Verb-first constructions as a syntactic and functional resource in (spoken) Swedish

Jan Lindström & Susanna Karlsson

This paper explores different syntactic variations and functional properties of clausal units that are initiated by the finite verb in Swedish. We focus on V1 constructions that are basically declarative in function, thus excluding interrogative, conditional and directive uses. Because V1 constructions, and particularly certain variants of them, are typical of spoken Swedish, our examples and analyses focus primarily on the usage in speaking. The V1 constructions studied include whole-utterance constructions in conversational sequences, utterance-internal extensions, and utterance-internal reshapings, such as syntactic blends. We will offer an analysis of (declarative) V1 constructions, which in some respects differs from analyses proposed by generative syntacticians or traditional grammarians. Our analysis of the constructional resource is discourse oriented. In this perspective, V1 constructions are analyzable as sequentially dependent, second, or 'subsequent' moves, viz. units that can scarcely initiate a communicative project but which instead continue, extend or comment on an already initiated project. Thus, rather than analyzing V1 constructions as one type of ellipsis they could be seen as full-fledged clausal units whose existence is conditioned by their position in a discourse or utterance context. From a theoretical perspective, this paper is a contribution to an emerging dialogical or interactional model of (Swedish) grammar.

Keywords   CA, functional analysis, Interactional Linguistics, natural language corpora, Swedish, V1

Jan Lindström, Department of Scandinavian Languages and Literature, University of Helsinki, P.O. Box 24, FIN-00014 Helsinki, Finland. E-mail: jklindst@ling.helsinki.fi

Susanna Karlsson, Department of Swedish Language, Göteborg University, Box 200, SE-405 30 Göteborg, Sweden. E-mail: susanna.karlsson@svenska.gu.se

1. INTRODUCTION

Clauses initiated by a finite verb are a recurrent syntactic feature of Swedish, particularly in its spoken form. Such V1 CONSTRUCTIONS are as central a characteristic of the language as the general verb-second condition for Swedish declaratives, and may even be considered a consequence of it. Despite this, the conditions for the use of declarative V1 constructional formats in the grammar of Swedish have not been extensively researched. Apart from Swedish, verb-first clauses are a property of other

typologically verb-second languages, such as the Scandinavian sister languages and German.

The aim of this paper is to illustrate the wide syntactic and functional variety of verb-first clauses in Swedish. We will argue that V1 constructions are a central resource by which both the internal syntax of single utterances and their 'external syntax', i.e. in a sequence of utterances, may be tied together (for the internal and external syntax concepts, see Fillmore 1989, Linell 2005). We will also argue that the semantic coding of the V1 constructions studied here is undefined; instead, the motivation of this constructional format is pragmatic, serving as a tool of discourse organisation. The variations of the V1 format include fairly general, textually motivated uses, as well as lexicalized expressions that have lost their essential clausal substance. In an attempt to account for this variation, this paper will deal with the following subtypes of V1 constructions:

1. V1 constructions appended to a sequence, including lists, turn extensions, and responses.
2. V1 constructions reshaping the utterance, including syntactic blends.
3. V1 constructions appended to an utterance, including parenthetical clauses.
4. V1 constructions as discourse particles.

Swedish formal syntacticians have been particularly interested in declarative sentences with a V1 pattern (e.g. Platzack 1987, Mörnsjö 2002, and for a diachronic perspective, cf. Magnussson 2003), and corresponding structures have also been studied, for example, in German (e.g. Auer 1993, Diessel 1997). However, there have been no previous studies where the above subtypes of the V1 format have been discussed in relation to each other. Investigations of the discursive or interactional uses of the format have also been rare, but recently the import of certain variants of the clausal V1 format for spoken interaction have been studied by Linell (2003), Karlsson (2003), Nordberg (2003), Noreen (2003). Our intention here is to provide a generalized grammatical and functional account of V1 constructions that is more contextually and interactionally motivated, by linking the different formal and functional varieties of the construction together. We also focus mainly on usage in spoken interaction, due to the fact that many V1 constructions are most typically encountered in spoken Swedish.

2. V1 CONSTRUCTIONS AND THE BASIC SYNTAX OF SWEDISH

The finite verb has a key organizing role in the clausal syntax of Swedish. This is a reflection of the typological fact that Swedish is an XVS-language with a highly fixed grammatical word-order, where the finite verb in particular holds a fixed position. The basic word order of the main clause core can be represented in a topological word-order model, as in Table 1. The clausal core is initiated by the finite verb (v)

CLAUSAL BASE	CLAUSAL CORE		
x	v	s	o
[]	får	ni	kaffe
	get	*you*	*coffee*
[zero or constituent	[finite]	[nominal]	[nominal]
x e.g. *ni*, *kaffe*]		[← possible x]	[← possible x]

Table 1. The basic word order pattern in Swedish main clauses.

which is either the first constituent of the whole main clause, or preceded in the inner clausal frame by only one constituent, called the CLAUSAL BASE or topic (x).[1]

The basic main clause core is shared by declaratives, polar questions, *wh*-questions and, in principle, also by directives. A canonical declarative clause of modern Swedish has a topic constituent (the base) preceding the finite verb and the rest of the clausal core. The finite verb thus has a remarkable structural binding function, marking what has preceded the finite as belonging to the same sentential structure as the subsequent unit initiated by the finite. This happens when the pre-finite constituent is simple, as in (1) and (2), as well as complex, as in (3).

(1) Ni   **får kaffe**.
     you-PL get coffee
     'You'll get coffee.'

(2) Snart **får ni   kaffe**.
     soon   get you-PL coffee
     'Soon you'll get coffee.'

(3) Om ni   väntar en stund   **får ni   kaffe**.
     if   you-PL wait   a   moment get   you-PL coffee
     'If you wait a minute, you'll get coffee.'

When a clause element is used as the clausal base, its potential place in the clausal core is empty. Thus, the subject *ni* 'you' in (1) does not have a place within the clausal core, but is interpreted as the pre-finite topic element. The subject position in the clausal core is filled in instances where the clausal base consists of some clause element other than the subject, as in (2) and (3). The role of the clausal base is taken by a question word in *wh*-questions, (4), while directive clauses with the verb in the imperative, (5), and polar questions, (6), do not have anything in the base position, and thus start directly from the clausal core, i.e. with the finite verb as the first constituent.

	THE INNER CLAUSAL FRAME			
	CLAUSAL BASE	CLAUSAL CORE		
Ex.	x	v	S	o
(1)	Ni	får		kaffe.
(2)	Snart	får	ni	kaffe.
(3)	Om ni väntar en stund	får	ni	kaffe.
(4)	Var	får	ni	kaffe?
(5)		Ta	(ni)	lite kaffe!
(6)		Får	ni	kaffe?

Table 2. Examples of some basic word order patterns in Swedish main clauses.

(4) Var **får ni   kaffe**?
     where get you-PL coffee
     'Where do you get coffee?'

(5) **Ta** (**ni**) **lite   kaffe**!
     take you-PL a little coffee
     '(You) Have a little coffee!'

(6) **Får ni   kaffe**?
     get you-PL coffee
     'Do you get coffee?'

The word order principles exemplified by (2)–(6) are further illustrated in Table 2.

By comparison, English tends to retain the constituent order SVO in the clausal core irrespective of the type of the first element; however, there are some exceptions to this, including clauses starting with a negative expression, e.g. *Never has he been so lovely*.

Swedish declaratives are not always initiated by a clausal base; they can start directly with the finite verb, and thus contain only the clausal core. In a sense, V1 declaratives contrast with the canonical V2 declarative format in that they seem to lack the normally obligatory first clausal constituent. Such verb-first declaratives are characteristically found in lively, descriptive texts, where the construction is associated with the introduction of new discourse events within a larger, on-going event:

(7) **Följer** en sällan skådad uppvisning i artistisk förnedring,
     follows a rarely seen display in artistic degradation
     i megalomani, sexism och ren skär idioti.
     in megalomania sexism and clean pure idiocy
     'Then a rare display of artistic degradation, megalomania and pure idiocy
     follows.'   [HBL:03-07-31]

This V1 construction is subject to the condition that it develops and expands a communicative project of which it is a part, rather than initiating a project as a first move (for 'communicative projects', see Linell (1998:207ff.)). This V1 declarative, which could be called 'event dependent', or indeed APPENDED, is probably related to the old Swedish or old Norse presentation construction, which consisted of a V1 clausal core; the construction is also common in the Icelandic sagas (Wessén 1956:199):[2]

(8) **Liggär** lik a wigwalli.
  lies corpse on murder scene
  'There's a corpse lying at the scene of the crime.' [Wessén 1956:199]

The new referent, e.g. the unspecified 'corpse' in (8), is positioned further on within the clause, which is the preferred principle for the structuring of information of Swedish even today.[3] Like the type in (7), the construction in (8) also involves the addition of a new discourse event, which becomes the basis for further discussion. It is probable that it is the same basic V1 construction as has been semantically coded as a means of constructing polar questions (9) and the conditional protasis (10); and, because of this functional overlap, the old V1 presentation construction has evolved out of the language or at least its scope has been reduced (cf. Wessén 1956:189).

(9) Ligger boken på golvet?
  lies the book on the floor
  'Is the book lying on the floor?'

(10) Ligger boken på golvet, (då) ska du lyfta upp den.
  lies the book on the floor then shall you pick up it
  'If the book is lying on the floor, then you'll have to pick it up.'

Questions typically PRESENT topics that are event dependent, and one special subtype of the phenomenon is the PRESENTATION of the conditional protasis (the antecedent) before the apodosis (the consequent).[4] Consider also (11), with a question which consists of a kind of a condition or a background, followed by a consequential response to it.

(11) Ligger boken på golvet? Då ska du lyfta upp den.
  lies the book on the floor then shall you pick up it
  'Is the book lying on the floor? Then you'll have to pick it up.'

This functional link is cross-linguistically witnessed by the fact that questions, topics and conditional protases may be coded by the same grammatical markers in diverse languages, apparently because these encode acts that share the function of establishing the background or basis for further discussion (Haiman 1985:26–39; see also Schiffrin 1992). Thus, Swedish would be no exception to this general tendency.

SWEDISH V1 CONSTRUCTIONS	
EXPLICITLY CODED	IMPLICITLY CODED
polar interrogative	event presenting declarative [obsolete (or narrative inversion?)]
conditional protasis	appended ('event dependent') declarative
directives with the verb in imperative	

Table 3. General variants of the V1 constructional pattern in Swedish.

It is probably because the V1 presentation construction is obsolete in present-day Swedish that the basic relationship between interrogative/conditional V1 constructions and appended declarative V1 constructions is not usually recognized. Nevertheless, it is theoretically important to state the formal and functional relationships here, presented in Table 3.

Finally, it may be noted that polar questions and conditional protases are not experienced as 'incomplete' or 'elliptical' in any fashion, although formally they 'lack' the clausal base, whereas V1 declaratives of the type exemplified in (7) are at least considered not as complete as the general, syntactically filled V2 variant of the declarative, which includes a clausal base. To pursue the motivations for such a V1/V2 structural variation is thus one of the main objectives of this paper and the main reason for excluding V1 questions and conditionals from the present study. Indeed, the latter constructions would be worth a focussed study of their own. Directive clauses with the verb in the imperative would be one variant of V1 shaped clauses, but they constitute a more special constructional sub-type in having the verb in a distinct mood and usually omitting the (given) second person subject. Thus, such imperative clauses are not either considered in the following.

We will now move on to discuss different instances of modern Swedish clausal constructions that are initiated by the finite verb and are basically – historically speaking, at least – declarative in function. The present survey includes uses that often receive marginal treatment in grammars, such as so-called parenthetical clauses, discourse particles and syntactic blends (pivots). Our conclusion is that these structures do not belong to the grammatical periphery, but are part of a larger organizing principle of Swedish grammar. Thus, we aim to show that the previously neglected V1 constructions are related to functionally more prominent variants of verb-initial clausal structures. From the point of view of the spoken language, we will argue that verb-first constructions are an important resource for progressive syntagmatic turn-construction, as well as for the management of sequential discourse coherence.

3. V1 CONSTRUCTIONS FROM A SEQUENTIAL PERSPECTIVE

In this section we will take a closer look at the environments in which V1 constructions can occur in natural interaction. This section is specifically dedicated to the formal variants of the V1 format that could be considered the most 'clausal' or 'sentential', in that the V1 construction typically constitutes a clausal unit in its own right rather than being appended to a larger clausal frame. Most of the uses considered below are, however, clearly extensions of a host communicative project, and in relative terms they are thus necessarily 'dependent' structures.

When discussing verb-first constructions that are in principle declaratives, we can identify two primary structural variants (Mörnsjö 2002). The first variant can be understood to consist of a clausal core in which all the 'obligatory elements' are present, as illustrated in (12); in Mörnsjö's work, this means that all arguments of the verb are present, even though they may not be in the traditional order. The clause presented in the example/table in (12) is an illustration of this: when the clause is re-arranged from *ser man mördarens steg* to *man ser mördarens steg* – using the same constituents – it is no longer unacceptable. In the second variant, not all of these obligatory elements are present, which means in practice that the subject slot in the clausal core is empty, as in (13). This clause could not be re-arranged to form an acceptable clause.

(12) Ser man mördarens steg.

v	S	VP COMPLEMENTS	
ser	man	mördarens	steg
see	*man-GENPR*	*murderer-DEF-GEN*	step-PL

(13) Kommer att gå upp.

v	S	VP COMPLEMENTS
kommer	–	att gå upp
going		*to go up*

The common denominator for these variant V1 formats is that they jointly violate the general rule for canonical Swedish declaratives, according to which declaratives must start with one (but only one) clausal constituent prior to the finite verb, the so called 'foundation compulsion' (the clausal base of main clauses has traditionally been called the FUNDAMENT 'foundation' in Scandinavian syntactic

scholarship; see SAG 4:690). We do not generally assume that there is any essential functional difference between the variant constructions exemplified in (12) and (13), although one or other variant may be statistically more typical of certain discourse environments (perhaps conditioned by the subject matter). The central and shared property is the non-realization of the clausal base (foundation), and this structural feature is associated with many regular functional properties.

3.1 Narrative inversion

Declarative clauses with the finite verb in initial position followed by the subject are characteristic of narrative texts in many languages (L. Lindström 2001). Accordingly, the phenomenon has been called NARRATIVE INVERSION in the Scandinavian tradition (e.g. SAG 4:23, 693). The use of this V1 declarative format has been reported as a feature of adolescent storytelling (Eriksson 1997:127–129), and has also been observed in a study in which the informants were asked to talk freely about motion pictures, books etc. (Dahlbäck & Vamling 1983). As pointed by Wessén (1956), this storytelling device existed also in old Swedish and Scandinavian.

Narrative inversion is characterized by the presence of both the so-called OBLIGATORY CLAUSE ELEMENTS (cf. example (12) above) – subject and predicate – but in an unorthodox order, namely, as the name suggests, INVERTED, with the subject following the verb in the clausal core in a manner which is regularly associated with a polar question; Table 4 illustrates.

CLAUSAL BASE	CLAUSAL CORE		
x	v	S	o
	ser	man	mig
	see	*man*-GENPR	*me*

Table 4. Narrative inversion. From example (14). Also compare Table 2.

Contextually, as in example (14) below, narrative inversions are not questions. They are declarative clauses with a temporal/causal relationship to the preceding clause, but the speaker does not make use of any temporal/causal markers. When such a marker – typically a pronominal adverb of the type *så* 'so, like that', *då* 'then, at that time' or *sedan* 'then, after that' – is used, it occurs in the slot reserved for the clausal base, as shown in Table 5.

Dahlbäck & Vamling (1983) find narrative inversion to have three main functions: to be a means of inserting a comment from the narrator, to repeat a spate of talk during repair, and to enhance the dramatic effect of the storytelling. Example (14) illustrates narrative inversion as a dramatic enhancer. (Details of the corpora and transcription conventions used in this paper are given in the Appendix.)

CLAUSAL BASE	CLAUSAL CORE		
x	v	S	o
så	slår	mördaren	sin käpp i huvudet på mig
so	*hit*	*murderer*-DEF	REFL*stick in head*-DEF *on me*

Table 5. Temporal marking. From example (14).

(14) (after Dahlbäck & Vamling 1983:6)

```
1. Och så går två av dem  sin  väg
   and so go  two of them REFL way
   'and then two of them leave'
2. men så stannar jag kvar   och rättar  till blommorna
   but so stay    I   remain and correct to   flowers-def
   på  graven
   on  grave- DEF
   'but then I stay and fix the flowers on the grave'
3. ser man      mördarens      steg
   see man-GENPR murderer-DEF-GEN steps
   'you see the murderer's steps'
4. ser man      mig
   see man-GENPR me
   'you see me'
5. ser man      att  jag tittar mig omkring
   see man-GENPR that I   look   me  around
   'you see that I look around'
6. så slår mördaren      sin käpp  i  huvudet på mig
   so hit  murderer-DEF REFL stick in head-DEF on me
   'then the murderer hits me over the head with his stick'
```

Dahlbäck & Vamling (1983:6) describe this sequence, with narrative inversions in lines 3–5, as resembling the dramatic effect achieved by film-makers by showing short sequences from parallel events. In his study, Eriksson (1997) finds examples neither of this use of adolescent storytelling, nor of the use of this construction as a means of inserting comments. Instead, he finds that verb-initial clauses are used as a storytelling device to mark events in two or more narrative clauses as belonging together.

(15) (Eriksson 1997:128, ex. (69))

```
1. H: fönsterblecken     på andra  våningen på fönster på
      window ledge-PL-DEF on second floor    on window  on
      'the window ledges on the first floor on, windows of'
2.    Ekebyskolan (0.8) så ställde vi oss där  hoppa vi
      NAME-school        so stood   we REFL there jumped we
      'Ekeby School (0.8) so we got up there and we jumped'
```

```
3. O: ⌈Mm⌋
          'mm'
4. H=  ner   imponera på  tjejerna ba ( . ) jihihihihih
       down impress   on  girls-DEF PRT
       'down, to impress the girls, like jihihihihih'
5.     så    stuka    en foten     baa *öh ( . ) uh*
       so    twisted  one foot-DEF  PRT
       'then one guy twisted his ankle, like *öh ( . ) uh*'
```

In (15), the event expressed by *hoppa vi ner* 'we jumped down', is closely linked to the preceding line, *så ställde vi oss där* 'so we got up there'. Eriksson (1997:128) argues that narrative inversion emphasises the CAUSAL relation between the events, whereas cohesion markers such as *så/då/sedan* preceding the verb emphasise the TEMPORAL relationship between the events.

In the light of Eriksson's observations, example (14), from Dahlbäck & Vamling (1983), can also be said to be an example of how narrative inversion is used to mark events in subsequent clauses as 'belonging together'. Here the impression that there is a strong relationship between lines 3–5, in comparison to how they relate to the preceding events in lines 1 and 2 and the following event in line 6, is created by the V1 format, along with the employment of an identical form in all three lines building on the pattern *ser man* 'one sees'. It is also important to note that the verb-first clauses occur successively within a series of events and clauses describing the events. In other words, even though new successive actions are being presented, no new agent is presented; the agent is assumed, included in the overall topic of the narrative sequence.

