Camilla Wide

12 Constructions as resources in interaction: Syntactically unintegrated *att* 'that'-clauses in spoken Swedish

1 Introduction

As shown by Evans (2007) insubordination, that is, conventionalized main clause use of formally subordinate clauses, seems to be a typologically more widespread phenomenon than previously believed. Despite this, the phenomenon remains fairly unexplored both generally and in particular languages (cf. Verstraete, D'Hertefelt and Van Linden 2012: 124–125). According to Evans (2007: 279), insubordinated clauses, which I will call *syntactically unintegrated subordinate clauses*, emerge diachronically via a process of ellipsis and conventionalized ellipsis. In the final stage of the process, when the clauses are reanalyzed as main clauses, constructionalization takes place: the constructions get a meaning or function of their own and the traces of ellipsis may be lost. During this process toward insubordination, the grammatical dependency markers are, as pointed out by Mithun (2008: 3), functionally extended "from sentence-level syntax into larger discourse and pragmatic domains".

The typology of functions of insubordinated clauses presented by Evans (2007) includes a broad selection of functions such as, for example, expressing desire, warnings, requests (indirection and interpersonal control), epistemic and evidential meaning, exclamation (modal insubordination) and contrastive focus and reiteration (signaling presupposed material). In this paper, I will analyze the functions of syntactically unintegrated clauses with the connective *att* 'that' in Swedish from an interactional and Construction Grammar point of view. Syntactically unintegrated 'that'-clauses have been discussed in a number of recent studies (see e.g. Laury and Seppänen 2008; Keevallik 2008; Günthner 2011; Panther and Thornburg 2011; Verstraete, D'Hertefelt and Van Linden 2012; Weinert 2012; Mertzlufft and Wide 2013). The focus in this paper is on the type of 'that'-clauses which according to Verstraete, D'Hertefelt, and Van Linden (2012) express *discourse insubordination*. I will not discuss *att*-clauses with an expressive-evaluative function (Panther and Thornburg 2011; see also Verstraete, D'Hertefelt and Van Linden 2012: 139–142) in clauses like *Att det kunde gå så illa* 'That it had to end that badly' (SAG 4: 759–760, 766). The *att*-clauses I focus on

This is the publisher version of the following article:
Wide, Camilla, 2014. Constructions as resources in interaction: Syntactically unintegrated att 'that'-clauses in spoken Swedish. In Ronny Boogaart, Timothy Colleman & Gijsbert Rutten (red.), Extending the Scope of Construction Grammar (Cognitive Linguistics Research 34), 353–388. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. (DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110366273.353)

clarify or expand previous utterances similar to the way some of the *dat-* and *dass*-clauses in Dutch and German do (see discussion by Verstraete, D'Hertefelt and Van Linden 2012 for Dutch and Weinert 2012 for German.)

As I will show, *att*-clauses have a rephrasing or a reasoning function. Examples of these two related but yet slightly different functions are shown in (1) and (2) below. In example (1) an informer at a poison control centre explains what she means by *symptom* 'symptoms' when she uses the two *att*-clauses in lines 2–3. In example (2) a teenage boy draws a conclusion about a teacher based on what his sister has just said about the teacher. The conclusion is presented in the form of a syntactically unintegrated *att*-clause. (Both examples are analyzed in more detail in the empirical part of the paper.)

(1) Difficulties breathing? (GRIS: GIC 16519; I = informer C = caller)
1 I: […] men du har inga symptom från luftvägarna,
but you have no symptoms from the respiratory organs
'but you do not have any symptoms from the respiratory organs'

→*2* ***att*** *du tycker de e jobbit å andas eller* ***att*** *de trycker*
ATT you think it is difficult to breathe or ATT it presses
'that you find it difficult to breath or that it presses'

((Overlapping turn by the caller omitted))
→ *3 I: över=bröstet eller nåt sådant?*
over the chest or something like that
'over the chest or something like that?'

(2) Sculpture class (GRIS: Wallenberg; Anward 2003)
1 S: Birgitta hon har sådär eh kan ingenting.
Birgitta she has like knows nothing
'Birgitta, she has like knows nothing'

((5 lines omitted))
→*2 V: jaha* ***att*** *då ska ja'nte: välja henne i ↓skulptur.*
PRT ATT then shall I not choose her in sculpture
'okay, so I'm not choosing her for sculpture class, then'

As shown by Lehti-Eklund (2002) and Anward (2004), the interactional context plays a fundamental role in the use of syntactically unintegrated *att*-clauses in Swedish. The clauses clearly function as resources in certain types of communicative settings (see section 3). Rather than being licensed by the syntactic

context they can be seen as licensed by the interactional and pragmatic context. They are typified on the one hand, by the connective *att* 'that', which points both backward and forward in the conversation (see section 3) and, on the other hand, by the paraphrasing or reasoning function of the construction as a whole. The interesting question from an interactionally oriented Construction Grammar point of view is how these two functions should be related to the concept of constructions. Are we dealing with one construction, two constructions or two sub-variants of the same construction? How should the functions be dealt with within a Construction Grammar framework?

The outline of this paper is the following. In the next section, I present my data and the methodological and theoretical background of the study. In section 3, some basic facts on the connective *att* and clauses that use *att* are provided. Findings in previous studies on syntactically unintegrated *att*-clauses and similar clauses in other languages are discussed in the same section. Sections 4–5 form the empirical part of the paper. I start by discussing *att*-clauses with a paraphrasing function in section 4. In section 5 I discuss *att*-clauses with a reasoning function. The results of the analysis are summarized in section 6 where I also discuss the syntactically unintegrated *att*-clauses from a Construction Grammar point of view.

2 Data, method of analysis and theoretical points of departure

My method of analysis is Conversation Analysis (CA). In order to show the function and contextual features of the syntactically independent *att*-clauses I will present and discuss a number of extracts in which the clauses occur. The discussion is based on an analysis of a collection of recurrent occurrences in a number of authentic conversations in Swedish. The Sweden-Swedish examples in the collection are from the corpora of the projects *Grammar in Conversation: A study of Swedish* (GRIS) and *The Language and Music Worlds of High School Students* (GSM). The former corpus includes different types of conversations, such as everyday conversations, various types of institutional conversations, focus group conversations and mediated conversations (in total approximately 11 hours, of which 4 hours have been made available to me for this study). The latter corpus consists of group discussions with high school students on music and music styles (in total approximately 18 hours). All the Finland-Swedish occurrences in the collection are from the corpus of the project *Conversations in Helsinki* (SAM),

which includes everyday conversations, meetings and mediated conversations (in total 9 hours of recordings). (For more details on the data, see the list at the end of the paper.)

