

“You turn your back and there’s somebody moving in”

Syntactic anacrusis in spoken English

Paul J. Hopper

Carnegie Mellon University

Anacrustic Coordination (AC) is a type of biclausal conjunction such that an initial clause or phrase sets up a state of affairs and is followed by *and* and a strongly focused second clause, for example *three years it’s been sitting here and I haven’t done it*. AC figures in a number of kinds of interaction. One is the topic/comment conditional, as in *call it up and there’s something that actually says your number*. It is a possibility for enhancing certain illocutionary acts such as threats and warnings: *I’m gonna take that and I’m gonna dig it into you*. It is a basis for syntactic mirativity, the coding of surprise and unexpectedness (DeLancey 1997): *you turn your back and there’s somebody moving in*. AC raises questions about the nature of constructions and of Construction Grammar.

Keywords: coordination, anacrustic/anacrusis, emergent grammar, biclausal, construction, boosting, conditional, speech acts, mirativity, style

1. Introduction: Coordination with *and*

In their monograph study of detached constituents, Pekarek Doehler, De Stefani and Horlacher (2015:248) suggest that, rather than searching texts for examples of known constructions and seeking motivations for these constructions, linguists should analyze the ways that “...speakers actually go about building their utterances during the moment-to-moment unfolding of talk-in-interaction,” and scrutinize “the interactional contingencies of emerging syntactic trajectories rather than limiting attention to what may appear as the use of ready-made patterns.”

A case in point is the coordination of clauses with *and* in connected dialog. Adjacent clauses joined with the coordinating conjunction *and* have drawn considerable attention from logicians and linguists. Earlier work in this vein drew on manufactured sentences in order to establish the semantic features conditioning

the relationship between the clauses, for example Lakoff 1971. Such clause sets assumed a purely abstract, monologic frame, with no temporal sequencing, social context, or deference to an interlocutor. Consequently the relationship between the two clauses was a bidirectional one. According to Givón, the two conjuncts must have “mutual relevance”; they must “belong together” (1993: 335). Thus: ‘It is raining and the stock market is down’ might be understood as a coherent response to a question like ‘Why are you looking so gloomy?’ The order of the two clauses relative to one another is immaterial. Mutual relevance, however, in that it requires both a backward and a forward perspective, is a criterion that is only possible in the abstract situation in which a bird’s eye view of the pair obtains. In an interactive, temporal frame of reference, by contrast, relevance is not mutual but works only forwards. Spoken tokens, being unidirectional, cannot retrospectively influence what has already been said. Rather, they leave traces that may be taken up by other speakers or the same speaker (Hopper 1985, 2011; Du Bois 2014). These traces are what Auer (2015) has called *latencies*, that is, affordances for future reference.

Schmerling (1974) showed that the first conjunct of a pair has pragmatic “priority” in the sense of forming a preliminary background to the second conjunct. Once this move is admitted, the real-time order of the conjuncts becomes crucial, and makes the need for corpus-based studies of coordination inevitable. It is not hard to find examples. In the following, Judy presents Lea with a book that explains the backgrounds to Lea’s Japanese woodcuts:¹

Excerpt 1.

1. JUDY: those books you have,
2. this explain=ns what’s going on in the scenes.
3. And explains the background to them and,
4. LEA: .. Oh,
5. okay.
6. JUDY: And I thought,
7. ... it ex[plains],
8. LEA: [Yeah=].
9. JUDY: ... what’s happening [in],
10. LEA: [(H)] Yeah,
11. cause I’ve got some of these woodcuts.
12. Hunh.
13. JUDY: Right.
14. And they don’t have the explanation do they.

The sequence 1–14 comprises Judy’s reasons for buying Lea the book and Lea’s interspersed responses *oh, yeah, okay, hunh*. In lines 13–14, after Lea’s aligning response in 10–12, Judy resumes her ‘explaining’ theme with a Turn Construction

1. Unless indicated otherwise, conversational data are cited from Du Bois et al. (2000–2005), *The Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English*. Transcriptional conventions are listed at the end of this article.

Unit (TCU) introducing *and*. TCU-initial *and* in lines 3, 6, and 14 works to signal to the interlocutor that the argument is to be continued, if necessary overriding an intervening TCU of an interlocutor (an observation about the role of *and* that had been made earlier by Schiffrin (1986: 143)). Each TCU-initial *and* contributes a new increment to the developing argument which is confirmed by a response token from Lea. Unlike a simple adjacency pair, there is the unfolding in time of an argument. Moreover, the combining of clauses in lines 11–14 is a collaborative effort, the first clause being supplied by Lea in line 11 (*cause I've got some of these woodcuts*) and the conjunct added by Judy in line 14 (*and they don't have the explanation do they*).

The role of temporal sequencing in argument was described by Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1958, in Bolduc and Frank 2010: 308):

We have given the name *argumentation* to the set of discursive techniques allowing us to create or increase adherence to theses that are presented for assent; the traditional term *demonstration* is reserved for the means of proof permitting us to come to a conclusion by moving from the truth of certain propositions to that of other propositions and, in the field of formal logic, by moving from certain theses of a system to other theses of the same system with the aid of defined rules of transformation.

Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca's 1958 article, the French title of which is "De la temporalité comme caractère de l'argumentation," stressed the role of time as the prime differentiator between argumentation and what they called demonstration, a rhetorical category that includes formal logic. Temporality is also a theoretical pillar of the Interactional Linguistics paradigm (Auer 2000, 2009, 2015; Hopper 2019; Günthner 2015; Deppermann & Günthner 2015; Maschler 2015; Pekarek Doehler, De Stefani & Horlacher 2015; Keevallik 2020.).

Although coordination with *and* has been discussed extensively by linguists and logicians from the perspective of clause and phrase level conjunction (Haspelmath ed. 2004), it has attracted relatively little attention from students of spoken discourse (Laury ed. 2008 is an important exception). The theme of the present paper is a particular kind of coordination which will be called *anacrusic coordination*, a sequence of clauses in which the first member of a coordinate pair creates a background for a strongly focused (i.e., foregrounded) clause joined to it with *and*. In Excerpt (2) below, Marci's *and I haven't done it* in line 7 is foregrounded to her *three years it's been sitting here* in line 6:

Excerpt 2.

1. MARCI: .. I bought some extra= ... calico,
2. to put around [the e]dges,
3. WENDY: [Right],
4. MARCI: three sides.

5. (THROAT)
 6. .. Three years it's been sitting here,
 7. and I haven't done it,
 8. so I took it in to !Edna,
 9. so she's gonna do it.

Marci's line 6, which leads up to the focus in line 7, exemplifies an *anacrusis*, the clause that projects a focus clause here referred to as a *resolution*. The clause initial adverbial *three years* in line 6 strengthens the focus on line 7 *and I haven't done it*. Repetitive patterns of clauses of this kind are of interest because they force us to question the concept of subordination if this is held to require a subordinating conjunction (see Matthiessen & Thompson 1988). They also have implications for our definition of a construction, as will be discussed below.

