Syntax or morphology: German particle verbs revisited
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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.

1 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.

1 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.’

    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
    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.
    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 haben
    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 der Garaus gemacht\(^5\)

'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.


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.

\[(3) \text{Herein kommen wir schon, aber wie heraus.}\]

‘We will get in, but how are we going to get out.’

\(^5\)Mannheimer 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.

\[
\begin{align*}
(4) \quad &a. \text{ Das Licht ist an.} \\
&\quad \text{the light is on} \\
&b. \text{ An sollst du das Licht machen.} \\
&\quad \text{on shall you the light make} \\
&\quad \text{‘You shall switch on the light.’}
\end{align*}
\]

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.

\[
\begin{align*}
(5) \quad &a. \text{ (Ganz) zu hat sie die Tür geschlagen.} \\
&\quad \text{completely shut has she the door hit} \\
&\quad \text{‘She slammed the door completely shut.’} \\
&b. \text{ (Weit) hinaus ist der Ball geworfen worden.} \\
&\quad \text{far out is the ball thrown got} \\
&\quad \text{‘The ball was thrown far out.’}
\end{align*}
\]

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, Lütscher, 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.

\[
\begin{align*}
(6) \quad &\text{contains particles in fronted position that are related to nouns.}^6
\end{align*}
\]

---

^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.  Schlangen stehen bereits Hans Jürgen Syberberg, […] und Botho Strauss, […]7
  queue stand already Hans Jürgen Syberberg and Botho 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). Schlangen stehen is derived from in einer Schlangen stehen. I follow
(Wunderlich, 1987:98) in treating Schlangen 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.\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{13}
   green politics
   ‘Opinions differ on fundamental issues in green politics,’

(9) a. Fest steht aber auch, daß . . . \textsuperscript{14}
   PART(solid) stands but also that
   ‘But it is also certain that . . . ’

b. Fest scheint auch zu stehen, daß . . . \textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{12}taz, 13.07.1999, p. 20
\textsuperscript{13}NEGRA corpus.
\textsuperscript{14}tv-news, Tagesschau, 21.03.1998
\textsuperscript{15}In 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  
   ‘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 reine Strukturwissenschaft ist, die nichts mit Quantifikation zu tun hat.18  
   ‘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.  
   ‘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  
   ‘Reemtsma was only released after 30 Million DM had been paid.’

b. Verlustig geht ihnen damit auch die Kontrolle über Geldmenge, Inflation und Zinsen.21,22  
   ‘lost goes them that with also the control over money.amount 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 . . . ’

---

22 taz, 23.09.1998, p. 8
22 verlustig gehen in (13b) reminds one of the use of verloren gehen. See example (7a).
23 Mannheimer Morgen, 15.07.1998, Sport; MERC ist noch nicht vom Eis
25 taz, 10.11.1995, p. 4
26 taz, 15.07.1999, p. 19
27 NEGRA 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.stepped 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 im Westen.
    PART (up) goes the sun in.the east but PART (down) goes she 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.

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 schon schwieriger aus.

Intended: ‘He can take part, but it is more difficult for him to lose 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.

‘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.

‘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.\(^{30}\)

\[(21)\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. Es fängt zu regnen an.} \\
\text{it starts to rain } \text{PART} \\
\text{‘It is starting to rain.’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{b. * An fing es zu regnen.} \\
\text{PART started it to rain}
\end{align*}\]

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.

\[(22)\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{* Ein war der Studienrat getreten.} \\
\text{in was the teacher stepped} \\
\text{‘The teacher had entered.’}
\end{align*}\]

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:\(^{31}\)

\[\begin{align*}
\text{(i) An haben wir damit gefangen, daß …} \\
\text{PART(on) have we there.with caught that} \\
\text{‘We began our involvement in it when …’}
\end{align*}\]

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.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{(ii) An haben wir damit gefangen, daß …} \\
\text{PART(on) have we there.with caught that} \\
\text{‘We began our involvement in it when …’}
\end{align*}\]

\[^{30}\text{I caught myself saying (i).}\]

\[^{31}\text{It is unclear whether the es in (23) is a positional es or an antecedent of it-extraposition. But the actual distinction of both possibilities is not relevant for the rest of the argument.}\]
(23) Es steht aber auch fest, daß [...]  
\[\text{it}_{expl} \text{ stands but also } \text{PART that}\]

‘But it is also certain that . . .’

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

\[\text{PART is } \text{Nixon 1974 stepped}\]

Intended: ‘Nixon resigned in 1974.’

\[\text{PART stepped Nixon 1974}\]

\[\text{PART stepped is Nixon 1974}\]

(24b) could be continued with and he died in 1994, which would establish a contrast between the whole verb \textit{abtreten} and \textit{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.\textsuperscript{33}

\[\text{the Leviticus will we the scoundrel read}\]

‘We will read the scoundrel the riot act.’

b. Eine Abfuhr werden wir dem Aufwiegler erteilen.  
\[\text{a removal will we the instigator give}\]

‘We’ll take the rabble-rouser to shove off.’

(26) a. Unter den Tisch fällt, dass diese Kritiker weniger die Interessen der car.drivers but much more those of the industry look after

\[\text{under the table falls that those critics less the interests of the Autofahrer, sondern viel mehr die der Wirtschaft vertreten.}^{34}\]

\textsuperscript{32}See 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.

\textsuperscript{33}The 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

‘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] 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.

\[(28)\]  
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad * \text{Stehen werden sie Schlange.} \\
& \text{stand will they queue} \\
& \text{Intended: ‘They will queue up.’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{b.} & \quad * \text{Kommen wird er frei.} \\
& \text{come will he free} \\
& \text{Intended: ‘He will get free.’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{c.} & \quad * \text{Lassen wird er das Buch zurück.} \\
& \text{let will he the book behind} \\
& \text{Intended: ‘He will leave the book behind.’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{d.} & \quad * \text{Kommen wird Karl an.} \\
& \text{come will Karl} \text{ PART} \\
& \text{Intended: ‘Karl will arrive.’}
\end{align*}\]

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 \textit{erzählen müssen wird} and \textit{treu sein will} form a predicate complex:

\[(29)\]  
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{weil er ihr ein Märchen [v [v erzählen müssen] wird]} \\
& \text{because he her a fairytale tell must will} \\
& \text{‘because he will have to tell her a fairytale.’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{b.} & \quad \text{weil er ihr [v [v treu sein] will]} \\
& \text{because he her faithful be wants} \\
& \text{‘because he wanted to be faithful to her.’}
\end{align*}\]

\(^{39}\)See (Höhle, 1982:101), (Hafrika, 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 normaly not considered part of the verbal or predicate complex.

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

\(^{40}\)Höhle (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.  
\(^{41}\)taz, 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 Westen geht.\(^{42}\)

‘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.

43 Detmar Meurers, Tübingen, 09.03.2000
44 Uli Krieger, 2000
45 On 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


19


