languages with bridging constructions and a language in which bridging constructions are not grammaticalized, this paper demonstrates the fuzzy boundaries between bridging constructions and verbal repetition and makes a case for the discourse origin of recapitulative linkage.

Abbreviations

1	first person	F	feminine	PFV	perfective
2	second person	FUT	future	PL	plural
3	third person	NEG	negation	PREP	preposition
ACC	accusative	NEUT	neuter	PRS	present
CLIT	clitic	NOM	nominative	SG	singular
CONJ	conjunction	PART	particle	SBJV	subjunctive
COP	copula	PASS	passive		
DIM	diminutive	PST	past		

Appendix: Transcription symbols

The left bracket [is the point of overlap onset between two or more utterances (or segments of them).

The right bracket] is point of overlap end between two or more utterances (or segments of them).

The equal sign = is used either in pairs or on its own. A pair of equals signs is used to indicate the following:
(i) If the lines connected by the equals signs contain utterances (or segments of them) by different speakers, then the signs denote "latching" (that is, the absence of discernible silence between the utterances).

(ii) If the lines connected by the equals signs are by the same speaker, then there was a single, continuous utterance with no break or pause, which

was broken up in two lines only in order to accommodate the placement of overlapping talk. The single equals sign is used to indicate latching between two parts of the same speaker's talk, where one might otherwise expect a micro-pause, as, for instance, after a turn constructional unit with a falling intonation contour.

Numbers in parentheses (0.8) indicate silence, represented in tenths of a second. Silences may be marked either within the utterance or between utterances.

(.) indicates a micro-pause (less than 0.5 second).

A period indicates falling/final intonation.

A question mark indicates rising intonation.

A comma indicates continuing/non-final intonation.

Colons : are used to indicate the prolongation or stretching of the sound just preceding them. The more colons, the longer the stretching.

Underlining is used to indicate some form of emphasis, either by increased loudness or higher pitch.

The degree sign ° is used to indicate the onset of talk that is markedly quiet or soft. When the end of such talk does not coincide with the end of a line, then the symbol is used again to mark its end.

A hyphen - after a word or part of a word indicates a cut-off or interruption.

Combinations of underlining and colons are used to indicate intonation contours. If the letter(s) preceding a colon is underlined, then there is prolongation of the sound preceding it and, at the same time, a falling intonation contour. If the colon itself is underlined, then there is prolongation of the sound preceding it and, at the same time, a rising intonation contour.

The arrows mark sharp intonation contours. The upper arrow ↑ indicates sharp intonation rises, whereas the down arrow ↓ indicates sharp intonation falls.

The combination of the symbols > and < indicates that the talk between them is compressed or rushed.

The combination of the symbols < and > indicates that the talk between them is markedly slowed or drawn out.

Hearable aspiration is shown with the Latin letter h. Its repetition indicates longer duration. The aspiration may represent inhaling, exhaling, laughter, etc.

If the aspiration is an inhalation, then it is indicated with a period before the letter h.

Double parentheses are used to mark meta-linguistic, para-linguistic and non-conversational descriptions of events by the transcriber, e.g. ((laughs)).

Parentheses with dots (…) indicate that something is being said, but no hearing can be achieved.

Words in parentheses represent a likely possibility of what was said.

Acknowledgments

References

Blythe, Joe. 2013. Preference organization driving structuration: Evidence from Australian Aboriginal interaction for pragmatically motivated grammaticalization. *Language* 89(4). 883–919.

Brody, Jill. 1986. Repetition as a rhetorical and conversational device in Tojolabal (Mayan). *International Journal of American Linguistics* 52(3). 255–274.

Brown, Penelope. 2000. Repetition. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 9(1–2). 223–226.

Bybee, Joan. 2003. Mechanisms of change in grammaticization: The role of frequency. In Brian J. Joseph & Richard D. Janda (eds.), *The handbook of historical linguistics*, 602–623. Oxford: Blackwell.

