Pragmatic subordination: Causal clauses with verb first position in German

Karin Pittner, Ruhr-Universität Bochum

Abstract The article deals with a special type of causal clauses in German which exhibits the properties of verb-first position, an obligatory modal particle *doch* and obligatory postposition. It has often been noted that these clauses are neither clearly subordinated nor coordinated. Syntactic tests show that these clauses are not constituents of the clause they are related to and they may not be focussed, nor may the causal relation itself be focussed. Moreover, there are no correlates for them in their host clause. These characteristics show that the clauses in question contain their own information units.

It is argued that the causal meaning of these clauses is an inference due to an interplay of the verb first position, the meaning of *doch* and the postposition of these clauses. The verb position signals a close connection to the preceding clause as well as a diminished assertive force. The modal particle *doch* signals that the information given is uncontroversial but assumed not to be taken into account presently by the recipient. It is argued that the postposition of these clauses is due to the fact that these clauses have a kind of repair function and serve to support the acceptance of the preceding clause. It is shown that these clauses express their own illocutions which are subsidiary to the illocution of the preceding utterance. Thus these sentences are pragmatically subordinated although they do not exhibit characteristics of syntactic subordination. The article closes with a short discussion of

some hypotheses concerning the diachronic development of this special sentence type.

1   Introduction

Adverbial clauses have received a lot of attention because they are rather intricate on the syntactic as well as on the semantic/pragmatic level. They may operate on at least three levels, the content or propositional level, the epistemic level and the speech act level. This differentiation, due to Sweetser (1990), can be made for causal clauses as well. Causal clauses on the content level answer the question *why is it so*?, on the epistemic level the question *why do I believe this*? and on the speech act level the question *why do I say this?*

Causal clauses in German are usually introduced by a subordinating conjunction like *weil* or *da*. But there are causal clauses which exhibit some unusual characteristics and have received less attention so far. This article deals with causal clauses with verb first position, cf. the following examples:

(1)   a. Die   Welt   verliert   mit   jedem Stück
          the   world   lose.3SG   with   each   part
          Regenwald   einen Teil   ihrer grünen Lunge, ist
          rainforest   a   part   its   green lung, be.3SG
          doch   das   Gebiet des   Amazonas   die   größte
          MP   the   area   of   Amazon   the   biggest

CO$_2$-Senke,	die	wir	haben.
CO$_2$-reducer	that	we	have.1PL

'The world loses with each part of the rainforest a part of its green lung, since the Amazon area is the biggest CO$_2$-reducer that we have.' (*Frankfurter Allgemeine Sonntagszeitung*, 25. August 2019, Nr. 34, p. 18)

b.	Das	Urteil	ist	spektakulär,	rechtfertigt	es
	the	judgment	be.3SG	spectacular	justify.3SG	it

doch	den	Rechtsbruch	im	Interesse	des
MP	the	breach:of:law	in:the	interest	the.GEN

Klimaschutzes.
climate:potection
'The judgement is spectacular because it justifies breaking the law in the interest of climate protection.'
(*Süddeutsche Zeitung,* 16.1.2020 12/2020, p. 21)

Causal clauses in German have been often investigated in relation to Sweetser's levels and the degree of their syntactic integration, but for the most part the causal clauses of interest here have not been taken into account.[1] With regard to the three levels proposed by Sweetser it is not easy to determine their nature. Descriptions of their semantic/pragmatic relations to their host clause are contradictory. Önnerfors (1997), who counts them among V1-declarative sentences, characterizes their function as "inhaltliche Begründung" which is suggestive of a relation at the content level. Zifonun et al. (1997), on the other hand, describe them as operating on the epistemic and speech act level.

---

[1] E.g. Pasch (1983), Frey (2016), but they are taken into account by Frey (to appear).

With respect to their syntactic integration into their host or matrix host clause there are also different types of adverbial clauses. A distinction between central adverbial clauses, which are syntactically integrated into their matrix clause, and peripheral clauses, which do not exhibit all constituent characteristics, is quite common. Moreover, there are adverbial clauses that are not integrated at all into the sentence they are related to. As will be shown, verb first causal clauses (in the following V1-CC) are not integrated. And then the question arises how they are related to their host clauses.

V1-CC always have the modal particle *doch* in the middle field of the sentence, i.e. the field between the verbal elements that occur separately and form the sentence bracket. It has been suggested that this element has a connecting function, e.g. by Pasch et al. (2003). These authors assume that *doch* occurs in two different connecting functions, as an adversative connector (similar to *aber* 'but') and as a causal connector (cf. Pasch et al. 2003: 684). *Doch* is assumed to have a special causal meaning component in clauses with verb first position (cf. Pasch et al. 2003: 580 and passim). Although this is mentioned several times, no attempt is made to explain how this causal meaning comes about and what exactly the verb position and the particle contribute to it. *Doch* is considered to be a "lone wolf" within the class of adverbial connectors due to its position in the middle field and its restriction to a special sentence type (cf. Pasch et al. 2003: 580).[2]

Here it will be argued that all the peculiarities of *doch* can easily be captured if it is classified as a modal particle. It will be shown that *doch* in V1-causal clauses has the function of a modal particle with the same

---

[2] In the second volume of the *Handbuch der deutschen Konnektoren* this has been revised. *Doch* in causal clauses is no longer considered to be a sentence connector, but a "special particle" (Breindl et al.2014: 807), in reaction to Pittner (2007a) and (2011).

contribution to meaning as other instances of this particle in other sentence types. If it does not have a causal meaning by itself, the question arises how the causal meaning of the clauses in question comes about.

While it is sometimes held that V1-CC are a construction whose meaning can be described only holistically (cf. Jacobs 2015), this chapter proposes a compositional analysis of its meaning. Based on earlier studies (cf. Pittner 2007, Pittner 2011), it will be argued that the causal meaning arises from an intricate interaction between the modal particle *doch*, verb first position and the obligatory postposition of these clauses. Moreover, it will be shown that these clauses have a special function, which is to give a reason that supports the acceptance of the statement made in the clause they are related to. The main claim is that these clauses exhibit little or no characteristics of syntactic subordination, but are pragmatically subordinated by fulfilling a subsidiary function. They contain a separate information unit with less weight compared to the information in the preceding clauses and also an illocution of their own which serves to secure the acceptance of the statement/utterance made in the preceding clause.

After reviewing some general characteristics of V1-CC in Section 2, it will be shown in Section 3 that these clauses have no constituent characteristics, that there are no correlates for them (Section 4) and that they cannot be focussed (Section 5). Section 6 deals with the meaning contribution of the modal particle *doch,* which is argued to be the same as in other sentence types the particle occurs in. The role of V1-position is discussed in Section 7 and its interaction with the meaning of *doch* in Section 8. Section 9 deals with the reasons for the obligatory postposition of V1-CC to the sentences they are related to. Section 9 argues that V1-CC are not syntactically, but pragmatically subordinated. Some hypotheses concerning the diachronic development of this sentence type are discussed in Section 10. Section 11 contains short summary of the conclusions.

2   Characteristics of V1-causal clauses

It has been observed by several authors that V1-causal clauses fulfil very special pragmatic functions. Altmann (1993: 1020) calls them "functionally highly specialized sentence type" which is used "as the conclusion of sequence of statements in an argument, whose content motivates the entire chain of argumentation" (translation K.P.) By means of the particle *doch* the content is presented as "uncontroversial, commonly accepted" (*ibid.*). According to Engel (2004: 147) these clauses "contain a generally accepted or acceptable reason" (translation K.P.). Zifonun et al. (1997) mention V1-CC and describe their function, similar to *wo*-clauses with *doch,* as providing supporting arguments and facts that make the preceding statement plausible (cf. Zifonun et al. 1997: 2299).[3]

      Zifonun et al. (1997) see them as operating not on a propositional level, giving reasons for the proposition in the preceding clause, but on the level of "modus dicendi" which in their terminology comprises epistemic as well as speech act related clauses. An epistemic causal clause gives a reason for why the speaker thinks the proposition in the matrix clause is true ("Begründung" or "Erkenntnisgrund"), whereas a causal clause on the propositional level mentions a reason for the situation described in the matrix clause ("Realgrund" or "Ursache"). Since real reasons can be used to support a proposition they can also appear in V1-CC.

