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Pre- and post-positioning of wenn-clauses in spoken and written German

Peter Auer

This paper is concerned with the distinction between pre- and postpositioned (initial and final) wenn-clauses in German, and with the distinction between written and spoken language. A simple cross-tabulation of the two features [spoken/written] and [pre-/postpositioned] shows that initial wenn-clauses are preferred in spoken German, but final wenn-clauses are preferred in written German. An attempt will be made to explain these findings.

1. Introduction

The findings and discussions in this paper are corpus-based. They are partly quantitative, partly qualitative. With respect to both dimensions, the claim is that a full understanding of the syntax of (particularly) spoken language eludes the possibilities of a purely introspective methodology. Of course, no (quantitative or qualitative) corpus-based investigation can do without a strong reliance on the analyst’s knowledge (‘intuition’) about the language being researched; in fact, finding valid generalizations always involves Gedankenexperimenter, playing with structural changes in and recontextualizations of the ‘examples’ found to be used by the informants. On the other hand, not even the empirical starting point of the present investigation (i.e., the (differing) preferences of spoken and written language for post- and prepositioning) is available to a purely introspective approach, since it is of a quantitative kind. In order to reach an explanation of these findings, this quantitative analysis has to be complemented by an in-depth analysis of individual cases of usage. Such an analysis will pay attention (a) to the in-time emergence of syntactic patterns, including the details of their delivery such as hesitations, reformulations, break-offs, etc., and (b) to the interactional aspects of this emergence, including hearer feedback (or lack of it) and sequential placement. In this respect, spoken language research can profit in important ways from conversation analysis.
2. German wenn-clauses and English if-clauses: a brief syntactic and semantic overview

This, of course, is not the place for a full contrastive analysis of the two constructions. In order to facilitate the reader’s access to the examples to be discussed below, and in order to link up the present investigation with previous ones on if-clauses in spoken (and written) English, a short sketch of some important similarities and differences may, however, be in order here.

2.1. Syntax

The syntax of English suggests a (misleading) parallel between pre-and postpositioned adverbial clauses (including conditionals) since they can usually be exchanged without structural changes in either the main or the dependent clause. German syntax, on the other hand, treats the two positions quite differently. While post-positioned adverbial clauses always occupy the so-called post-field (Nachfeld), which is not obligatory, and are thus tagged on to an already complete syntactic pattern, pre-positioned subordinated clauses may be (and in written, normative language usually are) more tightly integrated into the syntactic structure of the following main clause: they occupy the so-called front field (Vorfeld) of the sentence, i.e., the uniquely available and obligatory position before the finite verb. Moving adverbial clauses from one to the other position therefore involves structural changes in the main clause:

(1) a. wenn sie =n JOB haben wollen, () müssen sie =n bisschen da auf =n PUNKT kommen. (original utterance)
   ‘if you want to have a job, you need to get down to the point’

   b. sie müssen n bisschen auf=n PUNKT kommen wenn sie =n job haben wollen. (fabricated)
   ‘you need to get down to the point if you want to have a job’

Positioning the wenn-clause in the post-field (1b) instead of the front-field (1a) implies that another constituent will fill this position (in the present case, it is the subject pronoun Sie). The dominant syntactic pattern in which pre-positioned adverbial clauses occur in written German may therefore be called “integrative”, while the English treatment is “non-integrative” (cf. König and van der Auwera 1988: 103-109 for this terminology and some further remarks). In spoken German, however, the fully integrated placement of the pre-positioned adverbial clause in the front-field is only one possibility. Alternatively, pre-positioned wenn-clauses may be followed by a resumptive particle (a local-temporal adverbial such as dann or one of its regional equivalents, e.g., na, denn, no, etc.; cf. (2b)); or they may even be used in a non-integrative way, rather like in English (cf. (2c)):

(2) a. wenn sie =n JOB haben wollen, () müssen sie =n bisschen da auf =n PUNKT kommen. (original utterance)
   ‘if you want to have a job, you need to get down to the point’

   b. wenn sie =n JOB haben wollen, () dann müssen sie =n bisschen da auf =n PUNKT kommen (fabricated)
   (same meaning)

   c. wenn sie =n WIRKlich n JOB hätten haben wollen; () sie hätten dann SCHON n-bisschen auf =n PUNKT kommen müssen (fabricated)
   ‘if you had really wanted a job, (then) you would have needed to get down to the point’

For (2c), special conditions of use hold, and it may therefore be considered to be “marked” (cf. König and van der Auwera 1988, Köpcke and Panther 1985, Günthner 1999, and below).

2.2. Semantics

The semantics of German wenn-clauses is not strictly equivalent to English conditional if-clauses either. The cognate of English if, German ob (> Germanic *ebo), has lost its original (OHG/MHG) function of introducing conditional clauses, although remnants of this usage may still be found in (etymologically) composite concessive conjunctions such as Modern German ob=wohl and ob=gleich and in concessive conditionals of the type ob X oder nicht… (‘whether X or not’). Filling the gap, the temporal conjunction wenn (or rather, its predecessors, MHG swenne/swanne), a cognate of English when, has taken over most of its functions. As a consequence, the semantics of wenn-introduced clauses oscillates between a temporal and conditional reading in the indicative mood. (For this reason, German wenn-clauses, other than English if-clauses, cannot be called conditional clauses.4) Other conjunctions are
available for a nonambiguous encoding of a conditional or a temporal relationship.

Disambiguation of *wenn* is possible on the basis of contextual information (i.e., the semantics of the remainder of the clause and/or its conversational context) in some, but certainly not all cases. Even in the following examples (which are among the clearest in my data) the paraphrases are not entirely beyond dispute. However, they do represent the prevalent readings of *wenn*-clauses:

(3) (temporal: consecutive)

\[ \text{dann MELD ich mich morgen bei ihnen? (-) wenn ((=SOBALD, SOWEIT)) ich bei AURor angerufen hab,} \]
\[ \text{‘so I’ll be in touch with you tomorrow as soon as I have given} \]
\[ \text{‘Auror’ a ring’} \]

(4) (temporal: simultaneous)

\[ \text{TREFFST du den (-) wenn ((=WAHREN, SOLANGE)) du in Peking bist?} \]
\[ \text{‘will you see him while you are in Peking?’} \]

(5) (temporal: iterative)

\[ \text{ich sprEch UNDEUTLICH, I LISpel auch n-b’ etwas, (-) und (-) ich} \]
\[ \text{sprEch dann OFER zu SCHNELL, (-) wenn ((=JEDESMAL WENN)) ich} \]
\[ \text{BEGLISTERT bin, oder (-) eh im element bin, (-) dann sprech ich zu} \]
\[ \text{SCHNELL.} \]
\[ \text{‘I speak inarticulately, I also lis a little, and then I often talk too fast. whenever I am enthusiastic about something, or ehm get} \]
\[ \text{carried away, (-) then I talk too fast,’} \]

