

analysis of talk-in-interaction can only be undertaken if the principles of recipient design (or "co-authoring" as Linell 2004 puts it), sequentiality and temporality are taken seriously (c.f. Auer 2009; Günthner 2010). Often it is argued that – due to memory processing restrictions for larger stretches of spoken language – the complexity of grammatical structures in these contexts is reduced (c.f. Deppermann 2011: 431):

That our memory is poorly adapted to the storage of speech, and is subject to quite evident limitations even for the content of what has been heard, but certainly for its form, has implications for the production and processing of language as well. [...] Spoken language copes with these conditions of oral communication by having shorter basic units of processing and by avoiding types of constructions that require processing *against* time. (Auer 2009: 2; Auer's emphasis)

In this paper, however, I want to analyze the dialogic design of stand-alone *deswegen*, which does exactly that: It is frequently used in spoken talk-in-interaction to refer to the foregoing interactional context, thus requiring the recipient to re-process what has been said before. With the term "stand-alone *deswegen*", I refer to instances of *deswegen* which constitute a turn construction unit (TCU) or an intonation phrase (IP) and that are marked off prosodically as "stand alone" by a falling intonation contour.² However, I do not include pauses or minimal responses in my definition of "stand alone".³ It is possible that "some silence begins to emerge" or that stand-alone *deswegen* appears "after a recipient has produced (some) minimal uptake" (Raymond 2004: 192) but I will not consider these necessary conditions as many instances of the stand-alone *deswegen* I am interested in are directly followed by a new TCU.⁴

Most of these occurrences of *deswegen* cannot be integrated into the directly preceding clause without changing its meaning, so their point of reference has to be reconstructed by the hearer by including larger stretches of previous talk. Moreover, the main characteristic of this stand-alone *deswegen* is – analogous to what Raymond describes for stand-alone *so* – that speakers "initiate a TCU that is designed to be left incomplete" (Raymond 2004: 210). Thus, it can function as an aposiopesis (c.f. section 3).

² Imo 2011 points out that a clear-cut distinction between an anacoluthon and an aposiopesis is sometimes hard to establish (e.g. in cases with ambiguous final pitch movements of intonation phrases or in cases without "aposiopesis markers"). Thus, in this paper, I will only concentrate on *deswegen*-aposiopeses where a mid- or low-falling pitch movement signals IP-completion.

³ In contrast to Raymond's (2004) criteria for English stand-alone *so*.

⁴ As will be shown below, stand-alone *deswegen* can co-occur with focus particles or double sayings of *ja* in one TCU. These examples will not be classified as instances of stand-alone *deswegen*. However, as will be argued in section 6, they also function as a *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis.

2 *deswegen* in spoken German

The grammatical classifications of German *deswegen* ('therefore/that is why') are diverse: Along the lines of Rehbein's functional pragmatic approach (1995), Gohl refers to instances of *deswegen* as compound causal reference words ("zusammengesetzten kausalen Verweiswörtern", Gohl 2002: 227). Hentschel/Weydt classify *deswegen* as a conjunctive adverb ('Konjunkionaladverb') as it shares its syntax with adverbs and functions as a conjunction in that it links clauses on a textual level (c.f. Hentschel/Weydt 2003: 305). In line with this syntactic and functional analysis, the Handbook of German Connectives (c.f. Pasch et al. 2003) groups *deswegen* among adverbial connectives ('Adverbkonnektoren'), which are "syntactic constituents of one of their semantic relata" (Blühdorn 2008: 65; c.f. Pasch et al. 2003: 495). This indicates the syntactic flexibility of *deswegen* (it can be positioned e.g. in the front field, middle field and it also occurs in end-field position, see table 1 below). Especially in spoken German, one can also find *deswegen* in pre-front-field position⁵ – where it shares many attributes with discourse markers – as well as instances of turn-constitutive *deswegen* (or analogous to Raymond's (2004) terminology "stand-alone *deswegen*").

Formal classification	Example ⁶		
pre-front field	(1)	001 MER	deswegen ich kenn ganz ANdere männer. <i>that is why, I know men who are very different</i> (IAuDa 32)
front field	(2)	001 BEA	deswegen durften wir GLEIten üben; <i>therefore/that is why we were were allowed to practice gliding</i> (IAuDa 159)
middle field	(3)	001 KIM	und (.) hab blöderweise deswegen AUCh nich gelernt; <i>and stupidly because of that I have not practiced</i> (IAuDa 112)
	(4)	001 ALEX 002	und äh (-) ja dass ich dEswegen ne schlechte Note hab, <i>and that I was given a bad mark for that reason</i> weil ich so viel FEHler hab; <i>because I have made so many mistakes</i> (IAuDa 159)
end field	(5)	001 WOLF	und vor zwölf jAhren haben die leute schon ANgefangen deswegen . <i>and twelve years ago people have started because of this</i> (IAuDa 152)
stand-alone deswegen	(6)	001 INT	erZÄHlen die manchmal noch davon? <i>do they talk about this sometimes</i>
		002 ANDR	ähm;
		003	[((lautes Geräusch))]

⁵ For further discussions of *deswegen* in pre-front-field position see König (2011a).

⁶ For a corpus description see section 4.

	<i>loud noise</i>
004	[ich MEIN also] nIch-
	<i>I mean, well, no(t)</i>
005	also mein vAter wurde glaub ich relativ schnell von der cap anamur aufgeFISCHT,
	<i>well, my father was I think fished out quite fast by the Cap Anamur</i>
006	<<p>desWEgen;>
	<i>that is why/therefore</i>
007	und meine mutter war wohl dann in THAIland, <i>and my mother must have been in Thailand then</i> (2009-11-27-02_ANDREA)

Table 1: Occurrences of *deswegen* in spoken German

In the following, I will refer to *deswegen* as a pronominal adverb (c.f. Pasch et al. 2003; Eisenberg 2006a; b) since this term hints at a decisive characteristic of German *deswegen* that will be discussed in this paper. The pronominal *des*-component⁷ can either refer backwards to something that has already been said or it can project something (i.e. a reason) that is still to come (normally in correlative constructions, see example (4) in table 1 above). The *wegen*-component, then, specifies the kind of relation to a proposition (c.f. Rehbein 1995: 171).⁸ Both its syntactic flexibility and its pronominal build-up mark off *deswegen* from other connectives (as e.g. conjunctions like *weil* ('because') which has a fixed position and which cannot stand alone).

Moreover, the type of connective relation that is established with *deswegen* is different as well: "Adverbial connectives link their relata neither by government and embedding nor by linear sequence. Instead, they connect them semantically or, more precisely, by reference." (Blühdorn 2008: 66) How can the referent of the *deswegen*-utterance be identified?

The semantic representation of an adverbial connective contains a slot for a referent that cannot be identified on grounds of the information provided by the sentence of which the adverbial is a constituent. In order to identify that referent, the interpreter must look for the necessary information in the preceding or following context. (Blühdorn 2008: 66)

So, instances of *deswegen* guide the interpreter – or in the context of spoken discourse rather: the hearer – to locate the referent in the interactional context preceding or following the utterance containing *deswegen*. In the case of stand-alone *deswegen*, the reconstructive process is twofold: Not only does the hearer have to reconstruct the referent from the preceding interactional context; also, the "TCU that is designed to be left incomplete" (Raymond 2004: 210), i.e. the actual internal argument (in terms of Pasch et al. 2003) of the *deswegen*-utterance has to be inferred from the preceding talk-in-interaction as well. I will refer to this internal argument as the point of reference of the *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis.

⁷ As Blühdorn 2008: 66 puts it: "[T]he referential element is morphologically visible." Redder 2009 groups *deswegen* among the deictically-based expressions in German.

⁸ Either one of these components can be stressed (c.f. Pasch et al. 2003: 49) so that "DESwegen" as well as "desWEgen can be found" (c.f. section 5).

Even if it is clear for the stand-alone *deswegen* micro-aposiopesis that the point of reference is to be looked for in the preceding context, it is not, in all cases, clear what exactly the point of reference is: It does not necessarily have to be the directly preceding clause; the point of reference can also lie in a far more distant stretch of talk.

Dealing with spoken language, distance is not a spatial but a temporal category. So references to a distant stretch of talk require from speakers and recipients alike that they remember quite a lot of what has been said before. Whereas recent papers building on the concept of on-line syntax (Auer 2000; 2009) stress the importance of projection which unfolds in time as to simplify the hearer's processing (c.f. Auer 2005; Günthner/Hopper 2010; Wegner 2010), stand-alone *deswegen* can – in contrast – be classified as an working "against time" (Auer 2009: 2).

3 Stand-alone *deswegen* as a micro-aposiopesis

For example (6) given in table 1 above, a characteristic function of stand-alone *deswegen* can be described.

Example (6): 2009-11-27-02_ANDREA "Cap Anamur"

001 INT erZÄHlen die manchmal noch davon?
do they talk about this sometimes

002 ANDR ähm;

003 [((lautes Geräusch))]
loud noise

004 [ich MEIN also] nIch-
I mean, well, no(t)

005 also mein vAter wurde glaub ich relativ schnell von der cap
 anamur aufgeFISCHT,
well, my father was I think fished out quite fast by the Cap Anamur

006 <<p>**desWEgen**; >
that is why/therefore

007 und meine mutter war wohl dann in THAIland,
and my mother must have been in Thailand then

In the example taken from a narrative interview with Andrea, whose parents fled Vietnam, the interviewer asks if Andrea's parents sometimes tell about their experiences as refugees (line 001). Andrea answers in the negative (line 004) and then gives an account of her father being picked up by a rescue boat (the "Cap Anamur", line 005) at an early stage during his escape. The following stand-alone *deswegen* (line 006) constitutes an IP with a mid-falling final pitch movement. In the following stretch of talk, Andrea does not offer a conclusion. Rather, she goes on to relate her mother's experiences (line 007). So, what does the stand-alone *deswegen* in this example achieve?

With this stand-alone *deswegen* a planned utterance is projected which is not completed in the following interaction. The stand-alone *deswegen*, however, is not treated as an anacoluthon (c.f. Imo 2011). Instead, the reconstruction of this planned utterance is left to the hearer. It "projects both an upshot and that it will not be produced." (Raymond 2004: 210f.) So here, the stand-alone *deswegen* has the function of an aposiopesis, i.e. "a pragmatic figure, signifying a sudden disruption of discourse by omitting the expected end of a clause or a sentence" (Grün-Oesterreich 2001: 29).⁹ Along the lines of Imo 2011, examples like these can also be called "micro-aposiopeses" since – as in example (6) – only one lexical element; here: the pronominal adverb *deswegen*, projects a planned utterance (c.f. Imo 2011: section 4.2).

In these cases of stand-alone *deswegen* which function as a micro-aposiopesis, it is again the hearer who has to reconstruct the planned but not realized utterance. The stand-alone *deswegen*, like the stand-alone *so*, "claims that what a speaker is prompting the other to [...] notice could already be known by them [...]." (Raymond 2004: 211)¹⁰ Thus, the hearer not only has to understand that in these cases *deswegen* constitutes an IP, but s/he also has to grasp what the speaker wants to but does not say. Since the only information the hearer has is the preceding conversational context, the intended message will have to be reconstructed from this source as possible points of reference. In this paper, the following questions will be dealt with in particular:

- In which sequential environments do speakers use stand-alone *deswegen* as a micro-aposiopesis? What is their interactional function in these contexts?
- How do speakers mark the point of reference of the *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis for the hearer? Which kinds of linguistic cues can be described?
- In what way do speakers and hearers deal with insufficient references?
- How can instances of stand-alone *deswegen* be classified where there is no clear point of reference?

4 Locating the point of reference in stand-alone *deswegen*-micro-aposiopeses

The following analyses are based on a general corpus of spoken German interaction, i.e. on the I AuDa-corpus (the linguistic audio database, c.f. Hauptstock/König i.Dr.), the SiN-corpus (taken from the DFG-project "Sprachvariation in Norddeutschland" ("language variation in northern Germany"); c.f. Schröder/Elementaler 2009), the FOLK-corpus (c.f. [---

⁹ Hoffmann 1999 and Zifonun et al. 1997 classify this structure as a "phatic ellipsis". C.f. Imo 2011 section 2 for a discussion.](http://agd.ids-</p></div><div data-bbox=)

¹⁰ See also Mulder/Thompson's analysis of final *but* with a "hanging implication", which "indexes certain pragmatic stances, in this case inviting the listener(s) to infer a contrast." (2008: 183)

mannheim.de/folk.shtml)¹¹ and a corpus of biographical narrative interviews (c.f. König 2011b). All in all, 39 instances of stand-alone *deswegen* were collected and analyzed.

4.1 Referring to a preceding conclusion marked with *deswegen*

With stand-alone *deswegen*, speakers can point back to a preceding proposition or statement including *deswegen* – be it front-field or pre-front-field position. That way a "bound structure" is established. In the following interaction, Lana talks to her friend Rita about a paper she had to write in English.

Example (7): IAUda 159-2 "spell-checker"

001 LANA °h und DIEsMal hab ich auch auf==
and this time I have
 002 =erst mal bevor ich das ama überhaupt geSCHICKT hab-
first, before I sent it to Ama
 003 das durch so_n spEllcheck geMACHT? (-)
I ran it through such a spell-checker
 004 so_n (.) wie son==ne, (.)
such a like such right
 005 da (.) dieses rechtsschreibproGRAMM,
there this error correction programme
 006 °h und das hab ich letzte mal AUCH nicht gemacht. (.)
and that's something I didn't do either the last time
 007 **deswegen** diesmal hab ich auf jeden fa:ll (-) keine SPRACHlichen
 fehler me:hr,
that's why this time I definitely won't have any linguistic mistakes any more
 008 <<acc> **desWEgen.**>=
therefore/that is why
 009 =aber mein inhalt ist glaub ich diesmal dafür <<;-> nen
 BISSchen,> (-)
but my content, however, is I believe a bit
 010 nen bisschen WIRSCH;
a bit confused

After having explained that she used a spell-checker, Lana comes to the conclusion that this time there will not be any linguistic mistakes left in her paper (line 007). Here, she uses *deswegen* in a syntactically disintegrated form, i.e. in the pre-front field of her concluding utterance (see König 2011a). The following stand-alone *deswegen* points back to this preceding conclusive formulation and emphasizes the point Lana wants to make.

Moreover, this stand-alone *deswegen* functions as a "closing marker": The final mid-rising pitch movement in line 007 indicates to the hearer that another TCU which is related to the same topic might follow. However, in line 009, Lana opens up a contrasting utterance (introduced by *aber*, "but") to comment on the content of her paper. In order to bring the topic of "linguistic mistakes" to an end, Lana uses stand-alone *deswegen* (i.e. with a low falling

¹¹ For further considerations about this corpus see Deppermann/Hartung 2011. The examples taken from this corpus have been re-transcribed by me.

pitch movement) to mark this end – without introducing new content. So, what seems to be a repetition in the first place, turns out to be the systematic use of what can be called – along the lines of Schegloff/Sacks – a "'topic-bounding' technique" (1973: 306). Bückler 2011 argues that this kind of topic-bounding technique – or as he calls them: "topic tags" – often functions to manage turn taking: A speaker indicates that his or her turn is finished and therefore – by inserting a (or an additional) closing element – opens up yet another slot for the recipient to take the next turn (in Schegloff's and Sack's 1973: 309 terminology a "floor-offering-exchange device").¹² However, this is not the case in the example above: Here the prosodic mark-up (accelerated tempo) and the latching with the next TCU signal that Lana has not yet finished her turn. Thus, the *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis here functions as a turn-continuing device. The stand-alone *deswegen* in example (7) relates back to the directly preceding TCU. Yet, stand-alone *deswegen* can also refer to a preceding *deswegen*-utterance in a larger interactional context. In the following sequence, which is taken from a narrative interview, Thao tells about her experiences as an exchange student in the US. Here, she argues, one cannot show negative emotions as openly as in Germany. This is supported by the interviewer's comment in line 001.

Example (8): 2009-12-12-02_THAO "fun killer"

001 INT das ZEIGT man (.) in amerika gar nicht [so.]
one does not show that the same way in America

002 HOA [ne]e; ;
no

003 (-)

004 INT [das IS] halt [irgendwie so:-]
this is somehow like

005 THAO [nee;] [ich GLAUB,] (.)
no ich liebe

006 **deswegen** hat sich die EIne zumindest son bisschen von mir
distanZIERT. (-)
that is why one of them has distanced herself from me at least a bit

007 weil ich [im]mer irgendwie geSAGT hab,
because I always somehow said

008 INT [ja,]
yes

009 THAO das (.) das hab ich [dann auch als typisch DEUTSCH]
bezEIch[net,]
that is what I have called typically German then

010 INT [(soll ich das hier drauf machen,)]
shall I put it here

011 HOA [ja-]

¹² As Schegloff/Sacks Schegloff/Sacks 1973: 304 put it: "[T]hey occupy the floor for a speaker's turn without using it to produce either a topically coherent utterance or the initiation of a new topic." Here, however, it will be argued that stand-alone *deswegen* marks the foregoing as coherent.

¹³ The interview was recorded in Thao's flat which she shares with her cousin Hoa who is co-present for a short time. Here, Hoa has entered the kitchen, in which the interview took place, to make some tea. She has also offered a cup to the interviewer (which can be seen in the short interaction in lines 010-011).

first *deswegen*-utterance in line 006 as its point of reference (so that the aposiopesis can be reconstructed as something like "that is why she turned away from me"). Moreover, the sequential structure might be of help here as well: First, Thao utters a conclusive statement for which she then gives an implicit reason which is illustrated with the animated voice of the person criticizing Thao. The *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis then refers back to the initial statement, thus establishing a coherent structure.

