

Christine Mertzlufft (University of Freiburg)

Camilla Wide (University of Turku)

The on-line emergence of postmodifying *att*- and *dass*-clauses in spoken Swedish and German

Abstract

This article investigates how speakers use *att*- and *dass*-clauses which have loose or no syntactic relationship to an element in the preceding discourse in authentic conversations in Swedish and German. The analysis is based on on-line syntax, which takes the temporal unfolding of speech in time into account (Auer 2005, 2007a, b, 2009). The results show that a) there is a continuum of *att*-/*dass*-clauses from those with a stronger to those with a looser or absent syntactic relationship to the preceding discourse; and that b) the function of the investigated *att*-/*dass*-clauses is to elaborate something said in the preceding discourse. On the general level, the functions of the *att*- and *dass*-clauses seem to be the same in Swedish and German conversations. Some differences can, however, be found concerning more specific functions of elaboration.

1. Introduction¹

In this paper we discuss the emergence of *att* and *dass* ‘that’-clauses in Swedish and German in contexts in which the relationship to a preceding clause or phrase is loose, vague or absent. As we will show, there is a continuum ranging from a stronger to a looser or absent syntactic relationship to the preceding discourse, and this may be compared with the findings of Weinert (2012) on the use of *dass* ‘that’-

¹ This study was carried out within the project *Syntax of Spoken Swedish and German* at the Universities of Freiburg and Helsinki 2007–2009. The project was financed by DAAD and the Academy of Finland and led by Prof. Peter Auer and Prof. Jan Lindström. We would like to thank the project leaders and the other members of the project (Karin Birkner, Anja Stukenbrock, Oliver Ehmer, Martin Pfeiffer, Camilla Lindholm and Sofie Henricson) for all their valuable comments at project meetings. We are also grateful for all the comments we received at conferences and seminars where we presented our results (special thanks to Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, Susanne Günthner, Per Linell and Jan Anward).

clauses in German and Laury & Seppänen (2008) on the use of *että* 'that'-clauses in Finnish.

Our analysis is based on an approach of syntax which takes the temporal unfolding of speech in time into account (Auer 2005, 2007a, b, 2009). We focus on clauses with a single *att* or *dass* which modify or explicate a concept or a point in the preceding discourse (complex connectives with *att* and *dass*, such as Swe. *så att*, Ger. *sodass*, 'so', *als dass* 'as (that)' and *anstatt dass* 'instead of (that)' are not discussed in the paper; see section 3). The aim of the paper is to explore the *on-line emergence* of this particular type of *att*- and *dass*-clause in conversational sequences in two closely related languages, Swedish and German. We are especially interested in the conversational contexts in which *att*- and *dass*-clauses with loose or no syntactic relationship to the preceding discourse come about. How do the *att*- and *dass*-clauses relate to the preceding and following discourse? What do they contribute to the situation? What possible loose or vague syntactic relationship to an element in the preceding discourse can be found? What similarities and differences can be found between Swedish and German?

Examples (1) and (2) illustrate the phenomena we analyze in the paper². Example (1) shows several *dass*-clauses in German which have a relationship to an element in the preceding discourse. Example (2) shows two *att*-clauses in Swedish without such a relationship. The German example is from the *Schmerz*-corpus ('pain-corpus') with recordings of patients with chronic pain diseases who participate in psychotherapy treatment. In the example, the patient (P) talks about diarrhea he had when he was in the hospital.

(1) Diarrhea (Schmerz 00072_2; T = therapist, P = patient)

- 01 P: EIN glück dass man das ge[SEHN hat
a luck that one that seen has
'luck that one has seen it'
- 02 T: [hm*:-
- 03 (---)
- 04 P: **dass** man das WIRKlich==
that one that really
'that someone really'

2 The Swedish examples in the paper are transcribed following general CA conventions (with a few symbols added; see list at the end of the paper). The German examples are transcribed following the GAT 2 conventions (Selting et al. 2009); see list of the symbols at the end of the paper).

- 05 =**dass** die SCHWEStern das (---) WIRKlich (-) SELber auch
 that the nurses that really selves even
 'that the nurses really have seen it by themselves'
- 06 geSEHN haben dass ich durchfall hab==
 seen have that I diarrhea have
 'that I have diarrhea'
- 07 T: =[ja;
 yes
 'yes'
- 08 P: =[ja;
 yes
 'yes'
- 09 (-)
- 10 P: das is wie (),=
 that is like ()
 'that is like'
- 11 T: =[JA das ham die SCHWEStern ein[deutig: öh;
 yes that have the nurses clearly
 'yes the nurses have clearly'
- 12→ P: un dass: (.) dass das (-) !NACH! [dem essen [passiert,=
 and that that it after the dinner happened
 'and that it happened after the dinner'
- 13 T: [hm=hm;
- 14 [absolut;=
 absolutely
 'absolutely'
- 15 P: =[dass das AUCh gesehn WURde,
 that it even seen was
 'that it even was seen'
- 16 T: =[absolut ja=a,
 absolutely yes
 'absolutely yes'
- 17 ja=[a;
 yes
 'yes'

In line 1, the NP *ein glück* ('luck') projects a *dass*-clause. The projection³ is

³ By projection we mean expectations that the speaker "creates in the listener about the further development of the emerging syntactic pattern" so that "a syntactic gestalt is opened up, which in the end will be closed via the production of a more or less predictable element" (Auer 2009: 4).

immediately fulfilled by an adjacent *dass*-clause in line 1: *dass man das gesehen hat* ('that one has seen it'). In lines 4 and 5, two additional *dass*-clauses follow (*dass man das wirklich dass die schwestern das wirklich selber auch gesehen haben dass...* 'that someone that really that the nurses really have seen it by themselves that...'). These *dass*-clauses, the first of which is broken off at the end of line 4, rephrase the *dass*-clause in line 1 by providing a specifying elaboration of it (that someone has seen it = that the nurses have seen that I have diarrhea). Syntactically, these two subsequent *dass*-clauses expand the first *dass*-clause in line 1 since they can be seen as complements to the phrase *ein glück* even though the projection of the phrase has already been fulfilled. After the acknowledgement by the therapist in line 11, the patient adds two more *dass*-clauses: *un dass dass das (-) nach dem essen passiert* 'and that it happened after the dinner' (line 12) and *dass das auch gesehen wurde* 'that it also was seen' (line 15). These *dass*-clauses are also syntactically dependent of the preceding, non-adjacent phrase *ein glück* in line 1. As complements to the NP *ein glück*, they also expand the *dass*-clauses in lines 4–6. The communicative function of the *dass*-clause in line 12 is to elaborate the utterance *dass ich durchfall hab* in line 6 (that I have diarrhea → that I had diarrhea after dinner). The *dass*-clause in line 15 emphasizes the point that the nurses saw that the patient had diarrhea (lines 5–6).

Example (2) is from a corpus of calls to a poison control centre in Sweden. In contrast to what was the case in example (1), no syntactic relationship to an element in the preceding discourse can be found in this example. (PRT stands for discourse particle).

(2) Difficulties breathing? (GRIS:GIC 16519; A = agent C = caller)

- 01 A: [...] *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'
- 02 C: [jaa,
PRT
- 03 A: 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 it-, but you do not have any symptoms in the re-
spiratory organs'
- 04 **att** du tycker de e jobbit å *andas* eller **at[t** de trycker
that you think it is difficult to breathe or that it presses
'such that you find it difficult to breath or that it
presses'

05 C: [näå
no

→ 06 A: över=bröstat eller nåt sådant?
over the chest or something like that
'on the chest or something like that?'

