"Final hanging *but*" in American English

Where a formal coordinator meets a functional subordinator

Mitsuko Narita Izutsu & Katsunobu Izutsu
Fuji Women's University / Hokkaido University of Education

Mulder and Thompson (2006, 2008) point out that the final hanging *but* ([X *but*]) developed from initial *but* (X [*but* Y]) through a sequence of formal reanalyses, and insightfully observe the functional and formal parallelism between the development of the hanging type of final *but* and the final particalization of the Japanese subordinator *-kedo*. The present article demonstrates that *but* (and *and* as well) can perform a terminal bracketing function and serve as functional subordinators in spoken American English, and that they behave like final particles when the sentences are truncated. Although they are not so final-particalized as Australian final *but*, their interpersonal functions in final position are edging them closer to the status of final particles in spoken American English.

1. Introduction

Mulder and Thompson (2006, 2008) claim that the "final particle *but*" (e.g. *Nice day, **but***) in Australian English developed from "initial *but*" through "final hanging *but*" (*I could scream **but**, …*) along a "grammaticization continuum". We argued elsewhere (2014a) that the final hanging *but* and the final particle *but* should be analyzed as deriving from two different syntactic processes (TRUNCATION and BACKSHIFT) and hence that their developments do not form a continuum. However, Mulder and Thompson correctly analyze the final hanging *but* ([X *but*]) as having developed through a sequence of formal reanalyses from initial *but* (X [*but* Y]) through Janus 1 *but* (X [*but*,] Y) and Janus 2 *but* ([X *but*]). It is still noteworthy that this type of final *but* is formally (prosodically/morphosyntactically) grouped with X rather than Y and can therefore be seen as another kind of final particle or a "subspecies" of final particle *but*. As Mulder and Thompson (2008) insightfully point out, the development of this hanging-type of final *but* largely corresponds

to the final-particalization of the Japanese subordinator *-kedo*: *Sakebukoto-wa dekita-**kedo**,…* (***though** I could scream,…/I could scream **but**,…*).

The present article demonstrates that the English coordinators *and* and *but* share pragmatic as well as prosodic/morphosyntactic characteristics with subordinators, some of which coincide with features of "left-subordinating" *and* (Culicover & Jackendoff 1997). It argues that those coordinators (or left-subordinating coordinators) have irregularly attained subordinator characteristics, which can thus be termed "functional subordinators", and that those characteristics can open up another developmental path from initial *but* to final particles or "subspecies" of final particles.

The development of hanging subordinators into final particles is commonly observed in verb-final languages. Japanese, a typical verb-final language, has subordinators ("sub.") after the subordinate clauses as schematized in (1a), while English, a non-verb final language, has subordinators before the subordinate clauses as in (1b) or (1c).

(1)   a.   [subordinate clause]-sub., [main clause].
      b.   sub.-[subordinate clause], [main clause].
      c.   [main clause](,) sub.-[subordinate clause].

Discourse-pragmatic conditions can dispose speakers to suppress or leave unsaid the content that could be coded in the main clause. This structure largely corresponds to Ohori's "suspended clause" (1995, 2000a), Evans' "insubordination" (2007), or Izutsu and Izutsu's "truncation" (2014a). In a truncated sentence structure of verb-final languages, the subordinator winds up in the sentence- as well as clause-final position as in (2a). As we argued before (Izutsu & Izutsu 2012), the structural analogy to a main clause with a final particle like (2b) encourages speakers to reanalyze the subordinator as a final particle ("FP").

(2)   a.   [subordinate clause]-sub.,….
      b.   [main clause]-FP.

Contrastively, similar suppression of a main clause does not produce a sentence structure like (2b) in non-verb-final languages because the subordinator precedes rather than follows the subordinate clause as seen in (1b–c). This difference is partly responsible for the observed fact that the path from subordinating conjunctions to sentence-final particles is less likely in head-initial languages like English (Izutsu & Izutsu 2014b). Interestingly enough, however, some English coordinating conjunctions (*and* and *but*) can have irregularly acquired subordinator characteristics and become used as functional subordinators, which could come to serve as a kind of final particle. The development from English final hanging coordinators to final particles or subspecies of final particles can be viewed as a parallel

to the grammaticalization pathway from Japanese subordinators to final particles that we advanced elsewhere (Izutsu & Izutsu 2014b).

Section 2 outlines the analysis of final *but* by Mulder and Thompson (2006, 2008) and our arguments for as well as against their analysis. Section 3 shows that English coordinating conjunctions like *and* and *but* can serve as functional subordinators, drawing on their similarities with Japanese subordinators as well as the observation of naturally occurring data of contemporary American English conversations. Section 4 reveals that the suppression of main clauses (suspended clause, insubordination, or truncation) sometimes generates final hanging coordinators, which can in turn bring them one step further toward grammaticalization into final particles. Section 5 argues that the final-particlehood of the hanging type of *and* or *but* is ascribed to the interpersonal functions it performs in discourse, which are associated with the semantic dependency of functional subordinators.

2. Final *but*: "hanging implication" and "final particle"

2.1 "Grammaticization continuum"

Mulder & Thompson (2006, 2008) assume that the "final particle *but*" in Australian English as in (3) developed from "initial *but*" via "final hanging *but*" as in (4):

(3) a. Nice day, **but**.   (Mulder & Thompson 2008: 193)
     b. I'm going to the shops, **but**.

(4) a. I could scream **but**, … (H)   (Mulder & Thompson 2008: 185)
     b. W'l now Didier – makes his money by going to Atlantic City **but** – (1.7)
                                                         (Mulder & Thompson 2008: 186)

The "final particle *but*" ("final 2 *but*") is used "to end and reinforce a sentence" or for "asking for confirmation" (Mulder & Thompson 2008: 193), and is "uttered with final prosody" with no implication hanging (2008: 191). Mulder & Thompson claim that "in Australian English 'final *but*' has become a 'fully-developed' final particle" (2008: 191). On the other hand, the "final hanging *but*" ("final 1 *but*") leaves a clear implication "hanging" and "invites the listener to infer what it is and continue the interaction appropriately given that implication" (2008: 186). For example, the speaker of (4a) admits that she could scream, but leaves open an implication that she didn't in fact.

For the development of "final particle *but*", Mulder and Thompson posit a "grammaticization continuum".

(5)   initial *but*   > Janus 1 *but*   > Janus 2 *but*
      X [*but* Y]   X [*but*,] Y   [X *but*]
      final hanging *but* > indeterminate *but* > final particle *but*
      [X *but*]   [X/Y *but*]   [Y *but*]
                                        (Mulder & Thompson 2008: 195)

They argue that "the behavior of *but* can be modeled as a continuum from a prosodic-unit-initial to a prosodic-unit-final discourse particle" (2008: 179), and ascribe the rise of "final particle *but*" to the presence of the indeterminate or "in-between" examples which can be interpreted either as a final hanging *but* or a final particle *but*. As they put it, "[i]t is out of this indeterminacy that the final 2 *but* emerges" (2008: 195).

2.2 Truncation and backshift: Two pathways to final *buts*

Although Mulder and Thompson (2008: 196) insist that "there is no 'leap'" between the apparently different structures [X *but*] and [Y *but*] in the continuum given in (5), the interpretive indeterminacy does not bridge a gap between the two types of *but*s. It is only in the mind of interpreters (addressees or analysts) that such indeterminacy exists; the speaker always intends one or the other interpretation when giving an utterance ending with a final *but*.

    We claimed that the "final hanging *but*" and "the final particle *but*" do not form a continuum and that they instead derive from syntactically different processes ("truncation" and "backshift"), respectively (Izutsu & Izutsu 2014a). The final hanging *but*, given in (4), arises from truncating a coordinate sentence structure "X *but* Y" (i.e. cutting Y off), as in (6a). The resulting sentence structure "X *but*" leaves an implication unstated. In contrast, the final particle *but*, shown in (3), involves backshifting of *but* (i.e. placing the conjunction after Y) with the resultant overall structure "X, Y *but*", as in (6b):

(6)   a.   TRUNCATION: X *but* Y. > X *but*. (final 1/final hanging *but*)
      b.   BACKSHIFT: X *but* Y. > X, Y *but*. (final 2/final particle *but*)

On the basis of some differences in their prosodic and syntactic behaviors, we also argued that the two types of final *but*s are inherently different (Izutsu & Izutsu 2014a). The truncation type has sentence-initial characteristics such as rising intonation, the presence of a prosodic break before the final *but*, and the possibility of filler attachment, whereas the backshift type has sentence-final characteristics such as falling intonation, the absence of a prosodic break before the final *but*, and the incompatibility with fillers. Since the backshift type of *but* has obtained emphatic or emotive meanings, typically observed in sentence-final particles, we

agreed with Mulder and Thompson that the backshifted *but* in Australian English has now attained a status as a sentence-final particle.