(6) (conditional: hypothetical)

\[ \text{er wird sie jetzt wieder HEILATEN, und die haben so ne FRIST ehm in} \]
\[ \text{den islamischen ländern dass innerhalb von nem halben JAHR} \]
\[ \text{oder so, muss die frau dann wieder zum MANN zurück wenn} \]
\[ \text{((=FÜR DEN FALL DASS, FALLS)) er sie DOCH wieder will h.} \]
\[ \text{‘he now wants to marry her again and they have kind of a deadline} \]
\[ \text{ehm in the Islamic countries that within half a year or so the wife} \]
\[ \text{has to return to her husband in case he wants her back again’} \]

(7) (conditional: factual)

\[ \text{(radio phone-in, psychotherapeutic consulting; the caller has} \]
\[ \text{complained about having no-one to turn to with his marriage} \]
\[ \text{problems; the therapist recapitulates and formulates her advice)} \]
\[ \text{denn LETZTlich h wenn ((=DA)) sie in ihrer verwandtschaft} \]
\[ \text{niemand HABn mit dems REönen können, h ah is=-danns BESie, (-) sie} \]
\[ \text{würden zu am Eheberater gehen?} \]
\[ \text{‘for in the end, since you have nobody among your relatives} \]
\[ \text{who you could talk to, ehm it’s best then to turn to a marriage counselor’} \]

Clearly, the temporal readings of *wenn* are not covered by English *if*, but by *when* instead.

Some verbal and prosodic features of *wenn*-clauses may facilitate or even enforce one or the other reading: (a) the temporal, non-iterative reading is not available in sentences referring to past events; here, the temporal conjunction *als* takes over (while English allows *when*); (b) focussing adverbials such as stressed *nur* (*‘only’*) in the main clause strongly suggest a conditional reading of the (following) *wenn*-clause; (c) the particle *schon* (no English equivalent) in the *wenn*-clause suggests a factual-conditional reading; (d) *immer wenn* (*‘always when’*) instead of a simple *wenn* as a conjunction enforces a habitual-temporal/contingent reading; (e) *selbst wenn* (*‘even if’*) and *wenn ... überhaupt* (*‘if ... at all’*) instead of a simple *wenn* enforce a conditional reading; (f) subjunctive (*Konjunktiv II*) in the *wenn*-clause enforces a hypothetical-conditional reading; (g) stressed *wenn*-conjunctions suggest a conditional instead of a temporal reading.

Two special uses of *wenn*-clauses need to be mentioned. The first is the expression of concessiveness through the combination of *wenn* and *auch* (*wenn nicht auch oder auch wenn*), roughly similar to Engl. *even if even if*:

(8) a. auch wenn sie KEInen job haben wollen, (-) müssen sie=n bisschen da aufn PUNKT kommen. (fabricated)
\[ \text{‘even if you don’t want a job, you need to get down to the point’} \]

b. wenn sie auch keinen JOB haben wollen, (-) sie müssen n bisschen da aufn PUNKT kommen. (fabricated)
\[ \text{‘even though you don’t want a job, you need to get down to the point’} \]

c. obWOHL sie KEInen job haben wollen, (-) müssen sie=n bisschen da aufn PUNKT kommen. (fabricated)
‘although you don’t want to have a job, you need to get down to the point’

The **auch wenn**-construction (8a) differs from **obwohl**-concessives (Engl. **although**, (8c)) in that the truth of the proposition it expresses can but need not be taken for granted (‘neutral epistemic stance’; cf. Fillmore 1990, Couper-Kuhlen, 1999): whereas the proposition ‘you don’t want a job’ is not asserted in (8a)/**auch wenn**, it is in (8c)/**obwohl**. **Auch wenn**-clauses therefore differ from **if-**conditionals and resemble true (**obwohl**) concessives in that the presupposed generic statement is negative (for the above example: ‘someone who does not want a job does not have to get down to the point’). At the same time, they differ from true concessives and are similar to true conditionals in that the truth of the antecedent may but need not be asserted. Note that, differently from **auch wenn** pre-positioned **wenn auch**-clauses (8b) co-occur with non-integrative word order in the consequent, and always receive a factual interpretation.

Finally, it should be noted that German **wenn**-clauses occur sometimes as obligatory constituents of the verb. (English often uses non-finite forms such as participle or infinitive clauses for this purpose, although **if**-clauses are also possible.)

(9) das EINFachste, da ham sie RECHT, das wär für uns, wenn sie mal=nn MONat (-) im teleFONmarketing ARbeiten würden.

‘the simplest solution for us, and here you are right, would be if you could work in our direct marketing sector for a month’

Syntactically speaking, **wenn**-clauses of this kind can be replaced by **dass**-(complement) clauses (**das Einfachste wäre, dass sie mal im TeleFONmarketing arbeiten**). Semantically speaking, various differences result from the choice between **dass**- and **wenn**-complements; most of them pertain to the presumed status of the information in the complement clause (cf. Eisenberg 1994: 365f. for some further discussion).

3. **German wenn**-clauses from a quantitative perspective

The observations in this section are based on a collection of 500 **wenn**-clauses taken from a corpus of spontaneous, direct conversations. All instances of **wenn** were considered for analysis, apart from obvious syn-

tactic break-offs in the **wenn**-clause, some non-reconstructable utterances, and the comparative uses of **als/wie wenn** (see note 5). In Figure 1, the total of n=500 tokens is broken down according to the position of the adverbial clause relative to the main clause: pre-positioning, post-positioning, parenthetical positioning within the clause, independent use of the **wenn**-clause as a turn-constructural unit of its own, and a residual category of ambiguous cases (e.g. apo-koinu constructions, see below). There can be no doubt that the front position is preferred in spoken German.

![Figure 1. Position of German wenn-clauses relative to the main clause; n=500.](image)

The results agree with Ford and Thompson’s findings on **if**-clauses in English conversations, according to which initials outnumber finals by a ratio of 4:1 (n=316, initial=81%, final=19%; Ford and Thompson 1986: 362), with Ford’s findings based on a smaller collection (n=52, 50% of which were preposed, 35% postpositioned, and 15% single; cf. Ford 1993: 24), and with more general claims about a universal preference for pre-positioning of antecedents in conditional constructions (Greenberg 1963). Note, however, that the preference found in the English data for pre-positioning of conditional clauses does not extend to temporal (e.g., **when**) clauses; rather, Ford (1993: 24) found these to follow their main clauses by a ratio of 2:1. Given the ambiguity of German **wenn**-clauses (in the indicative mood) between a conditional and a temporal reading, it may be asked if the preference for initial placement of **wenn**-clauses holds for both. To answer this question, those instances of **wenn**-clauses have been singled out (n=203) which have either a clear tempo-
oral or a clear conditional reading (based on the substitution tests and criteria discussed in section 2.3).9

Of the n=203 disambiguated wenn-clauses, 24% have temporal, the remainder conditional meaning. Exactly half of the wenn-clauses with temporal meaning are prepositioned and postpositioned respectively. (Of the 76% unambiguously conditional examples, about two thirds are pre-positioned (55% of the total), one third is postpositioned (21%).) There is, then, a clear difference between conditional and temporal uses: only for the former does the preference for pre-positioning hold. Since the majority of German wenn-clauses are semantically ambiguous between a temporal and a conditional reading, this finding also suggests that, taken as a whole, they behave syntactically like (English) conditional rather than temporal clauses.