A, who works as an agent at the poison control centre, is asking the caller (C), who is afraid that she might have been exposed to toxic varnish, whether she has noticed any symptoms of poisoning in her respiratory organs (line 3). In lines 4 and 6, A elaborates her question with two co-ordinated *att*-clauses: *att du tycker de e jobbit å andas eller att de trycker över bröstet eller nåt sådant?* 'such that you find it difficult to breathe or that it presses on the chest or something like that'. Pragmatically and interactionally, the *att*-clauses make perfect sense: they specify what A has just said, that is, they explicate A's question about C's condition (symptoms = difficult to breathe, pressure in the chest). Syntactically, however, there is no relationship to an element in the preceding discourse. There is no matrix clause to which the *att*-clauses are subordinated, nor do they syntactically complement a phrasal head as in example (1).

When we refer to *att-/dass*-clauses, either with or without a syntactic relationship to the preceding discourse, we mean cases like the ones shown in examples (1) and (2) above. The paper is organized as follows. In the next section we present the data, method and theoretical framework of the empirical analysis. Section 3 summarizes previous research on *att-* and *dass-*clauses in spoken Swedish and German. Sections 4 and 5 form the empirical parts of the paper. Since we are particularly interested in the continuum between clauses with or without a relationship to an element in the preceding discourse, the analysis in sections 4.1 and 4.2 will concern this aspect. We start in section 4.1 by discussing cases in which a syntactic relationship can be found and proceed from clear cases to less clear cases. In section 4.2, we discuss *att-/dass*-clauses in which no syntactic relationship to an element in the preceding discourse can be found. Finally, in section 5, we summarize and compare the conversational contexts in which *att-* and *dass-*clauses with loose or no syntactic relationship to the preceding discourse appear in Swedish and German.

2. Theoretical framework, method and data

The theoretical frameworks of our paper are *emergent grammar* and *on-line syntax*. According to Hopper (1998: 156), the notion of emergent grammar is "meant to suggest that structure, or regularity, comes out of discourse and is shaped by discourse in an ongoing process". The real source of grammar is prior text

since speakers say things that have been said before. Grammar thus consists of meaningful repetition and is always relative to context, which, as Hopper (1998: 157) points out, means that grammatical structure is always provisional, always negotiable, and epiphenomenal: “an effect rather than a cause”.

The term *on-line syntax* (Auer 2007a, 2009) refers to the temporal aspect of speech. As Auer (2009) points out, temporality has to be considered in all investigations of spoken language syntax. According to Auer, there are three main syntactic operations, *projection*, *expansion* and *retraction*, which are fundamental to all speaking and listening. When the speaker uses *projections* he or she creates expectations “about the further development of the emerging syntactic pattern” (Auer 2009: 4) and thus opens up a syntactic gestalt. When the gestalt is closed through “the production of a more or less predictable element” the projection is fulfilled (*ibid.*). *Expansions* include elements which neither project nor fulfill projections but rather expand the preceding structure, e.g. by adding an additional relative clause to a noun phrase (cf. Auer 2009: 7). *Retractions*, finally, reactivate and change syntactic structures in the preceding discourse, which means that they express a backward orientation in time (*ibid.*). Thus, structural latency (Ger. *Strukturlatenz*, Auer 2007a) plays an important role in on-line syntax: when syntactic patterns emerge, structural parts of preceding utterances are available for their interpretation. As we will show in sections 4–5, this is also the case in the contexts in which *att-* and *dass-*clauses occur in Swedish and German conversations.

In order to explore the communicative contexts and routinized patterns of the *att-* and *dass-*clauses we are interested in, we collected examples from authentic recorded conversations in Swedish and German. We categorized the clauses we found according to their syntactic and pragmatic relationship to the preceding discourse and analyzed their interactional functions in the situated contexts in which they occur. For German, we used the *Big Brother*-corpus which contains everyday conversations in various settings and the *Schmerz*-corpus which includes doctor-patient interaction in psychotherapeutical settings.⁴ For Swedish, we used everyday, media, focus group and institutional conversations from the corpora of the projects *Grammar in conversation: A study of Swedish* (GRIS) and *Conversations in Helsinki* (SAM).⁵ (For details on the data, see the list at the end of the paper.)

4 We are grateful to Peter Auer and Karin Birkner for providing us with data from different research projects carried out at the University of Freiburg.

5 We are grateful that we have been able to study Swedish conversations from these corpora.

3. Previous studies of *att-* and *dass-*clauses in Swedish and German

There are no previous comparative studies of *att-* and *dass-*clauses in Swedish and German. The use of *att-* and *dass-*clauses in spoken Swedish and German has, however, been discussed from a number of perspectives in previous research. In this section, we will point out some results that are of interest to our study of *att-* and *dass-*clauses with loose, vague or absent syntactic relationships to an element in the preceding discourse. At the end of the section we will discuss how we have delimited the scope of our study.

Anward (2004) emphasizes the fact that *att* in Swedish points both backward and forward in the discourse. According to Lyngfelt (2003: 148), *att* tends to be used in all kinds of contexts. He characterizes *att* as a “general wild card for expressing connection” since *att* may be used to mark affinity almost irrespective of which kind of syntactic or semantic relation is being expressed. Lindström & Londen (2008), who investigate complex connectives with *att* (see below), make a distinction between its function in *predication subordination* and *discourse subordination*. As shown by Lehti-Eklund (2002), *att*-clauses which relate to functions in the discourse rather than to syntactic subordination generally have a higher frequency and a wider use in Finland Swedish than in Sweden Swedish (see also Lyngfelt 2003). Both in Finland Swedish and in Sweden Swedish *att*-clauses occur in elaborations and conclusions (Lehti-Eklund 2002, Anward 2004). The use of *att*-clauses in closings of topics and transitions between communicative acts (see example (12) in section 5), however, seems to be a typically Finland Swedish phenomenon (Lehti-Eklund 2002) with a direct counterpart in Finnish (cf. Laury & Seppänen 2008).

As shown by Schlobinski (1992), *dass*-clauses can be added to a non-adjacent matrix clause in spoken German. Günthner (2008) discusses how speakers use *dass*-clauses as complements to utterance-initial adjectives when they mark their position to a given but not yet verbalized circumstance. In utterances such as *super dass es das forum gibt*, ‘excellent that this forum exists’, the *dass*-clauses are used as constructions or interactional gestalts with both a forward-pointing projective side and a backward-pointing reactive side. When using *dass*-clauses, speakers tie their turn to a preceding action, which at the same time makes them reacting speakers (Sacks 1968–72: 372, Günthner 2008: 9). As shown by Günthner (2011, 2012a, 2012b), *dass* ‘that’-constructions generally tend to emerge on-line in German conversations when speakers want to expand or modify something that has been said. Weinert (2012), who compares syntactically unintegrated *dass-* and *that-*clauses in spoken German and English, shows how unintegrated *dass*-clauses “are very varied and while they are at times clearly anchored to an element in the

preceding clause, the relation is often indeterminate” (ibid.: 248). Her German data include several unintegrated *dass*-clauses whereas unintegrated *that*-clauses are rare in the English data. The *dass*-clauses function as clarifications, elaborations, explications, reiterations, conclusions, and subtopics (ibid.: 252). Even though the *dass*-clauses cannot be classified as syntactically embedded they do not function independently because they are anchored in the previous discourse and have a content relation to it.

Both in Swedish and German, *att/dass* is used in complex connectives, such as Swe. *så att* ‘so (that)’, *(där)för att* ‘for (that), because that’, *men att* ‘but that’, Ger. *sodass* ‘so that’, *als dass* ‘as (that)’, and *anstatt dass* ‘instead of (that)’. According to Lindström & Londen (2008: 145) the role of *så att*, *för att* and *men att* in spoken Swedish is “to point back to a preceding discourse source and respond to this and expand from this”. The contribution of *så*, *för* and *men* is to “indicate more clearly the semantic relationship – causal, consecutive, adversative – between the assertions and actions that are joined together” (ibid.: 146). The complex connectives hence function as sequentially anchored resources for expanding upon previous assertions. In some cases, a simple *att* or *dass* may, however, express the same semantic relationship as a complex connective. This is the case in the *dass*-clauses in German discussed by Gohl (2006), in which *dass* could be interpreted from a causal point of view, that is, paraphrased with *sodass* or *damit* ‘so that’, e.g. *du verdeckst=et ja, =dass nich noch wat passiert* ‘you cover it so that nothing else will happen’ (p. 193).