Meanwhile, we also recognized the presence of some exceptions in our above argument, which we noted in our remark: "some examples of the truncation type can be uttered with no prosodic break, notably in the case of highly conventionalised expressions such as *excuse me, but …* or *sorry, but …*" (Izutsu & Izutsu 2014a: 111). In view of the fact that no prosodic break may be inserted before this truncation type of final *but*, it seems plausible to see it as serving a function similar to sentence-final particles.

In this respect, it is noteworthy that Mulder and Thompson (2008: 199) observe a parallelism between the truncation (or "final hanging/final 1") type of *but* and a Japanese connective particle (*-kedo*), citing the following examples:

(7)　a.　*Moo jikan-desu **kedo**…*
　　　　　now time-is　　but
　　　　　'It's time now, but….'
　　　　　(implying e.g. "don't you have to get ready to go out"?)

　　　b.　[*Moo jikan-desu **kedo***]$_1$, [*dekakeru yooi-wo*
　　　　　 now time-is　　but　　go:out　　ready-acc

　　　　　shinakutemo　　iindesuka?] $_2$
　　　　　do:not:have:to Q

　　　　　'It's time now, but don't you have to get ready to go out?"

(Mulder & Thompson 2008: 199)

Sentence (7a) is called a 'suspended clause' (Ohori 1995, 2000a) or an example of 'insubordination' (Evans 2007), which presumably derives from truncating a complex sentence structure as in (7b). With the main clause unsaid, the sentence leaves a hanging implication such as "don't you have to get ready to go out?" Significantly, Mulder and Thompson explicitly state that this phenomenon is "strikingly reminiscent of our 'final 1' *but*, where an implication is strongly left hanging for the listener to construe" (2008: 199).

We argued that some Japanese connective particles (subordinating conjunctions) developed into sentence-final particles (Izutsu & Izutsu 2014b).[1] Some

---

1. It might be arguable whether Japanese connective particles should be regarded as subordinating conjunctions/particles. There are several types of connective particles which differ with respect to the types of clauses they are attached to (Minami 1974, 1993; Ohori 2000b, *inter alia*). For example, *-kedo* 'though' and *-kara* 'because' can be attached to tensed clauses, while *-te* '(do)ing' cannot. Although it is difficult "to give an exhaustive definition of subordinate constructions" (Davison 1979: 106), Thompson and Longacre (1985) give a syntactic

examples of sentence-final *-kedo* still retain a sense of hanging implication as in
(8); others express more emphatic or emotive meanings as in (9):

(8)   *Moosiwakenai-n-desu-kedo*….
      sorry-FN-HON-but(SUB)
      'I feel sorry for you, but ….'

(9)   Father: *Bennkyo   yatteru-no-ka*?
                study   be:doing-FN-Q
                'Are you studying?'
      Son: *Yat-temasu-kedo!*
                do-be:doing:HON-but(SUB)
                'I'm doing!'

The concessive particle *-kedo* in (9) no longer has an implication hanging but
instead conveys the speaker's feeling of irritation or disgust.[2] Such departure from
the sense of hanging implication marks a further development into final particles.

---

characterization of subordinate clauses, which are marked by "three devices which are typi-
cally found among languages of the world" (1985: 172):

(a)   subordinating morphemes
(b)   special verb forms
(c)   word order

On the basis of these formal criteria, clauses followed by connective particles can be viewed
as subordinate clauses. They are marked by subordinating bound morphemes (i.e. connective
particles) sometimes along with special verb forms (adverbial/conditional forms), thus
satisfying the criteria (a) and/or (b). Adverbial verb forms alone can be exploited for coding
subordination, as in (i):

(i)   *Musuko-wa sono hi   hazimete hikooki-ni **nori**, oonakisi-ta.*
      son-TOP   that day first   plane-on ride cry:loudly-PAST
      'My son got on a plane for the first time and cried loudly on that day.'

Here, the adverbial form of *noru* 'ride' is used to form a subordinate clause. As the translation
suggests, however, such a subordinate clause is semantically akin to coordinate clauses.
Therefore, some scholars of Japanese linguistics refer to these clauses as "paratactic clauses",
which are syntactically classified under the heading of subordinate clauses (Masuoka 1997;
Noda et al. 2002). The connective particle *-te* is also used to form a paratactic clause.

2.   This is congruous with emotive meanings such as "surprise, anger, impatience, disap-
proval, blame, and complaint", which are found with some discourse markers for 'and' and
'but' in dialectal Japanese that "are used nearly exclusively in the sentence/utterance-final
position" (Izutsu & Izutsu 2013: 224). It is further parallel with what Abraham (1991: 358)
argues about *doch* in its modal particle use to express: "[i]mpatience, annoyance, disapproval,

In this connection, Takahashi (1993) makes an insightful observation on suspended clauses (or insubordinate clauses) in Japanese:

> If these forms [subordinate clauses] were used alone with the same meaning as their corresponding complex sentences, they would only be viewed as economical forms in that shorter forms are substituted for longer complex sentences. However, these forms not only indicate logical relationships between states of affairs, but they do also express interpersonal meanings which are projected from a speaker onto the addressee(s). These functions are not available when they are the subordinate clauses of complex sentences.
>
> (Takahashi 1993: 22, our translation)

He assumes that truncation (or *shooryaku* 'omission' in his terms) generates different forms from those of the original complex sentences, and gives rise to different kinds of illocutionary forces. He argues that these sentence-final connective particles which perform unique interpersonal functions should be regarded as sentence-final particles (1993: 23). Likewise, Fujiwara (1986) extensively discusses the final-particalization of subordinating conjunctions in dialects of Japanese.

Some connective particles are so conventionalized as sentence-final particles that they can sometimes express some new discourse-pragmatic meanings as seen in (9) above. Interestingly, Takahashi gives some examples where different connective particles can be interchangeably used because original connective meanings are weakened as a result of such conventionalization:[3]

(10) a. *Ima ocha ire-masu-**kara**.*
            now tea   make-HON-because
            'I'll make tea now.'

       b. *Ima ocha ire-masu-**kedo**.*
            now tea   make-HON-but(SUB)
            'I'll make tea now.'   (Takahashi 1993: 23)

Here, causal and concessive particles (-*kara* and -*kedo*) are both used to finish utterances for making an offer of tea.

As Fujiwara (1986) discusses, subordinating conjunctions are one of the major sources for sentence-final particles in Japanese. In head-final languages, complex sentences have the unmarked structure "X-sub., Y", where Y is sometimes left unstated and yields the insubordinate clause structure "X-sub". As we argued (Izutsu & Izutsu 2014b: 96), such insubordinate clause structures end with subordinating conjunctions, which are quite likely amenable to the development into final particles. In head-initial languages like English, the path from subordinating

conjunctions to sentence-final particles is unlikely, because they occupy clause-initial position as in "sub-X". We will demonstrate below that instead of subordinating conjunctions, some English coordinating conjunctions (*and*, *but*, etc.) can have irregularly attained subordinator characteristics and be used as functional subordinators. We will argue that such subordinator characteristics can bring the coordinators one step closer to final particles.

3. Functional subordinators *and* and *but*

3.1 How English coordinators are translated?

To have a general idea of how English coordinators sometimes behave like subordinators, we will first look at how they are translated in Japanese. The present discussion focuses on the coordinators *and* and *but* since they sometimes appear in sentence-final position and serve a function similar to sentence-final particles.

