

<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

Hendiadys in naturally occurring interactions : A cross-linguistic study of double verb constructions

Drew, Paul

2021-09

Drew , P , Hakulinen , A , Heinemann , T , Niemi , J & Rossi , G 2021 , ' Hendiadys in naturally occurring interactions : A cross-linguistic study of double verb constructions ' , Journal of Pragmatics , vol. 182 , pp. 322-347 . <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.02.008>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/346793>

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.02.008>

cc_by_nc_nd

acceptedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

Hendiadys in naturally occurring interactions: a cross-linguistic study of double verb constructions

Paul Drew¹, Auli Hakulinen², Trine Heinemann³, Jarkko Niemi², and Giovanni Rossi^{2,4*}

¹ University of York UK

² University of Helsinki

³ Independent researcher, Ærø, Denmark

⁴ University of California, Los Angeles

*indicates equal authorship

Paul Drew
Department of Language & Linguistic Science
University of York
York YO10 5DD
UK
paul.drew@york.ac.uk

Auli Hakulinen
Department of Finnish, Finno-Ugrian and Scandinavian Studies
00014 University of Helsinki
Finland
auli.hakulinen@helsinki.fi

Trine Heinemann
Øster Bregningemark 23
5970 Ærøskøbing
Denmark
aca.heinekvinde@gmail.com

Jarkko Niemi
Haaga-Helia University of Applied Sciences
Ratapihantie 13
00520 Helsinki
Finland
jarkko.niemi@haaga-helia.fi

Giovanni Rossi
University of California, Los Angeles
Department of Sociology
375 Portola Plaza, 264 Haines Hall
Los Angeles
CA 90095-1551
US
rossi@soc.ucla.edu

Formatted: Swedish (Finland)

Formatted: Finnish

Formatted: Finnish

**HENDIADYS IN NATURALLY OCCURRING INTERACTIONS: A
CROSS-LINGUISTIC STUDY OF DOUBLE VERB CONSTRUCTIONS**

Abstract

Double verb constructions known as *hendiadys* have been studied primarily in literary texts and corpora of written language. Much less is known about their properties and usage in spoken language, where expressions such as ‘come and see’, ‘go and tell’, ‘sit and talk’ are particularly common, and where we can find an even richer diversity of other constructions. In this study, we investigate hendiadys in corpora of naturally occurring social interactions in four languages, Danish, English (US and UK), Finnish and Italian, with the objective of exploring whether hendiadys is used systematically in recurrent interactional and sequential circumstances, from which it is possible to identify the pragmatic function(s) that hendiadys may serve. Examining hendiadys in conversation also offers us a special window into its grammatical properties, for example when a speaker self-corrects from a non-hendiadic to a hendiadic expression, exposing the boundary between related grammatical forms and demonstrating the distinctiveness of hendiadys in context. More broadly, we demonstrate that hendiadys is systematically associated with talk about complainable matters, in environments characterised by a conflict, dissonance, or friction that is ongoing in the interaction or that is being reported by one participant to another. We also find that the particular utterance in which hendiadys is used is typically in a subsequent and possibly terminal position in the sequence, summarising or concluding it. Another key finding is that the complainable or conflictual aspect in these interactions is expressed primarily by the first conjunct of the hendiadic construction. Whilst the first conjunct is **syntactically and semantically subordinated to the second**, it is pragmatically the most important one. This analysis leads us to revisit a long established asymmetry between the verbal components of hendiadys, and bring to light the division of labour between grammar and pragmatics in the complex system of language usage.

Keywords: Hendiadys, double verbs, complaining, conflictual environments, interaction

Hendiadys in naturally occurring interactions: a cross-linguistic study of double verb constructions

Overview

- §1 Introduction
- §2 What is verbal hendiadys – a literature review
- §3 Data and methods
- §4 Linguistic properties of verbal hendiadys
- §5 The interactional use of verbal hendiadys
- §6 Conclusion and discussion

§1 Introduction

There is a verbal construction known as *hendiadys* that occurs not infrequently in talk between participants in naturally occurring social interaction (in spontaneous spoken language and perhaps in other kind of interactions, though those do not concern us here), a construction which couples two verbs in such a way as to depict a ‘single’ action or event. Although we shall review some of the principal linguistic features of verbal hendiadys in the next section, here is an example illustrating this construction.

Ex.1 [F:TC:1:1:9] (US English)

Shirley: I said, yih don't honestly think. That we're all g'nna j's
stand here, .hh en watch you break the la:w.h

The two verbs in *stand here and watch you*, sharing a grammatical (usually human) subject, are conjoined (*and*); they cohere together and fuse into representing what can be conceptualised as a single event. Descriptively, it would have been straightforward enough for the speaker to have said . . . *we're all going to watch you break the law*, or even . . . *stand here while you break the law*; which is to say that it is conceivable that there might have been no loss of 'meaning' if Shirley had used either verb unaccompanied by the other. However, the two verbs work together to give the construction a certain force, which is perhaps what Aristotle recognised in the rhetorical character of constructions similar to hendiadys (though he did not call them that) representing 'clamorous and dramatic' and 'passions and affect' (Aristotle et al. 2012, p.332 and p.341 respectively). **This rhetorical or, as we prefer, pragmatic effect** is part of what we aim to explain in this study. Another observation we can make about example 1 is that the action described by the first verb (*stand*) can be regarded as being **conceptually subsumed** within the second (*watch*), almost as being necessary in doing what is represented in the second verb. If, then, there might be a certain redundancy associated with the first verb (or perhaps the second verb, considering *stand here while you break the law* as a possible alternative), it will be worth investigating what speakers are doing when they use a double verb construction, a hendiadys, when a single verb might have been considered sufficient?

As we will explain in the following section, most research on hendiadys has focused on *how* the two verbs in a hendiadys are constructed linguistically to cohere or go together, i.e. what are the linguistic properties of hendiadic constructions that enable the two verbs to be understood to go together and fused into a single clause. Our enquiry will take a different direction: our aim is instead to investigate what speakers are doing interactionally when they select a hendiadic construction in designing their turn(s) at talk (on turn design see Drew 2013). Dictionaries and encyclopedias typically describe the import of hendiadys in terms of "emphasis" or "intensification" (e.g. Bussmann, 1996; Quinn & Rathbun, 1996). **But this is rather generic and reductive. We** want to go deeper than that. In order to explore what might be regarded as the pragmatic function(s) of hendiadys, we have investigated their occurrence in four languages, in Danish, English (American and British), Finnish and Italian; the purpose of which is to provide an analysis of the pragmatic work or function of hendiadys that is a more appropriate basis for generalization than would analysis of their occurrence in a single language. Whilst we

will make observations about aspects of the structure of our four languages that pertain to the lexical and grammatical construction of hendiadys in each, and some of the different constructions to be found across these languages, nevertheless **this is not intended to be a linguistic-typological comparison**. We are, rather, exploring whether the use of the pragmatic function that can be identified for hendiadys in one language applies more generally.

In the remainder of this paper we first review the linguistics literature on hendiadys (section 2), then outline the data corpora we have assembled for this study and describe our methods of analysis (linguistic and conversation analytic) (section 3). The linguistic – syntactic and semantic – properties of hendiadys found in our data are summarized in section 4; after which we report the findings of our analysis of the interactional use for which speakers select hendiadic constructions in the four languages included in this study (section 5).

§2. What is verbal hendiadys – a literature review

Verbal hendiadys can be seen as part of a larger linguistic phenomenon that encompasses nominal and adjectival hendiadys. The phenomenon was first discussed by ancient philosophers in the III-V centuries (Porphyry, 1894; Servius, 1887) as a figure of speech involving two nouns (e.g. *cups and gold*, *towns and temples*) functioning jointly to convey a single conceptual idea — thus the term *hendiadys*, a latinised form of the Greek ἐν διὰ δύοϊν, *hèn dià duoîn*, literally “one by means of two”.

One of the key features of a hendiadic structure is claimed to be a relation of **logical subordination** of one of its elements to the other (Sansone, 1984). For example, in highly conventionalized forms of verbal hendiadys in English (e.g. *come and see*, *try and do*), the first conjunct is said to have a grammatical status comparable to that of an auxiliary, often adding an aspectual meaning to the second conjunct (Quirk et al., 1985, p. 979; Hopper, 2002, p. 148). This can be compared to the internal structure of adjectival hendiadys such as *nice and warm*, *good and loud*, where the first conjunct is understood **as a modifier of the second**. Across the spectrum of hendiadic expressions, **this relation of subordination** can be more ~~broadly~~ **broadly** /**specifically** understood as an asymmetry between the two elements, ~~wh~~ere one is semantically

bleached, lighter, less autonomous. Notably, these characteristics are often attributed to the first element of the hendiadic expression, which is argued to stand in a supporting relation to the second. In verbal hendiadys, such ordered asymmetry has been explained as an instance of ‘foregrounding’, where the first conjunct increases the bulk of the verb phrase and delays the focal verb, thus drawing the recipient’s attention to it (Hopper, 2002, pp. 163–164, 169), in accordance with general information-structural principles (Schmerling, 1975, p. 229). Be that as it may, ordered asymmetry entails that the two conjuncts cannot be reversed; this is a basic syntactic feature of hendiadys.

Another key syntactic feature is that verbal hendiadys constitutes a single clause with a common grammatical subject, tense, aspect, modality, and polarity; this distinguishes it from simple, “synthetonic” coordination between two separate clauses. Syntactic integration in verbal hendiadys also puts constraints on the elements that may be inserted between the two conjuncts. This is why expressions like *take copies off the shelf and read them*, and *take totally destroyed facilities and cover them over quickly* are likely outside the purview of hendiadys, and may be rather understood as two clauses representing two distinct actions or events (Hopper, 2002, pp. 154, 166). This is where the syntax of hendiadys meets its semantics. As mentioned above, two verbs in hendiadic relation **depict a single conceptual event** (see Croft, 1991, p. 269). When not semantically bleached, the action of the first verb is **logically subsumed** by the action of the second. A hendiadic conceptualization therefore contrasts with a sequence of temporally related but independent actions taking place one after the other, an example of which can be found in the following extract.

Ex.2 [NB:IV:10:6] (US English)

- 1 Lot: I'm not [I'm js:[t through wih the whole thi[:ng that's a]ll
 2 Emm: [hhh [I(b) [M e: toq:.]
 3 Emm: I'm not g'nnuh have this thing with Bu:::d in and uh:.hhhhhh
 4 (.) euh: do ah (.) yihknow e-uh wh'tEVER's tuh be's tih be
 5 that's all Lottie i[n this]
 6 Lot: [Yeah.]
 7 Emm: If this THANKSGIVING THING DOESN'TURN OU::T I'VE GOT THE
 8 TURKEY [an] ah'll cook the DA:MN THI:NG? [an] freeze part of it
 9 [an] give you some of it er

- 10 (1.0)
 11 Lot: Oh::
 12 (0.7)
 13 Lot: Uh::, no I don'wan'any,

It is evident that the verbs in example (2), *cook*, *freeze* and *give*, refer to consecutive actions/events; they are not fused to denote a single event, as are *stand here and watch you* in example (1), and therefore are not hendiadic. More details on the syntactic and semantic properties of verbal hendiadys are given in Section 4. However, there is a third aspect of linguistic structure that contributes to the hendiadic fusion of two verbs into a single unit, namely prosody. Hendiadic expressions are typically characterized by prosodic-phonetic integration, which is achieved by features such as smooth continuation of pitch, tempo, loudness, and by coarticulation and liaison effects (Barth-Weingarten & Couper-Kuhlen, 2011, p. 272; see also Barth-Weingarten, 2016, pp. 240–255). Speakers of verbal hendiadys tend to avoid prosodic boundaries around the conjunction *and* as well as to reduce phonetically the conjunction itself (Couper-Kuhlen & Selting, 2018, p. 433).

In sum, verbal hendiadys can be defined as a combination of two conjoined verbs that are **syntactically, prosodically, and semantically integrated** to describe what is conceptually a single event. A hendiadic structure involves an asymmetric relation between the two verbs such that one — typically the first — is **subsidiary** to the other. As we will see, however, an analysis of verbal hendiadys in naturally occurring interactions allows us to **revisit this asymmetry** and draw a distinction between the syntactic-semantic relation between the two verbs, and their pragmatic or interactional character, which turn out to exhibit opposite directionality.

Formatted: Font: Bold

§3. Data and methods

The data for all four languages – Danish, English, Finnish and Italian – consist of audio and video recordings of naturally occurring interactions in ordinary social settings, especially telephone calls and face-to-face conversations between family and friends, conversations in a café/restaurant and during some outdoor events. Even though they were assembled from data that

had been collected previously, for unrelated projects, these corpora are coherent in representing informal interactions between people who know each other well. Each author then identified all the cases in our data that appeared to be double verb constructions; we reviewed these cases collectively and discarded instances that seemed to resemble hendiadys but did not fit the definitional criteria discussed in the previous section. From the remaining cases that fitted our criteria for inclusion, we (randomly) selected a sample of 20 instances in each language, providing a total sample of 80 instances in the four languages. These were transcribed in detail using the conventions that are widely in use for conversation analysis (Jefferson 2004); the transcriptions of examples were reviewed and revised where necessary, as our research progressed. We listened to all examples, to ensure that each formed prosodically one clause.

The data were analysed according to the perspective and methods of conversation analysis (CA). Although there is a widespread impression that CA focuses almost solely on turn-taking, indeed is ‘about’ turn-taking - an impression for which a famous paper published in *Language* is partly responsible (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson 1974) – the focus of CA research is social actions, the design of those actions, the interactional environments in which certain actions designs are mobilised (selected), and the sequential patterns and consequences associated with given actions and action designs (Clift 2016, Levinson 2013). In some respects and cases, social actions may be close to what have been considered ‘speech acts’ (Austin 1962, Searle 1969); but ‘actions’ go beyond such vernacularly defined and constrained acts such as promising, offering and so on (Drew and Couper-Kuhlen 2014). They can encompass the activities for which we use language and other embodied semiotic systems, for which there do not appear to be ‘speech act’ equivalents (e.g. Schegloff 1996). Accordingly, our methodological approach was, initially, to examine how the linguistic resources of each language, including relevant structures in those languages, were employed in hendiadic constructions (linguistic analysis); then to examine closely the sequential environments in which speakers had selected hendiadys in our data, **in order to identify the action environment(s) in which hendiadys occurred**. From these action environments, and from an analysis of the interactional role played by hendiadys, we built up a picture of what is achieved by speakers, interactionally, through hendiadic constructions.

§4. Linguistic properties of verbal hendiadys

Hopper (2002) systematized and to an extent corroborated previous research into how verbs can be combined to form hendiadic constructions. From his investigation of a corpus of both spoken and written English (American and British), Hopper argues that the main criterion for distinguishing hendiadys from *synthetons* is their mono-predicateness, which is to say that though two verbs are used in both types of construction, in hendiadys the two verbs predicate a single event. Hopper then goes on to specify a number of syntactic and semantic characteristics of hendiadys, most notably the “semantic and syntactic interlacing” (Barth-Weingarten & Couper-Kuhlen (2011: 272) of the two verbs so that they share objects, agents and other syntactic elements and agree in tense and aspect. He also notes that the first verbs used for forming hendiadic constructions typically come from a small set of intransitive verbs of motion, and that **the semantic focus is on the second verb**, whilst the first verb is often bleached in terms of its meaning. In the following we will explore Hopper’s criterion for what constitutes a verbal hendiadic construction, to determine the boundaries between hendiadys and other constructions involving two (or more verbs) in the four languages that form the basis of our study.

4.1 Syntactic properties

Across our four languages, we find that the two verbs are typically conjoined with a coordinating conjunction (*ja* in Finnish, *e* in Italian, *å’* in Danish, *and* in English), and that there is agreement between the two verbs with respect to tense/mood as well as with respect to number- and person marking for those languages and verb forms where this is relevant. In the following examples, the two verbs, conjoined with a coordinating conjunction, agree in tense and, in Finnish, also in person.

Ex.3 [TH:S2:013] (Danish)

Det har de fandme >itt' ringe' å' < sagt te' mig.

that have they PRT not call.PROG and say.PROG to me

That have they bloody well not called and told me.

Ex.4 [SG 81 1A3] (Finnish)

Mä soitin ja kysyin ku<,hh ↑mä sain nii älyttömän vähän niinku nyt:< rahaa.

I called and asked as<, .hh I got so **mindlessly** little PRT money.

The two verbs may also both be in the infinitive, as in the following English example. Here, both the infinitives are in the scope of the modal verb *have got*:

Ex.5 [Heritage:01:6] (English)

all I'd got tuh do was tuh ring up Mann'n Comp'ny'n say oh by the wa:y uhm

When the two verbs do not share grammatical features, the construction will typically not be understood as describing a single action, as is the case in the following English example, where the first verb is in the past progressive, and the second verb is in the simple past:

Ex.6 [Virginia: 1129-1161] (US English)

Okay w'll she was sittin' the:re an'- eh::b opened it up

Based, among other things, on the difference in aspect between the two verbs, we can analyze example (6) as depicting two temporally distinct events. Quirk et al. (1985), however, note that some double verb constructions that lack congruence between the verbs may be “roughly equivalent” and “similar in meaning” to hendiadys (pp. 987-988), despite not meeting the grammatical and syntactic criteria discussed so far. Quirk et al. specifically discuss (for English) the case of a finite verb combined with an infinitive, e.g. *come to see*, which can be considered a “pseudo coordination” similar to hendiadys “especially in rather informal usage”. Of the four languages in our study, we have found that speakers of Italian and Finnish¹, in particular, make rather frequent use of infinitival constructions, and that they do share at least one basic feature

¹ In Danish, the infinitive marker and coordinating conjunction may coincide phonetically. In these cases it is difficult to determine whether the construction is coordinated or infinitival. Take the following, for instance: *Så behøver man heller ikk' å' sidde å' kigge op på dem man sidder overfor å' ve' siden a' å'* ‘Then one doesn't either need to sit and look up at the people across from one and next to one’. Here, the first *å'* is an infinitive marker, required by the preceding modal verb *behøver* (‘need’) whereas the second one between the two verbs that form the hendiadys ‘sit and look up’ is clearly a conjunction.

with hendiadys, namely that the two verbs combine to refer to a single event. This is illustrated in the following two examples, the first Finnish, the second Italian.

Ex.7 [Kampaamo] (Finnish) three lines?

- 1 HD: mun hytin (.) oven taakse tuli >niin niin< semmonen kolmevuotias
 behind my cabin door came PRT PRT a three year old
- 2 lapsi itkemään ja (.) mä menin kysymään että mikä sil on [†]hätänä nii
 child cry-INF and I go-PST ask-INF that what she has trouble-ESS so
 child crying and I went to ask what the trouble was with her so she
- 3 se sano että --
 she said that --

The double verb construction in this narration consists of a past tense motion verb in first person (*menin*, ‘I went’) and a speech action verb (*kysymään*, ‘to ask’) in an infinitive. The combination of these two verbs and semantically related ones is common in hendiadic constructions across our data (see the ‘called and asked/told’ examples above, examples (3) and (4)). Furthermore, it is clear that the speaker does not imply two temporally distinct actions, first going and then asking, which is another criterion for hendiadys. The construction “went to ask” does however indicate that the second action is contingent on the first, e.g. that the speaker expresses an intentional action of going in order to soothe the child. The underlying idea of an intentional action of *doing x in order to y* is apparent also in the following Italian example, where two men are sitting lazily in the living room; the proposition to smoke a cigarette thus evokes or requires effort in getting up from the couch to go somewhere to smoke:

Ex.8 [Aldo&Bino:239824] (Italian)

- Aldo andiamo a fumare un zait intanto
 go-NPST-1P smoke-INF one cigarette meantime
 let's go {to} smoke a cigarette in the meantime

That the relationship between the two verbs in infinitival constructions is different from that of hendiadys proper is perhaps most evident in the following English example, where an infinitival

construction is abandoned and reformulated as a hendiadys in the subsequent turn (see also section 5.3 on self-correction).

Ex.9 [From Sacks et al. 1974:714] (US English)

J: _____ = wh'n we get- (uh:: kay), I haven't even **sat down to do any-** y' know like
 'hh today I'm gonna **sit down 'n read** while you're doing yur coat,

While in both constructions, the combination of the two verbs clearly denotes a single event or action (e.g. that of sitting and reading, noting that the turn is aborted before 'reading' occurs) there are subtle differences between the two: in the infinitival construction, the action of reading is contingent on the action of sitting down, whereas in the hendiadic construction, the two are subsumed, are fused into a single event. The fact that the speaker here abandons the first construction and goes on to produce the hendiadys clearly illustrates that for her there is a meaningful difference between the two.

