

*Adverbial Clauses: New Horizons*

Berlin

9–10 March 2026

***Adverbial Clauses at the Syntax–Illocution Interface***

Werner Frey

[w\\_frey@gmx.de](mailto:w_frey@gmx.de)

## Adverbial Clauses at the Syntax–Illocution Interface

### Structure

I: Adverbial clauses (AdvCls) which are embedded and illocutionary force

Some discussion of

Jacobs (2025: 33): **Dependent clauses that perform an illocutionary act can be syntactically desintegrated, but also fully integrated.**

➤ Jacobs' (2025) thesis that **the potential for illocutionary force is not influenced by matters of syntactic embedding.**

II. AdvCls appearing in the external fields and illocutionary force

III. Two observations on German verb-first conditional clauses

## I. Embedded AdvCls and illocutionary force

- The three criteria used by Jacobs (2025) to determine whether a clause, embedded or not, encodes a speech act:

### The commentary test

“When a speaker performs an illocutionary act by uttering a sentence, it should be possible to refer to this illocutionary act in a subsequent commentary on the utterance.”

(1) A: Paul sollte vorsichtiger fahren, zumal er schon mehrfach Verwarnungen erhalten hat.

“Paul should drive more carefully, especially since he has already received several warnings.”

B: (mit Bezug auf die unterstrichene Teiläußerung): Es wundert mich, dass du behauptest, dass Paul schon mehrfach Verwarnungen erhalten hat.

“(with reference to the underlined part of the statement): I am surprised that you claim that Paul has already received several warnings.”

## Adverbial Clauses at the Syntax–Illocution Interface

- This test is applied to different fully and partially integrated AdvCls (in the terminology of Haegeman 2003: to CACs and to PACs) and to argument clauses (ACs).

(2) A: Paul kauft sich schon vor der Prüfung ein Auto, weil er nicht damit rechnet, durchzufallen.

“Paul already buys a car before the exam because he does not expect to fail.”

B: √ I'm surprised that you are claiming Paul doesn't expect to fail.

(3) A: Seit er ja im Oktober diesen Zusammenbruch mit den Anfällen hatte, hab ich einfach Angst, dass Stress ihm sehr schaden könnte.

“Since he had that breakdown with the seizures in October, I'm just afraid that stress could be very harmful to him.”

B: √ I'm surprised that you are claiming that he had a breakdown in October.

(4) A: Es hat sich herausgestellt, dass Hans keinen Führerschein mehr hat.

“It turned out that Hans no longer has a driving licence.”

B: √ I'm surprised that you are claiming Hans doesn't have a driving licence anymore.

**The occurrence of the modal particle *ja* as an indication of illocutionary force**

- (5) Bevor es ja dann leider durch den Lockdown erstmal wieder eine 4-wöchige Pause gibt, werden die Jungs nochmal alles raushauen!!

“Before there is unfortunately another four-week break due to the lockdown, the lads will give it their all once again!!”

- (6) Aber das geht nicht, weil ja Journalisten immer irgendwas schreiben müssen, und nicht einfach mal schweigen können.

“But that's not possible, because journalists always have to write something and can't just keep quiet.”

**The occurrence of the ‘speech act adverbial’ *offen/ehrlich gesagt* as an indication of illocutionary force**

- (7) und solange du ehrlich gesagt kein vernünftiges Kontra geben kannst, bestätigst du nur diesen Umstand viel mehr als ihn auszuhebeln

“and as long as you cannot, in all honesty, offer a reasonable counterargument, you are merely confirming this fact rather than refuting it.”

## Adverbial Clauses at the Syntax–Illocution Interface

- ▶ According to Jacobs (2025), these tests demonstrate that many fully and partially integrated AdvCls as well as several ACs have illocutionary force.
- Jacobs (2025): If these tests yield a negative result for a given example, it is because the example violates one or more of the three **semantic or pragmatic conditions**: the consistency requirement, the utility requirement and the requirement for referential completeness.

## Concerns about these tests

- The comment test also seems to yield counterintuitive results.

(8) A: Hans hat ein schönes Hemd und eine schöne Hose an.

“Hans is wearing a nice shirt and nice trousers.”

