

INTRODUCTION

Ritva Laury, Marja Etelämäki and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen*

Since the publication of the seminal volume *Interaction and Grammar* edited by Ochs, Schegloff & Thompson in 1996, the study of grammar in interaction has established itself as a robust and vibrant research paradigm in the field of linguistics. In the meantime, however, new models of grammar have been introduced in linguistics and existing ones have been further developed, including Linear Unit Grammar (Sinclair & Mauranen 2006), Cognitive Grammar (Langacker 1987, 2008), Emergent Grammar (Hopper 1987, 1998, 2011), Construction Grammar (Croft 2001; Fried & Östman 2004; Goldberg 2006), Dialogic Grammar (Du Bois 2001; Linell 1998, 2004, 2006, 2009; Anward 2003) and others. Most recently, linguists have become interested in embodied interaction (Streeck, Goodwin & LeBaron 2011) and its implications for what might be called Multimodal Grammar. This special issue focuses on ways of studying grammar in interaction in the light of these new developments. It presents case studies of grammar in interaction, in a variety of different languages, exemplifying the application of a selection of these grammatical theories and thus furnishing a state-of-the-art view of grammar-in-interaction research today. The articles touch on some of the most central questions facing grammarians who study conversational talk, and conversation analysts who are interested in grammar: What is the role of language, and more specifically of grammar, in interaction? How do theories of grammar relate to the study of language-in-interaction? What does the study of interaction have to offer for theories of grammar? While we do not pretend to offer exhaustive answers to these questions, the papers in this special issue represent an effort to begin answering them.

1. Background

Although the studies gathered together in the 1996 volume *Interaction and grammar* came from three different fields of research – linguistic anthropology, functional linguistics and conversation analysis, their authors were united in understanding grammar as a set of resources used for and in the organization of social life. They were also deeply committed to studying grammar in the recorded data of naturally occurring

* Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen and Marja Etelämäki acknowledge funding from the Finland Distinguished Professor project Grammar and Interaction (Academy of Finland) during the preparation of this article.

episodes of interaction. The volume highlighted three features that characterize a study of grammar using naturally occurring talk-in-interaction as research material: Temporality, activity implication and embodiment. It is perhaps no coincidence that precisely these features have been at the center of much interactional linguistic research since then, as Auer, Couper-Kuhlen & Müller (1999); Hausendorf (2007); Selting (1996); Lindström (2005); Curl (2006); Heinemann (2006); Curl & Drew (2008); Mondada (2006, 2007, 2009) and many others attest. Strikingly, however, these same three features also relate directly to the themes of this special issue: Temporality is a pivotal notion for Emergent Grammar (Hopper 2011), the activity implications of linguistic constructions figure in Construction Grammar (Günthner & Imo 2006), and embodiment serves as a prerequisite for cognitive conceptualization in Cognitive Grammar (Langacker 2008; see also Zlatev 2005, 2007).

The papers in the 1996 volume radically challenged existing linguistic theories. Rather than integrate into them, they promoted the idea that seeing grammar in an interactional framework requires a new understanding of linguistic structures. The commitment to use data from naturally occurring interactions, and to analyze the data interactionally, raised questions about the nature of grammar-for-interaction: What is the scope and range of elements that should be understood as belonging to grammar, and how should elements that were traditionally included in grammatical descriptions be understood in a re-theorized grammar for interaction? The issue of the nature of grammar-in-interaction continues to be relevant in interactional linguistics with commonly asked questions such as: What is the role of gestures and sequence organization in grammatical descriptions? Are grammatical notions such as e.g. “left-” or “right dislocation”, whose labels derive from written language and which reveal underlying theoretical assumptions foreign to real-time interaction, relevant for participants? If so, what should they be called? What is an appropriate linguistic theory, if there is one at all, for describing grammar-in-interaction?

The 1996 volume initiated the enterprise of understanding “what sort of thing grammar might be thought to be and how it might be configured” (Schegloff, Ochs & Thompson 1996: 27), leaving the issue of an adequate and proper linguistic theory open. However, the conduct of analyses presented in the papers of the volume did embody a (pre)theoretical take on the organization of grammar by promoting an understanding of grammar as an interactional phenomenon and considering every feature in the data as possibly relevant. The authors thus opposed approaches and methodologies that *a priori* excluded some features and possible organizations as less important than others. The aim was to understand interaction and grammar in terms of naturally occurring data, not in terms of a theory (see also Schegloff 2005).

The editors of the 1996 volume characterized the approaches to grammar in the articles as having, broadly defined, three different, partly overlapping perspectives on grammar. In some of the articles, grammar was seen as organizing interaction. In this view, grammar could be thought to exist *a priori*, as a set of resources that the speakers of a language can draw upon in doing interactional work. An example of this orientation is the paper by Fox, Hayashi & Jasperson (1996), which concerns same-turn self-repair by speakers of English and Japanese. The authors of this article argue that the different grammatical resources of the two languages account for the fact that speakers of each language accomplish the conversational practice of same-turn self-repair somewhat differently. In a second, more radical approach, grammar is seen as an outcome of social interaction. An article representing this perspective is Schegloff’s (1996) contribution,

in which he shows how grammar is shaped by the position of the turn constructional unit within its turn and the position of that turn within a sequence. The third approach takes the position that grammar is itself a mode of social interaction. In this approach, not only specific constructions, but also linguistic codes themselves can be seen as modes of interaction. The paper by Morgan (1996) is an example: She shows how the code-switching involved in 'signifying' constitutes an interactional move that counts as a bid to formulate participants' identities.