Combining CA or more generally Interactional Linguistics with Construction Grammar is a feasible but not a completely straightforward task (cf. Östman and Trousdale 2013: 484, 486). As discussed by Wide (2009), an interactional approach to Construction Grammar requires a dynamic and flexible view of constructions. Grammatical patterns must be seen as types that originally emerged out of typified utterances (Langacker 1987: 494; Ono and Thompson 1995; Linell 2009; Anward in prep.). These types, which serve as templates for analogous expressions (Langacker 2008), are based on speakers' and listeners' earlier experiences of situations and contexts (Linell 1998: 113). Constructions are hence affected by cognitive and social constraints arising from the interaction (Ono and Thompson 1995). All the uses in authentic interaction are both influenced by and influence the grammatical patterns themselves (Kemmer and Barlow 2000: ix; Langacker 2000: 1; Croft 2001: 365–366). The patterns can thus be locally managed, negotiated and adapted to new situations (Linell 1998: 113). More stable linguistic units emerge through the process of abstraction but concrete context-dependent uses are always primary to more abstract patterns (Langacker 2000: 35; cf. Fillmore 1989: 33; Croft 2001: 5).

Showing and describing explicitly how participants in a conversation use linguistic resources or patterns in order to do things in the interaction is thus crucial. As the context influences the symbolic linguistic structures, it gives rise to semantic variants (Langacker 2000: 35) which form complex categories that can be described in terms of networks of grammatical patterns (Langacker 2000: 36; see also Croft 2001: 25–26; Croft and Cruse 2004: 262–265). The units in the networks can be of any kind or any size (Langacker 2000: 13). Since more general patterns are abstracted from single uses, the networks include both more specific and more general grammatical patterns. Some patterns can be seen as sub-patterns to other patterns but the patterns at the lowest level (i.e. the most specific patterns) are always the primary ones which specify the distribution of more abstract patterns (Langacker 2000: 28–32).

In this paper I will argue that *att*-clauses with a paraphrasing or reasoning function can be seen as two different but closely related nodes in a network of grammatical patterns or constructions. Before I move on to the empirical analysis of the two types of *att*-clauses, I will present some background information on the connective *att* and *att*-clauses in Swedish as well as 'that'-clauses more generally.

3 The connective *att*, clauses with *att* and previous studies of the phenomenon

The connective *att* is thought to have its origin in the pronoun *þat* (*þät*) 'that' in Old Swedish. In present-day Swedish the form of the pronoun is *det*. As discussed by Lindström and Londen (2008: 112) the development from a pronoun to a connective marker is believed to have taken place as illustrated in example (3). The pronoun originally belonged to the matrix clause (3a) but was then reanalyzed as belonging to the clause following the matrix clause (3b). (See SAOB s.v. *att* konj.; Wessén 1956: 58, 254–259.)

(3) a. *Jag tror* ***det***, *han kommer.*
I think that he comes
'I believe so; he's coming.'

b. *Jag tror,* ***det*** *(= att) han kommer.*
I think that that he comes
'I believe that he's coming.'

In present-day Swedish *att* introduces narrative and consecutive subordinate clauses (example 4, 5) as well as expressive-exclamative main clauses of the type discussed in section 1 above (*Att det kunde gå så illa* 'That it had to end so badly', SAG 4: 766).

(4) *Detta ledde till att pengarna snart tog slut.*
this led to that the money soon ran out
'This led to the situation that the money soon ran out.' (SAG 2: 734)

(5) *Hon var så generös att pengarna snart tog slut.*
She was so generous that the money soon ran out.
'She was so generous that the money ran out fast.' (SAG 2: 734)

The most prominent function of *att* is to introduce nominal narrative clauses, especially clauses with a mental predicate such as saying, hearing, knowing, believing etc. As pointed out by Lindström and Londen (2008: 113–114), *att* often introduces indirect speech such as is illustrated in example (6).

(6) *I går sades det* ***att*** *fabriken skulle slå igen.*
Yesterday was said it that the factory would close down
'It was said yesterday that the factory would close down.' (SAG 4: 850)

When *att* introduces adverbial clauses as illustrated in example (5), the connective is usually combined with other connectives, such as *så* 'so' or *för* 'in order to'. The complex connective *så att* can also be used to introduce declarative main clauses expressing conclusions, cf. the two examples in (7) below.

(7) a. *Det regnade så (att) sadeln strax blev våt.*
It rained so that the saddle soon became wet
'It rained so (much) that the saddle became wet fast.'

b. *Det regnade, så (att) sadeln blev strax våt.*
It rained so that saddle became soon wet
'It rained so the saddle became wet fast.' (SAG 4: 634)

In both the subordinate clause in (7a), where the adverbial *strax* 'soon' precedes the finite verb, and the main declarative clause in example (7b), where *strax* follows the finite verb, *att* can be omitted. The complex connective *så att* is in fact used mainly in spoken language (SAG 4: 943). It sometimes replaces the complex connective *för att* 'in order to' in clauses with purposive meanings, cf. example (8) and (9) with *för att* and *så att* respectively.

(8) – *Jag har en hummer i kylskåpet, sa han lågt*
I have a lobster in the refrigerator said he low
'I have a lobster in the refrigerator, he said in a silent voice'
för att chauffören inte skulle höra.
in order to that the driver not would hear
'so that the driver would not hear it.' (SAG 4: 738)

(9) *[…] så gick han alltid undan, så att jag inte skulle se honom.*
so went he always away so that I not would see him
'then he always went away so that I would not see him.' (SAG 4: 738)

In older Swedish, *att* may be used alone in clauses with a purposive meaning. SAG (4: 546) illustrates this with the example shown in (10). A 19th century example from the Swedish Academy Dictionary (SAOB s.v. *att*, 19, 20) is shown in example (11).

(10) *Lyd din Gud att han icke må vända sitt ansikte från dig.*
obey your God that he not may turn his face from you
'Obey your god so that he won't turn his face away from you'

(11) *Drick, att kraften ej förgår!*
drink that the strength not disappears
'Drink so that you will not lose your strength' (1844)

As I will discuss in the empirical part of the paper, occurrences of simple *att* can be found also in present-day data in contexts where one would expect complex connectives such as *så att* and *för att* to be used. This is the case especially in syntactically unintegrated *att*-clauses with a reasoning function. The use of *att* alone is particularly frequent in Finland-Swedish varieties (Lehti-Eklund 2002; Lyngfelt 2003), which could be seen as an outcome of contact with Finnish, in which the corresponding connective *että* 'that' is used in similar contexts (see e.g. Laury and Seppänen 2008).

The use of the lexicalized complex connectives *så att* and *för att* (as well as *men att* 'but that') has been studied by Lindström and Londen (2008), who point out that *att* constitutes a formal link from a subsequent unit to a necessary antecedent unit. This is of special import in conversational language "where new utterances regularly build upon prior ones or are constructed *as if* developing from prior utterances in a sequence" (Lindström and Londen 2008: 116). In complex connectives such as *så att* and *för att*, which according to Lindström and Londen (2008: 145) "point back to a preceding discourse source and respond to this and expand from this", *att* has a general linking function whereas *så* and *för* (and *men*) "indicate more clearly the semantic relationship – causal, consecutive, adversative – between the assertions and actions that are joined together" (Lindström and Londen 2008: 146). In this paper I will not include occurrences with complex connectives such as *så att* and *för att* in the analysis. However, since there seems to be a link between at least some clauses with complex connectives and clauses with a simple *att* (cf. example 9 above), it will be necessary to refer to clauses that contain complex connectives in the discussion.