Bybee, Joan. 2006. From usage to grammar: The mind's response to repetition. *Language* 82(4). 711–733.

Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth. 1996. The prosody of repetition: On quoting and mimicry. In Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen & Margret Selting (eds.), *Prosody in conversation*, 366–405. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth. 2011. Grammaticalization and conversation. In Heiko Narrog & Bernd Heine (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of grammaticalization*, 366–405. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth & Margret Selting. 2001. Introducing interactional linguistics. In Margret Selting & Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen (eds.), *Studies in interactional linguistics*, 1–22. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth & Margret Selting. 2017. Online Chapter F: Further practices with language. In *Interactional linguistics: Studying language in social interaction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. http://www.cambridge.org/files/2015/1497/6105/Online-Chapter_F.pdf, accessed 2018-8-19.

de Vries, Lourens. 2005. Towards a typology of tail-head linkage in Papuan languages. *Studies in Language* 29(2). 363–384.

Drew, Paul. 2012. Turn design. In Jack Sidnell & Tanya Stivers (eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis*, 131–149. Boston, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Evans, N. J. & Stephen C. Levinson. 2009. The myth of language universals: Language diversity and its importance for cognitive science. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 32. 429–492.

Geluykens, Ronald. 1992. *From discourse process to grammatical construction: On left-dislocation in English.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gipper, Sonja. 2011. *Evidentiality and intersubjectivity in Yurakaré: An interactional account.* Nijmegen: Radboud University PhD Dissertation.

Givón, Talmy. 1979. *On understanding grammar.* New York: Academic Press.

Goodwin, Marjorie H. 1990. *He-said-she-said: Talk as social organization among black children.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Goodwin, Marjorie H. & Charles Goodwin. 1987. Children's arguing. In Susan Philips, Susan Steele & Christine Tanz (eds.), *Language, gender, and sex in comparative perspective*, 200–248. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Guérin, Valérie & Grant Aiton. 2019. Bridging constructions in typological perspective. In Valérie Guérin (ed.), *Bridging constructions*, 1–44. Berlin: Language Science Press. DOI:10.5281/zenodo.2563678

Guillaume, Antoine. 2011. Subordinate clauses, switch-reference, and tail-head linkage in Cavineña narratives. In Rik van Gijn, Katharina Haude & Pieter Muysken (eds.), *Subordination in native South American languages*, 109–140. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Halliday, M. A. K. 1973. *Explorations in the functions of language.* London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K. & Ruqaiya Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English.* London: Longman.

Heritage, John. 1984. A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. Maxwell Atkinson & John Heritage (eds.), *Structures of social action*, 299–345. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, John & Geoffrey Raymond. 2012. Navigating epistemic landscapes: Acquiescence, agency and resistance in responses to polar questions. In Jan P. de Ruiter (ed.), *Questions: Formal, functional and interactional perspectives*, 179–192. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hopper, Paul J. 1991. On some principles of grammaticalization. In Elizabeth C. Traugott & Bernd Heine (eds.), *Approaches to grammaticalization*, 17–35. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hopper, Paul J. 2011. Emergent grammar and temporality in interactional linguistics. In Peter Auer & Stefan Pfander (eds.), *Constructions: Emerging and emergent*, 22–44. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hopper, Paul J. & Sandra A. Thompson. 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56(2). 251–299.

Hopper, Paul J. & Elizabeth C. Traugott. 1993. *Grammaticalization.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jarkey, Nerida. 2019. Bridging constructions in narrative texts in White Hmong (Hmong-Mien). In Valérie Guérin (ed.), *Bridging constructions*, 129–156. Berlin: Language Science Press. DOI:10.5281/zenodo.2563686

Johnstone, Barbara. 1994. Repetition in discourse: A dialogue. In Barbara Johnstone (ed.), *Repetition in discourse: Interdisciplinary perspectives*, 1–20. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Joseph, Brian & Irene Phillipaki-Warburton. 1987. *Modern Greek.* London: Croom Helm.

