

## COMPLEMENT CLAUSES AS TURN CONTINUATIONS: THE FINNISH *ET(TÄ)*-CLAUSE

Eeva-Leena Seppänen and Ritva Laury

### Abstract

This paper examines the use of *että*-clauses in Finnish everyday conversation for extending a speaker's turn after a possible point of turn completion for the purpose of pursuing uptake from a turn recipient. Although *että*-clauses are considered complements in most grammatical descriptions of Finnish, the paper questions their status as subordinate clauses. We show that they nevertheless could be considered to function as increments, as either Extensions (Glue-ons, in terms of Couper-Kuhlen & Ono, this volume) or Free Constituents. This is interesting in view of Ford, Fox & Thompson's (2002) definition of increments as "nonmain-clause continuations after a possible point of turn completion." We also show that what makes *että*-clauses ideal for the pursuit of uptake is that both as a conjunction and particle, *että* functions to open up the participation framework and import new voices to the conversation.

**Keywords:** Increments; *Etä*-clause; Complementation; Subordination; Turn expansion; Finnish.

### 1. Introduction<sup>1</sup>

Our paper concerns the grammatical nature and interactional functions of Finnish *et(tä)*<sup>2</sup>-clauses. This places our study within the larger body of work that has come to be called 'grammar-in-interaction', the study of the ways in which grammatical forms are put to use and themselves emerge in interaction as meaningful patterns of social behaviour (e.g. Ochs, Schegloff and Thompson 1996). Within that larger topic, this paper, like the other papers in this volume, deals with the shape that turns-at-talk can take, and the ways that a participant may extend his or her current turn after a point where it is already prosodically, syntactically and pragmatically complete, and another

---

<sup>1</sup> The authors owe a great debt of gratitude to Yoshi Ono and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen for their many detailed comments on various drafts of the paper. Their input has improved the paper greatly. We would also like to thank audiences at the 8<sup>th</sup> International Pragmatics Conference in Toronto and the SKY 2003 symposium in Helsinki for their comments on our work on *että*. We have had inspiring discussions regarding the topic of this paper with Robert Englebretson, Auli Hakulinen, Leelo Keevallik, Aino Koivisto, Jan Lindström, Urpo Nikanne, Shigeko Okamoto, and Ryoko Suzuki. We are also grateful to our fellow panel members in Toronto, and the panel discussant, Peter Auer, for much useful input and inspiration. We also wish to thank Brian Agbayani for his help with references. All mistakes and inadequacies which remain in the paper are of course our responsibility.

<sup>2</sup> In our spoken data, speakers use both the form *että*, which is consistent with the form found in written language, and a shortened form *et*. It is quite possible that the variation in form is meaningful on some level, but here we treat the two variants as equivalents.

speaker could therefore take a turn. In particular, we are interested in the question whether *että*-clauses, which have been described as complement clauses in Finnish grammars, function as increments, that is, “nonmain-clause continuations after a possible point of turn completion (Ford, Fox and Thompson 2002: 16)”.

This question is interesting in two different ways. First, the grammatical category of complementation has been called into question recently (Thompson 2002; Englebretson 2003); we find this issue quite interesting for this clause type in Finnish. Further, although Ford, Fox and Thompson (2002) limited their study of clausal incrementation to subordinate clauses, Englebretson has recently suggested that subordination does not always need to be criterial for clausal increments (2003: 54; 104-105), and Couper-Kuhlen and Ono (this volume) also propose that finite clauses prefaced by coordinators could be functioning as increments (see also Auer, this volume). This opens up the possibility that even if *että*-clauses turn out not to function as complements in the traditional sense, they could still be used as increments. We will also consider the applicability of the typology of incrementation developed by Couper-Kuhlen and Ono (this volume) to the *että*-clauses in our data.

## 2. Data

Our data consist of dyadic and multi-party conversations among friends, family members and co-workers audiotaped in Finland. Some of the conversations were transcribed by the authors, while others come from corpora collected and transcribed at the universities of Turku and Helsinki. The authors thank the departments and persons who have generously made their data available for this study.

## 3. The syntactic and interactional features of *että*-clauses in conversation

In standard descriptions of Finnish grammar, *että*-clauses are described as complements. In other words, they are said to function as subjects and objects of other clauses (Hakulinen & Karlsson 1979: 346-347, 353-354; see also Vilkuna 1996: 66-68). Vilkuna notes that *että* is a marker of subordination (1996: 68), while the most recent descriptive grammar of Finnish suggests that *että* is a particle which is able to function either as an utterance particle or as a subordinating conjunction (Hakulinen et al 2004: 770). Our data indeed contain numerous examples of *että*-clauses occurring with crosslinguistically recognized complement-taking predicates (CTPs), namely verbs of cognition and speech act verbs. In our corpus, *että*-clauses occur with verbs such as *meinata* ‘mean’, *ajatella* ‘think’, *tietää* ‘know’, *nähdä* ‘see’, *kuulla* ‘hear’, *kirota* ‘swear’ *kysyä* ‘ask’, and especially frequently with *sanoa* ‘say’, as in the the following example. This example comes from a multi-party conversation among several relatives gathered for a holiday party.

