

## Chunking phenomena and phonological reorganization in spoken interaction

Nathalie Bauer | Jens Lanwer | Timo Schürmann  
(Universität Münster)

One of the core ideas of Construction Grammar (CxG) is that linguistic structure is abstracted from what Langacker (1987: 376) calls usage events. The abstracted patterns can be of any degree of complexity and specificity. The object of traditional linguistic inquiry are structures that combine minimal complexity with a maximum of specificity or the other way round. However, there is growing empirical evidence that the cognitive architecture of grammar favors the entrenchment of structures in between (Bybee 2010: 33-56; Schmid 2020: 24). Complex but (semi-)specific linguistic units become entrenched in a usage history of redundant patterning of utterances. Simultaneously, it is well known that those chunks or “prefabricated unit[s]” (Bybee 2001: 60) are an important structural resource for handling the temporal pressure coming along with the intricate contingencies and the inherent progressivity of spoken interaction (Auer 2009; Hopper 2011; Deppermann/Günthner 2015; Stivers/Robinson 2006; Bauer/Lanwer in prep.). Therefore, studies, especially from the field of Interactional Linguistics (IL), support the view already coined by Pawley/Sider (1983) that structures of spoken utterances are very likely of a high degree of redundancy in grammatical patterning, which leads to the routinization of very specific grammatical constructions (Bauer/Lanwer in prep.; Bücker 2014; Deppermann 2011a; Günthner 2011; Imo 2007). Furthermore, fragments of spoken utterances seem to consist vastly of recycled material – as Hopper (2011: 23) puts it – , i.e. they show a recurring phonological form. Bybee (2001: 137-166) in particular discusses patterns of phonological reorganization on the one hand as a significant effect of chunking in language and on the other hand as empirical evidence for the entrenchment of complex but specific units. Despite the evidence for prefabricated chunks in spoken interaction, within CxG still little is known about the effects of chunking phenomena on the phonological patterning of the form side of grammatical constructions. One reason might be that phonological form features are largely ignored within CxG, especially with respect to everyday language use. Within IL, one field of inquiry where aspects of chunking sometimes come into focus are discourse functional units, such as discourse or pragmatic markers. But here, too, dedicated descriptions of the phonological form are still rare (but see Bergmann 2014, forthcoming; Pekarek Doehler 2016; Maschler 2017; Zeschel/Brackhane/Knöbl 2019). Additionally, studying only chunks bearing specific discourse functions falls short of providing a complete picture of the cognitive and interactional mechanisms that control chunking processes in spoken interaction in general, especially regarding frequency-driven effects of phonological reorganization. Empirical observations suggest that (a) we find phenomena of chunking and phonological reorganization in all areas of structural patterning and (b) that structural reorganization of phonological form often paves the way for the assignment of new functions to these new forms (Bybee/Schreiber 1999). We invite contributions which address these desiderata in an empirically informed way, combining approaches from Cognitive Linguistics with IL methodology. The session thus attempts to broaden the scope of Interactional CxG (Deppermann 2006; 2011b; Fischer 2017; Günthner 2009; Imo 2007; 2015; 2018; Lanwer 2020) to the field of (lexical) phonology.

**Abstracts** (max. 500 words excluding references) can be submitted to [nathalie.bauer@uni-muenster.de](mailto:nathalie.bauer@uni-muenster.de) by April 25, 2024.

