

Syntax or morphology: German particle verbs revisited

Stefan Müller

This article appeared in Nicole Dehé, Ray Jackendoff, Andrew McIntyre and Silke Urban (eds.). 2002. *Explorations in Verb-Particle Constructions*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, New York.

1 Introduction

During the past years there has been a debate about whether particle verbs should be analyzed as morphological objects or as syntactic combinations. The most frequently cited arguments for a treatment as morphological objects are: 1) Non-transparent particle verbs have to be listed in the lexicon. Therefore they constitute one word. 2) In German particles cannot be fronted without their verb. 3) The particle cannot be separated from its verb in verb final contexts. 4) In certain dialects of German only words can combine with certain prepositions, and since particle verbs can do so, they must be words and have to be treated in morphology.

In what follows, I will show that all these claims are empirically wrong. When discussing the data, I will point out similarities of particle verbs with syntactic constructions and finally suggest a syntactic analysis.

[†]Thanks to Berthold Crysmann, Kordula De Kuthy, Anke Lüdeling, Andrew McIntyre, and Hans Uszkoreit for discussion, two anonymous reviewers for comments, and to Kordula De Kuthy, Detmar Meurers, Nicole Dehé, and Anke Lüdeling for supplying me with relevant literature. Thorsten Brants helped me to find the examples that are from the NEGRA corpus. I want also to thank Uta Waller who helped me translate sample sentences from newspapers.

I found the examples from the *Mannheimer Morgen* in the COSMAS corpus that is provided by the Institut für Deutsche Sprache (IDS) Mannheim (<http://corpora.ids-mannheim.de/~cosmas/>).

The research carried out for this paper was supported by a research grant from the German Bundesministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft, Forschung und Technologie (BMBF) to the DFKI project WHITEBOARD (“Multilevel Annotation for Dynamic Free Text Processing”), FKZ 01 IW 002.

2 Non-Productive Particle Verb Combinations

Many particle verbs have a non-transparent reading. It is clear that this has to be represented in the grammar somehow, but it does not follow that particle verbs are words. The point is that there are also other constructions that have non-regular meanings and that are clearly phrasal and take part in syntactic processes.

- (1) a. Man liest den Regierenden in Bonn die Leviten.
one reads the governors in Bonn the Leviticus
'The rulers in Bonn are read the riot act.'
- b. Am 1. Mai werden den Regierenden in Bonn die Leviten gelesen.¹
at.the 1 May are the governors in Bonn the Leviticus read
'On 1 May the rulers in Bonn will be read the riot act.'
- c. Ein Mann bekommt von seiner Frau die Leviten gelesen, weil er
a man gets by his wife the Leviticus read because he
beim Fernsehquiz versagte.²
by.the TV.quiz failed
'A man is read the riot act by his wife because he did not do well in the TV quiz.'
- d. Gerhard Schröders Doppelgänger mußte sich in Abwesenheit des
Gerhard Schröder's Doppelganger had.to self in absence of.the
Originals die Leviten lesen lassen.³
original the Leviticus read let
'Gerhard Schröder's Doppelganger had to have the riot act read to him as the original was not there.'
- (2) a. die Hunderttausende, die wochenlang auf die Straße gegangen sind
the hundred.thousands who weeks.long on the road went are
und einem verrotteten Regime den Garaus gemacht haben⁴
and a rotten regime the stop made have
'The hundred thousands who went on the streets for weeks on end to put a stop to a decayed regime.'

¹Mannheimer Morgen, 02.05.1998, Lokales; Kommentar Debattierclub

²Mannheimer Morgen, 09.10.1989, Feuilleton; Witzig und skurril, mit Charme und Hintersinn

³Mannheimer Morgen, 05.03.1999, Politik; „Derblecken“ auf dem Nockherberg

⁴Bundestagsprotokolle (2. Hj. 1990), Sitzung Nr. 219, Bd. 154, p. 17359–17375, 90.08.08, p. 17364

- b. in Heidelberg wird „parasitären Elementen“ unter den Professoren
 in Heidelberg get parasitic elements under the professors
 der Garaus gemacht⁵
 the stop made
 'In Heidelberg "parasitic elements" among the professors are done
 away with'

The examples in (1) and (2) show that idiomatic expressions can appear in various forms of passive. (1b) is an agentive passive, (1c) is a dative passive, and (1d) is a permissive *lassen* passive.

3 Fronting

Particles can be fronted, although this is often denied. There are different claims about frontability that will be explored below.

3.1 What Can be Fronted?

Bierwisch (1963:103) claims that particles like *ab*, *an*, *auf*, *aus*, *ein*, *über*, *unter* are not frontable. But as the examples in this paper show, there are instances of particle fronting for many of these particles. The frontability is not a property of the particle but rather a property of the particle verb.

Haider (1990:96; 1993:280; 1997a:35–36; 1997b:86–87, 93), Fanselow (1993:68), Neeleman and Weermann (1993:473), Kiss (1994:100), Haider, Olsen and Vikner (1995:17), Kathol (1996), Olsen (1997a: 307; 1997b: 21), and Eisenberg (1999:306) deny the frontability of particles. These authors do not mention any exceptions and some of them take the non-frontability claim as evidence to rule out certain sentence structures for German.

Zifonun (1999:227) uses the non-frontability as a defining property of particle verbs. She explicitly excludes cases like (3) from the class of 'true' particle verbs, since these verbs are entirely compositional and the particle also appears as pronominal adverb.