B: I'm surprised that you are claiming Hans is wearing a nice shirt / nice trousers /  
a nice shirt and nice trousers.

► Problem: It does not appear that A makes at least three different assertions with (8).  
Furthermore, the same test would yield that only one assertion is made with (9).

(9) A: Hans wird morgen ein schönes Hemd oder eine schöne Hose anhaben.

“Hans will wear a nice shirt or nice trousers tomorrow.”

Cf. also

(10)A: Hans hat ein schönes Hemd an.

B: I'm surprised that you are claiming that the shirt of Hans is nice.

## Adverbial Clauses at the Syntax–Illocution Interface

### - The commentary test obscures differences

(11) A: Seit er ja im Oktober diesen Zusammenbruch mit den Anfällen hatte, hab' ich einfach Angst, dass Stress ihm sehr schaden könnte.

“Since he had that breakdown with the seizures in October, I'm just afraid that stress could be very harmful to him.”

B: a. # Willst du etwa behaupten, dass du Angst hast, dass Stress ihm sehr schaden könnte?

“Are you claiming that you are afraid that stress could harm him?”

b. ✓ Willst du etwa behaupten, dass er im Oktober einen Zusammenbruch hatte?

(12) A: Während Paul sehr unbeherrscht ist, ist Max vollkommen ausgeglichen.

“While Paul is very unrestrained, Max is completely balanced.”

B: a. # Willst du etwa behaupten, dass Max vollkommen ausgeglichen ist?

“Are you claiming that Max is completely balanced??”

b. ✓ Willst du etwa behaupten, dass Paul sehr unbeherrscht ist?

## Adverbial Clauses at the Syntax–Illocution Interface

- I will refer to the process of checking the appropriateness of *Willst du etwa behaupten, dass ...* as an application of the confirmation test.

### The commentary test vs. the confirmation test

(13) A: Es hat sich herausgestellt, dass Hans keinen Führerschein mehr hat.

“It turned out that Hans no longer has a driving licence.”

B: √ I'm surprised that you are claiming that it turned out that Hans no longer has a driving licence.

B: √ I'm surprised that you are claiming Hans doesn't have a driving licence anymore.

(14) A: Es hat sich herausgestellt, dass Hans keinen Führerschein mehr hat.

B # Are you claiming that it turned out that Hans no longer has a driving licence?

B √ Are you claiming Hans doesn't have a driving licence anymore?

## Adverbial Clauses at the Syntax–Illocution Interface

- ▶ Summarising the observations, it seems that the commentary test for a (complex) proposition  $\phi$  primarily checks which other propositions follow from  $\phi$  and to which a speaker is also committed when s/he commits to  $\phi$ .
  - The presence of the modal particle *ja* in S does not indicate that S has illocutionary force
- (15) a. Ich überlegte mir, dass ich ja nach Montagnana fahren könnte.  
“I reasoned that I could travel to Montagnana.”
- b. Peter denkt, da ja Maria zurzeit in Paris ist, könnte er auch dorthin reisen.  
“Peter thinks that since Maria is currently in Paris, he could also travel there.”
- ▶ I think that there is no reason to believe that the embedded clauses in (15) containing *ja* encode an illocution; the commentary test would back this.

## Adverbial Clauses at the Syntax–Illocution Interface

- The presence of *offen/ehrlich gesagt* in S does not indicate that S has illocutionary force

(16) Paul glaubt, dass ich behaupte, dass er offen gesagt dafür ungeeignet ist.

“Paul believes that I am saying that he is frankly unsuitable for it.”

- ▶ Although the speaker of the complex sentence (16) bears the attitude *offen gesagt* expressed in S, there is no reason to assume that S fulfils an illocutionary function; the commentary test and the confirmation test would back this.
- Thesis: the presence of *offen/ehrlich gesagt* (‘frankly speaking/to be honest’) does not indicate illocutionary force. In the verbal domain, these are just high adverbials above TP. Note that they may occupy the prefield of a German verb-second clause (V2-clause), (17), and note the contrast to *kurz gesagt* (‘in brief’), (18).