I argue that this structure is constitutive for enabling the hearer to reconstruct what the speaker of the *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis leaves unsaid: Whereas Schegloff/Sacks describe closing techniques that operate "without regard to what the particular topic is" (1973: 306), this point has to be relativized for the above kind of stand-alone *deswegen*. As can be seen in examples (6) and (8) and in the majority of the upcoming examples, stand-alone *deswegen* usually works in contexts in which a speaker first utters a statement which is followed by one or more reasons that led the speaker to his/her initial statement. So, although this does not constitute *deswegen* as a topic-specific topic-bounding technique, it nevertheless restricts the use of stand-alone *deswegen* to specific sequential contexts in which argumentation takes place.¹⁵

4.2 Referring to a preceding conclusion with marked reasons

In examples (7) and (8) that the implied consequence has already been given before and marked as such in a preceding *deswegen*-utterance. Yet, in most cases the already given consequence or statement to which a *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis alludes is not marked itself. What is marked, however, are reasons or arguments that led to the speaker's conclusion. In these cases, the hearer is prompted to go back to the proposition for which the speaker has given reasons. For this reconstructive processing on the recipient's side, it can be helpful if the reasons have been marked as such – e.g. by a causal conjunction like *weil* ("because") as can be seen in the next interaction.

This example is taken from an oral examination in linguistics at a German university. The student has to do a grammatical analysis of underlined and numbered words in given example sentences. What can be reconstructed from the preceding conversation, is that the example sentence the student has to analyze must have looked something like the following: "X¹⁶ hat den überwältigenden Glücksaugenblick selten (7) so sinnfällig hervortreten lassen (8) wie in der Klavierspielerzählung" (a rough translation would be: "Only rarely has X made the

¹⁵ As indicated, this is not the case in all of the following examples. However, exceptions from this sequential "rule" will be discussed as problematic for the hearer since the reconstruction of a possible point of reference becomes more difficult without this structural background (see the discussion for example (13)).

¹⁶ The subject of the given sentence cannot be reconstructed.

overwhelming moment of happiness appear as meaningful as in the 'piano playing' story.") Before the following sequence sets in, the examiner (Exam.) has asked the student to analyze word number seven. The student has classified German *so* as a particle. The examiner, however, does not seem satisfied with this answer and draws the student's attention to the structure of the whole sentence. This leads the students to examine the following *wie* ("as/like") as well.

Example (9): FOLK_E_00029_SE_01_T_01

001 STUDENT das scheint mir DANN,
to me this seems to be then

002 (0.78)

003 wie eine konjunkTION zu sEIn?
like a conjunction

004 (0.31)

005 EXAMINER hm_hm,

006 (0.32)

007 STUDENT ä[hm::-]

008 EXAMINER [also d]as wIE is die KONjunktioN;
so, the "wie" is the conjunction

009 und das SO==
and the "so"

010 =sie sind schon RIChtig,
you are quite in the right

011 das !IS! ne partIkel.
it is a particle

012 STUDENT ja: ,
yes

013 EXAMINER GAR keine frAge; (.)
no question

014 so wie zuSAMmen. (.)
"so wie" together

015 STUDENT ja: ,
yes

016 EXAMINER IS aber dann- (.)
then is

017 KÖNnen sie als konjunktion sEhen.
you can see it as a conjunction

018 [hm_hm,]

019 STUDENT [oKAY,]

020 (2.55)

021 ähm:-

022 (0.28)

023 ja so' und da (.) hätt ich das nächste (.) n nich gAnz genau
(.) zuSAMmen betrAchtet==
yes so and there I would not have looked at the next quite exactly (as together)

024 =weil_s ja verschiedene NUMmern (.) [hAt.]
because it has different numbers

025 EXAMINER [mh_hm-] (.)

026 jaja nö das [WAR ja-]
yes yes no that was

027 STUDENT [desWEgen.]
that is why/therefore

028 EXAMINER °h (.) das war ja auch äh-
this was

029 (0.49)

030 °h <<creaky> äh (.) da->
 there
 031 (0.25)
 032 müssen müssen sie ja auch SEhen.
 you have to see this, too
 033 oKAY.

Although the examiner ratifies the student's classification of *wie* as a conjunction (line 008-010), she draws the student's attention to the fact that she should have looked at *so...wie* together (hinting at the fact that this operates as a correlative construction, line 014-017). The student then gives a reason why she did not consider *so* and *wie* jointly (because the two items have different numbers, line 024). She clearly marks this as a reason by using the causal conjunction *weil* ('because'). The following *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis (line 027) can be reconstructed as referring back to the student's initial statement in line 023. Thus, the hearer's reconstructive process is guided by way of the *weil*-clause back to the statement for which the student gave the reason.

However, the *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis is not uttered directly adjacent to the student's argumentation. It is realized in overlap with what can be interpreted as the beginning of a contradiction on the examiner's side (line 026). So here, it does not only mark the student's argumentation as coherent, but it is also used to re-emphasize the point she makes. Nevertheless, the examiner then goes on telling her that she should have recognized this structure (line 032).

4.3 Referring to non-marked utterances

A statement-reason structure in which a consequence or a reason is marked as such cannot be found in all cases. In some instances, as the following example illustrates, recipients can only look for an unmarked statement-reason structure in the preceding conversational context which helps them along the reconstructive pathway. In example (10), Lina is talking to her mother Ulla about the funeral service for Loki Schmidt, the wife of the former German chancellor Helmut Schmidt.

Example (10): lAuDa 217 "bypass"

001 LINA die ist ja auch (.) ALT geworden.=ne?
she also got old right

002 EinundNEUNzig o[der?]
ninety-one right

003 ULLA [hm_]hm,
004 geNAU.
exactly

005 LINA <<p,h> einundNEUNzig->
ninety-one

006 (1.2)

007 KRASS;
extreme

008 und BEIde rauchen sO: viel.
and both of them smoke so much

009 ((lacht))
((laughs))

010 ULLA hm_hm;
011 das hat mich AUch geWUNdert,
this has also astonished me

012 dass SIE- (-)
that they

013 dass sie (.) dabei so ↑ALT werden.
that they become so old with this

014 ich mein ich WEIß,=
I mean I know

015 =dass er auch schon mal n SCHLAGAnfall,
that he has already had a stroke

016 oder n HERZinfarkt hat[te-]
or a heart attack

017 LINA [JA?]
really

018 (--)

019 ULLA JA;
yes

020 der hatte schon mal [IRgendwas;]
he has already had something

021 LINA [ach SO-]
I see

022 ULLA <<acc> desWEgen.>
therefore/that is why

023 oder nen BYpass bekommen hat,
or (that) he had a bypass implanted

024 LINA Ah.

025 ULLA aber dass der dann noch so ↑ZÄH geblieben is dabei;
but that he has still remained so tough in all this

026 (--)

027 LINA JA:;
yes

028 ich MEIN (--)
ich mean

029 RAUchen,=
smoking

030 =is ja jetzt nich geSAGT,
it does not mean

031 dass man (.) davon (-) sofort STIRBT,
that you die of it immediately

At the beginning of this sequence, Lina expresses her astonishment that Loki Schmidt lived ninety-one years even though she was a heavy smoker. Her mother Ulla aligns with this assessment (lines 010-013) and then goes on to offer further reasons for her astonishment ("dass er auch schon mal nen SCHLAGAnfall, oder nen HERZinfarkt hatte-"; "that he has already had a stroke or a heart attack", lines 015f.). This is questioned by Lina with a short *ja* (in the sense of "really") in overlap (line 019). However, Ulla reaffirms what she has said (line 019) but tones down her description to "der hatte schon mal IRgendwas;" ("he has already had something" line 020). In overlap, Lina indicates her understanding with the change-of-state token "ach so" ("I see", line 021). Ulla's subsequent *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis both refers back to her initial statement of astonishment (line 011, so that it can be reconstructed as "that is why it has astonished me") and at the same time it stresses the point Ulla is trying to make – and which has been questioned by Lina before. So in this context, the stand-alone *deswegen* is used to reaffirm and emphasize Ulla's astonishment. In contrast to examples (7)-(9), this stand-alone *deswegen* does not close the general topic, here the enumeration of illnesses. Rather, Ulla goes on to list an illness-related treatment ("bypass", line 023), and she even does this by connecting this clause with the syntax of the subordinate clause which she began in line 015.

Finally, Ulla concludes her turn with another aposiopesis that refers back to her statement of astonishment which is again left unsaid ("aber dass der dann noch so ↑ZÄH geblieben is dabei;"; "but that he has still remained so tough in all this ", line 025). Lina does not take the next turn right away, but leaves a slot in which Ulla could have realized the implied utterance. However, she does not have to, as Lina's "ja" ("yes", line 027) signals understanding.

4.4 Referring to the act of speaking

Examples (6)-(10) illustrated instances of stand-alone *deswegen*-micro-aposiopeses which all referred back to a proposition which has been uttered by the same speaker in the more or less directly preceding interactional context. However, stand-alone *deswegen* can also point to the act of speaking or not speaking as such, as the next extract shows. Here, four friends – Ela, Kim, Frida and Lisa plan a women-only trip on the cruise liner Aida. It turns out that the journey will be cheaper if they find another person to accompany them. Now, the women are looking for someone who suits everyone.

Example (11): SiN "Aida with Jenny Kampmann"

001 ELA oder (-) °h jenny KAMPmann. (.)
or Jenny Kampmann

002 könntst_de damit LEben-
could you live with that

003 sollen wir se FRA:gen, (.)
shall we ask her

004 fragen LAssen, (.)
have her asked

005 KIM <<p> kann ich [mit LEben.]>
I can live with that

006 ELA [oder SAgen [wir-]
or do we say

007 FRIDA [haben] wir denn sonst niemand]
ANderen.
don't we have somebody else?

008 ELA [ich PFEIF drauf,]
I don't give a damn about it

009 [et sind HUNdertdrei]ßig euro Unterschied.
the difference is one hundred and thirty euro

010 FRIDA [hast du NIEmanden?]
you got no one

011 du weißt KEINnen.
you know no one

012 SO-
so/like

013 KIM JA:-
yes

014 äh (.) ich hatte nen (.) hätte eine beKANNte-
I had, would have an acquaintance

015 aber (.) ich glaube NICHT,=
but I don't believe

016 =dass das so optiMAL wäre.
that this would be optimal

017 FRIDA hm_hm,

018 KIM <<p> desWE[gen.]>
therefore, that is why

019 ? [°h UND-]
and

020 DAN ICH.
me

021 LISA [((lachen))]
((laughing))

022 FRIDA [((lachen))]
((laughing))

Ela introduces Jenny Kampmann as a possible candidate. While Kim gives her consent to this choice (line 005), Frida starts looking for further suggestions (line 007) and finally turns to Kim to ask her (in a negated formulation) if she knows someone ("hast du NIEmanden?"; "you got no one", line 010; "du weißt KEINnen."; "you know no one ", line 011). Thus, the fact that Kim has not proposed her own candidate so far is made relevant by Frida. Kim then explains that she could suggest one of her acquaintances but that she does not consider her suitable. The following stand-alone *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis does not refer back to a preceding statement Kim has made. Rather, Kim thereby comments on her justification why

she has not suggested her own candidate, i.e. the point of reference is a relevant previous action: "In this case it is especially interesting to see that in the actual use of aposiopesis in interaction the concept of an aposiopesis is not only a syntactic one; it is also an activity-related concept." (Imo 2011: 278; my translation).¹⁷ Also – analogous to the stand-alone *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis in example (10) – it can be argued that this instance of *deswegen* is used to emphasize a preceding argument.

4.5 Emphasizing understanding: stand-alone *deswegen* co-occurring with change-of-state tokens

Stand-alone *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis are not only used to emphasize a point that has been made in an argumentative sequence. The following example shows that it can also be used to strengthen a preceding change-of-state token (c.f. Heritage 1984). One night, Rabea and Peter want to play a game of cards with their flatmates. Rabea is eager to start the game right away since it is already late (before the given sequence she tells her flatmates "aber jEtzt oder GAR nicht." ("but either now or never")). Here, she enlists what else she has got to do:

Example (12): lAuDa 195 "coffee"

001 RABEA ich muss noch KANnen?¹⁸
I have to take a shower
 002 und ich mach noch_n KAFfee? (-)
and I will make another coffee
 003 und noch_n BROt,
and another slice of bread
 004 dann dauert das ne ↑HALbe stunde. (-)
then it takes half an hour
 005 können wa JETZT spielen,
can we play now
 006 oder (-) gehst du noch KANnen; (--)
or do you want to have a shower
 007 <<t> und machst du noch_n KAFfee;>
and will you make another coffee
 008 PETER <<lachend> ach SO:-
I see¹⁹
 009 **DESwegen;** >
therefore/that is why
 010 RABEA hm_hm;

Rabea tells Peter that she has to take a shower and wants to make a coffee and another slice of bread, which will take her about half an hour (lines 001-004) – indicating that this would postpone their game of cards to an even later time. She then goes on to ask about Peter's plans

¹⁷ C.f. Imo 2011: 278: "Besonders interessant in Bezug auf die Verwendung von Aposiopesen in der Interaktion ist in diesem Fall, dass es sich bei einer Aposiopese nicht nur um ein syntaktisches (bzw. äusserungsbezogenes) Konzept handelt, sondern auch um ein aktivitätsbezogenes [.]"

¹⁸ The verb "kannen" is used as a group code and its meaning can be reconstructed as "to have a shower".

¹⁹ Golato/Betz translate *ach so* as "oh I see" to emphasize that *ach so* indicates both "that new information has been received *and* understood", i.e. it does more than a simple *ach* (Golato/Betz 2008: 9).

for the evening (if he wants to take a shower) until she asks (in a lower pitch register) if Peter wants to make the coffee (line 007). With the change-of-state token *ach so* (c.f. Golato/Betz 2008; Imo 2009) in combination with the stand-alone *deswegen* (both uttered laughingly) Peter finally documents that he has understood what Rabea hints at (c.f. Gardner 1998; Deppermann 2008 for "documentations of understanding", *Verstehensdokumentationen*) or why she discusses her plans in such great detail – namely that she wants him to make coffee and that she thereby formulates an indirect request. Along with Golato/Betz it can be argued that Peter's *ach so* "deals with problems of understanding" (Golato/Betz 2008: 15; c.f. Imo 2009: 69) – contextualizing that he has not understood what Rabea aimed at before.²⁰

This example illustrates that not only the *wegen*-component of the pronominal adverb can be stressed (c.f. section 2) in the *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis. Here, it is the referential component which is stressed instead and thereby emphasized. This can also be described as a general function of the stand-alone *DESwegen*: Although the hearer still has to reconstruct the point of reference (see below) it is the reference, i.e. the reason for the projected upshot, which is focused (in this case Rabea's indirect request for coffee is highlighted by Peter). The stand-alone *deswegen* in the following examples (13) and (14) works in a similar way.

All in all, the stand-alone *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis could be reconstructed as "that is why you beat about the bush". So here, *deswegen* does not refer to a single statement or argument, but rather it is used to comment on the preceding stretch of talk. Thus, the conclusion Peter draws here can be considered new information which was not given before. Rabea's reaction (in line 010) ratifies Peter's documentation of understanding thus treating Peter's *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis as finished (c.f. Imo 2011: 280; Mulder/Thompson 2008: 191).²¹

5 Coping with insufficient references

Proceeding from example (7) to example (11), reconstructing what the stand-alone *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis points to becomes more and more difficult for the hearer. Whereas the point of reference can be a clearly marked preceding *deswegen*-utterance (section 4.1), the hearer also might also be led to look for a preceding statement-argument structure, in which the arguments or reasons are marked by causal conjunctions (section 4.2) or not at all (section

²⁰ In fact, Rabea has produced many slots in which Peter could have documented his understanding (i.e. pauses in lines 004 and 006).

²¹ C.f. Mulder/Thompsons' analysis for "final 1 *but*" where they also "find evidence that participants share an understanding of what 'might have' followed that *but*." (2008: 189) Golato/Betz argue that it common to treat an understanding as shared after *ach so* has been deployed (c.f. Golato/Betz 2008: 33). Also, "*achso* makes sequence closure relevant and is typically followed by a shift in action and/or topic." (Golato/Betz 2008: 33)

4.3). In some cases, however, it is not even a preceding statement to which the stand-alone *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis points. In these cases, the speaker rather justifies his/her reasons for speaking (or not speaking, as in the example in section 4.4.).

Whereas the hearers in the previous examples did not mark the use of stand-alone *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis as problematic, it can become the topic of discussion in some cases. In example (13), taken from a narrative interview, Thao reports that she has always felt like an outsider because of her Asian appearance.

Example (13): 2009-12-12-02_THAO "the father"

001 THAO irgendwie: (--) kam man sich schon immer wie son AUßenseiter
vor;
somehow one has always felt like an outsider

002 alle so (.) hübsch BLOND waren,
everyone was so nicely blond

003 ich war irgendwie immer KO:misch,
somehow I have always been strange

004 HOA hehe[he]
005 [mit] kurzen HAAren,
with short hair

006 ich war auch immer der JUNGe irgendwie-
also I was always the boy somehow

007 der PApa,
the father

008 INT [ja.]
yes

009 THAO [bei] mutter vater KIND,
in mother father child games

010 (-)
011 °h ähm:-
012 (1.0)

013 man hat irgendwie ganz früh geMERKT,=
somehow one recognized at a very early stage

014 =dass man ANders war.
that one was different

015 <<p> IRgendwie;>
somehow

016 INT hm_hm,
017 THAO **DESwegen**.
therefore/that is why

018 (-)

019 INT also (.) weil leute was geSAGT haben,
so because people said something

020 oder weil sie irgendWIE: [ähm-]
or because they somehow

021 THAO [man]sieht sich ja im SPIEgel;
one sees oneself in the mirror

022 und man sieht die ANdern (dann).
and then you see the others

023 INT hm_hm,

Starting from Thao's statement that she (here she refers to herself with the indefinite pronoun *man* "one"; c.f. König i.Dr.) has always felt like an outsider (line 001), Thao tells about situations in which she felt ostracized: She did not have blond hair (line 002), she had short

hair and she always had to play the boy (line 006) or father in family games (line 007). After a short hesitation and a pause, Thao then adds another general statement ("man hat irgendwie ganz früh geMERKT,=/=dass man ANders war."; "somehow one recognized at a very early stage that one was different", lines 13-14). This statement is followed by a hedging device ("irgendWIE"; "somehow", line 015) and (after a short acknowledgement token "hm_hm,") the turn is closed by a stand-alone *deswegen*.²² Here, however, the hearer does not signal understanding: After a short pause (line 018),²³ which leaves a slot for Thao to explain her reference, the interviewer asks for a clarification by starting to offer two different candidate answers (c.f. Pomerantz 1988). Hereby, the interviewer signals that the referents or reasons Thao refers to are not sufficient as an explanation. So, Thao has to give a reason why she has always felt different (lines 021f.). It is not the *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis as such that causes problems here. The fact that the interviewer asks for a clarification of reasons illustrates, however, that the hearer is oriented to the statement-reasons structure which was identified as decisive for the reconstruction of the *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis in the preceding examples as well.

6 Emphatic *deswegen*-micro-aposiopeses

For the following examples, a function is central for the use of the *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis which was already discussed for some of the examples above: It can be used to emphasize and focus certain aspects of what a speaker has said before. In my corpus, there are also examples of *deswegen*-micro-aposiopeses which co-occur with focus particles (and other particles as well) and double sayings of German *ja* (c.f. Barth-Weingarten 2011a,b). So, although these occurrences of *deswegen* cannot be classified as stand-alone in the strict sense (c.f. section 1), it is argued that on the functional level they still work in a comparable way.

6.1 ... co-occurring with focus particles

The following example is taken from a conversation in which eight friends play a football manager game. In this game, they have to make a bid for players in order to organize their own team. Martin starts the sequence below by offering four million euros for a specific football player.

²² Comparable to example (12) the stress is on the referential component of the pronominal adverb – indicating that THAO foregrounds the reason for her projected upshot. It is this reference, then, which the interviewer then asks for.

²³ Like in example (8), this illustrates how stand-alone *deswegen* can also be used as a turn-yielding device – analogous to what Mulder/Thompson describe for final *but* with "hanging implication" (2008: 183).

Example (14): FOLK_E_00021_SE_01_T_08 "one goal"

001 MARTIN VIER,
four
002 (0.51)
003 JAN [(das_s) ein typische]r MARTin[spieler-]
this is a typical Manni player
004 PAUL [vier EINS-]
four one
005 MARTIN [FÜNF,]
five
006 der spielt sowieSO nich.
he doesn't play anyway
007 (0.67)
008 PAUL ((lacht))
((laughs))
009 <<f> FÜNF?>
five
010 SVEN fünf [MILLionen.]
five million
011 PAUL [NIMM ihn.]
take him
012 (1.76)
013 DIRK für [fünf mill!ION!]en?
for five million
014 ? [+++ +++]
015 (0.54)
016 PAUL des gIng jetzt_n bissel zu SCHNELL.
that was a bit too fast
017 ((Lachansatz))
((starts to laugh))
018 MARTIN NÖ.
nope
019 (0.63)
020 ÜberhAUpt nich.
not at all
021 (0.49)
022 PAUL ja nur **weil** er da n TOR gemacht hat,=
yeah just because he scored a goal there
023 =im po[KAL,]
in the soccer cup
024 MARTIN [JA-] (.)
yes
025 **nur DESwegen.**
only/just because of that.
026 (1.21)
027 DIRK **SCHON (.) dESwe[gen;=oder?]**
really/quite because of this right
028 MARTIN [ich nehm Alle] die die (0.34) tor geMACHT
haben, (.)
I take all those who who scored a goal
029 im poKAL,
in the soccer cup

After Martin has made his first bid, Paul competes with him by offering 4.1 million euros (line 004). Paul gives in (line 011) after Martin's five million euro bid (line 005). In line 022, Paul wonders why Martin would pay so much money for this player: "ja nur weil er da n TOR

gemacht hat," ("yeah just because he scored a goal there") – mocking Martin by suggesting that he overestimates the players skills. Martin, however, is quick with an answer in that he confirms Paul's comment with a *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis and even intensifies it with the focus particle *nur* ("just" which can already be found in Paul's turn in line 022 *nur weil* "just because"). Here again, the referential component of *deswegen* is stressed, indicating that it is the reason for Martin's bid is of interest here – rather than the projected upshot "that is why I made the five million euro bid.". After a short pause, Dirk's comment "schon deswegen;=oder?" ("really/quite because of this right ", line 027) leaves this mocking mood to really ask for the reason Martin wants to buy this player. Here, *deswegen* is combined with the modal particle ('Abtönungspartikel') *schon* which in this context expresses an affirmative relation (c.f. König 1997: 60) to what Martin has suggested with his "nur DESwegen" (in this context it could be translated as "really" or "quite").²⁴ Martin's final answer that he takes all players who scored a goal in the soccer cup (lines 028f.), however, leaves open if he is serious or not.

So in both cases, *deswegen* – together with the focus particle *nur* and the modal particle *schon* – is used to emphasize a point that has already been made. Whereas the instances of the *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis discussed so far all refer back to what has been said by the same speaker, this example illustrates that *deswegen*-micro-aposiopeses can also be used to refer to reasons a different speaker has uttered before.

6.2 ... co-occurring with "jaja"

Example (15) is taken from a radio phone-in programme in which the caller Peer tells the programme's host Dan about his experiences in the German casting show "Deutschland sucht den Superstar" (roughly comparable to shows like American Idol or the X-Factor).

Example (15): lAuDa 22 "casting show"

001	PEER	äh:: ich muss daZU sagen, <i>ehm I have to add to this</i>	
002		ich bin: nen bisschen RUNDlich, <i>I am a bit tubby</i>	
003		also ich bin (.) ziemlich (.) ja [°h SCHWER,] <i>so, I am quite heavy</i>	
004	DAN		[ach (.) du-] <i>well you</i>
005		aber du KLINGST gar nich so; <i>but you don't sound like it</i>	
006		du klingst se:hr rAnk und SCHLANK; <i>you sound lithe and lissom</i>	

²⁴ In line with the general discussion which highlights the reason for Martin's bid, it is the referential component that carries a secondary accent.

007 PEER <<ausatmend> joa->
008 he
009 DAN hehe[he-]
010 PEER [BIN] ich leider nicht.
unfortunately I am not
011 DAN [ja;]
yes
012 PER [°h] also ich bin: äh: eins siebzig GROß,
so, I am one meter and seventy centimeters tall
013 und wieg zweiundNEUNzig?
and I weigh ninety-two (kilos)
014 DAN ey_ey_EY,
015 PEER <<p> ja;>
yes
016 DAN ja;
yes
017 PEER °h u:nd ähm: (-) °h JA;
and ehm yes
018 also das (.) erwähn ich **DESwegen**,
so, I mention it for that reason
019 **WEIL-**
because
020 also dann GING_s dann äh zur jUry rein,
so then I went to the jury
021 DAN aber ich könnte mir VORstellen, (.)
but I could imagine
022 die sind ja sO: DRAUF,
they are in such a mood
023 das äh (.) hab ich ja von anfang an [<<creaky>äh:>] beMÄNgelt,
I have criticized that from the beginning
024 PEER [hm_hm,]
025 DAN °h dass man (.) Eben-
that one
026 wenn man nich glatt geBÜgelt aussieht, (.)
if you don't look prim and proper
027 so wie a' alexANder,
like Alexander
028 oder (.) juliette-
or Juliette
029 oder wie se alle HEIßen-
or what's their name
030 °h dass man da sowieso keine großen chancen [hat.=oder?]
that you don't have a chance anyway right
031 PEER [°hhh]
032 **jaja desWEgen.**
yes_yes therefore/that is why
033 also ehm (.) ich kam halt da REIN,
so I arrived in there
034 und äh: ich sah schon wie dieter bohlen so_n BISSchen komisch
GUCKte;
and I could already see how Dieter Bohlen peered a bit strangely

As a sort of background information, Peer characterizes himself as "nen bisschen RUNDlich" ("a bit tubby", line 002) which then becomes a topic of discussion of the side sequence in lines 004-019. Here, Peer starts a correlative construction ("also das (.) erwähn ich DESwegen,/WEIL-"; "so, I mention it for that reason/because", lines 018-019) but does not finish it. Instead, he goes on with the general storyline ("also dann GING_s dann äh zur jUry

rein,"; "so then I went to the jury", line 020). At this point, it remains open if this structure is an aposiopesis or an anacoluthon (the final pitch movement in line 019 does not have a falling contour, the beginning of the next TCU "also dann" ("so then") could be interpreted as a re-start; c.f. Hoffmann 1991).