- (3) Herein kommen wir schon, aber wie heraus.
 there.in come we anyway but how there.out
 'We will get in, but how are we going to get out.'

⁵Mannheimer Morgen, 28.06.1999, Sport; Schrauben allein genügen nicht

However, on page 223 she states that all particle verbs that have a preposition other than *mit* as particle are ‘true’ particle verbs. As the data below will demonstrate, even particles that have the form of prepositions can be fronted. Non-frontability of the particle therefore cannot be a necessary condition for being a particle verb.

Engel (1977: 213; 1994: 192) claims that only particles that correspond to copula particles like those in (4) can be fronted.

- (4) a. Das Licht ist an.
the light is on
b. An sollst du das Licht machen.
on shall you the light make
‘You shall switch on the light.’

Grewendorf (1990:106) claims that only those particles which assign a theta role can be fronted. Stiebels and Wunderlich (1992:3) give the following examples and claim that the fronting is only possible if the particle occurs together with resultatives or directionals.

- (5) a. (Ganz) zu hat sie die Tür geschlagen.
completely shut has she the door hit
‘She slammed the door completely shut.’
b. (Weit) hinaus ist der Ball geworfen worden.
far out is the ball thrown got
‘The ball was thrown far out.’

Similarly, Webelhuth and Ackerman (1999) developed an LFG analysis that is supposed to explain what kind of particles can be fronted. They claim that only particles that have a resultative meaning can be fronted.

There are some authors, however, who realize that the fronting of particles is possible in a variety of cases that do not fall under those described above (Reis, 1976:68, Lötscher, 1985:211, Hoeksema, 1991, Bennis, 1991, Hoberg, 1997, Lüdeling, 1997, and McIntyre, 2001).

Since it is so often claimed that particles are non-frontable, an extensive discussion of data will be provided in the remainder of this section.

(6) contains particles in fronted position that are related to nouns.⁶

⁶I assume that *particle* is a separate grammatical category. Most particles are related to nouns, verbs, adjectives, or prepositions by a lexical redundancy rule. See also (Olsen, 1999:238; McIntyre, 2001:44).

- (6) a. *Rad* würde Karl gerne *fahren*.
bicycle would Karl with.pleasure ride
'Karl would like to ride a bicycle.'
- b. *Schlange stehen* bereits Hans Jürgen Syberberg, [...] und Botho
queue stand already Hans Jürgen Syberberg and Botho
Strauss, [...] ⁷
Strauss
'Hans Jürgen Syberberg [...] and Botho Strauss [...] are already queuing up.'
- c. *Schicht* hat von denen keiner *gearbeitet*. ⁸
PART(shift) has of those nobody worked
'None of them has worked shifts.'

In (7) the particles correspond to verbs. ⁹

- (7) a. *Verloren geht* dabei keiner, [...] ¹⁰
lost gets there.during nobody
'Nobody gets lost during this.'
- b. *Verloren gingen* danach auch die Spiele gegen die
lost went there.after also the games against the
Humboldt-Realschule und das Benz-Gymnasium. ¹¹
Humboldt.secondary.school and the Benz.high.school
'After that the games against the Humboldt secondary school and the Benz high school were also lost.'

Since these particle verbs resemble ordinary verbal complexes, it is not really surprising that such examples can be found.

In (8)–(9) the particles correspond to adverbs.

⁷Wiglaf Droste, *taz*, 27.02.1998, p. 20. The *taz* is a newspaper that appears nation-wide in Germany (<http://www.taz.de>). *Schlange stehen* is derived from *in einer Schlange stehen*. I follow (Wunderlich, 1987:98) in treating *Schlange stehen* as a particle verb.

⁸Spiegel, 48/99, p. 305

⁹Stiebels and Wunderlich (1994:962) list *verlorengehen* ('get lost', 'lose'), *stiftengehen* ('to hop it'), *spazierengehen* ('to go for a walk', 'stroll'), and *flötengehen* ('to go west') as particle verbs. The sentences in (7) falsify their claim that only resultative or directional particles can be fronted. See the discussion around (5).

¹⁰Mannheimer Morgen, 01.07.1998, Lokales

¹¹Mannheimer Morgen, 13.03.1998, Lokales

- (8) a. *Weiter macht er aber doch.*¹²
 PART(further) makes he but anyway
 ‘But he carries on anyway.’
- b. *Auseinander gehen die Meinungen über Grundsätzliches in der*
 PART (apart) go the opinions about fundamentals in the
*Grüne-Politik,*¹³
 green politics
 ‘Opinions differ on fundamental issues in green politics.’
- (9) a. *Fest steht aber auch, daß ...*¹⁴
 PART(solid) stands but also that
 ‘But it is also certain that ...’
- b. *Fest scheint auch zu stehen, daß ...*¹⁵
 PART seems also to stand that
 ‘It seems to be certain that ...’

The verb *feststehen* is a lexicalized form. The particle can neither be exchanged for another adjective or adverb (10a), nor can it be omitted (10b). The particle cannot predicate over a sentential complement (10c).

- (10) a. **Wacklig steht, daß ...*
 wobbly stands that
- b. **Daß nicht nur der zu verbalisierende Sachverhalt, sondern auch die Stellungnahme des Sprechers zum Sachverhalt in den jeweiligen Satzpaaren identisch sind, steht.*
 Intended: ‘That ... stands.’
- c. **Daß nicht nur der zu verbalisierende Sachverhalt, sondern auch die Stellungnahme des Sprechers zum Sachverhalt in den jeweiligen Satzpaaren identisch sind, ist fest.*
 Intended: ‘That ... is certain.’