Examples (11a)-(14a) are taken from the scripts of American movies and TV dramas, and the Japanese translations of the italicized parts are given in (9b)–(12b), respectively:

(11)　a.　LIBBY: Not so very far away, *the door will open **and** in he'll come*, wearing an old bathrobe soiled with the residues of all the times, the stains and streaks and smears … and tears … tears from a thousand eyes.　　(David Berry, *The Whales of August*)[4]

　　　b.　*doa-ga　　ai-**te**　　hait-te　　kuru-no-sa*
　　　　　door-NOM　open-CP　enter-CP　come-FP-FP

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(Ozaki & Saeki 1991:25)

(12)　a.　(The newsreel footage shows two black students being led into the schoolhouse.)
　　　　　NEWSMAN: *And so at day's end the University of Alabama in Tuscaloosa had been desegregated **and** students Jimmy Hood and Vivian Malone had been signed up for summer classes.*　　(Eric Roth, *Forest Gump*)

　　　b.　*Kekkyokunotokoro,　Arabama-syuu,　Tasukaruusa-ni-aru　Arabama*
　　　　　after:all　　　　　　Arabama-state　Tuscaloosa-in-be　　Arabama

　　　　　daigaku-wa　　　zinsyusabetu-o　haisisi,　　　Zimii
　　　　　university-TOP　segregation-ACC　abolish (ADV)　Jimmy

Huudo-to	*Bibian*	*Maroon-no*	*nimei-no*	*gakusei-ga*
Hood-with	Vivian	Malone-GEN	two:persons-GEN	student-NOM

kaki	*koosu-ni*	*nyuugaku-o*		*mitome-rare-masi-ta.*[5]
summer	course-to	entering:into:school-ACC		accept-PASS-HON-PAST

(Ross & Groom 1996: 66)

(13) a. MOLLY: No, no, I, I know that you don't approve. I don't approve, either. *I agree with you, **but** that doesn't change it.* You know, I should've slept with him, maybe that would have made it easier. But I don't think so. I just think that we were meant to be together even though we never will be.

(Michael Christofher, *Falling in Love*)

   b. *Wakatteiru-**kedo**, doonimo nara-nai-no-yo.*
   know-CP   in:any:way become-NEG-FP-FP

(Christofer 1996: 109)

(14) a. HOWARD: *This lady wants to return these sheets. **But** … something tells me we've got another bed wetter.*[6]

   TERRI: Do you see what I have to deal with here? God, hasn't she ever heard of a diaper? (*Glee*, season 1 episode 1)

   b. *Siitu henpin-no okyakusama-desu-**ga** … nandaka*
   sheet return-GEN customer-HON-CP   somewhat

   henna nioi-ga.
   strange smell-NOM

The coordinator *and* is often translated in Japanese with subordinators such as the connective particle *-te* as in (11a) or the adverbial form of a verb as in (12b). Similarly, the coordinator *but* is rendered with connective particles such as *-kedo* and *-ga* in (13b) and (14b), respectively. These connective particles are bound to the preceding verb groups to form subordinate clauses [X-sub.]. The adverbial verb form as in (12b) likewise indicates the subordinate status of its preceding clause. As these examples suggest, English sentences with coordinators "X co. Y" are often expressed in Japanese in complex sentence structures schematically described as "X-sub., Y" or "X(-sub.), Y".[7]

---

5. The adverbial form of the verb consists of the incorporated nominal *haisi* 'abolition', the verb root *s-* 'do', and the adverbial ending *-i*.

6. *But* is capitalized here, mainly because the sentence starts as a new subtitle line. However, a transcript website transcribes this utterance as: *his lady wants to return these sheets, but… something tells me we've got another bed wetter* (http://gleetranscripts.tumblr.com/post/13198819028/1x01-pilot).

7. X-sub., Y shows that clause contains a verb in the adverbial form, which signals the subordinate status of its preceding clause.

It should be borne in mind that Japanese also has morphologically independent conjunctions corresponding to *and* and *but*, such as *sosite* 'and,' *demo* 'but,' *sikasi* 'but' as in (15) and (16):[8]

(15) a. FORREST: **And** always answer every question with "Yes, Drill Sergeant!" (Eric Roth, *Forest Gump*)

  b. ***Sosite*** *nani-o   kika-re-temo, kotae-no   owari-ni*
  and   what-ACC ask-pass-CP answer-GEN ending-at

  "hai, gunsoo"-tte   ie-ba   yokat-ta.
  yes   drill:sergent-COMP say-CP good-PAST
  (Ross & Groom 1996:97)

(16) a. SARAH: Oh, **but** Helen Parsons has told me of your photographs ….
  (David Berry 1989, *The Whales of August*)

  b. ***Demo****, Heren Paasonzu-ga anata-no osyasin-no   hanasi-o*
  but   Helen Parsons-NOM you-GEN photograph-GEN story-ACC

  si-te-masi-ta-wa.
  do-CP-HON-PAST-FP
  (Ozaki & Saeki 1991:81)

Although these conjunctions could have been available to the translators of (11)–(14), they chose subordinators to translate many occurrences of *and* and *but*. This fact suggests that they may have considered that the first clauses followed by these conjunctions, i.e. [X *and*] and [X *but*] clauses, are functionally more akin to subordinate clauses in Japanese discourse.

3.2 Discourse-functions of [X *and*] and [X *but*] clauses

It is normally assumed that foreground and background information (or nucleus and satellite) in discourse correlates with main and subordinate clauses in sentences respectively (Tomlin 1985), but a number of studies have pointed out that there is not a categorical correspondence between them (Reinhart 1984; Thompson 1987; Matthiessen & Thompson 1988):

> Our point is that we have an argument in favor of our claim that hypotaxis is revealingly viewed as a grammaticization of Nucleus-Satellite relations in the fact that when such relations are grammatically coded, they are often, *but not always*, coded as hypotaxis.
>
> (Matthiessen & Thompson 1988:308, emphasis in original)

---

8. These morphological independent conjunctions can be viewed as coordinating conjunctions, though one might argue that they are sentence initial adverbials. See Yoda (2010) and

As Matthiessen and Thompson note, the Nucleus-Satellite (foreground-background) relation are not always coded as hypotaxis; it can be coded as a paratactic (e.g. coordinate) structure. Consider the following example which they cite from a personal letter:

(17) 1. Your kind invitation to come and enjoy cooler climes is so tempting
2. but I have been waiting to learn the outcome of medical diagnosis
3. and the next 3 months will be spent having the main thumb joints replaced with plastic ones.   (Matthiessen & Thompson 1988: 294)

Matthiessen and Thompson analyze unit 3 as presenting the nuclear argument of this discourse, which is supported by the other two satellite clauses. Unit 2 serves as a "background" satellite for unit 3, and unit 1 represents a "concession" satellite for the subsequent units.[9] Although the three units are grammatically realized as a sequence of coordinate structures, the first two units provide functionally subordinate information to the third one.

The fact that the asymmetric functions of clauses in discourse are often realized by syntactic coordination has also drawn attention in the generative tradition. Culicover and Jackendoff discuss what they call "left-subordinating *and*", where "the first conjunct is a main clause in syntax but is subordinate in conceptual structure" (1997: 212), as in (18):

(18) a. You drink another can of beer and I'm leaving.
(=If you drink another can of beer, I'm leaving.)

b. Big Louie sees you with the loot and he puts out a contract on you.
(=If Big Louie sees you with the loot, he'll put out a contract on you.)

(Culicover & Jackendoff 1997: 197–198)

The sentences prefer conditional interpretations with the first clauses semantically behaving like the protases. They exemplify what Culicover and Jackendoff call a "syntax and semantics mismatch".

