

Complex syntax-in-interaction: Emergent and emerging clause-combining patterns for organizing social actions¹

Simona Pekarek Doehler, Yael Maschler, Leelo Keevallik, and Jan Lindström

“Speakers do not possess a bird’s eye view of an utterance, but rather move forward in time through it.” (Paul Hopper, 2011, p. 23)

1. Introduction

The past two decades have witnessed a sea-change in our understanding of language. Grammar is no longer dominantly seen from a “bird’s eye view” (cf. Hopper, 2011) as an autonomously structured inventory of items and abstract combination rules, but is increasingly understood as a usage-based, temporal, and ever-adaptive resource for people’s acting in the social world (Hopper, 1987, 2011; Hakulinen, 2001; Thompson, 2002; Tomasello, 2003; Ellis & Larsen Freeman, 2006; Linell, 2009; Auer, 2009; Bybee, 2010; Fox & Thompson, 2010). The present collection of original chapters taps into

¹This is the introductory chapter published in Maschler, Yael, Pekarek Doehler, Simona, Lindström, Jan & Keevallik, Leelo (eds.) 2020, *Emergent syntax for conversation: Clausal patterns and the organization of action*. (Studies in Language and Social Interaction 32.) Amsterdam: Benjamins. Pp. 245–274.

this understanding of language and explores the ways by which patterns of complex syntax – that is, syntactic structures beyond a simple clause – relate to the local contingencies of action formation in social interaction, and how they are tied to participants’ nonverbal (prosodic and/or embodied) conduct. The collection investigates both emergent and emerging aspects of grammar (see the discussions in Hopper, 2011 and Auer & Pfänder, 2011a): it tracks on-line emergent clause-combining patterns as they are ‘patched together’ on the fly in response to local interactional contingencies (such as lack of recipient response); it also investigates emerging grammatical patterns, i.e., patterns that routinize (or sediment) in the grammar as interactional resources, for instance for the purpose of projecting what comes next. We thus focus both on the process of the structuring of patterns of language use in real time and on the results of repeated language use in and for social interaction over time, in an attempt to shed light on two facets of grammar as a highly adaptive resource for interaction.

For the past five decades, scholars working on the social dynamics of conversation have seen conversationalists’ use of language as one of the central foci of analysis. This has resulted in a collaboration with linguists towards “a syntax-for-conversation”, a concept famously coined by Schegloff (1979). However, the path towards a micro-socially attuned grammar, which puts the sequential organization of conversational talk in the foreground, has not been straightforward; it underwent significant development only rather recently, since the turn of the 21st century, not least through Schegloff’s visionary paper on the grammar of turn

organization (1996) and the advent of the sub-discipline of interactional linguistics (Selting & Couper-Kuhlen, 2001; Couper-Kuhlen & Selting, 2017; going back to Ochs, Schegloff & Thompson, 1996). It is in this tradition of interactionally sensitive research on language structure and the organization of social actions that we position ourselves, setting a special focus on the centerpiece of traditional grammatical inquiry, namely, syntax, which we scrutinize in light of its temporal structuring within situated social interaction.

To date, we have evidence from several languages that the clause – a core syntactic structure – also represents a relevant unit of interaction (e.g., Helasvuoto, 2001; Thompson & Couper-Kuhlen, 2005): Participants orient to clausal structures for turn-taking, action projection, utterance co-construction, and so on. Furthermore, both clauses – and more generally grammatical constructions – and turns at talk have been documented to be configured in real time, moment-by-moment, during the temporal unfolding of talk-in-interaction, based on close collaboration between speakers and recipients (Goodwin, 1981; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1987; Hopper, 1987, 2011; Auer, 1992, 2009). At any moment in time, a given syntactic trajectory may be revised or expanded beyond its first (second, etc.) completion point, as illustrated by the phenomenon of increments (Schegloff, 1996; Ford, Fox & Thompson, 2002; Couper-Kuhlen & Ono, 2007). Moreover, at any moment in time, the trajectory-so-far projects (Auer, 2005) a range of possible continuations or next actions, which may result in simple or complex clausal structures within the realm of a speaker's turn – or (collaboratively) across turns. This raises a central

question: *How does the organization of complex syntax in real time (i.e., in the very process of its production) relate to the on-line unfolding of turns and actions, and hence to such fundamental tasks in social interaction as action projection, formation and ascription?*

The present volume is designed to address this issue within a variety of everyday and institutional settings, and across a range of languages: English, Estonian, Finnish, French, German, Hebrew, Italian, Mandarin, and Swedish. The authors of each of the chapters set out to uncover how complex syntactic patterns, or routinized fragments of what are considered ‘canonical’ patterns, serve as resources for projecting and linking upcoming turns or actions (cf. e.g., Hopper, 2004; Auer, 2005; Hopper & Thompson, 2008), shedding light on the ways such patterns emerge incrementally, turn-by-turn, out of the real-time unfolding trajectories of action (cf. Schegloff 1996; Ford, Fox, and Thompson, 2002). The chapters in this volume are concerned with the manner by which formal variants of different clause-combining patterns relate to different social actions, examining how speakers employ specific patterns of clause combinations in order to accomplish specific actions, and how these patterns are oriented to by co-participants. Much attention is paid to the ways all of the above play out within the multimodal ecologies of interaction, involving grammatical, prosodic and embodied resources of meaning-making.

In a nutshell, the papers in this volume explore the ways in which on-line revisions of clause-combining patterns or expansions of these, as well as their routinization, relate to the building of social actions in real time. In doing so, they offer a radical alternative to a traditional

understanding of clause-combining and complex syntax as resulting from formal combination rules.

2. Complex syntax-in-interaction

As a consequence of this new conceptualization of grammar as a locally sensitive, temporally unfolding resource for social interaction, linguistic structures are increasingly studied in their natural ecology, i.e., talk-in-interaction, in relation to other semiotic resources, such as prosody, gaze, gesture, and the moving body (e.g. Hayashi, 2005; Keevallik, 2013, 2018; Mondada, 2014a, Pekarek Doehler, forthcoming). Owing to a robust literature in interactional linguistics in particular, we are beginning to understand how specific linguistic constructions function as interactional resources for accomplishing specific social actions in a growing number of languages.

