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ABSTRACT

Using Conversation analysis as a methodology, this study investigates the use and functions of the discourse marker voilà in French interaction. As my literature review will show (chapter 2), prior studies on voilà focused mainly on morphosyntactic aspects of voilà (e.g., Moignet, 1969; Morin, 1985, Hug, 1995). Despite being one of the most frequently used words in everyday French conversation the discourse marker voilà has yet to be systematically studied from a conversation analytic perspective. This oversight is reflected in beginning French textbooks, in which the treatment of voilà is in most cases restrictive and somewhat misleading.

The present study is the first comprehensive study of voilà which takes into account the sequential position of the discourse marker in talk-in-interaction in order to identify the multiple functions that it performs. My data come from two different speech exchange systems: four hours of ordinary phone and Skype conversations among native speakers of French, and over twenty hours of institutional talk in the form of radio and TV talk shows from France. All the functions of voilà described in this dissertation occur in both speech exchange systems, except for delicate talk which contained no instances of voilà.

In my analytical chapters I examine the use of voilà in sequence closings (chapter 3), the use of voilà in openings (chapter 4), and the use of voila in word search activities (chapter 5). In chapter 3 I show that voilà is used in second pair parts (SPPs) of adjacency pairs to claim higher epistemic authority over co-participants and in sequence closing thirds (Schegloff, 2007). In addition, voilà can close a turn before its syntactic/pragmatic ending. This usually occurs in delicate interactions, or when recipients are presumed to know the rest of the talk. In chapter 4, I investigate how speakers use voilà to present upshots of their prior talk, and to introduce hypothetical direct quotes. In chapter 5 I explore the use of voilà in word search activities. My
analyses show that speakers deploy voilà to preface the newly found word, and to mark the finding of the sought-for word. Speakers may also use voilà as a semantic place holder until the sought-for word is found. The occurrence of voilà in these various positions indicates that voilà is a rather prevalent device. Finally, in my conclusion chapter (chapter 6) I highlight the main findings, I point out the pedagogical implications of my findings, the limitations of the current study, and the avenues for future studies.

Throughout my analyses and discussion sections, I explore the question as to why voilà among any other possible linguistic elements is used by co-participants to perform its various actions. My analyses demonstrate that when voilà closes an action and indicates a speaker’s readiness to start the next action, it looks backward and forward at the same time. Likewise when voilà presents the newly found word, presents upshots of prior talk, projects the yet-to be found word in the projection space or presents the hypothetical direct quote in the imaginary and fictitious world, it clearly looks forward. All of these observations thus establish the fact that voilà in discourse is directly linked to its central semantic meaning, which is spatial-deictic (Bergen & Plauché, 2001, 2005). It is specifically voilà’s ability to look backward and forward at the same time that differentiates it from voici.

When voilà is used in combination with other discourse markers (e.g., enfin voilà), the actions are mainly performed by the additional discourse markers and not necessarily by voilà. Hence, when used by itself, the actions performed by voilà are first and foremost accomplished by virtue of its position in the ongoing talk. All of these observations lead to the conclusion that voilà’s is defined by its ability to shift orientation and thereby orient co-participants’ attention to specific parts of utterances. Therefore I argue that if from a morphosyntactic perspective voilà is
a subjectless or an existential verb (Moignet, 1969; Morin, 1985, Hug, 1995), then from a conversation analytic perspective *voilà* is primarily an orientation shift marker.
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“Les études sur voilà ne sont pas nombreuses et cela surprend: ou bien la question est trop simple pour qu’on s’y attarde, ou bien elle est d’une grande complexité et difficile. L’étude va montrer que la deuxième justification est la bonne”.

(Léard, 1992: 99)
Chapter 1: Introduction

Language can essentially be seen from two different perspectives: it is either an “action” or a “structured sets of abstract forms” (Linell, 2005: 3). In the former view, language is a dynamic process animated by interlocutors’ exchanges in interaction, whereas in the latter point of view, language is seen as a fixed product with fixed forms where the main interest remains its function as a system (Linell, 2005).

Indeed, for a long time language, and more specifically grammar, has been viewed as an independent and self-sufficient entity, i.e. as a fixed form. However, when used in everyday interaction, as Lerner (1996: 239) puts it, grammar is no longer a “structure of language” but is instead a “structure of practice”. From this viewpoint, grammar cannot be separated from interaction; we can even state that its existence relies mainly on interaction. As Ford, Fox, & Thompson (2003: 119) have stated, “in interactional settings, we can see grammar at work”. In other words, it is in interaction or in the exchanges and understanding displays that we perceive the meaning of grammar. In this sense, instead of being a predictable and strict structure, grammar becomes a malleable instrument that changes throughout the conversation. In Ford et al’s (2003: 122) words, grammar is modified incessantly through “what people have heard and repeated over a lifetime of language use”.

Thus, interaction offers a place for grammar to prosper, to be displayed and to be expanded as needed in talk-interaction. This implies that interlocutors are active participants in the unfolding interaction, who not only use the construction of turns to predict and project the change of speakers, but also use recipients’ responses to either expand upon and/or otherwise modify their initial turn (Ford et al., 2003). As Clayman & Gill (2004: 589) have pointed out
“human interaction lies at the very heart of social life”; we use interaction not only to communicate and exchange information, but to also socialize and share our cultural norms.

Interaction makes discourse coherence relevant. According to Schiffrin (1987), coherence demands an active participation and contribution of interlocutors to the ongoing interaction. Every time an utterance is produced, it is assessed and evaluated by the recipient, who in turn produces another turn based on the previous turn. This same mechanism is available to the analyst who studies how coherence was accomplished. In short, coherence cannot be separated from interaction; they are interdependent in that one cannot be achieved without the other. Any turn relies on the previous one to produce an appropriate response (Craig & Tracy, 1983). On this same topic of coherence, Schegloff (1984b) has also stated that every participant’s utterance is supposed to show that the speaker has attended to the prior utterance by the co-participant. Thus, every participant’s utterance displays that it is placed according to what was said before. For Schegloff (1984b: 37) this procedure is a “constraint” that co-participants have to respect. However, if it happens that co-participants do not respect this constraint, in other words if they do not produce the next relevant utterance, they will indicate it by using “misplacement markers” (Schegloff & Sacks 1973: 319-20 cited in Schegloff, 1984b: 37). These markers clearly indicate that what is about to come is not what is expected or is otherwise “out of place” (Schegloff, 1984b: 37).

Not all markers are indicative of misplacement; as a matter of fact markers, discourse markers in particular, are the main indicators of discourse coherence. In a way, the analysis of discourse markers is the analysis of discourse coherence (Schiffrin, 1987). Discourse markers serve to signal shifts in the discourse structure. To use Schiffrin’s (1987: 36-37) words, they “bracket” units of talk. Previously, discourse markers were treated by researchers as randomly
distributed fillers which were devoid of any meaning (Craig & Tracy, 1983: 36-37). However, several studies (e.g., Schiffrin, 1987; Hansen, 1997; Fraser, 1990) have since shown that discourse markers are words and phrases which are syntactically independent from the rest of an utterance, but which serve a variety of discursive functions and which achieve cohesion through tying previous utterances to upcoming ones. As Bolden (2006: 682) has said, discourse markers are “the smallest details of interactions” which need careful consideration because “social relationships are inextricable from them”.

Discourse markers are characteristic of spoken language in general, and in French not only are they frequently used, they are a “‘hallmark’ of spoken expression” (Pellet, 2005: 3). Discourse markers such as *bon* (Barnes, 1995), *et bien* (Hansen, 1996), *alors* (Hansen, 1997), and *donc* (Hansen, 1997; Pellet, 2005, 2009), to name a few, have been the object of various detailed studies. Perhaps surprisingly, however, and despite its being one of the most frequently, if not the most frequently, used word in everyday French conversation, the discourse marker *voilà* has yet to be systematically studied from a conversation analytic perspective (but see Bergen & Plauche, 2001; Delahaie, 2008; Delahaie, 2009a; Delahaie, 2009b; Grenoble & Riley, 1996; Léard, 1992; Moignet, 1969 on select functions of *voilà*). Introductory French textbooks reflect this oversight as well; the treatment of *voilà* in the few textbooks that mention it is limited to a very restrictive and possibly misleading meaning.

Using conversation analysis (CA) as a methodological framework, in this study I will analyze the frequently used French discourse marker *voilà*. The research promises to afford new insight into how and when French native speakers use the discourse marker *voilà* in everyday talk-interaction. The study will take account the sequential position of *voilà* in the ongoing interaction in order to identify the specific actions accomplished in each position.
My findings promise to be of great interest to the field of pragmatics and to the field of CA, in particular French CA, in that they will fill what to me is a surprising gap in the literature on French discourse particles. My study thus contributes to the knowledge of social interaction in French, as well as to comparative studies with other languages. While my research will be exclusively concerned with the study of the use of voilà between native speakers, my findings may also be relevant for the eventual development of more authentic teaching materials.
Chapter 2: Literature review

In this chapter, I will review and summarize previous research relevant to the current study. Specifically, the chapter begins with an overview of Conversation Analysis (CA). I will first describe key and basic concepts related to this methodology (e.g., turn taking, sequence organization, adjacency pairs, etc.). I will then review prior studies on specific interactional environments in which voilà regularly occurs. This overview will lay the necessary groundwork for understanding the analytic chapters. I will then turn to a discussion of prior research on closings, including prior studies on closings in French. The next section will focus on prior studies on word search activities, including the embodied actions which accompany them. Finally, I will summarize prior work on the discourse marker voilà.

2.1 What is conversation analysis (CA)?

CA can be defined as the “systematic analysis of the talk produced in everyday situations…” (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008: 11). The objective of CA is to analyze how co-participants understand and respond to one another in their turns at talk, the central focus being how sequences of actions are generated in the exchanges.

What sets CA apart from other linguistic analyses is that talk is not studied in terms of “structure of language” but rather “as a practical social accomplishment” (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008: 12). In other words, utterances in talk-interaction are used as negotiation tools in whatever activity (e.g., requests, complaints, etc.) interlocutors may be involved in (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). In CA terms, these activities are what are better known as actions (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008; Markee, 2000; Sidnell, 2010). In short, CA’s objective is to show interlocutors’ orientation
to their own talk; that is, CA studies the organization of talk from the participant’s *emic* perspective, and not from an external, *etic* point of view. As Schegloff & Sacks (1973: 290) put it, the orderliness of talk-interaction is explained by the fact that it has “been methodically produced by members of the society for one another”. Thus, it is the understanding of the participants, and not that of the analyst that is used by conversation analysts to observe what the action of a particular turn is (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). While speakers show their understanding of the previous talk in their sequentially next turn of talk, their understanding may or may not be identical to what the prior speaker wanted to convey. In any case, however, that understanding will be displayed in the next turn (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). The procedure to rely on the next turn to interpret the prior turn is called the “next-turn proof procedure” (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008: 13). As an illustration of this mechanism, let us consider the following exchange which is taken from a conversation between a mother and her son about an upcoming Parent-Teachers’ Association meeting (taken from Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008: 14)

**FIGURE 2.1**

1. Mother: Do you know who’s going to that meeting?
2. Russ: Who?
3. Mother: I don’t know!
4. Russ: Ouh:: prob’ly: Mr Murphy an’ dad said prob’ly
5. Mrs Timpte en some a’ the teachers.

In line 1, the mother’s question is ambiguous; it can either be an information seeking question or a go-ahead seeking pre-announcement. Russ’s answer in line 2 makes it clear that he interpreted the previous line as a pre-announcement. However, the mother’s response in line 3 shows that she was actually asking an information seeking question. Russ eventually answers the mother’s question in line 4. He could have answered the mother’s question earlier, but he was orienting to the sequentially unfolding talk. As Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008) explain, this
segment shows that participant’s understanding of a prior action can change in the course of the conversation. It also shows that speakers act based upon their orientation to sequential structure.

2.1.1 The ethnomethodological foundation of CA

Historically, CA emerged as an independent and autonomous field in the late 1960s and early 1970s with primarily H. Sacks, E. Schegloff and G. Jefferson when they started looking at “the level of social order which could be revealed in everyday practice of talking” (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008: 15).

However, the intellectual and theoretical frame of CA can be traced back to ethnomethodology. The term ethnomethodology was first used by Garfinkel (Markee, 2000). It refers to the “study in which every day common sense activities are analyzed by participants and by the ways in which these analyses are incorporated into courses of action” (Markee, 2000: 25). In other words, it refers to how members of society conduct themselves systematically in a way they know will make sense to other members of the same society. According to Garfinkel (1984; 1967), all social actions are based on the fact that humans share a common understanding of each other. Without these shared and accepted understandings or intersubjectivities, anything social will not be possible (Wetherell, Taylor, Yates, & Open University, 2001).

Garfinkel (1967) used games analogies to explain that only the shared and accepted explicit rules make social actions possible. What is interesting in Garfinkel’s observation is that in real life there are no written and explicated rules by which we all abide, but somehow these unwritten rules automatically become apparent when they are breached (Wetherell et al., 2001). Indeed, Garfinkel (1967) demonstrated through several experiments known as “breaching experiments” (Wetherell et al., 2001: 51) that if we remove all the social norms we
systematically assume are known and shared by other members of society, we will soon create confusion and misunderstanding. According to Wetherell et al (2001: 51) intersubjectivity for Garfinkel is “the product of a circular process, in which an event and its background are dynamically adjusted to one another to form a coherent ‘gestalt’” (cited in Wetherell et al. (2001: 51).

The perspective envisioned by Garfinkel is directly applied in CA, or to use Wetherell et al.’s (2001: 52) words, “the practices and procedures with which parties produce and recognize talk are talk's 'ethnomethods’”. However, CA’s characteristic is that it is able to show the achievement of intersubjectivity through the analysis of talk. In other words, through the analyses of speakers’ production of talk and recipients’ orientation to this talk, CA is able to show the display of collaborative effort, the mission of which is to accomplish social action by members of society for other members of this same society. The role of the analyst is to show how these members of a given community understand each other and achieve this sequentially structured talk (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008).

The analysis of any given data in CA is context dependent in the sense that the immediate sequential environments are what interlocutors use to make sense of what is said in previous turns and what they subsequently use to produce the relevant next action (Markee, 2000). On the other hand, the general organization of turn taking in talk-interaction does not depend on social status, gender, age, race, or location of interlocutors. These factors do not affect the mechanisms and organization of talk interaction (Sacks et al., 1974; Markee, 2000).
2.1.2 Sequence organization in CA

One of the most obvious things about conversation is that actions are typically arranged in pairs, for instance questions and answers, greetings and return-greetings, invitations and acceptances/refusals, etc. These sequences are called adjacency pairs (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). The two pair parts are uttered by two different speakers and they are often produced one next to the other. However, this is not always the case, as there can be insertions between the first and second part. However, upon the production of a first pair part (FPP), the second pair part (SPP) will remain relevant even if it is not produced in the next turn (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). This illustrates the “serial nature of talk-in-interaction and its sequential properties” (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008: 43). This is exemplified in the following exchange (from Schegloff, 1968, cited in Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008: 43):

**FIGURE 2.2**

1. A: Can I have a bottle of Mich?   question 1
2. B: Are you over twenty-one?   insertion 1
3. A: No.   insertion 2
4. B: No.   answer 2

In line 1 A asks B a question, which would be a FPP, but in line 2, but instead of answering A’s question in line 2, B asks another question, thereby providing another FPP instead of providing the SPP for A’s FPP in the previous turn. In line 3, A addresses B’s question and provides the SPP to B’s FPP in line 2. Once the inserted question and answer are completed, in line 4, B then addresses A’s question in line 1 and gives the relevant response to that question, that is, the SPP to the FPP in line 1.

This exchange shows that in line 2, B was not avoiding to answer A’s question in line 1, but that he was instead waiting to have the missing and important piece of information needed to address A’s question in line 1. As we saw, B eventually answers A’s question once he has the
necessary information to address the question. The exchange also shows participants’ ongoing understanding of the talk as it is unfolding, and also stresses the “normative character” (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008: 45) of adjacency pairs. In other words, speakers monitor at all times the responses by recipients and check if the responses are relevant to the questions.

Another feature of adjacency pairs is that some types of FPP have more than one type of SPP. For example, one can either accept or reject an offer, one can agree or disagree with an assessment, and one can either grant or reject a request. These alternative responses do not perform the same actions, nor are they delivered in the same manner (Pomerantz, 1984). Granting a request, accepting an offer and agreeing with an assessment are termed “preferred-actions” (Pomerantz, 1984: 64) whereas rejecting a request or an offer and disagreeing with an assessment are called “dispreferred-actions” (Pomerantz, 1984: 64). Preferred responses are typically delivered straightforwardly and are rather short, whereas dispreferred responses are usually longer, they are followed by some sort of accounts, hedges or hesitation markers as illustrated in the following example from (Schegloff, 2007: 64):

FIGURE 2.3

1 A: Yuh comin down early?
2 B: Well I got a lot of things to do before gettin cleared up tomorrow. I don’t know.
3 I w- probably won’t be too early.

In this exchange, we can see that A’s request/invitation (line 1) is not exactly declined but it is not either accepted straightforwardly. B’s response in line 2, starts with “well” which is usually used to hedge a dispreferred answer, then he offers an account (lines 2-3) followed by “I don’t know” which indicates that he cannot commit assuredly. Finally, he answers the question in line 4, but the addition of “probably” after a self-repair indicates that he cannot for sure grant the request/accept the offer (Schegloff, 2007).
2.1.3 Turn-taking in conversation

Conversation by definition implicates people taking turns to interact and the mechanism involved is known as turn taking. The procedure of turn taking functions in a way so that there isn’t a significant gap between the end of one speaker’s utterance and the beginning of another speaker’s utterance. In addition, speakers see to it that they do not overlap with another speaker’s talk (Sacks et al., 1974). In other words, typically, one speaker talks at a time.

Transitions from one speaker to another are governed by a set of rules. First written by Sacks et al. (1974), the main points of the rules are given below (taken from Sidnell, 2010: 43) (C= current speaker, N= next speaker)

a. If C selects N in current turn, then C must stop speaking, and N must speak next, transition occurring at the first possible completion after N-selection.

b. If C does not select N, then any (other) party may self-select, first speaker gaining rights to the next turn.

c. If C does not select N, and no other party self-selects under option (b), then C may (but need not) continue (i.e. claim rights to a further TCU).

There are of course a few exceptions to these commonly accepted rules. For example, if someone enters a room full of people, the person will mostly probably be greeted at the same time by everyone in the room, or if someone tells a joke the responsive laughter will normally come at the same time by everyone appreciating the joke, and indeed the contrary would be surprising; people don’t usually wait for one person to finish their laughter before they begin laughing themselves (Sidnell, 2010).
The turn-taking system in conversation is “locally managed” (Sacks et al., 1974: 725) and “party-administered” (Sacks et al., 1974: 726). It is locally managed because the mechanism takes care only of the immediate surrounding turns, i.e., the current and next turns, and not later turns of talk. It is party administered because there is no third party who monitors and decides who should and should not talk next; rather, this is decide by the interlocutors themselves. However, not all kinds of talks are organized in this manner. For example, in formal debates the turns of talk may be decided in advance, or may be allocated by a moderator to allow the same amount of talk to all parties participating in the debate. Likewise, in a classroom, the teacher can sometimes decide who should and should not talk in order to give the opportunity of participation to a maximum number of students (Sidnell, 2010).

2.1.4 What is a turn?

A turn can consist of one or more “turn-constructional units”, or TCUs. A TCU may be formed out of a simple word, a phrase or a whole sentence (Sacks et al., 1974: 702). The following example from Sidnell (2010: 41) illustrates theses different types of units.

FIGURE 2.4

01 Debbie: whatever: an [hhh
02 Shelly: [you were at the halloween thing.  Sentential turn
03 Debbie: huh?
04 shelly: the halloween p[arty Phrasal turn
05 Debbie: [ri:ght. Lexical turn

In this exchange, Shelly’s turn in line 2 would be an example of a sentential TCU. Debbie’s’ turns in line 3 and 5 are lexical TCUs, while Shelly’s turn in line 4 is a phrasal TCU. Each of these unit types “allow[s] a projection of the unit-type under way, and what, roughly, it will take for an instance of that unit-type to be completed” (Sacks et al., 1974: 702).
At the end of each TCU, the next speaker may want to take the next turn. These places where a transition from one speaker to another may occur are labeled “transition relevance places”, or TRPs (Sacks et al., 1974). These places are of interest to both speakers and recipients. For example, speakers who want to keep the floor may speed up their pace of talk towards the end of a TCU and latch to the next TCU, thereby obstructing recipients from taking the turn. On the other hand, recipients may anticipate the end of a TCU and prepare their entry to start their own TCU. Thus syntactic, prosodic and pragmatic features are useful indicators for recipients to project the possible end of a TCU (Sacks et al., 1974).

2.1.5 Methods: acquiring data, and transcription

In order to do conversation analysis, one has to acquire naturalistic data in the form of audio or video recordings. The next step is then to transcribe the data. In explaining the importance of working with a recording of real conversation, Sacks (1984 cited in Sidnell, 2010: 20) states:

“...I want to argue that, however rich our imaginations are, if we use hypothetical, or hypothetical typical versions of the world we are constrained by reference to what an audience, an audience of professionals, can accept as reasonable. That might not appear to be a terrible constraint until we come to look at the kinds of things that actually occur”.

Sidnell (2010: 23) remarks that to do conversation analysis, one has to practice “to listen to talk in a different way”. By this he means that in listening, one must pay attention not just to the words, but also to every silence, as well as to false starts, hesitation markers, intonation and pace changes, in breaths, etc. and transcribe them as precisely and faithfully as possible. In order to accomplish such an effort-demanding task, one must of course have to listen to the recordings...
as many times as necessary, with sometimes slowing down or speeding up the playback of talk if needed. The accuracy of the transcription is crucial because the interpretation of the data depends on the subtleties of meticulously transcribed talk (Sidnell, 2010). A transcription notation system developed by Jefferson and as described in Atkinson & Heritage (1984) is still used today to represent the relevant details in talk.

To conclude this section, we can use Markee’s (2000: 28) “defining characteristics of CA” to encapsulate CA’s main features:

1) CA is “agnostic” (Markee, 2000: 28) to etic interpretations, because the research is not based on members’ accounts of their own understandings.

2) CA analysts don’t rely on quantitative data, because they do not reveal much about the “underlying preferential structure of conversation” (Markee, 2000: 28).

3) “Prototypical examples” are not enough for a “convincing argument” (Markee, 2000: 28) concerning the finding of a particular observation or phenomenon; instead, the analyst must demonstration or show participants’ orientation to accomplish a particular function in the discourse and see if that function can be found in other similar environments.

2.1.6 Methodology: why CA?

As Markee (2000: 28) has pointed out, in CA arguments are not developed based on “quantitative and frequency data” but rather on how participants orient to each other’s turns and make subsequent and relevant responses. In other words, this is what defines a “qualitative study”.

Schiffrin (1987: 66) compares quantitative study to qualitative study for discourse markers analysis and acknowledges advantages for both methods. She states that both qualitative
and quantitative approaches are valuable and can even be complementary. In fact, she thinks that in reality these two terms represent somehow an “artificial dichotomy” (Schiffrin, 1987: 66). In other words, according to the author most analyses take account of both methodologies in their research. For example, according to Schiffrin (1987: 66) underlying a qualitative study is the notion that “more is better”, that is, the interpretations of a particular “phenomenon” will be convincing if we find more of the same phenomenon (Tannen, 1984: 37 cited in Schiffrin, 1987). We will agree with this interpretation only to some extent. This is because as Markee (2000: 28-29) noted, in CA “prototypical examples” are not enough to demonstrate the validity of an observation; instead, one has to use “the convergence of different types of textual evidence” (Markee, 2000: 29) to show how a particular phenomenon can have similar functions in different environments. For example, in an invitation sequence, one has to determine whether the invitation was declined or accepted by analyzing the turns before and after the invitation. Only then can one use those same observations that justified the identification of initiation rejection or acceptance to see if they could play the same role in other contexts (Markee, 2000).

Schiffrin (1987) explained that a quantitative analysis would not be possible without qualitative description. But most importantly, she points out that quantitative analysis is often not compatible with talk-in-interaction. This is because by definition, talk is an ever-changing activity, and to use the author’s words “it is just this quality that can lead an investigator to seat him or herself in the minds of conversationalist (or to even be a conversationalist) and interpret from the participant point of view just what is going on” (Schiffrin, 1987: 67). It is specifically this same quality that makes “counting exceedingly difficult” (Schiffrin, 1987: 67).

It is for this same particular reason that I opted to adopt the framework of Conversation Analysis (CA). As stated earlier, discourse markers are not placed randomly, but rather are
placed in specific positions and contribute thus to the coherence of the discourse (Schiffrin, 1987). Hence in analyzing the input of a discourse marker (e.g., *voilà*) in talk in-interaction, we should opt for “an approach which takes sequential accountability” (Schiffrin, 1987: 69). By showing how participants in talk in-interaction orient to specific actions and more pointedly how participants use *voilà* in specific positions, I will show the different functions that *voilà* plays in different environments and situations.

Schegloff (1993) has also noted that in talk in-interaction, the importance and the relevancy of a phenomenon is not necessarily measured by the number of times the phenomenon occurs but rather by the way co-participants’ attend and orient to “what a speaker has done” (Schegloff, 1993: 101). Besides, Schegloff remarks that “one is also a number” (Schegloff, 1993: 101), and for him a single case may be an indicative of a likelihood occurrence of similar cases on a larger scale. But most importantly, Schegloff (1993) argues that before one classifies and counts any examples as belonging to a specific category, one has to make sure the actions performed by these examples are exactly the same.

Of course, a quantitative analysis of discourse markers could be just as valuable and insightful. For instance, I would argue that *voilà* is most probably one of the most, if not the most frequently used particle in spoken French, and as such, a quantitative analysis would probably shed some light on the reasons for its frequency of use. For instance, a quantitative study would have offered some insights on whether its frequency is related to the fact that *voilà* is performing the functions of other discourse markers, etc. But once again and to paraphrase Schiffrin (1987) and Schegloff (1993), it would be hard to do a quantitative analysis before a qualitative study. It is with this “order” in mind that I approach the present study.
2.1.7 Data collection: description of subjects and research site

My data come from mainly three different sources: First my analyses are based upon approximately four hours of audio and Skype recordings of conversations among native speakers of French. The participants are mostly close family members: daughter-mother, granddaughter-grandmother, and niece-aunt. Due to the fact that they call and talk to each other on a regular basis, the conversations could be characterized as quite informal, ordinary and casual.

My second set of data comes from a talk show on the national French radio Europe 1. It is a two hour long and quite popular daily show hosted by an equally popular host, and is accompanied by a regular team of people with different professional backgrounds: writers, journalists, comedians, etc. Together, they comment on the main news of the day, with topics ranging from political to cultural and other social related news, all delivered in a very friendly and humorous manner. Some of the features of the show consist of news related quizzes, interactions with listeners/callers and a segment of discussion with a special guest. Some of the format is similar to the American radio show on public radio NPR “Wait Wait Don’t Tell Me”.

I chose to use this show as my main data for numerous reasons: first, it is a non-scripted show in which various topics are discussed on a daily basis on a quite long period of time (the show runs for about 2 hours per day). In my opinion, this is a valuable feature as it provides numerous occasions for production of the targeted word in different environments and performing different functions; some of the environments in which voilà are produced might not necessarily be found in planned recorded data (e.g., delicate topics). Most of the panelists are close friends of the talk show host, which in my opinion contributes to the fact that the interactions are naturalistic and friendly. The show even provides segments of interactions with
several callers/listeners. All of these qualities make the show similar to a non-elicited mundane conversation.

In addition, I am also using a few videos from national French television talk shows. This additional source has all the qualities of the radio show, while also providing visuals. Both visuals and gestures in CA are essential, in some cases they may even be crucial (e.g., in word searches).

For the first data set (i.e., the recordings of mundane conversation I collected), I use pseudonyms to protect the anonymity of the participants. Since the last two data sources are publicly available, however, I use interactants’ first names to identify them. The collected data were transcribed according to the transcription notation developed by Gail Jefferson (1984) for conversation analysis. The first lines have been transcribed in French, the second line provides a word by word translation in English, and the third line is an idiomatic translation in English.

2.2 Closing a conversation

One of the focuses of the current study concerns the use of voilà in sequence closings. Hence I will first discuss prior studies on closings. I will first review the sequential structure involved in closing a conversation (e.g., the structure of terminal exchanges) and in closing a sequence. I will also show how in some cases, sequences can be expanded after a closing has been initiated. I will address the delicacy involved in closing in general. Finally I will review closings in French language conversations.

One of the facts underlying the machinery of turn-taking is that the length of conversation is not specified in advance (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). In other words, we don’t know in advance when a conversation will end. As pointed out by Sacks et al. (1974), the turn-taking
mechanism itself also does not directly address the issue of closing conversations. However, it
does put “constraints on how any system of rules for achieving conversational closing (and thus
length) could operate” Sacks et al., 1974: 710).

The turn-taking system deals first and foremost with “ongoing orderliness” (Schegloff &
Sacks, 1973: 294). It is a system of sequences of talk within which there is an organization of
different types of sequences, and by reference to which the length or the closing of conversation
may be determined. On the basis of this argument, the authors formulate what they called “an
initial problem” (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973: 294) concerning closings as follows: “HOW TO
ORGANIZE THE SIMULTANEOUS ARRIVAL OF CONVERSATIONALISTS AT A POINT
WHERE ONE SPEAKER’S COMPLETION WILL NOT OCCASION ANOTHER SPEAKR’S
TALK AND THAT WILL NOT BE HEARD AS SOME SPEAKER’S SILENCE” (Schegloff &
Sacks, 1973: 294-295, capitalization in the original). In other words, how can the thread of this
“ongoing talk” be stopped without occasioning interlocutors’ disorientation or confusion?

According to Schegloff & Sacks (1973), part of the solution to this problem is to be
found in the use of a specific adjacency pair, namely the terminal exchange, e.g., an exchange of
“good-byes”. But if the terminal exchanges do actually close a conversation, this solution is only
a partial one since it still does not answer the question of where such closings can be placed in
the sequence. In other words, it is not clear when (and how) the closing of a conversation really
starts (ten Have, 2007).

Closing a conversation is indeed a delicate matter both socially and technically. For this
reason, Schegloff & Sacks (1973: 289) point out that conversations do not just end, but rather
must be “brought to a close”. In other words, while co-participants know that at some point they
will have to end the conversation they are engaged in, it has to be done in a manner that will not
cause resentment to either party involved. As Sidnell (2010: 215) puts it, a “rather specific place, or context, must be prepared for such actions if they are to be properly understood as simply ending the conversation rather than as expressing annoyance or anger” (Sidnell, 2010: 215). In any cases, closing sequences cannot start until all the topics in a given interaction, including the “unmentioned mentionables”, (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973: 303) have been dealt with.

Normally, closing a conversation is a two-step procedure, with the first step consisting of pre-closing/closing token: “well”, “all right”… produced with downward intonation contour; this is then followed by the terminal exchanges. But in order for the first turn to function as a pre-closing, it is necessary that this first turn be positioned at “the analyzable ends” of a topic (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973: 305). In other words, it has to be preceded by a sequence in which one partner offers to close down the topic and the other accepts.

The “archetype closing” (Button, 1987: 102) or canonical closing for Schegloff & Sacks (1973) consists of four turns organized in two adjacency pairs. The first and second turns (constituting the first adjacent pair) are realized with items such as “okay” and “all right,” terms which indicate for both parties that no new topic will be introduced, while the next two turns constituting the second adjacent pair or terminal exchanges often consist of an exchange of “goodbye” (or its equivalent) from both parties.

FIGURE 2.5 “archetype closing” (Button, 1987: 102)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A:</td>
<td>Well. [turn 1: A offers to close (pre-closing)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B:</td>
<td>Okay. [turn 2: B accepts (second close component)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:</td>
<td>Goodbye. [turn 3: A takes the first terminal turn]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B:</td>
<td>See you. [turn 4: B reciprocates]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While archetype closing or terminal exchanges account for the close ordering of the sequence, what is really relevant is not so much that they are initiated next after some other turn,
but that as Schegloff & Sacks (1973: 300) stated, it is a “properly initiated closing section”. In other words, terminal exchanges and pre-closings sequences cannot start before all the topics in a given interaction, including the “unmentioned mentionables”, (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973: 303) are dealt with.

Button (1987, 1989), who elaborated on Schegloff & Sacks (1974), states that there are more possibilities in closings sequences, and that these range from lengthening the closing section to actually “moving out” (Button, 1987: 104) from the closing section into continuing the conversation. Moving out sequences identified by Button (1987, 1989) include arrangements, back-references, reasons-for-calls, and appreciations.

In addition, Goldberg (2004) has observed that intonation contributes to introducing a closing sequence. She noted that there is an “amplitude shift mechanism” (Goldberg, 2004: 257) in bringing a conversation to a close. According to the author, after the initiation of closing and contrary to what might be expected, an increase in amplitude often occurs. Goldberg (2004) argues that the place right after the closing initiation is ripe for “sequence suspension activities” (Goldberg, 2004: 294).

By virtue of their structure, sequences are usually shorter than a whole conversation. A sequence can be closed right after the second pair part of an adjacency pair, or can go beyond those simple couple of turns. In the following section we will see how a sequence can be as short as a couple of turns, or in some cases how it can be expanded.

2.2.1 Closing a sequence

In an adjacency pair, the utterance of a first pair part (FPP) makes systematically relevant the occurrence of second pair part (SPP). This condition eliminates the possibility of a sequence
end after the FPP. However, if a sequence were to end after an FPP, then it would be indicative of some sort of abruptness (e.g., of someone deliberately ignoring a question). Then again, “ignoring” is an example of a sequence ending in an unrecognizable manner (Schegloff, 2007). In this respect, a sequence, just like a turn or any other recognizable structured unit, ends with a recognizable form of closure (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). So with the production of the second pair part, this constraint on sequence completion is met and the sequence is recognizably closed. This is commonly the case with sequences that have no preference structure, such as greetings, leave takings, etc. (Schegloff, 2007).

Parties involved in an interaction show that a sequence is closed by moving on to another sequence and/or by opening a new topic. However, it can also happen that speakers will allow a lapse of time at the end of one sequence and the beginning of a new one. This can happen while both speakers are present in the same interactional space e.g., in a car. In those moments speakers are in a “continuing state of incipient talk” (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973: 325). Those moments of silence are not interpreted as “awkward moments” or as some kind of interactional rule breach. In fact, at some point the lapse will end by speakers resuming the conversation with a new topic without any need for greetings or any other explanation (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973).

2.2.2 Post expansion

Most of sequences go beyond the minimal length of an adjacency pair. Such expanded sequences involve the addition of turns by the interlocutors. These expansions occur in three possible places: before the FPP (Pre-expansion) between the FPP and the projected SPP (insert expansion) and after the SPP (post expansion) (Schegloff, 2007).
In this section we will mainly focus on the post-expansion and on some of the ways in which parties in talk-interaction may expand a sequence before they close it. Let us first begin by stating that in general, sequences with agreeing SPPs are closure-relevant while ones with dispreferred SPPs are expansion-relevant (Schegloff, 2007). Among the closure-relevant sequences we will look closely at minimal post-expansions.

Minimal post-expansion sequences have one additional turn after the SPP. By “minimal” we should understand that the turn which is added is “designed not to project any further within-sequence talk beyond itself” (Schegloff, 2007:118). It is basically designed to close the sequence. These sequences are labeled “sequence-closing thirds” (SCT) (Schegloff, 1998: 568; Schegloff, 2007: 118). They come in a variety of forms or combinations of them. The most common forms in English are oh, okay, or assessment tokens.

2.2.3 Sequence closing thirds with “oh”

The main function of stand-alone marker oh is to mark or claim information receipt. It is a “change-of-state token” (Heritage, 1984: 299) because it indicates that the prior utterance was informative and that it has changed the recipient’s state “from non-knowing to now-knowing” (Heritage, 1984; Schegloff, 2007: 118). For the purpose of the current study, I will
mainly focus os the position of *oh* after the SPP, where the change-of-state token indicates the end of the sequence as illustrated in the following example.

FIGURE 2.7 (Schegloff, 2007: 119)

1 Nan: FPP =.hhh Dz he av iz own apar:rt[mint?]
2 Hyl: SPP [.hhhh] Yea:h,=
3 Nan: SCT=*oh*;
4 (1.0)
5 Nan: FPP How didju git iz number,

Here, we can see that the first turn functions as request for information. In line 2, Hyla produces a second pair part while in line 3 Nancy closes the sequence with *oh* and opens a new one in line 5.

2.2.4 Sequence closing thirds with “okay”

*Okay* and its variants such as *alright* are used to mark acceptance (Schegloff, 2007). *Oh okay* can also close down a sequence after a SPP as illustrated in the following example.

FIGURE 2.8 (Schegloff, 2007: 121)

1 Don: FPP Shall I pour it out?
2 Jon: SPP No I rih- I don’ want that much. Rea[llly.=
3 Don: SCT [Oh okay.
4 Jon:= I jus’wannid ‘l bit ( ).
5 Don: SCT Okay.

Don offers Jon some kind beverage (line 1). Jon starts by refusing the offer with “no” but then he specifies that he doesn’t want as much amount of the beverage as Jon was offering (lines 2 and 4). Don accepts Jon’s request with “oh okay” (line 3 and 5). After Jon provides an account for the rejection of the offer (line 4), Don again receipts it with *okay* (this time in second position). *Okay* can also close down a sequence after a dispreferred SPP as in the following example.
FIGURE 2.9 (Schegloff, 2007: 121)

1 Ali: FPP you wan’ me bring you anything?
2  (0.4)
3 Bet: SPP No: no: nothing.
4 Ali: SCT  k\o\:\k\\.

Here the offer in line 1 is rejected in line 3 after a pause in line 2, which is characteristic of dispreferred responses. Finally, in line 4 the dispreferred response is accepted.

2.2.5 Sequence closing thirds with assessments

Assessments in third position closings express what in Schegloff’s terms is a “stance taken up toward what the SPP speaker has said or done in the prior turn” (Schegloff, 2007: 124).

FIGURE 2.10 (Schegloff, 2007: 124)

1 Bee: FPP h\h\owuh you?:
2 Ava SPP  k\a::\y?hh=
3 Bee SCT  =\g\o\d.=\y\h\s[ou:nd] hh

In this extract, Ava uses the assessment term “good” as a SCT (sequence closing third) and rushes through to start a new sequence right after. Assessment terms can therefore be used as a pretext to start a new sequence.

Antaki, Houtkoop-Steenstra, & Rapley (2000) have shown that high-grade assessments such as brilliant, terrific, etc. in interview exchanges are not actually used to compliment or to positively assess “the informational content of the previous turn” (Antaki et al., 2000: 236) but rather that they “claim a closure on the previous material as having been, in the circumstances, successfully completed as a section in a segmented whole” (Antaki et al., 2000: 236). The authors argue that in interview settings, the general pattern of [answer receipt] + [“ok” or “right”] + [next question] is a very “schematic characterization” (Antaki et al., 2000: 238). This is because according to the authors, it does not take into account the repetitions of question, the
confirmation of answers, or any other similar things occurring in this environment (Antaki et al., 2000). Instead they have found that between an answer receipt and the beginning of the next sequence, interviewers use a “high-grade assessment” (Antaki et al., 2000: 238). According to the authors, the general sequence pattern would thus be: [answer receipt] + [“ok” or “right” etc] + [high-grade assessment] + [next item]. This is illustrated in the following example.

FIGURE 2.11 (Antaki et al., 2000: 240)

1 I right Ok ‘en (..) (.hh) compared to yr- ev’ryone
2 else Arthur (.)(tsk)d you think (.)(.) that you’re
3 >better o:ff< (.) about the same (.)(.) or worse off
4 (..)
5 AR ((throat noise)) I’m better off
6 I yer better off ri:ght (.) jolly good(.(.)hhh
7 ah (are most?) of the things that yo:u do Arthur (.)
8 AR yer

In this extract of an interview, I receipts AR’s answer (line 6) first with a repeat of AR’s answer (line 5) and another receipt token “right”. The high-grade assessment “jolly good” comes after a micro pause. This seems to show that the high-grade assessment doesn’t actually address the answer given by AR in the previous turn the same way that the receipt token does. So here, the high-grade assessment does not seem to be related to the informational content of the interview (Antaki et al., 2000), but instead it is used to close this question answer sequence before addressing the next sequence.

This next example is even more convincing, according to Antaki et al. (2000: 241).

FIGURE 2.12 (Antaki et al., 2000: 241)

01 I .hhhh do y’ave a family (.).Jimmy
02 JI no:: (.) they don’t comes (..) they don’t see: me now:
03 I they don’t never come and see: you=
04 JI = no:(..)
05 I right=
06 JI =(they) (2 syll) come: see:
07 I right:t (.) okay then (..) >brilliant<
08 (..) done the first [page:
09 [((pages shuffling))]
10 JI done the (fir’) page (.)(.) ye:s=
In this extract of an interview, JI complains about the fact that his family never comes to see him. This is obviously a rather sad situation, to say the least, and not something to cheer about. Thus, the interviewer’s assessment “brilliant” (in line 7) obviously is not a response to JI’s sad familial situation. If that had been the case, this assessment would have been interpreted as insensitive and offensive (Antaki et al., 2000). In fact according to the authors, there is an indication in the way the utterance is carried out that eliminates such interpretation. They argue that the assessment is not related to the information given by JI but rather it “signals that (whatever the informational content), that answer is now done and over, and it is time for next business” (Antaki et al., 2000: 242).

In another study Antaki (2002) found that high grade assessments are used to achieve “a return to closing” (Antaki, 2002: 11) after a closing sequence has been interrupted. But the author also points out that not necessarily all interrupted sequences resume with high grade assessments, but it seems that whenever they are found, they “preface a resumption of the close” (Antaki, 2002: 11). For instance, in the following example Leslie uses a high grade assessment after Ed’s turn in which he proposes future arrangements (Antaki, 2002).

FIGURE 2.13 (Antaki, 2002: 10)

1 Ed: [I think she’d like to.
2 (0.2)
3 Les: Hm:. hn- [Okay then. [Right well
4 Ed: [So- ] [(Yes) I ’ll see you on-
5 on Thursday at six thirty then.
6 Les: .t Lovely.
7 Ed: [:]
8 Les: [ Bah bye then, ]
9 Ed: Bye;,

In line 3, Leslie states what appears to be a first turn of a pre-closing, but Ed’s overlapped turn (line 4) is not consistent with a closing sequence. Instead of orienting to Leslie’s pre-closing, Ed initiates an arrangement sequence (line 5). As pointed out by the author, such arrangement turns
can lead to a closing immediately, or they can be extended letting the speakers move out of a closing (Button, 1987). Hence in line 6, by producing the high grade assessment “Lovely” Leslie chooses not to expand it. This seems to have prompted Ed to go back to the closing sequence (line 7). Even though what is said in line 7 is unintelligible, Leslie and Ed’s terminal exchanges (lines 8-9) seems to indicate that whatever was produced in line 7 was “consistent with closedown” (Antaki, 2002: 11) The high grade assessment then prefaces “the resumption of the closedown” (Antaki, 2002: 13).

2.2.6 Combination of sequence closing third tokens

Some sequence closing thirds tokens can be combined to form composites, with perhaps the most common one being “oh” plus “okay”. In the following example, Karen uses an excuse as something that is impeding her from accepting an invitation.

FIGURE 2.14 (Schegloff, 2007: 127)

1 Vic: FPP =I called um to see if you want to uh (0.4) c’mover en watch, the Classics Theater.
2 (0.3)
3 Vic: Sandy’n Tom’n I,=
4 Kar: Fins =She sto{ops t’Conquer?
5 Vic: [ ( )-
6 (0.4)
7 Vic: Sins Yeh.
8 (0.3)
9 Kar: SPP Mom js asked me t’watch it with her,h=
10 Vic: SCT= Oh. Okay,
11 (0.3)

After the invitation sequence (lines 1-2), there is a silence (line 3) followed by an insertion sequence (5-8) and then more silences (line 7 and 9), all of which indicate that a dispreferred answer is going to be produced (Pomerantz, 1984). And indeed, Karen clearly rejects the invitation (line 10). Thus, in the following turn the use of “oh” marks the receipt of
the information given by Karen, while the “okay” marks that the refusal of the invitation was accepted (Schegloff, 2007).

2.2.7 Closing a sequence with “anyway”

Park (2010) observed that sometimes talk can reach a point where it cannot continue any further. This is usually due to the fact that interlocutors cannot establish understanding anymore, or that there are other troubles impeding the talk from advancing. According to the author, in such cases, rather than pursuing the talk in vain, participants use anyway to signify “the current state of affairs as an impasse” (Park, 2010: 3285) and to signal “an abandonment of the search” (Park, 2010: 3285) and shows the participants’ desire to start a new topic. The author has also noticed that anyway is used by the person who initiated the unsuccessful talk. By stopping the extension of the talk in such a way, the speaker shows his executive right to ending the failed matter (Park, 2010). This is illustrated in the following example. Before this next extract, Hyla and Nancy talked about a man who was supposed to write to Hyla but never did. They both joked about how he is taking his time to write. Nancy then remarks that by the time the letter arrives, Hyla will be married with kids. Her remark was said in overlap. The sequence begins with some clarification turns (Park, 2010).
In line 21, Nancy repeats what she presumably said earlier. Hyla receipt this information minimally: with an ‘oh’ a change-of-state token (Heritage, 1984) followed by short laughter (lines 22-23). In line 24, Nancy who was probably expecting a longer response from Hyla, undermines her comments with “never mind”. By then, she must have realized that her comments were not funny. The silence in the next line heightens even further this awkwardness (line 24). This seems to force Nancy to acknowledge the inappropriateness of her remark (line 26). The laughter in her voice indicates that she is trying to take the tension out of the atmosphere. In line 29, Hyla agrees with Nancy that the remark was not funny, thereby
condemning it. The subsequent silences (line 32 and 34) did not seem to make the atmosphere less strained. Finally, Nancy gives up on this particular conversation with ‘anyway’ (line 35). In line 40, Hyla starts a new topic. Hence the ‘anyway’ closed an “intentionally stalled sequence” (Park, 2010: 3284).

In this section I reviewed some characteristics of closings in the English language. In the following section we will see some features of French closings.

2.2.8 Closings in French

Mondada & Traverso (2005) studied the sequential organization of the closing of a topic and of an activity in French. Mondada & Traverso (2005) argue that the closing of a topic and/or of an activity follows similar procedures as was shown by Schegloff & Sacks (1973) for the closing of conversations. Both studies (Mondada & Traverso, 2005; Mondada, 2006) looked at the sequential organization of topics and activities endings in interactions occurring in the workplace.

Mondada & Traverso (2005) analyzed the sequential environment in which all the participants orient to closing an activity. The following extract is from a meeting in a psychiatry facility, where a team of doctors is discussing the cases of their patients. (The original transcript is in French; the word by word translations as well as the idiomatic translation are mine).

FIGURE 2.16 (Mondada & Traverso, 2005: 39-40)

1  (1.6)

2 DrL: [voilà]
   [that’s it]

3 DrD: bô[n euh donc euh on a pas fini
   go[od uh so uh we have not finished
   o[k uh so uh we’re not done

4 d’en entendre parler de monsieur (.) david
In line 2 Dr. Laurencin initiates a pre-closing with voilà, following a pause in the previous turn (line 1) which indicates that none of the participants have anything more to add (Mondada & Traverso, 2005). At the same time or in overlap with the previous closing initiation, Dr Dumarsais initiates another kind of closing: a “common sense-related” expression (relevant du sens commun) (My translation) (Mondada & Traverso, 2005: 40). According to Mondada & Traverso (2005: 40) who cite (Schegloff & Sacks 1973), these kinds of idiomatic expressions

1 It is not clear from the data who was speaking before line 1. However, if DrL was speaking before the pause (line 1) then the voilà in line 2 indicates that he does not have anything to add. Thus with voilà, DrL is overtly handing back the floor. In other words, it does not necessarily indicate that the other participants do not have anything to add, as the authors claim.
which “prompt[s] agreement from the participants” (visant à susciter l’accord des participants) (Mondada & Traverso, 2005: 40) (my translation) are usually deployed in closing sections. Both closing initiations are followed by tokens of agreement to closing by the other participants (line 5 and 6). These tokens (line 5 and 6) are produced in a lower voice and are rather short; this indicates that the participants are orienting to closing. The rather long pause in line 7 validates this orientation (Mondada & Traverso, 2005). In line 8, Dr. Dumarsais initiates the next case concerning another patient, thereby indicating that the previous case is closed (Mondada & Traverso, 2005: 40).

The sequential structure could thus be summed up as follows (my translation from Mondada & Traverso, 2005: 40): “1. Projection of the upcoming closing of the activity. 2. Alignment by the other participants with the proposed initiation of closing. 3. Introduction of the next activity (i.e., the next case). 4. Alignment of the participants on this new shift of activity”².

However, the authors assert that all the participants don’t always orient toward the closing. In such cases, the sequential organization is obviously different from the one described above. For instance, the “misalignment” (désalignement) by participants toward the projected closing can come “more or less prematurely” (plus ou moins prématurément) (Mondada & Traverso, 2005: 42). The sequential structure can thus be summed up as follows (my translation from Mondada & Traverso, 2005: 44): “1. Projection of closing/accomplishment of pre-closing.

---
² The French original reads as: “1. projection de la clôture imminente d’une phase, réalisée par différentes ressources ; 2. alignement des autres participants sur la clôture ainsi initiée ; 3. introduction de la phase suivante ; 4. alignement des participants sur cette nouvelle phase” (Mondada & Traverso, 2005: 40).
2. misalignment of the projected/initiated closing. 3. Continuation/re-opening of previous activity”

According to the authors, misalignment in closing a topic can occur at different sequential moments. Depending on when this happens, participants can project more or less sooner the upcoming misalignment. This is illustrated in the following figure.

FIGURE 2.17 from (Mondada & Traverso, 2005: 45)

According to the authors, if A and B are two separate activities/topics, then the numbers 1- 4 indicate “the different sequential positions” (Mondada & Traverso, 2005: 45) where a participant can interrupt and halt the projected shift of topic. Hence, interference can occur as early as position 1 or as late as position 4 or anywhere in between (Mondada & Traverso, 2005). According to the authors, the positions where co-participants intervene could be the end of TCUs, pauses, or TRPs.

Mondada & Traverso (2005: 44) have also noticed the use of different kind “opposition markers” (marqueurs d’opposition) such as sauf que (except that) or alors que (whereas) used in misalignment in closing a topic. The authors have also noticed some voice modifications when the second speaker does not align with regard to closure of the sequence. It seems that such misalignments are designed in such a way as to be in contrast to the previous turn. However, the

---

3 The French original reads as: “1. projection de la clôture imminente d’une phase, voire accomplissement de la pré-clôture et passage à l’ouverture de la phase suivante ; 2. désalignement par rapport à ce qui est projeté ou initié ; 3. continuation de la phase précédente, voire réouverture” (Mondada & Traverso, 2005: 44).
authors clarify that when participants misalign, they don’t necessarily disagree with the information provided but rather with the structure of the closing sequences.

In this next study, Doehler, De Stefani, & Horlacher (2011) looked at the role played by left- and right-dislocated constructions in the closing of topics and sequences in French interaction. (Doehler et al., 2011: 56) define a dislocated construction as “a sentence structure in which a referential element (e.g., the waiter) is located to the left or to the right of a matrix clause (he left)”. The authors specify that in English, the pronoun (e.g., he) is a free morpheme, whereas in French the pronoun is a clitic. Their analyses showed a “complementary distribution” of these two types of constructions (Doehler et al., 2011: 51). Specifically, there seems to be a preference for a left-dislocated construction for closing a sequence in the same turn by the same speaker, whereas a right-dislocated construction is mainly used by the next speaker in a next turn closing (Doehler et al., 2011).

The following example illustrates the use of left-dislocated constructions (LDs).

FIGURE 2.18 (Doehler et al., 2011: 52)

1 JOS ((turn continued)) y a quand-même un:e there is still a:
   2 responsabilité de lui apprendre des langues pour que: responsibility to teach him languages so that
   3 euh (.) qu' il puisse après se débrouiller l'élève (.) hum that he can then get through the pupil
   4 un peu partout. a bit everywhere.
   5 LIO mhm

6 JOS (donc eh) (1.0) apprendre des langues à l'école learn-INF DET languages at DET school
   (so hum) to learn languages at school
   7 c'e::st quand-même ◦une chose◦ ◦◦ essentielle◦◦. it is nevertheless a thing essential
      that's still something essential
   8 LIO mhm
In this extract, Joséphine talks about the responsibility of teaching students languages and
the use they can make out of it (1-4). Then she uses a LD to conclude her talk about this topic of
“teaching responsibility” which she qualifies as “essential” (lines 6-7). In this dislocated
construction, the referential element would be *apprendre une langue à l’école* / ‘to learn
languages at school’, and it is placed to the left of the matrix *c’est quand même une chose
essentielle* / ‘That’s still something essential’. This is followed with an introduction of a new
topic by a new participant, who did not participate in the talk up until then (Doehler et al., 2011).
Indeed, Gisèle changes the topic as the authors put it from “school’s responsibility in teaching
languages to students’ responsibility in learning languages” (Doehler et al., 2011: 52)

The following example illustrates the use of RDs in the next turn by the next speaker.

**FIGURE 2.18 (cont.)**

9 GIS mais je pense que: . h c’ est aussi u: n aux
   but I think that it’s also a up to the
10 élèves de (◦◦) de se prendre a- un peu a:- après
   pupils to to look a- a little bit a- after
11 en charge,
   themselves,
In line 10, Lionel first acknowledges with *voilà* Bruno's previous lengthy turn (1-8) which end in a falling intonation. Lionel then goes on to assess Bruno’s last turn in the form of a RD (lines14-15). He then introduces a new sequence and selects the next speaker by calling her by name (line 18) (Doehler et al., 2011).

This study showed that the initiation of closings can actually be achieved in the same turn, even if sometimes the turns are lengthy. Doehler et al. (2011: 55) specify that usually LDs indicate “the closure of narrative or argumentative sequences”. In addition, the findings reveal that the majority of closing initiations were followed by new sequence initiations and not necessarily by alignment or misalignment tokens (Doehler et al., 2011). According to the
authors, this is does not correspond to Schegloff’s (2007) description of closing sequences, but again according to Doehler et al. (2011) this sequential property of the closings may have to do with the special type of interaction they have looked at; that is, “multi-party conversational interviews” (Doehler et al., 2011: 74).

The authors acknowledge that other studies (Button, 1987, 1989; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973; Schegloff, 2007, to name a few), have written in detail about the structures of closing initiations as well as the structure of aborted closing, but according to Doehler et al. (2011) there are not many studies of “the grammatical resources that are involved in such initiations”. However, in an earlier study, De Stefani (2007) had already argued that not only do LDs function as a “syntactic device” for closing down a topic or a conversational sequence, but in addition she had found that such constructions are often “rhythmically structured” (De Stefani, 2007: 137), which led her to claim that rhythm functions as a complementary device signaling an impending closing initiation sequence.

Hence, Doehler et al. (2011) advance our understandings of closing initiations in general but also of closing initiations in French in particular, as they provide the specific “linguistic features” deployed to accomplish them (Doehler et al., 2011: 73). As a matter of fact, Doehler et al. (2011: 73) point out that the use of dislocated constructions as closing initiators may be specific in French “where dislocated constructions are frequent”. Finally, although LDs and RDs constructions were not used in all closing initiations, there were enough occurrences to qualify them, to use their term, as “striking” (Doehler et al., 2011:54).

By looking closely at the use and function of the French discourse marker voilà in conversation closings, the current study will contribute to the existing literature on French closings.
2.3 Word searches

The current study will look at how French speakers deploy *voilà* in their word search activities. Therefore, in this section I will review prior studies on word searches.

Word searches have been studied extensively in conversations between native speakers (Goodwin, 1983, 1987; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Hayashi, 2003; Lerner, 1991, 1996), between native and non-native speakers (Brouwer, 2003; Park, 2007, Kurhila, 2006) and in the talk of speakers with aphasia (Helasvuo, Laakso, & Sorjonen, 2004; Wilkinson, 2009). For the purpose of this study, I will mainly focus on word searches with native speakers.

A word search is often indicated by a “display of trouble with the production of an item in an ongoing turn at talk” (Brouwer, 2003: 535). One of the characteristics of a TCU is that it is constructed in a way that permits recipients to know approximately when the TCU will end (Sacks, et al., 1974; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986, Lerner, 1991). Because of this characteristic, it becomes noticeable if a speaker self-interrupts a TCU in progress (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986). Such disruptions may display a word search, which are often indicated by sound stretches, hesitation markers (“u:hm”s’), repetitions of the last word before the actual word search, self-addressed *wh*-questions such as “what's it called,” “what was his name again?”, pauses/gaps and other non-verbal sounds (Goodwin, 1983; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Goodwin, 1987; Hayashi, 2003; Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks, 1977). These troubles indicate the “relevant unavailability” (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986: 55) of the missing word. That is to say, the missing words are specifically obstructing the talk from going forward (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986).

From a CA perspective, a word search is a kind of self-initiated repair sequence in that by searching for the missing word, participants interrupt their talk in order to address a problem of
speaking (Schegloff et al., 1977). Such repairs can be self-initiated and self-completed, as in this following example by Schegloff et al. (1977: 363).

FIGURE 2.20

Clacia: B't, a-another one theh wentuh school with me wa:s a girl na:med uh, (0.7) *W't th' hell wz er name. *Karen. Right. Karen.

In this example, we can see that Clacia is searching for a classmate’s name but can’t remember it. The searches are indicated by the stretch on the words “wa:s”, “na:med” which is then followed by the hesitation marker “uh”, then by quite a long pause. She then “asks herself” the name of the person she’s searching for, which is indicated by the lower voice. Finally, when she finds the name she first says it to herself, which she then approves to be the right one with “right”, and finally says it aloud to the potential participants in the interaction.

A word search can also be self-initiated and other completed as is illustrated in this following example taken from Lerner (1996: 261).

FIGURE 2.21

L: he said, the thing thet-thet-sad about the uhm black uhm (0.3)
P: muslims,
L: muslims, he said is thet they don’t realize...

L’s first turn is designed as a “pseudo cleft construction” (Lerner, 1996: 262). According to Wilkinson (2009), this type of construction projects the form of the upcoming word. This type of design is usually used when the projected word is a reference to a person, an object or any other form of entity. The author has also noticed that this type of construction “engenders a word search” (Wilkinson, 2009: 206). As noted by Lerner (1996: 262) “many turn units that end up containing word searches are designed in such a way that the search is placed near the end of the unit, thereby proving a place for candidates which will concomitantly be terminal item
completions”. This is what we notice in this example. At the end of the TCU, L goes into a search with “uhm”. In the next line, P completes L’s turn by providing the missing word with a slightly rising intonation, which indicates that the proposed word is not presented as a sure solution to the searched word. Thus, this construction seems to facilitate the entry by the other speaker and provide the missing component (Lerner, 1996).

It is precisely the disruption in the progression of the talk that justifies the “conditional entry by recipients” (Lerner, 1996: 261) to provide candidate solutions. Usually, under these circumstances “only the searched-for next word” is provided by the recipients, as shown in the previous example provided by Lerner (1996: 261).

However, when recipients provide a possible solution as soon as the search has begun their suggestions usually function as “assertedly correct” and not as “try-marked” candidate solutions, as illustrated in the following example from Lerner (1996: 262).

FIGURE 2.22

V: oh, it was funny we were up at Elsinore when they were having an airplane, uh=
L: =contest

According to Lerner (1996: 262-263) the “early opportunistic completion” is used by the recipient to create some sort of a “co-membership” rather than a “recipientship”.

The term word search is often referred as an “interactional practice” (Brouwer, 2003: 535) or as Goodwin & Goodwin (1986: 52) put it, it “is not simply a cognitive process” but rather something that is displayed overtly by the speaker and something recipients can contribute to resolve, if the conditions allow doing so (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Hayashi, 2003). The following example taken from Goodwin & Goodwin (1986: 52) provides evidence for this statement.
FIGURE 2.23

A: Her dress was,

B: Eye [let

A:     [Uh Eyelet. (0.8) Embroidered eyelet

After A pauses in middle of a TCU, B provides the missing word. However, the completion word is not necessarily always accepted by the first speaker, who ultimately can decide if he accepts the suggestion as being the word he is looking for. In this case, in the next turn A does not even “acknowledge” (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986: 52) B’s offer of a solution, instead A goes on to produce the same solution “eyelet” and after a pause, he even self-corrects as he describes what kind of “eyelet” it is. A was not just repeating what B said in the previous line, but was actually claiming an epistemic authority of the subject matter, and this is confirmed by the fact that A provides additional description (i.e., embroidered). According to Goodwin & Goodwin (1986) examples such as this one, where the solution of the word search was ultimately solved by the first speaker, may be illustrative of Schegloff et alʼs (1977) argument of the preference for self-repair over other repair.

Sometimes, though, help from others can be quite welcome, as is shown in this following example.

FIGURE 2.24 (Goodwin 1986: 53)

01  A: "What was thʼnameʼv the//place tch!
02  B: Ho: yeaum.
03  A: I canʼt th//nk.
04  B: Sir: uh no.
05  A: I know it w//as-
06  B: Steakʼn a:le.
07      (0.2)
08  A: Yeah r:right.
09  B: In Mount Pleasant.
10  A: r:Right. (0.2) I know it wz someplace out on Fifty One.
12 =But anyway thet he had a rilly good article on that.
In this example, A indicates that he is having difficulties remembering the name of a given place (line 1). While this may be a way for the speaker to prompt himself to remember, it can also solicit the recipient’s help, although typically this is the case when the speaker’s gaze is directed toward the recipient (there will be more on the topic of gaze in the next section). In line 6, B provides a candidate solution, the correctness of which A explicitly acknowledges. In fact “right” in both lines 8 and 10 does more than “acknowledging”, it shows A’s epistemic authority over the subject matter. It was A’s telling to begin with, so only A can decide what is right and wrong. This fact establishes her as the party who provided the outcome of the search. Thus according to Goodwin & Goodwin (1986: 53), participants’ level or amount of contribution in word searches is not something that is decided in advance, but it is rather something negotiated “within the activity itself”.

2.3.1 Gaze in word searches

One of the specificities of a word search is that participants in talk-in-interaction put on hold prior actions to address the disruption caused by the searched word. This modification may in turn affect recipients’ participation. In other words, they may be solicited to intervene and contribute to the solution of the searched word (Goodwin, 1983; Goodwin, 1987; Goodwin & Godwin, 1986; Hayashi, 2003). During a word search, speakers often gaze away from their recipients. But that does not mean that every time speakers gaze away, they are involved in a word search. Thus, the question is how participants recognize a gaze away as an indication of a word search (Goodwin, 1983; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Streeck, 1995). According to Goodwin & Goodwin (1986: 57), those gaze withdrawals that “occur near perturbations in the talk” display a word search. In addition, speakers typically display a “thinking face” (Goodwin,
1983; Goodwin, 1987; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986) as they withdraw their gaze. In addition, close examination of video recordings show that typically, recipients gaze toward the speaker (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986).

Recipients do not usually continuously gaze toward speakers throughout an interaction. Or, to put it in Goodwin’s (1996: 54) words, a gaze is not “simply an accidental type of alignment but something participants systematically work to achieve”. In other words, the fact that recipients go from not gazing to gazing toward the speaker indicates that recipients orient toward something that may need their assistance. Even though as Goodwin & Godwin (1986: 54) indicated gazing toward the speaker is not the hallmark of word search activity, it is in general what recipients do “during a face to face interaction” to display “hearership”: It shows recipients’ attentiveness to the talk, even if their help is not needed. However, gaze during a word search is an indication of a “heightened attention” during which recipients’ intervention may be needed (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986: 54). Most importantly if the speaker is gazing toward the recipient, the speaker is clearly and specifically soliciting help.

During the talk, especially right before the word search, recipients can see from what the speaker has already produced just about enough of a “phenomenon” (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986: 56) to allow them to evaluate and provide the appropriate possible solution. The provided solution may of course not necessarily be the sought-after word (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986).

According to Goodwin & Goodwin (1986: 64), word searches are marked by different stages. These stages range from a “solitary activity” (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986: 64) in which speakers try to look for the searched word without any help from recipients, to a stage where they explicitly solicit recipients’ help, to another “solitary activity” stage (if the speaker is not satisfied with the suggested outcome), before they go to the last stage where they offer a possible
solution, which they are not quite sure is the sought-after word. All of these stages are accompanied by several visual and gestural features, all of which show participants the level of help sought from them. This all implies that throughout the word search, recipients attend carefully to the signals sent by speakers.

Seen in this way, a word search is a multi-stage social activity in which each stage of the search “makes relevant a particular form of co participation by the recipients” (Hayashi, 2003: 115). As noted by Hayashi (2003), even a solitary word search activity is a visible signal that communicates to the recipient that the speaker does not need help as of yet. However, according to the author a solitary word search activity also asks recipients to keep orientating to the talk while speakers are occupied looking for the searched word.

In any case, visual features help the search in more than one way. First, they reveal the word search as a “discrete activity” (Goodwin & Goodwin 1986: 60). Additionally, they unite different sorts of expressions (e.g., word stretches, hesitation makers, self-addressed questions) to form one “intrinsic and congruent parts of a single activity” (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986: 60). Thus, in a word search, both the “vocal and the visual” function interdependently as a “mutual contextualization of language and the body” (Hayashi, 2003: 120).

2.3.2 Gestures in word searches

In word searches, both speakers and recipients orient to gestures, especially hand gestures, as they “shift their attention to them” (Streeck, 1995: 99). There can be a succession of gestures within a single word search, but these do not all occur at the same “spatial location” and they do not communicate the same things; there are gestures which invite the recipient’s help,
and there are other gestures that do not solicit any help. Hence, gestures are created locally and as needed by participants; in other words, they are anything but “idiosyncratic”, (Streeck, 1995).

Gestures, especially “iconic gestures” can hardly be separated from word search activities (Goodwin, 1983, Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986, Streeck, 1995); they usually function as “projection” of the lexical item to come (Schegloff, 1984a: 276; Streeck, 1995: 100). As Schegloff (1984a) argues, pre-positioned gestures show that the lexical affiliate involved is “‘in play’ - is in the ‘projection space’” (Schegloff, 1984a: 278). According to the author, these pre-positioned gestures give us an approximate extension of the projection space: they can measure back “from the production of the lexical affiliate” to the beginning of the “depicting gesture” (Schegloff, 1984a: 278).

The following example taken from Streeck (1995: 100) illustrates the projection of a word to come, as two Japanese women discuss car accidents which they both witnessed.

FIGURE 2.25

T . h nichiyooobi data shi ne(---)kuruma suiteta shi h

but, well, it was a Sunday and, you know, the car was empty and . h
(2.0)

supin shite

it spun around

According to Streeck (1995), Figure 2.26 depicts the gesture made by the speaker (a circular motion with her fingers) which she attends to and looks at, before she utters the verb supin. Then she looks up toward the recipients after she utters the verb (figure 2.27). This example shows that gesture and speech can “share a semantic profile” (Streeck, 1995: 100), the
gesture however projects the profile before the speech is produced.

FIGURE 2.26 (Streeck, 1995: 100)  FIGURE 2.27 (Streeck, 1995: 101)

The following example, taken from the same conversation, is one in which the gesture and speech don’t quite share the same semantic profile.

FIGURE 2.28 from (Streeck, 1995: 101)

T  watashi no hoo no seki ga ano hora (--------------) are
the seat on my side, you know, look (-------------) there
aru ja na (----) gaadoreru
was a guardrail

The word gaadoreru (guardrail) refers to the object (i.e., a rail) as well as the function of this object (i.e., guard) (Streeck, 1995: 101). However, according to Streeck (1995: 101) the gestures depicted in figure 2.29 and 2.30 describe only “a part of the object- the pole”.

FIGURE 2.29 from (Streeck, 1995: 102)  FIGURE 2.30 from (Streeck, 1995: 102)
We can thus notice a difference in the representation of the same object both with words and with gestures. To use Streeck’s (1995: 101) words, while the depiction of the gesture is not a “salient semantic component of the lexical unit”, it is however relevant in the story telling of the car accident because only the pole was involved in the accident (Streeck, 1995).

Since they are depicted before their affiliate words, iconic gestures can give “recipients opportunities for anticipatory understanding” (Streeck, 1995: 102). This is because even if the gestures are inspired by speakers’ interpretation of the depicted object, they are equally stimulated by the precise context and the need in which the gestures are depicted (Streeck, 1995).

Streeck (1995) remarks that both speakers and recipients attend to the depiction of gestures, if they are with the recipients’ field of vision and if they do not involve the actual touching of the face; according to Goodwin & Goodwin (1986) and Streeck (1995), in such cases recipients usually avert their gaze. Otherwise, the gestures become for a brief moment the “primary medium of communication (Streeck, 1995: 103).

2.3.3 Word searches in Japanese

Hayashi (2003) has demonstrated that in Japanese, just as in English, participants orient to the gazes and gestures displayed during a word search; his study thus confirms the “generalizability” (Hayashi, 2003: 111) of word searches.

However, Hayashi has shown in addition that unlike English speakers, during word searches Japanese speakers use the “distal demonstrative pronouns” are (that one) / asoko (that place) (Hayashi, 2003: 112, Hayashi & Yoon, 2006: 486) as “place-holders” for the searched word. Place holders can also be deployed in other languages. For example, in American English,
if someone is looking for a name, the use of “whatchamacallit” in the word search functions as a place holder.

Hayashi (2003) draws a parallel between such a use of demonstrative pronouns and a “prospective indexical” (Goodwin, 1996: 384 cited in Hayashi, 1996: 121), or the pointing out of the field to which the sought-after word belongs. The author argues that the use of these pronouns specifies the areas or fields in which the word being searched for could fit. According to the author, this use supplies recipients the means to get involved and pay more attention “in the process of discovering” the word being searched for (Hayashi, 2003: 126).

Finally, Hayashi (2003) indicates there is some evidence that Korean and Mandarin Chinese speakers use demonstratives in similar ways as Japanese speakers do. In a later study, Hayashi and Yoon (2006) showed that demonstratives are used in a similar fashion in five other languages: Russian, Ilocano, Indonesian, Romani, and Maliseet-Passmaquoddy.

2.3.4 Concluding remarks

As I have noted earlier, there have been numerous studies of word searches, and rightfully so, between non-native and native speakers (mainly native speakers of English). Several studies have also been conducted in the talk of aphasics. However, most of the studies among native speakers no matter how extensive are mostly done in English language talk. Very few studies on native talk beside English have been conducted.

By definition studies between non-native and native speakers cannot be used to show the words search deployments in the native languages of the non-native speakers. And usually word searches in non-native speakers are seen as indications of frustrations or lack of vocabulary (Brouwer, 2003; Park, 2007). The same observation can be applied in the studies of aphasia talk.
Aphasic talk displays usually communicative problems. Therefore, it typically assumed that word searches deployments in aphasia patients indicate that the searched word is not available anymore (in their talk).

Most of these studies have used mainly the findings in English language (namely Goodwin’s works) word searches to conduct their studies. For instance, Helasvuoto et al. (2004) did not study the word search mechanism in non-aphasic Finnish speakers before they conducted their research of Finnish speakers of aphasia. The study of non-aphasic word search deployment would have allowed, regardless of their communicative problems, to see if some word search mechanism specific to Finnish language are still available to aphasics. Likewise, none of the studies between non-native and native speakers of English, have looked if there are some specific features of word searches indications to a specific culture or language observed in the talk between non-native and native speakers of English.

This is not to claim that previous findings in English word searches cannot be used in other languages. As matter of fact, Hayashi (2003) has confirmed that most of word searches identifies by Goodwin (e.g., gaze, gestures, stretch) are also found in Japanese word searches displays. The same findings would probably be found on other languages native speakers researches on word searches. But most importantly, researches in other languages native talk, would allow identifying additional word search mechanism specific to a given language (e.g., Hayashi, 2003).

I believe more studies on native talk word searches are in need. The more we know about word searches in other languages the more we can confirm not only the universality of previous findings but also identify specific deployments of search in specific cultures and languages.
2.4 Review of *voilà*

In this section, I will review the prior literature on *voilà* and *voici*. I start out with some difference between *voici* and *voilà*. I will then present some of the definitions of *voilà* as proposed in some major French dictionaries before I review the different research done from pragmatic, morphosyntactic and semantic perspectives. Depending on the approach used, we will see that *voilà* can be a verb, a preposition, a presentative or a discourse marker. The reviews will also show however that reviewing *voilà* is quite challenging; it seems that *voilà* cannot entirely satisfy the requirements of any of the (grammatical) categories identified.

2.4.1 The difference between *voici* and *voilà*

Etymologically, *voici* and *voilà* are the imperative forms of the verb *voir/* ‘to see’ combined with the adverbs *ci/* ‘here’ or *là/* ‘there’ which yielded the forms *voici* or *voilà* (Bergen & Plauché, 2001). Up until the 14\textsuperscript{th} century, the imperative and the adverb were used separately. But in modern French, the imperative has become an invariable word and is combined with the adverb to form the single words *voilà* and *voici* (Bergen & Plauché, 2001).

Traditionally the adverbs *là* and *ci* are used respectively to indicate distance and proximity, as in the following examples (Bergen & Plauché, 2001: 46):

(a) Tu parles de ce type-là?
(a) *Are you talking about that guy there?*

(b) Non, de ce type-ci!
(b) *No, about this guy here!*

Delahaie (2009a) explains that *voici* is used to introduce a new referent whereas *voilà* refers to an already known referent. Thus, a sentence like *voici le facteur/* ‘here comes the postman’ is different than *voilà le facteur/* ‘here is the postman’, in the sense that the former
introduces new information to the interlocutor whereas the latter “implies that the coming of the
postman was expected” (est impliquée l’idée que le facteur est attendu) (my translation) and
viewed as a part of “stereotypical events” événement stéréotypiques (my translation) (Delahaie,
2009a: 6). The event could be: Il est neuf heures, j’attends mon courrier, voilà le facteur/ ‘It’s
nine o’clock, I’m waiting for the mail, here’s the postman’ (my translation) (Delahaie, 2009a: 6).
The idea of voici introducing a new event (rheme) and voilà referring back to the already known
(theme) is also stated by Adamczewski (Adamczewski, 1991). This opposition still holds in
formal speech (e.g., in the evening news (journal télévisé) and in written discourse).

But in general, in modern French these two forms are mostly interchangeable and they
don’t usually have significant semantic difference. However, voilà is used more frequently than
voici, especially by younger speakers (Bergen & Plauché, 2001). Hug’s (1995) analysis implies
that in some cases the opposition of voici and voilà is neutralized. The use of voici is more and
more limited to the point that its usage might be lost (Grenoble & Riley, 1996). This is also
confirmed in Porhiel’s (2012) study, who found that in a total of 1291 occurrences of
voici/voilà⁴, there were 1049 (81%) voilà, and only 242 (19%) voici. According to her, in some
idiolects voici has completely disappeared and has been replaced by voilà (Porhiel, 2012).

2.4.2 Definitions of voilà in dictionaries

Grammarians have always found it difficult to classify voilà, so much so that the
classified categories don’t even show all the meaning of the word (Porhiel, 2012). Thus, Le Petit
Robert (Robert, Rey-Debove, & Rey, 2007: 2730) identifies voilà as preposition/ ‘preposition’
with une valeur de verbe/ ‘verb-like value’, and says that is used to present a person or a thing.

---

⁴ For the corpus, Porhiel (2012) used the comic strips Tintin by Hergé. 22 books in total.
As for *Le grand Larousse de la langue française* (GLLF 1978, vol. 7 cited in Porhiel, 2012), this dictionary defines *voilà* as an *adverbe de phrase*/ ‘sentence adverb’ (i.e., they have neither a verb nor a subject for support but the whole sentence (GLLF 1978, vol. 1: 69 cited in Porhiel, 2012).

On the other hand, Grevisse (2007) the prescriptive dictionary on “the good usage” (*Le Bon Usage*) of the French language, classifies *voilà* in the chapter entitled *l’introducteur*/ ‘the introductory’. There, the term is defined as follows: *Nous appelons introducteur un mot invariable qui sert à introduire un mot, un syntagme, une phrase*/ ‘Introductors are invariable words used to introduce a word, a phrase, a sentence’ (my translation) (Grevisse, 2007: 1403).

### 2.4.3 Functional definition of *voilà*

Grevisse (2007) points out that this notion of introducteur covers in part the class of presentative. In fact, nowadays *voilà* is most commonly classified as a presentative (Chevalier, 1969; Moignet, 1969; Porhiel, 2012). Presentatives are usually defined as serving to designate something or someone. Under this label, grammarians usually also put *c’est*/ ‘it is’ and *il y a*/ ‘there is’ (Chevalier, 1969; Grevisse, 2007; Léard, 1992; Porhiel, 2012). In contrast to *c’est* and *il y a, voilà* is said to be a deictic presentative, as opposed to an existential presentative which is the function of *il y a* and as opposed to an identification presentative which is the function of *c’est* (Feuillet, 1986: 116 cited in Porhiel, 2012). Research has shown that *voilà* does not always function as a presentative; thus when it is not a presentative, it can function as a preposition or a discourse marker (Porhiel, 2012).
2.4.4 Voilà: a preposition and an adverb

When voilà functions as a preposition it is “followed by an expression of duration (not a point in time)” (Porhiel, 2012: 436) as shown in the following examples: *Elle est née voilà deux ans/ ‘she was born two years ago’; voilà deux ans qu’elle est née/ ‘It has been two years since she was born’. Voilà in this case can be replaced with the preposition depuis/ ‘since’. However, Moignet (1969: 193) claims that the interchangeability of voilà with depuis does not always work, and that it is limited to a specific verbal tense and aspect. For instance, according to Moignet (1969: 193) depuis cannot be exchanged with voilà as shown in the following sentence: One can say *Il travaille depuis huit jours/ ‘He’s been working for eight days’ but not *Il travaille voilà huit jours. Moreover, while we can say: *il est parti ne voilà pas huit jours, such negation would not be possible with depuis: * il est parti ne depuis pas huit jours. Thus, for Moignet (1969), voilà can at best, have prepositional use (emploi prépositionnel)(Moignet, 1969: 192) in discourse, but that may not be enough to qualify it as a preposition. In addition, voilà doesn’t even satisfy the basic definition of a preposition which, according to Moignet (1969: 192), is un mot établissant une relation entre deux éléments d’un énoncé/ ‘a word linking two elements of an utterance’ (my translation). For Moignet (1969) *il est parti voilà huit jours is simply the juxtaposition of two utterances: *il est parti and voilà huit jours. Moignet (1969: 194) rejects also the label of ‘adverb’ because, according to the author, even if the adverbs -là and -ci “contribute to the semanticity” (participent à la sémantèse) of voilà, that doesn’t make voici and voilà adverbs since -ci and -là are part of the words they form. In other words, -ci and -là are not

5 *ne…pas in French is placed around the conjugated verb to negate a sentence. However in this case, what is negated is not voilà but rather the “temporal indication” (indication temporelle numérique) (Moignet, 1969: 200) which implies une durée positive numériquement inférieure “an inferior duration”, i.e. less than eight days, and which is often used to express a surprise or astonishment.
added to an already identified verb or adjective as in facile (adj.) + ment (adv.) to form the adverb facilement (Moignet, 1969).

2.4.5 Voilà a verb? A morphosyntactic approach

Indeed, for Moignet (1969) voilà is not exactly either a preposition or an adverb for the reasons given above. Furthermore, he claims that a presentative is not quite a grammatical category (Moignet, 1969: 195). He observes however that voilà shares several syntactic similarities with a verb, and therefore suggests that it should indeed be considered as a verb in modern French. The author argues that just like a verb, voilà can be used by itself to form a sentence: voilà! It can be followed by a substantive which designate a person or a thing: “Voilà Pierre”, “Voilà la difficulté” (Moignet, 1969: 190). It can be preceded by a personal pronoun: me voilà/ ‘here I am’, les voilà/ ‘there they are’ (Moignet, 1969: 190). It can be followed by another verb which functions like a substantive: voilà bien instruire une affaire!/ ‘that’s the way to properly conduct an inquiry!’ (my translation) (Racine, Plaideurs, III, III cited Moignet, 1969: 190). It can be followed by an adverb: voilà évidemment le meilleur moyen/ ‘that is obviously the best solution’ (my translation) (Moignet, 1969: 191). Voilà can also be negated as we have seen earlier, and it can even be used in interrogatives. The interrogation is in particular used to express a “positive exclamation” (une exclamation positive) (Moignet, 1969: 192) as in the following example: Voilà -t-il pas Monsieur qui ricane déjà!/ ‘Wouldn’t you know it/who would believe it, but there’s Monsieur sniggering already!’ (my translation) (Molière, Tartuffe, I, 1 cited in Moignet, 1969: 192).

Hence, voilà has the “syntactical behavior” (comportement syntactique) (Moignet, 1969: 195) of any other regular/irregular French verb. But for Moignet it is mostly voilà’s predicative
function that justifies its categorization as a verb. Having said that voilà does not possess the morphological inflections of a verb. Moignet (1969) (who recognizes this oddness) likens voilà to a defective verb with only one form; that is to say, an impersonal verb. This analysis is adopted by most linguists and some of them qualify his analysis as “obvious” (évidente) (Hug, 1995: 133). As we saw earlier, the dictionary Le petit Robert for instance acknowledges the verbal value of voilà even if the dictionary classifies it as a preposition (Hug, 1995). But for Moignet (1969), it is important to point out that voilà is not voir (the verb to see). Indeed, unlike other researchers, mainly Léard (1992), who relate voilà to the verb voir, Moignet (1969: 201) thinks that the historical relation with the verb to see “obscures the problem” rather than clarifies it. In other words, for Moignet (1969) voilà is not an “invitation to look” (invitation à regarder) (Moignet, 1969: 201), because if it were the case, one could say: voilà une belle symphonie! ‘look (here) a beautiful symphony!’

6 A more appropriate translation would be ‘That’s some symphony!’ (my translation).

Hug (1995) who also adheres to Moignet’s (1969) analysis of voilà, points out however one syntactical aspect that he believes Moignet hasn’t addressed properly. For Hug (1995) the main problem with voilà is that unlike any other verb, it does not have a subject! Morin (1985) agrees also that the behavior of voilà is reminiscent of a verb, especially of a present indicative verb. He mentions nonetheless that voilà is a “defective” verb and a “subcategory of subjectless verbs” (Morin, 1985: 817). For (Bergen & Plauche, 2001, 2005) voilà has similarities with the
syntax of indicative and declarative sentences as well as the semantic of an imperative sentence, with this being mainly due to its functions of “pointing out” (Bergen & Plauche, 2001: 49).

However, Hug (1995) proposes an analysis that could account for the absence of a subject in voilà. According to Hug, voilà links on one hand le groupe syntaxiquement dependent de voilà/ ‘the group syntactically dependent upon voilà’ (my translation) and on the other hand le segment de contexte auquel on renvoie/ ‘the context to which voilà refers to’ (my translation) (Hug, 1995: 136). Hug specifically argues that ce contexte remplit semantiquement cette place de sujet/ ‘this context fills the semantic place of a subject’ (my translation), much like a zero anaphora (anaphore zéro) (Hug, 1995: 136). Thus, for Hug (1995) the semantic occupies the place of the subject. For instance someone says: voilà le directeur/ ‘here is the director’, the subject is the person pointed out by the same person who uttered the sentence. Unfortunately, no matter how appealing this analysis may be, even Hug (1995) recognizes that his theory does not apply to all uses of voilà, and furthermore hopes that maybe one of his readers of his findings would eventually contribute to solving this whole problem (Hug, 1995:140). I should mention however, that interestingly enough, the subject (impersonal subject il ‘it’) does actually appear in the interrogative form (cf. the voilà-t-il pas Monsieur qui ricane déjà! example cited earlier; Moignet, 1969).