Figure 2 shows the percentage of integrative, resumptive and non-integrative constructions among the pre-positioned wenn-clauses in the sample (n=280).

![Figure 2. Integration (%) of pre-positioned wenn-clauses into the subsequent main clause (n=280)](image)

The relatively large residual category ("others") covers wenn-clauses plus subsequent main clauses within larger hypotactical constructions (see below example (26)-(28)). Again, the results are very clear: resumptive constructions are preferred to fully integrated and totally non-integrated constructions. The canonical, integrative construction of standard written German only plays a secondary role in spoken German.

Some comments on non-integrative wenn-clauses in German are necessary at this point. Pre-positioned wenn-clauses occurring in the pre-front field of a sentence are basically of two types (cf. Auer 1996). We find instances which cannot be positioned in the front field (i.e., integrated into the main clause); in other words, the only available pattern for them is non-integrative syntax. This is sometimes for syntactic reasons; in particular, yes/no-questions and imperatives, which are verb-initial syntagms in German, do not have a front field, and in w-questions, the w-question word is usually said to occupy the front-field.10 In these contexts, adverbial clauses either need to be pre-positioned (despite the general preference for pre-positioning), or to be non-integrative. Of the 45 questions/imperatives in the sample, 16 have pre-positioned wenn-clauses, i.e., non-integrative word order (cf. (10)), while 29 have post-positioning; this means that the normal preference is reversed in this syntactic environment.

(10) ich mein ich muss Ihnen (-) ganz SCHNELL und GANZ vehement sagen wenns IRgendwie geht (-) fahms HIN
   'I mean I have to tell you without hesitating and very vehemently: if you can make it at all, go there!'

However, there are also semantic reasons why certain wenn-clauses have to occur in the pre-front instead of the front field. This is the case for "speech-act related" wenn-clauses which do not conjoin two propositions on the content level; often, they are used in order to mitigate subsequent face-threatening acts (such as, in the following example, an interruption). The apodosis is asserted independently of the protasis, and this semantic independence corresponds with obligatory syntactic non-integration:

(11) ([job interview])
   wenn ich (-) grad WEiter ausführen darf; (0.5) Sie wissen ja in de: in der AUTOindustrie herrschen SEHR große k' konkurRENZ, markt
   'if I may continue elaborating on that; (0.5) you know that in the car industry there is a lot of competition ((etc.))'

In such cases, the marked position of the wenn-clause in the pre-front field helps to contextualize a marked (non-referential) semantic interpretation.
But there are also contexts in which non-integrative syntax is frequent although not obligatory. For instance, there is a tendency for non-integrative clause-combining to occur in concessive wenn nicht-constructions:

(12) wenn auch die theoRIE; (-) eh (-) so IRgendwo mal gehört wurde
im KOPIF? (-) eh das UMsetzen das ist ja das entSCHEIdende,
‘even though the theory (-) ehm (-) may have been heard
somewhere in one's head (-) the decisive thing is putting it into
practice’

Another frequent function of non-integrated wenn-clauses is topicalization; in this case, the wenn-clause is typically followed by an anaphoric pronoun back-referencing the proposition expressed in the wenn-clause as a whole, or an element contained in it. In the following example, the wenn-clause introduces a new discourse referent or topic; it is in many ways equivalent to other topicalization constructions (such as a cleft construction: was Ihre Fragen angeht, die können Sie jetzt stellen), with the additional implication that the speaker is not certain about the relevance of the new discourse referent for the co-participant:

(13) also wenn sie FRAGen ham zwischendurch, eh DIE können Sie
ruhig STEllen?
‘well if you have any questions in between, ehm you can ask
THEM of course.’

A similar topicalization (not of a single referent, but of a whole proposition) is involved in the following example:

(14) un wenn ich mein Eltern anruft wurde, =DS wurde AUCH nix
bringen.
‘and if I called my parents, that wouldn’t be any use either.’

Here, the wenn-clause could even be entirely replaced by an infinitival construction (meine Eltern anzurufen), since potentiality is already expressed by the conditional verb form würde...bringen and redundantly coded by wenn. Finally, non-integrated wenn-clauses often express emphasis and lend an emotional meaning to the utterance.12

(15) wenn WIRKlich—n ganzen tag das telefon klingelt, und acht
STUN (--) man IS hinterher <<acc>> man WEISS was man>
getan hat. (--) geb ich ehrlich ZU,
‘if the phone really rings all day, and eight hours (--) afterwards
you are’ you know what you have done, i have to admit that.’

In (15), the speaker describes her working-day in a call-centre and wants to underline that dealing with callers is a tiresome job; one of the strategies used to convey this meaning is the non-integration of the protasis into the apodosis.

4. Some reasons for pre- and post-positioning

What are the advantages of pre-positioning wenn-clauses? This question seems less difficult to answer than the opposite one of why a certain number of these clauses – roughly a third in our data – are post-positioned. We will deal with each question in turn.

4.1. The advantages of pre-positioning

To start with, it should be noted that the preference for pre-positioned wenn-clauses is not just a quantitative finding but is reflected in speakers’ changes in the design of an emerging syntactic pattern ‘in mainstream’. Particularly striking are cases such as Ex. (5), in which a post-positioned wenn-clause is retrospectively turned into a pre-positioned one via what might be called an apo-koimu construction:

The konj one here, of course, is wenn ich beGEISTert bin, oder (--) eh
im element bin. It seems that the speaker, having completed the three-part list of his verbal handicaps, wants to qualify the last item retrospectively. He could have done this by simply adding the wenn-clause in the post-field but recycles this last component instead, with the wenn-clause inserted before it. The wenn-clause here is both final and initial. Instances in which a clause is broken off and a wenn-clause is inserted before it is re-started (as in (16)) are also evidence for the interactional relevance of pre- vs. postpositioning.

(16) ich fahr (--) wenns überHAUPT geht
denn fahr ich NA:CH(er) ersch at Urlaub,
I'll have if if it works out at all
then I'll only have my holidays afterwards.'

So why this additional effort? There seems to be some kind of cognitive
'naturalness' in the way in which conditionals create the ground – or, in
more recent but equally metaphorical parlance, set up a 'mental space'
(Fauconnier 1985) – in which some hypothetical or factual proposition
is located. For cognitive reasons, it is the grounding which (iconically)
precedes the focal proposition, and not the other way round. Ford, for
instance, suggests that 'the prevalence of initially placed if-clauses may
reflect the general tendency to signal (...) that the interpretation of
the coming clause will be, in some general way, limited by the contents
of the if-clause' (1993: 15). Further evidence for the 'naturalness' of this
position can be derived from the affinity of conditional clauses and
topic-introducing devices (topics precede comments), for which some
evidence has been given in the preceding section (see Haiman 1978,
Ford and Thompson 1986 for an in-depth treatment of this line of argu-
mentation), and from the affinity of conditional and causal clauses
(whence iconically precede their effects). The advantages of this
discourse function seem to outweigh the cognitive costs linked to the
deployment of a syntactic pattern which projects considerably into time.