2. Interactional linguistics

Building on the foundation of *Interaction and grammar* but enlarging its scope, the enterprise of *Interactional Linguistics* was first introduced in 2001 (Couper-Kuhlen & Selting 2001; Selting & Couper-Kuhlen 2001). The aim of this enterprise was to apply ethno-methodological methods, which had been successful in exposing the structure and organization of everyday conversation, to explore the structure and organization of language as used in social interaction. 'Language' was understood comprehensively as encompassing not only grammar, in the sense of morphology and syntax, but also phonetics and prosody, lexis, semantics and pragmatics. From the cumulative results of such exploration, it was hoped, a new theory of language would emerge. Today the interactional linguistic enterprise, conceived broadly, encompasses disciplines other than linguistics and methodologies other than ethno-methodological ones (see, e.g., Ford, Fox & Thompson 2002; Couper-Kuhlen & Ford 2004; Hakulinen & Selting 2005; Günthner & Imo 2006; Deppermann, Fiehler & Spranz-Fogasy 2006; Günthner & Bückler 2009; Barth-Weingarten, Reber & Selting 2010). However, all interactional linguists are united in the understanding that the turns, actions and sequences of talk-in-interaction are made interpretable by the systematic use of linguistic resources. Consequently, linguistic forms as deployed by genuine speakers in everyday and institutional encounters are the focus of their investigation.

Since the 1996 volume, the question of a linguistic theory has gradually come into focus in interactional linguistics. Conversation analysis is strictly committed to empirical research, and its original aim was to find the categories that the participants of a conversation themselves rely on and operate with when constructing intersubjective understanding (see e.g. Sacks 1987). Because any given theory brings with it a range of categories and terminologies, it is the task of an interactional linguist to carefully consider the use of them. Linguists who adopt Conversation Analysis as one of the main methods for studying language-in-interaction are then faced with the task of considering whether the categories and principles provided by linguistic theories are compatible with the basic understanding of interaction provided by Conversation Analysis: Are they the ones that participants themselves use as resources for talk-in-interaction? How can the danger be combatted that a theory and its *a priori* given categories and terminology come in between the observer and the data, and thus turn out to be directing the study, preventing new observations (Hakulinen 1996)? These questions have led to a rethinking of traditional linguistic units such as the sentence and explanatory factors such as topicality. Traditional categories of linguistic analysis were also re-examined and questioned by discourse-functionalists (e.g. Hopper & Thompson 1980, 1984); however, the latter have also been criticized by CA-oriented linguists for

having a monological view on language, for the basic units of analysis used, and for the guiding principles followed (Hakulinen 1989, 1996).

In present-day interactional linguistics, there already exists a cumulative body of studies on language and interaction, and understandings of grammar and interaction that have arisen out of them. The 1996 volume specifically foregrounded functional approaches to grammar, broadly conceived. During the past decade, Construction Grammar has been gaining ground as a candidate theory for interactional linguistics. In the 2005 volume *Syntax and Lexis in Conversation*, a *construction* was defined as “a partly fixed, partly free format” (Hakulinen & Selting 2005; see also Ono & Thompson 1995). The 2005 volume also brought up the question of lexical semantics, which is a relevant issue particularly when attempting to describe elements such as e.g. particles and other indexicals whose basic function is to organize the on-going interaction. Since then, a semantics for interaction has been left somewhat in the background (see, however, Deppermann 2005, 2006, 2011a, b), while more syntactically oriented theories of linguistic structure have explicitly been taken into interactional linguistics, namely Emergent Grammar (Auer & Pfänder 2011) and new versions of Construction Grammar (Günthner & Imo 2006). Parallel to these developments, the notions of on-line syntax (Auer 2009) and positionally sensitive grammar (Schegloff 1996; Thompson, Fox & Couper-Kuhlen 1996) seem to suggest that there is a need for a new theory of grammar. In addition, several recent studies on action formation/ascription have had reason to ask, does “action” belong to linguistic meaning? (Levinson 2006, 2013).

Because of the variety of grammatical theories that have recently been advanced, we find that now is the time to re-consider theoretical and terminological issues: Does there exist a theory of grammar that is compatible with interactional approaches to language or that could be revised and made compatible, or is interactional linguistics in need of a grammatical theory of its own? What terminology should be used in describing grammatical phenomena, e.g. ‘left-’ or ‘right-dislocation’, in order to make it possible to communicate with linguists coming from other backgrounds, but without compromising the understanding of language as profoundly interactional?

3. The current special issue and its focus

The articles in this special issue represent functionally oriented approaches to grammar that make provision for language as used in interaction. These approaches are also ones that have been appealed to by linguists who study language in interaction, often implicitly. One purpose of this issue is to acknowledge this and make it explicit. For reasons of space, we have not been able to include papers representing all the approaches used by linguists studying language use in interaction, e.g. Linear Unit Grammar (Sinclair & Mauranen 2006) and Dialogic Grammar (Du Bois 2001; Linell 1998, 2004, 2006, 2009; Anward 2003). In the following we provide short introductions to the grammatical approaches that are represented here, including Discourse-functional Grammar, Cognitive Grammar, Construction Grammar, Emergent Grammar, Online Syntax, and Social Action Formats.

3.1. Approaches to grammar in interaction

Discourse-functional grammar originated in the late 1970s and early 1980s as a reaction to the dominant paradigm of autonomous ('Chomskyan') linguistics, which used exclusively introspective data. While the approach first arose on the West Coast of North America, it was strongly inspired by European functional grammarians, for example the Prague school, and all of the early practitioners were veterans of extensive fieldwork on native American languages. Discourse-functional grammarians insist on the use of naturally occurring data as the basis for their theoretical claims, since discourse is viewed as the primary locus of grammar in the languages of the world (Cumming, Ono & Laury 2011). Much of the research is done on large corpora in order to detect which patterns are common, and therefore central in grammar; as put by Du Bois, "grammars code best what speakers do most" (1985: 363). The goals of discourse-functional grammarians are both descriptive and explanatory. On the one hand, a central question asked is whether traditional categories (e.g. noun and verb; Hopper and Thompson 1984), originally developed based on constructed examples, are found in and are relevant for actual language use in a range of typologically distinct languages. On the other hand, discourse-functional grammarians seek motivations for the categories found to be cross-linguistically valid (e.g., the origin of argument structure in patterns in discourse; Du Bois 1985). Explanations are sought both in cognitive factors relevant in production and processing of language (such as the cognitive and attentional state attributed by the speaker to the addressee; e.g. Chafe 1994) as well as social and, to some degree, interactional factors (e.g. stance, Clancy 1980; sequential development and social roles, Ford 1993).