Example (1). Joulukahvit: Täsmällinen

01 Liisa : joo:: m: m:ut tota: noil- nois kehitysapumaissa

- PTC but PTC DEM-ADE DEM-INE developing.country-PLINE  
Yeah but uh in those developing countries
- 02 *on sama juttu.=meilloj justii tōiissä yks e:*  
be same thing 1PL-ADE.be just work-INE one  
it's the same thing. We have just now at work a
- 03 *hammaslääkäri >joka oli miehensä kans<kaks vuotta*  
dentist REL be-PST man-ACC-POSS with two year-PRT  
dentist who was (there) with her husband for two years
- > *ni .hhh sano että,(.) kun ei ne: j- J:os: ne sanoo et-*  
PTC say-PST että PTC NEG 3PL if 3PL say et  
so (she) said that when they don't if they say to them that
- > *e- niille ä:: kun heille tuli apulaisia et,*  
3SG-ALL when 3PLLOG-ALL come-PST helper-PL-PRT et  
when they had housekeepers come that
- 06 *tulee kello yhdeksän. (0.3) nin ne tulee kello*  
come clock nine PTC 3SG come-PRES clock  
(they should) come at nine. So they come at
- 07 *kolme.*  
three  
three.
- 08 (.)
- 09 Keijo : *juu:: no se [on*  
PTC PTC 3SG be  
Yeah well it's -(
- 10 ( ) : [mm?
- 11 Liisa : [ne ei tunne niinku l:änsimaista  
3PL NEG know PTC west.land.ADJ  
they don't like know the western,
- 12 *a:: a- kelloo ja ajan- j- ja- [j:aksoa?*  
clock-PRT and time-GEN period-PRT  
clock and periods of time.

In this example, Liisa reports in lines 4-7 on something said by a dentist she works with using the verb *sano* 'said' followed by *että* and a report of what the dentist had said. Within the report, in line 4, there is another *sanoo et* 'say that' sequence followed by what the dentist (and her husband?) have reported saying to their household help, embedded within the first sequence. The reported speech is framed as an indirect quote: one indication of this is that the pronouns referring to the dentist and her husband within the reported speech, *ne* and *heille*<sup>3</sup>, are in the third person. In addition, the verbal form in the reported directive in line 6, which is indicative and not imperative, also tends to

<sup>3</sup> The pronoun *he*, here in the allative form *heille* 'to them,' which is used in standard (written) Finnish as a specifically human third-person pronoun, functions logophorically in many varieties of spoken Finnish: within reported speech, it refers to the reported speakers (Laitinen 2002). Thus it also marks the utterance as reported speech.

indicate that the dentist's words are not quoted exactly as she said them. The two instances of *että*-clauses in line 4 could thus be taken as examples of what has traditionally been called complementation: The *että*-clauses could be said to function as object complements of the verb *sano-* 'say', with *et(tä)* functioning as a subordinating conjunction.

On the other hand, the content of the *että*-clauses is in no way subordinate to the content of the reporting phrase, and they also carry the main thrust of the interaction, as argued by Thompson (2002) for English 'complement' clauses. The main content of Liisa's turn is the claim that people in the developing countries have a different sense of time than people in the Western (industrialized?) world; this is how she initiates her turn in lines 1-2, and this is also the part of the utterance that her listeners respond to, as shown below in example (2). The quotes from Liisa's co-worker function as evidence for her claim.

The prosody in this excerpt also tends to indicate that *että* is not a part of the clause that follows, that is, it is not a complementizer within the clause that contains the indirect speech<sup>4</sup>. Prosodically, the word *että* is grouped with the verb *sano-* 'say' in these sequences (see also A. Hakulinen 1989: 118); there is an intonational break (intonation unit boundary, in terms of Chafe 1994) marked by a pitch reset after the first *että* in line 4. In the same line, there is a dysfluency consisting of a truncation and partial repetition after the second *että*, as Liisa changes the direction of her utterance and adds a parenthetical *kun*-clause explaining who the dentist's words had been directed to; this also results in a prosodically separated *sanoo et*-sequence. And in line 5, the word *että* is separated by an intonational break from the reported speech following in line 6. This may be taken as an indicator that *että* forms a unit, a grammaticized epistemic/evidential phrase together with the reporting verb, rather than functioning as a subordinator within the complement clause. We suspect that the function of this phrase is to keep the participation framework and footing open at the point of the interaction where the phrase occurs, a point to which we will return a bit later in this paper.

Moving further away from traditional complementation are uses of *että* with direct quotes, as in example (2) below, coming from the same conversation as example (1).

#### Example (2). Joulukahvit. Täsmällinen.

35 Keijo : =(noin) ne on niin säännöllisii kus Sa<sub>1</sub>lot. =ku  
so 3PL be so regular-PL-PRT as Sa<sub>1</sub>lo-PL when  
In that way they are as punctual as the Salos. When

36 sä sanoit et tulkaa iltapäivällä ni ne oli  
2SG say-PST-2SG et come-2PL.IMP afternoon-ADE so 3PL be-PST  
you said come in the afternoon they were

37 viis yli kakstoist [(tossa)

<sup>4</sup> This raises an issue regarding the representation of the complementizer as being included within the complement clause as head (as suggested originally by Jackendoff 1977; later as head of CP, Chomsky 1986). However, we are not certain whether representatives of autonomous approaches to syntax would accept prosody as evidence for syntactic structure. We leave this issue aside for present purposes.



- 12 a:: a- *kelloo ja ajan- j- ja- [j:aksoa?*  
 clock-PRT and time-GEN period-PRT  
 clock and periods of time,
- 13 Tyyne : *[juu ne sitä*  
 PTC 3PL 3SG-PRT  
 Yeah they --
- 14 Liisa : *>et sano et< jos niille s:anoo jonku kellonajan*  
 et say-PST et if 3PL-ALL say some-ACC clock.time-ACC  
 That (she?) said that if (one) tells them some time
- 15 *ni se täytyy niinkum muuntaa .hh et heillä alkaa*  
 PTC 3SG must PTC transform-1INF et 3PLLOG-ADE begin  
 Then it has to be like translated, that for them
- 16 *se aamu siitä ku aurinko nousee,*  
 DET morning 3SG-ELA when sun rise  
 the morning begins from when the sun rises,
- 17 Tyyne : *juu [niin on*  
 PTC so be  
 Yeah, that's right
- 18 (Sini): *[mm:::?*
- > Liisa : *et sem mukaan täytyy sanoa se (.) [kelloaika*  
 et 3SG-GEN according-to must say-1INF DET clock.time  
 That (you) have to give the time along those lines.
- 20 Tyyne : *[joo*  
 PTC  
 Yeah
- 21 Liisa : *niin[kun, et se ei s::- s:e ei stemmaa meiän*  
 PTC et 3SG NEG 3SG NEG match 1PL-GEN  
 Like, that it doesn't match
- 22 (Sini): *[mm,*
- 23 Liisa : *kan[ssa.*  
 with  
 with ours.