In our study, we have, as pointed out above, excluded occurrences with complex connectives. Furthermore, we have chosen to focus in particular on *att/dass*-clauses with a postmodifying function of the kind shown in examples (1) and (2) rather than *att/dass*-clauses with a reasoning function of the kind discussed by Lindström & Londen (2008) and Gohl (2006). The reasons for this are the following. In previous studies, the focus has in most cases been on *att/dass*-clauses with a reasoning function. *Att/dass*-clauses with a postmodifying function have received less attention from scholars (see, however, Günthner 2011, 2012a, Weinert 2012). Including *att/dass*-clauses with a reasoning function in this study would have widened the scope of this paper too much and made it difficult to study the communicative contexts of the *att/dass*-clauses in both Swedish and German in detail. In addition to this, the relationship to the preceding context is of a different kind in the clauses we study than in the ones with a reasoning function – even though there are obviously some cases in which the postmodifying and reasoning functions overlap to some extent. We will discuss some cases like this in section 4.2. In section 4.1 we analyze cases in which the *att/dass*-clauses clearly have

(3) He remembered me from the wedding (GRIS: USAMGRAM 5:2)

- 01 M: prata ↑ru me honom nåt.
spoke you with him anything
'did you talk to him'
(1.2)
- 02 L: ↑ja ja: >mm< ha: (0.2) >bytt nåra o-< (0.2) ord
yes I mm have exchanged some w- words
'yes I have exchanged some words'
- 03 me honom?=
with him
'with him'
(four lines omitted))
- 04 L: [↑på bröllopet va de ege- gentlien bara att vi
on the wedding was it actu- tually just that we
'at the wedding, actually we only'
- 05 s:kaka hand men eh:ɔ
shook hands but
'shook hands but'
- 06 (0.6)
- 07 L: men sen träffa ↑ja honom när han va hos ER,
but then met I him when he was by you
'but then I met him when he was at your place'
- 08 (1.0)
- 09 L: å då (0.2) kom han ihåg mej.
and then remembered he me
'and then he remembered me'
- 10 (1.0)
- 11 M: ja:?
PRT
'yes?'
- 12 L: **att** ja hade varit på bröllopet ja kom inte ihåg
that I had been to the wedding. I remembered not
'that I had been to the wedding. I didn't remember'
- 13 att ja hade prata ↑me honom där men?
that I had talked with him there but
'that I had talked to him there but'

In line 1, M asks L whether she talked to the person at the wedding. In lines 2–3, L responds to this by saying that she exchanged a few words with him. After a comment by M in the omitted lines in which she says that the person in question is

easy to talk to, L states that she actually only shook hands with him at the wedding (lines 4–5). Following a short pause in line 6, L then starts to talk about when she met him at M's place. She begins her utterance in line 7 with the adversative conjunction *men* 'but'. After another pause (line 8), she points out that the person at that occasion remembered her (line 9). M responds to this with the particle *ja*: uttered with a rising intonation contour (line 11), after which L starts to explain her point. The explanation begins with an *att*-clause in line 12: *att ja hade varit på bröllopet* 'that I had been to the wedding'. Directly after the *att*-clause, L continues the elaboration of the whole point by saying that she did not remember herself that she had spoken to the person at the wedding (lines 12–13). Syntactically, the *att*-clause in line 12 is what Auer (2007a, 2009) calls a retraction. The projection of the verb phrase *kom ihåg* has already been fulfilled by the object *mej* 'me' in line 9. By using the *att*-clause in line 12, L reactivates the syntactic gestalt in line 9 by adding a different but syntactically equivalent constituent into the object slot (cf. Auer 2009: 7). On the pragmatic level, the *att*-clause elaborates the utterance in line 9 by specifying the point made: remembered me → remembered that I had been to the wedding.

Example (4) from the German *Schmerz*-corpus is comparable to the Swedish example (3) since it shows a case in which a *dass*-clause specifies something just said. In the example, the patient talks about his childhood. When the patient was four, his father planned to move to the USA together with the children but without the children's mother. Since the father made his plans without informing his wife (the children's mother), the wife was surprised when she heard about the move. In the example, the patient tries to reconstruct how his mother got the information.

(4) The move to the USA (Schmerz 0108_1, T = therapist, P = patient)

- 01 P: wie des DANN: (.) meine mutter rausgekriegt hat
 how it then my mother got to know has
 'how my mother got to know it'
- 02 weiß ich auch nicht geNAU;
 know I also not exactly
 'I don't know exactly either'
- 03 wahrscheinlich hab ICH oder meine schwester dann was geSAGT
 probably have I or my sister then something said
 'probably my sister or I said something'
- 04 dass der (.) papa mit uns in=d usA will
 that the dad with us in the USA wants
 'that dad wants us to go to the USA with him'

- 05 und dann war da halt MORDS theater
and then there was PRT big theater
'and then there was a big argument'
- 06 dann ham sie sich geZOFFT
then have they each other quarreled
'then they quarreled with each other'

In lines 1 and 2, the patient wonders aloud about how his mother got to know that his father wanted to move to the USA together with the children. In line 3, he concludes that probably he or his sister had mentioned something: *wahrscheinlich hab ich oder meine schwester dann was gesagt* 'probably my sister or I said something'. This syntactically completed gestalt is followed by a *dass*-clause in line 4: *dass der papa mit uns in=d usa will* 'that dad wants us to go to the USA with him'. As in the Swedish example (3), the *dass*-clause in line 4 is a retraction: it reactivates the preceding syntactic gestalt in line 3 (*was* 'something') by adding a syntactically equivalent constituent to the object slot. The *dass*-clause in line 4 thus clarifies what *was* 'something' means: that their father wanted them to go to the USA with him.

In example (5) from the German *Big Brother*-corpus, the *dass*-clause is also syntactically related to an element in the preceding discourse. In the example, Andrea (Adr) and John (Jhn) are talking about John's relationship to his parents-in-law. Since John used to be a squatter, his parents-in-law did not like him very much at first.

(5) Parents-in-law (Big Brother: bb84, lines 493-514)

- 01 Adr: aber ich mein die halt MÜßten sich doch jetzt mal
but I believe they PRT should themselves however now
'but I believe that they should'
- 02 langsam dran geWÖHNT haben;
by now to it used have got
'have got used to it gradually'
- 03 [daß de () ne?]
that you PRT
'that you'
- 04 Jhn: [=nee: hamse jetzt oo:ch.]
no have=they now also
'no they have done it now'
- 05 bloß det sin nich DIE-
but they are not those
'but they are not the kind of people'

- 06 die=et von heute auf morgen so ZEigen können oder
who it from today to tomorrow so show can or
'who can admit it from one day to another'
- 07 [so wat]
like what
- 08 ((Short response by Andrea left out))
- 09 Jhn: [du weest-]
you know
'you know'
- 10 dass=et so is? (--)
that=it so is
'that it is like that'
- 11 .h also ick WEEß_et für mich ei(je)ntlich; (.)
well I know=it for me actually
'well I myself know it'
- 12 (--).h und ab und zu müssen sie aber mal wieder sch' (.)
and from time to time must they however once again
'and from time to time they have'
- 13 paar SPItzen lassen;
couple spires let
'to tease me'
- 14 um es nicht so direkt [zuzuheben].
in order to it not so directly admit
'in order to not admit it'
- 15 Adr: [hmmm]
- 16 Jhn: weißte?
know-you
'you know'
- 17 Adr: **dass** de ja doch SO_n guter junge bist.
that you PRT still such a good boy are
'that you still are a good boy'
- 18 ne?
PRT
'don't you'
- 19 Jhn: hm
- 20 Adr: und SO_n guter vater.
and such a good father
'and such a good father'