2.4.6 Voilà as presentative: Pragmatic approach

Porhiel (2012), who acknowledges the challenges involved in classifying voilà in the traditional grammar, takes into account (Porhiel, 2012: 441) other criteria including morphosyntactic, enunciative and textual (discursive) perspectives to analyze voilà using a pragmatic approach. She identifies in total five components:
(1) “Voilà introduces a referent and attests its existence” (Porhiel, 2012: 442).
In this first category, Porhiel (2012: 442) argues that by definition for a referent to be introduced it must first and foremost exist. It is this unique condition that allows us to say for instance Ah! voilà un sceau/ ‘Ah! here is a bucket’ unless there is one around. And again, by definition such declarative sentences cannot be negated either: *Ne voilà pas un sceau. According to the author it is this default setting and believed-to-exist condition (Porhiel, 2012: 443) that separates the presentative voilà from the preposition or from the discourse maker voilà, as either of them can introduce a referent (Porhiel, 2012: 443).

(2) “Voilà can have a textual function or a non-textual function” (Porhiel, 2012: 443).
In its extra-linguistic (non-textual) function, voilà can point out somebody or something either physically present or not (Porhiel, 2012: 449), and thus has a deitic value (Feuillet, 1986: 116 cited in Porhiel, 2012: 443). And in its textual function, it refers to “portions of a text” (Porhiel, 2012: 443) the referent is not physically present (Porhiel, 2012: 449) and “it has a phoric function (anaphor and cataphor)” (Porhiel, 2012: 443). These two functions distinguish two sorts of views: “a physical (perception) and a discourse/textual level” (Porhiel, 2012: 443).

(3) “Voilà can introduce a discrete or a non-discrete referent” (Porhiel, 2012: 444).
In this criterion Porhiel (2012: 445) differentiates two kinds of views: The referents are either “perceptible and discrete units and can be spatially located” or they are “non-perceptible and non-discrete units and cannot be spatially located”. For example, nouns such as ‘desk’, ‘paper’, and ‘bicycle’ can be examples of discreet referents, whereas nouns such as ‘wind’, ‘sport’, ‘idealism’ etc. convey the idea of non-discreet referents (Porhiel, 2012). However, the author explains in some cases only “the context and situation” can indicate if it is referring to discrete or a non-discrete referent (Porhiel, 2012: 445). For example, réponse ‘signal’ is classified as a non-
discrete unit in: *Ah! Voilà la réponse de la compagnie/ ‘Ah! Here’s the signal of the company’* (Porhiel, 2012: 445), whereas in this following example it is classified as a discrete unit: *Et dès que tu auras reçu la réponse, viens me la porter. Je retourne sur la passerelle. OK, capitaine.* (.) *(.) Voilà la réponse/ ‘A soon as you get a reply to that, bring it to me on the bridge. OK skipper’ (.) *(.) ‘Signal, captain’” (Porhiel, 2012: 445). However “on a textual level the referents introduced by *voilà* are always non-discrete” as in this following example (Porhiel, 2012: 444): *Et voilà toute mon histoire, monsieur Rastapopoulos/ ‘So there you are, Mr. Rastapopoulos. That’s my story’.*

(4) “*Voilà* introduces a referent that is linguistically or non-linguistically expressed” (Porhiel, 2012: 445).

Typically a sentence using *voilà* as a presentative is formed as follows: “the form presentative + noun: *voici votre manteaux/ ‘here is your coat’* (Porhiel, 2012: 445). However, according to the author, if such construction is not found this does not mean the *voilà* does not function as a presentative. She goes on to state that pragmatically such a view does not hold. For instance, if in a restaurant at the end of the meal the customer offers money and utters “*voilà*”, this necessarily implies that the customer gave or presented money to the waiter (Porhiel, 2012). Hence according to Porhiel’s (2012: 447) analysis “the referent is situationally and physically present” but is not “expressed linguistically” hence such situation could exemplify an “anaphoric word-sentence” (Tesnière, 1992: 96 cited in Porhiel, 2012).

On the other hand, and from a discursive point of view, using *voilà* introduces the text to come (Porhiel, 2012) and so *voilà* functions cataphorically since it “creates an expectation” for what is to come. According to the author, this is indicated by the “tell me more” sort of question (Porhiel, 2012: 447) as in the following example from (Porhiel 2012: 447). The potential
explanation prefaced by *Eh bien, voilà* seems to be prompted by Tintin’s question in the previous line:

Tintin: *Et maintenant, capitaine, expliquez-moi comment vous êtes arrivés ici.*

Haddock: *Ah! oui... Eh bien, voilà…*

Tintin: “Now, Captain, tell me how you came to be here.

Haddock: Oh, yes… Right... Well…”

(5) “Voici/Voilà can present or represent” (Porhiel, 2012: 447).

According to Porhiel (2012) this last criterion concerns only a non-textual view; that is, when the referent is physically present. It involves not only the utterances but also who they are addressed to (themselves or somebody else). In the case of these data, which consist of Tintin’s comic strip books, some of the utterances are related to what is shown in the images (Porhiel, 2012).

According to the author, in the following example the utterance is directed at the reader of the book (Porhiel, 2012: 447):

Tintin descend l’escalier
*Tintin gets down the stairs*

Homme: Le voilà... Attention!... 
*Man: ‘Steady!... Here he comes’!* 

2.4.7  *Voilà from an integrated viewpoint*

Léard (1992) argues that *voilà* cannot be classified into only one grammatical category. Moreover the classification of *voilà* into a single category brings out its defective aspect, in other words it points out the different constructions that would specifically impede it from being entirely accepted in that category (Léard, 1992). For instance, earlier we have seen that by virtue of its syntactic properties, *voilà* is considered to be a verb or to have verb-like behavior.
However, it was labeled a defective (Hug, 1995; Moignet, 1969; Morin, 1985) verb due to the absence of morphological variations and a subject.

According to Léard (1992) *voilà* cannot be just a verb, a preposition, or a discourse marker, but rather each of these classifications depends on the structure and situation in which *voilà* occurs. Indeed, for Léard (1992) each *voilà*-containing construction has a specific syntactic structure which is then related to a specific semantic meaning. In his analysis, the author made use of different linguistic approaches, which for him “are too often isolated” (*trop souvent isolés*) (Léard, 1992: 155). His analysis of *voilà* especially shows the direct link between syntax and semantics. For instance, the structure *voilà* + noun phrase (NP) as in *voilà ton livre* / ‘here’s your book’ has a spatial value (Léard, 1992:116). Some constructions could however be ambiguous (Léard, 1992: 115). For instance, the sentence *Voilà Marie* can have two different meanings. The first meaning implies that the person uttering these words is introducing Marie to a third party, so this point of view has a “deitic and spatial value” (Léard, 1992: 116), whereas for the second meaning the person saying these words is only stating a fact, so this has an spectual value\(^7\) (Léard, 1992).

2.4.8 Semantic perspective

Bergen & Plauché (2001, 2005) also reject the classification of *voilà* into only one category. In fact Bergen & Plauché (2005: 4) go as far as to claim that *voilà* cannot be categorized in “any existing grammatical class” because “*voilà* displays both non-prototypical behavior in terms of traditional grammatical categories and a sufficiently wide range of semantic

\(^{7}\) As in *Voilà Marie, qui se plaint de nouveau!* / ‘Here is/there’s Marie complaining again!’
and pragmatic "senses" to defy a monotonic classification of its meaning” (Bergen & Plauché, 2001: 47).

They identify *voilà* first and foremost as a “deictic demonstrative” (Bergen & Plauché, 2005:1). Furthermore, the authors adopt the concept of “radial categories” as theorized by Lakoff (1987). Radial categories are defined as “polysemy networks where connections between senses are created through metonymy, metaphor, and other cognitive processes” (Bergen & Plauché, 2001: 53). The central sense of *voilà* can be analyzed through what Lakoff (1987) calls an “Idealized Cognitive Model (ICM)” that involves “Pointing Out’”(Bergen & Plauché, 2001: 47). Lakoff (1987: 490 cited in Bergen & Plauché, 2001: 48) describes the Pointing Out ICM as follows:

“It is assumed as a background that some entity exists and is present at some location in the speaker’s visual field, that the speaker is directing his attention at it, and that the hearer is interested in its whereabouts but does not have his attention focused on it and may not even know that it is present. The speaker then directs the hearer’s attention to the location of the entity (perhaps accompanied by a pointing gesture) and brings it to the hearer’s attention that the entity is at the specified location . . .”

Thus Bergen & Plauché (2005: 5) state that “the central sense of deictic demonstrative *voilà* and *voici* in French is a spatial one”, as exemplified in the following examples taken from Bergen & Plauché (2005: 5): *Voilà/voici son sac* ‘There’s/here’s his bag’; *Voilà/voici les clés que tu cherchais* ‘There/here are the keys you were looking for’.

Bergen & Plauché (2001, 2005: 5) further argue that all the other meanings of *voilà* are either direct or indirect derivations of its central spatial meaning. Interestingly enough, they also point out similar extensions in English *there*-constructions. The authors list a number of
extensions, among which they cite first the discourse deictic as being an “important extension” from the central deictic (Bergen & Plauché 2001: 53). They explain that the discourse deictic is directly derived from the central sense and via the metaphor: “DISCOURSE SPACE IS PHYSICAL SPACE, DISCOURSE ELEMENTS ARE ENTITIES, DISCOURSE IS MOTION ALONG A PATH, IMMEDIATELY PAST DISCOURSE IS IN OUR PRESENCE AT A DISTANCE FROM US, and DISCOURSE IN THE IMMEDIATE FUTURE IS MOVING TOWARDS US.” (Bergen & Plauché, 2001: 53, capitalization in the original).

(Grenoble & Riley, 1996) have also argued that the discursive functions of voilà are the “natural extension” of “the ostensive deictic functions of the presentative demonstratives” Grenoble & Riley (1996: 820). Bergen & Plauché (2001) have pointed out that voici is used to indicate an upcoming event: *Voici trois questions/ ‘Here are three questions’, whereas voilà points to an event that has just ended, as in *voilà une bonne argumentation/ ‘those were some good arguments’. As for Grenoble & Riley (1996), *voici and *voilà are differentiated by the traits +/- proximal, with *voici defined as +proximal (cataphoric) and *voilà as – proximal (anaphoric). According to the authors this seems also to be the case with the English demonstrative pronouns (Grenoble & Riley 1996: 821):

(1) This is/Here's what I want to say: it's just not going to work.

(2) it’s just not going to work. That's what I mean.

The other extension of the central deictic includes “the time deictic” via the metaphor “time is space, and points in time are points in space” (Bergen & Plauche, 2001: 54) as illustrated in the following example: *Voilà l’instant que nous attendions tous/ ‘Here’s the moment we’ve all been waiting for’. The complete extensions of the central deictic can be seen in the following chart from Bergen and Plauche (Bergen & Plauche, 2005: 22). The arrows going
from the central deictic would refer to direct extension, while the arrows going from the extensions would be indirect extensions.

FIGURE 2.31

2.4.9 The use of *voilà* in foreign language textbooks

In her doctoral dissertation, Delahaie (2008) advocates a new interpretation of the relation between spoken French and French as a foreign language (FFL). According to the author, much too often the spoken French that is taught is a reflection of the written conception of the language. Part of her study\(^8\) focused on the use of *voilà* in greetings (*acte de présentation*) (Delahaie, 2008: 7) and in agreements (*acte d’accord*) (Delahaie, 2008: 9) in both native and non-native interaction. The author remarks that some French introductory textbooks: *Latitudes*, *Forum*, *Reflets*, and *Espace* for instance, use *voici*/*voilà* as a presentative particle to introduce a person or an object. Yet her data have shown that native speakers practically never use *voilà* to present a person, for which they prefer instead the presentative structure *je te présente* (Delahaie, 2008; 2009b). The author explains that the confusion is due to the “semantic proximity”

\(^8\) Part of Delahaie’s research was based on the LANCOM corpus; a database which mainly constituted role-plays recorded in FFL classes non-native speakers of French. The corpus is accessible through the following link: http://bach.arts.kuleuven.be/elicop/ProjetLANCOM.htm
proximité sémantique (Delahaie, 2008: 123) between the “act of introducing” acte de présention and the grammatical class of presentatives⁹ (Delahaie, 2008).

On the other hand, Delahaie (2008, 2009b) notices the non-use of voilà in its other functions by learners, mainly in its function as an agreement token. Indeed the author points out that voilà is the third preferred “marker of agreement” marqueur d’accord (Delahaie, 2009b: 18) after oui/ ‘yes’ and d’accord/ ‘ok’ by native speakers. (9.5% for native speakers versus 0.8% for learners of French) (Delahaie, 2009b:23). The author defines, voilà as “the preferred answer to a confirmation request” (une réponse privilégiée à une demande de confirmation) (Delahaie, 2009b: 24). For Delahaie (2009b), each of these marqueurs d’accord (oui, d’accord and voilà) have specific uses and functions, therefore they cannot always be substituted one for the other.

2.4.10 Voici and Voilà in discourse

In this section I will review prior studies of voilà from a discursive perspective. My review will show that the functions of voilà are the interpretations and observations of the researchers as they understood them (i.e., from an etic perspective). Most importantly, the data used in most of the studies come from written literature (including comic books), and even invented sentences. I argue that as a discourse marker, voilà occurs mostly in oral interaction and therefore should be studied mainly in naturally-occurring conversation; that is, from a conversation analytic perspective, in which the description of the occurrences of voilà is meaningful first and foremost to those participating in the exchanges (i.e., from an emic perspective). All of these reasons justify the relevance of the current study.

⁹ Delahaie (2008) has also found the use of c’est/ ‘it’s’ in greeting exchanges, which as we have seen earlier is also categorized in the class of presentative.
Voilà as a discourse particle is considered part of what Adam & Revaz (1989: 66) have called a *marqueur d’intégration linéaire* (or MIL)/ ‘markers of linear Integration’ (my translation). The authors more specifically identify *voilà* as a *marqueur de clôture*/ ‘marker of closure’ (Adam & Revaz, 1989: 70). For the authors, MILs help to organize the text into coherent sequences. *Voilà* is also known as a connector (Grieve, 1996; Riegel, Rioul, & Pellat, 1994), more specifically as an “enumerative connector” (*connecteur énumératif*) which signifies the closure of an enumeration sequence *la clôture de la série* (Riegel et al., 1994: 622).

Broadly speaking, two major characteristics stand out concerning the discursive/textual *voici/voilà*:

1. they indicate the shift of topics by opening and/or closing a sequence (Grenoble & Riley, 1996). In this sense, they function as “metalinguistic presentatives” (Grenoble & Riley, 1996: 821).

2. It seems that the distinction between *voici* and *voilà* is still relevant in discourse: *voici* introduces text to come (cataphoric or prospective), while *voilà* refers to or points back to a previous text (anaphoric or retrospective) (Adamczewski, 1991; Riegel et al., 1994). *Voici invite l’interlocuteur à attendre la suite*/ ‘*voici* invites the interlocutor to wait for what’s to come’ (my translation) and *voilà demande l’interlocuteur de faire le lien avec la situation ou le contexte avant (ce qui a été dit auparavant)/ ‘*voilà* asks the interlocutor to make the link with the previous context/situation’ (my translation) (Adamczewski, 1991: 61). However, this distinction is sometimes neutralized and *voilà* can be used instead of *voici*, that is to say *voilà* can be used anaphorically and cataphorically (Grenoble & Riley, 1996: 821). On the other hand, *voici* never functions anaphorically and is never used to close a sequence (Grenoble & Riley, 1996).

Porhiel (2012: 439), who states that “*voici* and *voilà* delineate topical units and possess
distinctive textual characteristics”, lists some of the main differences as follows:

**voici**:

(a) “It is used as an opening” (Grenoble & Riley, 1996: 829 cited in Porhiel, 2012: 439)

(b) “It introduces a new discourse topic or information” (Grenoble & Riley, 1996: 830 cited in Porhiel, 2012: 439)

(c) “It is used to narrow a topic and to recall a previous frame of reference” (Grenoble & Riley, 1996: 931 cited in Porhiel, 2012: 931)

**voilà**:

(a) “it closes a topical unit” (Grenoble & Riley, 1996: 829, 833 cited in Porhiel, 2012: 440)


(c) “it identifies a point of significance” in what was said previously (Grieve, 1996: 499 cited in Porhiel, 2012: 440). As such, its use in such cases is much more forceful than the use of c’est/‘it is’, or to use Grieve’s term it is more “dramatic” (Grieve, 1996: 499).

… les modalités et le progrès de la vie, sous la forme humaine, dans les sociétés, 
- voilà l’objet propre de la science historique

…the modalities and the progress of life, in its human form, in societies,

- that’s the main purpose of historical science (my translation)


In this example, the author of the sentence summarizes his previous utterance with voilà, but most importantly describes his understanding of what “historical science” is (Grieve, 1996).

The sentence in question would have been far less dramatic if the author had instead said:
L’objet propre de la science historique, ce sont les modalités, le progrès de la vie, sous la forme humaine.

The main purpose(s) of historical science is/are…

(d) “it can indicate the end of an enumerative structure” (Adam & Revaz, 1989; Riegel et al., 1994: 622 cited in Porhiel, 2012: 440)

(e) it “is used to explain a previous statement, to state how the listener should view information already given” (Grenoble & Riley, 1996: 833–834 cited in Porhiel, 2012: 440)

To this list we can add:

(f) it has an illocutionary force (Léard, 1992). For instance, it stresses the fact that what was expected to happen has actually happened: voilà ce que c’est que de mentir! ‘that’s what happens to people who lie’ (my translation) (Léard, 1992: 152). Et voilà can indicate the “satisfaction” of having accomplished a task successfully (Léard, 1992: 151). Voilà (tout) can be used to react to what has been said previously or to defend one’s position, especially if the previous utterance implied some sort of a “criticism” (reproche) or incorrect statements (Léard, 1992: 152). An English equivalent could be “that’s all I’m saying”. The repetition of voilà voilà can announce that a request will be in compliance “without further delay” (Léard, 1992: 152):

Tu viens oui? “Are you coming?”


(g) It serves as an “opener” marker, (voilà ouvreur) (Delahaie, 2008:313) with some “sort of theatrical ability” une certaine théâtralité (Delahaie, 2008: 315) in the announcement of what is about to come.
(h) It can serve as an “agreement token” with what was said previously (Delahaie, 2008, 2009b; Grenoble & Riley, 1996: 836)

(i) it introduces an argument/explanation following a statement, and in so doing it acts as a “subordinate” to the main act. In this case, voilà is usually associated with either mais/‘but’ or seulement/‘only’ (Léard, 1992: 150):

Il faudrait que j’y aille, mais/seulement voilà je suis pris.

I have to go, but/the thing is I’m taken. (my translation)

When looking at the different functions of voici and voilà, we cannot fail to notice that voilà seems to have many more functions than voici. This corroborates Grenoble & Riley’s (1996) observation that voilà indeed is taking over voici and is assuming both voici’s and voilà’s functions. This is mainly the reason why they labeled voici as “marked” and voilà as “unmarked” (Grenoble & Riley, 1996: 837). We recall that most researchers had pointed out that the only domain where the difference between voilà and voici still holds is in written discourse: “In text/discourse, the ‘historical’ distinction between voici (proximal) and voilà (distal) still holds: voici introduces text to come (it is cataphoric or prospective) and voilà refers to or points back to previous text (it is anaphoric or retrospective)” (Porhiel, 2012: 439).

In reality, even in spoken discourse it seems that voici and voilà tend to be neutralized. Delahaie’s study in fact confirms this finding: Il est intéressant de constater que c’est voilà, et non pas voici, qui est employé en tant que marqueur d’ouverture, quoiqu’en disent les grammairies…/‘Interestingly enough it is voilà and not voici that was used as an opener marker, despite what grammarians advocate...’ (my translation) (Delahaie, 2008: 315). She goes on to say that she did not find actually any occurrence of voici as an opener, and in fact explains the use of voici would have been odd in interaction (Delahaie, 2008: 315):
C- oui voilà est-ce que i/l y a eu:h i/l y a possibilité d’avoir une vue mer?

yes voilà is-it u:h possible to have a sea view? (my translation)

C- **oui voici est-ce que i/l y a eu:h i/l y a possibilité d’avoir une vue mer?

**yes voici is-it u:h possible to have a sea view? (my translation)

According to the author, the reason why *voilà* is preferred to *voici* is because in “an interaction a topic is usually introduced in reference to what is already known” (*l’introduction d’un thème dans une interaction se fait généralement en renvoyant à du connu*) (my translation) (Delahaie, 2008: 315). For the author, only *voilà* possesses this capacity.

In the following example, from Porhiel (2012: 447) and seen earlier, *voilà* here clearly functions as an opener, as it is about to give an awaited explanation:

Tintin: *Et maintenant, capitaine, expliquez-moi comment vous êtes arrivés ici.*

Haddock: *Ah! oui… Eh bien, voilà…*

Tintin: “Now, Captain, tell me how you came to be here.

Haddock: Oh, yes… Right. … Well…”

As mentioned earlier, however, Delahaie’s data was mainly based on role playing, while Porhiel’s data come from a written/scripted corpus (i.e., Tintin comic strip books). It would be important and necessary to see whether this observation still holds and can be verified in naturally-occurring conversation.

2.4.11 Concluding remarks

This review has shown that the analysis of *voilà* is quite complex and challenging. To begin with, researchers, particularly traditional grammarians, are not always unanimous as to which grammatical class *voilà* belongs to. It is commonly accepted as belonging to the class of
presentatives, but for most researchers this qualification isn’t satisfactory, for instance for Moignet (1969) the presentative *ne dit rien de la nature du signe* ‘doesn’t say anything about the nature of the sign’ (my translation) (Moignet, 1969: 195). In other words, it does not describe the structure of *voilà*. In fact, the term “points at the semantic function of presentatives without saying anything about their syntactic function” (Marchello-Nizia, 2005: 320 cited in Porhiel, 2012). For others, it is a class of “made up of residue” (Bonnard, 1981:144 cited in Porhiel 2012) which traditional grammar books did not know how to deal with, and in which “we put everything that is disturbing” (*on y a placé ce qui derangeait*) (Léard, 1992: 100). Furthermore, the fact that the class of presentatives contains not only *voici/voilà* but also *il y a* ‘there is’ and *c’est* ‘it’s’ could also have been problematic. (Chevalier (1969) for example studied in details the similarities and differences among these three terms from a syntactic approach. Others such as Léard (1992) think that *voilà* should be studied separately, since there are many more differences than similarities between *voilà* and the two other presentatives. For others yet, presentatives are part of a bigger class. Thus, Grevisse (2007) claims they are part of the *introducteurs* “introducers”, a broader class than that of *presentatives* which encompasses *voici/voilà* but also *est-ce que. . .?* ‘Is there. . .?’.Thus, one could question such a classification (presentative/introducer) made up of so many heterogeneous items.

The review has also revealed that *voilà* is not always defined as a presentative. Researchers have identified three major categories: prepositions, verbs, and discourse markers. Some of these categories have received more attention than others. We have seen, for instance, that most dictionaries (such as *Le Petit Robert*) have labeled *voilà* as a *préposition* (*prép.*). However, most researches have mainly focused on the verbal aspect of *voilà*. Thus Moignet (1969), Morin (1985), and Hug (1995), among others, have argued that *voilà* in modern French
should be considered a verb. Despite some syntactic similarities that they share with French verbs, however, they are uninflected and are subjectless. Léard (1992), who based his analysis on Moignet’s (1969) work, observes that voilà definitely does not have a verbal value in all cases. For instance, in a sentence construction such as voilà\(^{10}\)SN qui\(^{11}\)P as in *Le voilà qui se met à dormir au chaud*, it does not function as a verb, or to use the author’s words *voilà SN qui P a quitté la zone verbes de perception et qu’il est bien marqueur aspectual/ ‘voilà SN qui P has left the perceptual verbs zone to become an aspectual marker’* (my translation) (Léard, 1992: 121). Not to mention that voilà when it is used as a discourse marker or a preposition, it is obviously not a verb. In short, Léard (1992) suggests “to look at the semantic reasons behind the syntactic deviances” (my translation) (*chercher les raisons sémantiques qui justifient le recours à ces déviances syntaxiques*) before classifying voilà in any grammatical category (Léard, 1992: 155). Nonetheless, the verbal origin of voilà is attested, but in most of its uses, this status is sometimes questioned. Thus for Grenoble & Riley (1996), voilà is first and foremost a deictic demonstrative.

Most of the authors, and whatever research perspective they adopted, have nevertheless pointed out that voilà possesses something unifying. Thus for Léard (1992), whether it is seen as a preposition, a verb, a discourse marker, or an aspectual marker, voilà is performing “a pointing out from a place or a time of speech” (*un pointage à partir du lieu ou du moment de parole*) (my translation) (Léard, 1992: 154). For Bergen & Plauché (2001, 2005) the central sense of voilà is a spatial one, from which all the others meanings come, especially the phoric (anaphoric and cataphoric) functions of voilà in discourse. Grenoble & Riley (1996: 820) have also stated that the discursive functions of voilà are the “natural extension” of the presentative voilà.

\(^{10}\) SN: Noun Phrase  
\(^{11}\) P: Sentence
Overall, we can undoubtedly say that studies of voilà have essentially “focused on its morphologic and syntactic properties” (Porhiel, 2012: 439). The discursive functions of voilà were mentioned in most studies as an “extension” or “derivation” of what appeared to be the “main” functions or properties of voilà. In doing so, it seems as though researchers were attempting to fit discursive voilà into one of the categories they had already identified. Hence there isn’t even a consensus concerning the part of speech it belongs to. This is precisely the question Léard (1992: 146-147) brings up. In trying to figure out the categorical status of voilà in discourse, the author poses two hypotheses:

a) In this first hypothesis, voilà in discourse would have the same values as the verb voilà except that instead of presenting the object, discursive voilà would present the discourse that it would “bracket” (le borne à gauche ou à droite) (Léard 1992: 146). According to Léard this hypothesis would justify “two facts”:

1. Morphologically: voici/voilà would have specific and strict roles: voici would present the discourse to come while voilà would point back to previous discourse

2. Semantically: voici would be labeled cataphoric and voilà anaphoric.

According to the author, this framing brings a major characteristic. Léard points out that by definition, one cannot indicate “verbally or with gestures an event or an object at the time they occur”, whereas in discourse the “pointing out can only occur before or after a discourse”. Let’s look at some examples from Léard (1992: 147):

Vous voulez mon avis. Eh bien (le) voici…

You want my opinion. Well here it is…(my translation).
Je voulais vous expliquer ce choix. Voilà qui est fait et qui devrait vous avoir convaincus.

I wanted to explain this choice to you. Now that it’s done, I hope you’re convinced (my translation).

b) The second hypothesis proposes to put voilà into a new category (different from a verb, a preposition or an aspectual marker). The main argument for the adoption of this status is that “the syntax of voici/voilà reveal unexpected characteristics” la syntaxe de voici/voilà y présente des caractéristiques inattendues (Léard, 1992: 147). Among some of these characteristics, Léard (1992) mentions the fact that voilà discursive does not have a complement (e.g., direct object). According to the author, on these grounds alone, voilà should be disqualified from being considered a verb, as this was the only morphosyntactic argument used to justify the verbal aspect of voilà is its predictive value. In addition, Léard (1992) discursive voilà is never followed by an expression of duration, and therefore cannot be a preposition either.

Nonetheless, Léard (1992: 148) notices that discursive voilà has its own “syntactic properties”, for instance it can be repeated: Et voilà et voilà! le tour est joué/ ‘There you go, there you go! It’s a done deal’ (my translation) (Léard, 1992:148). It can be complemented by tout (that’s all): Je change de domaine, voilà tout. Mais je continue/ ‘I’m just changing the domain that’s all. But I’m still continuing’ (my translation). It can be preceded by connective words such as: mais/ ‘but’, seulement/ ‘only’, and et bien/ ‘well’…J’irais bien mais/seulement voilà…/ ‘I would love to go but here it is…” (Léard, 1992: 147-148).

Hence for Léard (1992: 148) discursive voilà just like voyons/ ‘let’s see’, tiens/ ‘oh’, has lost all its verbal aspects and become “isolated on the syntactic level (relation sign-sign) without any role to play in referencing”. Léard concludes that the only function of voilà in this case, is
that of a discourse marker, in which “the relation between the enunciators dominate” (Léard, 1992:148).

I will indeed adopt the second hypothesis and treat voilà as a discourse marker as well. After reviewing all these previous studies on voilà, we can unquestionably acknowledge the challenges encountered in trying to define a seemingly simple word; the literature review has shown that voilà’s categorical and grammatical distributions are based on syntactical, semantic and pragmatic factors and sometimes all or some of these factors will contribute to an overall, “combined” perspective.

Voilà in discourse primarily functions as a “connective” (Hansen, 1997: 160). In other words, voilà is part of a class of syntactically autonomous items that “do not contribute to the propositional content of their host units” (they belong to that part of the utterance which is ‘shown’ rather than ‘asserted’) (Hansen, 1997: 161). As such, voilà should be first and foremost studied in terms of its functions and not in terms of the syntactic properties and grammatical categories it (should) belong to. As Léard (1992) pointed out, they do not relate to a presented item.

Thus we have seen that studies about voilà have primarily focused on its morphological and syntactic properties and that its discursive functions have been mostly overlooked. Very few researchers have pointed out this inequity, to say the least (Grenoble & Riley, 1996; Porhiel, 2012). Nonetheless previous studies were able to identify several discursive functions of voici/voilà. However, none on the studies were done from a conversation analytic perspective. The current study will not necessarily undercut or in any way reject any previous findings. Nevertheless, the methodology we will be using will hopefully corroborate these findings while identifying and describing new functions of voilà in interaction.
Chapter 3: The use of voilà in closings

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter, after a brief literature review on discourse markers used in closings, I will discuss the use and functions of voilà in closing sequences. Using data samples from my corpus, I will first show where in the sequential organization of an ongoing interaction the voilàs of interest occur; I will then describe the various functions fulfilled in these sequential positions. In the analyses, I will discuss all turns but will focus in detail on the turns of interest. Finally, I will summarize my findings and compare the use of voilà with closing practices in other languages.

3.2 Positions

The following are the environments in which voilà closes prior sequences or turns:

1) In sequence closing thirds

   A: turn at talk
   B: receipt with: ouais/ ‘yeah’, d’accord/ ‘okay’, mm hm
   A: voilà

2) In second pair parts (SPP) of adjacency pairs (AP)

   A: turn at talk (e.g., a confirmation request/specification/candidate understanding)
   B: voilà (“marker of agreement” (Delahaie, 2009b)) (stand-alone/ at the beginning of a TCU)

3) In speakers’ turns at talk. This category could be further divided into two subcategories:

   a) Speakers close their own turn in a multi-unit turn and/or turn at talk with voilà
      (e.g., voilà, c’est tout/ (c’est tout literally ‘that’s all’)
      in longer argumentative talk exchanges.

   b) Speakers close their turn before its syntactic, pragmatic ending. This usually occurs in delicate interactions or when recipients are presumed to know the rest
of the talk or can infer it from what they have already heard thus far.

3.3 Functions

Voilà’s main function in these various sequential positions is to manage shifts in activities and actions. Shifts in activities and action can, of course, also be accomplished by the production of a fitted second pair part to a first pair part. My analyses will show however that shifts of actions are not necessarily systematic and straightforward. Indeed, some sequential positions may be problematic (e.g., co-participants may not react appropriately to speakers’ ends of telling). In such cases, voilà may then overtly mark the end of the sequence and indicate the readiness to move to the next sequence of action. In addition, my analyses will also show how speakers manage to shift action using voilà in designedly incomplete turns, how speakers use voilà to mark a shift of action as they react to B-event statements (Labov & Fanshel, 1977). Finally, I will examine the use of voilà in separating a main telling from a side sequence.

3.4 Prior studies on discourse markers in closings

There are several studies on the use of discourse markers in closings sequences. For instance, Beach (1993: 326) has shown that okay is deployed to move “from prior to next positioned matter.” In other words, okay functions as a transition marker from a previous topic to an upcoming topic or sequence of action. It seems that okay in German business talk also functions in similar ways (Barske, 2009). The German discourse marker gut (literally ‘good’) closes the previous sequences and simultaneously opens a next sequence (Meier 2002 cited in Barske & Golato, 2010). It appears that both gut and okay can be found in pre-closing sequences.

In their study of the use and function of the German discourse marker so, Barske & Golato (2010) found that in German interaction, so is used as a sequence management device as
it closes the prior sequence and indicates readiness to start a new sequence. According to the authors, the sequence following the production of a *so* is usually the "logical next phase" (Barske & Golato, 2010: 245) in a course of action. But unlike *gut* and *okay*, *so* is not found in a pre-closing sequence of telephone interaction and it’s never found in a second pair part (SPP) of an adjacency pair.

In Japanese, Hayashi & Yoon (2009) have demonstrated that the deployment of a third position minimal response (e.g., *mhm*) can be “closure implicative” (Hayashi & Yoon, 2009: 252). This is the case when speakers utter a minimal response after recipients have responded to speakers’ first turn at talk with a minimal acknowledgement receipt token (e.g., *mhm*). In other words, by uttering a minimal response in sequentially third position, speakers communicate that they have nothing else to add to the previous topic and propose to move on to a new topic or sequence.

In French, Delahaie (2009b) has shown that when *d’accord* ‘okay’ is used in sequentially third position, it closes the sequence. This is illustrated in the following example from a conversation exchange in a travel agency:

**FIGURE 3.1:** (from Delahaie, 2009b: 25) (C stands for “client” and E for “employee”)

01 C: là vous attendez une confirmation d’Aquatour?
   are you waiting for a confirmation from Aquator?

02 E: voilà
   that’s right

03 C: d’accord
   okay

According to the author, when *d’accord* is used in this position, it has an “acknowledgement of receipt” value (my translation) *(accusé de reception)* (Delahaie, 2009b: 25); that is, the speaker validates the response to his question thereby closing the sequence. Winther (1985: 87) has shown that *bon* (literally ‘good’) is used in a debate setting by the moderator to “punctuate” the
end of a speaker’s turn at talk\textsuperscript{12}, before allocating the turn to another speaker. The author specifies that the use of \textit{bon} in this closing environment does not necessarily entail a positive assessment. As a matter of fact, the author points out that a moderator can use \textit{bon} to close interactants’ talk that in his estimation has gone on too long. This is what the author calls \textit{une clôture autoritaire} ‘an authoritative closure’ (my translation) (Winther 1985: 88). The repetition of \textit{bon} as in \textit{bon, bon, ça suffit!} ‘okay, okay, that’s enough’ (my translation) (Winther 1985: 83) also reinforces the idea that this-has-gone-on-long-enough-and-must-stop-immediately\textsuperscript{13}. For Winther (1985), \textit{bien} and \textit{très bien} (literally ‘well’ and ‘very well’) are variants of \textit{bon}; that is, they can be used either to close the previous turn and allocate the turn to someone else, as in \textit{très bien, Michel Ciment?} (Winther, 1985: 88), or to terminate a turn that has gone on too long. This is usually expressed by the duplication of \textit{(très) bien} which conveys the intensity of the request to close: \textit{très bien, très bien! tu l’diras t’d à l’heure!} ‘Okay, okay! You can say that later’ (my translation) (Winther, 1985: 88). In any case, when used in discourse, \textit{bon, bien} and \textit{très bien} lose their evaluative (positive) value, and become closure markers of variable intensities (Winther, 1985). Barnes (1995) has shown that in argumentative talk, the more influential participant in the interaction can stop the discussion with a \textit{bon} prefaced TCU. According to the author, the sentence following \textit{bon} expresses a change of topic. Hence for Barnes (1995: 815), \textit{bon} is a “marker of transition”, that is, a pivotal device which serves to close the previous topic and simultaneously open a new sequence. Hansen’s (1998a, 1998b) work corroborates previous findings on \textit{bon}, as he affirms that a speaker can use \textit{bon} to stop an ongoing exchange and shift it to a more appropriate and relevant subject matter in the ongoing conversation.

\textsuperscript{12} No original data were included in the article, so it is not clear where in the turn \textit{bon} is positioned.

\textsuperscript{13} Stivers (2004) and Golato & Fagyal (2008) have also shown that repeats of tokens can be used to stop an ongoing action.
We notice here that markers used to close a sequence in most languages have originally
different semantic meanings, which are lost when they are used as discourse markers. In the next
section, I will show how *voilà*, another word with semantic meaning (see literature review of
*voilà*), is also used as a closing device in various sequential positions.

3.5 Analysis of *voilà* in closings: an action management device

In the following sections, I will first show how *voilà* is used in sequentially third position
to shift from one activity to another different activity. In the remaining sections I will illustrate
how co-participants manage to accomplish shifts of activity/action even in some problematic
sequential environments.

3.5.1 Shift in activity type

This first example from the CLAPI\(^{14}\) corpus shows how the co-participants go from
discussing a data excerpt to an entirely different activity, namely data listening. In this example,
a group of students (G, D, S and I) discuss an audio recording and data transcription. Before this
extract, the group had experienced trouble in properly understanding one particular word of the
audio data. More specifically, they could not agree on what each of them had heard. I suggests
that the word she heard may be *avril* ‘april’, but the rest of the group thought they heard either
*huit* ‘eight’ or *août* ‘august’. The group listened eight times to the data excerpt before they
resolved the issue. Before this extract, some of participants seem to have agreed that the word
they heard could be *avril*. They all have excluded the possibility that the word they heard could

---

\(^{14}\) CLAPI (Corpus de LAngues Parlées en Interaction) is an online corpus of Spoken French
interactions. The databank is composed of audio and video recordings which were collected in
various situations (e.g., private conversations, institutional talk). The data can be accessed at
http://clapi.univ-lyon2.fr/
be huit or août, because according to their analysis neither of these words would actually fit the context of the conversation.

FIGURE 3.2

01 G: euh: il est question d' avril. 
uh: it is question of april. 
uh: april is mentioned.

02 S: [oui:]. 
[yes].

03 D: [oui] ça c'est sûr. 
[yes] that it’s sure. 
[yes] that’s for sure.

04 (0.6)

05 G: oui (.) et euh (.) bon à mon avis il le dit 
yes (.) and uh (.) good to my opinion he it said 
yes (.) and uh (.) okay in my opinion he said it

06 mai:s c'e:st (0.8) d'abord j'ai- j'ai compris août 
but it i:s (0.8) first I've- I've understood august 
but it i:s (0.8) first I- I understood august

07 ensuite j'ai com- j'ai compris huit 
then I’ve un- I’ve understood eight 
then I un- I understood eight

08 (0.5)

09 comme vous aussi (0.5) et euh: c- c'e:st 
like you also (0.5) and uh: it i:s 
like you did (0.5) and uh: it i:s

10 (1.6)

11 G: bon [ben i-] 
good [well i-] 
okay [well i-]

12 D: [c'est] isadora qui a soulevé le [problème] 
[it’s] isadora who has raised the [problem] 
isadora is the one who raised the issue

13 G: 

14 s- e:st (0.6) une transcriptrice phénoménale 
s- i:s (0.6) a transcriber phenomenal 
s- i:s (0.6) a remarkable transcriber

15 comme nous l’ savons tous donc on devrait 
like we it know alle so one should
FIGURE 3.2 (cont.)

as we all know so we should

16 lui faire confiance c’est elle (0.3) qui décide. to her do trust it’s she (0.3) who decide. trust her she is the one (0.3) who decides.

17 I: merci. thanks.

→ 18 G: voilà. < ((écoute des données)) (68.1)> that’s it. < ((data listening)) (68.1)>

19 (0.5)

20 G: est ce qu’elle dit rendre ou prendre did she say return or take

In line 1, G states the word could after all be avril ‘april’, while S and D also seem to align with him (line 2 and 3). G then summarizes the processes they all went through to figure out the word they heard (lines 5-8). D acknowledges I’s contribution to solving the transcription problem (line 11). G compliments I’s transcribing ability and suggests that she should have the final say on what the word is going to be (lines 12-15). I accepts G’s compliments (line 16), thereby bringing the compliment sequence to a closure. This also marks the closure of the overall sequence of identifying the word avril ‘april’. After G utters voilà in line 1, he then clicks on the recording machine. None of the other participants talk, instead they all listened to more data. When they next stop the audio data recorder to discuss what they just heard, we notice that they are now trying to figure out a different word (line 19). Thus, here voilà signals an overt shift to a new activity. In other words, it is placed at a transition place between two types of activities as it closes the previous data discussion activity, and prefaces the next activity (i.e, data listening). As such, voilà functions here as a transition marker.
Thus, this data sample exemplifies the use of *voilà* in this straightforward transition from one activity/action to another. Note that this use of *voilà* is very similar to the use of *okay* in English (Beach, 1993) and the use of *so* in German (Barske & Golato, 2010).

However, intersubjectivity in interaction is not always unproblematic, as evidenced by the fact that co-participants don’t necessarily recognize sequence boundaries. In the following section, I will illustrate how interactants use *voilà* in such difficult sequential positions to overtly mark the end of the previous sequence and indicate their readiness to go on to the next sequence.

### 3.5.2 Shift of action in sequentially difficult environments

Recognizing the ends of stories or larger tellings can cause difficulties for interactants, as displayed in figure 3.3. The recipient of the telling can be seen to produce continuers at almost every turn-transitional relevant place, thus signaling their expectation that the telling continue. Figure 3 also shows how the utterance of *voilà* finally prompts the recipient to give an appropriate response to the rather long telling that the speaker had just ended. The example comes from a Skype voice conversation between a mother (M) and her daughter (C). While C is away on study abroad, M is taking care of C’s cat. In this excerpt, M) updates C on the health condition of C’s cat.

**FIGURE 3.3**

01 M: eh ben écoute elle était émerveillée devant ton chat, and well listen she was amazed before your cat, well listen she was impressed by your cat,

02 (.)

03 qu’ elle a trouvé en pleine santé, eu:h that she has found in full health, uh: which she found in good health, uh:
elle était émerveillée.  
_ she was amazed._
_ she was impressed._

(0.5)

C: ah bon.  
oh good.  
oh okay.

M: elle l’ a trouvé gras, elle l’ a trouvé attentif, câlin  
_ she him has found fat, she him has found attentive, cuddly_  
_ she found him chubby:, she found him attentive, cuddly_  

et le monsieur qui t’ a fait ts- qui t’ avait dédicacé  
and the mister who you had ts- who you had signed  
and the man who had ts- who had signed the book for you

le livre est venu pasque j’ en ai: commandé un autre pour  
the book is came because I some ha:ve ordered an other for  
came by because I ordered another book for u:h (.)

euh (.).euh la la future euh nouvelle femme de:( )  
_ u:h (.). uh the the future uh new wife of:( )_

C: mm hm

M: et euh il est venu, eh ben impeccable le chat est venu,  
and u:h he is came, and well impeccable the cat is came,  
and u:h he came, well perfect the cat came,

Câlin: ( ) c’était a-assez mignon.  
cuddly:( ) it was e-enough cute.  
cuddly: ( ) it was q-quite cute.

C: [mm  
[  
M: [et constance elle a dit ( ) pour un vieux chat  
[and constance she has said( ) for an old cat  
[and constance she said ( ) for an old cat

ehel ne revenait pas. Il faisait tout  
_ she not coming back not. He was doing all_  
_ she couldn’t believe it. he was anything_  

Sauf euh s’ ennuyer.  
but uh himself bored.
but bored.

18  (0.2)

19 C: ah ouais? hh hh c’est marrant.
oh yeah? hh hh it’s funny.
19  oh really? hh hh that’s funny.

20 M: et- oui oui mais et puis toujours euh toujours prêt à
and- yes yes but and then always uh always ready to

21 cattalk, always uh attentive to what goes on around him=
chatparle:r, toujours euh attentif à ce qui se passe=

22 =c’est marrant hein?
it’s funny huh?
22  =that’s funny don’t you think?

23 M: mm mm

24 C: ‘lors je me dis tiens encore un mois, tiens
so I to me say hold still one month, hold
so I say to myself hang in there one more month,

25 encore un mois, parqu’ il est quand même (0.5) il a
still one month,because he is when same (0.5) he has
hang in there one more month, because nevertheless (0.5)

26 une respiration un petit peu difficile
a breathing a little bit difficult
his breathing is a little bit difficult

27 mais euh il tient très bien.
but uh he holds very well.
27  but he’s holding on very well.

28 C: mm

29  (1.3)

30 M: voilà.
that’s it.

31  (0.5)
In lines 1-3, M reports to C the compliments that C’s sister had made about the cat. C receipts M’s previous turn with a continuer *ah bon* (line 6). In line 7 M continues to report on what the sister had said about the cat, and in lines 7-13 M tells C how the cat behaved with another person. In line 14, C receipts M’s telling with a minimal continuer. In lines 15-17, M reports the sister’s reaction to the cat, and makes the same assessment she had already made earlier about the animal. M is probably repeating the assessment because she did not get an appropriate response, such as an assessment from C on her previous account about the cat. Having finished her account, M hands back the turn to C with an assessment of the cat. C does not immediately respond (line 18). In line 19, C starts her turn with an astonishment marker *ah ouais* uttered with rising intonation, then finally provides a positive assessment of M’s account. In lines 20-22, M first confirms C’s request, the *oui oui*, indicating a “stronger” agreement to the previous turn (Müller 1996 in Stivers 2004), then she continues to make the same assessment that her daughter has made earlier about the cat (i.e., in line 19), followed by a confirmation-seeking token *hein*. M’s use of the same assessment indicates that she is now claiming ownership of the assessment as she uses *hein* to elicit an agreement from C, who in line 23 agrees with a minimal token *mm mm*. In lines 24-27 M first tells C that she begged the cat not to die soon, and
then shares with C her concerns about the cat’s long term health condition. Given that M is
talking about C’s cat, one would expect C to react in some way either at the end of the TCU in
line 26, where M points out a health problem, or at the end of line 27 when M is producing a
reassurance. However, in line 28, C once more receipts M’s previous turn with a minimal
continuer. The long silence in line 29 suggests that M was probably expecting C to say more in
response to the rather long account that M just completed. In line 30, M utters voilà with falling
intonation, thereby recompleting her turn and handing it back to C. In other words, with the voilà,
M indicates that she is done with her turn, thus giving C one more chance to respond to the
telling. After yet another silence in line 31, C finally assesses M’s long telling in line 32. In line
33, in overlap with C’s turn and more specifically at a point when an assessment is projectable,
M starts a new donc/ ‘so’- prefaced topic to resume a subject matter that she and C had talked
about earlier in their conversation. So, the fact that M has started a new topic in line 33 shows
that the voilà in line 30 was clearly used to close the telling about the cat. By uttering voilà in
line 30, M has communicated to C that she did not have anything else to add to her telling. Thus,
this example demonstrates thus that it is the utterance of voilà which prompted C to reorient to
the prior talk not as a telling in progress, but as a telling that has come to an end. Here, voilà
prompted her to give an appropriate response to a longer telling, namely an assessment (line 32).

This next example is similar to the previous example, in that the co-participant is not
providing an appropriate response when it is due. Again, the speaker produces a voilà to overtly
indicate that their telling has come to an end and that thus an assessment is due. The data
example is taken from a telephone conversation between M, a grandmother, and her
granddaughter A. In this excerpt, M updates A on her mother’s (A’s mother) health, since A’s
mother is recovering after some sickness.
FIGURE 3.4

01 M: donc et ta maman a été arrêtée pendant toute la semaine,
so and your mom has been stopped during all the week,
so and your mom was on medical leave for the whole week,

02 M: ...et demain, elle est au repos.
[and tomorrow, she is resting.]

03 A: [ouais. d’accord.]
[yeah. okay.]

04 M: al-euh parce qu’elle pouvait pas sortir tu comprends?
s- uh because she could not go out you understand?
s- uh because she couldn’t go out you see what I mean?

05 A: et oui::.
and yeah::.
sure.

06 (1.1)

07 M: parce que:: à cause de la sécu ...et:
because:: to reason of the insurance ...and:
that’s because of the insurance and:

08 demain elle est de repos, ça tombe comme ça,
tomorrow she is of rest, that falls like that,
tomorrow she’s resting, that’s how it is,

09 A: uh hm=

10 M: =alors je- elle m’ a dit je viendrai te voir. (. ) mai:s
=so I- she to me has said I will come you to see.(. ) bu:t
=so I- she told me I’ll come to see you.(. ) but

11 elle a tellement de boulot,( ) reposer là tu vois=
she has so much of work, ( ) to rest there you see=
she has so much work ( ) to rest you see=

12 =elle a dormi, elle se repose pour ( ) un peu.
=elle has slept, she herself rest to ( ) a little.
=she slept, she’s resting ( ) a little.

13 A: bon ben [tant mieux.
good well[much better.
well [that’s good.

14 M: [voilà.
FIGURE 3.4 (cont.)

[that’s it.

15 A: tant mieux.=
much better.=
that’s good.=

16 M := et:: ton papa
= an::d your dad

M\textsuperscript{15} tells A what her mother has been up to for the whole week and what she will do the next day (line 1-2). In overlap, A receipts M’s telling with minimal receipt tokens (line 3). M gives additional information on her mother’s status and ends the turn with a comprehension check (line 4). A confirms her understanding in line 5 with \textit{et oui}. The pause in the next turn (line 6) indicates that M was probably expecting more than a claim of understanding; she was presumably expecting A to demonstrate/articulate her understanding as to why the mother could not leave the house. When realizing that the explanation is not forthcoming, M ends up giving the explanation herself in the next turn (line 7). At the end of the TCU, M produces an in breath and a stretched conjunction, presumably to provide space for A to produce aligning talk. However, when this is not forthcoming, M repeats information in line 8 that she had already given earlier (i.e., in line 2). By doing so, M provides A with an opportunity to redo her prior response. In other words, this is most probably a way for M to elicit a longer response from A that she did not get the first time around. In line 9, A does not provide a longer response, and instead receipts M’s telling again with a minimal token. In lines 10-13, M goes on to tell A about her mother’s promise to come and see her (M), but due to her health condition, M doubts that she

\textsuperscript{15}It is not clear if M’s information is ‘news’ to A. If it is indeed news, the reaction is rather strange, but if it is not, then A’s response may be understandable. But even in the latter case, one would then expect some sort of explanation from A to M that she does know this already.
would be able to make it. M finishes the turn with downward intonation after repeating again that
the mother is still resting. In line 13, A begins her turn with with *bon ben* ‘well’, followed by
an assessment. The *bon ben* ‘well’ does not necessarily project an assessment or longer turn to
follow. It is at this point that M overlaps A’s turn to utter *voilà* (line 14). Again, I argue that this
*voilà* functions to overtly signal a recompletion of the turn and an invitation for M to respond. In
line 15, A does just that by repeating the assessment in the clear. That is, A displays a
reorientation to the prior talk as one in which an assessment and not just a continuer is the
appropriate response. In line 16, M begins a new sequence of action thereby confirming that her
*voilà* in line 15 has definitively closed the telling or re-closes the telling: having finished the
telling on A’s mother, M has now started a new telling on A’s father. We notice here that *voilà* is
uttered to recomplete a turn that was already complete, thereby indicating to the co-participant
that more is expected from her (i.e., an assessment), which she provided in overlap in line 13 and
in clear in line 15. This example thus further illustrates the significance of appropriate responses
in sequence organizations.

In the examples above, we have seen instances in which recipients produced continuers to
tellings when other forms of receipts such as assessments were due. As argued above, uttering
*voilà* serves to indicate that the telling has come to an end, thereby signaling that a different
response than the one given is due. In the next examples, co-participants can be seen to provide
an appropriately aligning response to a telling, but only a minimal one. This apparently can also
be cause for some sequential difficulties that are then managed with the production of a *voilà.*
The following excerpt illustrates this. The data example is from the CLAPI corpus. In this
excerpt, a group of students (G, D, S and I) discusses the beginning of an audio recording and
data transcription. Right before listening and discussing the data, one of the group members (S)
asks the rest of the group to explain the context of the recording. G and I, who were present during the recording, explain the context and answer most of S’s questions. Toward the end of the explanation, the conversation shifts and focuses on one of the participants of the recording. I explains that the person in question was difficult to deal with, due in part to his frantic personality. G at some point asks I if she had a fight with that person. The excerpt starts with a portion of I’s response to G’s question. (The original transcript is all in French; the word by word translations as well as the idiomatic translation are all mine).

FIGURE 3.5

01 I: non non mais je le laissais parler (.)
no no but I him left talk (.)
02 entre lui et moi en fait il y avait pas
between him and me in fact it there was not
in fact, I did not have a problem with him
03 de problème à résoudre c'est pour ça
of problems to resolve it’s for that
and that’s maybe why u(hh)h
04 p’t-être eu(hh)h on s’est pas engueu(hh)lés,((laughter))
may be u(hh)h we each other is not figh(hh)t,
I did not have a figh(hh)t with him,
05 G: ah bon, ((laugh tokens))
oh good,
oh okay,
06 I: non mais du reste je j’ai- j’aurais pas vraiment vu
no but of the remaining I I- I would not really saw
no but in any case I wouldn’t know
07 comment le faire avec lui parce-que justement
how it do with him because rightly
how to deal with him because as I said
08 il te laissait pas placer une (0.5) une phrase
he you left not place one (0.5) one sentence
he wouldn’t let you say a (0.5) a sentence
09 où t’expliquais vraiment euh entièrement quelque chose.
where you explaining really uh entirely something,
in which you could really entirely explain something.
In lines 1-4, I clarifies the situation and explains that she did not really have a problem with the person in question. Her turn at talk ends with continuing intonation, which projects there’s more to come. G receipts I’s answer in line 5 with a continuer. I then goes on to complain about his rude behavior toward G. G confirms and agrees with I’s account (line 10) with a ouais uttered in lower voice. While this is an appropriate response, it is rather minimal. The pause in line 11 could probably be explained by the fact that I was presumably expecting more from G, most probably an alignment with her account or some sort of co-complaint. Finally, I utters voilà in line 12, after which G in line 14 proposes to start a new activity, that of listening to the audio data. In fact, G uses bon (“marker of transition”; Barnes, 1995) to shift the topic from the discussion of a recorded data, to listening to audio data. Thus, this example shows that by uttering voilà in line 12, I officially closes the previous telling after having made sure that G has nothing more to add to her account. In contrast to previous examples, G did provide an appropriate response, as he confirmed I’s utterance. However, it is only a minimal response in a situation where a co-complaint could have been expected. Specifically, he initiates the next sequence using the transition marker bon. Thus, G does not display a re-orientation to the prior
talk as in the other instances, but by changing the topic he also recasts his prior turn as complete (and appropriate).

In the following excerpt, a voilà is again used to manage sequence and topic closure. In this case, the speaker opts to overtly close their telling with voilà and move on to the next sequence. The example is a continuation of the conversation between A and her grandmother (M). In this extract, A asks M what the temperature is like where she lives. The excerpt begins with M passing the question on to her husband P (lines1-2).

FIGURE 3.6

01 M: euh: ce matin qu’est-ce qu’il y avait papi
uh: this morning what is it what it there was papi
uh: this morning Papi what’s

02 comme température?
like temperature?
the temperature like?

03 (0.5)

04 P: cinq. (((P)Papi’s voice from background )))
five.

05 M: cinq.
five.

06 (0.9)

07 A: ah [oui.
oh [okay.
[

08 M: [cinq et main– et maintenant= et demain il va faire froid=
[five and no– and now= and tomorrow it goes do cold=
[five and no– and now= and tomorrow it’s going to be cold=

09 =.h enfin toute la semaine.
=.h well all the week.
=.h well the whole week.

10 A: ah:=}
FIGURE 3.6 (cont.)

11 M: =puis on va vers le froid main’ant, c’est [noël bientôt, =then we go toward the cold now, it is [christmas soon, =and we’re approaching the cold period now, [soon it’s Christmas, [  

12 A: [ah oui. 

13 A: ouais. 

[yeah. 

14 M: voilà. 

that’s it. 

15 A: nous-[ 

we- [  

16 M: [.h et ben écoute je pense à toi [.h and well listen I think to you [.h well listen I think about you 

P answers M’s question in line 4\(^\text{16}\). M then repeats the answer for A’s benefit (line 5). In line 6 neither A nor M take the next turn. A then receipts M’s answer in line 7 with a minimal acknowledgement token. In overlap, M starts a new turn and expands her answer (line 8) by repeating her previous answer (i.e., *cinq*) as if to link what she is about to say to what she said previously. A continues receiving and acknowledging M’s telling with minimal acknowledgement tokens (line 10, 12 and 13). Given that it was A who asked about the weather in France, it is somewhat surprising that A does not comment further on the information she received (or contrast it with the weather where she is). After M utters *voilà* in line 14, both M and A overlap in starting a new sequence of action in the next turn (lines 15 and 16, respectively). In line 15, A starts what looks like a “my side telling” (Pomerantz, 1980) while M starts a new turn, which is presumably a telling of her care and concerns about her granddaughter’s well-being. In other words, lines 15 and 16 indicate that both speakers orient to the *voilà* in line 14 as

\(^\text{16}\) In French, although not systematic it is quite common to tell just the number of the temperature, without specifying with “degrees”.
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a means to close the previous “temperature telling” sequence. By uttering voilà, M communicates to A that she has nothing more to add to her telling, and that she wishes to move on to the next sequence. In addition, this example shows that after the utterance of voilà either the speaker or the interlocutor can take the next turn.

This next example shows how the utterance of voilà prompts the recipient to take the next turn. The example comes from the Skype telephone conversation between M and her daughter C. Before this excerpt, M made sure that C, who is living abroad, has received the documentation containing her missing driver’s license number that she had sent her earlier.

FIGURE 3.7

01 M: on peut pas—on peut pas—sais pas= one can not— one can not— know not= you can’t— you can’t— I dunno=

02 =aller demander un duplicata de = go ask a duplicate of = ask for a replacement of your driving

03 permis avec ce numero, je suppose, permit with this number, I suppose, license with this number, I guess,

04 C: non, tu peux pas. no, you can not. no, you can’t.

05 M: non(◦) no (◦)

06 C: mm.

07 (1.8)

08 C: ts. voilà. ts. that’s all.

09 M: et donc quelle heure est-il?=il est quatroze heures ici donc and so what time is-it?=it is fourteen hours here so and so what time is-it?= it’s two pm here so
In lines 1-3, M inquires if there is a way that C could use the documentation she had sent her to replace her missing driver’s license. In line 4, C answers negatively to M’s inquiry. In the next turn, M begins by repeating C’s negative answer. Although what she says in the remainder of the turn is unclear, it seems that she aligns with C’s explanation given earlier in their conversation as to why she cannot get her license back so easily (line 5). In the next turn (line 6), C acknowledges/agrees with her mother’s turn with a minimal token. Neither M nor C immediately takes the next turn (line 7). In line 8, C utters *voilà*, while in the next turn (line 9) M introduces a new topic as she inquires what time it is where C lives. Of note here is that M did not take the turn after C’s receipt/agreement token in line 6. The rather long pause in line 7 could possibly be due to M’s expecting C to expand on her answer. By uttering *voilà* in line 8, however, C officially closes her previous turn, thereby communicating to M that she has nothing to add to her answer. This effectively hands back the turn to M, which she takes in line 9. Thus, the utterance of *voilà* by C prompts M to take the next turn, thereby repairing the turn taking system which one could say was momentarily out of service.

Finally, this last example shows how speakers could use the composite *et puis voilà* (*et puis* literally means ‘and then’) to manage another type of difficult situation, namely ending a dispreferred action. This example comes from the telephone conversation between A and her grandmother (M). In this excerpt, M mentions to A that her father (A’s father) has enlarged one of A’s picture for her (M).
FIGURE 3.8

01 A: c’est dommage, enfin il s’embête,
   it’s pity, at last he himself annoyed,
   what a pity, I mean he’s gone through trouble,

02 pourquoi il m’a pas envoyé un email=
   why he to me has not sent an email=
   why did not he send me an email=

03 =Je vous aurais envoyé par email les photos,
   =I to you would sent by email the pictures,
   =I would’ve sent you the pictures by email,

04 la qualité numérique serait restée
   the quality digital would stayed
   The digital quality would’ve stayed the same

05 parce que là il est en train de faire ça à partir
   because that there he is in the middle of to do that from to start
   because now he’s starting out with

06 des photos que vous avez, .h que je vous ai envoyées
   of the pictures that you have, .h that I to you have sent
   the pictures I sent you

07 donc il y a: (0.8)[un peu moins de qualité. enfin bon.
   so it there has:0.8[a little less of quality. at last good.
   hence it has:0.8[a little less quality. well anyway.
   ]

08 M: [(° °)]

09 ben, tu m’en referas une autre et puis voilà.
   well, you to me some will redo one other and then that’s it.
   well, you’ll send me another one and that’s it.

10 A: oui::.
    ye::s.
    su::re.

11 M: bon.
   good.
   okay.

12 A: hh hh hh

13 M: h. dis moi-
    h. tell me-
In lines 1-7, A explains in one long turn why her father would have been better off asking her for a digital picture rather than enlarging the picture she supposedly had sent to him earlier. She is thus criticizing the actions of her father. She finishes her turn in line 7 with falling intonation, before adding another TCU, *enfin bon*, which marks the end of the explanation and of A’s turn at talk. In the next turn (line 9), M requests that A send her another picture. Both of these actions are dispreferred (Pomerantz, 1984). M then closes her turn with *et puis voilà*. In the next turn, A accepts the requests (line 10). In line 11 M utters *bon*, which is a “marker of transition” (Barnes, 1995), to indicate her readiness to tackle the next topic, which she does in line 13. I would like to suggest that the *et puis voilà* in line 9 is used to close the “picture topic”. Notice that M did not wait for A’s response of acceptance or rejection before uttering *et puis voilà*. Instead, M linked *et puis voilà* to the previous action, and thus does not leave any room for the request to be granted or rejected. By closing the topic with *et puis voilà*, M presents the action as one that does not require an acceptance, and/or will unquestionably be granted. A of course accepts M’s request in the next turn, with A’s laughter in line 12 possibly expressing her amused reaction to M’s double dispreferred action. More importantly, however, this example shows that *et puis voilà* is used not only to close the turn at talk, but also to communicate the speaker’s wish “not to talk about the subject matter any further”.

In this section I have demonstrated how the utterance of *voilà* manages actions and activities in sequentially problematic positions. In the next section, I will show how *voilà* prompts shifts in actions in syntactically and pragmatically incomplete turns.
3.5.3 Shift in syntactically and pragmatically incomplete turns

The following examples illustrate how uttering a *voilà* in syntactically and pragmatically incomplete turns can prompt co-participants to react. In such turns, recipients interpret *voilà* as an indication that the speaker desires to shift the topic/action. This usually occurs in delicate interactions, or when recipients are presumed to know the rest of the talk or can infer it from what they have already heard thus far.

In this first example, *voilà* is placed before the syntactic ending of the turn. This placement indicates that the speaker assumes the recipients will not need the missing element in order to understand the turn at talk as it is. The data sample comes from a talk show broadcasted every week on national French television. In this excerpt, the talk show host (L), along with his two co-panelists, reviews the week’s hot topics. One of this week’s hot topics was the widely spread rumor about the possible return of the former French president Nicolas Sarkozy to the political arena. L first went over several newspapers that announced the possible return. He then turns to one of the panelists (N) and asks her if she too thinks he will return. N responds that the former president himself is convinced that he will return and she even suggests that he is using his wife to strategically further spread the rumors of his possible return. In support of this claim, N cites the former president’s wife’s interview with *Atlantico*, an online based news website. The *voilà* of interest is in line 9.

**FIGURE 3.9**

01 N: elle a déclaré au site atlantico, que eu:h she has stated to the site atlantico, that u:h she stated on the website of atlantico, that u:h

02 en deux mille dix-sept on allait avoir in two thousand seventeen we going to have in the year two thousand seventeen there’s going to be
In lines 1-11, N explains how in her interview the former president’s wife subtly indicates the president would come back. In paraphrasing the interview, N presents the telling in a way that highlights the person in question (i.e., the former president) without yet naming him. She first projects a possible not-so-desirable scenario in the upcoming presidential election (lines 03-06). For the use and function of this voilà see section 3.5.4
2-5), then suggests that there is only one person who could prevent this undesirable scenario. Hence, in line 07, N starts what seems like a left-dislocated construction, as she first states the matrix clause *le seul qui peut empêcher ça*, with a stress on *seul*/*only* as if to highlight this element. Then she begins to announce the referent, uttering *c’est?* with rising intonation and slightly opening her hands and arms to add a theatrical element to this announcement (line 8). But instead of the missing name/reference, a pause follows, which heightens even more this awaited announcement. After a longer silence, she finally utters *voilà* with falling intonation (line 9). In overlap with this, L proposes a name (the first name of the former president) to collaboratively complete N’s turn from line 8. After an additional silence, he suggests another name in the clear with falling intonation as he looks toward N, which suggests that L is instead requesting confirmation: *mon Raymond*. (the wife’s nickname for the former president). In line 11, N confirms L’s suggestion, thereby ratifying the president’s name as the one she was referring to without identifying him in line 8. The stretch in *voilà* in line 11 adds one last dramatic effect to this whole theatrical announcement of the missing name, as it functions as some sort of a “solution” to this long anticipated yet well-known name. The fact that N confirms L’s candidate completion also indicates that she (N) claims to have epistemic authority over this telling. In other words, the pause that followed *c’est?* in line 8 was not an indication of a word search, but rather a blank that did not necessarily need to be filled for the turn to be understood by recipients. In other words, this was an intentionally incomplete turn specifically designed for the recipient to complete (Koshik, 2002).

The following example illustrates another case of an incomplete TCU closed with *voilà*. In this particular case, it seems the speaker did not necessarily wish to go all the way to the end of the TCU. The excerpt is from the same weekly talk show on national French television as the
one in the previous example. In this particular show, one of the guests was LR, a well-known and beloved French actress, singer, and activist who, together with her husband, was part of what might be called a mythical couple. Now in her eighties, LR came to the show to promote her memoirs, in which she writes about her career which spanned over sixty years, but in which she also reveals that she was not faithful to her husband. This news was introduced by the talk show host (L) as being a “surprise” to many French people. Before this excerpt, LR discussed her long career and life at length, including the alleged extramarital affair. Right before this clip, L shows an archived clip, a musical/cabaret number that LR did while she was working in Las Vegas some fifty years ago. After the clip, LR and L briefly commented with humor on her attire and look at that time before LR says the following:

FIGURE 3.10

01 LR: donc je suis partie pour trois mois
so I am gone for three months
so I went there for three months

02 je suis restée deux ans. et c’est là où:
I am stayed two years. and it’s there where
and I stayed for two years. and that’s where

03 voilà bon. [la france me manquait tellement-
that’s it good. [the france to me missing so much-
that’s it anyway. [I missed france so much-

04 L: [ou vous avez fauté.
[where you have sinned.
[where you sinned.

In lines 1-2, LR starts a *donc* ‘so’ prefaced turn to resume a topic she had mentioned earlier, namely her life in Las Vegas, and specifies how long she stayed there. In her second TCU (line 2), LR starts to relate some sort of event that presumably occurred there. She does not complete her TCU, but instead utters *voilà* followed by *bon* with falling intonation. LR then
starts a new TCU on a different topic, specifically the fact that she missed her country very much while living in Las Vegas (line 3). In line 4, in overlap with the new topic TCU, L repeats the last word LR used (où/ ‘where’) before uttering voilà and then he completes her turn with a rather euphemistic expression. Note that due to the downward intonation with which the completion is uttered, it is not presented as a candidate understanding despite the fact that LR has epistemic authority on events occurring in her life. LR may have claimed epistemic authority by confirming it, but given that L’s turn has overlapped with LR prior turn, LR probably did not hear L’s contribution. However, we can still claim that L has recognized LR’s TCU as being an incomplete one, for he completed her TCU. Thus, voilà is here used by the speaker to communicate that she either does not wish to add anything more to this TCU, or that she believes she does not need to add anything more for the TCU to be understood as it is. In the latter case, the argument could be that LR has already talked in detail about her extramarital affairs earlier in the discussion/interview, including the fact that it happened while she was living in Las Vegas. In such a case, she may have felt she did not need to repeat it again, especially since this is clearly a somewhat delicate story. As for L, he was not necessarily “outing” her, but he was most likely doing what might be called “a good talk show interviewer”, that is, he may have felt the need to complete the TCU for the benefit of the audience and therefore for the sake of clarity. We notice here that LR also used the transition marker bon (Winther, 1985) to self-censor her talk from going any further and shift her action and introduce a new sequence of action.

The following example of an incomplete TCU closed with voilà shows how recipients could infer the rest of the talk from what they had heard thus far. The excerpt again comes for the same television talk show. Here, one of the guests (V) was on the show to promote an upcoming film that she had directed. Along with her were two of the actors who had played
characters in the film. Right before the excerpt, the actors profusely complimented V on her abilities to cope with not-so-easy working and living conditions while shooting the film. Most probably in an attempt to downplay her “sacrifices”, V addressed the compliments as follows:

FIGURE 3.11

01 V: c’est pas la taille de la loge qui fait it’s not the size of the trailer which does
the size of the trailer doesn’t contribute much

02 la qualité du film, et je- j’ai déjà eu the quality of the film, and I- I’ve already had
to the quality of the film, and I- I’ve already had

03 des gra::nds car-loges où on pouvait some bi::g trailers where one could
some hu::ge trailers where one could

04 B: [.h hh hh hh

05 V: [tenir à cinquante, e:::t voilâ. [hold at fifty, a:::nd that’s it.
[fit fifty persons in, a:::nd that’s it.

06 V: [◦(.h e- j- )◦ ((V looks down with a smirk on her face))
[

07 L: [h.. ha ha je crois qu’ on a compris la suite,
[h.. ha ha I think that we has understood the rest,
[h.. ha ha I think we can figure out the rest,

08 écoutez (.) je crois que vous les aimez déjà tous les trois- listen (.) I think that you them love already all the three-
listen (.) I think these three have already conquered your heart-

In lines 1-2, V explains that the quality of a film is not measured by the level of lavishing accommodations provided for actors and directors during film shootings. To illustrate her point, she starts to relate what seems to be a story from a past experience (lines 2-4). However, V does not finish the story. She starts by saying that she had large accommodations in which 50 persons could fit, then she builds on her turn with e:::t / ‘a:::nd’ but does not continue her telling to
explain how this impacted the film. Instead she closes her turn with *voilà* uttered with falling intonation. In the next turn, L, the talk show host, first laughs while the audience is clapping and V is muttering an imperceptible utterance and looking downward with a smirk on her face. L then asserts that he thinks that everyone understood where the actress was going with her telling (line 5). L concludes the interview as he looked into the camera and communicates to the audience his good feelings about his three guests (line 6). We don’t know what exactly V was going to say or what L thought he understood, however if we follow up the rest of V’s reasoning, we can arguably claim that the example she began to provide was most likely meant to illustrate that just because she worked under comfortable conditions on her previous film(s), she was not necessarily happy with the “quality” of the film(s). By leaving this turn incomplete, V thus avoided mentioning that she had worked “on not so great films.” She thereby circumvented what could have been an embarrassing admission. L’s laughter at the beginning of line 5 seems to highlight this potentially embarrassing and yet avoided admission. At the same time, however, V had provided enough information for recipients to infer the content of the rest of the talk. This inference is confirmed by L in the next turn (line 7), whose use of the inclusive *on* /‘we’ indicates that V’s incomplete turn could potentially have been completed not only by L, but also by the audience. This example shows that even if *voilà* was used to close an incomplete turn, recipients are able to infer the rest of the talk from what they have heard thus far. However, note that L did not complete the rest of V’s talk; in other words, even if he could have inferred the rest of the talk, he refrained from verbalizing the rest of her thought, and instead moved on to the next sequence of action (i.e., concluding the interview segment) (Not shown in the transcript).
The following is another excerpt in which recipients do not complete the incomplete turn closed with *voilà*. This example is from a telephone conversation between a niece (A) and her aunt (M). The following exchange takes place right after A and M have exchanged greetings.

FIGURE 3.12

01 A: alors je te préviens je t’enregistre
so I you warn I you record
so I just want to warn you I’m recording you

02 un peu, [.hh ha ha
a little [.hh ha ha
a little bit[.hh ha ha

03 M: [ah bon pourquoi?
[oh good why?
[oh really why?

04 A: .hh hh c’est pour une étudiante:te ma collègue
.hh hh it is for a student uh my colleague
.hh hh it’s for a student my colleague

05 qui fait une étude sur la langue et du coup
who does a study on the language and of the sudden
who’s doing a study on language and so

06 elle voulait que j’lui enregistre des conversations,
she wanted that I her record some conversations,
she wanted me to record some conversations for her,

07 M: en franc(h)ais, hh hh
in Fr(h)ench, hh hh

08 A: en français.
in french.

09 (.)

10 A: mais eu::h c’était=>voilà.<
but uhhh it was =>that’s it.<

11 M: m[m. ouaih.(0.7) et ben, c’es:t mm: (0.5) ts
m[m. yeah. (0.7) and well, it i:s mm: (0.5) ts

12 A: [.hh hh
FIGURE 3.12 (cont.)

13 M: alors : stéphanie a bien reçue la casquette, merci-
so: stéphanie has well received the cap, thanks-
so: stéphanie got the cap you sent her, thanks-

In lines 1-2, A informs M that she’s recording the telephone call. M inquires as to why she is doing so (line 3), and A provides a reason (lines 4-6). In line 7, M produces an increment to A’s turn, but does so with slightly rising intonation. For this reason, the increment can be heard as a candidate understanding. A confirms M’s candidate understanding in line 8. After a brief silence, A starts a new *mais* ‘but’ prefaced TCU, she then hesitates before uttering a subject and a verb but instead of completing the sentence, she latches *voilà* to the verb. The *voilà* is delivered at a higher speed and with falling intonation (line 10). By adding *voilà* to an incomplete turn, the speaker communicates that not only did she not want to add anything more to the TCU, but more specifically she withheld additional words/information that would have come out if it were not for the latched *voilà*. M minimally receipts A’s prior turn, then after some hesitation markers and other false starts, she starts a *donc* ‘so’ prefaced TCU to introduce a new topic (line 13). M’s minimal receipt token at the beginning of line 11 shows that she ratifies A’s incomplete turn and thereby communicates to A that she doesn’t need to add anything more to her turn, even if it is incomplete. That she has gone on to start the next topic shows that M has no further inquiries about the topic of recording. Therefore, M has agreed to the recording of the call, or at least does not express any objection to its recording before moving on to the next topic. Thus, this incomplete TCU which is closed with *voilà* did not prevent the conversation between A and M from going forward. Put differently, the completion of this specific TCU was not necessary in the local negotiation between A and M.
It is worth mentioning however that this segment is slightly different from the other incomplete turns we have seen before. In the previous examples, the turn seems to be designedly incomplete, and the co-participants were in a position to complete the turn themselves. This does not seem to be the case in this data example. Moreover, it is not clear if the incomplete turn was going to be about the same topic or about a new topic. Hence, there may be too little information included for the co-participant to guess what would have come. It seems as if the voilà here is used for a self-interruption or a cancelling of what the speaker (A) had started to say.

Finally, the next example will show that even if voilà is uttered after a complete turn, co-participants may view voilà as having come “too soon”, which is to say they may feel that the action has not come to completion. In other words, even though one participant may want to transition to a next action, there can be resistance from the co-participants. The example comes from a daily radio talk show. S is a frequent panelist and has a specific musical segment in the show: he presents fun music-related stories. For this particular day, S brought two songs with similar melodies, and he thinks that one of them has plagiarized the other. Usually before S presents these kinds of segments, he provides some brief background to the music extracts that he is about to present. After listening to the extracts, the panelists decide if indeed there is a case of plagiarism. In this particular segment, S presents the usual background story as follows:

**FIGURE 3.13**

01 S: donc la chanson avait été créée par une certaine
          so the song has been created by a certain
02  irma thomas, qui était, à l’ époque, paraît-il
          irma thomas, who was, at the era, seems it
03  la reine du rhythm and blues, à la nouvelle orléans.
          the queen of the rhythm and blues, at the new orleans.
FIGURE 3.13 (cont.)

the queen of rhythm and blues, of new orleans.

et curieusement (.) h. otis redding a repris and curiously (.) h. otis redding has reprised and interestingly enough (.) otis redding reinterpreted

pratiquement la même mélodie, les arrangements practically the same melody, the arrangements practically the same melody, the arrangements

ont été: bien entendu: changés, et la chanson have been well listened changed, and the song were of course different, and the song

a presque le même titre, ça s’appelle has almost the same title, that itself call has almost the same title, it’s called

pain in my heart, ça été une de ses plus gros tubes, pain in my heart, that been one of his most big hits, pain in my heart, that was one of his biggest hits,

et: et voilà\(^{18}\), j’suis étonné que otis redding and and here it is, I’m astonished that otis redding and and here it is, I’m surprised to find out that otis redding

ait été plagieur, puisque euh il a signé cette chanson has been plagiarist, because uh he has signed this song was a plagiarist, because uh he signed this song

ou on lui a fait signer cette- cette chanson, or they to him has does to sign this- this song, or someone made him sign this- this song,

n’empêche que (.) .h c’est un plagiat flagrant. nevertheless that (.) .h it’s a plagiary flagrant. nonetheless (.) this is flagrant plagiarism.

((écoute morceaux de chansons 35s.)) voilà. ((music listening 35s.)) that’s it.

L: ha ha ha ah oui on s’attendait ha ha ha oh yeah we ourselves waiting

\(^{18}\) For the use and function of this voilà see next chapter (i.e., opening voilà)
In lines 1-3, S introduces the first singer and credits her for originally creating the song that he is about to present. He then introduces the second singer and mentions that this singer practically reinterpreted the same song (lines 3-8). S then expresses his astonishment that the second singer has apparently plagiarized the first singer (lines 9-12). As soon as he has finished this background story, we hear the two extracts of music, with the alternations of the similar portions for listeners and panelists to compare and contrast. This listening activity lasts exactly 35 seconds. Right after the music stopped, S utters voilà with downward intonation, indicating the end of his segment (line 13) and a transition to a next action. In the next turn (line 14), the first reaction to S’s turn was an outburst of laughter, then L explains that they were actually expecting some sort of concluding remarks (lines 14-15) then he latches those remarks to the next line as he compliments S and acknowledges the resemblance between the two songs (line 16). In line 17 and in overlap mid-way through L’s previous turn, S justifies why he failed to provide any concluding remarks. In the next turn L starts a new topic of discussion (line 18). In sum, in this example the voilà was an attempt to close not only the end of the listening activity,
but also S’ turn at talk (i.e., his broadcasting segment) as well. But according to the recipients’ expectations, there was a missing element between the end of the activity and the utterance of *voilà*. In other words, L and the other panelists were expecting additional talk from S after the end of the listening activity and before he closed his turn at talk, most probably an “after listening” remark that would match up with the “pre-listening” talk he provided at the beginning of the segment. This expectation may be genre-related, i.e., it could be that usually in his segments, the listening activity is followed up with additional remarks. This would also explain the speaker’s justification (he attempted to find a funny remark but was unable to). However, in this specific case, by uttering *voilà*, S may be indicating “the evidence is so compelling that there is nothing more to add”. In other words, this specific example does not need any additional remarks for S to make his point. This observation can be also be corroborated by the fact that there is no pause between the end of the music and the utterance of *voilà*.

Here then, *voilà* did not close an incomplete turn, and as a matter of fact L’s compliments show that S has successfully demonstrated the similarity of the two songs. Hence S’s “missing talk” did not impede the panelists from understanding S’s turn at talk and give the appropriate response to it, even if they “questioned” the placement of *voilà* in the sequence. So even if this *voilà* closed a complete activity, it seems that it was uttered before its pragmatic ending, or at least it was a turn understood as being “pragmatically incomplete” by the recipients.

To sum up, in this section I have shown how *voilà* is used to end syntactically and pragmatically incomplete turns. In doing so, I have demonstrated how speakers communicate the wish to move on to the next sequence of action. I have shown how recipients orient to this wish by initiating the next sequence of action. We also notice that recipients systematically complete the turns, which indicates their orientation to the action fulfilled by the *voilà*. 
In the next section, I will show how recipients use *voilà* in b-event statements (Labov & Fanshel, 1977) to claim a higher epistemic authority (Heritage & Raymond, 2012) and propose to move on the next sequential action.

3.5.4 The use of *voilà* in b-event statements

B-event statements, which are usually formed as an understanding check, can produce sequentially “tricky” situations mainly because they involve speakers making statementss over which recipients have higher epistemic authority. Indeed, according to Heddesheimer (1974: 30 cited in Delahaie, 2009b: 24), when a recipient (i.e., interlocutor B) confirms a speaker’s (i.e., interlocutor A) prior turn with *voilà* on matters over which he/she has epistemic authority (i.e., B-event), he/she expresses that “he/she could have uttered the same statement as the interlocutor A” ([…] c’est l’acte verbal par lequel l’interlocuteur B marque expressément qu’il aurait pu émettre le même énoncé que l’interlocuteur A. La demande de confirmation porte donc sur des faits que l’on peut appeler A-B : A asserte quelque chose sur un fait B, mais il n’en est pas sûr, B est le mieux placé pour savoir ce qu’il en est et il interprétera l’énoncé de A comme une demande de confirmation). In this section, I will thus examine how co-participants claim a higher epistemic authority by uttering *voilà*. I will further argue that they also simultaneously close the adjacency pair formed by the interlocutors’ understanding check turns.

This first example comes from a telephone conversation between a mother (M) and her daughter (S). In this excerpt, S is trying to identify one of her mother’s friends whom her mother has been talking about. Before this excerpt, M has told S about this colleague/friend of hers who will soon be moving to another city because she found a job there. At the beginning of the
telling, S did not seem to know this person, but as her mother discloses more details, S suddenly seem to have recognized the person.

FIGURE 3.14

01 S: ah:, c’est cette personne qui s’en va=
   oh:, it’s this person who away goes=
   oh:, that’s the person who’s leaving=

02 M: [oui
   [yes

03 S: =[c’est ta-  c’est ta p’tite copine en fait=
     =[it’s your- it’s you small friend in fact=
     =[that was your- that was your friend=

04 =elle voulait toujours te parler: et tout.
   =she wanted always to talk to you and all.
   =she always wants to talk to you and everthing.

05 (0.9)

06 M: toujours.
   always.

07 S: elle voulait prendre ses déjeuners avec toi, c’est ça?
   she wanted always to have lunch with you, it’s that?
   she always wanted to have lunch with you, right?

→ 08 M: voilà.
   exactly.

09 S: ah:: tu vas être: triste alors.
   ah:: you go to be: sad then.
   oh:: so you’re going to be sad.

In line 1, S has recognized the person her mother was talking about earlier. The ah:: at the beginning of the turn marks this sudden “change-of-state” (Heritage, 1984). S produces the beginning of a candidate understanding which is completed in lines 3 and 4. M provides a continuer in line 2. Then, after a brief silence, M confirms S’s understandings (line 6). One could assume that now the conversation continues as the referent has been identified. However, S continues with one more candidate understanding (line 7). M confirms S’s prior turn with a
stretched *voilà* (line 8), as if to stress the accurate description of S. With the *voilà* in line 8, M not only provides a second pair part to the candidate understanding, but she also closes the whole person identification sequence which started in line 1. The closure of the sequence is also confirmed by the utterance of S in the next and last turn (line 9): Having understood who the mother is talking about, S now assesses the situation in terms of its effect on the mother.

A *voilà* can also close an insertion sequence in a longer telling, as illustrated in the following example. This excerpt comes from a radio talk show in which one of the guests (P) is promoting an upcoming charity event she is organizing to benefit her association. Before this excerpt, P explains how the event works: People would buy tickets online and if they are lucky enough, they might win a highly prized Picasso painting.

**FIGURE 3.15**

01 P: *vous pouvez aller sur ce site et vous avez toutes les infos*  
*you can go on the site and you have all the info*

02 *évidemment qui expliquent, qu’il y a uniquement*  
*obviously who explain, that there has only*

03 *cinquante mille billets,* [donc vous avez beaucoup de chance*  
*fifty thousand tickets,* [so you have lots of luck*

04 C:  
*[(ah oui )]*  
*[(oh really )]*

05 P: *de gagner, c’est une chance élevée,*  
*to win, it’s a luck high,*

06 L: *une chance sur cinquante mille.*  
*one chance in fifty thousand.*

07 P: *voilà,* alors il faut savoir que on a mis  
*that’s it, so it must know that we have put*
FIGURE 3.15 (cont.)

exactly, but you have to know it took us

08 quand même presque deux ans à avoir les autorisations—
when same almost two years to have the authorisations—

nonetheless almost two years to get the authorizations—

In lines 1-5, P explains how listeners can get more information about the event. Apparently the number of tickets for sale is low thus the chances to win a painting are very high. In line 6, the talk show host (L) specifies exactly how likely it is to win a painting. In line 7, P confirms L’s specification with voilà and goes on to specify, with an alors/‘so’ prefaced turn, how long it took her to put together this event (lines 7-8). In this telling, line 6 and the voilà in line 7 are an inserted adjacency pair. L’s specification turn (line 6) functions as a FPP while P’s confirmation with voilà (line 7) functions as a SPP. P has epistemic authority over this event and its procedure, but as a host L could also have accessed the same information as he prepared for this interview segment. Since L is talking about P’s event, she treats his utterance as a candidate understanding, thereby claiming a higher epistemic right over L.

This following example will illustrate the opposite scenario, which is when the recipient confirms a subject matter over which he does not have epistemic authority. The example comes from a weekly TV talk show. The show host (L) is about to show an extract of a sketch of one of his guests (S), a standup comedian. In this segment, L says a few introductory words before the viewing of the sketch.

---

19 Here it is worth mentioning that voilà forms its own TCU even if it is uttered in a continuation intonation. In other words, voilà here does not preface the next TCU. The TCU in question is prefaced in this case by alors/ ‘so’.
FIGURE 3.16

01 L: c’est un extrait d’un sketch que vous avez fait
it’s an extract of a sketch that you have done
this is an extract of a sketch that you did

02 à l’atelier de pierre palmade, avec un camarade à vous,
at the workshop of pierre palmade, with a friend at you,
at pierre palmade’s studio, with a friend of yours,

03 S: benoît moret.

04 L: voilà, eu::h regardez c’es:t l’humour de sébastien castro-
that’s it, u::h look i:t’s the humour of sébastien castro-
exactly, u::h take a look that’s the humor of sébastien castro-

In lines 1-2, L identifies and describes S’s sketch that he is about to present to viewers. In his description, L mentions that S’s friend appears in the sketch. In line 3 S identifies his friend by his name. In the next turn (line 4), L confirms S’s previous turn with voilà and continues his introduction as he invites the viewers to watch the upcoming sketch. By uttering voilà, L confirms S’s additional information of the name of his friend. Obviously S has epistemic authority over the name of his friend and co-worker. L may or may not have known the name before, or he may have known the name and may have experienced a temporary memory lapse. But in any case, L did not display any attempt at name searching, and instead simply used a descriptor to identify the friend in question. S’s turn on the other hand in line 3 is not a confirmation request but an assertion; that is, an additional specification in L’s telling. Therefore L could not have replied for instance with oui/‘yes’, which is an answer token to a question (Delahaie, 2009b). However, he could have said d’accord/okay/‘okay’. Had this occurred, it would have meant that L treated S’s assertion as an informative turn. That is, had he ratified S’s turn with d’accord/okay, it would have been an acknowledgement that this information was unknown to him before (Delahaie, 2009b). Hence by specifically using voilà, which according to Delahaie (2009b) is the preferred confirmation marker token to an assertive utterance, L claims
and communicates to S that he has just as much epistemic authority over his assertion\(^{20}\). In other words, S projected himself as the most knowledgeable one (K+) (Heritage & Raymond, 2012). However, in his response with *voilà*, L demonstrated that he is just as knowledgeable (K+), and thereby communicates that there is no knowledge gap in the “epistemic gradient” between the two of them (Heritage & Raymond, 2012: 180). In any case, the utterance of *voilà* closes the inserted sequence and L goes on to his main telling, namely that of introducing the upcoming sketch.

To sum up, what is interesting in these last three examples is that we have seen that recipients systematically treated speakers’ prior turns as an understanding check. Whether the turn is a real confirmation request (example 3.14), or a specification (example 3.15 and 3.16), by uttering *voilà* the recipient claimed a higher epistemic authority over the subject matter. What is also interesting is that these utterances of *voilà* are placed at the boundary of sequentially positioned actions: That is to say, right after the utterance of *voilà* either the speaker takes the next turn of the sequentially next action (example 3.14), or the recipient keeps the turn but shifts to the next action (example 3.15 and 3.16). The use of *voilà* within speakers’ turns at talk is precisely what I will examine in the next section.

### 3.5.5 Shift in action within speakers’ turns at talk

The following excerpts show how speakers use *voilà*, more specifically the composite *voilà* (i.e., *voilà*, *c’est tout*), to shift the course of action within their turn at talk. Speakers of French use the composite *voilà*, *c’est tout* to defend their position in argumentative talk or to clarify their talk.

---

\(^{20}\) According to Delahaie (2009b: 27) *c’est ça* ‘that’s it’ when used as a confirmation token, has a similar function as *voilà*, only statistically speaking it is used less frequently than *voilà*. 
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In the first example, B and A are having an argument on a radio show concerning endangered animals. B is a frequent panelist on the show and is known for his grumpy and grouchy character. A is a journalist and a well-known fervent animal rights advocate. In this particular show, A was invited to talk about the protection of endangered species. During the discussion, the issue of wolves and bears came up. Even if wolves and bears may be identified as endangered species, B does not see the necessity of reinserting these species in the countryside because according to him, they cause more harm to other animals than good. On the other hand, A thinks that they contribute to the diversity of species, the maintenance of natural life. He further mentions that shepherds actually support and value the presence of these endangered species. B challenges the notion that shepherds would support the reinsertion of wolves and bears in their countryside as follows:

FIGURE 3.17

01 B: vous-vous-vous affirmez ici. à europe 1.  
you-you-you are asserting here. on europe 1.

02 A: oui.  
yes.

03 B: à- à six heures moins le quart  
at- at six hours minus the quarter  
at- at a quarter to six

04 du soir. ((rire du fond de la salle)) un mardi,  
of the evening. ((background laughter)) one tuesday,  
in the evening. ((background laughter)) on a tuesday,

05 au mois de juin, ((rire continue))  
at the month of june, ((laughter continues))  
of the month of june, ((laughter continues))

06 que (. ) la grande majorité des berges (. ) sont  
that (. ) the big majority of shepherds (. ) are  
that (. ) the vast majority of shepherds (. ) are

07 pour la réintroduction de loups, et de- et d’ours,  
for the reintroduction of wolves, and of- and of bears,
FIGURE 3.17 (cont.)

for the reinsertion of wolves and of bears,

08 A: c’est marrant=
   it’s funny=

09 B: = dans leurs campagnes. [oui?
   = in their countrysides. [yes?
   = in their countrysides. [is that right?  
      [  
10 A: 
   [la manière-
   [the way-

11 la manière dont vous interprétez les choses.
   the way of which you interpret the things.
   the way you interpret things.

12 est-ce que j’ai dit la grande majorité=  
   is-it that I’ve said the big majority=  
   did I say the vast majority=

13 =jamais de la vie .h
   =never of the life .h
   =never ever .h

14 B: vous dites [il y a une majorité qui votent ça  
   you say [it there has a majority who vote that
   you said [there’s a majority who voted for that
   [  
15 A: []’ai dit- j’ai dit qu’il y avait des ber-
   [I’ve said- I’ve said that it there was some shep-
   [I said- I said that there are some shep-

16 B: il y a une minorité qui est contre.  
   it there has a minority who is against.  
   there’s a minority who is against it.

17 A: oui, il y a une majorité, il y a eu des
   yes, it there has a majority, it there has had some
   yes, there’s a majority, there were some surveys

18 sondages qui ont été faits dans les pyrénées notamment,
   surveys that have been done in the pyrenees specifically,
   done in the pyrenees specifically,

19 il y a une majorité de gens, dont
   it there has a majority of people, of whom
there is a majority of people,

20  [des bergers qui souhaitent la présence des ours
[some shepherds who wish the presence of the bears
[some of whom are shepherds who want the presence of bears
[
21 L: [alain

→ 22 A: voilà, c’est tout. mais il y a un voilà
that’s it, that’s all. but it there has here it is
that’s it, that’s all. but there are voilà

23 [des gens qui sont opposés.
[of the people who are opposed.
[some people who are opposed.
[
24 L: [a- alain ne vous laissez pas faire.
[a- alain not you leave not to do.
[a- alain don’t let him push you around.

25 on a un seul [ours
we have one only [bear
he’s the only [bear we have
[
26 A: [non non je me laisse pas faire.
[no no I not leave not to do.
[no no I’m not letting him push me around.

27 L: on a un seul ours [autour de cette table,
we have one only bear [around of this table,
he’s the only bear [we have at this table,
[
28 A: [oui, je tombe sur lui.
[yes, I fall on him.
[yes, I had to bump into him.

29 L: on- o(hh)n essaye de le sauvegarder, on se
we- w(hh)e try to him protect, we ourselves
we- w(hh)e’re trying to protect him, let’s

30 re(hh)trou(hh)ve après la pu(hh)b.
m(hh)eet after the publicity.
m(hh)eet again after the br(hh)eak.

21 For the use and function of this voilà see the next chapter.
In lines 1-9, to the delight of the panelists and audience, B confronts A in a rather theatrical manner on what he supposedly said earlier in their discussion. A refutes B’s claim and accuses B of distorting his words (lines 8 and 10-13). B rephrases A’s earlier claim (in line 14 and 16). In line 15, A first starts to remind B of what he said earlier, and then drops out to address B’s rephrasing (lines 17-20). A starts by acknowledging having mentioned some portion of the claim but goes on to defend the claims as he clarifies what he exactly meant to say (lines 17-20). This clarification is followed by voilà, c’est tout delivered with falling intonation (line 22). A then starts a new TCU prefaced with mais/‘but’ to mitigate what he just defended in the previous TCUs (lines 22-23). In this instance, voilà, c’est tout is positioned between the end of the clarification sequence and before the mitigation sequence. It thus separates two courses of action within the same topic. Finally, the talk show host (L) takes the next turn to end this argument with humor before there is a commercial break (lines 24-30).

This next example of argumentative talk comes from a weekly TV show, in which various guests (e.g., artists, politicians, and writers) participate. The show is hosted by one main host and two journalists (NP and AP). The court-like setting usually frightens the guests and the journalists are known for asking challenging questions. In this particular show, CH was one of the guests; he is a journalist/TV radio host turned musician. Other guests include GD and FD, both of whom are artists. CH came to the show to promote his new CD. Neither of the journalists likes the CD and they were both extremely critical of CH’s artistic ability. Before the beginning of this segment, there was a very heated discussion which lasted for about twenty minutes, at the end of which CH finally decided to leave the show. This extract is part of the exchanges that took place after GD went backstage and convinced CH to come back. The other guests, GD and FD, thought that the journalists were harsh toward CH.
FIGURE 3.18

01 GD: non mais vous pouvez admettre être maladroite
no but you can admit to be clumsy
et blesser parfois les gens.
and to hurt sometimes the people.
02
03 FD: la difficulté c’est quand c’est blessant.
the difficulty is when it’s hurtful.
04 GD:
[ c’est possible? ça existe non? 
[ it’s possible? [that exists no? 
[ is that possible?[you can do that, can’t you?
05 FD:
[ on peut donner son avis
[ you can give your opinion
[ you can give your opinion
06 mais il faut (.) un p’tit peu ( )
but it must (.) a little bit ( )
but you have (.) to be a little ( )
07 AP: mais alors qu’est-ce qui était blessant dans son avis.
but so [that is] [what was hurtful in her opinion.
but then [what was hurtful in what she said.
08 franchement.
frankly.
honestly.
09 NP: [je n’avais aucune volonté de blesser, j’essayais
[I not had none wish to hurt, I was trying
[I had no intention to be hurtful, [I was trying
[10 GD:
[eh ben,
[and well,
[well,
11 c’est raté.
it’s failed.
you failed.
12 NP: d’analyser cette démarche qui est quand même étonnante,
to analyze this step which is when same surprising,
to analyze this approach of yours that I find quite surprising,
FIGURE 3.18 (cont.)

13 qui me semblait dans la droite ligne de toute which me seemed in the straight line of all and which in my opinion, reflected the

14 la façon que vous avez construit votre carrière. the ways that you have built your career. way you built your career.

15 CH: [{ }

16 NP: [.h et après je faisais savoir que moi [.h and after I was doing to know that me [.h then I was mentioning

17 je trouve (. ) étonnant en fait d’ avoir ce b- ce I find (. ) surprising in fact to have this n- this the fact that I find (. ) surprising this n-

18 besoin de sortir en permanence de ce rôle need to leave in permanence of this role need of yours to constantly step out of your

19 d’ animateur voilà, c’est tout. of host(TV) that’s it, it’s all talk s[how host function. that’s it, that’s all.]

20 CH: [oui mais vous pouvez (. )pos- [yes but you can ( .)pos- [yes but you can ( .) as-

21 CH: po[sez des questions, po[se of the questions, as[k questions,]

22 NP: [je n’ vois du tout en quoi c’était humiliant. [I not see of the all in what it was humiliating [excuse me but I don’t see how this was humiliating.]

23 [pardonnez-moi. [pardon-me [excuse me]

24 CH: [vous pos- c’est pas humiliant, mettez-vous à la place- [you as- it’s not humiliating, put you at the place- [you as- it’s not humiliating, but put yourself in the place-
Both GD and FD accused NP of being hurtful (lines 1-6). In line 7 AP defends her fellow journalist as she questioned the “hurtful” nature of the interview. In line 8, NP first states that her intention was not to be hurtful and goes on to justify her interview as she explained the lens through which she was looking at CH’s career move (lines 12-19). In line 19, NP finishes her explanation, and then utters *voilà, c’est tout* with falling intonation. In overlap with NP’s prior turn, CH seems to be telling NP what she should have or could have done, but he does not complete his TCU (lines 20-21). In lines 22-23, NP challenges the description of her interview as “humiliating”. In the next turn (line 24), CH first starts by repeating part of the argumentation he started in lines 20-21, then he drops out to address NP’s challenge in the prior turn. The line of interest here is line 19: up to the utterance of *voilà, c’est tout*, NP was defending herself as she justifies her interviewing process, but her action has changed after *voilà, c’est tout*, for she is now challenging her co-participants to prove her wrong. This example shows thus that *voilà, c’est tout* is placed at a sequential boundary, between the defense and the challenge.

In this section, I have shown how speakers use *voilà* to shift from one action to the next and thus manage sequences of actions within their turn at talk. In this last section, I will examine how co-participants manage sequences of actions whenever their interactions involve side sequences.

3.5.6 The use of *voilà* in the closing of side sequences

Side sequences are turns that are inserted either by the speakers in their own turn at talk, or by the co-participants in the speakers’ turn at talk. In the following examples, we will see how *voilà* is used to manage sequences of actions, by first closing the side sequence and then shifting to the next course of action.
This first excerpt is taken from a telephone conversation between M and her granddaughter (A). Right after the greeting exchanges, the two of them talk about what the weather is like where M lives.

FIGURE 3.19

01 A: bonjour mame?
good day mame?
good morning mame?

02 M: bonjour phanie.
good day phanie.
good morning phanie.

03 A: comment vas-tu?
How go-you?
how are you?

04 M: Ça va?
it goes?
how are you?

05 A: ça va bien=
it goes well=
I’m fine=

06 M: Ça va= tu veux que je t’envoie le soleil de-
=it goes= you want that I you send the sun from-
=I’m fine= do you want me to send you some sun from-

07 bordeaux?
bordeaux?

08 A: ah oui, si tu en as=
oh yes, if you some have=
oh yeah, if you have some=

09 M: Il fait froid.
=it does cold.
=it is cold.

10 A: ha ha ha [ha ah

11 M: froid et il y a de la neige, enfin pas chez nous
cold and it there has some snow, well not at us
cold and it’s snowing, well not here

12 A: [okay.

13 M: mais du côté de périgieux, et puis dans le nord
but from nearby of périgieux, and then in the north
but near périgieux and in the north of france
FIGURE 3.19 (cont.)

14 de la france c’est plein de neige, il fait très très froid.  
of the france it’s full of snow, it does very very cold.  
there’s a lot of snow and it’s very very cold.

15 A: ah mince.  
oh shoot.

16 M: voilà.  [(°h-  °)  
that’s it.  [(°h-  °)  

17 A: [il fait quelle température exactement, il fait-  
[it does which temperature exactly, it does-  
[what is the temperature, it’s-

Lines 1-6 constitute a regular telephone opening with a greeting and how-are-you sequence. In lines 6-7, M brings up the topic of the weather by offering to send along some sun, an offer which A accepts in line 8. M then starts a more specific side sequence on how cold the weather is where she lives (line 9). M’s weather telling is delivered progressively: she first makes a general comment about the weather being cold, and stresses each word she utters as if to highlight the level of coldness (line 9). A receipts M’s remark with laughter (line 10), then M goes on to specify that it is also snowing but then adds/corrects that is not snowing where she lives (line 11). A receipts this specification with a minimum token (line 12), in overlap with A’s turn. M then specifies where exactly, geographically speaking, the cold areas are located (lines 13-14). A receipts M’s additional information with an assessment (line 15). In line 16, M utters voilà with downward intonation. I argue that this voilà serves to close M’s side sequence on “how cold the weather is”. The next turn (line 17) provides support for this reading, as A now asks about the temperature. In other words, by saying voilà, M communicates that she has nothing more to add to this side sequence. As a consequence, A, who has been receiving the telling with minimal tokens, orients to the voilà having closed the side sequence about the
weather in other areas in France. She can be seen to return to the topic prior to the side-sequence by asking about the specific temperature where M lives.

The following example illustrates a side sequence inserted by a co-participant in the speaker’s turn at talk. In this excerpt from a radio talk show, before saying goodbye, the host (L) tells his audience, as he always does at the end of his Friday shows, about some events and other happenings during the weekend. He announces the first event as follows:

FIGURE 3.20

01 L: au théâtre sylvia-montfort, ça c’est beaucoup plus connu,
at the theater sylvia-monfort, that it’s lots more known,
at silvia-monfort theater, that’s more popular

02 G: ah, oh,

03 L: amédée ou comment s’en débarrasser de eugene ionesco,
amedée or how itself some get rid from eugene ionesco,
amedée or how to get rid of it by eugene ionesco,

04 mise en scène par roger planchon, ça c’est quand même
put in scene by roger planchon, that it’s when same
staged by roger planchon, planchon is nonetheless

05 un des rois du théâtre planchon, amédée d’ionesco
one of the kings of the theater planchon, amedée d’ionesco
one of the kings of theater, amedée by ionesco

06 au théâtre sylvia monfort,
at the theater sylvia monfort,
at silvia-monfort theater,

07 T: moi il y a le festifemme,
me it there has the: it there has the festifemme,
for me there’s the: there’s the festifemme,

08 c’est à marseille, c’est un festival humoristique
it’s at marseille, it’s a festival humoristic
it’s going be in marseille, it’s a humoristic festival

---

22 Amédée, or How to Get Rid of It (original French title: Amédée ou comment s’en débarrasser) is a play written by Eugène Ionesco in 1954.
et dont j’ai souvent été le parrain,
and of which I’ve often been the sponsor,
and for which I often acted as a sponsor,

et il y a que des des des:: des jeunes femmes
and it there has only some some some:: some young women
and only uhm uhm uhm young female comedians

comiques qui participent. euh comme son nom l’indique. voilà.
comedians who participate. uh like its name it indicate. that’s it.
participate in it. uh as the name suggests. that’s it.

L: signalons aussi les zola-
let’s signal also the zola-
let’s also mention les zola-

In lines 1-6, L announces the name of the play, the author, the stage manager and the place where this event is going to take place. In line 6, L finishes the turn with slightly upward intonation and by stretching the pronunciation of last word. But in line 7, T, a panelist on the show, takes the next turn to announce his event, so to speak (lines 7-11). T finishes his turn at talk with two successive TCUs delivered with downward intonation, followed by voilà delivered with downward intonation as well (line 11). This closes off his contribution. In line 12, L picks up where he left of in line 6 and continues relaying more announcements for the weekend to come.

We notice that T’s turn at talk (lines 7-11) is actually closed before the utterance of voilà, so the utterance of voilà re-closes the telling. T’s turn is actually prompted by L’s telling (i.e., his relaying of weekend events). By self-selecting with a moi ‘for me’ prefaced turn, T has interrupted L’s main sequence to insert an aside telling. Accordingly, by uttering voilà after an already closed turn, T communicates to L that he can now take back the turn and carry on with the main sequence of action that he started in line 1. In other words T’s insertion sequence is
“marked” by virtue of its position. By this reasoning, it is only appropriate to end such a turn/sequence in an overtly marked manner as well.

The next example comes from the same radio show. In this extract, the talk show host (L) is interacting with a guest (A) over the phone. A is a casting director for singers who perform in Paris’s subways. L interviews A on how he chooses the contestants, what prizes the winners of the contest receive, etc. Before ending the conversation, L thanks A for being on the show and seemed to be prepared to close the conversation. However, A has an idea to suggest to L and for this reason stops the closing sequence from going any further. The voilà of interest is in line 13:

FIGURE 3.21

01 L: on vous remercie [monsieur nasau-we you thanks [mister nasau- 
we thank you [mister nasau-

02 A: [mais mais j’avais juste une question pour laurent. 
[but but I had just one question for laurent 
[but but I just have one question for laurent.

03 L: oui. 
yes.

04 A: laurent qui: justement c’est un adepte 
laurent who: precisely it’s a supporter 
laurent who: by the way is a supporter

05 des- des- des comedies musicales et des- des artistes, 
some- some- some comedy musicals and some- some artists,
of of- of-comedy musicales and artists,

06 L: merci à partir [du (.)) deux octobre [jeudi soir 
thanks from to go [of the (.)) two october [thursday evening 
thanks starting (.)) on (.)) october second [thursday evening

07 A: [h- 
[exactement. 
[exactly.

08 L: c’est la premiere d’ aznavour, 
is the first of aznavour, 
we will debut aznavour,
FIGURE 3.21 (cont.)

09 A: voilà. alors moi j’avais [une idée à- à- à- exactly. so me I had [an idea to- to- to- exactly. so I had this idea

10 L: [au gymnase.
[at the gymnasium.

11 A: soumettre à laurent c’est peut-être d’écrire
submit to laurent it’s maybe to write
to submit to you laurent maybe you can write

12 une comédie musicale sur les artistes du métro.
a comedy musical on the artists of the metro.
a comedy musical on subway artists.

13 L: [◦ah oui.◦
[◦ah yeah/right.◦
[

14 A: [on sait jamais. voilà.
[one knows never. that’s it.
[you never know. that’s it.

15 L: ah c’est pas bête ça.
oh it’s not stupid that.
oh that’s not a bad idea.

In line 1, L thanks A, which indicates that he’s ready to end the call. However, in the next turn (line 2) and in overlap, A stops the closing sequence with a pre-announcement on what he’s about to say. L gives him the “go ahead” in line 3. In lines 4-5, A starts first by complimenting L on his artistic abilities. L accepts the compliments and takes the opportunity to plug his upcoming comedy musical (lines 6, 8 and 10). A first agrees with L’s account with exactement in line 7 and with voilà in line 9, then he resumes the telling with an alors/ ‘so’ prefaced turn as he suggests to L that he create a musical comedy based on subway singers (lines 9, 11, and 12). L receipts A’s telling minimally in the next turn (line 13). In Overlap (line 14), A mitigates somewhat his telling and finishes this first TCU in his turn with downward intonation followed

---

23 We notice here that A used voilà (line 9) to claim an equal epistemic authority (see section 3.5.4) over the subject matter concerning L’s domain.
by *voilà* also delivered with falling intonation. L receipts A’s suggest with a somewhat positive assessment (line 15).

Once more we notice here that *voilà* re-completes the speaker’s turn at talk, which was syntactically and pragmatically complete before the utterance of *voilà*. In this particular case, just like in the previous example, A’s turn at talk is a “marked” sequence, inserted interruptively during the closing of the conversation. The sequence itself was introduced with a pre-announcement, and is therefore a sequence which necessitated the recipient’s licensing to even occur. By re-closing an already closed turn with *voilà*, A communicates to L that he can now resume the closing sequence he had started before the beginning of the sequence.

The next example is another instance of an inserted side sequence. The excerpt is from a radio talk show in which P participates frequently as a panelist. He regularly presents a segment in which he pays tribute to recently deceased personalities. On this day, P is remembering an internationally known African singer and activist. Before his tribute, P starts his sequence with an aside story as he reminds the audience how the activist died:

**FIGURE 3.22**

1. P: le public eu:h l’ a applaudie à tout rompre
   the audience u:h her has applauded at all to break
   the audience u:h applauded her wildly

2. quand elle s’ est retirée en coulisse,
   when she: herself is retired in backstage,
   as she went backstage,

3. il l’ a rappelée, qu’elle revienne etcetera,
   it her has called back, that she come back etcetera,
   the audience called her back, so that she come back etcetera,

4. et puis eh ben pour une fois elle n’ a pas répondu
   and then and well for one time she not has not responded
   then well for once she did not respond

5. parce que: aussitôt sortie d’scène elle s’ est
   becau:se immediately left of stage she herself is
becaus: as soon as she left the stage she

écroulée en coulisse, avec une crise cardiaque, collapsed in backstage, with a heart attack,
collapsed backstage, with a heart attack,
et pendant son transport à l’hôpital, plus and while her transportation to the hospital, more
and she was on her way to the hospital, more
exactement (.) elle a été transportée à l’hôpital exactly (. ) she was transported to the hospital
specifically (. ) she was transported to the hospital
elle est morte euh à l’hôpital voilà. .h donc c’est—she is dead uh at the hospital that’s it. .h so it’s—
and she died uh at the hospital that’it. .h so it’s

it’s there, in itlay, uh to— to: protest,
it’s there in italy, uh to— to: protest,
ou pour sout’nir un-un-un- un auteur condamné or to support a- a- a— an actor sentenced
à mort par la mafia, donc condamné à l’ exile, to death by the mafia, so sentenced to the exile,
to death by the mafia, in other words in exile,
que, euh elle est v’nue chanter—
that, uh she is came to sing—

In lines 1-9, P narrates the last minutes of the singer’s life. He presents the news progressively, explaining in lines 1-2 how the audience clapped when she left the stage, then in lines 3-6 explaining the reason why she did not come back from backstage to salute the audience, and finally announcing where exactly she died (lines 7-9). At the end of this telling, he utters voilà with downward intonation. Then, in lines 9-13, P explains the reason why she came to sing in Italy in the first place with a donc/ ‘so’ prefaced TCU. Thus, here voilà closes the side telling on how the singer died and donc introduces the main action (i.e., the beginning of his tribute).
To conclude, we have seen in this and in previous sections how *voilà* is used at the boundary of actions to close the previous and indicate readiness to tackle the next sequence of actions. In the next section I will summarize my findings.

3.6 Summary of findings and discussion

In this chapter, I have demonstrated that *voilà’s* main action is not so much to close the previous sequence, but rather to manage sequences/courses of actions. It is used in drastic action shifts (e.g., example 3.2), when the speaker doesn’t recognize the end of a telling and provides continuers instead of other more fitted talk, such as assessments, etc. (e.g., example 3.3), when asides or insertion sequences were used that were topically related to the main sequence (e.g., example 3.20), and in incomplete turns (e.g., example 3.10).

*Voilà* is used by both speakers and recipients. Speakers use *voilà* to close their talk in sequentially third position, to close their TCUs in a multi-unit turn. When *voilà* is a stand-alone token or the last element in the turn/TCU, it is always uttered by the speakers with falling intonation. When speakers use composite *voilàs* (i.e., *voilà, c’est tout; et puis voilà*), they function as one unit and carry an additional illocutionary meaning, as they close the previous sequence in specific sequential environments. My analyses have also shown that *voilàs* are used by recipients as responsive tokens. They are used by recipients in second pair parts to perform three specific actions: to agree with the prior speaker, to confirm the prior speaker’s candidate understandings, and to mark the end of their answer. If *voilà* is the only element of the second pair part (i.e., the agreement/confirmation token), then it is uttered with falling intonation. If however the adjacency pair was an inserted sequence, then the *voilàs* were mostly uttered with slightly rising intonation. In other words, the recipients put the main action on hold to address the
inserted sequence, after which they uttered voilà and then returned to main action. This presumably explains its being uttered with continuing intonation (e.g., data example 3.15 and 3.16). However in data example 3.21, the recipient closed the speaker’s first pair part with a voilà uttered with a falling intonation, before resuming the ongoing main sequence with a donc/‘so’ prefaced TCU.

Both recipients and speakers recognized voilà as a closing marker, as they both orient to its closing feature as they take the next turn/TCU to start the next sequence of action. My data collection shows that if the speakers use voilà within their own turn at talk, then their next move is to start a new action of the same topic rather than start a new topic. This is mainly exemplified by the composite voilà, c’est tout. For instance, in data example 3.18, voilà, c’est tout is placed at a point in the conversation when the speaker moves from defending herself to challenging the co-participant. Another example which illustrates the use of voilà separating two sequences of actions would be data example 3.22, in which the speaker uses the marker to separate a side telling from a main telling.

Regardless of who speaks after the voilà has been uttered after the prior sequence has been closed, a new action is started. If the prior speaker continues, the action is topically related (e.g., example 3.4) whereas if the co-participant continues, then it is not necessarily related. Indeed, when speakers close their turn at talk with voilà, they specifically propose to move on to a new sequence of action unless the recipients have something to add to the sequence. For instance, in data example 3.19, after the speaker has closed her turn at talk on the topic of the weather elsewhere in France, the recipient returned to the main sequence by questioning the speaker about the current outside temperature where she lived.
When speakers use voilà they look backward and make some sort of statement in reference to it. For instance, when voilà is used as a transition marker, it looks backward and forward at the same time. When speakers close with voilà an incomplete turn, they communicate that they don’t wish or need to add anything more to the previous turn. Likewise, when recipients use voilà as an agreement marker they communicate they could have said what the previous speaker has just said. To sum up, it seems that the use of voilà in closings is directly linked to its semantic meaning which is spatial-deictic (Bergen & Plauché, 2001).

One could assume that because voilà is used in closings, then it is also used in environments in which conversations are closed. This, however, is not the case. In other words, voilà does not pre-close the conversation, nor does it invite recipients to close the conversation. I did not find an example in my telephone data in which voilà triggered terminal exchanges (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). In my data corpus the telephone conversations were mostly pre-closed with d’accord/‘okay’, okay, bon/‘okay’ and allez (literally, allez is the imperative form of the verb ‘to go’ (formal)). For instance, this is how M and her granddaughter (A) concluded their telephone conversation:

FIGURE 3.23

01. A:            [et(.) au week [end prochain.  
        [and(.)to week [end next.  
        [and(.)talk to you next[week.  
        [  
02. M:                                  [à  bientôt.  
        [to soon.  
        [talk to you soon.  

03. A: à  bientôt mamie.  
        to soon     granny.  
        talk to you soon granny.  

        okay.
FIGURE 3.23 (cont.)

05. A: gros bisous.
   big kisses.

06. M: d’accord d’accord.
   okay      okay.

07. A: [bye
     [
08. M: [allez
     [go
     [okay

09. M: au revoir
     bye

10. A: au revoir mami:e, bye.
     bye      grann:y, bye.

Allez is commonly used in French conversation closings. In this particular case, we can observe that it was used to initiate the closing sequence as it served as a “go ahead” for the final exchanges. However, I do not have a great number of telephone conversations in my corpus (only 5 hours’ worth); therefore, these preliminary remarks regarding the placement of voilà in telephone closings would have to be confirmed with a larger corpus.

Co-participants in French interaction do not wait for voilà to take the next turn; the transition from one speaker to another is governed by the turn taking rules (Sacks et al., 1974), just as in every other language. But there are a couple of environments in which voilà plays a defining role in turn taking. The first environment concerns syntactically incomplete turns. As my analyses have shown, only the utterance of voilà signaled the ending of those turns and prompted recipients to take the next turn of action. The other environment is when recipients do not take the next turn immediately, or when there is a long enough pause between the end of one speaker’s turn and the beginning of the next speaker’s turn. For instance, in example 3.7, only
C’s utterance of *voilà*, which came after a long pause, prompted M to take the next turn, and thus repaired the turn taking system, which we can say was momentarilly out of service. By the same token, co-participants can also question the utterance of *voilà* if they estimate that it came too soon (e.g., in a pragmatically incomplete turn, as in example 3.13). All of these observations indicate that French speakers have an additional device available to them in their interaction to regulate and adjust the turn taking system.

Most of the actions fulfilled by *voilà* in closings are not exclusive to the French language. For instance, the use of *voilà* as a transition marker device is similar to the use of *so* in German (Barske & Golato, 2010) and *okay* in English (Beach, 1993). Sequentially third position closing responses are also used in others languages (e.g., Schegloff, 2007; Hayashi & Yoon, 2009). In French, Delahaie (2009b) has also shown how speakers deploy *d’accord/ ‘okay’* in sequentially third position to close their turn. Besides its use in sequentially third position, *d’accord* is also used as an agreement marker by recipients (Delahaie, 2009b); however, it is never used to close speakers’ turns at talk/TCUs nor is it used to close recipients’ answers. Concerning the practice of closing syntactically incomplete turns, it is again not restricted to the French language; Hayashi & Yoon (2009) have shown how co-participants co-orient to close syntactically incomplete turns in Japanese and Korean. Nevertheless, whether it is in French or in any another language, the same closing marker is rarely used in so many sequential positions as is *voilà*. For instance, the German closing marker *so* is not a responsive marker, and therefore it is never used in a second pair part of an adjacency pair (Barske & Golato, 2010). Usually in other languages, most of the functions performed by *voilà* are fulfilled by various markers.

Schegloff (2007: 213) has pointed out that successive sequences, in which the second ones follow closed sequences, are related to one another with at least two types of relationships
which he identifies them as follows: “One kind of relationship is another sequence of the same type but with reversed participatory alignment; the second kind of relationship is another sequence of the same type, with the same participator alignment but a different item/target/topic”. My analyses have shown that the use of *voilà* at sequence boundaries illustrates each of these two types of relationships.

To conclude, in this chapter I have demonstrated how co-participants in French deploy *voilà* to negotiate meaning, epistemic authority, turn taking, and in sum negotiate action and topic boundaries and thus manage the organization of sequences of actions. Its occurrence in so many different closing positions and its use in performing so many different actions establishes the fact that *voilà* is a ubiquitous discourse marker and a rather prevalent device in French.
Chapter 4: The use of *voilà* in openings

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, after a literature review on hypothetical talk/direct quote, I will investigate the use of the discourse marker *voilà* in presenting upcoming utterances. In my literature review chapter, I extensively discussed the use of the presentative *voici* to introduce new and upcoming referents (both cataphoric and prospective ones). However, as my data examples will show, it is *voilà*, and not *voici*, that is used to introduce an upcoming utterance. In other words, the presentative *voici*, unlike *voilà*, does not extend into the realm of the discourse marker. I will thus explore and discuss the interactional value of *voilà* that is lacking in *voici*. Using data samples from my corpus, I will first show where in the sequential organization of an ongoing interaction the *voilàs* of interest occur. Following this, I will then describe the various functions fulfilled in these sequential positions. The data will show that depending on its position, *voilà* is used to present an upshot (e.g., an assessment of previous talk), and to present hypothetical direct quotes. Finally, I will summarize my findings.

4.2 Positions

The following are the environments in which *voilà* presents upcoming talk. It is used in the middle of a speaker’s turn at talk to:

1) present an upshot (with or without other discourse markers (e.g., *enfin voilà*)

and with the grammatical conjunction *mais* (i.e., *mais voilà*)

2) present a hypothetical direct quote
4.3 Literature review on upshots and on hypothetical talk

4.3.1 Literature review on upshots

A long stretch of talk can sometimes be confusing and ambiguous, hence a re-wording or formulation of prior talk can be helpful in that it can clarify or sum up prior talk (Heritage & Watson, 1979). According to Heritage & Watson, reformulations of prior talk can be performed by both speakers and recipients as illustrated in the following example:

FIGURE 4.1 (Heritage & Watson, 1979: 125)

C calls E to inform her that he will not be able to make it to a trip planned presumably at an earlier time. In line 4, C first tells E the reason why he is calling, then he explains why he cannot make it to this trip (lines 8-10). Finally in line 14, he presents the upshots of his prior talk.
In line 16 E re-words C’s formulation. According to Heritage & Watson, C’s upshot turn “formulates materials which are conventionally ascribable as known to C and formulated by him as part of his delivery of news” (Heritage & Watson, 1979: 125), whereas E “formulates materials furnished to her as a news recipient”. Hence E does not have the same stance as C in regards to this news, which explains the rising intonation she uses to formulate her candidate understanding of C’s prior turn. By re-wording and keeping key features of prior talk, formulations thus assure intersubjectivity between co-participants (Heritage & Watson, 1979).

Speakers very often use ‘so’ to present upshots of prior talk and thereby close complex turns (Raymond, 2004). However, speakers can also deploy a stand-alone ‘so’ to project an “unstated upshot” (Raymond, 2004: 190). The following example illustrates how ‘so’ (line 6) uttered with a continuing intonation clearly projects an upshot, which here the speaker never in fact produces.

FIGURE 4.2 (from Raymond, 2004: 189-190)

01 Mark: [It’s a religious: (0.3) thing we’re gonna have. ]
02               (0.3)
03 Mark: I d’know why:, °b’t
04               (0.5)
05 Mark: Uh::m, (•) No- her ex boyfriend’s getting married en
06 → she:’s:gunnuh be depressed so:,
07               (0.8)

We do not have much information in this data example, but it seems that Mark is presumably giving an account about someone. The ‘so’ in line 6, uttered with continuing intonation, seems to imply that the upcoming upshot is obvious and self-evident, hence Mark doesn’t have to verbalize it.

According to Raymond (2004), a stand-alone ‘so’ is by design incomplete and is supposed to invoke an upshot without being verbalized. As a matter of fact, it is meant to prompt the recipients to produce the relevant next action. A recipient’s failure to provide the next action
could be considered as “a missed opportunity for collaboration” (Raymond, 2004: 211). Hence the stand-alone ‘so’ is deployed by the speaker to prompt the recipient to produce the sequentially next action.

French speakers use also *donc* ‘so’ to present an upshot. However, in my data examples speakers never use *donc* by itself; rather, they deploy it in combination with *voilà* to present the upshot and bring to completion a long stretch of talk. Besides *donc*, speakers also use *mais* and *enfin* in combination with *voilà* to present upshots. I will thus explore the exact function of *donc/mais/enfin* and the function of *voilà* when they are used in combination to present upshots.

4.3.2 Literature review on hypothetical talk

Hypothetical quotes can be defined as talk that has never been uttered before, and that is used by speakers to accomplish several interactional functions (Golato, 2012). These hypothetical quotes are typically introduced as direct quotes through modal verbs (e.g., can, could, should, etc.) or conditional verbs (Golato, 2012). By using these verbs, “speakers tend to open up alternative worlds” (Golato, 2012: 30) and thereby indicate that the direct quotes are fictitious. The use of hypothetical quotes is practiced in several other languages (e.g., Danish, Dutch, French, and Russian) but little is known of the interactional functions accomplished by these hypothetical quotes in these languages (Golato, 2012).

In German, speakers use hypothetical quotes in their talk 1) to model talk that one could say in a given situation, 2) to illustrate entertaining stories, or 3) to illustrate prior talk/claims (Golato, 2012). According to the author, in the first case, speakers produce the hypothetical quotes typically in reaction to the co-participants’ actions (e.g., complaints). In the last two cases, speakers make their claims then illustrate them with hypothetical quotes. The following example
from Golato (2012: 9) illustrates a model hypothetical quote. Before this extract, A had complained to T how she disliked overhearing people’s private talk when she is put on hold when calling a doctor office. T tells A what she should say if this were to ever occur again (Golato, 2012).

**FIGURE 4.3**

```
1 A: glaubst du denn dass ich zeit habe?
   do you think that I have time?

2 T: du musst nur bollen ganz ge- laut
   you must.ind-2s only bellow.inf very (?) loud
   du muss-t nur bollen ganz ge laut
   you only have to bellow very loud

3 T: APOTHEKE HIE::R!
   Apotheke hier!
   Pharmacy.sg here
   PHARMACY HE::RE!

4 (.)

5 T: irgendwie [sowas musste sagen.
   somehow [like this must-2sc you say.inf
   irgendwie [so etwas muss-t du sagen
   something [like that you have to say.

6 B: [he he he he [hee

7 H2: [he he he ja?
   [he he he really?
```

In line 2, T first gives A advice on what she should be doing (i.e., bellow very loudly) then in line 3, she demonstrates how she should say it (i.e., use of loud voice) and in line 5, she explains that this is one utterance among other possible utterances thereby communicating that this is only model talk (Golato, 2012).

Goodwin (1990) has also looked at the use of hypothetical direct quotes in her extensive study of the structure of one type of gossip/dispute talk (i.e., “he-said-she-said”) that occurs specifically among young African American girls. The author observed that two young African
American girls used hypothetical direct talk as a way to visualize a much dramatized and fantasied exchanges between an offender and offended party. This is illustrated in the following example from Goodwin (1990: 276).

Prior to this exchange, Bea had informed a girl named Barbara concerning offensive talk about her by another girl named Kerry. In response to this reporting, Barbara promised to confront Kerry. In this exchange, Bea meets with yet another girl, Martha, and tells her about the meeting she had with Barbara including the upcoming confrontation between the offender (i.e., Kerry) and the offended party (i.e., Barbara) (Goodwin, 1990).

FIGURE 4.4 Goodwin (1990: 276)

(8) 1  Martha:  Can't wait t' see this
2  Bea:  But if Barbara say // she
3  Martha:  I laugh-I laugh I laugh if Kerry say-
   Bea s- I laugh if Barbara say,
6   "I wrote it
7   so what you gonna do about it."
8  Bea:  She say, she- and- and- and she
9   and she probably gonna back out.
10  Martha:  I know.
11  Bea:  Boouh boouh // boouh
12  Martha:  And then she gonna say "You didn't
13   have to write that about me Barbara."
14  She might call her Barbara fat somp'm.
15  =Barbara say "Least I don't have no long:
16  bumpy legs and bumpy neck. Spot legs,
17  *h Least I don't gonna fluff my hair up
18  to make me look like // I hadda bush."
19  Bea:  Y'know she's- she-
20   least she fatter than her.
21  Martha:  Yeah an' "Least I got bones.=
22  At least I got shape."
23  That's what she could say. (0.6)
24  Barbara is cuter than her though.
In lines 1-2, Martha expresses that this future confrontation is an event she is looking forward to. In the remainder of the exchange, Bea and Martha act out the future confrontation between Barbara and Kerry (lines 3-22) in the form of direct hypothetical quotes (e.g., lines 6-7, 12-13 and 15-18) (Goodwin, 1990). In imagining what the two girls would say to each other, Bea and Martha used exaggerated language, which included personal insults (Goodwin, 1990). The author confirms that in the confrontation between the offended and offending person, which occurred sometime after the above exchange, neither the guilt admission nor exchanges involving insults actually occurred (Goodwin, 1990). According to Goodwin (1990: 277) “hypothetical future stories provide a way for instigator and peripheral party to talk about absent parties and play with speech actions which are generally taboo in female interaction”. The hypothetical talk was thus used in anticipation of a much fantasied and dramatized exciting event/show.

According to Goffman (1974, 1981), participants can play various roles in storytelling. Hence a teller can be the animator who produces the utterances or the “sounding box in use” (Goffman, 1981: 144), the principal that is “someone whose position is established by the words that are spoken, someone whose beliefs have been told” (Goffman, 1981: 144) and/or the author that is “someone who has selected the sentiments that are being expressed and the words in which they are encoded” (Goffman, 1981: 144). When speakers willfully and directly pronounce their own utterances in an interaction, they then become the animator, principal and author of their own utterances; however, whenever speakers quote other speakers or characters, they can then no longer be characterized by all three features at the same time (Goffman, 1974, 1981). In other words, the combination of these three features will vary depending on whether speakers are

24 Hypothetical talk of this kind has not only been observed in everyday interaction, but also in classroom talk (i.e., planning activities/tasks) (for more on this see Kunitz, 2013).
quoting other speakers’ actual quotes or whether they are quoting fictional characters (e.g., staged play). In the latter case, they may or may not be credited for authoring these quotes. In any case, when speakers quote other speakers, they systematically shift “footing” (Goffman, 1981) to adopt the stance of the quoted person or character. According to Goffman (1981: 128) “A change in footing implies a change in the alignment we take up to ourselves and the others present as expressed in the way we manage the production or reception of an utterance. A change in our footing is another way of talking about a change in our frame for events”.

In this chapter, I will argue that when speakers use *voilà* to present a hypothetical direct quote, they are much like stage characters in that they pronounce statements that have never been uttered before but could/would/should be uttered in a projected imaginary space/world. In this fictional space, speakers become the “authors” and “animators” of the “principals”/“originators”, to use Goffman’s (1974, 1981) terminology. Using examples from my data corpus, I will demonstrate how *voilà* is used to project hypothetical quotes in this alternative stage-alike imaginary space that the speakers set up.

4.4 Analysis of *voilà* in openings: A discourse structuring device

In the following sections, I will show how co-participants in French interaction use *voilà* to structure and organize their talk. Briefly, speakers use *voilà* mainly to give an upshot of their previous talk, and to incorporate direct hypothetical quotes into their current talk. When used in an upshot, *voilà* gives the gist/summary of prior talk, assesses the prior talk, or presents the consequence or the outcome of the prior talk.
4.4.1 Voilà in upshots

In an interaction, an upshot can be presented in the form of an outcome, an assessment, a result/consequence, or as the gist of speakers’ prior talk. In other words, there is a cause and effect relationship between speakers’ prior talk and the following upshot. In this section, I will specifically show how speakers use voilà to link their prior talk to the upcoming upshot. Most of the examples come from the same radio talk show.

This first example comes from an interaction between L, the show host, and B, a French actor who came to the show to promote his latest film. In this excerpt L goes over B’s filmography and the highlights of his career.

FIGURE 4.5

01 L: les voleurs (. ) daniel auteuil, catherine deneuve, the thieves (. ) daniel auteuil, catherine deneuve, thieves (. ) daniel auteuil, catherine deneuve,

02 un de vos premiers grand succès, si on oublie one of your first big success, if we forget one of your first biggest successes, if we don’t count

03 évidemment la vie est un long fleuve tranquille, obviously the life is a long river quiet, of course life is a long quiet river,

04 vous étiez gamin, h. ( . ) là c’est vraiment le premier you were a kid, h. ( . ) there it’s really the first you were a kid, h. ( . ) but this tchinen’s film is really

05 grand succès, le film de tchinen. big success, the film of tchinen. your first big breakthrough.

06 B: oui disons que j’avais fait euh ben j’avais fait yes let’s say that I had done euh well I had done yes let’s say that I had done uh well I was in

25 André Téchiné is a leading French screen writer and movie director.
FIGURE 4.5 (cont.)

07 les films de chatiliez, les films de christine li-
the films of chatiliez, the films of christine li-

08 lipinska, pardon j’avais douze treize quatorze ans,
lipinska, excuse me I had twelve thirteen fourteen years,
lipinska, excuse me I was twelve thirteen fourteen years old,

09 après j’ai fait (           ) de marcel bluwal, avec (.)
after I’ve done (           ) of marcel bluwal, with (.)
then I was (           ) of marcel bluwal, with (.)

10 pas mal de gens, et puis là c’est le retour
not bad of people, and then there it’s the return
lots of people, and then there was this come back

11 au cinéma (           ) avec téchiné,
at the cinema (           ) with téchiné,
to the cinema (           ) with téchiné,

12 L: ◦ouais.◦
◦right.◦

13  hhh voilà, c’était un c’ était un grand moment.
  hhh here it is, it was a it was a big moment.
  hhh here it is, it was a it was a big deal.

In lines 1-5, L mentions two of the films which played important roles in B’s filmography. L assesses the first film (i.e., les voleurs) as being one of his biggest successes (line 2) and the second film as his biggest success (i.e., the film with the director Téchiné) (lines 4-5). In the next turn, B starts by agreeing with L’s assessment, then he goes on to elaborate his response as he cites several other films in which he played, presumably before his film with Téchiné (lines 6-10). He then explains that the film he did with Téchiné marked his comeback to the cinema (lines 10-11), before he utters voilà followed with a positive assessment of this comeback (line 13). B starts by agreeing with L’s assessment about Téchiné’s film being his breakthrough (line 6), but by first listing all the other films he was on before, then introducing Téchiné’s film as his
comeback to the cinema, he manages to put in perspective this particular film and thereby highlight it even further. The assessment introduced with voilà concerns thus this specific film. B designed his turn in a way that what he said prior to voilà leads to what he said after voilà. In other words, there’s a causal relationship between his talk before voilà and his talk after voilà. This observation is also corroborated by the intonation pattern. Voilà is positioned between two units uttered with continuing intonation. It thus bridges the highlight of B’s filmography with the assessment of this highlight. The upshot is thus presented as the concluding part of B’s turn at talk. B’s assessment in line 13 simultaneously validates L’s statement in lines 3-5 as much as it functions as the upshot of B’s prior talk. However, even though both L’s and B’s assessments are positive, by choosing a different positive assessment, B claims ownership and entitlement over his performance in this specific film.

In this next example, P, a choreographer and dancer, came to the show to promote his latest show. In this excerpt, the host (L) lists some of the attractions featured in P’s show.

FIGURE 4.6

01 L: les kaléidoscopes, matrix, j’veux donne quelques noms
des kaléidoscopes, matrix, I want to give some names
02 des attractions ça donne envie, la galerie
des attractions it gives want, the gallery
03 des glaces, les capteurs d’ombre, la pièce déformée,
of the ice, the sensors of shade, the room distorted,
04 la boîte à lumière, .h la roue stroboscopique, les carrousels
the box at light, .h the wheel stroboscopic, the carousels
05 d’images, la tapisserie d’y eu, voilà, c’est vrai
d’images, the tapestry of yeu, here it is, it’s true
In lines 1-6, L lists several examples from among the attractions featured in P’s show, and then utters \textit{voilà} before he qualifies the show as primarily intended for children (lines 5-6). The listing in line 6 ends with a slightly rising listing tone, followed by \textit{voilà} which is also uttered with continuing intonation. Hence \textit{voilà} is positioned between two elements uttered with continuing intonation, and is thus used to link the listing with the assessment. In other words, the assessment is presented via \textit{voilà} in reference to the previous talk. The two actions are thus related: L uses \textit{voilà} to present an upshot of his prior talk: i.e., what follows the \textit{voilà} is a characterization of the show based specifically on the types of attractions featured in P’s show. In the next turn, by stating that one can bring children, P implies that the show is also for adults (line 7).

In the remaining examples, the upshots are presented with composite \textit{voilà}s or with \textit{voilà} in addition to another grammatical conjunction or discourse marker (i.e., \textit{enfin}, \textit{donc} and \textit{mais}). My analyses will show that when speakers use \textit{voilà} in addition to another discourse marker (i.e., \textit{enfin} and \textit{donc}), the actions seem to be performed specifically by those discourse markers and not necessarily by \textit{voilà}. In such cases, \textit{voilà} seems to present and thereby highlight the upcoming upshots. However, when \textit{voilà} is used in combination with \textit{mais}, the upshot is presented by \textit{voilà} and not by \textit{mais}.

Speakers most commonly use \textit{enfin} (literally ‘at last’) \textit{voilà} to sum up their prior talk. \textit{Enfin} by itself is a frequently used oral discourse marker which performs several actions.
(Beeching, 2002). One of its functions is that of “a discourse marker signaling the end of enumeration or to flag “in short, “to sum up…”” (Beeching, 2002: 151). In other words, it summarizes prior discourse, as illustrated in the following example: *Il est intelligent, travailleur, enfin il a tout pour réussir*/ ‘he is intelligent, hardworking, in short he has everything he needs to succeed’ (Beeching, 2002: 128). However, this example doesn’t seem to be an authentic utterance but rather an invented sentence. In my data samples, the use of *enfin voilà* in upshots is highly systematic. When introducing a summary or the gist of their prior talk, speakers hardly ever use just *enfin* by itself, especially if the prior talk consists of a rather long stretch of discourse, as illustrated in the following examples. Instead, *enfin* is always used in combination with *voilà*.

This first example comes from the same radio show as the last example. Every day at the beginning of this radio show, P, a journalist, gets assigned some reporting tasks. In this excerpt, the show host (L), tells P about one of the topics that he wants him to investigate.

**FIGURE 4.7**

01 L: autre grand événement du weekend, le l’eurovision, another big event of the weekend, the the eurovision,

02 alors là j’aimerais mon cher paul, [que vous fassiez now here my dear paul I would like you to do [to do [quel évènement (.). [what event (.). [what an event (.)

03 S: [h. oh là là. [h. oh there there [h. oh boy.

05 [un p’tit résumé géopolitique [de c’ qui s’est passé [a little summary geopolitical [of this who has happened [of what really happened [
FIGURE 4.7 (cont.)

06 C: [.h ha ha ouais. [.h ha ha yeah.

07 L: pendant les votes. pa’ce que moi j’fais partie during the votes. ‘cause me I do belong during the votes. ‘cause personally I’m one of

during the votes. ‘cause personally I’m one of

08 de ceux qui ne regardent pas le classement et of those who not watch not the classification and of those who don’t watch the ranking and

09 les votes pa’ce que je trouve ça trop long, the votes ‘cause I find that much long, the votes ‘cause I find that too long,

10 donc j’ai pas eu les détails. moi j’aurais aimé savoir so I’ve not had the details. me I would’ve liked to know so I don’t have the details. what I would like to know

11 justement, puisque tout le monde nous dit que les choix justly, because all the world to us say that the choices specifically is, everybody keeps telling us that the choices

12 et les::s [et les notes sont données pour des raisons eu:h and the:: [and the grades were given for some reasons u:h and the:: [and the points were attributed for reasons u:h |

13 P: [bien sûr. [of course.

14 L: souvent euh euh extra on va dire chansons mais plutôt often uh uh extra we goes to say songs but rather often times uh uh let’s just say for reasons not really

15 politiques, alors est-ce que effectivement, eh ben political, so is-this that effectively, and well related to music but rather for political reasons, well

16 i’ y a des pays qui en ont favorisé it there has some countries who some have favored are there countries which favored some other countries,

17 d’ autres, quels sont les pays qui nous ont donné some others, which are the countries who to us have gave what are the countries which gave us some points
In lines 1-7, L requests that P investigate the voting in the “Eurovision”\(^\text{26}\), one of the major events of the weekend. In lines 7-10, L provides an account for this request stating that he did not watch all the details (e.g., the votes, ranking). He further accounts for this by assessing this part of the show as tedious. He then continues with the request stating that he specifically wants to know how the votes were attributed. He accounts for this additional request by reporting on hearsay: L has heard that the votes were strategic (lines 10-15). In lines 15-18, L provides P with some possible questions that may be asked to find out if countries cast political votes. He utters *enfin voilà* before he sums up the other questions in one final question, namely if there is any cronyism (line 19). L then further requests that P give the panelists specific examples to support his findings (line 20). The question in line 19 may be considered as a general question which sums up L’s prior questions (lines 15-18). In addition, if all previous questions were answered with ‘yes’, and if examples could be found, then one would indeed have a case of cronyism. Therefore when L utters *enfin* ‘in short’ at the end of line 18, he communicates to P “I don’t need to give you anymore example questions”. In other words, with *enfin* L stops the listing of possible questions and presents with *voilà* what might be called a more global question.

\(^{26}\) The Eurovision is an annual song competition held among and broadcasted live in all European countries.
which indicates the bigger picture of the whole investigation. Hence, L uses *enfin voilà* to give an upshot of his prior talk summed up in one question. Thus, the summing-up action is performed by *enfin* and not *voilà*. Instead, *voilà* is used to present and thereby highlight the upcoming upshot.

The following example illustrates a similar case. In this segment, the show host (L) asks the panelists a soccer game related question. More specifically, he asks them if they can think of any pattern that seems to be occurring every time the team of France plays soccer against the country that is organizing the soccer tournament. After multiple attempts by the panelists, (F) one of the panelists, gives the following answer.

**FIGURE 4.8**

01 F: à chaque fois qu’on a joué contre l’ organisateur
   at each times that we has played against the organizer 
ev\’ery time we played against the organizer country

02 à l’ euro, on a perdu?
   at the euro, we has lost?
   for the euro, we lost?

03 L: _excellente réponse de ((nom de chroniqueur)),_
    excellent _answer from ((name of panelist)),_
   _excellent answer by ((name of panelist))_

04 on n’a jamais gagné contre le pays ((applauds))
   we not has never won against the country
   we never won against the organizer

05 organisateur le pays hôte. voyez par exemple
   organizer the country host. see for example
   country the host country. see for example

06 en afrique du sud, on a perdu contre l’ afrique
   in africa of the south, we has lost against the africa
   in south africa, we lost against

07 l’ afrique du sud,
   the africa of the sou:th,
south africa:;
FIGURE 4.8 (cont.)

08 T: on n’a pas joué.
we not has not played.
we did not play.

09 ((the panelists laugh))

10 R: on a perdu contre tout le monde
we has lost against all the world
we lost against every country

11 en afrique du sud. ((the panelists laugh))
in africa of the south.
in south africa.

12 L: .h hh en argentine quand le mondial était en argentine
.h hh in argentina when the worldwide was in argentina
.h hh in argentina when the world cup was in argentina

13 on a perdu contre les argentins, en angleterre contre
we has lost against the argentiniens, in england against
we lost against the argentinians, in england against

14→ les anglais .h enfin voilà, on fait match nul
the english .h at last here it is, we do match nil
the english .h in short here it is, we either tie

15 ou on perd mais on n’a jamais gagné.
or we lose but we not has never won.
or we lose but we have never won.

In lines 1-2, panelist F gives a possible answer; the rising intonation indicates that F is not sure about his response. In the next turn, L accepts F’s response as he assesses the answer as “excellent”. Then L goes on to elaborate on the answer. First, in lines 4-5 L reformulates F’s response (i.e., the fact that France never won against an organizer country), and then in lines 5-7 and in lines 12-14 he illustrates this reformulated answer with various examples before he utters *enfin voilà* and presents the upshot of the prior talk. We notice here what is presented after *enfin voilà* is the gist or the summary of his prior detailed talk. *Enfin voilà* is positioned between the various examples and the commonality of these various examples. In other words, L used *enfin*
voilà to link the various examples to the point he was trying to make by citing these examples. We notice here that L does not finish the listing of the various examples with falling intonation and then open up the upshot. Rather, L linked the examples to the upshot with continuing intonation in a way that implies the upshot is made in reference to the various examples cited before *enfin voilà*. Just like in the previous example, the end of sample examples and the readiness to introduce the upshot is communicated primarily by *enfin*, hence *voilà* is mainly used to present and highlight the forthcoming upshot.

In the next two examples, the upshots are presented with *voilà* in combination with *donc* ‘so’. *Donc* as a discourse marker has been the subject of various and detailed prior studies (e.g., Hansen, 1997; Pellet, 2005, 2009). According to Hansen (1997) *donc* is used to mark a result or a conclusion. As for Pellet (2009: 165), *donc* as a discourse particle “marks topic continuity through the indexing of a consequence”. In my data corpus, *donc* appears to have a similar function in that it presents the upshot of the prior talk. When used in combination with *voilà*, *donc* indicates the concluding nature of the forthcoming upshot while *voilà* presents the outcome of the speaker’s prior talk overall.

In the following example, the speaker utters *donc* followed by *voilà* to present the upshot of her prior talk. In this excerpt, the show host (L) is interacting with a caller (F).

**FIGURE 4.9**

01 L: vous faites quoi dans la vie fabienne?
   you do what in the life fabienne?
   *what do you do for a living fabienne?*

02 F: alors en ce moment, je:: je fais une pause
   so in this moment, I:: I do a pause
   *so right now, I:: I’m taking off some time*

03 dans mon travail, puisque j’attends un bébé,
   in my work, because I wait a baby,
FIGURE 4.9 (cont.)

*from work, because I’m expecting a baby,*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04 L</td>
<td>très bien.</td>
<td>très bien.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>very well.</td>
<td>okay/great.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

→ 05 F: donc voilà je: je me repose.  
so here it is I: I myself rest.  
so here it is I: I’m getting some rest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06 L</td>
<td>et il va arriver quand à peu près le bébé?</td>
<td>et il va arriver quand à peu près le bébé?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and he goes to arrive when at little near the baby?</td>
<td>and when approximately is the baby due?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In line 1, L asks F about her professional occupation. In lines 2-3, F explains that she does not work for the time being and gives an account as to why she is not working. In line 4, L receipts and simultaneously minimally assesses F’s response. In line 5, F reformulates her answer with a *donc* followed by *voilà* and provides an upshot of her previous turn. By uttering *donc*, F indicates that she is ready to introduce the outcome/consequence of her status. She is expecting a child, therefore the consequence is that she has to stay at home and not work. The *voilà* is thus there to present the forthcoming consequence and the reformulation of F’s answer in lines 2-3.

In this next example, the speaker utters *voilà* followed by *donc* / ‘so’ to present the upshot of her prior talk. In this excerpt, the radio show host (L) is interacting with a former French minister (C).

FIGURE 4.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01 L</td>
<td>c’est un bon souvenir, ministre?</td>
<td>c’est un bon souvenir, ministre?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>it’s a good memory, minister?</td>
<td>was it a good memory, being a minister?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 C</td>
<td>oui, oui et non, oui c’est le souvenir de pouvoir:</td>
<td>oui, oui et non, oui c’est le souvenir de pouvoir:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes, yes and no, yes it’s the memory to be able:</td>
<td>yes, yes and no, yes it’s the memory to be able:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 4.10 (cont.)

ye:s, yes and no, yes I have the memory of having been

changer un certain nombre de choses, modestement,
change a certain number of things, modestly,
able to change some things, in all modesty,

mais enfin quand même d’avoir fait quelques
but at last when same to have done some
but nonetheless of having done some things

choses auxquelles je suis très attachées, mais
to which I am very attached, but
dear to my heart, but

c’est aussi d’ une pression absolument terrible,
it’s also of a pressure absolutely terrible,
it’s also a terrible pressure,

d’une vie personnelle pas facile, euh
of a life personal not easy, uh
a not easy personal life, uh

de moments pénibles, voilà donc c’est comme
difficult times, here it is so it’s like

all things of the life, you know it there has
everything in life, you know there are

des (.) choses sympathiques et puis d’ autres
some (.) nice things and then some others

deme (.) nice things and some

qui le sont moins.
who it are less.
less nice things.

In line 1, L asks C if she enjoyed being a minister. In line 3, C answers the question after some silence (line 2). The pause can probably be explained by the fact that C is reflecting on how to answer this question which seems to be potentially complex. This observation is confirmed in C’s answer: she first gives an affirmative answer, but then goes on to mitigate her answer as she gives both an affirmative and negative response tokens, which implies that she has both good and not so good memories of being a minister. In lines 3-6, she explains what she has accomplished while she was a minister, then in lines 6-9 she lists all the inconveniences that
came with her status of being a minister. In lines 9-12, she first utters *voilà* followed by *donc*/ ‘so’ and then compares her experience with life experiences in general. That is, she states the commonplace observation that life is filled with both good and not so good things. She thereby implies that her experience of being a minister is similar to other life events which have positive and negative aspects. Note that the actions before and after the utterance of *voilà* are related: before *voilà* she lists the pros and cons of her experience, and after *voilà* she qualifies and assesses the overall experience in general terms. In this example, the speaker utters *voilà* first, and then *donc* before she introduces the upshot of her prior talk. The *voilà* presents the upcoming assessment, while *donc* prefaxes the assessment. Both *voilà* and *donc* work together to accomplish the same action (i.e., presenting an upshot). Although the action of presenting the assessment is performed mostly by *donc*, by virtue of its position in the ongoing turn at talk, *voilà* contributes to communicating the same action. In terms of the overall accomplishment of the upshots, it would appear from these data that it makes no difference whether *voilà* is uttered before or after *donc*. However, a larger data corpus would be needed in order to verify the interchangeability of *voilà* and *donc* in upshots.

In the next two examples, the upshots are presented with *mais*/ ‘but’ followed by *voilà*. This first extract comes from a Skype conversation between A and her aunt M. In the extract below, A and M are talking about clothing and clothing stores. Before this excerpt, A had expressed her displeasure with the clothing stores where she lives.

FIGURE 4.11

14 A: on a un grand euh-(0.8) on a big
we have a fa:t uh-(0.8) we have a big
we have a big mall

15 centre commercial un peu comme à van cap?
center market a little like in van cap?
FIGURE 4.11 (cont.)

much like in van cap?

16 M: mm mm

17 A: plan de campagne mais il y a rien comme habits en fait plan de campagne but it there has nothing like clothes in fact

18 [.hh hh hh

19 M: [ah bon? [oh really?

20 A: .enfin il y a des magasins mais c’est pas beau du tout(hh)t .hh .well it there has some stores but it’s not nice at all(hh)l .hh .well there are some stores but they’re not nice at all(hh)l .hh

21 M: mm:::

22 A: .et ils ont pas zara ni H&M, .and the have not zara nor H&M, .and they don’t have zara nor H&M,

23 M: mais ça c’est des marques euh un peu ah ben en europe hein, but that it’s some labels uh a little well in europe huh, but those are designer stores uh well like in europe you see,

24 (1.0)

25 A: ben à chicago ils ont zara. well in chicago they have zara.

26 M: [m– [

27 A: [mai:s voilà il faut aller à chicago. [but here it is one must go to chicago. [but the thing is you have to go to chicago.

28 M: mm.

In lines 1-7, A gives an account as to why she could not buy her clothes where she lives. She explains that even though there is a big shopping mall, she does not really like the clothes they have there. In line 9, A gives examples of stores that are missing where she lives. In the next
turn, M disputes and challenges A’s information. She explains that the stores mentioned by A are high fashion stores found mainly in Europe (line 10). In line 12, A expresses her disagreement with M’s explanations with a *ben* /‘well’-prefaced turn. In other words, according to A, the stores mentioned do exist outside of Europe. To support her claim, she gives an example of a city where at least one of the stores can be found. This also indicates that she is (indirectly) again complaining about the stores in the town where she lives. In line 14, A self-selects to elaborate more on her previous turn. She starts a *mais* /‘but’-prefaced turn which indicates some sort of restriction/condition. The condition in this case is: if A wants to shop at Zara’s, she has to go to Chicago, since the store does not exist where she lives. The utterance is prefaced with *mais* followed by *voilà* and finally the statement of the requirement. The upshot in this example is the consequence of A’s complaints. Thus *mais voilà* here prefaxes an upshot TCU, that is, it sums up A’s reasoning up to the point where she utters it.

This next segment will also illustrate another use of *mais voilà*. In this short extract, the radio talk show host (L) announces which one of the two callers, Marion (M) or Julien (J), is the winner of the game they just played. Right before this extract, L acknowledges and congratulates M for giving the right answer to his question and the audience applauds and M minimally receipts the good news.

**FIGURE 4.12**

01 L: marion et julien, vous étiez sympathiques l’un
marion and julien, you were sympathetic the one
marion and julien, you were both nice

02 et l’autre, mais voilà, c’est marion qui a gagné
and the other, but here it is, it’s marion who has won
but here it is, it’s marion who won the gift basket

03 on va envoyer à marseille le fameux filet garni
we goes send at marseille the famous net garnished
In lines 1-2, L compliments both M and J and in line 2, he extends his turn with the conjunction *mais* followed by *voilà* to announce that M is the winner and will therefore be the recipient of the gifts (lines 3-4). The upshot introduces the consequence of L’s prior observation before *mais voilà*. Put differently, L acknowledges that while both contestants were agreeable, the designation of the game winner is not based on personality appeal but rather on who has given the correct answer. Based on this specific criterion, only one of them could have been selected as the winner of the game. Thus, the upshot presents the outcome of the overall game.

The upshots in the last two examples clearly introduce the consequence of some sort of restriction or constraint in reference to the talk before *mais voilà*. The *mais* does the restriction, but this restriction is an upshot from the prior talk that seems to be communicated by *voilà*. In other words, the upshot could not have been accomplished just by *mais* and without *voilà*. Thus, when *voilà* is combined with *mais*, it seems to function differently than when it is combined with discourse markers (i.e., *enfin, donc*).

In this section I have shown how speakers use *voilà* or a composite *voilà* to present the upshot of their prior talk. The upshot could be presented in the form of an outcome/consequence, an assessment, a characterization, or a summary of prior talk. My analyses and the intonation patterns have shown that speakers do not close their prior talk to open an upshot TCU; rather, they link their prior talk via *voilà/composite voilà* to the upcoming upshot, thereby illustrating a cause and effect relationship between prior talk and the following upshots. When *voilà* is
combined with *enfin* and *donc*, the upshots are mainly introduced specifically by these discourse markers (i.e., by *enfin* and *donc*). When *voilà* is combined with *mais*, however, the upshot is first and foremost accomplished by *voilà*. In the next section, I will show how *voilà* is used to present hypothetical direct quotes.

4.4.2 *Voilà* in hypothetical direct quotes

In this section, I will show how speakers use *voilà* to incorporate hypothetical direct quotes into their telling. The use of *voilà* in hypothetical story telling is a highly systematic feature. In my corpus, all hypothetical quotes are systematically introduced via *voilà*, whereas when speakers report actual utterances pronounced at some point in the past, they do not use *voilà* to present them, especially if the direct quote is presented as verbatim quote.27 I would argue that by using *voilà* in hypothetical quotes, speakers project these direct quotes in a fictional and imaginary space. This hypothetical talk is always presented in the form of a direct quote (Golato, 2012; Goodwin, 1990). Golato (2012) has demonstrated that speakers use hypothetical direct quotes for several reasons (i.e., to present model talk, for entertainment reasons, and to illustrate prior claim). She further shows that in Germany, these quotes are usually introduced through modal verbs. My analyses of French data will show some similarities and differences with these findings.

Before quoting the hypothetical citations, speakers first set the context in which the hypothetical quote will be uttered, after which they introduce the hypothetical quote with *voilà*, thereby shifting footing (Goffman, 1981) to adopt the role of the character whose talk is quoted. What is introduced with *voilà* is not the whole hypothetical situation but rather the hypothetical

27 If speakers use *voilà* to quote actual utterances that had been produced sometime in the past, then their reporting is not presented as verbatim but rather as some sort of re-wording of the quotes.
quotation. In short, in hypothetical direct quotes speakers present what one might/could/should say.

The first extract comes from the same radio show as some of the other examples in this chapter. L, the show host, speaks with a caller whose job it is to invent names for new car models. Before this excerpt, L and the panelists expressed interest in this caller’s uncommon job as they asked her several questions related to it (e.g., they asked her the names of the cars for which this caller’s company was responsible). In the excerpt, L asks the panelists what they would do if they had an assignment where they would have to invent names for cars.

FIGURE 4.13

01 L: alo- alo- réfléchissions, là on est-
          s- s- let’s think, there we is-
          s- s- let’s see, there’s

02 M: bien sûr.
        well sure.
        of course.

03 L: franchement on est (. ) on va dire
          frankly we is (. ) we go to say
          really there’s (. ) let’s say

04 six hein, =on compte pas pierre. alors-
         six uh, =we count not pierre. so-
         there’s six of us ok, = we don’t count pierre. so-

05 ((rire  2.5s))
    ((laughter from panelists  2.5s))

06 L: on est si:x,=
          we is si:x,=
          there’s six of u:s,=

07 J: =ouais,
        =yeah,

08 L: admettons on nous confie, renaul
        let’s admit one to us entrusts, renaul
        let’s just say we have an assignment, renaul
In lines 1-12, L presents the scenario in which they might participate to perform the task of car naming. The scenario set-up is reminiscent of a theatrical set up. First, by saying réfléchissons/ (literally ‘let’s think’) (line 1), L clearly indicates that what he is about to say is a product of his imagination and not some recollection of past events. He goes to act as a casting director for this potential assignment as he selects the potential actors and excludes some (i.e., Pierre, one of the panelists) (lines 4-6). Then L visualizes Renault, the French car manufacturer contacting them to take on this special assignment (lines 8 and 10). By saying admettons/ ‘let’s say’ (line 8), L communicates to the panelists “let’s pretend this is happening” thereby compelling them to visualize and picture this hypothetical world. The panelists seem to be captivated by this developing story as they provide continuers to encourage L to tell them more about it (lines 7 and 9). Once L has built up the context, he then imagines some representatives
from the company Renault telling them what to do (lines 10-12). This hypothetical quote is presented as a direct quote, and describes what these potential company representatives would say. The description includes the size of the car and that it would target a female audience. L introduces this potentially possible utterance with *voilà*. *Voilà* separates here the quoted talk form L’s talk. In other words, L uses *voilà* to shift his “footing” (Goffman, 1981: 128) into adopting the stance of these hypothetical potential interlocutors. Thus, *voilà* indicates what L’s own talk is and what the talk of the quoted individuals is. This shift systematically changes the speaker-recipient positions. L is no longer the speaker but the recipient of this hypothetical quote, much like the other panelists; in other words, L is now the author and animator of these originators/principals (i.e., the representatives of Renault) (Goffman, 1974, 1981). Therefore, in addition to being a casting director and an animator/actor, L is also acting as the screen writer of this hypothetical quote.

This quotation is provided by L to prompt the panelists to provide possible names for this potential car. The description turn did not end with falling intonation, which suggests that there is more to add to this hypothetical and potential car depiction (line 12). Nevertheless, in line 13, F, one of the panelists suggests a name (i.e., DSK\textsuperscript{28}), which prompts L’s laughter (line 14) and the positive assessment of this suggestion by J (line 15) in addition to the audience’s laughter. The laughter seems to indicate that the suggested name is funny, but in any case, this is not a name that could be seriously considered for a car (see footnote 27). As for J’s positive

\[\text{\textsuperscript{28} DSK stands for Dominique Strauss-Kahn, the name of the former Director of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and former French minister. Mr. Strauss-Kahn, who is commonly known by his initials (i.e., DSK), is also very often mocked by French comedians for being a womanizer, to say the very least. In addition, at the time this specific radio show was being broadcasted, multiple and highly publicized accusations of sexual assaults and other sexual misconducts had been made against Mr. Strauss-Kahn. He was thus very much in the news. It therefore seems that what prompted F to offer the name “DSK” is most probably related to the mention of “female clientele” in the car description.}\]
assessment, it seems to address F’s quick-witted creativity. In the remainder of the talk, they commented more on this specific name, and suggest other more or less amusing names before moving on to another topic. Therefore, it seems the whole purpose of this segment was rather humoristic and not necessarily a realistic brainstorming for a car name. By setting up some sort of “picture this” hypothetical context, the panelists managed to create a playful theatre/comedy-like entertaining game.

The next example also seems to illustrate a humoristic story. In this segment, a listener (I) calls in to the radio show and tells the host (L) that he has actually found a job thanks to the show. Then, L playfully says that all listeners should say they listen to this show if they want to be hired. In the following extract, L explains what listeners should say to their potential employers.

FIGURE 4.14

01 L: quand vous postulez pour un emploi, vous dites
when you apply for a employment, you say
when you apply for a job, you say

02 → voilà euh écoutez si vous m’prenez, j’enverrai
here it is uh listen if you me take, I will send
here it is uh listen if you hire me, I will send

03 un mail [à ((nom d’animateur)), et je ferai
a mail [to((name of host)), and I will do
an email[to((name of host)), and I will do

04 I: [.h ha ha ha

05 de la pub pour votre entreprise.
some publicity for your enterprise.
some advertisement for your company.

In line 1, L first sets up the context in which the potential listeners/job seekers would utter this “conditional job bargain talk” (line 1). Then, in lines 2-5 L uses voilà to introduce what these potential jobs seekers/listeners would have to say in the form of a hypothetical direct quote.
Since the *voilà* is positioned right before the direct quote, it is used to shift footing and to assume the stance of the potential job seekers/listeners. By doing so, L goes from being the speaker to being the animator of these potential job seekers (Goffman, 1981). However, in this case L is not the recipient but just an actor. The *écoutez* / ‘listen’ in line 2, establishes the beginning or the setup of the new speaker-recipient hearership. Put differently, in this hypothetical projected space, the job seekers are now the speakers and the hiring agencies/employers are the listeners/recipients. In line 4, laughter from I (who is one of the panelists) seems to indicate that L’s reasoning and suggestion is amusing but not necessarily serious. Indeed, the likelihood of all listeners, no matter their backgrounds and job qualifications, to be hired just because they would promise to make advertisements for the potential companies on this particular show is next to nil. In other words, the gap between the portrayal of this hypothetical job interview and the reality of job search process creates the comical effect. In depicting a hypothetical and somewhat improbable world, L creates a comical story. It is specifically in this implausible world that the *voilà* is used to project the hypothetical utterance.

Unlike the two previous examples, the next example illustrates a rather serious hypothetical context. In this excerpt, the show panelists discuss the case of a young man who has been in a coma for a long period of time. The parents of this young man have always refused to terminate the life of their son. The case had captured the attention of French people for a long time. This subject matter was brought up and discussed on this particular day of the radio show, because the doctor who had been treating the son was publicly pleading in a newspaper for the termination of the life of this young man. E, one of the panelists, expresses her feeling as follows:
In lines 1-5, E acknowledges the delicate nature of the subject matter. To illustrate her point, E imagines and visualizes a context portraying a similar case (i.e., a body in a coma) (lines 1-2). Thus E is not referring to the specific case the panelists were discussing before, but rather to another possible and plausible case in which one could/would face a comparable difficult situation (i.e., a hypothetical scenario). By relating the body in question to hypothetical family members, E has now created a compelling and compassionate context (lines 3-4). Once E has established this sensitive background, she goes on to introduce what one particular close family member (i.e., a hypothetical wife) would potentially and hypothetically have to say to herself in deciding the fate of her spouse under such difficult circumstances (lines 5-7).
Voilà is used to project this hypothetical direct quote in the hypothetical and imaginary world that E has just created. Thus, voilà also separates E’s talk from the hypothetical wife’s talk that is quoted by E. Put differently, E shifts footing to adopt the identity of this imaginary wife. Therefore, E becomes the author and animator of this fictional originator (Goffman, 1981). The quote itself (i.e., *je vais choisir de mettre fin à cette vie*! ‘I’m going to choose to put an end to this life’) is used to highlight the sensitivity of the subject matter. The stress on *je* shows the responsibility the wife would have to face in making such an important decision. This hypothetical quote therefore exemplifies how difficult it would be for a hypothetical close family member to utter these words, and most importantly how hard it would be for her to make such a difficult decision. E appears to have used this hypothetical situation to illustrate and defend her point, which is that one does not easily decide to end the life of a loved one.

Obviously, French speakers could also report direct actual quotes in their telling, but in such cases, the utterances are not introduced with voilà. Let us consider the telling of this next story. In the excerpt, the panelists discuss the recent travel of the president of France to the United States. During the discussion, one of the panelists (G) mentions that the president speaks terrible English and deplores the fact that as a president, he did not make an effort to learn better English. To illustrate his point, G reports to the rest of the panelists a TV segment that he had watched and in which the president was interacting with some Americans.

FIGURE 4.16

01 G: on le voit sur le une terrasse, avec we him see on the a terrace, with you can see him on the a terrace, with

02 des chefs d’entreprise, et il commence some chiefs of company, and he starts some company heads, and he starts
à saluer les mecs et il leur dit euh
to salute the guys and he to them says uh
greeting the guys and he says uh

good morning chais pas quoi, et après
good morning don’t not what, and then
good morning whatever, and then

il est emmerdé pas’que les gars
he is troubled because some guys
he got stuck because the guys

parlent pas français, .h et il y a, un type,
speak not french, .h and it there has, a guy,
don’t speak french, .h and someone told him

dont on lui a dit qu’il allait euh
which we to him has say that he was going u::h
that there was this guy who is preparing u::h

y préparer un projet pour aller sur mars.
there prepare a project to go on mars.
a project for his travel to mars.

I: [hh hh hh]

G: [et il lui dit euh you go on mars? ((with a french accent))
and he to him says uh you go on mars?
[so he asks him you go on mars?

I: [ha ha]

G: [bon déjà ( ) tu vois ((background laughter))
good already ( ) you see
[ok already ( ) you see what I mean

et le gars dit yes ((followed with gibberish talk))
and the guy says yes

et hollandae enchainne en disant with the fusée?
and hollandae goes on in saying with the fusée?
and hollandae goes on to say with the fusée?
In lines 1-2, G sets the background in which the interaction between the French president and the Americans took place. Then in lines 3-4, G goes on to tells how the French president greeted the Americans. Then in lines 5-6, G explains that the French president was not able to carry on the conversation in French as his interlocutors did not speak French. In lines 6-13, G reports the specific interaction that the French president carried out in English with one specific person. G builds up the story up to the point when he delivers the punch line (line 14) much to the amusements of the co-participants. When shifting footing, G does adopt the stance of the quoted principals and animates them as well (e.g., with accent imitation) (Goffman, 1981); however, none of the direct quotes are introduced with voilà, but instead are introduced with other verbs of saying. The fact that G did not use voilà to introduce the direct quote shows that the loci of these quotations are implied and understood as having occurred sometime during the described meeting and in the context and location specified by G beforehand.

To sum up, in this section my analyses have shown that speakers use voilà to introduce not actual direct quotes, but rather hypothetical direct quotes of what somebody could, would or should say in a hypothetically projected and imaginary space. Consequently, it seems that the non-use of voilà to present actual direct quotes is the default practice. In other words, when past

---

29 What seems to the source of amusement here is probably the fact that the president has used a French word (i.e., fusée, which means ‘rocket’) in his interaction in English.
utterances are reported in the form of direct quotes, they are systematically understood as having been uttered sometime in the past, in the context and location that speakers specify in the telling. In the following section I will summarize and discuss the findings of the entire chapter.

4.5 Summary of findings and discussion

In this chapter, I have shown how speakers of French use the discourse marker voilà to present an upcoming utterance. Speakers use voilà to present an upshot of their talk in the form of an assessment (e.g., example 4.5), a summary of prior talk (e.g., example 4.7) or a consequence of prior talk (e.g., example 4.9). Typically, prior to the upshots, speakers produce long stretches of discourse which can include listings of assertions. They then utter voilà or voilà in combination with another discourse marker (i.e., enfin, donc) or with a grammatical conjunction (e.g., mais) before they present the upshot. When speakers use voilà in combination with donc and enfin, it seems that the action is mainly performed by the discourse markers donc and enfin and not necessarily by voilà. However, in such cases, voilà still presents and thereby highlights the upcoming upshots. By contrast, when voilà is combined with mais, the upshot seems to be presented by voilà and not by mais. Moreover, when voilà is used by itself to present the upshot (e.g., example 4.6), it is mainly by virtue of its position that we can understand and interpret its function. Hence, it is worth mentioning that there is only a functional similarity between voilà and donc/‘so’ and that the functions of donc/‘so’ are otherwise different from voilà and vice versa.

In any case, when speakers use voilà before presenting the upshot, they do not close the prior talk and open an upshot TCU; rather, they use voilà to link the prior talk to the following upshot thereby suggesting that talk before voilà entails the talk following voilà (i.e., the upshot).
In the previous chapter (i.e., the use of *voilà* in closings), I showed how speakers deploy *voilà* to close an action and open the next one. *Voilà* in closings thus separates two sequences of action which are not necessarily related to one another. In other words, in closing one action, speakers indicate they are ready to move on to the next action. On the other hand, in the present chapter I have shown that when deploying *voilà* to present upshots, speakers clearly communicate that there is a cause and effect relationship between the upshot and the prior talk. This is also evidenced by the intonation contour; in all my data examples, *voilà* is either positioned between two utterances with continuing intonation (e.g., example 4.5 and 4.6), preceded by an utterance with continuing intonation (e.g., example 4.7), or is uttered with continuing intonation (e.g., example 4.8).

In addition to presenting an upshot, speakers also use *voilà* to present hypothetical direct quotes into their telling (e.g., example 4.13). My analyses have shown that when speakers use *voilà* to present hypothetical quotes, they project these quotes into a fictitious and imaginary space. Speakers do not use *voilà* to present actual direct quotes that had been uttered sometime in the past. Hence, when speakers quote other speakers’ actual talk, the loci of the quotations are understood as having occurred sometime in the past. In other words, unlike in the case of hypothetical and imaginary projected spaces, speakers need not deploy a device (i.e., *voilà*) to locate the quotations as having been uttered at some point in the given context/situation. Consequently, when speakers deploy *voilà* to present hypothetical quotes, they mark the quotations as not having been uttered in the past, and rather as something that could/should/would be uttered somewhere in an imaginary projected space. Therefore, when speakers use *voilà* to preface these quotes, they are not just presenting a piece of talk, but are
instead picturing some sort of theatrical stage in which one could envision these characters taking shape as they are animated through the speakers.

The use of hypothetical direct talk in speakers’ telling is practiced in other languages as well (Golato, 2012; Goodwin, 1990; Goffman, 1974, 1981). It seems that in German and English, the hypothetical direct quote is indicated mainly by the use of modal verbs. By contrast, French is a language without a distinct grammatical class of modal verbs. Nonetheless, by using voilà to preface the quotes, speakers project the quote out of the real world into somewhere in the imaginary space. Based on my data examples, speakers use hypothetical direct quotes to illustrate a point of view or for entertainment reasons. However, my examples were very limited; a larger data corpus and/or the use of other data sources might yield additional interactional functions.

Hence, whether it is to present upshots or project hypothetical talk, it is clearly the “deictic-spatial” (Bergen & Plauché, 2001) feature of voilà that is in play. Prior studies have established that voici (and not voilà) is used to present upcoming discourse (Delahaie, 2008, 2009a; Adamczewski, 1991; Bergen & Plauché, 2001; Grenoble & Riley, 1996; Porhiel, 2012). However, in my data I did not find voici used as a marker of upcoming discourse. This finding corroborates Delahaie’s (2008) prior findings. Delahaie (2008: 315) indeed observed that it is voilà and not voici that was used in presenting upcoming utterances. The author explained that the absence of voici as an ouvreur/ ‘opener’ to an upcoming utterance is mainly due to the fact that voici, unlike voilà, does not have the capacity to look forward and backward at the same time. My analyses have indeed shown the capacity of voilà to be

---

30 Delahaie (2008) looked at voilà at the beginning of a turn, as in: alors en fait voilà je voulais vérifier parce que j’aurais éventuellement une personne qui souhaiterait se rajouter/ ‘so in fact here it is I wanted to know because there would be someone who would like to be added’ (my translation) (Delahaie, 2008: 313). Her data corpus comes from interactions in a travel agency.
cataphoric and anaphoric at the same time. The talk that is introduced with voilà is linked to the previous utterance before voilà. For instance, the upshots are made in reference to what speakers have said prior to uttering voilà.

Adamczewski (1991) demonstrated that the only difference between voici and voilà is not the proximal versus distal distinction, but rather the fact that voici is used to present a new referent and voilà to refer to the already known referent. For Adamczewski (1991: 59) a news broadcaster who says voici nos informations / ‘Here are the news’ (my translation) by definition is presenting new information, while when the same person utters voilà toutes les informations dont nous disposons pour le moment! ‘that’s all the news we have for now’ (my translation) is referring back to the news which just ended. Therefore, according to the author, this same person could not have said voilà nos informations at the beginning of presenting the news. In my corpus, voici is also used exclusively as a presentative of a new referent as illustrated perfectly in the following example.

In this excerpt, the radio talk show host (L) is getting ready to ask a question to two listeners who called in the show to play a game. Before this extract, L explains what they would win if one of them answers the question correctly. He then goes on to introduce the question as follows:

FIGURE 4.17

01 L: voici la question max et caroline.  
here is the question max and caroline.

02 (1.0)

03 J: ( ) faut la poser hein,  
( ) must it ask huh,  
( ) how about asking it huh,
FIGURE 4.17 (cont.)

04 L: voici la question max et caroline.  
      here is the question max and caroline.

05  (0.6)

06 J: on vous écoute max et caroline vous avez  
      we you listen max et caroline you have  
      we’re waiting max and caroline you have

07  dix secondes pour répondre.  
      ten seconds to answer.  
      ten seconds for the answer.

08 M: [hh hh hh hh

09 C: [ha ha ha ha

10 L: voici la question max et caroline.  
      here is the question max and caroline.

11  (0.7)

12 C: et alors qu’est-ce qui s’passe.  
      and so what is it [who happens  
      but what is] going on.

13 L:  [pourquoi ils réagissent  
      [why they react  
      [why don’t they react

14 pas quand je leur dis ça?  
      not when I to them say that?  
      when I say that?

15 J: ils sont concentrés?  
      they are concentrated?  
      they’re staying focused?

16 C: mais oui.  
      but yes.  
      of course.

17 L: ( )on dit oui, on est prêt, chais pas moi  
      ( )one says yes, we is ready, don’t not me  
      ( )one says yes, we’re ready, I don’t know
FIGURE 4.17 (cont.)

18 un truc quoi .h voici la question max et caroline.  
a thing what .h here is the question max an caroline.  
something .h here is the question max and caroline.

19 M: on n’ attend que ça.  
we not wait only that.  
that’s all we’re waiting for.

20 L: voici. dites donc ça était long à v’nir hh hh hh.  
the re we go. say so that was long to come hh hh hh.  
the re we go. that was long coming hh hh hh.

L uses voici to announce an upcoming question (i.e., new and unknown information)  
(lines 1, 4, 10 and 18). We can see in this rather comical exchange that L was actually waiting  
for the ‘go ahead’ (Schegloff, 2007) to ask the question from the two contestants. By definition,  
a ‘go ahead’ is provided to prompt the delivery of new and informative talk. The ‘go ahead’  
finally came in line 19, and was recognized by L in the next turn with a stretched voilà to  
indicate the coming of a long-awaited response (line 20).

Delahaie (2009a) had also established that voilà is systematically related to something  
expected, whereas voici is used to introduce a new referent. Hence voilà la question to introduce  
a question for the first time would actually not have been possible. The use of voilà la question  
would have implied that the arrival of the question was expected at some specific time (Delahaie  
2009a) or that some sort of search activity was going on. As a matter of fact, throughout my data,  
L systematically introduces his questions to listeners with voici and never with voilà. In any case,  
the use of voici in my corpus is actually limited to its presentative function whereby voici is  
syntactically linked to the rest of the talk (Moignet, 1969). This limited use of voici (i.e., as the  
presentative of a new referent), combined with its inability to be cataphoric and anaphoric at the  
same time, explains the overtaking of voici by voilà in modern French interaction (Grenoble &
Riley, 1996; Delahaie, 2008). Participants’ talk in an interaction is mostly a reaction to previous talk, thus, the ubiquity of *voilà* over *voici* in a conversation is not so surprising. Thus, all of these observations establish the fact that it is *voilà* (and not *voici*) that is overwhelmingly found within the realm of discourse and as such is used as a discourse marker in naturally occurring French conversation.

To conclude, in this chapter, I have shown that French speakers use *voilà* not so much to open an utterance, but rather to structure and organize their tellings by presenting and highlighting part of their talk. This use of *voilà* also demonstrates that the rules underlying the grammar of interaction are not reflections of written prescriptive grammar.
Chapter 5: The use of voilà in word searches

5.1 Introduction

In the prior two chapters, I have analyzed voilà in closings and voilà in presenting upcoming utterances. A third environment in which voilà routinely occurs in my corpus is in word searches. As the analytic section of this chapter will show, there are three positions in which voilà is used in a word search activity.

5.2 Positions

Voilà in word searches either

a) prefaces the searched-for word,

b) follows the newly found searched-for word, or

c) is placed in the middle of a search for the word

As the discussion will show, in each of these positions voilà fulfills a different interactional function. In the first case, speakers indicate with voilà that they have found the searched-for word, in the second case, with voilà they confirm that the found word is what they were looking for, whereas in the last case, speakers indicate that they are on the way to finding the searched-for word. As such, it is used as a ‘place holder’ until the missing word is found. This chapter starts out with a brief review on the use of place holders and fillers in word search activities in other languages, followed by the use and function of voilà of in searches for real objects. Then, using examples from my corpus, I explore and discuss the use and function of voilà in word search activities in mundane French interaction. Finally, I will summarize my findings.
5.3 Prior studies on word searches

In my literature review chapter, I extensively discussed the features of word searches. In this section, I will discuss more specifically the use of place holders in word search activities. I will also discuss the prior work done on *voilà* in relation to (word) search activities.

5.3.1 ‘Place holders’ across languages

Place holders are different from what are commonly known as fillers (e.g., hesitation markers, sound stretches), for they occupy the syntactic space of the missing word and substitute for it (Hayashi & Yoon, 2006). For instance, in American English the expression “whatchamacallit” functions as a place holder, whereas “uhms” and “uhs” are just fillers. Hayashi & Yoon (2006) have also distinguished between two types of demonstratives: *are/asioko* (placeholders) and *ano* (interjective hesitator) in Japanese. For the authors, an interjective hesitator is just a delaying device; unlike a place holder, it does not pinpoint any particular referent. This next example from Hayashi & Yoon (2006: 490-49) shows the use of the Japanese distal demonstrative placeholder *asoko* ‘that place’ in a word search activity.

FIGURE 5.1

1 T: *indo iki tte yuu no ga a-- aru no?*  
   India for QT say N SP exist FP  
   ‘Is there ((a direct flight)) to India?’

2 R: *eeto ne:: doko haitta kke::: iki wa::*  
   well FP where entered Q the.way.to TP  
   ‘Well, where did ((I)) fly into... On the way to ((India)), …’

3 → *asoko:: *kara haitta n ya (asoko)* (1.5) “shuto.”  
   LOC.DIST.DEM from entered N CP LOC.DIST.DEM capital  
   ‘((I)) entered ((India)) through asoko [=that place], (*asoko*) (1.5) “the capital”’

4 → (0.5) *derii(h):*  
   Delhi  
   ‘(0.5) Delhi(h)’
We notice here that the second instance of *asoko* in line 3 is used as a place holder until the searched-for word is found, which the speaker (R) eventually provided in line 4 (i.e., Delhi) (Hayashi & Yoon, 2006). The use of demonstratives as placeholders is also found in other languages (e.g., Mandarin Chinese, Indonesian and Russian) (Hayashi & Yoon, 2006).

In addition, Podlesskaya (2010) explores the use of the Russian proximal demonstrative pronoun place holder *eti*, marked for accusative plural, to project a sought-for plural noun. Amiridze (2010) on the other hand discusses the use of a fully inflected filler verb with its suppletive root -*svr* as a place holder in modern Georgian.

Unlike a demonstrative, *voilà* is not referential and thus might not be defined as a place holder. However, I would argue that *voilà* indicates some sort of indexability and projectability mainly due to its semantic meaning. Hence in this sense it is more than a hesitation marker or filler. In light of this observation, I will specifically explore the function of *voilà* in the middle of word searches activities.

5.3.2 The use of *voilà* in real object search

Bruxelles & Traverso (2006) have observed that the presentative-deictic *voilà* is used to mark the finding of an object. According to Bruxelles & Traverso (2006: 76), this *voilà* is uttered “at the end of a search activity and more specifically at the moment the object of interest is found” (à l’issue d’une activité locale de recherche d’un objet, au moment où l’objet est “trouvé”) (my translation). The authors labeled this *voilà* the “eureka *voilà*” (*voilà eurêka*) (Bruxelles & Traverso, 2006: 71). The following examples from Bruxelles & Traverso (2006: 76) will illustrate this usage of *voilà*. Their data come from discussions/interactions during architects’ meetings.
In this first excerpt, three architects (C, L and M) discuss the modifications of a first draft of a hotel construction project. Before the meeting, the architects had submitted the draft documents to the main sponsor of the hotel, who faxed it back with his comments, questions and requests for modifications. The main task of the architects in this meeting is to go through the questions and see if the requests and modifications could be granted. One of the questions of the sponsor concerns room 33; the sponsor wanted to know if the room had windows. In order for the architects to answer this question, they first had to locate the room in question on their maps.

FIGURE 5.2 (Bruxelles & Traverso, 2006: 76)

The original transcript is in French, the idiomatic translation is mine.

PL: stands for Plan/ ‘project draft’; D stands droite/ ‘right’; ---- > indicates that the gesture continues; G stands for gauche/ ‘left’

1 C: où est-ce que t’as mis ((rires)) (...) où est-ce que tu
   where did you put ((laughter))(...) where did you
   ((tout le monde est penché et cherche sur le PL5\textsuperscript{31}))
   ((everybody looks down and searches on PL5))

2 nous a fait une chambre trente-trois/
   put room thirty three/

3 *(1.0)*
   *C se penche à D et cherche dans la pile de D*
   *C looks down and searches in the pile on the right side (D)*

4 C: [là-bas
   [over there/
   ]

5 L: [mm mm mm ( ) ça doit être là
   [mm mm mm ( ) it must be in there

6 -------> C tire PL4 de la pile de D
   -------> C draws PL4 from the pile on the right (D)

7 dans cette aile là je pense euh
   in this aisle here I think uh
   ((L pose sa main sur PL4; L pointe sur PL4))
   ((L puts his hand on PL4; L points toward PL4))

\textsuperscript{31} The drafts seem to be identified by the number associated to them.
FIGURE 5.2 (cont.)

8 C: ah voilà trente trois
   oh here it is thirty three

9 L: trente-quatre trente-cinq:
    thirty four thirty five

10 M: ah oui
     oh right

11 C: *c’est au rez-de-chaussée alors*
    *so it’s in the basement*

12 *3.0)(**M tire PL4 vers elle*)
   *3.0)(**M draws PL4 toward her*)

   ((C cherche dans la pile de G))
   ((C searches in the pile on the left*))

13 M: non ca (. ) non (,) ça c’est trente (..) quatre
    no that’s (.) no (.) that’s thirty (..) four

   ((C essaye de tirer plan 3 du pile G))
   ((C tries to draw the map 3 from the pile on the left (G)))

14 M: [trente cinq
15 [thirty five
   [
16 C: [(

17 (2.0)
   ((L qui était accoudé sur la pile G se recule))
   ((L who was resting his elbows on the left pile has now moved back))

   ((M ramène ses mains dans la pile de G))
   ((M puts her hands back on the left pile))

18 C: ça doit être celle la trente-trois
    this one must be thirty three

   ((C dégage PL3 de la pile et le pose sur la pile))
   ((C draws PL3 from the pile and puts it on the pile))

19 ➤ (1.0) voilà/ trente-trois/.(.)((C scrute, C pointe))
    (1.0) here it is/ thirty three/.(.)((C scrutinizes, C points))

20 L: a-t-elle une fenêtre/((rire))
    does the room have a window/((laughter))

21 mm (0.2) eu::h oui y en a pas encore mais-
    mm (0.2) u::h yes not yet but-
At the beginning of the transcript, all architects seem to search for the room in question (i.e., room 33) on PL5/ ‘map 5’ (lines 1-5), then C draws PL4 towards himself (line 6) and utters *ah voilà* when he thought he had located room 33 (line 8). In lines 8-12, the architects tried to verify the information given by C concerning the location of room 33. In line 12, M draws the same map towards her (i.e., PL4) and differs with C’s affirmation (line 13). In lines 17-18, they all seem to be mobilized for another search as they tried to locate room 33. C now draws another map closer (i.e., PL3), affirms having located the room, and utters *voilà* as he points towards the located area (lines 18-19). Once the search activity has ended and they have located the room on their map, they now answer to the question by looking on the newly found map (lines 20-21) (Bruxelles & Traverso, 2006). In sum, in both instances in which C locates the room on the map, he precedes his utterance with a *voilà*.

According to the authors, the utterance *voilà* occurs at the end of a local activity (i.e., at the end of a search) but it also contributes to the overall and global structure of the interaction as the finding of the searched-for objects triggers the next activity (Bruxelles & Traverso, 2006: 77-78).

In my own data corpus, I have observed that *voilà*, specifically the composite *ben voilà*, can be used to mark the finding of a solution to an interactional problem and the finding/locating a person as illustrated in the following examples. This first example comes from a Skype conversation between a mother (M) and her daughter (C). The conversation occurred a few weeks before Christmas. C lives abroad and is expected to come home for Christmas. Right before this extract, her mother (M) asks C what she would like her sister give her for Christmas. C first explains that she doesn’t need anything specifically and then she goes on to exclude some potential gifts. Among the potential gifts, she excluded any gifts having to do with
home/apartment decorations. Her mother asks her daughter how she would feel about pharmaceutical/cosmetics related objects, but C rejects the offer. The following is part of C’s explanation for the rejection.

FIGURE 5.3

35 C: j’aime pas trop les (.)les coffrets
I like not much the (.the boxes
actually I do not like (.make up

36 en fait, parce que la moitié
in fact, because the half
sets very much, because you do not get

37 dont tu t’ sers pas.
which you yourself serve not.
to use half of what’s inside.

38 (0.5)

39 M: ◦mm◦ (.) [◦bon◦
[◦well◦
[◦okay◦
[

40 C: [◦ouais◦ tu vois donc euh
[◦yeah◦ you see so uh
[◦yeah◦ so you see uh

41 C: les les crèmes pour les mains et tout,
the the creams for the hands and all,
hand creams and things like that,

42 ça je peux en acheter ici=
that I can some buy here=
I can buy them here=

43 c’est vraiment pas cher,
it’s really not expensive,
they’re really not expensive,

44 (.)

45 donc eu:h hm:: non, peut-et’ eh-
so u:h hm:: no, maybe eh-
C explains why she doesn’t like make up sets (line 1-3). The silence in line 4 probably belongs to M as C is expecting her to react to the information she just provided her. M receipts the explanation minimally (line 5). C goes on to give further account as to why she doesn’t like make up sets (line 6-9). Then C suggests a possible gift (i.e., pajamas) with a *donc* ‘so’ prefaced turn (line 11-13). The silence in line 14 belongs here once more to M as C is expecting her to receipt the information she just provided. In line 14, M accepts and approves the suggestion and goes on to make a positive assessment of the object in question. M first deploys the change-of-state token (Heritage, 1984) *ah* to mark the prior utterance as informative and as news. Then she used the composite *ben voilà* to mark the finding of a possibly suitable gift, after they had gone through an extensive exchange of talk and negotiations over possible and potential gifts. The *ben voilà* thus marks the resolution of the interactional problem that C and M were having (i.e., finding a suitable gift). Once both have identified the pajamas as a potential gift, C explains to her mother what kind of pajamas she would like to get (not shown in the transcript).

The next example shows that *ben voilà* marks the finding or mention of a person name within a specific category of individuals. The extract comes from a radio talk show. Usually, the
host (L) asks callers to the show who their favorite panelists are. Callers’ favorites of course vary, but apparently one of the panelists is rarely mentioned as being one of the callers’ favorites. In fact, callers usually mentioned him as being their least favorite panelist. All that is done playfully, and even the panelist in question takes the comments good-naturedly and with lots of humor. On this day, as he usually does, L asks one of the callers (M) who her favorite panelists are.

FIGURE 5.4

01 M: je vous aime beaucoup tous.
   I you love lots all.
   I like all of you very much.

02 L: même gérard miller?
   even gérard miller?

03 M: même gérard miller.
   even gérard miller.

04 B: ET BEN VOILÀ. ((background cheers))
   AND WELL HERE IT IS.
   WELL THERE YOU GO.

05 L: ah ça y est=
   oh that there is=
   oh finally/there we go=

06 B: =on a trouvé une ha ha ha ha
   =we have found one ha ha ha ha

In line 1, M answers the question by saying that she actually likes everybody

In line 2, L requests a confirmation as he asks M if her answer included Gérard Miller. In line 3, M confirms by repeating L’s question with downward intonation, thereby turning his question into an assertion. By asserting and not simply affirming L’s question, M actually displays a higher epistemic authority over her claim (Heritage & Raymond, 2012). In the next line B, one of the frequent panelists, receipts this information with ben voilà uttered in higher voice, which
is then followed by background cheers. In line 6, B goes on to say on a trouvé une! ‘we have found one’, referring to this person (M) who happens to like this specific panelist. This line thus confirms that B used ben voilà in line 4 to mark the finding of this person. This confirmation functions also as a post-mortem verbalizing of the action (Schegloff, 2007). Moreover, the ça y est/ ‘finally’ (line 5) by L implies repeated failures in the past to finding a person who actually likes this panelist.

In this last example, ben voilà is used to mark the location of a person in the audience. The excerpt comes from a radio talk show. At the beginning of the show, the host (L) regularly reads letters that listeners have sent in to the show. In this extract, L reads one of these letters.

FIGURE 5.5

01 L: on m’ appelle brigitte j’aimerais
      they myself call brigitte I would like
      my name is brigitte I would like

02 signaler la présence de mon fils
      to signal the presence of my son
      to inform you of the presence of my son

03 dix-huit ans tristan, .h dans le public
     ten-eight years tristan, .h in the audience
     eighteen years old, tristan .h in the audience

04 aujourd’hui, malgré son âge c’est un
     today, despite his age it’s a
     today, despite his age he’s an

05 fan incontesté de pierre benichou,
     fan undisputed of pierre benichou,
     undisputed fan of pierre benichou,

06 où est tristan dans le public,
     where is tristan in the audience,

07 (0.4)

08 → ah ben voilà [il est là tristan
     oh well here it is [he is there Tristan
In lines 1-5, L reads a letter from a mother in which she notifies the show’s host of the presence of her son Tristan in the audience. In line 6, L searches for the person in question in the audience. In the next line, L marks the location of Tristan by first deploying the change-of-state token (Heritage, 1984) ah, then by uttering ben voilà, then finally by stating that he was indeed in the audience. The pause at the end of line 7 seems to indicate the time that it took L to locate Tristan. His presence in the audience is also indicated by C, a panelist on the show. Once L has identified and located Tristan, he greets him (line 9).

In the last three examples, I have shown how co-participants deploy the composite ben voilà to mark the finding of a person or mark the resolution of interactional problems. In these last three examples we have seen that there was some sort of search going on as the co-participants collaborate to finding the solution. As soon as the solution is found, they utter ben voilà to mark the finding of the solution. The ben voilà is thus placed between the search and the finding of the solution. The use of ben voilà is thus similar to the use of voilà in real object searches, in that they both mark the finding of the element of interest.

In the following sections, I will demonstrate that the utterance of voilà in word searches plays the same exact function as in the above examples. I argue that the cognitive mechanisms of a search for an actual object are the same as the cognitive mechanisms displayed in a word search.
5.4 Analysis of *voilà* in a word search

In the following sections, I will demonstrate how co-participants use *voilà* in word search activities. My analysis will show that they can deploy *voilà* right before the found word, in the middle of the search, or after they have found the word.

5.4.1 *Voilà* prefacing the searched-for word

In this first section, I will analyze the use of *voilà* before the sought-for word is found. The first examples illustrate how speakers recycle part of their utterance after they utter *voilà* and before they complete the projected sentence. This first example is from a national French weekly TV talk show. In this week’s show, one of the invitees (S) is a former presidential election candidate and a former minister in a prior government. In this segment, L and S talk about the current minister of justice, who has been the victim of vicious racist attacks from several people in the country. The incidents had captured the attention of the French people who have expressed their indignation. In reaction to these attack and to honor what the current minister of justice has accomplished over the year, the magazine ELLE, a leading French feminine magazine, has chosen her as the woman of the year. L asked S what she thinks about the choice.

FIGURE 5.6

01 L: vous aussi j’imagine qu’ vous êtes touchée par ce choix?  
   you also I imagine that you are touched by this choice?

02 S: oui, en plus elle l:e mérite, mais au-delà  
   yes, in plus she i:t deserves, but beyond

03 de de son cas personnel, c’est toute une cause,  
   of of his case personal, it’s all a case,
   this this personal case, it’s about a whole cause,
FIGURE 5.6 (cont.)

04  ➔ c’est tout un enjeux, c’est c’est voilà
   it’s all a stake, it’s it’s here it is
   it’s about what is at stake, it’s it’s here it is

05  ((slightly extends hand)) c’est savoir c’que
   it’s to know th’what
   it’s about knowing what

06  c’que c’est vraiment la france,
   th’what it’s really the france,
   what france is really all about,

07  la france n’ est n’ est pas un pays raciste-
   the france not is not is not a country racist-
   france is really not a racist country-

In line 1, L asks S an agreement-seeking question, as evidenced by the use of j’imagine/ ‘I guess’ to indicate that L is expecting an affirmative response to this question. In the next turn, S confirms the question with oui, then goes on to upgrade her answer as she affirms that the person in question deserves the nomination. In lines 2-7, S expands her answer as she explains what this award means beyond the nomination of a single person. In line 3, she starts by listing the bigger implications of this nomination, i.e., what this nomination is all about as she lists what it entails. S uses a listing tone and starts each TCU with c’est/ ‘it’s’ as she cites the implications of this nomination. We notice that in line 3 and 4, S did not have any difficulty completing the c’est -TCUs. However, as she starts her second c’est TCU in line 4, S goes into a word search: She repeats the word twice and stretches the second repetition. Immediately thereafter, she utters voilà and recycles c’est before she completes her TCU (lines 5-6). In line 7, S elaborates even more as she explains what she thinks of her country. We notice here that S did not use voilà after the first two c’est prefaced TCUs (lines 3-4), but the fact that she used voilà after she experienced word formulation difficulties demonstrates that voilà is indeed used to preface the newly found word. This example thus illustrates, unlike the prior three examples, the solution to
a word search. Speakers typically do not use composite *ben voilà* to mark the finding of the word. However, the *voilà*, just like in the prior examples, is positioned between the search and the finding of the sought-for word.

This next extract in this series comes from an interaction between a radio talk show host (L) and S, a casting director for singers who perform in the subways of Paris. In this excerpt, L closes down their conversation as follows:

**FIGURE 5.7**

01 L: on vous souhaite en tout cas un bon casting,
we you wish in all case a good casting,
anyway we wish you a good casting,

02 pa’sque après tout tous ce qui nous écoutent ‘cause after all all that who us listen
‘cause after all our listeners

03 et qui prennent le métro, en feront pour:::
and who take the subway, some will do for:::
who take the subway, will get thei::r

04 ➞ voilà en feront pour leur frais.
here it is some will do for their expense.
here it is will get their money’s worth.

05 c’est eux qui seront eu:h les futurs spectateurs
it’s them who will be u:h the futures audience
they’re the ones who will be the potential audience

06 de vo:s futures chanteurs. [merci m’sieur-
of you:r future singers. [thank you m’ster/sir-
[

07 S: [ah oui, le métro
[oh yeah, the subway

08 c’est quand même plus cinq millions de voyageurs
it’s when same more five millions of travelers
nonetheless it’s more than five million travelers

09 hein, [donc c’est
huh, [so it’s
you know, [so it’s
[
In line 1, L wishes S a good casting and goes on to build his turn as he explains how the success of this casting operation would impact his listeners who take the subway (lines 2-3). Midway through his explanation, L goes into a word search (at the end of line 3). The search is displayed specifically on the word *pour* /‘for’. L extends the word by first adding a schwa\(^32\) (ǝ) then by stretching the vowel he just added. The addition of the schwa increases the number of syllables of the word: *pour* initially is a one syllable word, but with the schwa it is pronounced in two syllables. The extension and the lengthening of the word indicate that L is experiencing difficulties finding the next word. In the next turn, L utters *voilà* then recycles part of his utterance and completes his TCU with falling intonation as he explains that listeners/subway takers will be the first to benefit from this operation (line 4). We notice here that the second *pour* (line 4) is neither lengthened nor stretched. We notice that the words following *voilà* are uttered without any hesitation or any word search-indicating markers. This indicates that *voilà* was used to preface the newly found word. In lines 5-6, L goes on to credit these subway users as the future audience of the future singers before he thanks S for being on his show. Hence, this example is similar to the previous example in that the speaker recycles part of his utterance after

\(^32\) According to Candea (2002), the difference between the *e d’appui* /‘epithetical e’ and the *e d’hésitation* /‘a hesitation marker’ is that the former is a stylistic marker which is usually associated with Parisian French people if it’s added to the previous word (e.g., *bonjour_ǝ*), and the latter functions as a hesitation marker if it is pronounced after the word. In such cases, it is usually transcribed *euh* /‘uh’. Throughout my data, whenever the schwa is pronounced in the same intonation contour of the word it is attached to, and it appears in a word search context, I transcribed it with the ‘epithetical e’/schwa and not the hesitation marker *euh*. It is possible in this specific case (i.e., epithetical e in a word search context) that the schwa may be functioning as a hesitation marker.
voilà, and we can see that the repeat is uttered without any indication of word formulation problems.

The following similar example comes from the same radio talk show. In this extract, the show panelists are discussing the life of Mata Hari, the Dutch courtesan convicted of being a spy. In the following excerpt, the show host (L) asks the other members a question concerning Mata Hari.

FIGURE 5.8

01 L: donc elle a été espionne au service
so she has been spy at the service
so she was a spy in the service

02 de l’ allemagne. c’est ça?
of the germany. it’s that?
of germany. right?

03 I: .h oui, enfin c’est c’qui se dit, il paraît
.h yes, well it’s th’who itself says, it seems
.h yes, well that’s what they say, it seems

04 c’est pas plus prouvé que ça, c’qu’on raconte
it’s not more proven than that, th’th’they tell
that it has never been proven, they also say

05 aussi, c’est qu’ê comme son procès a été un p’tit
also, it’s that as her trial has been a li’l
that her trial has been a little

06 peu::voilà un p’tit peu rapidement expédié,
fe:::w here it is a li’l few quickly expedite,
bis:::t here it is a little bit swiftly expedited,

07 .h son avocat lui avait fait croire que
.h her lawyer her had done to believe that

08 c’était une simulation d’ exécution elle est allée
it was a simulation of execution she is gone
it was a simulation of an execution she went there

09 eu:::h elle est allée se faire exécuter euh m:::-
 u:::h she is gone oneself to do executed uh m:::-
In lines 1-2, L requests confirmation that Mata Hari was a German spy. In the next turn, I answers the question: First she confirms L’s confirmation request, but then goes on to mitigate her answer with an *enfin* / ‘well’ prefaced TCU (lines 3-4). I then elaborates her answer even more as she specifies the condition of Mata Hari’s trial and execution (lines 3-14). She first starts by characterizing her trial, but mid-way through her TCU, she experiences trouble finding her words (lines 4-6). She stretches *peu:* then utters *voilà*, recycles part of her utterance and completes her TCU as she explains how Mata Hari’s trial was expedited swiftly (line 6). In the remaining lines she gives a detailed account of her execution (lines 7-14). In this example as in the previous one, we notice that *voilà* prefaces the newly found word together with some recycled words. Once more, the repeated word is now uttered without any hesitation.

This next example portrays a similar case. The extract comes from a TV documentary about the presidency of the former French president Nicolas Sarkozy. In the documentary,
people who worked in his government testify and talk about their experiences, their failures, successes, etc. In this excerpt, V, one of the former ministers, blames the global crisis for the economic failure in France during Sarkozy’s presidency.

FIGURE 5.9

01 V: la vérité, moi je le pense, si on avait su the truth, me I it think, if we had known
the truth is, I think if we had known

02 que la crise allait être aussi dure that the crisis was going to be as much hard
that the crisis was going to hit us that hard

03 aussi violente, .h qu’elle allait quasiment euh as much violent, .h that she was going virtually uh
that aggressively, .h that it was going to virtually uh

04 fracasser nos banques, nos pme:s, notre to shatter our banks, our sme:s, our
shatter our banks, our small businesse:s, our

05 industrie automobile, euh et j’allais dire
industry motor-car, uh and I was going to say
car industry, uh and dare I say

06 l’Europe, on::: on aurait sans doute the europe, we::: we would have without doubt
Europe, we::: we would’ve certainly

07 été euh plus économies, eu:h au démarrage
been uh more thrifty, u:h at the start
been uh more thrifty, u:h at the beginning

08 du quinquennat, on aurait sans doute
of the five-year term, we would have without doubt
of the five-year term, we would’ve certainly

09 été plus dans la réduction du déficit
been more in the reduction of the deficit
worked on the deficit reduction

10 au début du quinquennat,
at the beginning of the five-year term,
V explains that the Sarkozy government would have done things differently had they known the crisis would be as severe and damaging (lines 1-13). In lines 1-6, V lists the if-clauses, and then in lines 6-14, V explains what they would have done specifically to prevent the economic collapse. V goes into a word search while mentioning the things she would have done differently (lines 11-13). V started the same way when mentioning all the things that they or the government would have done differently: *on aurait sans doute été plus* ‘we would’ve certainly been more’ (lines 6-14) and she did not have any problem completing the TCUs that she started this way, except for the last one in line 11. In this last TCU (line 11), V starts her TCU the same way as she did the previous TCUs but right after *plus* ‘more’, she experiences difficulties retrieving the word that she is looking for: first she repeats *plus*, then she stretches the vowel, lengthens the word with an epithetic schwa (Candea, 2002), and stretches this additional schwa. She then utters *voilà*, recycles *on aurait sans doute*, repeats *sans doute*, and completes the TCU with the newly found missing part as she explains that they would have been more careful (had they been able to assess the magnitude of the crisis). In this example, again the speaker recycles part of her utterance after uttering *voilà* to mark the finding of the solution.

The last example of this section shows that speakers do not necessarily recycle previously uttered words after *voilà*. The excerpt comes from a TV documentary about the former French
president Nicolas Sarkozy. In this segment T, a former adviser of the former president, speaks about one of Sarkozy’s personality traits.

FIGURE 5.10

01 T: il est fabriqué comme ça.
he is fabricated like that.
that’s how he’s built.

02 il faut qu’il s’automotive, donc
it must that he himself self-motivate, so
he has to self-motivate, so

03 il faut qu’il se donne entièrement
it must that he himself give entirely
he has to commit himself entirely

04 eu::h voilà à sa nouvelle vie, qu’il
u::h here it is to his new life, that he
u::h here it is to his new life, that he

05 vive dans le présent au maximum,-
live in the present at the maximum,-
lives in the present to the to the full extent-

As we can observe, after a stretched hesitation marker in line 4, T utters voilà before he completes the projected utterance before voilà.

In this section, I have shown how voilà is used to preface an upcoming word search resolution. We have seen that upon finding the searched-for word, speakers typically utter voilà then recycle part of their utterance without any hesitation markers before they complete the projected turn. The last example shows that speaker can also complete the projected utterance right after voilà. In the prior section my analyses have shown that speakers utter ben voilà to mark the finding of the person of interest or to mark the resolution of interactional problems. Therefore, even though in both situations a prior search is involved, the practice of a word search is different from the practice of a search for a real object or person. In the next section, I will analyze data examples in which voilà is uttered after the just-found word.
5.4.2 *Voilà* after the finding of the searched word

In this section, I will show how speakers use *voilà* to mark the newly found word after that word has been uttered. In the first example, the guest of the radio talk show is D, an author of a book about the lives of some famous/infamous dictators’ wives. Right before this extract, the host (L) tells the author that she may have to write a third volume to include all remaining dictators’ wives. The author (D) explains that this is the second and last volume on the subject matter. The extract begins with L trying to provide a name of a person who he thinks could/should have been in the book, but then L cannot remember her name.

FIGURE 5.11

1 L: par exemple la femme euh euh de- de- euh
   for example the wife uh uh of- of- uh

2 du: chef d’état,
   of the: head of state,

3 son nom m’échappe d’un seul coup
   her name me escape of a sole sudden
   all of a sudden I can’t remember her name

4 .h euh asma al-assad,
   .h uh asma al-assad,
   .h uh asma al-assad,

5 D: ouai:s.
   yea:h.

6 L: voilà= ça y est= ça me revient.
   here it is=that there is = it to me come back.
   here it is=that’s it=I remember now.

7 L: .h on la voit partout en ce moment
   .h we her see everywhere in this moment
   .h we’re seeing her everywhere lately

8 dans dans tous les journaux,
   in in all the newspapers,

9 D: on la voit partout [parce qu’ils ont-
   we her see everywhere[because they have-
FIGURE 5.11 (cont.)

we see her everywhere because they-

10 L: [la-la rose la rose du desert]
[the-the rose the rose of the desert]

11 [on l’appelle.
[they her call.]
[they call her.]

12 D: [oui parce qu’ils ont voulu nous la montrer
[yes because they have wanted us her show
[yes because they wanted us to see her]

In lines 1-2, L begins to identify the person in question in reference to her spouse. After de we normally expect a name, but in this case it’s not clear if L in line 1 was trying to identify the spouse in question by his name or his title. In any case, he ends up identifying him by his title in line 2. In line 3, L comments on the fact that he cannot remember the name of the wife. He then retrieves the name in the next line. In line 5 D receipts the name minimally. In line 6, L utters voilà and goes on to state that the name he provides was actually the name he was looking for. Once more here the comments following voilà in line 6, ça y est ça me revient/ ‘that’s it, I remember now’, function as a postmortem (Schegloff, 2007). In the remainder of the turns, once L has identifies the person in question, he goes on making statements concerning her and her popularity (lines 7-8 and lines 10-11). Here once more, voilà clearly marks the fact that L has found the name he was looking for. The latched comments after voilà also confirmed this function of voilà (line 6). The utterance of voilà also marks the end of the search activity: once L and D had established the identity of the person in question, they went on to discuss her. This example thus illustrates the marking of the sought-for word. Put differently, the speaker utters voilà after he retrieves the word he was looking for. The voilà thus does not preface the solution but marks the finding of the solution.
This next example shows the searched-for word/name can also be provided by the recipients. In this excerpt, the radio show panelists remember a recently deceased longtime audio visual/TV personality. This leads them to talk about other older TV personalities and to wonder whether they are still alive. In this excerpt L, the show host, recalls two brothers but cannot remember their names.

FIGURE 5.12

01 L: comment s’ appelaient les frères,
how themselves were calling the brothers,
what were the names of the brothers,

02 vous savez, chais pas si vous vous [souvez-
you know, know not if you you [remem-
you know, do not know if you you [remem-

03 P:                             [les frères roulant non?
[the brothers roulant no?
[the roulant brothers no?

04 L: non les frères roulant, on sait qu’ il y en
no the brothers roulant, we know that it there some
no the roulant brothers, we know that one of them,

05 a un, hélas qui n’ est plus [assez jeune,
has one, unfortunately who not is no more [enough young,
unfortunately is not [quite young anymore,

06 B:                             [les frères bogdanoff?
[the brothers bogdanoff?
[the bogdanoff brothers?

07 P:  (                     )?

08 L: mais jean pierre roulant est toujours là
but jean pierre roulant is always there
but jean pierre roulant is still alive

09 L: non, les frères qui arbitraient à jeux
no, the brothers who used to referee at games
no, the brothers who used to be judges at games

10 sans frontières,
without frontiers,
[
In lines 1-2, L asks the panelists for the names of “the two brothers”. In line 3, P, one of the panelists, proposes a possible name with rising intonation. L rejects the proposition (lines 4-5 and line 8) in overlap with another suggestion by B. L goes on to describe the brothers in question by their occupation (lines 9-10). In line 11 B, another panelist, suggests an additional set of names with falling intonation after a change-of-state-token (Heritage, 1984) which indicates that the prior turn was informative. Finally L accepts the names with voilà in line 12 to mark the accuracy of the information provided by B. The ratification with voilà shows that L has just as much epistemic authority over the information (i.e., the brothers’ names). Once more voilà comes after the sought-for word to indicate the finding of these specific names. In the rest of their conversation, the panelists talked more about these two people they just identified (not shown in the transcript). In any case, as in the previous example the voilà closes off the search activity.

The last example in this section illustrates a similar case. In this example, the panelists reminisce about classes they had to take in high school. The host (L) remembers one particular class that he really did not care for, but he cannot remember the name of the course.
FIGURE 5.13 (cont.)

where we had to study

03 un moulin à café?
a grinder to coffee?
a coffee grinder?

04 Y: (     )?

05 C: heh heh heh

06 T: où on étudiait un moulin à café,
where one was studying a grinder to coffee,
where we had to study a coffee grinder,

07 B: (       )

08 M: ça s’appelle l’expresso. ((laughing voice))
that itself call the espresso.
it’s called the espresso.

09 C: tu étudiais un moul-
you were st(h)udying a grin-
you st(h)ied a coffee grin-

10 attends excusez-nous,
wait excuse-us,
wait a minute you’ll have to excuse us,

11 B: [(          )

12 T: [t’ es sûr t’ es pas allé dans une école spé-
you are sure you are not went in a school spe-
are you sure you did not go to a specialized schoo-

13 S: ah technologie.
    oh technology.

14 T: t’ es pas [allé-
you are not [went-
you did not [go-

⇒ 15 L: [[technologie. ((M laughs)) voilà. on a tous-
[technology. that’s it. we has all-
[technology. that’s it. we all have-

16 C: tu as étudié le moulin à café?
you have studied the grinder to coffee?
In lines 1-3, L asks his co-hosts for the name of the specific course in which he studied a coffee grinder, to use his expression. However, it seems that this specific course was not familiar to the panelists. In fact most of them are rather amused or puzzled by the question. For instance, both T (lines 6, 12 and 14) and C (lines 9-10) seem to be engaged in some sort of other-initiated repair. As for M, she provides a rather humoristic response, which indicates she was not really engaged in the search (line 8). In the meantime, in line 13 S provides a possible answer with falling intonation prefaced with a change-of-state token (Heritage, 1984). Then in line 15, by first repeating the word L indicates an epistemic authority over the proposed word (Heritage & Raymond, 2012). Then and only then does L accept the word as the one that he was looking for by uttering voilà. Once L closes the search activity with voilà, he then addresses the question by C concerning this specific course (lines 16-17).

