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We have two related goals in this article. The first goal is descriptive in nature. We focus on the grammar of Japanese *kara* ‘because/so’ and *kedo* ‘but’, which, based on the examination of constructed examples, have traditionally been understood as conjunctive particles whose primary function is to mark a “subordinate” clause postpositionally and connect it to the “main” clause. Grounding our analysis in the examination of conversational data, we highlight the way these forms are used by interactants, focusing on determining what they know about the use of *kara* and *kedo* in actual interaction.

The second goal is to highlight the emergent nature of Japanese interactants’ grammar. We use *emergent* to embrace both diachrony and synchrony. First, interactional data strongly suggest that only by taking a diachronic perspective can one begin to fully understand the form and use of these particles in everyday talk—that is, we see that language change is exhibited abundantly in actual use, where linguistic forms and functions mirror ongoing change in the form of grammaticization and lexicalization. Second, we also recognize the emergent nature of grammatical patterns from patterns of language use (Bybee, 2002a, 2002b, 2006, 2007, 2010; Hopper, 1987, 1991, 2011), and we consider how these patterns are exploited and adapted for specific interactional goals in real time as participants are interacting.

We discuss two case studies. The first focuses on both *kara* and *kedo* in contexts where they are becoming utterance-final particles (FPs). The second case study more specifically concerns *kara* as it lexicalizes into the discourse particle *dakara*. Each case study uses a different set of data: Case Study 1, draws on a phone conversation between two Tokyo matrons, whereas Case Study 2 uses data from several conversations among friends and family members speaking standard Japanese.

**CASE STUDY 1: KARA AND KEDO GRAMMATICIZING AS UTTERANCE-FPS**

The Japanese postpositional particles *kara* ‘because/so’ and *kedo* ‘although/but’ are often described (e.g., Iwasaki, 2002; Martin, 1975) as marking a subordinate clause, which is followed by its main clause, as in (1):

\[
(1) [\text{CLAUSE } \text{kara/kedo}] [\text{CLAUSE}]
\]

Several studies, however, have suggested that *kara*- and *kedo*-marked clauses are acquiring independent statuses (e.g., Iguchi, 1998; Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyujo [National Language Research Institute], 1960; Nakayama & Ichihashi-Nakayama, 1997) as independent clauses (i.e., they can occur on their own without being followed by a main clause):

\[
(2) [\text{CLAUSE } \text{kara/kedo}.] \ldots
\]
TABLE 1

Frequency of the “Canonical” Versus the “Grammaticizing” *Kara* and *Kedo* in Our Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Kara ‘Because/So’</th>
<th>Kedo ‘Although/But’</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canonical uses</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-canonical/Grammaticizing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>final-particle uses</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, we focus on language change in actual use, and suggest that the diachronic process that *kara* and *kedo* are undergoing can be seen as a type of grammaticization. Suzuki (1999) called this type of grammaticization “final-particle-ization,” and showed that it is a robust grammaticization process in Japanese. We further suggest that the emergent nature of this process is evident in the way these new FPs are exploited for interactional goals and adapted to the specific social activity in which interactants are engaged.

The evidence that final-particle-ization seems to be still in progress is that instances of both the canonical use (as shown in (1)) and the grammaticizing FP use (as shown in (2)) are found in the phone conversation used for Case Study 1.

As Table 1 shows, the tokens of the grammaticizing usage for both *kara* and *kedo* comprise about one-third of the total number of tokens of these two forms in our data.

Evidence for the process we are arguing for can also be seen in the fact that there are several ways in which grammaticizing *kara* and *kedo* (as schematized in (2)) behave similarly in conversation to FPs, such as *ne* and *yo*, which are well-known interactional devices in conversational Japanese (Cook, 1992; Morita, 2005; Suzuki, 1990; Tanaka, 2000a, 2000b):

1. Syntactically: *Kara*/kedo ends a clause, which is not followed by a main clause.
2. Prosodically: These *kara*/kedo-marked clauses sound “final.”

At the same time, like other forms in the midst of grammaticizing, grammaticizing *kara* and *kedo* can still be found with their earlier function as “conjunctive particles.” In these uses, they point to another “clause,” expressed or implied.

As for these FPs as emergent, we reiterate that there can be two separate, but related, notions of emergence, and we intend our use of the term to include them both:
1. Diachronic: We can see different items have grammaticized to different degrees, such that *kedo* seems to be more final-particle-ized than *kara*.

2. Synchronic: The social actions conveyed by linguistic forms may be adapted to speech events/interactional activities/genres (Hopper, 1997). In this connection, we compare our findings with those of Mori (1999b) and Nakayama and Ichihashi-Nakayama (1997), who discussed the connection between the emerging syntax and functions of various *kedo* clauses and genre/activity types.

Case Study 1 focuses on two negotiation sequences in one telephone conversation. Two Tokyo suburban matrons (Nishida and Yamada) are negotiating the planning of an annual dinner get-together with a group of friends. The key issue between them is that neither one of them wants to make the decisions about the menu. Nishida wants Yamada to decide because Yamada is a *ryoori no senmonka* ‘cooking professional’, whereas Yamada wants Nishida to decide because Nishida knows the two candidate restaurants and Yamada knows neither. We describe the negotiation in detail, focusing on the way Nishida and Yamada are using utterance-final *kara* and *kedo* with specific prosodic patterns in managing and handing off of turns as they both try to evade making the decision.

The first negotiation sequence is given as Excerpt (3). Just before this excerpt, Nishida (N) has explained to Yamada (Y) that the restaurant in question has fixed-course meals, but in lines 1 through 11, she instead suggests that they create their own menu for the upcoming dinner:

(3) (Yoyaku 3:53-4:25)

1  N: watashi wa osashimi to,
2  Y: n.
3  N: tenpura to,
4  Y: n.
5  N: nimono to,
6   gohan to tte [iu] fuu ni,
7  Y: [e].
8  N: ii mono o poppo tto koo,
9   ippin ryoori o,
10  (H) mazeawasete,
11  ichininmae ni <@shite morattara@>
   doo ka na to omotta *kedo*.
12  Y: [a]==[a],
13  X soo ne,
14  doo desho.
15  (H)  anone,
16  N:  n.
17  Y:  n=  dotchi de mo ii kedo=.
18  N:  . . .  ano ka-  --
19  Y:  [anata,
20     ano],
21  N:  [minna no ga X-]  --
22  Y:  soko de,
23  soodan shite kimete kudasatte mo ii kedo.
24  N:  iya sore wa (H) anata ga kimete.
26  N:  kotoshi [wa].
27  Y:  [a]no=,
28  (H)  [tashika ni]  --
29  N:  [XXX] atashi ga sono,
30  shashin no deta no o okuru kara.
31  Y:  @@@
32  N:  ne.
33  Y:  i-  ii wa yo=.