In its earliest form **Construction Grammar** (CxG) was seen as a way to overcome the artificial separation of syntax and lexicon in linguistic theory and to demarginalize a hitherto neglected aspect of language, namely idioms and other semi-fixed expressions (Fillmore, Kay & O'Connor 1988). *Constructions* were understood to be non-compositional pairings of forms (phonological, morphological and possibly syntactic) with meanings or uses (semantic and pragmatic) resulting in conventionalized symbolic units with varying degrees of schematicity and ranging in size from single words to phrases, clauses and clause combinations. Grammar for construction grammarians is a structured inventory of such constructions, representing speakers' knowledge of their language. Since its introduction, Construction Grammar has evolved in different ways, with several varieties now coexisting, including a HPSG unification-grammar variety (Kay & Fillmore 1999), a motivation and psycholinguistic-based variety (Goldberg 2006) and a 'radical' variety that eschews formal syntactic categories and relations and views all grammatical structure as language-specific (Croft 2001). The variety of CxG that Lindström's work (this issue) advocates is one that incorporates form-meaning correspondences beyond the sentence, acknowledging the existence of 'discourse patterns', i.e. discourse-based constructions (Östman 2005).

Like Discourse-functional Grammar, **Cognitive Grammar** (CG) developed as a reaction to a view on grammar that treats syntax, semantics and the lexicon as autonomous components that are distinct from each other. Its beginnings date to the late 1970s, and the first papers were published in 1981 and 1982 under the name Space Grammar (Langacker 1981, 1982; see also Langacker 2005). Its basic claim is that grammar is symbolic in nature: The lexicon and grammar form a gradation that consists in assemblies of symbolic structures; symbols are the pairings of semantic structure and

phonological structure. Like other approaches in this special issue, Cognitive Grammar is a usage-based model of grammar in the sense that usage events are understood as the source of all linguistic units (Langacker 2008). It comes particularly close to Construction Grammar in e.g. understanding linguistic knowledge as comprising vast numbers of constructions that are idiosyncratic to a large extent, viewing regularities as taking the form of constructions that are schematic in relation to instantiating expressions, and considering constructions as form-meaning pairings. There are, however, some rather crucial differences between CG and CxG. CxG - or at least some branches of it - claims grammar to be a generative device that assembles expressions (see e.g. Goldberg 1995; Evans & Green 2006: 659–661). In CG, by contrast, expressions are understood to be assembled by speakers, drawing on all available resources: Grammar is understood as "a structured inventory of conventional units available for exploitation in speaking and understanding" (Langacker 2005: 159). Another difference between CG and CxG lies in the claims they make about grammatical elements. In CG, basic grammatical constructs (such as e.g. noun, verb, subject, object) are understood to be fundamentally conceptual by nature, which means that the symbolic structures are understood as consisting of purely semantic and phonological poles. CxG, on the other hand, assumes a level of syntactic structure - a purely grammatical form - between the semantic and phonological structure, thus giving grammatical structure a status separate from semantics (Langacker 2005; Verhagen 2009). The third difference between CG and CxG can be seen as a consequence from the status of grammatical structure in these models: Whereas linguistic meaning, the various dimensions of construal and imaginative phenomena (metaphor, mental spaces), figure prominently in CG, CxG seems to put more stress on developing grammatical formalisms than semantic descriptions.

Despite being usage-based (Bybee 1998; Barlow & Kemmer 2000), Construction Grammar has taken little notice of the rich empirical database that casual conversation has to offer. Interactional linguists, however, have been particularly interested in 'constructions in conversation' (Ono & Thompson 1995; Hopper 2004; Deppermann 2006a; Günthner & Imo eds. 2006). The notion **Social Action Format**, first introduced by Fox (2000, 2007) to refer to the sequence-specific format [*NP looks/is (really) ADJ*] for complimenting in conversational English (see also Keisanen & Kärkkäinen, this issue) has proved to be one effective way of conceptualizing constructions in interaction without embracing the formal apparatus of Construction Grammar (CxG). More generally speaking, social action formats can be thought of as recurrent linguistic routines or conversational patterns, originating in the interactional needs of participants, which have become sedimented for the accomplishment of specific social actions in everyday interaction. Social action formats have the advantage that they can be conceptualized as not only linguistic, i.e. consisting uniquely of verbal elements, but also as partially or wholly non-verbal, incorporating various (conventionalized) forms of vocal and visible behavior for the accomplishment of social action. They are thus much closer to the observed reality of face-to-face social interaction.

While discourse-functional, constructional and cognitive grammarians tend to hold, at least implicitly, the view that languages do 'have' grammar, a more radical version that grew out of the discourse-functional paradigm is the theory of **Emergent Grammar** (Hopper 1987, 1998). Hopper claims that grammar, instead of being a stable resource that exists *a priori*, independent of its speakers, is constantly renewing itself

and being shaped in language use. Grammar is seen here, not as the source of communication, but as an epiphenomenal byproduct of it. Thus, consistent with other functional approaches, regularity is seen as emergent out of discourse and as constantly shaped by it: The concept of grammar is firmly situated in language use, and is to be found in observed repetitions in discourse. However, in this approach, grammar is not only something that originally arose out of usage patterns by speakers, but it *is* those usage patterns themselves, situated in the interaction itself, as temporal objects representing aggregations of patterns heard and used by the users of the language. **Online Syntax** shares with Emergent Grammar a focus on temporality and usage-based regularity in grammar. However, unlike the most radical version of Emergent Grammar, Online Syntax assumes a sedimented level of grammar that is independent of the ongoing talk. The argument is that participants need an independent sense of grammar in order to parse utterances, which they do online, thereby making their cognitive competence public.