## Adverbial Clauses at the Syntax–Illocution Interface

- (17) Ehrlich gesagt dachte ich, dass die Regierung von meinen Beiträgen, sowohl zur kapitalgedeckten Altersvorsorge als auch zur Kapitalmarktunion und zum europäischen Binnenmarkt, sehr angetan sei. (FAZ.NET, 01.03.26)  
“To be honest, I thought that the government was very impressed by my contributions, both on funded pension schemes and on the capital markets union and the European single market.”
- (18) \* Kurz gesagt dachte ich, dass die Regierung von meinen Beiträgen ... sehr angetan sei.
- Note also that *offen/ehrlich gesagt* can occur within an attributive AP, but this is not possible for *kurz gesagt*.
- (19) a. Peter trug eine offen gesagt schreckliche Krawatte.  
‘Peter wore a frankly awful tie.’
- b. \* Peter trug eine kurz gesagt schreckliche Krawatte.  
Intended: “Peter wore a tie. It was, in brief, awful.”

### A more conservative view

#### (20) Properties of a clause S with which a speech act is realised

- i. S has its own intonation contour and is a separate intonation unit.
  - ii. S can be separated naturally by pauses in speech.
  - iii. **Interaction-oriented discourse markers may occur before or after S.**
- Some German examples: *ehrlich* ('honestly'), *mit Verlaub* ('with all due respect'), *okay!*, *oh!*, *schau* ('look'), *hui!*, *juhu!*, *oh Mann/Gott* ('oh man/god'), *verdamm* ('damn'), *nicht wahr?* ('right?'), *kurz gesagt* ('in brief').

In the following the items in (iii) will also be referred to as strong root phenomena (RPs) (Frey & Meinunger 2019).

- ⇒ Note that strong RPs cannot occur inside a clause S, for example in the prefield of a V2-clause.

## Adverbial Clauses at the Syntax–Illocution Interface

(21)\* Ehrlich/mit Verlaub/oh Mann glaube ich ihm kein Wort.

Intended: “Honestly/with all due respect/oh man, I don't believe a word he says.”

► Strong RPs operate on the complete content of a sentence S.

→ Because strong RPs have an interaction-oriented meaning and necessarily operate on the whole content of a sentence S, the property (20iii) seems to be a good candidate for determining whether S has illocutionary force.

A standard example of a dependent clause which has illocutionary force is a German V1-causal clause (cf. e.g. Pittner 2023).

(22) Wer wird ihm das glauben? – Ist er doch einer der am wenigsten  
who will.3SG him it believe.INFV be.3SG he MP one of the least  
vertrauenswürdigsten Leute in der ganzen Gruppe. (Pittner 2023)  
trustworthy people in the whole group

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

## Adverbial Clauses at the Syntax–Illocution Interface

- (23)a. Ich glaube Max jedes Wort, ist er doch sehr vertrauenswürdig, ehrlich.  
“I believe every word Max says, as he is very trustworthy – honestly.”
- b. \* Da/weil er sehr vertrauenswürdig ist, ehrlich, glaube ich Max jedes Wort.  
Intended: “Because he is very trustworthy – honestly – I believe every word Max says.”
- c. Ich glaube Max jedes Wort – da/weil er sehr vertrauenswürdig ist, ehrlich.
- (24)a. Paul sollte vorsichtiger fahren, zumal er schon mehrfach Verwarnungen erhalten hat, ehrlich.
- b. \* Seit er ja im Oktober diesen Zusammenbruch mit den Anfällen hatte, ehrlich, hab ich einfach Angst, dass Stress ihm sehr schaden könnte.
- c. \* Es hat sich herausgestellt, [dass Hans keinen Führerschein mehr hat, ehrlich].

## Adverbial Clauses at the Syntax–Illocution Interface

### application of the confirmation test

(25)a. A Ich glaube Max jedes Wort, ist er doch sehr vertrauenswürdig.

B: # Willst du etwa behaupten, dass Max sehr vertrauenswürdig ist?

b. A: Paul sollte vorsichtiger fahren, zumal er schon mehrfach Verwarnungen erhalten hat.

B: # Willst du etwa behaupten, dass Paul schon mehrfach Verwarnungen erhalten hat?

➤ Dependent clauses that exhibit the characteristics in (20) and therefore also fail the confirmation test cannot occur embedded, cf. (26a,b). Embedded clauses do not tolerate a strong RP, cf. (23b), (24b,c). Clauses accompanied by a strong RP cannot be embedded, (26c).

(26)a. \* Maria sagte, [dass sie Max jedes Wort glaubt, ist er doch sehr vertrauenswürdig.]

b. \* Maria denkt, [dass Paul vorsichtiger fahren sollte, zumal er schon mehrfach Verwarnungen erhalten hat].

## Adverbial Clauses at the Syntax–Illocution Interface

- c. \* weil ich sage, ehrlich/mit Verlaub/oh Mann, Maria glaubt Max kein Wort  
because I say honestly/with all due respect/oh man Maria believes Max no  
word

### A note on the performative marker *hiermit* ('hereby')

(27) Weil ich Ihnen hiermit kündige, können Sie anfangen, ihr Büro zu räumen.

“Because I am hereby dismissing you, you may begin clearing out your office.”

- Krifka (2024) argues that *hiermit/hereby* refers to the utterance event. It expresses that the proposition encoded by its clause was not true before the utterance event and becomes true by the utterance event. (*Hier/here* is analysed as an anaphoric element with reference to the illocutionary act performed by the entire sentence.)

→ (27) does not exhibit ‘an embedded speech act’.

- **Conclusion: I think there is support to the claim that in German, the external syntax of a clause has a considerable influence on its illocutionary potential.**

## II. AdvCls appearing in the external fields (ExtAdvCls) and illocutionary force

- External fields: in the topology of the German clause, the regions in front of or (preceded by a break) following an independent verb-second clause or verb-first-interrogative or -imperative

### - Examples of ExtAdvCls

#### Irrelevance conditionals

- (28)a. Ob es regnet oder nicht, wir gehen spazieren.  
whether it rains or not we go for-a-walk
- b. Wenn du auch der Chef bist, ich gehe jetzt.  
if you even the boss are I go now

#### Non-integrated dependent clauses (non-int-depCls)

- (29)a. Obwohl Max heute schlecht geSPIELT hat\, /er hat wieder geWONnen.  
although Max today badly played has he has again won

## Adverbial Clauses at the Syntax–Illocution Interface

- b. Wenn Max das geahnt hätte, er wäre wohl nicht gekommen.  
if Max that known had he would probably not come

### Relevance conditionals

- (30)a. Wenn du etwas brauchst, mein Name ist Arnold.  
if you something need my name is Arnold
- b. Wenn du Hunger bekommst, im Kühlschrank ist eine Pizza.  
if you hungry get in-the fridge is a pizza

### Speech act related adverbials

- (31)a. Ob es Ihnen gefällt oder nicht: Ihr Vortrag war einfach langweilig.  
whether it you pleases or not your talk was just boring
- b. Wenn du mich jetzt so fragend anschaust, es regnet bald.  
if you look at-me now so questioningly it rains soon
- c. Da du dich doch für sie interessierst, /Maria wird die Stelle bekommen.  
since you yourself MP for her interest Maria will the job get  
“Since you are interested in her – Maria will get the job.”

## Adverbial Clauses at the Syntax–Illocution Interface

Frey (to appear):

- A principled distinction between ExtAdvCls has to be made:
  - (i) World-related ExtAdvCls (W-ExtAdvCls): refer to the world or a conceptualisation of the world.
  - (ii) Discourse-related ExtAdvCls (D-ExtAdvCls): allude to the speech act or the discourse context. They have a conversation controlling function.

W-ExtAdvCls: irrelevance conditionals, cf. (28); non-int-depCls, cf. (29).

D-ExtAdvCls: relevance conditionals, cf. (30); speech act related adverbials, cf. (31).

### ➤ Four phenomena distinguishing D-ExtAdvCls and W-ExtAdvCls

(I) When ExtAdvCls precede their host: D-ExtAdvCl < W-ExtAdvCl

- (32)a. Wenn Du mich jetzt so fragend anschaust, ob es regnet oder nicht, wir gehen spazieren.
- b. \* Ob es regnet oder nicht, wenn Du mich jetzt so fragend anschaust, wir gehen spazieren.