Since there are sentences with fronted *fest* where *stehen* is not adjacent to *fest*—namely those where *feststehen* is embedded under *scheinen*—Zeller’s assumption (1999:65) that *Fest steht, daß* can be analyzed as a fixed phrase is questionable.

¹²taz, 13.07.1999, p. 20

¹³NEGRA corpus.

¹⁴tv-news, Tagesschau, 21.03.1998

¹⁵In the main text of (Engel, 1977:219). Reis (1976:68) discusses a similar sentence in the context of the raising verb *scheinen*. She explicitly mentions the fact that a particle is fronted.

In (11) the particle corresponds to pronominal adverbs.

- (11) a. *Papier ist geduldig, und raus kommt sowieso nichts dabei.*¹⁶
paper is patient and PART(out) comes anyway nothing this.at
'Anyone can write drivel, and it doesn't lead to anything anyway.'
- b. *Raus kam der „Schwindel“ erst gestern.*¹⁷
'The fraud was only revealed yesterday.'
- c. *Dagegen ist zu halten, daß die moderne Mathematik eine
PART (against.this) is to hold that the modern mathematics a
reine Strukturwissenschaft ist, die nichts mit Quantifikation zu
pure structure.science is which nothing with quantification to
tun hat.*¹⁸
do has
'As an argument against this, it has to be said that modern mathematics
is a pure structure science which has nothing to do with quantification.'

The adverb in (11b) can be used predicatively as in (12).

- (12) *Jetzt ist es raus.*
now it is out
'It is out now.'

This is not the case for the *rauskommen/herauskommen* in (11a). This verb is used metaphorically. The same is true for *dagegenhalten*. The original meaning of *halten* is not present anymore.

In (13) the particles are related to adjectives.¹⁹

- (13) a. *Frei kam Reemtsma erst nach Zahlung von 30 Millionen Mark.*²⁰
free came Reemtsma only after paying of 30 million mark
'Reemtsma was only released after 30 Million DM had been paid.'
- b. *Verlustig geht ihnen damit auch die Kontrolle über Geldmenge,
lost goes them that.with also the control over money.amount
Inflation und Zinsen.*^{21,22}
inflation and interest

¹⁶taz berlin, 28./29.11.1998, p. 25

¹⁷taz, 06.08.1998, p. 9

¹⁸In the main text of (Heringer, 1973:93).

¹⁹Note that *freikommen* is not a resultative construction, since *freikommen* does not mean that the coming of an individual (*kommen*) causes the individual to be free (*frei*). See for instance Dowty (1979) on the meaning of resultative constructions.

²⁰taz, 31.03.1998, p. 1

‘With that they also lose control over the sums of money, inflation and interest.’

- c. Ganz *klar* *stellte* er aber auch, „daß wir keine Altlasten
quite clear stood he but also that we no old.burdens
übernehmen“.²³
over.take

‘But he also made it clear ‘that we will not pay any out standing debts’.’

In (14a) the particle *los* is fronted. In general, this particle marks the beginning of an event (*losfahren* (‘start to drive’), *losrennen* (‘start to run’), *losschreien* (‘start to shout’)).²⁴ In (14a) the verb with *los* is a lexicalized form. The core meaning of *gehen* is not present anymore.

- (14) a. *Los* *ging* es schon in dieser Woche.²⁵

PART went it already in this week
‘It already started this week.’

- b. *Vor* *hat* er das jedenfalls.²⁶

PART(before) has he that in.any.case
‘But he does plan this.’

- c. *Entgegen* *kamen* sich Koalition und Opposition in der Frage
towards came themselves coalition and opposition in the question
um die Verkehrsberuhigung der Titusstraße.²⁷
around the traffic.soothing of.the Titus.street

‘Coalition and opposition accommodated each other in the question of traffic reduction in Titus street.’

- d. *Auf* *fällt*, daß ...²⁸

PART falls that
‘It is noticed that ...’

²²taz, 23.09.1998, p. 8

²²*verlustig gehen* in (13b) reminds one of the use of *verloren gehen*. See example (7a).

²³Mannheimer Morgen, 15.07.1998, Sport; MERC ist noch nicht vom Eis

²⁴Cf. (Engel, 1988:440).

²⁵taz, 10.11.1995, p. 4

²⁶taz, 15.07.1999, p. 19

²⁷NEGRA corpus.

²⁸(Duden, 1991:62)

All examples in (14) have in common that the particle cannot be used in a predicative construction with the copula *sein* like the copula particles in (4) and (5a), and therefore they cannot be predicates of whatever kind was claimed to be possible in sentence-initial position.

The examples in (15) are from novels.

- (15) a. *auf* *schrie* die Ziehharmonika
PART shrieked the accordion
'the accordion shrieked'
- b. Es klopfte, *eintrat* der Studienrat.²⁹
it knocked in.steps the teacher
'There was a knock on the door. The teacher came in.'

The particle *auf* in (15a) marks the sudden begin of an event. The *ein* in (15b) is related to the preposition *in* (Olsen, 1997a:307).

3.2 Why Are These Frontings Possible?

The frontability seems to depend on the semantic content of the particle and the content of the verb. The more content a particle has, the better the fronting is. As was discussed above, most researchers agree about the cases where a particle that can also appear in copula constructions is fronted.

