

ON THE EMERGENT AND INTERACTIVE CHARACTER OF GRAMMATICAL RESOURCES IN INTERACTION: A SINGLE-CASE ANALYSIS OF A LEFT DISLOCATION IN SPOKEN FRENCH

FABIENNE H.G. CHEVALIER

Abstract

This article examines the left dislocation in naturally-occurring French interaction from a sequential and interactional perspective. Drawing on the single case of an incomplete left dislocation, it shows that, whilst topic promotion, a function generally advanced by the discourse functionalist literature, cannot be rejected for the case under consideration, a characterisation of this structure purely in terms of information structure underspecifies our understanding of what it is used to accomplish. The analysis shows that a sequential trajectory characterised by resistance contributes to the situated deployment of the left dislocation that is used to manage resistance and cross-cutting preference structures and to accomplish identity work and orient to disaffiliation and disagreement, to which the incompleteness of the turn is also sensitive. In this way, the analysis emphasises the emergent and interactive character of the left dislocation and calls into question a sentence topic understanding of the structure.

1. Introduction¹

A structure such as ‘Les Romains ils sont fous’ (the Romans they are crazy) (taken from Lambrecht: 2001) is known as a left dislocation. Left dislocations have been widely studied both from syntactic and discursive perspectives in a range of languages and are generally treated in terms of information structure and topic promotion. Relying upon naturally-occurring interaction, this article explores the left dislocation in French from an interactional perspective and proposes that an understanding of the work that this structure is deployed to accomplish can only derive from close examination of the sequential environment in which and for which it is deployed. The objectives are twofold: first, the article seeks to illustrate, through the lens of a particular syntactic structure, the payoffs that can be derived from the close examination of language in its sequential environment of occurrence, thus highlighting the dynamic, emergent and interactive character of grammatical resources such as left dislocation in talk-in-interaction. Second, it seeks to illustrate the fact that the complexity of language and the adaptive

1. My thanks go to Simona Pekarek Doehler, Trine Heinemann, Chiara Monzoni and Traci Walker for their valuable comments on an earlier version of this paper. Correspondence about this article should be addressed to the email address listed in the Notes on Contributors.

character of its grammatical resources in the coordination of actions in talk often lend them a malleability that cannot be reduced to a single function. In what follows, I summarise briefly the key elements of left dislocations before proceeding to the analysis of a single case from the point of view of topic promotion, social action and sequential organisation.

The term 'left dislocation' (hereafter LD) refers to a syntactic construction that includes a detached element (the Romans) appearing to the left of a matrix clause (*ils sont fous*). This element is represented in the matrix clause by a non-reflexive pronoun that is coreferential with it (see Barnes, 1985; Calvé, 1985; Cornish, 1987 and Lambrecht, 2001 for French; Prince, 1981; Geluykens, 1992 and Ziv, 1994 for English; Duranti and Ochs, 1979 and Monzoni, 2005 for Italian, amongst others.) The dislocated element is most frequently a lexical noun phrase (NP), as in the example above where 'les Romains' (the Romans) is the dislocated element and 'ils' (they) is the coreferential pronoun. In French, the pronoun is a clitic, whereas it is a full pronoun in English.²

The term 'left dislocation', first coined by French grammars (Bally, 1932), was adopted and developed by the generativists (Ross, 1967) that conceive of the structure as a marked construction that is a departure from, or exception to, a perceived canonical subject-verb-object (SVO) word order for French. However, Lambrecht (1987) points to the frequent use, in spoken French, of a range of non SVO structures such as dislocations, topicalisations, clefts, amongst others, questioning SVO as the basic order in this language. Although found in some written texts, the structure is highly prominent in spoken French (Barnes, 1985; Ashby, 1988).³ Studies that are concerned with the discourse functions of LD view it in terms of information structure and posit topic promotion as the primary function of LD⁴ (see, for example, Barnes, 1985; Ashby, 1988; Lambrecht, 1987, 1994, 2001 for French and Prince, 1997; Geluykens, 1992 and Gregory and

2. There is some disagreement in the literature regarding the grammatical status of both the dislocated element and the coreferential pronoun. Elements other than lexical NPs (e.g., stressed personal pronouns, adjectives or prepositional phrases) may also be less frequently dislocated. Similarly, the coreferential element in the matrix clause, which is typically a pronoun, may also be a noun phrase, and agreement in number and gender between the dislocated element and the coreferential pronoun, although generally accepted in the literature, is not always present (see Cornish, 1987). See Lambrecht (2001) for a detailed description of the type of grammatical functions and syntactic categories for both the dislocated element and the coreferential element.
3. Duranti and Ochs (1979) show a similar prominence in spoken Italian.
4. Lambrecht (1994: 118) describes topic as 'the thing which the proposition expressed by the sentence is about', adding that 'a referent is interpreted as the topic of a proposition if in a given situation the proposition is construed as being about this referent, i.e. as expressing information which is relevant to and which increases the addressee's knowledge of this referent'. (ibid: 127).

Michaelis, 2001 for English, *inter alia*).⁵ In essence, LDs are understood to introduce or reintroduce a referent that is accessible, but not yet active (that is, one that is assumed by the speaker not to be in the recipient's current centre of attention). Such approaches, however, fail to consider LDs in the context of the temporal and sequential unfolding of the talk in which they occur. In particular, they fail to take into account the interactive character of language and grammar that are used not only to shape and organise actions but are shaped, in turn, by this organisation.