Kim, Haeyeon. 2002. The form and function of next-turn repetition in English conversation. *Language Research* 38(1). 51–81.

Lee, Seung-Hee. 2012. Response design in conversation. In Jack Sidnell & Tanya Stivers (eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis*, 415–432. Boston, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Lerner, Gene H. 1992. Assisted story telling: Deploying shared knowledge as a practical matter. *Qualitative Sociology* 15(3). 247–271.

Mackridge, Peter. 1985. *The Modern Greek language: A descriptive analysis of Standard Modern Greek.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Martin, James R. 2001. Cohesion and texture. In Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen & Heidi Hamilton (eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis*, 35–53. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Mazeland, Harrie. 2012. Grammar in conversation. In Jack Sidnell & Tanya Stivers (eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis*, 475–491. Boston, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Muntigl, Peter & William Turnbull. 1998. Conversational structure and facework in arguing. *Journal of Pragmatics* 29(3). 225–256.

Norrick, Neal R. 1987. Functions of repetition in conversation. *Text* 7(3). 245–264.

Pomerantz, Anita. 1984. Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. Maxwell Atkinson & John Heritage (eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*, 57–101. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Raymond, Geoffrey. 2003. Grammar and social organization: Yes/No interrogatives and the structure of responding. *American Sociological Review* 68(6). 939–967.

Sacks, Harvey. 1995. *Lectures on conversation*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1968. Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist* 70(6). 1075–1095.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1987. Recycled turn beginnings: A precise repair mechanism in conversation's turn-taking organisation. In Graham Button & John Lee (eds.), *Talk and social organization*, 70–85. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1996a. Confirming allusions: Toward an empirical account of action. *American Journal of Sociology* 102(1). 161–216.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1996b. Turn organization: One intersection of grammar and interaction. In Elinor Ochs, Emanuel A. Schegloff & Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), *Interaction and grammar*, 52–133. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1997. Practices and actions: Boundary cases of other-initiated repair. *Discourse Processes* 23(3). 499–545.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2006. Interaction: The infrastructure for social institutions, the natural ecological niche for language, and the arena in which culture is enacted. In N. J. Enfield & Stephen C. Levinson (eds.), *Roots of human sociality: Culture, cognition, and interaction*, 70–96. London: Berg.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2007. *Sequence organization in interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, Emanuel A., Gail Jefferson & Harvey Sacks. 1977. The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language* 53(2). 361–382.

Schegloff, Emanuel A., Elinor Ochs & Sandra A. Thompson. 1996. Introduction. In Elinor Ochs, Emanuel A. Schegloff & Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), *Interaction and grammar*, 1–51. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sorjonen, Marja-Leena. 1996. On repeats and responses in Finnish conversations. In Elinor Ochs, Emanuel A. Schegloff & Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), *Interaction and grammar*, 277–327. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stivers, Tanya. 2005. Modified repeats: One method for asserting primary rights from second position. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 38(2). 131–158.

Stivers, Tanya. 2011. Morality and question design: 'Of course' as contesting a presupposition of askability. In Tanya Stivers, Lorenza Mondada & Jakob Steensig (eds.), *The morality of knowledge in conversation*, 82–106. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stivers, Tanya & Makoto Hayashi. 2010. Transformative answers: One way to resist a question's constraints. *Language in Society* 39(1). 1–25.

Tannen, Deborah. 1987. Repetition in conversation: Towards a poetics of talk. *Language* 63(3). 574–605.

Tannen, Deborah. 1989. *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thompson, Sandra A., Barbara A. Fox & Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen. 2015. *Grammar in everyday talk: Building responsive actions.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tyler, Andrea. 1994. The role of repetition in perceptions of discourse coherence. *Journal of Pragmatics* 21(6). 671–688.

Wong, Jean. 2000. Repetition in conversation: A look at "first and second sayings". *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 33(4). 407–424.