

## Pragmatic constructions in Finnish and Finland-Swedish from a DCxG perspective

Finnish and Swedish have existed side-by-side in Finland for more than 800 years. As a result, the Finno-Ugric language Finnish and the Indo-European language Swedish have a long history of language contact in Finland. Despite the typological differences between the two languages, this contact has left various traces in both languages, especially at the lexical level, but also at the grammatical and pragmatic levels of language (Wide & Lyngfelt 2009; Lindström & Wide 2015). Similarities at the pragmatic level (compared to Sweden Swedish), can, for example, be related to institutional roles and authority (Norrby 2021).

Differences in Finland Swedish compared to Sweden Swedish are often regarded as a result of language contact with Finnish. In some cases, the grammatical differences between Finnish and Swedish lead to more complex relationships between communicative patterns in the two languages. A case in point is the so-called zero-person construction in Finnish (*ja särkylääkettä saa ottaa* ‘and [one] may take painkillers’; Wide et al. 2019), which lacks a direct structural counterpart in Swedish, but may have an indirect impact on the Finland-Swedish use of expressions without an explicit reference to the addressee.

In our paper we will focus on a set of constructions used in Swedish and Finnish in a specific type of communicative situation: conversations between customers and staff at theatre box offices. The constructions occur at the beginning of the conversations where the customers express their reason for the visit (buying or picking up tickets). For example, there is a tendency in Finland Swedish to refer to states more often than in Sweden Swedish, e.g., saying *finns de biljetter ännu till i dag* ‘are there still tickets [left] for today’ instead *har ni ännu biljetter till i dag?* ‘do you still have tickets to today’ (Tolvanen & Wide 2019). Furthermore, there is a tendency to favor constructions with the auxiliary in the past tense rather than the present tense, e.g. *ja hade två biljetter beställda (.) ti kvällens ”Sista minuten”* ‘I had two tickets reserved to this evening’s [play]’ ‘The last minute’ (Lindström et al. 2020). In both these cases similar types of constructions can be found in Finnish. In our analysis we will discuss how these similarities between Finland Swedish and Finnish can be interpreted from the point of view of Diasystematic Construction Grammar (Höder 2018).

### References:

- Höder, S. 2018. Grammar is community-specific: Background and basic concepts of Diasystematic Construction Grammar. In H.C. Boas & S. Höder (eds.), *Constructions in contact. Constructional perspectives on contact phenomena in Germanic languages*, 37–70. Benjamins.
- Lindström, J. & Wide, C. 2015. Finlandssvenskt samtalspråk. In M. Tandelfelt (ed.), *Gruppspråk, samspråk, två språk*, 91–126. The Society of Swedish Literature in Finland.
- Lindström, J. et al. 2020. Om att presentera sitt ärende. En jämförande studie av servicesamtal på sverigesvenska, finlandssvenska och finska. *Svenskan i Finland* 18:149–163.
- Norrby, C. 2021. Interaction and Variation in Pluricentric Languages : Communicative patterns in Sweden Swedish and Finland Swedish. *Sociolinguistica* 35(1):267–276.
- Tolvanen, E. & Wide, C. 2019. Betydelseskäpande i tal – processtyper i sverigesvenska och finlandssvenska servicesamtal. *Svenskans beskrivning* 36:333–344.
- Wide, C. & Lyngfelt, B. 2009. Svenskan i Finland, grammatiken och konstruktionerna. In C. Wide & B. Lyngfelt (eds.), *Konstruktioner i finlandssvensk syntax. Skriftspråk, samtal och dialekter*, 11–43. The Society of Swedish Literature in Finland.
- Wide, C. et al. 2019. Variation in address practices across languages and nations. A comparative study of doctors’ use of address forms in medical consultations in Sweden and Finland. *Pragmatics* 29(4):595–621.