## Adverbial Clauses at the Syntax–Illocution Interface

- c. Da Du dich für Max interessiert, wenn er das gehnt hätte, er wäre nicht gekommen.
  - d. \* Wenn Max das gehnt hätte, da Du dich für ihn interessiert, er wäre nicht gekommen.
- (33)a. Wenn du mich jetzt so fragend anschaust, wenn er auch noch sehr jung ist, Max wird die Stelle bekommen.  
“If you look at me like that, even though he is still very young, Max will get the job.”
- b.\* Wenn er auch noch sehr jung ist, wenn du mich jetzt so fragend anschaust, Max wird die Stelle bekommen.
- (II) Only a W-ExtAdvCl can follow a parordinating conjunction.
- (34)a. Denn ob es regnet oder nicht, wir gehen spazieren.  
“Because whether it rains or not, we go for a walk.”
- b. Denn wenn du auch der Chef bist, ich gehe jetzt.

## Adverbial Clauses at the Syntax–Illocution Interface

- c. \* Denn wenn du Hunger bekommst, im Kühlschrank ist eine Pizza.  
because if you hungry get in-the fridge is a pizza
- d. \* Denn wenn du mich jetzt so fragend anschaust, es regnet bald.

(III) The semantic scope of a D-ExtAdvCl, but not that of a W-ExtAdvCl, may encompass the content of several subsequent sentences.

- (35)a. Um es klar zu sagen, [Max, mähe du jetzt den Rasen. Hans, schneide du schnell die Hecken.]  
“To say it clearly, Max, you mow the lawn now. Hans, you quickly trim the hedges.”
- b. \* Da die Sonne scheint, [Max, mähe du jetzt den Rasen. Hans, schneide du schnell die Hecken.]  
Intended: “Since the sun is shining, [Max, mow the lawn now. Hans, quickly trim the hedges.]

## Adverbial Clauses at the Syntax–Illocution Interface

(IV) All W-ExtAdvCls allow the occurrence of weak (e.g. modal particles, sentence adverbs) and strong RPs. All W-ExtAdvCls have illocutionary force.

The D-ExtAdvCls show a mixed picture. Some do not allow any RPs (see Haegeman 2022 for data like (36c)), some allow only weak RPs and very few allow both weak and strong RPs.

- (36)a. Ehrlich, ob es regnet oder nicht, wir gehen spazieren.  
b. Oh! Wenn Max das geahnt hätte, er wäre wohl nicht gekommen.  
c. \*Wenn du erstaunlicherweise etwas brauchst, mein Name ist Arnold.  
d. \*Ehrlich, wenn du etwas brauchst, mein Name ist Arnold.  
e. \*[Oh Mann, wenn du mich fragst]: es regnet bald.  
f. [Okay! Da du dich doch für sie interessierst], Maria wird die Stelle bekommen.

## Adverbial Clauses at the Syntax–Illocution Interface

- In Frey (to appear), it is argued that **the differences between W-ExtAdvCls and D-ExtAdvCls are related to the fact that the former are treated by a sentence grammar, while the latter are treated by a grammar of discourse.**

(Frey to appear also offers an account for the differences among D-ExtAdvCls regarding strong and weak RPs using the framework called Discourse Grammar, cf. Kaltenböck et al. 2011; Heine et al. 2013. It is argued that whether a D-ExtAdvCls allows strong or weak RPs depends on the type of clause on which it is based. This clause originates from sentence grammar.)

- Here, I just want to highlight that all W-ExtAdvCls necessarily have illocutionary force, but that not all D-ExtAdvCls do.

(37) Hat Lisa Stress mit Ihrem Chef? Weil sie so gereizt ist. (Freywald 2018: 115)  
“Is Lisa having problems with her boss? Because she is so irritable.”

## Adverbial Clauses at the Syntax–Illocution Interface

- There are adverbial clauses which may appear in the external field or as a sentence constituent. However, their properties differ in these two cases, cf. e.g. their different contextual requirements:

(38) A: Karl ist jetzt der Chef. Du weißt das.

‘Karl is now the boss. You know that.’

B: a. Ja, wenn auch Karl der Chef ist, gehe ich jetzt.

“Yes, even though Karl is the boss, I'm leaving now.”

b.\* Ja, wenn auch Karl der Chef ist, ich gehe jetzt.