3.2. *The articles in this special issue*

In what follows, we present summaries of the articles in this issue and a statement about their contribution to an understanding and appreciation of grammar for, in and as interaction. The authors investigate a range of grammatical phenomena from subject person marking, infinitives and demonstratives, verb-first constructions, ‘ellipsis’, pivots, clause combining, to directive-commissive actions and compliment activities. The data the articles are based on come from English, Finnish, French, German, Japanese and Swedish conversations, and they represent the theoretical frameworks described above. We have grouped the articles according to framework and ordered the frameworks roughly according to what we perceive their chronological development to be, starting with Discourse-functional Grammar, a framework predating the appearance of *Interaction and grammar* in 1996, and ending with Social Action Formats, a framework for describing the implementation of actions in interaction that incorporates multimodal dimensions of language use.

Discourse-functional Grammar

Searching for motivations for grammatical patternings (Marja-Liisa Helasvuo)

Helasvuo’s study of subject omission vs. expression in Finnish casual conversation is based on a syntactically tagged corpus from which more than 2000 exemplars of 1st and 2nd person-singular clauses were extracted automatically. Starting from the quantitative finding that pronominal forms are favored over zero forms for subjects in both 1st and 2nd person-singular clauses, Helasvuo examines qualitatively the “home environments” (typical contexts) for subject pronoun omission and subject pronoun expression in order to determine the motivation for one or the other alternative. With respect to subject pronoun omission, she finds that it is not so much a principle of economy (cf. Sacks & Schegloff 1979; Hachohen & Schegloff 2006) that motivates it, but rather the principle of recipient design: Subject pronoun omission occurs in environments where the larger sequential context allows co-participants to achieve early recognition and projection of the trajectory of the turn. With respect to subject pronoun expression, Helasvuo finds that it tends to occur with cognitive verbs such as *ajatella* ‘think’, *luulla* ‘think, believe’, *tietää* ‘know’, *muistaa* ‘remember’. Often the 1st/2nd

person+cognitive verb constructions are formulaic and used to mark stance. Given the preference for SV order in Finnish declarative sentences, a separate subject pronoun has the advantage of making the subject explicit from the outset and thus allowing for early projection of the trajectory of the turn.

Helasvuo takes a rigorously empirical approach to grammar in interaction in the sense that her database consists exclusively of recordings of spontaneous everyday conversation. The data are coded systematically for selected morphosyntactic and discourse features, which are then analyzed quantitatively in order to reveal systematic correlations and patterns. In other words, in keeping with the tradition of discourse-functional linguistics, Helasvuo starts with the forms and establishes what is most frequent and hence most sedimented. Possible motivations for these patterns are then sought based on typical examples viewed in their natural context of occurrence.

Cognitive Grammar

Why blend Conversation Analysis with Cognitive Grammar? (Marja Etelämäki & Laura Visapää)

Etelämäki & Visapää make an impassioned plea for combining the method of Conversation Analysis (CA) with the theory of Cognitive Grammar (CG). They argue that Cognitive Grammar considers grammar to be inherently social in the first place and that its descriptions of form-meaning pairings in language would stand to gain by incorporating knowledge of conventionalized ways of organizing interaction. At the same time, conversation analytic studies of interaction stand to be enriched by a semantic theory that sees ways of conceptualizing and construing the world through language as one means for structuring interaction. Two indexical phenomena are used as illustration: Demonstratives and free-standing A-infinitives in Finnish. These phenomena are first examined through the lens of CA and then re-analyzed within the framework of CG. The argument is that merging the two types of description makes it possible to capture the contribution of grammar to the schematic organization of conversation and to the dynamicity of the speech situation, grammar being understood as “a repository of socially shared conventions, including conventional ways of managing interaction”.

Of particular interest in this paper is the claim that Cognitive Grammar does not contradict the view that interaction is a dynamic process where situated meanings emerge that are to some extent shared between participants. Instead CG focuses on ways of conceptualizing that are conventionalized in grammar, the argument being that a certain amount of stability in grammar is required in order to make phenomena such as projection or joint turn construction possible. In this sense, CG, as presented here, shares the view of conventionalization of grammar in situations of use with Discourse-functional Grammar, Construction Grammar and perhaps even Emergent Grammar, although there is more of a focus on conventionalization through usage rather than on-line emergence.

Construction Grammar

On the place of turn and sequence in grammar: Verb-first clausal constructions in Swedish talk-on-interaction (Jan Lindström)

Lindström combines positionally sensitive grammar (Schegloff 1996) with a Construction Grammar Plus (CxG)-based account of Swedish verb-first clauses. He expands the scope of construction grammar by including the sequential domain in the

formal description of constructions. The sequential domain includes attributes such as turn-type (single or multi-unit turn), sequentiality (first pair part or second pair part) and TCU (first or subsequent TCU). By using sequential attributes, he shows that certain types of Swedish verb-first clauses, namely polar questions, receipt questions, responsive declaratives and conditional protasis, represent different constructions in spite of their seemingly similar inner syntactic structure.

Grammar is seen here, consistent with the principles of Construction Grammar, as a repository of form-function pairs that are more than the sum of their parts. At the same time, the forms are seen in their contexts of use and are treated as inseparably linked to them. Although Lindström aims at a formal account of grammatical phenomena, he does not propose constructional formalism as a goal in and of itself, but rather as an analyst's tool for teasing out distinctive features in order to arrive at precise descriptions (abstractions) of the data.

Emergent Grammar and Online Syntax

Syntactic structures and their symbiotic guests: Notes on analepsis from the perspective of online syntax (Peter Auer)

Auer's paper deals with *analepsis*, a 'structural copying' found, for instance, in certain kinds of answers, lists, repairs, and increments in conversation. An example within the turn of a single speaker might be 'I found her so interesting, and also the milieu', where the two parts of this utterance could be said to stand in a symbiotic relation to one another: 'I found her so interesting' serves as host and 'and also the milieu' is its symbiotic guest or *symbiont*. Auer argues that what makes such a phenomenon possible is that the syntactic structure of the host remains active for some time after its production, allowing it to be re-used by the symbiont. He calls the structural ties holding between a host and its symbiotic guest *structural latency* and represents them graphically using boxes in a fashion similar to Blanche-Benveniste's *grilles* (1990). Structural latency can hold within same-speaker talk or across turns and can involve the same or different actions. Auer sees the process as fundamental to spoken language and to the production of syntactic structure in real time (2005, 2009).