With regard to subordination V1-CC are a somewhat hybrid sentence type. Reis (1985: 285) notes that they have special characteristics which prevent them from being classified as either main or subordinated clauses. I will argue that there is no clear evidence for their syntactic subordination, but

---

[3] *Wo*-clauses are more flexible in their position and interpretation, cf. e.g. Günthner (2002), Müller (2017) and Taigel (2020) for a description of these clauses.

that they are pragmatically subordinated. First it will be shown that V1-CC are not constituents of their preceding clauses. Moreover, no correlates are possible for V1-CC and they cannot be focussed. Subsequently, the causal meaning is explained by an interaction of the obligatory modal particle, the verb position and the obligatory postposition.

3   Missing constituent characteristics

Subordinated clauses usually are constituents of their matrix clauses. For V1-CC there is no evidence for a status as constituents. This confirms Önnerfors' (1997) view that these clauses are not constituents of their preceding clauses. Constituent tests like pronominalization (cf. Section 4) and the question test produce negative results.

(2)   A: Warum   hat   er   das   getan?

            why   have.3SG   he   this   do.PTCP

            'Why did he do this?'

        B: weil   sie   es   so   wollte.

            because   she   it   so   want.3SG.PST

            'because she wanted it'

            *wollte   sie   es   doch

            want.3SG.PST she   it   MP

Also the permutation test cannot be applied since these sentences obligatorily follow the sentences they are related to.

It has to be noted, however, that some types of adverbial clauses also do not have characteristics of constituents, such as consecutive clauses with *so dass* and relative clauses relating to whole sentences. These sentence types

cannot be permuted but usually are postposed. Also the question test cannot be applied to some clauses, such as concessive clauses. But these clauses are commonly counted among subordinated clauses on the grounds that they are introduced by a complementizer and have verb-final position.

The missing constituent characteristics are closely connected to further characteristics described in the next sections.

4 No correlates possible

While there are correlates to *weil*-CC in the matrix clause like *deswegen, deshalb* 'therefore', such correlates do not exist for V1-CC:

(3) a. Er   hat   sie   lange angesehen,   weil
       he   have.3SG   her   long   look:at.PTCP because

       er   sie   liebt.
       he   her   love.3SG
       'He looked at her for a long time because he loves her.'
    b. Er hat sie deswegen lange angesehen, weil er sie liebt.
    c. *Er hat sie deswegen lange angesehen, liebt er sie doch.

The question arises what function the correlates fulfil in the case of adverbial clauses. It can be argued that the correlates have the effect that the main clause and the adverbial clause form one information unit (cf. Pittner 1999). While sentence (3a) can have one or two information units, the sentence in (3b) with the correlate *deswegen* ('therefore') contains only one information unit, where the correlate has the effect of focussing the subordinated clause. It often carries the nuclear accent and serves as focus exponent for the causal clause. This provides an explanation for why no

correlate is possible for V1-CC: They are separate obligatorily information units and cannot be focussed.

Moreover, by means of a correlate certain scope ambiguities can be resolved. Whereas the clause in (4a) may or may not be within the scope of the negation in the matrix clause, the correlate resolves this ambiguity: In (4b), the correlate precedes the negation, which relates only to the matrix clause, while in (4c) the causal clause lies within the scope of negation and invites a contrastive reading that there is another reason for the deed.

(4)   a.

Er	hat	sie	nicht	umgebracht,	weil
he	have.3SG	her	not	kill.PTCP	because
er	sie	liebt.			
he	her	love.3SG			

'He did not kill her because he loves her.'

b. Er hat sie deshalb nicht umgebracht, weil er sie liebt.

c. Er hat sie nicht deshalb umgebracht, weil er sie liebt (sondern...)

To sum up, correlates to adverbial clauses have the effect that these clauses do not have their own intonation contour and therefore are not separate information units. They disambiguate sentences containing adverbial clauses with regard to their information structure (cf. Pittner 1999: 224).

The impossibility of correlates to V1-CC means that these clauses are always separate information units which cannot be within the scope of elements in the preceding clause.

A note on causal clauses introduced by *da* is necessary here. There are no correlates corresponding to *da*-clauses. This is in line with their role

in information structure, since they always contain background information which may not be focussed.

5   Focusing not possible

V1-CC cannot be within the scope of focussing elements like focus particles or the negation in their host clause, while this is possible for *weil*-clauses:

(5)   a. Er   folgte   ihr   nach   Paris   nur
           he   follow.3SG.PST   her   to   Paris   only
           (deswegen),   weil   er   sie   wieder einmal
           (therefore)   because   he   her   again   once
           sehen   wollte.
           see.INFV   want.3SG.PST
           'He followed her to Paris only because he wanted to see her once again.'

        b. Er   hat   sie   nicht geheiratet,   weil
           he   have.3SG   her   not   marry.PTCP   because
           er   sie   liebt   (sondern   weil   er
           he   her   love.3SG   (but   because   he
           reich werden   wollte).
           rich   become.INFV want.3SG.PST)
           'He did not marry her, because he loves her (but because he wanted to become rich).'

For *weil*-clauses it is possible to focus the causal relation by placing an accent on the conjunction (6a), which may be contrasted with an adversative

connector like *obwohl* 'although' (6b). This is not possible for V1-CC since there is no connector that could be stressed, cf. (6c).

(6) a. Er   folgte   ihr   nach Paris, <u>weil</u>
        he   follow.3SG.PST   her   to   Paris   <u>because</u>
        sie   dort   einen Liebhaber   hatte.
        she   there a   lover   have.3SG.PST
        'He followed her to Paris <u>because</u> she had a lover there.'

     b. Er   folgte   ihr   nach Paris, nicht
        he   follow.3SG.PST   her   to   Paris, not
        <u>obwohl</u>,   sondern   <u>weil</u>   sie
        <u>although</u>   but   <u>because</u>   she
        dort   einen Liebhaber   hatte.
        there a   lover   have.3SG.PST

     c. *Er   folgte   ihr   nach Paris, nicht
        he   follow.3SG.PST   her   to   Paris   not
        <u>obwohl</u>,   sondern   hatte   sie
        <u>although</u>   but   have.3SG.PST she
        doch   dort   einen Liebhaber.
        MP   there   a   lover

More generally, focussing of adverbial clauses is only possible if they form one information unit with their matrix clause. Only then do they have a common focus-background structure with their matrix clause, where the adverbial clause (or the adverbial connector alone) may be focussed and the rest is background. Thus, the impossibility of focussing V1-CC is a consequence of their being separate information units.

Punctuation also gives a hint that V1-CC are independent. Instead of a comma, there may be a final stop, a colon or a dash before these clauses (cf. Önnerfors 1997: 163).

6   The contribution of *doch*

There are diverging opinions on the role of *doch* for V1-CC. Some authors hold that there is no meaning contribution of *doch* at all (cf. e.g. Önnerfors 1997, Jacobs 2015) or that *doch* has a special causal meaning in this sentence type (cf. Pasch et al. 2003). In this section, it will be argued that the meaning contribution of *doch* to V1-CC is the same as the meaning of this modal particle in other sentence types.

Doch is a modal particle occurring in a number of sentence types. Sometimes it carries an accent, but since *doch* is always unaccented in the sentences of interest here, we will not deal with the question how accented *doch* is to be categorized.[4]

The particle has already been widely discussed in the literature on modal particles and a number of proposals have been made to define its meaning and uses in interaction. Some authors hold that *doch* has an affirmative meaning component which groups it together with the modal particle *ja*. Lütten (1979) speaks of "consensus-constitutive" particles. Besides its affirmative meaning, however, *doch* is assumed to have a second contradictory or adversative meaning component (cf. e.g. König 1997). Thurmair (1989) sees the two elements 'known' and 'correction' at work in the modal particle *doch*. 'Known' may apply to the knowledge of the hearer

---

[4] Thurmair (1989) classifies accented *doch* as an affirmative adverb, Meibauer (1994) argues for a status as modal particle. Cf. also the discussion in Pittner (2007b). For a common core meaning of accented and unaccented *doch* cf. Meibauer (1994) and Pittner (2007b).

or, in the case of questions, to the knowledge of the speaker. She assumes that utterances with *doch* contain propositions which are uncontroversial to the hearer. In this respect, *doch* resembles the modal particle *ja* which also has the function to signal that the proposition is already known to the hearer and not controversial. *Doch* expresses an additional assumption of the speaker, namely that the speaker indicates that s/he has reasons to think that the hearer does not take the proposition into account at the moment. It is an instruction to the recipients to correct their assumptions and expectations on the basis of the facts known to them (cf. Thurmair 1989: 112; cf. Lütten 1979: 36).

A similar account is put forward by Ormelius-Sandblom (1997) who sees the two components 'affirmation' and 'adversativity' at work, captured in the following formula, which states that the proposition is taken as fact accompanied by a conventional implicature that there is a proposition q in the context which implies ¬p:

(7) λp [FACT p]

    implicature [$\exists q$ [q → ¬p]]

Önnerfors in his study on V1-declarative sentences refers to this description of the meaning of *doch,* which forces him to see the meaning component of adversativity as a conventional implicature which is eliminated in V1-CC, since these clauses have no adversative meaning. It remains vague however, under which circumstances the implicature may be cancelled. He assumes that this is the case only in V1-CC (cf. Önnerfors 1997: 168).

An analysis which avoids the pitfalls of postulating meaning elements that have to be cancelled in certain contexts is developed by Lindner (1991). According to her, the common core of all the uses of unstressed *doch* is the following:

(8)   If the speaker uses MP *doch* in an illocution type IT referring to α then s/he assumes at the time of speaking that it is not the case that α is being taken into consideration.

The variable α represents the proposition in assertive sentences and exclamations. For imperatives the first occurrence of the variable represents the proposition p, the second one "bringing about p". Although Lindner does not take V1-CC into consideration, her analysis sheds light on the contribution of the modal particle to these sentences.

In Lindner's approach, it is not assumed that 'being known' to speaker or hearer is part of the meaning of *doch*. This minimal analysis of *doch* avoids meaning elements which have to be cancelled in certain contexts and thus comes closest to the approach presented here. It is theoretically desirable to define a common core of meaning which holds for all the uses of *doch* and to develop a compositional view where the meaning contribution is stable and combines with the meaning of the various sentence types the particle occurs in.

Thurmair (1989) and Ormelius-Sandblom (1997) assume meaning elements which do not occur in all contexts, namely correction/adversativity, whereas Lindner refers to a present knowledge state where the proposition is not taken into consideration. Since this can be seen as an instruction to update knowledge, in this sense there can be a "correction".

As I have argued earlier (cf. Pittner 2007b, 2011), the unaccented modal particle *doch* signals that the proposition is not present in the context and that this is to be corrected. What it means not to be present in the context can be explained by the concept of common ground due to Stalnaker (1978, 2002), who defines it as the set of propositions that the participants in the communication mutually assume to be true.

Clark (1996) introduces a differentiation between personal and cultural common ground. Cultural common ground exists between members of certain groups, like people who speak the same language, belong to a nation, class or any other kind of group. In the following I call it general common ground. Personal common ground, on the other hand, is established by interactions between individuals, which means that there is no personal common ground between strangers.

For the purposes of this chapter, it is important to differentiate between personal common ground, which is the mutual knowledge gained through interactions between individuals, and dialogue common ground, which is the activated mutual knowledge at the time of the current interaction. This part of common ground is what Thomason (1992) called the "conversational record" which is established and constantly modified and updated during discourse.[5]

The analysis of *doch* presented here will make use of the distinction between general common ground and dialogue common ground. It is assumed that the participants in an interaction can draw upon a general common ground, but in order to become effective in the dialogue common ground, the beliefs, suppositions etc. of the general common ground must be activated. If the speaker presents them as her/ his individual dialogue common ground, the other participants have to ratify them in order for them to become part of collective dialogue common ground. In a process-oriented view of common ground the ways and means of offering, accepting or rejecting the offer to accept something as part of the collective dialogue common ground play an important role.

---

[5] Cf. Farkas & Bruce (2010) for a detailed description of the process of anchoring propositions in the common ground.

In Pittner (2007b) I argue that the modal particle *doch* serves "grounding" by anchoring a proposition in "dialogue common ground".[6] The proposition is signalled to be uncontroversial (present in the general common ground or at least compatible with it), but as not present in the dialogue common ground. To sum up, *doch* signals that a proposition of the general common ground is to be activated in the dialogue common ground.

A feature 'correction' or 'adversativity' does not occur in all uses of the particle, as will be shown. If such a feature is assumed it would have to be cancelled in certain contexts. Our approach comes close to the one by Lindner which is more reticent in this respect. A 'correction' takes place only as an instruction to update the individual dialogue common ground.

That there is this kind of correction is more obvious for accented *doch,* which can occur only if the opposite view is present in the dialogue common ground. As a first approximation, the common core meaning of accented and unaccented *doch* can be captured in the following formula which characterizes the content of the "metapragmatic instruction for the processing of an utterance" (König 1997: 71, translation K.P.) which is given by *doch*: [7]

(9)   replace ¬p by p

It is important to note, however, that the communicative status of ¬p differs. In the case of unstressed *doch* it refers to the individual dialogue common ground of either speaker or hearer in which p is not present (and only in this weak sense is there non-p). In the case of stressed *doch*, ¬p is present in the

[6] Cf. also Karagjosova (2004) and Döring & Repp (to appear) for an analysis of *doch* as relating to common ground.
[7] Meibauer (1994) and Pittner (2007b) argue that the meaning of accented *doch* corresponds to the meaning of unaccented *doch* with the additional meaning of a contrastive focus accent.

collective dialogue common ground. Somebody has expressed the opposite view or it is evident that somebody holds the opposite view.[8]

In the case of unstressed *doch* the speaker/writer has reasons to assume that the content of the clause containing this modal particle is not present active knowledge of the recipient. By means of the modal particle s/he signals this contrast and also signals that the content is uncontroversial. V1-CC sometimes refer to facts that the recipient may not have heard of before, as Müller (2018: 400) rightly notes. But it is crucial that they are signalled to be uncontroversial, part of a general common ground that is to be activated in the dialogue common ground.

Müller (2018: 400) objects to our analysis that it would imply that the writer has to find out the view held by the recipients in order to argue against this possible objection. This is basically a misunderstanding for two reasons. First of all, the difference between stressed and unstressed *doch* pointed out here is not taken into account. Unstressed *doch* does not signal a possible objection, but rather that the recipient is not aware of the proposition. And, of course, the author of a text does not know what the members of his audience individually think or are aware of. It is a projected recipient and a possible conversational crisis that is prevented by V1-CC (cf. Section 10). Following Roberts (1996) and Büring (2003), Müller assumes a discourse component that records the questions under discussion, which Farcas & Bruce (2010) call "the table". According to Müller (2018: 403), *doch* signals that the proposition is on the table, which means it is under discussion, "at issue". The particle is seen to signal an openness of a topic in the sense that the truth of a statement is not yet decided, where both options are neutral: *Doch* signals that p ∨ ¬p is on the table. But then the question arises why

---

[8] Cf. Karagjosova (2004: 50) for a similar analysis: "While *doch* indicates that that the speaker thinks that φ is not active at the time of utterance, *DOCH* expresses that the speaker assumes that not-φ is active in the addressee's mind."

doch occurs in these clauses. The description that p v ¬p is on the table is very general and holds for polar questions in general (cf. Farkas & Bruce 2010). If V1-CC answer an implicit or assumed question we should expect that this particle can occur in answers. This, however, seems only to be possible when the reply contains a correction of an assumption made in the question (*Wann bist du gestern zurückgekommen? Ich bin doch erst heute zurückgekommen.'When did you return yesterday? I returned only today.'*). Therefore the analysis proposed by Müller leaves the question open how the 'adversative' meaning component of *doch* can be captured*,* which was analysed here as an instruction to update individual common ground with a proposition belonging to general common ground.

Before it is shown how unaccented, medial *doch* contributes, together with other characteristics of V1-CC, to a causal meaning, we will take a closer look at *doch* in its interplay with declarative and interrogative sentences.[9] In declarative sentences *doch* signals that the present knowledge of the recipient has to be adapted: The speaker wants the hearer to activate something that he knows but which s/he assumes the hearer does not consider at the moment. Cf. the following example:

(10)   [A boy wants to drink wine from a bottle in the presence of an adult:]

Du	bist	noch	nicht	groß	genug.	Du
you	be.2SG	yet	not	big	enough	you
kannst		doch	nicht	eine	Flasche	Wein
can.2SG		MP	not	a	bottle	wine

---

[9] For a discussion of *doch* in other sentence types, cf. Thurmair (1989), Karagjosova (2004), Pittner (2007b), Grosz (2011), Egg (2013), among others.

allein   austrinken.

alone   drink.INFV

'You are not yet big enough. You cannot drink a bottle of wine alone.' (ex. from *Korpus Deutsche Mundarten*, slightly adapted, cf. Pittner 2011: 168)

By using *doch* in the second sentence, the speaker signals to the boy that s/he is telling him something that he actually knows but is not thinking about at the moment. Thurmair (1989: 112) sees this as an instruction to consider this knowledge. As she states it, "the knowledge assumed by the speaker on the part of the hearer is not so much asserted by *doch*, but the hearer is instructed to take this knowledge into account" (translation K.P.). In a differentiated view of "common ground" as sketched above the boy is instructed to update his present conscious knowledge, the "dialogue common ground" from the "general common ground".

For interrogative sentences the situation is a bit different. *Doch* cannot occur in information questions where the speaker is neutral with regard to the truth of the proposition. If *doch* occurs in yes-no-questions, it is a special type of assertive question which is marked by verb second position. In these cases the speaker expects a positive answer. Non-p is a possibility but is to be replaced by p in the answer which is expected to be 'yes' (*Du kommst doch morgen? 'Aren't you come tomorrow?'*). If *doch* occurs in wh-questions it is a special type of deliberative question where the speaker cannot think of the answer at the moment, although he usually would know it (*Wie hieß er doch noch? 'What was his name again?'*), or it is a rhetorical question which signals that the answer is part of the "general common ground" (*Wie sagte doch Goethe so treffend? 'How did Goethe put it so aptly?'*). In both cases the proposition with an instantiated wh-variable is not present in the dialogue common ground, although it is supposed to be

known and is part of the general common ground. In this way, *doch* signals in interrogative sentences the replacement of non-p by p.

To sum up, *doch* points to the need to update the "dialogue common ground" where, according to the sentence type it occurs in, what needs to be updated is the present knowledge of either the addressee or the speaker.

In order to understand the meaning contribution of *doch* to V1-CC, the role of V1-position has to be looked at first, in the next section.

7   Verb-first position

Verb first position in German occurs in conditional and concessive clauses, which exhibit characteristics of constituents, as they can appear in the position before the verb in verb-second position, the so-called prefield. V1-conditional and concessive clauses are not restricted in their position but may occur in the prefield, in the middle field as well as in the extraposition field ("Nachfeld"). In independent sentences verb first position occurs in polar questions, imperative and exclamative sentences. It is also a marked option for independent declarative sentences.

Since V1-CC are not constituents of their host clause, they are an instance of verb first position in independent declarative clauses, which have been described by Önnerfors (1997). Önnerfors calls V1-CC "V1-declarative sentence with the function to give a reason on the content level". As Önnerfors shows in his comprehensive study of various types of V1-declarative sentences, the verb position induces a close connection to the previous sentence(s) (1997: 170). Although V1-CC are not syntactic constituents of their host clause it can be assumed that they are closely connected by the verb position to their host clause.

Scheutz (2009) also describes verb first position as a highly marked option for declarative sentences and argues that the core meaning of this verb position in declaratives is to signal a textual dependence ("textuelle Unselbständigkeit") of the sentence which neither implies a syntactic dependence nor the lack of an independent illocution. This textual dependence means that V1-declaratives are only to be interpreted in a larger textual passage and inherently refer to a context. By their inherent reference to neighboring sentences ("Verweisfunktion") V1-declaratives lead to more "dense" textual passages. Although Scheutz does not make explicit reference to causal V1-CC, this also applies to this sentence type, which cannot stand alone but requires a preceding sentence it is related to. This obligatory postposition of V1-CC is not to be confused with a position in the post-field (Nachfeld), since this would presuppose a status as constituent of the preceding sentence.

Önnerfors (1997) assumes that there is no topic-comment structure in V1-declarative clauses. They only contain a comment and therefore have been assumed to be thetic sentences. A discussion of this assumption is found in Müller (2018: 381ff). Based on corpus data, she sees a strong tendency for V1-CC to contain expletive subjects which cannot be topics, but in a minority of cases, these clauses contain topics. Since it is not relevant for the analysis presented here, we will not pursue this question further.

V1-position plays a crucial role for the pragmatic subordination of V1-CC. It has been argued that V1-declarative sentences have only reduced assertive force. According to Reis (2000: 224), "V1-declarative sentences state true propositions, whereas V2-declarative sentences state that the proposition is true" (translation K.P.). In other words, the claim to truth is highlighted in V2-declaratives, but backgrounded in V1-declarative sentences. This means that only with V2-declaratives can the truth of a proposition be asserted, whereas V1-declarative sentences in a sense presuppose the truth of the

proposition. We will see that this applies to V1-CC, whose truth is of no concern, rather, what is at stake is the truth and the acceptance of the host clause.

8   The interaction between verb first position and *doch*

With this explanation of the verb position and the meaning contribution of *doch* we now have the most important ingredients for the causal meaning of the clauses in question.

It is very important that a causal connection between two independent sentences can occur without any lexical marker inducing this interpretation. Also, the particle has no causal meaning, as has been shown (cf. Önnerfors 1997). Consider (11a):

(11)   a. Hans   konnte   gestern   nicht   kommen.   Er

                 Hans   can.3SG.PST   yesterday   not   come.INFV   he

                 war   krank.

                 be.3SG.PST   ill

                 'Hans could not come yesterday. He was ill.'

    b. Hans konnte gestern nicht kommen. Er war doch krank.

    c. Hans konnte gestern nicht kommen, war er doch krank.

A causal relation between two sentences can be inferred without a modal particle or an explicit lexical marker. This has to be kept in mind when determining the contribution of *doch*. In (11b) *doch* indicates that the proposition in the second sentence is uncontroversial, but not present at the moment in the consciousness of the recipient. While in (11b) the proposition

of the second sentence is asserted as a fact due to V2-position, the second sentence in (11c) lacks the force of an independent assertion due to V1-position which additionally signals a close connection to the preceding sentence. The close connection invites the inference based on the maxim of relation that there is a close relation between the contents of the two sentences. The modal particle signals that the proposition is known or at least uncontroversial (part of the "general common ground" or at least compatible with it), but at the same time as not present in the "dialogue common ground". This is in line with the assumption that they mention a "commonly accepted or acceptable reason" (e.g. Engel 2004: 147). The propositions which serve to back up the acceptance of a preceding possibly controversial statement have to be uncontroversial themselves in order to fulfil their mission.

Why is the modal particle obligatory? The reason for this can be found in the underdetermination of the relation of the V1-clause to the preceding sentence. The relation is signalled by the modal particle. By indicating that the recipients' attention is drawn to a proposition which they are not aware of at the moment but which is uncontroversial, and in combination with the close connection to the preceding sentence, the relation of supporting evidence can be inferred. The particle refers to the recipients' activated knowledge in their dialogue common ground and instructs the recipients to update it.

Here it is very important to keep in mind that there is a tendency to establish a causal connection between two events occurring together if there is no other instruction for interpretation and also between two events which are described in adjacent sentences.[10]

---

[10] Cf. Breindl & Waßner (2006: 57, fn. 7) who see a causal relation between adjacent independent sentences without a connecting element as a kind of "default interpretation". This was also shown in experiments made by Riedl (1990).

It is also worth mentioning that the obligatory modal particle prevents the interpretation of a V1–CC as a conditional clause. Moreover, *doch* initiates a reasoning on the part of the recipient which enables him to infer a causal relation to the preceding clause which is not made explicit by a lexical marker with causal meaning.

9   Obligatory postposition

V1-CC are always postposed in present-day German. This is also true for other types of adverbial clauses, however. It holds for result clauses introduced by *so dass* as well as so-called "prospective" clauses introduced by *um*. They are part of a progression scheme ("Verlaufsschema" Leys 1988) where the event in the *um*-clause follows the event in the matrix clause in a sort of predetermined way.

(12)   a. Es   hatte   stark   geregnet,   so
           it   have.3SG.PST heavily   rain.PTCP   so
           dass   wir   alle   klatschnass   wurden.
           that   we   all   very:wet   become.3PL.PST
           'It had heavily rained, so that we all became very wet.'
       a'. *So dass wir alle klatschnass wurden, hatte es stark geregnet.
       a''.*Es hatte, so dass wir alle klatschnass wurden, stark
           geregnet.

(13)   a. Er   zog   nach Rom   um,   um
           he   move.3SG.PST to   Rome VPTCL   for
           dort   schließlich   überfahren   zu   werden.

there   finally   run:over.PTCP to   become.INFV

'He moved to Rome, only to finally be run over there (by a car).'

a'.*Um dort schließlich überfahren zu werden, zog er nach Rom um.

a''.*Er zog, um dort schließlich überfahren zu werden, nach Rom um.

In these cases obligatory postposition can be taken to be iconically motivated. A result follows the preceding event leading to it and also in the case of the prospective *um*-clauses the event takes place later than the event in the matrix clause.[11]

There is no general restriction for the position of causal clauses of this kind. Causal clauses introduced by *weil* and *da* can be positioned freely.[12] Therefore, the restriction to postposition has to be looked for in special conditions on the use of these sentences, which do not hold for causal clauses in general. The obligatory postposition can be seen as a hint at syntactic subordination, since there are no order restrictions between independent sentences. It should be emphasized here that this is the only characteristic hinting at subordination, and we will argue that postposition is due to the pragmatic function these sentences fulfil.

Since postposition for V1-CC cannot be explained by iconic motivation, as for instance for result clauses, the explanation has to found elsewhere. Preposing would necessitate that V1-CC contain background information which is contextually present (cf. Pittner 1999: 237) This, however, is in conflict with the meaning of *doch,* which marks the content

---

[11] Cf. also Diessel (2005: 463ff.) on iconic motivation for the positioning of adverbial clauses.
[12] It has been observed by several authors, however, that *da*-clauses tend to be preposed. Cf. Diessel (1996, 2008) for factors determining the position of adverbial clauses.

of V1-CC as not present in context and containing background information that may not be focussed.

Obligatory postposition can be explained by the special pragmatic functions V1-CC fulfil. They do not have the frame-setting, orienting function that sentence initial adverbial clauses often have (e.g. Ford 1993) but rather have a special kind of repair function. In a study of the uses of postposed causal clauses introduced by *because* in spoken and written English Ford (1994) comes to the conclusion that postposed causal clauses in spoken language are often used in order to make a non-preferred reaction in a speech act sequence more acceptable for the hearer.[13] Based on this observation she also assumes that postposed causal clauses in written language often have a similar function. As she observes, these clauses often occur after contrasting and negative sentences which do not fulfil the recipients' expectation.[14] They serve to make these sentences more acceptable by providing a fact that supports the previous proposition. According to Ford, this is possible because the writer is having a kind of "an internal dialogue with an intended recipient" (1994: 549). Ford´s thesis of an internal dialogue is supported by the modal particle in the corresponding V1-CC in German, which to my knowledge has no equivalent in other Germanic languages. That this particle relates to the recipient's present conscious knowledge can be interpreted as a dialogic element.

Adopting an explanation of this kind, some of the characteristics of the causals considered here are motivated by their function. These sentences are

---

[13] Cf. Ford (2000) who identifies a more general pattern not dependent on any specific connector of contrasts followed by explanations or solutions.

[14] This view is supported by observations of Müller (2018), who finds in a sample of 100 V1-CC that they follow a sentence containing a contrast in 14 cases or an evaluation in 35 cases as well as assumptions and evaluations that call for an explanation. Müller (2018: 410) also makes interesting observations about the sentences preceding V1-CC and *wo*-clauses. Whereas V1-CC often serve to support assumptions and arguments, *wo*-clauses often appear after reproaches and complaints.

not focussed, because they do not carry the main information but rather have a subsidiary function. This also provides an explanation for their postposition: They are postposed because their function is to support a statement already made. It makes no sense to repair an utterance that has not been made yet. The potential problem has to occur before it can be repaired. In this way, the postposition reflects the pragmatic functions of V1-CC.

10   Pragmatic subordination

It will be argued in this section that V1-CC are pragmatically subordinated. In Section 4 it was already demonstrated that they contain information units of their own. According to Brandt (1989), subordinated clauses that are separate information units contain background information, while their matrix clauses present foreground information. This is a kind of more global information structure whose counterpart on the local level is the focus-background structure within one information unit (cf. Brandt 1994: 15).

If we assume that V1-CC and their host clauses form a unit in some sense as far as information structure is concerned, V1-CC obviously contain background information.[15]

I would like to go a step further and show that V1-CC not only contain separate information units but also illocutions of their own. It is controversial whether subordinate clauses that are separate information units also have illocutions of their own which have a subsidiary function with regard to the illocution expressed in the matrix clause.

---

[15] W*eil*-causal clauses can form one information unit with their matrix clause or contain a separate information unit. This can be made explicit by the intonation or by the particle *nämlich*. *da*-clauses, on the other hand, contain background information (cf. Brandt 1989). This is backed up by the fact that correlates to *da*-clauses are very rare, since they focus the causal clause.

Since the hints at a subordinated character of V1-CC are very weak, the question arises whether they express an illocution of their own. Clearly subordinated sentences have no illocution of their own. As has been shown, the evidence of syntactic subordination is very meagre for V1-CC. Therefore, the question arises whether they have illocution of their own.

It can be assumed that all elements which do not lie within the scope of an illocutionary operator of another unit have their own illocution. The fact that V1-CC and their host clauses are both declarative sentences could give rise to the assumption that V1-CC are in the scope of the illocutionary operator of their host clauses.

However, it is important that this congruence in sentence mood is not necessary but allows for exceptions. That V1-CC are always declarative is an effect of their pragmatic function. Since they give a fact which supports the preceding utterance, they have to be at least weakly assertive and therefore cannot be an interrogative or an imperative sentence. But what about the sentence type of the host clause? It is possible that the host clause is an interrogative sentence, especially if it is a rhetorical question, cf. the following example:

(14)	Wer	wird	ihm	das	glauben? –	Ist	er
	who	will.3SG	him	it	believe.INFV	be.3SG	he
	doch	einer	der	am	wenigsten		
	MP	one	of	the	least		
	vertrauenswürdigsten	Leute	in	der	ganzen	Gruppe.	
	trustworthy		people	in	the	whole	group

‘Who will believe him? He is one of the least trustworthy people in the whole group.’

This rhetorical question contains a statement (nobody will believe him), and it is possible to secure its acceptance by giving a supporting fact. The host clause also may be a real question, as in the following example:[16]

(15)   Von   wem   wird   dieser fragwürdige Wahnsinn
          by   whom will.3SG   this   questionable insanity
          eigentlich   genehmigt? Weiß   man   doch,
          actually   approved.PTCP know.3SG one   MP
          dass   in   Naturschutzgebieten alle Veränderungen
          that   in   nature:reserves   all   changes
          beziehungsweise   Störungen   zu   unterlassen
          respectively   disturbances to   avoid.INFV
          sind.
          be.3PL

          'Who approves this questionable insanity? It is well-known that in nature reserves areas all changes or rather disturbances must be avoided.' (DeReKo, *Braunschweiger Zeitung*, 25.02.2009)

Here it can be argued that the V1-CC is related to the mental state of wondering, not so much a reason for the speech act. However, the line between a mental attitude towards the proposition and the speech act that may result from it is difficult to draw. It is important though to note that V1-CC cannot occur with a reference to the utterance situation, unlike, for instance, *weil*-clauses, which embed a question into the utterance situation, as in *weil ich dich gerade sehe* 'because I see you right now' or *weil du gefragt hast* 'because you were asking'. In terms of Sweetser's levels they operate on an epistemic level. But they do so differently than epistemic *weil*-clauses. While epistemic *weil*-clauses (e.g. *he is at home, because the light is on*) give a reason why the speaker thinks his assumption is true, i.e.

---

his reason for assuming the matrix proposition, V1-CC give supporting facts why the recipient should accept the preceding utterance.