We also have evidence for the fact that grammatical constructions are not used as ready-made templates, but are adapted in the very course of their production in response to local interactional contingencies such as co-participants' conduct so that syntactic trajectories can be re-oriented or expanded in real-time. For example, linguistic structures such as increments and left-dislocations may emerge across interacting parties (Pekarek Doehler et al., 2015; Mondada, 2016), and variably-routinized segments of syntax come to constitute systematic practices for projection of talk (Maschler, 2009, 2015; Auer & Maschler, 2013; Keevallik, 2011; Pekarek

Doehler, 2011a, 2015)² or practices for projection of bodily demonstrations (Streeck, 2002; Keevallik, 2015). These studies show that interactional use shapes grammar, which is accordingly understood as a continually evolving set of constructional patterns emerging from recurrent social actions.

The chapters in the present volume set out to explore the formatting of social actions that involves complex syntactic practices of different structural types, comprising subordination and coordination in various forms, as well as structurally more ambiguous concatenations that involve juxtaposition or a leaning towards insubordination (cf. Evans, 2007; Evans & Watanabe, 2016; Günthner, 2017; Maschler, 2018). In particular subordination phenomena have been identified as being in need of re-thinking in a number of earlier studies on the syntax of spoken language (e.g. Van Valin, 1984; Thompson, 2002; Lindström & Londen, 2008; Laury & Suzuki, 2011). For instance, subordinating structures have been considered to be part of bi-clausal constructions in which one of the clauses ('the dependent clause') is embedded as one of the arguments or adverbial complements of the main verb, or modifies one of the nominal constituents. However, once investigated in actual spoken language use, this traditional description of subordination is often found lacking (for pioneering usage-based statements, see Matthiessen & Thompson, 1988; Thompson & Mulac, 1991). It has been shown, for example, that the 'main clause' of what is classically considered a bi-clausal pattern (e.g., involving a complement-taking-predicate) often occurs in talk-in-interaction as a routinized "fragment" (e.g., English *I dunno*), that is, a grammaticized

² See also the papers in Laury & Suzuki, 2011; Auer & Pfänder, 2011b; Deppermann & Günthner, 2015.

marker of epistemic/evidential/evaluative stance.³ ‘Main clauses’ have also been shown to function as projecting constructions, or even as prototypical discourse markers (Maschler, 2009), that foreshadow certain types of action- or turn-trajectories to come (Thompson, 2002; Maschler, 2012, 2017; Pekarek Doehler, 2016; Polak-Yitzhaki & Maschler, 2016; Deppermann, 2011; Keevallik, 2011, Pekarek Doehler, forthcoming). For instance, French *je sais pas* ‘I don’t know’, in its morphophonologically reduced forms *chais pas* or *ch’pas*, can be used as a device for projecting a dispreferred response, as illustrated in excerpt 1. In line 01, Marie asks Julie why she chose to learn languages by means of immersion rather than via standard instruction:

Ex. (1) (Pekarek Doehler, 2016, Coll_JSP_90)

01 MAR: et- pourquoi.
and why

02 (0.8) ((sliding sound, followed by two short
knocks))

03 JUL: be:n >ch’p↑as< je trouve c’est mi↑eux^he.
well dunno I find it’s better

The delay at line 02, the *be:n* ‘well’-prefacing and the *ch’pas* ‘dunno’ conspire to project a dispreferred response: Julie’s *je trouve c’est mi↑eux^he* ‘I find it’s better’ clearly does not conform to the terms of Marie’s question, which implicates an account for Julie’s preferring immersion over standard instruction as a relevant next; Julie, however, simply re-affirms that she prefers immersion. Further evidence of *I-don’t-know*-type of constructions that have routinized as discourse marker-like

³ See, e.g., Thompson, 2002; Kärkkäinen, 2003 on English; Keevallik, 2006 on Estonian; Imo, 2007 on German; Laury & Okamoto, 2011 and Laury & Ono, 2014 on Finnish and Japanese; Maschler, 2012, 2017 on Hebrew; and the collection of studies in Lindström, Maschler & Pekarek Doehler, 2016.

what that-say.PAST.1SG
what I said,

105 ...hi lo tsrixa lehagid l-o,
 she NEG need.F.SG say.INF to-3M.SG
 she doesn't have to say to him,

106 ?FEM: @

107 Liraz: takshiv,
 listen.FUT.2M.SG
 listen,

108 'a

109 ...hit'oreru b-i regashot,
 stirred_up.PAST.3PL in-1SG feelings
 [new] feelings have stirred up in me,

(continued for 8 more
 intonation units)

In (2) *ma she-'amarti*, ‘what I said’ (2. 104) projects a rephrasal of the speaker’s (Liraz’s) previous talk, in order to clarify it and oppose her interlocutor, who had misrepresented it in her view. What follows is a stretch of discourse much longer than a clause that is not marked as being syntactically related to the initial piece – it lacks both the copula *ze* ‘is’ and the subordinator *she-* ‘that’ necessary in a ‘canonical’ Hebrew pseudo-cleft construction (i.e., *ma she-'amarti ze she-...* ‘what I said **is that...**’). Thus, a fragment of the so-called canonical pseudo-cleft – *ma she-'amarti*, ‘what I said’ – has become routinized for the interactional purpose of projecting, and in this case specifically projecting the rephrasal of one’s prior utterance (Maschler & Fishman, forthcoming).

Furthermore, it has been shown that a structure that looks like a ‘dependent’ clause may be syntactically more or less free-standing, or ‘insubordinate’ (Evans, 2007; Wide, 2014; Lindström et al., 2016; Günthner, 2017), or be sequentially rather than grammatically embedded, and that subordinating conjunctions may function as discourse markers that

on French). This phenomenon is illustrated here with the following excerpt from a Finnish telephone conversation, where Vikke tells her friend Missu which mutual acquaintances she had seen in a dream.

Ex. (4) (Laury & Helasvuo, 2015, p. 160–161)

- 01 Vikke: No siel oli, (.) khm (0.3)
PRT DEM+LOC be.PST+3SG
Well there was
- 02 .mt mun ↑serkkuni <Salla>,
1SG.GEN cousin.1SGPX Name.FEM
my cousin Salla,
- 03 Missu: Nii.
PRT
Yeah.
- 04 Vikke: Rantalan Anni,
LastName.GEN Name.FEM
Anni Rantala.
- 05 Missu: £Joo-o£?,
PRT
Yeah?
- 06 (.)
- 07 Vikke: ja sit se yks poika: Lahdesta.
and then DEM3 one guy PlaceName.ELA
and then that one guy from Lahti.
- 08 (.)
- 09 **Mikä on, (0.6) oli, v- vaihtoopilaana .h**
REL be+3SG be.PST+3SG exchange.student.ESS
Who is, was, away as an exchange student
- 10 (0.3)
- 11 Vikke: **just vuaden?, se, Mäkelän Kimmon kaveri.**
just year.ACC DEM3 LastName.GEN name.MASC.GEN friend
for one year?, that friend of Kimmo Mäkelä's.
- 12 (0.3)
- 13 Missu: KUka,h
who
WHO,
- 14 Vikke: Se mikä on sen, (0.3) sen,

DEM3 REL be+3SG DEM3.GEN DEM3.GEN
The one who is that, that,

15 sen poliisim [poika.
 DEM3.GEN police.GEN son
that policeman's son.

16 Missu: [.hhh Se Vehviläine,h
 DEM3 LastName
That Vehviläinen.

17 Vikke: >Nii<.
 PRT
Right.

The first two persons mentioned in the list (4. 2 and 4) are unproblematic, but identification becomes an issue with the third item, *se yks poika: Lahdesta* ‘that one guy from Lahti’ (4. 7). This prosodically complete turn part is followed by a micro pause in line 8, after which the speaker adds a relative clause, thereby enhancing the identifiability of the person in question (4. 9). Some trouble still ensues, until the recipient Missu, after some further clues from Vikke, displays recognition in line 16.

More generally, these kinds of syntactic expansions have also been documented to involve revisions of syntactic trajectories so-far, often entailing change in constituent status in pivot-like constructions (Horlacher & Pekarek Doehler, 2014; the collection of papers in Norén & Linell, 2013; Pekarek Doehler, 2011b; Walker 2007). Take the following classical example quoted by Walker (2007), in which Lottie and Emma talk about buying a turkey for Thanksgiving dinner (the pivot pattern is highlighted in bold):

Ex. (5) (Walker, 2007, p. 2219)

01 Lot: I went down there and got a- (.) Rancho a fresh one
 02 (0.6)
 03 Emm: **oh that's what I'd like to have is a fresh one**

The segment *what I'd like to have* (5. 3) represents the pivot element forming a grammatical unit both with what precedes and with what follows: It appears first as the second part of what is known in the literature as an inverted pseudo-cleft construction (*that's what I'd like to have*), and then as the first part of a pseudo-cleft construction (*what I'd like to have is a fresh one*). Phenomena of this kind show us that the syntactic constituency of the turn-in-progress can be changed on the fly. Pivot constructions, just like many of the clause-combining patterns discussed above, are local constructs resulting from the “patching together” (Pekarek Doehler & Horlacher, 2013) of linguistic resources in real time. A further example of a “patched-up” type of utterance is provided by Hopper’s (2011) analysis of ‘sluicing’ (Ross, 1969), as in *She said okay, I'll stay another year, but, **I don't know why***, where the boldfaced segment is shown to be an incremental addition of a ready-made piece, rather than part B of a bi-clausal construction which is considered to be an elliptical contraction of a longer sentence (such as *I don't know why she said it*).

Finally, recent evidence suggests that speakers’ use of grammar is tightly related to their deployment of embodied resources, such as gaze, body movements and moving through space (Keevallik, 2013, 2014; Iwasaki, 2011; Broth & Mondada, 2013; Mondada, 2009, 2011, 2014a). For example, Keevallik (2013) analyzes speaker turns in dance class interaction in which a syntactically incomplete clause is followed by a bodily demonstration, such as in the following, produced by an instructor in a Swedish couple-dance class:

Ex. (6) (Keevallik, 2013, p. 8)

01INS **För om killarna gör,** *(2.0)*
because if guy.PL.DEF do
Because if the guys do
step step

02 **Så kommer ju tjejerna att göra,** *(1.3)*
then FUT PRT lady.PL.DEF INF do
then the ladies will do
step step

03 eftersom de följer. Eller hur.
because they follow. Right?

This turn is composed of two syntactically incomplete clauses, each one projecting a bodily demonstration. Together, the two tokens of [incomplete clause+demonstration] form a complex clausal structure of the *if... then* type. Keevallik argues that the classic list of unit-types comprising turn-constructural units (Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson, 1974) should be expanded to include syntactic-bodily constructions. In the same vein, our conceptions of syntactic patterns of clause-combining could be expanded by considering the syntactic-bodily constructions. Multimodal research shows how embodied conduct plays into such fundamental issues as turn-taking (see pioneering work by Goodwin & Goodwin, 1987; Goodwin, 2000; Mondada, 2007) and projection of emergent structures through gaze and gesture (Mondada, 2006; Streeck & Jordan, 2009). Importantly, it has been demonstrated that the real-time production of an utterance may be affected by others' embodied conduct (see e.g. Goodwin, 1981; Mondada, 2009; papers in Streeck, Goodwin, & Le Baron, 2011; Sorjonen & Raevaara, 2014), and that such conduct may in turn trigger on-line emergent clause-combining patterns (Stoenica, 2018). Such evidence calls for work carrying us further toward a more holistic understanding of the

functioning of language and grammar as situated in the multisemiotic ecologies of social interaction (Mondada, 2014b; 2016, Keevallik, 2018).

