

New insight into German argument *wenn*-clauses

The paper is about constructions where the propositional argument of a matrix predicate is realized by a conditional as in (1) *Frank bedauert es, wenn Maria krank ist* 'Frank regrets it if Maria is ill'. It will discuss the syntactic and semantic status of argument *wenn*-clauses and propositional correlates associated with them as well as the semantic properties of the verb classes licensing these argument adverbials.

I. An argument *wenn*-clause is neither an object- nor a subject-clause introduced by a non-canonical complementizer as suggested by Böttcher & Sitta (1972), but an adverbial which restricts the matrix clause and simultaneously provides the propositional argument of the matrix predicate – cf. Williams (1974), Pullum (1987), and Hinterwimmer (2012) for English, Fabricius-Hansen 1980 for German, and Quer (2002) for Spanish and Catalan. The reasons for its adverbial status are for instance: *i.* An obligatory propositional argument has to be realized by a correlate if the *wenn*-clause is preposed – cf. (2) *Wenn Maria krank ist, bedauert *(es) Frank* 'If Maria is ill, Frank regrets it'. Preposed complement clauses like *dass*-, *wh*-, and *ob*-clauses leave a trace in the complement position thus prohibiting a correlate there. *ii.* Unlike *dass*-argument clauses, argument *wenn*-clauses cannot be adjoined to DPs or PPs, respectively – cf. (3) *Das, dass/ *wenn Maria krank ist, ...* 'The fact that/*if Maria is ill' or (4) *Darüber, dass/*wenn Maria kommt,* 'the perspective that/* if Maria will come. *iii.* A paraphrase of constructions with argument *wenn*-clauses can contain a *dass*-clause in the complement position of the matrix predicate – cf. (5) *Wenn Maria krank ist, bedauert Frank, dass Maria krank ist.* 'If Maria is ill, Frank regrets that she is ill.' *iv.* Preference predicates admit *wh*-movement out of a *dass*-clause but they do not so if there is a *wenn*-clause – cf. (6) *Wohin zieht Frank vor, dass/*wenn Maria fährt?* 'Where does Frank prefer that Maria will go?'

Similarly to Pesetsky (1991), I consider extraposed argument *wenn*-clauses as base-generated VP- or vP-adjuncts which are indirectly licensed by a correlate or, if there isn't any, by a propositional *pro* – cf. (7) *Frank bedauert, wenn Maria krank ist.* 'Frank regrets if Maria is ill'. *Wenn*-clauses in the left periphery like (2) originate in the Spec-position of the functional category TP where they are licensed by T^0 . Since they are out of VP, they are ordinary adverbials. Argument *wenn*-clauses inside VP, however, are rather complement-like ones.

II. Correlates like *es, das* as well as prepositional correlates like *darüber* 'pro-about' are the canonical propositional arguments of predicates licensing argument *wenn*-clauses. They are theta-marked by these predicates and refer to a contextually given proposition. The latter is either anaphorically given as in (2) or denoted by an extraposed *wenn*-clause as in (1). A correlate in a complement position licenses an extraposed *wenn*-clause by m_c -command in terms of Pesetsky (1991). Semantically, it is represented as an indexed variable that absorbs the index of the *wenn*-clause it m_c -commands or is preceded by. If there is no overt correlate as in (7), the propositional argument is represented as a phonologically empty propositional *pro*. This *pro* is licensed if it is theta-marked by V^0 and if it m_c -commands the *wenn*-clause, which provides its index. Unlike a correlate, *pro* does not indicate that there is a context-given proposition.

III. The *wenn*-clause σ in a construction with such a predicate is either regarded as the protasis of an implication as in (8) $\sigma \Rightarrow \tau(\sigma)$ (cf. Williams 1974, Fabricius-Hansen 1980, and Hinterwimmer 2011) or as the restrictor of an operator in the matrix clause as in (9) $[\forall e: e \text{ involves } \sigma]\{e \text{ involves } \tau(\sigma)\}$ (cf. Kratzer 1986 for ordinary conditionals and Quer 2002 and Thomson 2012 for argument *if*-clause constructions), respectively. And, it is assumed that a predicate licensing argument *wenn*-clauses is (potentially) factive – cf. *bedauern* 'regret' in (1). I will show that approaches like (8) and (9) do not account for constructions where the matrix verb is a preference predicate – cf. (10) *Mia zieht es vor, wenn Paula Klavier spielt.* 'Mia prefers it if Paula plays the piano' (cf. Fabricius-Hansen 1980). Following the approach given in (8) as far as potentially factive predicates are concerned, I will modify it insofar that the *wenn*-clause σ 'Paula plays the piano' restricts the matrix clause τ 'Mia prefers that σ ' in that it expresses that it is contingent – cf. (11) $\forall e: \varphi(e) [(e \text{ involves } \sigma) \vee (e \text{ involves } \neg\sigma)] \Rightarrow \tau(\sigma)$. If one substitutes φ , for instance, by 'family celebration', one gets: For all family celebration events e , if e involves Paula's piano playing or her not-piano playing, Mia prefers Paula's piano playing. Thus, it is obvious that potential factivity is not a necessary condition for a predicate to license an argument *wenn*-clause. It will also be shown that it isn't a sufficient condition either since there are potentially factive predicates like *darüber nachdenken* 'cogitate about' that are factive, but do not allow argument *wenn*-clauses.

References

- Böttcher Wolfgang & Horst Sitta (1972): *Zusammengesetzter Satz und äquivalente Strukturen*. (Deutsche Grammatik III). Frankfurt a. M.: Athenäum.
- Kratzer, Angelika. (1986): Conditionals. in: *Papers from the Parasession on Pragmatics and Grammatical Theory*, ed. by Anne M. Farley, Peter Farley and Karl Eric McCollough., Chicago: Chicago Linguistics Society, pp. 115-135.
- Fabricius-Hansen (1980): Sogenannte ergänzende wenn-Sätze. Ein Beispiel syntaktisch-semantischer Integration, in: *Festschrift für Gunnar Bech: zum 60. Geburtstag am 23. März* ed. by Gunnar Bech, Mogens Dyhr, Karl Hyldgaard-Jensen & Jørgen Olsen. (Kopenhagener Beiträge zur germanistischen Linguistik, Sonderband 1). København: Institut for germansk filologi, pp. 61-83.
- Hinterwimmer, Stefan (2011): When-Clauses, Factive Verbs and Correlates, to appear in a Festschrift for Peter Staudacher. Eds.: G. Fanselow und T. Hanneforth.
- Pullum, Geoffrey (1987): Implications of English extraposed irrealis clauses, in: *ESCOL '87: Proceedings of the Fourth Eastern States Conference on Linguistics* ed. by Ann Miller & Joyce Powers. Columbus: The Ohio State University, pp. 260-270.
- Pesetsky, David (1991): *Zero Syntax: vol. 2: Infinitives*. Unpublished manuscript, MIT.
- Quer, Josep (2002): Non-logical *If*, in: *Current issues in Romance languages: selected papers from the 29th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL), Ann Arbor, 8-11 April 1999* ed. by Teresa Satterfield, Christina Tortora & Diana Cresti. (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 220). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 241-254.
- Schwabe, Kerstin & Robert Fittler (2011): Über semantische Konsistenzbedingungen deutscher Matrixprädikate. ZAS Ms. 1-38.
- Thomson, Anie (2012): Referring to adverbials: Adverbial extraposition without movement. Talk delivered at the Workshop *(Mis)matches in clause linkage*, ZAS Berlin, April 13-14, 2012.
- Williams, Edwin (1974): *Rule Ordering in Syntax*. Unpublished PhD thesis, MIT.