The observation on syntactic coordinators serving as semantic subordinators allows us to consider why the translators chose subordinators (*-te* '(do)ing', *-ga* 'though', and *-kedo* 'though') or the adverbial form of a verb over other conjunctions (*sosite* 'and', *demo* 'but', *sikasi* 'but'). This question can be settled by examining the discourse-functions of the first clauses of the sentences in question in (11)–(14) above. In (11a), the door's opening will enable him to come in; hence, the first clause presents a background situation in which the event designated in

---

9. The terms "background" and "concession" used here represent types of nuclear-satellite relations in Rhetorical Structure Theory (Mann & Thompson 1987; Matthiessen & Thompson 1988).

the second clause can occur. The particle preposing (*in he'll come*) in the second clause unambiguously indicates that it represents foreground information as compared with the first clause. In (12a), the newsreel footage shows that this news story is about two African-American students who are allowed to be enrolled in summer classes at the University of Alabama. The second clause reports the main event of this news story, for which the first clause describes a background condition. In the italicized sentence of (13a), the speaker concedes in the first clause that her relationship with a married man is not approvable, but then goes on to insist that the situation nevertheless does not change. The first clause expresses an agreement with the interlocutor, which prefaces the speaker's assertion in the second clause. Similarly in (14a), a shop clerk brings the sheets which a customer wants to return, but a more serious problem is that they have awful smell. His colleague continues to complain about the latter topic, which constitutes the main storyline of this conversation.

These examples illustrate that as many previous studies have pointed out, the two units of a coordinate sentence are not always symmetric in discourse-functional terms: one may be more foregrounded (or backgrounded) than the other. In particular, the first unit tends to convey background or supplementary information with respect to the second one. The comparison with Japanese translations may lead us to assume that coordinating conjunctions can sometimes function as "terminal brackets" (Schiffrin 1987: 37) which mark the closing boundary of background information as in the structures of [X *and*] and [X *but*].

3.3 The terminal bracketing function of *and* and *but* in spontaneous conversation

The preceding discussion on the uses of *and* and *but* as terminal brackets appears to run counter to our traditional understanding of English coordinating conjunctions. Haspelmath (2007) discusses the constituency divisions of coordinate structures, illustrating that English *and* normally forms a constituent with the following unit in terms of intonation and pauses:

(i) Intonation: In certain cases, English *and* forms an intonation group with the following phrase, not with the preceding phrase (*Joan, and Marvin, and their baby*; not: **Joan and, Marvin and, their baby*; here commas represent intonation breaks). Of course, this test does not apply in the simplest cases: A construction such as *Joan and Marvin* forms a single intonation group.

(ii) Pauses: In English, it is much more natural to pause before *and* (*Joan … and Marvin*) than after *and* (*??Joan and … Marvin*).   (Haspelmath 2007: 8)

However, a survey of naturally occurring data from the Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English (DuBois et al. 2000, 2003, 2004, 2005) reveals that

there are not a few examples of terminal *and* [X *and*] and terminal *but* [X *but*] in American English. We can find examples of NP coordination as in (19) or VP coordination as in (20):[10]

(19)   1   MARY: … I don't know.
       2   (H) Oh I freaked !Cookie **and**,
       3   … !Rita **and**,
       4   … !Gary out tonight.   (SBC007 *A Tree's Life*)

(20)   1   LUCY: [3And then3] they .. put a … primer coat of paint on it.
       2   So all we have to do is go in **and** … paint it.
                                                    (SBC049 *Noise Pollution*)

In each example, *and* is followed by a pause of medium length, which is indicated by a sequence of three dots (…) in lines 3 and 4.[11] This suggests that *and* forms a constituent with the preceding NPs or VPs.

We can also find examples where two or more independent clauses are combined by terminal *and* or *but*.

(21)   1   WESS   … We were –
       2   We went –
       3   … One day,
       4   we used to go out in back of my … dad's barn,
       5   .. and talk to Mister ~Heschberger and Oscar.
       6   … (H)= I got home from the war **and**,
       7   … (H) we're out there talking,
       8   and Oscar says,
       9   come on,
       10   we'll go up to Schultz's.
       11   I'll buy one.   (SBC059 *You Baked*)

(22)   1   RAMON: … Well,
       2   I agree- –
       3   I agree with what he was saying **but**,
       4   .. I think m- maybe one of the reasons could be,
       5   .. they're not being represented,
       6   they don't think they're being represented,
       7   .. they don't,
       8   … um,   (SBC012 *American Democracy is Dying*)

---

10. Non-clausal coordination by terminal *but* is rare.

11. A sequence of three dots represents a pause of about half a second (between 0.3 and 0.6

In (21), the speaker does not only takes a pause after *and* but also breathes in before starting the next clause as indicated by the symbol (H). The conjunction forms an intonation group with the preceding clause, not with the following one. The final consonant of *war* is linked to the first vowel of the following word *and* and the two words are pronounced like [wɔ:rən]. In (22), there is a short break after *but*, as indicated by a sequence of two dots (..). The clause terminated by the *but* and the subsequent clauses exhibit the "Cardinal Concessive" Pattern (Barth-Weingarten & Couper-Kuhlen 2002) with the first unit making the acknowledgement of a claim while the second one expressing a counter-claim for it. This pattern is typically marked with the subordinating conjunction *(al)though*, and thus lines 3–5 are aptly paraphrased as: *Although I agree with what he was saying, I think maybe one of the reasons could be they're not being represented.*

The conjunction *but* serves as a terminal bracket in a conventionalized concessive formula. In (23), *yeah but* forms an intonation unit, which is followed by an interrogative clause. The fact that the clause following the *but* is marked by subject-auxiliary inversion (*is the form in English?*) suggests that it is more asserted or foregrounded than the element preceding it (Hopper & Thompson 1973):

(23) 1 SHARON: (H)= Yeah,
      2   that takes two weeks to process.
      3   I mean,
      4   how do you [explain that to th-] –
      5 KATHY: [Yeah **but**,
      6   is the form in Eng]lish?
      7 SHARON: … (H) They have a form in Spanish [al=so].
                                          (SBC004 *Raging Bureaucracy*)

Also in (24) a short pause follows *but*, which occurs with laughter. The subsequent clause manifests subject-auxiliary inversion for exclamation (*boy= can he run fast*), and thus more asserted or foregrounded than the preceding clause. In other words, the terminal *but* serves to indicate the functionally subordinate status of the clause that precedes it, and the two clauses that it conjoins can be roughly paraphrased as a complex sentence: *Although he can't see very well, boy can he run fast.*

(24) 1 CYNTHIA: … (H) Well I ra=n,
      2   and I ran and I ran and I ran,
      3   … but all the while,
      4   there was rhino.
      5   (H) Running .. right .. after me.

6		(H) He can't see very well @**but**,
7		.. boy= can he run fast.
8		… [Tha=t's ba=d said tiger].

<div align="right">(SBC054 'That's Good', Said Tiger)</div>

The terminal *and* can also have a subordinating function. In the following example, *and* occupies the final position of a clause in line 4. This clause sets a precondition for an event described in some subsequent clauses, i.e. going to meet him in Great Falls. The *and* creates a sentence which can be referred to as "indirect condition" (Quirk et al. 1985:1089). A logical reasoning behind Alice's utterance is that if we all get some money together, we can go to Great Falls to meet him and if so, she is wondering whether there is any way he could come there:

(25)	1	ALICE:	… (H) I don't think it's such a good idea for you to go up there in the winter.
	2	MARY:	… (TSK) Mm=.
	3		… I've been thinking about that.
	4	ALICE:	(SWALLOW) … We should all get some money together **and**,
	5		… is there any way he could [like,
	6	MARY:	[(H)=]
	7	ALICE:	meet us in Great Falls] or something?
	8		… Cause I'd like to go up there and go to the,
	9		.. um,
	10		… (H) Red Lobster?
	11	MARY:	… (TSK) (H) Really?
	12	ALICE:	… Yeah.
	13		… Cause I've been just,
	14		… cr=aving [seafood].
	15	MARY:	[That's the half]-way point,
	16		he could do it.

<div align="right">(SBC007 A Tree's Life)</div>

Similarly in (21) seen above, the clause that precedes *and* presents a setting for a series of events described in some subsequent clauses, which is indicated by the past tense of the verb (*I got home from the war*). The clauses that ensue are narrated in the historical present tense, which is typically used to represent foreground events (Brinton 1992:221).

The observation of naturally occurring conversations reveals that *and* and *but* can form a constituent with the preceding clause and perform a terminal bracketing function. The terminal *and* and *but* contribute to structuring functional asymmetry between two clauses and serve as functional subordinators with the first clause being backgrounded or more subordinate than the second.