More recently, a growing number of studies of talk-in-interaction have documented, in a perspective now known as Interactional Linguistics under the impetus of Conversation Analysis (CA), the situated use of grammatical structures in a range of languages and the ways in which grammatical resources are deployed by participants to interactional ends (see, amongst others, Ochs et al., 1996, on the relationship between grammar and interaction, Pekarek Doehler and Müller (2007) for pseudoclefts and left dislocations in French and Chevalier and Clift (2008) for the interactional use of unfinished turns in French conversation).⁶ With regards to LDs, a number of studies have shown that these grammatical structures cannot be understood purely in terms of information structure. LDs have been shown to be used as turn entry-devices and to be working as floor-seeking and floor-holding practices (Duranti and Ochs, 1979; Pekarek Doehler, 2001), as requests for definitions (De Stefani, 2005), as disconnected interjections deployed to initiate abrupt action or topic shifts in Italian (Monzoni, 2005) and as closing devices for extended turns (Pekarek Doehler et al., this volume). In line with these studies, this article proposes to investigate the ways in which a particular sequential trajectory contributes to the deployment of a LD to accomplish activities that display an orientation to the particulars of the sequential environment in which the LD occurs. Focusing upon a single case analysis, the article first addresses the topic promotion aspect of the LD to show that a reading of LD purely in informational terms underspecifies our understanding of what the structure is used to accomplish. The second section focuses on the analysis of the sequential environment of occurrence of the LD, leading to an understanding of the social actions and the interactional work that the LD is used to implement. The article concludes with a discussion of the implications and payoffs of treating language and grammar in the interactive, temporal and sequential environment of

5. Prince (1997, 1998) claims that the LD has three distinct functions in English: Simplifying LDs, Partially-ordered LDs and topicalisation. Also see Manetta (2007:1034) for Unexpected Subject Type Left Dislocation. All of these view LDs in terms of information structure.
6. For an overview of CA, see Heritage (1984a) and Drew (2005). For an overview of Interactional Linguistics, see Mondada (2001) and Lindström (2009:96-103). Examples of conversation-analytic work focusing on interactional linguistics aspects include Goodwin (1979) on the interactional construction of a sentence, Lerner (1991, 1996) on compound turn-constructional units, Hakulinen and Selting (2005) on syntax and lexis and Hayashi (1999, 2003) on joint utterance production in Japanese.

their occurrence. The inadequacy of the term ‘left dislocation’ has been argued elsewhere. It implies that the dislocated element to the left of the matrix clause has been extracted from a standard SVO clause (see Pekarek Doehler, 2011). The term is well embedded in the literature and is used here for clarity, but its use should not be taken to imply adherence to the perception of the structure as a broken version of a standard SVO sentence. The article is based on a single case and no claim of generalisability is made with regards to the functions of LD. In the light of the possibilities that a single-case analysis affords, this article is also intended as a demonstration of the type of detailed, sequential analysis that CA can yield for those NFS readers less familiar with this type of discursive approach.

2. Analysis

The case upon which this article is based comes from a face-to-face conversation between M and her husband who are visiting C, their daughter, at home. Shortly after their arrival, C offers them a pre-lunch/dinner drink.⁷

[Gin]⁸

- 1 C (N:ous) >on va s' boire un p'ti apé↑↑ro<
(U:s) >we are going to have ourselves a little dri↑↑nk<
- 2 (0.7)
- 3 M Hein_i
Uh_i
(0.4)
- 4 C < On va s'boire > un p'tit apéro_i (.).hh ↑T'PEUX
<We're going to have ourselves> a little drink_i (.).hh ↑CAN YOU
- 5 AM'NER L'PASTI:S= ((to someone else possibly in another room))
BRING THE PASTI:S= ((a popular alcoholic aperitif drink))
- 6 =AH MERDE! ya rien pour /Maman.
=OH SHIT! There's nothing for /Mum.
- 7 (0.5)
- 8M ↑Oh ça fait rien.= al[ors de l'eau.]
↑Oh it doesn't matter:=[(some) water then.]⁹
- 9 C [DU SCHWE:PPE]S:̣=
[(SOME) SCHWE:PPE]S:̣=

7. Although ‘apéro’ (short for ‘apéritif’) refers to the round of drinks one has before a meal, it does not imply that M and her husband have been invited to lunch/dinner.

8. I thank Véronique Traverso for making this piece of data available to me. A number of symbols differ from the Jeffersonian system. ‘/’ marks a less marked intonational rise than ‘↑’, ‘\’ a less marked intonational fall than ‘↓’. ‘ë’ indicates that the ‘mute e’ (schwa), commonly not pronounced in French, has been pronounced. Transcription symbols feature in the translation line only to assist the reader. Where possible, the translation lines retain some of the syntactic features of the French language.

9. ‘Some’ is placed in brackets because it is not obligatory in English, unlike the partitives ‘de’ at line 8 and ‘du’ at line 9, which are in French.

- 10 M = De l'eau. De l'eau.
=> (Some) Water. (Some) water.
- 11 C [Du Schwe:ppes_i
[(some) Schwe:ppes_i
- 12 M Nan, de l'eau.
No, (some) water.
(0.1)
- 13 C→ .h du gin ça te::[:
.h (some) gin that you::[:
- 14M [De l'eau.
[(Some) water.
- 15 (0.8) ((footsteps))
- 16 M S'il te plait.
Please.
- 17 (0.9) ((fridge door opened))
- 18 M Tu m'f'ras bien plais[i:r.
You'll really please me/That'll really do me fine.
[(clinking of bottles))

