

‘PIVOTAGE’ IN FRENCH TALK-IN-INTERACTION: ON THE EMERGENT NATURE OF [CLAUSE-NP-CLAUSE] PIVOTS

Anne-Sylvie Horlacher and Simona Pekarek Doehler

Abstract

French talk-in-interaction shows a recurrent patterning of utterances that can schematically be presented as [clause-NP-clause], as in *elle_i va s’effacer l’image_i; elle_i va s’effacer* (‘it_i is going to fade away the image_i; it_i is going to fade away’), where _i signals co-indexicality. In this pattern, the NP represents a pivot element which together with the preceding clause can be heard as forming a right dislocation ([clause-NP]), and together with the subsequent clause can be heard as forming a left dislocation ([NP-clause]). One interactionally consequential feature of the [clause-NP-clause] pattern is that it organizes specific types of units in specific ways during the temporal unfolding of talk: It allows speakers to proffer two subsequent predications about the same referent, typically within one TCU, whereby the temporally second predication may be either identical (mirror image-like pivot patterns) or different from the first. We demonstrate that speakers use the [clause-NP-clause] pivot pattern to accomplish a set of interactional jobs related to the management of repair, to stance taking, to the progressivity of talk, and to issues of reciprocity. We also show that, recurrently, the pattern is configured on-line, following an emergent trajectory which is adapted to local interactional contingencies; this is what we refer to as *pivotage* (‘pivoting’), i.e. the grammatical shaping of pivot patterns ‘in the making’. Based on these findings, we argue that the [clause-NP-clause] pivot pattern testifies to the adaptive, emergent and thoroughly temporal nature of grammar.

Keywords: Emergence; On-line grammar; Pivot; Dislocation; Speaker’s stance; Repair; Progressivity.

1. Introduction: The temporality of grammar¹

Regularly, participants in talk-in-interaction shape their turns and turn constructional units (TCUs) grammatically in ways that do not fit the established patterns of grammar. One such grammatical shaping has gained much attention in recent work in interactional linguistics and conversation analysis under the heading of “pivot construction” (or

¹ We thank Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, Ritva Laury and two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments on a previous version of this paper.

sometimes simply “pivot”². While the role and the nature of syntactic pivots³ in talk-in-interaction have recently been examined in a variety of languages, including German (Scheutz 2005; Betz 2008), Swedish (Norén 2007; Linell 2013) and English (Walker 2007; Clayman 2012), only limited attention has been paid to the on-line configuration of pivots as they emerge in response to locally occurring interactional needs (but see Norén and Linell 2013; and Pekarek Doehler and Horlacher 2013). Recent findings suggest that a key feature of how pivots work in talk-in-interaction is the concrete grammatical material they are made of and the arrangement of this material throughout the temporal unfolding of talk (Pekarek Doehler and Horlacher 2013). Such findings suggest that the term ‘pivot’ or ‘pivot construction’ refers to a family of related constructions⁴, of varying degrees of syntactic and prosodic integration, of varying degrees of sedimentation as well as of varying syntactic shape, rather than to a single construction (see also Norén and Linell 2013). This is why we choose to speak of ‘pivot pattern’ rather than of ‘pivot construction’, considering that speakers use different types of pivot patterns that may be routinized to different degrees.

In this paper, we set out to analyze pivot patterns from the vantage point of an understanding of grammar as thoroughly temporal (Auer 2007, 2009) and emergent (Hopper 1987, 2004, 2011). Such a view has two basic analytic implications.

First, it implies the central relevance of the temporal arrangement of units of talk, i.e. of what comes first and what comes next, in the very course of talk-in-interaction. Temporality here relates not only to the sequential organization of actions, but also to the moment-by-moment unfolding of units within the grammatical shaping of turns and TCUs. A given grammatical pattern or construction allows the speaker to place concrete linguistic material at specific moments within turns and TCUs in progress. The interactional import of the temporality of grammar has been demonstrated by an abundant body of research. Work on projection⁵, for instance, has shown how given units of talk allow participants to foreshadow and anticipate possible next units (or actions) and ends of these (cf. Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974). Recent studies on ‘asymmetries’ in the grammar of interaction have shown how grammatical units can be ‘positionally sensitive’: Lindström (2012) documents how Swedish *jag tycker/jag tror* ‘I think’ has different interactional effects depending on whether it is pre- or post-posed with regard to a target stretch of talk; Thompson and Couper-Kuhlen (2012) show how pro-repeat responses to informings in English of the type *did you?* or *you did?* work differently depending on how their constituents are arranged (*did you* vs. *you did*). Such evidence testifies to the fact that participants constantly orient to how both actions and

² In the literature, the term ‘pivot’ has been employed to refer to phonetic and syntactic properties of talk as well as to topic management and sequence organization: For phonetic pivots see Schegloff 1979: 275-276; for topical pivots see Schegloff and Sacks 1973; Jefferson 1984; Drew and Holt 1995, 1998; Holt and Drew 2005; for sequential pivots see Pekarek Doehler 2004; and Tanaka 2001.

³ Related phenomena have also been analyzed under the headings of *syntactic double-bind* (Franck 1985), *janus-faced utterances* (Franck 1985), *syllapse syntagmatique* (Apothéoz and Zay 2003), *echo-constructions* (Dovicchi 2010) and *apokoinou* (most recently Norén 2007; Linell 2013).

⁴ We use the term ‘construction’ to refer to patterns of language use of various size (e.g. phrase, clause, clause-combination) that are more or less routinized for the accomplishment of communicative functions/actions. Constructions often contain explicit lexical material and often are at least partially schematic (i.e., they contain schematic positions – or: ‘Slots’ – that range over a number of lexical items), and they may exhibit different degrees of compositionality (Bybee 2010, ch. 5).

⁵ Projection refers to the property of a given segment of discourse to prefigure possible trajectories of the next segment (Auer 2005; Goodwin 2002; Schegloff 1996).

linguistic structures are organized temporally, i.e. to how these unfold in real time on a moment-by-moment basis.

Second, an understanding of grammar as thoroughly temporal and emergent also implies a central analytic focus on how the grammatical shaping of turns and TCUs may be adapted, changed or expanded in the very course of its production. The syntactic trajectories of utterances can be expanded in real time (Schegloff 1996) after having reached first transition relevance points (TRPs); the construction of a single sentence can be adapted in the very course of its production in reaction to recipient actions or absence thereof (Goodwin 1979); syntactic trajectories can be revised 'on the go' to a point where the grammatical status of already produced constituents may retrospectively be re-adjusted or changed (Pekarek Doehler 2011b). These expansions, adaptations and revisions of syntactic trajectories are finely tuned to the temporal unfolding of actions: They are accomplished to accommodate local interactional needs, such as dealing with reciprocity or maximizing the progressivity of talk. This *hic et nunc* adaptability of grammar is what Hopper (2004: 153) refers to as *emergence*: "grammar is a result of interactions rather than a prerequisite to them, it is not a fixed code but is caught up in a continual process of local adaptation (emergence)".

In this paper, we set out to explore how speakers grammatically configure turns and TCUs to get some interactionally relevant job done. We focus on a specific grammatical patterning that we will call the [clause-NP-clause] pivot pattern. We demonstrate that the temporal ordering of the grammatical material which this specific pivot pattern implements – i.e. what comes first and what comes next – is decisive for the interactional work speakers get accomplished by means of that pattern. We also show that, regularly, what to the researcher is interpretable *a posteriori* as a pivot pattern is patched together by the speaker piece by piece in the very process of production, as a practical solution to local interactional contingencies. This is what we refer to as *pivotage* ('pivoting'), i.e. the grammatical shaping of pivot patterns 'in the making'. We hence are centrally interested in the speaker's *process* of producing what to the linguist may be recognizable only *post hoc* as structure, pattern, construction.

In what follows, we first provide a general picture of the syntactic, prosodic and interactional features of pivot patterns in talk-in-interaction (section 2). We then present the [clause-NP-clause] pattern, focusing on its emergent nature as it occurs in the data (section 3). In the main body of this paper, we present the analysis of four interactional uses of the [clause-NP-clause] pivot pattern in French talk-in-interaction (section 4): Managing self-repair (section 4.1), upgrading speaker's stance (section 4.2) or disagreement (section 4.3), managing the progressivity of talk (section 4.4) and dealing with lack of reciprocity (section 4.5). We conclude (section 5) by discussing our findings in the light of current research on the temporal and emergent nature of grammar (see most recently the papers collected in Auer and Pfänder 2011).

2. Pivot constructions

Following Walker (2007: 2218), a syntactic pivot can be defined as "some piece of talk [...] produced such that it can be interpreted not only as a possible end of one grammatical unit (e.g. phrase, clause, sentence), but also as a possible beginning of a next unit". In other words, pivots correspond to the B-part of [A-B-C] patterns, in which B represents both the possible end of a grammatical unit [A-B] and the possible

beginning of another unit [B-C] (Scheutz 2005; Walker 2007). Again following Walker (2007), we call [A] the pre-pivot, [B] the pivot (or pivot element) and [C] the post-pivot, and we consider this to be the researcher's *retrospective* analysis of how speakers grammatically shape their utterances in real time.