4.   From left-subordinating coordinators to final particles

4.1   Truncation type of final *and*

As discussed in 2.2, subordinators or connective particles are one of the sources for final particles in Japanese. Given that English coordinating conjunctions sometimes functionally behave like subordinating conjunctions in clause-final position, it will be naturally assumed that such coordinators can further undergo the truncation of the sentences and develop into final particles or at least "subspecies" of final particle.

The functional subordinator *and* is likely to develop into a truncation type of final particle, which leaves an implication hanging. In (26), a speaker withholds what would follow *and* in line 8, leaving open the implication, for example, of his rich work experience. He does not continue this story and shifts his talk to a more general topic, i.e. one of his life lessons for leading a successful life:

(26)   1   TOM_2:   … they said,
    2   (H) what we've now said is,
    3   you have to stay twenty years.
    4   So I said fine.
    5   So,
    6   .. handshakes all around.
    7   TOM_3:   [Mhm].
    8   TOM_2:   [(H)][2= Then I2] went off and worked for a couple of companies **and**,
    9   TOM_1:   [2Mhm2].
    10 TOM_2:   (H) uh,
    11 … my .. my success in life,
    12 if I can say it is,
    13 is is,
    14 consists of two things.
    15 Skill and luck.   (SBC032 *Handshakes All Around*)

A similar example of final *and* is discussed in Norrick (2009: 321):

(27)   1   Mary: I thought maybe it was his first day back
    2   'cause he was in on Monday,
    3   but it turned out that he had been a week before he lost his badge. ((laughs))
    4   but isn't that typical?
    5   and I'm walking over to Roseanna's desk to hand it to her,
    6   he was in the room.
    7   she goes, it's a good thing I didn't find it,
    8   I'd walking around the whole building with it. ((laughs))

9	Susan:	are you?
10		he lost it in the file lab one time,
11		and people hid it, y'know **and**. ((laughs))
12	Mary:	poor guy.
13	Susan:	yeah. (LSWEC-AC 128701)[12]

The final *and* implies that "there is more to be said about the topic" (Norrick 2009: 321), which Susan assumes to be shared with Mary as signaled by the discourse marker *y'know*. Norrick (2009: 321) maintains that "[c]learly, final conjunctions can suggest certain sorts of stances, particularly within the realm of shared knowledge, while they round out a turn".

These utterances with the subordinating *and* can be regarded as a kind of suspended (or insubordinate) clause with the following clause unstated (Ohori 1995, 2000a; Evans 2007). It communicates a unique interpersonal meaning or a certain communicative stance which would not arise in a complete coordinate sentence: that is, a speaker entrusts the interlocutor(s) with a further inference.

The next example illustrates another interpersonal function of final *and*. The conjunction leaves an implication hanging, but it also serves to keep a conversation going in a more cooperative and collaborative way. Tannen (1990: 204–205) regards this cooperative use of final *and* as a kind of device for creating rapport, though observing that it is typically accompanied by overlapping. There are also examples of cooperative *and* which do not overlap with the interlocutor's utterance. In (28), Annette supports Alice's previous utterance by offering another option when going out. The final *and* is used here as a "turn-transition device" (Schiffrin 1987: 148) and is intended to invite Alice's further continuation:

(28)	1	ALICE:	… What are you just gonna do,
	2		hang out and watch movies and [stuff]?
	3	ANNETTE:	[Oh],
	4		probably get something to eat **and**,
	5	ALICE:	… Why don't you do something
			really .. reasonable [for dinner].
	6	ANNETTE:	[<HI Well that's HI> inex]pensive.
	7	ALICE:	What?
	8	ANNETTE:	That's inexpensive. (SBC043 *Try a Couple Spoonfuls*)

The *and* helps establish an interpersonal connection and create rapport in a conversation. A sense of rapport suggested here would be less likely to be communicated without the conjunction, whose original function is to combine the preceding linguistic unit with the upcoming one. By refraining from saying what

---

12. This example is taken from the London Spoken and Written English Corpus (LSWEC-AC).

would follow the *and,* the speaker tactfully gives the interlocutor a chance to take a new turn, an illustration of collaborative work in a conversation.[13]

4.2   Truncation type of final *but*

Mulder and Thompson (2006, 2008) and Mulder, Thompson and Williams (2009) evince that American English has only the truncation type of final *but*, which they call "final 1 *but*" or "final hanging *but*". They argue that the backshift type of final *but* ("final 2 *but*" or "final particle *but*") is characterized as "a distinctive feature of Spoken Australian English" (Mulder & Thompson 2008: 193).

The truncation type of final *but* may be less "fully-developed" (Mulder & Thompson 2008: 192) as a final particle than the backshift type in that it leaves an implication hanging and does not completely manifest sentence-final prosody. However, it approximates a function of final particles because it is deployed as an interpersonal communicative device for fine-tuning the impact of the immediate linguistic unit upon the interlocutor(s), which is a function specifically reserved for the right periphery of a sentence (Waltereit & Detges 2012). Such an interactive function is not available in an unmarked inter-clausal position, where the function of clause-combining is generally expected. In this respect, the truncation-type of final *but* can be analyzed as a kind of final particle.

A speaker using this type of final *but* typically intends to leave something as an implication, whether it is contextually salient or not. Examples (29) and (30),

---

13. There are examples where conjunctions happen to occupy final position because of an interlocutor's interruption. In (i), *and* in line 6 would appear to be a final coordinating conjunction, but it is more plausible to consider that the speaker stopped her utterance because she noticed that her interlocutor was going to take his turn as he started saying "yeah".

(i)	1	LUCY:	[Mhm],
	2		.. (H) But,
	3		.. they had.. big meetings.
	4		… And,
	5		these people never bothered to go to the meetings.
	6		To find out exactly what they would be [doing] **and**.
	7	JOHN:	[Yeah].
	8		Well y- I c- –
	9		Some people just get s[tubborn].	(SBC049 *Noise Pollution*)

As Norrick (2009: 322) aptly observes, the status of such a final conjunction is "questionable on closer inspection", because the speaker does not intend to place it in final position. Since the present study is concerned with a speaker's intentional or strategic use of final conjunctions,

which are also cited in Mulder and Thompson (2008: 189), illustrate examples where the implication is obvious in each context:

(29) 1 RICKIE: I don't think he would do anythi=ng,
      2   … when people are around.
      3 REBECCA: [Right].
      4 RICKIE: [You know],
      5   down at the other seat[2s or ⟨X in2] back X⟩,
      6 REBECCA: [2Right2].
      7 RICKIE: I could scream **but**,
      8   .. (H)
      9 REBECCA: Yeah.   (SBC008 *Tell the Jury that*)

(30) 1 ANNETTE: why waste money on … a hot dog,
      2   when I,
      3   or %,
      4   on .. food when I could just eat a hot dog.
      5   So I had two of em,
      6   and I mean the first one kinda tasted pretty [good?
      7 ALICE: [@@@@@@ (H)]
      8 ANNETTE: (H) And I ate the other one,
      9   then half of the other one],
      10   it was like,
      11   whoah=.
      12 ALICE: .. [Yeah].
      13 ANNETTE: [I don't l]ike hot dogs that well **but**,
      14   … and then we had cake. (SBC043 *Try a Couple Spoonfuls*)

In (29), Rebecca is a lawyer and Rickie is a witness to testify in a criminal trial. In line 7, the final *but* invites the implication that screaming would have been of no use in the situation. Rebecca's response *yeah* indicates her understanding of the implication. The *but* communicates Rickie's reluctance to continue her speech, but also suggests her reliance on Rebecca, trying to seek understanding of the situation. In (30), Annette is talking to her mother Alice about a lunch party for the "customer appreciation day". She said that she ate two hotdogs, but in line 13 she admitted that hotdogs were not her favorite food. As Mulder and Thompson (2008: 185) explain, the final *but* forms a concessive subordinate clause, whose main clause is left unstated: 'even though she does not like hot dogs that well, (she ate these two anyway)'. The implication left hanging is already given in line 5.

Similarly in (31), an example also discussed in Norrick (2009: 326), Kathy is helping her boyfriend Nathan with his study of math. In line 2 Nathan expresses his concern about whether Kathy is tired or not. She is first honest to disclose her current physical state and responds, *I mean kind of*, which indicates that she is

kind of tired. However, she ends with *but*, which modifies the orientation of the foregoing statement and implicates that she is not really tired. The fact that she entertains this implication is clarified in line 5, where she asks why he is going to go home.

