

HUOM! Tämä on alkuperäisen artikkelin rinnakkaistallenne. Rinnakkaistallenne saattaa erota alkuperäisestä sivutukseltaan ja painoasultaan.

Käytä viittauksessa alkuperäistä lähdettä:

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*. DOI:10.1016/j.pragma.2021.02.008

PLEASE NOTE! This is an electronic self-archived version of the original article. This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version:

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*. 10.1016/j.pragma.2021.02.008

© 2021 Elsevier

This is a post-peer-review, pre-copyedit version of an article published in Journal of Pragmatics. The final authenticated version is available online at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.02.008>

© 2021. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

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

Paul Drew¹, Auli Hakulinen², Trine Heinemann³, Jarkko Niemi⁴, and Giovanni Rossi^{2,5*}

¹ University of York UK

² University of Helsinki

³Independent researcher, Ærø, Denmark

⁴Haaga-Helia University of Applied Sciences, Helsinki

⁵University of California, Los Angeles

*Alphabetical listing indicates equal authorship (authors contributed equally to all aspects of the research)

February 2021

(Forthcoming in the *Journal of Pragmatics*)

The authors declare that we have no conflicts of interest relevant to or that might compromise this research. This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors. We gratefully acknowledge the scholarly support of the Finnish Centre of Excellence in Research on Intersubjectivity in Interaction, and of Marja-Leena Sorjonen who was the Director of the Centre at the time we worked together on this project.

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 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 element in these interactions is expressed primarily by the first conjunct of the hendiadic construction. Whilst the first conjunct is semantically subsidiary 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 to bring to light the synergy between grammar and pragmatics in language usage.

§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 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. 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, echoing those of previous scholars of hendiadys, 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, 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?

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 fused into and understood as a single clause. Our study corroborates and extends a number of findings from this previous research with data from naturally occurring conversation in four languages: Danish, English (American and British), Finnish and Italian. Examining hendiadys in conversation 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. Our enquiry, however, takes us beyond the grammar of hendiadys to investigate what speakers are doing interactionally when they select a hendiadic construction in designing their turns at talk (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 (cf. Raymond 2017). We want to go deeper than that. Our analysis of hendiadys in naturally occurring interactions shows that its use 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 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 element in these interactions is expressed primarily by the first conjunct of the hendiadic construction. Whilst the first conjunct is semantically subsidiary to the second, it is pragmatically the most important one.

Our cross-linguistic study gives us a wider and more solid basis for documenting the pragmatic work or function of hendiadys than would an 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. Our aim is not to document how hendiadys differ grammatically across languages. Rather, our aim

is to show that the pragmatic functions that can be identified for hendiadys are common across languages, despite grammatical variability.

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). We conclude by discussing the implications of our findings at the intersection between grammar and pragmatics. This will include revisiting the long-established asymmetry between the verbal components of hendiadys and bringing to light the synergy of grammar and pragmatics in the system of language usage.

§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 ἓν διὰ δύοῖν, *hèn dià duoîn*, literally “one by means of two”.

Key to a hendiadic structure is an asymmetric relation between its two elements. 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, the asymmetric relation between the two elements tends to be one of logical or semantic subservience, where one element is less autonomous and may have undergone semantic change, often but not exclusively that of semantic bleaching. These characteristics are normally 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 without breaking the integrity of the construction. This is why expressions like *take copies off the shelf and read them*, and *take totally destroyed facilities and cover them over quickly* are outside the purview of hendiadys and 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); 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 Emm: I'm not g'nnuh have this thing with Bu:::d in and uh:.hhhhhh
 2 (.) euh: do ah (.) yihknow e-uh wh'tEVER's tuh be's tih be
 3 that's all Lottie i[n this]
 4 Lot: [Yeah.]
 5 Emm: If this THANKSGIVING THING DOESN'TURN OU:::T I'VE GOT THE
 6 TURKEY an' ah'll cook the DA:MN THI:NG? an' freeze part of it

7 [ən] give you some of it er

It is evident that the verbs in example (2), *cook*, *freeze* and *give*, denote 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 phonetically reduce 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 — normally 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

semantic relation between the two verbs, and their pragmatic or interactional character, which turn out to exhibit opposite directionality.

