

Special issue on fragments: construction and reconstruction

Fragments: a usage-based view¹

YOLANDA FERNÁNDEZ-PENA 

Universidade de Vigo

GUNTHER KALTENBÖCK

Karl-Franzens Universität Graz

and

JAVIER PÉREZ-GUERRA 

Universidade de Vigo

(Received 17 May 2024)

1 Introduction: aim and scope of the special issue

Fragments constitute a pervasive characteristic of everyday language use, particularly, but not only, in spoken language. Fernández & Ginzburg (2002), for instance, identified 11.15 per cent of all utterances in a subcorpus of the *British National Corpus* (Burnard 2000) as fragments. Given their ubiquitous nature, fragments have, however, been surprisingly neglected in previous research. The aim of the special issue is therefore to move them further centre-stage and contribute to the linguistic characterisation of fragments in Present-Day English by combining empirical and theoretical perspectives.

One reason why fragments have garnered comparatively little attention is the unclear definition of the term itself, on which there has been no consensus in the literature. As will be reported in section 2, various terms have been used to refer to the same linguistic phenomenon: irregular sentences, non-sentences and non-sentential utterances, among others. We have chosen the term ‘fragment’ in this special issue for its widespread use and transparency.

Fragments are taken here as linguistic units which are functionally (semantically, discursively, communicatively) felicitous, although intonationally and syntactically independent and non-canonical (non-sentential) (see Haegeman 1991; Bowie & Aarts

¹ We would like to express our deepest gratitude to all the contributors, who made this special issue possible. We also thank those colleagues who acted as external reviewers and from whose valuable comments and insightful suggestions both the editors and the authors have benefited greatly. Thanks are also due to the editorial team of *English Language and Linguistics*, in particular Bernd Kortmann, for their interest in this project from the very beginning and their support at various stages in the preparation of the special issue. Finally, Yolanda Fernández-Pena and Javier Pérez-Guerra gratefully acknowledge funding from MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 (grant PID2020-117541GB-I00, project *Fragments: Constructionalising Non-Canonical Expressions in Written English*) and Xunta de Galicia (grant no. ED431C 2021/52).

2016; Hall 2019). Typical examples of fragments to be discussed in this issue are thus the following (for further illustrations, see also section 2):

- (1) **Better not to pretend it is an option.** ('All we want', *The Economist*, 26 November 2022)
- (2) (A: Hurry up with the scissors Pauly.)
B: **Why the rush?** (BNC1994 DS: KD0 499)
- (3) (What would you go for?) **Not alcohol.** (COCA 2018 MOV)
- (4) **Last I recall**, you were studying the law. (COCA 2017 TV: TURN:Washington'sS...)
- (5) (B: They do my German tea, so...)
C: **What German tea?** (LLC-2)

This special issue provides an up-to-date overview of current research on the topic. The unifying framework adopted for the individual contributions is that of a usage-based approach (e.g. Langacker 2000; Bybee 2023). As alluded to in the title of the issue (viz. *Fragments: construction and reconstruction*), the focus is on questions such as the status of fragments as a potentially independent grammatical unit (i.e. a 'construction') and their 'construction' over time into conventional form–meaning pairs as well as their relationship to 'complete' constructions (i.e. 'reconstruction'). In line with its usage-based orientation, the special issue also adopts a corpus-based methodology, providing qualitative as well as quantitative analyses of naturally occurring language data. Each contribution thus brings together, in its own unique way, two perspectives, viz. (grammatical) form and (situational, pragmatic) function, and investigates the dynamic relationship between them.

More specifically, the contributions address one or more of the following interrelated research questions:

- (i) Why do speakers use fragments? Unlike generative theories of fragments, which are mainly preoccupied with their form, the usage-based outlook takes into account their discourse functions in equal measure. This includes the question of what determines the choice between a fragment and a full sentence (an underexplored question according to Lemke 2021: 3). See Fernández-Pena & Pérez-Guerra's and Haselow's contributions.
- (ii) How are fragments used in discourse? This question relates to the discourse functions of fragments and their use in different registers and text types (e.g. Bowie & Aarts 2016). Cappelle's and Mustafa & Kaltenböck's articles address this issue.
- (iii) How can fragments be classified? More specifically, how can corpus data help us distinguish between different types and develop taxonomies of fragments (e.g. Fernández *et al.* 2007; Bowie & Aarts 2016; Fernández-Pena 2021)? Various parameters of categorisation come into play here, such as their communicative functions, degrees of independence from the co(n)text, and degrees of conventionalisation, i.e. whether we are dealing with fully conventionalised fragments or cases of spontaneous ellipsis. See the contributions by Fernández-Pena & Pérez-Guerra and Kim.
- (iv) How can fragments be modelled in a usage-based framework? Drawing on the findings from corpus data, many contributions consider how they can be

generalised and incorporated into a grammatical model, particularly a constructionist account. Kim's article addresses this question, and also Mustafa & Kaltenböck's and Nykiel & Pöldvere's.

In the remainder of this introduction, we look at these and related questions in more detail, attempting to give a brief overview of some of the pertinent topics in the research on fragments. Section 2 presents different definitions and classifications of fragments. Section 3 discusses their discourse functions, while section 4 surveys different approaches to the modelling of fragments in grammatical theory. Section 5, finally, provides an overview of the individual contributions to the volume.

2 What are fragments? Definitions and classifications

As already mentioned, prior research on fragmentary utterances lacks a comprehensive and exhaustive definition of these structures, as well as a fine-grained classification. The term 'fragment' itself denoting a 'part broken off or otherwise detached from a whole' or a 'detached, isolated, or incomplete part' (*OED*, s.v. *fragment* 1, 2.a.), fragmentary utterances can come in many shapes and sizes. In the broadest sense of the term, many different structures can be considered to be fragmentary, in the sense that they lack a fully fledged clausal structure: from interjections (6), discourse markers (7), reaction signals (8) and other types of formulae (9) to exclamatives (10), echo questions (11), short answers (12), freestanding subordinate clauses (13) and instances where the subject and/or operator is/are elided (14).

(6) Wow. (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 853)

(7) Right. OK. (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 852)

(8) Certainly not. Absolutely. Not at all. (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 852)

(9) Congratulations. Thanks. (Biber *et al.* 1999: 1103)

(10) How cool! (Biber *et al.* 1999: 1102)

(11) (A: Yeah, we ended up coming home Saturday?

