

From subordination to coordination?

Verb-second position in German causal and concessive constructions

[1]

von Susanne Günthner

Konstanz 1996

1. INTRODUCTION:

During the last few years various analyses of spoken colloquial German have discussed the apparently growing tendency of the use of main clause constructions (i.e. verb-second position) in causal and concessive clauses, and the reinterpretation of "subordinate conjunctions", such as WEIL, OBWOHL as "coordinate conjunctions".[2]

German, which has "verb-second" as its basic word order in independent sentences, requires final position of the finite verb in subordinate clauses. Thus, adverbial clauses introduced by "subordinate" conjunctions, such as WEIL ("because") and OBWOHL ("although") - according to German grammar - display "verb-final" ordering (e.g. "ich geh jetzt nach Hause, weil ich müde bin"; "ich esse kein Fleisch, obwohl ich's eigentlich gern mag"). German thus provides a clear signal for the grammatical incorporation of one clause into another.[3] However, during the last ten to fifteen years, in spoken colloquial German as well as in certain written genres that reproduce colloquial language (e.g., interviews, dialogues in advertisement), speakers are tending more and more to use main clause order (and thus "verb-second"-position)[4] in final adverbial clauses introduced by WEIL and OBWOHL.[5]

In this paper, based on German everyday interactions, I shall analyze the interactive functions of different word-order constructions ("verb-second position/main clause construction" versus "verb-final position/subordinate

clause construction") in final adverbial clauses introduced by WEIL and OBWOHL. I shall also demonstrate that speakers are starting to use the pronominal adverb WOBEI as a concessive conjunction displaying subordinate as well as main clause order. Furthermore, the relationship between syntactic means and discourse-pragmatic functions of clause integration will be investigated and the results will be discussed in connection with prevalent hypotheses concerning grammaticalization. I argue that the choice between the two word order patterns (main clause order - subordinate clause order) in present-day spoken German is not random or unpredictable[6]; instead, there is a close relationship between the choice of the particular word order and the discourse-pragmatic function of the clause.

The analysis is based on 37 everyday informal conversations among friends and family members (dinner table conversations, coffee chats, telephone interactions) collected from 1983 to 1995.[7] A discourse-based approach to word order is used to investigate the different uses of WEIL, OBWOHL and WOBEI in their natural environment; i.e. in communicative contexts. The analysis aims at contributing to the study of the "ecology of grammar" (Hopper/Thompson 1994:461); and thus, at investigating the life and work of grammatical constructions in their communicative contexts and the way these contexts in turn shape grammar.

2. WEIL-CONSTRUCTIONS

2.1. Subordinate clause order in WEIL-clauses

The standard, unmarked word order for WEIL-clauses is verb-final position; and thus "integrative word order" (Känig/van der Auwera 1988), marking the WEIL-clause as a subordinate one.

In her analysis of the causal conjunction "because" Sweetser (1990) distinguishes among three different interpretations of "because": as a conjunction of content, of premises in the epistemic world, and of the speech acts performed via the utterance of the clauses in question.[8] This differentiation in the interpretation of clauses as operating in the "content", "epistemic" or "speech act" domain turns out to be relevant for word order choices in German WEIL- constructions.

The following segment is taken from a telephone conversation between Sonja and her friend Kaja, who has a sore shoulder. They are discussing which doctor Kaja should consult, when Sonja provides the following reason why Kaja should go to Dr. Kielmann:

ARZTBESUCH (SEEING A DOCTOR)

138Sonja: 'hh auf der andern Seite wär der Kielmann vielleicht besser

139 weil der gleich en Röntgengerät da hat.

140Kaja: ja genau.

138Sonja: 'hh on the other hand Kielmann might be better

139 because he has an X-ray right there.

140Kaja: *yes that's right.*

The causal clause "weil der gleich en Röntgengerät da hat." (*because he has an X-ray right there.*) provides the reason for the main clause proposition "auf der andern Seite wär der Kielmann vielleicht besser" (*on the other hand Kielmann might be better*) and thus operates in the content domain. The two clauses (the main clause and the subordinate WEIL-clause) are closely connected by "real-world causality" (Sweetser 1990). The WEIL-clause is within the scope of the illocutionary force of the main clause.

Causality operating in the content domain also connects the two clauses in the following segment. Dora tells Leo about a conflict interaction she had on the phone when she was talking to an acquaintance (Thomas Vollenmaier):

ANRUFBEANTWORTER (*ANSWERING MASCHINE*)

14Dora: drei Dag später hats Telefon gklingelt,

15 i geh ran,

16 Thomas Vollenmaier.

17 [(...)] schon mal)=

18Leo: [(.)]

19Leo: = ja. ja.

4

20Dora: und des han- des war [arrowup]UN.glaub.lich. peinlich am Anfang.

21 (0.5)

22 weil der ANgfang hat

23 ((spitz))[arrowup]<ICH=HAB=AUF=DEIN ANRUFBEANTWORTER=GEREDET.>

14Dora: *three days later the phone rang*

15 *I answered it*

16 *Thomas Vollenmaier.*

17 [(...)] *already once*=

18Leo: [(.)]

19Leo: = *yeah yeah*

20Dora: *and it has- it was unbelievably embarrassing at the beginning*

21 (0.5)

22 *because he started with*

23 *((sharp)) I left a message on your answering machine*

Dora gives the reason for the embarrassing situation with the WEIL-clause (22-23). However, in contrast to the WEIL-construction in ARZTBESUCH, the initial main clause in ANRUFBEANTWORTER is not thematic, but carries new information. Yet, it still operates in the content domain and the WEIL-clause ties back to the scope of the main clause illocutionary force.

A closer look at the prosodic realization of the two causal constructions shows that in ARZTBESUCH, the initial main clause and the WEIL-clause are integrated into one intonation contour. The main clause "auf der andern Seite wär der Kielmann vielleicht besser" carries a rising intonation contour, signaling that the present utterance is still in progress. In ANRUFBEANTWORTER, however, the two clauses are prosodically non-integrated; both clauses display their own intonation contour.^[9] The clause final intonation of the main clause marks it "as an independent assertion rather than as a presupposition" (Sweetser 1990:83).

In general, causal relations operating in the content domain, with the WEIL-clause tying back to the scope of the preceding clause's illocutionary force, are expressed by means of integrative word order. As ARZTBESUCH reveals, the syntactic integration can be emphasized by means of prosodic integration; however, prosodic integration is not a necessary prerequisite for subordinate word order in WEIL-clauses.^[10] In my data prosodic integration is generally used in cases where the initial main clause is presupposed, but it is not necessarily used in cases where the initial clause carries new information.

2.2. Main clause order in WEIL-clauses

Now we shall consider WEIL-clauses which display main clause order with the finite verb in verb-second position; a word ordering which is considered to be "ungrammatical" by many reference grammars. Although WEIL-clauses can be in initial as well as in final position, main clause word order only appears in final WEIL-clauses.

2.2.1. Speech act domain

In the following segment, Ute utters the first part of an adjacency pair and asks Rita, "what in her opinion wouldn't be okay" (24). When no reply follows (there is a pause of 0.5 sec.), Ute - by introducing a WEIL-clause - gives the reason for her question:

PROBLEMGESPRÄCH (*TROUBLES-TALK*)

23Rita: s' macht mir echt NICHTS AUS.

24Ute: WAS WR denn deiner Meinung nach [arrowup]NICHT OKAY. (0.5)

25 ((zunehmend leiser))[arrowdown]<weil=du=hast=ja=vorhin=gesagt=

26 er=NERVT=dich=ganz=schän.>

23Rita: *actually it doesn't bother me at all*

24Ute: *what in your opinion wouldn't be okay (0.5)*

25 *((decreasing volume))[arrowdown]<because=you=just=said=that*

26 *he=really=gets= on=your=nerve>*

The main clause (24) is not a statement but a question, and the WEIL-clause (25-26) connected to it, does not provide a reason in the content domain, but instead, gives a causal explanation of the speech act performed by the preceding clause. The reading is something like "I'm asking what in your opinion wouldn't be okay, because you just said that he really gets on your nerves". The WEIL-clause is outside the scope of the main clause illocutionary force. The two clauses connected by WEIL not only reveal different illocutionary forces (question and account) but also different intonation contours. This prosodic discontinuity is furthermore marked by the pause following the main clause and by differences in loudness and tempo between the two clauses.

In the next segment Udo, who is invited to dinner at Maria and Karl's house, requests whether they "by any chance" have the local political magazine "Blasrohr":

FLIEGEN (*FLYING*)

22Udo: *ihr habt nich s- (.) zufällig s'Blasrohr. (-) oder?*

23Maria: **he eh.**

24Udo: *weil da is ja em Peter sein Flugartikel drin. (-) über? (-)*

22Udo: *you don't happen to have the Blasrohr here (-) do you*

23Maria: **no**

24Udo: *because Peter's article on flying is in it (-) about (-)*

The pause in line 22 already indicates an upcoming disagreement. After Maria says "no", Udo provides the reason for his request and thus a causal connection on the speech act level: a common friend (Peter) has published an article in it. Here again, the speaker uses main clause order to introduce the reason why he performed a particular speech act.

Whenever WEIL-clauses provide the cause for the preceding speech act, speakers in my data use main clause order.^[11] Both clauses have their own illocutionary force (e.g. interrogative and account; request and account) and are presented as independent assertions, whose content is non-presupposed.^[12] The non-integrative word order in speech act qualifications is supported by prosodic means: The two clauses carry their own intonation contours and often the prosodic discontinuity between the clauses is further marked by means of pauses, differences in tempo and volume.

This type of causal constructions regularly occurs in contexts in which an expected recipient reaction (e.g. an answer to a question; or a reply to a request) does not follow, or when the response is rather hesitant and thus projecting possible disagreement. Speakers then provide causal accounts, which come close to

what Ford (1993) calls "post-completion extensions". These WEIL-clauses arise from particular interactional circumstances: they are prompted by the presence of a possible dispreferred reaction and thus ward off and defeat doubts or disagreements in advance. [13]

2.2.2. Epistemic domain

There is a second type of causal relation which German speakers express in using WEIL with main clause order: causal connections in the epistemic domain.