§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. Although we did not exhaustively sieve through the entirety of our corpora (ranging between 30-60 hours), we sampled from a variety of informal interactions involving a diverse range of speakers and activities. We reviewed these cases collectively and discussed both core cases and boundary cases of hendiadys, which progressively led to the formulation of the definitional criteria presented in the previous section and reviewed in more detail in the next section. We listened and auditorily examined all examples, to ensure that each formed prosodically

one clause. At the end of the process, we set aside the cases that did not fit the criteria for inclusion and from those that did we randomly selected a sample of 20 instances in each language, providing a total sample of 80 instances in the four languages.¹ 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.

The data were analysed according to the perspective and methods of conversation analysis (CA). The focus of CA research is social actions, the design of those actions, the interactional environments in which certain actions designs are utilized, and the sequential patterns and consequences associated with given actions and action designs (Clift 2016, Levinson 2013). In some respects, social actions can be compared 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 encompass a wide range of 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

¹ This sampling procedure was adopted for reasons of comparability: we limited the sample to 20 instances in each language in order to match the total number of cases found in one of our languages, Italian, where hendiadys appears to be less frequent. We will return to this issue in the Discussion.

approach was, initially, to examine how the linguistic resources of each language, including relevant structures in those languages, were employed in hendiadic constructions; 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 learn what is achieved by speakers, interactionally, through the use of 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 a set of two coordinated clauses (*synthethon*) is its mono-predicateness: although two verbs may be used in both coordinated clauses and hendiadys, in the latter the two verbs predicate a single event. Hopper went on to specify a number of syntactic and semantic characteristics of hendiadys, most notably the “semantic and syntactic interlacing” (see also Barth-Weingarten & Couper-Kuhlen 2011: 272) so that the two verbs share objects, agents, and other syntactic elements, and agree in tense and aspect. He also noted that the

verbs used as the first conjunct in 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 what follows, we review Hopper's criteria for what constitutes a verbal hendiadic construction with an eye to establishing the boundaries between hendiadys and other constructions involving two verbs in our four languages.

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, *og* 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 the latter, also in person.

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

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

that have they PTC 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.

1SG call-PST-1SG and ask-PST-1SG 1SG get-PST-1SG so mindless-GEN a.little PTC PTC now money-PAR

I called and asked as<, .hh I got so unreasonably little kind-of like 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 two coordinated verbs do not share grammatical features, the construction is typically not understood as describing a single action. In the following case from English, for instance, 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. At the same time, however, as Quirk et al. (1985) note, there are other double verb constructions which, despite lacking congruence between the verbs, may be considered as “roughly equivalent” and “similar in meaning” to hendiadys (pp. 987-988). Quirk et al. specifically discuss the case of a finite verb combined with an infinitive in English, 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 Finnish, in particular, make rather frequent use of infinitival constructions, and that these share at least one basic feature with hendiadys, namely that the two verbs combine to refer to a single event.² This is illustrated in the following two examples, the first Finnish, the second Italian.

Ex.7 [SG 108 B] (Finnish)

1 HD: mun hytin (.) oven taakse tuli >niin niin< semmonen kolmevuotias
 1SG-GEN cabin-GEN door-GEN behind come-PST-1SG three.year.old
 behind my cabin door came a three year old

2 lapsi itkemään ja (.) mä menin kysymään että mikä sil on ↑hätänä nii
 child cry-INF-ILL and I go-PST-1SG ask-INF that what it-ADE be-3SG trouble-ESS so
 child crying and I went to ask what the trouble was with her so

3 se sano että
 3SG say-PST-3SG PTC
 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 the infinitive. The combination of the verbs ‘go’ and ‘ask’ (or similar, semantically related verbs), is common in hendiadic constructions in our data (see the ‘called and asked/told’

² 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 ikke' 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 a conjunction.

examples above, examples (3) and (4)). Furthermore, it is clear in (7) that the speaker is not referring to two temporally distinct actions, first going and then asking, but rather to actions that are part of a single event, just like in hendiadys. The expression ‘went to ask’ does however indicate that the second action is contingent on the first, e.g. that the speaker expresses a purposive action of going in order to soothe the child. The underlying idea of a purposive 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-1PL smoke-INF a cigarette meanwhile
 let's go {to} smoke a cigarette in the meantime

Further evidence for the distinction between infinitival and hendiadic double verb constructions comes from 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,

In both constructions, the combination of the two verbs denotes a single event (e.g. that

of sitting and reading, noting that the turn is aborted before ‘reading’ occurs).³ However, there are subtle but important 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 fused into a single event. The fact that the speaker here abandons the first construction and goes on to produce a hendiadys is evidence for a meaningful difference between the two.

Another syntactic criterion for hendiadys that is perhaps not as clear cut as one would expect is the presence or absence of a conjunction between verbs. Serial verb constructions without a conjunction occur 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 in 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.

holiday-ELA come-PST-PAS bake-INF prepare-INF such-PAR

(we) came from holiday to bake prepare so. that sort of thing

³ Whilst it seems most likely from the self-correction that J was going initially to say ‘sat down to do any reading’, nevertheless it is conceivable that another activity might have been in prospect – although that ‘activity’ would have been sedentary, as J continues “I haven’t not done anything the whole weekend”: this is immaterial for the point here.

As 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 mono-clausal structure with one grammatical subject, tense, aspect, modality, and polarity, denoting a single conceptual event. This is the case in both examples above: despite the absence of a conjunction, the two verbs in both examples jointly refer to the same course of action. Moreover, we can note that in both cases the cohesion of the hendiadic construction is enhanced by phonetic parallelism or alliteration (*go get* and *leipomaan laittamaan*).

Our data also show that syntactic *scope* is 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. Scope becomes relevant also with 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.

On the other hand, a single action interpretation becomes problematic when the verbs take different complements. In example (13) for instance, a hendiadic interpretation is compromised by the fact that the first verb takes a direct object (*his clothes*) that is not shared with the second verb, as well as by the repetition of the subject pronoun *he* before each verb.

Ex.13 [NB:IV:4:1] (US English)
 .hh.hh So'EE ↑PACKED IZ CLO:THES'N'EE WENT

The effect that different complements have for the interpretation of a construction as hendiadic or non-hendiadic is even more apparent 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 help to establish that a construction is not hendiadic are elements that are placed between the first and the second verb, whether this be the explication of a subject, a direct object (as in example 6) or an adverbial modifier.⁴ This does not mean, however, that the presence of any linguistic element (aside from the conjunction) rules out a hendiadic interpretation. For example, when the element

⁴ Related to this, a possible reason for the lower frequency of hendiadys in Italian may be traced to a syntactic preference for bi-clausal constructions even when shared arguments could in principle be dropped. For example, the English 'She called and told me' is rendered in Italian with *Mi ha chiamato e mi ha detto* 'She called me and she told me'. We thank one of our reviewers for making this point. This syntactic preference is independent of tense or aspect.

between the two verbs is a preposition that is part of a ‘phrasal’ or ‘prepositional verb’ (Quirk et al 1985: 1155–67), as in the following examples from English and Danish, this does not prevent a hendiadic reading.

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) argued that in hendiadic constructions the second verb is the focal one, while the first verb has developed into something like a satellite, its meaning being bleached, such that it has acquired a more or less auxiliary status (with various degrees of grammaticalization). In this section, we look more closely at the different ways in which the semantics of first verbs in hendiadys can be characterised.

In our data, first verbs in hendiadic constructions typically come from a relatively restricted set, including ‘go’, ‘come’, ‘stand’, ‘sit’, and ‘call’ (though our languages differ somewhat in the frequency of verbs within the set). We have several examples where verbs of asking or saying are preceded by a verb for ‘calling’, as in examples (3), (4), (5)

above, and (24) and (35) below. In these combinations, the first verb refers to an action that is preliminary or a prerequisite to the main action expressed by the second verb, but 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 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'tt
 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 (see also Quirk et al., 1985, p. 979; Hopper, 2002, p. 148). At the same time, the use of a hendiadic construction is associated with the speaker conveying a pragmatic or affective stance, typically one of irritation, complaining, or some other negative positioning (see also Haddington et al, 2011: 101). In one of the languages in our collection, this *negative* positioning is often literal in hendiadic construction itself: in Danish, half of all our cases include the negative adverb *ikke* taking scope over both verbs (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 being presented. We also have examples of negation in Finnish (e.g. example (22) 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:ime 'n a:nd uh

Ex.19 [TH:M2:02] (Danish)

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

What the phrasal verb brings to the reading of a hendiadic 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 warning the co-participant not to go so far as to buy special boots.