When providing a description of how latent syntactic structures come into use in similar fashion in varied interactional contexts, Auer proposes a description of syntax that functions independently of particular activities or actions; in this sense, grammar is seen as having an existence independent from usage, while the approach still shares some similarities with Emergent Grammar. Although Auer expands the scope of syntax beyond the sentence level, his article shows how sentence-level syntax operates on-line, and is in this sense emergent, while assigning structure and interpretation to separate phrasal units.

The limits of grammar: Clause combining in Finnish and Japanese conversation
(Ritva Laury & Tsuyoshi Ono)

Using data from Finnish and Japanese conversations, Laury & Ono discuss the limits of grammar with respect to the size of linguistic structures that can be understood to be relatively permanent for speakers of a language. They present an emergent view of grammar, stating that grammar consists of a constantly fluctuating set of relatively stable linguistic patterns that range from lexically specific, idiomatic set expressions to abstract patterns (such as e.g. argument structure). They propose that clause combinations, i.e. units that are bigger than a clause, are not pre-planned, grammatical

structures for the speakers, but instead emerge as a result of various on-line factors. Although speakers of a language do not share clause combinations as structured grammatical units, they share knowledge of how to combine clauses and produce complex units on-line by using e.g. argument structure, fixed expressions, prosody and turn final particles for projecting either more talk to come or proposing closure of a turn. In their grammatical analyses, Laury & Ono take into account syntax, semantics/pragmatics, prosody and non-verbal means, but leave the question of what dimensions of language use should be included in grammar open for further research.

The case studies described in this article provide exemplary evidence for the emergence of grammatical patterns in real time. Given the fact that this evidence comes from two languages with very little in common typologically (one is reportedly verb-final, the other verb-second), the implication is that the grammatical emergence of clause combinations is as widespread as is language itself.

'Pivotage' in French talk-in-interaction: On the emergent nature of [Clause-NP-Clause] pivots (Anne-Sylvie Horlacher & Simona Pekarek Doehler)

Horlacher & Pekarek Doehler view grammar as fundamentally temporal, and emergent on a moment-by-moment basis in interaction. Their attention is focused on one recurrent pattern, namely an amalgamation of 'Right Dislocation' and 'Left Dislocation' in French, whereby the dislocated element functions as a pivot, a constituent belonging at once to what precedes and to what follows. The authors are adamant in insisting that this pattern is not pre-planned but comes about bit by bit in real time. Consequently, it can only be recognized as such after the fact. But they show that the process of patching together specific pieces of syntax in a particular order serves as a malleable resource for a number of interactional tasks, such as managing self-repair, upgrading a speaker's stance, managing the progressivity of talk, and dealing with lack of reciprocity. Horlacher & Pekarek Doehler work out how and why these pivot-like patterns are able to provide flexible means for managing these tasks. Because their study targets a process rather than a product, it furnishes powerful evidence for 'grammar in the making'.

Horlacher & Pekarek Doehler's approach is thoroughly temporal (unit-based) and views grammar as a practical accomplishment. It provides striking evidence for the relevance of the temporal ordering of constituents in real time and in doing so, underlines the constant adaptation of grammatical production to contingency.

Social Action Formats

What does grammar tell us about action? (Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen)

Couper-Kuhlen discusses a family of initiating actions in English conversations that involve an attempt to bring about some future action, event or situation. She introduces a family of directive-commissive actions including Proposals, Offers, Requests and Suggestions, distinguished in terms of which participant(s) will carry out the future action, and which one(s) will benefit from it. She shows that these actions are routinely associated with a range of lexico-syntactic constructions that deliver distinctive cues to the type of action being implemented. However, as her examples show, there is not a perfect match between action type and the grammatical format used to carry it out, and this sometimes leads to misalignment, which is then dealt with in the interaction.

In showing that grammar provides the basis on which recipients form working hypotheses about what action the co-participant is initiating, Couper-Kuhlen responds to Schegloff (1984) and suggests that the linguistic forms used are indeed important, although not sole nor exhaustive indicators of social action. She notes that these formats are in many ways reminiscent of constructions in Construction Grammar; however, since they are used for specific kinds of social actions, and since they can embrace both linguistic and embodied forms, she suggests that social action formats may be a more appropriate conceptual framework for the description of conventionalized ways of implementing action in interaction.

A multi-modal analysis of compliment sequences in everyday English interactions
(Tiina Keisanen & Elise Kärkkäinen)

Keisanen & Kärkkäinen present a multimodal analysis of compliment turns and responses in English. They argue for the view that bodily-visual displays and prosodic cues together with recurrent linguistic material form routinized conversational patterns, or social action formats, that are used for accomplishing particular actions in interaction. Compliment turns regularly include extreme case formulations and intensifiers, and they are prosodically marked to strengthen the affective tone. In addition, the producer of the compliment regularly seeks to establish mutual gaze with the recipient during the production of the compliment turn. Compliment responses are minimal, and compliment recipients typically avoid mutual gaze by turning their head towards their lap or some object at hand, in order to resist self-praise. Using compliments as an example, Keisanen & Kärkkäinen propose that embodied means for implementing social actions should be taken into account in studies of practice-based grammars.

This understanding of social action formats as routinized conversational practices is likely to be compatible with a view of grammar as emergent. Moreover, if social action formats are conventionalized form-function pairings, they come close to what Construction Grammar and Cognitive Grammar have proposed. However, Keisanen & Kärkkäinen's description appears to be aimed at concrete realizations of social actions rather than at abstractions (whether cognitive or theoretical).

4. Conclusion

The three perspectives on grammar for, in and as interaction initially introduced in *Interaction and Grammar* (1996) can be seen to converge in the present special issue. The articles relying on Discourse-functional Grammar (Helasvuo) and Construction Grammar (Lindström) can be seen as taking the view that languages, in some sense, 'have' grammar which is in turn shaped by interaction. The papers representing Emergent Grammar and Online Syntax (Horlacher & Pekarek Doehler; Laury & Ono; Auer), on the other hand, take the view that grammar is an outcome of, in other words, emerges from interaction. Finally, the papers concerning Social Action Formats (Couper-Kuhlen; Kärkkäinen & Keisanen) take the view that grammar, broadly conceived, is a form of interaction. The paper by Etelämäki & Visapää can, in some sense, be seen as uniting all three perspectives, as it combines an emergent, cognitively based view of grammar with a view of grammar as interaction.