(31)	1	NATHAN:	… Okay.
	2		… Are you tired?
	3	KATHY:	… ⟨P N=ot really.
			… I mean kind of **but**,
	4	NATHAN:	… I'm gonna go home in just a few minutes.
	5	KATHY:	Why P⟩.
	6	NATHAN:	.. (H) Cause I can work on this .. at home,
	7		and let you get some sleep. (SBC009 *Zero Equals Zero*)

This property of leaving an implication hanging is often exploited in formulaic expressions such as *excuse me but…*, *sorry but…*, *yeah but…*, *that's true but …*, etc.

The next conversation contains two examples of final *but*. In this case, the clauses ending with the *but*s behave like parentheticals, which add certain reservation to the ongoing argument. Lajuan and his friend are talking about their own experiences about gay men. In the excerpt below Lajuan is talking about his ex-boyfriends Ron and Darren. He seems to be more attracted to Ron, saying that he is perfect and beautiful. In so doing, he tries to keep a balanced view of the two ex-boyfriends, thus inserting a clause with final *but* when he is describing Ron's good points:

(32)	1	LAJUAN:	And that's how I ended up with ~Ron,
	2		and how I ended up with ~Darren.
	3		And I and I realize that,
	4		(H) you know I always think well,
	5		especially ~Ron.
	6		I mean ⟨% he= was just like %⟩,
	7		.. oh,
	8		.. just .. perfect.
	9		Well ~Darren was too **but**,
	10		(H) ~Darren,
	11		(H) a lot of people don't like auburn hair or reddish brown hair.
	12		They don't .. ca- care for it.
	13		But ~Ron just is just a- –
	14		.. (H) just a beautiful man.
	15		They both were **but**,
	16		(H) I find that that's what happens in these fraternities.

(SBC044 *He knows*)

While Lajuan is commending on how perfect Ron is, he also mentions that Darren was too in line 9. The *but* implicates that Darren's perfection may be spoiled by his auburn hair, which he later remarks in lines 11 and 12. Likewise in line 15, after saying that Ron is a beautiful man, Lajuan adds that both of the ex-boyfriends were beautiful. Given his great praise for Ron, the final *but* induces us to infer that Darren might be less attractive to him.

The following two examples illustrate a further development into final particles. The final *but*s in both examples complete the utterances. The period following *but* indicates that "transitional continuity is understood as *final* in a given language" (DuBois et al. 1993: 54, emphasis in original), which is typically realized in English as final falling intonation contour. In (33), an example discussed in Norrick (2009: 326), Dana wants to use a container for sugar, though she knows that it is basically for something else. Since the container is actually a gift from Kelly, Dana is asking for a permission to use for another purpose using the utterance with final *but* in line 9. Kelly's response (*that's okay*) in line 10 clearly signals that she allows her to use it for sugar. The implication hanging here is paraphrased as 'although it is not really for sugar, may I use it for sugar?' Norrick (2009: 326) observes that the final *but* "transforms a statement into a request for consent". This function of changing speech act types is one of the characteristics of final particles. In Japanese, for example, the addition of the sentence-final particle *-ka* transforms a statement into a question. A similar function is also performed by question tags in English.

(33)	1	KELLY:	… This is cute.
	2		who brought this.
	3	DANA:	… I did.
	4	KELLY:	… Oh really?
	5		… Oh yeah.
	6		I think I ⟨@ remember unpacking it @⟩.
	7		… @@
	8		… @@
	9	DANA:	It's not really for sugar **but**.
	10	KELLY:	… That's okay.
	11		It's .. basically for crea=m?
	12		… I won't tell. (SBC050 *Just Wanna Hang*)

(34) illustrates a case where an implication suggested by *but* is less obvious. While Julie is showing Gary around her ranch, she starts explaining about her stallion, which she failed to breed with a mare the other day. However, she also says that she will not have to worry about him. After saying that he has a pretty coat, she adds that he is also real even tempered. Since she continues to talk about his success in having his first foal, the final *but* in line 7 does not seem to implicate

some negative inference contrasting with the foregoing clause. Instead, the *but* is used in final position just as a signal of providing supplementary or additional information for the preceding argument. This function is similar to the parenthetical use of final *but* as seen in (32), but in this case the implication evoking function is weaker.[14]

(34) 1 GARY: .. ⟨@ A gay stallion @⟩.
      2 JULIE: … Oh I said,
      3   <VOX well,
      4   that way at least I don't have to worry VOX> about gelding him.
      5   And he'll keep= his pretty coat,
      6   you know we just won't worry about him.
      7   … And he's real even tempered **but**.
      8   % We just had his first foal.
      9   He did manage to breed my old mare last year.
     10   But she's r=eally experienced.

<div align="right">(SBC056 What is a Brand Inspection?)</div>

The function of presenting supplementary or additional information is likewise attested with Japanese *-kedo*, which developed into a final particle from the use of a connective particle (subordinating conjunction) in a suspended clause. Shirakawa (2009: 29) calls this function of final *-kedo* as "presenting reference information". For example, the utterance *kaigi-ga owarimasita-**kedo*** 'the meeting has finished but' is presented as reference information in the ongoing discourse (Shirakawa 2009: 30). The speaker provides the information so that the interlocutor can refer to it for his/her further communicative act. A contrastive implication is not necessarily expected here. Since final particles essentially have the interpersonal function of presenting information to an interlocutor with a certain attitude (Saji 1957; Matsumura 1971; Sakuma 1983; Nakano 1992, 1995, inter alia), the function of presenting supplementary or additional information as well as the final falling prosody leads us to consider that the final *but* in (34) shows a further development into a final particle.

---

14. This final *but* might implicate some opposition between the stallion's effeminate nature of being even tempered and its masculinity which gets him to have his first foal. Or it may be used as a kind of topic changer, which is used to wind up a sentence and move on to the next topic (Toshiaki Komura, personal communication).

5. From functional subordinators to final particles

5.1 The rise of an interpersonal function in final coordinators

In the preceding discussion we have seen that final coordinators gain a new function or meaning, which they could not express in compound sentences. The following functions have been attested in our investigation of spontaneous conversations in American English.

- (a) Inviting an inference or leaving an implication hanging
- (b) Inviting an interlocutor's utterance
- (c) Transforming the kind of speech act
- (d) Presenting additional or supplementary information in discourse

Many examples of the truncation type of final *and* or *but* have the meaning of hanging implication in (a). By withholding a subsequent clause, a speaker entrusts the interlocutor(s) with drawing a further inference from the foregoing clause. As demonstrated in Section 4, the structures [X *and*] and [X *but*] are functionally similar to suspended clauses (or insubordinate clauses). Ohori argues that "suspended clauses have their own discourse functions that are not manifest in a non-suspended version" (1995: 216) and claims in his later article that suspended clause constructions "embody particular procedures for interpretation, namely preference for inference-intensive readings and reinforcement of inter-personal functions" (2000a: 478). The truncation of a compound sentence generally rests on a speaker's presupposition of background knowledge shared with the interlocutor (Norrick 2009: 320) and relies on the interlocutor's ability to make an inference expected by the speaker. In this respect, inviting an interlocutor to infer an implication is a kind of interpersonal function.

This interpersonal function is more evident in the three other uses of final *and* or *but*. First, inviting an interlocutor's utterance in (b) is an oft-used strategy for the interactive and collaborative building of a conversation. Transforming one kind of speech act to another in (c) changes the influence of an utterance on an interlocutor. Final conjunctions are also used to change the degree or strength of illocutionary force, as discussed by Norrick (2009: 325). Finally, presenting additional or supplementary information in discourse in (d) presupposes a speaker's estimation of the interlocutor's mental representation of the information being provided in a conversation. This function is often realized by final particles in some languages, for example Japanese final particles *-yo*, *-ne*, *-sa*, and others (Nakano 1992, 1995) and is also communicated by final particles developing from connective particles (subordinating conjunctions) such as *-kedo* and *-kara* (Shirakawa 2009).