Anward (2004) points out that *att* generally has the function of introducing a known situation into the conversation, which is in line with what, for example, Bolinger (1977: 11) concludes about the corresponding connective *that* in English: "we see that [*that*] is appropriate when the clause in question does not represent a disconnected fact but something tied with a previous matter to which *that* can point back". *Att*-clauses, however, can also bring new information into the situation. The action performed with *att* thus has two sides: it refers to the preceding context but also changes the emerging context by, for example, introducing a new phase in the on-going episode. One of the examples discussed by Anward was shown in (2) above. In this example the syntactically unintegrated clause ***att*** *då ska ja'nte: välja henne i ↓skulptur* 'so I'm not choosing her for

sculpture class, then' clearly relates to what has been said in the preceding discourse (about a particular teacher). At the same time, it introduces something new, a conclusion regarding what choices the speaker should make when he is planning his school year.

The function of syntactically unintegrated *att*-clauses in Finland-Swedish conversations has been investigated by Lehti-Eklund (2002), who analyzes *att* as a discourse marker in clauses which are not subordinate to any syntactic element in the preceding discourse. In Lehti-Eklund's data *att* occurs in elaborations, conclusions, closings of topics and transitions between communicative acts. As shown by Anward (2004), *att* occurs in elaborations and conclusions in Sweden-Swedish conversations as well (see example 2). Closings of topics and transitions between communicative acts, however, seem to be typical of Finland-Swedish varieties. An example of transitions between acts from Lehti-Eklund (2002) is shown in (12) below. In lines 1–3 and 5, the chair of a board of a political youth organization suggests two possible funding sources that the board should investigate. After the pause in line 6, a transition between acts takes place when the chair reformulates her suggestions as a directive. (I will return to the example in section 4 below.)

(12) It should be checked (SAM: V2; Lehti-Eklund 2002: 102; R = chair person, N = secretary)

1 R: [..] hh så kan man kolla me den hä: (.) kulturföreningen (.)
so can one check with this the cultural organization
'then one can check with this cultural organization'

2 PARTY X' kulturföreningen om di vill ge pengar? (.)
the cultural organization if they want give money
'the cultural organization of party X if they want to give us money'

3 di har nämligen pengar
they have namely money
'because they have money'

4 N: jå
PRT
'yes'

5 R: så kan man kolla me:d ungdoms- (0.8) centralen
so can one check with youth- centre
'and then one can check with the youth centre'

6 (1.5)

→*7 R:* ***att*** *checka nu me di här för nu sku de vara kiva att=*
ATT check PRT with these because PRT would it be nice to
'so check with these because it would be nice to'

8 *kunna ge någå arvode (.) [annars får vi bara ge=*
can give some remuneration otherwise may we only gi-
'be able to give remuneration, otherwise we can only give'

9 (?): *[jå*
PRT
'yes'

10 R: *=blommor*
flowers
'flowers'

Syntactically unintegrated clauses initiated by *att* alone have been investigated in less detail in Sweden-Swedish data than in Finland-Swedish data. In Sweden-Swedish conversations, clauses with complex connectives such as *så att* and *för att* are more common than clauses with simple *att* (Lyngfelt 2003). Syntactically unintegrated clauses with simple *att* do, however, occur also in Sweden-Swedish varieties. One of the aims of this paper is therefore to explore the use of *att*-clauses in Swedish more generally. Some examples of the functions of *att*-clauses which are typical of Finland-Swedish varieties, will, however, also be discussed in the empirical part of the paper.

As pointed out in the introduction, a number of studies of syntactically unintegrated 'that'-clauses in different languages have been published recently. Some of the papers focus or touch upon the same types of clauses that I am discussing in this paper. Günthner (2011) shows how syntactically unintegrated *dass*-clauses emerge on-line in German conversations. She, however, excludes "Adverbiale *(so) dass*-Konstruktionen (mit finaler, konsekutiver und kausaler Funktion)" (Günthner 2011: 4), that is, 'that'-clauses with a reasoning function, from her study. This is also done by Mertzlufft and Wide (2013), who compare the emergence of 'that'-clauses with a post-modifying function in Swedish and German conversations and argue that there is a continuum between syntactically integrated and syntactically non-integrated *att*- and *dass*-clauses. On the pragmatic level, however, the clauses at both ends of the continuum show similar functions: they modify, explicate or explain something said in the preceding discourse. The function of explaining or explicating something said is

also discussed by Verstraete, D'Hertefelt, and Van Linden (2012) in their paper on *dat*-clauses in Dutch and by Weinert (2012) in her paper on *dass*/*that*-clauses in German and English. Both papers, however, discuss 'that'-clauses in a broader perspective. Verstraete, D'Hertefelt, and Van Linden (2012), who, as pointed out, categorize clauses of the kind discussed in this paper as *discursive insubordination*, only touch upon the phenomenon in Dutch by showing some examples. Weinert (2012) presents a more detailed analysis of unintegrated *dass*-clauses. She concludes the following about unintegrated *dass*-clauses and correlative *dass*-clauses of the type *has du das auch schon mal gehabt (.) dass du träumst du kannst nicht aufwachen*? 'have you ever had the kind of dream from which you aren't able to wake up'?:

> They function as clarifications, elaborations, explications, reiterations, conclusions, subtopics and so on. Since they are anchored in the previous discourse, have a content relation to it and do not function independently, they can therefore still be considered to have a complementing function. Whether the link is achieved through the association of *dass*-clauses with presupposition or through the explicit marking via the complementiser is a moot point. The constraints on unintegrated *dass*-clauses have yet to be defined. (Weinert 2012: 247)

The purpose of this paper is to present a detailed analysis of syntactically unintegrated *att*-clauses in Swedish. As pointed out in the introduction, I will argue that some of the clauses have a rephrasing function whereas others have a reasoning function. Similar to Günthner (2011), who excludes clauses of the adverbial type, I make a distinction between two different types of syntactically unintegrated 'that'-clauses. There are, however, some cases where the difference between the clauses is rather subtle. An example of this will be discussed at the end of section 5. In the next section, I start the empirical analysis by discussing the rephrasing function of *att*-clauses. *Att*-clauses with a reasoning function are discussed in section 5.

4 *Att*-clauses with a paraphrasing function

Let us begin the analysis of syntactically unintegrated *att*-clauses with a paraphrasing function by returning to example (1), which is shown in an extended version in example (13). In the example, the informer at the poison control centre (I) is asking the caller (C) whether she has noticed any symptoms of poisoning in her respiratory organs (line 3).