➤ A W-ExtAdvCl cannot occur embedded

(39)a. \*Maria vermutet, ob es regnet oder nicht, Max geht spazieren.

Maria assumes whether it rains or not Max goes for-a-walk

b. \*Ich glaube, obwohl Max schlecht vorbereitet ist, er wird gewinnen.

I believe although Max ill prepared is he will win

## Adverbial Clauses at the Syntax–Illocution Interface

- I want to adopt the notion of a subsidiary speech act as it is employed by, e.g., Pittner (2011, 2023) and Freywald (2018).
- **W-ExtAdvCls necessarily realise a subsidiary speech act.**

For example:

(28a) Ob es regnet oder nicht, wir gehen spazieren.

- By using the *ob*-clause, the speaker anticipates and dismisses a potential objection before making the assertion.
- A subordinate speech act provides background information to which the speaker is publicly committed and which supports the dominant speech act.
- Freywald (2018:120): “In terms of argumentative categorisation, there is always a discernible orientation towards the dominant illocution.”

## Adverbial Clauses at the Syntax–Illocution Interface

- **A side note on the internal and external syntax of the different types of adverbial clauses**

Krifka (2023)

(40) Semantic operations to be distinguished as part of a speech act:

- i. the forming of a thought/proposition  $\phi$ , which has truth conditions,
- ii. the building of a judgement by a thinking mind  $x$  concerning a proposition  $\phi$ , a private act, resulting in  $\psi$ ,
- iii. the taking over of a commitment by a thinking mind  $x$  toward  $\psi$ , resulting in  $\omega$ ,
- iv. the performing of a speech act by a thinking mind  $x$  involving  $\omega$ , a public act.

(41) Syntactic representations of the different semantic objects

- i. The TP represents a proposition.
- ii. The judgement phrase (JP) encodes the private assessment of a proposition by a judge.

## Adverbial Clauses at the Syntax–Illocution Interface

- iii. The commitment phrase (ComP) encodes the commitment of a committer to a judgement.
- iv. The speech act phrase (ActP) encodes the act of a speaker performing a speech act.

Frey (2023)

- a. A weak RP needs syntactic licensing inside its minimal clause by  $J^0$ .
- b. A strong RP gets licensed by being adjoined to an ActP.

► Proposal for the syntactic categories of the different types of adverbial clauses

(42)i. CACs: [<sub>CP</sub> C<sup>0</sup> TP]

  ii. PACs: [<sub>CP</sub> C<sup>0</sup> JP]

  iii. W-ExtAdvCls: ActP

- PACs contain a  $J^0$  → Every PACs has an epistemic flavour.

## Adverbial Clauses at the Syntax–Illocution Interface

(43) Frey (to appear)

- ▶ A W-ExtAdvCl is an  $\text{ActP}_{\text{subs}}$ , which has to be adjoined to an ActP, it constitutes a subsidiary speech act.

An  $\text{ActP}_{\text{subs}}$  can host weak and strong RPs, an ActP cannot occur embedded.

### III. Two observations on verb-first conditional clauses (V1-conds)

- V-1 cond are possible as W-ExtAdvCls

- (44)a. [Hätte Max das geahnt, okay!], er wäre wohl nicht gekommen.  
“Had Max known that, okay, he probably wouldn't have come.”
- b. \*Hätte Max das geahnt, okay!, wäre er wohl nicht gekommen.
- c. \*weil ich glaube, hätte Max das geahnt, er wäre wohl nicht gekommen
- d. weil ich glaube, hätte Max das geahnt, wäre er wohl nicht gekommen

- V-1 cond are not possible as D-ExtAdvCls

- (45)a. \*Schaust du mich jetzt so fragend an, Max wird die Stelle bekommen.  
Intended: “If you look at me questioningly like that, Max will get the job.”
- b. \*Brauchst du etwas, mein Name ist Arnold.
- c. \*Bekommst du Hunger, im Kühlschrank ist eine Pizza.
- d. \*Fragst du mich, es regnet bald.

## Adverbial Clauses at the Syntax–Illocution Interface

Note, however, that there exist the examples in (46).

- (46) a. Bekommst du Hunger, ist im Kühlschrank eine Pizza.  
b. Fragst du mich, regnet es bald.