3.2 List constructions

Unlike narrative inversions, not all the obligatory elements are present in the V1 constructions in (16): none of them have a subject, either as the clausal base or in the subject position in the clausal core; cf. Table 6.

```
(16) 1. A: [ja:   >å    de    ä  liksom< d:e
            yes   and it    is like    it
            'yeah, and it's    like    there's'
     2.     görs    ju ingenting va¿ de gör   e-- en mycke
            make-PASS MP nothing    what it makes a   a   very
            'nothing done, you know. They perform a very'
     3.     summarisk undersö:kning då[:, .h
            summary   examination   then
            'brief examination'
     4. B:                             [a: de e
                                        yes it is
                                        'yeah, well they'
```

CLAUSAL BASE	CLAUSAL CORE		
x	v	S	o
[–]	tryckte *pressed*	[–]	på magen *on belly-DEF*

Table 6. From example (16).

```
 5.      knappt dom  gör  de   skulle ja vilja
         barely they do   that should I  want
         'barely do that, I'd'
 6.      [säja,
          say
          'say'
 7. A:   [((slight cough))
 8.      (0.2)
 9. A:-> tryckte på magen↑
         pressed on belly-DEF
         'pressed his belly'
10. ->   kände på fontanelle:n↑
         felt   on fontanel-DEF
         'felt his fontanel'
11. B:   a[:
         'yes'
12. A:-> [pt titta  på vikt   å   längd  å, (0.3)
             looked on weight and length and
         'checked weight and height and'
13.      huvud då¿
         head   then
         'head'
14. B:   a:
         'yes'
15.      ( . )
16. B:-> lyssnar,
         'listen,'
17.      ( . )
18. A:   å↑ lyss:nar↓,
         'and listen'                      [GRIS:UMOL:A:4]
```

In example (16), where two friends discuss the routines at the local child health care clinic, the V1 format in line 9 enhances the relationship between this line and the reporting in lines 1–3 of how 'they (doctors) don't do anything', only a 'very brief examination'. The three list items in lines 9–13 are all V1 phrases: the first, *tryckte på magen* in line 9, follows a cough by A and a brief silence, after which A initiates a more detailed account of what the brief examination entailed. By initiating the item with the finite verb, it is construed as emanating from *en mycke summarisk undersökning då*: 'a very brief examination', in lines 2–3, rather than being a new

project. The item ends in a strongly rising intonation, which indicates completion of the list ITEM, but that there is more to be added to the PROJECT, i.e. it is produced so that the item will be construed as the first item in a list.

The second list item is produced using the same syntactic format and the same prosodic 'gestalt' as the first item, thus marking them very strongly as belonging together. The V1 format adds even more emphasis to the linking of these two items. The second item, too, prosodically projects 'more to come', indicated by the sharply rising intonation, as well as by virtue of it being the second item in a list, lists predominantly consisting of three items (Jefferson 1990).

The second item is followed by a brief acknowledgement token from B. A begins her third list item in partial overlap with B's utterance, with a smacking ingressive sound (*pt*) followed by yet another V1 construction. This time it ends with only a very slightly rising intonation, which marks the list as intonationally complete. Typically, however, the final item of a list is initiated by a binding element, such as *och*, 'and', a feature this item does not have, and interestingly, in line 16, after a pause, B suggests a fourth item to the list, using the same V1 format (or only V) as in A's list.[5] This suggestion, *lyssnar* 'listen', is confirmed by A's *å lyss:nar*, which is produced with an audible confirming intonation, starting with a high onset, as a continuation, and ending with a sharply falling intonation. Intonationally, it is an enhanced mirroring of B's utterance in line 16. Line 18 is not merely a repetition of B's utterance, but is also produced as a 'last list item', beginning with the connector *å* (= *och* 'and'), and produced with a finalizing intonation.

The lack of competition for the turn in line 9, and thereafter during the list construction, which constitutes a large predictable project that strengthens A's right to the turn, is a typical interactional environment for V1 constructions. It is worth noting that the only V1 construction in example (16) where there is anything at all preceding the finite verb is in line 12, where the sound *pt* produced by A is produced in overlap with B's response token *a:*. A's ingressive sound could be seen as signalling a wish to keep the floor, which is also enhanced by the continuing functional value of the clausal V1 format.

Verb-first lists are traditionally analyzed as a kind of 'anaphoric ellipsis', where the predicate constituents are coordinated (SAG 4:692). We would like to emphasise that V1 list constructions are not essentially very different from V1 clauses that constitute 'narrative inversion'. In both cases the verb-initial clausal pattern signals that the V1 elements are subsequent, dependent parts of a larger sequential project. No topic constituent, and in the case of the list construction not even a subject, is introduced, since the 'topic' can be recovered. The structural and communicative unity of the sequential whole is achieved by the V1 format. Rather than saying that the construction types above are elliptical in some general fashion, we would like to stress that they are constructed the way they are in order to achieve sequential coherence (which is, perhaps, what ellipsis in essence is about).

3.3 Extending a sequence

Verb-first clauses are not used just to constitute new successive phases in an on-going sequence; the constructional format can be also used to extend a smaller scale communicative project, for example, an utterance. An example of the addition of further talk to an audibly completed utterance is given in extract in (17).

```
(17) 1. A:   pt .hh så att de:,  å   nu  bandar ja de
                  so that it   and now tape   I   this
                  'so...and now I'm taping this'
     2.       h (h)är s (h)amt(h)aleth,
               here    call
                  'call'
     3. B:   ja ja j[a: (blä:: hehe du    har  provbandare
             yes yes yes  INTERJ      you-SG have test. recorder
             'yeahyeahyeah blah hehe you have a test recorder'
     4. A:-> [ja:hehehe kommer ja på: här,
             yes         come  I  on  here
             'yes, (it) just occurred to me'       [GRIS:UMOL:A:4]
```

Here the same speakers as in the previous example are commenting on the recording situation. In lines 1–2, A produces a complete turn to which B responds in line 3. Partly in overlap with B's response, A initiates a new contribution in line 4. It begins with an acknowledgement token *ja*: 'yes', followed by laughter, and then a V1 clause *kommer jag på här* 'just occurred to me'. This retrospective addition connects to the previous utterance, possibly as a comment on the suddenness of A's becoming aware of the recording situation, to emphasise that she is just realising that they are recording some quite potent gossip. The utterance in lines 1–2 is used as a platform, a kind of an implicit syntactic X-element (clausal base), for the subsequent V1 clause.

The practice of continuing an audibly complete utterance with talk that is audibly a continuation, not designed to stand on its own, has been called INCREMENTAL CONTINUATION (Schegloff 1996, Ford, Fox & Thompson 2002). As can be seen from example (17), the V1 declarative is an ingenious device for the construction of incremental utterance continuations within the scope of general syntactic resources of Swedish.

3.4 Other-continuations

Extracts (16) and (17) are both examples of cases where the speakers continue their own projects. However, verb-initial constructions can also be produced as collaborative other-continuations, i.e. as syntactically continuative of an utterance by another speaker. An example of this can be seen in (18). Here speaker C is the caller to a box office service, and E is the operator. C offers her name to the operator (line 10), and E adds the V1-shaped clause *heter du* 'is your name', in line 12, whereby she seems to tick off the offered item on her list of the information she will

need to elicit from the caller in order to make a successful sale. This kind of checking by an interrogative in a response position has also been called the 'appendor question' (Sacks 1992: 528ff; Bockgård 2004). The practice can be seen as the inversion of the checklist answer-elicitation format of producing what looks like a statement with the last argument left out, for example *och du heter* 'and your name is?', which normally would be followed by the other speaker offering his or her name 'in collaboration'.[6]

```
(18) 1. C:  >ja skulle vilja bara< fråga
             I   should want   just   ask
             'I'd just like to ask'
     2.      en  sån  sak   att (0.6) ä: ( . )
             one such thing that
             'about something (0.6) eh'
     3.      kan man    beställa här  dom  här  biljetterna¿
             can man-GEN order     here those here tickets
             'can I order those tickets here¿'
     4.      ( . )
     5. E:   till,
             to
             'for'
     6. C:   de   här (0.3) ä christer sjö[gren.
             that here        NAME     NAME
             'this eh (0.3) eh Christer Sjögren.'
     7. E:                             [jå~ de   kan man~
                                        yes that can man-GEN
                                        'yes you can'
     8.      (1.3)
     9. C:   äm (1.1) vänta nu (0.5) ä: ( . )
                      wait  now
             'ehm (1.1) hang on (0.5) eh ( . )'
    10.      sonja lindqvist¿
             NAME  NAME
             'Sonja Lindqvist¿'
    11.      (0.6)
    12. E:-> heter      du?
             are. called you-SG
             'is your name?'
    13.      (0.7)
    14. C:   mm                                          [Luckan:18]
```

The result of this interactional practice is a kind of a collaborative utterance – *Sonja Lindqvist heter du* 'Sonja Lindqvist is your name' – in which an antecedent utterance (the presentation *Sonja Lindqvist*) is implicitly re-used as the clausal X-element (the clausal base) in the formation of a subsequent utterance, *heter du*, which in itself would have to be regarded as incomplete and thus 'ungrammatical'.