## References

- Auer, Peter. 2009. Online syntax: Thoughts on the temporality of spoken language. *Language Sciences* 31, 1–13.
- Bergmann, Pia. 2014. Hauptsei bin dick und fett: Konstruktionen mit *Hauptsache* im gesprochenen Deutsch. In Pia Bergmann, Karin Birkner, Peter Gilles, Helmut Spiekermann & Tobias Streck (eds.), *Sprache im Gebrauch: Räumlich, zeitlich, interaktional; Festschrift für Peter Auer (OraLingua 9)*, 211–229. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Bergmann, Pia. forthcoming. Discourse influences on the prosody and phonetics of ‘auf jeden Fall’ and ‘jedenfalls’ in German spontaneous speech. In: Schlechtweg, Marcel (ed.), *Interfaces of phonetics*. Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter.
- Bücker, Jörg. 2014. Konstruktionen und Konstruktionscluster. Die Zirkumposition *von XP her* im gesprochenen Deutsch. In Alexander Lasch & Alexander Ziem (eds.), *Grammatik als Inventar von Konstruktionen? Sprachwissen im Fokus der Konstruktionsgrammatik*, 117–135. Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter.
- Bybee, Joan L. 2001. *Phonology and language use* (Cambridge studies in linguistics 94). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bybee, Joan L. 2010. *Language, usage and cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bybee, Joan L. & Joanne Scheibman. 1999. The effect of usage on degrees of constituency: the reduction of don't in English. *Linguistics* 37 (4), 575–596.
- Deppermann, Arnulf. 2006. Construction Grammar – Eine Grammatik für die Interaktion? In Arnulf Deppermann, Reinhard Fiehler & Thomas Spranz-Fogasy (eds.), *Grammatik und Interaktion. Zum Zusammenhang von grammatischen Strukturen und Gesprächsprozessen*, 43–65. Radolfzell: Verlag für Gesprächsforschung.
- Deppermann, Arnulf. 2011a. Constructions vs. lexical items as sources of complex meanings. A comparative study of constructions with German *verstehen*. In: Peter Auer & Stefan Pfänder (eds.): *Constructions: emerging and emergent*, 88–126. Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter.
- Deppermann, Arnulf. 2011b. Konstruktionsgrammatik und Interaktionale Linguistik. In Alexander Lasch & Alexander Ziem (eds.), *Konstruktionsgrammatik III. Aktuelle Fragen und Lösungsansätze*, 205–238. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- Deppermann, Arnulf & Susanne Günthner. 2015. Introduction: Temporality in Interaction. In Arnulf Deppermann & Susanne Günthner (eds.), *Temporality in Interaction* (Studies in Language and Social Interaction 27), 1–23. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Fischer, Kerstin. 2017. Cognitive linguistics and pragmatics. In Barbara Dancygier (ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics* (Cambridge Handbooks in Language and Linguistics), 330–346. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Günthner, Susanne. 2011. Between emergence and sedimentation: Projecting constructions in German interactions. In: Peter Auer & Stefan Pfänder (eds.): *Constructions: emerging and emergent*, 156–185. Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter.
- Günthner, Susanne. 2009. Konstruktionen in der kommunikativen Praxis. Zur Notwendigkeit einer interaktionalen Anreicherung konstruktionsgrammatischer Ansätze. *Zeitschrift Für Germanistische Linguistik* 37 (3), 402–26.
- Hopper, Paul J. 2011. Emergent Grammar and Temporality in Interactional Linguistics. In Peter Auer & Stefan Pfänder (eds.), *Constructions: Emerging and Emergent* (Linguae & litterae 6), 22–44. Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter.
- Imo, Wolfgang. 2007. *Construction Grammar und Gesprochene-Sprache-Forschung: Konstruktionen mit zehn matrixsatzfähigen Verben im gesprochenen Deutsch*. Tübingen: Niemeyer
- Imo, Wolfgang. 2015. Interactional Construction Grammar. *Linguistics Vanguard* 1 (1), 69–77.

- Imo, Wolfgang. 2018. Valence patterns, constructions and interaction: Constructs with the German verb *erinnern* (remember). In: Hans Boas & Alexander Ziem (eds.), *Constructional approaches to argument structure in German*, 131–180. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1987. *Foundations of cognitive grammar: Volume I: Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Lanwer, Jens. 2020. Appositive Syntax oder appositive Prosodie? In Wolfgang Imo & Jens Lanwer (eds.), *Prosodie und Konstruktionsgrammatik*, 233–281. Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter.
- Maschler, Yael. 2017. The emergence of Hebrew *loydea/loydat* ('I dunno MASC/FEM') from interaction. Blurring the boundaries between discourse marker, pragmatic marker, and modal particle. In Chiara Fedriani & Andrea Sansó (eds.), *Pragmatic Markers, Discourse Markers and Modal Particles: New perspectives* (Studies in Language Companion Series 186), 37–69. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Pawley, Andrew & Frances Hodgetts Syder. 1983. Natural selection in syntax: Notes on adaptive variation and change in vernacular and literary grammar. *Journal of Pragmatics* 7 (5), 551–579.
- Pekarek Doehler, Simona. 2016. More than an epistemic hedge: French *je sais pas* 'I don't know' as a resource for the sequential organization of turns and actions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 106, 148–162.
- Schmid, Hans-Jörg. 2020. *The Dynamics of the Linguistic System*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stivers, Tanya & Jeffrey D. Robinson. 2006. A preference for progressivity in interaction. *Language in Society* 35, 367–392.
- Zeschel, Arne, Fabian Brackhane & Ralf Knöbl. 2019. Reanalyse und phonetische Reduktion pragmatischer Marker mit *sagen*. In Ludwig M. Eichinger & Albrecht Plewnia (eds.), *Neues vom heutigen Deutsch. Empirisch – methodisch – theoretisch*. (Jahrbuch des Instituts für Deutsche Sprache 2018), 81–98. Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter.