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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: "Eγό τον εκόπσα.
     ‘I stopped drinking coffee.’
02 (1.3)
03 Pol: Vέvea éxodas kópsi to tsiɣáro o kafés îtane: (0.5)
     ‘Of course compared to quitting smoking coffee was (0.5)’
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

¹Valérie 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

²Conversations 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 omissions 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 òçi ‘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 ti: e 
02 [moré. pços kséri na oðiyái?] 

‘=eh what eh hey. Who knows how to drive?’
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 forming 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 conversation, 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 ðélune,
‘And they all have the right to participate, whoever wants to participate;’
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02 FS >> .hh kánũ[ne]: [,:grup.]  
  .hh make.3PL.PRS group  
  ‘.hh they form groups,’
03 Our:  
  [{((giggle))}]
04 Mar:  
  [.h Fad]ázese na min íçes ce δíçéoma  
  ((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 >>  
  [kánũne] grup, ci éci:  
  make.3PL.PRS group and have.3SG.PRS  
  they form groups, and it is’
09 e- ci éxun polí pláka: jatí [parusiázune po]li 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 majiépsume?< ‘Shall we go and cook?’ or ‘Why don’t we cook?’), that expects a positive an- swer. 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 re- peated clause is modified (na páme na majípseume? ‘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
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guzína na majirépsu? ‘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: Pínasa.  
‘I am hungry.’

02  (1.1)  
03 Kat:FS>> >Den báme na majirépsu?<  
NEG go.1PL.PRS SBJV COOK.1PL.PFV  
‘Shall we go and cook?’

04 =Rináci θa fa:ς?=  
Eirini.DIM FUT eat.2SG.PFV  
‘Eirini will you eat?’

05 Eir: =Oçi. alá θa voιθ[i sto majirikí sas.]=  
‘No. but I will help you with the cooking.’

06 Kat:  
[<jatí de θa fa:ς?> ]=  
‘Why won’t you eat?’

07 Eir: = [.h jatí éfaɣa sì]mera. de boró álo. éxo ská:si.  
((noise starts))  
‘.h because I ate today. I cannot eat any more. I am full.’

08 Kat:  
=[avɣá me patá:(tes).]  
‘eggs with potatoes.’

09 Eir: >ce θa jino< xodró. .h o- θa voιθiso 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 páme na majirépsu?  
so SBJV go.1PL SBJV COOK.1PL.PFV  
‘So. Shall we go and cook?’  
((noise ends))

12 SS+>> òë[lete? =ðen báme st in guží]na  
want.2PL.PRS NEG go.1PL in kitchen(f).ACC.SG  
‘Do you want? Shall we go in the kitchen’

13 Zoi:  
[Ade. páme. páme. ]  
‘Come on. let’s go. let’s go.’

14 Kat:SS+>> na majirépsu[me?]  
SBJV COOK.1PL.PFV  
‘and cook?’
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15 Eir: [Ne.] =páme 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, pursuit 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 ðilónete? ‘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 maθénis °siníθos. ‘Usually you find out about it.’). His first TCU overlaps with Yorgos’ 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) ðiáfori. ]
‘Various people come.’

02 Yor: FS >> [Aftó ðilónete?] this.neut.nom.sg announce.3sg.pass.prs
‘Is this announced?’

03 SS >> aftó ðilónete::? pos to maθénis? this announce.3sg.pass.prs how it learn.2sg.prs
‘Is this announced? How do you find out about it?’

04 Sot: FS >> [To maθénis °siníθos. 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.’
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In example (7), in lines 2–3, Thanasis makes a statement (‘Esí ti ynórites aftín. ‘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 ynórites. ‘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 ta pe.<] ‘Yes, he told me. He told me.’
02 Th: FS >> [‘Esí ti [ynó]rites] 2SG.NOM 3SG.F.ACC meet.2SG.PST aftín.
03 3SG.F.ACC ‘You met her.’
04 Tel: [‘(Ne,)]] (Yes,)
05 Tel: Eh?=
06 Th: SS >> =‘Ti ynórites] . 3SG.F.ACC meet.2SG.PST ‘You met her.’
07 Tel: [.hh ] >Oçi, 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 fêvjeta (...) ‘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 (>Póte tha fijete.< ‘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 (>Póte tha fijete 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 (>Ρότε θα φιτέτε εσίς< ‘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: Πέμπτι ίνε ανιξτά. κι Καλιρόι εκ ταυζοθί να πάμε. ‘It is open on Thursday. and Kokiri insists that we go.’
02 stin ayorá na psonís[i: blú]za.= ‘to the market, she wants to buy a T-shirt.’
03 Roz: [Σίμερα?] ‘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 >> =>Póte θa fijete< when FUT leave.2PL.PFV ‘When are you leaving?’
07 Mar: [↑Alá: áma]vyo na psonís[o ap ti má:na,= ‘But if I go shopping for mum,’
08 Lin: SS+ >> =>Póte θa fijete es[i:is?] when FUT leave.2PL.PFV 2PL.NOM ‘When are you leaving?’
09 Mar: [pu ] θéλ ‘she wants’
10 patá[es, θéλ] ‘potatoes, she wants’
11 Lin: [>Re su mi[ļ:]a] o re Dalára.< ‘Hey I am talking to you.’
12 Mar: [Ne. ] ‘Yes.’
13 Lin: SS+ >> =>Póte θa fijete esíz. when FUT leave.2PL.PFV 2PL.NOM ‘When are you leaving?’
15 Mar: δὲν γζέρο, Σάβατο?
‘I don’t know, on Saturday?’