These interpersonal functions allow us to see the truncation type of final *and* and *but* as final particles or at least subspecies of them. In fact, many researchers of Japanese, a language having final particles in the grammatical repertoires, emphasize interpersonal aspects of the particles: "the function of appeal to the interloctuor(s)" (Sakuma 1983: 59, our translation, cf. Fujiwara 1982), "an indicator of a speaker-addressee relationship" (Suzuki 1976: 60, our translation), and "affixes for closing up an epistemic gap between a speaker and addressee" (Chin 1987: 93, our translation). Such interpersonal aspects pertain to the nature of final position, because it is the final locus for a speaker's manipulating the ongoing utterance. In other words, final position "offers the speaker a last chance to modify the current utterance" (Norrick 2009: 328) and allows him/her to carry out a last-minute strategy for changing the impact of an illocutionary force on the interlocutor(s).

One more important interpersonal feature of final particles is that they signal "turn-transition point" or indicate a possible position of "turn-yielding" (Mulder & Thompson 2008: 188). Even in languages without grammaticalized final particles, such interpersonal functions are often realized in the right-peripheral position of a sentence (Mittwoch 1979; Haselow 2011). Although the truncation type of final coordinator, unlike the backshift type, neither explicitly marks the utterance as a finish nor indicates that it is semantically complete by itself, one can safely say that it is closer to the status of final particles as a turn yielding marker with a different kind of interpersonal function. We have seen that some examples of [X *but*] end with final falling prosody and are less likely to be felt as inviting an inference. Such examples of final *but* are moving one step forward in the development into a final particle.

5.2 Inference-evoking, turn-yielding, and dependency

As discussed in 2.2, one of the major sources of Japanese final particles is connective particles (subordinating conjunctions) (Fujiwara 1986; Shirakawa 2009). The conjunctions occupy clause-final position and form the structure of suspended (or insubordinate) clauses. As conventionalization proceeds, some suspended clauses have lost the meaning of hanging implications and come to acquire some new discourse-pragmatic meanings such as emphatic or emotive meaning (Izutsu & Izutsu 2014b). Although *and* and *but* as functional subordinators have not undergone such a degree of conventionalization, they are getting closer to final particles because of their shift from textual to interpersonal orientations.

Ohori (1995, 2000a) argue that Japanese suspended clauses (insubordinate clauses) form a construction different from complete complex sentences and functionally favor inference-intensive readings. Since suspended clauses invite an inference and their subordinators serve as a turn-yielding cue, the subordinators are viewed as behaving like final particles in terms of their interpersonal functions as well as the position they occupy in sentences.

Section 3 has revealed that the truncation type of final *and* and *but* can have a terminal bracketing function and the foregoing clause communicates more subordinate or background information than the following one, which leads us to conclude that such final *and* and *but* are a kind of left-subordinating coordinator or functional subordinator. When truncation occurs in sentences with functional subordinators, we can see a parallelism between suspended clauses and clauses terminated by the functional subordinators *and* and *but* especially in inference-evoking and turn-yielding functions. We argued elsewhere (Izutsu & Izutsu 2014a) that the backshift type of *but*, which is observed in Australian English or other varieties of English (e.g. *Nice day, but*), undergoes a development into a final particle. As discussed in this paper, the characteristics of subordinators which *and* and *but* have irregularly attained help open another developmental pathway from coordinators to final particles or at least subspecies of final particles.

A question now arises: why do clause-final subordinators and functional subordinators have such inference-evoking and turn-yielding functions, which make them suitable as potential candidates of final particles? We assume that one of the reasons lies in their function of marking semantic as well as syntactic dependency on the main clauses. In its unmarked use, a subordinate clause is neither structurally autonomous nor semantically complete; it always presupposes the presence or continuation of the other clause. Even if a main clause is not mentioned, the presupposition that some relevant information will ensue still encourages an interlocutor to seek for an implication or inference. The interlocutor tries to find out what will follow a suspended clause. This tacit speaker-interlocutor interaction through the use of clause-final subordinators and functional subordinators give them an interpersonal function typical of final particles.

This kind of function is of course found with subordinate clauses in head-initial languages like English as well. Since subordinators in those languages occupy clause-initial position, their development into final particles is not likely. However, coordinators such as *and* and *but* could serve a terminal-bracketing function and play a role of functional subordinators. They lean toward final particles like connective particles (or subordinating conjunctions) in head-final languages like Japanese.

6. Conclusion

Mulder & Thompson (2008) insightfully point to the functional as well as formal parallelism between the development of the hanging type of final *but* and the final particalization of the Japanese subordinator *-kedo*: *Sakebukoto-wa dekita-**kedo**,…* (*I could scream **but**, …*). One of our earlier papers argued, pace Mulder, Thompson,

and therefore do not form a continuum (Izutsu & Izutsu 2014a). Nevertheless, we do agree with them that the hanging (truncation) type of final *but* in American English is now leaning toward the status of sentence-final particle.

The present article has hopefully demonstrated that some examples of the truncation type of *but* (and the same type of *and* as well) behave like final particles if they have acquired a terminal bracketing function and served as functional subordinators in natural discourse. Making some reasonable consideration of their formal, semantic, and functional similarities to Japanese suspended clauses ending with *-kara* 'because' and *-kedo* 'though', we argued that the structures of [X *and*] and [X *but*] communicate some interpersonal functions and that the final *and* and *but* play the role of turn-transition device. Although the truncation type of final *and* and *but* exhibits a lesser degree of finality compared with the backshift type, these interpersonal functions are edging them closer to the status of final particles in spoken American English.

Keys to abbreviations

ACC	accusative
ADV	adverbial form
COMP	complementizer
CP	connective particle
DAT	dative
FN	formal noun
FP	final particle
GEN	genitive
HON	honorific
NOM	nominative
PAST	past tense
SUB	subordinator
TOP	topic
Q	question

References

Abraham, Werner. 1991. The grammaticization of the German modal particles. In *Approaches to Grammaticalization, vol. II*, Elizabeth Closs Traugott & Bernd Heine (eds), 331–380. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Barth-Weingarten, Dagmar & Couper-Kuhlen, E. 2002. On the development of final *though*. In

Studies in Interactional Linguistics [Studies in Discourse and Grammar 14], Margret Selting & Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen (eds), 345–61. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Brinton, Laurel J. 1992. The historical present in Charlotte Bronte's novels: Some discourse functions. *Style* 26(2): 221–244.

Chin, J. 1987. Syuujoshi: Hanashite-to kikite-no ninshiki-no gyappu-o umeru-tameno bunsetsuji. *Nihongogaku* 6(10): 93–109.

Christofer, Michael. 1996. *Koi-ni Ochite (Falling in Love)* [Kadokawa Script Book Series]. Tokyo: Kadokawa.

Culicover, Peter W. & Jackendoff, Ray. 1997. Semantic subordination despite syntactic coordination. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28(2): 195–217.

Davison, Alice. 1979. Some mysteries of subordination. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 9(1): 105–128.

Du Bois, John W., Schuetze-Coburn, Stephan, Cumming, Susanna & Paolino, Danae. 1993. Outline of discourse transcription. In *Talking Data: Transcription and Coding in Discourse Research*, Jane A. Edwards & Martin D. Lampert (eds), 45–89. Hillsdale NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Du Bois, John W., Chafe, Wallace L., Meyer, Charles & Thompson, Sandra A. 2000. *Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English*, Part One. Philadelphia PA: Linguistic Data Consortium. ⟨http://www.linguistics.ucsb.edu/research/ santa-barbara-corpus⟩

Du Bois, John W., Chafe, Wallace L., Meyer, Charles, Thompson, Sandra A. & Martey, Nii. 2003. *Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English*, Part Two. Philadelphia PA: Linguistic Data Consortium. ⟨http://www.linguistics.ucsb.edu/research/santa-barbara-corpus⟩

Du Bois, John W. & Englebretson, Robert. 2004. *Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English*, Part Three. Philadelphia PA: Linguistic Data Consortium. ⟨http://www.linguistics.ucsb.edu/research/santa-barbara-corpus⟩

Du Bois, John W., & Englebretson, Robert. 2005. *Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English*, Part Four. Philadelphia PA: Linguistic Data Consortium. ⟨http://www.linguistics.ucsb.edu/research/santa-barbara-corpus⟩

Evans, Nicolas. 2007. Insubordination and its uses. In *Finiteness: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations*, Irina Nikolaeva (ed.), 366–431. Oxford: OUP.