1–11  N:  I wondered if (rather than fixed-course meals) we should have (the
restaurant) create an individual meal by mixing good items from
different categories, like sashimi dishes, tempura dishes, cooked items,
and steamed-rice dishes KEDO.
12  Y:  oh=,
13  well,
14  what shall (I say)?
15  uhm,
16  N:  m.
17  Y:  mm either is fine KEDO.
18  N:  uh ka-  --
19–23  Y:  one idea would be for you to decide by consulting (the chef) over
there KEDO.
24  N:  no that, (H) you decide.
26  N:  for this year.
27  Y:  uhm,
28  surely --
29  N:  I uh,
30  will send (you) one (a brochure) with photos so.
31  Y:  @@@
32 N: OK?
33 Y: you don’t have to.

Note that Nishida ends this turn in line 11 with *kedo*. This *kedo*-clause sounds prosodically final, terminating in what we are calling a “fade-out.” Note further that there is no obvious main clause in the conversation, so *kedo* is behaving just like well-known FPs. Nishida’s *kedo* allows her to present her suggestion with a hedge, interpreted as conveying something like, “I have this idea, but an expert like you might not like it,” or “I have this idea but what do you as an expert think?,” and so forth, putting Yamada on the spot to respond.

At this point, Yamada recognizes that it is up to her to respond; in lines 12 through 14, she begins to respond:

(4) **Lines 12–14:** Y: a=, X soo ne, doo desho.
   ‘oh well FP how COP
   ‘oh=, well, what shall (I say)?’

This is a dispreferred response: She delays her turn with a news-receipt token *a*= ‘oh=’ and with the particle-cluster *soo ne* ‘well’. Finally, with *doo desho* ‘what shall I say?’, she neither accepts nor rejects the suggestion.

After the continuer *n* ‘mm’ in line 17, Yamada says the following:

(5) **Line 17:** Y: n= dotchi demo ii *kedo*=
   mm either even good KEDO
   ‘mm either is fine KEDO.’

This *kedo*-clause is prosodically final, this time with falling–rising pitch. As with Nishida’s *kedo*-clause in line 11, there is no obvious main clause in the sequence; thus, again, *kedo* is behaving like a FP. Yamada is non-committal; and here, as with Nishida’s *kedo*-clause in line 11, we claim that her clause-final *kedo* leaves Nishida to work out the implications of its contrastive semantics. The clause is interpreted as conveying something like, “Either is fine, so it’s up to you—I won’t make the decision,” throwing the decision-making back to Nishida.

It is not clear what Nishida is trying to say either at line 18 or at line 21. However, in overlap with Nishida’s utterance in line 21, Yamada offers a proposal in lines 19 and 20, as well as lines 22 and 23:

---

1We are grateful to Betty Couper-Kuhlen and Hiromi Aoki for their expert ears and insights into the prosody of all the turns in this entire excerpt.

2On preference organization, see Pomerantz (1984) and Schegloff (2007).

Yamada’s utterance again ends with *kedo* ‘but’. Once again, this *kedo*-clause is prosodically final, with falling–rising pitch. As before, there is no obvious main clause in the surrounding discourse, so *kedo* is once more behaving like a FP; and, like our earlier instances of *kedo*, Yamada’s utterance is again a hedged suggestion, but effectively puts Nishida on the spot to respond.

So far, all the instances of *kedo* that we have seen can be argued to have grammaticized as FPs in the following respects:

- There is no clear main clause in the immediate context.
- All sound final, with either:
  - a. a fade-out or
  - b. a falling–rising pitch pattern.
- All occur at the end of an utterance that makes a *suggestion* (as in lines 1–11 and lines 19, 20, 22, & 23) or conveys a *non-committal stance* (as in line 17).
- In each case, the *kedo*-marked utterance sets in motion an expectation that the recipient will take the next turn (i.e., it turns the floor back to the recipient).

So, what we have seen so far is that a speaker packages a suggestion or non-committal stance in an utterance that is produced and taken by her recipient as complete. With these resources—namely, syntactic positioning and prosody—we suggest, the speaker is thereby indicating that she is finished with her turn. However, notably, there is a “hanging” *kedo* ‘but’ at the end of the utterance, which is being exploited to solicit the recipient’s response. This type of *kedo* works as a device to put the recipient on the spot to respond. This has implications for the decision about what to order at the restaurant, a decision that neither participant wants to commit herself to. With the expert use of final *kedo*, with its unique prosodic, semantic, and inferential properties, we claim, the participants in this conversation are able to engage in an exquisite ‘dance’, a back-and-forth routine, each throwing the decision back to the other.

In line 24, Nishida immediately “attacks back” in reaction to Yamada’s proposal in (6):
Here, Nishida initially only shows her stance by saying *iya sore wa* ‘no, that... ’. Then, after an in-breath, Nishida very clearly presents her request by saying *anata ga kimete* ‘you decide!’ With the predicate in the polite imperative form, the tone of this turn is polite but firm.

At line 25, there is a long pause, then Yamada gives a dispreferred, less than enthusiastic response: the not clearly heard <X n= X>.

In line 26, Nishida then produces a prototypical *increment*\(^4\), which creates a new ending (cf. Tanaka, 1999, who termed this type of turn continuation a *recompleter*):

(8) **Line 26:** kotoshi wa.
    ‘for this year.’

This increment is produced with final prosody, and is indeterminate in the action it is conveying: It can be understood as making Nishida’s original request for Yamada to make the decision back at line 24 either:

- more inevitable: “It’s your turn!” or
- less demanding: “Just for this year!”

However, neither Yamada nor we analysts can know for sure which is intended.

To this undetermined handoff, Yamada responds non-committally in lines 27 and 28 by saying *ano* ‘uhm’, then takes an inbreath and starts to say *tashika ni* ‘surely’. Finding herself in overlap with Nishida at this point, she cuts off, and Nishida, perhaps thinking that Yamada is still not accepting her request, produces an offer in lines 29 and 30, ending with *kara*:

(9) **Lines 29-30:** atashi ga sono, shashin no deta no o okuru *kara*.
    ‘I uh, will send (you) one (a brochure) with photos so.’

Nishida’s *kara* ‘because/so’ is the first that we have seen so far; here, *kara* is prosodically final, with a fade-out. Semantically and syntactically, it ties back to Nishida’s *anata ga kimete* ‘you decide!’ in line 24. If we put the two together, we have a “traditional” *kara*-construction, with the *kara*-clause projecting a following clause, as in schema (1):

(10) atashi ga sono shashin no deta no o okuru kara, anata ga kimete
   ‘I uh, will send (you) one (a brochure) with photos, so you decide!’

[constructed]

But, in contrast to schema (1), where the kara-clause precedes the main clause, we note that here, in lines 29 and 30, what might be considered as the main clause has already occurred—it precedes the kara-clause, rather than following it.

So, at this point, we ask whether it helps our understanding to consider the utterance in lines 29 and 30 as an increment. By offering to send the brochure in line 30 with a clause ending with kara, Nishida is forcing Yamada’s hand in two ways:

1. offering to create a situation where decision-making by Yamada will become easier and/or
2. trying to create a situation where decision-making by Yamada will be more inevitable.

In either case, Nishida’s offer, marked by kara in lines 29 and 30, sets a “condition” that she hopes will lead to the specific desired outcome—namely, to make the menu decision, which is what she wants Yamada to do. So, we suggest that whether or not the turn in lines 29 and 30 is analyzed as an increment, what counts for the participants is the interactional work that that utterance is doing.

Yamada laughs in line 31, but she still neither responds to Nishida’s offer nor accepts the request, and Nishida produces in line 32 a stand-alone FP that also could be analyzed as an increment:

**Line 32:** ne.
   ‘OK?’

Again, we note that Nishida’s ne is prosodically final. But, what does it go with? There are four possibilities, as outlined in (a) through (d):

- (a) line 24: anata ga kimete. ‘you decide!’
- (b) lines 29–30: atashi ga sono shashin no deta no o okuru kara. ‘I will send (you) one (a brochure) with photos so’,
- (c) both, or
- (d) neither, in which case ne here is something like English ‘OK?’

In this sequence, then, we see that Nishida produces a series of increment-like utterances in connection with anata ga kimete ‘you decide!’ in line 24 to obtain the answer that will accomplish her interactional goal of getting Yamada to agree to decide on the menu for the dinner.
In line 33, Yamada takes Nishida’s turn *ne ‘OK?’* as (b), whereupon she rejects Nishida’s offer in lines 29 and 30 (which has the effect of indirectly rejecting Nishida’s request for Yamada to decide in line 24):

**Line 33:** *i- ii wa yo=.*

‘you don’t have to.’

Thus, Yamada is saying that she does not need the brochure, thereby avoiding getting herself into the situation where she has to decide.

Now, in the next 45 seconds, Nishida and Yamada back off of the negotiation talk and discuss locations of branches, the spelling of the name of the restaurant, and so on. During all of this, Yamada keeps attempting to get back to decision-making:

(Yoyaku 5:11-5:31)

34 Y: *(H) soo ne oryoori no naiyoo wa moo,*

35 *(H) Nishiyama san chokusetsu,*

36 *(H) soko no itamaesan to hanashite kimetekudasatte ii kedo.*

37 N: iya shashin deta panfuretto moratta *kara=,*

38 Y: *n n.*

39 N: *(H) ano sore o ana [ta] ni okuru [kara].*

40 Y: *[so]*

41 *[de],*

42 ano yo[san wa ne=],

43 N: *[datte hinichi ga] mada ikkagetsu mo aru kara=,*

44 Y: *(0) soo ne.*

45 *(H) ja,*

46 ano j- basho dake e- --

47 *... to jikan to,*

48 N: *n.*

49 Y: *... goji= zengo de, ii n ja nai desu ka?*

34 Y: well, as for the content of the meal,

35 Nishiyama san (you) directly,

36 *(it would be) okay if (you) decide by talking with the chef over there KEDO.*

37 N: *no/but, I got this brochure with photos (from them) so,*

38 Y: *uh huh,*

39 N: *uh (I) will send that to you so.*

40 Y: *yes.*

41 *and,*

42 *uh as for the budget,*
43 N: (I mean) because (we) still have a month so,  
44 Y: (0) that’s right.  
45 so then,  
46 uh (can you reserve) just the place e- --  
47 and the time and,  
48 N: m.  
49 Y: around 5 pm would be good, wouldn’t it?

In lines 34 through 36, just as she did in (6), Yamada again proposes that Nishida decide on the food in consultation with the chef with a kedo-final turn:

**Lines 34–36:**  
Y: soo ne oryoori no naiyoo wa moo,  
‘well, as for the content of the meal,’  
Nishida san chokusetsu,  
‘Nishida san (you) directly,’  
soko no itamaesan to hanashite kimetekudasatte ii kedo.  
‘(it would be) okay if (you) decide by talking with the chef over there KEDO.’

This kedo-clause is prosodically final (again, with a falling–rising pitch contour); and, again, there is no obvious main clause for this kedo-clause in the entire conversation, which means that kedo is again behaving like a FP. This utterance again conveys a clear suggestion, and now Nishida is once more put on the spot to respond.

So far, three out of the four kedos we have seen are in the expression ii kedo ‘... is good KEDO’, and all of them have a falling–rising pitch pattern. We speculate that ii kedo may have become a fixed expression, and further that the fixed expression ii kedo may have emerged specifically in response to its suitability for this type of delicate negotiation.