The grammatical approaches exemplified in the papers collected here may be thought of as in some ways similar: All are functionally oriented and usage-based. All rely in one way or another on naturally occurring interactional data. Yet they are in other crucial ways quite distinct. First, they make different theoretical assumptions and rely on different sets of technical terminology for their analysis. While the paper by Lindström, for instance, assumes a level of grammar independent of semantics, the paper by Etelämäki & Visapää does not make this assumption. Lindström appeals to CxG notions of ‘value’ and ‘attribute’, Etelämäki & Visapää to the CG notions of ‘conceptualizer’ and ‘grounding’; yet none of these technical terms have equivalents in other approaches. Second, the papers collected here use different methodologies and in doing so, obtain different kinds of results. Helasvuo’s study, for instance, takes grammatical form as its starting point: It uses coding and quantification to identify frequencies and distributional skewings, which provide insight into grammatical patterning as a “frequency effect” (Bybee & Thompson 1997). Keisanen & Kärkkäinen’s study, by contrast, takes action as its starting point, and arrives at form-related findings based on qualitative micro-analysis of representative single cases. For Keisanen & Kärkkäinen, formal patterns encompass more than verbal elements; at the same time, these patterns are treated at a less granular level than, for instance, those identified by Etelämäki & Visapää. The grammatical forms the latter describe are purely verbal but are viewed with greater granularity and ‘decomposed’ into richly layered meanings. Finally, the papers collected here differ with respect to how central temporality is for the phenomena under investigation. While the articles by Auer, Horlacher & Pekarek Doehler and Laury & Ono are focused squarely on the moment-by-moment temporal emergence of different kinds of grammatical structure, real-time temporality plays a much less central role in the studies by Helasvuo and Lindström. The action-based studies by Keisanen & Kärkkäinen and Couper-Kuhlen incorporate time but on a sequential scale.

What are the implications of this panoply of approaches for the study of grammar in interaction? In the last analysis, no one approach can be accorded pride of place. Which one an interactional linguist chooses will depend in large measure on the phenomenon itself and on the research question that attaches to it. Nevertheless, we hope to have laid out some of the alternatives at hand and to have shown how they can be applied to best effect.

References

- Anward, J. (2003) On recursivity. Clauses in a dialogical grammar of Swedish. In L.-O. Delsing, C. Falk, G. Josefsson, and H. Sigurdsson (eds.), *Grammatik i fokus. Festskrift till Christer Platzack*. [Grammar in Focus. Festschrift for Christer Platzack]. Vol. 2. Lund: Institutionen för nordiska språk, pp. 17-23.
- Auer, P. (2005) Projection in interaction and projection in grammar. *Text* 25.1: 7-36.
- Auer, P. (2009) On-line syntax: Thoughts on the temporality of spoken language. *Language Sciences* 31: 1-13.
- Auer, P., E. Couper-Kuhlen, and F. Müller (1999) *Language in Time: The rhythm and tempo of spoken*

interaction. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Auer, P., and S. Pfänder (2011) Constructions: Emergent or emerging? In P. Auer, and S. Pfänder (eds.), *Constructions: Emerging and emergent*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter: pp. 1-21.

Auer, P., and S. Pfänder (eds.) (2011) *Constructions: Emerging and emergent*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

Barlow, M., and S. Kemmer (2000) *Usage Based Models of Language*. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information.

Barth-Weingarten, D., E. Reber, and M. Selting (eds.) (2011) *Prosody in Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Blanche-Benveniste, C. (1990) Un modèle d'analyse syntaxique "en grilles", pour les productions orales. *Anuario de Psicología* 47: 11-28.

Bybee, J. (1998) The emergent lexicon. *Chicago Linguistic Society* 34: The Panels. pp. 421-435.

Bybee, J., and S.A. Thompson (1997) Three frequency effects in syntax. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 23: 378-388.

Chafe, W. (1994) *Discourse, Consciousness, and Time. The Flow and Displacement of Conscious Experience in Speaking and Writing*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Clancy, P. (1980) Referential choice in English and Japanese narrative discourse. In W. Chafe (ed.), *The Pear Stories: Cognitive, cultural, and linguistic aspects of narrative production*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, pp. 127-202.

Couper-Kuhlen, E., and M. Selting (eds.) (2001) *Studies in Interactional Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Couper-Kuhlen, E., and C.E Ford (eds.) (2004) *Sound Patterns in Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Croft, W. (2001) *Radical Construction Grammar: Syntactic theory in typological perspective*. New York NY: Oxford University Press.

Cumming, S., T. Ono, and R. Laury (2011) Discourse, grammar and interaction. In T.A. van Dijk (ed.), *Discourse Studies*. 2nd edition. London: Sage, pp. 8-35.

Curl, T.S. (2006) Offers of assistance: Constraints on syntactic design. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38: 1257-1280.

Curl, T.S., and P. Drew (2008) Contingency and action: A comparison of two forms of requesting. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 41.2: 129-153.

Deppermann, A. (2005) Conversational interpretation of lexical items and conversational contrasting. In A. Hakulinen, and M. Selting (eds.), *Syntax and Lexis in Conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 289-317.

Deppermann, A. (2006a) Construction Grammar - eine Grammatik für die Interaktion? In A. Deppermann, R. Fiehler, and T. Spranz-Fogasy (eds.), *Grammatik und Interaktion*. Radolfzell: Verlag für Gesprächsforschung, pp. 43-65.

Deppermann, A. (2006b) Konstitution von Wortbedeutung im Gespräch: Eine Studie am Beispiel des jugendsprachlichen Bewertungsadjektivs *assi*. In A. Deppermann, and T. Spranz-Fogasy (eds.), *Bedeutungen: Wie Bedeutung im Gespräch entsteht*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, pp. 158-184.