(13) Difficulties breathing? (GRIS: GIC 16519; I = informer, C = caller)

1 I: *[…] se om de här kan ha nåt samband, f[ör de beror*
see if this can have some connection because it depends
'see if this has any connection, since it depends'

2 C: *[ja:,*
yes
'yes'

3 I: *på va de- (0.6) men du har inga symptom från luftvägarna,*
on what it- but you have no symptoms from the respiratory organs
'on what i- but you don't have any symptoms from the respiratory organs'

→4 ***att** du tycker de e jobbit å andas eller **at[t** de trycker*
ATT you think it is difficult to breathe or ATT it presses
'that you find it difficult to breath or that it presses'

5 C: *[nä:*
no
'no'

→6 I: *över= bröstet eller nåt sådant?*
over the chest or something like that
'over the chest or something like that?'

In lines 4 and 6, I elaborates her question about the symptoms with two coordinated *att*-clauses: *att du tycker de e jobbit å andas eller att de trycker över= bröstet eller nåt sådant?* 'that you find it difficult to breathe or that it presses over the chest or something like that'. Pragmatically and interactionally the *att*-clauses make perfect sense: they specify what I has just said, that is, they clarify I's question about C's condition (symptoms = difficult to breathe, pressure over the chest). Syntactically, however, no relationship to an element in the preceding discourse can be found. There is no matrix clause to which the *att*-clauses are subordinate, nor do they syntactically complement a phrasal head. As discussed at the beginning of the paper, informer I at the poison control centre explicates what she means when she asks if the caller has noticed any symptoms in her respiratory organs. The two *att*-clauses which are not syntactically subordinate to any element in the preceding structure give two examples of what the symptoms may be: that it is difficult to breathe and that there is a feeling of pressure over the chest. The informer thus rephrases her question to the patient and makes it more specific. The relation between the *att*-clauses and the preceding discourse could roughly be described as follows:

do you have NOUN X → [that is] do you feel Y or Z…? [EXAMPLES OF X]

In example (13), the element which the *att*-clauses rephrase is a noun (*symptom* 'symptoms'). Example (14) from a focus group discussion on genetically modified food shows a case where the expression which is being rephrased is a verb phrase. In the example, pesticides are being discussed by the farmers participating in the discussion.

(14) Resistance to pesticides (GRIS: L Tema K, GML 4; A, C, F, G, H = farmers).

1 G: *ja (0.4) då blir ju ogräset resistent [å ja=*
PRT then becomes PRT the weed resistant and PRT
'well then the grass becomes resistant and well'

2 H: *[ja:¿*
PRT
'yes'

3 G: *=(0.2) så måste [man ( )*
then has one
'then one has to'

4 H: *[>å sen får vi hitta på e<*
and then get we invent a
'and then we have to invent a'

5 *nytt s[prutmedel [å [sen¿*
new pesticide and then
'new pesticide and then'

6 G: *[ja:¿ [.ja*
PRT PRT
'yes' 'yes'

7 C?: *[°(mm)°*

8 C?: *°(mm)°*

9 H: *blir de resistent emot de å sen får m- (0.4)*
becomes it resistant against that and then gets o-
'it becomes resistant against that and then one has to'

10 *så [går de så¿*
then goes it so
'then it goes like that'

11 *((4 lines omitted))*

12 C: *[a just ogräsmedel blir ju ↓kanske'nte*
PRT precisely pesticide becomes PRT perhaps not
'well, pesticides do not perhaps become'

13 *resistent↓ [m[en de e ju däremot svampar=*
resistant but that is PRT on the other hand fungi
'resistant, it is rather the fungi that are that'

14 A: *[n [ä:,*
PRT
'no'

15 F: *[nä,*
PRT
'no'

→16 C: *=å [bakterier **att** dom (0.2) ↓förändras ju=*
and bacteria ATT they change PRT
'and bacteria, they change'

17 F: *[a:o (.) a:o.*
PRT PRT
'yes' 'yes'

18 C: *=å [virusarna dom ä[ndras [ju↓.*
and the viruses they change PRT
'and the viruses, they change'

19 F: *[mm::. [mm:.*

20 H: *[>a j-<*
PRT I-
'yes I'

At the beginning of the example, G says that grass becomes resistant to pesticides (line 1). H responds to this by concluding that new pesticides then have to be invented (lines 4–5). In lines 5 and 9–10, when H says that *it* (Swe. *de(t)*) in turn becomes resistant to *that* (*å sen blir de resistent emot de* 'it becomes resistant against that'), the reference is ambiguous. C's contribution in lines 12–13 and 16–18 could be seen as a reaction to this. He points out that it is not the pesticides that become resistant but rather the fungi, viruses and bacteria. During this contribution he uses a syntactically unintegrated *att*-clause: *att dom förändras ju* 'that they change' (line 16).

As in example (13), the *att*-clause in example (14) refers to something specific in the preceding discourse which is rephrased in some way. In lines 13–16, C says that fungi and viruses are resistant: *a just ogräsmedel blir ju kanske'nte resistent men de e ju däremot svampar å bakterier* 'well, pesticides do not perhaps become resistant, it is rather the fungi and bacteria that are that'. When he continues by saying that *att dom förändras ju* 'that they change' he rephrases the characterization expressed by the verb in the previous clause: fungi and bacteria are resistant → fungi and bacteria change. The function of this *att*-clause seems to be to strengthen the point C is making about the contrast between pesticides, on the one hand, and bacteria and fungi, on the other hand. As in example (13), the *att*-clause occurs within the same turn and directly after the clause with the word which is rephrased. The relationship between the *att*-clause and the preceding discourse could be summarized as follows:

they VERB X are Y → [that is] they VERB Z [EMPHASIZING A POINT MADE]

In some cases syntactically independent *att*-clauses are also used when speakers rephrase specific acts in the preceding discourse. This is the case in example (15), which is from a different call to the poison control centre than the call in example (13). The caller has just told the informer that he has been stung by a bee in his tongue. When the informer hears this she suggests that the caller should go to the hospital (line 1).

(15) Stung by a bee (GRIS:GIC 16784; I = informer C = caller)

→1	I:	*[ja tycker att du ska åka in ti sjukhus.*
		I think that you shall go in to hospital
		'I think you should go to the hospital'
2		((four lines left out))
3	I:	*[…] om man får de i munnen eller i ansiktet¿*
		if one gets it in the mouth or in the face
		'if you get it in your mouth or face'
4	C:	*jaha.*
		PRT
		'oh'
5	I:	*eller speciellt inne i munnen,*
		or especially inside in the mouth
		'or especially inside your mouth'

6 C: *jaa¿*
PRT
'okay'

7 I: *så kan de eh (0.2) kan de svullna, så att man ehm (0.2) får*
so can it can it swell so that one gets
'it can it can swell so that one gets'

8 *svårihet, (.) som du säjer svårihet me andning å så*
difficulties as you say difficulty with breathing and so
'difficulties as you say difficulty with breathing and so'

9 *vidare,*
further
'on'

10 C: *jaa¿*
PRT
'uhu'

11 *(0.5)*

12 I: *e:h=*

13 C: *=ha?=*
'so:: eh?

→14 I: *=**att** eh (0.6) de e därför tycker ja de e bra om du:, (0.2)*
ATT it is therefore think I it is good if you
'that is why I think it is good if you'

→15 *åtminstone e på sjukhus å (0.2) så att dom kan, eh*
at least are in hospital and so that they can
'at least were in the hospital and, so that they can'
(0.8)

16 C: *bedöma då [(om),*
assess then if
'assess then whether'

→17 I: *[a bedöma de, å ha dej kanske under*
PRT assess that and have you perhaps under
'yes assess that and have you perhaps under'

→18 *observation en stund,*
observation a while
'observation for a while'

In the four lines omitted from example (15), the informer says that people in her profession are normally quite cautious with bee stings of the kind the caller has told her about. The caller reacts to this with a minimal response. When the informer continues by explaining why one should be cautious when you get stung by a bee in your mouth or face (you can get a swelling which makes it difficult to breathe), the caller still reacts only with minimal responses (*jaha* 'oh' in line 4, *jaa* 'okay/uhu' in lines 6 and 10). In line 12, the informer, after a 0.5 second-long pause, makes a hesitation sound (*eh* 'uh'). The caller responds to this by saying *ha?* 'so:: eh?', which indicates that he needs more information in order to draw a conclusion. Following this, in lines 14–17, the informer rephrases her suggestion that the caller should go to the hospital by producing a syntactically independent *att*-clause. The clause starts with a reference to what the informer herself has just said about swelling: *att eh (0.6) de e därför* 'that is why'. By using *därför* 'because' as a pivot, the informer can then continue by saying that she thinks it would be good if the patient were in the hospital. She is then on her way to explicate her suggestion further when she interrupts herself: *så att dom kan, eh* 'so that they can' (line 15). After a 0.8 long pause, the caller begins to complete the informer's unfinished clause by saying *bedöma då om* 'assess then whether' (line 16). He is overlapped by the informer who repeats what the caller has said and adds that the caller can also be under observation for a while at the hospital (lines 17–18). In the context following the example, the caller grasps the seriousness of the situation.

The context of the *att*-clause in example (15) is more complex than the contexts of the clauses in examples (13) and (14). In this case, it is not only a specific word or expression which is paraphrased but rather a suggestion which has been expressed with a main clause some turns earlier: you should go to the hospital → you should at least be in the hospital so that they can... As in examples (13) and (14), the speaker returns to something previously said in order to clarify what she means. The function seems to be to strengthen a point made, more specifically to restate a suggestion (cf. example 14). The informer is trying to persuade the caller to go to the hospital, but the caller does not seem to respond to this before the informer rephrases her suggestion in lines 14–16 and 17–18. The relationship to the preceding discourse could be described as follows:

you should VERB X to Y→ [I really think] you should at least VERB Z in Y so that... [RESTATING A SUGGESTION]

Example (15) is similar to the example shown in (12) in section 3, which also exhibits a rephrasal. In (12), the chair person of a political youth organization (R) makes some suggestions as to how the organization could get funding for

an event they are planning to organize (lines 1–3, 5). The other members of the board do not seem to pick up these suggestions. Following a 1.5 second-long pause at the end of the example, the chair in line 7 uses a syntactically independent *att*-clause (*att checka nu me di här* 'so check with these') to rephrase her suggestions as a directive. Instead of pointing out what *one* could do, R uses an imperative form of the verb *checka* 'check', which is semantically equivalent to *kolla* 'check' in lines 1 and 5. She thus makes her request explicit and directs it to the other members of the board, perhaps the secretary N in particular. Directly after the request she provides a reason for why her request should be met: *nu sku de vara kiva att kunna ge någå arvode (.) annars får vi bara ge blommor* 'it would be nice to be able to give [them] remuneration, otherwise we can only give [them] flowers' (lines 7–8, 10).

As pointed out by Lehti-Eklund (2002: 2) in her analysis of the same example, the *att*-clause in example (12) occurs at the transition between acts. When R rephrases her statements that certain organizations should be contacted as a directive, she moves from discussion to decision-making. Nonetheless, the contents of the *att*-clause rephrase something that has been said in the preceding discourse. The function of the clause seems to make the request explicit and thus "add it to the records" in the sense discussed by Anward (2004). The relationship to the preceding discourse could be described as follows:

one could contact X → [I really want you to] contact X [MAKING A REQUEST EXPLICIT]

To summarize, the syntactically unintegrated *att*-clauses in all the examples discussed in this section paraphrase something said in the preceding discourse. In examples (13) and (14) a specific wording in the preceding discourse is specified, clarified or modified. The wordings concern a concept expressed by a noun (symptoms) and an outcome expressed by a verb phrase (being resistant) respectively. In example (15), a specific clause with a suggestion (you should go to the hospital) is repeated and specified and in example (12), which was shown in section 3, previously presented suggestions are rephrased as a directive. The contents of all the *att*-clauses in question have already been expressed in some way in the preceding discourse. By using the syntactically independent *att*-clauses, the speakers present the contents again by adding more specific information or specifying an act such as a suggestion or request. All the examples occur in situations in which the speakers either react to something that has been said or not said and/or want to a get a certain reaction from the other speaker(s). The syntactically unintegrated *att*-clauses thus clearly function as communicative resources of a particular kind in the conversations and could be

seen as constructs of a construction with a certain function (rephrasing for example questions or suggestions in order to make them more explicit). In the next section, I will discuss *att*-clauses with a reasoning function, which occur in slightly different contexts than *att*-clauses with a paraphrasing function.

5 *att*-clauses with a reasoning function

Example (16) shows an extended version of example (2) which was discussed in the introduction. In the example, S and V are talking to their mother (U) about their schedule at school. S, who is V's older sister, is describing a particular teacher (Birgitta), of whom she does not seem to be very fond.

(16) Sculpture class (GRIS: Wallenberg; Anward 2003; U = mother, S = daughter, V = son)

1 *S: Birgitta hon har sådär eh kan ingenting.*
Birgitta she has like knows nothing
'Birgitta, she has like knows nothing'

2 *(0.8)*

3 *S: [hon har skulptur: å så [sen så säjer hon=*
she has sculpture and then then so says she
'she teaches sculpture class and then she says'

4 *U: [nähä.* *[jaha.*
PRT PRT
'oh oh'

5 *S: .hhh ↑prata↑ me min O- .hh min eh bror O::scar¿*
talk with my my brother Oscar
'talk to my to my brother Oscar' ((artificial voice))

6 *U: ↑jaså de e hon: jaha.*
PRT it is she PRT
'oh it's her I see'
(0.6)

→7 *V: jaha* ***att*** *då ska ja'nte: välja henne i ↓skulptur.*
PRT ATT then shall I not choose her in sculpture
'okay, so I'm not choosing her for sculpture class, then'

In line 1, S says that Birgitta, the teacher, knows nothing. She then goes on to say that Birgitta teaches sculpture and says "talk to my brother" (lines 3, 5).