One can observe that even particles that cannot appear as predicates in copula constructions can be fronted if they are contrasted (Haftka, 1981:720–721). Hoeksema (1991) and Bennis (1991) discuss the fronting of particles in Dutch. Their examples have been translated into German by Lüdeling (1997:231):

- (16) Auf geht die Sonne im Osten, aber unter geht sie
PART (up) goes the sun in.the east but PART (down) goes she
im Westen.
in.the west
'The sun rises in the east, but is going down in the west.'

A similar example has been provided by Hoberg (1997:1622). Examples like (17a) are rather odd, but if a contrast is established as in (17b) the sentence is okay.

²⁸Günter Grass, *Die Blechtrommel*, München: Deutscher Taschenbuchverlag, 1993, p. 272

²⁹Walser, *Ohne einander*, p. 51. Quoted from (Hoberg, 1997:1621).

- (17) a. ?* Um färbt Karl den Stoff.
 PART dyes Karl the cloth
 Intended: 'Karl is dyeing the cloth a different colour.'
- b. Nicht um färbt Karl den Stoff sondern ein.
 not PART dyes Karl the cloth but PART(in)
 'Karl is not dyeing the cloth a different colour. He is dyeing it for the first time.'

Uszkoreit (1987:101) claims that the fronting of semantically non-autonomous particles is blocked even if it establishes a semantic contrast. He tries to prove this claim with the following sentence, where *teilnehmen* has to be understood with a contextually given argument: a weight loss course.

- (18) * Teil kann er immer nehmen, mit dem Abnehmen sieht's
 PART can he always take with the weight.loosing looks.it
 schon schwieriger aus.
 already more.difficult PART
 Intended: 'He can take part, but it is more difficult for him to loose weight.'

However, the reason for this ungrammaticality is that the meaning of the verbs in (18) is totally unrelated. Imagine a context where an actor has to gain 10 kilos to have the right shape for a particular role in a movie. In a conversation one speaker claims that he has read that the actor has to lose 10 kilos to get the role. Then the reply in (19) would be possible.

- (19) Nein, nicht ab muß er nehmen sondern zu.
 no not PART must he take but PART
 'He has to gain weight, not lose it.'

So the generalization seems to be that the fronting of semantically non-autonomous particles is possible if a contrast is established between two particle verbs that have the same verb but different particles which add information to the core meaning of the verb. The verb *färben* ('dye') has a meaning that is related to the meaning of *umfärben*. This is not the case for *einfallen* ('remember'). The meaning of *fallen* is *fall*. This is the reason for the ungrammaticality of (20).

- (20) * Nicht auf ist mir die Tatsache gefallen sondern ein.
 not on is me the fact fallen but PART
 Intended: 'I did not notice the fact, I remembered it.'

That *an* of *anfangen* can hardly be fronted is due to the non-compositionality of *anfangen*.³⁰

- (21) a. Es fängt zu regnen an.
 it starts to rain PART
 ‘It is starting to rain.’
 b. *An fing es zu regnen.
 PART started it to rain

Since *anfangen* is non-transparent, it is impossible to establish a contrast between particles or base verbs.

Examples like (14) and (15) are not very frequent. They cannot be explained as contrastive readings. Hoberg (1997:1621) assumes that the particles are fronted to allow nominal constituents to occupy the rightmost position in a clause which is sometimes desired for reasons of information structuring. The fact that frontings like (15b) are unacceptable if the particle verb is non-finite is explained by her assumption, since in (22) the NP is not positioned at the rightmost position.

- (22) *Ein war der Studienrat getreten.
 in was the teacher stepped
 ‘The teacher had entered.’

However, this explanation cannot account for fronting of particles in sentences where the particle verb takes a sentential complement. As sentential complements can be extraposed easily, an expletive positional *es* as in (23) could be used to fill the sentence-initial position. When using such an expletive, (9a) would be reformulated as:³¹

³⁰I caught myself saying (i).

- (i) An haben wir damit gefangen, daß ...
 PART(on) have we there.with caught that
 ‘We began our involvement in it when ...’

The sentence was uttered to explain to someone who entered the room why the people in the room were talking about a strange topic. I asked the two people involved in the conversation for judgments of (i). Both considered (i) normal. The information structuring in (i) is different from that in (21). The subject in (21) is an expletive pronoun, whereas the subject in (i) is a referential pronoun. In (21) the sentence-initial position is filled with a semantically empty element. Since a positional *es* can hardly be used in sentences that contain referential pronouns (see (Erdmann, 1886:§ 94)), the fronting in (i) is the only way not to front the subject or the pronominal adverb.

³¹It is unclear whether the *es* in (23) is a positional *es* or an antecedent of *it*-extraposition. But the actual distinction of both possibilities is not relevant for the rest of the argument.

- (23) Es steht aber auch fest, daß [...]

it_{expl} stands but also PART that

'But it is also certain that ...'

Zeller (1999:64) explains the contrasts in (24) via focus assignment.³²

- (24) a. ?* Ab ist Nixon 1974 getreten.

PART is Nixon 1974 stepped

Intended: 'Nixon resigned in 1974.'

b. ? Ab trat Nixon 1974.

PART stepped Nixon 1974

c. Abgetreten ist Nixon 1974.

PART.stepped is Nixon 1974

(24b) could be continued with *and he died in 1994*, which would establish a contrast between the whole verb *abtreten* and *sterben*. Since this focus on the whole verb cannot as easily be established in (24a) as in (24b), where the two elements of the verb are adjacent, (24a) is marginal and the (24c) is preferred. In the perfect construction in (24c) the complete verb is fronted and one continuous element can be focused.

That frontings are possible when the sentence-initial position is occupied by constituents that do not contribute compositionally to the meaning of the sentence is demonstrated by the sentences in (25)–(26) where a part of an idiom is positioned in sentence-initial position.³³

- (25) a. Die Leviten werden wir dem Burschen lesen.

the Leviticus will we the scoundrel read

'We will read the scoundrel the riot act.'

b. Eine Abfuhr werden wir dem Aufwiegler erteilen.

a removal will we the instigator give

'We'll take the rabble-rouser to shove off.'

(26) a. Unter den Tisch fällt, dass diese Kritiker weniger die Interessen der

under the table falls that those critics less the interests of.the

Autofahrer, sondern viel mehr die der Wirtschaft vertreten.³⁴

car.drivers but much more those of.the industry look.after

³²See also Uszkoreit (1987:100) for the observation that many particle frontings are better when the verb is in second position, i.e., adjacent to the particle.

³³The examples in (25) are from (Uszkoreit, 1987:107).

‘It is not mentioned that these critics do not represent the interests of motorists, but rather those of the economy.’

- b. Ein schlechtes Licht wirft die Bilanz auf den Osten der Stadt:
a bad light throws the balance on the east of the city
...³⁵

‘The balance showed the east of the city in a bad light.’

The examples in (25)–(26) could be instances of the pattern in (24b). While Zeller’s assumptions explain most of the data that was discussed above, the sentences (6c), (9b), and (11c) remain unexplained. These sentences show that the adjacency of particle and verb is not a necessary condition for fronting. In (6c) the particle verb is embedded under the perfect auxiliary *hat* (‘has’), in (11c) it is embedded under the modal *sein* (‘be’) and in (9b) it is embedded under *scheinen* (‘seem’). In (6c) it is clear that the contribution of the noun is focused. The verbs in (9b) and (11c) embed both clausal complements. Again, information structuring is the reason for such frontings, but instead of the insertion of a positional *es*, the particle is fronted.

The analogous examples with idioms are shown in (27).

- (27) a. Den Vogel aber hat die Münchner Messegesellschaft abgeschossen
the bird but has the Munich trade.fair.company PART(off).shot
[...] ^{36,37}
...
‘But the Munich trade fair company was by far the best.’
- b. *Eine Rolle* habe auch *gespielt*, dass er erstmals verletzungsfrei in die Saison gegangen war. ³⁸
‘It was also significant that he began the season without any injuries for the first time.’

The verbs of the idioms in (27) are embedded under perfect auxiliaries and similar examples exist where the idiom is embedded under a modal. So, as with the particle verb frontings in (6c), (9b), and (11c), there is no adjacency between

³⁴taz, 06.01.2000, p. 3

³⁵taz berlin, 05.02.2000, p. 24

³⁶Mannheimer Morgen, 26.08.1989, Wirtschaft; Tick-Tack-Tec

³⁷Nunberg, Sag and Wasow (1994:512) give a similar example that they quoted from a manuscript of Ackerman and Webelhuth.

³⁸taz, 28.08.1999, p. 18

heads and complements that are combined non-transparently. For more data and the discussion of similar claims in connection with multiple frontings see Müller (2000).

3.3 The Impossibility of Fronting the Base Verb

A non-finite particle verb cannot be fronted without its particle.³⁹ This is demonstrated by the sentences in (28) which contain particles that are related to different categories.

- (28) a. *Stehen werden sie Schlange.
 stand will they queue
 Intended: ‘They will queue up.’
- b. *Kommen wird er frei.
 come will he free
 Intended: ‘He will get free.’
- c. *Lassen wird er das Buch zurück.
 let will he the book behind
 Intended: ‘He will leave the book behind.’
- d. *Kommen wird Karl an.
 come will Karl PART
 Intended: ‘Karl will arrive.’

The examples of particle fronting discussed above are parallel to examples where verbs or adjectives with or without dependents are fronted. Such examples were discussed in (Müller, 1997; Müller, 1999:Chapter 18; Müller, 2001). There I assumed that *erzählen müssen wird* and *treu sein will* form a predicate complex:

- (29) a. weil er ihr ein Märchen [_v [_v erzählen müssen] wird]
 because he her a fairytale tell must will
 ‘because he will have to tell her a fairytale.’
- b. weil er ihr [_v [_v treu sein] will]
 because he her faithful be wants
 ‘because he wanted to be faithful to her.’

³⁹See (Höhle, 1982:101), (Haftka, 1981:721), (Olszok, 1983:127), (Lötscher, 1985:212), and (Uszkoreit, 1987:104) for similar examples.

The non-finite verbs and the finite verb are combined before the whole verbal complex is combined with the complements. Similarly the adjective, the copula and the modal verb form a predicate complex that is combined with the arguments of the involved heads later.

The ungrammatical examples in (28) are parallel to (30).

- (30) a. * Müssen wird er ihr ein Märchen erzählen.
must will he her a fairytale tell
- b. * Sein will er ihr treu.
be wants he her faithful

The generalization about these ungrammatical examples is that if parts of the predicate complex are fronted (alone or with adjuncts or complements), all parts of the predicate complex that are governed by fronted heads have to be fronted together with this head. So in (30a), *müssen* governs *erzählen*. If *müssen* is fronted, *erzählen* has to move as well. If particles are analyzed as parts of the predicate complex, the ungrammaticality of the sentences in (28) is explained.⁴⁰

4 Separation in Verb Final Contexts

As I argued in the last section particle verbs should be treated as part of the predicate complex. The examples in (31) and (32) seem to be problematic for such an analysis since particles and verbs are not adjacent and are separated from each other by material that is normally not considered part of the verbal or predicate complex.

- (31) Andrew Halsey ist auf dem Weg von Kalifornien nach Australien weit
Andrew Halsey is on the way from California to Australia far
ab vom Kurs gekommen.⁴¹
off from.the course come.
- ‘On the way from California to Australia Andrew Halsey strayed way off course.’

⁴⁰Höhle (1982) and Lötscher (1985) suggested treating the particle as part of the verbal complex. I assume that copula constructions and certain other predicative constructions are also analyzed as complexes (Müller, 2000, 2001) and that particle verb combinations are of the same construction type.

⁴¹taz, 04.10.1999, p. 20

In (31) the particle meaning is further specified by a *von*-PP. There are no particle verbs in German that have a *von* as particle. *ab* is used instead (Fourquet, 1974; Stiebels, 1996:86, 94). In (31) the particle *ab* is not adjacent to *gekommen*, but its projection—the phrase *weit ab vom Kurs*—is. Sentences like (31) are unproblematic for analyses that assume that particle and verb are combined in syntax.

In (32) the particles are separated from their verb by a locative PP.

- (32) Ich weiß, daß die Sonne auf im Osten und unter im
 I know that the sun PART(up) in.the east and PART(under) in.the
 Westen geht.⁴²
 west goes
 ‘I know that the sun rises in the east and sets in the west.’

But as (Lüdeling, 1998:57) notes, these examples are caused by focus split. That it is possible to intrapose certain parts of the predicate complex was also shown by the examples with adjectives in (Müller, 1999:Chapter 18.4.3). So, this is another similarity of adjective copula and particle verb combinations. While a syntactic analysis can account for (32), a morphological one clearly fails.

5 Ripuarian and Bavarian

Stiebels and Wunderlich (1994:927) discuss the following data from two German dialects and argue that this data constitutes evidence for a morphological analysis of particle verbs.

- (33) a. Er ist sein Zimmer am aufräumen.
 he is his room at.the PART(up).clearing
 ‘He is tidying up his room.’
 b. *Er ist am sein Zimmer aufräumen.
 he is at.the his room PART(up).clearing
 c. *Er ist sein Zimmer auf am räumen.
 he is his room PART(up) at.the clearing

am is an amalgamated preposition. *am* together with the auxiliary *sein* expresses the progressive aspect. Stiebels and Wunderlich note that all NP complements have to appear before *am*. According to Stiebels and Wunderlich, the prepositional element *am* takes a nominalized infinitive and has to appear immediately before

⁴²(Lüdeling, 1998:57)

it. However, when I heard Detmar Meurers speaking, I realized that this is not the complete story.

- (34) Wir sind die grade am komplett Durchbestellen.⁴³
we are them just at.the completely PART.ordering
'We are ordering all of them now.'

(34) was uttered while we were talking about a series. In (34) an adverb, i.e., syntactic material follows *am*. This means that either the nominalization of syntactic combinations is allowed in this position or—if just *Durchbestellen* or *bestellen* is the nominalization—that syntactic material is allowed after *am*. In any case Stiebels and Wunderlich's argument is weakened.

Furthermore, examples like (35) show that nominal material can appear in such constructions.

- (35) Er ist ständig am Werbung für sich Machen.⁴⁴
he is permanently at.the advertisement for self make
'He is permanently indulging in self-promotion.'

I asked several speakers of this dialect and they considered sentences like (35) and (34) normal.

It is not clear to me what the exact restrictions of this construction are, but in the present context they are not important.⁴⁵ The examples in (34)–(35) are sufficient to show that these nominalizations are not relevant for claims about the status of particle verbs. Even if examples like (34)–(35) did not exist, the examples in (33) would not be evidence for particle verb combinations being non-syntactic, as was claimed by Stiebels (1996:44). Nominalized predicative constructions (*das Gutfinden* 'the good finding'), resultative constructions (*das Leerfischen* 'the empty fishing'), and verbal complexes (*das Artig-Sein-Wollen* 'the well-behaved be want.to') show the same order as nominalized particle verbs. The verbal complex is nominalized as one unit. The data in (33) therefore has to be regarded as additional evidence that particle verb combinations are similar to predicative constructions, resultative constructions, and verbal complexes, i.e., to other constructions that are regarded as syntactic combinations.

⁴³Detmar Meurers, Tübingen, 09.03.2000

⁴⁴Uli Krieger, 2000

⁴⁵On some constraints see (Bhatt and Schmidt, 1993).

6 Conclusion

In this paper I have discussed arguments for the treatment of particle verbs as morphological objects that are repeated in various forms throughout the literature. While it was previously claimed that particles cannot be fronted, that they cannot be separated from the based verb in head final contexts, and that they cannot be modified, I have demonstrated that these claims cannot be upheld in general, and suggested a syntactic analysis where the particle is treated as part of the predicate complex.

It is clear that in many instances fronting, separation, and modification are impossible, but this is not due to general properties of particle verbs. In the case of particle fronting and intraposition, other factors interfere, like information structure and the possibility of establishing a contrast. Whether a particle can be modified or not depends on semantic factors. In my opinion, it is the right approach to allow fronting, intraposition, and modification and to account for the appropriate syntactic structures. Additional constraints like those discussed for fronting then rule out or specify the markedness of certain constructions.

A more detailed discussion of data and a fully formalized account that explains both the syntax of particle verbs and their inflectional and derivational morphology is given in (Müller, 2000).

Bibliography

- Bennis, Hans. 1991. Theoretische Aspekten van Partikelvooropplaatsing. *TABU Bulletin voor Taalwetenschap* 21(3), 89–95.
- Bhatt, Christa and Schmidt, Claudia Maria. 1993. Die *am+Infinitiv*-Konstruktion im Kölnischen und im umgangssprachlichen Standarddeutschen. *Linguistische Berichte Sonderheft 5: Dialektsyntax*, 71–98.
- Bierwisch, Manfred. 1963. *Grammatik des deutschen Verbs*. studia grammatica II, Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Dowty, David R. 1979. *Word Meaning and Montague Grammar*. Synthese Language Library, No. 7, Dordrecht, Boston, London: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- Duden. 1991. *Die deutsche Rechtschreibung*, volume 1. Mannheim, Leipzig, Wien, Zürich: Dudenverlag.
- Eisenberg, Peter. 1999. *Grundriß der deutschen Grammatik*, volume 2. Der Satz. Stuttgart, Weimar: Verlag J. B. Metzler.

- Engel, Ulrich. 1977. *Syntax der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*, volume 22 of *Grundlagen der Germanistik*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag.
- Engel, Ulrich. 1988. *Deutsche Grammatik*. Heidelberg: Julius Groos, second edition.
- Engel, Ulrich. 1994. *Syntax der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*, volume 22 of *Grundlagen der Germanistik*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, third completely revised edition.
- Erdmann, Oskar. 1886. *Grundzüge der deutschen Syntax nach ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, volume 1. Stuttgart: Verlag der J. G. Cotta'schen Buchhandlung, Reprint: Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1985.
- Fanselow, Gisbert. 1993. Die Rückkehr der Basisgenerierer. *Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik* 36, 1–74.
- Fischer, Ingrid and Keil, Martina. 1996. Parsing Decomposable Idioms. In Jun-ichi Tsuji (ed.), *Proceedings of Coling-96. 16th International Conference on Computational Linguistics (COLING96). Copenhagen, Denmark, August 5-9, 1996*, pages 388–393, Somerset, New Jersey: ACL – Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Fourquet, Jean. 1974. Die verbalen Zusammensetzungen des Neuhochdeutschen. Trennbare und untrennbare Partikeln. In Ulrich Engel and Paul Grebe (eds.), *Sprachsystem und Sprachgebrauch. Festschrift für Hogo Moser*, volume 33 of *Sprache der Gegenwart – Schriften des IdS Mannheim*, pages 98–111, Düsseldorf: Pädagogischer Verlag Schwann.
- Grewendorf, Günther. 1990. Verb-Bewegung und Negation im Deutschen. *Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik* 30, 57–125.
- Haftka, Brigitta. 1981. Reihenfolgebeziehungen im Satz (Topologie). In Karl Erich Heideolph, Walter Fläming and Walter Motsch (eds.), *Grundzüge einer deutschen Grammatik*, pages 702–764, Berlin – Hauptstadt der DDR: Akademie Verlag.
- Haider, Hubert. 1990. Topicalization and other Puzzles of German Syntax. In Günther Grewendorf and Wolfgang Sternefeld (eds.), *Scrambling and Barriers*, *Linguistik Aktuell / Linguistics Today*, No. 5, pages 93–112, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Haider, Hubert. 1993. *Deutsche Syntax – generativ. Vorstudien zur Theorie einer projektiven Grammatik*. Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik, No. 325, Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Haider, Hubert. 1997a. Precedence among Predicates. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 1, 2–41.
- Haider, Hubert. 1997b. Projective Economy. On the Minimal Functional Structure of the German Clause. In Werner Abraham and Elly van Gelderen (eds.), *German: Syntactic Problems—Problematic Syntax*, *Linguistische Arbeiten*, No. 374, pages 83–103, Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