Another grammatical or syntactic criterion for hendiadys that is perhaps not as clear cut as one would expect is that of conjunctions, specifically their absence or presence in the combination of two (or more) verbs. Serial verb constructions without a conjunction feature in languages e.g. of Amazonia, West Africa, New Guinea and Southeast Asia, and appear to be emerging in English (Durie, 1997; Hopper, 2008) as well as Finnish, as illustrated in the two examples below:

Ex.10 [Virginia:360-375] (US English)

let me: get up an' ***go get** some.

Ex.11 [SG143 A 07] (Finnish)

lomalta tultiin **leipomaan laittamaan ni**, ff °m° simmosta.
 (we) came from holiday to **bake prepare** ff ff °m° that sort of thing

As has been described in previous studies (Durie, 1997; Aikhenwald, 2006), many prototypical features of a serial verb construction are shared with hendiadys: two or more verbs that can otherwise function independently are fused together into a single monoclausal structure with one grammatical subject, tense, aspect and modality, and polarity, denoting a single conceptual event

This is clearly the case for both examples above; despite the absence of a conjunction, the two verbs in both the English and the Finnish examples agree and are fused together to refer to a single conceptual event. Moreover, we can note that in both these cases, the cohesion of the hendiadic construction is enhanced by phonetic parallelism (alliteration, *go get* and *leipomaan laittamaan*).

Scope appears to be a constitutive feature of hendiadys, in so far as both verbs have to be within the scope of the same element. This does not apply just to modal auxiliaries but to any type of auxiliaries. Moreover, scope also becomes relevant with respect to adverbs such as for instance ‘just’ or ‘really’ and negative operators such as ‘not’. In the Danish example below we have both the adverb *lige/li’*: (‘just’) and the negative adverb *ikk’* (‘not’) taking scope over both verbs:

Ex.12 [TH:M225] (Danish)

Ja:hm' >jeg ka' ikk'< li': stå å' remse dem allesammen op.

Yes but >I can't< just stand and list them all.

~~Clearly, with the adverb 'just' being shared by both verbs, the hendiadic reading is not compromised.~~
is when the verbs take different complements. In example (13) for instance, the hendiadic interpretation is compromised by the repetition of the pronoun ‘he’ before each verb, and especially by the fact that the first verb takes a direct object (*his clothes*) that is not shared with the second verb.

Ex.13 _____[NB:IV:4:1] (US English)

_____.hh.hh So`EE ↑PACKED IZ CLO:THES`N`EE WENT

That this will prevent a hendiadic reading is even more obvious when the two verbs take different complements, as is the case in the following example:

Ex.14 [NB:IV:13] (US English)

AH WENT DOWN th`BEA:CH`n lu- an:d (.) an' looked et the water

Many of the linguistic features that specifically help to determine that something is not a hendiadic construction, according to our definition, are elements that are placed between the first and the second verb, whether this be the explication of the subject, a direct object (as in example 6) or an adverbial modifier. This does not mean, however, that the presence of any linguistic element (aside from the conjunction) rules out the hendiadic interpretation. For example, when the element between the two verbs is a preposition that is part of a ‘phrasal’ or ‘prepositional verb’ (Quirk et al 1985: 1155–67), the hendiadic reading is still possible, as in the following examples from English and Danish.

Ex.15 [MDE: MTRAC:60-1:2] (US English)

W't's 'e g'nna do go down en pick it up later?

Ex.16 [TH:M2:02] (Danish)

Du ska' ikk' gå hen å' købe vandrestøvler.

You shall not go over and buy hiking boots

4.2 Semantics

Hopper (2002) stated that in hendiadic constructions the second verb is the focal one, the first verb having developed into something like a satellite, **the meaning bleached** from the original, **such that** it has acquired a **more or less** auxiliary status amounting to different degrees of grammaticalization. In this section, we look more closely at the different ways in which the semantics of the first verbs has evolved.

First, hendiadys seems to be formed with a rather restricted range of particular verbs that depict human activities, though the individual languages in the present data differ somewhat in this regard. What is common to all of them is that the first verb of a hendiadic construction comes from a limited set, e.g. ‘go’, ‘come’, or ‘stand’, ‘sit’ and ‘call’. Of these, the verbs of asking are often preceded by a verb for ‘calling’, as in examples (3) and (4) above. In these cases, the first verb is preliminary or a prerequisite to the ‘main’ action introduced by the second verb, and it has not undergone any further semantic development away from the literal meaning of ‘calling’.

Common to most of the other verbs in this set is that they can be classified as motion verbs, expressing coming, going, leaving, getting up or sitting down, which are typically intransitive. In languages such as Finnish and English speakers frequently use motion verbs (see also Haddington et al. 2011). Danish seems to differ significantly from the other languages by making frequent use of static verbs such as ‘lie’, ‘sit’ and ‘stand’ (as in example 9). In such cases, however, it seems evident that **the literal meaning of the static verb is ruled out**. Instead, such verbs as ‘lie’, ‘sit’ and ‘stand’ are employed to describe a continuous, extended activity (specified by the second verb). In example (12) above, the construction ‘I can’t just stand and list them all’ does not (necessarily) mean that the speaker is literally standing at the moment at which the construction is produced, nor does it mean that it is impossible for him to be standing up while listing a number of items. Rather, it is intended to mean that he does not have the time at present to engage in what he would characterize as an extensive and time-consuming activity. In the following example, any literal understanding of the static verb ‘lie’ is ruled out, as it would be inconsistent with the motion verb ‘run’ that is the second verb in the construction.

Ex.17 [TH:F4:HH:1-2] (Danish)

_____ å' når du' kommet i seng så' du kommet i seng. => så ska' du't
 _____ and when you've gone to bed then've you gone to bed. => then you shall not
 _____ ligge' rende oppe,
 _____ lie and run around,

This case should be understood to mean that the person described should not habitually and continuously, in this situation (where she has been put to bed), be ‘running around’. On the basis of examples like these, we suggest that the development that has taken place in the meaning of the verbs **is not bleaching, but rather constitutes a move towards an aspectual sense**. In a hendiadic construction, **therefore, they seem to implicate something about the attitude of the speaker, their stance, is implicated – be – were** it irritation, or some other negative stance embodied in the description (see also Haddington et al, 2011: 101). In one of the languages in our collection, this negative sense is often literal in hendiadic constructions: in Danish, half of all our cases include the negative adverb *ikke* taking scope over both verbs (see section 4.1; see e.g. examples (12) and (16)). Thus, many Danish hendiadys are used to describe a single action that has not been done, should not be done etc., which is consistent with the account we give below (in section 5) of their interactional

use **in sequences in which some complainable matter, friction or conflict is represented**. We also have examples of negation in Finnish (e.g. example (23) below) and English (example (17) above) but, nowhere near as prevalent as in Danish. There is no obvious typological explanation that we are aware of for the extended use of negation in Danish.

On the other hand, effort and deliberateness in the action are brought about when the description is formulated with a prepositional verb, a resource found in English and Danish:

Ex.18 ———[NB:IV:4:4] (US English)

En ↑**they** didn't get h:ome til real ↑late yihknow'n **they** wan'us
 come over'n see the ga:me 'n a:nd uh

Ex.19 ———[TH:M2:02] (Danish)

Du ska' ikk' gå hen å' købe vandrestøvler.
 You shouldn't go 'at' and buy hiking boots

Formatted: Swedish (Finland)

What the phrasal verb brings to the reading of the hendiadys construction is **a description of the speaker's stance**. In the English example (18), the utterance could be read as a complaint: 'they' demand or 'want' the speaker and her companion to do something that requires an effort (moreover, late at night). In the Danish example (19), the speaker is, as it were, warning the co-participant not to go so far as to buy special boots.

Formatted: Font: Bold

These examples show that it may be too simplistic to see bleaching as the straightforward explaining factor about the first verbs. Rather, the verbs that are placed first seem to have developed into **conveying stance**.

4.3 Idiomaticity and the notion of construction

Some constructions may become grammaticalized to the extent that the first verb has lost all or most of its grammatical and semantic features. The following example shows a case of the

Finnish verb *ottaa* ‘take’, which is frequently used as the first verb in hendiadic constructions. Here, the verb has lost its literal meaning as well as transitivity.²

Ex.20 [SG 95 B 14] (Finnish)

Sami: mu:tta Raulin isä otti ja kuoli tossa
 but NAME1-GEN father take-SG3.PST and die-SG3.PST there
 but Rauli’s father took and died

However, the first verb does contribute a particular meaning to the construction; in this case, as well as in the ones found in the literary translations (see fn2), it conveys unexpectedness. A potential generalization with respect to the first verbs is that the more ‘general’ the (original) meaning of the first verb is, the more idiomaticity the hendiadys appears to involve. However, to be a construction and not just a fully fixed idiom, one of the slots for a verb must be open, i.e., freely changeable. This is the case with the verb *ottaa*, as was seen in the fn. 1; there is a large array of possible second verbs, while it is the task of the first verb to bring about some extra sense to the construction that is not directly inferable from the (original/literal) meaning of the first verb.

If neither of the slots is open, the construction has become totally fixed, unproductive and so it is an idiom. This is the case in the following two examples, from Finnish and English, respectively:

Ex.21 [SG 437:1:10] (Finnish)

Tuula: Jaa:a (.) mene ja tiedä.
 PRT (.) go and know.
 Who knows?

Ex.22 [Virginia:360-375] (US English)

M: let me: get up an’ *go get some.

² In translations of English novels into Finnish, Kersti Juva frequently makes use of the construction *ottaa ja V*, literally ‘take and V’. For example, from Jayne Ann Phillips ‘Lark and Termite’, *One day she walked off*. ‘Eräänä päivänä se otti ja lähti’ (she took and left); Julian Barnes ‘The sense of ending’, *So when time delivered me all too quickly into middle age* ‘Niinpä kun aika sitten otti ja toimitti minut aivan liian nopeesti keski-ikään’.