In lines 1–3, Andrea wonders whether John's parents-in-law have gotten used to his alternative lifestyle. John answers that they have, but that they have problems

with admitting it (lines 4–7). After a short response by Andrea, John says that he is certain that they are used to it (lines 9–11). Nonetheless, his parents-in-law tease him sometimes because they do not want to admit that they have changed their minds (lines 12–14). When Andrea in line 17 says *dass de ja doch so=n guter junge bist* ‘that you still are such a good boy’, she seems to continue a syntactic structure that John has produced, either *du weeßt dass=et so is?* ‘you know that it is like that’ in lines 9–10 or *um es nicht so direkt zuzugeben* ‘in order not to admit it’ in line 14.⁶ Andrea’s utterance could thus be interpreted as a co-construction (for co-constructed *dass*-constructions, see Günthner 2012b). If her *dass*-clause relates back to lines 9–10, it is an expansion, since the projection of *du weeßt* ‘you know’ in line 9 is immediately followed by *dass et so is* ‘that it is like this’ in line 10, which can be expanded with a *dass*-clause (*dass et so is dass...*). Andrea’s *dass*-clause in this case refers to *so* and elaborates it, e.g. Andrea explains what John knows: that he is a good boy. On the other hand, her *dass*-clause in line 17 can be analyzed as a retraction of the subject *et* ‘it’ in line 10, which it in that case elaborates (*et* ‘it’ → that John is a good boy). Günthner (2012a) discusses a comparable *dass*-clause which relates back to a preceding *es* (‘it’) in an adjacent turn. As Günthner points out, this preceding *es* is re-functionalised as a cataphoric element (Günthner 2012a: 11). This could also be the case in our example. However, a third interpretation is also plausible: that Andrea’s *dass*-clause is a retraction of lines 12–14 in John’s preceding turn. Since line 14 has a falling intonation contour, Andrea’s turn in line 17 can be interpreted as a new action which reactivates and changes an already completed syntactic structure: *und ab und zu müssen sie aber mal wieder sch’ paar spitzen lassen; um es nich so direkt zuzugeben* ‘and from time to time they have to tease me in order to not admit it’ in lines 12–14. The function of this retraction (which is also a co-construction) is to elaborate the object *es* ‘it’ in John’s turn in line 14 (*um es nich so direkt zuzugeben*): the parents-in-law do not want to admit directly that John indeed is a good person. At the same time, Andrea pays John a compliment by making her positive stance on John’s personality explicit.

Just like the *att*-clause in example (3) and the *dass*-clause in example (4), the *dass*-clause in line 17 in example (5) refers back in time to a preceding structure. The relationship to this structure is, however, not as straight-forward as in examples (3) and (4). On the one hand, the *dass*-clause in line 17 is a co-construction, that is, it relates to something said by another speaker. On the other hand, there are several structures in the preceding discourse which the *dass*-clause could be seen as either expanding or reactivating. The example thus shows how structural latency plays

⁶ Since *weißte* ‘you know’ in line 16 is a question tag it cannot be seen as the matrix clause of the *dass*-clause in line 17.

a role in the emergence of *dass*-clauses in authentic conversational contexts. The syntactic parts of preceding utterances are available for the interpretation of *dass*-clauses that emerge (cf. Günthner 2011, 2012a, 2012b).

Extract (6) from a Swedish TV discussion on music videos shows an example with several *att*-clauses. The example illustrates how *att*-clauses may syntactically relate to a non-adjacent matrix clause. As in example (5) from our German data, structural latency plays an important role in the emergence of the *att*-clauses in this example.

(6) Classic robbing scenario (GRIS: L ISK TT3, Tryck till;
M = Moderator, H = guest in the studio)

- 01 M: [för] ja fick en känsla av **att-** i i den
because I got a feeling of that in in this
'I got a feeling of that in in this'
- 02 här videon **att att** de dom gör e **att** nån
(here) video that that that they do is that someone
'this video that that what they do is that some'
- 03 slags (0.5) (eh) roadmovie westerngrej
kind of road movie western thing
'kind of road movie western thing'
- 04 f' [att de-] (.) dom har nämligen spelat in=
because that it they have namely recorded
'because that i-, they have recorded'
- 05 H: [mm]
- 06 M: =de i en <westernstudio>, .hh en gammal sån
it in a western studio an old such
'it in a western studio, one of these old'
- 07 här klassisk e:h å **att** dom rånar egentligen
(this) classical and that they rob actually
'classic ones, and they rob actually'
- 08 **att** de e de [(de e frågan om)]
that it is that it is question about
'that that is what it's all about'

In the example, M, who is participating in a TV program on music videos, is trying to explain what a certain video is about. In line 1, he starts by using the expression *jag fick en känsla av* 'I got a feeling of', which projects a nominal complement. He then produces three *att*-clauses which are all left unfinished: *att i den här videon* 'that in this video' (lines 1–2), *att de dom gör e* 'what they do is' (line 2), *att nån slags (eh) roadmovie westerngrej* 'that some kind of road movie western thing'

(lines 2–3). Following a parenthetical explanation in lines 4 and 6 (*f'att de dom har nämligen spelat in de i en westernstudio, en gammal sån här klassisk* 'because that it, they have recorded it in a western studio, one of these old classic ones'), he returns to stating the main plot of the video with a clause initiated by *att*: *att dom rånar egentligen* 'that they rob actually' (line 7). As the position of the postverbal adverbial *egentligen* 'actually' shows, the word order of this *att*-clause is overtly marked as that of a main clause and not as a subordinate clause (the subordinate clause word order would be *att dom egentligen rånar* 'that they actually rob').⁷ Directly after the *att*-clause, he continues with another *att*-clause: *att de e de (de e frågan om)* 'that that is what it's all about' (line 8). This latter *att*-clause has a reasoning function (expressing a conclusion) and *att* could be paraphrased with the connective *så att* 'so that' (cf. section 3).

As in example (5), there are several structures in the preceding discourse to which the *att*-clause in line 7 (*att dom rånar egentligen* 'that they rob actually') in example (6) can be related. There is thus clearly a structural latency for *att*-clauses in the context in which it emerges. On the one hand, the *att*-clause in line 7 could be analyzed as a nominal complement which completes the projection of the phrase *en känsla av* 'a feeling of' in line 1. On the other hand, the *att*-clause could be seen as fulfilling the projection of the clause *att de dom gör e* 'that what they do is' in line 2. It is, however, more likely that the *att*-clause in line 7 relates back to the *att*-clause in line 2, which is left unfulfilled before the parenthetical information about how the video was filmed in lines 4 and 6. In either case, the fulfillment of the preceding structure can be analyzed as a distance projection (cf. Auer 2007a). The fulfillment is, however, not straightforward since the *att*-clause in line 7 is preceded by the conjunction *å* 'and', which breaks the gestalt starting in line 2. The *att*-clause furthermore retracts to a slot in the structure it fulfills, *att* in line 2 (or 1). Syntactically, the *att*-clause thus also modifies an already-existing construction. The function of the *att*-clause seems to be to reactivate the issue of what the video is all about. Similar to several of the *att/dass*-clauses discussed above, the *att*-clause in line 7 points backward to a previous structure and rephrases something

⁷ In Swedish, *att*-clauses may have a main clause word order in spoken as well as in written language when the clauses express what somebody thinks, knows, understands or says. Especially in spoken language, but also in informal written language, main clause word order sometimes also occurs after verbs expressing other events, e.g. *Han lärde oss att man kunde inte skriva samtidigt som man pratade* 'He taught us that one could not write at the same time as one speaks' (cf. *att man inte kunde...*, with the negation in front of the finite verb). (See SAG 4: 537f.). In German, *dass*-clauses always have subordinate clause word order (see, however, Freywald 2008).

that has been said: what they do is some kind of road movie western thing → they rob actually. The *att*-clause in line 8, *att de e de (de e frågan om)* ‘that that’s what it’s all about’, on the other hand, neither points backward to the phrase *få en känsla av att* ‘get a feeling of’ in line 1 nor to the clause *att de dom gör e* ‘that what they do is’ in line 2. Rather, this last *att*-clause states a conclusion or summary of the whole sequence shown in the example (cf. examples of similar *att*-clauses discussed by Lehti-Eklund 2002, Anward 2004).

In example (6), the relationship of the *att*-clause to a structure in the preceding discourse can be characterized as looser than in the other examples discussed so far. On the continuum shown in Figure 1 in the beginning of section 4, the clause in (6) could be placed further away from the left pole (clauses with a syntactic relationship to the preceding discourse). Let us now end the discussion in this section by looking at an example of a *dass*-clause in which the syntactic relationship to the preceding discourse is also loose or vague. In this example from the German *Big-Brother corpus*, John is talking about racism between villages in the Schwarzwald area (lines 1–5).

(7) Racism between villages (Big Brother: bb01, lines 4533–4549)

- 01 Jhn: ein dorf wat ZEHN kilometer entfernt ist;
a village that ten kilometers away is
‘a village which is about ten kilometers away’
- 02 da heißt et nur ach-
there is called it only oh
‘there it is just said’
- 03 die ha_ja ein zimmerner;
they have PRT one ?
‘they have got a (?)’
- 04 die haben sowieso ne macke. .h
they have anyhow a defect
‘anyhow, they are idiots’ *
- 05 da fängt der kleene rassismus schon an; (---)
there begins the small racism already
‘there the minor racism already begins’
- 06 **dass** [man halt so einjeschränkt ist auf seine]
that one just so limited is to his
‘that one is so limited to one’s’
- 07 Jrg: [der fängt doch schon in der fam- ((gaspings))]
it begins however already in the fam-
‘the (racism) begins already within the fam(ily)’

- 08 Jhn: (-) äh äh (--)
uh uh
'uh uh'
- 09 und det is ja auch anerzogen;
and this is PRT also acquired
'and this is also acquired'
- 10 det is_et ja.
this is that PRT
'that's it'
- 11 ick denke mal ((snuffles)) dieset ehm [...] [
I think sometimes this uhm
'I think that this uhm'

In lines 1–4, John explains what shape xenophobia can take in the countryside: inhabitants of two villages within a distance of only 10 kilometers can see each other as idiots. In line 5 in the example, John starts to talk about how “minor racism” begins in the villages: *da fängt der kleine rassismus schon an* ‘there the minor racism already begins’. He finishes the prosodic phrase in line 5 with cues for turn completion (a falling intonation contour followed by a pause). But instead of completing his turn John expands it with a *dass*-clause and elaborates the preceding utterance with the clause *dass man halt so einjeschränkt ist auf seine* ‘that one is so limited to one’s’ (line 6). When he has produced the word *dass*, he is overlapped by Jürgen who says that “it” (racism) starts within the family. After Jürgen’s withdrawal from the overlapping talk at the end of line 7, John holds on to his turn and becomes the sole speaker. John’s *dass*-clause in line 6, however, remains incomplete since he does not finish the prepositional phrase *auf seine* ‘to his’. A possible completion, which can be inferred from the context, would be *auf seine kleinen Bereiche* ‘to his small areas’.

In the utterances in lines 5 and 6, an emerging change of plan can be observed. The verb *anfangen* ‘to start’ in line 5 can be used in two case frames: *anfangen*₁ = V + S as in *Die Schule fängt an* ‘school starts’ and *anfangen*₂ = V + S + prepositional object as in *Es fängt mit Kopfschmerzen an* ‘It starts with a headache’. The prepositional phrase in the latter type can be replaced by the pronominal adverb *damit* ‘so’ (*Es fängt damit an* ‘It starts so that’) which projects a complement in form of a *dass*-clause: *Es fängt damit an, dass man Kopfschmerzen bekommt* (‘It starts with the fact that one gets a headache’). In example (7), John begins line 5 with the structure *anfangen*₁ preceded by the adverb *da* ‘there’ (*da fängt der kleine rassismus schon an* ‘there the minor racism already begins (with)’). With the clause *dass man halt so einjeschränkt ist auf seine* ‘that one is so limited to one’s’ in line 6, he reactivates and retrospectively changes the structure into *anfangen*₂. In this

retraction, *da* is reinterpreted as the pronominal adverb *damit*: *es fängt damit an, dass man halt so eingeschränkt ist* 'it starts with the fact that one just is so limited'. Due to the retraction, the *dass*-clause in line 6 can be seen as a complement to the main clause in line 5 (*da fängt der kleene rassismus schon an*). Since the syntactic relationship between the clauses presupposes an implicit re-interpretation of the main clause, the relationship of the *att*-clause to the preceding discourse is vaguer than any of the examples discussed so far.

To summarize, the *att-* and *dass-*clauses in examples (3)–(7) above can all be related to a syntactic element in the preceding discourse, even though they do not fulfill a projection of a structure in the immediately preceding context. The analysis based on the concept of *on-line syntax* (Auer 2007a, 2009) reveals different kinds of syntactic embeddings depending on what kind of syntactic operation (*projection*, *expansion* or *retraction*) is accomplished. In many cases, the *att/dass*-clauses reactivate a structure in the non-adjacent discourse by retracting to an already existing slot in this structure. In some of the German examples, the *dass*-clauses function as expansions, that is, as syntactic structures which are not projected but nonetheless expand a preceding structure with a new syntactic element. In example (6) from Swedish, the *att*-clause discussed fulfills a non-completed projection in the non-adjacent discourse but at the same time it retracts to a slot in the preceding structure. As the examples show, the distance to the syntactic element in the preceding discourse varies. Furthermore, the relationship can be clear as in examples (3) and (4) or looser or vaguer to varying degrees as in examples (5)–(7). In some cases, such as in examples (5) and (6), the syntactic relationship to a preceding structure is ambiguous, since several options are available. In other cases, such as in example (7), the relationship is vague since the speaker changes constructions. In all the examples, however, the *att/dass*-clauses are pragmatically integrated into the preceding context. The function of the clauses is to reactivate something said in order to elaborate or explicate it (cf. Weinert 2012). What *att* and *dass* seem to do is to link the new contributions to the preceding discourse (cf. Anward 1994, Keevallik 2008, Lindström & Londen 2008, Laury & Seppänen 2008, Weinert 2012, Verstraete et al. 2012).

Even though the examples we have shown from Swedish and German highlight slightly different cases, the patterns of emergence and the functions of the *att/dass*-clauses with a syntactic relationship to the preceding discourse seem to be quite similar in both languages. In the following section, we will discuss some cases in which it is more difficult to find a clause or phrase in the preceding context to which the *att/dass*-clauses could be seen as having a syntactic relationship. As we will show, greater differences between the use of *att-/dass*-clauses in Swedish and

German can be observed.

4.2. Clauses without a syntactic relationship to an element in the preceding discourse

In the introduction, we showed an example with two *att*-clauses in Swedish which do not have a syntactic relationship to an element in the preceding discourse. Let us start the discussion in this section by looking closer at this example, which is reproduced in (8) below.