Her mother (U) reacts to this by concluding *jaså de e hon: jaha* 'oh it's her I see' in line 6. After a 0.6 long pause S' brother V takes the floor and draws the conclusion *jaha att då ska ja'nte: välja henne i skulptur* 'okay, so I'm not choosing her for sculpture class, then'. This conclusion is presented in the form of a syntactically independent *att*-clause which is preceded by the response particle *jaha* 'okay'.

In a similar way as the examples discussed in section 4 above, the syntactically independent *att*-clause in example (16) clearly relates to something said in the preceding discourse. However, in contrast to the *att*-clauses discussed in section 4, the *att*-clause in example (16), does not rephrase something that has been said. Instead, it expresses a consequence of what another speaker has said. In the example, *att* has the same meaning as the complex connective *så att* 'so (that)' (cf. example 7b in section 3; Lindström and Londen 2008). The relationship of the *att*-clause here to the preceding discourse is thus clearly different from the examples discussed in section 4. It could be described as follows:

person X is Y → [so] I should not choose X [DRAWING A CONCLUSION]

Example (17) shows a case in which a speaker draws a conclusion based on what she has just said herself. In the example, which is from the same meeting within a youth organization as example (12), speaker H uses a syntactically independent *att*-clause to expand her description of the so-called Cable Factory, that is, the cultural centre where the youth organization is considering organizing a party.

(17) Party at The cable factory (SAM:M2; Lehti-Eklund 2002: 6; R = chair person, H = participant at annual meeting)

1 *H: men den e den e nog enorm (.) de e [liksom fem meter ti*
but it is it is PRT huge it is like five meters to
'but it's huge, it's like five meters to'

2 *R:* *[jå*
PRT
'yes'

→*03* *H: take °eller någå sånt°* ***att*** *de sku liksom va:*
the ceiling or something like that ATT it should like be
'the ceiling or something like that so it would have to be'

→*04* *smockfullt me människor för att de ska bli (någå)=.*
packed with people in order to that it would become something
'packed with people in order for it to work'

In line 1, speaker H says that the space in the Cable Factory is huge. She then elaborates on this by saying that it is five meters to the ceiling "or something like that". Having said this, she continues with a syntactically unintegrated *att*-clause and says *att de sku liksom va: smockfullt me människor för att de ska bli någå* 'so it would have to be packed with people in order for it to work'. The *att*-clause here expresses a consequence of the fact that the Cable Factory is huge: in order for the party to be a success, the place would have to be packed with people.

The fact that the *att*-clause in example (17) is used to elaborate something said makes it partly similar to the *att*-clauses discussed in section 4, which also clarify, specify or emphasize something said. However, just like the *att*-clause in example (16), the *att*-clause in example (17) does not paraphrase something already said; rather it presents a consequence of what has just been said. Instead of specifying or modifying a word or clause, the *att*-clause expands the line of reasoning. H points out that there has to be a lot of people at the party if it is to be organized at the Cable Factory (since the space there is so huge). The relationship between the *att*-clause and the context in which it occurs could be presented as follows:

place X is Y → [so] there must be Z in X in order to... [PRESENTING A PREREQUISITE]

Example (18) from a group discussion about music and music styles shows a slightly different use of an *att*-clause with a reasoning function. In the example, the high school students participating in the discussion are answering the moderator's questions about whether they listen to music on CDs or on tapes.

(18) CDs are better (GSM: 5; K3, K4, K5, K6 = female high school students)

1 *K5: men de e ändå tråkigt (0.7) me band också*
but it is still tedious with tapes also
'but it is also tedious with tapes as well'

((four lines omitted))

2 *K4: nä- när man har band så e de en låt så vet man inte*
whe- when one has tapes so is it one song then knows one not
'wh- when one has a tape it's one song, then one doesn't'

3 *på vicken låt man e så ska man sp- [ja de- nej de e-]*
on what song one is so has one pl- yes it- no it is-
'know what song one is on, then one has to pl-, yes i- no it is'

4 K3: *[a: de e otymp]ligt e de (.)*
PRT it is unconvinient is it
'yes it is unconvienient it is'

5 *då e [de bättre] me CD [men ändå ( )]*
then is it better with CD but still
'so it's better with CDs but still'

6 K5: *[a:]*
PRT
'yes'

→7 K6: *[att man liksom kan] (.) hoppa (lit-) till*
ATT one PRT can jump litt- to
'that one like can skip a litt-(le) to'

8 *liksom (.) den lå[ten som e sist] när man e på första typ*
PRT that song which is last when one is on first PRT
'like the song which is last when one is like on the first one'

9 K3: *[mm-m]*

10 ?: *mm-m*
(0.2)

11 K5: *men de e ju mest såna som har en speciell musiksmak då*
but it is PRT mostly those who have a special music taste PRT
'but it's those who have a special music taste'

12 *som köper skiver*
who buy records
'who buy records'

At the beginning of the extract shown in the example, K5 says that tapes are tedious. K4 elaborates on this in lines 2–3 when she points out that you do not know where you are on tapes. K3 agrees with K4 (line 4) and states that it is better with CDs (line 5). This line of thought is then picked up by K6 who presents an argument for why it is better with CDs: you can skip, for example, from the first song to the last. When she presents this argument in lines 7–8, she uses a syntactically non-integrated *att*-clause. The *att*-clause expresses the benefit of choosing CDs. Just like all the *att*-clauses discussed in sections 4 and 5, this *att*-clause elaborates on something just said in the discourse. However, rather than rephrasing something in the way that the *att*-clauses analyzed in section 4

do, the *att*-clause in example (18) extends the line of thought. This is similar to the way the other *att*-clauses discussed in this section function: K6 presents a reason for why it is better to use CDs.

it is better with Y than X → [because] you can do Z [PRESENTING AN ARGUMENT]

It could, however, be argued that the *att*-clause in example (18) also explicates something in the preceding discourse (why CDs are better) in a way that is similar to, for example, the *att*-clause in example (13) (see above). The difference between the two types of *att*-clauses, *att*-clauses with a paraphrasing function and *att*-clauses with a reasoning function, can thus be rather subtle. Is there then a large enough difference between the two types that they need to be analyzed as two different types of constructions? Or are we dealing with two different types of uses of the same construction? This question will be discussed in the next section.

To summarize, the syntactically independent *att*-clauses discussed in this section show similarities to the examples discussed in section 4 in the sense that they elaborate a topic under discussion. The *att*-clauses in this section, however, introduce a new perspective rather than specify information that has already been presented. Furthermore, all the *att*-clauses in this section draw conclusions based on something said whereas the *att*-clauses in section 4 rephrase a specific word, phrase or clause. As the last example shows, the difference between *att*-clauses with a rephrasing and reasoning function respectively, is, however, sometimes rather subtle.