- Haider, Hubert, Olsen, Susan and Vikner, Sten. 1995. Introduction. In Hubert Haider, Susan Olsen and Sten Vikner (eds.), *Studies in Comparative Germanic Syntax*, volume 31 of *Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, pages 1–45, Dordrecht, Boston, London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Heringer, Hans-Jürgen. 1973. *Theorie der deutschen Syntax*. Linguistische Reihe, No. 1, München: Max Hueber Verlag, second edition.
- Hoberg, Ursula. 1997. Die Linearstruktur des Satzes. In Hans-Werner Eroms, Gerhard Stickel and Gisela Zifonun (eds.), *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache*, pages 1495–1680, Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Hoeksema, Jack. 1991. Theoretische Aspekten van Partikelvooropplaatsing. *TABU Bulletin voor Taalwetenschap* 21(1), 18–26.
- Höhle, Tilman N. 1982. Über Komposition und Derivation: zur Konstituentenstruktur von Wortbildungsprodukten im Deutschen. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 1, 76–112.
- Kathol, Andreas. 1996. Discontinuous Lexical Entries. In Philippe Blache (ed.), *Third International Conference on HPSG–Abstracts. 22-24 May 1996*, pages 43–44, Marseille.
- Kiss, Tibor. 1994. Obligatory Coherence: The Structure of German Modal Verb Constructions. In John Nerbonne, Klaus Netter and Carl J. Pollard (eds.), *German in Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*, CSLI Lecture Notes, No. 46, pages 71–108, Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Lötscher, Andreas. 1985. Syntaktische Bedingungen der Topikalisierung. *Deutsche Sprache* 13, 207–229.
- Lüdeling, Anke. 1997. Strange Resultatives in German: New Evidence for a Semantic Treatment. In Ralph C. Blight and Michelle J. Moosally (eds.), *Proceedings of the 1997 Texas Linguistics Society Conference*, pages 223–233, University of Texas Department of Linguistics.
- Lüdeling, Anke. 1998. *On Particle Verbs and Similar Constructions in German*. Ph.D.thesis, Universität Tübingen.
- McIntyre, Andrew. 2001. *German Double Particles as Preverbs: Morphology and Conceptual Semantics*. Studien zur deutschen Grammatik, No. 61, Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag.
- Müller, Stefan. 1997. Yet another Paper about Partial Verb Phrase Fronting in German. Research Report RR-97-07, Deutsches Forschungszentrum für Künstliche Intelligenz, Saarbrücken, a shorter version appeared in *Proceedings of COLING 96*, pages 800–805. <http://www.dfki.de/~stefan/Pub/pvp.html>. 06.11.2003.
- Müller, Stefan. 1999. *Deutsche Syntax deklarativ. Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar für das Deutsche*. Linguistische Arbeiten, No. 394, Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, <http://www.dfki.de/~stefan/Pub/hpsg.html>. 06.11.2003.

- Müller, Stefan. 2000. *Complex Predicates: Verbal Complexes, Resultative Constructions, and Particle Verbs in German*. Habilitationsschrift, Universität des Saarlandes, Saarbrücken, <http://www.dfki.de/~stefan/Pub/complex.html>. 06.11.2003.
- Müller, Stefan. 2001. Case in German – Towards an HPSG Analysis. In Walt Detmar Meurers and Tibor Kiss (eds.), *Constraint-Based Approaches to Germanic Syntax*, Studies in Constraint-Based Lexicalism, No. 7, pages 217–255, Stanford: CSLI Publications, <http://www.dfki.de/~stefan/Pub/case.html>. 06.11.2003.
- Neeleman, Ad and Weermann, Fred. 1993. The Balance between Syntax and Morphology: Dutch Particles and Resultatives. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 11, 433–475.
- Nunberg, Geoffrey, Sag, Ivan A. and Wasow, Thomas. 1994. Idioms. *Language* 70(3), 491–538.
- Olsen, Susan. 1997a. Prädikative Argumente syntaktischer und lexikalischer Köpfe: Zum Status der Partikelverben im Deutschen und Englischen. *Folia Linguistica* 31, 3–4.
- Olsen, Susan. 1997b. Zur Kategorie Verbpartikel. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 119, 1–32.
- Olsen, Susan. 1999. Verbpartikel oder Adverb. In Angelika Redder and Jochen Rehbein (eds.), *Grammatik und mentale Prozesse*, Stauffenburg Linguistik, pages 223–239, Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag.
- Olszok, Klaus. 1983. In finite Formen im Vorfeld. In Klaus Olszok and Edith Weuster (eds.), *Zur Wortstellungsproblematik im Deutschen*, Studien zur Deutschen Grammatik, No. 20, pages 89–169, Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Reis, Marga. 1976. Reflexivierungen in deutschen A.c.I-Konstruktionen. Ein transformationsgrammatisches Dilemma. *Papiere zur Linguistik* 9, 5–82.
- Stiebels, Barbara. 1996. *Lexikalische Argumente und Adjunkte: Zum semantischen Beitrag verbaler Präfixe und Partikeln*. *studia grammatica* XXXIX, Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Stiebels, Barbara and Wunderlich, Dieter. 1992. A Lexical Account of Complex Verbs. Arbeiten des SFB 282 No. 30, Seminar für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft. Universität Düsseldorf.
- Stiebels, Barbara and Wunderlich, Dieter. 1994. Morphology Feeds Syntax: the Case of Particle Verbs. *Linguistics* 32(6), 913–968.
- Uszkoreit, Hans. 1987. *Word Order and Constituent Structure in German*. CSLI Lecture Notes, No. 8, Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Webelhuth, Gert and Ackerman, Farrell. 1999. A Lexical-Functional Analysis of Predicate Topicalization in German. *American Journal of Germanic Linguistics and Literatures* 11(1), 1–61.

- Wunderlich, Dieter. 1987. Schriftstellern ist mutmaßen, ist hochstapeln, ist Regeln mißachten. – Über komplexe Verben im Deutschen. In Brigitte Asbach-Schnitker and Johannes Roggenhofer (eds.), *Neuere Forschungen zur Wortbildung und Histographie*, Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik, No. 284, pages 91–107, Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Zeller, Jochen. 1999. *Particle Verbs, Local Domains, and a Theory of Lexical Licensing*. Dissertation, University of Frankfurt, Frankfurt/Main.
- Zifonun, Gisela. 1999. Wenn *mit* alleine im Mittelfeld erscheint: Verbpartikeln und ihre Doppelgänger im Deutschen und Englischen. In Heide Wegener (ed.), *Deutsch kontrastiv. Typologisch-vergleichende Untersuchungen zur deutschen Grammatik*, Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag.