

## Review of Michael Cysouw: *Encyclopedia of German Diatheses*

I think this is a very inspiring book which brings a whole lot of observations together. The book should – in my view – definitely be published. A number of revisions – especially concerning the language data – are needed. Quite a number of examples are either ungrammatical or all right although the author claims differently. I recommend using attested examples rather than constructed ones and to check the acceptability of some examples with native speakers. This might affect the entire analysis presented in the volume.

Examples have been checked and corrected. However, a deep investigation of all judgements is beyond the present scope. Any specific suggestions for revision in this review have been taken into account.

Although the volume is focused on the morphosyntactic realization of arguments, it might be worth taking semantics more into account. This cannot be done systematically, I admit, but it seems that a number of generalizations/explanations are possible, if one relies on semantics.

I completely agree, and I make various suggestions as to possible semantic generalizations. However, as said, that full discussion is far beyond the current scope, and I am happy to leave great generalizations for others to publish!

A major issue concerns the use of the notion ‘light verb’ which I think is totally unjustified in very many cases. The author should be more careful in especially using this term but also in using other terms like for example ‘affectedness’. A number of general issues – some concerning the analysis, some concerning the form – are listed below.

After thorough consideration (more below) I still think that the term ‘light verb’ is the least problematic of all alternatives. There is indeed always a problem when using terms in slightly novel ways, but this term is the least confusing, compared to all alternatives (as listed in Section 1.3.1).

My general recommendation is that the book should be published after revision as it is a very interesting collection of different argument realization patterns! It is an inspiring book which I enjoyed to read.

## General comments

### 1. General impression

There are some serious problems with a number of examples. As a native speaker, I disagree with many sentence judgements. There are examples which I consider as ungrammatical and examples which are said to be ungrammatical but which are not (at least to my intuition). I recommend to rely on attested examples as much as possible and to refrain from constructing examples. I provide a detailed listing of problematic examples below. Reconsidering these examples might affect the analysis here and there.

Thank you for all detailed input! I have gone through the examples and considered your input. The examples have also been checked by another German native speaker. In general, I agree that constructed examples are not ideal, but they mostly have the function to quickly identify what I have in mind. A full corpus-based investigation of all the hundreds of constructions summarised in this book is a big desideratum!

### 2. References

I wonder why there are so few references in the body of the text. It is obvious that the author is familiar with the relevant research literature but he could cite it more often in the body of the text. It would be interesting for the reader to gain an overview on the relevant literature. Especially in chapter 7.1, I wondered why no references are included. I recommend taking the literature into account and providing the required references.

Thank you for the additional references! And indeed, there is surely much more that could be included. However, my goal is not to provide a complete survey of everything that has ever been said, but provide a survey, a starting point, for further study. The more than 150 references are indeed just a start, and I plan to revise and expand this in future editions of this book. By getting a first version out into the world I hope to have a point of reference for more discussion.

Specifically as to 7.1: this is a difficult point, as there is an enormous literature about reflexives, which mostly deals with completely different topics. The seminal work of Kunze (1997) as cited seems an appropriate reference in this context.

Please check the reference section for correct spelling, especially the use of capital letters with German words.

done, though there were only very few issues with capitalization.

### 3. Light verbs

The notion ‘light verb’ is used prominently in this volume. The term is used in a special way and the author should explain his conception of the term. How does the term ‘light verb’ – as used in the volume – relate to Jespersen’s (1942) original notion of the term? How does the term ‘light verb’ relate to the German notion ‘Funktionsverb’? I would like the author to be more precise with respect to his use of the notion of a ‘light verb’. On page 39 (for example), it is claimed that hören, fühlen und spüren can also be used as light verbs. This is the first time I have ever seen someone making such a claim. It requires better support as it somehow contradicts the mainstream’s view on light verbs. Why is the term ‘light verb’ rather than ‘auxiliary’ used? On page 390, Funktionsverbgefüge are briefly mentioned. It is said that (this specific type of) Funktionsverbgefüge are not included in the volume. But the examples contain lots and lots of Funktionsverbgefüge.

The term ‘light verb’ is explicitly introduced and discussed at the start of the book (Section 1.3.1, see <http://cysouw.github.io/diathesis/fulltext.html#1.19>). I don’t think that going back all the way to Jespersen will shed new light on this term. In general, the term ‘light verb’ is used widely in the description of the world’s languages with widely differing interpretations. However, I still think that it is fitting in the current context. There are many other terms used in the German grammatical tradition (see the linked section for a survey), but they all have a rather different gist as what I have in mind here. So I use a term that has no tradition in German (different from the reviewer, I do not think that there is a ‘mainstream’ view on light verbs in German), but is still compatible with what in general a ‘light verb’ is supposed to mean, viz. the functional part of a complex predicate in a monoclausal construction, often grammaticalised with a bleached semantic content.

Specifically: ‘Auxiliary’ (Hilfsverb) is not suitable, because it has a very strong interpretation in the German tradition for *sein/haben/werden*. Further, the note on p.390 is about *präpositional angeschlossene Funktionsverben* as used in the Duden grammar, which is something completely different from the constructions discussed in this book. *Funktionsverbgefüge* seems to be used mostly in that sense (e.g. <https://grammis.ids-mannheim.de/terminologie/85>). So that term is explicitly not what I have in mind when I used ‘light verb’. I realise that the English term ‘light verb’ is used as a translation of the German *Funktionsverbgefüge* in Fleischhauer (2021; 2022), and this double usage is unfortunate. However, in my opinion it is not problematic, as we could easily be more specific for the two different uses, e.g. my usage could be ‘light verbs with a verbal main predicate’, while in a *Funktionsverbgefüge* it could be ‘light verbs with a nominal main predicate’. I have added a section in Chapter 12 about this.

The claim that *hören/fühlen* etc. are also light verbs (in my definition) is indeed unusual, but it seems only logical to include them here, as the ACI-constructions behave completely parallel to all the other constructions discussed. In general, this is a problem of terminology, and I think that ‘light verb’ is the least confusing option.