3. Purpose and structure of the volume

The present volume contributes original empirical work to the above line of investigation. It offers a collection of chapters that study complex syntax in interaction and provide new findings across a range of languages stemming from different (branches of) language families: Finnish and Estonian (Finno-Ugric), French, Italian, German, and Swedish (from the Romance and Germanic branches of Indo-European), Hebrew (Semitic) and Mandarin (Sino-Tibetan). The volume as a whole expands our understanding of the functioning-in-use of natural languages through the scrutiny of a basic over-arching syntactic operation – clause-combining – and provides support for a conception of linguistic units as fundamentally temporal, emergent, and sensitive to local interactional contingencies.

This introduction is followed by ten chapters presenting empirical research on clause-combining practices as they emerge in the temporal, interactional, and/or embodied context of talking. The research chapters are organized according to the ways in which they address two key themes: i) emerging projecting constructions, and ii) locally-emergent clause-combining patterns. As both themes can be intertwined with one another, the chapters naturally also cross these thematic boundaries.

i) Emerging projecting constructions

Focusing attention on linguistic forms that have to do with the formation of complex syntax structures, the chapters in this section are concerned with grammatical, sequential, and prosodic aspects of sedimentation, most prominently in its relation to the interactional work of projection. These chapters show in particular how complex syntax patterns (or pieces of ‘canonical’ types of such patterns) routinize for the purpose of projecting upcoming structural configurations and trajectories of actions, and relating ongoing actions to prior turns and actions.

The chapter by De Stefani shows the ways by which the Italian phrase *nel senso (che)* ‘in the sense (that)’ is employed as a projector phrase and a connector in conversation. The phrase, which according to traditional understanding projects a restrictive relative clause, is regularly used between clauses, the second of which is not grammatically tied to the first but is pragmatically related to it, specifying, elaborating, or expanding on its content. *nel senso (che)* can occur in turn-beginnings, where it displays the manner by which the incipient turn relates to a preceding turn. As a device for constructing multi-unit turns, it can be used for introducing a turn extension at moments of insufficient recipient reaction, such as lack of verbal or embodied acknowledgement. This study also demonstrates that the shorter variant of the phrase, *nel senso*, is deployed turn-finally together with an open-hand gesture and gaze movement, in order to seek support for the speaker's standpoint in a multiparty conversation. Together, the findings provide evidence for the routinization of the construction for interactional

purposes, and show how these purposes may involve precise embodied conduct on the part of the speaker.

The chapter by Laury and Helasvuo demonstrates more or less fixed and more or less syntactically complex patterns that occur with two Finnish verbs, *ajatella* ‘think’, and *tietää* ‘know’. Based on a careful quantitative analysis of corpora, the authors show that while both of these verbs tend to occur in the 1st person singular form, they differ in their predominant use of tense, polarity, syntax, and projection of action. While *ajatella* is rarely reduced, frequently combined with a complementizer, only rarely negated, and projects information about the speaker’s own thoughts and plans, as well as expresses epistemic and evaluative/affective stance, *tietää* occurs most regularly in the negated form, often comes entirely without complements and occurs in response to the prior turn, often to questions, but also to compliments and other types of first pair parts requiring responses. *Tietää* is in itself a projective epistemic expression. The paper furthermore details the phonetic reduction of the different structures and ultimately shows the ways by which structures which would componentially be analyzed as main clauses are emerging as formulaic fragments, often with reduced syntactic complexity and considerable morpho-phonological reduction.

Based on data from Hebrew, Maschler discusses the in subordinate-subordinate continuum of clausal combinations. She examines variations of patterns in which syntactically integrated and unintegrated *she*-‘that/which/who’-clauses are produced following final and continuing intonation contours. A comparison of patterns in the data shows that the

conjunction *she-* is generally utilized as an element that ties back to a preceding stretch of interaction and projects an elaboration or evaluation of it. This elaboration can result in morpho-syntactically complex constructions involving relative, complement, or adverbial clauses, but in insubordinate cases the *she*-clause can also stand on its own. Moreover, it is shown that elaboration can target not only NPs and clauses, but also gestures. The patterning of the insubordinate-subordinate continuum suggests that canonical, syntactically integrated varieties of Hebrew relative, complement, and adverbial clauses stand out as sedimentations of syntactically less integrated clause combinations that are frequently deployed in spoken, interactional language.

Polak-Yitzhaki's chapter on the Hebrew *ha'emet (hi) she-* 'the truth (is) that' construction reveals the ways in which the initial part of a nominal clause can function as a projective item (perhaps a discourse marker), and consequently, how it implements specific functions in combination with the ensuing predicative clause. This chapter offers an account of the ways by which grammatical patterns constitute routinized solutions for specific communicative needs, which in turn addresses the central issue of the nature of language. Rather than thinking of grammar as a generic algorithm capable of expressing every possible proposition, this study shows how speakers have a range of complex but pragmatically specific form-meaning packages at their disposal. Speakers employ the focus construction to formulate a revelation of sensitive information concerning themselves, to set the record straight regarding some potential misunderstanding of what they have just said, or to express speaker stance. As an epistemic claim

about access to truth, the construction projects information that the speaker is certain about, which explains its collocation with statements about self.

