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Glossary of notations used in presenting speech events

.. Indicates a pause within an utterance without terminal intonation contour.
— Indicates a broken-off or interrupted utterance.
—— Indicates an utterance or a part of an utterance which was unclear and could not be transcribed.
( ) Parentheses in both a Finnish utterance and its English translation indicate that the enclosed word or portion of a word was slightly unclear and may have been incorrectly transcribed. Utterances with very dubiously transcribed sections were excluded from the samples. Parentheses which appear only in the English translation of an utterance and not in the Finnish original simply indicate words which are necessarily present in a grammatical translation, but which do not have counterparts in the Finnish utterance.
\( \langle \) Angle brackets indicate that the enclosed part of a word was not actually pronounced by the child. Seppo in particular often omitted sounds or entire syllables from the last part of words. For example, *apina* ‘monkey’, was always rendered as *api*, and *saappaat* ‘boots’, as *saappaa*. *Palo-auto* ‘fire-car’ (‘fire engine’), was often simply *palo*.
:: Indicates intervening utterances by child or parent or both.
> Indicates a particular utterance, usually in a sequence of utterances, which is the example referred to in the text or title of the table.
“ ” Double quotation marks indicate that the word so marked is not a legitimate Finnish word, but, rather, is either Seppo’s idiosyncratic pronunciation or substitution for a Finnish word, or is a ‘baby’ word provided by his mother. Words which are widely used by children but not by adults are simply translated as ‘doggie’, ‘piggie’, ‘moo-cow’, ‘teddy bear’, ‘bunny’, etc., and are not otherwise marked.
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The names of participants in speech events are abbreviated as follows:

S  Seppo
R  Rina
K  Kendall
M  Mother
D  Daddy
B  Bowerman (the investigator)