B: Are you serious?

A: Yes.)

B: **Saturday?** (Biber *et al.* 1999: 1101)

(12) (A: What did she give you?)

B: **A t-shirt.** (Huddleston & Pullum *et al.* 2002: 1542)

(13) That I should live to see such ingratitude! (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 841)

(14) Hope you're right. Never seen anything like it! (Huddleston & Pullum *et al.* 2002: 1540–1)

Prior research has mostly focused on fragments where clausal status is intended (e.g. (10)–(14) above). More specifically, the literature has explored structures (i) with varying degrees of compositionality, such as the more compositional example in (15) and the more conventionalised (though not fully idiomatic) instance in (16), (ii) with and without an explicit antecedent, such as (17) and (18) respectively, and (iii) structures which can or cannot be potentially reconstructed, such as (19) and (20) respectively.

- (15) (Benigno got into a taxi and said:) **To Segovia. To the jail.** (Stainton 2006: 96)
- (16) (We didn't have a choice, Jim.) **Not a real one. Not one that was right.** (Cappelle 2021: 71)
- (17) (A: Who did she see?)
B: **Bob Dylan.** (Harnish 2009: 252)
- (18) [Uttered by a waiter displaying a bottle of wine to customers] **From Italy.** (Hall 2019: 605)
- (19) (A: Which movie did you see?)
B: **Casablanca.** (Progovac *et al.* 2006: 2)
- (20) Me first. (Progovac *et al.* 2006: 2)

Some studies have used examples such as the last two to differentiate between fragments proper (19) and nonsententials (20), a contrast which reflects the two generative approaches adopted in the analysis of fragmentary utterances: sententialist accounts, which claim that all fragments have a silent sentential structure that can be reconstructed via ellipsis (i.e. *I-saw Casablanca* in (19)), and nonsententialist approaches, which maintain that all fragments are subsentential expressions which are enriched pragmatically to full propositions within a given context (**Me am first* in (20); see Progovac *et al.* 2006: 1 and section 4 for further information).

Apart from the previous distinction, the literature lacks an overall homogeneous treatment of these structures. Starting with comprehensive grammars, they discuss examples like the ones above as well as related structures in sections dealing with elliptical phenomena and non-canonical syntax. Quirk *et al.* (1985: 849), for instance, classify examples such as (6)–(8) as ‘nonsentences’, as they are ‘usually but not exclusively noun phrases [that] occur frequently in speech, mostly in informal conversation’. Instances of freestanding subordinate clauses and of sentences with elided subjects and/or operators ‘recoverable from the linguistic form of the sentence’, such as (13) and (14) above, are considered to be ‘FRAGMENTARY, lacking constituents that are normally obligatory’ and, hence, termed ‘irregular sentences’ (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 838; emphasis in the original). Apart from considering clausal units with ellipsis, Biber *et al.* (1999: 1099) also refer to fragmentary instances in their discussion of ‘syntactic non-clausal units’: for instance, *Not really*, *Absolutely* or *Good for you*, whose “‘fragmentary’ nature ... reflects a dependence of the message on context, explicable in general terms either by anaphoric or situational ellipsis’. However, they also point out that further ‘non-clausal material’ which ‘extends far beyond ellipsis[,] cannot be analysed in terms of clause structure [and] is not analysable as part of any neighbouring clause’ involves, among other examples, ‘sentence fragments’. This is a category which for Biber *et al.* (1999: 224–6) comprises any ‘non-clausal material in running written text’, such as headlines, captions, lists or tables. Huddleston & Pullum *et al.* (2002: 944–5), finally, apart from accounting for cases of ellipsis of various types within the clause, devote a section to what they label ‘minor sentences’. This category includes the abovementioned freestanding subordinate clauses, as well as optatives (e.g. *So be it.*), verbless directives (e.g. *Careful!*) and parallel structures (e.g. *The sooner, the better.*). Huddleston & Pullum *et al.* (2002: 855) also very briefly introduce

the concept of ‘clause fragment’ in reference to ‘various kinds of verbless construction, such as open interrogative *What about the others?* or exclamative *What a disaster!*’.

The lack of a homogeneous treatment is also evident in the broad range of terms that the literature and previous studies have used to refer to utterances lacking an overt fully-fledged clausal structure:

- (i) ‘fragmentary elliptical sentences or utterances’ (Merchant 2004);
- (ii) ‘irregular/minor sentences’ (Kline & Memering 1977; Sadock & Zwicky 1985);
- (iii) ‘nonsentential utterance types or units’ (Barton 1990; Fernández & Ginzburg 2002; Schlangen & Lascarides 2003; Barton *et al.* 2005; Culicover & Jackendoff 2005; Fernández Rovira 2006; Progovac *et al.* 2006; Fernández *et al.* 2007);
- (iv) ‘non-sentences’, ‘subsences’ (Stainton 2004, 2006; Hall 2007);
- (v) ‘reduced constructions’ (Bauer & Hoffmann 2020);
- (vi) ‘clause fragments’ (Bowie & Aarts 2016; Bowie & Popova 2019; Hall 2019), and
- (vii) ‘sentence fragments’ (Morgan 1973, 1989; Goldberg & Perek 2019).

The most recent literature on fragmentary structures of a very diverse nature has opted for the term ‘fragment’: e.g. Cappelle 2020, 2021; Lemke *et al.* 2020, 2021; Nykiel & Hawkins 2020; Fernández-Pena 2021; Goldberg & Herbst 2021; Lemke 2021; Abeillé & Kim 2022; Nykiel & Kim 2020; Fernández-Pena & Pérez-Guerra 2023, 2024 (for further information on taxonomies, see section 4).

Despite the research carried out, there is still no agreement on how to define ‘fragment’ either. In their study of clause fragments in spoken English, Bowie & Aarts (2016: 262) define them as

non-sentential units of discourse which ... depend on grammatical links to surrounding structures for their interpretation [and] make a complete contribution within their discourse context, by performing an act within the discourse (such as answering or asking a question, agreeing or disagreeing), and typically by conveying a propositional meaning.

Their definition thus excludes instances of (loosely attached) discourse markers and vocatives (e.g. *Oh, did you want to see me, Jo?*; *Okay*), incomplete utterances and free-standing constructions such as *What about Sam?* or *The sooner the better*.