(8) Difficulties breathing? (GRIS:GIC 16519; A = agent C = caller)

- 01 A: [...] 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'
- 02 C: [jaa,
 PRT
- 03 A: 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 do not have any symptoms in the re-
 spiratory organs'
- 04 **att** du tycker de e jobbit å andas eller **at[t** de trycker
 that you think it is difficult to breathe or that it presses
 'such that you find it difficult to breath or that it
 presses'
- 05 C: [nää
 no
- 06 A: över=bröstet eller nåt sådant?
 over the chest or something like that
 'on the chest or something like that?'

Just as the *att*- and *dass*-clauses we discussed in section 4.1, the *att*-clauses in example (8) elaborate a previous contribution by stating more accurately what has been said or pointed out in the preceding discourse: symptoms = problems of breathing and pain around the chest. Semantically, the *att*-clauses have a postmodifying function. Syntactically, they are, however, neither connected to the noun *symptom* 'symptoms', nor to the preceding clause (*men du har inga symptom från luftvägarna* 'but you do not have any symptoms in the respiratory organs'). Paraphrasing the *att* with *så att* 'so that, in order to' is not possible since the clause does not project a consequence or conclusion, but rather a specification of something that has been said: A clarifies what she means by symptoms in the

respiratory organs. If an implicit link between the clause *men du har inga symptom från luftvägarna* and the two co-ordinated 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 on the chest or something like that’) was to be construed, it would be *det vill säga* ‘that is’ (cf. Verstraete et al. 2012:148) or *till exempel* ‘for example’.

Example (9) shows a case from our German data in which a *dass*-clause without a syntactic link to the preceding discourse nonetheless provides an elaboration of something that has been said in the immediately preceding discourse. In the example, which is from the *Schmerz*-corpus, the therapist wants to know if men are present in the patient’s fantasy world. In her answer, the patient reveals that she has a (fantasy) boyfriend who wants to marry her.

(9) Boyfriend (Schmerz 108_4)

- 01 T: so dieser RAUM den sie da so in der Fantasie
so that space that you there so in the fantasy
‘that space in your imagination that you’
- 02 eingerichtet haben;=
established have
‘have established’
- 03 =das is ja n WUNSCHraum.
it is PRT a wish space
‘it is just a wish space’
- 04 P: hm=hm,
((three lines left out))
- 05 T: wie sieht es DA aus mit m mann;
how look it there with a man
‘what about a man there’
- 06 (-)
- 07 P: DA isch eigentlich nur mein mein freund;
there is actually only my my boyfriend
‘there is actually only my boyfriend’
- 08 dass de:r (----) (mit e) BLUmestrauß vor mir steht und
that he with a bouquet of flowers in front of me stands and
sagt HEIrat mich jetzt endlich;
says marry me now finally
‘that he stands in front of me with a bouquet of flowers
saying marry me finally’
- 09 T: [ah ja;
‘oh yes’

The example starts with the therapist’s conclusion that the patient’s fantasy world is a wish space (lines 1–3). After that he asks if there is a man in the patient’s

imaginary world (line 5). The patient's answer *da isch eigentlich nur mein mein freund* 'there is actually only my boyfriend' (line 7) is syntactically complete and does not project a new syntactic element. When the patient continues by saying *dass der mit e blumestrauß vor mir steht und sagt heirat mich jetzt endlich* 'that he stands in front of me with a bouquet of flowers saying marry me finally', she adds a *dass*-clause which does not have a syntactic relationship to an element in the preceding context. The utterance in line 8, however, points back to the utterance in line 7 since it specifies the patient's answer about her fantasy boyfriend: he stands in front of her with a bouquet of flowers and asks her to marry him. Despite the lack of a syntactic relationship to the preceding discourse, the *dass*-clause in example (9) is clearly embedded in the preceding discourse on the semanto-pragmatic level (cf. similar *dass*-clauses with this function in Weinert 2012).

Examples (8) and (9) support the point made by Auer (2007b) that unit expansions cannot be limited to cases in which a syntactic relationship to an element in the preceding discourse is present. Example (10), which is from a Swedish focus group discussion on genetically modified food, shows a slightly different case of elaboration expressed by an *att*-clause without a syntactic link to the preceding discourse. In this case, the elaboration seems to have the function of strengthening and emphasizing a point made, rather than (only) explaining a specific concept.

(10) Resistance to pesticides (GRIS: L TEMA K: GML 4)

- 01 GKL: ja (0.4) då blir ju ogräset resistent [å ja=
PRT then becomes PRT the weed resistant and PRT
'then the grass becomes resistant and'
- 02 HML: [ja:ɔ
PRT
- 03 GKL: =(0.2) så måste [man ()
then has to one
'then one has to'
- 04 HML: [>å sen får vi hitta på e<
and then get we invent a
'and then we have to invent a'
- 05 nytt s[prutmedel [å [senɔ
new pesticide and then
'a new pesticide and then'
- 06 GKL: [ja:ɔ [.ja
PRT PRT
- 07 CKL?: [° (mm) °
- 08 CKL?: °(mm)°

- 09 HML: blir de resistant emot de å sen får m- (0.4)
become it resistant against it and then get o-
'it becomes resistant against it and then one has to'
- 10 så [går de så;
then goes it so
'then it goes like that'
- 11 ((4 lines omitted))
- 12 CKL: [a just ogräsmedel blir ju ↓kanske'nte
PRT precisely pesticide becomes PRT perhaps not
'well, the pesticide does not perhaps become'
- 13 resistant⁻ [m[en de e ju däremot svampar=
resistant but that is PRT on the other hand fungi
'resistant, but it is rather the fungi that is that'
- 14 AML: [n[ä:,
PRT
- 15 FML: [nä,
PRT
- 16 CKL: =å [bakterier att dom (0.2) ↓förändras ju=
and bacteria that they change PRT
'and bacteria, that they change'
- 17 FML: [a:o (.) a:o.
PRT PRT
- 18 CKL: =å [virusarna dom ä[ndras [ju⁻.
and viruses they change PRT
'and the viruses, they change'
- 19 FML: [mm:.. [mm:..
- 20 HML: [>a j-<
PRT I-

In the example, pesticides are being discussed. In line 1, GKL talks about how grass becomes resistant to pesticides. In lines 4–5, HML responds to this by concluding that new pesticides therefore have to be invented. When HML continues in lines 5 and 9–10 by saying that *it* (Swe. *de(t)*) (in turn) becomes resistant to *that* (*å sen blir de resistant emot de* 'it becomes resistant against that'), the reference is ambiguous. The anaphoric pronoun *de(t)* normally refers to something that has been mentioned just before, which in this case (the first occurrence of *de* in line 9) would be the pesticide, not the grass. CKL's contribution in lines 12–13 and 16–18 could be seen as a reaction to this. CKL points out that it is not the pesticides that become resistant but rather the fungi, viruses and bacteria. During this contribution CKL uses an *att*-clause in line 16: *att dom förändras ju* 'that they change'. The clause is

not syntactically related to any element in the preceding discourse. The pragmatic function of the clause seems to be to emphasize a point, that is, the contrast that speaker CKL highlights: pesticides do not become resistant but viruses and bacteria do since *they* change. Here, *att* could possibly be paraphrased with *för att* 'because of that'. As in all the examples discussed so far, the *att*-clause in line 16 refers to something said in the preceding discourse which is elaborated or rephrased in some way. In this case, the *att*-clause occurs during a sequence when the speaker is correcting something that another speaker has said, but by the time the speaker uses the *att*-clause, he has already made his point. What the *att*-clause does is to emphasize this point by making the explanation explicit: fungi and bacteria become resistant ← fungi and bacteria change.

In all the examples discussed so far in this section, the *att/dass*-clauses have elaborated, explained or explicated something said in the immediately preceding discourse. In the last example discussed in this paper, example (11) from our Finland Swedish data, the *dass*-clause occurs after a 1.1 second long pause. In the example, the women participating in an everyday conversation are talking about a pair of shoes that one of the women (Asta) recently bought.