The uses of *että* in this excerpt are much less conjunction-like than those in examples (1) or even (2). In particular, the first *et* in line 14, and the *et*-initial clauses in lines 15, 19 and 21 are not contiguous to any complement-taking predicates, and they follow syntactically complete sequences<sup>6</sup>. It may of course be that the earlier instances of the verb *sanoa* are still available in the discourse model (cf. Englebretson 2003: 103), and in that sense the *että*-clauses could be considered to be additional complements of the earlier occasions of use of that verb.

<sup>6</sup> Liisa's utterance in line 12, while syntactically complete, is prosodically marked for incompleteness by rising intonation. This is a very unusual contour in Finnish. Routarinne characterizes it as "evoking expectations regarding continuation" (2003: 11). A terminal rising contour is not associated with yes/no questions in Finnish, although it is in English.

These uses also differ from the earlier examples prosodically and interactionally. In examples (1) and (2), *et(tä)* was prosodically grouped with the verb *sano-* ‘say’, while in example (3), in lines 14 (the first *et*), 15, 19 and 21, *et* is grouped with the clause that follows (see A. Hakulinen 1989: 118 on this feature of the syntactization of the particle *et(tä)*). The use in line 19 could even be analyzed as turn-initial. Namely, at the end of line 16, Liisa has come to a point where her utterance is both syntactically and semantically complete. Although it is prosodically not marked for completion by falling intonation, and is thus not a CTRP in the sense of Ford and Thompson (1996), at this point, both Tyyne and Sini comment briefly. After this, Liisa continues with her *et*-initial utterance, which is essentially a rewording of what she has said before. The *että*-initial clause is not syntactically integrated into the preceding clause, and thus not subordinate in any sense; instead, it is a summary of Liisa’s previous comments.

This allows us two possibilities for the interpretation of the function of utterance- and turn-initial *et(tä)*. First, in its use with reported speech, *että* prefaces paraphrases, or at least more or less accurate renderings, of something that has (at least purportedly) been said earlier (on the accuracy of quoted speech, see Mayes 1990). For this reason, it is not strange that in its particle use, *et(tä)* should also precede a paraphrase or a summary. In fact, it has been proposed by previous studies that in its particle use, *että* is used by speakers to interpret or paraphrase their preceding utterances or turns (Raussi 1992: 4; Hakulinen et al 2004: 984<sup>7</sup>). Liisa’s use of *että* in line 19, and perhaps also in line 21, would thus count as a guide to interpretation: “Do not take this as a new topic, but rather as a paraphrase or summary of what precedes”. The reason for taking a turn of this type might be precisely the fact that no-one else has taken a turn; thus the previous speaker recycles her preceding turn. Secondly, *että* could be thought to serve an epistemic or evidential function here in that it marks Liisa’s *että*-prefaced utterances as something heard from her co-worker, that is, they function to show that Liisa is not the author or principal here (Goffman 1981: 144), or at least they leave open the exact footing on which these comments are made. This indicates that the function of the particle *et(tä)* is (at least) two-fold: It projects backward to the previous utterance or turn of the current speaker, often providing a summary or paraphrase of it, and it also regulates the participation framework by leaving open the footing on which the utterance is produced. Both of these functions can be seen as inheritance of the contexts in which *että* is used in its subordinating conjunction function.

The uses of *että*-clauses in example (3) seem to blur the line between what should be considered a complement clause and what should not. This pattern is in keeping with other recent findings questioning standard accounts of complementation and the crosslinguistic validity of the grammatical category of complementation in English (Thompson 2002) and Indonesian (Englebretson 2003).

As Vilkuna has noted, *että*-clauses can also occur by themselves, without any attached main clause (1996: 70), or even a preceding CTP earlier in the conversation. An example follows. This excerpt comes from a conversation between a grandmother

---

<sup>7</sup> Interestingly, very similar summarizing and paraphrasing uses have been reported for the Estonian *et* and the Finland Swedish *att*, both also traditionally analyzed as complementizers translatable as ‘that’ in English, by Keevallik (2000) and Lindström (2003). Keevallik (2000) also notes that the use of *et* in Estonian is connected with polyphony, that is, the allocation of responsibility for what is expressed in the utterance to the participants in the interaction in general, rather than to just the current speaker.

and her granddaughter, who has just unpacked a new toy consisting of numerous small pieces.

Example (4). Playmobil.

- 1 Eppu: ... *onks nää semmosia pa—*  
 be-Q these such-PL-PRT pi—  
 Are these like,
- 2 *joutavia palasia.*  
 superfluous-PL-PRT piece-PL-PRT  
 Throw-away pieces.
- 3 .. *nämä .. kato.*  
 These look-2SGIMP  
 These, look.
- 4 Salla: *on.*  
 be  
 Yes they are.
- 5 Eppu: *ettei ne oo Laurin suussa [kohta.]*  
 että-NEG 3PL be Lauri-GEN mouth-INE soon.  
 So they won't be in Lauri's mouth in a moment.
- 6 Salla: *[tää pape= --]*  
 This pape- --
- ... *Tämä= --*  
 this
- .. *tässon lapio.*  
 here+be shovel  
 Here's a shovel.