Unlike previous accounts, Fernández-Pena (2021) and Fernández-Pena & Pérez-Guerra ([forthcoming](#)) propose a corpus-driven definition of ‘fragment’ based on data extracted from the British component of the *International Corpus of English* (ICE-GB; Nelson *et al.* 2002). Building on Bowie & Aarts’ (2016) study, Fernández-Pena & Pérez-Guerra ([forthcoming](#)) manually analysed a total of 9,563 fragments in samples of both spoken and written English. Their analysis resulted in a database of 957 examples of ‘valid’ fragments, a concept which Fernández-Pena & Pérez-Guerra ([forthcoming](#)) define as follows:

standalone utterances which are formally reduced, syntactically and structurally independent, hence having their own separate prosodic contour, and convey a

propositional meaning that can be taken to be semantically, discursively and pragmatically equivalent to that of the corresponding complete sentences.

Their definition accounts for examples of clausal fragments with nonfinite (21) or finite (22) verbs, Small Clauses (23) and other verbless clauses (24)–(25), *wh*-interrogatives (26) and exclamatives (27) and various types of phrasal fragments (28)–(30):

- (21) Good interception coming in from Enrique at the back (ICE-GB:S2A-010 #018:1:A)
 (22) If only she would admit it! (ICE-GB:W2F-008 #066:1)
 (23) Better go now. **Good old Hendon next stop.** (ICE-GB:W1B-003 #105:1)
 (24) **Enough about me for the moment.** (What about you?) (ICE-GB:W1B-001 #123)
 (25) Good luck to Simon for his exams! (ICE-GB:W1B-004 #111:3)
 (26) (I'll be able to have my first shorts and burgers Bar-B-Q on my balcony in no time at all.) **And why not.** (ICE-GB:W1B-002 #116:2)
 (27) (A: We're going into Kingston.)
 B: <laugh> **What a nice thought** (ICE-GB:S1A-036 #059:1:B)
 (28) (A really lovely day[.]) **Brilliant views of the bridge & bay.** (ICE-GB:W1B-011 #080:2)
 (29) (Debbie's got the clock!) **About 1 AM?** (ICE-GB:W1B-003 #046:1)
 (30) (a new era to my life-) **Quite frightening but exciting too.** (ICE-GB:W1B-014 #131:6)

Fernández-Pena & Pérez-Guerra's (*forthcoming*) definition thus encompasses structures which had already been the focus of attention of previous studies, as is the case of the (semi-)jinsubordinate constructions in (22) above and (31) below (see Kaltenböck 2016, 2021; Beijering *et al.* 2019) and the Small Clauses in (23) and (32) (see Progovac *et al.* 2006). Apart from these, previous research has also explored further fragmentary structures, such as comment clauses (33) (Brinton 2008; Kaltenböck 2013), parentheticals (34) (Dehé 2014; Griffiths 2015) and appositives (35) (Vries 2012).

- (31) Well, funny you should ask, Florence (Kaltenböck 2021: 127)
 (32) Class in session. (Progovac 2006: 33)
 (33) It was that sort of time of the year **I suppose** (Kaltenböck 2013: 286)
 (34) John will, **I fear**, be late. (Griffiths 2015: 199)
 (35) Yesterday, Joop asked Anna – **and I might add that she, who in fact loves Jaap (also a nice guy, as you will agree), didn't see this coming** – to marry him, the poor fellow. (Vries 2012: 186)

Given the scholarly attention that fragments have garnered, we can also find more recent publications on specific fragmentary constructions, such as, among others, the *coffee*-construction (36) (Heine 2011), the *nice-of-you* construction (37) (Goldberg & Herbst 2021), elliptical *turns out* (38) (Bauer & Hoffmann 2020), *not*-fragments (39) (Cappelle 2020, 2021), *me too* fragments (40) (Abeillé & Kim 2022) and *why*-fragments (41) (Fernández-Pena & Pérez-Guerra 2023, 2024):

- (36) (Gillian shook hands briskly.) 'Coffee? Tea? Do have a seat'. (Heine 2011: 57)
 (37) Nice of you to be with us today. (Goldberg & Herbst 2021: 19)

- (38) **Turns out**, I was right. (Bauer & Hoffmann 2020: 241)
- (39) (It will never happen.) **Not today. Not tomorrow. Not ever.** (Cappelle 2021: 55)
- (40) (A: I can't deal with you right now.)
B: **Me too.** (Abeillé & Kim 2022: 16)
- (41) (I mean, it was a lot of trouble to return it.) **WHY DO IT?** (Fernández-Pena & Pérez-Guerra 2023: 104)

This special issue extends the scope of previous research by including structures and issues that have so far received less attention in the literature, among others, the relationship between fragments and imperatives (42), *why*-fragments (43), Mad Magazine sentences (44), negated fragment answers (45), evidential *last I* fragments (46) and the reactive *what-X* construction (47), and by focusing particularly on their 'elliptical' nature:

- (42) What to do now? Remember that we have to discuss publication options.
- (43) Why not submit a special issue on fragments to *ELL*?
- (44) Us submit a special issue on fragments to *ELL*!
- (45) (Have you sent a proposal for a special issue before?) **Not to *ELL*.**
- (46) **Last I checked** (they required a four-page proposal).
- (47) What? A four-page proposal?

3 Why use fragments? Discourse functions

The *raison d'être* of fragments has not been at the forefront of generative approaches to language, whose main preoccupation is with form. In fact, the question why speakers use fragments rather than unreduced forms is, as noted by Lemke (2021: 243), 'almost unexplored' in this research paradigm. Especially from the perspective of more formalist, computational theories of language, the discourse function of fragments is often seen as a 'linguistic puzzle' (Schmeh *et al.* 2015), a problem which needs to be 'resolved' (Schlangen & Lascarides 2002). Incidentally, the term 'fragment' itself is liable to evoke negative connotations, as something that is 'fragmented' and thus 'incomplete' and inherently 'lacking'. And yet, language users make frequent use of such structures: as noted in the introduction, a corpus study based on a subcorpus of the *British National Corpus* (Burnard 2000) found that fragments made up 11.15 per cent of all utterances (Fernández & Ginzburg 2002). So, clearly, they must have some role to play.