At the other end of the cline (or ‘gradient’, Hopper 2002:169; or ‘continuum’, Aikhenvald 2006:56) from idioms, there are instances in which a hendiadys involves a first verb that does not belong to the narrowly defined set of first verbs. The fact that we also find this kind of cases supports the idea that hendiadys is a linguistic resource, a speaker’s device to be used even in unique situations and with a first verb that has perhaps never occurred in this kind of construction before. Example (23) clearly illustrates that the hendiadic construction is an open and emerging resource, and that the first verb ‘slot’ is in principle open to any type of verb (here a perception verb rather than a motion verb).

- Ex.23 [SG143 A 04] (Finnish)
- 266 Jorma: että vauvan ääntä että (.) että niin jos ei nyt
that baby’s voice that (.)that PRT if one hasn’t PRT
- 267 oo (.) jos ei noo ihan< (.) .h onn: h (.) niinkun
be if NEG-SG1 be quite congrat- like
(.) if one has not quite< (.) cong: h (.) like
- 268 h mh .h nähny ja onnitellu niin oikein paljo< (.)
h mh .h seen and congratulated so very much< (.)
- 269 h onnea ja siunausta että< .hh >hän on< .ff
h happiness and blessings that< .hh >she is< .ff

What makes this kind of untypical use of the hendiadys interesting is that they are explicable *in casu* in the specific context, unlike the routinized kinds of hendiadys. Accordingly, example (23) can be heard as an account expressing remorse: the vicar Jorma is only now congratulating a member of the congregation for her baby when hearing it babble; the hendiadys *nähny ja onnitellu* ‘seen and congratulated’ conveys the idea that he would have congratulated had he *seen* the mother and also that he is aware of the belatedness of his present act.

§5. The interactional use of verbal hendiadys

We turn now to focus on the use or function of hendiadys in naturally occurring interactions. Whilst this linguistic form has been little studied in its natural interactional environment, those studies that have explored hendiadys-in-use, including some of those reviewed in §2, have

tended to suggest what can best be described as general hints of the interactional function of hendiadys. Quirk et al (1985: 987-988), for instance, note that verbal hendiadys may relay a somewhat derogatory tone to an utterance, a line that is followed up by Hopper's (2002: 169) observation that at least some types of verbal hendiadys "impart a sense of uncertainty or an attitude such as mild annoyance or frustration". Similar observations have been made in studies of hendiadys by Haddington et al of Finnish spoken corpora, who conclude that Finnish *go-say* and *come-say* constructions are used for expressing **often negative affect** (Haddington et al. 2011: 107). In a single case analysis of the verbal hendiadys *came and delivered something*, Couper-Kuhlen & Selting (2017:434, their emphasis) reference Drew (1998) on how the use of "two predicates instead of one *overdetermines* the description and attributes a moral dimension to the behavior being described". It does not appear that these studies have explored hendiadys systematically across corpora of actual verbal interactions; moreover, their conclusions about use and function are often impressionistic ("increasing bulk") and rather generic ("negative affect"). One exception to this is Zinken's study of a specific type of hendiadic construction in Polish — the double imperative *weź (i) x* 'take (and) x' — as used for getting another to do something. The construction was found to serve the mobilization of someone who is expected to be already attending to the progression of an activity but for some reason isn't. Here, the use of a double imperative "reanimates" the recipient's responsibility for the activity in question in the face of their current non-involvement and, as such, it "often carries an element of criticism" (Zinken 2013: 59).

In the present study, we examine a much wider range of hendiadic constructions across diverse settings and activities in informal interaction in four languages. Our analysis results in four principal findings, integrating the interactional environment in which hendiadys are used to depict an action or event, with what is achieved through hendiadic constructions in this environment. These findings are as follows:

- Hendiadys are generally used in environments characterised by disaffiliation and conflict – in interactional sequences in which there is some discord, dissonance, misalignment, resistance or friction between participants; **or speakers are discussing some friction, discord or disaffiliation that** has occurred in a previous interaction involving a third (non-present) party.

- The turns in which hendiadic constructions are used generally concern some **complainable matter**.
- The first/initial verb in the hendiadic construction contributes to the ‘complainable’ or negative, conflictual aspect.
- The particular utterance in which a hendiadys is used is generally not a ‘first’ or in initial position in a sequence. Indeed, the hendiadic utterance is usually in a subsequent, possibly terminal position, summarising or concluding the sequence.

Formatted: Font: Bold

In broad terms, therefore, we have found that hendiadys is an interactional device for attributing to some ‘doing’ its conflictual or complainable character. Without the initial verb in the construction, the description of some action or ‘doing’ would seem to be unexceptional, routine, neutral or devoid of any negative aspect; however, the initial verb indicates the respect in which the ‘doing’ of something is or was problematic (in its manner or consequence). In our explication of these findings, for reasons of space we will show only one example from each language (in quoting from the excerpts in the text we show only the English translation, in italics).

5.1 Disaffiliative or conflictual environments

The majority of examples of hendiadys in our samples in all languages occur in the course of sequences in which there has been or has emerged some friction, conflict or difference (of opinion) between participants in the interaction, or in which some friction or conflict between third parties is being reported or discussed – in short, hendiadys is used in disaffiliative interactional environments. An Italian example illustrates just such an environment.

- Ex.24 [Biscotti Pome:01-1154327] (Italian)
- 1 Azio: 'scolta Eliana però tu mi devi dire a che ora
listen-IMP.2SG NAME but 2SG.N 1S.D must-2SG say-INF at which hour
listen Eliana you've got to tell me at what time
- 2 finisci quella cazzo di vi[sita
end-3SG that dick of visit
you're going to be done with that fucking tour though
- 3 Eliana: [io non lo posso sapere

1SG.N not can-1SG know-INF

I can't know that

- 4 Azio: °dio po° ((peevd tone))
 god pig
 °goddamn°
- 5 Eliana: penso comunque che (vada dai) venti minuti
 think-1SG anyway CMP (go-SBJ-3S from-the) twenty minutes
 I think at any rate that it (should last around) twenty minutes
- 6 (0.4)
- 7 Azio: puoi chiamare e chiedergli quanto dura
 can-2SG call-INF and ask-INF=3SG.D how.much last-3SG
 can you phone and ask them how long it lasts?
- 8 (0.7)
- 9 Eliana: mmmhh::[: ((flutters hand conveying indecision))
- 10 Azio: [vuoi che t'accompagni fallo
 want-2S CMP 2S.D=accompany-SBJ-1S do-IMP.2S=3S.A
 do you want me to drive you? {then} do it
- 11 (2.0)
- 12 Eliana: allora piuttosto se fai così niente cè
 then rather if do-2SG like. this nothing PTC
 alright if you're like this it's better to forget about it
- 13 (0.7)
- 14 Azio: no 'scolta t- io devo sapere perché mi devo organizzare
 no listen-IMP.2SG 1S.NG must-1SG know-INF because RFL must-1SG organise-INF
 no listen t- I must know because I have to organise myself
- 15 (.)
- 16 Azio: capisci=
 understand-2SG
 do you understand?

The conflictual aspect of this interaction is evident from the beginning, from the opening turn when Anzio says to Eliana, *Listen Eliana you've got to tell me . . .*, and becomes more evident as that turn progresses, with an expletive used to describe the tour in which Eliana will be involved (lines 1 and 2). Eliana's 'resistance' in line 3, in which she initially declines to give an answer to

what time she's going to be done further contributes to the disaffiliation between them. This is the sequential/interactional environment in which Anzio produces the hendiadic *phone and ask* (line 7), to which we will return later - though the conflict between them is evident in their continued disputatious ending (lines 12-16), especially Eliana's concluding dismissively *alright if you're like this it's better to forget it* (line 12).

The next example is from our Danish corpus; a home help is assisting an elderly woman to fix her dentures, by holding her dentures in place to make them stick.

- Ex.25 [F4:HH:1-1 (Danish face-to-face) (The home help holds Maren's dentures in place for some time, to enable them to stick)
- 1 Maren: Tror du det' nok?
Do you think that's enough?
- 2 (0.3)
- 3 Help: Nøj det ve' je'itt'.
No I don't know.
- 4 (0.8)
- 5 Maren: (D) tror (j) ikk'.
I don't think so.
- 6 (0.6)
- 7 Help: Så får du (d) lidt te'.
Then you'll get a bit more.
- 8 Maren: Jerh tak.
Yes please.
- 9 (4.0)
- 10 Maren: Sådan.
That's it/There.
- 11 (0.8)
- 12 Maren: Nej det var ikk' nok.=
No it wasn't enough.
- 13 Help: HHHHHhhh
- 14 Maren: >(m) søde ven.<
>my dear.<

- 15 (0.9)
- 16 Maren: (Det' jeg ked a' [()
(I'm sorry [()
- 17 Help: [Ja. Maren. >Men det ka' jo'tt' ny- Jeg
[Yes. Maren. >But it's no use- I
- 18 ka' jo'tt stå her< å' trykke i flere tīmer jo.
can't JO stand here< and push for several hours JO.

It is evident that they are having difficulty fixing Maren's dentures. Whilst they don't exactly disagree, when at the beginning of this extract Maren asks the help whether she thinks *that's enough* (presumably holding the dentures firmly in place), they get into a cycle of a further attempts followed by Maren's dissatisfaction (e.g. line 12), for which she apologises (line 16). Finally, in exasperation (note Help's exasperated outbreath in line 13, in increased amplitude), the home help complains that *it's no use I can't stand here and push for several hours* (line 18). Furthermore, the epistemic particle 'jo' used by Help in lines 17 and 18 is also associated with complaining (Heinemann et al. 2011). Again, we will return later to the home help's hendiadic construction here. But for the present, the key observation is that there is some friction, some dissonance, in the sequence out of which **the home help's exasperation emerges**, albeit that up to this point the conflict between them was relatively low level - though the conflict between them is evident in their continued dispute about whether the denture fixing is working (lines 12-16).