The existing literature on so called pivot constructions has provided evidence for a rich array of interactional work that speakers accomplish by means of these constructions: Self-repair (Scheutz 2005; see Schegloff 1979: 275 for prosodic self-repair), floor holding (e.g. Sacks 1992 II: 146; Walker 2002, 2007; Clayman 2012), management of overlap (for e.g. Schegloff 1987; Betz 2008), smooth topic shifts (Franck 1985; Betz 2008), etc. There is, however, some vagueness in the literature as to in how far the three parts of a pivot construction can stand alone as grammatically complete entities. According to Walker (2007: 2225), "they can only be understood as part of larger structures". However, consider the following excerpt, quoted by Walker (2007). The pivot pattern is marked in bold and the pivot element is highlighted by grey overlining:

(1) Walker (2007: 2230)

[talk has been about Ben, a mutual acquaintance of both Leslie and Kevin]

01 KEV [...] after his retirement he seems to have uh: (1.0) uh:
 02 (0.4) be benefitting (0.3) benefitting from the uh (0.2)
 03 the experien[ce
 04 LES [y:es that's right **I'm sure**
 05 **it's a weight off his mind I'm sure** .hhhhhh
 06 (0.5)

Here, *it's a weight off his mind* (l. 05) can stand alone on syntactic grounds: It is a clausal unit. As to the two *I'm sure* tokens (l. 04 and l. 05), both of them could be interpreted as markers of epistemic stance. Alternatively, however, both of the *I'm sure* tokens could in principle be interpreted as clausal units – at least in this context. Depending on its prosodic properties, Leslie's turn at line 04 could in fact be heard as coming to a possible close with her *I'm sure*; and, again depending on the prosodic properties of the stretch of talk, the second *I'm sure* could be heard as a complete clause. As a consequence, the pivot pattern in excerpt 1 could be analyzed as presenting a possible syntactic completion point after the initial *I'm sure*, another one after *it's a weight off his mind*, and, of course, a third after the second *I'm sure*. On purely syntactic grounds, then, it cannot be determined how exactly the three parts are fitted together; an analysis of the prosodic properties of the pivot pattern is needed to determine in how far its three parts can stand alone as grammatically complete entities.

The issue here is, however, that the prosodic properties of pivot patterns have received non-identical treatments in the literature. While Walker (2007: 2221) argues that genuine pivot constructions are packaged prosodically as a single unit, whose design in terms of pitch, loudness and temporal proximity mark them out as being of a piece, several other authors point out that pivot patterns may be prosodically composed of two, and even three pieces (Norén 2007; Betz 2008; Norén and Linell 2013; Pekarek Doehler and Horlacher 2013). While these latter accounts allow for the possibility of

incrementally composed pivot patterns, this is not the case for Walker's interpretation⁶.

3. 'Pivotage': Pivots as practical accomplishments

The present study is based on a database of roughly 25 hours of audio-recorded French talk-in-interaction, comprising radio phone-ins (corpus 'Horlacher'), focus-group discussions (corpus 'FNRS'), classroom interactions (corpus 'CODI') and semi-directive interviews (corpus BB⁷). The data have been transcribed following the Jeffersonian transcription conventions (see annex). The notation of prosodic features is based on auditory perception. In this section, we present the design features of the pivot pattern under analysis and in the following section (section 4) we turn to the interactional jobs speakers get accomplished by means of that type of pattern.

In our data, we see speakers configure some of their utterances in a way that shows a specific type of pivot pattern, of which a first illustration is provided in excerpt (2):

(2) **Horlacher BM20022007**

01 MAC **elle va s'effacer l'ima(ge) elle va**
it₁ is.going.to PRO.REFL fade.away the image₁ it₁ is.going.to

02 **s' effacer au fil du temps.**
PRO.REFL fade.away after a while

This stretch of talk can be represented schematically as consisting of a [clause-NP-clause] pattern in which the NP – a definite NP (highlighted in grey) – consists of a referential element that is co-indexed within each of the surrounding clauses by means of a clitic pronoun (co-indexicality is signaled with an *i*). The prosodic features of the pivot pattern mark it out as being of one single piece, thereby “abrogat[ing] the transition relevance suggested by the possible syntactic and pragmatic completion which accompanies the end of the pivot” (Walker 2007: 2225) as well as the end of the pre-pivot. Accordingly, in excerpt (2) as well as in the following excerpts, the absence of any notation regarding intonation within the pivot pattern (e.g., in ex. 2, on *s'effacer* and *l'image*) suggests that we treat the whole pattern as one TCU (see also ex. 3 below). By contrast, in those cases where the pattern is composed incrementally (see ex. 5 and 16), we do annotate intonation at the end of the initial clause of the pattern (i.e. the end of the pre-pivot) and/or at the end of the clause-NP combination (i.e. the end of the pivot element).

The prosodic packaging of the stretch prevents a hearing of the post-pivot as a restart or an independent clause. Rather, the initial clause and the following NP form a first grammatical unit that can be heard as what has classically been called a right dislocation (RD); that same NP and the subsequent clause in turn form another

⁶ In a personal communication (June 14, 2010), however, Walker states that he would not exclude incrementally configured patterns from the category of pivot constructions, although he does not find such occurrences in his data.

⁷ We thank Laure-Anne Johnsen for drawing our attention to the two excerpts taken from the Blanche-Benveniste corpus (excerpts 3, 6 and 7, quoted in their larger context as 8 and 10 below). The corpus was published as an audio CD supplement to Blanche-Benveniste *et al.* (2002); transcriptions are ours.

grammatical unit that can be heard as what has classically been called a left dislocation (LD)⁸. Accordingly, the stretch of talk quoted in (2) can be interpreted as showing a syntactic pivot pattern that amalgamates an RD and an LD⁹. We will call this type of pivot pattern the [clause-NP-clause] pattern.

In the discourse functional literature, the use of dislocated constructions has been explained by pragmatic principles related to information structure (Lambrecht 2001). The relative frequency of dislocated constructions in French, as opposed to for instance German or English, can be accounted for by the fact that other languages may use other means to address these pragmatic principles (e.g. de-accentuation in languages with flexible sentence accent, like English and German; cf. Lambrecht 2001: 1054). It is therefore also possible that the specific pattern under analysis can be found more regularly in French than in English or German.

One distinctive feature of the [clause-NP-clause] pattern is that it comprises three possible syntactic completion points, i.e. one after the pre-pivot (i.e. after the first clause: *Elle va s'effacer* 'it's going to fade away'), a second after the pivot element (i.e. after clause + NP: *Elle va s'effacer l'image* 'it's going to fade away the image') and a third, of course, after the post-pivot. This is different from other types of pivot patterns where neither the pre-pivot nor the post-pivot form in themselves grammatically complete units (such as a clause), but do so only in combination with the pivot element (see however Clayman 2012¹⁰).

This specific grammatical configuration of the [clause-NP-clause] pattern is an interactionally consequential issue. It implies that the pre-pivot does not project a range of possible next units (contrary to what is usually the case for pivot patterns); rather, it presents a syntactically complete unit in itself. Only retrospectively can the pivot element be heard as being syntactically fitted to the pre-pivot, as part of an RD. Also, in the position in which it occurs, the pivot element itself does not carry any grammatical

⁸ A dislocated construction is commonly understood as a sentence structure in which a referential element (most often a NP, *l'image* in ex. 2) is located to the left or to the right of a 'matrix' clause containing a pronoun (*elle*, in ex. 2) which is co-referential with that element. In French, the pronoun is a clitic (Lambrecht 2001), while in English it is a free morpheme (Givón 1983). The left or the right peripheral element can cover a range of syntactic categories; the co-indexical pronoun can cover a range of grammatical functions. Most frequent in French are dislocated pronominal or lexical NPs which are co-indexed within the clause as subjects or (less frequently) objects – direct or indirect. The dislocated NP is referentially definite (that is, it is a definite NP, but can be an indefinite NP in the case of generic reference, cf. Givón 1983).

⁹ To our knowledge, dislocations as pivots have not been attested so far in the rich literature on pivot constructions. See however Franck (1985) who points – en passant – to the existence of pivots as dislocated formats:

Franck (1985: 237)

01 **eerst hoor je ze de hele tijd zo'n beetje rommelen in de gang die poezen**
first you hear them all the time sort of messing around in the hallway those cats
 02 **zitten ze d'r mee te spelen**
they are having fun with them (the mice)

In this example, as Franck (1985) notes, *de poezen* 'those cats' is first heard as a postponed reference specification of the first *ze* 'them' and then as a left dislocated NP to which the second *ze* 'they' refers – implying syntactic category switching for the referential element 'those cats', which is first object of 'you hear' and then subject in 'they are having fun'.

¹⁰ Clayman (2012) shows how turn-medial address terms appearing at a point that is syntactically complete can serve as a resource for expanding turns at talk. The pivot utterances he analyzes also comprise three possible syntactic completion points. Clayman (2012: 1859) notes however that the address term is prosodically tied to the prior and the subsequent unit "so as to forge the grammatical units into a single through-produced utterance", hence the idea of *unit-bridging address terms*.

projection – which is commonly the case for pivot patterns; again, what follows the pivot element is only retrospectively analyzable as fitting what precedes, and hence as implementing a pivot pattern. In sum then, as talk unfolds in real time, an utterance mapped as [clause-NP-clause] reaches a first point (after completion of the pre-pivot) where the utterance so-far can be heard as a syntactically complete unit; it then reaches a second point (after completion of the pivot element) where the pivot element can retrospectively be heard as part of the preceding unit; finally, it reaches a third point where the post-pivot can, again retrospectively, be heard as being part of a larger unit, i.e. the entire pivot pattern.