Usage-based approaches to language, by comparison, are by their very nature much more at ease with linguistic phenomena such as fragments, with a clear interest also in their discourse functions. The focus of usage-based investigations is, however, not usually on the category of fragments in general but on specific constructions that may have fragmentary form. We thus find a plethora of studies dealing with the use and functions of structures such as insubordination (e.g. *If you come this way*), discourse markers or comment clauses (e.g. *I think, you know*), parentheticals (e.g. *in brief, frankly*), imperatives (e.g. *hold on!*), formulae of social exchange (e.g. *good morning*),

vocatives (e.g. *darling!*), interjections (e.g. *damn!*), exclamations (e.g. *good boy!*) and the like. A detailed discussion of these is clearly beyond the scope of this overview and we will therefore content ourselves with just a few general observations.

On a very general level, the principle seen as motivating the use of fragments, as opposed to fully fledged forms, is typically that of economy and communicative efficiency (e.g. Grice 1975; Hankamer & Sag 1976; Greenbaum & Nelson 1999: 117; Goldberg & Perek 2019: 189). Quirk *et al.* (1985: 860), in this context, argue that – all things being equal – language users follow the maxim ‘reduce as much as possible’. Such reduction may also enhance clarity ‘by reducing items which are shared as “given information”, so that attention will be focused on fresh material, or “new information”’ (ibid.), except in cases where this would lead to ambiguity. The text types which most frequently make use of such reduction are informal spoken texts, while written texts generally have a much lower incidence of fragments. In a study of the British component of the *International Corpus of English* (Nelson *et al.* 2002), for instance, Fernández-Pena (2021, 2022) found that fragments occur most frequently in the spoken text categories ‘private dialogue’ and ‘unscripted monologue’ (with 36.8 and 71.1 occurrences per 1,000 parsing units, respectively). At the same time, however, they are not uncommon in the written registers either, particularly in the category ‘correspondence’, where they have a normalised frequency of 37.3 occurrences per 1,000 parsing units (see also Greenbaum & Nelson 1999; Bowie & Aarts 2016).

While economy and clarity undoubtedly play a central role in the use of fragments, this is only one part of the story. As elliptical structures, fragments arguably also require more active involvement from the hearer, who has to ‘reconstruct’ the intended structure or meaning by filling in the ‘missing’ parts. As such, fragments may be considered more interpersonal or interactive, to the extent that they ‘draw in’ and activate the hearer. On the textual level, they also contribute to greater cohesion, to the extent that the elements or structures to be ‘recovered’ are furnished by the preceding co-text. This (typically) anaphoric orientation of the fragment establishes a cohesive link with the preceding text.

Many fragments are also extra-clausal constituents (or disjuncts) in terms of their syntactic status (e.g. Kaltenböck *et al.* 2016). In fact, fragmentary form may act as an important cue for signalling this extra-clausal status and thus their use as, what have been referred to as, theticals (e.g. Kaltenböck *et al.* 2011; Heine *et al.* 2013). Theticals are elements of sentence grammar (of varying sizes) that are being redeployed (‘coopted’) for discourse-pragmatic purposes and, as such, are syntactically, semantically and prosodically independent, positionally mobile, and may be elliptical. The communicative function of theticals has been identified as relating to the immediate ‘situation of discourse’. More specifically, this involves the dimensions text-organisation, expression of speaker attitude and speaker–hearer interaction (among others).

Many fragments have developed their own, highly specific discourse functions, often resulting from a process of conventionalisation, which can be described in terms of grammaticalisation, pragmaticalisation or constructionalisation. These functions often

distinguish them from their non-reduced counterparts and may be highly idiosyncratic to a particular fragment, in which case these structures qualify as constructions in their own right in a Construction Grammar sense (e.g. Goldberg 2006). Examples of such fragments with their own quirky (unpredictable) meaning are, for instance, insubordinate *if*-clauses, such as *If you'd like to take a seat* (e.g. Kaltenböck 2016), semi-insubordinations, such as *Funny you should say that* (e.g. Kaltenböck 2021), or *not*-fragments of the type *Not in a million years!* (e.g. Capelle 2021).

4 What is their syntactic status? Modelling fragments in grammatical theory

Most scholarly focus on fragments has been directed towards unravelling the mechanisms that elucidate their structure and meaning. As already mentioned, investigations into the structural, syntactic aspects have predominantly operated within the Generativist framework, where two contrasting theories emerge: derivational, ellipsis-based or sententialist approaches on the one hand, and non-derivational, non-ellipsis-based or non-sententialist accounts on the other. Adhering to the notion that ‘speakers mentally represent the full grammatical structure, even if they utter only fragments’ (Newmeyer 2003: 690), sententialist approaches argue that fragments possess a sentential structure that can be reconstructed through ellipsis (Hankamer 1979; Morgan 1989; Stanley 2000; Merchant 2004), as in (17) above, adapted here as (48) for convenience. From this perspective, even the absence of an explicit antecedent in the immediate context, as in (18) above, repeated here as (49), does not pose an issue as long as the extralinguistic context enables the invocation of a relevant linguistic expression that facilitates the interpretation of the fragment (Stanley 2000).

(48) [A: Who did she see?] B: **She saw Bob Dylan.** (Harnish 2009: 252)

(49) [Uttered by a waiter displaying a bottle of wine to customers] **From Italy.** (Hall 2019: 605)

Conversely, there are scholars who reject the assumption of such silent syntax and advocate instead for a non-derivational explanation of fragments, where ‘what you see is basically all the linguistic structure you get’ (Hall 2019: 605), as in (20) above, adapted here as (50). Fragments are thus considered to be generated as subsentential expressions, which are pragmatically enriched to full propositions within a given context (Barton 1990; Ginzburg & Sag 2000; Carston 2002; Barton & Progovac 2005; Progovac *et al.* 2006; Stainton 2006; Bezuidenhout 2013).

(50) Me first. [**Me am first*] (Progovac *et al.* 2006: 2)

One approach that is particularly suited for the analysis of fragments is a usage-based one, where linguistic structure is assumed to arise out of usage events (Goldberg 2006; Bybee 2010). Such a ‘bottom-up’ view of language, which does not postulate a strict separation between actual usage and speaker’s grammatical knowledge, and crucially allows for all kinds of non-sentential structures to be stored in the grammar (‘grammat-i-con’) can account not only for their grammatical status (e.g. independent constructions in their own right) but also for their diachronic development (e.g.

increasing conventionalisation). The usage-based perspective posits, among its principles, that speakers exhibit both impressive creativity and remarkable repetitiveness in their linguistic expressions (Goldberg 2013: 26). According to this view, these dynamics of creativity and repetition extend beyond the scope of individual lexical items to influence entire constructions (Van de Velde *et al.* 2015). Along these lines, a particularly promising usage-based framework for analysing multi-word patterns is Construction Grammar. As non-derivational approaches, usage-based construction grammars operate on the premise that our understanding of language is rooted in language use. According to (Cognitive) Construction Grammar, a linguistic expression is a construction if it is non-predictable (Hilpert 2019: 13) and/or sufficiently prevalent in language. In consequence, phenomena that have been traditionally attributed to ellipsis, such as fragmentary expressions, can be better explained as unique pairings of form and meaning, that is, as constructions in their own right. In Bauer & Hoffmann's (2020: 241) words, fragments can 'become entrenched in a speaker's mental grammar provided they occur with sufficient token frequency'.