- Deppermann, A. (2011a) The study of formulations as a key to an Interactional Semantics. *Human Studies* 34. 2: 115-128.
- Deppermann, A. (2011b) Constructions vs. lexical items as sources of complex meanings. A comparative study of constructions with German *verstehen*. In P. Auer, and S. Pfänder (eds.), *Constructions: Emerging and emergent*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 88-126.
- Deppermann, A., R. Fiehler, and T. Spranz-Fogasy (eds.) (2006) *Grammatik und Interaktion*. Radolfzell: Verlag für Gesprächsforschung
<http://www.verlag-gespraechsforschung.de>
- Du Bois, J.W. (1985) Competing motivations. In J. Haiman (ed.), *Iconicity in Syntax*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 343-365.
- Du Bois, J. (2001) Towards a dialogic syntax. Ms. Department of Linguistics, University of California, Santa Barbara.
- Evans, V., and M. Green (2006) *Cognitive Linguistics. An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Fillmore, C., P. Kay, and M.K. O'Connor (1988) Regularity and idiomaticity in grammatical constructions. The case of *let alone*. *Language* 64: 501-538.
- Ford, C.E. (1993) *Grammar in Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ford, C.E., B.A. Fox, and S.A. Thompson (eds.) (2002) *The Language of Turn and Sequence*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Fox, B.A. (2000) Micro-syntax in English conversation. Paper presented at the conference *Interactional Linguistics* (sponsored by EURESCO), September, Spa, Belgium.
- Fox, B.A. (2007) Principles shaping grammatical practices: An exploration. *Discourse Studies* 9: 299-318.
- Fox, B.A., M. Hayashi, and R. Jasperson (1996) A cross-linguistic study of syntax and repair. *Interaction and grammar*. E. Ochs, E.A. Schegloff, and S.A. Thompson (eds.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 185-237.
- Fox, B.A., S.A. Thompson, C.E. Ford, and E. Couper-Kuhlen (2013) Conversation analysis in linguistics. In J. Sidnell, and T. Stivers (eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Blackwell, pp. 726-740.
- Fried, M., and J.-O. Östman (eds.) (2004) *Construction Grammar in a Cross-language Perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Goldberg, A. (1995) *Constructions: A Construction Grammar approach to argument structure*. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press.
- Goldberg, A. (2006) *Constructions at Work: The nature of generalization in language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Günthner, S., and J. Bücker (eds.) (2009) *Grammatik im Gespräch. Konstruktionen der Selbst- und Fremdpositionierung*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Günthner, S., and W. Imo (eds.) (2006) *Konstruktionen in der Interaktion*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Hacohen, G., and E.A. Schegloff (2006) On the preference for minimization in referring to persons: Evidence from Hebrew conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38: 1305–1312.
- Hakulinen, A. (1989) Keskustelututkimuksen tavoitteista ja menetelmistä [On the aims and methods of conversation analysis]. In A. Hakulinen (ed.), *Suomalaisen keskustelun keinoja I* [Ways of Finnish conversation I]. Kieli 4. Helsinki: Department of Finnish, University of Helsinki, pp. 9–40.
- Hakulinen, A. (1996) Keskusteluanalyysin profiilista ja tilasta [On the profile and state of conversation analysis]. In A. Hakulinen (ed.), *Suomalaisen keskustelun keinoja II* [Ways of Finnish conversation II]. Kieli 10. Helsinki: Department of Finnish, University of Helsinki, pp. 9–22.
- Hakulinen, A., and M. Selting (eds.) (2005) *Syntax and Lexis in Conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Hausendorf, H. (ed.) (2007) *Gespräch als Prozess. Linguistische Aspekte der Zeitlichkeit verbaler Interaktion*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Heinemann, T. (2006) 'Will you or can't you?': Displaying entitlement in interrogative requests. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38: 1081–1104.
- Hopper, P. (1987) Emergent grammar. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 13: 139–157.
- Hopper, P. (1998) Emergent grammar. In M. Tomasello (ed.), *The New Psychology of Language*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 155–175.
- Hopper, P.J. (2004) The openness of grammatical constructions. *Chicago Linguistic Society* 40: 239–256.
- Hopper, P. (2011) Emergent Grammar and temporality in interactional linguistics. In P. Auer, and S. Pfänder (eds.), *Constructions: Emerging and emergent*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 22–44.
- Hopper, P.J., and S.A. Thompson (1980) Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56: 251–299.
- Hopper, P.J., and S.A. Thompson (1984) The discourse basis for lexical categories in universal grammar. *Language* 60.3: 703–752.
- Kay, P., and C.J. Fillmore (1999) Grammatical constructions and linguistic generalizations. The what's X doing Y construction. *Language* 75: 1–33.
- Langacker, R.W. (1981) The integration of grammar and grammatical change. *Indian Linguistics* 42: 82–135.
- Langacker, R.W. (1982) Space grammar, analyzability and the English passive. *Language* 58: 22–80.
- Langacker, R.W. (1987) *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, Volume 1: Theoretical prerequisites*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Langacker, R.W. (2005) Integration, grammaticization, and constructional meaning. In M. Fried, and H.C. Boas (eds.), *Grammatical Constructions. Back to the Roots*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 157–189.
- Langacker, R.W. (2008) *Cognitive Grammar. A Basic Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lindström, A. (2005) Language as social action: A study of how senior citizens request assistance with practical tasks in the Swedish home help service. In A. Hakulinen, and M. Selting (eds.), *Syntax and Lexis in Conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 209–233.
- Linell, P. (1998) *Approaching Dialogue: Talk, interaction and contexts in dialogical perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Linell, P. (2004) On some principles of a dialogical grammar. In K. Aijmer (ed.), *Dialogue Analysis VIII: Understanding and misunderstanding in dialogue*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, pp. 7-23.
- Linell, P. (2006) Towards a dialogical linguistics. In M. Lähteenmäki, et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the XII International Bakhtin Conference*. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, pp. 157-172.
- Linell, P. (2009) *Rethinking Language, Mind, and World Dialogically: Interactional and contextual theories of human sense-making*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Levinson, S.C. (2006) On the human "interaction engine". In N.J. Enfield, and S.C. Levinson (eds.), *Roots of Human Sociality. Culture, cognition and interaction*. Oxford: Berg, pp. 39-69.
- Levinson, S.C. (2013) Action formation and ascription. In J. Sidnell, and T. Stivers (eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, pp. 103-130.
- Mondada, L. (2006) Participants' online analysis and multimodal practices: Projecting the end of the turn and the close of the sequence. *Discourse Studies* 8: 117-129.
- Mondada, L. (2007) Multimodal resources for turn-taking: Pointing and the emergence of possible next speakers. *Discourse Studies* 9: 195-226.
- Mondada, L. (2009) The embodied and negotiated production of assessments in instructed actions. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 42.4: 329-361.
- Morgan, M. (1996) Conversational signifying: Grammar and indirectness among African American women. In E. Ochs, E.A. Schegloff, and S.A. Thompson (eds.), *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 405-434.
- Ochs, E., E.A. Schegloff, and S.A. Thompson (eds.) (1996) *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ono, T., and S.A. Thompson (1995) What can conversation tell us about syntax? In P.W. Davis (ed.), *Alternative Linguistics. Descriptive and theoretical modes*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 213-271.
- Östman, J.-O. (2005) Construction Discourse: A prolegomenon. In J.-O. Östman, and M. Fried (eds.), *Construction Grammars. Cognitive grounding and theoretical extensions*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 121-144.
- Sacks, H. (1987) Notes on methodology. In J.M. Atkinson, and J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of Social Action. Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 21-27.
- Sacks, H., and E.A. Schegloff (1979) Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversation and their interaction. In G. Psathas (ed.), *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology*. New York: Irvington Publishers, Inc., pp. 15-21.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1984) On some questions and ambiguities in conversations. In J.M. Atkinson, and J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 28-52.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1996) Turn organization: One intersection of grammar and interaction. In E. Ochs, E.A. Schegloff, and S.A. Thompson (eds.), *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 52-133.
- Schegloff E.A. (2005) On integrity in inquiry... of the investigated, not the investigator. *Discourse Studies* 7.4-5: 455-480.