In this example, Eppu asks a polar question of her granddaughter in lines 1-2 regarding the status of some of the small pieces she is occupied with. The lexical choice in this question, the word *joutavia* 'disposable' arouses an implication that some of the pieces could be thrown away. There is a brief delay: The projected second pair part to this question does not immediately follow. Eppu attempts to deal with this by providing an unattached NP (functioning as an increment<sup>8</sup>) followed by the second-person singular imperative *kato* 'look', designed to direct her granddaughter's attention to the particular set of pieces she is concerned with, thus treating the lack of uptake as a problem with

<sup>8</sup> Which type of an increment this utterance might be in itself an interesting question. The utterance could be considered syntactically and prosodically independent from the clause preceding it, and thus a Free Constituent in terms of Ford, Fox and Thompson (2002). However, it could also be considered a right dislocation, probably accompanied by a gesture clarifying the reference (see Auer, this volume).

referent resolution. In line 4, Salla responds with a partial repeat of the question, one of the two possible ways to provide an affirmative answer to a Finnish polar question (Sorjonen 2001). This type of answer analyzes the preceding question as a request for information new to the person asking the question; at the same time, it “suggests that the just-constituted piece of knowledge is part of an activity that has somewhere to go and displays a possibility of a forward-movement in that activity (Sorjonen 2001: 44).” In other words, Salla’s response could be taken as an acknowledgement of the suggestion of the suitability of the pieces in question for being thrown away. In that sense, her response is minimal, although the conventional meaning of this response type leaves open the possibility that there could be further action. However, Salla does not offer to throw away the pieces, something that Eppu may have been implying. Eppu’s next turn could be taken as an elaboration of the implication raised by her original turn in lines 1-3, made relevant by what she may see as a less than adequate response. She provides an account for why the pieces should be thrown away: To eliminate the possibility that they might end up in the mouth of her baby grandson Lauri.

This use of *että* comes close in certain ways to the types of functions increments were shown to perform in Ford, Fox and Thompson’s (2002) English data. However, Eppu does receive a response to her question, and in that sense, here there is not a problem of reciprocity. At the same time, Eppu appears not to have received the type of response she was looking for, and therefore her turn in line 5 could count as dealing with a problem of uptake: It is an account produced after a minimal response.

Furthermore, although Eppu’s previous turn in lines 1-3 is syntactically, semantically, prosodically and interactionally complete, the utterance in line 5 is surprisingly well designed to provide a syntactic continuation to her utterance in line 3, involving a reanalysis of it. Although *kato* at the end of line 3 could be analyzed as a simple imperative form directing the attention of the addressee to the referents of *nämä* (‘These, look.’), it is also a perfectly plausible host for the *että*-clause which follows in line 5. That is, the sequence *kato ettei ne oo Laurin suussa kohta* is completely possible syntactically and pragmatically. In such a sequence, *kato* could either be reanalyzed as a particle focusing the addressee’s attention on what follows (Hakulinen and Seppänen 1992), providing a meaning something like, ‘you see, so that they won’t get into Lauri’s mouth’, or as a full verb, with the meaning ‘see to it that they won’t get into Lauri’s mouth’, instead of the simple imperative ‘look’, the way it would be interpreted without a following *että*-clause at the end of line 3. In fact, the utterance in 5 is ambiguous in terms of whether it is designed as a syntactic completion of Eppu’s previous turn in line 3 or not.

For these reasons, it is also unclear which type of increment, if any, we would be dealing with here. Line 5 is a (possible) syntactic continuation of the preceding utterance, which would make it an Extension in terms of Ford, Fox and Thompson (2002), and a Glue-on in terms of Couper-Kuhlen and Ono (this volume), with the retrospective syntactic restructuring effects they note for their English and Japanese data. However, as we have shown above, line 5 could also be analyzed as being syntactically independent of the preceding utterance, like the English Unattached NP increments of Ford, Fox and Thompson (2002). Like the Unattached NPs in their data, line 5 also constitutes a different action from the talk in lines 1-3, since it does not deal with reference resolution relating to the question in lines 1-3, but rather provides an account for why the question was produced. These types of elements are considered Free constituents by Couper-Kuhlen and Ono, who, differing from Ford, Fox and

Thompson (2002), do not consider them increments proper, since they are syntactically and often also actionally separate from the TCU they follow, and in that sense rather something between a new TCU and an increment proper. This example shows clearly, as also pointed out by Auer (this volume), and others, that the question of what should be considered a turn continuation and what should not is by no means clear, at least at this point in the existing research.

Another, intriguing aspect of the meaning of *että* is the work it does in regulating the participant structure in interaction. As we have shown above, it is used as a conjunction within reporting phrases, which function to index the footing of the utterance they precede. If, in its particle use, *että* retains this same function, then it would make it very useful for contexts where pursuit of uptake is the concern. Namely, if utterances prefaced with the particle *että* (that is, cases where *että* occurs initially in an utterance, without any preceding reporting phrase) are framed as being relatively open with respect to footing, then they can be seen as proffering stances or assessments which do not belong to the speaker alone, but rather are offered as more general ones which could then be adopted by the recipient(s) as well. Thus they can easily be seen, for instance, as well suited for modeling the types of responses the speaker is looking for, one of the jobs increments, at least in the sense of Ford, Fox and Thompson (2002: 26), do. We would like to argue that this is precisely the type of work that the several utterance-initial uses of *että* in example (3) are doing: In that example, the footing of the statements the speaker produces is left open; she is seen to be proffering assessments which she frames as being adoptable by the other participants as well.