To illustrate constructionalist studies on fragments, in one of the earliest publications on this topic, Heine (2011) explores the so-called *coffee* construction. She argues that instances of non-coordination-based ellipsis, such as *Coffee?*, differ from their non-reduced counterparts (*Would you like some coffee?*) in that the former (i) lack stylistic markings, being exclusively used with consumption items, and (ii) exhibit a more specific correspondence between the reduced form and its meaning. Heine (2011: 74) thus asserts that the schema *[NP?]* 'is stored as a rather independent construction in its own right, which overlaps with the full form but also displays independent features'. In a similar vein, Goldberg & Herbst (2021) delve into the *nice-of-you* construction (e.g. *It's nice of you to be worried about my health*), a pattern that instantiates a distinctive form–meaning pairing: it tends to associate with specific adjectives (e.g. *nice, good, wrong, typical*) and conveys the precise meaning of evaluation of how an action reflects on its agent. Finally, Cappelle (2021) and Abeillé & Kim (2022) are examples of constructionalist, usage-based studies of emphatic constructions. Cappelle (2021) investigates the use of emphatic negative fragments, such as *Not today!* or *Not him again!*, which he includes within the constructional schema *Not X!*. Abeillé & Kim (2022) propose a construction-based Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar account of *me too* fragments in English and French. These fragments consist of nominal remnants and additive adverbs that can be used emphatically (e.g. [A: *John left.*] B: *HIM too!*) or contrastively (e.g. [A: *John left.*] B: *Me too*). Their corpus-based study demonstrates that these fragmentary expressions exhibit various types of (person, number, gender) mismatches with respect to their antecedent clauses, may lack overt antecedents and can occur in island configurations. These findings challenge derivational approaches and thus advocate for a constructional account.

Finally, scholarly attention has also been directed towards the empirical investigation of fragments. The literature can be categorised into more qualitative analyses that depict or

classify fragments extracted from various types of English texts (e.g. plays, journals, essays) (Kline & Memering 1977; Malá 2000; Schuster 2006), as well as quantitative analyses based on corpora. In the latter category, there are studies that propose taxonomies driven by corpora (Fernández-Pena 2021), most of them utilising English oral corpora to facilitate the automatic identification and classification of fragmentary structures through Machine-Learning techniques, and/or interpret those fragments within the framework of Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar (Purver *et al.* 2001; Fernández & Ginzburg 2002; Schlangen & Lascarides 2003; Fernández Rovira 2006; Fernández *et al.* 2007). Only a limited number of corpus studies have explored the usage and/or communicative function of specific types of fragments in spoken and written English (Greenbaum & Nelson 1999; Bowie & Aarts 2016; Cappelle 2020). Finally, to the best of our knowledge, only Fernández-Pena & Pérez-Guerra (*forthcoming*) have investigated from a constructional perspective the cognitive mechanisms operating in fragments which allow them to work as alternatives in the competition between fragments and complete clauses in language.

5 The contributions to this special issue: an overview

As highlighted in the preceding sections, while there are still a number of open questions in the research on fragments, a usage-based approach can provide a useful framework for answering them. This is precisely what the six contributions to this special issue set out to do: they offer new insights into the use, discourse functions and syntactic status of English fragments based on empirical evidence provided by natural language data.

The contribution by **Bert Capelle** entitled ‘The special position of fragments and imperatives in polished prose: Data from *The Economist* editorials’ identifies fragmentary clauses in a genre where one might least expect them: in carefully edited journalistic writing, more specifically, editorials in *The Economist*. The article first highlights the formal and functional similarities between the two categories in question, i.e. fragments such as *What to do?* and imperatives such as *Take spending cuts as an example*, both of which are shorter than canonical clauses and typically have non-truth-conditional semantics. It is further shown that fragmentary clauses and imperatives also have a similar use. Rather than occurring evenly distributed in a text, both constructions tend to appear in specific, conspicuous positions: at the beginning or end of a paragraph, particularly in the second paragraph, where the writer presents a contrasting view from the opening paragraph, and in the concluding paragraph. The study thus makes a case for considering stylistic properties in the characterisation of fragments and, in doing so, for expanding our scope to broad discourse phenomena, going well beyond the boundaries of the sentence.

The study ‘A constructionalist account of *why*-fragments and Mad Magazine sentences: The “Sceptical Small” construction’ by **Yolanda Fernández-Pena** and **Javier Pérez-Guerra** focuses on *why*-fragments or WFs (*Why deal with fragments here?*) and Mad Magazine sentences or MMs (*Us deal with fragments here?*). WFs

and MMs, having a meaning and discourse function equivalent to complete (interrogative) sentences, occasionally convey an ‘enriched’ specific nuance of scepticism regarding a proposition. By analysing data retrieved from the 1994 and 2014 editions of the *British National Corpus* and the *Corpus of Contemporary American English*, Fernández-Pena and Pérez-Guerra show that, whereas WFs remain formally and semantically ‘under construction’, MMs prove to be fully conventionalised in contemporary English. Having dismissed a deletion-based explanation, the authors give support to the analysis of WFs and MMs as examples of an umbrella Sceptical Small (i.e. untensed) construction. Treating these patterns as constructions within the framework of (Cognitive) Construction Grammar allows for an account of both their non-compositional enriched interpretation and their formal (intonational, structural, syntactic) similarities.

In his contribution ‘Syntactic fragments in social interaction: A socio-cognitive approach to the syntax of conversation’ **Alexander Haselow** focuses on the reciprocal interplay of speakers in successful language-based interaction and argues that fragments play a crucial role in this. Drawing on the principles of Conversation Analysis, the article argues for a reorientation in syntactic description from a single-mind to a dual-mind view of syntax, one in which interacting speakers are not studied as isolated agents but as forming a social unit. To this end, an analytic framework labelled ‘dual-mind syntax’ is proposed, which includes a social signature in descriptions of spoken syntax, more generally, and fragments, more specifically. Accordingly, fragments are not seen as deficient or incomplete syntactic units, but, on the contrary, as resulting from a successful communicative practice which designs structures in a responsive-contingent fashion in social interaction. As such, fragments are part of a network of mutually dependent, coherent structures. Based on empirical data from the *Santa Barbara Corpus* it is further shown how speakers use fragments for coordinating actions, for collaborative structure-building, and, more generally, for contributing to the emergence of a structurally integrated, coherent whole.

Jong-Bok Kim in ‘(Negated) fragment answers in English: A discourse-oriented and construction-based perspective’ conducts a corpus-based analysis of fragment answers to *wh*-questions, such as [A: *What was his motive?*] B: *Not money*, where *not* syntactically combines with a remnant phrase. Kim examines the category of the remnant in the fragment answer (AdvP, PP, NP, AP, VP, subordinate clause), its syntactic function concerning a reconstructed propositional source (modifier, subject, object, predicative complement, oblique complement), *c/overt*ness of the antecedent question and constituent versus sentential negation in the fragmentary construction. The data, retrieved from the *Corpus of Contemporary American English*, reveal that these negated fragment answers often refer to syntactic/semantic structures of the antecedent questions and that, at times, they are associated with discourse structures that diverge from the questions. Consequently, Kim rejects a deletion-based approach and advocates a surface-oriented direct-interpretation approach couched within the framework of construction-based Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar, according to

which the status of the fragment is not clausal but a maximal phrasal category that is projected into a non-sentential utterance.

The article by **Ozan Mustafa** and **Gunther Kaltenböck** is entitled '*Last I heard: On the use of evidential last I fragments*' and investigates a fragment that has emerged only recently. It takes the elliptical form of '*last I + Verb*', as in *last I checked, last I heard*, and is evidential in meaning. Data from COCA show a steep increase in frequency for this construction in recent decades. Syntactically, these fragments are identified as disjuncts, which are positionally mobile with respect to their host clause and whose 'elliptical' form can be linked to different 'full' forms, viz. specificational sentences and temporal adjuncts. What makes these fragments interesting, apart from their relative novelty, is that their underlying evidential meaning gives rise to different discourse functions. Depending on contextual use, these range from downtoner to booster and ironic use. Fragmentary form, moreover, is shown to be more closely associated with evidential meaning than the unreduced counterparts, with reduced form thus acting as an important marker of evidentiality. Finally, it is argued that the grammatical status of these fragments is best captured by a constructional account which identifies them as constructionalising units.

In 'Ellipsis meets the reactive *what-x* construction in English', **Joanna Nykiel** and **Nele Pöldvere** offer an analysis of expressions such as [A: *but this museum is double the size of Tate Modern even with the the uh the extension*] B: *what the extension that's not open* as instances of ellipsis, whose interpretation and usage in discourse can be justified by categorising them as either 'reprise' (i.e. clarification) or 'direct' fragments. Drawing on data retrieved from the spoken London–Lund corpora, and adopting a nonsententialist approach to the study of fragments couched within Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar, Nykiel and Pöldvere describe the discursive (never discourse-initial), structural (optional *what* plus S/NP/PP/VP/CP), syntactic (matrix-clause single-tone-unit phenomenon) and semantic (non-interrogative) characteristics of the reactive *what-x* construction in British English. The construction's formal and semantic properties are accounted for by the assimilation of reactive reprise and direct *wh-x* types into, respectively, merger and sprouting strategies.

Guest editors' addresses:

Department of English, French and German
Universidade de Vigo
Campus Universitario s/n
36310 Vigo
Spain
yolanda.fernandez@uvigo.gal

Department of English
 Karl-Franzens Universität Graz
 Heinrichstraße 36, 3rd floor
 8010 Graz
 Austria
gunther.kaltenboeck@uni-graz.at

Department of English, French and German
 Universidade de Vigo
 Campus Universitario s/n
 36310 Vigo
 Spain
jperez@uvigo.gal

References

- Abeillé, Anne & Jong-Bok Kim. 2022. *Me too* fragments in English and French: A direct interpretation approach. *The Linguistic Review* 39(3), 457–94.
- Barton, Ellen L. 1990. *Nonsentential constituents: A theory of grammatical structure and pragmatic interpretation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Barton, Ellen & Ljiljana Progovac. 2005. Nonsententials in Minimalism. In Reinaldo Elugardo & Robert J. Stainton (eds.), *Ellipsis and non-sentential speech*, 71–93. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Bauer, Eva-Maria & Thomas Hoffmann. 2020. *Turns out* is not ellipsis? A usage-based construction grammar view on reduced constructions. *Acta linguistica Hafniensia* 52(2), 240–59.
- Beijering, Karin, Gunther Kaltenböck & María Sol Sansiñena (eds.). 2019. *Insubordination: Theoretical and empirical issues*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Bezuidenhout, Anne. 2013. Structuring silence versus the structure of silence. In Laurence Goldstein (ed.), *Brevity*, 36–52. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad & Edward Finegan. 1999. *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. London: Longman.
- Bourgeois, Samuel. 2020. ‘Well, like, oh yeah...’: Non-dialogical functions of discourse markers in journalistic writing. PhD dissertation, University of Neuchâtel.
- Bourgeois, Samuel. Forthcoming. ‘Oh yeah, one more thing: It’s gonna be huge’: On the use of *oh yeah* in journalistic writing. In Susanne Flach & Martin Hilpert (eds.), *Broadening the spectrum of corpus linguistics: New approaches to variability and change*, 196–225. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bowie, Jill & Bas Aarts. 2016. Clause fragments in English dialogue. In María José López-Couso, Belén Méndez-Naya, Paloma Núñez-Pertejo & Ignacio M. Palacios-Martínez (eds.), *Corpus linguistics on the move: Exploring and understanding English through corpora*, 259–88. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Bowie, Jill & Gergana Popova. 2019. Grammar and discourse. In Bas Aarts, Jill Bowie & Gergana Popova (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of English grammar*, 554–80. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brinton, Laurel J. 2008. *The comment clause in English: Syntactic origins and pragmatic development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burnard, Lou. 2000. *Reference guide for the British National Corpus* (World edition). Oxford: Oxford University Computing Services.

- Bybee, Joan. 2010. *Language, usage and cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bybee, Joan. 2023. What is usage-based linguistics? In Manuel Díaz-Campos & Sonia Balasch (eds.), *The handbook of usage-based linguistics*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Cappelle, Bert. 2020. *Not on my watch* and similar *not*-fragments: Stored forms with pragmatic content. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 52(2), 217–39.
- Cappelle, Bert. 2021. *Not*-fragments and negative expansion. *Constructions and Frames* 13(1), 55–81.
- Carston, Robyn. 2002. Linguistic meaning, communicated meaning and cognitive pragmatics. *Mind and Language* 17, 127–48.
- Culicover, Peter W. & Ray Jackendoff. 2005. *Simpler syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Craenenbroeck, Jeroen van & Tanja Temmerman (eds.). 2019. *The Oxford handbook of ellipsis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dehé, Nicole. 2014. *Parentheticals in spoken English: The syntax–prosody relation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fernández, Raquel & Jonathan Ginzburg. 2002. Non-sentential utterances in dialogue: A corpus-based study. *Traitement automatique des langues* 43(2), 13–42.
- Fernández, Raquel, Jonathan Ginzburg & Shalom Lappin. 2007. Classifying non-sentential utterances in dialogue: A machine learning approach. *Computational Linguistics* 33(3), 397–427.
- Fernández-Pena, Yolanda. 2021. Towards an empirical characterisation and a corpus-driven taxonomy of fragments in written contemporary English. *Revista Electrónica de Lingüística Aplicada* 20(1), 136–54.
- Fernández Pena, Yolanda. 2022. An analysis of fragments in Present-Day written and spoken English. In Francisco Gallardo-del-Puerto, M^a del Carmen Camus Camus & Jesús Ángel González-López (eds.), *Moving beyond the pandemic: English and American studies in Spain*, 56–64. Santander: Universidad de Cantabria.
- Fernández-Pena, Yolanda & Javier Pérez-Guerra. 2023. A corpus-based analysis of the enriched interpretation of *why*-fragments in contemporary British English. In Luis Javier Conejero Magro, Cristina Blanco García, Laura Méndez Márquez & Jennifer Ruiz-Morgan (eds.), *Bridging cultures: English and American studies in Spain*, 103–11. Cáceres: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Extremadura.
- Fernández-Pena, Yolanda & Javier Pérez-Guerra. 2024. Why *why*-fragments? A corpus-based constructionist analysis of their form and meaning. In Stefania Maci & Giovanni Garofalo (eds.), *Investigating discourse and texts: Corpus-assisted analytical perspectives*, 131–160. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Fernández-Pena, Yolanda & Javier Pérez-Guerra. Forthcoming. An ecology of fragmentary constructions in English: A corpus-driven cognitive categorisation. In Torsten Leuschner, Jóhanna Barðdal, Gauthier Delaby & Anaïs Vajnovszki (eds.), *How to do things with corpora: Methodological issues and case studies*. Berlin: J. B. Metzler.
- Fernández Rovira, Raquel. 2006. Non-sentential utterances in dialogue: Classification, resolution and use. PhD dissertation, King's College London.
- Ginzburg, Jonathan & Ivan Sag. 2000. *Interrogative investigations: The form, meaning, and use of English interrogatives*. Stanford, CA: Center for the Study of Language and Information.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 2006. *Constructions at work: The nature of generalization in language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 2013. Constructionist approaches. In Thomas Hoffmann & Graeme Trousdale (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of Construction Grammar*, 15–31. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goldberg, Adele E. & Thomas Herbst. 2021. The *nice-of-you* construction and its fragments. *Linguistics* 59(1), 285–318.
- Goldberg, Adele E. & Florent Perek. 2019. Ellipsis in Construction Grammar. In van Craenenbroeck & Temmerman (eds.), 188–204.

- Greenbaum, Sidney & Gerald Nelson. 1999. Elliptical clauses in spoken and written English. In Peter Collins & David A. Lee (eds.), *The clause in English: In honour of Rodney Huddleston*, 111–25. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Grice, Paul. 1975. Logic and conversation. In Peter Cole & Jerry Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and semantics*, vol. 3, 22–40. New York: Academic Press.
- Griffiths, James. 2015. Parenthetical verb constructions, fragment answers, and constituent modification. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 33(1), 191–229.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 1991. Parenthetical adverbials: The radical orphanage approach. In Shuki Chiba, Akira Ogawa, Norio Yamada, Yasuaki Fuiwara, Osama Koma & Takao Yagi (eds.), *Aspects of Modern English linguistics: Papers presented to Masamoto Ukaji on his 60th birthday*, 232–54. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- Hall, Alison. 2007. Subsentential utterances, ellipsis, and pragmatic enrichment. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 19, 235–59.
- Hall, Alison. 2019. Fragments. In van Craenenbroeck & Temmerman (eds.), 605–23.
- Hankamer, Jorge. 1979. *Deletion in coordinate structures*. New York: Garland.
- Hankamer, Jorge & Ivan Sag. 1976. Deep and surface anaphora. *Linguistic Inquiry* 7(3), 391–428.
- Harnish, Robert M. 2009. The problem of fragments: Two interpretative strategies. *Pragmatics & Cognition* 17(2), 251–82.
- Heine, Lena. 2011. Non-coordination-based ellipsis from a Construction Grammar perspective: The case of the *coffee* construction. *Cognitive linguistics* 22(19), 55–80.
- Heine, Bernd, Gunther Kaltenböck, Tania Kuteva & Haiping Long. 2013. An outline of discourse grammar. In Shannon Bischoff & Carmen Jany (eds.), *Functional approaches to language*, 175–233. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hilpert, Martin. 2019 (2014). *Construction Grammar and its application to English*, 2nd edn. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Huddleston, Rodney & Geoffrey K. Pullum et al. 2002. *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kaltenböck, Gunther. 2013. Development of comment clauses. In Bas Aarts, Joanne Close, Geoffrey Leech & Sean Wallis (eds.), *The English verb phrase: Investigating recent language change with corpora*, 286–317. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kaltenböck, Gunther. 2016. On the grammatical status of insubordinate *if*-clauses. In Gunther Kaltenböck, Evelien Keizer & Arne Lohmann (eds.), *Outside the clause: Form and function of extra-clausal constituents*, 341–78. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kaltenböck, Gunther. 2021. *Funny you should say that*: On the use of semi-insubordination in English. *Constructions and Frames* 13(1), 126–59.
- Kaltenböck, Gunther, Bernd Heine & Tania Kuteva. 2011. On thetical grammar. *Studies in Language* 35(4), 848–93.
- Kline, Charles R., Jr & W. Dean Memering. 1977. Formal fragments: The English minor sentence. *Research in the Teaching of English* 11(2), 97–110.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 2000. A dynamic usage-based model. In Michael Barlow & Suzanne Kemmer (eds.), *Usage-based models of language*, 1–63. Stanford, CA: Center for the Study of Language and Information.
- Leech, Geoffrey, Marianne Hundt, Christian Mair & Nicholas Smith (eds.). 2009. *Change in contemporary English: A grammatical study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lemke, Robin. 2021. *Experimental investigations on the syntax and usage of fragments*. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Lemke, Robin, Lisa Schäfer, Heiner Drenhaus & Ingo Reich. 2020. Script knowledge constrains ellipses in fragments – Evidence from production data and language modelling. *Proceedings of the Society for Computation in Linguistics* 3, 441–4.