The chapter by Wang and Tao presents a study of a Mandarin Chinese mental verb construction – *wo juede* ‘I feel/think’ – showing that it has evolved from a matrix clause involving a complement-taking predicate to a projecting construction introducing a multi-unit turn. The *wo juede* construction has developed not only epistemic and evaluative uses in the (inter)subjective domain, as has been shown for constructions of this type in a variety of languages; it has then developed also a conversation organizational use as a ‘prospective indexical’ (Goodwin, 1996) that facilitates the extension of turns – a pattern described for other languages but not yet for any Sino-Tibetan language. The authors show that this latter use contrasts with the two earlier uses in terms of both syntax and prosody. Finally, they suggest an interaction-based explanation for this particular grammaticization path: evaluation sequences often get much extended due to the interactive nature of stance negotiation among participants. This may cause the link between the matrix clause and the ensuing complement clauses to weaken, with the result that the matrix clause gradually drifts to an independent status and exhibits greater dissociation from the original clause-combining pattern.

ii) Locally emergent clause-combining patterns

The chapters in this section analyze the broad spectrum of clause combining phenomena from subordination to coordination that are configured in real time as resources for action formation. Such an analytic

scope contributes to our understanding of what kinds of interactional tasks such on-line grammatical patterning can generally solve, while further testifying to the locally sensitive and locally configured nature of clause and action combining. The authors demonstrate the ways in which complex syntactic patterns emerge from the sequential concatenation of actions in real time and document the type of interactional work such emergent patterns accomplish in response to precise interactional contingencies.

Günthner presents formal variations of conditional *wenn*-clauses in German talk-in-interaction, ranging from canonical, syntactically integrated (and subordinated) uses of prepositioned *wenn*-clauses to extraposed, non-integrated and free-standing conditionals. These varying practices of clause-combining are connected to the speaker's sensitivity to contingencies in the temporal unfolding of talk, and deal with issues of projection, expansion and accomplishment of social action. Sedimented bi-clausal patterns are a powerful resource for projection, interactionally most notably manifest in collaborative productions. The analysis shows that syntactic and prosodic non-integration of *wenn*-clauses transforms them into turn segments that prepare the recipient for a more focused communicative action, for example, when staging the punchline of a narrative. Loosely-integrated conditionals are also used in expanded turns that may incorporate several turn-constructive units, serving to reserve the floor until a foreshadowed consequence or conclusion is reached. Finally, *wenn*-clauses can stand alone, implementing a social action in their own right, typically in expressing wishes, requests, threats or exclamative stances, in which the conditional form is a way of dealing with possibly

sensitive actions. Such uses call into question the traditional binary categories of dependent and independent clauses, a problem that the author discusses with reference to insubordination.

Keevallik's paper examines the Estonian coordinating conjunction *ja* 'and' as it is used by instructors in Pilates classes. *Ja* is employed either for the overall structuring of the class (moving into a next exercise) or for the organization of different steps within a given exercise (e.g., notifying the students of an upcoming return to the starting position). The use of *ja* for exercise-organizational purposes contrasts with the fact that the coordination of clauses is otherwise accomplished by the instructor without an explicit coordinator, by mere juxtaposition. Furthermore, it is shown how *ja* can be used as a practical means for the temporal extension of talk to achieve synchronicity with embodied behavior: the instructor extends *ja* through syllable lengthening while waiting for the students to arrive at a certain position for her next utterance to be appropriately timed with the student's next move. In Pilates classes, then, the clause-combining pattern of the coordination type emerges over time in ways that are responsive to co-participants' bodily movements and the conjunction functions as a temporal index of the embodied trajectories of action. Prosodic features are shown to differentiate uses of different types; for instance, *ja* produced with a distinct low-fall of pitch contour is used to provide a starting signal for an exercise. The findings offer compelling evidence for the ways in which participants' local meaning-making rests on a complex interplay between vocal (grammar, prosody, voice quality) and bodily conduct.

The chapter by Lindström, Lindholm, Grahn, and Huhtamäki demonstrates a generic syntactic pattern consisting of an imperative, declarative, or phrasal first part followed by a consecutive clause as a second part. The pattern accomplishes a combination of a directive action and an account for it in the context of individual physical training. The trainer can produce the instructional pattern as a single whole, or pause for his/her own demonstration or for compliance by the trainee. These options occur in different phases of the training process: while trainers' demonstrations are produced during the preparatory phases, the trainees' compliance happens during the practice itself. The authors argue that the first part of the pattern most often prosodically projects the second part, even though that first part is pragmatically complete. Most importantly, the clause combination emerges across participants and modalities; it is timed with and locally conditioned by the embodied behavior of the trainer and the trainee. The paper thus demonstrates that the fact interactants have bodies may be consequential for grammar. At the same time, it shows that a close scrutiny of function in specific activities may reveal grammatical regularities that could not have been found in abstract theorizing, such as an adverb and consecutive conjunctions constituting a functional paradigm.

The chapter by Proske and Deppermann examines the combination of matrix clause plus right-dislocated complement clause with the subordinating conjunction *dass* 'that' in German interactions. In this combination, the first clause contains the back-linking demonstrative pronoun *das* 'this/that', and the second one is a *dass*-complement clause that specifies the propositional reference of the demonstrative; for example,

das hab ich nich mitbekommen. (0.32) dass es da so YouTubevideos gab. ‘I wasn’t aware of that. That there were videos about that on YouTube.’ The clause-combination, then, consists of an action combination: a first responsive action followed by a commentary on it that can involve a perspective shift. The authors show that this constructional pattern facilitates an incremental constitution of meaning and reference, which can be related to responding to another speaker’s prior turn or tying together parts of the current speaker’s multi-unit turn. They provide further evidence showing how various bi-clausal constructions (the one they studied, along with e.g. extrapositions or pseudo-clefts) can be produced as two separate “chunks“ each of which has distinct interactional functionalities in everyday language use.

The chapter by Stoenica and Pekarek Doehler is a demonstration of the ways in which the recipient’s bodily behavior affects the emergence of relative clauses in French talk-in-interaction. It argues that a clausal combination consisting of a “main” clause and a “subordinate relative” clause may be produced in response to local interactional contingencies, such as a puzzled face of the interlocutor, and that the resulting clause-combination is only retrospectively analyzable as such. Focusing on self-increments, the study documents the manner in which referential repair with a relative clause is produced following a vocal or non-vocal display of trouble by the recipient, while referential elaboration via a relative clause may ensue following the recipient’s display of recognition of the referent. The paper also shows that increments, which have typically been analyzed as continuations of the “same” action, may accomplish actions of their own.