Another example of an other-continuation is given in extract (19). Here, speaker A is directing a compliment to D using the formulaic expression *när man väntar på nå gott, väntar man aldri för länge*, 'good things come to those who wait'. D connects to A's utterance as if syntactically continuing it with the verb-first construction of her

slightly deprecatory acceptance of the compliment, *säger du nu* '(that's what) you're saying now'.

```
(19) 1. A: när   man     väntar på nå
            when  man-GEN  waits  on something
            'good things come'
      2.    gott, väntar aldri för läng[e¿
            good  waits  never too long
            'to those who wait'
      3. B:                             [he:haha
      4. C: precis.
            'exactly'
      5. D: säger du  nu, snälla du¿
            say   you now kind   you
            'that's what you say now, dear'        [GRIS:SÅI NF 2:1]
```

On the face of it, this continuation too is produced in an interactive and syntactic collaboration between two speakers. The prior material, viz. the utterance produced by A, is exploited by D as a platform for further elaboration and 'complementation' of the clausal structure at hand; at the same time, the utterance in line 5 is a result of D's own authorship, although specially adapted to the external syntactic environment. Collaborative utterances/constructions in Swedish have been studied especially by Bockgård (2004); for English, see Lerner (1991, 1996).

3.5 Response utterances

In addition to successively produced narrative clauses, list constructed clauses, and self- and other-utterance extensions, V1 declaratives are frequently used in utterances that constitute a response to a contribution by another speaker. Strictly speaking, other-continuations are one form of a responsive turn format, but subject to the condition that the continuation in one way or another results in a coherent 'construction' with the prior unit of another person's talk. There are, however, utterances that are responsive in a more general fashion, and made to cohere as some kind of continuation of the prior talk through the very use of the verb-initial clausal format. Extracts (20) and (21) give examples of two basic variants of V1 responses, (21) representing the type where all the obligatory elements are present in the clausal core, and (20) representing the type where the subject is not present.

```
(20) 1. A: va  dy:r      potatisen   ska   bli
            how expensive potatoe-DEF shall become
            'potatoes are getting expensive'
      2.    å   såna där   saker.=
            and such there  things
            'and that kind of thing'
      3. B: =a:=
            'yeah'
```

```
    3. C: =mm, kommer ju å   gå upp,=
           mm   comes  PRT and go up
           'mm, are going to increase'          [GRIS:SÅI NF 2:1]


(21) 1. A: det är faktiskt mer  ansträngande
           it  is actually more strenuous
           'it's actually more of an effort'
     2.    för kroppen än   vad  man    tror.
           for body.DEF than what man-GEN believes
           'for the body than you'd think'
     3. B: ja, tror   jag med.
           yes believe I   with
           'yeah, I think so too'               [Mörnsjö 2002, ex. C:15]
```

An important similarity between the types of V1 utterances already discussed
and verb-initial responsive clauses is that they are contributions that are clearly
produced as subsequent units of talk that connect to a prior, project-initiating unit
(cf. Linell 2003). In such responsive utterances, the continuative relation carried by
the subsequent V1 utterance is demonstrated by the lack of the topic element (the
clausal base); instead, the topic is assumed to be provided by the prior contribution in
the interactional sequence. Moreover, since the topic is understood to such a degree
that it is not even represented by a syntactic dummy (a pro-adverb or an expletive
subject), the V1 responses are marked as dependent, possibly only accompanying or
collaterally commenting moves in a conversation. This feature of accompaniment is
present in both (20) and (21) above, where the V1 clauses are preceded by response
tokens that can also function as back-channeling responses (*mm*, *ja*).

The implication of some kind of side-remark response can in fact sometimes
signal the attitude taken by the speaker, signaling for example lack of personal
involvement, reluctance to co-operate (as regards a topic proffer) or sometimes even
a confrontation with the other interactant. The 'auxiliary' and 'deficient' interactional
characteristics of V1 responses can in a sense be seen to be in an iconic relation to the
seemingly reduced clausal syntax of these expressions. This communicative potential
is so regular that it can be exploited as a caricature of a dialogic conflict, as in the
extract from a comic strip in (22).

```
(22) A: Det där måste vara den sämsta saft som nånsin funnits!
     B: Trodde du, ja! Då skulle du ha varit här igår!! Då var det
        tre som spydde!!
     A: 'This must be the worst lemonade ever!'
     B: 'That's what you think?! You should have been here yesterday!!
        Three people threw up!'                [Ernie, HBL 14/6/2004]
```

It is a general feature of responses that they tend to consist of less material than a
conceivable syntactic full form response; it is even probable that a 'full sentence'
response is an interactionally marked alternative in many contexts. Thus, a question

like *Who won the race?* would be likely to receive response forms like *Al* or *Al did* rather than *Al won the race*. This phenomenon has traditionally been treated as 'response ellipsis', avoiding unnecessary repetition of material which is provided in the prior context, e.g. *Al* (*won it*); *Al did* (*win the race*). The problem is that we cannot know what exactly has been 'left out' in an elliptical response: is it, for example, the main verb (*won*), a pro-verbal repetition of it (*did*), the object noun (*the race*) or a pronominal repetition of it (*it*)? Instead, 'ellipted' responses should be regarded as fully-fledged constructions in their own right, conforming to identified customary responsive patterns in different interactional micro-situations. Of course, the minimal nature of many responsive utterances relies on the background provided by the prior contribution; in fact, it is this sequentially dependent feature that makes a response a response. But we cannot say exactly if anything is 'lacking', and if so what that might be, in a given type of 'elliptical' response (Schegloff 1996:106f., cf. Harris 1981:152 on 'the doctrine of ellipsis').

Hence, verb-initial responses are one recognizable non-full form response type in Swedish.[7] The occurrence of this type is conditioned by its positioning in a sequence of utterances as the 'subsequent' one. When contrasted with a full form declarative, it is the clausal base that seems to be 'omitted' from the V1 response type; this also coincides in some cases with the 'omission' of the anaphoric subject in the clausal core (20). What is left is a kind of basic clausal core: V + (S) + Compl. It is easy to 'transform' these response types into full clausal forms with the grammarian's knowledge that canonical Swedish declarative sentences normally have one constituent prior to the finite verb, and that in responses it could be a pronominal, pro-adverbial or expletive element like *det*, *så*, *då* (Mörnsjö 2002), or even a more substantial element, like the repetition of *potatisen* 'the potatoes', or the implied *priserna* 'the prices' in (20), where the rise of the cost of potatoes becomes the issue; the alternatives are illustrated in (23).

(23) Mm, {det/ de/ potatisen/ priserna} kommer ju å gå upp.

'Mm, {it/ they/ the potatoes/ the prices} is/are going to go up.'

But this kind of 'prescriptive' complementation is neither necessary nor, indeed, unequivocally possible. We can instead say that the V1 pattern in (20) singles out the utterance as a response, syntactically and pragmatically bound to the contribution prior to it. In other words, the V1 form suggests that the reference of the utterance – e.g. the potatoes and/or their prices – can be understood only in relation to the surrounding micro-universe of discourse. The topical and syntactic X-element not represented in the V1 response is thus implied as existing in the prior discourse, in a somewhat similar manner as in, say, list-constructed, i.e. 'anaphorically ellipted' verb-first clauses, in which the X-element can be more clearly traced back. Moreover, the V1 pattern signals – by the 'lack' of an initiating topic constituent – that no new communicative project is offered; the V1 utterance is instead a dependent,

incremented or collateral expansion of an on-going host project.[8] Conversational turns in this format could, then, scarcely stand as first pair-parts in a sequence of turns.

3.6 Deictic V1 constructions

The verb-initial declarative clausal format is sometimes used in a manner which, instead of being 'anaphoric', i.e. in some sense relating backwards, could be analyzed as DEICTIC, i.e. relating to a referent in the actual communicative situation. Such verb-first constructions usually seem to 'omit' the self-evident subject that could have occupied the slot of the clausal base, the topical X position, in front of the following clausal core. This use is typical of short written instructions, like *Kommer strax* 'Coming soon', i.e. *Jag kommer strax* 'I am coming soon', and in notes and letters, such as in (24).

(24) Jag har flyttat in här på dagtid. **Förstod** att du mest är här på kvällarna, så månne vi inte ska kunna samsas om bordet. **Ska** försöka att inte sprida ut mig väldigt mycket.
'I have moved in here in the daytime. (I) Heard that you're mostly here during the evenings, so we'll probably be able to share the desk amicably. (I) Shall try to not spread out too much.'

[A note left to a colleague, 2004]

This type of verb-initial construction can occur independently of a prior discourse context, which means that it is different to some degree from the sequentially dependent V1 constructions discussed hitherto. However, there is also a great deal of shared functional motivation. The deictic verb-initial construction is also a 'dependent' communicative act, but it is dependent on a situational frame that makes the reference recognizable, whereas the identification frame in the more 'anaphoric' uses of verb-initial constructions is provided by the surrounding discourse.

It should also be noted that deictic uses can simultaneously be sequentially dependent. In letters and notes, as in (24), the reference of the V1 clauses is deictic (the writer herself) but the V1 clauses also occur as subsequent units in the communicative project; note that the first sentence is initiated with the first person subject. Moreover, it is worth considering that personal letters (or e-mail) can be understood to be both deictic and sequential in their nature: the writer is not only given, but usually also familiar to the recipient, and a single letter is potentially one in a sequence of letters. The verb-initial format may thus be a means of enhancing the impression of the current letter (e-mail or note) being the continuation of a larger correspondence project.

4. V1 CONSTRUCTIONS RESHAPING THE UTTERANCE

The basic XVS syntactic pattern for Swedish main clauses is systematically applied in the shaping and reshaping of the course of progressive, on-line utterance construction.

Linguistic material can be engaged and re-engaged in a clausal construction by the introduction of a finite verb following this material and suggesting its possible (re)interpretation as a clausal base. In other words, the material produced before the finite verb could be interpreted as the clausal X-constituent in a larger sentential unit. This constructional resource is exemplified here by two uses, which are related to repair practices: appended finite duplication and clausal blends (i.e. pivot constructions or *APOKOINOU*). For more detailed studies on the syntactic and interactional aspects of these phenomena, we refer the reader to two recent studies in Swedish: Nordberg (2003) on finite duplication, and Noreen (2003) on clausal blends.