We made the point earlier that whilst in some instances the conflict that precedes the hendiadic turn – the conflictual environment that generates the hendiadys – involves some friction between the participants, as happened in examples (24) and (25). In other examples speakers report some **conflict or complaint concerning a non-present third party**; that is, the disaffiliation does not involve the present participants, but rather involves an encounter which one (or sometimes both/more) of the participants have had with someone else. Here is such a case, from a US telephone call, in which Shirley, who waits tables in a bar part-time, is complaining bitterly about a mutual acquaintance of theirs who, when Shirley was on duty recently, was caught drinking alcohol underage

Formatted: Font: Bold

Ex.26 [F:TC:1:1:9] (US telephone call) (Expansion of example 1)

- 1 Shi: .t.hhh I s'd Cathy. I s'd you mus'think the people
 2 who work here are rilly stupid.
 3 (1.0)
 4 Shi: Yihkno:w,
 5 (0.5)
 6 Ger: nYeah.
 7 Shi: I said, yih don't honestly think. thet wir all g'nna j's
 8 stand here, .hh en watch you break the la:w.h
 9 (0.4)
 10 (S): .pt.hhh
 11 Shi: Youkno:w,
 12 (0.2)

Before this excerpt, Shirley has already given an account of another untoward incident involving their mutual acquaintance (Cathy); she has now begun a second story about Cathy's egregious conduct. Prior to and during this excerpt Shirley overtly complains about Cathy having been drinking underage. Reporting what she said when she confronted Cathy, she uses hendiadys with which to summarise her complaint, *stand here en watch you break the law* (data not shown), thereby admonishing Cathy both for breaking the law and thereby jeopardizing the establishment's liquor license. The friction or discord in example (26) is, therefore, not between the two participants, Shirley and Geri, but between the teller, Shirley, and a non-present third party, Cathy, during a previous 'external' interaction (though a caveat – there is evidence of some emerging disaffiliation between Shirley and Geri, which will be relevant in the next subsection).

This happens also in the following excerpt from a Finnish telephone call, which likewise involves a speaker reporting some problematic, complainable circumstance external to this interaction. In response to Viki's enquiry about Sami's plans for Christmas (lines 1-2), Sami gives an account of how his Christmas plans have come to be upset.

Ex.27 [SG:95:B:14] (Finnish) (Expansion of example 20 above)

- 1 Viki: °joo.° .hh no miten muuten, ooks sä tota noin ni
yeah .hh well how by the way are you ehm
- 2 jouluu viettämäs mite,
spending your Christmas in what way,
- 3 Sami: .h no, phh tässä nyt on pikkasen kuviot sillee muuttunu
.h well phh now things have changed a bit here
- 4 että tuota .mt mhh
so ehm
- 5 tai sanotaan että näin mun kohdalta
or lets say that for my part
- 6 että mhh mun piti lähtee eilen, (.)
so mhh I was supposed to leave yesterday
- 7 tai huomenna ois
or tomorrow
- 8 pitäny lähtee pu- pukiks yhtee paikkaa
I should have acted as santa claus in one place
- 9 ja sitte olla siä mun vanhempien luona
and then to be there in my parent's place
- 10 ja sitte mä oon luvannu mennä sinne siskon
and then I have promised to go to my sister's
- 11 luo mennä,
place
- 12 Viki: mm:, joo, [mä oon kans-
PRT yeah [I have also –
- 13 Sami: [mu:tta Raulin isä otti ja kuoli tossa
but NAME1-GEN father take-SG3.PST and die-SG3.PST there
[but Rauli's father took and died
- 14 toissa yönä,
the night before last
- 15 Viki: ↑aha,↓ no se on ikävä juttu,
PRT PRT that's a sad thing,

That Sami was going to tell about some trouble is evident right away in his prefatory *no* in line 1,

translated as ‘well’³. Viki’s question begins with a *no*-particle, which typically invites a longer telling as an answer. In this way, an answer beginning with a *no* can be seen as aligning with the question. However, the initial particle preceded by an audible inbreath and followed by a sound *phh*, indexing despair, is used as foreboding that the answer is going to depart from what was expected by the question. In contrast to what Viki might have expected in a casual pre-Christmas exchange of news (cf. *muuten* ‘by the way’ in line 1), a report of Sami’s plans for Christmas, Sami’s narrative is instead one of how his plans were upset (*things have changed a bit here*, line 3; *I was supposed to leave yesterday*, line 6; *I should have acted as a Santa Claus*, line 8; after which *I was to be there at my parents place*, line 9, then *promised* to visit *my sister*, lines 10/11). Quite apart from the substance of this account, the choice of the verb in each case indicates that what he had originally planned is no longer going to happen. Sami’s account of the upset to his plans for Christmas culminates in the hendiadys with which he reports the sudden death of his relative (‘Rauli’s father’, line 13), who *took and died the night before last* (lines 13-14). Whilst this is not exactly a complaint comparable to Shirley’s in the previous example, nevertheless there is a complainable matter (Sacks 1992: e.g. 46, 47, 151, 438 and 441) that is suppressed, adumbrated but nevertheless visible in the untimeliness of his in-law’s death, which is to say a death in the family happening at such an inconvenient time and upsetting his Christmas plans.

Here are two further cases, one US English the other UK English; in the first, Emma is complaining to her sister about her husband’s treatment of her.

Ex.28 [NB:IV:4:4] (US English)

- 1 Lot: Yer not ↓goin [°any °°(place'r y')°°]
 2 Emm: [Im jus' g u n n u h]sta:y en be
 3 quiet'n I'll (.) wrap th'presents but (.) yihknow
 4 it's very emberressing with ↓Bi:ll. .hh En ↑they
 5 didn'get h:ome til real ↑late yihknow'n they wan'us
 6 come over'n see the ga::me 'n a:nd uh (.)
 7 .hh.hh.hh.hh (0.3) *u-↑Qh: (.) I dun'know it ↑jis
 8 seem like evrything *em nu u-like when'e came in en

³ For the turn initial particle *no* in Finnish, see Vepsäläinen (2019). Suomen *no*-partikkeli ja kysymykseen vastaaminen keskustelussa. (The Finnish particle *no* in answers to questions.)

9 saw that on the sink'e sz you know you don't p't that
 10 back in the freezer.when it's been ou:t'n I s'd ↑I: ↓know
 11 that ↑w'ts the matter with you ↓*:

In this next case, Will's telephone conversation with Gordon is interrupted by some noisy kids playing in the street outside the house.

Ex.29 [Holt:SO88:1:1:2-3] (English)

1 Wil: C'n you- (.) jus' (.) hold on a minute I'll]=
 2 [((Kids-----))]=
 3 =[((Kids-----[--))
 4 Wil: =[jus' go tell these kids to[shut up]
 5 Gor: [hhhYhhe]ah (h)alright I c'n
 6 [hear them in [the °background.°]
 7 Wil: [Right [Hey would you shu]t up ((this said to kids, out of the window))

In this section, we have reviewed cases from each of our four languages illustrating that turns in which speakers construct hendiadys generally occur in the context of discordant sequences – ‘**discordant**’ in a broad sense, to include disaffiliation between participants in the current interaction, and disaffiliation or friction of some kind between the speaker and another non-present third party, during another interaction. We have demonstrated therefore that hendiadys is not really rhetorical, so much as a pragmatic device for **conveying negative affect** in awkward or frictional interactional/sequential environments. We turn now to consider *where* in such sequences hendiadic turns occur.

5.2 Hendiadys in subsequent position, summarizing or concluding

At the beginning of this section we noted that our second principal finding is that hendiadic turns tend to occur in some ‘subsequent’ position. We do not find an instance in which a hendiadys occurred in some ‘first’ position, in a sequence initial turn. Rather, they occur in a subsequent position in a sequence, often to summarise or conclude the sequence. Example (30) is taken from

an argument between Sofia and Furio, a couple, over how they could manage to place multiple pots on top of one another for the purposes of a particular cooking technique.

- Ex.30 [Biscotti Mattina 02-52709] (Italian)
- 1 Sofia no perché si fonde col vapore invece che col fuoco
no because RFL melt-3SG with-the steam instead REL with-the fire
no because it gets melted by the steam rather than by the fire
- 2 (2.2)
- 3 Furio ma non si fonde col vapore perché
but not RFL melt-3SG with-the steam because
but it doesn't get melted by the steam because
- 4 è il contatto con la con la [pentola capisci
be.3SG the contact with the with the pot understand-2SG
it is the contact with the with the pot do you understand
- 5 Sofia [ma qui ci metti l'acqua
but here LOC put-2SG the=water
but you put water in here

(8 lines omitted)
- 15 (1.5)
- 16 Furio cè dovremo trovare un'altra soluzione
PTC must-FUT-1PL find-INF one=other solution
I mean we'll have to find another solution
- 17 (0.3)
- 18 Sofia ma deve toccarsi
but must-3SG touch-INF=RFL
but they have to touch each other
- 19 (0.4)
- 20 Furio va bene allora fai come vuoi
go.3SG well then do-NPST-2SG like want-2SG
alright then do as you want
- 21 (0.7)
- 22 Sofia ma n- non ho capito qual è il tuo problema
but not not have-1SG understand-PSTP which be.3SG the your problem
but I- I don't understand what your problem is

- 23 Furio va bene **mettici dentro l'acqua e fallo**
 go.3SG well put-NPST-2SG=LOC inside the=water and do-IMP.2SG=3SG.ACC
 alright **put in the water and do it**
- 24 (0.8)/((Sofia laughs))
- 25 Furio basta che non mi spacchi le palle
 suffice-3SG CMP not 1SG.DAT break-2SG the balls
 just don't hassle me

Throughout this sequence Furio and Sofia dispute with one another the best way of arranging the cooking apparatus involved, a dispute that they bring to conclusion with Furio's prefatory and repeated *va bene/alright* in lines 20 and 23, and his seemingly resigned acceptance of Sofia's suggestion. It is clear that in the other examples, the hendiadic turns occur well into and towards the end of some disaffiliative sequence, though it will be worth considering how Shirley's complaining in example (26) plays out. It will be recalled that she has complained about (her having caught) Cathy drinking alcohol in the bar where she waits tables. Here again are the last few lines of example (26).