- Schegloff, E.A., E. Ochs, and S.A. Thompson (1996) Introduction. In E. Ochs, E.A. Schegloff, and S.A. Thompson (eds.), *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1–51.
- Selting, M. (1996) Prosody as an activity-type distinctive cue in conversation: The case of so-called 'astonished' questions in repair. In E. Couper-Kuhlen, and M. Selting (eds.), *Prosody in Conversation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 231–270.
- Selting, M., and E. Couper-Kuhlen (2001) Forschungsprogramm 'Interaktionale Linguistik'. *Linguistische Berichte* 187: 257–287.
- Sinclair, J.M., and A. Mauranen (2006) *Linear Unit Grammar: Integrating speech and writing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Streeck, J., C. Goodwin, and C. LeBaron (eds.) (2011) *Embodied Interaction. Language and body in the material world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thompson, S.A., B.A. Fox, and E. Couper-Kuhlen (forthcoming) *Grammar and everyday talk: Building responsive actions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Verhagen, A. (2009) The conception of constructions as complex signs: Emergence of structure and reduction to usage. *Constructions and Frames* 1.1: 119–152.
- Zlatev, J. (2005) What's in a schema? Bodily mimesis and the grounding of language. In B. Hampe (ed.), *From Perception to Meaning: Image Schemas in Cognitive Linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 313–342.
- Zlatev, J. (2007) Embodiment, language and mimesis. In T. Ziemke, J. Zlatec, and R. Franck (eds.), *Body, Language and Mind*. Vol 1: Embodiment. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 297–337.

RITVA LAURY is Professor of Finnish in the Department of Finnish, Finno-Ugric and Scandinavian Studies at the University of Helsinki and Professor Emerita of Linguistics at California State University, Fresno. Her research has concerned the ways in which grammatical elements in everyday talk are shaped by contextual factors and also shape context. She is the author of *Demonstratives in Interaction* (1997) and the editor of four volumes, most recently *Crosslinguistic Studies of Clause Combining* (2008) and *Subordination in Conversation* (2011, coedited with Ryoko Suzuki).

Address: Department of Finnish, Finno-Ugric and Scandinavian Studies, PL 3 (Fabianinkatu 33) 00014 University of Helsinki, Finland. E-mail: ritva.laury@helsinki.fi

MARJA ETELÄMÄKI is a researcher in the Department of Finnish, Finno-Ugric and Scandinavian Studies and Finnish Centre of Excellence in Research on Intersubjectivity in Interaction at the University of Helsinki. Previously, she was Coordinator of the research project Grammar and Interaction: The linking of actions in speech and writing. Lately, her research has focused on combining the method and insights of conversation analysis with the theory of cognitive grammar. Her dissertation *Toiminta ja tarkoite. Tutkimus suomen pronominista tämä* [Activity and referent. A study on the Finnish pronoun tämä] was published by the Finnish Literature Society, Helsinki, in 2006.

Address: P.O. Box 4 (Vuorikatu 3A), 00014 University of Helsinki, Finland. E-mail: marja.etelamaki@helsinki.fi

ELIZABETH COUPER-KUHLEN was Finland Distinguished Professor for Interactional Linguistics at the University of Helsinki from 2009-2013. Before this appointment she held professorships in English Linguistics at the University of Konstanz and the University of Potsdam in Germany. Her interests lie in the study of language in interaction. She is the author of *An Introduction to English Prosody* and *English Speech Rhythm*; co-author (with Peter Auer and Frank Müller) of *Language in Time*; and co-editor of *Prosody in Conversation* (with Margret Selting), *Studies in Interactional Linguistics* (with Margret Selting) and *Sound Patterns in Interaction* (with Cecilia E. Ford).

Address: Faculty of Arts, University of Helsinki, 00014 Helsinki, Finland. E-mail: elizabeth.couper-kuhlen@helsinki.fi