2.1 Topic promotion

In this section, I examine briefly the case under consideration from a topic promotion perspective. The LD in this extract occurs at line 13. The noun phrase 'du gin' (gin) is dislocated to the left of an incipient matrix clause and is taken up in this clause by the clitic 'ça' in subject position. The term 'incipient matrix clause' is used to refer to the fact that the matrix is incomplete. In particular, it lacks a verb. This will be discussed further in the concluding section. The matrix clause is incomplete, but the production of a clitic pronoun (ça) serves to construct 'du gin' as a LD.¹⁰ In other words, the 'ça' projects the start of a predication and, in this way at least, line 13 differs from the phrasal TCUs 'de l'eau' and 'du Schweppes', which stand in isolation. As noted earlier, the discourse functionalist literature tends to treat LDs in terms of topic promotion as items that are understood to introduce or reintroduce, to the status of topic, a referent that is accessible, but not yet active. Givón points out that 'L-dislocation is typically a device to mark topical referents, most commonly definite and anaphoric ones, that have been out of the focus of attention for a while and are being brought back into the discourse' (2001: 265; also see Givón, 1983). Duranti and Ochs (1979:395) also argue that the referents in LDs occur generally not in the immediate discourse, but further back. In the case under investigation, 'du gin' at line 13 is not being reintroduced in the discourse. It is discourse new in that it has not been mentioned before either in the immediate discourse or further back. As such, it is

10. Given the absence of a verb it is not possible to say whether 'te' is a direct or indirect pronoun.

not given (Prince, 1981).¹¹ The referent may, however, be said to be situationally accessible to/inferable by the participants as one of a range of drinks to be had for the aperitif (hearer-old, to use Prince's (1992) distinction).¹² There is a semantic link between the dislocated element (a type of drink) and the prior discourse (apéritif). The notion of linking relations between a referent and the prior discourse has been captured by a number of researchers. Amongst them, Ochs and Duranti's observe that 'rarely (...) is a LD referent not relevant to ongoing concerns' (1979:396). They propose the intra-frame referent shift as one way in which a referent may be tied to the prior discourse, as the dislocated element 'expresses a member of a general concept referred to in the immediate discourse' (1979:398). Prince (1997) introduced the notion of Poset relationship to indicate the relationship of the dislocated element to other entities in the discourse, since it 'triggers an inference on the part of the hearer that the left dislocated NP represents an entity standing in a salient partially-ordered set relation to entities already evoked in the discourse' (Prince, 1998:6). Tracy (1984) argued that the relevance maxim (Grice, 1975), which is concerned with how speakers relate their contributions to that of other participants, can be understood both locally as a way in which a turn is related to the speaker's immediately prior turns and globally as a way in which it is related to the main idea in the speaker's message. Here, the relationship of the NP 'du gin' would be with the ongoing theme 'un apéro'. 'Du gin' introduces an unmentioned yet accessible referent into the discourse and, in this way, may be a 'mechanism for topicalizing and foregrounding the referent' (Ashby, 1988:224). It does not, however, succeed in establishing topic shift (Duranti and Ochs, 1979; Ashby, 1988) since the referent is not taken up again in the subsequent discourse, diverging, in this respect, from Givón's

-
11. There is much divergence in the literature about the notion of givenness. Prince (1981) proposed a model that defined givenness in terms of predictability/recoverability, saliency and shared knowledge, but where all definitions rely upon the speaker's assumptions about the hearer's knowledge or ability to assume or infer. Similarly, Lambrecht (1987:5) defines a strictly given referent as 'one that is assumed by the speaker to be present in the consciousness of the addressee at the time of the utterance'. Relying upon assumptions about what may be in the consciousness of a recipient is problematic in terms of relevance (Schegloff, 1991) since, by definition, the analysis is not 'grounded in aspects of what is going on that are demonstrably relevant to the participants, and at that moment (...) (1991:49)'. Although this was argued in the context of which category term may be applied to a participant, this has resonances with our purpose since a range of things may be in M's consciousness, without it having been shown from the particulars of the talk that this particular item is what the recipient is oriented to. For an overview of the inadequacies of such definitions and the impossibility of verification, see Geluykens (1992).
 12. Although old information is often assumed to be necessary for an element to be a topic, Lambrecht (1994) shows that topics may involve both new and old information, depending on the extent to which the information is active.

'lookback' (1983) and from Ochs and Duranti's observation that referents in LD constructions 'continue to receive attention beyond the utterance in which they are expressed' (1979:394). Schegloff and Sacks (1973) and Schegloff (2007) have shown that topic shift is a collaborative process that involves the proposal of a new topic by a participant and its ratification by another. Here, M does not ratify the gin topic and C does not have a second try at establishing it as topic. The failure to establish topic shift is connected to the sequential environment of occurrence of the LD and will be discussed in the next section. The introduction of this referent may be said to serve to establish a contrast with the immediately prior turn, particularly with the NP 'de l'eau' (for LDs as resources for establishing a contrast between two items, see Barnes, 1985; Geluykens, 1992; Pekarek Doehler, 2001, amongst others), and to signal that the topic of Schweppes in C's prior turn is not being maintained and that that of gin is being proposed. Whilst topic promotion may be argued as a function for this particular LD, limiting our analysis to an understanding in terms of topic management and failure to establish topic shift only leads to a *sentence* topic characterisation of the LD that fails to capture the ways in which the local sequential environment contributes to the situated deployment of this structure to particular interactional ends at that moment and to its declination as a new topic. The next section examines the sequential environment of occurrence of this LD.