### 5. *Että*-clauses as increments

In what precedes, we have argued that Finnish *että*-clauses are not traditional complements, even when they follow complement-taking predicates, and we have also shown that *että* is not only a conjunction but also a turn-initial particle. Thus, given the uncertain status of *että*-clauses as subordinate clauses, they might not be very good candidates for increments, at least if they are defined as non-mainclause continuations of an already possibly complete turn, as done by Ford, Fox and Thompson (2002: 16) for the purposes of their study (see also Goodwin 1979). In this regard, we are encouraged by Engelbretson's comment that subordination does not need to be criterial for clausal increments (2003), and by the discussion by Couper-Kuhlen and Ono as well as Auer (this volume) regarding the status of coordinate clauses as increments. In addition, we have also shown that *että*-clauses in our data are used to address problems with reciprocity, the typical function of increments. So far, however, we have not presented any unambiguous cases of incrementation, but such uses do exist in our data, and we present three such cases below.

Our first example of an increment used in the pursuit of uptake comes from a conversation among three young women friends. EL is knitting a sweater for her boyfriend, and in the excerpt below she asks one of her friends to stand up so she can try it on her.

Example (5). Tutot

1 EL *nouseks*                      *vähä seisomaa*                      *mää pruuvaan tätä.*

Arise.2SG-Q-CLT little stand-3INF-ILL 1SG try this-PRT  
 Would you stand up for a bit (so) I (can) try this.

2 *kuin pitkä tää on.*  
 how long this is  
 How long this is.

3 RV @*hänel vai.*  
 3SG-ALL or  
 On her?

4 AL *mul vai.*  
 1SG-ALL or  
 On me?

5 EL *nii.*  
 PTC

*et [mä] suurin piirtein tiära.*  
 että 1SG large-INSTR feature-INSTR know.1SG  
 (So) that I can tell approximately.

7 AL [eöh,] ((A VOCAL NOISE INDICATING MILD ANNOYANCE))  
 (...)

EL's turn in line 1 is a request which projects an action as a response: She asks AL to stand up. The request is surprising, because the sweater is not intended for AL, and both AL and RV provide clarification questions, repair initiations indicating trouble with the previous turn. In response, EL produces the particle *nii*, an affirmative response which is typically produced after candidate understandings. According to Sorjonen, candidate understandings which get *nii* as a response often take up the reference of indexical expressions; *nii* also typically occurs in continuation-relevant environments, so that at the point where a *nii*-response is produced, the larger on-going sequence and activity is still underway (2001: 58-61). This is the case here: The question *nii* responds to concerns the (ambiguous) recipient of the directive produced by EL. *Nii* could thus be taken as closing the repair sequence, after which EL could expect AL to stand up. Instead, she produces an account which provides a paraphrase or explanation of her previous request. As already noted, this is a typical use of *et* as a turn-initial particle. In line 6, EL explains that she wants to know whether the sweater is long enough. We can see here the typical function of *että*-prefaced utterances in that what EL says in line 6 projects backward to her earlier utterance and paraphrases it in the sense that *pruuvata* 'to try (on)', the verb used in line 1, already involves a search for knowledge.

EL's *et*-prefaced clause in 6 seems to be a clear case of an extension increment, a Glue-on in terms of Couper-Kuhlen and Ono (this volume). It follows a syntactically, semantically and interactionally complete turn: *nii* in line 5 is an entirely complete and appropriate affirmative response to AL's and RV's clarification questions. In other words, there is a CTRP at the end of line 5. Like the *et*-prefaced utterance in (4), the *et*-

clause in line 6 is also designed so that it will be a syntactically and semantically compatible continuation of the preceding TCU, the particle *nii* produced in line 5. In itself, this is not surprising because *nii* is a particle, and complexes of more than one particle can occur turn-initially in Finnish. *Nii et* is a fine sequence, analyzable as either a particle sequence or perhaps as a complex conjunction (Vilkuna 1996: 69), glossed as ‘so that’ in the free translation of line 6. Such a syntactic fit would make line 6 an Extension, or a Glue-on. The *et*-prefaced clause in this example is also very similar in function to the *et*-prefaced clause in example (4): It also provides an account after a dispreferred response. The account is provided to address the problem of lack of uptake from the recipient: AL has failed to comply with EL’s request. Thus the increment in line 6 is “an attempted solution to a lack of displayed reciprocity” (Ford, Fox and Thompson 2002: 18-19); it provides another possible point of completion, and another chance for AL to comply with EL’s request.

Although what we have seen so far seems to suggest that we have here a clear case of an extension, there is another interpretation of the example. Just as in example (4), the *et*-clause in line 6 in example (5) also counts as a separate action from the preceding *nii*, which, at the end of line 5, is interpretable as an affirmative answer to a clarification question produced as a side sequence, while the *et*-clause is an account for why the original request was made. The ambiguity of syntactic fit with the preceding TCU is consistent with the actional discontinuity. In terms of syntactic and actional continuity, then, this increment more clearly resembles the Free Constituents of Ford, Fox and Thompson (2002), and for this reason it would not be considered an increment at all by Couper-Kuhlen and Ono (this volume). However, the first analysis is also a possibility; the sequence as a whole is in a way analogous to a syntactic blend in that *nii* in line 5 could be seen to play a double role as a response particle to the questions in lines 3 and 4 as well as forming, post hoc, a particle complex with the following *et*<sup>9</sup>, as also done in instances of Glue-ons in Couper-Kuhlen and Ono’s data.

The following is an example of an *että*-clause as a Free Constituent pursuing uptake from a recipient. It comes from a conversation between a mother and a daughter who are preparing fresh-salted salmon, a typical Finnish holiday dish. The mother, E, has purchased the fish for Christmas dinner, and the daughter, R, remarks upon its color.

Example (6). Suolalohi 34-44

1 R: *tää on vaaleemman punasta.*  
This be light-COMP-GEN red-PRT  
This is lighter red.

2 *[tää lohi.]*  
this salmon  
This salmon.

---

<sup>9</sup> Yoshi Ono has pointed out to us that simply the nextness of two juxtaposed constructions may create an impression (at least in the analyst!) that they are syntactically fitted. This is an intriguing point not much discussed in the literature, and well worth exploring. On the other hand, it is quite possible that in the process of production, speakers may indeed fit what they say onto what they have just previously said, although the earlier construction, at the point it is produced, does not project such a continuation.

- 3 E: *[juu.*  
PTC  
Yes.
- 4 *tää on] oikeeta lohta.*  
this be real-PRT salmon-PRT  
This is real salmon.
- 5 *se--*  
3SG  
It
- 6 *... tää ei oo keinoruokittuu,*  
this NEG be artificial-feed-PASS-P.PPL  
This is not artificially fed,
- 7 *tää on oikeen mereltä tullutta ja,*  
this be really sea-ADE come-PRES.PPL-PRT and  
This has really come from the sea and,
- 8 *t- lohi .. ei oo... kovin punalihasta,*  
salmon NEG be very red-meat-ADJ  
salmon doesn't have very red meat
- 9 *.. sillon ku se on oikeen –*  
then when 3SG be really  
when it's really
- 10 *.. oikeen meressä ollutta,*  
really sea-INE be-PRES.PPL-PRT  
(the kind that) has been in the sea,
- 11 *et sitä ei oo ruokittu.*  
että 3SG-PRT NEG be feed-PASS.P.PPLE  
(so) that it hasn't been fed.
- 12 R: *joo.*  
PTC  
Yeah.
- 13 E: *ymmärrätsä.*  
understand-2SG-2SG  
Do you understand.
- 14 ((a child intervenes with a request))

After R's remark (which could be taken as a topic proffer) about the color of the salmon, E takes a turn which consists of providing an explanation for why the salmon is

light in color: This is because it has been caught in the open sea, and is not farm-raised. The TCU she provides in line 4 counts as a positive assessment, since ‘real’ salmon is presumably better, certainly more difficult to obtain and more expensive than farm-raised salmon. Since E’s utterance is complete syntactically, semantically and prosodically at this point, it provides a possible transition point: Her positive assessment might be expected to be followed by an affiliative positive assessment from R, especially in view of the fact that E has purchased the salmon. However, R does not take a turn, and E provides further talk consisting of further positive assessment of the salmon and an expansion of the content of the TCU in line 4: The salmon is ‘real’ in the sense that it has not been artificially fed and it comes from the sea (i.e., not from a fish farm); this is followed by the background information that salmon is not very red when it comes from the sea. During this talk, E comes to two points of syntactic and semantic completion, at the end of line 6 and again at the end of line 10, although both are prosodically marked as continuing.

In line 11, after the possible TRP at the end of line 10, E produces the *että*-clause which is of interest to us: As *että*-clauses typically do, it presents a paraphrase of what she has already said, but the *että*-prefacing also functions to present the utterance as general knowledge, indexing the opening up of the footing: What E says here is presented as not just what E thinks or knows, but rather something someone else might also have said. In that sense, the information presented in the *että*-clause is different from the utterance in line 6, which it paraphrases: Unlike the utterance in line 6, which concerned the particular salmon E and R were preparing, it puts the assessment in the arena of general knowledge – it is about generic sea-caught salmon.

The utterance in line 11 resembles the Free Constituents of Ford, Fox and Thompson, since the *että*-clause is not syntactically integrated into what it follows, and could be taken as explicitly modeling the type of uptake E is pursuing from R. If it were produced by the recipient, it would be the kind of affiliative response E is seeking. Like some of the Free Constituents in Ford, Fox and Thompson’s data (2002: 30-31), line 11 also performs an assessment following another assessment. However, prosodically speaking, as we have noted, the end of line 10 is not a CTRP, making the analysis of line 11 as an increment problematic<sup>10</sup>. The lack of prosodic closure at the end of line 10 may be due to the fact that this *että*-clause continues or at least performs the same action as the prior TCU: it would thus prosodically contrast with incremental *että*-clauses which begin an action different from the immediately preceding TCU, as in example (5).

R’s response particle in line 12 is consistent with the understanding of the situation as displayed by E’s turn. *Joo*, differently from other Finnish positive responses, “responds merely to the factual character of the prior utterance and registers it as understood, leaving aside its affiliation-relevant aspect (Sorjonen 2001: 280)”. In other words, in spite of her efforts, E still fails to get the type of response from her recipient she is seeking. This is confirmed by her next turn, asking whether R understood what she meant.

Our third example comes from the same conversation as examples (1) and (2) above. The grandparents of Marjut, a 2-year-old child who is present in the

<sup>10</sup> And of course, as pointed out previously, Couper-Kuhlen and Ono do not consider Free Constituents increments at all. Furthermore, as Auer (this volume) points out, the role of prosody in incrementation is still not fully understood.

conversation, are telling about a clever comment she is reported to have made at daycare.

Example (7). Joulukahvit: Tätipukki

- 10 Liisa : [*>*kyllä< tää jo?  
PTC this already  
This one already
- 11 Liisa : *oli l- l:eikki- tarhassa sanonu,*  
be-PST kindergarten say-P.PPLE  
had said at kindergarten,
- 12 (.)
- 13 Sini : mm::?
- 14 (.)
- 15 Keijo : *sukupuolem mää[ritelmän,*  
gender-GEN definition-ACC  
a definition of gender
- 16 Raija : [*<*kato:s>  
PTC  
I'll be.
- > Timo : *nii että tätipukki s(h)e oli ainoo joka [(huomas).*  
PTC *että* aunt.santa 3SG be-PST only REL notice-PST  
So *että* auntie Santa she was the only one who noticed.
- 18 Keijo : [mm:: hm,
- > Timo : *että tätipukki.*  
*että* auntie.santa  
*että* auntie Santa.
- 20 Raija : *ni[i.*  
PTC  
That's right.
- 21 ( ) : [mm::,
- 22 Timo : *.hjoo*  
PTC  
Yeah.