FRÜHSTÜCK (*BREAKFAST*)

12 Anne: der hat sicher wieder gsoffen. (-)

13 weil (-) sie läuft total deprimiert durch die Gegend.

12 Anne: *he must have been drinking again.* (-)

13 *because (-) she walks around looking totally depressed*

Anne's WEIL-clause (13) provides the basis for her conclusion that *he must have been drinking again*. The causality of this epistemic WEIL-construction is that between the premise (*she walks around looking*

7

totally depressed) and the conclusion in the speaker's mind (*he must have been drinking again*). [14] The modal adverb "sicher" (line 12) functions as lexical indication for this epistemic reading.

In the following transcript Fritz, Gabi, and Rolf are talking about symbols and "indicators" of cultural assimilation. Gabi introduces "SCHWEINEFLEISCH" (pork) as an "indicator" for Moslems' assimilation to the West:

SCHWEINEFLEISCH (*PORK*)

48 Fritz: aber de- [des war (.....)]

49 Gabi: [aber s'isch (-) Scheine-] SCHWEINEFLEISCH IST

50 glaub=auch=so en INDIKATOR.

51 weil (-) ich hatte auch en persischen Freund

52 (.....) früher und da war [arrowup]IMMER der Indi[arrowup]kator

53 die fragen sich gegenseitig (-)

54 ißt du Flei- SCHWEINEFLEISCH.

48 Fritz: *but th-* [that was (.....)]

49 Gabi: [but it's (-) pork-] pork is

50 *such an indicator I believe*

51 *because (-) I also had a Persian friend*

52 (.....) *before and there was always the indicator*

53 *they asked each other (-)*

54 *do you eat mea- pork.*

The causal clause "weil (-) ich hatte auch en persischen Freund..." (*because (-) I also had a Persian friend*) provides the premises and thus the background for the conclusion stated in the preceding clause "SCHWEINEFLEISCH IST glaub=auch=so en INDIKATOR." (*pork is such an indicator I believe*). The verb "glaub" (*believe*) in line 50 supports the epistemic reading. As in FRÜHSTÜCK, the non-integrative word-order is accompanied by prosodic non-integration. [15]

A characteristic feature that epistemic WEIL-clauses share with speech-act WEIL-clauses is that in both types of causal constructions, the WEIL-clause is "separately assertable"; i.e. it could occur as a separate assertion [16]; both clauses are rhematic; they both have their own illocutionary forces. The separate assertion of the two clauses in speech act and epistemic WEIL-constructions is not only revealed on the syntactic level by means of main clause order; but also on the prosodic level: The WEIL-clause is prosodically disconnected (by means of an own intonation contour, pauses and other prosodic contextualization cues indicating non-integration) from the preceding main clause and thus from the material it elaborates on. Syntactic and prosodic means of non-integration go hand-in-hand

with the discursive functions of these constructions: The first part of the construction is presented in such a way that it could actually stand by itself. An epistemic WEIL-clause is often added to this independently constructed main clause, in cases where an expected recipient response is noticeably missing; e.g. after affectively loaded evaluations; sensitive moral judgments or other kinds of strong assessments that are sensitive to disagreement. By introducing a causal clause, the speaker gives an account, presents an explanation, etc., and thus prophylactically counters possible doubts or disagreements.

2.2.3. WEIL-clauses that are not directly related to the preceding clauses

In the WEIL-constructions considered so far, word order functions as a cue to interpret the causal relationship as operating in the content or the speech act and epistemic domain. In these constructions the WEIL-clauses followed the main-clauses, which they operated on. However, there are also WEIL-clauses displaying main clause order, which differ from this kind of clause organization and reveal a much more complex structural organization. WEIL-clauses can operate on material which has not been explicitly stated; they can give explanations for larger sequential units or for just one particular item of the preceding clause. In these kinds of causal clause combinations, (which are difficult to attribute to a particular domain), the WEIL-clause is not directly connected to the preceding utterance and indicates this dissociation by means of syntactic and prosodic non-integration.

In the following transcript Urs talks about a common friend Anna, who refused to talk to her brother and sister (at a recent family meeting) and to be "forgiving" towards them:

GESCHWISTER (*BROTHER & SISTER*)

55Urs: die war fand=ich sehr [arrowup]UNVERZEIHLICH. so.

56Dora: gegenüber dem BRUDER oder der SCHWESTER. oder?

57Urs: ne. gegenüber dem BRUDER isch ja OKAY. (0.5)

58 aber gegenüber der [arrowup]SCHWESTER.

59 (1.0)

60 weil die SCHWESTER hätte sich da irgendwie

61 ganz anders anstellen müssen (-)

62 nach ihrer Meinung.

63Marie: wa- WANN?

64Urs: WHREnd der eh HochZEIT.

55Urs: I thought she was being very unforgiving

56Dora: towards her brother or sister you know

57Urs: no. towards her brother I can understand (0.5)

58 but towards her sister

59 (1.0)

60 because her sister should have behaved

61 very differently (-)

62 according to her

63Marie: wh- when?

64Urs: during the eh wedding

After Dora's question whether Anna's being unforgiving was directed towards the brother or the sister, Urs responds by providing his own perspective. According to his opinion Anna's being unforgiving towards her brother could be understood, but not towards her sister (57-58). When his evaluation receives no response (there is a pause of 1.0 sec.), he then adds a causal clause (60) to introduce Anna's perspective of the affair and her reason for being unforgiving towards her sister: *the sister should have somehow behaved totally different (-) according to her*. This reason is not semantically tied to the preceding utterance, but relates to a premise which is unexpressed but reconstructable from the context: *Anna was unforgiving towards her sister....* The change of perspective between the WEIL-clause (Anna's reason for being "unforgiving") and the preceding utterance (Urs' evaluation), and thus the fact that the

WEIL-clause does not provide a reason related to Urs' preceding evaluation, is indicated by syntactic non-integration. Loose linkage between WEIL-clauses and the preceding turns and thus "dissociation from an established schema" [17] tend to be iconically represented by means of syntactic and prosodic non-integration. [18]

In the next segment Sara asks her mother Ulla, whether she plans to go to Stuttgart for a shopping trip that day. In line 30 Ulla gives the reason for why she is considering to go: Because "DIE" (*she*) (line 30), i.e. Ulla's youngest daughter Lisa, wants to buy something. So Ulla asked her son (Rolf), if he has plans to drive to Stuttgart:

EINKAUFEN (*SHOPPING TRIP*)

29Sara: fahret ihr nach [arrowup]STUTTGART heut?

30Ulla: ha i- weil doch DIE parTOUT was will.

31 no han i jetzt zum Rolf gsa: (.) i han gsa:

32 gell=heut=isch=langere=Samschdich. ihr=fahret=net=nach=Stu:gart?

33 no hot er gsa: eigentlich NET. (-)

34(to Lisa:) weil du hosch ja die [arrowup]GANZ Woch irgendwas.

35 ond dein Vater nehm i einfach net (immer gern) mittags in OH:spruch.

29Sara: *are you driving to Stuttgart today*

30Ulla: *well I- because she absolutly wants to buy some things.*

31 *so I just said to Rolf (.) I said to him*

32 *today is one of those Saturdays when the shops are open longer*

aren't you going to Stuttgart

33 *then he said well no not really (-)*

34(to Lisa:) *because during the week you've got things to do*

35 *and I don't (always) like bothering your father in the afternoons*

(Here, we are interested in the WEIL-construction in line 34 and not in the WEIL-clause in line 30, which on the content level provides the reason for

Ulla's shopping trip to Stuttgart). At first one might wonder what the WEIL-clause (line 34) connects to. Surely not to the preceding utterance, in which Ulla reconstructs her interaction with Rolf about whether he is going to drive to Stuttgart that day. Here again we have a case of "dissociation from schema instantiation" (Ono/Thompson in print). The WEIL-clause is not part of the schema instantiated in line

33, and thus is not part of the reported speech. Ulla not only switches back again from the reported world to the reporting world with this WEIL-clause, but she also introduces a change in participation framework: The addressee changes from Sara to Lisa. Thus, the WEIL-clause does not directly relate to the preceding clause itself, but to a proposition which remains implicit: "I'm considering going today - on a Saturday (because you (Lisa) are always busy during the week)".

In the next segment Mira is explaining to Geli the kind of work a common friend (Pia) is doing as a freelance publishing agent. Mira uses examples to demonstrate the kind of work she does:

VERLAGE (*PUBLISHING HOUSES*)

40Mira: du has zum=Beispiel (-) hh' beim ABC Verlag publiZI[ERT,]

41Geli: [mhm]

42Mira: und willst wech[seln,]

43Geli: [mhm]

44Mira: o- ja (.) oder wenn du en andern Verlag WILLST

45 der mehr WERBung macht (.)

46 weil=ABC=Verlag=macht=überhaupt=keine (.)

47 ja eh DANN (-) zum Beispiel KANNste sie fragen.

40Mira: for example you've been publishing hh' with the ABC publishing [house,]

41Geli: [mhm]

42Mira: and you want to [change,]

43Geli: [mhm]

44Mira: o- well (.) or if you want a different publisher

45 who does more advertising (.)

46 because ABC publishing house doesn't advertise at all (.)

47 well then for example (-) you could ask her

Mira starts with a conditional construction "wenn du..." (44). After presenting the protasis, which presupposes that other publishing houses advertise more for their books than ABC, she interrupts her construction by adding a parenthetical causal clause which provides a reason for this implication: "weil=ABC=Verlag=macht=überhaupt=keine (.)" (*because ABC publishing house doesn't advertise at all*). Thus, with the WEIL-clause Mira "jumps out" of the construction in progress, adds an explanation and then "jumps back" into her conditional construction.

Sometimes, however, speakers leave their original construction to add a WEIL-clause that provides some sort of explanation and then do not "jump back" into their original construction as in the next dialog. Here Clara, who is planning to travel to Thailand, asks her colleague Nora for information.

THAILAND

12Nora: hh' Chiang Rai isch schlimm was do: jetzt [arrowup]anfängt (.) du:

13 des- dieser brutale [arrowup]SEXtourismus hihhh'

14Clara: des (hasch mitkriegt?)

15Nora: AB.SO.LUT BRUTAL.

16 und zwar diese (-) Schwei((hi))ne von Typ((hi))en die da kommen (-)

17 weil ja: Bangkok isch ihne zu sehr aidsverseucht=

18Clara: =ahja.

19Nora: und jetzt kommen se dorthin.=

20Clara: =un- jetzt kommen se da[hin]

21Nora: [mhm].

12Nora: hh' Chiang Rai it's terrible what's starting to go on there

13 the- this brutal kind of sex tourism hihhh'

14Clara: you (saw this)

15Nora: it's totally unbelievable

16 well these (-) bru((hi))tes ((hi)) who go there (-)

17 because they think Bangkok is already too much infected with aids=

18Clara: =oh yeah

19Nora: and now they go there=

20Clara: =an- now they go th[ere]

21Nora: [mhm].

After the highly affective evaluation, Nora starts with a construction "und zwar diese (-) I-Schwei ((hi))ne von Typ((hi))en die da kommen" (*well these (-) bru((hi))tes ((hi)) who go there (-)* (16), stops, leaves the construction in progress and adds a WEIL-clause, which provides an epistemic reason for her conclusion that these tourists are "Schwei((hi))ne". The causal explanation may have been triggered by the fact that Nora presents a highly affect-loaded evaluation "AB.SO.LUT BRUTAL." (15) and refers to these tourists as "Schwei((hi))ne" - without receiving any response from her co-participant. Her giggling interspersed into the highly evaluative term indicates the sensitivity of this typification and thus invites her recipient to display co-alignment. However, when no response appears, Nora adds the account "weil ja: Bangkok isch ihne zu sehr aidsverseucht" (17) which had lead her to the morally loaded judgment. In contrast to VERLAGE, the speaker in this episode does not return to her original construction. Here again, the

dissociation of the WEIL-clause from the preceding construction is indicated by means of syntactic and prosodic non-integration.

2.3. Collaborative production of Causal-Construction

So far, in this analysis we have only considered causal clauses, uttered by a single speaker. However, in everyday interactions causal constructions often appear as collaborative productions of different speakers. [19] At first, one might assume that such jointly produced

12

causal-constructions involving two different speakers and spreading over two turns demand for non-integrative word order. However, this is not the case: a second speaker joining a prior speaker's utterance by adding a WEIL-clause, usually marks this kind of collaboration by means of syntactic integration. [20]

(i) The display of congruent perspectives [21]

In the following segment Lena is complaining to Kai about her cousin's behavior. Kai signals co-alignment with Lena's indignation and formulates a hypothetical comparison between the cousin and the local baker (Lehmann):

BÄCKER LEHMANN (*BAKER LEHMANN*)

107Kai: [arrowup]mein Gott[arrowdown]. da müßt de Bäcker LehMANN (-)

108 eh eh müßt- müßt en wa:hnsinnigen Auf- eh Terror machen,

109 wei:l irgendeinen anderer Bäcker ihm in sein Ge[arrowup]biet rein [(geht.)]

110Lena: [JA. NA[arrowup]TÜRLICH.

111 WEIL ER AU [arrowup]WECKLE BÄCKT.

112Kai: JA: also [des isch]

107Kai: my Gosh it would be like when the baker Lehmann (-)

108 eh eh starts raising an incredible terror

109 because some other baker enters his [territory]

110Lena: [yeah off] course

111 because he also bakes rolls

112Kai: yeah well [this is]

By presenting agreement tokens ("JA NA[arrowup]TÜRLICH") (110) and adding a causal clause, Lena not only displays her acceptance of Kai's hypothetical comparison but actively joins in extending his rhetorical format ("similitudo"). With her expansion of Kai's turn as well as the analogy, Lena is communicating her congruent perspective of the event.

The question arises why collaborative causal constructions display integrative word order. By adding a WEIL-clause to prior speaker's utterance, the information of the preceding clause is treated as "given" (thematic). This constellation of a thematic main clause and a rhematic WEIL-clause seems to make integrative word order necessary. [22] Furthermore, in using syntactic integration, the second speaker grammatically incorporates her utterance into the preceding turn and iconically marks her turn as a continuation of his. This strategy comes close to what Falk (1979) calls "conversational dueting": The second speaker takes over the turn of the prior speaker and continues in an unisono way, signaling that s/he is "in synchrony" with the prior speaker.

(ii) Supporting one's own argumentative line

Whereas in BÄCKER LEHMANN the second speaker had taken for the floor to produce an expansion of prior speaker's clause and thereby demonstrating concordance and agreement, in the following example - which is taken from an argumentative context - the second speaker ties her utterance to the prior one and continues by outlining reasons for the prior speaker's assertion which contradict his argumentative line. The transcript is taken from an argumentation between Doris and her Chinese colleagues (Yang and Tan) on women's rights in China and the West:

YANG 24a

67Doris: also [ich] VERSTEH eigentlich nich unbedingt

68Tan: [hm]

69Doris: WARUM du sagst eh in in Kina gibts kein Frauenproblem.

70 des Problem is eigentlich das gleiche bloß daß

71 (-) eh:m? daß es mehr verTUSCHT wird.

72Yang: * keine so stark wie hier*

73Doris: JA WEIL DIE FRAUEN HIER BEWUßTER SIND.

67Doris: *well [I] don't quite understand*

68Tan: [hm]

69Doris: *WHY you say that eh in in China there aren't any women's problems*

70 *the problem actually is the same it's just that*

71 (-) *eh:m? that it is hushed up much more.*

72Yang: ** not as bad as here**

73Doris: *yes because women are more conscious here*

In line 73 Doris latches her WEIL-clause back to Yang's assessment that "women's problems" in China

are not as bad as in Germany. She thus takes his turn as premise to which she adds the agreement token "JA" plus a causal clause. The WEIL-clause provides an explanation that supports her own argumentative line but contradicts her opponent's line of arguing. Thus, in argumentative contexts, close linkage of a WEIL-clause to a preceding assessment can be used as an argumentative strategy to support one's own argumentative line and at the same time attack the oponent's line of argumentation. [23]

(iii) Understanding check [24]

Participants also use syntactically integrated WEIL-clauses to check their understanding of a prior speaker's turn.

Gabi had noticed a wood tick on her leg and had gone to a pharmacy to inquire about what to do. However, the pharmacists turned out to be "totally incompetent". In an affectively loaded way Gabi tells Ira on the phone about her interaction with the pharmacists:

14

ZECKENBISSE (*WOOD TICK BITES*)

11Gabi: und die ham mir wirklich nix anderes sagen können

12 als daß ich halt mal zum Schmidt gehn soll.

13Ira: und Schmidt, weil des DEIN Arzt isch [oder was.]

14Gabi: [JA:hh]

15Ira: 'hhhh hhh' SCHEI:::ßE.

11Gabi: and they really couldn't tell me anything else

12 besides that I should go to see Schmidt

13Ira: and to Schmidt, because he's your doctor [or what]

14Gabi: [yeah]

15Ira: 'hhhh hhh' shit

Ira's causal clause (14) connects back to Gabi's utterance and provides a "candidate" explanation for the preceding statement (Ford 1993:127). Also in cases of offering "candidate" explanations, the causal clause is closely linked to prior speaker's turn, taking prior speaker's assessment as given material to work on. This close linkage is iconically represented by means of syntactic integration.

(vi) Astonished questions

Closely connected to checks of understanding are WEIL-constructions, which are used to express astonished questions: The second speaker ties her WEIL-clause back to prior speaker's utterance and provides a "candidate explanation"; however, in contrast to a check for understanding, this type of candidate explanation communicates the speaker's surprise or astonishment. In the following segment Rolf tells Anna about the troubles he had had with a student who had cheated on an exam. After noticing

that she was cheating, he had taken away her exam. The student then reported this to the dean, and a teacher's conference had been held.

SEMINAR

44Rolf: und dann gabs ja ne große Lehrerkonferenz,

45 (eh) ne kleine Lehrerkonfe[renz]

46Anna: [wie?][arrowup]<weil DU des Manus[arrowup]KRIPT WEGNOMMEN hast.>

47Rolf: ja=ja. die hat in der- ich hab die AUFSICHT ghabt.

44Rolf: and then there was a big teacher's conference

45 (eh) a small teacher's confe[rence]

46Anna: [what?] because you took the exam away from her

47Rolf: yeah=yeah she had in the- I was the one supervising the exam

Anna's causal clause does not only provide a "candidate" explanation for Rolf's aßeßment that a conference was held, but at the same time it expreßwes her astonishment: The high global pitch, the local increase of volume and the rising-falling pitch movements function as prosodic means of contextualizing surprise and astonishment.

The analysis of "WEIL"-clauses in everyday interactions reveals that the two word order patterns (WEIL with main clause order and WEIL with subordinate clause order) function as resources, which speakers of colloquial everyday German use to communicate particular discourse-pragmatic meanings: In cases of close causal connections operating in the content domain and with a high degree of dependency between the main clause and the WEIL-clause, subordinate word order is used; in cases of relative independence between the two clauses; e.g. in epistemic and speech act causality as well as in cases in which the WEIL-clause the does not directly relate to the preceding clause, syntactic non-integration is used. Syntactic devices such as word order are highly iconic: pragmatic non-integration (i.e. both clauses have their own illocutionary forces) is communicated by means of syntactic non-integration; and close pragmatic integration (i.e. WEIL-clauses are within the scope of the main clause illocutionary force and the WEIL-clause provides a content level reason for the preceding clause) is communicated by means of grammatical incorporation.

Thus, in order to communicate particular discourse-pragmatic meanings in colloquial spoken German WEIL is reinterpreted as a coordinate conjunction displaying main clause syntax.^[25] In such cases of reinterpretation, the WEIL-clause as well as the preceding one has its own illocutionary force. The WEIL-clause is subdued from the scope of the would-be main predication and independently expresses speaker's point of view (Lehmann (1991:526). (Thus, WEIL as a coordinate conjunction replaces the causal coordinate conjunction DENN. As pointed out in Günthner (1993a), DENN - as a causal conjunction - is only very seldomly used in colloquial language; in certain Southern German varieties DENN is used mainly as a modal particle.)