#### 4. Coherence

The notion ‘coherence’ is a central term in the volume. I wonder whether this is a good choice of terminology as the term is also used in different senses in linguistics. It might be worth demarcating the use of ‘coherence’ in the current volume from the notion of ‘coherence’ as used in others work.

The Term *Kohärenz*/coherence is widely used in the syntactic literature on German. I have added a few lines explaining the possible confusion in 1.3.1.

#### 5. Language of examples (minor issue)

As a native speaker of German, I am able to understand every example but non-native speakers must a lot without a translation of the examples. If this would be a book about a language I do not speak, I am not sure whether I would finish the book. It would be quite a lot of work translating all examples but it could be a compromise translating the numbered examples and just leaving the ‘further examples’ without translation.

As noted in the preface I have also considered this, but currently I have decided against it. Basically, this book is written for readers that both have some basic knowledge of German and English. That is also one of the reasons to use many constructed examples, because they are ‘easier’ to interpret. I do not think that there is anything to gain from adding interlinear glossing to the more than 1000 numbered example sentences.

## 6. Mesoroles & Macroroles

‘[...] a ‘German Patiens’ might be defined as those lexical roles that are changed from accusative to nominative in the warden passive’. I know that this is just an example but – in my view – it does not work. With this test the second arguments of verbs like *schlagen*, *sehen*, *hören*, *zerstören*, *erschrecken*, etc. would be a ‘patiens’. The second arguments play entirely different roles in the events denoted by the verb and should, in my view, not be lumped together in a single role. But is this really what is intended? If not, be more precise in explaining how, for example, the second argument of *erschrecken* can be distinguished from the second argument of *zerstören*.

The problem I address is a different one: the notion ‘patiens’ is ill-defined in the literature. Mostly it is only very vaguely or implicitly defined. So, I personally simply do not know (technically) what a *patiens* is supposed to be. I do of course have a clear intuition, but that is not enough. So, my proposal (and indeed, this is not worked out at all here) is to reverse the situation: set a clear definition and adapt one’s intuition to this definition. Actually, what I do here is just to define a grammatical category “X” and I need a name for this category. Because there is a strong overlap with intuitions about the term “*patiens*” this can be used as a name for “X”. I have tried to make this clearer in the text.

The notion ‘macrorole’ is used differently from, for example, Van Valin (2005). Macroroles are usually conceived as abstractions over semantic/thematic roles and not as subsuming syntactic functions like ‘subject’ and ‘object’.

I think my definition is completely in line with Van Valin’s approach. The misunderstanding seems to lie in my usage of the terms ‘subject’ and ‘object’, which I use in a language-specific meaning, and not as abstract grammatical roles. I have tried to be more explicit in the text.

## 7. Order of diatheses

It is claimed that ‘the order of diatheses in a stack is of crucial importance’ (p. 29). The examples in (2.31) suggest that ‘modal’ precedes ‘perfect’, is this right? What motivates this order? Does it follow from the data? I wonder how

one can derive at such an order based on the data under discussion.

yes, this is basic syntactic analysis, which I do not want to expand in this book. Basically, the question of order-of-application is one of scope and can be identified syntactically by the order of the verbal elements in the construction. Also semantically it is clear that the order of application of constructions is crucial to the meaning of the end result.

#### 8. Italics

The use of italics is not entirely consistent. Sometimes one finds ‘bleiben+zu+Infinitiv’ and sometimes terms for categories use not written in italics, e.g., ‘bleiben+zu+Infinitiv’. This should be made consistently.

I have searched extensively for this to be consistent, but I have not been able to find instances. So I hope that I have not misunderstood this comment.

#### 9. Epitheses

One productive pattern is missing ‘stehen davor zu + Infinitive’, e.g., ‘Er steht davor das Turnier zum ersten Mal zu gewinnen’ (termed ‘prospective’ in Fleischhauer under review). This is also a coherent construction and attested with several hundred different infinitives.

Actually, this is a highly interesting construction, but it does not fall under the definitions as used in my work. *stehen* as discussed by Fleischhauer takes a governed preposition *vor*. The criterion for ‘governed preposition’ that I use is whether the preposition can also be used with a *da+vor* with a subordinate construction. Note specifically that it is not possible to have a construction *stehen vor + zu-Infinitiv* (without ‘da’). There is an interested detail, that I do not delve into, what kind of subordinate constructions are possible. Most the *da*- constructions allow for finite complement clauses (*dass ...*), while *stehen vor* only allows a non-finite subordinate construction.

Actually, this is a highly interesting construction, but it does not fall under the definitions as used in my work. *stehen* as discussed by Fleischhauer takes a governed preposition *vor*. The criterion for ‘governed preposition’ that I use is whether the preposition can also be used with a *da+vor* with a subordinate construction. Note specifically that it is not possible to have a construction *stehen vor + zu-Infinitiv* (without ‘da’). There is an interested detail, that I do not delve into, what kind of subordinate constructions are possible. Most the *da*- constructions allow for finite complement clauses (*dass ...*), while *stehen vor* only allows a non-finite subordinate construction.

#### 10. Affectedness & other categories

The notion ‘Affectedness’ is used differently by different authors. How is the term used in the current volume? I am not sure why, for example, ‘selbstbezogener Reflexiv’ (p. 92) and ‘Reziprok’ (p. 93) is subsumed under the notion of ‘affectedness’. The notion ‘affectedness’ needs a precise explication in the book. I wonder in how far the examples in 4.38 (p. 93) display a (slight) difference in affectedness of the subject-referent. Is this mere intuition or supported by linguistic test criteria?

The term ‘affectedness’ in chapter 4 was indeed unfortunate. I have changed it to the more non-committal ‘diathetical epithesis’. This is clearly not an ideal name, and I look forward to a better analysis of the phenomena discussed under this heading. Note that there are a few incidental uses of the word ‘affectedness’ still in the book, but in these cases the word is clearly used atheoretically.