2.2 The LD is used in the context of sustained divergence and resistance

The LD structure at line 13 occurs at a point where each of the participants has rejected the action performed by the other on several occasions and where each is resisting the development of the project proposed by the other. The LD enables C to sustain the sequential track that she has followed so far (an offer), whilst rejecting the sequential track followed by the co-participant (a request). At line 1, C, the host, has offered her guests some drinks, an offer which is repeated at line 4 following repair by M at line 3. The second TCU of lines 4-5, addressed to another participant (presumably C's partner), proposes that Pastis is a suitable drink for all. In that it displays knowledge of what the guests normally drink, it also displays recipient attentiveness. At line 6, having offered drinks, C locates a trouble (for which she is responsible as host) through a sudden noticing/remembering accompanied by a change-of-state token 'AH' (Heritage, 1984b) and an expletive 'merde' (shit): there are no suitable drinks for one of the guests (Mum). This may be heard as some kind of modification/retraction of the earlier offer. However, it is noticeable that C does not follow up with an immediate offer for an alternative.¹³ The 0.5 second gap that is allowed to pass (line 7) suggests trouble, which M, the affected guest, may be heard as attempting to minimise by receipting this retraction through a mitigation at line 8 '↑Oh ça fait rien.' (↑Oh it doesn't matter.) and a

13. Sequentially, it is C's turn to propose an alternative (having made an earlier offer that is no longer deliverable) rather than M's turn to make a request.

subsequent request for water ‘=al[ors de l’eau.’ (=[(some) water then.]), presumably a drink that is likely to be available in the absence of any other suitable drinks (nothing for Mum). M’s request for water receives neither of the sequentially implicative responses it projects. It is neither granted nor rejected. Neither does C’s next turn seek confirmation that water is really what M wants. The placement of C’s alternative (Schweppes, a beverage frequently drunk on its own in France) in overlap with M’s request (line 9) enables her to disattend the request and to bypass a response to it. At the same time, C’s line 9 displays an orientation to the trouble marked by the 0.5 second pause at line 7. The notion of preference is illuminating here. Conversation-analytic research has shown that many aspects of the organisation of talk are favourable to the maintenance of social solidarity and the avoidance of conflict (see Heritage, 1984a and Sacks, 1992), which explains the preference for some actions over others. Preference is used here in the conversation-analytic sense to refer to a structural relationship between turns and to the occurrence of some actions with particular features and with greater incidence (for a detailed discussion of preference, see Schegloff, 2007. Also see Pomerantz, 1984, Sacks, 1987 [1973]), Pomerantz, 1984 and the summary in the introduction to this volume). Of particular relevance here is the preference for offers over requests. Schegloff (2007:81ff) shows that requests regularly occur with features of dispreference (accounts, mitigations, excuses etc), which can serve to expand the turn in which the request will occur and provide extended opportunities for the recipient of a request in the offing to make an offer. Here, no such dispreference features are involved at line 8. The request is made neat and marked through the ‘alors’ (then) as a direct consequence of the noticing of the absence of any suitable drink for M. Although only ‘al’ of ‘alors (then)’ has been produced at the point of C’s overlap, it is sufficient in this environment to project that M’s current move derives from these new circumstances and can be heard as her attempt to minimise the trouble. With the specific placement of this overlap, C can be heard to anticipate M’s projected next move and to pre-empt it with the preferred offer. As noted, C did not issue an alternative offer immediately after the trouble arose at line 6. Thus, at line 9, she can be heard to orient to the trouble and to M’s effort to fix it by placing her own alternative offer before M can complete her TCU. In particular, the onset of ‘du Schweppes’ in C’s turn is produced just before C verbalises ‘de l’eau’. Further, ‘du Schweppes’ is produced with raised volume, is stressed and lengthened, all of which suggest that C does more than just compete for the floor, but instead attempts to make Schweppes stand in contrast with whatever item M has projected is on the way to being requested. C’s orientation to the trouble and her attempt to fix it at line 9 also follow sequentially her noticing at line 6 that cast any subsequent offer she might make as second best rather than as Mum’s favourite drink.

The resistance that has developed so far does not end here though. Through its louder volume and the fact that it ends shortly after M has completed her request,

C's offer is now the sequentially last active action. However, neither of the sequentially implicative responses to an offer, acceptance or declination (e.g., 'yes please', 'no thank you' or such like), is produced. Instead, M immediately reiterates her request for water (line 10), the immediacy being marked by the latching symbol =. Whilst this serves to disattend the offer of Schweppes and can in some way constitute some form of non-granting in that it occurs in the sequential position where an acceptance or rejection is due, this does not just contribute to not accepting Schweppes but, through recycling part of line 8, it is primarily built as a reiteration of her prior request. With this repeat, M displays that she is sustaining the same sequential track that she had initiated earlier. Her preference (in the vernacular sense) for water over Schweppes is displayed by the speed (marked by the carets) and emphasis (marked by the underlining) with which 'de l'eau' (water) is said, and by its repetition in the same turn (i.e., with no mitigation, account or other dispreference markers), both TCUs being produced with terminal intonation. The production of the first possibly complete TCU 'de l'eau' offers a transition-relevance place (TRP) (Sacks et al., 1974), which C exploits to come in with a repeat of her prior offer for Schweppes (line 11). Again, M's request for water (line 10) is followed by neither of the sequentially relevant responses, acceptance or rejection, but the occurrence of C's repeated offer (line 11) in overlap with M's repeat of her request in the slots where an acceptance or rejection is due serves as some way of not granting M's request for water. In other words, the production of another sequence-initiating action (an offer) requiring a sequentially implicative response of its own disattends the request. Once more, the repeat at line 11 of the TCU at line 9 does more than not grant the request. It also serves to reiterate the action that C had initiated at line 9 and to claim that this action is still active and is the one to be addressed. Having requested water twice, M directly rejects C's offer of Schweppes with a continuously intoned 'nan' (no) (line 12) and reissues her request for water with a terminal prosodic contour, marking its finality. Again, C does not grant this request at L13.

Based purely on the incompleteness of the turn, the action that line 13 is accomplishing cannot be stated with certainty. It could be an offer for an alternative drink, but it could also be, for example, a comment/reminder serving as a rejection of the idea of drinking gin (e.g., *du gin, ça te convient pas* (gin, that doesn't agree with you) or *'du gin ça te soûle* (gin, that gets you drunk) or such like), although a change-of-state token such as 'ah' might have been produced turn-initially in this case (Heritage, 1984b). However, the sequential position of this turn after a particular type of drink has been declined, meaning that the matter of what M will drink has yet to be resolved and that the sequence about what is to be drunk remains active, suggests that line 13 may have been produced as an offer for an alternative type of drink. Ultimately, despite the turn's incompleteness, M, the recipient, treats line 13 as an offer, which she rejects.

The finality of M's request for water, which has stood as a rejection of Schweppes, may help to account for Schweppes being abandoned and an alternative drink being offered at line 13. C's pursuit of her offer of Schweppes has generated a clear unmitigated rejection at line 12. 'Du gin' at line 13 is then produced as a LD that arises in a divergent and resistant environment in which both participants have kept to their respective sequential tracks. It occurs after a firm declination of one item and a repeated unmitigated request for another item by the recipient of the offer (line 12), an environment in which both have resisted the action that the other has initiated and designed their respective turns as the respective actions to be addressed here and now. In other words, each participant initiates and sustains her own course of action in the face of the other's persistence. In addition to emerging in the context of sequential divergence and resistance, this LD is also sequentially fitted to sequential closure. Its occurrence allows the introduction of an alternative drink, i.e., an alternative to Schweppes. By not taking up the item in the prior turn, it contributes to closing the sequence dealing with Schweppes, whilst keeping alive the larger sequence about what is to be drunk and sustaining the identities of host and guest in the process. In producing gin as an alternative to Schweppes and water, with the LD, C is heard to sustain her course of action and to insist upon renewing her offer. Returning to the issue of topic shift, we can now see that the divergence and resistance that characterises this episode can account for M's rejection of gin as new topic. The course of action that she has pursued (request) has yet to be worked through and completed. The repeat of 'de l'eau' (water) persists with this course of action and it is the resistance sustained during the sequence that contributes to the rejection of gin as new topic.¹⁴

The resistance that is built and sustained throughout the sequence is not just a matter of what drinks will be drunk. It is also tied up with the local identities of the participants as (good) host and (good) guest. Through her attempts to fix the trouble and request the drink that may be the least problematic (water), M can be heard to take on the role of the good, non-disruptive guest, whilst C, in attempting not only to fit her alternative offer in before M's request but also to display her awareness of C's favourite drink, takes on the role of the good host. The identities

-
14. Pekarel Doehler and Muller (2006) showed additive and contrastive listing as one of the functions of LD (also see Barnes, 1985, and Ashby, 1988) Although the LD in this case may appear to be part of a list, appearing as a third item, it does not share all the characteristics of listing because the second 'du Schweppes' at line 11 is a repeat of the prior offer at line 9, which arises out of the overlap and the rejection in the prior turns. Nonetheless, the three-partedness of lists that Jefferson (1990) identifies as a basic structural principle to which participants orient might also be said to be at play for pursuits in the environment of disagreement. Even though L11 is a repeat, sequentially C has had three attempts at the offer. By producing an alternative (gin), thereby having a third try, she proposes that the activity is incomplete and that M's responses are not properly acceptable to her. Nonetheless, she abandons her pursuit after three attempts.

of host and guest translate here as offerer and requester and point to C's prerogative to make offers as host in her own home. Further, the work that C does to display her identity as a good host reveals something of the relationship between identity (being a good host) and preference structure (aligning with others' projects). In particular, what may be at play here is a clash between multiple cross-cutting preferences. C appears to be caught between 'being a good host' and doing a preferred move (offering) on the one hand, and, on the other, doing another preferred move (granting/ratifying a request), which would somewhat dent the 'good host' identity by being equivalent to agreeing to the least 'worthy' drink. Thus, C can be seen to align with M, with regards to one interactional project, whilst disaligning with her, with regards to the other. Although what was due to come after the pronoun at line 13 is not known, it might, in addition to the possibilities mentioned earlier, also have been an account for the offer, which, in preference terms, would have oriented to the dispreferred or pushy nature of the repeated offer in a sequential context where a request has been disattended. In other words, what may have started as an attempt by both participants to fit their interactional conduct to their respective local identities as host and guest results in a resistant environment in which each participant frustrates the development of the other's project.

2.3 Left dislocation and orienting to disagreement

With all this in mind, one might then ask what the use of a LD may do here and now that a simple phrasal TCU may not have achieved. To address this question, we must consider the shape of the LD. What makes what could have been a phrasal TCU 'du gin' a LD is the occurrence of the coreferential clitic pronoun 'ça' (that) that binds the first element 'du gin' and the second element of the LD. In other words, 'du gin' is understandable retroactively as a LD because of the occurrence of the clitic which specifies the relationship between the two elements. The traditional view of LDs considers that the occurrence of a preliminary element (dislocated element) projects the occurrence of a second element (matrix clause) (Pekarek Doehler, 2011). Whilst the 'ça' clearly projects a predication, it is not the case here that the production of 'du gin' projects in and of itself a second element, since its stand-alone occurrence as a phrasal TCU would not only have fitted well in this sequential environment with the previous phrasal TCUs (lines 9 and 11), but could also have been possibly complete. Without the occurrence of the clitic 'ça', the dislocated element would have remained a phrasal TCU, as was 'du schweppes'. Here, then, the occurrence of a clitic is what casts 'du gin' retroactively as a detached element.