6 Discussion

In sections 4 and 5 I have presented a number of examples of syntactically unintegrated *att*-clauses in two different types of interactional contexts in Swedish. In both cases the clauses are clearly linked to the preceding discourse even if they are syntactically not subordinate to any specific element in it. The relationship to the preceding discourse is of a different nature in the two types of clauses. In the first type, the *att*-clauses rephrase something specific that has been said in the preceding discourse. In examples (13) and (14), a specific wording was explained or explicated, and, in examples (12) and (15), suggestions were either restated or reformulated as directives. The way in which the *att*-clauses brought a new perspective into the emerging context (Anward 2004) varies. In (13), examples of a phenomenon were given in order for the other

participant of the conversation to be able to answer a question of importance for the on-going activity (clarifying the symptoms of poisoning). In (14), some facts presented in the preceding context were corrected, and, in (12) and (15), suggestions or directives were put forth in order to persuade the other participants in the conversations to do certain things (check the possibility to get funding from certain organizations; go to the hospital).

The examples show clear resemblances with some of the examples of discourse insubordination and unintegrated *dass*-clauses respectively discussed by Verstraete, D'Hertefelt and Van Linden (2012) and Weinert (2012). Verstraete, D'Hertefelt and Van Linden (2012: 48) discuss the possibility to insert a predicate like *ik bedoel dat* 'what I mean to say is that' into the syntactically unintegrated *dat*-clauses expressing discourse insubordination. As they conclude, "even that may be reading too much into the data". Nonetheless, their formulation quite nicely captures the relationship between the context and the rephrasing type of 'that'-clauses which I have been analyzing in this article. In the schematic presentations of the *att*-clauses discussed in section 4, I used expressions such as "that is", "I really think" or "I really want to" to describe the semantic/pragmatic link between the clauses and the preceding context.

In the other type of *att*-clauses discussed in this paper, syntactically unintegrated clauses with a reasoning function, the relationship to the preceding context was of a different kind. Rather than rephrasing something said, the *att*-clauses in examples (16)–(18) explicated consequences of something that had been said in the preceding discourse. The consequences were of slightly different types. In example (16), a conclusion was drawn based on something said in the preceding discourse. In example (17), a prerequisite for an event (a party at a particular place) was presented based on the information given (by the same speaker) in the immediately preceding context. In example (18), an argument for an evaluation just presented was put forth. In all cases, the line of argumentation was expanded when the syntactically unintegrated *att*-clauses were used. Instead of rephrasing something already presented in the conversation, the *att*-clauses brought new information into the conversation. The relationship to the preceding context could in most cases be described with "so" (cf. Lindström & Londen 2008: 128–145).

Even though both *att*-clauses with a reasoning function and *att*-clauses with a rephrasing function elaborate on something said in the preceding discourse, the elaboration is of two different kinds. The two types of clauses are – at the most specific level of language – used as communicative resources in different types of interactional settings. As pointed out above, a distinction between the two types of syntactically unintegrated 'that'-clauses has also been drawn e.g. by Günthner (2011) and Mertzlufft and Wide (2013), who focus on interaction in

a similar way as I have done in this paper. When investigating syntactically unintegrated *att*-clauses from an interactional point of view, the difference between the two types of clauses becomes salient: speakers use the two types of clauses for different purposes in interaction. But does this make it possible to see the two types of *att*-clauses as two different constructions?

If this question is approached from a mainstream Construction Grammar point of view, where the role of context has been considered only to a limited extent (Bergs and Diewald 2009: 2), the answer could be no. The motivation would then, for example, be that differences in meaning or function have to be reflected in differences in form (cf. Boogaart 2009). Such an approach, however, implies that form is given priority over function even though most versions of Construction Grammar stress that constructions are holistic form-function/meaning constellations. If, on the other hand, form and function are given equal weight in the form-function constellations, one could argue that the same form can develop into two different constructions with different functions. If constructions are seen as nodes in networks of grammatical patterns, it is also possible to treat the two different types of *att*-clauses as different constructions. As discussed in section 2, the influence of context can give rise to different semantic variants (cf. Langacker 2000: 35–36). However, in the case of the two types of syntactically unintegrated *att*-clauses, it remains unexplored whether they have even developed from the same source. As shown in examples (10)–(11), clauses with simple *att* (with a reasoning function) seem to have been more widely used in older Swedish in contexts where complex connectives such as *så att* and *för att* are used today. As discussed for instance in connection to example (16), simple *att* with a reasoning function still today sometimes occurs in similar contexts as the complex connective *så att*. *Att*-clauses with a rephrasing function, on the other hand, do not occur in contexts where *att* can as easily be replaced with a complex connective. What we could thus be dealing with are actually two syntactically different types of *att*-clauses (narrative vs. adverbial) to begin with. Whether this is really the case, however, needs to be explored in future research.

Another possibility is to treat the relationship to the prior context as a form-related feature. If this is done the two types of syntactically unintegrated *att*-clauses discussed in this paper can indeed be seen as reflecting a difference in form since they occur in different types of interactional settings and perform different types of acts (rephrasing something said vs. extending the line of reasoning). As Östman and Trousdale (2013: 488) point out, context features are seen as part of constructions within discourse approaches to constructions. In line with Linell (2009) it could be argued that the two types of *att*-clauses have a different external syntax (the discourse context) even though their internal syntax (on the clause level) is the same.

7 Conclusion

When one investigates the use of syntactically unintegrated *att*-clauses in actual use in authentic conversations in Swedish, it becomes quite clear that we are dealing with two different constructions or patterns: one which rephrases something said and one which expands the line of reasoning by relating to something said. Through the process of abstraction the two types of clauses can be seen as forming a more general construction: syntactically unintegrated *att*-clauses which relate to the preceding discourse and elaborate upon it. As argued by Langacker (2000: 35; cf. also Fillmore 1989: 33; Croft 2001: 5), the more specific constructions at the lowest levels of language, in this case *att*-clauses with a rephrasing function and *att*-clauses with a reasoning function, must, however, be seen as primary to such an abstract and more general construction.

Data

GRIS = The kernel corpus of Swedish conversations made available within the project *Samtalsspråkets grammatik* (Grammar in conversation: a study of Swedish), see http://www.tema.liu.se/tema-k/gris/.

GSM = The corpus of group discussions with teenagers made available within the project *Gymnasisters språk- och musikvärldar* (The Language and Music Worlds of High School Students). Department of music sciences and Department of Swedish, University of Gothenburg.

SAM = The corpus of Helsinki Swedish conversations made available in the project *Svenska samtal i Helsingfors* (Swedish conversations in Helsinki). Department of Finnish, Finno-Ugrian and Scandinavian Studies, University of Helsinki.

References

Anward, Jan. 2004. 'att' ['that']. *Språk och stil* 13: 65–85.

Anward, Jan. In prep. Interaction and Constructions. In: Benjamin Lyngfelt and Camilla Wide (eds.), *Constructions*, Special issue on Swedish constructions.

Bergs, Alexander and Gabriele Diewald. 2009. Contexts and constructions. In: Alexander Bergs and Gabriele Diewald (eds.), *Context and Constructions*, 1–14. (Constructional Approaches to Language 9.) Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bolinger, Dwight. 1977. *Meaning and Form*. London/New York: Longman.

