

Finnish *jos* 'if' -conditional clauses as suspended clause constructions

Subordinate clauses in turn-initial position are often considered to project turn continuation (see, e.g., Auer 2005). However, it is also known that clause types ordinarily considered subordinate can also, in some contexts, appear without main clauses (e.g. Ford 1993; Kauppinen 1998; Clancy & Akatsuka 1997; Suzuki 2009). In this paper, I will examine uses of Finnish *jos* 'if' -clauses without any main clauses. I will show that the independent *jos*-clauses have emerged as constructions in particular interactional contexts and are treated by participants as complete constructions. The paper is based on data from the conversation archives of the Department of Finnish language and literature at the University of Helsinki.

The independent *jos*-clauses in my data function to name irrealis events or states of affairs (cf. Couper-Kuhlen & Thompson 2009), which may be presented as either undesirable or desirable by the speaker. An independent *jos*-clause may function as a directive or it can simply propose a future state of affairs without having directive force. If the directive is intended to involve an action by a coparticipant, it is always person-marked in my data and responded to by the participant whose action is requested or proposed. Consider the example below:

Missu: *niij jos tota, te maksasitte sittem meille takas.*
PTC if PTC 2PL pay-COND-2PL then 1PL-ALL back
so if um, you would pay us back then.

Anna : *joo-o? totta kai.*
PTC true PTC
yes? of course.

In contrast, if a joint action by the speaker and coparticipant(s) is proposed, there is no person marking; instead, the Finnish passive form is used. The Finnish passive always implies human agency, and it is the verb form used in the first person plural in spoken varieties of Finnish, ordinarily with a separate pronoun. The next example shows the use of the passive form in a directive proposing joint action. The passive verb may be in conditional or indicative form, as in the example below. These are normally also responded to by the other participants. The response may take various forms, such as a conditional, as in the next example.

Kaaka: *.hh jos: nähdää huomenna vaikka?,*
if see-PASS tomorrow although
let's meet tomorrow for instance.

Missu: *joo nähtäiskö vaan;*
PTC see-PASS-COND-Q just
yes, let's just meet tomorrow.

Another option available in *jos*-clauses used for directives is the zero person construction. This involves a third person verb form without a subject argument. The zero person construction leaves the matter of who is to do the action predicated open to negotiation (Laitinen 1994). *Jos*-directives done with the zero person construction are often embedded in a lengthy negotiation. The next example is taken from a telephone conversation where the participants are negotiating who would notify a group of acquaintances about a particular event.

Missu: *tai no jos sanos vaikka Mar:- tota: .hh*
or PTC if say-COND although Mar:- PTC
or maybe if (one) would ask for instance Mar:-

Miialle et <soittais?>,
M-ADE COMP call-COND
Miia to call.

(3.8)

Note that no response to this proposal is forthcoming. The speaker continues her turn after the excerpt above and her coparticipant eventually offers to do the action proposed by Missu.

Independent *jos*-clauses can also be used to name a possible state of affairs without directive force. In these, both the conditional and indicative verb form occur. These are usually also responded to by a coparticipant.

Miia: **jos ne on epä]hygienisiä**.
if 3PL be un-hygienic
what if they're not clean.

Anu : *>tä<*
PTC
what.

Susa: *eIko kyl ne miun mielest pestää to#ta:#<*
NEG-CLT PTC 3PL 1SG-GEN mind-ELA wash-PASS PTC
no I think they are actually washed um

My paper will consider the grammatical formats, sequential contexts and the participation structure of the independent *jos*-clauses in my data.