One particularly noteworthy point about these temporal features of the pattern is that speakers can be found to 'patch it together' on a moment-to-moment basis in a locally contingent way. Excerpt 3, which we will discuss in more detail in section 4.1 and 4.2, gives a first sense of this process:

(3) BB2002

01 INF °c'es:t (0.2) c'est l'horreu:r° °°le fonctionna-
it's it's the horror DET civil.serv-

02 le fonctionnariat en médecine°° °°c'est l'horreur.°°°
DET civil.service in medicine it's the horror

This excerpt shows no prosodic breaks between the pre-pivot and the pivot element, and the pivot element and the post-pivot respectively (hence the absence of any notation of intonation at these points in the transcript; see above). By contrast, the cut-off on *le fonctionna-* 'the civil serv-' represents a prosodic break and introduces a caesura in the ongoing syntactic trajectory (*c'est l'horreu:r le fonctionna-* 'it's the horror the civil serv-'), yet what follows that cut-off is prosodically presented as a continuation of the TCU in progress (no notable upgrade or downgrade in pitch) rather than a restart. Thereby, the repaired NP (*le fonctionnariat en médecine* 'the civil service in medicine') is 'repackaged' as part of the subsequent formulation of *c'est l'horreur* 'it's the horror'. It is as if the post-pivot *c'est l'horreur* 'it's the horror' (better translated into English as 'it's a horror') was contingent on the preceding repair, i.e. was triggered by that very repair rather than being produced by the speaker as part of a ready-made pivot construction (for a more detailed analysis of this excerpt in its larger interactional environment see section 4.2 below).

A more striking case of such 'patching together' of syntactic trajectories resulting in pivot patterns is shown in (4):

(4) Horlacher AM17052004

01 MAC .h:^((smack) et nous les femmes nous avons suffisamment
and we DET women we have enough

02 d'intuition pour voi:r .h::: (0.2)le sincère du baratin
intuition to distinguish DET sincerity from sweet-talk

03 (1.3)

04 CÉD °mh[m°.

- 05 MAC [.h:((smack))mais la façon don't vous l' avez dit là
 but the way PRO.REL you PRO.3SG.DO say.PP-MASC there
 'but the way you said it there'
- 06 (0.4) **cette phra:se** (0.2) vous l' avez dite,
 this sentence you PRO.3SG.DO AUX say.PP-FEM
 'this sentence you said it'
- 07 .h: (ben) c'était très joli,
 (well) it was very nice
- 08 c'était:t superbe,
 it was wonderful
- 09 c'était (0.2) vraiment sincè:re.
 it was really sincere
- 10 (0.4)
- 11 CÉD ben merci.
 well thank you

Excerpt (4), unlike (3), does not show a self-repair on the pivot element; rather, in (4) the post-pivot repairs the pre-pivot. Up to line 09, Macha builds her turn piece by piece; each added element prolongs a trajectory initiated earlier. Lines 05-06 do not exactly show a [clause-NP-clause] pattern: The pre-pivot *la façon dont vous l'avez dit là* 'the way you said it there' is not a clause but a complex NP; it therefore cannot stand alone syntactically (nor can it stand alone pragmatically, given its sequential environment). The pivot itself *cette phra:se* 'this sentence' can be heard as anaphorically fitted to the pre-pivot, being co-referential with the pronominal object *l'* 'it' occurring within the pre-pivot; the pre-pivot plus pivot hence yield *la façon dont vous l'avez dit là (0.4) cette phra:se* 'but the way you said it there (0.4) this sentence'. Finally, the post-pivot is a clause, and the pivot NP plus the post-pivot can be heard as an LD: *Cette phra:se (0.2) vous l'avez dite* 'this sentence you said it'. The pre-pivot (l. 05), or possibly the whole pivot pattern (l. 05-06), can retrospectively be heard as related to the subsequent *c'était très joli* 'it was very nice' (l. 07) as well as to the two further assessments occurring at lines 08 and 09 based on the anaphorically interpretable *ce* 'it'.

One key feature of this complex architecture of the turn is the switch from the masculine form of the past participle *dit* 'said' (l. 05) in the pre-pivot to its feminine form *dite* 'said' (l. 06); in the post-pivot. In French, past participles that take the auxiliary *avoir* 'to have' normally agree in gender and number with the pronominal direct object that occurs *before* the auxiliary (they do not agree with the lexical direct object that occurs after the auxiliary). In the quoted excerpt, the shortened form *l'* 'it' of the pronominal third person direct object *le* 'it-masculine' or *la* 'it-feminine' does not carry any indication of gender; gender is indicated only by means of the past participles *dit* 'said-masculine' (l. 05) and *dite* 'said-feminine' (l. 06) respectively. In this sense, the formulation of the pre-pivot does not match the feminine NP *cette phra:se* 'this sentence' (l. 06); only the post-pivot, where Macha uses the feminine form *dite* (l. 06), matches that NP in gender. Consequently, excerpt (4) suggests that Macha's turn is not planned in advance: The clitic pronoun *l'* 'it' (l. 05) occurring in the pre-pivot is not produced as being co-referential with *cette phra:se* 'this sentence'. It is only after having provided the feminine NP *cette phra:se* 'this sentence' that Macha recycles *vous*

l'avez dit là 'you said it there' (l. 05) as *vous l'avez dite* 'you said it there' (l. 06) – matching the feminine form of the past participle with the preceding feminine NP. Such mismatches in gender between the pre-pivot and the pivot element, which may be adjusted in the post-pivot, are not uncommon in our data (see also excerpt 17 below). Typically, in such cases, the speaker produces a default (masculine) referential form in the pre-pivot, which then may be repaired in the post-pivot to fit the mention of the NP in the pivot. Such occurrences clearly testify to the emergent nature of the pivot patterns. Also, they show that pivots patterns provide a practical solution for dealing with repair, where the post-pivot repairs some element occurring in the pre-pivot (cf. Betz 2008; Schegloff 1979; Scheutz 2005), allowing the speaker to minimize the disruptiveness of repair, and hence to maximize the progressivity of talk (cf. Pekarek Doehler and Horlacher 2013).

The patching together of pieces of talk that retrospectively appear as pivot(-like) patterns is most strikingly illustrated in excerpt (5). Here, both the NP in line 04 and the second clause in line 07 are added incrementally, to a point that the NP seems to be 'floating' between two free-standing clauses:

(5) FNRS F, 52

01	MAR	donc c'est une^{euh}:: une discipline parmi d'autres. so it's one one discipline among others
02		(0.4)
03	VER	ouais= yeah
04	MAR	=le:: (.) euh la langue [quoi. DET-m DET-f language PRT
05	VER	[mhm
06		(0.7)
07	MAR	c'est pas quelque chose de différent. it's not something different
08	VER	non. no

The structure shown in bold does not fit the established definition of a pivot. Here, prosody indicates a TRP both at lines 01 and 04 (both: Final falling intonation). The occurrence of a TRP at line 04 is further enhanced by *quoi*, a conclusive particle in French. However, prosodically, lines 04 and 07 are designed to be continuations of the speaker's preceding talk: Their onsets match the end of lines 01 and 04 respectively in pitch (no noticeable shift in pitch). Also, praxeologically, the turn is expanded both in lines 04 and 07 in a way that makes the expansions maximally fitted to what precedes. Observably, Martha is pursuing more than a minimal uptake from Vera (which Vera offers in line 03 and 05); in lines 04 and 07 she thus "prolongs" the action she has initiated at line 01, so as to create additional points for recipient action, just as has been attested in the rich literature on increments (e.g. Tanaka 1999; Couper-Kuhlen and Ono 2007).

Taken together, excerpts (3) to (5) suggest that there are fuzzy boundaries between speakers' configuring (syntactically, anaphorically, prosodically) a given stretch of talk as a pivot pattern or not. Rather than producing a pivot, i.e. implementing some ready-made construction, speakers can be seen to be involved in a process of *pivotage*, of patching together on a moment-to-moment basis what only retrospectively may become recognizable to the researcher as a pivot pattern.

4. The [clause-NP-clause] pivot pattern as an interactional resource

In this section, we analyze the interactional renderings of the [clause-NP-clause] pivot pattern.

4.1. Post-pivot after repair: Maximizing the continuity of talk

The data show several instances of the [clause-NP-clause] pivot pattern comprising a self-repair on the pivot element. Excerpts (6) and (7) provide illustrations (ex. 6 was quoted earlier as 3):

(6) BB2002

01 INF °c'es:t (0.2) c'est l'horreu:r° °°le fonctionna-
it's it's the horror DET civil.serv-

02 le fonctionnariat en médecine°° °°c'est l'horreur.°°°
DET civil.service in medicine it's the horror

(7) BB2002

01 DOC c'est un support °quoi° en fait euh le-le restau :^le café
it's a support PRT actually the-the restau the coffee(shop)

02 c'est °le support°.
it's the support

The quoted excerpts have at least four characteristics in common. First, the pivot element is self-repaired. Second, the pivot pattern corresponds to what is commonly called a mirror-image construction¹¹: The pre-pivot clause is recycled identically or quasi-identically in post-pivot position. Third, the pivot pattern is prosodically compact, that is: The pivot element is prosodically presented as a continuation of the pre-pivot, and the post-pivot as a continuation of the pivot (no notable upgrade or downgrade in pitch); also, while the cut-offs in line 01 create a caesura, what follows those cut-offs is again prosodically presented as a continuation of the TCUs in progress. Fourth, there is decreased volume on the post-pivot (in ex. 6 volume decreases continuously throughout the quoted stretch of talk). It is also noteworthy that both (6) and (7) carry an evaluative dimension, which we will not further comment on (but see section 4.2), as this is not a typical feature of pivot patterns comprising a repair on the pivot element.

¹¹ A mirror-image construction is "a symmetrical construction with B as its axis, where A and C are literally or at least semantically identical" (Franck 1985: 238; see also Scheutz 2005; Betz 2008).

The four features mentioned above, i.e. the fact that there is repair on the pivot element, the symmetry between pre- and post-pivot, the decreased volume on the post-pivot and the prosodic integration of the whole pattern, suggest that what is at issue here is the speaker's optimizing the integration, both prosodic and syntactic, of the repaired element into the ongoing talk. This is in line with earlier work suggesting that speakers use pivot patterns "in order to insure and stabilize the textual cohesion [by repeating] neighboring parts of the utterance which preceded the problematical section" (Scheutz 2005: 120; see also Norén 2007; Betz 2008). In our excerpts, through the repetition of the pre-pivot in the post-pivot, speakers display the resolution of the trouble source and close the ongoing action trajectory: As talk unfolds across time, the speaker produces a stretch of talk that is recognizable as an RD, but encounters trouble on the right peripheral NP, the repair of which introduces a slight caesura (cut-offs and recycling of material) in the flow of talk; after repairing that NP, the speaker immediately recycles the pre-pivot clause, thereby integrating the repaired NP maximally with the subsequent clause, by means of a configuration that can be heard as an LD. The decreased volume on the post-pivot may possibly be indicative of this being a move toward closing down of the action trajectory (see also section 4.2 below). The post-pivot can hence be interpreted as contingent on the occurrence of repair on the preceding NP: It is the occurrence of repair that seems to trigger the recycling of what precedes the repair. The ensuing pivot pattern appears to be a practical solution for organizing repair in a way so as to maximize progressivity of talk. Rather than implementing a ready-made constructional schema, the pivot pattern is the emergent product of the speaker's dealing with local interactional contingencies, as they occur throughout the temporal unfolding of turns and TCUs.

4.2. [clause-NP-clause] patterns as assessments: Upgrading speaker's stance

The [clause-NP-clause] pattern may be built in a way so as to present the pivot (the NP) as an assessable, while filling the clause with an assessment segment (plus a pronominal mention of the assessable), as shown for instance in excerpt (6) quoted earlier: *C'est l'horreur* 'it's the horror'. In the data, speakers use symmetrical pivot patterns to stress their stance, and they use non-symmetrical pivot patterns to upgrade their stance, by presenting in post-pivot position an assessment segment that is a (slightly) modified version of the pre-pivot assessment segment. We did not find any assessments in post-pivot position that would present a downgraded version of the assessment in pre-pivot position.

Excerpt (8), of which lines 08-10 were quoted earlier as excerpt (6), is taken from an interview with a nurse. ENQ is the interviewer, INF the nurse:

(8) BB2002

- 01 ENQ .h:- vous travaillez (.) dans un dispensaire?
you are.working in a dispensary
- 02 INF alors le mati:n, euh j' vais à l'hôpita:l, (0.2)
so in.the morning I go to the hospital

- 03 eu:h j' vai:::s aussi eu:h d:eux matinées
I go also two mornings
- 04 dans un dispensai:re,
to a dispensary
- 05 et pui:s eu:h .h (0.6) >finalement
and then finally
- 06 j' me suis installée quand même<,
I settled down nonetheless
- 07 (0.6) pour des raison:s euh purement financières,=
for purely financial reasons
- 08 =parce que sinon °c'es:t (0.2) c'est l'horreu:r° °°le
because otherwise it's it's the horror the
- 09 **fonctionna- le fonctionnariat en médecine°° °°°c'est l'horreur.°°°**
civil.serv- the civil.service in medicine it's the horror
- 10 (0.3)
- 11 INF .h: (0.2) donc eu::h (0.6) j' travaille
so I'm working
- 12 régulièrement, (0.6)
regularly
- 13 et: à chaque fois ça: (euh)je:- j'suis stressée.
and each time it I I'm stressed

As a response to the interviewer's question (l. 01), the nurse starts enumerating aspects of her professional life. In the course of her turn, she shifts from descriptive statements (she goes to the hospital, she goes to the *dispensaire*¹², she settled down for financial reasons) to a strongly evaluative statement that she presents as an account for what precedes (see the *parce que* 'because' at the start of l. 08). Assessments have been shown in earlier work to occur frequently in sequence closing sequences (Drew and Holt 1998; Schegloff 2007: 186-187). The assessing account here is closing implicative, as manifest in the decreasing volume and the final intonation (l. 09) (see Pekarek Doehler, De Stefani and Horlacher 2011, for the complementary distribution of LD and RD in sequence closing sequences). It is shaped as a strong negative assessment of the type of profession held by the nurse: *C'est l'horreur le fonctionnariat en médecine c'est l'horreur* 'it's the horror the civil service in medicine it's the horror'. The strength of the assessment is possibly enhanced by the sound stretch on *l'horreu:r* 'the horror' in pre-pivot position (l. 08), as well as the repetition of the assessment *c'est l'horreur* 'it's the horror' in post-pivot position. The pivot pattern here (for comments on prosody see ex. 3 above) clearly contributes to stressing the speaker's stance with regard to the object of the assessment, while at the same time maximizing the continuity of talk after repair on the assessable (see section 4.1 above).

Norén (2007) has observed similar features of pivot patterns used for assessments. He notes that assessments are a kind of action that participants tend to emphasize and

¹² A health clinic that offers free treatment, especially designed for poor people.

confirm by the use of *apokoinu* (in his terminology). Norén quotes examples that are different from ours in that the pivot element contains the assessment segment proper while the assessable, often in pronominal form, occurs in combination with the verb in the pre- and the post-pivot:

(9) Norén (2007: 246)

07 BM3 >men de e väldigt< lättsmält musik >e re<.
but it is very easy-digested music is it
'but it's very undemanding music it is'

Here, the speaker extends the assessment with a full recycling of the subject and finite verb in reversed order: *de e* and *e re*. Norén (2007: 247) states that "the retro-constructing post-pivot is mainly used in order to confirm and strengthen the assessment and make it more salient as a topic for following talk". This confirming effect is even stronger in the cases found in our data, as it is the whole assessment segment that is proffered twice on behalf of the same assessable.

The twofold proffering of the assessment segment also allows for the possibility of upgrading the assessment in post-pivot position. This is illustrated in excerpt (10), taken from an interview with a medical doctor (DOC) (lines 10-12 have been quoted earlier as excerpt 7):

(10) BB2002

01 DOC [...] on leur rend visite,
we to.them pay visit

02 (euh) on les aide eu::h dans leurs démarches,
we them help in their efforts

03 et ils en ont à faire quoi pour les::
and they have a lot to do PRT for the

04 point de vue administratif?
from an administrative point of view

05 (0.9)

06 DOC et puis on: sort avec eu:x,
and we go.out with them

07 on va même eu::hm^au restauran:t,
we even go to the restaurant

08 on va boire un ve::- (.) un p'tit café?
we go and have a drin- a small coffee

09 (1.4)

10 DOC c'est une façon
it's a way

- 11 dison:s **c'est un support** °quoi° en fait euh
 let's.say it's a support PRT actually
 'let's say it's supportive actually'
- 12 **le- le restau:^le café** c'est °le support°.
 the- the restau the coffee(shop) it's the support
 'the restaurant the coffee(shop) it's supportive'
- 13 (0.8)
- 14 DOC c'est pour eu::h continuer à discuter avec eux,
 it is to continue to discuss with them
- 15 pour voir s'ils se sont bien intégrés à l'extérieur.
 to see if they are well integrated outside

Similarly to what we have observed in excerpt (8), the speaker here shifts from enumerating aspects of her professional life (in l. 01-08 she lists items related to her daily routine with patients) towards an assessment. The doctor's team taking patients out for meals or coffee (l. 06-08) is presented as being supportive of the patients (l. 11-12). In this context, *c'est un support* 'it's a support' can clearly be heard as positively assessing the team's attending to the patients. Note also that the whole pivot pattern is here again packaged prosodically as a single unit (no final intonation after the pre-pivot or the pivot element; no upgrade or downgrade of pitch at the start of the pivot or the post-pivot, nor of the repair). Like in excerpt (8), the assessment closes down her turn: It ends on final falling intonation, and lower volume, and it is followed by a 0.8 second pause, after which the sequence is reopened in line 14. Again, the assessing nature of the speaker's statement is enhanced by its being formatted as a [clause-NP-clause] pivotal pattern, whereby the assessment segment is produced twice, occurring both in pre- and in post-pivot position. Interestingly, however the post-pivotal assessment segment does not simply reproduce the pre-pivotal assessment segment. Rather it upgrades it verbally (yet not prosodically; see the decrease in volume) by means of a shift from *c'est un support* 'it's a support' to *c'est le support* 'it's the support'. This shift confers an exclusive value to the object of evaluation: Taking patients out for coffee offers not merely *one* support among others but it offers *the* support, and in particular *the* support that the doctor's team can provide. It is as if the doctor was saying: This is the best we can do. In the light of the strong evaluative stance taken by the doctor, the lack of uptake on the part of her co-participant, as evidenced in the 0.8 second pause in line 13, indicates a striking absence of alignment. To this the doctor reacts by self-selecting to present further explanations of the support that she offers (l. 14-15).