At this point, in line 37, Nishida immediately rejects the proposal, and brings up the brochure again:

**Line 37:**  
N: iya shashin deta panfuretto moratta kara=,  
‘no/but, I got this brochure with photos (from them) so,’

Here, we see that this kara-clause is prosodically continuing; its pitch contour is falling–rising–falling, and Nishida produces it with lengthening, indicating that she intends to go on.

Yamada, indeed, hears it this way, and produces a continuer:

**Line 38:**  
Y: nn,  
‘uh huh,’
In line 39, Nishida continues with the same proposal as in line 30, done in the same way with *kara*:

**Line 39**: N: ano sore o anata ni okuru *kara*.
   ‘uh (I) will send that to you so.’

Just as in line 30, this *kara*-clause is prosodically a final fade-out, and implies a variety of “results,” such as “you pick the food.” The older function of *kara* of connecting forward to the main clause seems to still be present in this use (cf. *persistence*; Hopper, 1991). This *kara*-clause can in fact be understood to connect with the idea that Yamada decides (on the food), originally requested in line 24. Thus, it is again like an increment, or *recompleter* (Tanaka, 1999; see our discussion of (8)), in that it creates the second opportunity for Yamada to respond.

Yamada persists in resisting what Nishida is trying to get her into, and starts talking about the budget in lines 41 and 42:

**Lines 41-42**: de, ano yosan wa ne=,
   and uh budget WA FP
   ‘and, uh as for the budget,’

Overlapping Yamada’s talk in line 42, Nishida produces this in line 43:

**Line 43**: datte hinichi ga mada ikkagetsu mo aru *kara* =,
   ‘(I mean) because (we) still have a month so,’

Now, this *kara*-clause is prosodically continuing, with falling–rising–falling pitch and with lengthening. It implies such results as, “I will send it to you,” “We can take our time to do this,” and so on. In fact, just as with (10), this utterance can be combined with (part of) the utterances in lines 37 and 39 to produce a more or less well-formed sentence. One example would be the following:

(11) datte hinichi ga mada ikkagetsu mo aru *kara*=
   ‘(I mean) (we) still have a month so,’
   ano sore o anata ni okuru *kara*. (cf. line 39 above)
   ‘uh (I) will send that to you so.’
   [constructed]

Yamada immediately responds in line 44:

**Line 44**: soo ne.
   ‘that’s right.’
Interestingly, after this brief utterance, she immediately continues with the discussion of the place and the time for the dinner. In other words, the utterance soo ne in line 44 only accepts the idea that they still have enough time; Yamada still does not accept Nishida’s offer to send her a brochure, nor does she accept the request for her to make decisions about the food.

At this point, the talk continues for about 5 min more. They leave it vague how exactly they will decide on the food, but they agree that Nishida will stop by the restaurant on the following day to make a reservation. Nishida also says that she will find out what types of dishes/arrangements are available at the restaurant and get back to Yamada.

Case Study 1: Summary

What do we learn about turn continuation from Case Study 1, looking at this conversational extract?

- *Kara* and *kedo* are grammaticizing as FPs.
- Like other FPs in Japanese, they can be exploited for participants’ interactional goals.
- Like other FPs in Japanese, they cluster together, reflecting negotiations of stance (Suzuki, 1990).
- Unlike older FPs in Japanese, their lexical meanings persist, which shapes the interactional work they perform.

We believe that our excerpts from this conversation show the way *kara/kedo* work as a pair of speakers try to negotiate the planning of an upcoming event, where neither one wants to make the decisions. We have tried to show how an understanding of these emerging FPs in this interaction crucially involves the intersection of at least two dimensions.

**Turn continuation.** Diachronic data show that *kedo* and *kara* used to be, and in some uses still are, turn-continuing devices, but that now they are becoming less turn-continuing and more turn-yielding. Comparing the two forms, our data suggest that *kedo* now plays a more turn-final role than *kara*. For one thing, the prosody and grammar of *kedo*-final utterances solicit a response by expressing a suggestion or a non-committal stance and by yielding speakership to the other person, as schematized in the following:

(12) [suggestion] *kedo.*

What our data show about *kara*, on the other hand, is that the prosody and grammar of *kara*-final utterances solicit a response by laying out a condition,
which projects “results.” These results can be expressed elsewhere in the interaction, or unexpressed. We argue that Nishida exploits this projective ability of *kara* in (9), in trying to get her recipient to carry out what she wants her to carry out:

(13) ‘I will send you a brochure *so*’

In the case at hand, lines 29 and 30 are performing an offer, reiterated in line 39. An offer is an action whose preferred response is acceptance (Schegloff, 2007, pp. 59–60). We suggest that Nishida’s *kara*-final offer instantiates a practice whereby it will be socially difficult for Yamada not to accept the offer; thus, it projects such potential results as Yamada making the decision.

In line 43, Nishida names a situation—that the dinner is still one month away—which warrants and justifies her sending the brochure to Yamada:

(14) ‘We still have a month *so*’

Once again, this *kara*-final clause projects such results as taking the time to send the brochure to Yamada, which, in effect, again leads to an implication that Yamada will make the decision.

As we see, then, in both cases, Nishida is making use of clause-final *kara* to present a condition that projects a situation where Yamada would decide on the food.

**Grammaticization, emergence, and types of interaction.** We have argued that the conjunctive particles *kara/kedo* are grammaticizing as FPs, and that the persistence of *kara* and *kedo*’s meanings affords specific interactional work in everyday interaction. Our data suggest that *kedo* has grammaticized to a FP to a greater extent than *kara*. So, whereas the use of *kedo* does allow a speaker to present a suggestion with a hedge, *kara* still has the “connecting power” of implying a “result,” whether this result is expressed or not.

Thus, we see these emergent structures arises as a response to specific communicative goals. In our conversation, a delicate negotiation provides an ideal environment for the emergence of *kedo/kara* as FPs. Nakayama and Ichihashi-Nakayama (1997) and Mori (1999b) discussed the connection between the syntax and functions of various *kedo* clauses and genre types, focusing on the use of *kedo* in narrative and opinion negotiation segments. They argued that in narrative segments, *kedo* provides background information for the main line of the narrative; and in opinion negotiation talk, it is used for self-qualification or to “soften” assertions. In our data involving decision-making sequences, however, speakers use *kedo* and *kara* to put the recipient on the spot to respond when neither speaker wants to commit to making the decision. These two studies, and
our article, then, show that the social actions conveyed by linguistic forms may be adapted to certain speech events and interactional projects (as also argued in Hopper, 1997, and Mori, 1999b).

We take our Case Study 1, then, to have shown that a consideration of kara and kedo in the context of turn organization, grammaticization, and emergence enriches our understanding of the grammar of interaction engaged in by actual speakers who are skillfully negotiating a delicate issue.

CASE STUDY 2

Case Study 2 highlights lexicalized uses of kara ‘because/so’ exploited for turn continuation purposes, showing that, as we saw in Case Study 1, different uses of kara ‘because/so’ reflect various stages of its ongoing change. It is now well accepted that a combination of the copula particle da and the conjunctive particle kara has developed into an independent conjunction dakara, as illustrated in constructed examples by Matsumoto (1988, p. 341):

(15)  
Taro wa mada kodomo da kara, sore wa muri da  
Taro WA still child COP because that WA unreasonable.request COP  
‘Since Taro is still a child, he is not equal to that task.’

According to Matsumoto (1988), the bound sequence da kara in (15) detached itself from the rest of the clause over time and began to function as an independent word dakara ‘therefore’, as in (16):

(16)  
Taro wa mada kodomo da. Dakara sore wa muri da  
Taro WA still child COP therefore that WA unreasonable.request COP  
‘Taro is still a child. Therefore, he is not equal to that task.’

Notice that in (16), the first part, Taro wa mada kodomo da ‘Taro is still a child’, ends with the copula particle da, providing evidence that there has indeed been a reanalysis of da as part of a new lexical item dakara. In this new lexical item, da is obviously no longer a copula ending a “sentence.” The form dakara is, in fact, listed in dictionaries as a lexical item, and classified as a “consequential conjunction” in Martin’s (1975, p. 818) reference grammar. This is generally accepted as a clear case of lexicalization, where a sequence of grammatical morphemes have become an independent lexical item. Dakara is typically understood as connecting two sentences:
We return to this point later; but interestingly, we frequently come across actual usage where the previously illustrated semantic relation seems almost reversed:\(^5\):

(18) Two high school boys are talking about smoking (High school boys L682-691; 32:30).
1 L: oyaji wa kibishi n da yo.
   father WA strict NOM COP FP
   ‘my dad is strict (about it).’
2 R: [uso].
   lie
   ‘no kidding!’
3 L: [o]yaji no mae de wa suenai n da kedo=,\(^6\)
   father LK front at WA smoke.NEG NOM COP but
   ‘(I) can’t smoke in front of my dad, but’
4 → uchi no oyaji dakara <X hontoo X>,
   my LK father really
   ‘my dad because/I mean really’
5 R: (Hx) inai to[ki <X suen X> no].
   exist.NEG when smoke.POT Q
   ‘when (he) is not there, can you smoke?’
6 L: [kodomo ga ko]domo ga dekita toki ni,
   child GA child GA pregnant when at
   ‘when my mom got pregnant’
7 R: un.
   yeah
   ‘yeah’
8 L: yameta rashii kara tabako.
   quit QT because cigarette
   ‘(he) quit smoking, I heard.’

\(^5\)This “reversal” is reminiscent of the pathway followed by English *but*, as outlined in Mulder and Thompson (2008) and Mulder, Thompson, and Williams (2009); and *though*, as discussed in Barth-Weingarten and Couper-Kuhlen (2002).

\(^6\)Unlike the instances of *kedo* that we examined in Case Study 1, it is not clear what the function of L’s *kedo* is in this turn. We suggest that this is related to the fact that the interactional goal of N’s and Y’s *kedo-final* turns throughout the phone call examined in Case Study 1 was to yield the floor and get the other to make decisions about the dinner. In (18), however, L appears to be ambivalent as to whether his turn is finished.
L says, “(I) can’t smoke in front of my dad,” in line 3, and follows it with *dakara*, “my dad quit smoking when my mom got pregnant, I heard. (He) is fairly angry (about that).” in lines 4, 6, 8, and 9—that is, we observe a use of *dakara*, which adds an explanation for what has been said, as illustrated in (19):

(19) [X]: ‘I can’t smoke around my dad,’

*dakara* ‘therefore/so’ → ‘because/I mean’

[Y]: ‘my dad quit smoking when my mom got pregnant, I heard. (He) is fairly angry (about that).’

Thus, in contrast to the “consequential” uses shown earlier in (15) through (17), the interclausal relation seems to be reversed: Y provides an explanation for X. We call this type of *dakara* “non-consequential.”

A few studies have so far examined *dakara* in actual language use. Maynard (1989, 1993) provided qualitative analyses of non-consequential uses of *dakara* partly based on casual conversations and partly on written dialogues from Japanese novels, and provided a quantitative analysis comparing the uses of *dakara* in the two genres. Mori (1999a) provided a qualitative analysis of the uses of *dakara* in casual conversations from the perspective of delivery and pursuit of agreement. She found that *dakara* is often used by an addressee to align with “a speaker’s proffering of a negative evaluation or complaint” (66) in a kind of “agreement-plus-elaboration” format (50): *Dakara*-marked clauses typically introduce the recipient’s own “consequences or examples” of the circumstances described by the first speaker (67). Mori (1999a) also found that *dakara* is frequently used in turn continuations to offer clarification of one’s evaluation in pursuit of agreement from a recipient.

Our Case Study 2 takes a conversational approach to *dakara* focusing on aspects that contribute to our understanding of turn continuation, in general. We examine both non-lexicalized and lexicalized uses in casual conversation, but give particular attention to non-consequential uses of lexical *dakara*, where we argue that it does two kinds of social work: It provides explanations, and it (re)claims a turn.

As we see, lexicalized uses have introduced phonologically reduced forms; we look at all the related forms (e.g., *dakara, daka*, and *da*) to see if they are tied to particular uses—that is, we highlight diachronic aspects of *dakara* by considering lexicalization, functional change, and phonological reduction. To do this, we provide quantitative results of an analysis of our corpus.

---

7Here, we refer to *da*, the reduced form of *dakara*, not to the copula *da*. 
TABLE 2
Frequency of Da Kara/Dakara in Each Conversation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I Gaikogugo</th>
<th>II Kinkyoo</th>
<th>III Ootoo</th>
<th>IV S &amp; Y</th>
<th>V Bukatsu</th>
<th>VI Hatachi</th>
<th>VII Ryokoo</th>
<th>VIII High School Boys</th>
<th>IX Arasoi</th>
<th>X Zeitaku</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3
Frequency and Percentage of Grammatical Da Kara and Lexical Dakara

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Grammatical</th>
<th>Lexical</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>54 (24)</td>
<td>171 (76)</td>
<td>225 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specifically, we examine 10 standard Japanese conversations among friends, couples, and family members, audio-recorded between 1989 and 2008, which amount to more than two hours of recording. Speakers' ages range from high school age to 51 years old at the time of recording.

Findings

Table 2 gives the combined frequency of grammatical da kara and lexical dakara (illustrated in (15) and (16) earlier) and their related forms in our data. As we can see, either da kara or dakara or both are found in all the conversations, suggesting that it is a form commonly used in actual talk.\(^8\) Table 3 gives the frequency of grammatical da kara and lexical dakara separately, which shows that both of these uses are readily found in our data. Here is an instance of grammatical da kara:

(20) K is talking to her concerned roommate about her hectic schedule, saying that she cannot help it because she is the type of person who cannot stop what she is doing once she starts something (Zeitaku L718-723; 09:20).

1 K: yooryoo warui desu shi ne.
   ‘(I) am inefficient.’

2 ma,
   ‘well’

\(^8\)In fact, both da kara and dakara are found in all of the conversations, except one. These two uses are readily distinguishable on both prosodic and sequential grounds.
3 yaridashitara tomannai taipu $d_a$ $k_a$=,
do.begin.if stop.Neg type COP because
‘(I) am the type (of person) who can’t stop once I get going so’
4 nanka mo shooganai n desu yo.
‘uhm I can’t really help (it).’

We can schematize this use of copula $d_a$ plus conjunctive particle $k_a$ as (21):

(21) [X]: reason/cause ‘(I) am the type (of person) who can’t stop once I get going’
   $d_a$ $k_a$ ‘COP because’
[Y]: result/consequence ‘uhm I can’t really help (it)’

Now let us compare lexical $dakara$. Unlike grammatical $d_a$ $k_a$, which always has a consequential use in our data, we see that lexical $dakara$ has both consequential and non-consequential uses. Extract (22) illustrates the consequential use:

(22) Y is saying that she becomes shy about using her roommate’s fridge when she is around (Satoshi & Yuka L140-142; 6:50).
1 S: a jaa kyoo mo inai n da.
   ‘oh then (she) is not (at home) today either.’
2 Y: so kyoo mo inakutte=,
   ‘no (she) is not (at home) today either’
3 $dakara$=,
   ‘so’
4 ima wa= mizu o= chanto reezooko $<X$ no n $X>$ ni irete an no. @
   @ @ @
   ‘now (I) have (my) water in the fridge.’
5 $<@$ nanka iru to tsukaenai jan @>. 
   ‘somehow (I) can’t use (it) when (she) is around.’

Note that $d_a$ in $dakara$ in line 3 is not a copula; we know that $dakara$ is a lexicalized conjunction because Y’s clause in line 2 ends with a verb predicate $inakutte$ ‘is not (at home)’. Here, she suggests that because her roommate is not at home today, she feels free to put her water in the fridge, as schematized in (23):

(23) [X]: reason/cause ‘she is not at home’
   $dakara$ ‘therefore/so’
[Y]: result/consequence ‘I have my water in the fridge’
Extract (18), repeated here as (24), illustrates dakara in its non-consequential use:

(24) Two high school boys are talking about smoking (High school boys L682-691; 32:30).
1 L: oyaji wa kibishii n da yo.
   father WA strict NOM COP FP
   ‘my dad is strict (about it).’
2 R: [uso].
   lie
   ‘no kidding!’
3 L: [o]yaji no mae de wa suenai n da kedo=,
   father LK front at Cont smoke-Neg NOM COP but
   ‘(I) can’t smoke in front of my dad, but’
   →4 uchi no oyaji dakara <X hontoo X>,
      my LK father really
      ‘my dad because/I mean really’
4 R: (Hx) inai to[ki <X suen X> no].
   exist-Neg when can-smoke Q
   ‘when (he) is not there, can you smoke?’
5 L: [kodomo ga ko]domo ga dekita toki ni,
   child GA child GA pregnant when at
   ‘when my mom got pregnant’
6 R: un.
   yeah
   ‘yeah’
7 L: yameta rashii kara tabako.
   quit QT because cigarette
   ‘(he) quit smoking, I heard.’
8 R: kekko i- <@ ikatten da yo @>.
   fairly angry COP FP
   ‘(he) is quite angry (about that).’

We can schematize this non-consequential use as in (25):

(25) [X]: ‘I can’t smoke around my dad,’
   
   dakara ‘therefore/so’ → ‘because/I mean’
   [Y]: ‘my dad quit smoking when my mom got pregnant, I heard. (He) is fairly angry (about that).’

Comparing (22) and (24), we see that the cause–result relationship is reversed:
In (24), Y adds an explanation for X.
From (24), then, we can observe that lexical *dakara* serves an “explanatory” function, as originally suggested by Maynard (1989, 1993), which is reminiscent of Mori’s (1999a) “remedial” function. We note that *dakara* in line 4 appears to be syntactically less bound than is suggested by the schema in (24): It does not begin, but is inserted, within Y, giving the explanation for why L cannot smoke around his dad—namely, that his dad had to quit smoking when his mom got pregnant and he is angry about that.

Interestingly, the following extract shows that what we might call “explanatory *dakara*” seems to have gone beyond the structure given in (17); it introduces Y, but Y is not a sentence, as suggested by the schema in (17), or even a clause. In (26), Y is now just noun phrase [NP] + FP:

(26) U talks about which extra-curricular activities he did and didn’t do when he was in high school (Bukatsu L949; 10:51).

1 U: ore hora,
   ‘I, you know’
2 handobu tsuttara yappa,
   ‘if it was the handball club’
3 umai n daro tte minna ni omowareru daroo [na tte iu jishin] wa atta n da yo.
   ‘(I) knew that everyone will think that I am good.’
4 M: [u=n].
   ‘mhm’
5 u=n.
   ‘mhm’
→6 U: *dakara* (/da/) onnanoko ni ne.
   ‘I mean, girls (would).’
7 M: un. @@@[@@]
   ‘mhm’
8 a so- -- @@@@]@
   ‘oh, I s-’
9 U: [sonokoro wa moo soikoto shika kangaete nai jan].
   ‘(you) only think about such things at that age.’
10 dai[tai].
   ‘after all’
11 M: [@ @]
   soo ka.
   ‘I see.’
12 U: un.
   ‘mhm’
In (26), with his continuing turn in line 6, U explains what he meant by minna ‘everyone’. So, we see dakara is doing more than connecting sentences—that is, we see that Line 3, which corresponds to [X] in our schema, is syntactically and prosodically complete, which gets acknowledgment from his recipient, M, and that dakara in line 6 introduces a replacement increment NP “girls” for “everyone” (Couper-Kuhlen & Ono, 2007), as in (27):

(27) [X]: ‘if it was the handball club, I knew that everyone will think that I am good.’
   dakara ‘I mean’
   [Y]: ‘girls (would).’

The next example provides an even more dramatic illustration of the departure of the non-consequential use of lexical dakara from the schema in (17):

(28) A and K are talking about what happened to their common friend, Chika, who flew back to Japan from the States when a big earthquake hit Japan. In the sequence, K tries to deliver her point that Chika might have had great difficulty going home from the airport in Japan due to the destruction that the earthquake had caused. However, A does not follow her and instead misunderstands that K thinks Chika might have been killed in the earthquake (Hatachi L161-167; 50:19).

1 K: a X demo chikachan ... sa=,
   Oh but Chika-chan FP
   ‘oh, but Chika, you know’

2 ga kaetta toki ni,
   GA returned when at
   ‘when (she) went back (to Japan)’

3 jishin ga atta [tte shitteta=]? earthquake GA existed QT knew
   ‘there was an earthquake, did you know?’

4 A: <HI<F [a=tta] yo.
   existed FP
   ‘riiiight!’

5 <A so so so so shitte [[ ru wa yo]] A>F>HI>.
   yeah yeah yeah yeah know FP FP
   ‘yeah, yeah, yeah, I know.’

→ 6 K: <A [[daka ch-]] da da chikachan wa
   Ch- Chika-chan WA
   dakada doo natta n yaro A>.
   how became NOM COP
   ‘so, Ch- so so, I mean I wonder what happened to Chika.’
Schematically, then:

(29) [X]: Did you know that there was an earthquake when she went back (to Japan)?
    
    *dakara* ‘I mean’

   [Y]: I wonder what happened to Chika.\(^9\)

In (28), we see several pieces of evidence that *dakara* has widened the domain of its use from the non-consequential function of connecting clausal/sentential elements to the more interactional domain of claiming a turn. Whereas *dakara* has the same “explanatory” function as we have seen in (24) and (26), in (28), K appears to be defending her own ongoing turn by using *dakara*. Evidence supporting this analysis is provided by these facts:

- Overlapping with the end of K’s question in line 3, A starts talking rather excitedly in line 4, as can be seen in her lengthening *a=ittayiyoy ‘right!’* in line 4 and the repeated *so so so so ‘yeah yeah yeah yeah’* in line 5.
- Additionally, her talk in lines 4 and 5 is high in pitch (represented by <H1H1>), with relatively louder volume (<F1F1>) and a relatively faster tempo (<A1A1>).
- Apparently, interpreting these features of A’s turn as attempts to take the next turn, in overlap with A in line 5, K now continues her talk in 6, suddenly also speeding up (<A1A1>). We suggest that K’s multiple uses of *dakara* ‘I mean’, produced in reduced form (*daka* and *da*), reveals her attempt to maintain the floor and keep her claim on her turn.

Example (28) nicely exemplifies and supports Mori’s (1999a) view: “[T]he employment of . . . *dakara* could be related to the perceived pressure to maintain or regain one’s speakership” (p. 168).

This example also shows how the copula meaning of *da* “persists” (Hopper, 1991). Here, *da* obviously does not occur with a predicate nominal, as it would in its copula function. Interestingly, however, it seems to still retain the property of having to “cling” to something. K’s *daka da da* at the beginning of her turn in line 6 displays that her turn is not finished, but is still continuing—that is, the use of erstwhile copulas *daka da da* here seems to invoke the predicate nominal that a copula *should* have with it. K’s claiming of the turn is, thus, accomplished, iconically as it were, by the use of copulas, which makes it look as if she is

---

\(^{9}\)This phenomenon is reminiscent of certain uses of the English *because*; for a recent discussion, see Sanders, Sanders, and & Sweetser (2009).
simply completing the nominal predicate by adding a copula to the NP, which she has just produced.\(^{10}\)

The next example shows that *dakara* can connect elements that are even farther from being canonical sentences. In (30), *dakara* is used to reclaim a turn that has been taken away by another speaker:

(30) As B is talking about the location of his house, which is in Hiyoshi in the Keio area, A interrupts his talk and starts talking about his brother who went to the Hiyoshi campus by mistake to take a university entrance exam. When A finally comes to the end of his story, B reclaims his original turn to talk about where his house is and how to get to downtown Tokyo from there (Otooto L623–688; 19:45).

1 B: hiyoshi tte yuu eki ga atte,
   Hiyosh QT call station GA exist
   ‘there is a station called Hiyoshi and’

2 A: un.
   ‘mm’

3 B: keio no eki na n da shitteru?
   Keio LK station COP NOM COP know
   ‘it’s the train station in the Keio area, do you know?’

4 A: un.
   yeah
   ‘yeah’

5 B: . . . hiyoshi --
   Hiyoshi
   ‘Hiyoshi’

6 hiyoshi ga keio ni atte,
   Hiyoshi GA Keio in exist
   ‘Hiyoshi is in Keio and’

7 A: hiyoshi kyampasu --
   Hiyoshi campus
   ‘Hiyoshi campus’

8 B: . . . so so [so].
   yeah yeah yeah
   ‘yeah, yeah, yeah’

9 A: 
   [ano] uchi no ootoo sa=,
   um my LK younger-brother FP
   ‘um, my younger brother, you know’
   ((approx. 45 seconds omitted; 19:52-20:35 ))

\(^{10}\)For a related phenomenon involving commencing a turn with a postposition, see Hayashi (2003).
10 A: nde nimanen haratte,
and twenty-thousand-yen pay
‘and, (he) paid twenty thousand yen and’

11 B: u=n.
yeah
‘yeah’

12 A: de dasshu de,
and dash in

13 ... itta toka itte.
went something say
‘he said he something like he had dashed off (to the other campus) and such.’

→14 B: ... soo uchi daka sono hiyoshi na n da=.
yeah home that Hiyoshi COP NOM COP
‘yeah I mean my house is in that Hiyoshi (area).’

15 ... de hiyoshi kara=,
and Hiyoshi from
‘and from Hiyoshi’

16 ... shibuya made toyokosen de ikete=,
Shibuya upto Toyoko.Line by go.POT
‘(you) can go up to Shibuya by the Toyoko line and’

17 A: un.
‘mm’

18 B: de sokkara ... yamanote de ... yoyogi,
and from there Yamanote.Line by Yoyogi
‘and from there by the Yamanote line to Yoyogi’

19 ... yoyogi made it[te=],
Yoyogi upto go
‘go to Yoyogi and’

20 A: [un].
‘mm’

B continues

So, in (30), we have a perhaps even clearer instance of non-consequential dakara acquiring the function of turn (re-)claiming. B’s utterance in line 6 is syntactically/semantically/prosodically continuing, suggesting that B intends to continue his turn. However, A “hijacks” the floor by starting a story about his brother in line 9, which ends in line 13. B’s utterance in line 14 now includes dakara and resumes what was left off in line 6.

We suggest that with dakara, B is here reclaiming his original turn in a way similar to the analysis Lenk (1998) gives anyway in English. However, unlike
anyway, we see that the same form *dakara* is being used both for holding and reclaiming a turn. Furthermore, this is the same *dakara* that we saw being used for giving explanations for an assertion in an immediately preceding turn (as illustrated in (24) and (26)), as well as for simply linking two clauses in a consequential relationship (as illustrated in (22)).

Again, as in the previous example about the Hiyoshi area, we find the reduced form *daka* used in the domain of (re-)claiming a turn, which is doing more interactional work than simply connecting “sentential” elements. We discuss the theoretical relevance of this point in next section.

Case Study 2: Summary

Just as with *kara* and *kedo* in our Case Study 1, we take the use of *dakara* in Case Study 2 to show how an understanding of an emerging conjunction, which is further becoming a discourse particle, crucially involves the intersection of at least two dimensions.

**Turn continuation.** As we saw with *kedo* and *kara*, with the combination *da + kara*, we see that it is still used as a consequential turn-continuing device, but that this combination has lexicalized, and now has two non-consequential uses as well: (a) to *continue* a turn by adding an explanation, where it connects more than just sentences, and (b) further, to *(re-)claim* a turn, rather than to simply *continue* a turn.

**Lexicalization, emergence, and types of interaction.** We have seen that the grammatical combination of (copula + conjunctive particle) *dakara* is in the process of lexicalizing as a conjunction and further as a discourse particle, as we can see from its frequent appearance in reduced forms. In addition, we find that the persistence of *da’s* copula meaning affords specific interactional work in situations where speakers are competing for turns.

We summarize this development in (31):

(31)

- Grammatical: connecting a subordinate clause to its main clause
- Lexical
  - Consequential: connecting two sentences
  - Non-Consequential
    - Explanatory: connecting two utterances, but not necessarily sentences
    - Turn-Claiming: continuing with her or his earlier talk and projecting more talk
What Case Study 2 has shown us, then, can be illustrated as in Table 4, which also shows the frequencies of grammatical and lexical *dakara*.

Table 4 reveals that among tokens of lexical *dakara*, the non-consequential use is actually more common than the consequential use (97 vs. 74 cases), making the commonly used label “consequential conjunction” inadequate as a reflection of its occurrence in everyday talk.

Table 5 shows the occurrence of reduced forms for various uses of *dakara*. Interestingly, the ratio of reduced forms shows a nice correlation with these uses, and supports our hypothesis regarding these different developmental stages of an ongoing change. In Table 5, the ratio of reduced forms of *dakara* becomes larger as one goes from the left to right, where uses of *dakara* are aligned from more grammatical (conjunctive particle connecting sentences) to more interactional (giving an explanation for what was said in a previous utterance or [re-]claiming a turn)—that is, as the discourse-level use of *dakara* becomes more encompassing, *dakara* becomes shorter—a common cross-linguistic tendency observed in diachronic change (Bybee, 2010; Hopper & Traugott, 2003).

### TABLE 4
Frequency and Percentage of Three Uses of Lexical *Dakara*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Grammatical</th>
<th>Lexical</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>54 (24)</td>
<td>171 (76)</td>
<td>225 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non-Consequential**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Consequential</th>
<th>Explanatory</th>
<th>Turn-Claiming</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>74 (43.3)</td>
<td>77 (45)</td>
<td>20 (11.7)</td>
<td>171 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 5
Ratio and Percentage of Reduced *Dakara*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Grammatical</th>
<th>Consequential</th>
<th>Explanatory</th>
<th>Turn-Claiming</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of reduced forms</td>
<td>1/54</td>
<td>14/74</td>
<td>20/77</td>
<td>10/20</td>
<td>45/225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSION

We take our Case Studies 1 and 2, then, to have shown that considerations of language change, emergence of linguistic structure from usage, and types of conversational interaction all play a crucial role in our attempt to understand the grammar of turn continuation in Japanese. In particular, we have shown the extent to which grammatical structure exhibits traces of diachronic change, much of which seems to be a direct response to various online demands of actual interaction. We suggest that by only taking linguistic structure as an emergent phenomenon can we begin to appropriately model everyday talk and to understand human language itself.
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