Closely related is the discussion of the distinction between unmarked anticausatives and unmarked causatives (p. 110). There seems to be an intuitive decision for analyzing the examples in 5.33 as an instance of a causative alternation. One wonders whether this can be substantiated by linguistic test criteria. One could argue, for example, that a *gebautes Haus* always presupposes that someone has built the house. There is definitely some semantics literature dealing with this issue (one could start with Andrew Koontz-Garbooden’s work). Anyway, a decision to analyze the example in terms of this or that category should be supported by linguistics criteria and not mere intuition.

This is indeed a difficult issue, and actually I have been changing my mind various times over the last few years while I was working on this book. I have added some more clarification about my thinking in the text, but this remains a dubious point. Please note that I do explicitly not want to base my decision on semantics, as laid out in 1.3.4.

## 11. Section references

There are some wrong references to sections throughout the book. Instead of the section number, it is only reference to ‘Section X’, e.g., page 105 (last line), p. 107, p. 113, p. 158, p. 179, p. 184 (twice), p. 186 (twice), p. 188 (3x), p. 195.

done. thanks.

## 12. Verb senses

Various sentence pairs contain verbs which superficially look similar but have different meanings, e.g. *verfügen* and *halten* on page 151. I am not sure whether one wants saying that the different interpretations are the result of an argument alternation. If yes, one needs saying something about the semantics of the alternation. If not, I wonder whether it makes sense to conceive such pairs as an instance of an alternation at all. In my view, we are dealing with two different lexical entries which have their own argument realization patterns. Thus, I wouldn’t relate such entries by an alternation. This issue is briefly discussed on page 160 (why just there and not earlier?) without a clear result. I recommend discussing this issue already in chapter 1 and take a clear stance on the question whether clearly distinct lexemes are related in an alternation or not.

It is discussed in Section 1.3.2 already, immediately at the start

## Detailed comments

- p. 4 ‘empirical linguistic class’: what is meant by this phrase?

rephrased

- p. 7 ‘can be used the identify the boundary’: ‘to’ rather than ‘the’

done

- p. 13 ‘Basic summaries of german diathesis’: German

done

- p. 21 Is 2.9 intended to demonstrate that there is no gender agreement between *das Mädchen* and *es*? If yes, it is not true. If not, consider rewriting this passage and adding an example which illustrates the lack of gender agreement.



text rephrased

- p. 24 Example 2.21a: It should be ‘dem Teich’

done

- p. 25 ‘A diathetical operation is change’: ‘Is a change’ (?)

done

- p. 29 2.32g: The sentence is not ok with Fräser as an argument but it might improve with an animate referent: Der Chef lässt den Auszubildenden dem Patienten einen Schlitz in den Nagel schneiden.

removed *lassen* diathese here, because it indeed does not fit.

- p. 32 2.36b: dem Lehrling

done

- p. 32 ‘full applicative induces’: induced

done

- p. 33 ‘be used both the mean ‘interpret’’: ‘to’ instead of ‘the’

done

- p. 35 ‘Many sich intransitive verbs’ [last line]: sich (italics) or is sich wrongly put there?

should be *sich* :-)

- p. 37 ‘Very similar an anticausative’: ‘to an anticausative’

done

- p. 39 2.60b: I do not like the sentence; do you have an attested example for such a use?

changed to “Ich finde das Projekt gescheitert.”

- p. 39 2.60 & 2.61 The ambiguity in the interpretation of *lassen* can be demonstrated much clearer since both sentences allow for a causative as well as permissive interpretation. Ich lasse den Jungen einschlafen: (i) Ich verursache, dass der Junge einschläft (zum Beispiel durch Hypnose), (ii) Ich lasse es zu, dass der Junge einschläft. The same with *pure schlafen*.

added

- p. 40 ‘Therefore is called’: Therefore

rephrased

- p. 40 2.63b it should be seinem Sohn

done

- p. 40 2.66 Also Das Geschenk erfreut mich (similar to 2.66 a) is possible.

yes, but the point is that the alternation *freuen-erfreuen* might be an example of a special diathesis, which is (when real) highly unusual in German. This example is not ideal, because I do not know of better examples ...

- p. 44 ‘for any promising semantic or structural generalisations’: or instead of of

done

- p. 46 2.87b I prefer *bekommen* rather than *haben* in the paraphrase as, at least for me, the sentence means that the subject referent does not possess a fortune yet.

rephrased

- p. 46 ‘performing a predicate’: One cannot perform a predicate better write ‘performing the activity denoted by the predicate’

right! rephrased :-)

- p. 47 2.91b mein Hund

done ('Hemd')

- p. 48 2.95b In my view, the sentence is odd.

Changed examples to 'Ich erwarte ein Geschenk von dir'

- p. 50 2.100b In the right context, the sentence is all right: Was tust du gerade? Ich presse etwas Saft für das Frühstück. Attested example: Deswegen schenkte mir mein Gatte zum Geburtstag eine Küchenmaschine. Seitdem bediene ich täglich mit Hingabe die Maschine. Ich presse Saft. Ich mache Eis. Ich schlage Sahne. Vor allem aber häcksel' ich. <https://www.derwesten.de/staedte/hattingen/eheglueck-id3502326.html>; 30.12.2021

changed example to 'Ich klopfe den Staub von meinem Mantel.'

- p. 57 'However, with verb like': 'with a verb'

done

- p. 57 The meaning of 'creation' in relation to 3.10 is not clear to me. Why saying that Aufgabe is a creation of the teacher in 3.10a? What does this mean?

it is created by the teacher. rephrased.

- p. 58 3.12d Is this example really an instance of the perfect and not of the Zustandspassiv?

indeed, that is also my analysis (as discussed in 5.5.5). I have slightly changed the wording here.

- p. 58 3.13d The sentence is ungrammatical, maybe this is acceptable in a certain dialect?

I think it is possible (Zustandspassiv of the transitive), but the context of the examples is indeed strange. I changed the examples to "Der Zettel hat an der Wand geklebt./Der Zettel ist an die Wand geklebt."

- p. 58 3.13 Also possible: Ich habe den Teller geklebt.

indeed, though in a different sense of *kleben*.

- p. 59 ‘verbs like schreiben [...] are fine with the sein-Zustandspassiv but not with the bleibenKontinuativantikausativ’: But what about: Der Text bleibt bis zur nächsten Schulstunde an die Tafel geschrieben. Attested: Denn wo die Motivation geblieben wäre, wenn man den Angestellten nur quasi den Speck durchs Maul gezogen hätte und anschliessend bedauernd zur Mitteilung gezwungen gewesen wäre, es sei nun halt doch nichts gewesen, bleibt in den Sternen geschrieben. (A99/APR.29312 St. Galler Tagblatt, 27.04.1999, Ressort: AT-APP (Abk.); Belohnter Mut)

indeed: in the *Schule*-context *schreiben* becomes reversible. The example from the Galler Tagblatt is interesting. Sound rather innovative to me. However, I simply changed the example verb to *drucken*

- p. 60 First line after 3.6.7: translations of German verbs are missing

These are light verbs, which I do not translate. Added ‘light’ to indicate this.

- p. 60 3.18b Why ‘?’ in the example? The sentence is also ok with a durch-PP: Er wirkt durch die Stille entspannt.

For me the questionmark signals that there is something strange here that needs more attention. I think this status is exactly right. I agree that it is not obviously wrong, but somehow it feels strange, and I cannot completely express why. So, no change.

- p. 61 It is mentioned that the actor in a passive construction can be expressed by a von -or durch-PP but there exist various other means for realizing the actor, cf. the enormous literature on the German passive construction, e.g., Pape-Müller (1980).

Thanks for the useful reference: indeed, there are more options. I have added a reference in the section on the passive in Chapter 10.

- p. 62 3.25b Not ‘?’ but ‘\*’

Acceptability seems to swing widely depending on the lexical verb. I added another example to make this point clearer.

- p. 62 ‘The original subject an optionally’: ‘can’ instead of ‘an’

done

- p. 65 3.33b In this case, the infinitive is nominalized and you are dealing with a clear instance of a German Funktionsverbgefüge.

I completely agree that this construction is on the boundary to nominal constructions. This construction is from the last chapter of the book. Originally, I had planned to add more chapters on *Funktionsverbgefüge* with derived verbs. In the end I decided to stop with constructions that have infinitives. Maybe I’ll add more chapters in the future. However, given my current delimitations, this construction is in, while others are not discussed.

- p. 65 3.34c The preposition *am* is possible, cf. *Er hat einen Tropfen am Mund hängen*. So, the last sentence preceding the example is wrong. The reason that 3.34c does not allow *am* is that the contraction is not possible in case of feminine articles and *an*, also something like *an’r Nase* is ok in spoken German.

My point is a different one: the *am* is not possible in front of the infinitive. I have rephrased the text to make this clearer.

- p. 65 ‘in this diathesis the original nominative *es* demoted’: *es* demoted

done

- p. 66 It is claimed that *begrünen* is derived from the adjective *grün* but it is derived from the verb *grünen* which is derived from the adjective. (<https://www.dwds.de/wb/gr%C3%BCnen>) The same for *verdunkeln* which is derived from *dunkeln* und not from *dunkel*. (<https://www.dwds.de/wb/dunkeln>)

I changed the examples to make the point less contentious, e.g. *ermatten* and *befähigen*. I also added a few lines about the verbal intermediate in the main section on this phenomenon, 8.6.2.

- p. 67 ‘*Is* is not in widespread use and sound like’: sounds like

done

- p. 67 ‘The light verb status of *geben* is better exemplified together with verbs that take clausal complements’: Why?

With clausal complements only the causative interpretation is possible, not the literal interpretation. I have rephrased the text to make this clearer.

- p. 68 ‘The possibly leads’: This possibly leads

done

- p. 68 3.44a Again a clear case of a German Funktionsverbgefüge. One might wonder whether the noun *Kuss* is a regular argument of *geben* or not. There is some debate concerning this question, for references see Fleischhauer (in press). You could also use *küssen* instead of *Kuss geben*, if you like avoiding Funktionsverbgefüge: *Du küsst ihn; Ich sehe dich ihn küssen; Ich sehe, dass du ihn küsst.*

indeed, the example with *Kuss geben* is problematic here. Note that the verb *geben* is not crucial here. I have exchanged the example with something more concrete, viz. *Kuchen backen*.

- p. 68 3.45b Soundy old-fashioned.

I don’t think it is old-fashioned, but uncommon surely. Long discussion in the relevant section in Chapter 10. Basically, it gets much better in embedded position, e.g. “als man die Band schon fast eingeschlafen glaubt kommt der Song zurück und kann mich diesmal sogar richtig begeistern” (<https://www.metall.info/metal-reviews/code-nouveau-gloaming/>)

- p. 69 3.11.2 Why are you proposing a further diathesis? The dative marking of the original subject is expected (have a look at the typological literature on causatives). The cause becomes the new subject and is realized in the nominative. If there is already a direct object, the original subject can only become either an indirect object or realized within a PP. What is the reason for analyzing this construction as a type of ‘passive’?

See Section 11.2.5 for an extensive discussion of the need to differentiate this diathesis (link added in this section). Basically, there simply is a different role-remapping, so it will be differentiated here. As noted throughout, it is indeed very similar to another diathesis, viz. *Permisivkausativ*. Note that the proposed German Name is *Passivkausativ*, so it is a type of Kausativ, namely one that in some sense is reminiscent of a passiv (as the nominative is demoted to a prepositional phrase).

- p. 70 ‘though in this instance the diathesis is induced by a adverbial’: induced by an adverbial

done

- p. 70 3.51b Ich beende dir den Vertrag sounds slightly odd. Are there attested examples of this type?

Example exchanged. I don’t know why I used such a contrived example here :-)

- p. 71 ‘with an obligatory location in meinem Gesicht’: in mein Gesicht

done

- p. 71 3.52b in mein Gesicht

done

- p. 71 3.54b Ich glaube deiner Aussage. and Ich glaube an deine Aussage.