These examples show that, beyond semantic bleaching, aspectual meaning, modality, and other grammatical characteristics of first verbs in hendiadic constructions can be involved in conveying a pragmatic 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 its transitivity.⁵

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

Sami: mu:tta Raulin isä otti ja kuoli tossa

but NAME1-GEN father take-3SG.PST and die-3SG.PST there

but Rauli’s father took and died

The first verb, however, does contribute a particular meaning to the construction; in this case, as well as in similar ones found in literary translations (see fn. 5), the first verb conveys unexpectedness. A potential generalization with respect to first verbs is that the more ‘generic’ 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

⁵ 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 nopeasti keski-ikään’.

idiom, one of the slots for a verb must be open, i.e., freely changeable. This is the case with the verb *ottaa* ('take'), which makes possible a range of different second verbs. If neither of the slots is open, the expression has become entirely fixed, unproductive, and thus an idiom. This is the case in the following example from Finnish.⁶

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

Tuula: Jaa::a (.) mene ja tiedä.

PTC (.) go-IMP and know-IMP

Well well Who knows

At the other end of the cline (or 'gradient', Hopper 2002:169; or 'continuum', Aikhenvald 2006:56), there are hendiadys involving a first verb outside the narrow set of recurrent first verbs discussed above. These cases support the idea that hendiadys is a linguistic resource, a tool that can be used in unique situations and with a first verb that has perhaps never occurred in this kind of construction before. Example (22) shows 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.22 [SG143 A 04] (Finnish)

266 Jorma: että vauvan ääntä että (.) että niin jos ei nyt
 that baby-GEN voice-PAR that so if NEG now
 that baby's voice that (.) that PTC so if one hasn't
 267 oo (.) jos ei noo ihan< (.) .h onn: h (.) niinkun

⁶ Italian features a comparable expression with an infinitival construction: *vai a sapere* (go-IMP-2SG to know-INF), also translatable as 'who knows'.

- be if NEG-3SG be quite congrat- like
 (.) if one has not quite< (.) cong: h (.) like
- 268 h mh .h nähny ja onnitellu niin oikein paljo< (.)
 see-PTCPL and congratulate-PTCPL so really lot.of
 h mh .h seen and congratulated so very much< (.)
- 269 h onnea ja siunausta että< .hh >hän on< .ff
 happiness-PAR and blessing-PAR
 h happiness and blessings that< .hh >she is< .ff

What makes this unusual case of hendiadys interesting is that it is explicable *in casu* in the specific context, unlike more fixed or routinized hendiadic expressions. Accordingly, example (22) 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 in the background. 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, the 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 often used for expressing negative affect (Haddington et al. 2011: 107). In a single case analysis of the verbal hendiadys *came and delivered something*, Couper-Kuhlen & Selting (2018:434, 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 verbal interactions; moreover, their conclusions about use and function are often impressionistic ("increasing the bulk") and generic ("negative affect"). One exception to this is Zinken's (2013) 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).⁷

In the present study, we examine a wide 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.

⁷ There may be some similarity here between the semantic development of this Polish construction and the Finnish *ottaa* (‘take’), as in ‘do it quickly, without hesitation’.

- The 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.

In broad terms, we find that hendiadys is an interactional device for attributing to some ‘doing’ a 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 usually show only one example from each language (in quoting from the excerpts in the text we show only the English translation, in italics), but the findings are consistent across all four languages.

5.1 Disaffiliative or conflictual environments

We find that hendiadys occur in the course of sequences in which there has been or 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 interactional environments characterized by

ongoing or reported disaffiliation between people. An Italian example illustrates just such an environment.

- Ex.23 [Biscotti Pome:01-1154327] (Italian)
- 1 Alfio: 'scolta Eliana però tu mi devi dire a che ora
listen-IMP.2SG NAME but 2SG.NOM 1SG.DAT 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.NOM not can-1SG know-INF
I can't know that
- 4 Alfio: °dio po° ((peevd))
°goddamn°
- 5 Eliana: penso comunque che (vada dai) venti minuti
think-1SG anyway COMP (go-SBJ-3SG from-the) twenty minutes
I think at any rate that it (should last around) twenty minutes
- 6 (0.4)
- 7 Alfio: puoi chiamare e chiedergli quanto dura
can-2SG call-INF and ask-INF=3SG.DAT 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 Alfio: [vuoi che t'accompagni fallo
want-2SG COMP 2SG.DAT=accompany-SBJ-1SG do-IMP.2SG=3SG.ACC
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 forget it
- 13 (0.7)
- 14 Alfio: no 'scolta t- io devo sapere perché mi devo organizzare

no listen-IMP.2SG 1SG.NOM must-1SG know-INF because RFL must-1SG organise-INF

no listen t- I must know because I have to organise myself

15 (.)

16 Alfio: capisci=

understand-2SG

do you understand?

The conflictual aspect of this interaction is evident from the opening turn when Alfio says to Eliana, *Listen Eliana you've got to tell me . . .*; Alfio's prefatory 'Listen' indicates right away a divergence with whatever came before (cf. Sidnell 2007 on 'look-' and 'listen-'prefaced turns). This conflictual character 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 resists in line 3 by initially declining to give an answer to *what time* she's going to be done with the tour, which contributes to amplify the disaffiliation between them (see Alfio's *°goddamn°* in line 4). This is the sequential/interactional environment in which Alfio then goes on to produce the hendiadic *phone and ask* (line 7), to which we will return later. The conflict between participants is evident in their continued dispute (lines 12-16), especially Eliana's concluding dismissively *alright if you're like this 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.24 [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: Næj 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 timer 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 further attempts followed by Maren's dissatisfaction (e.g. line 12), for which she apologises (line 16), thereby acknowledging a misdeed of some kind (his apology received no absolution, 'that's all right', from Help; Robinson 2004). Finally, in exasperation (note Help's 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), her exasperation conveyed in part through the exaggeration in 'several hours'. 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 (23) and (24), in other examples speakers report some conflict or complaint concerning a non-present third party; that is, the disaffiliation may not involve the present participants but rather 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.

Ex.25 [F:TC:1:1:9] (US English: 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 jeopardising the establishment's liquor license. The friction

or discord in example (25) 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 sub-section).

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.26 [SG:95:B:14] (Finnish) (Expansion of example 20 above)
- 1 Viki: °joo.° .hh no miten muuten, ooks sä tota noin ni
 PTC PTC how else be-2SG-CLI PTC so
 yeah .hh well how by the way are you ehm
- 2 jouluu viettämäs mite,
 Christmas-PAR spend-INF-INNESS how
 spending your Christmas in what way,
- 3 Sami: .h no, phh tässä nyt on pikkasen kuviot sillee muuttunu
 PTC here now be-3SG a-little design-PL that-way change-PTCPL
 .h NO phh now things have changed a bit here
- 4 että tuota .mt mhh
 so that
 so ehm
- 5 tai sanotaan että näin mun kohdalta
 or say-PAS that like-this 1SG-GEN part-ELA
 or let’s say that for my part
- 6 että mhh mun piti lähtee eilen, (.)
 that 1SG-GEN have-to-PST leave-INF yesterday

- so mhh I was supposed to leave yesterday
 7 tai huomenna ois
 or tomorrow be-COND
 or tomorrow
- 8 pitäny lähtee pu- pukiks yhtee paikkaa
 have-to-PTCPL santa.claus one-ILL place-ILL
 I should have acted as santa claus in one place
- 9 ja sitte olla siä mun vanhempien luona
 and then be-INF 1SG-GEN parent-PL at.house-ESS
 and then be there in my parent's place
- 10 ja sitte mä oon luvannu mennä sinne siskon
 and then I be-1SG promise-PTCPL go-INF there sister-GEN
 and then I have promised to go to my sister's
- 11 luo mennä,
 at. house-TRA go-INF
 place
- 12 Viki: mm:, joo, [mä oon kans-
 Mm:.yeah [I have also –
- 13 Sami: [mu:tta Raulin isä otti ja kuoli
 but NAME1-GEN father take-3SG.PST and die-3SG.PST
 [but Rauli's father took and died
- 14 tossa toissa yönä,
 there before.last night-ESS
 the night before last
- 15 Viki: ↑aha,↓ no se on ikävä juttu,
 AHA NO that's a sad thing,

That Sami was going to tell about some trouble is evident right away in his prefatory *no* particle in the beginning of line 1, translated as 'well'. Viki's question begins with a *no*-particle, which typically invites a longer telling as an answer (Vepsäläinen 2019). 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.27 [NB:IV:4:4] (US English)

1 Lot: Yer not ↓goin [°any °°(place'r y')°°]
 2 Emm: [I'm 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. .hhh En ↑they
 5 didn't 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.hhh.hh.hh (0.3) *u-↑Oh: (.) I dun'know it ↑jis
 8 seem like evrything *em nu u-like when'e came in en
 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.28 [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 (there are parallels in this regard with the use of idiomatic expressions to summarise, especially also in complaint sequences: Drew and Holt 1988). Example (29) is taken from an argument between a couple, Sofia and Furio, over how they could manage to place multiple pots on top of one another for the purposes of a particular cooking technique.