As shown in excerpts (8) and (10), because of its specific syntactic composition as clause + NP + clause, the [clause-NP-clause] pattern is particularly suited for allowing the speaker to insist on his or her stance by proffering two assessment segments with regard to one single assessable within one and the same TCU. This point can be corroborated by a quick glance at a pivot pattern whose syntactic material (clause & 'dislocated' NP) is the same as for the [clause-NP-clause] pattern, but where this material is arranged differently, namely [NP-clause-NP].

In another study on pivot patterns (Pekarek Doehler and Horlacher 2013), we analyzed speakers' use of [NP-clause-NP] pivot patterns (where the NPs are co-

referential, and are co-indexed within the clause by a pronoun). We have shown that speakers use a highly sedimented [NP-clause-NP] format for proffering assessments. The prosodic features of the format mark it out as being of one single piece. Excerpts (11) and (12) show representative instances of these assessing pivot patterns:

(11) Horlacher BM07022007

01 BRI parce qu'il y a tellement d'hypocrisie,
because there is so much hypocrisy
02 et ça- ça c' est eu:h c' est affreux ça.
and DEM_i CLI.N_i is CLI.N_i is awful DEM_i.
'and that's awful'

(12) CODI secII J-M 3 127

01 CLA ça c' est un peu provocateur ce que vous dites.
DEM_i CLI.N_i is a bit provocative [what you say]_i
'what you're saying is a bit provocative'

In the quoted excerpts, the initial NP is typically a demonstrative pronoun, and the final NP is also a demonstrative pronoun. The pivot element consists of [neuter clitic + copula + evaluative adjective] combination implementing a full clause. As opposed to the [clause-NP-clause] pivot pattern discussed in this paper, the assessment in excerpts (11) and (12) is expressed in the pivotal 'matrix'-clause and, therefore, is proffered only once. Consequently, this type of pattern – though being equally formatted as a pivot – is not designed to strengthen the speaker's stance. Based on its relatively stable lexico-semantic features and its recurrence in the data, we have interpreted the pattern as a relatively sedimented format for proffering assessments in spoken French.

A critical implication ensues from this short comparison, namely the interactional consequentiality of the grammatical material that pivot patterns are made of, and of the way they allow speakers to organize that material in very course of their utterances. The [clause-NP-clause] and the [NP-clause-NP] pivot pattern respectively map units of talk in specific ways onto the temporal unfolding of turns and TCUs; accordingly, they allow speakers to accomplish different interactional jobs, in different sequential environments. One of the interactionally most consequential features of the [clause-NP-clause] is that it allows the speaker to proffer two predications on behalf of the same referent within a single TCU. This makes the pattern particularly apt to be used for proffering an assessment and upgrading that assessment within the same breath so to say.

4.3. [clause-NP-clause] patterns in dispreferred responses: Upgrading disagreement

We have just established that the grammatical compositionality of the [clause-NP-clause] along with its temporal properties allow speakers to proffer two predications on behalf of the same referent within a single TCU (see section 4.2 above). This very property makes the pattern also particularly suitable to be used for proffering a dispreferred response and then insisting on that response or upgrading it, again within

the same breath. A first illustration of such a use is offered in excerpt (13), taken from a radio phone-in. Christophe has been talking about his difficulties in dating girls because of a strong attachment he has to a past love. To this Macha, the hostess, reacts with a confirmation request (l. 01-03):

(13) Horlacher BM20022007

- 01 MAC .h: (0.2) mais l'image est toujours là,
but the image is still there
- 02 (0.3) l'image de l'autre,
the image of this person
- 03 (0.3) [est toujours là.
is still there
- 04 CHR [voilà.
right
- 05 (0.2)
- 06 CHR parce que^{eu::h} parce [que^{eu::h} xx
because because
- 07 MAC [oui mais
yes but
- 08 **elle va s'effacer l'ima(ge) elle va**
it₁ is.going.to PRO.REFL fade.away the image it₁ is.going.to
'it is going to fade away the picture it is going to'
- 09 **s'effacer au fil du temps.**
PRO.REFL fade.away along course of time
'fade away over time'
- 10 .h:: parce qu' vous pouvez pas passer votre^{eu}-
because you cannot spend your
- 11 vous êtes très jeune,
you are very young
- 12 (.) .h: (0.2) vous allez pas souffrir d'amou:r comme ça eu:h
you are not going to suffer for love like that

While Christophe confirms (l. 04) that he is still haunted by the strong image of his past love, and then starts to provide an explanation (l. 06), Macha objects that the image will end up fading away (l. 07-09). Her turn is formatted as a dispreferred next action; it comes in late with regard to Christophe's confirming *voilà* 'right' (but is produced in overlap with his turn extension). It starts with *oui mais* 'yes but' and takes the shape of a pivot pattern¹³. As mentioned earlier (ex. 2, section 3), the pattern is produced

¹³ The presence of the reflexive pronoun *se* 'herself/himself/itself', here shortened to *s'*, unmistakably qualifies the subject pronoun *elle* 'she' and the left peripheral (feminine) NP *l'image* 'the image' as co-referential, hence inducing a reading of *l'image* 'the image' as left dislocated element (by contrast, the absence of the reflexive pronoun would induce a non-coreferential reading, suggesting that *l'image* 'the picture' is the grammatical object 'elle va effacer...' 'she will efface ...').

prosodically as a single unit, with no TRP occurring in the course of its production; a TRP is reached only at its very end. The repetition of *elle va s'effacer* 'it is going to fade away') in post-pivot position can be understood as displaying Macha's insistence while at the same time allowing the speaker to specify the temporal dimension of the fading away: *Au fil du temps* 'over time' (l. 09).

Similar features can be observed in excerpt (14). A group of students living in the French speaking part of Switzerland and learning German as a second language debates the possibility of establishing a letter exchange with a group of partners who speak German:

(14) Corpus FNRS E, 1536-1571

- 01 AME [...] on: on leur parlerait en:: en allemand.=
us we would speak to them in in German
- 02 MON voilà.
there you go
- 03 (0.2)
- 04 AME [donc ça:-
so it
- 05 MON [pis eux ils parleront français?
and them they would speak French
- 06 (0.3)
- 07 AME (non) ils peu[vent pas.
(no) they can't
- 08 MON [voilà.
[there you go
- 09 (0.6)
- 10 MON pourquoi?
why
- 11 AME parce qu'ils apprennent l'anglais.
because they learn English
- 12 (1.3)
- 13 MON où?
where
- 14 AME ben (0.2) ((smack)) `h:: (.) en:: en allemagne,
well in in Germany
- 15 (.) ils appr- [ils apprennent en anglais.
they lear- [they learn in English
- 16 MON [a:h ouais mais (ça pourrait être) en
[ah yeah but (it could be) in

- 17 suisse alémanique?
German-speaking Switzerland
- 18 (0.8)
- 19 AME ouais euh ouais s: mais **c'est pas la même chose en fait**
yeah yeah but it's not the same thing actually
- 20 **l'allemand et puis le: le suisse allemand**
DET German and then DET Swiss German
- 21 **c'est quand même pas la même chose.=**
it's really not the same thing
- 22 MON =non mais ils peuvent parler en allemand les
no but they can speak German the
- 23 [suisses allemands.
Swiss Germans
- 24 AME [ouais ouais °j'sais°
yeah yeah I know
- 25 (0.6)
- 26 MON euh benoît?
Benoît

In line 01, Amélie suggests that they would talk (i.e. write) to their colleagues in German (meaning standard German). After some negotiations about what language their German speaking partners would write in (Germans learn English as a second language), Monica suggests that they could as well establish an exchange with Swiss Germans (whose second language is French). Amélie's subsequent turn (l. 19-21) bears typical traits of a dispreferred turn format (Pomerantz 1984): It comes in late (see the 0.8 second pause at l. 18), it starts off somewhat hesitantly, and it is patterned as a 'yes but' response. Thereby, her objection *c'est pas la même chose en fait l'allemand et puis le: le suisse allemand*, 'it's not the same thing actually German and Swiss German' is pushed further back into the turn. The pivotal patterning of this objection here again contributes to displaying Amélie's insistence and the pivot pattern is again delivered without prosodic break. Most importantly, just like in excerpt 13, the post-pivot does not simply copy the pre-pivot. The added particle *quand même*, replacing the *en fait* occurring in the pre-pivot, confers an evidential tone to the predication, thereby upgrading the disagreement. Indeed, as it stands in line 19, the *en fait*, much like English 'actually' or 'as a matter of fact', conveys that the current speaker presents the information provided (or the stance taken) as being in some sense new for his or her co-participant, yet related to preceding talk. By contrast, as it stands in line 20, the *quand même*, similarly to English 'really', conveys that the current speaker treats the information provided or the stance taken as evident.

In sum, the [clause-NP-clause] pattern allows speakers to proffer two predications concerning the same referent within one TCU (but, as shown in excerpt 5 above, it can also be composed incrementally; see section 4.5). Additionally, symmetrically built [clause-NP-clause] patterns, by implementing the same predication two times, lend

themselves to insisting on and enhancing the speaker's stance. In this section we have observed this property for the occurrence of [clause-NP-clause] patterns in dispreferred responses and have shown in the preceding section (4.2) similar effects for assessments. Slight changes in the predication allow speakers to adjust online what they are saying and doing. This may have the effect of upgrading a disagreement (or an assessment) in the post-pivot. Of course, downgrading effects may be possible, but we did not find any clear occurrences of downgradings in post-pivot position in our data (one may possibly argue that the specification of *au fil du temps* 'over time' may be heard as a downgrading in excerpt 13; but it can also be heard as upgrading, suggesting something like: It will take time!). This is a particularly interesting issue for the case of dispreferred responses. In dispreferred responses shaped as [clause-NP-clause] pivot patterns, the stronger version of the disagreement occurs in the post-pivot position, and thereby is pushed far back into the speaker's turn. Dispreferred responses cast as pivot patterns hence open the possibility for proffering two versions of the response packaged into a single TCU, but ordered sequentially so that the weaker version comes first and the stronger version comes last. [clause-NP-clause] patterns therefore provide speakers with a practical resource for dealing with the general conversational principle of the preference for agreement and contiguity (Sacks 1987; Pomerantz 1984; Bilmes 1991).

4.4. Doing two things at once: The use of [clause-NP-clause] patterns for managing the progressivity of talk

So far we have discussed three types of usage speakers make of [clause-NP-clause] patterns in talk-in-interaction. In these cases, in which the pattern is either symmetrical or near-symmetrical and where the lexico-grammatical shape of the pre-pivot and its contents may be re-adjusted in the post-pivot, pre- and post-pivot belong to the same action type. In this section, we discuss occurrences of the [clause-NP-clause] pattern where the pre-pivot and the post-pivot implement two clearly distinct predications and may accomplish two distinct actions (e.g. question and response). Due to the fact that, by means of the [clause-NP-clause] pattern, speakers can attach two different predications to the same referent, this pattern lends itself particularly well to enhancing the progressivity of talk. Excerpt 15 is taken from a French as a second language classroom. The excerpt provides an illustration of the fact that pivot patterns allow speakers to ask a question and provide an answer to it within the same TCU (see also Walker 2007).

(15) Corpus CODI L2-secII-JM-5, 502-508

((laughters: 2.4))

- 01 PRO et (2.5) entêté= ((writes on blackboard))
and stubborn
- 02 SEL =was heisst das?= ((in German))
what does it mean
- 03 PRO =qu'est-ce que c'est entêté=c'est quand a-
what it is stubborn is is when
'what is it stubborn it is when'

- 04 **quand on a sa propre tête,**
 when you have your own head
 `when you have your own mind'
- 05 *et on veut faire à sa tête, (.) °hein° c'est (1.0)*
 and we want to do as we want PRT it is
- 06 KAI °stur° ((in German))
 stubborn
- 07 PRO *oui (.) oui*
 yeah yeah

In the start of the excerpt (l. 01), the teacher brings up the French word *entêté* 'stubborn' and writes it down on the blackboard. Séline then inquires, in German, about the meaning of the word (l. 02), to which the teacher reacts by re-casting the question in French (l. 03), and immediately providing a definition (l. 03-04). The prosodic features of the pivot pattern mark it out as being of one single piece, thereby preventing us from hearing a TRP at the end of the pivot element (cf. Walker 2007: 2225). The pivot element *entêté* 'stubborn'¹⁴ is co-indexed both in the pre-pivot and in the post-pivot by means of the neuter clitic pronoun *ce* 'it' (here shortened to *c'*; see De Stefani and Horlacher 2005, for the frequent use of dislocated constructions in definition inquiries). The excerpt hence makes a strong case for pivot patterns providing speakers with a practical solution for enhancing the progressivity of talk by allowing them to accomplish two actions in one stroke.

This of course is a more general feature of pivot patterns, and can be done by other configurations than the [clause-NP-clause] pattern discussed here, as illustrated in excerpt 16. The excerpt is taken from a classroom discussion between high school students on the theme of adolescents' developing a critical stance and independence from their parents. The pivot pattern is here again prosodically delivered as a single piece:

(16) CODI L1 secII E03, 226

- 01 LUC & ben la- la soeur de mon copain par exemple?
 well my friend's sister for example
- 02 *elle a des parents super mais elle vote +U-D-C, ((spelling))*
 she has great parents but she votes U D C¹⁵
- 03 (0.3) *tu sais pas pourquoi?*
 you don't know why
- 04 [*mais euh y a des choses comme ça?*]
 but there are things like that
- 05 STU [((laughter and comments))]

¹⁴ Grammatically speaking, *entêté* 'stubborn' is of course not a NP; however, in its current use referring to the meaning of *entêté*, the clitic pronouns in the pre- and the post-pivot are clearly interpretable as co-indexical with that element.

- 06 LUC >pis je pense que< **ça c' est une maturité c'est-**
and I think that PRO.DEM_i CLI.3N_i is a maturity₁ CLI.3N₂ is
'and I think that that's also a maturity means'
- 07 **aussi de pouvoir TE VOIR TOI en tant que personne, (.)**
also to be.able.to you see yourself as person
'also being able to see yourself as a person'
- 08 pis: ben par rapport aux parents justement
and well in relation to the parents exactly
- 09 c'est de pouvoir aimer ses parents, (.)
it's to be able to love your parents
- 10 toujours en tant que parents,
always as parents
- 11 parce que c'est toujours tes parents,
because it's always your parents
- 12 mais de pouvoir les percevoir après en tant que personnes ?
but to be able to see them afterwards as persons

Here, neither the pre-pivot nor the post-pivot can stand alone (they are not clauses). Yet, the same NP *une maturité* 'a maturity' is syntactically exploited to form a full clause both together with the pre-pivot (*ça c'est une maturité* 'that's a maturity') and with the post-pivot (*une maturité c'est aussi de pouvoir TE VOIR TOI en tant que personne*, 'maturity also means being able to see yourself as a person'). Both of these segments offer an element of definition of what maturity means. Interestingly, the pivot here embodies a topic transition from the specific case of a friend's sister (the case is quoted in l. 02-04, and then referred to via the discourse anaphoric *ça* 'that' in line 06) to a more general and abstract definition of maturity. This shift from the specific to the generic is significantly incorporated in the two distinct readings that the NP *une maturité* 'a maturity' obtains in combination with the pre-pivot and the post-pivot respectively. The pre-pivot and pivot taken together, *ça c'est une maturité*, translate as something like 'this is a (kind of) maturity', where the NP receives an attributive reading. By contrast, in the pivot and post-pivot combination, *une maturité c'est aussi de pouvoir TE VOIR TOI en tant que personne*, 'maturity also means being able to see yourself as a person' the same NP receives a generic reading. By the same token, *une maturité* changes its status from subject complement in the [pre-pivot + pivot] *ça c'est une maturité* 'that's a maturity' to being co-indexed by the subject clitic *c'* (neuter) in the post-pivot *c'est aussi de pouvoir TE VOIR TOI en tant que personne*, 'it also means being able to see yourself as a person'. Here, then, we witness an on-line reconfiguration of both the grammatical function and the referential reading of the same pivot element – a reconfiguration that is done retrospectively, by means of the re-exploitation of the same NP in the post-pivot.

4.5. Incrementally composed [clause-NP-clause] pivots: Fishing for reciprocity

As noted in section 2, one of the distinctive features of the [clause-NP-clause] pivot pattern is that it comprises three possible syntactic completion points, one after the pre-

pivot and one after the pivot element, plus of course one after the post-pivot. It follows from this property that the [clause-NP-clause] pattern can be composed by means of two incremental strokes, as illustrated above in section 3 (ex. 5). In this section we turn to such incrementally composed pivot patterns. These show a different prosodic packaging than the excerpts discussed so far in section 4: They are prosodically delivered as being composed of several units.

Excerpt (17) shows an occurrence of an incrementally composed pivot-like pattern. Cécile is complaining about men and their cowardice:

(17) Horlacher (2007: 127)

- 01 CEC [...] même si on est des femmes,
[...] even if we are women
- 02 et qu'on a l'air fragile,
and that we look fragile
- 03 donc eu:h .h: on peut encaisser beaucoup de choses,
(so) we can bear a lot of things,
- 04 et: (euh) .h et je pense que beaucoup de femmes préfèrent euh
and and I think that many women prefer
- 05 [effectivement [euh .h des démarches un peu franches [quoi.&
in fact moves that are a bit frank PART&
- 06 MAC [.h [et je ne sais pas c'est s- xx [ouais
and I don't know it's yeah
- 07 CEC &une démarche de franchise et [d'honnêteté: euh[.h:bon
a matter of frankness and honesty well
- 08 MAC [ouais [je ne sais pas
yeah I don't know
- 09 si: on est: les hommes savent
if we are men know
- 10 à quel point nous pouvons être fragiles,
to which extent we can be fragile
- 11 et même si on le montre pas.
even if we don't show it
- 12 (1.4)
- 13 MAC ((smack)) **parce qu'on le montre de moins en moins?**
because we it_i show from less to less
'because we show it less and less'
- 14 (0.4)
- 15 MAC **notre fragilité?**
our fragility_i
'our fragility'

- 16 MAC (.) .h: **c'est pas la mode?** .h::
it's not the fashion
'it's not fashionable'
- 17 CEC non:=
no=
- 18 MAC =mais [on devrai:t .h alors on-
=but we should so we
- 19 CEC [c'est pa::s c'est parce qu'on a tort voyez?
it's not it's because we are wrong you see

Cécile argues that although women look fragile, they can bear much trouble (see l. 02-03). At lines 08 to 11, Macha starts to disalign with Cécile, suggesting that men may not know to what point women can be fragile. Macha's turn ends on a TRP marked by final intonation, and is followed by a lack of uptake on the part of her co-participant (see the 1.4 second pause at line 12). Macha subsequently offers an account of her preceding statement: *Parce qu'on le montre de moins en moins* 'because we show it less and less' (l. 13), in which the personal pronoun *le* 'it' anaphorically relates back to women's being fragile (*être fragiles* 'be fragile', line 10). Her turn again reaches a TRP, but still does not receive any uptake on the part of Cécile (see the 0.4 second pause at line 14). Macha then expands her turn by adding *notre fragilité* 'our fragility' (l. 15). Given its sequential context, this incrementally added NP can be heard as being co-indexical with the preceding clitic pronoun *le* 'it' in *on le montre de moins en moins* 'we show it less and less'. It is hence referentially and syntactically fitted to the preceding clause as a right peripheral element within what can syntactically be interpreted as a RD. The incrementally added NP appears to offer a second relevant place for recipient reaction ('recompletion', according to Tanaka 1999; see Horlacher 2007, 2012 for such uses of incrementally composed RD). At the same time, the lack of morpho-syntactic agreement between the masculine *le* 'it' and the feminine *notre fragilité* 'our fragility' is symptomatic for a subtle on-going transformation of the reference, shifting from women's state of being fragile to women's fragility. By means of the increment Macha hence adjusts the reference of the earlier cliticized pronoun, in a manner similar to what we have observed in excerpt (4) above.

After the incrementally added *notre fragilité* 'our fragility', which again ends on final intonation (here: Rising), Cécile still does not show any reaction. In the absence of Cécile's uptake, Macha further expands her turn by adding another clause containing a clitic pronoun (*c'*) that is co-referential with the preceding *notre fragilité* 'our fragility': *C'est pas la mode* 'it's not fashionable' (l. 16). Only now does she receive a recipient reaction from Cécile (l. 17), while she projects further talk (see her in-breath in line 16). Although *notre fragilité* 'our fragility' might not be strictly interpretable as a left-peripheral NP with regard to "*c'est pas à la mode*" 'it's not fashionable' because it is prosodically disintegrated from that segment of talk, it still appears as referentially and pragmatically related to both the preceding and the subsequent clauses. Its interpretation as a pivot-like element is in line with Betz's (2008: 22) observation about turn expansions as pivot elements: "After such an expansion, the speaker produces further talk, prompting a reanalysis of the expansion as a first element in a new construction".

In short, Macha's successive add-ons prompt a reanalysis of the increment in line 15 as a 'floating' element that is anaphorically related both to the preceding and to

the subsequent clause. Quite similarly to what we have observed in excerpt 16, this implies a shift in the grammatical co-indexicality of the pivotal element from pre- to post-pivot: Within the pre-pivot, the pivotal NP *notre fragilité* ‘our fragility’ is co-indexed as an object (see the object-clitic *le* ‘it’ in line 13) while in the post-pivot it is co-indexed as a subject (see the subject clitic *c*’ at line 16). This excerpt then shows how speakers configure emergent grammatical trajectories as a resource for talk-in-interaction: In addition to being instrumental in creating additional opportunities for Cécile to provide affiliative responses, Macha’s layered composition of a pivot-like pattern also allows her to attach two predications (l. 13 and 16) to the same referential element (l. 14), hence fostering the progressivity of talk while at the same time changing the grammatical co-indexicality of the related NP. The grammatical shaping of the turn in progress is configured *ad hoc*, throughout the moment-by-moment unfolding of talk, and becomes only retrospectively analyzable as a pivot-like pattern.

5. Discussion and conclusion

Conversation analytic research has attested to a rich array of interactional uses of pivot and pivot-like patterns across several languages. In this paper, we have stressed the need to closely examine the grammatical shapes of different types of pivots, along with their sequential embeddedness, as different types of pivot patterns (i.e. patterns whose grammatical composition is different) may not accomplish the same interactional jobs – and this is so because they enable speakers to map units of talk in different ways onto the temporal unfolding of turns and TCUs.

In this paper, we focused on one specific grammatical configuration found recurrently in French talk-in-interaction, namely the [clause-NP-clause] pivot pattern, where a relation of co-indexicality holds between the pivotal NP and a pronoun occurring in the pre- and in the post-pivot. We have shown that the pattern allows speakers to accomplish a range of interactionally relevant jobs. First, the [clause-NP-clause] pivot pattern has the effect of maximizing the continuity of talk when repair occurs on what has classically been treated as a right dislocated element (the NP in the [clause-NP] type of sentential pattern), by allowing speakers to ‘repackage’ the repaired element coherently within the post-pivot clause. Second, the pattern enables speakers to attach two identical or similar predications to a given referent, thereby enhancing the speaker’s stance in the case of assessments or upgrading a disagreement. In this latter case, the pivot pattern has also the effect of pushing an upgraded disagreement further back into the turn, thereby providing the speaker with a resource for dealing with the preference for agreement. Third, the [clause-NP-clause] pivot pattern is put to use by speakers to accomplish two distinct actions in one stroke, such as asking a question and providing an answer to it. Finally, we have inspected pivot patterns (or rather: Pivot-like patterns) that show a specific design feature, namely an incremental adding on of the pivot and the post-pivot, by means of which speakers create additional points for recipient action.

In all of the quoted cases, the [clause-NP-clause] pattern appears as a practical solution for a recurrent interactional need, namely to expand a turn beyond a point of possible completion. What comes to the fore if we look at pivot patterns from the vantage point of on-line grammar is the central import of the grammatical-temporal compositionality of the patterns. In the case under analysis, the fact that a first clause is

followed by a NP, which is then followed by a second clause, is a temporal-grammatical feature decisive for the interactional renderings of the pattern. The temporality of grammar, i.e. what comes first and what comes next, hence proves to be a key element not only in how speakers use a given type of pivot pattern, but also in how different types of pivot patterns lend themselves to different types of use.

Whatever the exact interactional jobs speakers accomplish by means of the [clause-NP-clause] pivot pattern, this pattern emerges as a practical solution for locally occurring interactional needs. Often, speakers compose the pattern incrementally for dealing with issues of reciprocity; in other cases, the post-pivot clause may emerge in reaction to the occurrence of repair on the pivotal NP. Similarly, in the course of the syntactic configuration of TCUs in progress, the grammatical and/or referential status of constituents may be retrospectively re-adjusted or changed by means of the adding-on of a post-pivotal clause. A close analysis of this temporal unfolding reveals that pivots are processual products, recognizable for the analyst *post hoc*, but shaped by the speakers *ad hoc*, based on syntactic trajectories that are configured in real time.

Pivot patterns therefore result from local adaptation. They are not the product of the implementation of ready-made constructional schemata; rather they emerge through a process of *pivotage*, revealing grammar in the making. In our understanding (cf. Pekarek Doehler 2011a and b), however, this grammar in the making is not limited to the 'newness' of patterns, but also applies to classical grammatical constructions such as LD or RD. Although speakers assemble the grammatical shapes of TCUs on the fly, they do not do it randomly. Rather they map their utterances onto routinized constructional schemata, such as LD and RD, and they orient to such schemata as a background against which they configure things *ad hoc*. Consequently, these schemata are not put to work as fixed constructions, but are (re)configured praxeologically, and are contingently caught in a continuous process of local adaptation (cf. Hopper 1987). As such, they are part of an "emergent grammar for all practical purposes" (Pekarek Doehler 2011b).