It furthermore challenges the traditional account of restrictive vs. non-restrictive relative clauses by showing examples that contradict classical claims (e.g., proper nouns being followed exclusively by non-restrictive relative clauses). Finally, the paper makes a compelling case that an incrementally added relative clause can deal with, or pre-empt, trouble while maximizing progressivity of talk.

Our volume ends with an Afterword written by Paul Hopper, bringing into sharp relief two threads running through the ten chapters – *temporality* (“time insofar as it manifests itself in human existence”, Hoy, 2009, p. xiii, cited in Hopper, this volume), and *dialogue* – as the two theoretical keystones of interactional linguistics.

References

- Auer, P. (1992). The neverending sentence: Rightward expansion in spoken language. In M. Kontra, & T. Váradi (Eds.), *Studies in Spoken Language: English, German, Finno-Ugric* (pp. 41–59). Budapest: Hungarian Academy of Science.
- Auer, P. (2005). Projection in interaction and projection in grammar. *Text*, 25, 7–36.
- Auer P. (2009). On-line syntax: Thoughts on the temporality of spoken language. *Language Sciences*, 31, 1–13.
- Auer, P., & Pfänder, S. (Eds.). (2011a). Constructions: Emergent or emerging? In P. Auer, & S. Pfänder (Eds.), *Constructions: Emerging and emergent* (pp. 2–21). Berlin: de Gruyter.

- Auer, P., & Pfänder, S. (2011b). *Constructions: Emerging and emergent*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Auer, P., & Maschler, Y. (2013). Discourse or Grammar? VS patterns in spoken Hebrew and spoken German narratives. *Language Sciences*, 37, 147–181.
- Broth, M., & Mondada, L. (2013). Walking away: The embodied achievement of activity closings in mobile interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 47(1), 41–58
- Bybee, J. (2010). *Language, usage and cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clift, R. (2007). Grammar in time: The non-restrictive ‘which’-clause as an interactional resource. *Essex Research Reports in Linguistics*, 55, 51–82.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2012). Turn continuation and clause combinations. *Discourse Processes*, 49(3/4), 273–299.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E., & Ono, T. (2007). ‘Incrementing’ in conversation: A comparison of practices in English, German, and Japanese. *Pragmatics*, 17(4), 513–552.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E., & Selting, M. (2017). *Interactional linguistics: Studying language in social interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E., & Thompson, Sandra A. (2008). On assessing situations and events in conversation: ‘Extraposition’ and its relatives. *Discourse Studies* 10(4), 443–467.

- Deppermann, A. (2011). Constructions vs. lexical items as sources of complex meanings: A comparative study of constructions with German verstehen. In P. Auer, & S. Pfänder (Eds.), *Constructions: Emerging and emergent* (pp. 88–126). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Deppermann, A., & Günthner, S. (Eds.). (2015). *Temporality in interaction*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Ellis, N. C., & Larsen-Freeman, C. (2006). Language emergence: Implications for applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, 27, 558–589.
- Evans, N. (2007). Insubordination and its uses. In I. Nikolaeva (Ed.), *Finiteness: Theoretical and empirical foundations* (pp. 366–431). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Evans, N., & Watanabe, H. (2016). *Insubordination*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Eriksson, M. (2001). Syntaxens sociala sida [The social aspect of syntax]. *Språk och Stil*, 11, 5–24.
- Ford, C. E. (1993). *Grammar in interaction: Adverbial clauses in American English conversation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ford, C. E., Fox, B. A., & Thompson, S. A. (2002). Constituency and the grammar of turn increments. In C. Ford, B. Fox, & S. Thompson (Eds.), *The language of turn and sequence* (pp. 14–38). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fox, B. A., & Thompson, S. A. (2010). Responses to WH-questions in English conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 43(2), 133–156.

- Goodwin, C. (1981). *Conversational organization: Interaction between speakers and hearers*. New York: Academic Press.
- Goodwin, C. (1996). Transparent vision. In E. Ochs, E. Schegloff, & S. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 370–404). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodwin, C. (2000). Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32, 1489–1522.
- Goodwin, C., & Goodwin, M. Harness (1987). Concurrent operations on talk: Notes on the interactive organization of assessments. *IPrA Papers in Pragmatics*, 1(1), 1–55.
- Günthner, S. (2006). "Was ihn trieb, war vor allem Wanderlust" (Hesse: Narziss und Goldmund): Pseudocleft-Konstruktionen im Deutschen. In S. Günthner, & W. Imo (Eds.), *Konstruktionen in der Interaktion* (pp. 59–90). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Günthner, S., & Hopper, P. (2010). Zeitlichkeit & sprachliche Strukturen: Pseudo-clefts im Englischen und Deutschen. *Gesprächsforschung – Online-Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion*, 11, 1–28.
- Günthner, S. (2017). Alleinstehende Nebensätze: Insubordinierte *wenn*-Konstruktionen in der kommunikativen Praxis. In Y. Ekinci, E. Montanari, & L. Selmani (Eds.): *Grammatik und Variation: Festschrift für Ludger Hoffmann zum 65. Geburtstag* (pp. 97–111). Heidelberg: Synchron Wissenschaftsverlag der Autoren.
- Hakulinen, A. (2001). Minimal and non-minimal answers to yes-no questions. *Pragmatics*, 11(1), 1–15.