Are you sure about the dative *deiner* ? That seems only to occur in old examples in the DWDS.

- p. 72 3.55a Sie wichen vor der Polizei.: odd; better: Sie wichen vor der Polizei zurück.

seems to be attested, but might be old-fashioned, e.g. *Und er wich vor keiner Drohung, keiner Gewalt.* (DWDS: Die Zeit, 15.05.1981, Nr. 21). However, I changed the example to *entfliehen*.

- p. 73 There is some debate whether verbs like *singen* – which are usually conceived as ‘incremental theme verbs’ – entail the creation of something

in their intransitive use (Ich singe → Ich singe etwas). It seems that these verbs are basically transitive which seems to be contrary to the position adopted in the book (?), cf. e.g., Mittwoch (1982).

I changed the example to *laufen*, which is less problematic. I do not really see the relevance of Mittwoch (1982), as there seems to be simply a general statement that all labile verbs are basically transitive. I still think that there is a difference between transitives with an accusative drop and intransitive with an accusative addition. However, as I note, the difference is not very large.

- p. 74 3.65b The sentence is ok, no ‘?’ needed.
- p. 74 What is the difference between ‘optional Akkusativ’ and ‘Aktionsfokus’, this does not get clear to me.

changed the example verb to *sehen* and added some explanation. The difference is not large. The point is that many transitive verbs (like *sehen*) can still be used intransitively in a sense of ‘to be capable of seeing’. I have restricted my definitions to make the differentiation clearer.

- p. 75 3.68c Start the sentence with a capital letter

done

- p. 76 3.69a in mein Hemd

done

- p. 79 3.78a The sentence is odd.

Example changed.

- p. 79 3.79b The sentence is ok (in context), as already mentioned above.

Example changed here as well.

- p. 79 Is it claimed that there cannot be resultatives with intransitive verbs? One somehow gets the impression by reading this section.



no, there is no such implication. Also note that the term ‘resultative’ has multiple different meanings in grammatical theory. See fn. 6 in Chapter 2.

- p. 82 ‘is placed at the end in a subordinate situation’: not the situation is subordinated but the clause.

changed

- p. 82 ‘has a specific set of verbs to which can’: ‘to which it can’

done

- p. 84 4.6b The sentence has a habitual rather than a progressive interpretation due to ‘dauernd’. You can drop ‘dauernd’ and the progressive reading obtains.

changed adverb and reformulated explanation

- p. 87 In the discussion of the absentiv, it is claimed that the subject is not present. ‘Subject’ is a grammatical term and there is definitely a subject in the sentence. What is meant is that the subject referent is not present. But not present where? In how far does ‘Ich bin beim Arbeiten’ mean that the subject referent of I is not present? For me, the sentence has a progressive interpretative. Wouldn’t be ‘Ich bin bei der Arbeit’ closer to what is usually called ‘absentiv’?

Explanation rephrased. The construction in isolation is indeed some kind of progressiv, but in context it can only be used when the intended meaning is that the participant is absent. This is also the general consensus in the literature as discussed in the main discussion in Chapter 11

- p. 88 4.20b Here we have a Funktionsverbgefüge again.

again, please consider my definition carefully: this construction has a non-derived infinitive *stehen*, so I consider this still within the realm of diathesis, though on the boundary. I call this construction a *Präpositionsinfinitiv* which consist of preposition+article+infinitive. Funktionsverbgefüge starts when the verb is overtly derived into a noun by a nominalising suffix.

- p. 88 Concerning 4.3.8., it is claimed that no symmetrical construction with *gehen* exists but we find other constructions like *zum Stehen bringen*.

That is a highly interesting construction, discussed at the end of 13.2.2. After long deliberation I have decided that the *bringen+zum+Infinitiv* construction is not yet grammaticalised, although it is argueably close. The arguments are laid out in detail in that section. Note that when this construction is considered as a grammaticalised construction, then it would be a kind of causative, so it is functionally not the counterpart of *kommen+zum+Infinitiv*.

- p. 89 4.25b The sentence is ungrammatical but it would be fine with *gedenke* rather than *denke*.
- p. 89 4.26b (as well as the second sentence in a): I do not like the sentences. Are they attested?

yes they are, see the full discussion in Chapter 12 as referenced. They are arguably old-fashioned or at least highly elaborate to the point of being poetic. I have added some lines to explain this status more clearly (both here and in the full discussion in Chapter 12).

- p. 91 Is the example in 4.32 really (not) coherent, one can say *dass das Wetter droht schlecht zu werden*; *dass er das Licht auszuschalten droht*. I am not sure whether the contrast - proposed by the author really exists. The same for 4.33 on page 92 *dass er immer wieder das Licht auszuschalten verspricht*. I would even prefer these structures in sentences like *Dass er immer wieder das Licht auszuschalten verspricht und doch nicht tut, ärgert mich sehr*.

The contrast as proposed is extensively discussed by Diewald & Smirnova (2010) as extensively covered in the full discussion of this construction in Chapter 12 (as references in the text). There is indeed some leeway, but I'm quite convinced by their analysis as repeated here. Note that the short introduction here cannot present all details (and is not planned to be).

- p. 96 'the possible connections attested between construction': 'constructions'

done

- p. 97 Concerning 5.2.2 I wonder whether 'quantified' is the right predicate. *Laut*, as in 5.3.c, is clearly not an instance of quantification. (Also 5.15

on page 104)

But I think (with some leeway) the phrase *einen Tick zu laut* can be considered as a kind of quantification. That is what intended. I call it a ‘measure phrase’ in the text. No change.

- p. 98 The lexicalized noun-verb combinations are compared with noun incorporation. The noun-verb form are, in various instances, not a morphological word which is clearly different from noun incorporation. E.g., *Er stand die ganze Nacht über Wache*. This extends to page 100, there ‘noun incorporation’ is listed as a category of attested verbs. It might be worth comparing it with pseudo-incorporation, see, for example, the introduction in Borik & Gehrke (2015).

Thanks for the tip. I have added a few lines and the useful reference! However, for the purpose of the current book it is not really important what kind of noun incorporation is present in such cases.