Peer cannot continue his narration since Dan takes his turn to elaborate on the topic of the importance of the outer appearance in this casting show. If one does not look as good as the former candidates, Dan argues, then one does not have a chance (line 026-030). This argumentation is closed by a question tag in line 030 ("oder"; literally "or", here it could be translated as "right"), which opens a slot for Peer to present his point of view. Peer, however does not elaborate on Dan's comment. Instead, he closes this topic with a stand-alone *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis which is combined with a double saying of *ja* ("yes") in order to re-start his narration ("also ehm (.) ich kam halt da REIN,"; "so I arrived in there", line 033).

Peer's "jajA desWEgen." (line 032) marks Dan's comment as something which has already been made clear in the previous interaction, as something which should already be common knowledge to both interlocutors. This is also partly achieved by *jaja*, which is "produced when the prior speaker utters something that is obvious and/or known by the *jaja* speaker" (Golato/Fagyal 2008: 241; see also Zifonun et al. 1997: 378).²⁵ Here, the *jaja* displays misalignment with the topical focus Dan introduces²⁶ (thus, its function is comparable to what Golato/Fagyal 2008 describe as the second type of *ja*[^]*ja*, i.e. with a pitch peak on the second syllable).²⁷ In the example above, Peer uses *jaja* to mark his misalignment with the introduction of Dan's assessment sequence at a time in which he has not yet told his story – which is after all the reason for his call. In order to "reestablish the coparticipants' alignment with each other" (Golato/Fagyal 2008: 266), the *jaja* speaker normally expands his/her turn by giving an account for why the previous speaker's turn is misaligned (c.f. Golato/Fagyal 2008: 266; Barth-Weingarten 2011b: 159). It can be argued that this is done in short by the *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis.²⁸ This way, Peer contextualizes why he does not go on with this

²⁵ See also Barth-Weingarten's study on the range of phonetic and prosodic features for German *jaja*. In this example, the two instances of *ja* are realized on the same pitch level (so it would belong into Barth-Weingarten's category of "other"; c.f. Barth-Weingarten 2011a: 310). Moreover, the *jaja* is prosodically integrated with the following *deswegen*.

²⁶ Furthermore, it can be argued that Dan's comment can be classified as a B-event statement, meaning that Dan relates to something for which Peer has the epistemic authority since he is the one who actually participated in such a casting (c.f. Golato/Fagyal 2008: 253f.).

²⁷ That is, the *jaja* speaker "treats the action/content of the previous speaker's utterance as either unwarranted or self-evident and takes issue with it." (Golato/Fagyal 2008: 252) See also Stivers 2004: 288: "Multiple sayings function to display that the speaker finds the prior speaker's course of action problematic, typically its perseveration, and proposes that that course of action be halted."

²⁸ However, this does not correspond to what Golato/Fagyal 2008 describe as "sequence continuing, but sequence changing" (Barth-Weingarten 2011b: 182).

topic and rather returns to his narration. So his "jaja deswegen" closes a topic but not his turn.

How can the hearer reconstruct the point of reference of Peer's *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis here? It can also be argued that Peer refers back to the incomplete correlative construction (lines 010f.) so that the aposiopesis could be interpreted as "that is why I mention it [i.e. my being tubby]" (comparable to what has been discussed in section 4.1). However, the reasons that lead Peer to this conclusion are given in Dan's turn (as it was the case in example (8)).

7 Implying coherence strategically

In most of the examples of the *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis discussed so far it has been possible to identify a point of reference in the preceding interactional context. Yet, examples (11) and (12) can be classified as exceptions to this "rule": In these examples, no point of reference can be found in a proposition that was uttered before. Rather, in example (11) the stand-alone *deswegen* points to reasons for not speaking and in example (12) it is used to comment on a sequence which ended in an indirect request. Thus, both examples can be classified as instances of activity-related stand-alone *deswegen* in which the conclusion that is drawn is new to the given interactional context.

In some cases, however, it is not possible to identify a point of reference or an activity which a stand-alone *deswegen* points to. This is illustrated in the following example. The flatmates Birte and Hannah talk about Henry, one of their other flatmates. Hannah has fallen in love with Henry; Henry, however, does not seem to be interested in her but rather in Birte. Now, Birte tries to appease Hannah.

Example (16): lAuDa 45 "not in love"

001 BIRTE man kann (.) muss sich von der BACke wischen, °h (.)
one has to get rid of the idea

002 dass man bei (.) einem menschen se (.) <<creaky> alle
 bedürfnisse ABdeckt.> (-)
that one can fulfil all of a person's needs

003 [es] gibt bestimmt nen bedürfnis was DU [abdEckst,] (.)
there certainly is a need that you can fulfil

004 HANNAH [mh-] [keine AHnung.]
no idea

005 BIRTE es gibt n bedürfnis was ICH abdecke- (.)
there is a need that I fulfil

006 aber ich glaub NICHT, (-)
but I don't think

007 dass wie geSAGT,
that as I said

008 e' (--) ich (-) ich glaub NICHT,=
I don't believe

conclusive meaning in this context. Still, the recipient as well as the speaker do not treat this stand-alone *deswegen* as problematic – as it was the case in example (13) (c.f. section 5). What Birte nevertheless does with this structure, is that she contextualizes her turn as coherent with what has been said before – even if this coherence is difficult to reconstruct. This move allows her to introduce a change in perspective (c.f. Gohl 2006: 237). Now she can leave the "not being in love"-topic to move on to a general characterization of Henry's character (lines 014f.) and his need for stability that is met by Birte (line 016). All in all, *deswegen* here is used to structurally align with the foregoing although it does not contextualize affiliation (c.f. Stivers/Mondada/Steensig 2011; Stivers 2008). So the stand-alone *deswegen* in the above example operates on a discourse level in that it links sequences rather than propositions. As such it shares its function with *deswegen* in pre-front-field position which is prosodically integrated into the following utterance (c.f. König 2011a). Thus, it can be questioned if the stand-alone *deswegen* here still functions as a micro-aposiopesis.

That a stand-alone *deswegen* is used for strategic purposes can also be observed in the next example. Vera, who has called Dan, the host of a radio-phone-in programme, tells about her mother's drinking problems and how her mother refuses any kind of treatment. Vera's father is not able to take her mother to a psychiatrist or a general practitioner – a strategy Dan has suggested insistently in the preceding interactional context.

Example (17): lAuDa 164 "drinking problem"

001 DAN bringt er_s den übers hErz z_äh (.) zu SEhen,
does he have the heart to see
002 wie sie sich TOTsäuft,
how she drinks herself to death
003 (--)
004 VERA °hh das ist SCHWIERig,=
that's difficult
005 =weil mein vater halt ähm (.) wir haben halt so viel proBLEme
dadurch-
because my father ehm we have so many problems because of this
006 durch MAH:nungen-
because of demanding notes
007 und was sie halt alles nicht mehr (.) geBACKen kriegt-
and everything else she is no longer able to cope with
008 RECHnungen zu bezahlen und so=-
paying bills and the like
009 =und das für ihn im moment sehr WICHTig.=
and that is very important for him at the moment
010 =aber °h (.) er kann diesen schritt halt nicht GEHen,
but he is not able to take the step
011 IHR zu helfen.=
to help her
012 =weil eigentlich für UNS halt die möglichkeit nur noch is,
because actually the only alternative left for us is

013 wie gesagt (.) ne entZIEHnungskur,
as I said a withdrawal treatment

014 und [dann die] tabletten die sie halt beKOMmen hat,
and then the pills she got

015 DAN [hm_hm;]

016 VERA dass sie die dann SCHLUCKT;
that she takes them then

017 [und]sie muss halt viel verARbeiten;
and she has to come to terms with so much

018 DAN [hm:]

019 VERA [schätz ich mal AUCH;]
I also reckon

020 DAN [(einatmen durch Nase))]
((breathing in through his nose))

021 aber vielleicht [ist es auch auch] sehr HILFreich,
but perhaps it is also very helpful

022 VERA [und dazu ()]
and for this

023 DAN wenn wenn dein vater eben (.) mit mit einem kompetenten
 medIZiner sprICht,
if if your father does in fact talk to a competent physician

024 und er von [von (.) von dER] seite aus dann auch nochmal (.)
 °h die arguMENTe zu hören beKOMmt.
and if he hears the arguments again from that side

025 VERA [dass DER ihn noch-]
that he

026 DAN das is dann [noch_n] hat_n Anderes gewicht als wenn !DU! was
 sAgst. (.)
that is that carries more weight compared to when you say something

027 VERA [hm_hm;]

028 JA.
yes

029 **desWEgen** . =
therefore/that is why.