Fujiwara, Yoichi. 1982. *Hoogen Bunmatsushi 'Bunmatsujoshi' no Kenkyuu (Joo)*. Tokyo: Shunyoodoo.

Fujiwara, Yoichi. 1986. *Hoogen Bunmatsushi 'Bunmatsujoshi' no Kenkyuu (Ge)*. Tokyo: Shunyoodoo.

Haselow, Alexander. 2011. Discourse marker and modal particle: The functions of utterance-final *then* in spoken English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43: 3603–3623. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2011.09.002

Haspelmath, Martin. 2007. Coordination. In *Language Typology and Linguistic Description,* II: *Complex Constructions*, 2nd edn, Timothy Shopen (ed.), 1–51. Cambridge: CUP.

Hooper, Joan B. & Thompson, Sandra A. 1973. On the applicability of root transformations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4(4): 465–197.

Izutsu, Katsunobu & Izutsu, Mitsuko Narita. 2012. Exaptation and adaptation: Two historical routes to final particles. A paper presented at the 45th Annual Meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea, Stockholm University, August 2012.

Izutsu, Katsunobu & Izutsu, Mitsuko Narita. 2013. From discourse markers to modal particles: Where the position reveals about the continuum. In *Discourse Markers and Modal Particles: Categorization and Description,* Liesbeth Degand, Bert Cornillie & Paoala Pietrandrea (eds), 217–235. Leuven: University of Louvain.

Izutsu, Mitsuko Narita & Izutsu, Katsunobu. 2014a. Truncation and backshift: Two pathways to final hanging *but* in American English... *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 15(1): 92–122.

Izutsu, Mitsuko Narita & Izutsu, Katsunobu. 2014b. 'Leap' or 'continuum'?: Grammaticalization pathways from conjunctions to sentence-final particles. In *Language and Creative Mind*, Mike Borkent, Barbara Dancygier & Jennifer Hinnell (eds), 83–99. Stanford CA: CSLI.

Mann, William C. & Thompson, Sandra A. 1987. *Rhetorical Structure Theory: A Theory of Text Organization*, USC Information Sciences Institute, Technical Report ISI/RS-87-190.

Masuoka, Takashi. 1997. *Fukubun*. Tokyo: Kurosio.

Matsumura, Akira (ed.). 1971. *Nihon Bunpoo Daijiten.* Tokyo: Meijishoin.

Matthiessen, Christian M.I.M. & Thompson, Sandra A. 1988. The structure of discourse and 'subordination.' In *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse* [Typological Studies in Language 18], John Haiman & Sandra A. Thompson (eds), 275–329. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Minami, Fujio. 1974. *Gendai Nihongo-no Koozoo*. Tokyo: Taishukan.

Minami, Fujio. 1993. *Gendai Nihongo Bunpoo-no Rinkaku.* Tokyo: Taishukan.

Mittwoch, Anita. 1979. Final parentheticals with English questions – Their illocutionary function and grammar. *Journal of Pragmatics* 3: 401–412. DOI: 10.1016/0378-2166(79)90016-X

Mulder, Jean & Thompson, Sandra A. 2006. The Grammaticization of *but* as a final particle in English conversation. In *Selected Papers From the 2005 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society*, Keith Allan (ed.), 1–18. ⟨http://www.als.asn.au⟩

Mulder, Jean & Thompson, Sandra A. 2008. The grammaticization of *but* as a final particle in English conversation. In *Crosslinguistic Studies of Clause Combining: The Multifunctionality of Conjunctions* [Typological Studies in Language 80], Ritva Laury (ed), 179–204. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Mulder, Jean, Thompson Sandra A. & Williams, Cara Penny. 2009. Final *but* in Australian English Conversation. In *Comparative Studies in Australian and New Zealand English: Grammar and Beyond* [Varieties of English around the World G39], Pam Peters, Peter Collins & Adam Smith (eds), 339–359. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Nakano, N. 1992. "Ne"-to "yo"-no hataraki-nitsuite. *Bulletin of the Faculty of Education, Yamaguchi University* 41(1): 1–18.

Nakano, N. 1995. Shuujoshi "*sa*"-to "*na*"-no hataraki-nitsuite. In *Tsukishima Hiroshi Hakushi Koki Kinen Kokugogaku Ronsyuu*, Tsukishima Hiroshi Hakushi Koki Kinenkai (ed.), 1063–1085. Tokyo: Kyukoshoin.

Noda, Naoshi, Masuoka, Takashi, Sakuma, Mayumi & Takubo, Yukinori. 2002. *Fukubun-to Danwa*. Tokyo: Iwanami.

Norrick, Neil R. 2009. Conjunctions in final position in everyday talk. In *Language in Life, and a Life in Language: Jacob Mey – A Festschrift*, Bruce Fraser & Ken Turner (eds), 319–328. Bingley: Emerald.

Ohori, Toshio. 1995. Remarks on suspended clauses: A contribution to Japanese phraseology. In *Essays in Semantics and Pragmatics: In Honor of Charles J. Fillmore* [Pragmatics & Beyond New Series 32], Masayoshi Shibatani & Sandra A. Thompson (eds), 201–218. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ohori, Toshio. 2000a. Framing effects in Japanese non-final clauses: Toward an optimal grammar-pragmatics interface. *BLS* 23: 471–480.

Ohori, Toshio. 2000b. Gengochishiki-toshite-no koobun: Fukubun-no ruikeiron-ni-mukete. In *Ninchigengogaku-no Hatten*, Shigeru Sakahara (ed.), 281–315. Tokyo: Hituzi.

Ozaki, Makoto & Saeki, Namie. 1991. *Hachigatsu-no Kujira (The Whales of August)*: *English-Japanese Screen Library 6*. Tokyo: Nanundoo.

Quirk, Randolph, Greenbaum, Sidney, Leech, Geoffrey & Svartvik, Jan. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

Reinhart, Tanya. 1984. Principles of gestalt perception in the temporal organization of narrative texts. *Linguistics* 22: 779–809.

Ross, Eric & Groom, Winston. 1996. *Foresuto Ganpu: Ichigo Ichie (Forest Gump)* [Kadokawa Script Book Series]. Tokyo: Kadokawa.

Sakuma, Kanae. 1983. *Gendai Nihongohoo-no Kenkyuu*, rev. edn. Tokyo: Kurosio.

Saji, Keizo. 1957. Shuujoshi-no Kinoo. *Kokugokokubun* 26(7): 23–31.

Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: CUP. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511611841

Shirakawa, Hiroyuki. 2009. *'Iisashibun' no Kenkyuu*. Tokyo: Kuroshio.

Suzuki, Hideo. 1976. Gendai nihongo-niokeru syuujoshi-no hataraki-to sono soogo shoosetsu-nitsuite. *Kokugo-to Kokubungaku* 53(11): 58–70.

Takahashi, Taro. 1993. Shooryaku-niyotte dekita jutsugo keishiki. *Nihongogaku* 9(12): 18–26.

Tannen, Deborah. 1990. *You just don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation*. New York NY: HarperCollins.

Thompson, Sandra A. 1987. "Subordination" and narrative event structure. In *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse* [Typological Studies in Language 11], Russell S. Tomlin (ed.), 435–454. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Thompson, Sandra A. & Longacre, Robert E. 1985. Adverbial clauses. In *Language Typology and Syntactic Description,* II: *Complex Constructions*, Timothy Shopen (ed.), 171–234. Cambridge: CUP.

Tomlin, Russell S. 1985. Foreground-background information and the syntax of subordination. *Text* 5(1–2): 85–122.

Waltereit, Richard & Detges, Ulrich. 2012. *Moi, je ne sais pas* vs. *je ne sais pas, moi*: French disjoint pronouns in the left vs. right periphery. Abstract of a paper presented at Newcastle/Northumbria Joint Linguistics and Language Sciences Research Day, Northumbria University, January 2012.

Yoda, Yusuke. 2010. Sore wa Hontooni Tooikoozo? *Nihongo Nihonbunka Kenkyuu* 20: 65–75.