- p. 98 5.7b I agree that a question with *was* is impossible (not ‘?’ but ‘\*’) but you can ask *Wie ist er gestorben? – Einen qualvollen Tod!*

To me that answer sounds really strange. However, I have added this option (though with a question mark still!).

- p. 100 5.11c *Um* is a preposition in this case and requires an argument *Ich ziehe den Zaun um das Feld*. Otherwise you can say *Ich ziehe um (nach Köln)* and even *Der Zoo zieht die Seelöwen um*.

right! I was confused, it was meant to be parallel to *umwerfen* and the like. Changed to *aufziehen*

- p. 102 ‘The verbs listed here need a genitive Argument’: ‘argument’

done

- p. 110 ‘*Ich bin weggetreten*’: This also has the meaning ‘being unconscious’; this is the dominant interpretation for me

changed to example to prevent this interpretation.

- p. 110 'Ich habe den Lärm der Stadt entflohen': I only accept sein; dialectal variation?

Section is rather strongly reformulated. The verb *entfliehen* is removed.

- p. 110 Concerning the 'further examples': What is the rationale behind the listing? Sometimes the list includes the perfect of the transitive verb, sometimes not.

Examples are harmonized to always show intransitive present and perfect, but only transitive present.

- p. 111 'The Schreck benimmt ihm den Atem': Without be-

DWDS lists this also with *be-* <https://www.dwds.de/wb/benehmen>

- p. 111 5.3.7 Why are there no examples?

Because there do not seem to be any verbs (anymore?) that **only** allow for this constructions. I have rephrase the text slightly to make this clearer.

- p. 104 'Er hat zehn kilo zugenommen': Kilo

done

- p. 104 For verbs like wiegen and kosten have a look at Gamerschlag (2014), there you find a useful discussion of the interpretation as well as argument realization of these verbs.

Thank you for the reference. Impressive work. However, because of the semantic approach the listings of Gamerschlag are difficult to relate to my strongly syntactically-determined classes. I have added a reference to his work.

- p. 106 'Das kochen klappt noch nicht so gut.': Kochen

done

- p. 107 5.5.4 Is this just an instance of 'impersonal passive'? If yes, say so. If not, this would also be interesting to know.

This comment is not clear to me. The ‘impersonal passive’ is a concrete construction *werden+Partizip* with intransitive verbs. The constructions discussed in Section 5.5. are clearly different constructions, though there is indeed a similarity in that both belong to the class of ‘verbative’ diatheses (see, e.g. 2.7.2 and 3.2). Nothing changed.

- p. 107 ‘Die Wunde hat geheilt’: Odd, I only accept sein

I agree, this is erroneously added here. removed

- p. 108 ‘Die Fähre hat abgestoßen’: That’s ungrammatical (at least for me). Due you have an attested example?

I took this from DWDS “die Fähre ist, hat (vom Lande) abgestoßen” <https://www.dwds.de/wb/abstoßen>. I have added this reference.

- p. 108 Besides ‘Die Bombe hat gezündet’ also ‘Die Bome ist gezündet’ is possible. Which is worth mentioning since you mention the variation between sein and haben regarding duschen in 5.26.

Indeed. That sentence should have been here. Added.

- p. 108 5.28c The second sentence is incomplete: Mein Sohn ist angehalten pünktlich zu sein; I think adding von mir is not acceptable. But this would be worth checking in a corpus as there might be sentences of this type in which adding a von-PP is acceptable.

Sentence completed. I agree that the *von* phrase is problematic here, but at this place in the book that is not important. I have removed the *von* phrase.

- p. 111 5.6.3 Further verbs: sitzen – setzen, liegen legen

These verbs belong in 6.6.2 as they need a locational phrase.

- p. 112 The examples in 5.37 and 5.38 illustrate different types of illustrations. Either you discuss this in more details or you should you list examples exemplifying the same type of alternation. The conative alternation in 5.37c is something different from the plain intransitive use of *essen* or *backen* in 5.37b and 5.38c.

Reformulated to make it clearer that the *essen*, *backen*, *sehen* examples are **not** part of this diathesis.

- p. 113 5.42 The examples contain different uses of *unterrichten*, in b. and e. it means ‘teach’, in c. and d. it means ‘report, notify’ and in a. it can mean both. It might be worth distinguishing between the different uses to check systematically whether the alternations are dependent on the verb’s meaning (use).

Slightly changed examples and explicitly added that the meaning ‘notify’ is not intended here.

- p. 114 5.43a The example is odd, at least for me.

I took it from DWDS “ich danke ihm mein Leben”. I have added a reference to that source.

- p. 114 In 5.7.4 it is stated that some verbs only allow inanimate subjects; one of the examples is *sitzen*. This is related to a specific interpretation of *sitzen*, right? Like in *Die Jacke sitzt (mir) gut*.

Yes: that is exactly the last example as listed in the section ‘Further Examples’

- p. 115 ‘this diathesis seem to be restricted’: seems

Done

- p. 115 ‘Ich spreche dir den Dank aus’: either without *den* or something like *den Dank aller Kollegen*

changed accordingly

- p. 116 ‘The verb *nahelegen* is is’: delete one ‘is’

done

- p. 116 ‘to read aloud\*’: wrong symbol

corrected

- p. 116 ‘Ich bezichtige dich nicht’: Only possible in a context like: ‘Du bezichtigst mich des Diebstahls. Nein, ich bezichtige dich nicht.’ But even here, I think the genitive NP is highly missing.

I agree. Verb removed here. I have added it to Section 5.3.7, which was discussed above already. That section didn’t have any examples, but now *bezichtigen* is the only one.

- p. 117 ‘Er hat die 400 meter geschwommen.’: Meter

done

- p. 118 ‘er floh ihren Blick’: Er

done

- p. 118 5.51 Punctuation mark is missing

added

- p. 119 ‘Mir dampft der Tee’/‘Mir stinken die Socken’: Strange sentences; attested? Stinken with a dative subject does not mean ‘smell’ but (roughly) ‘dislike’.

agree, removed this example. There is a nice neologism “mir dampft die Bluse”, but that is not (yet?) relevant [https://www.handelsblatt.com/arts\\_und\\_style/aus-aller-welt/filmsprueche-von-bud-spencer-mir-dampft-ja-schon-die-bluse/13800342.html](https://www.handelsblatt.com/arts_und_style/aus-aller-welt/filmsprueche-von-bud-spencer-mir-dampft-ja-schon-die-bluse/13800342.html)

- p. 119 ‘Mein Kopf schwindelt. Mir schwindelt der Kopf’: I think both sentences are rather strange.

agree, example removed

- p. 120 5.56 The contrast between b. and c. is due to the determiner: Ich koche deine Suppe für dich (deine Lieblingssuppe) and Ich koche die Suppe für dich (die, die du bestellt hast) are ok. The same for the examples in 5.58.

I have reformulated the text to make clearer why I think these examples are noteworthy.

- p. 122 5.64a This rather is odd, therefore it would be worth citing an attested example.

The example is from the DWDS dictionary. I have added a link.

- p. 128 6.11c 'ich bin getanzt': Ich

done

- p. 129 'The comitative interpretation': the

done

- p. 129 6.13a/c Punctuation marks missing

done

- p. 129 6.16 What about sentences like Ich kämpfe mit dem Schwert; the PP cannot easily dropped

That is exactly the point I'm trying to make here. I have added a sentence to make this clearer

- p. 130 6.17 Is there something missing between b. and c.?

No. Slight reordering of the example to remove any possibly confusion. Oh: I found the problem: in the PDF there was a layout error with too much whitespace.

- p. 130 'paraphrased by um zu-Infinitive phrase': either 'an um zu-Infinitive phrase' or 'phrases'

rephrased

- p. 130 6.18c I think bekomme is preferred over habe, if arbeiten is in the present tense.



Indeed, sound better. Changed.

- p. 130 6.21a Only a von-PP not a durch-PP is possible.

changed example

- p. 131 6.23b This only works with zerbrechen not with brechen. Or you add a result-XP Ich breche den Spiegel entzwei/kaputt/in Teile.

nice observation. Seems to be dependent on the noun. Changed *Spiegel* to *Brot*

- p. 132 ‘Das Problem steht zur Diskussion’: zur Diskussion stehen is a Funktionsverbgefüge; similarly unter Zugzwang geraten in 6.26b

Indeed. And they do not allow for a *da*-paraphrase. I have removed them, and some others that likewise were listed here erroneously.

- p. 132 ‘Das Buch handelt über die Relativitätstheorie’: I prefer von

I have the same intuition. *über* is attested, though rare. I have added a corpus example.

- p. 133 ‘Er hat viel Arbeit an das Haus gewandt’: Totally unacceptable

This example is taken from the DWDS dictionary. I have added a link.

- p. 134 6.30 Verwarnung/verwarmen instead of Warnung/warnen would be more idiomatic.

changed

- p. 134 6.32b The sentence is acceptable in the right context, it means ‘Karl is cooperative’.

But only in very special circumstances. I have not changed this example.

- p. 135 ‘Ich komme zu einem harmlosen Ergebnis. Gestern kam es zu einem Streit.’: The pair of examples contains different Funktionsverbgefüge.

I disagree that this is a *Funktionsverbsgefüge* because *kommen dazu, dass* seems to be prominent. However, there is indeed a question whether all these construction still mean the same. I decided to keep this example in., and I hope that such example might bring up more discussion.

- p. 135 6.34a The example means ‘He is missing/longing for his money’ not ‘He is lacking money’.

There is indeed some slight semantic shift in the meaning of *fehlen* here, but I have kept the example in so the two options can more easily be compared. A different choice of nouns might become more idiosyncratic.

- p. 136 6.35b Compare *Mir ist kalt* with *Ich bin kalt*; it is a well-known cross-linguistically that experiencer subjects are realized in the dative case.

Agree, but this book is about German.

- p. 138 6.39d *Hände* is not a real instrument but – following the analysis of Van Valin & Wilkins (1996) – an implement. It might be worth taking this into account as it explains the ungrammaticality of the example. See, also, Van Hooste (2018).

Thanks for the references, I added a bit more discussion at this point. However, note (as an aside) that I do not agree with the notion of ‘explain’ as proposed in this comment. The different usage defines the grouping of roles IMO, so any explanation on this basis would be circular.

- p. 138 ‘who produces the source’: If ‘source’ is intended to be a grammatical term, you should rephrase is by ‘the referent of the source argument’ or something like this. Otherwise, I am not sure what this sentence is intended to mean. I also think that ‘produce’ is not appropriate (see comment above).

rephrased

- p. 141 It is claimed that the ‘present tense’ is not possible for intransitive *öffnen*. If this is really what the author wants to say, it is wrong. *Die Tür öffnet automatisch [...]*. <https://www.welt.de/wirtschaft/webwelt/article179800530/Smart-Locks-Diese-smarten-Schloesser-oeffnen-dieHaustuer-selbststaendig.html>; 03.01.2022

Thanks for pointing this out. The verb *öffnen* was a poor choice here for the point I wanted to make. I have replaced the examples based on the verb *putzen*.

- p. 141 6.50d The example is odd, but ‘Der Zoo öffnet’ is fine.

see above

- p. 141 ‘Die Soldaten rücken in die Kaserne’: I think the right verb is *einrücken* not just *rücken*

This example is from the DWDS dictionary. I have added a link.

- p. 141 ‘Das hohe Gehalt zieht ihn nach Australien. Er zieht nach Australien’: These are two different meanings of *ziehen*.

I agree that there is some semantic shift here, but the similarity between the meaning is striking nonetheless. I leave this example in.

- p. 141 ‘Ich schwemme das Pferd im Fluß’: Totally ungrammatical

The example is taken from the DWDS dictionary. I have added a link.