- Lemke, Robin, Ingo Reich, Lisa Schäfer & Heiner Drenhaus. 2021. Predictable words are more likely to be omitted in fragments—Evidence from production. *Frontiers in Psychology* 12, 662125.
- Malá, Markéta. 2000. Irregular sentences in colloquial English. *Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Philologica. Prague Studies in English* 22, 79–90.
- Merchant, Jason. 2004. Fragments and ellipsis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27(6), 661–738.
- Morgan, Jerry L. 1973. Sentence fragments and the notion ‘sentence’. In Braj B. Kachru, Robert B. Lees, Yakov Malkiel, Angelina Pietrangeli & Sol Saporta (eds.), *Issues in linguistics: Papers in honor of Henry and Renée Kahane*, 719–51. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Morgan, Jerry. 1989. Sentence fragments revisited. In Bradley Music, Randolph Graczyk & Caroline Wiltshire (eds.), *CLS 25, Parasession on language in context*, 228–41. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Nelson, Gerald, Sean Wallis & Bas Aarts. 2002. *Exploring natural language: Working with the British component of the International Corpus of English*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Newmeyer, Frederick J. 2003. Grammar is grammar and usage is usage. *Language* 79(4), 682–707.
- Nykiel, Joanna & John A. Hawkins. 2020. English fragments, Minimize Domains, and Minimize Forms. *Language and Cognition* 12, 411–43.
- Nykiel, Joanna & Jong-Bok Kim. 2020. Case-matching effects & fragments. Paper delivered at ECBAE3: Experimental and Corpus-Based Approaches to Ellipsis, Florence, 15–17 July.
- OED = *The Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. ‘fragment (n.)’, September 2023, <https://doi.org/10.1093/OED/6781669731>
- Östman, Jan-Ola. 2005. Construction discourse: A prolegomenon. In Jan-Ola Östman & Mirjam Fried (eds.), *Construction grammars: Cognitive grounding and theoretical extensions*, 121–44. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Partington, Alan. 2017. Corpus-assisted studies of humor and laughter-talk. In Salvator Attardo (ed.), *The Routledge handbook of language and humor*, 322–39. New York and London: Routledge.
- Pöldvere, Nele & Carita Paradis. 2019. Motivations and mechanisms for the development of the reactive *what-x* construction in spoken dialogue. *Journal of Pragmatics* 143, 65–84.
- Pöldvere, Nele & Carita Paradis. 2020. ‘What and then a little robot brings it to you?’ The reactive *what-x* construction in spoken dialogue. *English Language and Linguistics* 24(2), 307–32.
- Progovac, Ljiljana. 2006. The syntax of nonsententials: Small clauses and phrases at the root. In Progovac *et al.* (eds.), 33–71.
- Progovac, Ljiljana, Kate Paesani, Eugenia Casielles & Ellen Barton (eds.). 2006. *The syntax of nonsententials: Multidisciplinary perspectives*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Purver, Matthew, Jonathan Ginzburg & Patrick Healy. 2001. On the means for clarification in dialogue. In Jan van Kuppevelt & Ronnie Smith (eds.), *Current and new directions in discourse and dialogue*, 235–56. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech & Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.
- Sadock, Jerrold M. & Arnold M. Zwicky. 1985. Speech act distinctions in syntax. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description*, vol. 1: *Clause structure*, 155–96. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schlangen, David & Alex Lascarides. 2003. The interpretation of non-sentential utterances in dialogue. In Alexander Rudnicky (ed.), *Proceedings of the 4th SIGdial Workshop on Discourse and Dialogue*, 62–71. Sapporo: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Schlangen, David & Alex Lascarides. 2002. Resolving fragments using discourse information. In Johan Bos, Mary Ellen Foster & Colin Mathesoni (eds.), *Proceedings of the 6th International Workshop on Formal Semantics and Pragmatics of Dialogue (EDIALOG 2002)*, 161–8. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh.

-
- Schmeh, Katharina, Peter W. Culicover, Jutta Hartmann & Susanne Winkler. 2015. Discourse function ambiguity of fragments: A linguistic puzzle. In Susanne Winkler (ed.), *Ambiguity: Language and communication*, 199–216. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Schuster, Edgar H. 2006. A fresh look at sentence fragments. *The English Journal* 95(5), 78–83.
- Stainton, Robert J. 2004. The pragmatics of non-sentences. In Laurence R. Horn & Gregory Ward (eds.), *The handbook of pragmatics*, 266–87. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Stainton, Robert J. 2006. *Words and thoughts: Subsentences, ellipsis, and the philosophy of language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stanley, Jason. 2000. Context and logical form. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 23, 391–434.
- Thompson, Sandra A. 2002. ‘Object complements’ and conversation: Towards a realistic account. *Studies in Language* 26, 125–63.
- Van de Velde, Freek, Hendrik De Smet & Lobke Ghesquière. 2015. On multiple source constructions in language change. In Hendrik De Smet, Lobke Ghesquière & Freek Van de Velde (eds.), *On multiple source constructions in language change*, 1–17. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Vries, Mark de. 2012. Parenthetical main clauses – or not? On appositives and quasi-relatives. In Lobke Aelbrecht, Liliane Haegeman & Rachel Nye (eds.), *Main clause phenomena: New horizons*, 178–201. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.