The dislocated element is one in a series of phrasal TCUs that have been rejected so far. The inclusion of an incipient matrix clause and, with it, the production of the turn as a LD structure, orients to the resistance that has emerged and does interactional work. It allows a softening of the 'sequential fight' that has

developed with each participant rejecting the other's course of action. In particular, the incipient matrix clause allows the inclusion of a second-person personal pronoun 'te' (you) that displays recipient attentiveness by invoking that the offer is done for this recipient. Further, the LD enables the speaker to project that what she is doing is fitted to the wider sequential structure (offer for yet another type of drink), whilst signalling that this current move in the structure is somewhat disjunctive and may constitute something of a departure from what preceded it (prior request for water) and from the interactional impasse that the participants went down.¹⁵ The design of line 13 manifests explicitly, and turn-initially, that it does not take up the issue of water, which may be seen to privilege an orientation towards disagreement, without actually articulating this disagreement. Pekarek Doehler (2001) identifies a number of departures to LDs in terms of sequential structure and management of turn allocation. However, the LDs in her data serve to maintain a preference for agreement by taking up the topic of the prior turn turn-initially, whilst privileging an orientation towards disagreement later on in the turn, akin to a 'yes, but'.¹⁶ The incompleteness of the turn and, specifically, the suspension of the turn after the pronoun 'te' (you), rather than after the clitic, serve to temper the misalignment and resistance in the face of the recipient's multiple requests for water and, as previously noted, orient to the possibility of upcoming rejection. Not completing a turn has been shown to be a resource for addressing talk that is in some way delicate or problematic either in terms of sequential development or in terms of the type of social actions that speakers seek to accomplish (Chevalier, 2008; Chevalier and Clift, 2008). It displays a clear orientation to the sequential trajectory of talk and can be a resource deployed as a way of seeking affiliation. Here, the LD structure, coupled with the incomplete turn, allows attentiveness to the recipient to emerge, contributing to a softening of the divergence that a simple phrasal TCU would have sustained. Disagreement is not formally articulated, but can be observed further in the response to the offer of gin and in C's subsequent abandonment of her pursuit. M declines the offer by reiterating her request for water and, after a long pause, softens her request with a

15. We are considering here a sequential context that is significantly greater than that normally invoked in the study of left dislocations where the prior discourse considered tends to be limited, at best, to the prior couple of turns, thus ignoring the possible relationship of any given turn to the wider sequence in which it may participate. This case shows clearly that the position of a turn cannot be reduced to what it exhibits about the prior turn and that the wider sequential context in which and, for which, it is deployed must be considered. See Schegloff (1996) for other cases of turns whose relevance is to the sequence rather than to the immediately preceding turn.
16. Duranti and Ochs (1979) find a similar floor-seeking function of left dislocation as Pekarek Doehler (2001), often one that is underpinned by a competitive bid for the floor. Whilst here there is no strict competition for the floor in the form of overlap at the point where the LD occurs, there has been misalignment and disaffiliation and the left dislocation may be one way for C to signal a competitive element that is latent in her upcoming departure.

politeness term '*S'il te plait.*' (Please.) and a display of appreciation (line 18), both of which can be heard, through their delayed production, to orient to the persistence of her sustained request.

3. Concluding remarks

In this paper, I examined the interactional deployment of a left dislocation structure in a naturally-occurring conversational episode. Several points may be drawn out. First, the LD involved in this case is one of several resources used to accomplish identity work and to display attentiveness towards her co-participants. C uses it to display her competence as host. The exact sequential placement of C's initial offer in overlap with M's initial request, thus attempting to pre-empt that request, as well as the sustained repetition of her offers in the sequential slots in which acceptance or rejection of M's requests are due, serve to disattend the requested water and contribute to rejecting it as an inappropriate aperitif drink to give a guest. By offering gin (in the form of a LD) as an alternative drink to that just rejected by M, C displays her sustained orientation to what is an acceptable drink for a guest and to her identity as a good host who can offer more than water (which, interestingly, is not rejected on the basis of its unavailability) and who displays knowledge of her guests' favourite type of drink. Thus, despite nothing being available for Mum, Schweppes and gin are nonetheless offered, even though they are second best options. As Sacks (1992, vol 2:236) noted, participants 'offer the product of what can be seen to have been specifically done as an educated analysis, and thereby be seen to have been done by someone who knows how to...', with the 'how to' here being how to be a host. Sequentially disattending the requested water and repeatedly offering alternatives creates a disaffiliative environment in which the host works to display her identity as a good host. The unfinished turn in which the LD emerges partly works to soften the disaffiliation that has emerged from the sequential trajectory.