Fußnoten:

- [1] I would like to thank Peter Auer and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen for their valuable comments on an earlier version of this paper. Thanks also to Allison Wetterlin for her help with the English.
- [2] Cf. Gaumann (1982); Küper (1984; 1991); Günthner (1993a); Wegener (1993); Keller (1993).
- [3] Cf. König/Van der Auwera (1988).
- [4] Speakers of colloquial German also often display main clause syntax in adversative WÄHREND ("while") (e.g. "den Peter find ich okay, während den Paul, den find ich entsetzlich"; *I find Peter okay; whereas Paul, I find him horrible*) and conditional constructions (e.g. "wenn Paul anruft; ich bin im Garten"; *if Paul calls, I am in the garden*). In this article, however, I shall only consider causal and concessive constructions.
- [5] Actually, up to the 16th century both word order constructions were possible; however - due to the influence of Latin - around the 17th century verb-final position became the standardized norm in subordinate clauses (Arndt 1956). Cf. also Sandig (1973) for the historical development of subordinate clause order in German.
- [6] Cf. Küper (1991) Günthner (1993a).
- [7] The family data stems from middle-class families in Southern Germany (Baden-Württemberg); the participants of the "conversations among friends" are 25-45 year-old academics from different parts of Germany.
- [8] Cf. Halliday/Hasan's (1976:240ff.) distinction between "external" and "internal" conjunctive relations.
- [9] Thus, in WEIL-constructions with subordinate word order the main clause neither has to be always prosodically realized with rising intonation, nor does - as Wegener (1993) claims - the whole construction necessarily have to be uttered as one single intonational unit.
- [10] Generally, when the initial clause is presented as presupposed, it has a rising intonation and the following WEIL-clause is prosodically integrated into one intonation contour embracing both the main and the subordinate clause. Cf. also Küper (1991). Sweetser (1990) uses the terms "commaless intonation" for prosodic integration and "comma intonation", when the "because"-clause is preceded by a "clause-final intonation drop".
- [11] In cases of speech act qualifications, a substitution of WEIL with the coordinate conjunction DENN is possible: "ihr habt nich s- (.) zufällig s'Blasrohr. (.) oder? denn da is ja em Urs sein Flugartikel drin".
- [12] Cf. Foley/Van Valin's (1984:239) typology of clause combining; and also Lehmann (1988:193).
- [13] Cf. Sacks (1987).
- [14] For epistemic causal clauses cf. Sweetser (1990). Cf. also Küper's (1991) concept of epistemic causality, which is restricted to cases where the conjuncts (p and q) are reversed (q, because p). I shall adopt Sweetser's broader concept of epistemic causality. Cf. also Keller (1993) for the use of epistemic WEIL and Willems' (1994) critique of Keller.
- [15] In contrast to syntactically integrated WEIL-clauses, WEIL-clauses with syntactic non-integration can display "main-clause phenomena" (Green 1976). Cf. Günthner (1993a).
- [16] For the term "separate assertion" cf. König/van der Auwera (1988:111ff.).
- [17] Cf. Ono/Thompson (1994).

[18] Küper (1991); Günthner (1993a).

[19] Cf. Ford (1993) for collaborative causal constructions in English conversations; and Ono/Thompson (1994) for different types of collaborative activities.

[20] There are no cases of syntactic non-integration in collaboratively produced WEIL-clauses in my data.

[21] Cf. also Ford (1993) for collaborative "display of agreement".

[22] Cf. Küper (1991); Günthner (1993a).

[23] Cf. Günthner (1993b).

[24] Cf. Ford (1993).

[25] WEIL with main clause syntax cannot be used in initial position (preceeding the main clause). This syntactic restriction is due to the fact that coordinate conjunction must go between what they coordinate. Cf. Günthner (1993a); Lehmann (1991).

3. OBWOHL-CONSTRUCTIONS

3.1. Subordinate clause order in OBWOHL-clauses

As with WEIL-clauses, the standard unmarked word order for OBWOHL-concessives is verb-final position (i.e. syntactic integration), marking the OBWOHL-clause as grammatically incorporated into the preceding main clause.

In the next dialog Hanna is telling Sara about a colleague (Eva) who had already started to apply for a job, although she has not yet finished her habilitation (her post-doc thesis):

KAFFEEKLATSCH (*COFFEEKLATSCH*)

16Hanna: eh:m da kamen wir (.)

17 da erzählte die- die erzählte daß

18 SIE=jetzt=anfängt=sich=zu=bewerben,

19 ob[wohl] ihre Habil noch nich fertig is.

20Sara: [mhm]

21Hanna: ehm (-) und dann kamen wir da irgendwie drauf

16Hanna: ehm we got to talking

17 she told me that she- she

18 she's started to apply for jobs

19 although she hasn't finished her post-doc thesis yet

20Sara: [mhm]

21 Hanna: ehm and then somehow we got on to the topic

As Quirk et al. (1985: 1098) state, "Concessive clauses indicate that the situation in the matrix clause is contrary to expectation in the light of what is said in the concessive clause". Concessives carry an element of "contradiction" or "surprise"[\[1\]](#) or, as König/van der Auwera (1988:107) point out, there is a "relationship of 'normal incompatibility' or dissonance between the two component propositions".

However, as Thompson (1987) points out, concession should be treated as a discourse-functional relation and thus has to be studied in its discursive environment. In using the concessive construction "die erzählte daß SIE=jetzt=anfängt=sich=zu=bewerben, obwohl ihre Habil noch nich fertig is." (17-19), Hanna expresses the fact that *Eva has not finished her post-doc thesis* does not have the expected consequence that she cannot apply for a job yet. The concessive clause "obwohl ihre Habil noch nich fertig is." (*although she hasn't finished her post-doc thesis*), which operates in the content domain, is within the scope of the main clause illocutionary force. The main clause displays a rising intonation contour, signaling that the present utterance is still in progress. However, syntactically integrated OBWOHL-clauses do not necessarily have to be prosodically integrated.

In the next segment Maria is gossiping about another family (the Müller's) and supports her evaluation that they are "unheimliche SPIEßER" ('incredible petit bourgeois conformists') and "engstirnig"

('narrow-minded') by providing an example. Herr Müller would not allow his daughter to wear "jeans" and bought her a dress instead:

FAMILIE MÜLLER (*FAMILY MÜLLER*)

6Maria: wo GOTT=und=die=Welt=JEA:NS getragen hat

7 hat ER ihr e KLEID beim ABC LADEN gekauft

8 aber koine Jea:ns.

9 (1.0)

10 obwohl des Mädle GHEULT hot.

11 (4.0)

6Maria: at a time when God and the world was wearing jeans

7 he bought her a dress at the ABC shop

8 but no jeans

9 (1.0)

10 although the girl was crying

11 (4.0)

Maria presents the example (6-8) to support her morally sensitive evaluation of the father. However, after the expected recipient responses and co-alignment fail to follow, she adds an OBWOHL-clause to introduce a further piece of information: *the girl was crying* (10). The OBWOHL-clause thus functions as an additional argument to support her negative judgment. It implies, that in "normal situations" one could expect that if the daughter is crying, the father would give in and fulfill her wish by buying her a pair of jeans. The post-completion OBWOHL-extension - although marked off from the preceding clause by means of a pause and an own prosodic contour - still operates on the proposition of the preceding clause (content domain) and is retrospectively tied to the illocutionary force of the preceding statement. Thus, by using subordinate clause order post-completion OBWOHL-clauses still function as regular concessives. However, as the following examples reveal, post-completion OBWOHL-extensions with main clause order invite a different interpretation.

3.2. Main clause order in OBWOHL-clauses

In colloquial German, speakers often use syntactically non-integrated OBWOHL-clauses. These non-standard variations, which display main clause order, have - as the analysis will show - specific discourse-pragmatic functions.

Ulla is talking about a neighbor who suddenly became seriously ill and comes to the conclusion that one can be lucky enough to have had good health so far:

KRANKHEITEN (*ILLNESSES*)

36Ulla: do: kann man bis=jetzt=no=eigentlich (-)

37 TOI. TOI. TOI (.) no ganz FROH sei. gell?

38 (0.5)

39 OBWOHL man weiß jo gar net was in oim SCHLUMMERT.

40 (1.5)

18

41 vielleicht sen mir au scho bald mol DO.GWESE.

36Ulla: up to now one can actually (-)

37 knock on wood (.) be glad. right

38 (0.5)

39 although one never knows what is lying dormant inside of you

40 (1.5)

41 perhaps our time in this world will soon be up

In lines 36-37 Ulla states that she is glad that she has always been healthy up to now. However, after a short pause, the OBWOHL-clause introduces a sudden switch in her perspective: "OBWOHL man weiß jo gar net was in oim SCHLUMMERT." (*although one never knows what is lying dormant inside of you*). Here, the OBWOHL-clause does not present an "incompatibility" between the proposition of the preceding main clause and that of the OBWOHL-clause, but it limits the validity of the preceding utterance. Instead of lying in the scope of the main clause illocutionary force, the OBWOHL-clause has its own illocutionary force and thus functions as an independent assertion.

The next segment is taken from an interaction between Gero and Tom. Tom invited Gero to dinner. However, before they start eating, Gero has to make a phone call. Because he does not know the particular telephone number, he intends to call information, and therefore asks Tom for a pencil:

SKIFAHREN (*SKIING*)

32Gero: DU=ich brauch en kleinen STIFT.

33 (0.5)

34Tom: moment mal (...)

35Gero: ob[arrowup]wohl NE. eigntlich weiß ichs auch AUSwendig. glaub=ich.