(11) Shoes with rubber soles (SAM:V2)

01 Mon: =di e nästan som toff- [(.) tofflor () e di eleganta
 they are almost like slipp- slippers are they elegant
 'they are almost like slipp- slippers, () they are
 elegant'

02 Asta: [jä (.) å [ja har satt gu- låti=
 PRT and I have put ru- let
 'yes, and I have put ru- let'

03 Eva: [°m°

04 Asta: =sätta gummi [(.) sula () under jä sidu när man bor
 put rubber sole under PRT PRT when one lives
 'put a rubber sole () beneath, when one lives'

05 Eva: [aj du satt de?
 PRT you put that
 'you did that?'

06 ?Eva: [jä (.) [jä de+e (.) när de+e fuktit nu så blev de=
 PRT yes it is when it is damp now so became they
 'yes, it is when it is damp now it became'

07 Mon: [.tjä (.) [de+e fukt- [()
 PRT it is damp-
 'it is damp-'

08 Asta: [()

- 09 Eva =ju också lite tjockare bottnar
 PRT also little thicker soles
 'also a little bit thicker soles'
- 10 (1.1)
- 11 °att de+e ju bara bra°
 that it is PRT only good
 'that that's only good'
- 12 (1.3)
- 13 Eva: >ne di e ver-< (.h) ja Tove den här väskan köpte #ja#
 PRT they are rea- PRT this bag bought I
 'they are see-, well Tove this bag I bought'

When the extract starts, Monika (Mon) says that the shoes, which look like slippers, are elegant (line 1). Following this, Asta tells the other women that she put rubber soles on the shoes (line 4). In lines 6 and 9, Eva elaborates this by pointing out that it is damp outside and the rubber soles make the soles thicker (*när de+e fuktig nu så blev de ju också lite tjockare bottnar* 'when it is damp now it became also a little bit thicker soles'). Following the 1.1 second pause, Eva continues by saying *att de+e ju bara bra* 'that that's only good'. This could be seen as an explication of what she has just said, that is, that it is good to have thick soles on your shoes in damp weather. However, it seems more likely that the *att*-clause here evaluates the whole point about the rubber soles on the shoes. The reason Eva adds this evaluation (which she has already conveyed implicitly in lines 4 and 9) seems to be that nobody else takes the turn. The *dass*-clause hence continues the topic under discussion, which can be seen as an expansion on the interactional level, but not on the syntactic level. As seen in line 12, Eva continues to talk about the topic after yet another pause but then breaks off the evaluation she seems to be on her way to formulating in line 13. Directly after the break-off, she starts to talk about another topic (a bag she has bought).

The *att*-clause in example (11) thus occurs at the end of a sequence. No syntactic relationship to an element in the preceding discourse can be found. On the pragmatic level, however, the clause explicates a point made in the on-going sequence (about the rubber soles). The *att*-clause thus has a retrospective and discourse-structuring function in the example (cf. Lehti-Eklund 2002). Similar to *että*-clauses in Finnish, the *att*-clause here occurs in what Laury & Seppänen (2008: 171) characterize as "summaries, explanations and candid understandings of what has been said before in the same conversation". In contrast to our (Finland) Swedish data, our German data did not contain *dass*-clauses with this kind of a discourse-structuring function. There were also fewer 'that'-clauses which had no

syntactic link to preceding discourse in our German data than in our Swedish data.

To summarize, the *att/dass*-clauses shown in this section lack a syntactic relationship to an element in the preceding discourse. Nonetheless, they all have a retrospective orientation on the pragmatic level since they elaborate, explain or explicate something said in the preceding discourse (cf. Weinert 2012, Verstraete et al. 2012). The *att/dass*-clauses in examples (7)–(11) form a continuum ranging from clauses that elaborate a specific element in the preceding discourse, such as *symptoms* in example (7), to clauses that elaborate topics under discussion such as in example (11). The *att*- and *dass*-clauses in examples (7)–(11) thus have a postmodifying function which is similar to the examples discussed in section 4, in which it was possible to find some kind of syntactic relationship to an element in the preceding discourse. In Finland Swedish, *att*-clauses may, as shown in example (11), also have a discourse-structuring function. Generally, *att/dass*-clauses without a syntactic relationship to an element in the preceding discourse seem to have a wider functional potential in Swedish than in German.

5. Discussion

In this paper we analyzed the use of *att*- and *dass*-clauses in spoken Swedish and German in contexts in which the syntactic relationship to an element in the preceding discourse is either loose, vague or absent. The focus was on clauses with a postmodifying function rather than a reasoning function. We started our analysis in section 4.1 with examples in which some kind of a syntactic link to a phrasal head or a clause could be found and then proceeded in section 4.2 to cases in which this link is absent. As the analysis showed, there seems to be a continuum ranging from cases in which the syntactic relationship is clearly observable to cases in which the relationship is looser or vaguer. On the pragmatic level, however, the function of all the *att/dass*-clauses is to elaborate something said in the adjacent or non-adjacent preceding discourse. In examples (3) and (5), a point was explicated, and in examples (4) and (6) more specific information was provided about something discussed. Structural latency and retraction to a slot in a preceding structure turned out to play an important role in several of the examples, but, as shown in example (5), some cases could possibly also be categorized syntactically as expansions. In addition to this, we also found examples of *att/dass*-clauses fulfilling a projection (example 6) and changing a structure more fundamentally (example 7).

The analysis of *att/dass*-clauses which exhibit a loose or vague syntactic relationship to an element in the preceding discourse did not show any significant differences between Swedish and German with regards to the functions of the

clauses and the syntactic operations involved in the emergence of them. When we moved on to the cases in which no syntactic relationship to an element in the preceding discourse could be observed, it turned out to be more difficult to find examples in our German data than in our Swedish data. Example (9) showed one of the few clear examples that we found in the German data. In the example, a person just mentioned was described in more detail with a *dass*-clause with no syntactic link to an element in the preceding discourse. A similar case from Swedish was shown in example (8), in which a concept (symptoms) was specified with two *att*-clauses. Examples of the type shown in (10) and (11) could, however, only be found in Swedish or Finland Swedish. In both these examples, the *att*-clauses emerged in situations in which something was being emphasized or explicated. Whereas the *att*-clause in the Sweden Swedish example in (10) occurred in the immediately following discourse, the *att*-clause in the Finland Swedish example in (11) occurred after a pause and explicated an evaluation of a point made during a longer stretch of talk. The function of the *att*-clause in this example could be characterized as discourse-structuring (Lehti-Eklund 2002), which is a typical function of *että*-clauses in Finnish (Laury & Seppänen 2008).

In sum, we could observe four main subtypes of elaborations in our Swedish and German data. German *dass*-clauses of the kind we have investigated show fewer functions than the corresponding *att*-clauses in Swedish. Table 1 summarizes the functions.

Type of elaboration	Swedish	German
Provide more specific information	X	X
Reactivate something discussed	X	X
Emphasize a point made	X	X
Explanation or evaluation	X	

Table 1. Subtypes of elaboration with *att/dass*-clauses in the Swedish and German data

Even though some clear differences could be found between Swedish and German in the use of *att/dass*-clauses which have no syntactic relationship to an element in the preceding discourse, the study clearly showed that *att/dass*-clauses function as an interactional resource for speakers of both languages in certain types of communicative contexts (cf. Günthner 2012a). Typical for these contexts is that a concept or point in the preceding discourse needs to be elaborated, and this is then specified, explained or explicated (cf. Weinert 2012, Verstraete et al. 2012). The *att/dass*-clauses examined support previous studies that have pointed out the linking, that is both backward- and forward-pointing, function of *att* and *dass* (Lehti-

Eklund 2002, Anward 2004, Lindström & Londen 2008, Günthner 2008, 2011, 2012a, 2012b, Weinert 2012; cf. also Laury & Seppänen 2008, Keevallik 2008 on *et(tä)* ‘that’ in Finnish and Estonian). By using *att/dass*-clauses, the speakers can either reactivate and change already completed or syntactically fulfilled structures or relate to something in the preceding discourse.