Second, the incompleteness of the turn in which the LD occurs raises questions about an understanding of LDs as involving an 'association of the dislocated phrase with a grammatically complete sentence (...)' (Lambrecht, 2001:1063). As noted previously, this case does not involve a grammatically complete sentence, since it 'lacks' a verb. In the discourse functionalist literature, grammatical sentential completeness appears to be a condition for the expression of the focus of the sentence. In this perspective, topic and focus are often related. The focus of a sentence corresponds to the most informative part of the sentence (Lambrecht 1994:55), the comment or 'the information in the sentence that is assumed by the speaker not to be shared by him and the hearer' (following Jackendoff (1972) quoted in Lambrecht (1994:207). In other words, it refers to what is being said about the referent. Lambrecht (1994) links topic and focus in his definition of topichood when he argues that 'a referent is interpreted as the topic of a proposition if in a given situation the proposition is construed as being about this

referent, i.e., *as expressing information which is relevant to and which increases the addressee's knowledge of this referent.*' (p127, italics added). Thus, the focus is understood to be an obligatory component of a LD structure. However, the incompleteness of the turn obscures what the focus might be in this case. Beyond the resumptive pronoun 'ça', the only thing present in the matrix clause is a personal pronoun which cannot be said to be particularly informative about the topic or to be 'specif[ying] an ensemble of entities with respect to which the following clause is going to present some relevant information" (Dik 1997:389). Thus, notions of focus, comment and argument, which all relate to sentence topic, are no longer serviceable here and emphasise the necessity to attend to the interactional and sequential dimension. In particular, this case highlights the import of projection and projectability. Viewed as the ability for unfolding talk to prefigure what it may roughly take for the turn to be possibly complete (Sacks et al., 1974), these resources articulate a relationship between the dislocated element and the rest of the turn in relation to its sequential position. That the recipient was able to come in with a relevant response displaying an understanding of what the prior turn sought to accomplish shows that participants draw heavily upon the sequential position of the utterance and parse the composition of a turn not primarily for its grammaticality but for what it reveals of the action(s) that the turn performs. The central position afforded to the sentence as the basic grammatical unit is weakened, whilst the need to analyse talk in terms of the units to which interactants orient is bolstered (on this particular point, see Schegloff, 1996).

Related to this last point is the observation that LDs can clearly be seen to have interactional import and to be addressing a number of interactional contingencies. The LD contributes to the situated accomplishment of the participants' interactional projects. Detailed sequential analysis revealed how a left-dislocated structure came to be mobilised and configured as a resource deployed and designed to respond to local contingencies in the service of a collaboratively-constructed course of action. In particular, this case revealed the interplay between the multiple functions that LDs can be seen to exhibit, including topic management, the management of divergence and resistance, the management of preference structures and the possible disaffiliative environment that emerges from such a sequential terrain. A single case offered a rich empirical terrain to show that an understanding of the use of grammatical and linguistic resources can only be properly achieved through the close *in situ* examination of the sequential environment in which and for which they are deployed. An example such as this illustrates the interwoven character of the relationship between syntactic, lexical and sequential resources in the organisation of turns at talk. Language and grammar are used to interactional ends. This notion was at the heart of Hopper's emergent grammar (1987), which was conceptualised both as a resource that shapes interaction and is, in turn, shaped by it and as a solution to local interactional needs. The analysis presented here shows that structures such as LDs

should be understood not as a set of fixed rules allowing the production of well-formed and acceptable sentences, but as the outcome of interactive and collaborative work between participants who deploy such structures to interactional ends. Thus, syntax is shaped for the temporal development of real-time interaction. As the real-time emergence of a turn reveals both its possible future shape and the interactional task(s) for which it is used, it also enables speakers to organise the shape and timeliness of their contributions in line with the local, interactional contingencies for which the turn has emerged in the first place. Consideration of language and grammar in their natural home of real-time human interaction shows that grammatical resources are emergent, dynamic and interactive resources that allow participants in interaction to adapt to the changing possibilities for coordinating action across turns in a collaborative manner.

References

- Ashby, W. J. (1988) 'The Syntax, Pragmatics and Sociolinguistics of Left and Right Dislocations in French', *Lingua*, 75:2-3: 203-223.
- Bally, C. (1932) *Linguistique générale et linguistique française*. Bern: Francke.
- Barnes, B. K. (1985) *Left Dislocation in Spoken French*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cadiot, P. (1992) 'Matching Syntax and Pragmatics: A Typology of Topic and Topic-Related Constructions in Spoken French', *Linguistics*, 30:57-88.
- Calvé, P. (1985) 'Dislocation in Spoken French', *The Modern Language Journal* 69:3:230-237.
- Chevalier, F.H. G. (2008) 'Unfinished Turns in French Conversation: How Context Matters', *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 41:1:1 -30.
- Chevalier, F.H.G. and Clift, R. (2008) 'Unfinished Turns in French Conversation: Projectability, Syntax and Action', *Journal of Pragmatics* 40:1731-1752.
- Cornish, F. (1987) 'Anaphoric Pronouns: Under Linguistic Control or Signalling Particular Discourse Representations' *Journal of Semantics* 5:233-60.
- De Stefani, E. (2005) 'Les demandes de définition en français parlé : Aspects grammaticaux et interactionnels', *TRANEL* 41 : 147-163.
- Dik, S. (1997) *The Theory of Functional Grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Drew, P. (2005) 'Conversation Analysis', In K. Fitch and R.E. Sanders (eds.) *Handbook of Language and Social Interaction*, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp.71-103.
- Duranti, A. and Ochs, E. (1979) 'Left Dislocation in Italian', In T. Givón (ed.), *Discourse and Syntax*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 377-416.
- Geluykens, R. (1992) *From Discourse Process to Grammatical Construction: On Left Dislocation in English*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Givón, T., (ed.) (1983) *Topic Continuity in Discourse: A Quantitative Cross Language Study*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Givón, T. (2001) *Syntax: An introduction*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Goodwin, C. (1979) 'The Interactive Construction of a Sentence in Natural Conversation', In G. Psathas (ed.), *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology*. New York: Irvington Publishers, pp.97-121.