It may not have been sufficiently taken into account in previous re-
search on clause positioning, however, that this projection in time has an
interactional side as well:14 speakers who open up far-reaching syntactic
gestalts claim the turn for at least the time which is necessary to bring
them to a well-formed conclusion. In other words, producing a wenn-
clause gives the speaker the right and obligation to go on talking; it
functions as a turn-holding device until the formulation of the conse-
quently is completed. There are numerous cases in the data in which
highly complex turns emerge in this way, since the speaker uses the
space between a gestalt-opening wenn-clause and a terminating main
clause for detailing the 'mental space' opened up by the first com-
ponent. Two elaborate examples (as they seem to be typical for institu-
tional talk) are (17) and (18):

(17) (job interview; applicant B is talking about his previous
employment in a West German consultant company which,
however, withdrew from East Germany, despite the fact that it
had highly experienced consultants)

B: zum Beispiel einen herren. (J.KELLer)
(-) eh der (...) is: (J.FÜNFundzwanzig hung
junghmensberater. (J.der hat-n STAMMKlientel in um es ah
Kanada?)
I: mhm,
B: und DER war natürlich. (-) ein FACHmann. (-) aber er KOMMT.
() in die neuen BUNdesländer? (J.<<acc>>er war ja mu) (-) eh
hatte es ja gar nicht mehr NÖng gehabt; =da (J.so [VIEL] (-) zu
REIsen,
I: [mhm.]
B: aber (-) er IS in die neuen BUNdesländer gekommen, (-)
um auch etwas zu beWegen. (-) aber wenn er dann nur auf der
STRASse (...) sitzt, (-) und DANN (-) den (J.kliENten (J.) mit nach
schweRIN nehmen muss um-=n FORderantrag zu stellen; (-) dann
wieder zur BANK, (-) und die BANK sagt (-) wir brauchen
erst-ne ZUstimmung von dem FORderinstitut,
I: =<p>mhm,
B: vor[her) kÖn]Men wir nicht die geSMTfinanzierung,
I: [(h)]
<p> wie mit KOpenick ja
B: (-) fund er dajMN NUR auf der STRASse ist;
I: [(h)]
B: (-) dann SAGT er das LOHNT sich für mich nicht. (-)
dann bleibt ich LIEber () in nordrhein westFAlen.

'B: for instance a Mr Keller
ehm who has been a consultant for 25 years
he has his regular clients in the U.S. and Canada
I: mhm,
B: and he was a specialist of course. (-) but he is coming
to the New States (J.) he certainly had (-) ehm he had no need to do
that any more, to travel so [much there
I: [mhm,]
B: but (-) he did come to the New States, (-)
in order to get something moving. (-) but if he is on the road all
the time (-) and then (-) he has to take his client with him to
Schwerin in order to hand in the proposal for the subsidies; (-)
and then back to the bank, (-) and the bank says (-) first we need
the subsidizing body's consent
I: mhm,
B: before [that we cannot (do) the total financing
I: (h)
like with Köpenick
B: and () and he is just on the road then he says this isn’t worth it for me.
then I’d rather stay in North Rhine-Westphalia ((a West German state))

This passage is embedded into a larger report the applicant gives of his participation in a West German consultant agency in the New States, which however closed down its East German office, making him redundant. The interviewer does not seem to know the company and questions its importance on the market. The applicant counters by stating that although small, the company had very professional consultants. At the same time, he has to deal with the interviewer’s innuendo that the company withdrew from the East German market because it was not working successfully. In this context, the case of “Mr. Keller” is mentioned, an experienced consultant who was disappointed by the kafkaesque way in which state and bank authorities made it hard for new enterprises to get subsidies, and returned to the Old States.

After he has been portrayed as a successful consultant who came to East Germany mainly for idealistic reasons, “Mr. Keller’s” dissatisfaction with the situation is described in a complex turn construction which starts out with a wenn-clause (wenn er nun auf der Straße sitzt...). In the given context, the interpretation is not hypothetical but refers to a (factual) state of affairs (“since he was always on the road”), which is established as the ground from which some conclusion can be drawn. Before this conclusion is reached, however, the speaker elaborates at considerable length on the unfortunate situation in which “Mr. Keller” and his clients found themselves; in four clauses each introduced by (und) dann, the various fruitless journeys between the financing bank and the state authorities in Schwerin are described. Towards the end of this elaboration (securely produced by the speaker within the realm of his own turn, since a syntactic projection – that of the when-clause – still remains to be taken care of), the interviewer produces some reciprocity tokens which, although not claiming the turn (cf. their reduced loudness, indicating non-competitiveness), nevertheless acknowledge the speaker’s point: two laughter particles and one comment (wie mit Köpenick) display understanding. Only after this feedback does the speaker close the syntactic gestalt with two resumptive dann-clauses. Their content is highly predictable, given the fact that it has been mentioned before that the company closed down its East German branch. It seems, then, that what the speaker wanted to convey by this complex turn is not so much this consequent but rather the details of the situation which led to it. The relevant information of this complex construction is what is produced between the initial wenn-clause and the final dann-clauses. The speaker employs the projecting force of the first in order to claim conversational space for himself, and makes use of this space as long as he needs it to ‘convince’ the recipient of his point (as evidenced by the recipient’s responses). The ‘orderly’ conclusion of the turn is produced as soon as this purpose is reached.

The following extract similarly shows how pre-positioned wenn-clauses can be used to claim conversational space:

(18) (bulimia therapy)
M: aso ich hab ma mit einer zuSammengewohn,=
− und .h die hab ich EH nich so leidn könnt un sie mich AUCH nich,
und dann hab ich Immer so .h (0.5)
und (-) DIE: es schon wesentlich DIcker als ich:−
− und dann hab ich ECHT immer gedacht (0.5)
iich hab so alles des (-) AUF se projiziert
und wenn se viel geGESSn hat,−
= die hat sich .h SAHne n ganzn becher SAHne mit
Apfelschinken drin gegessen.−
− und das war für mich ECHT der Abscheu.−
<<fast-n hab ich gedacht> .h des is ja wohl (1.0) des is
FURCHTBar (1.0)
wie KAMmer denn sowas ESsn un auch noch mit gUIm geUSSn.

‘M: you see I once lived with a girl
and I couldn’t really stand her and neither could she me
and then I always
and she really was a lot bigger than I was
and believe me I always thought
I projected everything on her
and when/if she ate a lot,
she put cream a whole cup of cream she ate with slices of apple in it
and to me that was really disgusting.  
then I thought: it isn’t that (1.0) that is really appalling
how can you eat anything like that and without even feeling
guilty."

Once more, a speaker is involved in telling a story which in this case is
supposed to show how she projected her own feelings of guilt for eating
too much onto her flatmate. And once more, a wenn-clause is the first
component of a syntactically cohesive turn construction which spans six
intonation units. The speaker does not go into gestalt closure (apodosis)
after the wenn-clause, but rather parenthetically includes information
detailing the claim that the roommates ‘ate a lot’, and how she herself
reacted to that emotionally. Only then does a (dan)in-clause follow
which ties back to the initial part of the turn, where a story concerning
‘projection’ (ich hab so alles des auf se projiziert) was announced.

There is only one legitimate way for a recipient to share (or rather,
intrude into) the conversational space which a wenn-projection creates
for the current speaker: by becoming a co-speaker herself, i.e., by
collaboratively producing the gestalt-closing apodosis matching the already
produced protasis (cf. Lerner 1991). Both inserted material between
protasis and apodosis and collaborative constructions pivoting around this
transition suggest that there is some interactional work going on, and
that, at least in a substantial subgroup of examples, the construction is not
planned and executed as one whole, but rather develops in (at least)
two steps.

4.2. Why post-positioning at all?

If pre-positioned wenn-clauses are both cognitively more ‘natural’ and
interactionally more advantageous than post-positioned ones, why do
the latter occur at all? Two reasons have already been mentioned in section 3: wenn-clauses may be used for expressing the temporal circumstances of an event, and since temporal adverbial clauses do not follow the preference for pre-positioning, wenn-clauses of this semantic type need not do so either. Secondly, it was shown that the absence of a front-field in questions and other verb-initial syntagms makes their post-positioning more likely. There are, however, other important reasons.

First of all, it may be asked if there are any further syntactic environments in which post-positioning is preferred or even necessary.

There is indeed another construction in which the front-field is not available: that in which the wenn-clause plus subsequent clause are themselves embedded into a larger construction. The various types of embedding show different patterns with respect to the possibility of pre-positioning. As in Ford and Thompson’s English data (1986: 359), final positioning is preferred “when a conditional clause occurs within a
nominalization, an infinitive, or a relative clause”. Take, for instance, the following case of a relative clause:

(19) (therapy session)
TM: s-ESs'm isch wie? ein Teddybär =
TW: =ja,
TM: den' den sie: (2.0). h mit sich RUMtrag'.
  damit SIE <p> nich allEin sein müssn.>
  un dem=mer (-) sich RANzieht, ja? (-) wenns HART wird;
(3.0) an dem=mer sich FESCHThält, (2.0) wenn=mer EINsam
  ich, (1.0) nd der ü berall MIT muss.

‘TM: eating is like a teddy bear.
TW: yeah
TM: who who you carry around with you.
so that you don’t have to be alone.
and whom one holds close, right? (-) (-) when life becomes hard;
whom one clings to, (2.0) when one is lonely,
and who has to come along all the time.’

Both wenn-clauses in this extract are part of a relative clause introduced
by an oblique relative pronoun, i.e., their matrix clause is itself subordinated,
and therefore has verb-final syntax (cf. the placement of the finite verbs ranzieht and festhält). Here, the wenn-clause cannot be placed in
front of the relative clause (*und wenn’s hart wird den man sich ran-
zieht), pre-positioning would require a superordinate main clause insteade of the relative clause (*und wenn’s hart wird, zieht man sich den
ran) 18. The same applies to dependent clauses introduced by wie ‘as’,
obwohl ‘although’, weil ‘because’, etc. which likewise do not allow ini-
tial wenn-clauses.

However, subordination by the most frequent complementizer dass
(‘that’) shows a different pattern. Here, we frequently encounter initial
placement of the pre-positioned wenn-clause before the complementizer
dass.
MEIN interesse is natürlich
Wenn ich da: schon als Postdoc auf=m ZEITvertrag bin;
dass ich während de dieser ZEIT dann; (-) auch=n paar
ergebnisse MITnehme
‘my interest of course is
if I am there as a post-doc on a temporary contract
that I can take at least some results with me during this time’

und DESwegen wäre es natürlich; (-) für uns WÜNSchenswert; (-)
<<scanning>> Wenn wir uns einigen KÖNnten,
dass sie so früh wie möGLich <dim>natürlich anfangen.
‘and therefore of course it would be desirable for us
if we could come to an agreement
that you start as soon as possible’

The additional stress on wenn in these examples may give us a clue to
the origin of this construction; arguably, it underlines the semantic link
between antecedent and consequent. Fronting the wenn-clause to a position
before the dass-complementizer may be another way of focussing
on the semantic link established by wenn.19 Note in passing that
the fronting of the wenn-clause renders its scope ambiguous both in (20)
and (21); it may or may not include the initial phrases mein Interesse ist
natürlich/...wäre es natürlich für uns wünschenswert (i.e.: ‘of course, if
I am only there as a post-doc on a temporary contract, then my interest
is to take at least some results with me’ and ‘if we could come to an
agreement it would of course be desirable for us that you start as soon as
possible’ respectively).20

In addition to these syntactic constraints, there are semantic-syntactic
reasons for post-positioning wenn-clauses. In particular, wenn-clauses in
complement function are usually post-positioned (cf. (9) above). As a
rule, the main clause contains an evaluative two-place predicate, with
the wenn-clause expressing the proposition which is evaluated.21 The
opposite serialization is not unacceptable; nevertheless, it is very rare.
The dominant pattern obviously parallels that of dass-introduced com-
plement clauses which can, but rarely do, precede the main clause as
well. Complements make up ca. 25% of all the post-positioned wenn-
clauses in the spoken materials investigated.

Finally, and most importantly, post-positioning of wenn-clauses is
linked to the pragmatic status of the proposition they express, and to the
interational possibilities this position opens up both for the speaker and
the hearer. As outlined in section 1, final subordinated clauses in Ger-
man are added onto an already complete syntactic structure. They are
therefore a straightforward means for expanding a syntactic gestalt,
and thereby the turn-at-talk. This is particularly obvious in cases where
syntactically complete syntagms preceding the wenn-clause are marked as
terminal by intonation, e.g. by a pitch fall to the speaker’s base line (full
stop in the transcription); the wenn-clause then appears as an after-
thought, or epexegesis (cf. Auer 1991):

((hypothetical talk about a situation in which two people are in
conflict over where to put the cup for the coffee; B is asked to
mediate))

B: ich würd [einfach] die (.) die tasse kaffee NEHmen,

Il: [<p>= h.m.]

B: und eh (-) WEGstellen (-) h ja? (.)
eh=s da stundenlang streitenREten gibt,
würd ich sagen, al[so]: jetzt is:-

Il: [hm.]

(0.5)


B: [schluss aus ENde?]

Il: [wenn SIE mir dann auch noch den KAFfee (wegschließen.)]

B: [he he he he he he

Il: I would [simply take the (.) the cup of coffee

Il: [mhm

B: and eh (=) put it away. (-) you see?
before they start quarreling for hours,
I would say right [now it is

Il: [hm,]

(0.5)

Il: then I would have trouble [with you.