4.1 Appended finite duplication

Clausal constructions with appended duplication of the finite verb fall into a few subcategories of use. One recurrent pattern is the use of the pro-verb *göra* 'do', in a V1-shaped extension as a retrospective orientation to a verb phrase in the preceding clausal structure, as can be seen in line 3 in (25).

```
(25) 1. U: .hh jo  men, att  han ge:r  dom  ti rävarna.
              yes but  that he  gives them to foxes-DEF
           'yes but, he gives them to the foxes.'

     2.    ( . )

     3. U: gör   han.
           does he
           'he does.'

     4.    (1.8)

     5. I: jaha¿
           yes
           'I see¿'                              [GRIS:UGIC:16500]
```

With auxiliary verbs, the second representation of the verb is a repetition of the first, like the present *e* (*är*), 'is' in (26):

```
(26) 1. F:    men eh: ( . ) [ni gå]r på klassiska konsärer eller?
              but           you go  to classical concerts or
              'but erm you go to classical concerts, do you?'

     2. BM3:            [ a: ]
                        'yeah'

     3. BM2:  .hh nä[ej ]
              'no'

     4. BM3:      [a ja] har faktiskt  [vart   på  en =
                  'yes I have in fact   been  to  one'

     5. BM1:                           [gått   me  skolan=
                                       'gone  with the school'

     6. BM3: =eh:::          ]
     7. BM1: =å så du  vet.]
             'and so you know'
```

```
   8. BM2: >ja de va< [me        skola]n  >de ja<.
              'yes that was with the school that yes'
   9. F:                    [ °jaha.°]
                              'yeah'
  10.  BM3: °a:°
              'yeah'
  11.       (0.2)
  12.  F:   °.ja°
              'yes'
  13.       (0.4)
->14. BM3: men de e  mäktigt  e  re.=
              but it is majestic is it
              'but it's majestic indeed'
  15. BM1: =mm,  ( . )  mm:  mm:              [GRIS:GGSM 7]
```

The second, pro-verbal or repeated realization of the finite verb in example (25) follows a possibly complete clausal (and communicative) unit, to which it constitutes a parenthetical, minimal clausal addition. Such appended finite structures seem to mark the decisive turn-closure, or are orientations to a failed turn-transition. They thus have the character of turn extending increments, as can be seen in the use in (25). Semantically, the finite-duplicating clauses do not add any new information, but can be assumed to have a general reinforcing function, which is observable in (26).

An example of a somewhat different variant of the double finite V1 construction is given in (27).

```
(27) 1.    P: [ja:vi:sst jo  de va   sån  här
              yes. sure  yes it was such here
              'oh yes, well, it was like'

     2.       auktion  vart  [ju,
              auction  became MP
              'an auction, that's what it became'

     3. K:                   [ja hahi:[ ja  ha:
                             yes oh      yes oh
                             'oh yes I see'

     4. P:                            [ja:
                                      'yeah'    [GRIS:UGRU 7:A:1]
```

In this variant the duplication does not involve a pro-form of the verb or an auxiliary repetition, but a variation on the first verb as regards tense or aspect. The final V1 construction *vart ju* in line 2 is not added after a possibly completed turn, but concludes, if not a turn, then at least a turn constructional unit (TCU). The terminating turn-part *vart ju* may be seen as a re-orientation to the verbal mode in the preceding part of the utterance, retrospectively changing the verbal aspect from the stative *va(r)* 'was', to the ingressive *vart* 'became'. As for the syntax of the subsequent finite clausal structure, we can note that there is no subject in the appended clausal core

(cf. *vart* [*det*] *ju* 'became [it] apparently'); rather, the subject is implied by the preceding context (the candidate subject being *auktion* 'auction').

As pointed out by Nordberg (2003), appended finite duplication seems to have both emphatic (especially in types such as that shown in example (26)) and tense- or aspect-specifying functions (27). The subsequent clausal V1 part is in all cases appended to a potentially well-formed clausal structure. However, the V1 addition is generally produced in prosodic unity with the host clausal unit, which suggests that clausal constructions with a final duplication of the finite verb form one legitimate type of turn constructional unit in spoken Swedish. The often ellipted form of the minimally shaped subsequent V1 clause also supports an analysis of the whole clausal combination as a distinct construction type rather than the result of a repair practise. The general V1 format of the appended clausal units suggests that the addition is linked as a (discursive) continuation of a preceding, larger communicative project – the 'topic' – and constructed as a dependent part of it.

4.2 Clausal blends

The appended finite duplications discussed above are in certain respects reminiscent of clausal blends, i.e. pivot constructions, but they typically lack a constituent in the clausal core which is not, in direct syntactic terms, provided by the preceding clausal structure. In (27), for example, a possible combined XVS structure of the available material would be *auktion vart ju* 'auction became apparently', but this is not a wholly acceptable Swedish clause; we would need to add an expletive subject in the clausal core: *auktion blev det ju*. However, the repetitive or pro-verbal variant, as in (25), can be hard to distinguish from a pivot construction, which suggests that these construction types are closely related.

Genuine pivot constructions have good syntactic readings in both directions around the central, pivoting element. In other words, the syntactic blend is complete in clausal blends, whereas it may remain in some respects incomplete in appended finite duplications. An example of a clausal blend is in (28) (the pivoting element is underlined).

```
(28) 1.  T:    e     du     på   lande    mycky
               are   you-SG  on   country  much
               'do you spend much time at the summer house'

     2.  A:->  hördu        ja ha   vari nu↑  två nätter i
               hear. you-SG  I  have been now  two nights in
               stan=
               town.DEF
               'well, I've now been two nights in town'

     3.  T:    =jaha=
               yes oh
               'I see'
```

```
4.  A:->  =blir    de väl nu  här  i  stan (1.0) å
          becomes it PRT now here in town.DEF    and
          dedär
          that. there
          'it'll be perhaps now here in town (1.0) and erm'
                                              [GRIS:HSAM:V2]
```

The pivot *två nätter i stan* 'two nights in the town', in line 2 revolves between two finite verb phrases, *(ja) har varit* '(I) have been', (line 2) and *blir* (*de väl nu*) '(it) becomes (probably now)', (line 4). The result of this combination is one syntactically coherent sentence, although not according to the rules of traditional Swedish grammar, where sentences normally have only one finite verb and do not share constituents (syntactic blends are not included, for example, in the comprehensive SAG grammar). Through the addition of the subsequent finite unit, the utterance takes a slightly new direction from what has been said in the initial clausal unit. This involves a change of tense and verbal aspect, and thus a change of viewpoint (from the perfect, 'having been', to the ingressive, 'becoming'); thus, the resulting modification works in much the same direction as the appended finite duplication exemplified in (27). The second finite clausal unit is less certain in the attitude it conveys than the initial clausal frame, a fact which is also indicated by the suppositional modal particle *väl* 'perhaps' in the second unit (line 4).

The opportunity to carry out these kinds of modifying practices on-line during the syntactic construction of an utterance can be assumed to be one of the motivations for the realization of clausal blends. Such a strategy can be vital in interactional terms. It is generally assumed that speakers have the right to produce one turn constructional unit (e.g. a sentence) in a conversational turn, whereas the production of multiple units can require negotiations and involve the risk of losing the turn. Clausal blends result in a single coherent unit, while the construction simultaneously allows the speaker to take new directions – by changing his viewpoint, for example. Other motivations for the construction include the management of overlap: by adding an explicating subsequent clause the speaker may re-introduce information that may have been vulnerable to overlapping talk at the beginning of the utterance (Noreen 2003).

A characteristic of clausal blends is that the central pivot element has dual grammatical status because it is shared by two verb phrases. The phrase *två nätter i stan* in (28) is an adverbial complement in the preceding clausal structure (*ja ha vari nu två nätter i stan*), but a predicative clausal base in the subsequent clausal structure (*två nätter i stan blir de väl nu här i stan*). From the viewpoint of Swedish grammar in general, clausal blends accord with the principal constituent order (X)VS, where the central pivoting element constitutes the X (the clausal base) for the second clausal core. In appended finite duplications like (27), the finite verb's connection to both the X and S elements often remains more implicit; see Table 7.

Ex.	ANTECEDENT CLAUSE	COMPLEMENT TO AC/X TO SC	SUBSEQUENT CLAUSE
(28)	ja ha nu vari	två nätter i stan	blir de väl nu i stan
(27)	de va sån här auktion	(sån här auktion?)	vart ju

Table 7. Clausal blend and appended finite duplication.

Appended finite duplications and clausal blends have certain features in common with repair practices, since these phenomena often provide a way of revising the current utterance. However, as has been stressed by both Nordberg (2003) and Noreen (2003), typical markers of progression problems and repair activity, like pauses and hesitating sounds, do not occur with the constructions under discussion here. On the contrary, the prosodic utterance patterns are typically unified. It seems, then, that appended finite duplications and clausal blends result in a single sentential unit that is experienced as syntactically, pragmatically and prosodically coherent. The possibility of engaging the reshaping clausal additions as if they were legitimate (X)VS constructions, taking the prior-to-verb element as the possible X, is probably the key syntactic resource that contributes to the impression of coherence. Thus, appended finite duplications and clausal blends work in a principally similar way to the sequentially appended V1 constructions discussed in section 3. The major difference is that the former work within the frame of an utterance (or a turn constructional unit), whereas the latter constitute utterances in themselves, positioned within a series of utterances.

5. V1 CONSTRUCTIONS AS PARENTHETICAL CLAUSES

In this section, the focus lies on parenthetical clauses, or comment clauses, that have become formulaic to a certain extent, and that often hold adverbial properties, modalising the utterances to which they are added (cf. Urmson 1963, Andersson 1976), or specifying the source of the utterance. These parentheticals are usually constructed according to the format [mental verb + 1st pers.sing.pron] – e.g. *tycker jag*, 'I think', *förstår jag*, 'I understand' – but can also be more complex – e.g. *skulle man kunna säga* 'one could say'. In a traditional syntactic analysis, these phrases are construed as matrix clauses that are preceded by subordinate clauses;[9] i.e. the preceding clause has been analyzed as the first constituent (the BASE) of a larger, in a way MACRO-clausal unit. Parenthetical clauses are often somewhat phonetically reduced, although very little semantic bleaching has, as yet, occurred. In principle, parenthetical clauses do not differ much from the less formulaic ways of extending utterances, discussed in section 3 above.

Parenthetical clauses occur in both final and medial position in the TCU (turn constructional unit; cf. section 4.1 above), but not initially as V1 clauses. This can be taken as a strong indication of V1 order being a token of a 'subsequent structural unit'.[10] For the purposes of the present study, only the TCU-final parenthetical clauses have been considered. Like the utterance extensions and response utterances studied in section 3, parenthetical clauses have a commenting, auxiliary function, which is why they can often be understood as asides attached to a more important host utterance; however, in the case of parenthetical clauses this auxiliary function is even more apparent. For a more detailed interactionally and syntactically oriented discussion of parenthetical clauses, see Karlsson (2003).

In the corpus used for the present study, two categories of TCU-final parentheticals emerge: re-categorising clauses and CLAUSAL EXTENSIONS. Both are clauses with an appended parenthetical, but the former constitute an utterance produced as one prosodic unit, the latter an utterance produced as two units.

5.1 Re-categorising clauses

Re-categorizing clauses are constructions produced as a single intonational gestalt, i.e. made up from an initial main-clause shaped element, followed by a more or less formulaic, prosodically projected V1 clause. The V1 clause here has traditionally been seen as redirecting the preceding main clause from being a potentially self-sufficient clause, a TCU in its own right, to being in the final analysis the subordinate part in relation to the V1 matrix clause. This, however, is a view formed with the final result in mind, a *post-hoc* view of grammatical constructions. Instead, we shall argue that the latter V1 clausal units are dependent main clauses, with adverbial traits (cf. Andersson 1976, SAG 4:862) and appended to a potentially self-sufficient clause (cf. section 3 above).

(29) 1. A: JONNA ska   du ha   i arbetsmiljö   **tror   ja**.
            NAME *shall you have in work. environment believe I*
            'Jonna will be your teacher for 'safety at work' I think'
                                                        [GRIS:Wallenber]

This more progressive analysis can be applied to the typical example (29). The first clausal unit reaches a syntactic, but not prosodic, possible completion after the word *arbetsmiljö* 'safety at work'. By the end of *arbetsmiljö* the intonation curve is still in the process of rising, and the TCU is audibly incomplete until the last section, the finally placed verb-first clause, has been produced. We may assume that the motivation of the V1 unit *tror ja* is that of expressing evidentiality and that this modification of the contribution is probably not produced as an afterthought.

5.2 Clausal extensions

Clausal extensions are very similar to re-categorizing clauses, but with some important differences. Most importantly, where the re-categorizing V1 clause constitutes a SINGLE prosodic gestalt together with the prior main-clause-shaped argument, the clausal extension is audibly made up of its own prosodic unit, appended to a preceding completed prosodic gestalt. In example (30), the V1 clause in line 7 is attached to a clause that has reached an audible point of completion by the end of *även fall de inte e så stor skillnad på dom¿'* 'even though there's no great difference between them', in line 5.

```
(30)  1.  A:   jo  men: > jag tycker nog< > de går  no:g< å
               yes but   I   think  MP      it goes MP    to
               'yeah, but I think it's okay to'

      2.       lyssna på men (.) Jumper e   väl (.) strået
               listen on but     NAME   is  MP      straw-DEF
               'listen to but Jumper is probably a bit'

      3.       vassare >i såna fall<
               sharper  in such cases
               'better in that case'

      4.  B:   mm:.

      5.  A:   även fall de inte e  så stor skillnad   på dom¿
               even case it not  is so big  difference on them
               'even though there's no great difference between
               them'

      6.       (0.6)

      7.  A:-> >tycke ja.<.
               think  I
               'I think'

      8.       (0.3)

      9.  B:   hm.                              [GRIS:GGSM:7]
```

At the end of line 5, the utterance has reached a point where it would be easy, and possible, for another speaker to take the turn. However, no speaker volunteers, and the 0.6 second pause is a significant delay in speaker uptake. By appending the V1 clause *tycker jag* 'I think', as an increment to his utterance, the speaker exploits the format of re-categorising clauses, thus turning the 0.6 second pause into an INTRA-turn break, rather than an INTER-turn pause. By re-completing his utterance, the speaker also signals once more that he is ready to pass on the turn. The parenthetical, just like the appended finite duplication in example (26) in section 4.1 above, functions as the decisive turn-closing device of a unit which has already been brought to an audible end.

As can be seen in Table 8, both re-categorising clauses and clausal extensions follow the principal constituent order (X)VS, where X is made up of the antecedent,

	ANTECEDENT CLAUSE		PARENTHETICAL CLAUSE	
Ex.	X		V	S
(29)	Jonna ska du ha i arbetsmiljö		tror	jag
(30)	. . . även fall det inte är så stor skillnad på dem		tycker	jag

Table 8. Re-categorising clauses and clausal extensions.

in a way fuller clausal unit. Like the V1 constructions discussed in section 4, parenthetical clausal additions work within the frame of an utterance.

However, even though the syntactic structures of the two are similar, the two types of parenthetical clauses are produced very differently, as we have already seen. Re-categorising clauses result in a single syntactic unit, and are heard as syntactically, pragmatically and prosodically coherent wholes. Clausal extensions, on the other hand, are audibly made up of TWO prosodic units, the first unit being a contribution possibly brought to a closure, the subsequent unit a structurally fitted increment to the preceding one. In the latter case, then, a speaker makes the antecedent clausal unit and the V1 increment to APPEAR as a unit although they were not originally designed as such. Hence, clausal extensions could be said to make a strategic interactional use of the available (X)VS format of the language in a fashion comparable to more elaborate retrospective V1 shaped extensions (cf. example (17) in section 3.3 above).

6. V1 CONSTRUCTIONS AS DISCOURSE PARTICLES

In this final section, we will discuss a special category of elements that are historically V1 clausal constructions but have subsequently been grammaticalized into DISCOURSE PARTICLES. Such a development is not very surprising if we take into account the fact that some variants of the V1 constructional format seem to have semi-formulaic discourse and utterance-modifying functions, as we have seen in the context of appended finite duplication and parenthetical clauses.

The most typical discourse particles modelled on a basic V1 format include *vetdu* 'you know', *serdu* 'you see', *förstårdu* 'you understand' and *vetja* 'I know (guess, suggest)'.[11] Except in the last case, these expressions consist of a finite verb in the first position followed by the second person singular pronoun *du* 'you', cliticized on to the verb; if several persons are being addressed, a variant with the second person plural pronoun *ni*, e.g. *vetni*, is chosen. In practice, these elements, historically minimal clauses, are lexicalized as one single functional unit without an overt propositional content in much the same manner as expressions of the type *you know* in English (cf. Östman 1981, Schiffrin 1987).

The V1 or VS shaped discourse particles appear in syntactic extraposition in any position in the utterance, as shown in the examples below.

(31) 1. A: **vettu**   när hon s<u>a</u> de där, 'ja men då kanske
      know-you-sɢ when she said that there yes but then maybe
      'you know, when she said that, "well, then maybe'

   2.   ja skulle hälsa ord<u>e</u>ntlit', först trodde
      I should greet properly   first believed
      'we should introduce ourselves properly", first I'

   3.   ja hon skämta
      I she joked
      'thought she was kidding'   [GRIS:UMOL:A:4]

(32) 1. A: jorå nä   men de går bra de **serru**   å låna
      yes no   but that goes well that see-you-sɢ to borrow
      den där,
      that there
      'sure, you can borrow it, that's no problems.'
                                   [GRIS:UVAT6:A:6]

(33) 1. A: jaha¿ jamen   ja: nästan sluta me de föratt   .hh ja
      yeah yes-but I almost quit with it for-that I   I
      'Yeah, yeah but I almost gave it up because I'

   2.   mår inte bra **förstår du**¿
      feel not well understand-you-sɢ
      'don't feel well, you see.'   [GRIS:SÅI NF 2:1]

(34) 1. A: ja: **vetja** man skulle gå å börja rada in
      yeah know-I one should go and begin to go through
      'yeah I guess one should begin to collect'

   2.   de där kassetterna nu
      those cassettes   now
      'those cassettes now'   [SVESTRA:OB]

Unlike re-categorizing clauses and their TCU-extending variants, the V1 discourse particles do not form potential matrix clauses, nor constituents in the inner clausal frame, but rather units of their own juxtaposed to a semantically more prominent (often clausal) unit.

Historically, this class of discourse particles may have evolved from the type of re-categorizing clauses discussed in section 5, e.g. *tycker jag* 'I think', *ser jag* 'I see' (see Hellberg 1985:92, J. Lindström & Wide 2005). Thus, the implied X-element that would trigger the VS order in *vetdu* etc. would have been originally provided by an antecedent clause with which *vetdu* etc. would cohere syntactically according to the general word order pattern XVS.

It must be agreed, however, that the VS pattern could also originate from a polar interrogative source: *vet du det?* 'do you know that?'. However, this origin would be pragmatically odd for the lexicalized expression *vetja* 'I know (guess, suggest)'; would it be reasonable for the speaker to 'ask' him- or herself whether he or she

'knows' something or not? In fact, the effect conveyed by *vetja* is the opposite: the speaker signals that he or she feels entitled enough to say what is being said (and, so to speak, 'knows' this). Thus, there is no compelling reason to discard the V1 declarative origin hypothesis as regards the class of discourse particles discussed here.

Independent of the exact historical source, the clausal meaning of *vetdu*, *vetja* etc. is considerably bleached, which is the reason that V1 particles are not limited to any one particular utterance position, for example final, and can also frame an utterance in initial position. This is a considerable difference from parenthetical clauses of the type *tycker jag* 'I think', which in their V1 shape are restricted to final and medial utterance positions.

Finally, we may note that certain utterance- or constituent-modifying adverbial expressions, like *kanske*, *kanhända*, *måhända* (all translating as 'maybe', lit. 'may happen'), originate from a kind of V1 construction. For example *kanske* was originally used as a matrix sentence followed by a subordinate clause of THAT-type: *Kanske att han kommer* 'Maybe that he comes' (SAOB s.v. *kanske*, K 383). This construction type is old in Scandinavian, and similar lexicalizations occur also in English (*maybe*) and French (*peut-etre*). It is difficult to say anything decisive about the roots of this adverbial construction, but it is not inconceivable that it might have responsive origins. *Kanske* etc. may have been used in short responses evaluating claims made by another speaker. An indication of such a context of use is provided by the V1 response *kan wäl wara* 'may possibly be', from an 18th century play presented in note 7 to section 3.5.

7. CONCLUSION

In this study we have shown the structural versatility and pragmatic usefulness of basically 'declarative' verb-first constructions in Swedish. It is clear that this constructional format is not a peripheral phenomenon, but a central grammatical resource of the language. The V1 constructions we have studied comply with the general Swedish word order pattern XVS. Unlike canonical declaratives, the first obligatory clausal constituent (X) is not realized, but is merely contextually implied. V1 constructions should not be seen as deviations from the general V2 declarative format, but as a specifically conditioned alternative to it.

The structural analysis put forward in this paper offers an alternative to analyses made by formal syntacticians of the generative school, as well as to accounts made within traditional grammar. The cornerstone of our argument is that verb-first constructions constitute dependent units of discourse on the structural macro- and micro-levels, i.e. both textually and utterance internally. Rather than suggesting that V1 units include some kind of deleted expletive or pro-adverbial first constituent,

we propose that they should be seen, as regards their internal syntax, as a legitimate clausal construction type in Swedish. Thus, no X constituent WITHIN the V1 unit has been left out. Instead, such an X unit can be pragmatically recovered from the context necessarily preceding a V1 unit. V1 constructions are subject to the external syntactic condition of being units that characteristically succeed an antecedent unit that, with varied clarity, could be interpreted as the structural X constituent (the CLAUSAL BASE); i.e. the antecedent unit could be a prior utterance or a prior part-utterance. The discourse status of V1 constructions ranges from full utterances (turns and/or TCUs in a conversational sequence) to part-utterances (parts or extensions of a TCU). Verb-first constructions, then, constitute necessarily appended parts of an already-introduced communicative project, rather than units that initiate a project (Linell 2003:18f.). In this respect, modern Swedish V1 declaratives differ from the old Scandinavian V1 presentation construction. We may still discern a certain event or context-dependent presenting function in the use of modern declarative V1 clauses, most evidently when presenting a new phase in a narrative or a new item in a list.

We have observed that V1 constructions are an essential grammatical resource in spoken Swedish. They offer an effective way of re-shaping the structure and contents of utterances during the progressive, incremental turn construction process. The V1 format provides a way of changing the aspect or modality of an utterance, or of changing the extension of the utterance by optionally lengthening it, thus serving turn-taking by calibrating and re-calibrating turn transition relevance places. On a more general level, verb-first units provide a method of constructing sequential discourse cohesion by, in an explicitly structural sense, building on a prior utterance by the same speaker or another speaker (cf. also Wessén 1956:200 on 'inversion' in old Swedish). The most specific discourse organizing function is, of course, carried out by the category of V1 constructions that have evolved into discourse particles.

The verb-first constructional format also seems to be a vehicle by which the speaker can signal that nothing totally new is being said; after all, no *topic*, even in a structural sense, is introduced. Quite often the effect of V1 is as if something was said in passing, even in a laconic manner, particularly in the case of collateral comments constructed as own-utterance or other-utterance continuations, parenthetical clauses, response utterances and even in some of the deictic uses of the V1 clausal format. This pragmatic effect proceeds primarily from the fact that V1 constructions in one way or other communicate accompanying, continuative and context-dependent moves, rather than new discursive openings that could stand alone.

Hence, an adequate understanding of the motivation of V1 declaratives requires a dialogical model of grammar which is being emerging in the realms of interactionally inspired linguistics (cf. Helasvuo 2001, Steensig 2001; J. Lindström 2005, Linell 2005). Central to this view is that not only contents and attitudes but also grammatical constructions are co-constructed by the speakers and adapted to the prior (and possible following) context to a high degree. Declarative verb-first constructions offer a good

example of a sequentially rooted construction type, whose internal syntax can be thoroughly accounted for only if related to its 'external' syntax.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

NOTES

1. We have adapted the grammatical terms introduced in the comprehensive and influential grammar *Svenska Akademiens grammatik* (SAG) as regards basic structural features of Swedish. However, the translations into English are our own suggestions, e.g. the concept CLAUSAL BASE from Sw. *satsbas*. The table presentations of a clausal topology are an adaptation of the syntactic field model launched by the Danish grammarian Paul Diderichsen (1946), also heavily used as a descriptive tool in SAG.

2. This type of V1 construction is related to a narrative use of inversion that is still common in spoken Swedish. In fact, the construction Wessén refers to may be an instantiation of the phenomenon called 'narrative inversion' in later works (see section 3.1).

3. In introducing an indefinite referent, modern Swedish would favour a 'presentation' construction with the expletive subject *det* 'it' in the clausal beginning, *Det ligger ett lik på mordplatsen* 'There is a corpse lying on the scene of murder' instead of placing the indefinite subject in the beginning, *Ett lik ligger på mordplatsen* 'A corpse is lying on the scene of murder'. Like the historical V1 presentation construction, also the construction with an expletive subject reserves a place for the rhematic referent later in the inner clausal frame.

4. It is worth noting that the V1-formed conditional protasis can only precede the consequent, which can be seen as a reflection of its basic presenting function. The order between the clauses may be reversed when the protasis is constructed as a subordinated *om* 'if'-clause: *Du ska lyfta upp boken om den ligger på golvet* 'You'll have to pick up the book if it's lying on the floor'.

5. In lines 1–3 and in 16–18 present tense is used, but not in 9–13, where the verbs are in the past tense. It could be argued that A in lines 1–3 is referring to the general practice of the clinic where she has taken her baby, and that the events referred to in the list in lines 9–13 are what took place during the visit she has just told B about, whereas A, who did

not actually experience the visit, but who, in the previous discussion, has shown that she has knowledge of the procedures, in line 9 adds an item which refers to what generally is a part of the procedures, which is subsequently confirmed by A in line 18.

6. In fact, one such practice can be observed in lines 5 and 6, where the sole preposition *till* 'to, for' in line 5 demands a 'complement' as an answer, i.e. 'for [which event you want to have tickets]'.

7. We may also note here that V1 utterances with a responsive orientation are not a novel feature of Swedish. We have found instances of such uses, for example, in theatre plays from the 18th century (the corpus collected in the project *Svensk dramadialog under tre sekler* (The Corpus Drama Dialogue in Sweden, Uppsala University)). The following example is from the play *Håkan Smulgråt* by Reinhold Gustaf Modée, written in 1738:

> T: (. . .) Men om jag törs fråga: huru länge täncker Herrn ännu at bruka denne råcken?
> S: Det war en underlig fråga. Så länge jag lefwer må du täncka; för du wet, at jag ej har någon annan. Och när jag en gång dör, då faller han dig först til, om du då skulle lefwa. Och så är det beskaffat {Testamenten}.
> T: **Kan wäl wara**, jag förstår mig intet på så dane saker.
> T: 'But if I dare ask: how long do you Sir aim to use this coat?'
> S: 'That was a peculiar question. As long as I live you may think; because you know that I do have no other. And when I once die, then it will be yours in the first place, if you should live then. And so it is constituted in My last will.'
> T: '(That) **may be** (so), I do not understand such things.'

8. We can also consider the argumentation used in research within CA. In the words of Schegloff, there are '[s]pates of talk . . . [that] can be recognized as having *starting places* which may or may not have *beginnings* in them' (Schegloff 1996:74f.; emphasis as in the original). To start a unit of talk without a hearable beginning, can – in certain sequential environments – mark it as NOT a new communicative project, i.e. not pragmatically new (Ford & Thompson 1996, Ford et al. 2002, Ford 2004), but a continuation of a project already at hand. Against this background, starting a contribution with a clausal V1 construction could be analyzed as a way of starting a unit of talk without a 'hearable beginning' with all the relevant interactional implications following from this strategy.

9. It should be noted here that the X-fields in both clause types have main clause syntax. This is not normally the case with clauses in the X-field of another clause; thus, only (iii), where the X-fielded clause is syntactically subordinate, is a well-formed sentence:

 (i) *Stina fick inte många julklappar, förvånade mig.
   'Stina got not many Christmas gifts, surprised me.'
 (ii) *Många julklappar fick inte Stina, förvånade mig.
   'Many Christmas gifts got not Stina, surprised me.'
 (iii) Att Stina inte fick många julklappar, förvånade mig.
   'That Stina did not get many Christmas gifts, surprised me.'

We thank Sten Vikner for pointing this out to us.

10. Note that *TCU* FINAL and *MEDIAL* does not refer to positions in *TURNS*, only in TCUs. The two may or may not overlap. Cf. Schegloff (1996) and Kärkkäinen (2003).

11. The particle *hördu* 'listen' is closely related to this functional class but its historical origins are slightly different: a combination of a verb in imperative (*hör* 'hear, listen') and a vocative subject pronoun (*du* 'you'). This is, of course, one type of a V1 construction but not basically 'declarative' and thus not evolved via the same route as *vetdu* etc. (see J. Lindström & Wide 2005). Also other imperatives, most often without the optional second person subject pronoun, have developed into discourse markers, such as *se* 'see' *titta* 'look', *tänk* 'think' and *vänta* 'wait'.

REFERENCES

Andersson, Lars-Gunnar. 1976. Talaktsadverbial [Speech act adverbials]. *Nysvenska studier* **56**, 25–46.

Auer, Peter. 1993. Zur Verbspitzenstellung im gesprochenen Deutsch [On verb initial placement in spoken German]. *Deutsche Sprache* **21.3**, 193–222.

Bockgård, Gustav. 2004. *Syntax som social resurs: En studie av samkonstruktionssekvensers form och funktion i svenska samtal* [Syntax as social resource: a study of form and function of co-construction sequences in Swedish conversation]. Ph.D. dissertation, Uppsala University.

Dahlbäck, Hans & Karina Vamling. 1983. "Tog han dått foto" – ett syntaktiskt fenomen i malmöitiskt talspråk ["Tog han dått foto" – a syntactical phenomenon in Malmoe spoken language]. Ms., Department of Linguistics, Lund University.

Diderichsen, Paul. 1946. *Elementær dansk grammatik* [Elementary Danish grammar]. København: Gyldendal.

Diessel, Holger. 1997. Verb-first constructions in German. In Marjolijn Verspoor, Kee D. Lee & Eve Sweetser (eds.), *Lexical and syntactical constructions and the construction of meaning*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 51–68.

Eriksson, Mats. 1997. *Ungdomars berättande: En studie i struktur och interaktion*. [Storytelling in adolescence: a study of structure and interaction]. Ph.D. dissertation, Uppsala University.

Fillmore, Charles. 1989. Grammatical construction theory and the familiar dichotomies. In Rainer Dietrich & Carl F. Graumann (eds.), *Language Processing in Social Context*. North-Holland: Elsevier Science Publishers, 17–38.

Ford, Cecilia E. 2004. Contingency and units in interaction. *Discourse Studies* **6.1**, 27–52.

Ford, Cecilia E., Barbara A. Fox & Sandra A. Thompson. 2002. Constituency and the grammar of turn increments. In Cecilia E. Ford, Barbara A. Fox & Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), *The Language of Turn and Sequence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 15–37.

Ford, Cecilia E. & Sandra A. Thompson. 1996. Interactional units in conversation: syntactic, intonational, and pragmatic resources for the management of turns. In Elinor Ochs, Emanuel A. Schegloff & Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 134–184.

Haiman, John. 1985. *Natural Syntax: Iconicity and Erosion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harris, Roy. 1981. *The Language Myth*. London: Gerald Duckworth & Company Ltd.

Helasvuo, Marja-Liisa. 2001. *Syntax in the Making: The Emergence of Syntactic Units in Finnish Conversation*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Hellberg, Staffan. 1985. *Scandinavian Sentence-types*. Gothenburg: Department of Swedish.

Jefferson, Gail. 1990. List construction as a task and interactional resource. In George Psathas (ed.), *Interaction Competence*. Washington, DC: University Press of America, 63–92.

Karlsson, Susanna. 2003. Interactional uses for an epistemic marker: the case of "Jag Tycker"/"Tycker Jag" in Swedish. *Melbourne Papers in Linguistics and Applied Linguistics* **3.1**, 5–23.

Kärkkäinen, Elise. 2003. *Epistemic Stance in English Conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Lerner, Gene. 1991. On the syntax of sentences-in-progress. *Language in Society* **20**, 441–458.

Lerner, Gene. 1996. "On the semi-permeable" character of grammatical units in conversation: Conditional entry into the turn space of another speaker. In Elinor Ochs, Emanuel A. Schegloff & Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 238–276.

Lindström, Anna. 1994. Identification and recognition in Swedish telephone conversation openings. *Language in Society* **23**, 231–252.

Lindström, Jan. 2005. Grammar in the service of interaction: exploring turn organization in Swedish. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*.

Lindström, Jan & Camilla Wide. 2005. Tracing the origins of a set of discourse particles. Swedish expressions of the type 'you know'. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* **6**, 211–236.

Lindström, Liina. 2001. Verb-initial clauses in narrative. In Mati Erelt (ed.), *Estonian: Typological Studies* **V**. Tartu: University of Tartu, 138–168.

Linell, Per. 1998. *Approaching Dialogue: Talk, Interaction and Contexts in Dialogical Perspectives*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Linell, Per. 2003. Responsiva konstruktioner i samtalsspråkets grammatik [Responsive constructions in the grammar of interaction]. *Folkmålsstudier* **42**, 11–39.

Linell, Per. 2005. En dialogisk grammatik? [A dialogic grammar?]. In Jan Anward & Bengt Nordberg (eds.), *Samtal och grammatik: Studier i svenskt samtalsspråk* [Conversation and grammar: studies in Swedish conversational language]. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Magnusson, Erik. 2003. Subject omission and verb initial declaratives in Swedish. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* **71**, 103–143.

Mörnsjö, Maria. 2002. *V1 Declaratives in Spoken Swedish: Syntax, Information Structure, and Prosodic Pattern*. Ph.D. dissertation, Lund University.

Nordberg, Bengt. 2003. Teleskopiskt tempus eller självkorrektion? [Telescopic tempus or self-correction?] In Bengt Nordberg, Leelo Keevallik Eriksson, Kerstin Thelander & Mats Thelander (eds.), *Grammatik och samtal* [Grammar and conversation]. Uppsala: Uppsala University, 173–187.

Noreen, Niklas. 2003. Apokoinou som metod för hantering av turkonkurrens och samtidigt tal i samtal [*Apokoinou* as a method for handling turn taking competition and simultaneous speech in conversation]. In Bengt Nordberg, Leelo Keevallik Eriksson, Kerstin Thelander & Mats Thelander (eds.), *Grammatik och samtal* [Grammar and conversation]. Uppsala: Uppsala University, 189–198.

Platzack, Christer. 1987. The case of narrative inversion in Swedish and Icelandic. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* **31**, 9–14.

Östman, Jan-Ola. 1981. *You Know: A Discourse Functional Approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Sacks, Harvey. 1992. *Lectures on Conversation* **I**. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

SAG = Teleman, Ulf, Staffan Hellberg & Erik Andersson. 1999. *Svenska Akademiens Grammatik* [The Swedish Academy Grammar]. Stockholm: Norstedts.

SAOB = *Ordbok över svenska språket* [Dictionary of the Swedish language]. Published by the Swedish Academy since 1883.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1996. Turn organization: one intersection of grammar and interaction. In Elinor Ochs, Emanuel A. Schegloff & Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 52–133.

Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schiffrin, Deborah. 1992. Conditionals as topics in discourse. *Linguistics* **30**, 165–197.

Steensig, Jakob. 2001. *Sprog i virkeligheden: Bidrag til en interaktionel lingvistik* [Language in reality: contributions to an interactional linguistics]. Århus: Aarhus Universitetsforlag.

Urmson, James O. 1963. Parenthetical verbs. In Charles E. Caton (ed.), *Philosophy and Ordinary Language*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 220–240.

Wessén, Elias. 1956. *Svensk språkhistoria III: Grundlinjer till en historisk syntax* [Swedish language history III: foundations for a historical syntax]. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Wirdenäs, Karolina. 2002. *Ungdomars argumentation: Om argumentationstekniker i gruppsamtal* [The argumentation of senior high school students: on argumentative techniques in group conversations]. Ph.D. dissertation. Göteborg University.

APPENDIX

Data sources

GRIS = fragments excerpted from the kernel corpus of the project *Samtalsspråkets Grammatik* (Grammar in conversation: a study of spoken Swedish): GSM (arranged group discussion; Göteborg University, see Wirdenäs 2002), HSAM:V2 (everyday conversation; Helsinki University), SÅI NF 2:1 (everyday conversation; Uppsala University), UVAT6:A:6, UMOL:A:4 (telephone conversations; Uppsala University, see A. Lindström 1994), Wallenberg (everyday [dinner] conversation; Göteborg University). For more information on the project and the corpus, see: <http://www.tema.liu.se/tema-k/gris>

HBL = *Hufvudstadsbladet*. A Swedish daily newspaper published in Finland. Excerpt from a review on the movie Spinal Tap: 'Alla tiders rockparodi' [An immemorial rock parody] by Krister Uggeldahl, 31 July 2003.

Luckan = Telephone conversations to a box office service in Helsinki. Part of a corpus of Swedish Service Encounters in Sweden and Finland, Department of Scandinavian Languages and Literature, University of Helsinki.

SVESTRA = A corpus of Finland Swedish conversations collected in the project Finlandssvenska samtalsstrategier (Finland Swedish conversational strategies): OB is a part corpus of recordings collected by in the Ostrobothnian dialect region.

Transcription

men	emphasis	=	latching
MEN	louder	ja:	long sound
ºmenº	soft speech	(.)	a pause shorter than 0.2 sec
hh	exhalation	(0.6)	a pause measured in tenth of a second
.hh	inhalation	(men)	uncertain transcription
pt	smacking sound	()	inaudible
>men<	rapid speech	((cough))	transcriber's comments
<men>	slow speech	?	rising intonation
me-	cut off	¿	slightly rising intonation
~	stylisation	,	level, continuing intonation
''men''	reported speech	.	falling intonation
(	start of overlap	↑	sudden upstep