In this section thus, I have shown how speakers use voilà to mark the finding of the sought-for word and to simultaneously close the whole search activity. The missing part can be found by either the speakers themselves or the recipients. In any case, the voilà is uttered by the speakers and never by the recipients. When speakers utter voilà after they have found the missing word themselves, they mark the finding of the word. However, when the word is found by recipients, by uttering voilà the speakers not only accept the proposed word but they also claim a higher epistemic authority over the subject matter. This claim of entitlement is even more heightened if the speakers repeat the proposed answer before uttering voilà.
With *voilà*, speakers also close the whole search activity. This finding also corroborates the findings of Bruxelles & Traverso (2006), who observed that *voilà* closed off the search activity. Recall that once the architects in my data located the room in question, they went on to check if the room had windows. Hence there is a similarity between the utterance of *voilà* after the sought-for word is found, and the utterance of *ben voilà* or *voilà* after the object or the person of interest is found. As a matter of fact, it happens that speakers produce a postmortem (Schegloff, 2007) after they have closed the search activity (i.e., example 5.4 and example 5.11). By definition, a postmortem can only come after a closed action (Schegloff, 2007).

This practice is thus different from when speakers preface the newly found word with *voilà*. In the following section, I will analyze the function of *voilà* in the middle of an ongoing search.

5.4.3  *Voilà* in the middle of a word search

In this section, I will analyze examples in which *voilà* occurs in the middle of a search. The *voilà* in such cases does not preface the searched-for word, at least not immediately after *voilà*. In addition, as my analyses will show, the searched-for word may or may not be found at the end of the projected utterance. In any case, it seems that speakers use *voilà* as a sort of delaying device for the yet-to-be-found word.

This first data excerpt is from a weekly French public TV show called *Vivement dimanche*, which is hosted by M, a popular French host. The guest is A, a stand-up comedian who incidentally also happens to work for *Vivement dimanche*. Guest A has had a successful career as a comedian for quite some time, but she has become even more popular ever since she began appearing on this specific show. In this show, two of her friends and fellow comedians, L
and MB, were also invited to participate. In this extract, M talks with L. Right before the extract, M reminds the audience that L and A have known each other for a long time from having worked together on a radio comedy show.

FIGURE 5.14

The guests are seated on the semicircular red couches: the host (M) is seated on the middle couch, while A and L are seated to the right of M. The extract begins with M asking L if he is surprised by the current popularity of his friend and colleague A.

FIGURE 5.15

01 M: et le succès éclatant qu’elle a cette année, and the success dazzling that she has this year, and the impressive success she’s having this year,

02 qu’elle va avoir (.). maint’nant, ne vous étonne pas. that she goes have (.). now, not you surprise not. that she’s going to have (.). now, doesn’t surprise you.

03 L: non pas du tout il est totalement justifié no=not of the all it is totally justified no=not at all it’s well deserved

04 euh évidemment la télévision particulièrement votre émission uh evidently the television particularly your show uh obviously television in particular your show

05 c’est euh- ((gestures with hands)) c’est it’s uh-

06 une sorte ((gaze away)) de de- voilà de de- a kind of of- of- here it is of- of-
In lines 1-2, M inquires whether L is surprised by A’s success. The falling intonation at the end of the TCU indicates that this is more like a confirmation-seeking inquiry than a yes/no question. In line 3, L answers M’s question by giving the preferred answer (i.e., confirmation of the question), and then rushes through to upgrade his answer. L then addresses A’s current success on TV (line 4). As he starts to explain the impact of TV on A’s career, he begins a word search for the right descriptor (line 5). Right after c’est/‘it’s’ (line 5), L moves his hands in repeated fast back and forth motions as if to indicate the amplification or acceleration of something. (FIGURE 5.16 and 5.17)

L also removes his gaze from M (the host) who was sitting right in front of him, by turning his head toward the left (Figure 5.16), then bringing it back slightly to the right and
gazing downward (Figure 5.17). The addition of *c’est une sorte de* ‘it’s a kind of’ (lines 5-6) helps to specify or narrow the domain of the searched-for word; given the syntactic constraints of this phrase, L indicates that the searched-for word is a noun. L is still not able to find the word, and the search continues with him repeating *de- de* followed by *voilà* (line 6) (Figure 5.18). This is followed by another search as indicated by the repetition of *de- de* (Figure 5.19).

![FIGURE 5.18 “voilà” (gaze downward)](image)

In line 7, L finally gazes up towards the recipient and utters the searched-for word *accélérateur* (Figure 3.20) followed by another brief search repetition of *de*, before completing the whole TCU by uttering the last missing word *notoriété*.

![FIGURE 5.19 “de- de” the search continues continues after voilà (gaze downward)](image)  ![FIGURE 5.20 “d’accélérateur” (gaze upward)](image)

While he utters the word *accélérateur*, we notice that L is not only gazing toward the recipient, but that his gesture changes; *accélérateur* is now accompanied by what I would call,
for lack of a better term, a presenting-the-searched-for-word gesture by putting his hands forward as if to offer the newly found word (Figure 5.20). The stress on the first two syllables of *accélérateur* also shows L’s excitement at having found the searched-for word. Thus in line 7, L finishes what he started doing in line 4, which is to talk about the impact of television on A’s career.

Lines 5-7 are of core interest. *Voilà* appears here right in the middle of the search. In other words, the searched-for word is not found immediately after *voilà* and thus here it does not preface the searched-for word. However, by uttering *voilà* in the middle of the search, L indicates to the co-participants that he is still engaged in the search and that the searched-for word is on its way to being found. In so doing, he is also requesting to keep the turn through using *voilà* as a delaying device.

We also notice that the search indicators deployed by L before and after *voilà* are exactly the same. L repeats *de* before and after *voilà*. This is an indication that L’s search did not advance after *voilà*, but it does not mean that he is abandoning the search; rather, it seems that he is communicating to the co-participants that even though he is still deploying the same search indicators, he wants the recipients to keep attending to his search.

In addition, during the whole search and including the utterance of *voilà*, L averts his gaze from the host and from all the other participants in the interaction; for this reason, this search seems to have been framed as a solitary activity (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Hayashi, 2003) that does not solicit help. However, even if it is a solitary activity, the listeners orient to L’s search by gazing in his direction. Furthermore, L does not stop gesturing when uttering *voilà*,

---

33 It is not clear if speakers display the same embodied actions when they preface the newly found word with *voilà*. A larger data corpus would clarify this question.
reinforcing the idea communicated by the gesture that the searched-for word is in the projection space (Schegloff, 1984; Streeck, 1995).

This next example bears some similarity to the previous one. The extract comes from the same TV documentary about the presidency of the former French president Nicolas Sarkozy. In this extract, one of his ministers (V) talks about the personality of the former president.

FIGURE 5.21

1 V: je pense qu’i (.) il est plus froid d’abord,  
   I think that (.) he is more cold first,  
   I think that (.) he is rather cold at first,

2 il a plus du mal â à  
   he has more of the difficulty to to  
   he doesn’t know how to to show

3 donner des marques de:: d’ affection,  
   to give some marks of:: of affection,  
   signs of:: of affection,

4 mais en réalité je pensais que  
   but in reality I was thinking that  
   but in fact I was under the impression that

5 nicolas sarkozy c’était p- c’était quelqu’un  
   nicolas sarkozy it was m- it was someone  
   nicolas sarkozy was m- was someone

6 de vraiment ((frowning face))  
   of really  
   really

7 très très très ((eye gaze down and away the from interlocutor))  
   very very very

8 ➔ voilà ((creaky voice))  
   ..hhh chais pas comment le dire  
   here it is ((creaky voice))  
   ..hhh don’ know how it to say  
   here it is uh ((creaky voice))  
   ..hhh don’ know how to say it

9 ((eye gaze upward)) *très du:r,* ((*frowning face*))  
   very ha:rd,  
   very seve:re,
In lines 1-9, V explains that she was under the impression that the former president was a rather cold and austere personality. According to V, this was a false impression as she now states that he is actually a person who is capable of showing affection (lines 10-11).

Lines 5-9 are of interest. While expressing her impression of the president, V goes into a search as she struggles to find the accurate descriptor. The search begins with the embodied action, specifically a frowning face as she utters the word *vraiment* / ‘really’ (Figure 5.22) (line 6). She then repeats *très* three times. We notice that the last repetition is uttered with an addition of a schwa (ə) (Candea, 2002) (line 7). Then she gazes downward and away from the interlocutor as she utters *voilà* in a creaky voice (figure 5.23) (line 8). However, after *voilà* V does not present the found word, but rather admits she still did not find the right word (figure
5.24). Finally in line 9, V gazes upward\(^3^4\) and recycles part of her previous utterance (i.e., \textit{très}) before she adds the missing word (i.e., \textit{du\:r}) as she frowns at the same time (figure 5.25).

![Figure 5.24](image1.png)  
**“Chais pas comment le dire”**  
((pulled back face/chin and averted gaze))

![Figure 5.25](image2.png)  
**“très du\:r”**  
((gaze upward with a frowning face))

The stretching in \textit{du\:r}, followed by the slightly rising intonation, indicates that V is not done describing the personality traits of the former president and is about to add more characterizing adjectives. This is confirmed in line 10, as she again recycles the adverb \textit{très}, which she repeats twice indicating that she is now engaged in a new word search. But instead of completing the projected sentence with the missing adjective, V abandons the search to go on negating her prior impression of the former president, before stating her current impression of him (lines 10-11). By presenting this new characterization as the current one, V implies thus that she had previously mischaracterized the former president.

Once more in this example, \textit{voilà} is uttered in the middle of a search. Just like in the previous example, in this example the speaker has displayed embodied actions during the search and while presenting the resolution. However, unlike the previous example, in this example the search indicators displayed before and after \textit{voilà} are not exactly the same. Before the utterance of \textit{voilà} V has repeated the adverb \textit{très} three times. This indicates that the projected word is most

\(^3^4\) Presumably V is gazing toward the interlocutor; however the screen shot/video data does not show the person in front of her.
likely a characterizing adjective. After *voilà* V states where she is at in the ongoing search as she indicates she “doesn’t know how to *say it*” yet. This statement shows that V has some sort of semantic representation of the searched-for word but cannot yet verbalize it. Moreover, as she made this statement, V still had her gaze averted from the interlocutor, which indicates that the statement is rather self-addressed and not uttered to the attention of the recipients. In other words, with this statement she is not asking for the recipient’s help, but rather this statement is asking the recipients to keep attending to the ongoing search. Hence, V is using *voilà* mostly as a delaying device. However, unlike the speaker in the previous example who did not display any indication of advancement in the search after *voilà*, in this example V was able to display her progression in the ongoing search activity by precisely updating the recipients on its progress.

We also notice here that V displayed the exact same embodied action (i.e., frowning face) at the initial phase of the search and as she uttered the found word (i.e., *très duːr*). This indicates that the gesture has indeed preceded the verbalization of the word (Goodwin, 1983, Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986, Streeck, 1995).

In the next example, the speaker uses *voilà* in the middle of the search, but mid-way through the search he abandons the syntactically projected sentence. The extract comes from a radio show which is also broadcast with a live video-feed on the internet. In this show, the host G interviews a veteran French singer (M). Before the following extract, G and M had talked about the news of another French singer retiring from touring. Then G had asked M if he too thinks about retiring one day. M jokingly answers that his friend is retiring because he’s tired of eating the same hotel food, implying he was tired of the monotony that comes with touring. After they both laugh about the remark, G picks up on it to talk about touring habits.
FIGURE 5.26

M is on the left and facing G (the host).

FIGURE 5.27

1 G: c’est ce que je vous disais
   it’s this that I you was saying
   that’s what I was telling you

2 tout à l’heure, c’est à dire que
   all at the hour, it’s at to say that
   earlier, that is to say

3 à un moment donné, cette vie de
   at a moment given, this life of
   at some point, this life of

4 ➜ (*0.5*) voilà de de .hh euh sur les routes,
   (0.5) here it is of of .hh uh on the road,
   (0.5) here it is of of .hh uh the road life,
   (*circular motion with right hand upright, gaze averted*)

5 on peut, aussi, lass[er. ((gaze toward interlocutor))
   one can, also, to we[ary.
   can, also:, wear you [down]
   []

6 M: [ah::: ben [c’est-à- dire
   [oh::: well [it’s at to say
   [oh::: well [I mean
   [

7 G: [quand on fait ça depuis
   [when one does that since
   [when you’ve been doing that

8 quarante-cinq ans.
   forty five years.
   for forty five years.
9 M: c’est-à-dire que oui, on connaît les hôtels. it’s at to say that yes, one knows the hotels. in other words yes, we know the hotels.

In lines 1-2, G recalls their earlier conversation and starts to elaborate on what he meant to say. Then after à un moment donné cette vie de/‘at some point this life of’ he produces a circular motion gesture with his upright right hand as he utters voilà while his gaze is turned away from the interlocutor (lines 3-4) (figure 5.28 and 5.29).

After the utterance of voilà, G keeps on searching as he repeats de three times followed by a hesitation marker (line 4). The projected talk after à un moment donné cette vie de is normally a noun, but instead of completing the projected sentence with the missing noun, G abandons the projection to start a new projection with sur les routes (line 4). In line 5, after some additional searches G completes this newly projected utterance and presents this newly found word with his gaze toward the interlocutor (figure 5.30).
In this example just like in the two previous cases, the speaker displayed embodied actions during the search. In the segment, G and M were discussing touring and the effect of long time touring on singers, hence G’s circular motion with his right hand may have some sort of semantic association with the subject matter. However, unlike in the previous two examples, in this case the speaker did not complete the projected sentence. Therefore, we do not know exactly what was represented in the gesture.

Nevertheless, by the time he utters voilà G was still very much engaged in finding the projected word (i.e., the noun). Therefore, by saying voilà G communicates to the recipients that the projected word is on the way to being found. Just like in the previous two examples, the fact that G’s gaze was averted from the co-participant as he says voilà indicates that he is not soliciting the recipient’s help. The search as projected is only abandoned after additional search indicators after voilà. This example shows thus that the utterance of voilà during the search indicates first and foremost the speaker’s state of mind as they are engaged in the ongoing search. Put differently, voilà does not necessarily guarantee the finding of the sought-for word, but rather by saying voilà, speakers keep the search activity relevant and indicate that it is worthwhile to pursue it. Voilà in the middle of a search is thus used mainly as delaying device.
This last example shows that the sought-for word can be found by the recipients. In this extract of the radio show, the host (L) greets two listeners-contestants, and as he usually does, he asks them a few informational questions. Before he asked the questions, L also has to tell them what the winning prize is and has to advertise the company offering the gift. In the middle of the advertisement, L goes into a word search as he tries to find the right word defining the vacation that the contestants have a chance of winning. Right before the extract, there was an inserted sequence involving funny exchanges between two of the panelists. The extract begins with L still laughing.

FIGURE 5.31

1  L: ha ha ha ha ha .h pierre en tout cas
   ha ha ha ha ha .h pierre in all case
   ha ha ha ha ha .h pierre anyway

2  vous allez affronter ((laughter in the back ground continues))
   you go face
   you’re going to face

3  elizabeth pour[remporter peut-être(.)un séjour
   elizabeth to [win maybe (.).a sojourn
   [  
4   P:           [oui.
   [yes.

5  L: au chalet hôtel kaya:, c’est dans la vallée des belleville
   at the chalet hotel kaya:, it’s in the valley of (the) belleville

6  bref, vous l’avez compris, (.). une petites::
   in short, you it have understood, (.). a little::
   in short, you know what I mean, (.). a little::

7  ⇒ voilà, une petites:::
   here it is, a little:::

8  C:           [escapade?
   [get away?

9  M: [escapade?
   [get away?
FIGURE 5.31 (cont.)

10 L: [escapade.[merci je cherchais le mot, euh à la nei:ge.  
[get away.[thank you I was looking the word, uh at the sno:w.  
[get away.[thank you I was looking for the word, uh in the sno:w.

11 C: [°bon:.°  
[°goo:d.°

12 L: un accès privilégié vers le domaine skia:ble.(.)  
a access privileged toward the domain ski:ble. (.)  
a privileged access of the ski area. (.)

13 P: [h-  

14 [trois double vé hôtel kaya point com pour tout savoi:r  
[three double v hotel kaya dot com to all know  
[double u double u double u hotel kaya dot com to learn more

15 sur cet accès privilégié en savoie, au chalet hôtel, kaya.  
on this access privileged in savoie, at the chalet hotel, kaya.  
about this privileged access in savoie, at the chalet hotel, kaya.

In lines 1-5, L explains to the two contestants what one of them will be winning. In line 6, L begins to summarize his previous turns. But right after he utters petite he experiences difficulties retrieving the following word, more specifically the following noun. He first adds a schwa at the end of petite, then stretches this epithetical schwa (Candea, 2002), then utters voilà before he recycles une petite (line 7). In line 8 C, one of the panelists, offers a possible noun. In the next turn (line 10), L first accepts the word as he repeats it, thereby claiming epistemic authority over the word, then thanks the recipient for providing the word he was looking for before he carries on with the details of the winning prize that he had started earlier (lines 10-15).

In this example just like in the previous ones, voilà was uttered in the middle of a search. As in the example 5.15, in this example the search indicators before and after voilà are exactly the same. Therefore, even though L has not advanced in his search, by uttering voilà he indicates that the searched for item is on the way to being found and asks the receipts to keep attending to
the ongoing search. However, unlike in the previous examples, in this case the projected and searched-for item was found by one of the recipients and not by the speaker.

Since this is an audio data example, we do not know if the speaker displayed any embodied actions seeking any help from the recipients. That said, L’s turn design may have favored and encouraged recipients’ participation. In line 6 L was actually in the middle of giving what looks like an upshot or a summary of his previous talk. This prior talk was thus available to recipients as well, who may have been thus indirectly invited to participate in this particular search process. In any case, this example also shows that recipients have recognized voilà, by virtue of its position, as a search indicator as well.

In short, in this section I have demonstrated that speakers use voilà to preface the newly found word, to mark the just found word, or as a sort of delaying device in the middle of a search. In the latter case, my analyses have shown that speakers may either end up finding the missing lexical item, they may be helped by recipients to find the word, or they may abandon the projected sentence and start a new projection. In any case, voilà is always uttered by the speaker and never the recipient. In the next section, I will summarize and discuss the findings.

5.5 Summary of findings and discussion

In this chapter, I started out by reviewing the use of voilà in searches involving real objects (Bruxelles & Traverso, 2006). Then I showed the similarities with the use of ben voilà in searches of real persons and in the resolution of interactional problems from my own data. Both ben voilà and voilà seem to accomplish the same action, i.e., they mark the finding of the resolution. This practice is similar to the use of voilà after a sought-for word is found. In such cases, co-participants use voilà or ben voilà to close off the search activity and move on to the
next sequential action. In fact, the use of postmortems (Schegloff, 2007) in examples 5.4 and 5.11 confirms that the previous action was closed. According to Schegloff (2007: 143), postmortems do not extend the prior sequence, but simply make some sort of commentary on the just closed action.

In addition to using *voilà* to mark the just found word, I have demonstrated that *voilà* in word search activities can also preface the newly found word, or serve as a delaying device for the upcoming sought for word. When *voilà* functions as the-presenter-of-the-newly-found-word, speakers are responsible for the finding of the word. Typically, before presenting the newly found word, speakers recycle part of their prior utterances after uttering *voilà* (e.g., example 5.6 and 5.7), but they can also directly present the newly found word after *voilà* (e.g., example 5.9).

My data corpus of this section is mainly audio data; therefore I could not establish any systematic pattern of speakers’ embodied actions when they preface the newly found word with *voilà*. A larger video data corpus would yield more promising results in regard to this question. However, in my entire data corpus, whenever speakers produce the newly found word right after *voilà*, they seem to indicate that by the time they utter *voilà* they have already retrieved the missing element. Hence the *voilà* indicates that it is ready to be uttered. However, whenever speakers use *voilà* and do not present the sought-for word, they are then using *voilà* as a delaying device.

My analyses have thus shown that besides using *voilà* to preface the newly found word and to mark the finding of the new word, speakers can also utter *voilà* as a delaying device in the middle of their search. In other words, the search continues before and after the utterance of *voilà*. Speakers may recycle the exact same utterance before and after *voilà*, as in example 5.15, or they may display a variety of other hesitation markers before and after *voilà* (e.g., example 5.21).
When speakers recycle part of their talk in the middle of a search, the recycled talk is not immediately followed by the newly found word, unlike the cases discussed in the previous paragraph. The question is then: what is the function of voilà in such a position?

Since voilà is used to preface a newly found word as well as to mark the finding of a word, then when it is uttered in between these two positions, it clearly indicates that it functions as some sort of search indicator device. Moreover, the gestures before, during and after voilà corroborate this remark. For example V’s frowning face (i.e., example 5.21) which she displayed before voilà clearly “shares a semantic profile” (Streeck, 1995: 100) with the found word (i.e., très dur). Therefore, by uttering voilà in the middle of the search, speakers communicate to recipients that they are still working on the search. Moreover, when speakers uttered voilà in the middle of their search, their eyes were systematically averted from the interlocutors. Hence by framing the search thus far as a solitary activity (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986), speakers show their commitment to finding the sought-for word without the help of recipients.

In short, by uttering voilà speakers indicate that the yet-to-be-found word is in the projection space (Schegloff, 1984; Streeck, 1995). According to Hanks (1990, 1992) “Not only is the speaking ‘ego’ a social construction, but the act of deictic reference is in important ways grounded on the relation between interlocutors. When speakers say ‘Here it is’, he or she unavoidably conveys something like, ‘Hey, you and I stand in a certain relation to each other and to this object and this place, right now’ […]” (Hanks, 1990: 7- 8). Thus according to Hanks (1992), a spatial deictic involves a relation between the referent or the spatial location (“figure”) (Hanks, 1992: 61) and the “indexical framework” (Hanks, 1992:51), that is the “origo” (Hanks, 1992: 51) (e.g., the speaker, the hearer) relative to which the location is identified (“ground”)
(Hanks, 1992:61). I argue that it is specifically the spatial deictic feature of *voilà* that plays a part in the activity of a word search.

However, *voilà* in the middle of a search activity is not deployed to point out a specific location or to present a linguistic or a non-linguistic referent, since by virtue of the kind of activity speakers are engaged in, they cannot actually point out or present the missing element. Nonetheless, by directing recipients’ attention to a specific space where the yet-to-be-found-missing-element resides, speakers manage to create a common space to which both speakers and recipients can attend. Thus, *voilà* is used to point out the projected space where the missing element cannot be pinpointed and verbalized just yet.

In this sense, we may be tempted to label *voilà* a place holder for the missing element. However, a place holder is a lexical item that contributes to the syntactic structure of the unfolding sentence (Hayashi & Yoon, 2006). If we adopt this definition then *voilà* would not be defined as a place holder because *voilà* is not referential. Nevertheless, just like demonstrative place holders, *voilà* shows the indexability and projectability of the searched-for word and projects the upcoming resolution of the search. Hence we can claim that *voilà* semantically holds the place for the upcoming and to-be-found word. In this sense, *voilà* is more than a mere filler or hesitation marker.

A word search is always about the next item due, so when speakers use *voilà* to present the newly found word, it is obviously the forward looking and presentative (Porhiel, 2012) feature of *voilà* that plays a part. But by definition before presenting the newly found word, speakers have to first close the search phase of the activity. Thus, when presenting the sought-for word, *voilà* is necessarily positioned at a transitional space between the “searching” and “finding” space of the whole activity. When speakers recycle part of their talk after *voilà*, we notice that
the recycled talk is uttered without any hesitation markers. When speakers use voilà as a delaying device, they project the yet to be found item in the projection space. Finally, when speakers utter voilà after the word is found, they clearly mark not only the finding of the word, but they also close the whole search sequence and go on to the next activity, as discussed earlier. In any case, it seems it is definitely the spatial-deictic feature of voilà that is at play in all circumstances (Bergen & Plauché, 2001, 2005).

To conclude, whether it is to present a newly found word, to mark a just found word or to update co-participants on the status of an ongoing search, voilà is always uttered by speakers and never by recipients, even when the latter are responsible for finding the missing word. Therefore voilà is mainly a word search framing device used by speakers, as they deploy it to manage and organize their action before, during and after this word formulation activity.
Chapter 6: Conclusion

The objective of this study was to analyze the use and function of the discourse particle *voilà* in naturally occurring interaction. I started out by presenting my research methodology and my reasons for choosing it. I then reviewed prior research on *voilà*. In the subsequent chapters, I have shown how the same marker (i.e., *voilà*) can perform multiple functions depending on its sequential position in the ongoing conversation.

My literature review chapter showed that the definition, classification, and categorization of *voilà* has always been challenging for traditional and prescriptive grammarians. For Moignet (1969), for instance, *voilà* is an impersonal and existential verb. Morin (1985) and Hug (1995) argued that *voilà* is first and foremost a subjectless verb. Porhiel (2012) on the other hand claims that only a pragmatic approach which includes not only a morphosyntactic, but also a textual/discursive perspective would yield a more complete picture of *voilà*, while according to Léard (1992) any attempt to classify *voilà* in just one category will only bring out its defective value. Thus for Léard (1992), *voilà’s* classification depends on the context and the structure in which it occurs. On the other hand, Bergen and Plauché (2001, 2005) claim that *voilà* should not be characterized in terms of category or classification, but rather in terms of its central semantic meaning. Bergen and Plauché argue that the central sense of *voilà* is spatial. They further claim that all the other meanings derive from this central meaning, especially the functions of *voilà* in discourse.

Bergen & Plauché (2001) analyzed the central sense of *voilà* through what Lakoff (1987) calls an “Idealized Cognitive Model (ICM)” which involves “Pointing Out”. We recall here the

“It is assumed as a background that some entity exists and is present at some location in the speaker’s visual field, that the speaker is directing his attention at it, and that the hearer is interested in its whereabouts but does not have his attention focused on it and may not even know that it is present. The speaker then directs the hearer’s attention to the location of the entity (perhaps accompanied by a pointing gesture) and brings it to the hearer’s attention that the entity is at the specified location . . .”

This description is closely related to voilà’s literal meaning, since voil/ ‘see’ gets one’s attention, and the adverb là/ ‘here/there’ directs the co-participants’ attention to a specific location (Bergen & Plauché, 2001). As the analyses in all three analytic chapters of this dissertation show, the use of voilà can be traced back specifically to its deictic spatial character.

In chapter one, I analyzed data examples illustrating speakers’ use of voilà in closings. When speakers deploy voilà to close one action and open the next one, they actually refer back to the previous discourse anaphorically and make a statement in reference to it. In other words, they communicate “I have nothing more to add to the previous talk” or “I don’t wish/need to add anything more to the previous talk”, thereby indicating their readiness to open the next action. Voilà is also used by recipients in second pair parts (SPP) of adjacency pairs (AP). In this case, recipients use voilà as an agreement marker over matters for which they have higher epistemic authority (Heritage & Raymond, 2012). When recipients agree with a prior speaker with voilà, they refer back to speakers’ prior talk and communicate “I could have said what you just said” (Heddesheimer 1974 cited in Delahaie, 2009b: 24).
In chapter two, I demonstrated that when speakers use *voilà* or composite *voilà* in the middle of their turn, they use them to link the previous talk to an upcoming upshot. In other words, when speakers use *voilà* to present an upshot, they systematically make reference to the prior talk. Despite what traditional grammarians advocate, in all my data examples it is *voilà* and not *voici* that was used to present the upcoming utterance. I specifically explored the interactional value of *voilà* that is lacking in *voici*. My finding corroborates Delahaie’s (2008: 313), who observed that only *voilà* has the capacity to be anaphoric and cataphoric at the same time. In this chapter, I also demonstrated that speakers can also use *voilà* to present and project hypothetical discourse in an imaginary and fictitious world.

In chapter three, I showed how speakers use *voilà* to frame a word search activity as they deploy it before, during and after the search activity. My analyses demonstrated that when speakers deploy *voilà* to preface the newly found word, they do so to present the newly found word. When they utter *voilà* after the searched-for word is found, they mark the finding of the searched-for word and the end of the search activity. Finally, when they pronounce *voilà* in the middle of the search, speakers use it as a delaying device until the sought-for word is found. In all situations, *voilà* is either used to look forward and project the to-be-found word, to look backward to mark the just found word, or to present the newly found word. My analyses have also shown that that the use of *voilà* differs in object/person searches and in word searches. In my data, *voilà* was systematically uttered after the objects/persons in question were found, and served to mark the finding of the object/person. On the other hand, the use and position of *voilà* in word searches varies depending on whether the word in question is still being searched for or has already been found.
Some of my data examples also showed that in some cases when speakers use composite voilà or when voilà is combined with another discourse marker, the actions seem to be performed mainly by the additional discourse marker and not necessarily by voilà. In such cases, voilà is used to present and thereby highlight the upcoming utterances. Similarly, I showed that when speakers use the composite voilà, c’est tout (literally ‘that’s all’) in closing argumentative talk, the action of closing is performed by c’est tout and not necessarily by voilà.

All of these observations lead to the conclusion that voilà’s first and foremost function in interaction is to shift orientation. Specifically, voilà looks backward and forward at the same time to shift action, looks forward to present and highlight part of utterances, looks forward to present the newly found word, looks backward to mark the just found word, looks forward to present/locate in the projection space the yet-to be-found-word, and projects hypothetical quotes in an imaginary world. In other words, with voilà co-participants direct recipients’ attention to a specific part of their utterances. Hence, the various actions performed by voilà regardless of its position are mainly due to its ability to shift orientation. The use of voilà in all my data analyses thus demonstrated that it is directly linked to its central semantic meaning, which is spatial-deictic (Bergen & Plauché, 2001, 2005). In short, the grammatical function of voilà in interaction seems to be that of an orientation shift marker.

The few prior studies that did not focus on the morphosyntactic aspect of voilà (e.g., Moignet, 1969. Hug, 1995) have actually pointed out both the anaphoric and cataphoric property of voilà and the cataphoric nature of voici (e.g., Grenoble & Riley, 1996; Porhiel, 2012; Adamczewski, 1991). However, these studies focused mainly on voilà/voici as a presentative, and not as a discourse marker. Additionally, all of these studies were based on written discourse. Léard (1992), on the other hand did look at the discursive functions of voilà, and noted voilà’s...
different “syntactic properties” (Léard, 1992: 148). Unfortunately, the examples that he chose to illustrate some of the illocutionary force accomplished by voilà in discourse were out of context and involved invented sentences. For this reason, my findings on the use and function of the discourse marker voilà make an important contribution to the existing literature, in that they fill gap and limitations of prior studies. The present dissertation is the first comprehensive study of voilà to be based on naturally occurring interaction. More specifically, my study takes into account the sequential position of voilà in the ongoing interaction in order to identify the specific actions accomplished in each position.

My findings promise to be of great interest to the field of pragmatics and to the field of CA, in particular French CA. For instance, my work on voilà in sequence closings contributes to research on action and topic management, epistemic authority, meaning negotiations, talk boundaries and conflict talk. Likewise, my work on the functions of voilà at the beginning of upshots of prior talk contributes to our understanding of how action is organized, and how parts of utterances are presented or highlighted. My work on hypothetical direct talk contributes to the exiting literature on storytelling. Finally, my word search chapter contributes to the body of work on epistemic and memory.

There are a few limitations to the present study. For instance, even if I have established the use and function of the composite ben voilà to mark the finding of an object/person, it is likely that ben voilà performs other actions in other sequential position. In addition, there are other composite voilàs that I was not able to analyze due to insufficient data examples, namely et voilà, and the repetition of voilà as in voilà voilà. These two composite have been pointed out by Léard (1992) as having specific functions in French interaction (see my literature review chapter). I intend to undertake further study of voilà by looking at these additional composite forms of it.
As indicated earlier, most of the functions of voilà occur in both ordinary phone/Skype conversations as well as in institutional talk. However, in my data the use of voilà in delicate talk only occurred in institutional talk. There may be several explanations for this. First, my phone/Skype conversation data were limited, which by definition limited the occurrence of all potential voilàs. Second, the institutional talk setting may have favored some sort of self-censoring on the part of participants, who may have preferred to cut short the ongoing turn with voilà as if to indicate “I don’t want to say more about this (topic) publicly”. Further research with a larger data corpus would have to address this question.

Finally, this study did not systematically take intonation into account in when analyzing the different utterances of voilà. The role of intonation in talk-in-interaction is critical. How voilà is pronounced in different exchange situations may strongly contribute to its interactional function. For instance, the delicate voilà seems to be uttered with downward intonation and a faster pace. In contrast, voilà can sometimes be uttered with dramatically rising intonation when it is used to announce the finding of a missing object.

Furthermore, my findings have potentially significant pedagogical implications. As argued below, most traditional introductory French textbooks are illustrated with artificial dialogues that bear little resemblance to dynamic and authentic language use. This artificiality deprives learners from getting acquainted with several functions performed by grammatical items which can only be observed in authentic interactions. Let us consider the following dialogue from Vis-à-Vis (p. 41) (5th edition), a leading introductory French textbook. The dialogue, which is titled Rencontre d’amis à la Sorbonne! ‘Meeting with friends at the Sorbonne’, is supposed to illustrate a typical interaction between college friends. Under the image
illustrating four youthful-looking men and women (i.e., students) in what looks like a campus library, we find the following dialogue:

FIGURE 6.1 (Vis-à-Vis p.41, 5th edition)

01 XAVIER: Salut, Françoise! Vous visitez l’université?
Hi, Françoise! You’re visiting the university?

02 FRANÇOISE: Oui, nous admirons particulièrement la bibliothèque.
Yes, we are admiring particularly the library.

→ 03 Voici Paul, de New York, et Mireille, une amie.
Here is Paul, from New York, and Mireille, a friend.

04 XAVIER: Bonjour, Paul. Tu parles français?
Good morning, Paul. You speak French?

05 PAUL: Oui, un petit peu.
Yes, a little bit.

06 XAVIER: Bonjour, Mireille. Tu étudies à la Sorbonne?
Good morning, Mireille, you study at the Sorbonne?

07 MIREILLE: Non, je travaille pour la bibliothèque.
No, I work for the library.

This transcript features a number of inconsistencies with naturally occurring conversation. For instance, while the interaction consists of questions and answers there are no receipts of answers at all (i.e., third position responses are lacking). The lack of third position responses in textbooks dialogues has been noted by Delahaie (2009b: 26): “... les manuels de FLE dépassent rarement le niveau de la phrase, vont parfois jusqu’à l’échange binaire [...] mais jamais jusqu’à l’échange ternaire”/ ‘...Foreign languages textbooks rarely go beyond the sentence levels, sometimes we find binary exchanges [.....] but there are never third position responses in the dialogues’ (my translation). Because of this lack of third positions, we have no means of knowing how the co-participants are relating to one another, i.e., we never know whether there are alignments with the responses given.

In addition, we notice that the responders answer the questions, but they never give the appropriate second pair part responses to the greetings in first pair parts (i.e., line 1, 4 and 6).
There is no overlap, there are no hesitations, false starts, or repetitions, and no pauses in between the utterances. All of these factors combined give us the impression that, far from being a natural, friendly conversation, this is a rather cold and very formal interrogation.

In natural conversation, questions are not necessarily asked with rising intonation as shown in the dialogues. The use of rising intonation in textbook-dialogue questions limits the possible answers that responders could have otherwise provided. Delahaie (2009b) has observed the overuse of oui/‘yes’ by leaners in all circumstances; this overuse may be explained by the fact that leaners are mainly exposed to questions with rising intonation. Other agreement markers that French speakers frequently use include d’accord, tout à fait, exactement, c’est ça, absolument and voilà. It so happens that voilà is the third preferred agreement/confirmation marker to an assertive utterance (Delahaie, 2009 b). If the interaction were authentic, the questions would not necessarily have been asked with rising intonation, which means that responders would probably have used voilà to agree with the prior speaker’s statement/inquest. This is all the more so if the inquiry concerns a domain in which the responder has epistemic authority, which seems to be the case in this specific dialogue. Yet no textbook authors mentions voilà’s function as an agreement token, most probably because they choose linguistic/grammatical forms intuitively and not based on conversation analytic studies.

Last but not least, in line 3 we see Françoise introducing Paul to her friends with voici Paul. This is yet another example of linguistic form selection based on intuition. A recent study has shown that native speakers practically never use voici to present a person, for which they prefer instead the presentative structure je te présente (Delahaie, 2008; 2009b). The use of voici to introduce a person can also be found in another leading beginning French textbook, Chez Nous (3rd edition).
Overall, the treatment of *voici* and *voilà* in all beginning textbooks is somewhat restrictive and misleading. For instance, most textbooks make no distinction between *voilà* and *voici*. Concerning these two particles here is what the authors of *Chez Nous* (3rd edition) write in the margin on their textbook: “We avoid the traditional *voici/voilà* distinction because native speaker usage is highly variable. *Voilà* is the neutral term, acceptable in wide variety of contexts.” (p.14). Indeed, most textbooks use *voici* and *voilà* almost interchangeably. For instance, on page 32 of *Vis-à-Vis* (5th edition) we see the phrase *voici la bibliothèque* used to caption the image of what looks like a library, while a few pages later (page 38) we see the use of *voilà la bibliothèque* as part of a dialogue between Anne (a French student) and Alex (a visiting American student). Anne is presumably showing Alex around a university campus. My study has shown that *voici* and *voilà* are not interchangeable. *Voici* is used to introduce a new element (Adamczewski, 1991) whereas *voilà* can only be used if we know that the element in question is expected (Delahaie, 2009a) or that it has been the subject of a prior search (Bruxelles & Traverso, 2006). Both *voici la bibliothèque* and *voilà la bibliothèque* are grammatically correct utterances. However, without the specification of the proper context in which each of these utterances could be uttered, learners will almost certainly end up assuming both *voici* and *voilà* have very similar if not identical pragmatic functions.

Prescriptive grammar defines *voici* as + proximal (*ci* meaning ‘here’) and *voilà* - proximal (*là* meaning ‘there’) (Grenoble & Riley, 1996). This historical distinction does not actually hold in modern French interaction (Adamczewski, 1991). Yet it is not uncommon to see the use of *voici* to introduce a proximal element and *voilà* a distal element in most traditional beginning French textbooks. This brings out the main problem with foreign language instruction as it is carried out today. Foreign language teaching is a reflection of the prescriptive written
conception of the language (Delahaie, 2008). There is much more focus on formal aspects of language than on real use of language. Consequently, it is wrongly assumed that by putting together these formal linguistic structures, learners develop communicative competence; in my estimation, students who have mastered enough of the linguistic forms of the French language are not necessarily able to conduct a mundane conversation in all socio-cultural contexts using the appropriate forms.

On the other hand, if we envision learning language from a discursive/conversation analytic perspective, which would be based on transcriptions of naturally-occurring talk, then one would learn how to conduct a conversation. I believe that in doing this, grammar and structure would emerge and develop in learners. There is a growing interest in CA informed language pedagogy publications. For instance, Wong & Waring’s (2010) book introduces conversation analysis (CA) as a system, and illustrates detailed interactional competence by presenting key concepts such as turn taking, sequencing, structuring practices and repair practices, which are of course illustrated with naturally occurring talk. The authors illustrate each chapter with pre- and post-reading tasks. Then they complete each chapter with what the authors call awareness raisings tasks and practicing activities for leaners to test what they have learned and apply their understanding. Wong & Waring (2010) publication is mainly designed for TESOL courses. There seems to be a growing interest in developing CA-informed pedagogical materials for other languages as well (e.g., Huth & Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006; Huth, 2007 for German). However, in Romance languages there have to date been no such efforts. Most Romance language teaching still depends heavily upon traditional textbooks.

Besides the sporadic usage of voilà mentioned at the beginning of textbooks (i.e., in the first two chapters), the word is not at all activated in the subsequent chapters. This comes much
as a surprise considering the multiple and various function of the word in every French conversation. Let us consider the following questions: How do we know when to take the next turn? How do we end/close a sequence? How do we avoid delicate/taboo topics? How do we display trouble finding a word? How do we tell a story? As native speakers of any language, we all know how to answer any of these questions. However, it does not seem that any of these practices are taught specifically in our language classrooms. It so happens that in the answers to all of these questions, voilà plays a part. My findings have inspired me to develop authentic teaching materials based on conversation analysis which would enable learners to not only learn linguistics forms, but also develop pragmatic awareness and acquire appropriate language usage in all socio-cultural contexts. I am specifically interested in exploring the use of various agreement markers in French and showing how the choice of one agreement marker over another could have a specific interactional meaning.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that voilà is one of the most recognizable French words in other languages, mainly in English and probably in other languages as well. When English speakers use voilà in English, they seem to use it to accomplish two specific pragmatic functions: 1) to mark the satisfaction of having successfully completed a given task, and 2) to mark the finding of a searched-for object (i.e., Eureka voilà) (Bruxelles & Traverso, 2006). These observations could lead to other avenues of future research. For instance, it would be worthwhile verifying these anecdotal observations and further explore to what extent the pragmatic functions performed by voilà might be transferred into another language, specifically into English. Indeed, American learners seem to be familiar with voilà. However, the way they use it in their interlanguage seems to be directly influenced by their L1 pragmatic knowledge and not necessarily by their understanding of voilà’s function in the French language. Studies exploring
which pragmatic functions of voilà might be transferred into English would be valuable, as they would help prepare efficient teaching materials based on actual learner performance, and accurate pragmatic functions of the target language. Voilà.
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