B: [over and out

Il: [if you (shut away) my coffee

B: ‘he he he he he’

At a point where B has already suggested to simply ‘taking away’ the
disputed coffee cup, but is in the middle of a syntactic construction
elaborating on this proposal (eh’s da stundenlang Streiterei gibt würde
ich also sagen. Schluss, aus, Ende) Il intervenes during an intra-turn
hesitation pause to refute this solution: ‘if you did that, there would be trouble between the two of us’ (i.e. between the mediator, B, and one of the two people quarreling, i.e. himself). The utterance is linked to B’s proposal by the initial anaphoric da; it is semantically and syntactically complete, and being marked by a final fall, it certainly is a candidate for a complete turn. However, B does not pick up this refutation, but continues with the production of the unfinished syntagm in another piece of simultaneous talk. Sequential structure and temporal development are now out of phase: a response has been produced to an utterance which is still in need of being completed, and is only completed after the response. In this context, II’s following wenn-clause, syntactically expanding an already complete turn/syntagm, can be seen as a skillful way of re-aligning sequentiality and timing: it re-instantiates II’s refutation of B’s proposal without repeating it, by retrospectively transforming a simple construction into a hypotactical one with a post-positioned adverbial clause. Semantically, this expansion adds nothing new: it just restates what B herself has said before.

The possibility of such an expansion is not only available to the speaker but also to the recipient, of course, who may become a co-speaker and co-producer of the emerging syntactic pattern by adding a wenn-clause himself/herself:

(23)

    L:  hdamn.  eh ()  wir ’ der Hund wird auch  jetzt  zunehmend  ruhiger;
    S:  mHM () des GUT so; ()
    L:  Ja ja des also wird langsam (a) =richtiger HUND;
    S:  oHA
    L:  hm, ()
    S:  wenn-er (nicht mehr) abhaut, ()
    hat (name) des ANgebot jetzt für den zaun? =

‘L: then ehm beco the dog is becoming more and more calm now;
S: this is how it should be;
L: yeah slowly he’s turning into a real dog.
S: I see
L: hm,
S: if he doesn’t escape (any more),
did NN get the offer for the fence in the meantime?’

So it is not only the transition between a wenn-clause and its subsequent main clause which is sensitive to turn-taking, but also the inverse transition between a (main) clause and its subsequent wenn-clause. But obviously, there is an important difference: while in the first case an open syntactic projection is in play, in the second case the first speaker has already come to an orderly completion of the sentence/turn.

Post-positioned wenn-clauses thus offer the possibility not only of expanding a turn, but also of expanding a sentence by adding a post-field constituent. At least example (22)22 also points to an important pragmatic feature of such expansions: its low information value. Indeed, this applies to a very large number of post-positioned wenn-clauses. Often it is the whole previous text which functions to build up the ‘mental space’ that is necessary to come to the conclusion expressed in the main clause, while the post-positioned wenn-clause only summarizes this preceding text, sometimes slightly changing the focus. In (24), the introductory adverbial insoweit explicitly establishes this resultative link between pre-text and conclusion, while the post-positioned wenn-clause just repeats what is known from the previous conversation anyway (the wenn-clause is factual here):

(24) ((after a long discussion of the applicant’s career aspirations in the bank, and an equally long description of the branch of the bank in Stralsund and its sophisticated private customer service, which seems to match these wishes))

    (()) das HAM wir alles in Stralsund, also insoweit, () eh wäre das – ne ideale () STELle, () wenn sie () praktizieren wollen im vertriebsbereich im KUNDdennahmen bereich.

‘we’ve got all that in Stralsund, so in that regard, this would be an ideal position if you want to be a trainee in the sales department, in client-oriented business.’

As in other, similar cases of low-relevance wenn-clauses in final position, the front-field is used here for a connecting (anaphorical) adverbial, which is preferentially placed in sentence-initial position, where its indexical meaning is most easily processed. Since only one constituent may be placed in the front-field, this position is not available for the wenn-clause any longer.

Since post-positioned wenn-clauses are often of low pragmatic relevance, upgrading their informational value requires special means; a standard technique for doing so is the use of focussing particles such as
(stressed) auch, nur or dann, or a combination of these. In this case, it is the focussing particle which projects syntactically: it requires a constituent to follow which is in its scope. Therefore, wenn-clauses such as the following cannot be treated in the same way as post-field wenn-clauses in general: they do not expand an already complete syntactic pattern but rather close a gestalt projected by the particle.

(25) ((about wearing glasses))
ich zieh=se nur DENN nur wENN=i=se wirklich (-) Effektiv
brauch
‘I only put them on then when I really and positively need them’

**Ex negativo**, the necessity of using such focussing particles in order to upgrade the following wenn-clause to thematic status is evidence for the (sub)thematic status which wenn-clauses usually have in the post-field.

5. Pre- and post-positioning of wenn-clauses in written German

In the last sections, it has been shown that wenn-clauses are preferentially pre-positioned with respect to their main clauses in spoken German, and that this serialisation has a number of cognitive and interactional advantages. It has also been shown that the more marked structure, i.e. post-positioned wenn-clauses, which does occur in about a third of all instances, has its own specific contexts of usage. These are partly due to (a) syntactic constraints on pre-positioning in superordinate clauses without a pre-field or in which two complementizers occur in adjacent position, partly to (b) turn-taking (afterthought position), partly to (c) semantic-syntactic reasons (wenn-clauses in complement function are postpositioned), and partly to (d) pragmatic reasons (post-positioned dependent clauses are thematic or subthematic, unless focussing particles indicate the contrary).

In written German, wenn-clauses are generally less frequent than in spoken discourse, a finding which contradicts the frequent claim that spoken language avoids syntactically complex constructions: the frequencies of wenn-clauses per 100 words in the corpus of spoken language used above is 0.54, but in a corpus of written language, taken from the newspapers DIE ZEIT (politics section) and Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung (culture section), it is 0.33. To put it differently, every 186th word is wenn in our spoken corpus on an average, but only every 300th word in our written texts. Once more, this finding is in line with comparative work on written and spoken English (Ford and Thompson 1986, 354: 0.72 vs. 0.46; similarlyly: Beaman 1984 and Biber 1986), but also with previous work on German (Leska 1965: 450).

There are of course also qualitative differences between the wenn-clauses used in the two corpora; in particular, certain rather idiomatic patterns (constructions) seem to be more or less exclusively used either in spoken or written language. For instance, the reduced wenn-(dann)-constructions of spoken German (cf. section 2.2. above) do not occur in the newspaper corpus, while, on the other hand, the topological causative construction wenn p dann (deswegen), weil q (‘if p, then that is because of q’), as in (26), seems to be used exclusively in writing.

(26) (DIE ZEIT Nr. 8 17.02.1995)
Wenn wir das Leugnen von Auschwitz, anders als das Leugnen
der Kopernikanischen Wende, unter Strafe stellen, dann deswegen,
weil es uns nicht nur hypothetisch angst macht.
‘If we punish the denial of Auschwitz, and not the denial of the
Copernican revolution, then that is because it does not make us
feel afraid only hypothetically.’

Also, and contradicting received wisdom according to which written
language is more logical and more explicit, we find instances of wenn as
a conjunction in the newspaper texts with semantics which are exceed-
ingly vague, as for instance in (27):

(27) (F.A.Z 19.06.1993, S. 27 / Nr. 139)
Aber wenn zum stets und inständig angestrebten "Weltneuheit" der
DDR die Stellvertreterschaft des überragenden, fortschrittlichen,
darin sogar selbst "bürgerlichen" Kulturberges gehört, dann
äußert sich nun das Aufschließen zur Weltoffenheit seltsam
kleinmütig.
‘But if the representation of an outstanding and progressive
cultural heritage, one which includes even the “bourgeois”,
belonged to the ever and urgently sought after “international
standard” of the GDR, then growing into cosmopolitan
open-mindedness expresses itself rather timidly nowadays.’
Here, the *wenn-dann* construction seems to vaguely express something between adversativity and concessivity.

However, these differences only affect a relatively small number of examples and are not directly linked to the positioning of the *wenn-* clause. The important question for the present discussion is rather whether the preference for pre-positioning of *wenn-* clauses is also to be found in written German (as it is in written English, cf. Ford and Thompson 1986\textsuperscript{25}). Fig. (3) shows that this is not the case:

![Figure 3. Percentage of post- and pre-positioned *wenn-* clauses in written German (n=626)](image)

In the written materials, post-positioned *wenn-* clauses are almost one and a half times more frequent than pre-positioned ones, while the opposite ratio is found in the spoken material.\textsuperscript{25} As would be expected, the number of integrative pre-positioned *wenn-* clauses is higher than in conversational language (65.56%), and both the number of non-integrative (9.28%) and resumptive (26.16%)\textsuperscript{26} structures is markedly reduced. The preference for post-positioning is only slightly less pronounced in unambiguously conditional *wenn-* clauses than in unambiguously temporal ones (65% vs. 71%) (n=301).

What could be the reason for this reversal of preferences for post- and pre-positioning in written German compared to spoken language? Three factors seem to be primarily responsible for it. First, the number of (almost exclusively final) *wenn-* clauses with a preceding focus particle in the main clause is about eight times as high in the written as in the spoken material (40 vs. 5 occurrences). An example is:

(28) (DIE ZEIT Nr. 7 10.02.1995)
Danach dürfen Frauen ungewollte Schwangerschaften in den ersten drei Monaten nur beenden, wenn sie sich vorher haben beraten lassen: in einer Beratungsstelle und vom abtreibenden Arzt.

'Accordingly, women may only terminate an unwanted pregnancy during the first three months if they have undergone counselling in an advice centre and also by the physician who does the abortion.'

Secondly, although embedded *wenn-* clause plus main clause constructions are not more frequent in the written than in the spoken material, all 52 *wenn-* clauses of this type are post-positioned, while a majority of them (34 of 54, all of which are embedded into *dass-* constructions) are pre-positioned in the spoken materials. In other words, fronting of *wenn-* clauses before the embedded matrix clause such as in (20) or (21) does not occur in the newspaper texts.

Finally, one of the important reasons outlined above for frequent pre-positioning in interactional language use is simply not applicable to writing: this is the need for the speaker to claim conversational space for the production of a larger turn, through projecting syntactically beyond the current clause. Instead, another factor becomes relevant: in writing, the *wenn-* clause may become so complex that processing it would become difficult even in reading if it was pre-positioned with respect to its main clause; cf. for instance:

(29) (DIE ZEIT Nr. 03 13.01.1995)
Und man denkt an Talleyrands Feststellung: "Hochverrat ist eine Frage des Datums", wenn man sich daran erinnert, daß Hans Modrows in einer Phase als Reformer und Hoffnungsträger galt, aber in der nächsten für schuldig erachtet wurde, weil er miterantwortlich war für das DDR-System.

'And one thinks of Talleyrand’s statement: “High treason is a question of the date” when one recalls that Hans Modrow was regarded as a reformer and as a source of hope in one phase, but that he was found guilty in another, because he shared responsibility in the GDR political system.’
Neither of these reasons for post-positioning in written German can explain the difference between the English and the German results, of course. Why should these same reasons not lead to a preference for post-positioning in written English as well? If one was looking for a structural explanation, one would probably try to find an answer based on the most prominent difference between English 
if- and German wenn-clauses, i.e. the semantic ambiguity of the latter. For instance, it might be argued that since wenn can often be interpreted either conditionally or temporarily, German newspaper journalists try to disambiguate their sentences by using other, strictly conditional conjunctions instead, such as falls, im Falle dass, für den Fall dass, sofern or soweit. However, this hypothesis receives little empirical support in my data: not only are these conjunctions very rare in the newspaper texts (a total of 31 tokens!), they also fail to show a positional distribution different from that of wenn (6 initial vs. 17 final tokens, with 8 parentheticals))

Another possibility to express conditionality in German which is not available in present-day English (apart from peripheral cases) is inversion (as in: komst du zu spät, bestraft dich das Leben – wenn du zu spät kommst, dann bestraft dich das Leben ‘if you are late, you will be punished by life’). This possibility is almost never used in spoken German because of its bookish and high-register connotations but its occurrence cannot be excluded in rather conservative newspapers such as DIE ZEIT and F.A.Z.; and since the distribution of pre- and post-positioned conditional clauses with inversion is unknown we cannot exclude a balancing effect, for instance due to a preference for pre-positioning in this case. Since this syntactic pattern can only be quantified in syntactically labelled corpora, there is no possibility to test this hypothesis in a straightforward way in our materials. However, preliminary analyses of some texts suggests that inversion hardly occurs in newspapers. Alternatively, one might look for a non-structural explanation which would locate the reason for diverging English and German patterns on the textual level, possibly in the stylistic preferences of English and German text composition. The matter clearly awaits further investigation.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, I have looked at the placement of German wenn-clauses in spoken and written texts. Various explanations for the general quantitative results – i.e., that spoken German prefers pre-positioning, written German post-positioning – have been presented and discussed on the basis of individual conversational contexts in which wenn-clauses occur. The general conclusion of this study is that the supposed parallel between ‘left’ and ‘right’ in syntax (suggested by paralles such as ‘left extraposition’ vs. ‘right extraposition’, or ‘left-adjoined’ vs. ‘right-adjoined’) is fundamentally mistaken when applied to spoken syntax; in speaking, to be sure, there is no ‘left’ and ‘right’, but only ‘earlier’ and ‘later’. At least for an approach to syntax which takes the in-time (‘online’) emergence of (particularly) oral language units seriously, what is dealt with first and what is taken care of later cannot be seen as a decision between two logical equivalents (as between ‘right’ and ‘left’). Rather, it involves one of the most basic and far-reaching decisions a speaker can make, with all kinds of cognitive, interactional and structural repercussions.

Appendix: Regularisation of Transcriptions of Word-Count(example)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original transcription:</th>
<th>Regularised transcription:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ich will umgehen den nächsten ANrufer, wieder einen Hörer begrüßen guten Abend?</td>
<td>Ich will umgehen den nächsten Anrufer, wieder einen Hörer, begrüßen: Guten Abend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A guten Abend.</td>
<td>Guten Abend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B guten Abend? (0.5)</td>
<td>Guten Abend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ja, also das Problem aller steht auch vor mir jetzt irgendwo. Und wo anfangen?</td>
<td>Ja, also das Problem aller steht auch vor mir jetzt irgendwo. Und wo anfangen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A jahm,</td>
<td>Jahm,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ja?</td>
<td>Ja?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ja, und auch ich recht GU:T eigentlich =natürlich mit den üblichen ALLtags-schwierigkeiten die überall existieren</td>
<td>Ja, und auch recht gut, eigentlich. Natürlich mit den üblichen Alltags-schwierigkeiten die überall existieren</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
vate everyday conversations, partly on the telephone. In the latter two types of data, southern German speakers prevail.