Appendix

Symbols used in transcripts

[]	overlap, and, if relevant, end of overlap
=	latching
&	turn continuation after overlap
(0.5)	measured pause, in seconds
(.)	a micro pause of 0.1 second
coul-	cut-off
ce:	lengthening of preceding sound
chemin?	rising intonation
temps.	falling intonation
train,	level intonation
besoin	accentuation

NON	louder than surrounding talk
°ça fait tout°	softer than surrounding talk
.h	in-breath
h.	out-breath
>enfin<	faster than surrounding talk
<mais>	slower than surrounding talk
((laughing))	transcriber's comment

Symbols used in the gloss

DET	determiner
PRO	pronoun
CLI	clitic pronoun
DEM	demonstrative pronoun
N	neuter
il _i	_i indicates co-indexicality
3SG	3 rd person singular
DO	direct object

References

- Apothéloz, Denis, and Françoise Zay (2003) Syllepses syntagmatiques dans l'improvisation orale. In F. Sánchez Miret (ed.), *Actas del XXIII Congreso internacional de lingüística y filología románica*, vol. II. Tübingen: Niemeyer, pp. 47-59.
- Auer, Peter (1996) On the prosody and syntax of turn-continuations. In E. Couper-Kuhlen, and M. Selting (eds.), *Prosody in conversation: Interactional studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 57-100.
- Auer, Peter (2005) Projection in interaction and projection in grammar. *Text* 25.1: 7-36.
- Auer, Peter (2007) Syntax als Prozess. In H. Hausendorf (ed.), *Gespräch als Prozess. Linguistische Aspekte der Zeitlichkeit verbaler Interaktion*. Tübingen: Narr, pp. 95-142.
- Auer, Peter (2009) On-line syntax: Thoughts on the temporality of spoken language. *Language Sciences* 31.1: 1-13.
- Auer, Peter, and Stefan Pfänder (2011) *Constructions: Emerging and emergent*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Betz, Emma (2008) *Grammar and interaction. Pivots in German conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Bilmes, Jack (1991) Toward a theory of argument in conversation: The preference for disagreement. In F.H. Van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J.A. Blair, and C.A. Willard (eds.), *Proceedings of the Second*

- International Conference on Argumentation*. Amsterdam: Sicsat. International centre for the study of argumentation, pp. 462-469.
- Blanche-Benveniste, Claire, Christine Rouget, and Sabio Frédéric (eds.) (2002) *Choix de textes de français parlé: 36 extraits*. Paris: Champion.
- Bybee, Joan (2010) *Language, Usage and Cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clayman, Steven (2012) Address terms in the organization of turns at talk: The case of pivotal turn extensions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 44: 1853-1867.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth, and Tsuyoshi Ono (eds.) (2007) Turn continuation in cross-linguistic perspective. *Pragmatics* 17. 4, Special issue.
- De Stefani, Elwys, and Anne-Sylvie Horlacher (2005) Interrogative structures in second language acquisition: The interactional resources of definition inquiries in French. Paper presented at the *9th International Pragmatics Conference (IPrA)* in Riva del Garda (Italy), 10-15th July 2005.
- Dovicchi, Francesca (2010) *Costrutti-eco nell'italiano parlato. Da 'ripetizione' a 'cardinalità'*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Drew, Paul, and Elisabeth Holt (1995) Idiomatic expressions and their role in the organization of topic transition in conversation. In M. Everaert et al. (eds.), *Idioms. Structural and psychological perspectives*. Hillsdale NJ: Erlbaum, pp. 117-132.
- Drew, Paul, and Elisabeth Holt (1998) Figures of speech: Figurative expressions and the management of topic transition in conversation. *Language in Society* 27: 495-522.
- Ford, Cecilia E., Barbara A. Fox, and Sandra A. Thompson (1996) Practices in the construction of turns: The 'TCU' revisited. *Pragmatics* 6.3: 427-454.
- Franck, Dorothea (1985) Sentences in conversational turns: A case of syntactic 'double bind'. In M. Dascal (ed.), *Dialogue*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 233-245.
- Givón, Talmy (1983) Topic Continuity in discourse: An introduction. In T. Givón (ed.), *Topic Continuity in Discourse: A quantitative cross-language study*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 1-41.
- Goodwin, Charles (1979) The interactive construction of a sentence in natural conversation. In G. Psathas (ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology*. New York: Irvington, pp. 97-121.
- Goodwin, Charles (2002) Time in Action. *Current Anthropology* 43: 19-35.
- Holt, Elisabeth, and Paul Drew (2005) Figurative pivots: The use of figurative expressions in pivotal topic transitions. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 38.1: 35-61.
- Hopper, Paul J. (1987) Emergent Grammar. *Berkeley Linguistics Conference* 13: 139-157.
- Hopper, Paul J. (2004) The openness of grammatical constructions. *Papers from the 40th regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* 40.2: 153-175.
- Hopper, Paul J. (2011) Emergent grammar and temporality in interactional linguistics. In P. Auer, and S. Pfänder (eds.), *Constructions: Emerging and emergent*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter, pp. 22-44.
- Horlacher, Anne-Sylvie (2007) La dislocation à droite comme ressource pour l'alternance des tours de parole: Vers une syntaxe incrémentale. [Right-dislocation as a resource for turn-taking: Towards an incremental syntax]. *TRANEL* 47: 117-136.

Horlacher, Anne-Sylvie (2012) La dislocation à droite revisitée: Une investigation interactionniste. [Right-dislocation revisited: A grammar-in-interaction account]. Thesis manuscript, University of Neuchâtel, March 2012.

Jefferson, Gail (1984) On stepwise transition from talk about a trouble to inappropriately next-positioned matters. In J.M. Atkinson, and J.C. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies of conversation analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 191-222.

Jefferson, Gail (1991) List construction as a task and resource. In G. Psathas (ed.), *Interactional competence*. New York, NY: Irvington Publishers, pp. 63-92.

Lambrecht, Knud (2001) Dislocation. In M. Haspelmath et al. (eds.), *La typologie des langues et les universaux linguistiques. Manuel international*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 1050-1078.

Lindström, Jan (2012) Epistemic stance markers in turn initial and final position. *Jag tycker and jag tror* 'I think' in Swedish. Paper presented at a *FRIAS Workshop*, 16-17th May 2012.

Linell, Per (2013) The dynamics of incrementation in utterance-building: Processes and resources. In B. Szczepek Reed, and G. Raymond (eds.), *Units of Talk - Units of Actions*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 57-90.

Norén, Niklas (2007) *Apokoinou in Swedish talk-in-interaction: A family of methods for grammatical construction and the resolving of local communicative projects*. Linköping University: Linköping Studies in Arts and Science.

Norén, Niklas, and Per Linell (2013) Pivot constructions as everyday conversational phenomena within a cross-linguistic perspective: An introduction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 54: 1-15.

Pekarek Doehler, Simona (2004) Une approche interactionniste de la grammaire: Réflexions autour du codage grammatical de la référence et des topics chez l'apprenant avancé d'une L2. *AILE* 21: 123-166.

Pekarek Doehler, Simona (2011a) Clause-combining and the sequencing of actions: Projector constructions in French conversation. In R. Laury, and R. Suzuki (eds.), *Subordination in conversation: A crosslinguistic perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 103-148.

Pekarek Doehler, Simona (2011b) Emergent grammar for all practical purposes: The on-line formatting of dislocated constructions in French conversation. In P. Auer, and S. Pfänder (eds.), *Constructions: Emerging and emergent*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 46-88.

Pekarek Doehler, Simona, Elwys De Stefani, and Anne-Sylvie Horlacher (2011) The grammar of closings: The use of dislocated constructions as closing initiators in French talk-in-interaction. *Nottingham French Studies* 50.2: 51-76.

Pekarek Doehler, Simona, and Anne-Sylvie Horlacher (2013) The patching-together of pivots in talk-in-interaction: On 'double dislocations' in French. *Journal of Pragmatics* 54: 92-108.

Pomerantz, Anita (1984) Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. Atkinson, and J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of social action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 57-101.

Sacks, Harvey (1987) On the preferences for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation. In G. Button, and J.R. Lee (eds.), *Talk and social organisation*. Clevedon, U.K: Multilingual Matters, pp. 54-69.

Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson (1974) A simplest systematics of the organization of turn-taking in conversation. *Language* 50: 696-735.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1979) The relevance of repair to syntax-for-conversation. *Syntax and Semantics*

12: 261-286.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1987) Recycled turn-beginnings: A precise repair mechanism in conversation's turn-taking organization. In G. Button, and J.R. Lee (eds.), *Talk and Social Organization*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, pp. 70-85.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1996) Turn organization: One intersection of grammar and interaction. In E. Ochs, E.A. Schegloff, and S.A. Thompson (eds.), *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 52-133.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (2007) *Sequence Organization in Interaction. A Primer in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, Emanuel A., and Harvey Sacks (1973) Opening up closings. *Semiotica* 8.3: 289-327.

Scheutz, Hannes (2005) Pivot constructions in spoken German. In A. Hakulinen, and M. Selting (eds.), *Syntax and lexis in conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 103-128.

Tanaka, Hiroko (1999) *Turn-taking in Japanese conversation: A study in grammar and interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Tanaka, Hiroko (2001) The implementation of possible cognitive shifts in Japanese conversation: Complementizers as pivotal devices. In M. Selting, and E. Couper-Kuhlen (eds.), *Studies in interactional linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 81-109.

Thompson, Sandra A., and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen (2012) Left-right asymmetries: The grammar of pro-repeat responses to informings in English Conversation. Paper presented at a *FRIAS Workshop*, 16-17th May 2012.

Walker, Gareth (2002) Phonetic and interactional detail of a turn-holding practice: 'Pivots' in conversation. Poster presented at the *ESF-Conference on Interactional Linguistics*, Helsinki, 6-11th September.

Walker, Gareth (2007) On the design and use of pivots in everyday English conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39: 2217-2243.