16 Lin: Α:: >tha fιʝete Σάβατο.<
‘Ah:: you are leaving on Saturday.’

Finally, self-repetition operates as a stylistic feature used for emphasis. In ex-
example (9), participants assess positively a movie they watched. In lines 4–5, Yan-
nis refers to a scene of action that he found exciting, and he uses the interroga-
tive 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 in-
onation (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 func-
tion.

(9) 01 Yan: =[Το pos kata]fέρνι [i tenίa xorίs na] simvί [←tίpο]ta,>
‘The movie creates such a suspense when nothing is
happening,’

02 Ama: =[Χολι orό. ] [Χολι orό. ]
‘Very nice. Very nice.’

03 Nik: [((Fоверό.))]

04 Yan: FS >>  esi na se ρές. zi i
2SG.NOM SBJV COP.2SG.PRS like.that live.3SG.PRS or
‘you are wondering. Is he alive or’

pέθαne?

die.3SG.PST
‘dead?’

06 SS/SS+>> zi i pέθαne, [zi i pέθαne,
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: [((Orό.))]
‘(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 ḍe- ci íne tό so ʝelíο 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 (ine jelíο epiçírima ‘it is a ridiculous argument’), with modifications. She omits the adverb and adds emphasis on the adjective.

(10) 01 Mar: tétça práymata.
‘such things.’
02 [aftό to len< diá:fori. ]
‘many people say this.’
03 Roz: FS >> [Ce ḍe- ci inε tό]so jelíο
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 inε jelíο epiçírima,
yes COP.3SG.PRS ridiculous argument(NEUT).NOM.SG
‘Yes it is a ridiculous argument,’
06 [alά (...)]
‘but (...)’
07 Roz: [↑Pé:de] çiliáðes Evréi ↓ítan léi:, ecí pu ôÚlevan,
‘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 Ἐκδικόστα?* ‘Was- was the Hatzikosta hospital open?’, and the answer is implemented via repetition of the clause with falling intonation (*Efiméreve to Ἐκδικόστα.* ‘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 Ἐκδικόστα?]_ 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 Ἐκδικόστα._
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 _ine períerjì i periôcì._* ‘It’s just a weird neighborhood.’), and in lines 3–4, Polychronis agrees with the assessment (*Ine períerjì i periôcì._ ‘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 _ine períerjì i_
just COP.3SG.PRS weird.F.NOM.SG DEF.F.NOM.SG

> ‘It’s just a weird’

02[_periôcì._]
area(F).NOM.SG

> ‘neighborhood.’

03 Pol: SS >> [ _Ine períerjì_
COP.3SG.PRS weird.F.NOM.SG

³A declarative or subjunctive main clause in Greek can be turned into a polar question through rising intonation toward the end of the utterance.
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 ("ðe 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: ↑Oçi. cítakse. ðilaðí, ta çi riθmísi ta práymata se scési
‘No. Look. That is, he has kept things in moderation compared to’
02 me to: pos ìtan >(ótan eɣó)< to- to ɣnórísa,
‘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 >> "ðe 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.
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 (májiré’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 τόρα ’now’ and the clause that delivers the informing májirévete ’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’.
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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’, dé vríkame ‘we didn’t find’, jírnáɣame ‘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 Zíθο° ‘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 oçi ‘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 jalú ksecinísame, ‘And it just happened to us because we started heading to another place,’

02 FS >> ‘ksecinísame na páme sto Zíθο?’°
begin.1pl.pst sbjv go.1pl to Zitho(m).acc.sg
‘were we going to Zithos?’

03 Pol: pú itane. [ðe] vríkame trapézi “ecí péra >ce metá,”°
‘where was it? We didn’t find a table over there and afterwards,’

04 Ale: [Ne]
‘Yes,’

05 Pol: (.) kápos jírnáɣame, (ékane-) íche półi krio ’ecíni [ti méra,]
‘we were wandering around, it was- it was a very cold day;

06 Ale: [Oçi. ]
‘No.’
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.¹

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

¹Jarkey (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.
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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
Angeliki Alvanoudi

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.
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