Boogaart, Ronny. 2009. Semantics and pragmatics in construction grammar. The case of modal verbs. In: Alexander Bergs and Gabriele Diewald (eds.), *Context and Constructions*, 213–241. (Constructional Approaches to Language 9.) Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Croft, William. 2001. *Radical Construction Grammar. Syntactic Theory in Typological Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Croft, William and D. Alan Cruse. 2004. *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Evans, Nicholas. 2007. Insubordination and its uses. In: Irina Nikolaeva (ed.), *Finiteness. Theoretical and Empirical Foundations*, 366–431. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Fillmore, Charles J. 1989. Grammatical Construction Theory and the Familiar Dichotomies. In: Rainer Dietrich and Carl F. Graumann (eds.), *Language Processing in Social Context*. Amsterdam: North-Holland/Elsevier.

Günthner, Susanne. 2011. *Dass*-Konstruktionen im alltäglichen Sprachgebrauch – Facetten ihrer "interaktionalen Realität". *Gidi Arbeitspapiere* 35. [http://noam.uni-muenster.de/gidi/arbeitspapiere/arbeitspapier35.pdf]

Keevallik, Luule. 2008. Conjunction and sequenced action: The Estonian complementizer and evidential particle *et*. In: Ritva Laury (ed.), *Crosslinguistic Studies of Clause Combining. The Multifunctionality of Conjunctions*, 125–152. (Typological Studies in Language 80.). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kemmer, Suzanne and Michael Barlow. 2000. Introduction: A Usage-Based Conception of Language. In: Michael Barlow and Suzanne Kemmer (eds.), *Usage-Based Models of Language*, vii-xxviii. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1987. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. Volume 1. Theoretical Prerequisites. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Langacker, Ronald W. 2000. A Dynamic Usage-Based Model. In: Michael Barlow and Suzanne Kemmer (eds.), *Usage-Based Models of Language*, 1–63. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Langacker, Ronald W. 2008. *Cognitive Grammar. A Basic Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Laury, Ritva and Eeva-Leena Seppänen. 2008. Clause combining, interaction, evidentiality, participation structure, and the conjunction-particle continuum: The Finnish *että*. In: Ritva Laury (ed.), *Crosslinguistic Studies of Clause Combining. The Multifunctionality of Conjunctions*, 153–178. (Typological Studies in Language 80.) Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Lehti-Eklund, Hanna. 2002. Om *att* som diskursmarkör [About *that* as a discourse marker]. *Språk och stil* 11: 81–118.

Linell, Per. 1998. *Approaching Dialogue: Talk, interaction and contexts in dialogical perspectives*. (IMPACT: Studies in Language and Society 3.) Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Linell, Per. 2009. Grammatical constructions in dialogue. In: Alexander Bergs and Gabriele Diewald (eds.), *Context and Constructions*, 97–110. (Constructional Approaches to Language 9.) Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Lindström, Jan and Anne-Marie Londen. 2008. Constructing reasoning. In: Jaakko Leino (ed.), *Constructional Reorganization*, 105–150. (Constructional Approaches to language 5.) Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Lyngfelt, Benjamin. 2003. Samordnande *att* – en talspråklig sambandsmarkör sedd från ett syntaktiskt perspektiv [Co-ordinating *that* – a spoken language connective marker seen from a syntactic perspective]. In: *Texten framför allt. Festskrift till Aina Lundqvist på 65-årsdagen den 11 september 2003*, 139–149. University of Gothenburg: Department of Swedish Language.

Mertzlufft, Christine and Camilla Wide. 2013. The on-line emergence of postmodifying *att*- and *dass*-clauses in spoken Swedish and German. In: Eva Havu and Irma Hyvärinen (eds.),

Comparing and Contrasting Syntactic Structures. From Dependency to Quasi-subordination, 199–229. (Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki 86.)

Mithun, Marianne. 2008. The extension of dependency beyond sentence. *Language* 83: 69–119.

Norén, Kerstin and Per Linell. 2007. Meaning potentials and the interaction between lexis and contexts: An empirical substantiation. *Pragmatics* 17: 387–416.

Östman, Jan-Ola and Graeme Trousdale. 2013. Dialects, discourse and Construction Grammar. In: Thomas Hoffman and Graeme Trousdale (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar*, 476–490. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ono, Tsuyoshi and Sandra A. Thompson. 1995. What can conversation tell us about syntax? In: Philip W. Davis (ed.), *Alternative Linguistics. Descriptive and Theoretical Modes*, 213–271. (Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science. Series IV – Current Studies in Linguistic Theory.) Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Panther, Klaus-Uwe and Linda L. Thornburg, Linda. 2011. Emotion and desire in independent complement clauses: A case study from German. In: Mario Brdar, Stefan Th. Gries and Milena Žic Fuchs (eds.), *Cognitive Linguistics. Convergence and Expansion*, 87–114. (Human Cognitive Processing 32.) Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

SAG. 1999. Teleman, Ulf, Staffan Hellberg and Erik Andersson. Svenska Akademiens grammatik [The Swedish Academy Grammar]. Stockholm: Svenska Akademien (distr. Norstedts ordbok).

SAOB. 1898–. *Ordbok över svenska språket* [Dictionary of Swedish]. Utg. av Svenska Akademien [Published by the Swedish Academy]. Lund.

Verstraete, Jean-Christophe, D'Hertefelt, Sarah and Van Linden, An. 2012. A typology of complement insubordination in Dutch. *Studies in Language* 36 (1): 123–153.

Weinert, Regina. 2012. Complement clauses in spoken German and English: Syntax, deixis and discourse-pragmatics. *Folia Linguistica* 46 (1): 233–265.

Wessén, Elias. 1956. *Svensk språkhistoria III. Grundlinjer till en historisk syntax.* [The history of Swedish III. Main lines of a historical syntax.] Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell.

Wide, Camilla. 2009. Interactional Construction Grammar: Contextual features of determination in dialectal Swedish. In: Alexander Bergs and Gabriele Diewald (eds.), *Context and Constructions*, 111–142. (Constructional Approaches to Language 9.) Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Transcription and glossing symbols

[	utterances starting simultaneously
]	point when overlapping talk stops
=	a single continuous utterance or two ”latching” utterances
.	a falling intonation contour
,	a continuing intonation contour
?	a rising intonation contour
¿	a somewhat rising intonation contour
↑	prosodic up-step
↓	prosodic down-step
w<u>o</u>rd	emphasis
wo:rd	lengthening of the sound
>word<	compressed or rushed talk
<word>	slower talk or drawl
º<u>word</u>º	quiet or soft voice
(word)	uncertain transcription
( )	talk not discernible
wo-	an audible cut-off
.word	a word pronounced with a audible inhalation
hh	audible exhalation
.hh	audible inhalation
(.)	silence shorter than 0.2 seconds
(0.5)	silences measured in tenths of a second
((laughs))	transcriber’s comments
(?):	uncertain speaker identification
PRT	discourse particle