- Ex.29 [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 do 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 mettimi 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 (25) 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 (25).

From Ex.25 [Excerpt] (US English)

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)

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 (data not shown). 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 three times with minimal acknowledgements (*yeah* and *m-hm*), otherwise remaining silent until the sequence concludes thus:

- Ex.30 [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 (30) 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 (25) and (30) 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 (24), line 19,

From ex.24 [F4:HH:1-1 (Danish)

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

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

19 ka' jo'tt stå her< å' trykke i flere timer jo.

can't JO stand here< and push for several hours JO.

and example (27) lines 13-14,

From ex.27 [SG:95:B:14] (Finnish)

13 Sami: mu:tta Raulin isä otti ja kuoli tossa

but NAME1-GEN father take-3SG.PST and die-3SG.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, a kind of liqueur) Fie had given her for her birthday.

Ex.31 [TH.M2.24] (Danish)

- 1 Fie: .fnthh Fik du drukket din bæjlis?:
 .fnthh Did you manage to drink your Baileys?
- 2 Connie: Ne↑j:[h, den står 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
 [Nyo: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: å:[h .hhh
 then 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). It may be noticed that Fie was herself on the way to using a hendiadic construction in line 13, "sit and", at which point she is overlapped by Connie; they are therefore mutually oriented to the use of hendiadys in a concluding environment. 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.32 [TH:S2:005] (Danish)
- 1 Mie: =eJah.
=eYes.
- 2 .hh ehh >men a'< der: (.) >en chance for
.hh ehh >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: stor 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 ka' jeg jo ikke si':,<

- Hehh- >T-a- that I can't say JO,<
 10 hømfnh ø::hm: >Mandag formiddag< a' jeg hjemme.=
 huhmfhn 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 ti a' jeg hjemme.
 thirty. .hh so before nine thirty I am home.
 13 (0.6)
 14 Mie: Mandag formiddag,=
 Monday morning,=
 15 Jens: =>.hhp- Jahm' j- j'ellers går jeg jo.< øhh [AnneMie
 >>.hhp- Yesbut I- otherwise I leave JO.< ehh 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 the particle *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).

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 (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.

Ex.33 [SG80] (Finnish)

- 1 Juha: °Nii.h° .h tjeskö se Pepe muuten
 PTC know-PST-1SG name else
 .h Did Pepe know by the way
- 2 hotellin nimmee missä ne on
 hotel-GEN name-PAR where 3PL be-3SG
 the name of the hotel they are staying
- 3 (.)
- 4 Juha: >Et t[ainnu kysyä,
 NEG-2SG may-PTCP ask-INF
 You maybe did not ask,
- 5 Ari: [No ei ollu kyllä puhetta sii[tä.
 PTC NEG be-PTCP sure talk-PAR it-ELA
 [there was no talk about [it.
- 6 Juha: [Joo, >no o:n se lehessä.h
 PTC PTC be-3SG it paper-INE
 [Yeah, >NO it i:s in the papers.h
- 7 Ari: Onhan se lehessä ja kyllähä se nyt varmaa sen tietäs.
 be-3SG it paper-INE and sure-CLI 3-SG now certainly know-COND-3SG
 It is in the papers and he should actually know it for sure.
- 8 (.)
- 9 Juha: .mt P₁ittää mennä sinne vut-, .h h₁armi ku ei oo käyny siellä
 0 have-to go-INF there bother when NEG be visit-PTCPL there
 .mt (One) has to go to (), .h a pity that one hasn't been
- 10 >ei es itseasias< no #uuv# (.) kutsulippuja ku,< hhh >on
 NEG in.fact PTC invitation.ticket-PL-PAR as 0 be.3SG