Frey (to appear)

- ExtAdvCls and word-identical counterparts that occur within sentences have different internal structures and different properties.

Consider the examples:

- (47) a. Wenn du Hunger bekommst, im Kühlschrank ist eine Pizza.  
b. Wenn du Hunger bekommst, ist im Kühlschrank eine Pizza.

## Adverbial Clauses at the Syntax–Illocution Interface

- The external occurring variant cannot host a sentence adverbial (a weak RP), but the internal occurring one can.

(48) a. ??Wenn Du nun bedauerlicherweise eben doch Hunger bekommst, im Kühlschrank ist eine Pizza.

Intended: “If you do, unfortunately, get hungry after all, there's a pizza in the fridge.”

b. Wenn Du nun bedauerlicherweise eben doch Hunger bekommst, ist im Kühlschrank eine Pizza.

- There are different contextual requirements of the examples.

(49)A: Was mache ich, wenn ich Hunger bekomme?

B. a. \* Wenn Du Hunger bekommst, im Kühlschrank ist eine Pizza.

b. Wenn Du Hunger bekommst, ist im Kühlschrank eine Pizza.

- I would like to suggest that the integrated *wenn*-clause in (47b) functions as a clause-internal frame-topic.

## Adverbial Clauses at the Syntax–Illocution Interface

- ▶ We can assume that the same holds for the integrated V1-cond in (46a).

Likewise, we find differences between (50a,b).

- (50) a. Wenn du mich fragst, es regnet bald.  
b. Wenn du mich fragst, regnet es bald.

for example: there are different contextual requirements

(51)A: Glaubst du, dass es bald regnet?

- B: a. \* Wenn du mich fragst, es regnet bald.  
b. Wenn du mich fragst, regnet es bald.

- ▶ Conjecture: the *wenn*-cond in (50b) functions as a clause-internal source adverbial.
- ▶ We can assume that the same holds for the integrated V1-cond (46b).

## Adverbial Clauses at the Syntax–Illocution Interface

### V1-causal clauses

- As Pittner (2011) observes, it is also not possible to refer to an utterance itself using V1 causal clauses. The reasons for speech acts can only be given by means of an introduced causal clause.

(52) Wo bist du denn gestern gewesen? – weil ich dich gerade sehe/\*sehe ich dich doch gerade.

- A note on the structural meaning of V-in-C
  - It is widely believed that V-in-C serves to mark some kind of illocutionary force (a.o. Gärtner 2002; Truckenbrodt 2006; Lohnstein 2020).
  - ▶ This assumption is difficult to reconcile with the integrated occurrence of V1-cons. See also Jacobs (2025), who disputes the inherent illocutionary force of V2-clauses in German.

## Adverbial Clauses at the Syntax–Illocution Interface

- I would like to follow Meinunger (2006):
  - The uniform function of V-in-C is to mark information as (discursively) new, regardless of its illocutionary potential.
- A V1-cond cannot pick up given information

(53)A: Maria kommt zum Empfang.

“Maria will come to the reception.”

B: a. Wenn Maria zum Empfang kommt, komme ich auch.

“When Maria comes to the reception, I'll come too.”

b. \* Kommt Maria zum Empfang, komme ich auch.

‘premise’ conditionals

(54)a. Wenn ihr schon hier seid, könnt ihr auch mithelfen.

“Since you're here, you might as well help out.”

b. \* Seid ihr schon hier, könnt ihr auch mithelfen.

## Adverbial Clauses at the Syntax–Illocution Interface

- c. Wenn er nun mal so schlau ist, sollte er uns auch helfen.  
“If he is just so clever, he should help us too.”
  - d. \* Ist er nun mal so schlau, sollte er uns auch helfen.
- Based on the two observations, a proposal regarding the uniform function of V-in-C:
- V in C enforces world reference.
    - V1-conds are not possible as a D-ExtAdvCl
  - V-in-C marks the information encoded in its clause as (discursively) new.
    - V1-conds cannot pick up given information.

### Main points

- ▶ Regarding AdvCls and illocution, I have not argued for new horizons, but rather for an old-fashioned view: **integrated AdvCls cannot have illocutionary force.**

Integrated AdvCls are not of category ActP but of JP or TP.

→ The structural position of a clause affects its illocutionary potential.

- ▶ Regarding adverbial clauses appearing in the external field, a distinction must be made between world-related ones and discourse-related ones (between W-ExtAdvCls and D-ExtAdvCls).

- ▶ All W-ExtAdvCls have illocutionary force and represent a subsidiary speech act. They are ActPs and are attached to an ActP, their discourse function is subordinate.

(Whether a D-ExtAdvCls has illocutionary force depends on the type of clause it is based on.)

## Adverbial Clauses at the Syntax–Illocution Interface

- ▶ V1-conds occurring in the external field are necessarily instances of W-ExtAdvCls, they cannot appear as D-ExtAdvCls.
- ▶ Regarding the structural meaning of V-in-C, the following tentative proposals have been made:
  - the uniform function of V-in-C is to mark information as discursively new,
  - V in C enforces world reference.

## Adverbial Clauses at the Syntax–Illocution Interface

### References

- Frey, W. .to appear. On different types of adverbial clauses appearing outside of their hosts. In M. Cogniglio, K. Müller and M. Steinbach (eds.), *Adverbs and Adverbials at the form-meaning interface*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Frey, W. & A. Meinunger .2019. Topic marking and illocutionary force. In V. Egerland, V. Molnar & S. Winkler (eds.): *Architecture of Topic*. Studies in Generative Grammar, 95-137. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Freywald, U. .2018. *Parataktische Konjunktionen. Zur Syntax und Pragmatik der Satzverknüpfung im Deutschen – am Beispiel von "obwohl", "wobei", "während" und "wogegen"*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- Gärtner, H.-M. .2002. On the force of V2 declaratives. *Theoretical Linguistics* 28, 33–42.
- Haegeman, L. .2022. *The typology of adverbial clauses and the role of discourse syntax*. Handout, Conference: Typology of adverbial clauses, University of Cologne.
- Haegemann, L. .2003. Conditional clauses: External and internal syntax. *Mind and Language* 18. 317–339.
- Heine, B., Kaltenböck, G., T. Kuteva & H. Long .2013. An outline of Discourse Grammar. In *Functional approaches to language*, S. T. Bischoff & C. Jany (eds.), 155–206. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Jacobs, J. .2025. Zur Illokutionsfähigkeit abhängiger Sätze. Manuscript. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/395188071 Zur Illokutionsfahigkeit abhängiger Satze#fullTextFileContent](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/395188071_Zur_Illokutionsfahigkeit_abhangiger_Satze#fullTextFileContent)

## Adverbial Clauses at the Syntax–Illocution Interface

- Kaltenböck, G., B. Heine & T. Kuteva. 2011. On thetical grammar. *Studies in Language* 35(4). 848–893.
- Krifka, M. .2024. Performative updates and the modeling of speech acts. *Synthese* 203:31
- Krifka, M. .2023. Layers of the clause: Propositions, judgements, commitments, acts. In: J. M. Hartmann & A. Wöllstein (eds.): *Propositionale Argumente im Sprachvergleich: Theorie und Empirie. / Propositional arguments in cross-linguistic research: Theoretical and empirical Issues*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Lohnstein, H. .2020. The grammatical basis of verb second – the case of German. In: S. Wolfe & R. Woods (eds.): *Rethinking Verb Second*, 177–207. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Meinunger, A. .2006. On the discourse impact of subordinate clauses. In: Molnár, V. & S.Winkler (eds.): *The Architecture of Focus*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 459–487.
- Pittner, K. .2023. Pragmatic subordination: Causal clauses with verb first position in German. In: Ł. Jędrzejowski & C. Fleczonek (eds.). *Micro- and Macro-variation of Causal Clauses. Synchronic and Diachronic Insights* (Studies in Language Companion Series), 101-128. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Pittner, K. .2011. *Subsidiäre Begründungen*. In: Ferraresi, G. (ed.), *Konnektoren im Deutschen und im Sprachvergleich: Beschreibung und grammatische Analyse*. Tübingen: narr, 157-182.
- Truckenbrodt, H. .2006. On the semantic motivation of syntactic verb movement to C in German. *Theoretical Linguistics*, 32.3, 257–306.