The host clause may also be an imperative clause, cf. (16a, b) or an optative clause as in (16c):

(16) a. Legt die Waffen nieder! Führt
put.2PL.IMP the arms down lead.3SG
doch Gewalt nur zu mehr Gewalt!
MP violence only to more violence
'Lay down the arms! Violence only leads to more violence.'

b. bewahr dich Gott und hab
preserve.2SG.IMP you God and have.2SG.IMP
mich lieb. Ist doch nichts anders auf
me dear be.3SG MP nothing else on
der Welt
the world
'God preserve you and hold me dear, because there is nothing else in the world.'
(Goethe to Charlotte vom Stein, quoted from Mattausch 1965: 69)

c. Gepriesen sei übrigens der unbekannte
praised be by:the:way the unknown
Schöpfer! Erdachte er doch einen der
creator conceive.3SG he MP one of
wenigen deutschen Begriffe, die sich
few German concepts that REFL
stur und starr jeder Amerikanisierung
obstinately and rigidly any americanisation
verweigern.

refuse.3PL

'Praise be to the unknown creator who thought up one of the few German notions that obstinately refuse to be americanized.' (DeReKo, *Nürnberger Nachrichten*, 03.05.2008, p. 2)

Here again, it can be argued that these V1-CC do not embed the imperative clause in the utterance situation but give a reason why the action denoted in the imperative clause is desirable to carry out and thus is directed to the recipient. The optative clause gives a reason why the speaker feels his wish is justified.

In any case, that V1-CC is always declarative whereas a different sentence type may be the host is a strong argument for the assumption that they have illocutions of their own.

Some authors assume that illocutions are hierarchically ordered. According to Brandt & Rosengren (1992) texts have an illocutionary structure with dominant and subsidiary illocutions which have the function of securing the success of the dominating illocution. It can be argued that V1-CC have illocutions which have a subsidiary function. They give an uncontroversial fact whose aim is to promote the acceptance of the proposition in their host clause.

Döring & Repp (to appear), working in the framework of Rhetorical Structure Theory (cf. Mann & Thompson 1988), come to a similar conclusion. Within this framework, sentences containing the modal particle *doch* can be seen as satellites related to a nucleus. They assume "that the reminding/retrieval function of the particles is used by the speaker to mark the evidence that the satellite presents as uncontroversial which plausibly strengthens the argument made in the nucleus" (p. 21). They see this as a function of both *ja* and *doch*, where *doch* additionally has the function "to

avoid a protest of the addressee about the previous speech act by dismissing (potentially) conflicting assumptions" (Döring & Repp to appear: 21). Although Döring & Repp do not explicitly refer to V1-CC, this can be seen as an apt description of the function of this sentence type.

The lack of integration into their host clause and the corresponding impossibility of focussing them ensure that V1-CC cannot be mistaken as the main information. These characteristics clearly mark their subsidiary function with regard to their host clause. In this way, V1-CC provide a means of disambiguation in written language for which spoken language provides other means, namely intonation. A pause and a separate intonation contour indicate that the causal clause contains an extra information unit. This may be a reason why V1-CC rarely occur in spoken language. In samples consisting of 60 sentences with the modal particle *doch* in spoken language and written language, respectively, there was no V1-CC in spoken language but 14 V1-CC in written language.

To sum up, the hybrid character of V1-CC with regard to subordination results from their syntactic independence and their pragmatic subordination. They contain background information and subsidiary speech acts which serve to secure the acceptance of the proposition of their host clause.

11 Diachronic development – some hypotheses and tendencies

The aim of this section is to give an overview of possible origins and predecessors of V1-CC and their later development.

Delbrück (1912) traces these clauses back to sentences with clause-initial *ja* with an affirmative meaning.

(17)   troeste   mir den   lîp: jâ   verdiene

console.2SG.IMP	me	the	body	yes	deserve.1SG

ichs   wol

I:it   well

'console my body, I really deserve it'

(Reinmar, quoted from Hentschel 1986: 108)

Although *jâ* occurs in the prefield, it had nearly the same functions as the modal particle *ja* in present-day German (cf. Hentschel 1986: 108f.).

    The position was freer for these *ja*-clauses than for V1-CC in present-day German. Delbrück (1912: 275) gives the following examples for preposed *ja*-clauses (18a) and as a parenthetical (18b), which he considers to be equivalent in meaning to V1-CC:

(18)   a. ja   bistu,   quad   er,   heiler, nu

                  MP   you:are   say.3SG.PST he   heal   so

                  ni   sunto thu   mer

                  not   sin   you   more

              'He said, you are healed, sin no more'

        b. druhtin,   quad   er,   wio   mag   sin

                  lord   say.3SG.PST he   how   can.3SG   be

                  (ja   bin   ich   smaher   scalg   thin),

                  (MP   be.1SG I   poor   servant   your

                  thaz thih   henti mine zi   doufene   birine?

                  that you   hands my   to   may   touch

             'He said, Lord, how can it be, being the humble servant of

                 yours, that I may touch you?'

Delbrück assumes that there were sentences with similar meaning containing the clause-medial particle *doch*, which lead to the appearance of the particle *doch* in the *ja*-clauses. Consequently, *ja* became superfluous and

could be omitted which lead to verb-first position in the respective clauses. As an alternative account, he assumes that both sentence types could have been present in the language and were blended in a way, such that the original *ja*-clauses were responsible for the verb position and the *doch*-clauses for the particle. However, it seems questionable whether the V1-position has to be explained by the omission of sentence-initial *ja*. In earlier stages of Germanic languages and going back to Indo-European, V1-position in general was a marked alternative to verb final position, which is assumed to be the basic verb position. Also, V1-position in declarative sentences can already be found in proto-Germanic and still exist in present-day German as a marked option with specialized functions.[17]

In any case, the modal particle was more flexible in earlier stages of German. Sanders (1883) notes that causal sentences with the modal particle *ja* or *doch* or a combination of these two particles are equivalent in meaning. As he states, these particles mark the sentence as known or acceptable and something which cannot be argued against ("als etwas Bekanntes oder Anzuerkennendes. nicht zu Bestreitendes"), which is in line with the description given in this chapter. So it is of no surprise that the affirmative particle *ja* could appear in V1-CC.[18] Sanders characterizes these sentences as independent declarative clauses which function as a reason for the preceding clause and notes that the verb may be in first position in these clauses.[19]

---

[17] A comprehensive overview of the development of V1-position in Germanic languages is given by Önnerfors (1997).

[18] While Önnerfors assumes that *ja* no longer occurs in V1-CC, Müller (2018: 372) shows that it still exists as a marginal possibility. Her corpus data, however, illustrate an overwhelming dominance of *doch*. In DeReKo she finds 3685 instances of *doch.* opposed to 22 instances of *ja*.

[19] For examples from Goethe cf. Mattausch (1965: 69), who sees a special emotional emphasis in these causal clauses:

(i)	Ich	will	nicht	mehr	geleitet,
	I	want.1SG	not	more	lead.PTCP
	ermuntert,		angefeuret		seyn,

(19)　Warum　kommt　ihr　zu　mir? Hasset

　　　why　come.2PL　you　to　me　hate.2PL

　　　ihr　mich　doch

　　　you　me　MP

'Why do you come to me? (I wonder) because you hate me.'

(1. Mos. 26,27, quoted from Sanders 1883: 74)

It can be speculated that *doch* is more suitable for the purpose of these clauses than *ja* since it has an 'adversative' meaning component which we explicated as a discrepancy between the addressee's present knowledge state, which is to be updated, and general common ground.

　　　Jacobs (2015), who sees V1-CC as constructions that cannot be given a compositional analysis, assumes that V1-clauses with the modal particle *doch* occurred frequently as a supporting argument ("Begründung") for the preceding sentence which led to their grammaticalization. During this process the particle lost its meaning by semantic bleaching. It is not quite clear, however, why the particle should have lost all its meaning components, since semantic bleaching is a gradual process where older meanings often are transparent over a long period of time. Although Jacobs grants *doch* a "reminding function" in questions like *Wie war doch sein Name?* ('What was his name again?'), he sees no connection to this meaning in V1-CC.[20] It remains unclear why there should be no connection in meaning to other uses of *doch* in present-day German.

---

　　　encouraged.PTCP　　cheer:on.PTCP　be.INFV
　　　braust　dieses　Herz　doch　genug　aus　sich　selbst.
　　　roar.3SG this　heart　MP　enough　from　REFL　REFL
　　　'I do not want to be led, encouraged, and cheered on, because this heart roars enough from itself.' (Werther I 4, 223)

[20] Cf. Pittner (2009) for modal particles with a 'reminding function' in questions.

The analysis presented here has the advantage of showing the close connection of the meaning of the modal particle in V1-CC to its meaning in other sentence types. Moreover, it relates its meaning to its predecessor in a grammaticalization process. The development of the modal particle *doch* already appears in Old High German and can be explained by a grammaticalization of the adversative conjunction or adverb as stated by Molnár (2002).

> The (logical) adversative relation between two sentences which was marked by the conjunction or the adverb was transferred to the communicative situation, to the relation between speaker and hearer. Thus, the presupposition of the speaker that the hearer might hold the opposite view could be signalled. (Molnár 2002: 116, translation K.P.)

This development is in line with the tendency for pragmatic strengthening during grammaticalization. As Traugott (1988) states, there are three tendencies at work: The shift of meaning from the external situation to an internal (evaluative, perceptive, cognitive) situation, the shift of meaning from an external or internal situation to a textual relation/situation, as well as a shift of meaning to subjective cognitive states and attitudes towards the situation. As we have seen, the modal particle does not relate to a contrast between two sentences but to a contrast between a subjective knowledge state on the part of the recipient assumed by the speaker and the general common ground.

To sum up, in its diachronic development the construction has become more stable and more restricted with regard to the modal particle occurring in it. While in earlier stages *ja* and *doch* as well as the combination of these particles was possible, in present-day German only

doch occurs. Also the predecessors of V1-CC could be positioned more freely and were not restricted to postposition.

12   Conclusions

It was argued that the causal meaning of V1-CC is the result of an interplay of the obligatory modal particle *doch* and the verb position. The contribution of the modal particle is to signal the proposition as uncontroversial, i.e. compatible with the common ground, but not activated in the dialogue ground on the part of the recipient. It instructs the recipient to consider its proposition which is not present in the dialogue common ground but is compatible with the general common ground.

By the V1-position a close, but underdetermined, connection to the preceding sentence is established. A causal relation is not explicitly marked but has to be inferred from the close connection to the preceding clause, the diminished assertive force associated with V1-position and the modal particle *doch,* which marks the proposition of the V1-CC as uncontroversial and acceptable but not activated at the moment on the part of the recipient.

It was argued that V1-CC have illocutions of their own, which have a subsidiary function and serve to back up the acceptance of the preceding sentence. Their obligatory postposition is due to this kind of repair function. V1-CC are not constituents of their host clause and not part of its intonation contour and information structure. They are not syntactically subordinated, but they contain subsidiary speech acts and are pragmatically subordinated. In terms of Sweetser's levels it was argued that V1-CC operate on an epistemic level. But in contrast to epistemic *weil*-clauses which give the reason why the speaker thinks the matrix proposition is true, they provide supporting facts which make the utterance in the preceding clause more

acceptable to the recipient. Thus they have an inherently dialogic nature which is made explicit by the modal particle.

Finally, some diachronic lines of development were sketched and it was shown that V1-CC in earlier stages of German were more variable regarding the modal particles they could contain.

Abbreviations

¬ – negation, 1/2/3 – 1st/2nd/3rd person, GEN – genitive, IMP – imperative mood, INFV – infinitive, MP – modal particle, PL – plural, PST – past tense, PTCP – past participle, REFL – reflexive pronoun, SG – singular, V1-CC – verb first causal clause, V2 – verb second, VPTCL – verb particle.

Acknowledgments

Primary sources

Datenbank Gesprochenes Deutsch (Pfeffer-Korpus, Freiburger Korpus) (https://dgd.ids-mannheim.de/dgd/pragdb.dgd_extern.welcome).

Deutsches Referenzkorpus (DeReKo) /Archiv der Korpora geschriebener Gegenwartssprache, provided by Leibniz-Institut für Deutsche Sprache (https://cosmas2.ids-mannheim.de/cosmas2-web/).

Secondary References

Altmann, Hans. 1993. Satzmodus. In *Syntax. Ein internationales Handbuch der zeitgenössischen Forschung* Volume 1 [Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft 9], Joachim Jacobs, Arnim von Stechow, Wolfgang Sternefeld & Theo Vennemann (eds), 1006−1029. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110095869.1.

Brandt, Margareta. 1989. Zur Fokus-Hintergrund-Gliederung in komplexen Sätzen. *Sprache & Pragmatik* 13, 43−53.

Brandt, Margareta. 1994. Subordination und Parenthese als Mittel der Informationsstrukturierung in Texten. *Sprache und Pragmatik* 32, 1−37.

Brandt, Margareta & Inger Rosengren. 1992. Zur Illokutionsstruktur von Texten. *Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik* 86, 9−51.

Breindl, Eva & Ulrich Hermann Waßner. 2006. Syndese vs. Asyndese. Konnektoren und andere Wegweiser für die Interpretation von semantischen Relationen in Texten. In *Text – Verstehen. Grammatik und darüber hinaus* [Jahrbuch des Institut für Deutsche Sprache 2005], Hardarik Blühdorn, Eva Breindl & Ulrich Hermann Waßner (eds), 46−70. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110199963.1.46.

Breindl, Eva, Anna Volodina & Ulrich Hermann Waßner. 2014. *Handbuch der deutschen Konnektoren* Volume 2 [Schriften des Instituts für Deutsche Sprache 13]. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110341447.

Büring, Daniel. 2003. On D-trees, beans, and B-accents. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26(5), 511−545. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1025887707652.

Clark, Herbert. 1996. *Using Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511620539.

Coniglio, Marco. 2012. On V1 declarative clauses in Middle High German. *Linguistische Berichte* 229, 5−37.

Delbrück, Berthold. 1912. Die stellung des verbums in sätzen mit *doch* und *ja*. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 37, 273−278. Halle: de Gruyter.

Diessel, Holger. 1996. Processing factors of pre-and postposed adverbial clauses. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 22, 71–82. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3765/bls.v22i1.1344.

Diessel, Holger. 2005. Competing motivations for the ordering of main and adverbial clauses. *Linguistics* 43(3), 449−470. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.2005.43.3.449.

Diessel, Holger. 2008. Iconicity of sequence. A corpus-based analysis of the positioning of temporal adverbial clauses in English. *Cognitive Linguistics* 19(3), 457−482. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/COGL.2008.018.

Döring, Sophia & Sophie Repp. To appear. The modal particles *ja* and *doch* and their interaction with discourse structure: Corpus and experimental evidence. In *Information Structure and Semantic Processing*, Sophie von Wietersheim (ed.). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Egg, Marcus. 2013. Discourse particles, common ground, and felicity conditions. In *Beyond Expressives: Explorations in Use-Conditional Meaning* [Current Research in the Semantics/ Pragmatics Interface 28], Daniel Gutzmann & Hans-Martin Gärtner (eds), 127–151. Leiden: Brill.

Engel, Ulrich. 2004. *Deutsche Grammatik*. Neubearbeitung. München: Iudicium.

Farkas, Donka & Kim Bruce. 2010. On reacting to assertions and polar questions. *Journal of Semantics* 27(1), 81–118. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/ffp010.

Ford, Cecilia E. 1993. *Grammar in interaction. Adverbial clauses in American English conversations* [Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 9]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511554278.

Ford, Cecilia E. 1994. Dialogic aspects of talk and writing: *Because* in the interactive-edited continuum. *Text* 14(4), 531–554. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1994.14.4.531.

Ford, Cecilia E. 2000. The treatment of contrasts in interaction. In *Cause, Condition, Concession and Contrast: Cognitive and Discourse Perspectives* [Topics in English Linguistics 33], Bernd Kortmann & Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen (eds), 283−311. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110219043.3.283.

Frey, Werner. 2016. On some correlations between formal and interpretative properties of causal clauses. In *Co- and subordination in German and other languages. Special issue of Linguistische Berichte* 21, Ingo Reich & Augustin Speyer (eds), 153−179. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.

Frey, Werner. To appear. On the categorical status of different dependent clauses. In *Propositionale Argumente im Sprachvergleich: Theorie und Empirie./Propositional Arguments in Cross-Linguistic Research: Theoretical and Empirical Issues* [Studien zur Deutschen Sprache], Jutta M. Hartmann & Angelika Wöllstein (eds). Tübingen: Narr.

Grosz, Patrick. 2011. Facts and ideals: on the role of *doch* in conditionals and optatives. In *Sinn und Bedeutung 15. Proceedings of the 2010 Annual Conference of the Gesellschaft für Semantik*, Ingo Reich, Eva Horch & Dennis Pauly (eds), 275–289. Saarbrücken: universaar.