- there (are) in fact NO (.) no invitation tickets when, <hhh> (one)is
 11 kutsuvieras .hhhh
 an invited guest .hhhh
 .
 ((6 lines omitted, about them being invited guests))
 .
- 19 Juha: Eiku sehä ↑kuhtu kato tuota sillon, sillon ku
 No.but 3SG-CLI invite-PST-3SG PTC then when
 No but he ↑did invite see then when
- 20 pelattiin pallo et tuuha ↑käymään et hänellä on niitä mut
 play-PST-PAS ball that come-IMP-2SG visit-INF that 3SG-ADE be-3SG-PAR but
 we were playing ball ↑come to visit so he has those but
- 21 Ari: ↑Pitäskö minun läh-, #o:ö# kä:övästä ja lähettää. Nii nehän
 must-CON-1SG I-GEN sen- drop_by-INF and send-INF so they-CLI
 should I se-, #o:ö# drop by and send (them). So they
- 22 ker[kee.
 be on time-3SG
 will be on time.
- 23 Juha: [E:hin minä ni< .h mut jos kää t tuota nii kysyypäs >onko
 have.time-1SG 1-SG but if 2SG go-2SG PTC ask-IMP-2SG-CLI
 [I: can manage so< but if you drop by then ask>whether
- 24 sillä niitä mainoksia kotonah,
 3SG-ADE those-PAR advertisement-PL-PAR home-ESS
 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 express their exasperation about this lack of information, in the course of which Juha expresses regret that ‘one’ hasn’t been there (lines 9-11), perhaps to collect the tickets and thereby ascertain the address of the

event. There is, though, a more directly disaffiliative aspect to this matter of finding/knowing the address; in line 4 Juha's suggestion that *Maybe you didn't ask* is a mild complaint or rebuke, in response to which Ari's subsequent turns are variously defensive (e.g. his initial response is that *there was no talk about it*, which seems to be directly rebutted by Juha's pointing out that it had been in the newspapers . . . and so on)

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 (*should I se-*, he self-corrects to substitute that with *drop by and send (them)* (line 21), where 'dropping by' more specifically conveys an expectation that Ari is required to put himself out, to go to the trouble or inconvenience of going there to find out. 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 (22).

Ex.22 [SG143 A 04]) (Finnish)
 266 Jorma: että vauvan ääntä että (.) että niin jos ei nyt
 that baby-GEN voice-PAR that so if NEG now
 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< (.)
see-PTCPL and congratulate-PTCPL so quite a_lot
h mh .h seen and congratulated so very much< (.)
- 269 h onnea ja siunausta että< .hh >hän on< .ff
happiness-PAR and blessing-PAR
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(ulated)* (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 through self-correction, from our Finnish corpus.

- Ex.34 [SG 81 1A3] (Finnish)
- 09 Pike: [°et-° (.) oli tullu eilen.
so have-PST come-PTCPL yesterday
[() (.)It arrived yesterday.
- 10 Erja: > °Joo° <. Mä ihmettelin,=Mä soitin tänään
PTC 1SG wonder-PST.1SG 1SG call-PST today
Yeah<. I wondered,=I phoned today
- 11 meidän palkkakonttoriin.=Mä soitin ja
1PL-GEN pay.office-ILL .1SG call-PST and
our pay office. =I phoned and

- 12 kysyin ku<, .hh ↑(mä sain) nii älyttömän
ask-PST-1SG 1SG get-PST-1SG so mindless-GEN
asked as<, .hh (I got) so unreasonably
- 13 vähän niinku nyt:< rahaa.=
a.little like now money-PAR
little kind-of like money.=
- 14 Pike: =mm.
- 15 Erja: .hh Mut ↑kyl ne väitti et se niinku
but really 3PL claim-PSTthat it like
.hh But ↑really they claimed that it like
- 16 oikeen oli ja (0.8) °#kaikki mut#°.
right be.PST 3SG everything but
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 *phoned and asked* (lines 11/12), using the hendiadic form that complements and therefore is appropriate to the complainable matter (*I got*) *so unreasonably little like money* which they (tax office) claimed was correct (lines 12-16).

Here are two further examples, from English.

- Ex.35 [NB:II:2:20] (US English)
- 1 Nan: .tch So no one's heard fr'm'm since th'kids never ha:ve
2 heard fr'm'im: u-a:nd ah,h I gotta letter fr'm Roul
3 Junior'n .hhhhh 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 .hhhhh 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 onv'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 .hhhhh en said thet he: (.) yihknow
 13 the reason'e: hadn't. uh, (0.6) th't'e wz sending it like this
 14 wz becuz: u- he: assoom' 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.36 [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 studies, 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) (for congruent findings on cross-linguistic similarities in patterns of action sequences, see Kendrick et al. 2020; Floyd et al. 2020).

The grammatical properties of verbal hendiadys have previously 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 functional salience in everyday conversation such as 'call' and 'phone'. Other findings corroborated by our study include the fact that the first conjunct is semantically 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 pragmatic properties also thanks to cases of self-correction. These are cases where the speaker begins with a non-hendiadic expression (e.g. a single verb like 'send' or one including 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 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 offer 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 which loses its lexical meaning but gains an aspectual or attitudinal meaning. 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 a sample size of 20 cases of hendiadys (see also § 4, fn. 4). Note, however, that the relative infrequency of hendiadys in this language does not affect the cross-linguistic validity of 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), nor does it affect the common pragmatic function of hendiadys, to which we now turn.

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? Other authors have argued that hendiadys is part of a family of double/multiple verb constructions that add aspectual meaning (e.g. inception, stativity, suddenness) to an event (Brinton 1988; Ekberg 1993; Vannebo 2003). Other authors have argued that hendiadic expressions are emotionally charged and used to convey meanings such as "impatience", "irritation", "annoyance", "frustration", "negative affect" (Hopper 2002; Królak & Rudnicka 2006; Haddington et al. 2011). The latter resonates with accounts provided in dictionaries and encyclopaedias where the import of hendiadys is typically described in terms of "emphasis" or "intensification" (e.g. Bussmann, 1996; Quinn & Rathbun, 1996). Most of these accounts, however, are based on decontextualized sentences and utterances, and while they may well pick up on relevant aspects of the meaning of hendiadys, they tend to be rather generic, lacking grip on the situated meaning of hendiadys in actual usage. Moreover, we have demonstrated that through self-correction, speakers orient to the special force or pragmatic function of hendiadys.

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 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 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 does the social relational work. This stands in opposition to the semantic subservience of the first conjunct to the second, which is definitional of hendiadic grammar (see § 2, § 4). When not semantically bleached, the action expressed by the first verb is logically subsumed by the action expressed by the second. Indeed, a verb that “*overdetermines* the description” (Couper-Kuhlen & Selting 2018:434, their emphasis) may be considered redundant, its omission implying no loss of linguistic ‘meaning’. And yet, pragmatically, it is the first verb that stands out to fulfil the interactional function of the construction, by conveying imposition or deliberateness

in a course of action or event that is, in one way or another, discordant. 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 synergy of grammar and pragmatics in 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, D. (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. (2013) Turn design. In Jack Sidnell & Tanya Stivers (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell:131-149.

- Drew, P. and Holt, E. (1988) Complaining matters: The use of idiomatic expressions in making complaints. *Social Problems*, 35(4): 398-417.
- Drew, P. and Holt, E. (1998) Figures of speech: figurative expressions and the management of topic transition in conversation. *Language in Society*, 27: 495-522.
- 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.
- Floyd, S., Rossi, G., & Enfield, N. J. (Eds.). (2020). *Getting others to do things: A pragmatic typology of recruitments*. Language Science Press.
- 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 J. L. Bybee and M. Noonan (Eds.), *Complex Sentences in Grammar and Discourse: Essays in Honor of Sandra A. Thompson*. 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.
- Kendrick, K., Brown, P, Dingemanse, M, Floyd, S., Gipper, S., Hayano, K., Hoey, E., Hoymann, G., Manrique, E., Rossi, G. and Levinson, S.C. (2020) Sequence organization: a universal infrastructure for social action. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 168: 119-138.
- Królak, E. and Rudnicka, K. (2006) Selected Aspects of Directives in Polish. *Revista Española de Lingüística Aplicada* (19): 129–42.
- 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 Porfyriosis 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.

Raymond, C.W. (2017). Indexing a contrast: The 'do'-construction in English conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 118: 22-37.

Robinson, J.D. (2004) The sequential organization of "explicit" apologies in naturally occurring English. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 37(3), 291-330.

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.

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

Schegloff, E.A. (2013) 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.
- Sidnell, J. (2007) 'Look'-prefaced turns in first and second position: launching, interceding and redirecting action. *Discourse Studies*, 9, 387-408.
- 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