- Hayashi, M. (2005). Joint turn construction through language and the body: Notes on embodiment in coordinated participation in situated activities. *Semiotica*, 156, 21–53.
- Helasvuo, M.-L. (2001). *Syntax in the making: The emergence of syntactic units in Finnish conversational discourse*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Helmer, H., Reineke, S., & Deppermann, A. (2016). A range of uses of negative epistemic constructions in German: ICH WEIß NICHT as a resource for dispreferred actions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 106, 97–114.
- Hopper P. J. (1987). Emergent grammar. *Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 13, 139–157.
- Hopper, P. J. (2001). Grammatical constructions and their discourse origins: Prototype or family resemblance? In M. Pütz, S. Neimeier, & R. Dirven (Eds.), *Applied cognitive linguistics I: Theory and language acquisition* (pp. 109–129). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hopper, P. J. (2004). The openness of grammatical constructions. *Proceedings from the Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 40(2), 153–175.
- Hopper, P. J. (2011). Emergent grammar and temporality in interactional linguistics. In P. Auer, & S. Pfänder (Eds.), *Constructions: Emerging and emergent* (pp. 22–45). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Hopper, P., & Thompson, S. A. (2008). Projectability and clause combining in interaction. In R. Laury (Ed.), *Crosslinguistic studies of clause combining* (pp. 99–123). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Horlacher, A.-S. & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2014). ‘Pivotage’ in French talk-

- in-interaction: On the emergent nature of [clause-NP-clause] pivots. *Pragmatics*, 24(3), 593–622.
- Hoy, D. C. (2009). *The time of our lives: A critical history of temporality*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Imo, W. (2007). *Construction Grammar und Gesprochene-Sprache-Forschung. Konstruktionen mit zehn matrixsatzfähigen Verben im gesprochenen Deutsch*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Iwasaki, S., (2011). The multimodal mechanics of collaborative unit construction in Japanese conversation. In J. Streeck, C. Goodwin, & C. LeBaron (eds.), *Embodied interaction: Language and body in the material world* (pp. 106–120). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kärkkäinen, E. (2003). *Epistemic stance in English conversation: A description of interactional functions, with a focus on I think*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Keevallik, L. (2006). From discourse pattern to epistemic marker: Estonian (*ei*) *tea* ‘don’t know’. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics*, 29(2), 173–200.
- Keevallik, L. (2008). Conjunction and sequenced actions: The Estonian complementizer and evidential particle *et*. In R. Laury (Ed.), *Crosslinguistic studies of clause combining: The multifunctionality of conjunctions* (pp. 125–152). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Keevallik, L. (2011). Interrogative “complements” and question design in Estonian. In R. Laury, & R. Suzuki (Eds.), *Subordination in*

- conversation: A cross-linguistic perspective* (pp. 37–68). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Keevallik, L. (2013). The interdependence of bodily demonstrations and clausal syntax. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 46(1), 1–21.
- Keevallik, L. (2014). Turn organization and bodily-vocal demonstrations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 65, 103–120.
- Keevallik, L. (2015). Coordinating the temporalities of talk and dance. In A. Deppermann, & S. Günthner (Eds.), *Temporality in interaction* (p. 309–336). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Keevallik, L. (2018). What does embodied interaction tell us about grammar? *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 51, 1–21.
- Koivisto, A., Laury, R., & Seppänen, E.-L. (2011). Syntactic and actional characteristics of Finnish *että*-clauses. In R. Laury, & R. Suzuki (Eds.), *Subordination in conversation: A cross-linguistic perspective* (pp. 69–102). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Laury, R. (Ed.). (2008). *Crosslinguistic studies of clause combining: The multifunctionality of conjunctions*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Laury, R., Etelämäki, M., & Couper-Kuhlen, E. (Eds.). (2017). *Linking clauses and actions in social interaction*. Helsinki: SKS.
- Laury, R., & Helasvuo, M.-L. (2015). Detached NPs with relative clauses in Finnish conversation. In M. M. J. Fernandez-Vest & R. D. Van Valin (Eds.), *Information structuring of spoken language from a crosslinguistic perspective* (pp. 149–166). Berlin: De Gruyter.

- Laury, R., & Okamoto, S. (2011). *Teyuuka* and *I mean* as pragmatic parentheticals in Japanese and English subordination in conversation: A cross-linguistic perspective. *Studies in Language and Social Interaction*, 24, 209–230.
- Laury, R., & Ono T. (2014). The limits of grammar: Clause combining in Finnish and Japanese conversation. *Pragmatics*, 24(3), 561–592.
- Laury, R., & Suzuki, R. (Eds.). (2011). *Subordination in conversation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Lindström, J., Lindholm, C., & Laury, R. (2016). The interactional emergence of conditional clauses as directives: Constructions, trajectories and sequences of actions. *Language Sciences*, 58, 8–21.
- Lindström, J., & Londen, A.-M. (2008). Constructing reasoning: The connectives *för att* (causal), *så att* (consecutive) and *men att* (adversative) in Swedish conversations. In J. Leino (Ed.), *Constructional reorganization* (pp. 105–152). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Lindström, J., Maschler, Y., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (Eds.). (2016). *Grammar and negative epistemics in talk-in-interaction: Cross-linguistic studies*. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 106, special issue.
- Linell, P. (2009). *Rethinking language, mind, and world dialogically: Interactional and contextual theories of human sense-making*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Maschler, Y. (2009). *Metalinguage in interaction: Hebrew discourse markers*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

- Maschler, Y. (2012). Emergent projecting constructions: The case of Hebrew *yada* ('know'). *Studies in Language*, 36(4), 785–847.
- Maschler, Y. (2015). Word order in time: Emergent Hebrew (Ns)V/VNs syntax. In A. Deppermann, & S. Günthner (Eds.), *Temporality in interaction* (pp. 201–236). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Maschler, Y. (2017). The emergence of Hebrew *loydea / loydat* ('I dunno MASC/FEM') from interaction: Blurring the boundaries between discourse marker, pragmatic marker, and modal particle. In A. Sansò, & C. Fedriani (Eds.), *Pragmatic markers, discourse markers and modal particles: New perspectives* (pp. 37–69). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Maschler, Y. (2018). The on-line emergence of Hebrew in subordinate *she-* ('that/which/who') clauses: A usage-based perspective on so-called 'subordination'. *Studies in Language*, 42(3), 669–707.
- Maschler, Y., & Dori-Hacohen, G. (2018). Constructing a genre: Hebrew *lo yode'a / lo yoda'at* '(I) don't know' on Israeli political radio phone-ins. *Text & Talk*, 38(5), 575–604.
- Maschler, Y., & Fishman, S. (forthcoming). From multi-clausality to discourse markerhood: The Hebrew *ma she-* ('what that') construction in pseudo-cleft-like structures.
- Matthiessen, C., & Thompson, S. A. (1988). The structure of discourse and 'subordination'. In J. Haiman, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Clause combining in grammar and discourse* (pp. 275–329). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Mondada, L. (2006). Participants' online analysis and multimodal practices:

- Projecting the end of the turn and the closing of the sequence. *Discourse Studies*, 8, 117–129.
- Mondada, L. (2007). Multimodal resources for turn-taking: pointing and the emergence of possible next speakers. *Discourse Studies*, 9(2), 194–225.
- Mondada, L. (2009). Emergent focused interactions in public places: A systematic analysis of the multimodal achievement of a common interactional space. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41(10), 1977–1997.
- Mondada, L. (2014a). Bodies in action: Multimodal analysis of walking and talking. *Language and Dialogue*, 4(3), 357–403.
- Mondada, L. (2014b). The local constitution of multimodal resources for social interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 65, 137–156.
- Mondada, L. (2016). Challenges of multimodality: Language and the body in social interaction. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 20(3), 336–366.
- Norén, N., & Linell, P. (Eds.). (2013). *Pivot constructions in talk in interaction*. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 54, special issue.
- Ochs, E., Schegloff, E. A., & Thompson, S. A. (Eds.). (1996). *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oloff, F., & Havlik, M. (2018). An initial description of syntactic extensions in spoken Czech. *Pragmatics*, 28(3), 361–390.
- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2011a). Clause-combining and the sequencing of actions: Projector constructions in French conversation. In R. Laury, & R. Suzuki (Eds.), *Subordination in conversation: A crosslinguistic perspective* (pp. 103–148). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2011b). Emergent grammar for all practical purposes: The on-line forming of dislocated constructions in French conversation. In P. Auer, & S. Pfänder (Eds.), *Constructions: Emerging and emergent* (pp. 46–88). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2015). Grammar, projection and turn-organization: (*il*) *y a NP* ‘there is NP’ as a projector construction in French talk-in-interaction. In A. Deppermann, & S. Günthner (Eds.), *Temporality in interaction* (pp. 173–200). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2016). More than epistemic hedge: *Je sais pas* ‘I don’t know’ in French talk-in-interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 106, 148–162.
- Pekarek Doehler, S. (forthcoming). At the interface of grammar and the body: *chai pas* (‘dunno’) as a resource for dealing with lack of recipient response. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., De Stefani, E., & Horlacher A.-S. (2015). *Time and emergence in grammar: Left-dislocation, right-dislocation, topicalization and hanging topic in French*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Horlacher, A.-S. (2013). The patching together of pivot-patterns in talk-in-interaction: On ‘double dislocations’ in French. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 53, 92–108.
- Polak-Yitzhaki, H., & Maschler, Y. (2016). Disclaiming understanding? Hebrew *'ani lo mevin/a* (‘I don’t understand MASC/FEM’) in everyday conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 106, 163–183.
- Ross, J. R. (1969). Guess who? In R. I. Binnick, A. Davidson, G. M. Green, & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Papers from the fifth regional meeting of the*

- Chicago Linguistic Society* (pp. 252–286). Chicago, IL: The Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50, 696–735.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1979). The relevance of repair for syntax-for-conversation. In T. Givon (Ed.), *Syntax and semantics 12: Discourse and syntax* (pp. 261–288). New York: Academic Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1996). Turn organization: One intersection of grammar and interaction. In E. Ochs, Schegloff, E. A., & Thompson, S. A. (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Selting, M., & Couper-Kuhlen, E. (Eds.). 2001. *Studies in interactional linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamin.
- Stoenica, I.-M. (2014). Répétition et différenciation dans les reprises structurelles intégrant des relatives. *TRANEL*, 60, 209–220.
- Stoenica, I. M. (2018). *Le rôle des relatives dans l'organisation séquentielle de l'interaction: une approche temporelle, interactionnelle et praxéologique*. (Doctoral thesis.) Neuchâtel: University of Neuchâtel.
- Sorjonen, M. L., & Raevaara, L. (2014). On the grammatical form of requests at the convenience store: Requesting as embodied action. In E. Couper-Kuhlen, & P. Drew (Eds.), *Requesting in social interaction* (pp. 243–268). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

- Streeck, J. (2002). Grammars, words, and embodied meanings: On the uses and evolution of *so* and *like*. *Journal of Communication*, 52(3), 581–596.
- Streeck, J., Goodwin, C., & LeBaron, C. (Eds.). (2011). *Embodied interaction: Language and body in the material world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tomasello, M. (2003). *Constructing a language: A usage-based theory of language acquisition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Thompson, S. A. (2002). “Object complements” and conversation: Towards a realistic account. *Studies in Language*, 26, 125–163.
- Thompson, S. A., & Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2005). The clause as a locus of grammar and interaction. *Discourse Studies*, 7(4-5), 481–505.
- Thompson, S. A., & Mulac, A. (1991). A quantitative perspective on the grammaticization of epistemic parentheticals in English. In E. Closs Traugott, & B. Heine (Eds.), *Approaches to grammaticalization* (pp. 313–329). Vol. II. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Van Valin, R. D. (1984). A typology of syntactic relations in clause linkage. *Proceedings of the Tenth annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society*, 542–558.
- Walker, G. (2007). On the design and use of pivots in everyday English conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, 2217–2243.
- Wide, C. (2014). Constructions as resources in interaction: Syntactically unintegrated *att* ‘that’-clauses in spoken Swedish. In R. Boogaart, T. Coleman, & G. Rutten (Eds.), *Expanding the scope of construction grammar* (pp. 353–388). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.