36 (0.5) WEI:L ich nämlich die Vorwahl is: (0.5)

37 NU:LL FÜ:NF eh: (1.0) drei drei acht.

32Gero: *hey I need a small pencil*

33 (0.5)

34Tom: *just a second (...)*

35Gero: *although no actually I do know it by heart*

36 (0.5) *because the area code is (0.5)*

37 zero five eh: (1.0) *three three eight*

Gero's OBWOHL-clause does not operate on the propositional level of his preceding demand for a pencil, but rather on a metacommunicative level: After having asked for a pencil, a short pause arises, then he realizes that he does remember the number and therefore does not need the pencil. The negation particle "ne" (35) supports this interpretation. The main clause syntax in the OBWOHL-clause thus implies a particular interpretation of the sequence which contrasts with the interpretation, a subordinate clause syntax would have implied:

(a) The subordinate syntax: "Ich brauch en kleinen Stift, obwohl ichs eigentlich auch auswendig weiß" would suggest that even though the speaker knows the number by heart, he still needs the pencil. The two dissonant

propositions are presented as co-occurrent. The truth of the main clause is asserted, despite the proposition contained in the OBWOHL-clause; i.e. both clauses are presented as valid.

(b) However, the main clause syntax: "Ich brauch en kleinen Stift (-) obwohl eigentlich weiß ichs auch auswendig" suggests that the speaker at first assumes he needs a pencil. Then, however, after he realized that he does remember the number and therefore does not need the pencil, he corrects himself.

In the next example, Eva has prepared green tea and offers some to Hans:

GRÜNER TEE (*GREEN TEA*)

44Eva: *willsch mal proBIERE?*

45Hans: *hm. ich MAG kein grünen Tee.*

46 (0.5)

47Hans: *obwohl GEB mir doch mal ne (-) h' HALBE Tasse voll.*

44Eva: *you want to try some?*

45Hans: *hm. I don't like green tea.*

46 (0.5)

47Hans: *although pour me a half cup of it*

Hans first rejects the offer by stating his dislike for green tea (45). After a short pause, he changes his mind and asks for a half a cup of tea (47). The OBWOHL-clause again limits and corrects the validity of the preceding speech act. As in the previous examples, both clauses not only have their own prosodic contours but also their own illocutionary forces; however, in GRÜNER TEE, the illocutionary acts performed by the two clauses differ: The preceding clause is a declarative, functioning as a refusal; whereas the OBWOHL-clause introduces an imperative. Cases with differing illocutionary acts demand OBWOHL-clauses with syntactic non-integration; i.e. OBWOHL with subordinate clause order would not only give a different reading to it, but would not be possible at all.

In contrast to integrated OBWOHL-clauses, where the speaker asserts two propositions 'p' and q, which "normally do not go together", in non-integrated OBWOHL-clauses the speaker first asserts p; then however - contrary to expectations of 'p' being valid - s/he presents another proposition 'q' that corrects the preceding statement and thus limits the validity of 'p'. So, non-integrated OBWOHL-clauses can be considered as post-completion extensions, which have the meaning of "against what I just said". They no longer function as "concessives" in the strict sense (entailing both components 'p' and 'q'), but come close to "adversative relations"[\[2\]](#) or even to repair formats, in which the second utterance 'p' restricts the

validity of the previous statement 'p'. In contrast to WEIL-clauses added as "post-completion-extensions", OBWOHL-clauses do not function to support one's preceding statement but to take it back (either totally or only parts of it). Thus, the pragmatic function of this kind of OBWOHL-clause exceeds that of a concessive relation and comes close to a repair format.

3.3. Collaborative production of OBWOHL-constructions

Similar to WEIL, OBWOHL-clauses often appear as joint productions of different speakers. A second speaker uses the prior speaker's turn to add an OBWOHL-clause on to. In contrast to joint WEIL-clauses, collaborative OBWOHL-clauses may display syntactic integration as well as non-integration.

3.3.1. Subordinate clause order in collaborative OBWOHL-clauses

(i) Adding further explanations

A second speaker can join a prior speaker's turn with an OBWOHL-clause, and add further explanations, hereby constituting her or his status as a "co-teller".[\[3\]](#)

Leo and Anna are talking to Paul about their intercultural experiences in China and mention the - in their eyes - "disturbing fact" that the Chinese often laugh as reaction to troubles-talk. Leo states that in situations when one is telling a Chinese person about a personal problem and the co-participant responds by laughing, one can become "really angry":

INTERKULTURELLE PROBLEME (*INTERCULTURAL PROBLEMS*)

33Leo: da reagiert man dann schon zie:mlich HEFTIG.

34 und wird echt SAUER.

35Paul: (mhm)

36Anna: obwohl mans WEIß.

37Leo: ja=ja. obWOHL mans weiß. (.) und schon drüber glesen hat.

33Leo: *then one reacts rather harshly*

34 *and becomes really angry*

35Paul: (mhm)

36Anna: *although one knows about it*

37Leo: *yeah=yeah although one knows about it (.) and has already read about it*

Anna in line 36 provides an OBWOHL-extension to Leo's preceding statement. The OBWOHL-turn adds further background information emphasizing the unexpectedness of one's reaction: even though one knows about cultural differences concerning laughing, one still reacts with anger. Thus, by

connecting a syntactically integrated concessive clause to prior's speaker's turn, Anna establishes her status as "co-teller" (Ford 1993:124ff.) and as someone who also has the relevant knowledge about the topic.

(ii) Astonished questions

Similarly to collaborated WEIL-clauses, a second speaker can also raise an astonished question by means of a joined OBWOHL-clause. In this case she also uses syntactic integration.

Du, a Chinese lecturer of German and her German colleagues (Eli and Anna) are talking about possible reasons why so few women have leading positions at Chinese universities. Du explains that female Chinese students usually assume that they are not as intelligent as men:

DU 3

71Du: die meisten Frauen. GLAUBEN. auch. daß sie eh nicht so

72 intregente? intelligenter? und auch=

73Eli: =mhm

74Du: nicht so [eh] tüchtiger als die Männer [sind.]

75Anna: [mhm] [mhm]

76Eli: [arrowup]<OBWOHL sie oft BESSERE PRÜFUNGSergebnisse haben.>(.)

77 [arrowup]<trotzdem GLAUBen sie's nicht.>

78Du: trotzdem.

71Du: *most of the women believe that they eh are not as*

72 *intregente intelligent and also=*

73Eli: *=mhm*

74Du: *not so [eh] hard working as [men]*

75Anna: *[mhm] [mhm]*

76Eli: *although they often have better results in their exams (.)*

77 *they still won't believe it*

78Du: *still*

With the OBWOHL-clause (76) Eli not only checks her understanding but displays her astonishment. The OBWOHL-question signals that the preceding assessment (*most of the female students think they are not as intelligent as the male students*) contradicts certain facts (*women's results in the exams are better than men's*) and thus surprises her. The astonishment is expressed by prosodic devices, such as high global pitch, changes of pitch movement and locally increased loudness. [4] The OBWOHL-clause provides a particular fact which under normal conditions would contradict the preceding conclusion. This seemingly contradiction or dissonant fact is closely linked to the prior's speaker's turn and takes the preceding assessment as given material to work with. This close linkage is supported by means of syntactic integration.

The following segment is taken from the same interaction between Du, Eli and Anna. Du has just told about a very successful Chinese manager, who had been living with a woman and was not married. Therefore, his private life was considered to be "mentally corrupted" and he was thrown into prison.

DU 8

53Du: *ah verdorben. geistlich verdorben.*

54 *und dann muß eh kann er nicht mehr eh?*

55Anna: *mhm*

56Du: *ja (auf diese Stelle arbeiten dann er)*

57 ** muß sogar ins Gefängnis geworfen.**

58Eli: *[arrowup]<[arrowup]WA:S (-) obWOHL er das ALLES geleistet hat.*

59Du: *ja obwohl.*

53Du: *ah corrupted mentally corrupted and then*

54 *he has to eh he can't any longer eh?*

55Anna: *mhm*

56Du: yeah (do his job anymore. then he)

57 even has to be thrown in prison

58Eli: what (-) although he achieved all this?

59Du: yeah although

Eli's indignant exclamation "WAS" followed by an OBWOHL-clause marks her astonishment and moral indignation concerning Du's report that the particular manager who worked very efficiently, was sent to prison for leading a "loose" life. Although the OBWOHL-clause is taken up by another speaker and is disconnected from the preceding clause and indignation cry, Eli still connects it to Du's previous turn by means of syntactic integration.

Expression of astonishment and indignation often display features of question-answer-sequences. As they comment on "outrageous behavior" which seems hardly believable and contradicts expectations of "normal behavior", speakers tend to signal their indignation by demonstrating a "fictitious" problem of understanding or doubt. [5] In emphasizing the concessive conjunction "ja obwohl" (DU 8) and "trotzdem" (DU 3), Du acknowledges the dissonance and thus displays her co-alignment with the indignation of her co-participants.

3.3.2. Main clause order in collaborative OBWOHL-clauses

In the preceding examples we could observe how second speakers use syntactically integrated OBWOHL-clauses to join prior speaker's utterance and check their understanding or express their astonishment and indignation about the facts presented. In the following transcripts, in which second speakers join prior speakers' turns by adding syntactically non-integrated

OBWOHL-clauses, these collaborative constructions reveal very different functions.

The display of disagreement

Gerda and Anna who both work in China are talking about Gerda's eye problems. Gerda mentions her fear of having an eye operation done in China and that she is considering going back to Germany for the operation:

WUHAN

1Gerda: aber ich traue mich nicht das hier zu machen.

2Anna: [he. eh.]

3Gerda: [(würdest] du auch nicht bei so ner wichtigen Stelle ne.

4 (ich warte ab bis zum) Winter.

5 ich fahre im Februar zurück.

6 meine Eltern (.....)

7Anna: obwohl es gibt ja hier ganz GUTE Krankenhäuser. gell=

8Gerda: =man kann GLÜCK haben,

9 und man kann PECH haben

10 ich hab auch schon (-) Pech gehabt.

1Gerda: *but I don't have the nerve to do it here*

2Anna: *[no]*

3Gerda: *[(you) wouldn't] when it concerns such an important part of your body*

4 *(I'm gonna wait till) summer*

5 *I will be going back in August*

6 *my sister (.....)*

7Anna: *although there are also good hospitals here you know=*

8Gerda: *=one can have luck*

9 *and one can have bad luck*

10 *I've already had bad luck once*

After Gerda expresses her fears of having the operation in China, Anna produces a disagreement in form of an OBWOHL-clause "obwohl es gibt ja hier ganz GUTE Krankenhäuser gell" (*although there are also good hospitals here you know*). The OBWOHL-clause presents an assertion "die Krankenhäuser hier sind ganz gut" which contradicts Gerda's implicit assumption and thus the reason for her fears. By using syntactic non-integration, the OBWOHL-clause functions similar to a non-integrative OBWOHL-clause uttered by a single speaker: it limits the validity of the preceding turn.

Word order in collaborative OBWOHL-clauses thus functions to differentiate between co-telling explanations or astonished questions on the one hand and disagreement on the other. If Anna's OBWOHL-clause had displayed subordinate syntax, the interpretation could be that of a surprised or astonished question:

<

Gerda: ich trau mich nich das hier zu machen. (*I don't have the nerve to do it here*)

Anna: obwohl es hier ganz gute Krankenhäuser gibt. (*although there are also good hospitals here you know*)

However, the OBWOHL-clause with main clause syntax indicates disagreement. This interpretation is supported by Gerda's reaction: she justifies her fear by referring to her own bad experience with Chinese hospitals: "ich hab auch schon (-) Pech gehabt" (*I've already had bad luck once*) (10).

In the following example, Klaus and Hans are discussing the quality of non-alcoholic beer:

SOMMERHITZE[6] (*SUMMER HEAT*)

1Klaus: das is echt s'BESTE BIER. (-)

2 ich mein von den alkoholfreien.

3 (-)

4Hans: hhm. obwohl es gibt schon BESSERE.

5 zum Beispiel BECKS is bei weitem TRINKBARER.

1Klaus: *this is really the best beer (-)*

2 *I mean among the alcohol free ones*

3 (-)

4Hans: *hhm. although there are better ones*

5 *for example Becks is much more drinkable*

After Klaus' assessment concerning the high quality of the beer he is drinking, a short pause appears, which may already indicate upcoming disagreement. Then, Hans uses an OBWOHL-clause to utter his disagreeing second assessment: "obwohl es gibt schon BESSERE." (*although there are better ones*). Syntactic integration ("das is echt s'BESTE BIER. ich mein von den alkoholfreien obwohl es schon BESSERE gibt") would not be possible here, because the disagreement does not only modify the preceding turn but is a straight forward contradiction.

In contrast to syntactically integrated OBWOHL-clauses, which take the preceding clause as given material to work with, syntactically non-integrated collaborative OBWOHL-clauses refute the preceding clause and provide partially or totally contradicting assessments. The reading of these joined OBWOHL-clauses is something like "As against what you just said...".

The analysis of OBWOHL-clauses in everyday interactions reveals that - as in WEIL-constructions - the syntactic options (main clause syntax and subordinate clause syntax) are resources speakers exploit in order to communicate specific discourse-pragmatic meaning. Grammatical integration in OBWOHL-constructions is used in cases in which speakers wish to express close pragmatic connections between the two clauses. Whereas, speakers reinterpret OBWOHL as a coordinate conjunction in cases in which they intend to limit or correct the validity of the assertion postulated in the preceding speech act.

4. WOBEI-constructions

4.1. Subordinate clause order in WOBEI-clauses

Traditionally, WOBEI does not function as a subordinate conjunction used in adverbial clauses, but rather as a pronominal adverb introducing an embedded clause, e.g. "ich hab dann Goffman im Seminar

behandelt, wobei ich besonders auf dieses GENDER Buch einging" (*in the seminar I talked about Goffman, whereby I in particular concentrated on his book on gender*). The subordinate clause introduced by the pronominal adverb WOBEI introduces a co-occurring aspect in the sense of "whereby"; or "while doing a, I did b".

In the following segment, Sonja tells her co-participant about the Milgram experiment:

MILGRAM EXPERIMENT[7]

1 Sonja: Milgram Experiment heißt des und des war so n Versuch

2 wobei die Versuchspersonen selbst nicht wußten

3 daß sie selbst die Versuchspersonen sind

4 gings darum sie sollten andere Leute mit Stromschlägen bestrafen

1 Sonja: this is called Milgram experiment and it was an experiment

2 whereby[8] the test persons themselves didn't know

3 that they were being tested

4 they were supposed to punish the other people with electric shocks

The subordinate clause introduced by the pronominal adverb WOBEI ("wobei die Versuchspersonen selbst nicht wußten ...") relates back to the main clause ("des war so n Versuch"): it introduces a sort of relative clause which explains this kind of experiment by providing further details.

In my data, however, a different use of WOBEI is much more frequent than the traditional pronominal adverb: WOBEI is being used as a "concessive" connector which may display - similar to OBWOHL - syntactic integration as well as syntactic non-integration.

Ira tells Lisa about the problems she has had with her friend and that she "wanted to get out of this very close relationship":

FREUNDINNEN (*GIRL-FRIENDS*)

32 Ira: ich WOLLte auch da rauskommen.

33 ich hatte KEIne LUST mehr.

34 ich=hab=des=auch=wirklich=LANnge=gelebt.

35 Lisa: mhm. [mhm.]

36 Ira: [so] zu IHRen Bedingungen [weißt du.]

37 Lisa: [mhm]

38 (0.7)

39 Ira: wobei ich sie UNHEIMlich gern mag

40 und sie mir sehr NAH is.

32Ira: *I really wanted to get out of it.*

33 *I just didn't want it anymore.*

34 *I've lived through it long enough*

35Lisa: *mhm. [mhm.]*

36Ira: *[following] her conditions [you know.]*

37Lisa: *[mhm]*

38 (0.7)

39Ira: *whereby I really like her a lot*

40 *and I feel very close to her*

The WOBEI-clause in line 39 does not function as a pronominal adverb anymore, but comes close to a concessive conjunction. After having mentioned that she wants to get out of this kind of relationship, Lisa states the fact: "wobei ich sie UNHEIMlich gern mag". This co-existing fact, however, stands in some conflict to the preceding assertion. Similarly to OBWOHL-concessives, here WOBEI presents a fact 'p' ("I really like her a lot"), which "normally" is not expected to go together with 'q' ("I really wanted to get out of this relationship"). Ira thus indicates that the situation mentioned in the preceding utterance is contrary to expectation in the light of what was said in the WOBEI-clause.

This concessive use of WOBEI is neither mentioned in German grammars nor in any of the linguistic studies of main clause syntax in causal and concessive clauses. In the data at hand, it is only used in the interactions among the young and middle aged academics; it is not used - except once - in the family interactions. (The exception concerns the use of WOBEI by a 25-year-old woman). Moreover, in the data collected in the early and middle 80's among (young and middle aged) academics, there is only one single case where WOBEI is used as a concessive conjunction. This suggests that the concessive use of WOBEI may be a recent phenomenon in spoken German.

4.2. Main clause order in WOBEI-clauses

Speakers not only reinterpret WOBEI as a concessive conjunction, but in certain contexts they also use main clause order in WOBEI-constructions.

The following transcript is taken from a dinner table conversation between Urs, Fritz and Claus. Urs, a journalist, is telling about his colleague Fred, who cannot sing very well. However, one can "program" Fred in such a way that if one sings a "stupid melody" in his presence, he will get this melody in his head, and he will be singing it all day long:

PROGRAMMIEREN (*PROGRAMMING*)

1Urs: ja und den FRED, (-) der kann eigentlich kaum singen,

2 aber den kannst so schön PROGRAMMIEREN,

3Fritz: hahahahaha

4Urs: also du mußt- du mußt irgendeine GANZ IDIOTISCHE Melodie

5 du=kannst=zum=Beispiel=deutsche=Nationalhyme=singen.=

6Claus: =mhm=

27

7Urs: =ja. (-) woBEI des is PEINlich wenn du irgendwie? (-)

8 in- in? Sachsen bist, (.)

9 und du hast den auf Nationahymne programmiert,

10 und du stehst=nun=da=irgendwie=vor der PDS Zentrale

1Urs: *yeah and Fred (-) actually he can't sing very well*

2 *but you can program him in such a nice way*

3Fritz: *hahahahaha*

4Urs: *you just- you just have to sing any stupid melody*

5 *for example you can start singing the German national anthem*

6Claus: =mhm=

7Urs: =yeah. (-) whereby this is embarrassing when you are somehow (-)

8 in- in Saxony (.)

9 and you programmed him to sing the national anthem

10 and you are standing somewhere in front of the PDS[9] headquarters

With the syntactically non-integrated WOBEI-clause in line 7, Urs adds a further aspect to the "programming episode": Fred's singing "idiotic melodies" is funny, but can turn out to be embarrassing. The WOBEI-clause here still carries part of the traditionally WOBEI-meaning; i.e. the co-existing of two facts: *you can program Fred for example to sing the German National anthem* and at the same time *it is embarrassing when Fred has this melody in his head and keeps on singing it while you (as journalists) are in Saxony in front of the headquarters of the PDS*. However, there is also a concessive reading possible in this context: the fact that one can program Fred to sing all sorts of melodies is presented as being amusing; however in line 7 Urs, by using a WOBEI-clause, in a jocular way reveals a problematic aspect of this kind of programming: Fred's behavior can lead to embarrassing situations. Thus, the WOBEI-clause modifies the preceding funny implication of Fred's singing and receives a concessive meaning. One can substitute WOBEI with OBWOHL. Main clause syntax is used here to present the WOBEI-clause as an independent unit, which limits the funniness implied in the preceding turn. As in syntactically non-integrated OBWOHL-clauses, the WOBEI-clause is presented as a past-completion utterance, implying that Urs retrospectively adds a modification to the presented fact.

The modification provided in syntactically non-integrated WOBEI-clauses can vary from slight modifications up to clear contradictions of the previously stated fact.

The following transcript is taken from a telephone interaction between Bert and Karl. Bert called to invite Karl and Anna for dinner on Thursday evening:

ESSENSEINLADUNG (*INVITATION FOR DINNER*)

11Bert: ja KÖNNT Ihr?

12Karl: ja. (-) wobei ich hab am frühen Abend ne Univeranstaltung

28

13 und weiß nicht genau wann die zuENDE ist.

14Bert: na kannst DU [ja später nachkommen.]

15Karl: [(ich komm) dann gegebenen]falls später.

11Bert: is it okay by you

12Karl: yeah (-) whereby I have a seminar at the university in the early evening

13 and don't know for sure when it will be over

14Bert: then you can [join us later]

15Karl: [(I will come)] later if that's the case

The WOBEI-clause, which follows the agreement particle "ja" and a short pause, provides a sort of correction of the validity of the agreement. One could argue that this kind of syntactically non-integrated WOBEI-clause does not operate in the content but in the speech act domain: the speaker indicates that after he just said something, a conflicting aspect crosses his mind. The reading of this WOBEI-clause is similar to: "yes we can come. However, while I am saying this I just remember that I have a seminar at the university in the early evening".

Whereas, in ESSENSEINLADUNG, the WOBEI-clause introduced a modification of the agreement, in the following episode, a clear contradiction is presented in the WOBEI-construction:

MÜLL (*GARBAGE*)

45Herta: und=der=Restmüll,=

46Vera: =gelber Sack. das ist dann jeden ZWEITEN Montag.

47Herta: mhm.

48 (1.0) ((Vera blättert im Kalender))

49Vera: wobei das is seltener.

50 das ist NICH alle ZWEI Wochen.

51 einundzwanzigsten zweiten, zwanzigsten dritten. das is SELTENER.

45Herta: *and the left over garbage,*

46Vera: *=yellow garbage bag. it's every other Monday*

47Herta: *mhm.*

48 (1.0) *((Vera flicks through the calendar))*

49Vera: *whereby it's less frequent*

50 *it is not every two weeks*

51 *twenty first of February, twentieth of March. it's less frequent*

In line 46 Vera asserts that the yellow garbage bag will be picked up every other Monday. After Herta has signaled her acknowledgment and after a pause of one second had passed, Vera - who in the meantime has checked the dates in the garbage calendar - now explicitly contradicts her prior statement: "wobei das is seltener. das ist NICH alle ZWEI Wochen." (*whereby it's less frequent it is not every two weeks*) (49-50). Thus, the WOBEI - similarly to syntactically non-integrated OBWOHL-clauses - can function as a connector to introduce a correction, which takes back the preceding assertion.

As with syntactically non-integrated OBWOHL-clauses, WOBEI can also connect two clauses with differing illocutionary forces:

MÜNCHEN

1Harri: ah gut. ich kontaktier ihn dann sobald er jetzt mal da isch.

2Lea: jahh.

3Harri: WOBEI: (-) kann ich da ANrufen?

4 muß ich da nich hin.

5Lea: des geht glaub=ich=schon am Telefon.

1Harri: *okay fine I'll contact him then as soon as he'll be around*

2Lea: *yeahh.*

3Harri: *whereby (-) can I actually call there*

4 *don't I have to go there*

5Lea: *you can do it by phone I assume*

The WOBEI-clause (3) connects a prior declarative with a question. Again, the WOBEI-clause appears with a time gap and is added to the preceding turn as a post-completion-extension: after Harri has mentioned that he plans to contact the person they are talking about, he seems to have second thoughts about it and utters his doubts, if he can actually contact that person by phone. The WOBEI-construction has a reading similar to "okay fine I'll contact him as soon as he's around. However, while I am saying this//after I just said this, I am wondering if I can actually do it by phone". Thus, similarly to non-integrated OBWOHL-clauses, non-integrated WOBEI-constructions have the meaning of "as against what I just said".

4.3. Collaborative productions of WOBEI-constructions

In my data, all collaborative WOBEI-constructions display syntactic non-integration;[\[10\]](#) so far there are no cases of collaborative WOBEI-constructions expressing astonished questions nor providing further explanations by a co-teller. Collaborative WOBEI-constructions displaying main clause order, however, turn out to have similar functions to collaborative OBWOHL-constructions with main clause syntax: the second speaker signals her/his disagreement with the prior speaker's utterance. This signaling of disagreement can vary from presenting a slight modification of the precedingly stated fact up to uttering a clear contradiction.

Klara considers having her father, who is very ill, moved into her house so that she can look after him. She and Nora discuss the consequences this decision would have for Klara's dissertation plans:

DISS (*DISSERTATION*)

67Klara: naTÜRlich würd ich auch dazu STEHN daß ich dann HIER bin.=

68Nora: =mhm.

30

69Klara: und nicht s'G[fühl hab] ich müßt dann meine DISS grad fertig schreiben.

70Nora: [(.....)]

71Nora: *jetzt=kuck=ich=schnell=nachm=Zug*

72Nora: woBEI: (.) du kannst dich ja auch immer beURlaubn lassen.

67Klara: *of course I would stand behind my decision that I was going to be here=*

68Nora: =mhm.

69Klara: *and not have the[feeling] that I would have to finish my disseration exactly during this time*

70Nora: [(.....)]

71Nora: **just a second I'm going to check on my train connection**

72Nora: WOBEI (.) *you can always take a leave of absence*

Here, the WOBEI-clause introduced by Nora (72) offers a new aspect to consider: she could "take a leave of absence". As this newly introduced aspect stands in contrast to the perspective taken into account so far, there is a disagreeing component to it.

The next transcript is taken from a telephone interaction between Bert and Anna. They are planning to see a movie that night and Anna has just read out loud from the newspaper what movies were playing.

KINOPLÄNE (*MOVIE PLANS*)

1Bert: kommt ja also: MURIELS Hochzeit in Frage.

2Anna: oder der bewegte MANN.

3 (-)

4Bert: wobei ich find den ja eher schlecht.

5 des is so en Intellektuellenfilm aber toTAL HOHL.

1Bert: well then there's only "Muriels Hochzeit" that's worth considering

2Anna: or the "bewegte Mann"

3 (-)

4Bert: whereby I actually think it is not a very good one

5 it's a sort of intellectual movie but totally shallow

After Bert concluded that only "Muriels Hochzeit" is worth considering, Anna adds a further alternative ("der bewegte Mann") in a rather suggestive tone. The pause in line 3 already indicates an upcoming disagreement. In line 4 Bert then explicitly states his negative evaluation of that movie. This negative evaluation introduced by the WOBEI-clause stands in conflict to Anna's preceding proposal and thus turns it down.

The data show that WOBEI is used in spoken colloquial German as a "concessive" conjunction which - similarly to OBWOHL - can display either subordinate or main clause order. Syntactically integrated WOBEI-clauses present a fact - which "normally" (i.e. under "normal expectations") would not go together with the fact stated in the preceding clause - as co-occurring (e.g. FREUNDINNEN *I wanted to get out of this kind of relationship* at the same time *I really like her very much*). Thus, the facts stated in both clauses are presented as factual and valid. In contrast, syntactically non-integrated WOBEI-clauses provide a post-completion assertion which modifies, corrects or

contradicts the preceding utterance. With both types of concessive WOBEI-clauses speakers present a relation "contrary to expectation"; however whereas integrated WOBEI-clauses communicate a dissonance on the propositional or content level of the two clauses, stating that despite 'q', 'p' is still valid; in non-integrated WOBEI-constructions the speaker by stating 'q' limits the validity of pre-stated 'p'. So, the interpretation is something like, "as against what I (or you) just said", and the WOBEI-clause functions similar to a repair format.

The question arises, why the pronominal adverb WOBEL is used as source for expressing concessive relations. As König/Eisenberg (1984) and König (1988) point out, among the major sources in the development of concessive conjunctions there are expressions which "imply remarkable co-occurrence or co-existence of two facts as part of their literal meaning" (König 1988:155). The traditional use of WOBEL as a pronominal adverb implies such a "co-occurrence or co-existence of two facts" (e.g. "ich hab dann Goffman im Seminar behandelt, wobei ich besonders auf sein GENDER Buch einging"; *in the seminar I talked about Goffman, whereby I mainly concentrated on his book on gender*). As the data show, some of the WOBEL-clauses still retain part of their original meaning alongside the concessive implicature. By pointing out that two facts co-occur, even though there is a general incompatibility between the two situations, the (syntactically integrated) WOBEL-construction suggests a concessive reading. Traugott/König (1991) discuss this process of development from concomitance to concessivity as part of a grammaticalization process. They argue that "there are so many things cooccurring that mere cooccurrence or concomitance of two situations (states, in particular), is rarely highly relevant information. Nevertheless, there are some contexts in which concomitance may be highly relevant and worthy of pointing out. One of these contexts is where there is a general incompatibility between the two situations; i.e. where one situation does not normally cooccur with the other". (Traugott/König 1991:200).

CONCLUSION

The analysis of the data reveals that syntactic structures of everyday language are closely connected to discourse-pragmatic factors: although in many cases both word order patterns are possible, word order variations are not random and unpredictable. The alternative word order constructions in causal and concessive adverbial clauses fulfill important discourse-pragmatic functions: speakers tend to use syntactically integrated WEIL-, OBWOHL-, and WOBEL-clauses in cases of close integration between the main clause and the subordinate one; i.e. when the causal or concessive clause is within the scope of the main clause illocutionary force and the adverbial construction operate within the "content domain". In contrast, speakers tend use syntactic non-integration when adverbial clauses are subduced from the scope of the main clause illocutionary force; this is the case when the causal or concessive constructions operate within the speech act or epistemic domain or when there is only a very loose relationship between the WEIL-clause and the preceding one. These causal- or concessive clauses have their own independent illocutionary force. Furthermore, syntactic "independence" is generally supported by means of prosodic dis-integration (whereas subordinate adverbial clauses often are prosodically integrated into preceding main clause by forming one single intonation contour) and the possible presence of other "main clause phenomena". Thus, discourse-pragmatic functions determine the reinterpretation of subordinate causal and concessive conjunctions as coordinate ones.[\[11\]](#)

The results of the analysis are closely connected to three issues discussed within grammaticalization theory:

- (i) Concerning the concessive use of WOBEL, we can observe the development of a concessive connective out of an adverb whose original meaning was "co-occurrence". Traugott/König (1991:200ff.) speak of this process of grammaticalization, in which "expressions of simultaneity, concomitance, or correlation" are "amplified and interpreted as expressions of concessivity", as the process of "conventionalizing of conversational inferences".
 - (ii) The data demonstrate that conjunctions such as WEIL, OBWOHL (and WOBEL) are used in everyday colloquial language not only as operating in the "content" domain but also in "speech act" and "epistemic" domains. Within grammaticalization theory this tendency is considered to be a process of
-

grammaticalization, in which "meanings tend to become increasingly situated in the speaker's subjective belief-state/attitude toward the situation" (Traugott/König 1991:205).

(iii) The third tendency observed in the data, however, contradicts a major assumption of grammaticalization theory: Theories of grammaticalization (Hopper/Traugott 1993) postulate an unidirectionality in clause combining from relatively free juxtaposition to syntactic bondedness and argue that there is a continuum of development from more to less paratactic clause combining.

Grammaticalization theory postulates that there is a development from coordination to subordination in adverbial clauses. In their analysis of clause integration in German and Dutch concessives, König/van der Auwera (1988:108) argue, that German has "undergone a process of successive clause integration" leading from non-integrative to integrative word order and thus from parataxis to embedding. This may well be the case for written German. However, as our analysis shows, there is a different tendency at work in spoken German: Causal and concessive constructions seem to develop back from integration to non-integration and thus again display the ordering possibilities of main clauses. [\[12\]](#) This kind of grammatical "renewal" (Lehmann 1991:524ff.) of subordinate clause order by main clause order, however, is restricted to causal and concessive constructions which speakers use to express particular discourse-pragmatic meaning. [\[13\]](#)

The investigation into grammatical structures of causal and concessive clauses in everyday spoken German shows the inseparability of linguistic structure from discourse. We are dealing with an "ecology of grammar", in which forms of syntactic constructions are molded to suit the conditions and purposes of face-to-face-interactions (Pawley/Syder 1983:552).

Appendix: Transcription conventions

[ja das] finde ich conversational overlap;

[du ab]

(-) short pauses of less than 0.5 sec.;

(0.5) pauses of 0.5 sec. and longer;

(??) unintelligible text;

(gestern) uncertain transcription;

= continuous utterances;

=und=dann=ging= fast tempo;

? intonation phrase-final: rising;

<< intonation phrase-final: slightly rising;

. intonation phrase-final: falling;
, intonation phrase-final: slightly falling;
[arrowup] <word word> global high pitch;
[arrowdown] <word word> global low pitch;
[arrowup] like[arrowdown] high fall;
[arrowdown]like[arrowup] low rise;
a: lengthening;
no soft voice;
NEIN loud voice;
mo((hi))mentan laugh particles within the utterance
hahaha laughter;
((hustet)) nonlexical phenomena (e.g.coughing).

Literature

Arndt, E. (1956): Die begründenden Sätze im Neuhochdeutschen und ihre wichtigsten Konjunktionen. Dissertation. Humboldt Universität Berlin.

Chafe, W. (1984): How People Use Adverbial Clauses. In: C. Brugman and M. Macaulay (eds.): Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society. 437-449.

Eisenberg, P. (1989): Grundriß der Deutschen Grammatik. Stuttgart: Metzler.

Foley, W. A. and Van Valin, R. D. (1984): Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar. In: Cambridge: University Press. 238-320.

Ford, C. (1993): Grammar in Interaction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gaumann, U. (1982): 'Weil die machen jetzt bald zu'. Dissertation, Universität Mainz.

Green, G. (1976): Main clause phenomena in subordinate. *Language*, 52, 382-397.

Günthner, S. (1993a): '...weil - man kann es ja wissenschaftlich untersuchen' - Diskurspragmatische Aspekte der Wortstellung in WEIL-Sätzen. *Linguistische Berichte*, 143, 37-59.

Günthner, S. (1993b): Diskursstrategien in der Interkulturellen Kommunikation. Analysen deutsch-chinesischer Gespräche. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

- Günthner, S. (1995): Exemplary stories: The cooperative construction of indignation. *Versus*, 70/71, 147-175.
- Halliday, M. A. K. and Hasan, R. (1976): *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Hopper, P. J. and Thompson, S. A. (1994): Introduction. *Text* 14 (4): 461-463.
- Hopper, P. and Traugott, E. C. (1993): *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Keller, R. (1993): Das epistemische WEIL. Bedeutungswandel einer Konjunktion. In: H. J. Heringer and G. Stätzel (eds.): *Sprachgeschichte und Sprachkritik*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter. 219-247.
- König, E. (1985): On the history of concessive connectives in English. Diachronic and synchronic evidence. *Lingua*, 66, 363-381.
- König, E. (1988): Concessive connectives and concessive sentences: Crosslinguistic regularities and pragmatic principles. In: J. A. Hawkins (eds.): *Explaining Language Universals*. New York: Basil Blackwell. 145-166.
- König, E. and Eisenberg, P. (1984): Zur Pragmatik von Konzessivsätzen. In: G. Stickel (ed.): *Pragmatik in der Grammatik*. Düsseldorf: Schwann. 313-332.
- König, E. and Van der Auwera, J. (1988): Clause integration in German and Dutch conditionals, concessive conditionals and concessives. In: J. Haiman and S. A. Thompson (eds.): *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 101-133.
- Küper, C. (1984): Zum sprechaktbezogenen Gebrauch der Kausalverknüpfers DENN und WEIL: Grammatisch-pragmatische Interrelationen. *Linguistische Bereiche*, 92, 15-30.
- Küper, C. (1991): Geht die Nebensatzstellung im Deutschen verloren? Zur pragmatischen Funktion der Wortstellung in Haupt- und Nebensätzen. *Deutsche Sprache*, 19, 133-158.
- Lehmann, C. (1988): Towards a typology of clause linkage. In: J. Haiman and S. A. Thompson (eds.): *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 181-226.
- Lehmann, C. (1991): Grammaticalization and related changes in contemporary German. In: E. C. Traugott and B. Heine (eds.): *Approaches to Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 493-535.
- Ono, T. and Thompson, S. A. (1994): *Interaction and Syntax in the Structure of Conversational Discourse*. Manuscript. University of California.
- Pawley, A. and Syder, F. H. (1983): Natural selection in syntax: Notes on adaptive variation and change in vernacular and literary grammar. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 7, 551-579.

Quirk, R.; Greenbaum, S.; Leech, G. and Svartvik, J. (1985): *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

Sacks, H. (1987): On the preference for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation. In: G.

Button and J. R. Lee (eds.): Talk and social organisation. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Sandig, B. (1973): Zur historischen Kontinuität normativ diskriminierender syntaktischer Muster in spontaner Sprechsprache. Deutsche Sprache 3, 37-57.

Selting, Margret (1995) Prosodie im Gespräch. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Sweetser, E. E. (1990): From Etymology to Pragmatics. Metaphorical and cultural aspects of semantic structure. Cambridge: University Press.

Thompson, S. A. (1987): 'Concessive' as a discourse relation in expository written English. In: B. Joseph and A. M. Zwickey (eds.): A Festschrift for Ilse Lehiste. Ohio State University. 64-73

Traugott, E. C. and König, E. (1991): The semantics-pragmatics of grammaticalization revisited. In: Traugott and Heine (eds.): Approaches to Grammaticalization. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 189-218.

Wegener, H. (1994): weil - das hat schon seinen Grund. Zur Verbstellung in Kausalsätzen mit WEIL im gegenwärtigen Deutsch. Deutsche Sprache, 4, 289-305.

Willems, K. (1994): weil es hat mit Bedeutung nicht viel zu tun... Zum Sprachwandel einer Konjunktion. Deutsche Sprache, 3, 261-279.

Fußnoten

[1] Cf. Eisenberg (1989:358).

[2] Cf. König (1985:6), who defines adversative relations ('p' but 'q') as "relations between propositions that support contradictory conclusions with the main point of the speaker expressed by the second proposition". Thus, a sentence "'p' but 'q'" expresses that the first clause 'p' is an argument for a conclusion 'r', whereas the second clause 'q' supports the very opposite conclusion 'not-r'. Furthermore, this second conclusion carries more weight in the whole argument. In contrast to syntactically non-integrated OBWOHL-clauses, where the second component restricts (or even takes back) the validity of the first component, in adversative constructions (e.g. "I like skiing, but Paula doesn't like it") both components 'p' and 'q' are still entailed.

[3] Cf. Ford (1993:124-129) on adverbial clause extensions to other speaker's turns. In her data second speakers often co-tell some information by adding a "because"-clause.

[4] Cf. Selting (1995) for prosodic features of astonished questions.

[5] Cf. Günthner (1995).

[6] This segment was written down immediately after it occurred.

[7] I am thankful to Kirsten Nazarkiewicz for this transcript.

[8] Even if it might sound slightly like a legal lease in some cases, I shall translate WOBEI with WHEREBY.

[9] PDS is the "party of democratic socialism"; the successor party of the SED (the socialist party in former East Germany).

[10] This, of course does not mean that collaborative WOBEI-clauses with syntactic integration are not possible. However, for the analysis at hand, I can only consider the collaborative productions available in my data.

[11] This usage of subordinate conjunctions (or pronominal adverbs) as coordinate ones also explains why syntactically non-integrated causal and concessive clauses cannot occur as initial adverbial constructions: as coordinate conjunctions they must go between what they coordinate (Lehmann 1991:527).

[12] Here, it should be added that - since only during the last twenty years linguists have started to systematically analyze spoken data, - main order constructions in WEIL- and OBWOHL-clauses may have always been in use in spoken German. Only due to the fact, that linguists have started analyzing spoken grammar has it been possible to discover these syntactic structures.

[13] Due to this fact, I want to argue against the hypothesis that German syntax is on the way to abolish verb-second position in subordinate clauses.