- Ex.26 [Excerpt] (US English)
- 7 Shi: I said, yih don't **honestly think**. thet wir all g'hna j's
 8 **stand here**, .hh en watch you break the la:w.h
 9 (0.4)
- 10 (S): .pt.hhh
- 11 Shi: Youkno:w,
 12 (0.2)

The pauses in lines 9 and 12 here in which her interlocutor, Geri, does not respond, begin to indicate that **Geri might not quite be affiliating with Shirley's complaint**. This becomes more apparent as Shirley continues her account of her confrontation with Cathy, during which Shirley uses other hendiadic constructions (e.g. *I looked at'er en I s'd Cathy, I said*) in successive attempts to close the narrative in such a way as to elicit from Geri some form of affiliation with her (Shirley's) complaint. She does not succeed in doing so. Over 42 further lines of transcript (data not shown) there are 9 further pauses at breaks after each segment of Shirley's narrative,

some as long as 1.0 and 1.2 seconds (see Jefferson 1988 on the significance of silences of 1 second +/- 0.1sec, as indicating possible conversational breakdown); throughout this continued complaining sequence Geri responds only 3 times with minimal acknowledgements (*yeah* and *m-hm*), otherwise remaining silent until the sequence concludes thus:

- Ex.31 [F:TC:1:1:9] (US English)
- 81 Shi: .hh So I ↑told'er if you ever drink ANYthi:ng. .hhh yer
- 82 g'nna *ee- don' ↑WOrry. hhah-hah-hah,
- 83 (.)
- 84 Shi: .hhh[hhh
- 85 Ger: [.tch Oy::hh
- 86 Shi: Such a sh::mucky ki:d you kno:w?
- 87 (.)
- 88 Shi: .hhh I wz rilly aggravated.
- 89 (0.4)
- 90 Shi: .t.hhh B't anyway I made a lot of money last night . . .

Geri has not in the slightest affiliated with Shirley, nor in response to Shirley's conclusion in example (31) does Geri say more than *Oy::*. In short, Shirley has continued with her complaint narrative in search of Geri's affiliation, which is not forthcoming. Shirley deploys hendiadys in what are successively 'subsequent' and potentially/designedly summarizing and concluding positions as a device to secure **Geri's affiliation**, but without success. The hendiadys in examples (4) and (6) are therefore attempts to summarise and conclude, attempts which fail. Geri cannot be persuaded to affiliate with Shirley's condemnation of Cathy's drinking underage. Hence the conflictual character of interactions in which hendiadys is used as a resource can involve both a sense of conflict (tension, non-affiliation) between speakers simultaneously with (reported) conflict between speakers and third parties.

The pre-terminal and summary-like character of the hendiadys in example (25), line 19,

From ex.25 [F4:HH:1-1 (Danish)

18 Help: [J_a. Maren. >Men det ka'jo'tt' ny- Jeg

[Yes. Maren. >But it's no use- I

- 19 ka' jo'tt st̩̄ her< å' trykke i flere t̩̄mer jo.
can't JO stand here< and push for several hours JO.

and example (28) lines 13-14,

From ex.28 [SG:95:B:14] (Finnish)

- 13 Sami: mu:tt̩ Raulin is̩ä otti ja kvali tossa
but NAME1-GEN father take-SG3.PST and die-SG3.PST there
but Rauli's father took and died
- 14 toissa yönä,
the night before last

are clear enough. So too is it clear that Connie's hendiadic summary in this next Danish example brings to a close the sequence in which she has complained about not having been able to drink something special (a bottle of Bailey's) Fie had given her for her birthday.

Ex.32 [TH.M2.24] (Danish)

- 1 Fie: .fnthh Fik du drukket din bæjlis:?
.fnthh Did you manage to drink your Baileys?
- 2 Connie: Nēʃj:[h, den st̩̄r stadigvæk henne på
No:h, its still standing over on
- 3 Fie: [Nå:,
[Oh/right,
- 4 Connie: bord[et.
the table
- 5 Fie: [>Nå jeg troede det var i går
[>Oh I thought it was yesterday
- 6 du sku' drikke de[n,<
you were going to drink it<
- 7 Connie: [Na:jh >fordi der
[Nyø:h >because there
- 8 var ikk' no'en a' de andre

- wasn't anyone of the others
- 9 der ku' li'det.<
who liked it.<
- 10 (0.2)
- 11 Fie: Nå.
Oh/right.
- 12 (0.2)
- 13 Fie: så ville du ikk' sidde: â:[h .hhh
the you didn't want to sit a:nd .hhh
- 14 Connie: [Nej så vi'
[No then I
- 15 jeg ikk' sidde å' drikke den n[år de ikk'
didn't want to sit and drink it when they didn't
- 16 Fie: [N*ejh
[N*oh
- 17 Connie: ku' li' det.
like it.
- 18 Fie: N*ej=[nej*.
N*o=no.*

Connie's complaint here concerns the unco-operativeness of 'the others' who didn't like Bailey's and therefore would not join her, her complaint being that she didn't want to *sit and drink* it alone (note also the complaint implicative "wasn't anyone of the others", Drew 1998). Finally, another Danish example illustrates clearly how a speaker, Jens, used a hendiadic construction to summarise his evident unease at being tied down to a day when he might be home and therefore when Mie might call.

- Ex.33 [TH:S2:005] (Danish)
- 1 Mie: =eJah.
=eYes.
- 2 .hh eh >men a'< der: (.) >en chance for
.hh eh >but is< there (.) >a chance that
- 3 vi ka' få fat i dig mandag?<

- we can get hold of you Monday?<
- 4 Jens: Jerh.
Yeah.
- 5 (0.3)
- 6 Jens: M' det'r'n: stōr chance for.
But there's a big chance of that.
- 7 Mie: Jerh, å'- å' hvor er det så †hjem[me?
Yeah, an- and where is that then at home?
- 8 Jens: [hhhhh
- 9 Høhh->D-a- det kã' jeg jo ikke si':,<
Hehh->T-a- that I can't say JO,<
- 10 hōhmfñh ø::hm: >Mandag fōrmiddag< a' jeg hjemme.=
huhmfñh e::hm: >Monday morning< I'm home.=
- 11 =Jeg lukker Boregård op øhm: klokken halv
=I open up Boregård ehm: at nine
- 12 ti. .hh så inden halv tī a' jeg hjemme.
thirty. .hh so before nine thirty I am home.
- 13 (0.6)
- 14 Mie: Mandag fōrmiddag,=
Monday morning,=
- 15 Jens: =>.hhp- Jahm' j- j'ellers går jeg jo.< øhh [AnneMie
>>.hhp- Yesbut I- otherwise I leave JO.< eh Anne Mie
- 16 Mie: [(†Mm,)
- 17 Jens: >al'så je- je-< jeg ka' jo ikke (.) jeg ka' jo
>ALTSÅ I- I-< I can't JO (.) I can't JO
- 18 ikke sidde her >å' vente ve' telefonen vel,
sit here >and wait by the telephone can I,
- 19 hele mandagen.
all Monday.
- 20 Mie: .h J†ahm' jeg troede du var ledig Jens,
.h Yes-but I thought you were unemployed/free Jens,

Mie is a local tourist and business director; Jens, who is unemployed, has offered to help staff (unpaid) at an internet cafe opening in the summer. Mie suggests that she call on Monday, to

give Jens more information that he needs and some further instructions. Jens's unease in response to Mie's suggestion to call Monday is evident in his turns in lines 6-15, where he prevaricates ("I can't say", line 9) about where exactly he'll be, and whether he'd be at home beyond a certain limited time ("before nine thirty", line 12). His reservations are most clearly summarised in the complainable hendiadys "I can't sit here and wait by the telephone can I, all Monday." (lines 17-19); again, his frequent use of 'jo' in lines 15 and 17 highlight the **complainability of having to wait**, 'jo' meaning approximately 'you know', though conveying a stronger sense of self-evidentiality (this is something Mie ought to know).

Formatted: Font: Bold

5.3 Self-correction

Part of what might be regarded as the mess of talk, of linguistic 'performance' in ordinary interactions, is that speakers very commonly correct themselves. Research has identified the mechanisms or practices with which speakers correct what they are saying, in the course of their turns at talk (see especially Schegloff 2013); research has shown also how the 'speech production process' through which speakers monitor their own speech results in the disfluency that is so characteristic of natural speech ("interruptions in the flow of speech when trouble is detected", Levelt 1983:41). But research has only recently begun to demonstrate that amongst the disfluency associated with self-correction in speech, in 'performance', we can discern a key aspect of people's competence as speakers of a language – that is, their orientation to the normative construction of action, to selecting the linguistic form that is appropriate to undertaking a given action in a particular sequential environment or context (Drew et al. 2013).

That is, speakers select the linguistic form that is appropriate for conducting a given action in a given sequential context. This selection is mostly hidden from view, invisible, accomplished in the ordinary course of the design of a turn at talk. However, what underlies that selection, the 'work' that goes into turn design, including selecting the correct word (and other linguistic properties), is exposed when a speaker initially selects the 'wrong' word (or wrong phrase, or syntax, or prosody etc.) then corrects it within the same turn at talk. Analytically speaking, the speaker's monitoring (Levelt 1983) their talk and finding they have selected the 'wrong' linguistic form is manifest or exposed in the disfluency of self-correction. Comparing the

speaker's initial and often aborted attempt (often referred to as the repairable) with the version they select subsequently (the repair), reveals what the speaker takes to be the 'correct' – that is, normatively appropriate – form of expression of this action in this context. Thus, we find crucial evidence for the normative connections between turn design and sequence/interaction in self-corrections, where speakers orient to what is the appropriate form to do *this* action in *this* sequential place.

