
Non-canonic verb positioning in disintegrated verb-final *weil*-clauses in German

Nathalie Staraschek
Bergische Universität Wuppertal

nathaliest@gmail.com

- (1) Weil Paul nie den Rasen mäht.
because Paul never the lawn mows
'because Paul never maws the lawn'

The talk deals with the necessary conditions for verb-final *weil*-clauses (disWVL) in German, which are neither integrated in respect to their syntax nor their information-structure and carry an assertional force (cf. (1)). One aspect is, that these phrases may only encode a causal relation to a non-presupposed proposition, which seems to be due to the fact that their disintegration results in a complete interpretation of the antecedent before their own meaning is deciphered¹. Within contexts as described there are two ways for these causal clauses to be informative, the proposition of their antecedent not being presupposed. They can relate to just a causal relation or encode an additional non-presupposed proposition, therefor being not yet or already integrated into the *common ground* (CG), the latter not being true for the disintegrated V2-variants. Possible questions to be dealt with: Are these phrases purely syntactic variations? If not, is the idea that the propositions of disWVL are not put on top of the metaphorical table (cf. Bruce/Farkas (2010)), but listed as publicly committed to by the speaker, adequate? Should this be true, would this and if how, be reflected in terms of integration of the non-presupposed proposition into future CG-states?

References: • Antomo, M./Steinbach, M. (2010), Desintegration und Interpretation: Weil-V2-Sätze an der Schnittstelle zwischen Syntax, Semantik und Pragmatik, in: *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 29, 1-37 • Bruce, K.B./Farkas, D.(2010), On Reacting to Assertions and Polar Questions, *Journal of Semantics* 27, 81-118

¹The same condition holds for *weil*-verb-second clauses. This constitutes an essential contrast to integrated causal clauses (iWVL), which may encode and assert solely the causal relation of two presupposed propositions. This difference is due to their different syntactic and pragmatic status, which force iWVL into being interpreted in a conjoined discourse update with their antecedent. About the notion, that disintegrated causal clauses are processed separately from the antecedent cf. Antomo/Steinbach (2010:28).