Finally, the study showed how closely related the emergence of *att/dass*-clauses is to pragmatic factors in the discourse. These factors may override the syntactic restraints in the preceding clause. Even though the *att/dass*-clauses we have discussed may seem odd when looked upon in isolation, they play a crucial role in the on-going interaction.

Data

- Big Brother = The corpus of informal conversations in German from the reality television show *Big Brother* (approx. 23 hours). German Department, University of Freiburg.
- 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/>.
- SAM = The corpus of Helsinki Swedish conversations made available in the project *Svenska samtal i Helsingfors* (Swedish conversations in Helsinki). Department of Scandinavian languages and literature, University of Helsinki.
- Schmerz*-corpus = therapist-patient interaction with chronic pain patients (10 hours). German Department, University of Freiburg.

References

- Anward, Jan 2004: ‘att’. *Språk och stil* 13: 65–85.
- Auer, Peter 2005: Projection in interaction and projection in grammar. *Text* 25 (1). 7–36.
- Auer, Peter 2007a: Syntax als Prozess. *Gespräch als Prozess. Linguistische Aspekte der Zeitlichkeit verbaler Interaktion*. Hausendorf, Heiko (ed.). Tübingen: Narr. 95–124.
- Auer, Peter 2007b: Why are increments such elusive objects. *Pragmatics* 17:4. 647–665.
- Auer, Peter 2009: On-line syntax: Thoughts on the temporality of spoken language. *Language Sciences* 31. 1–13.

- Freywald, Ulrike 2008: Zur Syntax und Funktion von *dass*-Sätzen mit Verbzweitstellung. *Deutsche Sprache* 3. 246–285.
- Gohl, Christine 2006: *Dass*-Konstruktionen als Praktiken des Begründens. *Konstruktionen in der Interaktion*. Günthner, Susanne & Imo, Wolfgang (eds.). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 181–204.
- Günthner, Susanne 2008: “Adjektiv + *dass*-Satz”-Konstruktionen als kommunikative Ressourcen der Positionierung. *Gidi Arbeitspapiere* 18 [http://noam.uni-muenster.de/gidi/arbeitspapier18.pdf].
- Günthner, Susanne 2011: *Dass*-Konstruktionen im alltäglichen Sprachgebrauch – Facetten ihrer “interaktionalen Realität”. *Gidi Arbeitspapiere* 35. [http://noam.uni-muenster.de/gidi/arbeitspapiere/arbeitspapier35.pdf].
- Günthner, Susanne 2012a: Vom schriftsprachlichen Standard zur pragmatischen Vielfalt? Aspekte einer interaktional fundierten Grammatikbeschreibung am Beispiel von *dass*-Konstruktionen. *Gidi Arbeitspapiere* 41. [http://noam.uni-muenster.de/gidi/arbeitspapiere/arbeitspapier41.pdf].
- Günthner, Susanne 2012b: ‘Geteilte Syntax’: Kollaborativ erzeugte *dass*-Konstruktionen. *Gidi Arbeitspapiere* 43. [http://noam.uni-muenster.de/gidi/arbeitspapiere/arbeitspapier43.pdf].
- Hopper, Paul J. 1998: Emergent Grammar. *The New Psychology of Language: Cognitive and Functional Approaches to Language Structure*. Tomasello, Michael (ed). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum. 155–175.
- Keevallik, Leelo 2008: Conjunction and sequenced action. *Crosslinguistic Studies of Clause Combining. The multifunctionality of conjunctions. Typological Studies in Language* 80. Laury, Ritva (ed). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 125–152.
- Laury, Ritva & Seppänen, Eeva-Leena 2008: Clause combining, interaction, evidentiality, participation structure, and the conjunction-particle continuum. The Finnish *että*. *Crosslinguistic Studies of Clause Combining. The multifunctionality of conjunctions. Typological Studies in Language* 80. Laury, Ritva (ed). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 153–178.
- Lehti-Eklund, Hanna 2002: Om *att* som diskursmarkör. *Språk och stil* 11. 81–118.
- Lindström, Jan & Londen, Anne-Marie 2008: Constructing reasoning. *Constructional Reorganization. Constructional Approaches to language* 5. Leino, Jaakko (ed). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 105–150.
- Lyngfelt, Benjamin 2003: Samordnande *att* – en talspråklig sambandsmarkör sedd från ett syntaktiskt perspektiv. *Texten framför allt. Festskrift till Aina Lundqvist på 65-årsdagen den 11 september 2003*. Göteborg University: Department of Swedish Language. 139–149.

- Sacks, Harvey 1968–1972: *Lectures on Conversation*. Vol II. Cambridge/Mass.: Blackwell.
- SAG = Svenska Akademiens grammatik. Teleman, Ulf, Hellberg, Staffan & Andersson, Erik 1999: Stockholm: Svenska Akademien (distr. Norstedts ordbok).
- Schlobinski, Peter 1992: *Funktionale Grammatik und Sprachbeschreibung. Eine Untersuchung zum gesprochenen Deutsch sowie zum Chinesischen*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Selting, Margret; Auer, Peter; Couper-Kuhlen, Elisabeth; Birkner, Karin; Barth-Weingarten, Dagmar; Bergmann, Pia; Deppermann, Arnulf; Gilles, Peter; Günthner, Susanne; Hartung, Martin; Kern, Friederike; Mertzlufft, Christine; Peters, Jörg; Stukenbrock, Anja; Uhmann, Susanne 2009: Gesprächsanalytisches Transkriptionssystem 2 (GAT 2). *Gesprächsforschung. Online-Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion*. 353–402.
- Verstraete, Jean-Christophe; D’Hertefelt, Sarah & 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.

Transcription symbols, Swedish data

[utterances starting simultaneously
]	point when overlapping talk stops
=	a single continuous utterance or two “latching” utterances
.	a falling intonation contour
,	a continuing intonation contour
ˆ	a somewhat rising intonation contour
↓	prosodic down-step
<u>word</u>	emphasis
w <u>o</u> :rd	lengthening of the sound
WORD	louder voice
wo+ord	legato pronunciation
#word#	squeaky pronunciation
>word<	compressed or rushed talk
<word>	slower talk or drawl
°word°	quiet or soft voice
(word)	uncertain transcription
()	talk not discernible

wo-	an audible cut-off
.word	a word pronounced with an audible inhalation
hh	audible exhalation
.hh	audible inhalation
(.)	silence shorter than 0.2 seconds
(0.5)	silence measured in tenths of a second
((laughs))	transcriber's comments
*	pronounced with laughing voice
?:	uncertain speaker identification

Transcription symbols (GAT2; Selting et al. 2009), German data

[]	overlap and simultaneous talk
[]	
.h/h.	in-/outbreaths of appr. 0.2-0.5 duration
(.)	micro pause, estimated, up to 0.2 sec. duration appr.
(-)	short estimated pause of appr. 0.2-0.5 sec. duration
(--)	intermediary estimated pause of appr. 0.5-0.8 sec. duration
(---)	longer estimated pause of appr. 0.8-1.0 sec. duration
(0.5) / (2.0)	measured pause of appr. 0.5 / 2.0 sec. duration (to tenth of second)
and_uh	cliticizations within units
uh, uhm, etc.	hesitation markers ("filled pauses")
((coughs))	non-verbal vocal actions and events
()	unintelligible passage
(may I)	assumed wording
=	fast, immediate continuation with a new turn or segment (latching)
,	cut-off by glottal closure
SYLlable	focus accent
sYllable	secondary accent

final pitch movement of intonation phrase

?	rising to high
,	rising to mid
—	level
;	falling to mid
.	falling to low