2. Constructions in spoken language

2.1 Constructions

The study of natural conversation presents a predicament for the linguist accustomed to data from written or made-up texts. If we bring to conversation the fixed structural templates devised by grammarians, we will rarely find a perfect match. This raises the question of when we have a 'construction.' The usual criteria for a construction cannot be applied consistently to a segment of transcribed speech. The perfect exemplars displayed in descriptions of the written language turn out on inspection of a spoken context to be simply one of a number of possibilities, some of which cannot even be admitted with certainty to the same family of constructions (Hopper 2004). Throughout this paper it is assumed that anacrustic coordination is a construction. Yet, while there are clear cases, it merges with simple coordination of clauses, from which it can only be distinguished by a context that shows there to be a semantic lead up from a backgrounded clause to a significant segment of discourse. We have occasional pairings of a clause subsequently identified as an anacrusis with a conjoined clause used as a resolution. Anacrustic coordination underlines a recurrent problem with construction grammar and other theories that rely on fixed schemata. Often we can only glimpse a fragmentary resemblance between a formal construction and its supposed manifestation in discourse. It is a dilemma of which Hermann Paul was acutely aware:

Yet even the smallest variation in usage is already a complicated process that we cannot understand without taking into account the modification of usage by the

individual. Where standard grammar tends to separate and draw boundaries, we must strive to detect every possible intermediate step.²

The idea of a construction has a contoured, templatic sense that is hard to reconcile with the fluid, even random nature of spoken language. Perhaps it is time for interactional linguists to replace the term *construction* with *process*, a term which is more compatible with the temporality of language and the online emergence of structure.

2.2 Constructions in Conversational Data

As long as we limit ourselves to single isolated sentences we can reasonably claim to identify unambiguous instances of ‘canonical’ constructions that conform to a template with selected lexical items and discrete right and left boundaries. The standard procedure has been to assume a fixed schema and examine a corpus for instances of it, as Prince (1978) and Collins (1994) did for pseudoclefts. More recent studies have shown that supposedly fixed grammatical templates dissolve in real time into fragments which derive their cumulative value from the pragmatics of interactions. Thus in the following example of the pseudocleft, the two clauses that are held in normative grammars to comprise the construction appear as fragments separated from one another:

Excerpt 3.

1. ALICE: ... Yep (Hx).
2. ... And he's rolling in it, Mary.
3. ... And you know what the sad thing,
4. ... the thing that really scares me?
5. ... is that they're n=- --
6. ... (H) th- at the rate they're going
7. ... and with all the breaks that they've gotten,
8. ... (H) they're never gonna have hard times.
9. MARY: ... Hard times do train you.
10. ALICE: ... Yep.
11. MARY: ... They do.

Assembling the fragments, we can create a written grammar construction: *what the sad thing is, is that they're never gonna have hard times*. Defragmenting constructions in this way, however, bypasses the fact that the intervening parts of the speaker's action (lines 4, 6, and 7) themselves have communicative significance. After reporting in line 2 that the subject of her contribution is wealthy (*he's rolling in it*), Alice laments (line 8) that people like him never know hardship.

2. Doch auch die geringste Veränderung des Usus ist bereits ein komplizierter Prozess, den wir nicht begreifen ohne Berücksichtigung der individuellen Modifikation des Usus. Da, wo die gewöhnliche Grammatik zu sondern und Grenzlinien zu ziehen pflegt, müssen wir uns bemühen alle möglichen Zwischenstufen und Vermittelungen aufzufinden. (Paul 1920: 33)

She evaluates this as *sad* (line 3) and says that it *scares* her (line 4). In lines 3–4 Alice sets up her premise with a rhetorical question to her interlocutor. She then (lines 6–7) interpolates a justification that projects her main point in line 8. It is apparent that any single motivation for using a pseudocleft construction such as to focus a particular constituent must be placed in doubt. Furthermore, the normativized pseudocleft construction has not been reconstructed on anything like a complete schema. There is nothing that corresponds to a notion of a sentence split into two clauses ('cleft'). Only the vestigial *what* that begins the unfolding of Alice's argument suggests a projected pseudocleft. What Günthner (2011) says of the pseudocleft is also true of other so-called biclausal constructions in interactions: "In interactional use, it is often difficult or even impossible to determine the exact ending of a pseudocleft, as the construction is incrementally prolonged, without clear endpoints" (Günthner 2011: 165–66). The observation is easily verified. In the following, Rebecca, an attorney, is coaching a witness to a crime:

Excerpt 4.

1. REBECCA: ... W- what will happen is,
2. ... you'll walk into the courtroom here.
3. RICKIE: .. [Mhm].
4. REBECCA: [There are door]s right here.
5. RICKIE: [2Yeah2].
6. REBECCA: [2(H)2] There are seats right here,
7. .. u=m,
8. .. that are for the audience,
9. but normally there's nobody in the audience but,
10. RICKIE: [Okay].
11. REBECCA:[your] husband will be there,

And so on for a considerable time. Here the first clause of the 'biclausal' pseudocleft, Rebecca's *what will happen is*, is sharply delineated, but there is no identifiable second clause; rather, the discourse continues solely on the theme of *what will happen*, where *happen* projects an event or a series of events (Hopper 2001; Thompson & Hopper 2009).

It is not only the second clause of the pseudocleft that appears in a distorted form. In the next excerpt, a partial pseudocleft appears as a focus clause introduced by *is* without the introductory *what* clause:

Excerpt 5.

1. BETH: .. So if you were % --
2. spent your whole life on your hands and knees,
3. you never get a backache.
4. That's ... basic[ally],
5. ROSEMARY: [(TSK) (H)] Actually,
6. [2that2] h=elps when you have a backache.
7. SHERRY: [2Hm2].
8. .. Really?
9. ROSEMARY: .. Is to .. get down on your hands and knees,
10. and walk arou- --
11. and crawl around?

Rosemary's *is to get down on your hands and knees* (line 9) is a focus clause without an introductory *wh*-clause. It does the same work as the Part B of a pseudocleft but lacks a defining element of a well-formed pseudocleft, namely an introductory *wh*-word. However, her *that helps when you have a backache* (line 6) serves the same function as a *wh*-clause. It might be called an emergent *th*-cleft, a dialogically created construction that has not (yet) made it into the received canon of grammatical constructions. The biclausal pseudocleft construction exists, then, as a possibility comprising recurrent partials each of which can, alone or in combination, within or across speakers, contribute to a set of communications. The pseudocleft as it appears in discourse is an ever expanding family of overlapping partials rather than a discrete construction (Hopper 2001). In this respect it resembles other alleged biclausal constructions, including the one to which we now turn, the anacrustic coordination construction.

3. Anacrustic Coordination

3.1 Syntactic Anacrusis

The adjective *anacrustic* and its noun *anacrusis* derive from a traditional usage in literary and musical studies. In poetry, anacrusis refers to an upswing at the beginning of a metrical line created by adding one or more unstressed syllables before the first complete foot. In the following example, from Samuel Coleridge's *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*, the first foot of the iambic line is preceded by an 'extra' unstressed syllable:

Excerpt 6.