030 DAN =ja.=
yes

031 =also (.) das würde ich dir und euch wirklich !SEHR! sehr
 DRINGend-
so that is why I would recommend to you (1 SG) and you (2 PL) really very very strongly

032 und !SEHR! (.) sehr schnell RATen,
and very very quickly

033 das (.) in die wege zu LEITen;
to arrange that

After Dan's rather pushy question, Vera argues why she and her father have not yet managed to arrange professional treatment for Vera's mother (lines 004-017):³⁰ Her father has to manage her mother's financial affairs (lines 005-009) while the mother has to come to terms with her situation (line 017). Nevertheless, Dan insists that it could be helpful for her father to consult another doctor since he might accept this opinion more willingly (lines 021-26). In her reaction, Vera agrees with Dan ("ja"; "yes", line 028) and adds a stand-alone *deswegen* (line 029). Although it could be argued that the point of reference of the stand-alone *deswegen* can be reconstructed along the lines of "that is why my father should consult a doctor", this instance of stand-alone *deswegen* is still out of place since this conclusion has not been drawn

³⁰ Apart from the pills she got from her family doctor, mentioned in line 014.

by her before (which is the case, however, in the preceding examples of the *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis; a reformulating *dass*-clause which could have signaled her agreement is not brought to an end).³¹ In fact, Dan has to make an effort to guide Vera to agreeing with his point of view. Otherwise, his strong recommendation at the end of this sequence would be inappropriate in its insistence.

It can be argued that this instance of *deswegen* is functionally analogous to an example of Barth-Weingarten's *jaja*-corpus in which a speaker claims previous epistemic access with a *jaja*-utterance although she has not made it explicit before (c.f. Barth-Weingarten 2011a: 324). Thus, this instance of stand-alone *deswegen* could be classified as a strategic claim to a previous statement which has, however, not been stated.³² Here, it would fit in with the interpretation that Vera tries to avoid further incessant suggestions on Dan's side.

8 Discussion

In Interactional Linguistics, the temporality of spoken language and the emergence of grammatical structures have been approached from two perspectives. On the one hand, one can look at increments that refer back to a given syntactic structure and that expand it (Auer 1996; 2007). On the other hand, projections can be analyzed with which speakers can help the hearer to process the upcoming utterances on-line. "Placing temporality in the front rank has important implications for the practice of linguistics. Speakers do not possess a bird's eye view of an utterance, but rather move forward in time through it [...]." (Hopper 2011: 23) In this paper with stand-alone *deswegen* a construction was discussed that expands a given sequence, which has to be processed against time.

The *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis projects an upcoming conclusive utterance which is, however, not given. Rather, the micro-aposiopesis operates on the basis of a "hanging implication" (Mulder/Thompson 2008). This demands from speakers and hearers alike (so both, from a productive as well as from a receptive perspective) that they remember large stretches of the preceding interactional context in order to be able to locate the point of reference which helps to reconstruct the aposiopesis. It was argued in this paper that speakers and hearers orient to specific structures which help them on their reconstructive pathway: Speakers who use the *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis can refer back to a preceding *deswegen*-utterance (be it in pre-front field, front-field or middle-field position). Moreover, the

³¹ C.f. Günthner 2011 for implications and functions of reformulating *dass*-clauses in German.

³² Drawing on Deppermann's analyses on strategic *denn*-utterances, this example of stand-alone *deswegen* could also be characterized as a counterfactual innuendo of coherence (c.f. Deppermann 2009).

sequential structure of "statement → reason → *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis" also helps them to locate the point of reference. Thus, the stand-alone *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis can be described as "accommodated to, or even designed for, dialogical conditions of language use" (Linell 2004: 21; c.f. section 1) since its application is highly dependent on the preceding interactional context.

As was argued in section 4.2, reasons can be – but do not have to be – marked as such by causal conjunctions. This structure does not necessarily have to be realized by the speaker of the *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis; it can also be constituted by other speakers' turns (see examples (14) & (15)). However, it was also shown that speakers and hearers can treat a *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis as problematic (section 5).

All in all, it is a general function of the stand-alone *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis (be it in the stand-alone variant or co-occurring with particles or double-sayings of *ja*) discussed here that it marks the foregoing as a coherent argumentation (Gohl 2002: 24). Thus, it can function as a "'topic-bounding' technique" (Schegloff/Sacks 1973: 306) with which a speaker can also close a turn or sequence. However, unlike what Raymond (2004) describes for English stand-alone *so*, German stand-alone *deswegen* does not necessarily prompt an action by the recipient, i.e. it does not have to be turn-yielding in all cases. Although the *deswegen*-structure as such may be turn-continuing,³³ it can nevertheless "renew the occasion for turn-transition" (Deppermann 2011: 436). Yet, there are also many cases in which the *deswegen*-micro-aposiopesis is used for a turn-continuation after the micro-aposiopesis. In most of these examples, however, the topic of the preceding sequence is closed off.

Although it was possible to reconstruct the point of reference in many of the examples discussed above, there are also cases of stand-alone *deswegen* for which there is no point of reference in the preceding talk-in-interaction. This is the case for instances of stand-alone *deswegen* which refer to the act of speaking or not-speaking (as in example (11)) or instances of stand-alone *deswegen* in which no point of reference can be identified. Here, stand-alone *deswegen* indicates conclusiveness or coherence for strategic purposes: The following turn is marked as coherently linked with the foregoing even though it can – as was argued for example (16) – introduce a change in perspective. Thus, here stand-alone *deswegen* contextualizes alignment although it does not necessarily imply affiliation (c.f. Stivers/Mondada/Steensig 2011; Stivers 2008).

³³ See Deppermann 2011: 436: "Such turn-continuations occur regularly if a projected next speaker does not take the turn when a transition relevance place is reached."

9 References

- Auer, Peter. 2009. "On-line syntax: Thoughts on the temporality of spoken language." *Language Sciences* 31/1, 1-13.
- . 2007. "Why are increments such elusive objects? An afterthought." *Pragmatics* 17/4, 647-658.
- . 2005. "Projection in interaction and projection in grammar." *Text* 25/1, 7-36.
- . 2000. "On line-Syntax – Oder: Was es bedeuten könnte, die Zeitlichkeit der mündlichen Sprache ernst zu nehmen." *Sprache und Literatur* 31, 43-56.
- . 1996. "On the prosody and syntax of turn-continuations." In: Margret Selting und Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen (Eds.). *Prosody in Conversation. Interactional Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 57-100.
- Barth-Weingarten, Dagmar. 2011a. "Double sayings of German JA - More observations on their phonetic form and alignment function." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 44/2, 157-185.
- . 2011b. "Response tokens in interaction – prosody, phonetics and a visual aspect of German JAJA." *Gesprächsforschung. Online-Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion* 12, 301-370.
- Barth-Weingarten, Dagmar/Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen. 2002. "On the development of final *though*. A case of grammaticalization?" In: Ilse Wischer und Gabriele Diewald (Eds.). *New Refelctions on Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 345-361.
- Blühdorn, Hardarik. 2008. "Subordination and coordination in syntax, semantics and discourse." In: Cathrine Fabricius-Hansen und Wiebke Ramm (Eds.). *'Subordination' versus 'Coordination' in Sentence and Text. A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 59-85.
- Bücker 2011. "Von Familienähnlichkeiten zu Netzwerkrelationen: Interaktion als Evidenz für Kognition." *GIDI Arbeitspapier* 33. <<http://noam.uni-muenster.de/gidi/>>
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth/Margret Selting. 2001. "Introducing Interactional Linguistics." In: Margret Selting und Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen (Eds.). *Studies in Interactional Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1-22.
- Deppermann, Arnulf. 2011. "Pragmatics and grammar." In: Wolfram Bublitz und Neal R. Norris (Eds.). *Foundations of Pragmatics*. Berlin, Boston: de Gruyter, 315-346.
- . 2009. "Verstehensdefizit als Antwortverpflichtung: Interaktionale Eigenschaften der Modalpartikel *denn* in Fragen." In: Susanne Günthner und Jörg Bücker (Eds.). *Grammatik im Gespräch. Konstruktionen der Selbst- und Fremdpositionierung*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.
- . 2008. "Verstehen im Gespräch." In: Heidrun Kämper und Ludwig Eichinger (Eds.). *Sprache - Kognition - Kultur. Sprache zwischen mentaler Struktur und kultureller Prägung*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 225-261.
- Deppermann, Arnulf/Reinhard Fiehler/Thomas Spranz-Fogasy. 2006. "Zur Einführung: Grammatik und Interaktion." In: Arnulf Deppermann; Reinhard Fiehler und Thomas Spranz-Fogasy (Eds.). *Grammatik und Interaktion. Untersuchungen zum Zusammenhang von grammatischen Strukturen und Gesprächsprozessen*. Randolphzell: Verlag für Gesprächsforschung, 5-9.