Evidence for the *normative* character of selecting a hendiadic form, rather than other constructions (e.g. single verbs), is similarly to be found in those self-corrections in which speakers subsequently amend the design of their turns through hendiadic forms, after having initially selected forms that are non-hendiadys. A clear example in which a speaker begins by using a simple (single) verb, cuts off and substitutes a hendiadic verbal construction is the following example **from our Finnish corpus. data set?**

Ex.34 [SG80] (Finnish)

- 1 Juha: °Nii.h° .h tjeskö se Pepe muuten
PRT .h Did Pepe know by the way
- 2 hotellin nimmee missä ne on
the name of the hotel they are staying
- 3 (.)
- 4 Juha: >Et t[ainnu kysyä,
You maybe did not ask,
- 5 Ari: [No ei ollu kyllä puhetta sii[tä.
[PRT there was no talk about [it.
- 6 Juha: [Joo, >no o:n se lehessä.h
[Yeah, >PRT it i:s in the papers.h
- 7 Ari: Qnhan se lehessä ja kyllähä se nyt varmaa sen tietäs.
It is in the **papers** and he should actually know it for sure.
- 8 (.)
- 9 Juha: .mt Pittää mennä sinne vut-, .h harmi ku ei oo käyny siellä
.mt (One) has to go to (), .h a pity that one hasn't been
- 10 >ei es itseasias< no #uuv# (.) kutsulippuja ku,< hhh >on
there in fact PRT (.) invitation tickets when, <hhh> (one)is

- 11 kutsuvieras .h[hhh
an invited guest .hhhh
.
((6 lines omitted, about their being invited guests))
.
- 19 Juha: Eiku sehä ↑kuhtu kato tuota sillon, sillon ku
No but he ↑did invite see PRT when when
- 20 pelattiin palloo et **tuuha** ↑**käymään** et hänellä on niitä mut
we were playing ball that ↑come on visit that he has those
- 21 but, .hh
- 22 Ari: ↑Pitäskö minun läh-, #o:ö# **kä:övästä ja lähettää**. Nii nehän
should I se-, #o:ö# **drop by and send** (them). So they-CLI
- 23 ker[kee.
will be on time.
- 24 Juha: —[E:hin minä ni< .h mut jos kääät tuota nii kysyypäs >onko
[I: can manage so< but if you drop by then ask-CLI >whether
- 25 sillä niitä mainoksia kotonah,
he has them advertisements at home,

In this excerpt Juha and Ari are discussing an event to which they have both been invited, but for which they have not received tickets nor any further information except through the newspaper (line 6). **In lines 1-11 they are expressing their exasperation** about this lack of information, in the course of which he expresses regret “been there”, perhaps to collect the tickets (lines 9-10). After more talk about their being invited guests (data omitted), Juha finally asks Ari whether he (Juha) should “send them”. However, having begun with what was going to be that single verb construction (Pitäskö minun läh-./should I se-), he self-corrects to substitute that with *kä:övästä ja lähettää*/drop by and send (them) (line 22). Through his self-correction, the speaker adjusts his turn/action to adopt a hendiadic construction, in precisely the interactional and sequential circumstances in which we are showing hendiadys is appropriate. A further example, also from our Finnish corpus, was shown earlier as example (23).

- Ex.23 [SG143 A 04] (Finnish)
266 Jorma: että vauvan ääntä että (.) että niin jos ei nyt

- that baby's voice that (.)that PRT if one hasn't PRT
 267 oo (.) jos ei noo ihan< (.) .h onn: h (.) niinkun
 be if NEG-SG1 be quite congrat- like
 (.) if one has not quite< (.) cong: h (.) like
 268 h mh .h nähny ja onnitellu niin oikein paljo< (.)
 h mh .h seen and congratulated so very much< (.)
 269 h onnea ja siunausta että< .hh >hän on< .ff
 h happiness and blessings that< .hh >she is< .ff

The speaker, Jorma, is here explaining how he came to overlook congratulating the mother of a new-born baby in his congregation. His initial version is *not quite congrat(ulating)* (line 267), which he subsequently corrects to the hendiadys (*not quite*) *seen and congratulated* (line 268). In this way, by correcting from a non-hendiadic form to using a hendiadys to account for his (complainable) oversight, the speaker orients to the appropriate form of making his admission.

Here is another example of selecting a hendiadys though self-correction, from our Finnish corpus.

- Ex.35 [SG 81 1A3] (Finnish)
 09 Pike: [°et-° (.) oli tullu eilen.
 [() (.)]It arrived yesterday.
 10 Erja: >°Joo°<. Mä ihmettelin,=Mä soitin tänään
 Yeah<. I wondered,=I phoned today
 11 meidän palkkakonttoriin.=Mä soitin ja
 our pay office. =I phoned and
 12 kysyin ku<, .hh ↑(mä sain nii älyttömän
 asked as<, .hh (I got) so **mindlessly/unreasonably**
 13 vähän niinku nyt:< rahaa.=
 little like PRT money.=
 14 Pike: =mm.
 15 Erja: .hh Mut ↑kyl ne väitti et se niinku
 .hh But ↑really they claimed that it like
 16 oikeen oli ja (0.8) °#kaikki mut#°.

was correct and (0.8) °all that but°.

Pike and Erja have each received tax rebates, but Erja reports not getting as much as she expected. She begins by reporting that she *phoned today* (line 10), but then elaborates by adding that she *called and asked* (lines 11/12), using the hendiadic form that complements and therefore is appropriate to the complainable matter (*I got*) so *mindlessly little like money* which they (tax office) claimed was correct (lines 12-16).

Here are two further examples, from English.

Ex.36 [NB:II:2:20] (US English)

- 1 Nan: .tch So no one's heard fr'm'm s'nce th'k'ids never ha:ve
 2 heard fr'm'im: u-a:nd ah,h I gotta letter fr'm Roul
 3 Junior'n .hhhhhh he said I ha:ven'ever heard
 4 fr'm Dad,h (.) w't's: th'matter with'im er where iz'e:
 5 en .hhhhhh A:nd. he sent me fifty dollars in ca:sh:.h
 6 uh:.h (.) fer iz car payment,h a:nd so I js took th'car,h
 7 (0.2) pay- Ah wrote a che:ck].h.hhhh B'cuz I don't think
 8 ihht's sa:fe tih se-end fifty do[(h)llars'n] the.: (0.2) yihknow
 9 Emm: [°Mm:::°°]
 10 Nan: ca:sh in en ov'lope, .hhhhh En I so I js sa'down I wrote a
 11 che:ck,h an' I: (.) js slipped it in th'sekint page a'th'letter,h
 12 which Roul hed written'n .hhhhhh en said that he: (.) yihknow
 13 the reason'e: hadn't. uh, (0.6) th't'e wz sending it like this
 14 wz becuz: u- he: assgom' w'n'e took iz car back his dad
 15 wz g'nna let im take th'payment book but iz dad didn't trust
 16 im enough tuh make th'car payments h

Ex.37 [Sacks et al. 1974: 714-715] (English, US) (extension of ex.9 above)

- 1 C: I should get a brush too and you should getta brush
 2 'n [you should fix your hiking boo[ts
 3 J: [Yeah suh:: [my hiking boots
 4 C: Which you were gonna do this weekend.

- 5 J: Pooh, did I have time this wk- well::
 6 C: Ahh c'mon=
 7 J: =Wh'n we get (uh::kay), I haven't even sat down to do any- y'know
 8 like 'hh today I'm gonna sit down 'n read while you're doing
 9 yur coat, (0.7) do yur- hood,
 10 C: Yehhh=
 11 J: =(Ok) (2.0) I haven't not done anything the whole weekend.

There is considerable disfluency in the first of these two examples, in which Nancy is complaining about her ex-husband's conduct and especially his uncommunicativeness. This disfluency begins in line 7 where she breaks off from *I js took th'car,h (0.2) pay-* to report instead that *Ah wrote a che:ck* (line 7), a single verb construction. Nancy seems now to insert (Schegloff 2013: 45-47) an explanation for writing a check (rather than sending cash in the mail), before resuming her account of writing a check – this time using the hendiadic construction *I just sa'down I wrote a che:ck* (lines 10/11). This clearly involves self-correction initiated during, and aborting, the first version of the verb construction, after which the speaker substitutes a verbal hendiadys to depict the same conduct (writing a check). Nancy is thereby orienting to the appropriateness of a hendiadic construction of the verb depicting **(complaining about) the trouble** to which she had to go because of her ex-husband's unhelpfulness. The second of these examples is rather more complex. In response to C's reproach about what J should be doing (lines 1-2, 4), J complains about how little time he's had to do anything over the weekend (lines 5, 7-9). He begins with what was an infinitival construction (*haven't even sat down to do any-*) but cuts off to substitute that with a 'pure' form of hendiadys, *sit down 'n read* (line 8) – thereby again orienting to an appropriate form to depict what he would have done if he had had time (the complainable matter).

These examples are perhaps sufficient to demonstrate that the pattern that we have shown, that in all four languages, hendiadys is used in complaint sequences for the verbal construction representing the complainable matter, is not merely an analytical construct, but is 'real' for speakers. Speakers orient (albeit unconsciously) to this pragmatic function of hendiadys, as an appropriate means for representing a complainable matter, in what are disaffiliative interactional environments (even though the conflict and disaffiliation may involve a non-present third party).

This is an entirely different order of evidence than the (generally) speculative or impressionistic methodology of most previous studies.

§6 Discussion and conclusion

The phenomenon of hendiadys has received a great deal of attention across various fields of linguistic and literary science, with studies looking both at its formal properties and at its functional ones. However, the pragmatics of hendiadys remains much less developed than its grammar, one important reason being that hendiadys has been rarely examined in spoken language use, let alone naturally occurring conversation.

The goal of this paper is two-fold: to uncover the pragmatic properties of hendiadys on the basis of naturally occurring conversation and at the same time to further our understanding of its grammatical properties as they emerge from its usage in four languages (Danish, English, Finnish, Italian). Our results offer new insights into the relation between grammar and pragmatics by bringing to the fore the complementariness between **grammatical subordination/modification** and **pragmatic prominence** in hendiadic expressions.

The grammatical properties of verbal hendiadys have been discussed primarily on the basis of its occurrence in literary texts and corpora of written language. Our study of verbal hendiadys in naturally occurring conversation corroborates a number of basic findings from this prior literature, for example, that the first conjunct typically comes from a small set of intransitive and generic verbs of motion (e.g. ‘go’, ‘come’) and static posture (e.g. ‘sit’, ‘stand’, ‘lie’). At the same time, we also show that the first conjunct may involve other verbs that have a particular functional salience in everyday conversation such as ‘call’ and ‘phone’. Other findings corroborated by our study include the fact that the first conjunct is grammatically subsidiary to the second and that the two conjuncts are syntactically, prosodically, and semantically integrated. Examining hendiadys in naturally occurring conversation offers us a special window into its grammatical properties also thanks to cases of self-correction. These are cases where the speaker begins with non-hendiadic expression (e.g. a single verb like ‘send’ or an infinitival construction like ‘sit down to do any [reading]’), but then quickly replaces the expression with a hendiadic one (e.g. ‘drop by and send’, ‘sit down and read’). This process exposes the speaker’s own

Commented [PD1]: Auli to review and add points about first verbs, beyond motion/stasis – and doesn’t understand ‘grammatically subsidiary – so revise?

understanding of the boundary between related grammatical forms; it demonstrates the distinctiveness of a hendiadic expression; and it brings to the surface the principles of its appropriateness in context.

Syntactic integration puts constraints on the elements that may be inserted between the two conjuncts of a hendiadic construction. At the same time, however, we observe a cline - or “gradient” (Hopper 2002, p. 169) or “continuum” (Aikhenvald 2006, p. 56) - of grammaticalization and conventionalization. The cline encompasses, at one end, fully grammaticalized hendiadys characterized by no elements in between the two conjuncts and by the syntactic reduction and semantic bleaching or abstraction of the first conjunct (e.g. Finnish *otti ja kuoli* ‘took and died’). At an intermediate point on the cline we have conventional and recurrent expressions such as English *go (and) get* and Danish *sid å' x* ‘sit and x’. Finally, at the other end, we find ad-hoc constructions where the two conjuncts are syntactically and semantically more autonomous (e.g. Italian *mettici dentro l'acqua e fallo* ‘put the water in and do it’) but still represent a single conceptual event. In defining the boundaries of hendiadys against the backdrop of this cline, we identify syntactic *scope* as an important element of distinction between hendiadys and bi-clausal constructions. Syntactic scope becomes relevant when considering constructions involving auxiliaries (e.g. modals) as well as adverbs like ‘just’ or ‘really’ and operators like ‘not’ (e.g. Danish *jeg kan ikke lige stå å' remse dem allesammen op* ‘I can’t just stand and list them all’).

Although our study does not involve a typological comparison, we have identified certain differences and tendencies in the lexical and grammatical make-up of hendiadys across our four languages. One difference is between languages where the first conjunct tends to involve verbs of motion (e.g. ‘go’, ‘come’) such as English and Finnish, and languages where the first conjunct tends instead to involve verbs of static posture (e.g. ‘sit’, ‘stand’, ‘lie’) such as Danish; the latter seems to go together with a greater degree of semantic bleaching or abstraction of the first verb. Danish stands out from the rest of our languages also with respect to negation, which appears to be a much more pervasive grammatical feature of hendiadys in this language. The abundance of negation in Danish hendiadic expressions creates a direct link between the grammatical and pragmatic properties of hendiadys in terms of conveying a negative stance (more on this below). Finally, our four languages differ in the proportion to which hendiadys is preferred over other constructions in conversation. On the one hand, we have Danish and English where hendiadys

(e.g. ‘go and ask’) is the prevalent construction for joining together two verbs expressing a single conceptual event. This is reflected in the fact that related infinitival constructions (e.g. ‘go to ask’), at least in English, appear more frequently in more formal language use (Quirk et al. 1985, p. 507). On the other hand, we have Finnish and Italian, where infinitival constructions seem to be just as prevalent in conversation as hendiadys or in fact more prevalent: this is especially the case in Italian, for which we found it particularly hard to reach the minimum sample size of 20 cases of hendiadys. Note, however, that the relative infrequency of hendiadys in this language doesn’t affect the robustness of cross-linguistic grammatical phenomena such as the presence of forms with strong syntactic reduction and semantic bleaching of the first conjunct (e.g. *prendere e andare* ‘take and go’, Bomtorin 2015).

Coming now to the function of hendiadys, a fundamental question that has occupied linguists and literary critics alike is: what does hendiadys do? Why should a speaker “increase the bulk of the verb phrase” (Hopper 2002, p. 169) when a single verb would do?

An action-based analysis of hendiadys allows us to substantiate claims about its meaning by reference to the rich social context and sequential development of conversation (see also Zinken 2013), thus adding specification to those “interpersonal” aspects (Hopper 2002, p. 169) that have been argued to underlie the use of hendiadys. What we find is that hendiadic expressions generally concern a complainable matter and are used in environments characterised by a conflict, dissonance, or friction that is ongoing in the interaction or that is being reported by one participant to another. We also find that the particular utterance in which hendiadys is used is typically not in an initial position in the sequence, but a subsequent and possibly terminal position, summarising or concluding the sequence.

Another key finding is that the complainable or conflictual aspect in these interactions is expressed primarily by the first conjunct of the hendiadic construction. In other words, it is the first verb that conveys the key pragmatic, **aspectual** dimension. **This stands in contrast with the syntactic and semantic subordination of the first conjunct to the second**, which we have seen is at the centre of the grammatical make-up of a hendiadic construction. When not semantically bleached, the action expressed by the first verb is logically subsumed by the action expressed by the second. Yet, from a pragmatic point of view, it is the **subordinate or subsidiary** verb that stands out to fulfil the interactional function of the construction. Our analysis of verbal hendiadys in naturally occurring conversation therefore allows us to revisit a

long-established asymmetry between the components of hendiadys and to bring to light the division of labour between grammar and pragmatics in the complex system of language usage.

References

- Aikhenvald, A. Y. (2006) Serial Verb Constructions in Typological Perspective.
In *Serial Verb Constructions: A Cross-linguistic Typology*, edited by R. M. W. Dixon and A. Y. Aikhenvald. Oxford, Oxford University Press: 1–68
- Aristoteles, T. L. and Gutas, D. (2012) *Aristotle's Poetics: Editio Maior of the Greek Text with Historical Introductions and Philological Commentaries*. Leiden, Brill.
- Austin, J. L. (1962) *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

- Barth-Weingarten, Dagmar. 2016. *Intonation Units Revisited: Cesuras in Talk-in-Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Barth-Weingarten, D. and Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2011) Action, Prosody and Emergent Constructions: The Case of ‘And.’ Pp. 263–293 in *Constructions: emerging and emergent, Linguae & Litterae*, edited by P. Auer and S. Pfänder. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Bomtorin, P. (2015) *As Construções Verbais Paratáticas: Gramaticalização Em Italiano [On Paratactic Verbal Constructions: Grammaticalization in Italian]*. Ph.D. dissertation, Sao Paulo State University.
- Brinton, L.J. (1988) *The Development of English Aspectual Systems: Aspectualizers and Post-Verbal Particles*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Bussmann, H. (1996) *Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics*. edited by G. Trauth and K. Kazzazi. London, Routledge.
- Clift, R. (2016) *Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E. and Selting, M. (2018) *Interactional Linguistics: Studying Language in Social Interaction*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Croft, W. (1991) *Syntactic Categories and Grammatical Relations: The Cognitive Organization of Information*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Drew, P. (1998) Complaints about transgressions and misconduct. *Research on Language And Social Interaction*, 31: 295-325.
- Drew, P., Walker, T., and Ogden, R. (2013) Self-repair and action construction. In Hayashi, M., Raymond, G. and Sidnell, J. (Eds.) *Conversational Repair and Human*

Understanding. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 71-94.

Drew, P. and Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2014) *Requesting in Social Interaction*.
Amsterdam, John Benjamins.

Durie, M. (1997) Grammatical Structures in Verb Serialization. In A. Alsina, J. Bresnan, and
P. Sells (Eds.) *Complex predicates, CSLI lecture notes*. Stanford, CA, CSLI
Publications: 289-354.

Ekberg, L. (1993) The Cognitive Basis of the Meaning and Function of Cross-Linguistic
TAKE and V. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 8(1):21-42.

Haddington, P., Jantunen, J.H., and Sivonen, J. (2011) Language and Affect: Go-
Say and Come-Say Constructions in Finnish. *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 24:75-117.

Heinemann, T., Lindström, A. and Steensig, J. 2011. Addressing epistemic incongruence in
question-answer sequences through the use of epistemic adverbs. In T. Stivers, L.
Mondada & J. Steensig (Eds.), *The Morality of Knowledge in Conversation*.
Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 107-130.

Hopper, P.J. (2002) Hendiadys and Auxiliation in English. In *Complex sentences in
grammar and discourse: essays in honor of Sandra A. Thompson*, edited
by J. L. Bybee and M. Noonan. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins: 145-73.

Jefferson, G. (2004) Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. Lerner (Ed.)
Conversation Analysis: The First Generation. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John
Benjamins: 13-31.

Levelt, W.J.M. (1983) Monitoring and self-repair in speech. *Cognition*, 14, 41-104.

Levinson, S. (2013) Action formation and ascription. In J. Sidnell and T. Stivers (Eds.) *The*

Handbook of Conversation Analysis, Chichester, Blackwell: 103-130.

Porphyry, Pomponius (1894) *Pomponi Porfyronis Commentum in Horatium Flaccum*.
Edited by A. Holder. Innsbruck, Ad Aeni Pontem.

Quinn, Arthur and Lyon Rathbun (1996) Hendiadys. In *Encyclopedia of rhetoric and composition: communication from ancient times to the information age*, Garland reference library of the humanities, edited by T. Enos. New York, Garland: 315.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G.N., and Svartvik, J. (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London, Longman.

Królak, E. and Rudnicka, K. (2006) Selected Aspects of Directives in Polish. *Revista Española de Lingüística Aplicada* (19): 129-42.

Sacks, H. (1992) *Lectures on Conversation, Vol.2*. Edited by G. Jefferson. Oxford, Blackwell.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A. and Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50 (4):696-735.

Sansone, D. (1984) On Hendiadys in Greek. *Glotta* 62(1/2):16-25.

Schegloff, E.A. (1996) Confirming allusions: Toward an empirical account of action. *American Journal of Sociology*, 102 (1): 161-216.

Schegloff, E.A. Ten operations in self-initiated, same-turn repair. In Hayashi, M., Raymond, G. and Sidnell, J. (Eds.) *Conversational Repair and Human Understanding*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 41-70.

Schmerling, S. (1975) Asymmetric Conjunction and Rules of Conversation. In P. Cole and J.

L. Morgan (Eds.) *Syntax and semantics Vol.3*. New York, NY, Academic Press: 211-231.

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Servius, Maurus, Honoratus (1887) *Servii Grammatici Qui Feruntur in Vergilii Bucolica et Georgica Commentarii*. edited by G. Thilo. Lipsiae: in aedibus B. G. Teubneri.

Vannebo, K. I. (2003) Ta Og Ro Deg Ned Noen Hakk: On Pseudocoordination with the Verb Ta 'Take' in a Grammaticalization Perspective. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 26(2): 165–93.

Vepsäläinen, H. (2019). *Suomen no-partikkeli ja kysymykseen vastaaminen keskustelussa (The Finnish particle no in answers to questions)*. Helsinki, University of Helsinki.

Zinken, J. (2013) Reanimating Responsibility: The Weż-V2 (Take-V2) Double Imperative in Polish Interaction. In N. Thielemann and P. Kosta (Eds.) *Approaches to Slavic Interaction, Dialogue Studies*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins: 35–61