And the cōmīng wind dīd rōar mōre lōud,
And the sáils dīd sigh līke sēdge

The first syllable in each of these lines is the anacrusis. Anacrusis is also known as *Auftakt*, or *Upbeat*, referring to the added lift imparted to the main stress by the extra unstressed syllable. In the extended syntactic sense used here, anacrusis is manifested as a constituent (phrase or clause) which adumbrates a follow-up constituent, normally a clause. The anacrustic part presents a frame such as a time or a condition against which the follow-up is in relief. This frame has the hallmarks of a topic in that it projects a prominent segment of discourse to come. Anacrustic coordination is a strategy for *boosting*, as this term has been used by researchers in rhetoric since Hyland (1998); the anacrusis boosts the effect of the resolution.

The kind of structure exemplified here can be seen formally as a kind of coordination, there being two constituents joined by a coordinating conjunction *and*. However, it is at the same time a *focusing* construction along the same lines as the

pseudocleft: It works to project and bestow prominence on a subsequent piece of discourse. Anacrusic coordination occupies a midway position between coordination and biclausality. As we will see below, it shares features that have been described for coordination (Schiffrin 1986; Schmerling 1974) and for biclausality (Barth-Weingarten & Couper-Kuhlen 2011).

Anacrusic coordination may be seen as an extreme case of asymmetric coordination, in which a clause projects a value forward to a following coordinated clause. Such asymmetric coordination is normal in natural conversation, in fact cases of symmetrical coordination with *and*, which comprise many of the examples discussed by sentence analysts, cannot really exist. This is so because oral discourse occurs in unidirectional real time, with clausal units succeeding one another, the temporal order being imposed by the dialogical situation. The relationship between successive coordinated clauses can be anacrusic, but more often it is a neutral, informational one, as in the following excerpt:

Excerpt 7.

1. HAROLD: ... We were at this dumb store,
2. and the clerk .. kept trying to keep us interested,
3. <@ while she was buy=ing @>.

Here, the speaker first, in line 1, locates the incident in a place and in lines 2–3 continues the topic of clothes-buying with *and*. There is thematic continuity, but the clauses are not interchangeable – the store and the clerk must be introduced in this order. While the coordination is asymmetrical, however, lines 1–2 do not constitute anacrusic coordination. Harold's *we were at this dumb store* in line 1 does not project any special enhancement of his continuation in lines 2–3. The contrast may be seen in the next excerpt:

Excerpt 8.

1. He'd have r=olls of hundreds,
2. or= something in his pocket,
3. and he'd wake up somewhere,
4. and it'd be all gone,
5. he didn't know where it went.

The speaker's line 4 *and it'd be all gone* is the main point of the narrative. Lines 1–2 set the stage for the events in lines 3–4. Line 3 is what is here called the anacrusis, the core of which is *wake up and*. The role of the anacrusis is to anticipate the more noteworthy action in line 4, the *resolution*, to follow, throwing it into relief. The speaker is not giving priority to the fact that the antagonist woke up, but that he had lost his money. The anacrusis often has the same subject as the resolution, but the above example, in which the anacrusis and the resolution have different subjects, is by no means unusual. Anacrusic coordination is therefore in this respect somewhat different from, although closely related to, the *VP and VP* con-

struction described by Barth-Weingarten and Couper-Kuhlen (2011), with examples such as *I would have to think that over and find out* (p.266).

The reduced emphasis that allows the anacrusis to contrastively enhance the resolution has a logical counterpart in the idea of a presupposition, which presents certain information as known to both speaker and hearer. In natural conversation such straightforward instances are quite rare. However, shared information can be created, sustained, and added to. There is thus a certain parallel (which should not be taken too far) between the presupposition-assertion structure of logical treatments of coordination and its more conspicuous manifestation in coordination in conversation (see Thompson & Hopper 2009:143 for some discussion of this point). Unlike the mentally constructed coordinate clauses of logic, anacrustic coordination does not occur out of the blue. Rather, it is prepared across several intonation units, as in the following:

Excerpt 9.

1. MILES: Every time I got up.
2. I'm thinking,
3. Go=d,
4. these guys don't waste any ti=me.
5. I mean,
6. you turn your back,
7. and there's somebody moving in.

Here, Miles tells about going to a certain night club with a girlfriend. His date doesn't want to dance, but prefers to sit and watch others dancing. Whenever Miles gets up to dance, he comes back to find that another man has moved in on his date. The anacrusis *you turn your back* in line 6 resumes the *these guys don't waste any time* of line 4, and the *every time I got up* of line 1 anticipates the *there's somebody moving in* of line 7.

3.2 Structuration of the anacrusis

The strategies that speakers use in creating anacruses include syntactic and lexical devices.

Because of the generally low informational content of the first clause of a biclausal construction, the first clause (the anacrusis) is often formulaic or near-formulaic, as is the case with *you turn your back and* in the previous excerpt. One frequently heard technique for creating an anacrusis is a tactical use of the verb *take*. In the next excerpt, Larry, a contractor, is explaining to his client Seth that previous workers have cleaned the stubs of the electrical contacts:

Excerpt 10.

1. SETH: ... So,
2. .. <X then you X> get duct work?
3. .. Or [is this the flue].

4. LARRY: [We=11,
 5. yeah].
 6. .. [2What they did,
 7. SETH: [2That's the flue I guess2].
 8. LARRY: they they2] took the stubs,
 9. and they cleaned em up (Hx).
 10. .. (H) So you can tie right into em.
 11. See?

In lines 8–9 Larry uses the *take NP and* construction (Hopper 2007). *Take* in this construction is a semantically empty verb that functions to introduce a new NP into the discourse (*the stubs*) and to project a transitive verb (*cleaned*), usually in the next intonation unit, the object of which (*em*) is coreferential with this NP. Almost always there is also an adverbial complement such as *up* in line 9. Larry must compete with Seth, who is distracted by a flue that he spots, and needs to affirm his claim to a continued turn. He speaks over Seth's action in lines 3 and 7 and spins out his projected *they cleaned the stubs up* by distributing the transitive verb *cleaned up* and the direct object *the stubs* over two intonation units (lines 8–9). The *take NP and* construction can be heard frequently in everyday talk. It occurs several times in the Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English:

Excerpt 11.

- a. 1. I mean this is a cliché,
 2. but,
 3. but business has always uh,
 4. ... taken these works,
 5. and,
 6. .. and manipulated em,
 7. either,
 8. ... to their benefit,
- b. 1. it's basically,
 2. (H) taking something and dividing it up randomly.
- c. 1. CAROLYN: .. what you do with those third-graders,
 2. you know,
 3. is you just like,
 4. (H) take them,
 5. and put them,
 6. you know,
 7. with one of the smarter fourth-graders,
 8. who's very [ver]bal,
 9. SHARON: [uh].
 10. CAROLYN: and .. and well-beha=ved.