In lines 10-11 of our example, Liisa, the child's grandmother, starts the anecdote, but leaves the construction incomplete syntactically and prosodically, thus inviting completion by other participants. In line 15, Keijo, the child's grandfather, provides an opaque characterization of what the child had said, using an accusative NP syntactically fitted to complete Liisa's utterance. After this, Timo, Marjut's father, takes a turn in line 17 in which the initial *nii* could be analyzed as an acknowledgment of Keijo's turn, followed by the particle/conjunction *että* and the actual word the child is reported to

have said upon noticing that the Santa Claus visiting the daycare center was in fact a woman. The lexical item comes from child language: Finnish children use the word *täti* (lit. ‘aunt’) for non-relative adult females. The reported utterance *tätipukki* ‘auntie Santa’ can thus be analyzed as a direct quote.

However, Timo’s turn in line 17 can also be analyzed as having been designed to complete Liisa’s utterance syntactically: The word *nii* in that case could be analyzed as an adverb<sup>11</sup> or particle meaning ‘so’, followed by *että* as either a conjunction or a particle. It is in this example in particular where the fuzzy boundary between the conjunction and particle use of *että* is evident. In fact, it may be reasonable to analyze the *niin*<sup>12</sup> *että* combination as a complex conjunction, as suggested by Vilkuna (1996: 69).

The rest of Timo’s utterance in line 17, in which the first three words, while prosodically integrated into the rest of the utterance, are not syntactically an argument of the clause which forms the rest of this intonation unit, is, especially in this context, potentially complete both syntactically and prosodically, but the *että*-initial utterance provided by Timo in line 19 is designed to fit syntactically with the clause in line 17. It is the utterance in line 19 which clearly functions as an increment. Note that up to this point, Keijo, the child’s grandfather, is the only person at the table who has reacted to the witty formulation the child has given to her observation, perhaps because others have not comprehended the child’s comment, and are thus unable to sufficiently appreciate it. Timo’s redoing of the word can be seen as another attempt to clarify the child’s comment in order to gain reciprocity from someone outside the team he has built with Keijo and Liisa for the purpose of reporting on his daughter’s cleverness.

Example (7) combines the typical characteristics of *että*-initial utterances. Syntactically, the *että*-initial utterances are ambiguous as either a complement of a CTP or a particle-initial utterance. Prosodically, they follow both complete (line 17) and incomplete (line 11) utterances. And, pragmatically, the use of *että* involves the introduction of a voice distinct from that of the current speaker, a paraphrase of what has been said previously, which functions interactionally as a continuation of a turn which is potentially complete, in the pursuit of an appropriate uptake from the other participants. In this example, the point that Marjut had said something worthy of appreciation has been made by the child’s grandparents and her father, and has not been reacted to by the other participants in an appropriately appreciative manner.

We have seen in this section that *että*-clauses can be used in Finnish conversation to pursue uptake of a desired sort from their recipient(s) by interpreting, explaining, paraphrasing or otherwise recycling the content of the turn which it is an increment of. The *että*-clauses in our data can also be analyzed as syntactic continuations of the previous TCU, both in cases where the previous turn has consisted of only a particle, or an element which could be reanalyzed as a particle, and after full clauses, as shown in our last example. Since *että* is often best analyzed as a particle in its clause-initial use, it is not surprising that it could be read as a syntactically viable continuation of another turn consisting of only a particle, since sequences of particles can occur clause-initially in Finnish. Actionally, *että*-clauses can either continue the action of the previous TCU

---

<sup>11</sup> *Niin* ‘in that way’ is one of the three-part demonstrative-based manner adverb paradigm in Finnish, in addition to functioning as a particle and a conjunction (see Sorjonen 2001:9-10); the borderlines between these form classes are often far from clear, as can be seen from this example and also example (5) above.

<sup>12</sup> *Niin* is the full form of the particle which in our data mostly has the form *nii*.

or constitute a separate action. There is some indication in our data that those increments which continue the action of the preceding TCU are prosodically integrated into the previous TCU, while those that constitute a separate action are not. So far, we have only found prosodically integrated *että*-clauses in assessment sequences.

Thus it seems to us that the *että*-clauses in our data can function as either Extensions (Glue-ons) or Free Constituents. Extensions, or Glue-ons in terms of Couper-Kuhlen and Ono (this volume), are syntactically and actionally integrated into the preceding TCU; this is the case in line 19 of example (7), which is syntactically a possible continuation of line 17, and also continues the action started there by Timo, and even previously by the other two speakers. However, some of our other examples seem to function more like Free Constituents, because they are less well integrated into what immediately precedes. In example (6), there is no syntactic integration, and in example (5), the syntactic integration seems only possible if the preceding TCU is reanalyzed post hoc as forming a particle complex or a complex conjunction with the *että* which follows rather than functioning independently as a response particle.

## 6. Conclusion

We have argued here that in spite of the fact that Finnish *että*-clauses are not very good examples of traditional complementation, and thus not at all clear examples of subordination, they are still used as increments in conversation to pursue uptake from a recipient. These involve both the types of clauses where *että* functions as a turn-initial particle, and clauses where it functions more like a conjunction; both types of *että*-clauses are used in conversation to paraphrase or summarize earlier turns and utterances by the same speaker, and to regulate the participant framework. In our data, both types of *että*-clauses are used as increments for the purpose of adding another possible transition point when uptake from a recipient is not forthcoming. In terms of the increment typologies developed by Couper-Kuhlen and Ono (this volume), many of the *että*-clauses are intermediate or ambiguous and could be analyzed as either Glue-ons or Free Constituents. Interactionally, these clause types are especially useful for the purpose of pursuing uptake because *että* typically functions to open up the participation framework, and thus implies that what has been expressed in the speaker's turn is something someone else has said or may also have said.

## References

- Chafe, Wallace (1994) *Discourse, consciousness and time. The flow and displacement of conscious experience in speaking and writing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Chomsky, Noam (1986) *Barriers*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Englebretson, Robert (2003) *Searching for structure. The problem of complementation in colloquial Indonesian conversation*. Studies in Discourse and Grammar 13. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Ford, Cecilia E., Barbara A. Fox, and Sandra A. Thompson (2002) Constituency and the grammar of turn increments. In Cecilia E. Ford, Barbara A. Fox and Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), *The language of turn and sequence*. Oxford Studies in Sociolinguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 14-38.
- Goffman, Erving (1981) *Forms of talk*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Goodwin, Charles (1979) The interactive construction of a sentence in natural conversation. In George Psathas (ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology*. New York : Irvington Publishers, pp. 97-121.
- Hakulinen, Auli, and Fred Karlsson (1979) *Nykysuomen lauseoppia*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Hakulinen, Auli (1989) Partikkelit ja muut kiteymät vuoroissa. In Auli Hakulinen (ed.), *Suomalaisen keskustelun keinoja 1*. Kieli 4. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopiston suomen kielen laitos.
- Hakulinen, Auli, and Eeva-Leena Seppänen (1992) Finnish *kato*: From verb to particle. *Journal of Pragmatics* 18: 527-549.
- Hakulinen, Auli, Maria Vilkuna, Riita Korhonen, Vesa, Koivisto, Tarja Riita Heinonen, and Irja Alho (2004) *Iso suomen kielioppi* [The big grammar of Finnish]. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Hakulinen, Lauri (1979) *Suomen kielen rakenne ja kehitys*. Helsinki: Otava.
- Jackendoff, Ray (1977) *X' Syntax: A study of phrase structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kangasniemi, Heikki (1997) *Sana, merkitys, maailma. Katsaus leksikaalisen semantiikan perusteisiin*. Helsinki: Finn Lectura.
- Keevallik, Leelo (2000) Keelendid *et ja nii et* vestluses. *Keel ja Kirjandus* 5: 344-358.
- Kuiri, Kaija (1984) *Referointi Kainuun ja Pohjois-Karjalan murteissa*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran toimituksia 405. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Laitinen, Lea (2002) From logophoric pronoun to discourse particle. A case study of Finnish and Saami. In Ilse Wischer & Gabriele Diewald (eds.), *New reflections on grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Laury, Ritva (2006) On subordination, Finnish style. Questioning the category of finite clausal complementation in Finnish. In Mickael Suominen, Antti Arppe, Anu Airola, Orvokki Heinämäki, Matti Miestamo, Urho Määttä, Jussi Niemi, Kari K. Pitkänen & Kaius Sinnemäki (eds.), *A man of measure*. Festschrift in honor of Fred Karlsson on his 60th birthday. Turku: The Linguistic Association of Finland, pp. 310-321.
- Laury, Ritva, and Eeva-Leena Seppänen (to appear.) Clause combining. Interaction, evidentiality, participation structure and the conjunction-particle continuum: The Finnish *että*. Ritva Laury (ed.), *Crosslinguistic studies of Clause Combining*.
- Lindström, Jan (2003) Syntaksia suomenruotsalaisittain [Syntax Finland Swedish style]. *Virittäjä* 4/2003: 545-567.
- Mayes, Patricia (1990) Quotation in spoken English. *Studies in Language* 14: 325-63.
- Munro, Pamela (1982) On the transitivity of 'say' verbs. In Paul J. Hopper and Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), *Studies in transitivity*. New York, N.Y.: Academic Press, pp. 301-318.
- Raussi, Anne (1992) *Et(tä)*-partikkelilla alkavat lausumat keskustelussa. Unpublished thesis, Department of Finnish, University of Helsinki.

Routarinne, Sara (2003) *Tytöt äänessä. Parenteesit ja nouseva sävelkulku kertojan vuorovaikutuskeinoina*. [Girls Speaking. Parentheses and rising intonation as interactive tools of the teller.] Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura

Sorjonen, Marja-Leena (2001) *Responding in conversation. A study of response particles in Finnish*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Thompson, Sandra A. (2002) 'Object complements' and conversation: Towards a realistic account. *Studies in Language* 26.1: 1125-164.

Vilkuna, Maria (1996) *Suomen lauseopin perusteet*. [Fundamentals of Finnish Syntax]. Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskuksen julkaisuja 90. Helsinki: Edita.

### Appendix: Key to the transcription symbols

Examples 1, 2, 3, and 7 have been transcribed using a system common in conversation analysis, while examples 4, 5, and 6 were transcribed using a simplified version of the system described in Du Bois et al 1993. There is a considerable amount of overlap between the symbols used. The symbols used in examples 1, 2, 3, and 7 are given first, followed by symbols used in examples 4, 5, and 6 which differ from or are not used in the other system. The main difference is that the lines in the transcripts done in the Du Bois et al system correspond to intonation units, a prosodically defined stretch of talk, while this is not the case with the CA system.

.	falling intonation
,	level or slightly falling intonation
?	rising intonation
here	emphasis
:	lengthening of the sound
> <	talk inside is done with a faster pace than the surrounding talk
hh	audible aspiration
le(h)t	talking through laughter
.hh	audible inhalation
(0.3)	silences timed in tenths of a second
(.)	silence shorter than 0.2 seconds
=	no silence between two adjacent utterances
[	utterances starting simultaneously
]	point where overlapping talk stops
( )	talk not discernible
(( ))	comments of the author

### Additional/different symbols used in examples 4-6

New line	intonation unit boundary
--	truncated intonation unit
=	lengthening of the sound

... medium pause (0.3-0.7 seconds)  
.. short pause (0.2 seconds or less)  
@ laughter