- Deppermann, Arnulf/Martin Hartung. 2011. "Was gehört in ein nationales Gesprächskorpus? Kriterien, Probleme und Prioritäten der Stratifikation des "Forschungs- und Lehrkorpus" (FOLK) am Institut für Deutsche Sprache (Mannheim)." In: Ekkehard Felder; Marcus Müller und Friedemann Vogel (Eds.). *Korpuspragmatik. Thematische Korpora als Basis diskurslinguistischer Analysen*. Berlin, Boston: de Gruyter, 415-450.
- Eisenberg, Peter. ³2006a. *Grundriss der deutschen Grammatik. Band 1: Das Wort*. Stuttgart: Metzler.
- . ³2006b. *Grundriss der deutschen Grammatik. Band 2: Der Satz*. Stuttgart: Metzler.
- Gardner, Rod. 1998. "Between speaking and listening: The vocalisation of understandings." *Applied Linguistics* 19/2, 204-224.
- Gohl, Christine. 2006. *Begründen im Gespräch: Eine Untersuchung sprachlicher Praktiken zur Realisierung von Begründungen im gesprochenen Deutsch*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- . 2002. "Retrospektive Markierung von Begründungen." *InLiSt* 30.
- Golato, Andrea/Emma Betz. 2008. "German *ach* and *achso* in repair uptake: Resources to sustain or remove epistemic asymmetry." *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 27, 7-37.
- Golato, Andrea/Zsuzsanna Fagyal. 2008. "Comparing single and double sayings of the German response token *ja* and the role of prosody: A conversation analytic perspective." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 41/3, 241-270.
- Grün-Oesterreich, Andrea. 2001. "Aposiopesis." In: Thomas O. Sloane (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 29-29.
- Günthner, Susanne. 2012. "Eine interaktionale Perspektive auf Wortarten: Das Beispiel *und zwar*." In: Björn Rothstein (Ed.). *Nicht-flektierende Wortarten*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 14-47.
- . 2011. "Dass-Konstruktionen im alltäglichen Sprachgebrauch – Facetten ihrer "interaktionalen Realität"." *GIDI-Arbeitspapiere* 35.
- . 2010. "Konstruktionen in der kommunikativen Praxis zur Notwendigkeit einer interaktionalen Anreicherung konstruktionsgrammatischer Ansätze." *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik* 37/3, 402-426.
- Günthner, Susanne/Jörg Bücker (Eds.). 2009. *Grammatik im Gespräch. Konstruktionen der Selbst- und Fremdpositionierung*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.
- Günthner, Susanne/Paul J. Hopper. 2010. "Zeitlichkeit & sprachliche Strukturen: Pseudoclefts im Englischen und Deutschen." *Gesprächsforschung. Online-Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion* 11, 1-28.
- Hauptstock, Amelie/Katharina König. i.Dr. "Gesprächsforschung und DaFUnterricht – Das lAuDa-Korpus am Centrum Sprache und Interaktion (CeSI) und Anwendungskontexte in Sprachwissenschaft, Beruf und DaFUnterricht." In: Sandro M. Moraldo (Ed.). *Deutsch als Fremdsprache. Deutsch Aktuell* 3. Rom: Carocci.
- Hentschel, Elke/Harald Weydt. ³2003. *Handbuch der deutschen Grammatik*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.
- Heritage, John. 1984. "A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement." In: J. Maxwell Atkinson und John Heritage (Eds.). *Structures of Social Action. Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 299-345.
- Hoffmann, Ludger. 1999. "Ellipse und Analepse." In: Angelika Redder und Jochen Rehbein (Eds.). *Grammatik und mentale Prozesse*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 69-90.

- . 1991. "Anakoluth und sprachliches Wissen." *Deutsche Sprache* 2, 97-120.
- Hopper, Paul J. 2011. "Emergent grammar and temporality in interactional linguistics." In: Peter Auer und Stefan Pfänder (Eds.). *Constructions: Emerging and Emergent*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 22-44.
- . 2008. "Die Bedeutsamkeit der mündlichen Interaktion für die Linguistik: Die Pseudocleft-Konstruktionen im Englischen." In: Anatol Stefanowitsch und Kerstin Fischer (Eds.). *Konstruktionsgrammatik II. Von der Konstruktion zur Grammatik*. Tübingen: Stauffenberg Verlag, 179-188.
- Imo, Wolfgang. 2011. "Cognitions are not observable but their consequences are: Mögliche Aposiopese-Konstruktionen in der gesprochenen Alltagssprache." *Gesprächsforschung. Online-Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion* 12, 265-300.
- . 2009. "Konstruktion oder Funktion? Erkenntnisprozessmarker (*change-of-state-token*) im Deutschen." In: Susanne Günthner und Jörg Bücker (Eds.). *Grammatik im Gespräch. Konstruktionen der Selbst- und Fremdpositionierung*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 57-86.
- König, Ekkehard. 1997. "Zur Bedeutung von Modalpartikeln im Deutschen: Ein Neuanatz im Rahmen der Relevanztheorie." In: Friedhelm Debus und Oddleif Leirbukt (Eds.). *Aspekte der Modalität im Deutschen – auch in kontrastiver Sicht*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 57-75.
- König, Katharina. i.Dr. "Indirekte Formulierungen mit *man* in narrativen Interviews." In: Saskia Kersten et al. (Eds.). *Language Learning and Language Use – Applied Linguistic Approaches*. Duisburg: Universitätsverlag Rhein-Ruhr.
- . 2011a. "Formen und Funktionen von syntaktisch desintegriertem deswegen im gesprochenen Deutsch." *GIDI-Arbeitspapiere* 36.
- . 2011b. "Migration und Sprachidentität: Positionierungsverfahren in Sprachbiographien." In: Anne Betten und Eva-Maria Thüne (Eds.). *Sprache und Migration. Linguistische Fallstudien*. Rom: Aracne, 143-166.
- Linell, Per. 2006. "Towards a dialogical linguistics." In: Mika Lähteenmäki et al (Eds.). *Proceedings of the XII International Bakhtin Conference*. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, 157-172.
- . 2005. *The Written Language Bias in Linguistics. Its Nature, Origins and Transformations*. London: Routledge.
- . 2004. "On some principles of a dialogical grammar." In: Karin Aijmer (Ed.). *Dialogue Analysis VIII: Understanding and Misunderstanding in Dialogue*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 7-23.
- Mulder, Jean/Sandra A. Thompson. 2008. "The grammaticization of *but* as a final particle in English conversation." In: Ritva Laury (Ed.). *Crosslinguistic Studies of Clause Combining*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 179-204.
- Pasch, Renate/Ursula Brauße/Eva Breindl et al. 2003. *Handbuch der deutschen Konnektoren. Linguistische Grundlagen der Beschreibung und syntaktische Merkmale der deutschen Satzverknüpfen (Konjunktionen, Satzadverbien und Partikeln)*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.
- Pomerantz, Anita. 1988. "Offering a candidate answer: An information seeking strategy." *Communication Monographs* 55, 360-373.

- Raymond, Geoffrey. 2004. "Prompting action: The stand-alone "so" in ordinary conversation." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 37/2, 185-218.
- Redder, Angelika. 2009. "Deiktisch basierte Konnektivität: Exemplarische Analyse von *dabei* in der Wissenschaftskommunikation." *Linguistische Berichte Sonderheft/Special Issue* 16, 181-201.
- Rehbein, Jochen. 1995. "Über zusammengesetzte Verweiswörter und ihre Rolle in argumentierender Rede." In: Harald Wohlrapp (Ed.). *Wege der Argumentationsforschung*. Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog, 166-204.
- Schegloff, Emanuel/Harvey Sacks. 1973. "Opening up closings." *Semiotica* 8/4, 289-327.
- Schröder, Ingrid/Michael Elmentaler. 2009. "Sprachvariation in Norddeutschland (SiN)." *Niederdeutsches Jahrbuch* 132, 41-68.
- Stivers, Tanya. 2008. "Stance, alignment, and affiliation during storytelling: When nodding is a token of affiliation." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 41/1, 31-57.
- . 2004. "'No no no" and other types of multiple sayings in social interaction." *Human Communication Research* 30/2, 260-293.
- Stivers, Tanya/Lorenza Mondada/Jakob Steensig. 2011. "Knowledge, morality and affiliation in social interaction." In: Tanya Stivers; Lorenza Mondada und Jakob Steensig (Eds.). *The Morality of Knowledge in Conversation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3-24.
- Wegner, Lars. 2010. "Unverbundene WENN-Sätze in der gesprochenen Sprache – zur zeitlichen Emergenz syntaktischer Konstruktionen im Interaktionsprozess." *GIDI-Arbeitspapiere* 28.
- Zifonun, Gisela/Ludger Hoffmann/Bruno Strecker et al. 1997. *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.