8. Embeddings of wenn-clauses into complex hypotactic constructions were not counted as parenthetical.

9. The count excludes, in addition to all polyvalent cases, all factual conditionals (i.e. those expressing a positive epistemic stance), which are always non-temporal, and all concessives, as well as wenn-clauses used as complements, but includes counterfactual conditionals and reduced wenn-dann routines.

10. *Warum wenn Du Kirschen magst* pflockt Du Dir keine vom Baum? *Why [if you like cherries] don’t you pick any from the tree*? therefore has to be understood as parenthetical. Resumption by dann is also excluded here, i.e., non-integration is the only option.

11. The term is used in a broader sense here than in Sweetser 1990. Details on this construction may be found in Günther 1999. Note that Sweetser’s „epistemic conditionals”, although not „content conditionals”, do not allow pre-front field placement in German (*Wenn er sich jeden Tag vollsaufen lässt, sie hat ihn verlassen*. „If he gets drunk everyday, she has left him.”).


15. Speaker 1 is most likely alluding to Zuckmayer’s play (and a famous German movie) Der Hauptmann von Köpenick, in which the Prussian state and army authorities are caricatured.

16. This of course, leaves the question open why temporal adverbial clauses should behave differently from conditional ones—a question which requires an investigation of its own.


18. In Wenn dann, however, though not in Wenn, the oblique relative pronoun—the wenn-clause can follow the relative pronoun (das Esser ist wie ein Teddybär, der, wenn es hart ist, immer bei ihnen ist, und der, wenn man einsam ist, zum Festhalten da ist). But here we are dealing with parenthetical placement in the middle field of the sentence; this is exceedingly rare in spoken German.

19. Of course, wenn is not always stressed in fronted wenn-clauses. Cf. the following example:

   ich ( ) hab (-) FÜNF Jahre lang an der schule französisch geHABT, mir fühlt eigentlich an ( ) PRAXis, h aber (-) ich bin überZUGT davon, wenn ich: eh eh ÖFters mal die gel.Eigenheit hatte zum beispiel in FRANKreich, eh mich aufzuhalten, ich dass des: (-) eh SICHERlich Aushaupftig ist.

   ‘I had French at school for five years, actually I’m lacking practice, but I’m convinced if I ocassion had the chance to spend some time for instance in France, that I could work on it.’

20. The tendency to place the wenn-clause early in dependent constructions is also evidenced by the fact that parenthetical placement immediately after dass is
frequent (cf. Note 18). Often, a second, resumptive dass is added at the beginning of the consequent:

kannst du ihm vielleicht (+) AUSrichten dass ich ANgeraßt habe?
und dass wenn er mit dem treilt geSPROChen hat über meine präfung.
dass er sich dann igurenweäl=Ganz kurz bei mir mElden soll?
"could you perhaps tell him that I called?" and that if he has talked to Treitz about my exams,
that he should give me a quick ring some time?"

21. The same was found in English conversations by Ford and Thompson 1986: 368.

22. In other-speaker produced post-positioned wenn-clauses this does not always hold, since second speakers may choose this way of intimately linking their speech to a preceding syntactic pattern but nonetheless produce unexpected and even contradictory information under this ‘disguise’.

23. More exactly, the corpus included the F.A.Z. Feuilleton-Glossen from Jan 8, 1993 (Auszgabe Nr. 6) to Dec 31, 1993 (Nr. 304) and DIE ZEIT politics section of Dec 30, 1994 (No. 1) to Feb 17, 1995 (Nr. 8). Transcriptions of conversational speech were regularized in order to make a comparative computer-based word-count possible; see the appendix for an example.

24. The written corpus used by Ford and Thompson consisted of philosophical essays, a professional text for automobile mechanics, and a personal narrative account (1986: 355). The preference for pre-positioning held for all these sources.

25. A separate count for the two newspapers shows that the quantitative results are identical.

26. The resumptive particle is dann in 46 cases and so in 16 cases. Dann and so are not freely interchangeable; in particular, so can be used with concessives (introduced by auch/sonst wenn), while dann cannot. Cf.: Auch wenn das Abgeordnetenhaus erst im Herbst, voraussichtlich am 22. Oktober, gewählt wird, so hat der Urabstimmung schon der Wahlkampf begonnen. (‘Even though parliament will not be elected until autumn, probably on October 22, so the electoral campaign has already begun with the strike ballot.’)

27. Of the 15 tokens in the spoken material, the three positions were about equally distributed.


References

Auer, Peter
1996 The the pre-front field in spoken German and its relevance as a grammaticalization position. Pragmatics (Special issue, eds. Johannes Wagner and Cecilia Ford), Vol. 6, No. 3: 295-322.

Biber, Douglas
1986 Spoken and written textural dimensions in English: Resolving the contradictory findings. Language 62: 384-416.

Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth

Dancygier, Barbara and Eve Sweetser

Eisenberg, Peter

Fauconnier, Gilles
1985 Mental space. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fillmore, Charles J.

Ford, Cecilia E.

Ford, Cecilia E. and Sandra A. Thompson

Greenberg, Joseph H.

Güthner, Susanne

Haiman, John
1978 Conditionals are topics. Language 54: 564-89.

König, Ekkehard
Counterfactual reasoning and desirability*

Noriko McCawley Akatsuka and Susan Strauss

This paper calls into question the popular view of counterfactual thinking under the influence of formal logic, which considers the utterance of a counterfactual sentence as an instance of complex and intricate reasoning skills. Using naturally occurring data from English, Japanese, and Korean, we will demonstrate that there exists a pattern of prototypical counterfactual reasoning which appears to be natural and spontaneous to every human being. Speakers/writers express a particular stance of desirability versus undesirability toward a particular event, based on their subjective evaluation of reality. Counterfactual conditionals are invoked as a necessary step in this line of thinking.

1. Introduction

This chapter represents a continuation of our inquiry into the most typical usage of counterfactual conditionals in everyday life across language and culture (Akatsuka 1997, 1999). We use the word “typical” here in the sense of “natural and spontaneous,” and thus underscore our claim that human beings appeal to counterfactual reasoning in dealing with the many aspects of everyday life that we find ourselves facing.

In the tradition of mathematics, philosophy and formal linguistics, the conditional sentence has been regarded as the epitome of Man’s rational capacity, the height of Man’s ability to reason logically. In the same vein, it has long been argued that underlying the counterfactual conditional is a similar, and perhaps even more logically complex type of reasoning, engendering such analytical sentences as in (1), from Fauconnier (1985: 118).

(1)
A: If Napoleon had been the son of Alexander, he would have won the battle of Waterloo.
B: But he would have died long before that.
A: Well, suppose he lived a very long life, without ever ageing, or that Alexander was resurrected in Corsica in the eighteenth century.