This transitive use of *take* is not to be confused with an intransitive use of *take* found in some registers in which *take and* is closer to an aspectual auxiliary.³ It

3. An oral narrative of Hurricane Katrina makes frequent use of intransitive *take* in an aspectual sense, for example: "To continue my story, I took and lied, told a little lie and got on a truck, a military truck and he brought me out of the dead... He brought me to an area where I seen people I knew and I took and waved goodbye at them because I was going on the plane." <<http://www.nzdl.org/cgi-bin/library.cgi?e=d-00000-00---off-oaliveint--00-1----0-10-0>

can be seen here that the anacrusis contributes little in the way of information, but rather has a temporal role (Günthner and Hopper 2010) of delaying the delivery of the resolution and, by creating tension, enhancing its importance. Moreover, by distributing NPs and verbs over two clauses, it attenuates their cognitive load (see Pawley and Sider 2000).

The low-information feature of anacrusis may be manifested in a variety of ways:

- i. The anacrusis may gather together information that has already been introduced and is therefore already in possession of both parties to the interaction:

Excerpt 12.

1. JULIE: Yeah.
2. (H) .. Is it --
3. Do you have enough time to br--
4. % run me by the vet clinic,
5. before we go pick up my truck,
6. because .. they close at [five thirty].
7. JACKIE: [I'm fine].
8. JULIE: ... Okay.
9. JACKIE: As long as [I can] --
10. JULIE: [And I've got]ta pick up,
11. I've got to give uh Shiba her shots.
12. And .. he ordered the vaccine and it's in,

Julie leads up to the anacrusis *he ordered the vaccine* and the resolution *and it's in* (line 12) by her previous *run me by the vet clinic* (line 4), *they close at five thirty* (line 6), and *I've got to give Shiba her shots* (line 11). The referents of *he* and *it* in line 12 are established through *vet clinic* in line 4 and *vaccine* in line 12. The name of Julie's mare Shiba has been introduced some time previous to the excerpt. In the following Excerpt (13), Miles assembles the anacrusis *he was actually here two weeks ago* from pieces of talk contributed previously by himself, Jamie, and Harold:

Excerpt 13.

1. HAROLD: I have no idea.
2. It was probably my= .. sister-in-law's idea because,
3. ... I think they saw= ... that movie.
4. JAMIE: ... Tap?
5. HAROLD: What [was the],
6. MILES: [<X They had X>] --
7. HAROLD: the movie with that .. really hot tap danc[er].
8. JAMIE: [Oh] that
- ki=d.
9. MILES: ... He was actually here two weeks ago,
10. and [I missed him].
11. JAMIE: [at the..at] the ja=zz..t[2ap thing or whatever2].

12. HAROLD: [2Was he a little kid2]?
 13. MILES: No he's sixteen now=.

The referent of *he* in line 9 and *him* in line 10 is a child tap dancer introduced in line 7, who starred in a movie first mentioned in line 3. The dancer's celebrity status is confirmed by Miles's *actually* in the anacrusis *he was actually here two weeks ago* (line 9), and explains the enhancement in the resolution *and I missed him* in line 10.

- ii. The anacrusis may consist of a fixed or near-fixed expression such as *take NP and* discussed above, *turn your back and*, *take advantage and*, *call NP up and*, *look at NP and*, *pick up the phone and*, all of which are attested in the corpus. Speakers of English know very many of these ready-made anacrusic expressions and how they are used; *looked him straight in the eye and*, for example, (not in the corpus) is a favored component of the punch line of anecdotes and jokes.
- iii. Forms of *to sit* with an adverb such as *around*, *here*, *back*, are quite frequent:

Excerpt 14.

- a. 1. TOM_1: She might a- %n] --
 2. Might alw- -so,
 3. be a little .. more helpful to her down there,
 4. if she had a- .. a television,
 5. so when she goes home then,
 6. there's something to do besides sit a[rou=nd.
 7. TOM_3: [@@@]
 8. TOM_1: (H)] And be lonely.
- b. 1. BETH: (H) Just @don't tell him,
 2. ROSEMARY: (H) Martha Jean sat there,
 3. BETH: and (Hx),
 4. ROSEMARY: and told all about how,
 5. .. % sick Barbara Jean was,
 6. when she was tiny,
- c. 1. ARNOLD: Oh I'm not,
 2. I'm just <X gonna sit back and look X>.
- d. 1. MARCI: .. I bought some extra= _ calico,
 2. to put around [the e]dges,
 3. WENDY: [Right],
 4. MARCI: three sides.
 5. .. Three years it's been sitting here,
 6. and I haven't done it,

Sit, being intrinsically inactive, could be considered an ideal choice for an anacrusis. The persistent use of *sit* and *go* in the anacrusic piece has implications for a typological feature of anacrusic coordination, its historical role in the grammaticalization of auxiliaries (Kuteva 2004). The use of *sit* with an inanimate subject that we have in excerpt (d) above echoes examples from Dutch, Danish, and Bulgarian cited by Kuteva, who shows how verbs like *sit* and *stand* may develop a grammatical function of signalling durative aspect.

- iv. Especially common in the anacrusis are simple verbs of motion such as: *go* and *go* plus a number of adverbial prepositions including *over*, *down*, *out*, *up*, *through*:

Excerpt 15.

- a. 1. MARIE: But she um,
 2. (H) but it was just rude,
 3. I was just being like really judgmental,
 4. like on purpose.
 5. Do you know?
 6. Cause I would never go up and say something,
- b. 1. DAN: He went and looked it up in the dictionary,
 2. so that he could spell it [wrong on] purpose.
 3. LUCY: [@@]

and many other examples. Such combinations constitute quasi-aspectual expressions. Unlike the standard kind of biclausal construction, the domain of which may extend over a stretch of subsequent discourse, these verb of motion anacruses are typically short, single clause extensions, usually a single predicate, and occur in the same intonation unit as the resolution or are otherwise prosodically linked as *VP and VP* expressions (Barth-Weingarten & Couper-Kuhlen 2011). They project something remarkable that was not easily anticipated. They may add additional senses to the subsequent predicate, such as volitionality and stance. For example, *go and* quite often imparts a negative sense to the combination. Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech and Svartvik (1985: 978) mention the often derogatory connotation of *go* in sentences like *he went and complained about us, they've gone and upset her again*. Combinations with *come* also occur frequently in the corpus: *come out and, come up and, come [up] to NP and, come by and, come back and*.

A single speaker can pursue an anacrustic coordination past a turn completion point and into the next TCU. In the following excerpt, Marilyn is telling Pete about a tactic used by holiday agents to entice customers to undertake expensive salmon fishing vacations:

Excerpt 16.

1. MARILYN: (H) And some guy who- --
 2. .. who knows a good thing when he's on to it,
 3. .. (H) calls them up.
 4. PETE: ... I [see].
 5. MARILYN: [(H) (TSK)] And says,
 6. .. (TSK) oh=.
 7. .. The fish are running,
 8. don't you want to come up here,

Pete's line 4 *I see* with its terminal contour intervenes between Marilyn's anacrusis *calls them up* (line 3) and her resolution *and says* (line 5). In this case, the two parts of the construction occur in different TCUs. It is a short step from here to

Of the *go X and ones*, *go ahead and* appears multiple times, and has features of auxiliaries, with the consistent meaning of doing something against resistance (Hopper 2002). This may involve permission, advice, or decision. In the following, Marilyn reports that Roy has allowed a neighbor to pick lemons from their tree; the neighbor responds by stripping the tree of fruit:

1. MARILYN: So ~Roy had said ... to him,
2. .. if you ever want lemons,
3. you know,
4. go ahead and .. and [have em].
5. PETE: [Right].
6. MARILYN: <X Then X> he said,
7. .. she said,
8. <O oh !Kenneth said I could have some lemons O>.

1. CAM: ... Oh=.
2. .. Well he should just,
3. .. [go to a gas] station.
4. LAJUAN: [So he said he'll] --
5. .. (H) Well there's one down the street from his house,
6. but it'll probably be open tomorrow morning.
7. CAM: .. Oh.
8. LAJUAN: It's not open now.
9. So he said he'd just rather stay home.
10. ... Instead,
11. and I said fi=ne,
12. go ahead and stay home.

With its stative-durative verb *stay*, the resolution *stay home* binds to the anacrusis *go ahead and* in the same intonation unit, neutralizing the possible dynamic force of *go*. At the same time, by using *go ahead and* Lajuan allows the suggestion of staying home to be the other person's choice instead of a response to a command. Somewhat similar is the following (Example (19)), where *go ahead and* confers a volitional sense on *withheld*. Here, Mitchell argues that his opponent in a court case, having agreed to pay the labor expenses for a job, should also have paid the employees' insurance contributions. He accuses his opponent of dishonest dealing by holding back the information that Mitchell was to pay the insurance contributions and thereby making it seem that Mitchell's profit would be greater than was to be the case:

Excerpt 19.

1. MITCHELL: .. He --
2. .. it would be,
3. ... if <X it may please you X>,
4. ... %uh,
5. .. the whole reason why I'm here.
6. ... Is because he took that twenty-six percent out,
7. that he told me he wasn't gonna take,
8. ... he used it as,
9. .. more or less bait me to do the job,
10. ... and went ahead and withheld it from me.
11. ... Without saying a word to it,
12. I had nothing,
13. .. I was expecting to make about a thousand dollars
14. on the job,

By using *went ahead and*, with its overtone of volitionality and contrary-to-expectation background, Mitchell attempts to construe *withheld* in line 10 as a devious action. The following excerpt (20), from the same conversation, similarly points up the way in which, by exploiting the 'contrary to expectation' sense of *go ahead and* (line 4) the speaker is able to impute deceit to his opponent:

Excerpt 20.

1. MITCHELL: ... Conversation was,
2. ~Mitch,
3. if you do this job,
4. ... I'll go ahead and pay all your employees,
5. and you in turn will be able to pa- make more money.
6. JUDGE: ... That was pretty much it.
7. MITCHELL: ... That's it.

As a final example of *go ahead and*, with a first person subject the meaning is typically a decision-making one that conveys that the speaker had weighed other possibilities. Here, Kristin, a dietician, is debating out loud the ideal calorie intake for a patient. She tells the patient her decision (line 5) and afterwards (lines 6–12) explains her reasoning:

Excerpt 21.

1. KRIS: (H)= So (Hx),
2. what we can do (Hx),
3. um,
4. .. (TSK) I would say,
5. I'm gonna go ahead and make it out about eighteen hundred.
6. .. Just because,
7. uh,
8. you're at a good weight,
9. you're about five fi=ve,
10. .. (H)= u=m,
11. ...(TSK)...I think that would be a prudent place to,
12. .. to start out from.

In all of these examples of *go ahead and* there is a prior build-up that justifies the construction. The build-up creates an obstacle that is set aside by the construction. Examples like *go ahead and stay home*, *went ahead and withheld it* show the construction in an apparently ideal form where the verb of the resolution

is stative-passive and the lexicality of *go* has become bleached. It is clear, however, that as with other constructions, the parts that make up the construction are drawn from previous discourse. *Go ahead* itself occurs alone, that is, without a resolution that would identify it as part of the *go ahead and* construction. Here, Lea is opening a present. Judy, Dan, and Tim are watching:

Excerpt 22.

1. LEA: hunh].
2. ... Can I open this book [2now2]?
3. JUDY: [20h sh2]=-- --
4. LEA: [3I know it's3] [4a book4].
5. JUDY: [3@=3][4@@
6. TIM: [4@@@4]
7. JUDY: You know it's a4] book.
8. LEA: @ [5@@5]
9. DAN: [5@=5][6=@@6]
10. JUDY: [6If it's from6] [7me7],
11. LEA: [7@7]
12. JUDY: you know it's a [8book8].
13. LEA: [8@@8]@
14. DAN: .. @ [9@9]
15. JUDY: [9Y9][e=s],
16. LEA: [9(H)9][@@]@ (H)=
17. .. Ah[2=2].
18. JUDY: [2A12]right.
19. ... [3@ (Hx)=3]@@ [4@@4]
20. LEA: [3XX3]
21. [4@@4]
22. ... <VOX I can't wait to see what it is VOX>.
23. JUDY: Oh=,
24. LEA: ... XX.
25. JUDY: ... @ @oh,
26. go ahead Mom,
27. just ... [keep doing] it.
28. LEA: [XX]
29. ... Oh= wow=.
30. Where [did you go] to get thi=s.

There is much laughter and anticipation, but eventually (lines 26–27) Judy urges her mother to finish the unwrapping (*go ahead Mom, just keep doing it*). There is no question here of a truncated *go ahead and* construction with an ellipted resolution, nor of a resolution projected from an anacrusis, such as we might find in a ‘complete’ *go ahead and* construction. Rather, we can see that the *go ahead and* construction, with its anacrusis and its resolution, when it occurs, is sedimented out of separately identifiable parts, *go*, *ahead*, and *and*, which in on-going discourse combine with an up-coming resolution to be mapped onto the construction’s emergent *Gestalt* (Günthner 2011). As Barth-Weingarten and Couper-Kuhlen have put it in their study of the *VP and VP* construction (which might be called a close cousin of anacrustic coordination): “Interestingly, the *VP* conjunction with *and* behaves in this respect similar to other conjunctionals...These linking elements all have in common that they introduce bits of talk which are dependent on prior talk for their full interpretation” (Barth-Weingarten & Couper-Kuhlen 2011: 268).

3.3 Co-construction of anacrustic coordination

Like other constructions, anacrustic coordination is assembled out of fragments of previous discourse, sometimes being mapped on to a readymade template, and most often presented within a single TCU. The work of assembling can, however, be distributed over two or more speakers, each speaker supplying part of the construction. The division of labor is such that one speaker sets up an anacrusis and another a resolution, as in the following excerpt (23). Here, Marilyn and Roy are preparing dinner. They are about to use a salad spinner. Marilyn comments (line 3) that the device cost a dollar ninety-eight. Roy overlaps her statement with a surprise comment (line 4) that the device is useless:

Excerpt 23.

1. ROY: Where is that salad spinner.
2. Here it is.
3. MARILYN: ... A dollar [ninety-eight].
4. ROY: [And possibly the most] spurious .. device ever invented.
5. MARILYN: Oh I think <X it X> they're great.

The anacrusis in line 3 *a dollar ninety eight* is a detached NP. Roy's resolution *and possibly the most spurious device ever invented* in line 4 structurally parallels Marilyn's anacrusis in line 3 in similarly lacking a finite verb. They not only co-construct a single grammatically coherent predicate (*a dollar ninety eight and possibly the most spurious device every invented*), but they also in lines 3–4 collaborate in creating an anacrustic coordination of two NPs. In the same conversation (Excerpt (24)), there are three participants, Roy, Marilyn, and Pete. The topic is a salmon fishing holiday:

Excerpt 24.

1. ROY: ... Um,
2. PETE: What was [the problem].
3. ROY: [was supposed to] be,
4. MARILYN: [2Supposed to be perfect weather=2],
5. ROY: [2right in between the --
6. Yeah2],
7. perfect weather,
8. and all that stuff?
9. PETE: Unhunh.
10. ROY: .. And they ended up getting .. early .. winter .. storms.

The construction can be put together as *it was supposed to be perfect weather and they ended up getting early winter storms*. Roy launches the theme *supposed to be perfect weather* by answering Pete's inquiry *what was the problem* (line 2). His *was supposed to be* is co-opted by Marilyn in her line 4 *was supposed to be perfect weather*. Roy amplifies *perfect weather* with the elaboration in lines 5–8. At this point (line 8) the three speakers have agreed on an anacrusis, concluding with the confirmation by Pete through his token *unhunh* in line 9. In this case it could be said that the *supposed to be* that has been supplied by Roy and Marilyn in lines 3–4

projects something unexpected. Sure enough, the *perfect weather* transforms in line 10 into *early winter storms*. It can be guessed that Roy's incomplete IU in line 5 *right in between the* is part of the prediction of perfect weather coming between seasons.

4. Semantics and pragmatics of anacrusic coordination

4.1 Speech acts

We have been considering a spoken language process, here called anacrusic coordination, consisting of two clauses linked by *and* such that the first clause, called the *anacrusis* or *anacrusic clause*, projects a second clause called the *resolution*. We saw that the anacrusic clause is a low-information expression, to the extent that it may even be a fixed or near-fixed expression such as *go ahead* or *turn around*, that works to throw the resolution into strong relief. We have seen that an anacrusis and its resolution may be discontinuous and that the two clausal components can be distributed over the participants in a conversation. We have, however, said nothing about the more general kinds of interactive contexts, that is, the *speech acts*, in which anacrusic coordination figures, and which move it beyond the realm of conversation analysis and into areas of more general linguistic interest.

Anacrusic coordination may be associated with a number of well-known linguistic and semantic-pragmatic categories. These include: speech acts of threatening, warning, and promising; conditionals; and mirativity. The boundaries among these categories are, to say the least, blurred (for some preliminary discussion see Green 2020). A warning can be construed as a threat, a threat as a promise, and so on. Threats and warnings can often be construed as conditionals.

Excerpt 25.

a. Warning/Threat

1. .. (H) And I said,
2. well I- --
3. Alrigh=t.
4. I said,
5. I'll apologize next time.
6. ... (H) % And I'm gonna make hay out of it.
7. Don't you worry.
8. @@@@@@@@@@

The speaker promises in line 5 to apologize, but at the same time threatens in line 6 to *make hay* (make trouble) out of her apology, that is, to apologize but in doing so to publicly embarrass the recipient. Her line 5 qualifies as an anacrusis by virtue of resuming an older discussion of the circumstances of the need for an

apology. It constitutes a settled norm against which the threat in line 6 is boosted. She seals her intention to *make hay* with her bitter *don't you worry* (line 7) and laughter (line 8).

In the next excerpt, Alina reacts to the behavior of an obnoxious child who is digging into the table with a cutlery knife:

b. Threat

1. ALINA: I said try it again.
2. One more time,
3. I'm gonna [come] over there,
4. LENORE: [(THROAT)]
5. ALINA: and I'm gonna take that,
6. and I'm gonna dig it into you.

Alina makes a double-barreled threat to *take* the knife and *dig it into* the child, and projects the threat forcefully with the anacrusis *I'm gonna come over there* in line 3. With her lines 1–2 *try it again. One more time*. Alina sets things up for the coming anacrusis-resolution structure of her threat. Such examples provide a good illustration of what is meant by the term anacrusis, which crucially imparts strong communicative force to an upcoming unit.

4.2 Conditional

The projection function of the anacrusis finds a number of pragmatic uses in spoken discourse. A frequent use of anacrustic coordination is as a conditional. As was argued by Haiman (1978), the basic structure of an *if...then* conditional is that of a topic-comment construction, the protasis being offered as a topic and the apodosis as a comment. This observation ties nicely with some examples of anacrustic coordination in spoken language also, where the anacrusis has the role of the protasis and the resolution the role of the apodosis. In the following excerpt (26), the speaker, Michael, is complaining that robot telephone voices would be better if the robot could store all possible number combinations instead of saying each digit separately:

Excerpt 26.

1. MICHAEL: ... It would be much more pleasant if they had done
2. all the combinations though.
3. ... (H) .. You know,
4. call it up,
5. and there's something that actually..says your number,
6. .. in toto,
7. .. You know @@?

The excerpt displays two possibilities for conditionals, one in line 1 as a subordinate clause with *if*, the other in lines 3–5 as a paratactic combination of anacrusis and resolution. Having presented his hypothesis in line 1 as an *if*-conditional, Michael repeats his idea in line 3 as an anacrusis, formulated as an imperative,

followed by a resolution in lines 4–5. The first conditional, with *if*, is offered as a complete intonation unit. The second is distributed over three intonation units in lines 3–5. It is an explicit account, broken down into successive intonation units, of the (hypothetical) procedure that is presented in a more general form in a single intonation unit with an *if*-conditional in line 1. There are, then, here two syntactic possibilities for forming conditionals. The *if*-conditional in line 1 is a standard biclausal construction consisting of a main clause and a hypotactic clause introduced by *if*. The second possibility is a more pragmatic one consisting of two clauses arranged paratactically, the first clause being an imperative. There is no grammatical subordination, yet it belongs in the emergent pattern of anacrusis-resolution that has been described above. It should be stated that if the sense of parataxis is limited to two clauses arranged equipollently, anacrustic coordination is not strictly speaking paratactic. In fact, as Hermann Paul pointed out, “There is no such thing as a purely paratactic relationship between two clauses in the sense that neither determines the other. The only possible concept of parataxis is that one clause does not unilaterally determine the other, but that each determines the other” (Paul 1920: 148).⁴

4.3 Mirativity

An anacrusis-resolution pair creates a surprise effect similar to one that has been described in morphological studies in a variety of languages, known since DeLancey (1997) as mirativity. Anacrustic coordination is syntactic mirativity, the syntactic expression of unpreparedness for an assertion. Typically, the anacrusis presents a ‘normal’ situation after which the resolution is semantically marked:

Excerpt 27.

1. .. But anyway,
2. .. um,
3. @@@@
4. (H) then,
5. .. you know,
6. we showed up there and they were all gone.
7. .. That really irritated me.

In Excerpt (27) the speaker recreates her indignation at being invited to a party and finding that she is the only person present. The *and they were all gone* in line 6 is an unexpected continuation of the ‘normal’ expectation after a clause such as *we showed up*.

4. Ein rein parataktisches Verhältnis zwischen zwei Sätzen in dem Sinne, dass keiner den andern bestimmt, gibt es also nicht; es ist kein anderer Begriff von Parataxe möglich als der, dass nicht einseitig ein Satz den andern, sondern beide sich gegenseitig bestimmen.

Excerpt 28.

1. KENDRA: That __
2. ... No more card[3s3],
3. KEVIN: [3And we3] turned around and our
4. car was gone.
5. WENDY: ... @[4=4]
6. KEVIN: [4@4] Just kidding.

In Excerpt (28), Kendra's story (lines 1–2) is interrupted in line 3 by Kevin's mischievous joke. Wendy's reactive gasp/laugh in line 4 reveals that for an instant she has succumbed to the surprise effect projected by the joke's anacrusis-resolution structure. Kevin's *just kidding* in line 5 retracts the joke.

Aichenvald (2012: 473) offers the following semantic areas as typical of mirative constructions:

- i. sudden discovery, sudden revelation or realization;
- ii. surprise;
- iii. unprepared mind;
- iv. counterexpectation;
- v. new information.

These domains are often present simultaneously in the resolution phase of an anacrustic coordination. Morphologically expressed mirativity may be more restrictive in having affixes or particles specialized to a subset of this list of semantic features, whereas syntactic mirativity is just one of many possibilities emergent from clausal combinations, and overlaps with other functions.

5. Conclusion

We may sum up with the following points:

1. The anacrusis is assembled from fragments of previous discourse supplied by both the speaker and the interlocutor that establish it as a provisional platform from which the resolution can be launched. These fragments are latent (Auer 2015) elements that, for whatever interactive reason, qualify to figure subsequently as parts of an anacrusis. The anacrustic clause is on a spectrum having a free clause at one end and a fixed, often quasi-auxiliary expression at the other. Between these are various more or less fixed expressions.
2. The structure of anacrustic coordination can be exploited by speakers in a number of ways. These include speech acts of various kinds, conditionals, and mirative functions. Speakers can share the construction of an anacrusis-resolution pair, a second speaker coming in on an utterance of another to retrospectively create the full construction. These actions have in common

3. Like other constructions, anacrustic coordination is temporal, that is, its form and interpretation depend on its developing role in an ongoing interaction. Its structure emerges on line (Auer 2000, 2009), looking backward to the latencies created earlier in the interaction by the speaker and other participants, as well as forward to the upcoming resolution. It therefore supports Barth-Weingarten's observation (2014: 342–44) about the Janus-like possibilities of *and*, and Barth-Weingarten and Couper-Kuhlen's study of *VP-and-VP* structures (2011). However, unlike the pseudocleft, whose initial *wh*-word projects something important to come, a clause followed by *and* may constitute the first part of an anacrustic coordination or it may not, depending on whether it adumbrates a "surprise" element. Thus a clause like *Annette picked up the limes* might be followed by the unremarkable *and dropped them in the blender* or by the surprising *and threw them at her boyfriend*. Whether a conjunct qualifies as a resolution in an anacrustic construction or as a simple incremental conjunct, however, can only be determined by its role in the discourse. There is no formal signal other than the build-up in the antecedent discourse to alert the participant in a conversation to the likely imminence of a resolution. In this respect anacrustic coordination is no different from, say, the analysis of an *-en* participle as a verb or as a predicate adjective in English sentences like "the seal was broken": Only a broader context can decide. The grammar of an anacrustic coordination, then, is emergent, that is to say, it is built up by the conversants during real time and within an interaction (Hopper 1987, 2011, 2012). One of many examples that illustrate this is the following excerpt, cited above as Excerpt (14) (a):

1. TOM_1: She might a- %n] --
2. Might alw- so,
3. be a little .. more helpful to her down there,
4. if she had a- .. a television,
5. so when she goes home then,
6. there's something to do besides sit a[rou=nd.
7. TOM_3: [????]
8. TOM_1: (H)] And be lonely.

In line 6, the speaker has reached the end of a TCU. At this point his turn is syntactically and pragmatically complete. It is also prosodically complete, as is indicated by the full stop, the transcriptional sign for terminal intonation. The second speaker comes in on cue with responsive laughter (line 7). The first speaker continues with line 8, *and be lonely*. The anacrustic coordination *there's something to do besides sit around and be lonely* is not delivered holistically from a ready made schema, but is patched together piece by piece 'on

the fly'. Although the first part *sit around* is a fixed expression, as has been discussed above, the whole construction emerges locally.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the Editors and two anonymous readers of my paper for their careful and useful comments.

Symbols used in transcripts

...	Three fifths of a second pause
..	Two fifths of a second pause
@	one pulse of laughter
=	drawled segment or syllable
,	rise
.	fall
?	appeal
-	truncated word
--	truncated intonation unit
X	incompletely heard item
[]	overlapping speech (numbers [2xxxx2] identify the overlapping stretches of talk in case of several overlaps)
Hx	exhalation
H	inhalation
%	glottal stop
! or ~	fictional name
TSK	click

References

- Aichenvald, A. (2012). The essence of mirativity. *Linguistic Typology* 16,3:435–85.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/lity-2012-0017>
- Auer, P. (2000). On-line-Syntax, oder was es bedeuten könnte, die Zeitlichkeit der gesprochenen Sprache ernst zu nehmen. *Sprache und Literatur* 85:43–56.
<https://doi.org/10.30965/25890859-031-01-90000005>
- Auer, P. (2009). On line syntax: some thoughts on the temporality of spoken language. *Language Sciences* 31:1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2007.10.004>
- Auer, P. (2015). The temporality of language in interaction: Projection and Latency. In A. Deppermann and S. Günthner (Eds.), 27–56. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slsi.27.01aue>

- Barth-Weingarten, D. (2014). Dialogism and the emergence of final particles: The case of *and*. In S. Günthner, W. Imo & J. Bücker (Eds.), *Grammar and Dialogism: Sequential, Syntactic, and Prosodic Patterns between Emergence and Sedimentation*, 335–66. Berlin: De Gruyter. (Linguistik: Impulse & Tendenzen, 61)
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110358612.335>
- Barth-Weingarten, D. & Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2011). Action, prosody and emergent constructions: the case of *and*. In P. Auer & S. Pfänder, *Constructions: Emerging and Emergent*, 263–292. Berlin: De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110229080.263>
- Bolduc, M.K. & Frank, D.A. (2010). Chaïm Perelman and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca's 'On Temporality as a Characteristic of Argumentation': Commentary and Translation. *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 43 (4): 308–315.
- Collins, P.C. (1994). *Cleft and Pseudocleft Constructions in English*. London: Routledge.
- DeLancey, S. (1997). Mirativity: The grammatical marking of unexpected information. *Linguistic Typology* 1: 33–52. <https://doi.org/10.1515/lity.1997.1.1.33>
- Deppermann, A., & Günthner, S. (2015). Introduction: Temporality in interaction. In A. Deppermann & S. Günthner (Eds.), *Temporality in Interaction*, 1–26. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slsi.27>
- Du Bois, J.W., Chafe, W.L., Meyer, C., Thompson, S.A., Englebretson, R., & Martey, N. (2000–2005). *The Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English, Parts 1–4*. Philadelphia: Linguistic Data Consortium.
- Du Bois, J. (2014). Towards a dialogic syntax. *Cognitive Linguistics* 25,3: 359–410.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/cog-2014-0024>
- Fielder, G.E. (2008). Bulgarian adversative connectives: Conjunctions or discourse particles? In R. Laury (Ed.), 79–98. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.80.05fie>
- Givón, T. (1993). *English Grammar: A Function-Based Introduction, Volume 2*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/z.engram2>
- Green, M. (2020). Speech Acts. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. <<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/speech-acts>> Accessed November 14, 2020.
- Günthner, S. (2011). Between emergence and sedimentation: Projecting constructions in German interactions. In P. Auer and S. Pfänder (Eds.), *Constructions: Emergent and Emerging*, 156–185. Berlin: De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110229080.156>
- Günthner, S. (2015). A temporally oriented perspective on connectors in interaction: *und zwar* ('namely/in fact') constructions in everyday German conversations. In A. Deppermann & S. Günthner (Eds.), *Temporality in Interaction*, 237–264. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 237–64. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slsi.27.08gun>
- Günthner, S., & Hopper, P.J. (2010). Zeitlichkeit und sprachliche Struktur: Pseudoclefts im Englischen und Deutschen. *Gesprächsforschung* 11:1–28. <<http://www.gespraechsforschung-ozs.de/ga-guenthner.pdf>>
- Haiman, J. (1978). Conditionals are topics. *Language* 54:565–589.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.1978.0009>
- Haspelmath, M. (Ed.), (2004). *Coordinating Constructions*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. (Typological Studies in Language 58) <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.58>
- Hopper, P.J. (1987). Emergent Grammar. *Berkeley Linguistic Society* 13:139–157.
<https://doi.org/10.3765/bls.v13i0.1834>

- Hopper, P.J. (2001). Grammatical Constructions and their Discourse Origins: Prototype or Family Resemblance? In M. Pütz & S. Niemeier (Eds.), *Applied Cognitive Linguistics: Theory, Acquisition, and Language Pedagogy* 109–30. Berlin: Mouton/De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110866247.109>
- Hopper, P.J. (2002). Hendiadys and auxiliation in English. In J. Bybee and M. Noonan (Eds.), *Complex Sentences in Grammar and Discourse*, 145–173. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/z.110.09hop>
- Hopper, P.J. (2004). The openness of grammatical constructions. *Chicago Linguistic Society* 40:153–175.
- Hopper, P.J. (2007). Emergent serialization in English: Pragmatics and typology. In J. Good (Ed.), *Language Universals and Language Change*, 520–554. London: Oxford University Press.
- Hopper, P.J. (2011). Emergent Grammar and Temporality in Interactional Linguistics. In P. Auer & S. Pfänder (Eds.), *Constructions: Emerging and Emergent*, 22–44. Berlin: De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110229080.22>
- Hopper, P.J. (2012). Emergent Grammar. In J. P. Gee & M. Handford (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, 301–315. London/New York: Routledge.
- Hopper, P.J. (2019). Timely Notes on Saussure and Hermann Paul after 1968. In H. Boas & M. Pierce (Eds.), *New Directions in Historical Linguistics*, 78–109. Leiden: Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004414075_005
- Hyland, Kenneth. (1998). Boosting, hedging and the negotiation of academic knowledge. *Text* 18,3:349–382. <https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1998.18.3.349>
- Keevallik, L. (2020). Grammatical coordination of embodied action: The Estonian *ja* ‘and’ as a temporal organizer of Pilates moves. In Y. Maschler, S. Pekarek Doehler, J. Lindström, & L. Keevallik (Eds.), *Emergent Syntax for Conversation: Clausal Patterns and the Organization of action*, 221–244. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slsi.32.08kee>
- Kuteva, T. (2004). *Auxiliation: An Enquiry into the Nature of Grammaticalization*. Oxford University Press.
- Lakoff, R. (1971). If’s, and’s and but’s about conjunction. In C. J. Fillmore & D. T. Langendoen (Eds.), *Studies in Linguistic Semantics*, 115–149. NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Laury, R. (Ed.) (2008). *Crosslinguistic Studies of Clause Combining: The Multifunctionality of Conjunctions*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.80>
- Maschler, Y. (2015). Word order in time: Hebrew (Ns)V/VNs syntax. In A. Deppermann & S. Günthner (Eds.), 201–36. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slsi.27.07mas>
- 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*, 275–328. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.18.12mat>
- Paul, H. (1920). *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*. 5. Auflage. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Pawley, A. & Syder, F.H. (2000). The one clause at a time hypothesis. In H. Riggensbach (Ed.), *Perspectives on fluency*, 163–199. Ann Arbor: U. of Michigan Press.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., De Stefani, E., & Horlacher, A.-S. (2015). *Time and Emergence in Grammar: Dislocation, Topicalization and Hanging Topic in French Talk-in-Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slsi.28>
- Perelman, C., & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1958). De la temporalité comme caractère de l’argumentation. *Archivio di filosofia* 28 (2): 115–33.

- Prince, E. (1978). A comparison of WH- and IT clefts in discourse. *Language* 54:883–906.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/413238>
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Schiffrin, D. (1986). Functions of *and* in discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 10:41–46.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(86\)90099-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(86)90099-8)
- Schmerling, S. (1974). Asymmetric conjunction and rules of conversation. In P. Cole & J.L. Morgan (Eds.), *Speech Acts. Syntax and Semantics* 3:211–231. Academic Press.
- Thompson, S.A. & Hopper, P.J. (2009). Projectability and Clause Combining in Interaction. In R. Laury, (Ed.), *Crosslinguistic Studies of Clause Combining* 99–123. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Address for correspondence

Paul J. Hopper
 Department of English
 Carnegie Mellon University
 Forbes Avenue
 Pittsburgh, PA 15213
 United States
hopper@cmu.edu

Publication history

Date received: 15 July 2020
 Date accepted: 2 March 2021
 Published online: 6 May 2021