Grosz, Patrick. 2014. German *doch*: an element that triggers a contrast presupposition. *Proceedings of the Chicago Linguistic Society* 46(1), 163–177. University of Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Günthner, Susanne. 2002. Zum kausalen und konzessiven Gebrauch des Konnektors *wo* im gesprochenen Umgangsdeutsch. *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik* 20(3), 320–341. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/zfgl.2003.002.

Hentschel, Elke. 1986. *Funktion und Geschichte deutscher Partikeln.* Ja*, doch, halt und* eben [Germanistische Linguistik 63]. Tübingen: Niemeyer. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111371221.

Jacobs, Joachim. 2015. Satztypkonstruktionen und Satztypsensitivät. In *Satztypen und Konstruktionen* [Linguistik – Impulse & Tendenzen 65], Rita Finkbeiner & Jörg Meibauer (eds), 23–71. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110423112.

Karagjosova, Elena. 2004. *The Meaning and Function of German Modal Particles*. PhD Dissertation, Universität des Saarlandes.

König, Ekkehard. 1997. Zur Bedeutung von Modalpartikeln im Deutschen: Ein Neuansatz im Rahmen der Relevanztheorie. *Germanistische Linguistik* 136, 57–75.

Leys, Odo. 1988. Prospektives *um*. *Deutsche Sprache* 16(2), 97–102.

Lindner, Katrin. 1991. Wir sind ja doch alte Bekannte. In *Discourse particles. Descriptive and theoretical investigations on the logical, syntactic and pragmatic properties of discourse particles in German*, Werner Abraham (ed.), 168–201 Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lütten, Jutta. 1979. Die Rolle der Partikeln *doch*, *eben* und *ja* als Konsensus-Konstitutiva in gesprochener Sprache. In *Die Partikeln der deutschen Sprache*, Harald Weydt (ed.), 30–38. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110863574.

Mann, William C. & Sandra A. Thompson. 1988. Rhetorical Structure
    Theory: Toward a Functional Theory of Text Organization. *Text* 8(3),
    243–281. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1988.8.3.243.

Mattausch, Josef. 1965. *Untersuchungen zur Wortstellung in der Prosa des
    jungen Goethe.* Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Meibauer, Jörg. 1994. *Modaler Kontrast und konzeptuelle Verschiebung.
    Studien zur Syntax und Semantik deutscher Modalpartikeln* [Linguistische
    Arbeiten 314]. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer. DOI:
    https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111339795.

Molnár, Anna. 2002. *Die Grammatikalisierung deutscher Modalpartikeln.
    Fallstudien*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Müller, Sonja. 2017. Kausale/konzessive Verberst- und *Wo*-Verbletzt-Sätze.
    Deutsche Sprache 45, 245–276. DOI: https://doi.org/10.37307/j.1868-
    775X.2017.03.04.

Müller, Sonja. 2018. *Distribution und Interpretation von Modalpartikel-
    Kombinationen* [Topics at the Grammar-Discourse Interface 2]. Berlin:
    Language Science Press. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1244028.

Önnerfors, Olaf. 1997. *Verb-erst-Deklarativsätze: Grammatik und
    Pragmatik*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Ormelius-Sandblom, Elisabeth. 1997. *Die Modalpartikeln* ja, doch *und*
    schon. *Zu ihrer Syntax, Semantik und Pragmatik* [Lunder germanistische
    Forschungen 61]. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Pasch, Renate. 1983. Untersuchungen zu den Gebrauchsbedingungen der
    deutschen Kausalkonjunktionen *da, denn* und *weil.* In *Untersuchungen zu
    Funktionswörtern (Adverbien, Konjunktionen, Partikeln)* [Linguistische
    Studien Reihe A Arbeitsberichte], 41–243. Berlin: Akademie der
    Wissenschaften der DDR.

Pasch, Renate, Ursula Brauße, Eva Breindl & Ulrich Hermann Waßner.
    2003. *Handbuch der deutschen Konnektoren. Linguistische Grundlagen*

der Beschreibung und syntaktische Merkmale der deutschen Satzverknüpfer (Konjunktionen, Satzadverbien und Partikeln) [Schriften des Instituts für Deutsche Sprache 9]. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110201666.

Pittner, Karin. 1999. *Adverbiale im Deutschen. Untersuchungen zu ihrer Stellung und Interpretation* [Studien zur deutschen Grammatik 60]. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.

Pittner, Karin. 2007a. Dialog in der Grammatik: *Doch* in Kausalsätzen mit Verberststellung. In *Von der Pragmatik zur Grammatik*, Sandra Döring & Jochen Geilfuß-Wolfgang (eds), 39–56. Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag.

Pittner, Karin. 2007b. Common ground in interaction: the functions of medial *doch.* In *Lexical Markers of Common Ground* [Studies in Pragmatics 3], Anita Fetzer & Kerstin Fischer (eds.), 67–87. Amsterdam: Brill.

Pittner, Karin. 2009. *Wieder* als Modalpartikel. *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik* 37(2), 296–314. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/ZGL.2009.019.

Pittner, Karin. 2011. Subsidiäre Begründungen. In *Konnektoren im Deutschen und im Sprachvergleich: Beschreibung und grammatische Analyse* [Studien zur deutschen Sprache 53], Gisella Ferraresi (ed.), 157–182. Tübingen: Narr.

Reis, Marga. 1985. Satzeinleitende Strukturen im Deutschen. Über COMP, Haupt- und Nebensätze, w-Bewegung und die Doppelkopfanalyse. In *Erklärende Syntax des Deutschen*, Werner Abraham (ed.), 271–311. Tübingen: Narr.

Reis, Marga. 2000. Anmerkungen zu Verb-erst-Satz-Typen im Deutschen. In *Deutsche Grammatik in Theorie und Praxis*, Rolf Thieroff, Matthias

Tamrat, Nanna Fuhrhop & Oliver Teuber (eds), 215–227. Tübingen: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110933932.215.

Riedl, Rupert. 1990. Die Folgen des Ursachendenkens. In *Die erfundene Wirklichkeit. Wie wissen wir, was wir zu wissen glauben? Beiträge zum Konstruktivismus*, Paul Watzlawick (ed.), 67–90. München: Piper.

Roberts, Craige. 1996. Information structure: Towards an integrated formal theory of pragmatics. *Semantics and Pragmatics* 5, 1–69. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.3765/sp.5.6.

Sanders, Daniel. 1883. *Satzbau und Wortfolge in der deutschen Sprache*. Berlin: Abenheim.

Scheutz, Hannes. 2009. Wie «narrativ» sind Verb-Erst-Deklarativsätze im Deutschen? In *Gesprochen – geschrieben – gedichtet. Variation und Transformation von Sprache* [Philologische Studien und Quellen 218], Monika Dannerer, Peter Mauser, Hannes Scheutz & Andreas E. Weiss (eds), 240–251. Berlin: Erich Schmidt.

Stalnaker, Robert. 1978. Assertion. *Syntax and Semantics* 9, 315–332. New York: Academic Press.

Stalnaker, Robert. 2002. Common Ground. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 25, 701–721. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1020867916902.

Sweetser, Eve. 1990. *From etymology to pragmatics. Metaphorical and cultural aspects of semantic structure* [Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 54]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511620904.

Taigel, Sonja. 2020. On the role of the left periphery in the interpretation of causal "Wo"-verbend clauses. In *Verb Second – Grammar Internal and Grammar External Interfaces* [Interface Explorations 34], Horst Lohnstein & Antonios Tsiknakis (eds), 329–370. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501508141-011.

Thomason, Richmond H. 1992. Accommodation, meaning and implicature: interdisciplinary foundations for pragmatics. In *Intentions in communication* [System Development Foundation Benchmark Series], Philip R. Cohen, Jerry Morgan & Martha E. Pollack (eds), 325–363. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Thurmair, Maria. 1989. *Modalpartikeln und ihre Kombinationen*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1988. Pragmatic strengthening and grammaticalization. *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 14, 406–416. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3765/bls.v14i0.1784.

Zifonun, Gisela, Ludger Hoffmann & Bruno Strecker. 1997. *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache* [Schriften des Instituts für Deutsche Sprache 7]. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110872163.