- Gregory, M.L. and Michaelis, L.A. (2001) 'Topicalization and Left-Dislocation: A Functional Opposition Revisited', *Journal of Pragmatics* 33:1665-1706.
- Grice, P. (1975) 'Logic and Conversation', In P.Cole and J.L.Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics, Vol.3. Speech acts*. New York: Academic Press.
- Hakulinen, A. and M. Selting (Eds.) (2005) *Syntax and Lexis in Conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hayashi, M. (1999) 'Where Grammar and Interaction Meet: A Study of Co-Participant Completion in Japanese Conversation', *Human Studies* 22:475-99.
- Hayashi, M. (2003) *Joint Utterance Construction in Japanese Conversation*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Heritage, J. (1984a) 'Conversation Analysis'. In J. Heritage (ed.) *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology* Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. 233-92.
- Heritage, J. (1984b) 'A Change-of-State Token and Aspects of its Sequential Placement', In J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.299-345.
- Hopper, P. (1987) 'Emergent Grammar' *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 13:139-157.
- Jefferson, G. (1990) 'List Construction as a Task and Resource', In G. Psathas (ed.) *Interaction Competence*. Lanham: University Press of America, pp.63-92.
- Lambrecht, K. (1987) 'On the Status of SVO Sentences in French Discourse, In R. S. Tomlin (ed.), *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 217-261.
- Lambrecht, K. (1994) *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lambrecht, K. (2001) 'Dislocation', In M. Haspelmath, E. König, W. Oesterreicher and W. Raible (eds.) *Language Typology and Language Universals. Vol. 2*. Berlin:Walter de Gruyter, pp. 1050-1078.
- Lerner, G. (1991) 'On the Syntax of Sentences-in-Progress', *Language in Society*, 20:3, 441-458.
- Lerner, G. H. (1996) 'On the "Semi-Permeable" Character of Grammatical Units in Conversation: Conditional Entry into the Turn Space of Another Speaker', In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff and S. Thompson (eds.) *Interaction and Grammar* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 238-276.
- Lindström, J. (2009) 'Interactional Linguistics', In S. D'hondt, J-O Östman and J. Verschueren (eds.) *The Pragmatics of Interaction* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 96-103.
- Manetta, E. (2007) 'Unexpected Left Dislocation: An English Corpus Study' *Journal of Pragmatics* 39:1029-1035.
- Mondada, L. (2001) 'Pour une linguistique interactionnelle', *Marges linguistiques* 1:1-21.
- Monzoni, C. M. (2005) 'The Use of Syntactic Marked Constructions in Italian Multi-Party Conversation', In A. Hakulinen and M. Selting (eds.), *Syntax and Lexis in Conversation* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 131-159.
- Ochs, E., Schegloff, E. A. and Thompson, S. A. (eds.) (1996) *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2001) 'Dislocation à gauche et organisation interactionnelle' *Marges Linguistiques* 2:177-94.
- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2011) 'Emergent Grammar for all Practical Purposes: The Online Formatting of Dislocated Constructions in French Conversation', In P. Auer and S. Pfänder (eds.) *Constructions: Emerging and Emergent*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 46-88.

- Pekarek Doehler, S. and Müller, G. M. (2006) 'Zur rolle von linksherausstellungen bei der interaktiven konstruktion von auflistungen: Linksversetzungen und pseudo-clefts im gesprochenen französischen', In A. Deppermann, R. Fiehler and T. Spranz-Fogasy (eds.) *Grammatik und Interaction*. Verlag für Gesprächsforschung, pp. 245-277.
- Pekarek Doehler, S. and Müller, G.M. (2007) 'Le problème c'est de les distinguer: Disloquée à gauche et pseudo-clivée dans la conversation', In D. Apothéloz, B. Combettes and F. Neuve (eds.) *Les linguistiques du détachement*. Nancy, France: Presse Université de Nancy.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984) 'Agreeing and Disagreeing with Assessments: Some Features of Preferred/Dispreferred Turn Shapes', In J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.) *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 56-101.
- Prince, E. (1981) 'Toward a Taxonomy of Given-New Information', In P. Cole (ed.) *Radical Pragmatics*. New York: Academic Press, pp.223-255.
- Prince, E. (1992) 'The ZPG letter: Subjects, Definiteness and Information Structure', In S. Thompson and W. Mann (eds.) *Discourse Description: Diverse Analyses of a Fundraising Text*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 295-325.
- Prince, E. (1997) 'On the Functions of Left-Dislocation in English Discourse', In A. Kamio, (ed.), *Directions in Functional Linguistics*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 117-144.
- Prince, E. (1998) 'On the Limits of Syntax, with Reference to Topicalization and Left-Dislocation', In P. Culicover and L. McNally (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics. Vol. 29*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 281-302.
- Ross, J. R. (1967) *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*. PhD Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Sacks, H. (1987 [1973]) 'On the Preferences for Agreement and Contiguity', In G. Button and J.R.E. Lee (eds.) *Talk and Social Organisation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, pp. 54-69.
- Sacks, H. (1992) *Lectures on Conversation*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A. and Jefferson, G. (1974) 'A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation', *Language* 50:4: 696-735.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1991) 'Reflections on Talk and Social Structure', In D. Boden and D. Zimmerman (eds.) *Talk and Social Structure*. Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. 44-70.
- Schegloff, E. 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, E.A. (2007) *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E.A. and Sacks, H. (1973) 'Opening up Closings', *Semiotica* 8:289-327.
- Tracy, K. (1984) 'Staying on Topic: An explication of Conversational Relevance', *Discourse Processes* 7: 447-464.
- Ziv, Y. (1994) 'Left and Right Dislocations: Discourse Functions and Anaphora' *Journal of Pragmatics* 22:629-45.