- p. 141 6.51 in dem Korb

done

- p. 142 ‘The generalization seem to be’: seems

done

- p. 143 6.57c dem Brief

done

- p. 144 ‘Der Knoten platzt’: This is an idiom, a better example would be ‘Der Ballon platzt’

Agree. Changed.

- p. 145 **Examples:** Why '\*'?

Markdown to Latex to PDF conversion error :)

- p. 145 'The possessor of the prepositional phrase': It is not the possessor of the phrase but of its referent.

rephrased

- p. 147 For argument alternations concerning *kratzen* cf. Fleischhauer (2018). Also for *beißen*, *zwicken* (page 149, 163) and *schlagen*, *treten* (page 150).

great article, it is discussed in the text. However, I think *kratzen* does not belong in (9a), it seems to have rather different morphosyntactic characteristics (I have added some discussion about this verb). *zwicken* does not occur in the article, but you are right that it is wrongly listed here.

- p. 148 In how far does affectedness play a role in the examples in 6.67a and c? What notion of 'affectedness' is used in this analysis?

All antipassives seems to be related to some kind of change in affectedness. I explicitly refrain from any detailed semantic analysis in this book, so other than some broad indications I will not go into detail here.

- p. 148 'Ich küsse auf deine Wange': Ich küsse dich auf deine Wange.

right, *küssen* is wrong here. removed.

- p. 148 'Ich treffe auf das Tor': I prefer *in* rather than *auf*. I think the preposition has a spatial meaning and use can say something like *Ich treffe ihn auf den Kopf* or *Ich treffe auf das Auto* meaning 'on top of the car'.

moved *treffen* to *in* antipassive

- p. 148 'Ich spreche Englisch. Ich spreche auf Englisch': This alternation shows contrast between having an ability and doing something in a specific way. The first sentence means 'I have the ability to speak English' and the second one means 'I am speaking in English'.

Indeed. And such a change in meaning is typical for diatheses! I have added a note on this difference.

- p. 148 ‘The verbs hören and achten show considerable semantic shift in this alternation’: Be more precise, how are they shifting? As I mentioned above, the same is true of other verbs.

It goes beyond the current book to delve into all the different lexical changes. I just make some notes here and there for future research. No change.

- p. 149 Further examples of 6.7.6.5: Does affectedness really play a role? Is it not the case that the subject referent plays a different role in the two sentences of each pair? The last sentence for example expresses a contrast for the subject being either the ‘Fahrer’ (first sentence) or just a ‘Mitfahrer’ (second sentence)?

The intended meaning is of an instrument with which the driving is performed, not the comitative of the driving. I have slightly changed the example to prevent this confusion.

- p. 150 6.70b I prefer the sentence without mit. 6.70c I prefer einander rather than miteinander.

right. I did some quick corpus research and I have to agree that this was wrong. *Heiraten* indeed does not seem to occur at all this a *mit* comitative. Removed example and verb from this section.

- p. 150 ‘Accusative objects that alternate with an von prepositional phrase’:  
a

done

- p. 151 ‘Ich nasche ein par Beeren’: paar

done

- p. 151 ‘Ich verfüge einen Einreisestopp. Ich verfüge über viel Geld’: Two entirely different senses. The first sentence means ‘to order something’, the second one means ‘to have something at one’s disposal’. The same is true of the pair ‘Ich halte dich. Ich halte zu dir’. I am not sure whether it makes sense comparing such sentence pairs. I do not think that the

different interpretations are derived by the alternation but that each sense has its own argument realization pattern. Thus, in my view it does not make sense speaking of an alternation in such cases.

I agree that there is quite some semantic difference in these examples, but they are still close enough together to be ‘on the list’ of considerations. As I have done with all such examples, I have added a note section to explain the problematic situation. The *zu* cases are all borderline, and I have explicitly said to.

- p. 151 6.72c The sentence is ok, why ‘\*’?

I disagree. This sentence is not OK without a location prepositional phrase. I have tried to find an example without such a location, but I was unable. No change.

- p. 151 6.73a I think the PP is not optional but required in this example.

Indeed, that is an interesting difference between the two examples listed here. I have a few lines to highlight this difference.

- p. 152 ‘Sie wichen vor der Polizei’: The sentence is ungrammatical without zurück.

I disagree: there are attested examples. I have replaced the constructed example with an attested corpus example.

- p. 153 ‘Ich zeige das Haus an den Käufer’: ungrammatical; the same with ‘Er entzieht das Sorgerecht von ihr’.

I agree. Both examples have been removed.

- p. 154 ‘Ich zögere damit, Maßnahmen zu nehmen.’: Nehmen does not work here, use ergreifen instead.

Great improvement. done.

- p. 155 ‘The genitive ditransitive in this group allow’: allows

corrected

- p. 155 ‘Er beraubt dich von deinen Rechten’: ungrammatical

Indeed. Moved verb to another section in Chapter 5

- p. 156 ‘Es kommt an auf die Eleganz. Mir kommt es an auf die Eleganz.’:  
In both sentences, an should go to the end of the sentence.

changed

- p. 156 6.78c Start with a capital letter.

done

- p. 157 First example without punctuation mark.

corrected

- p. 157 ‘In such constructions are location seems obligatory’: the instead of are?

corrected

- p. 157 ‘like in (6.79), and example’: examples (?)

corrected

- p. 157 ‘or the Accusative’: accusative

corrected

- p. 157 ‘dass... Phrase’: phrase

corrected

- p. 158 ‘ich schwitze einen Fleck in meinen Hemd.’: mein Hemd

corrected

- p. 158 ‘Sie gräbt das Frühstück aus dem Rucksack’: graben is used metaphorically, why don’t you use an example like: ‘Sie gräbt die Kartoffeln aus dem Boden’?

good suggestion, changed accordingly.

- p. 159 6.83c Is this really an attested example? Even if, it is clearly idiomatic.

added a corpus example instead

- p. 159 6.84d The sentence can also mean: 'Ich befehlige die Armee, die an der Front ist'

added a sentence indicating this interpretation

- p. 159 Last one of the further examples: Start with a capital letter

corrected

- p. 160 Punctuation mark missing after the second sentence.

corrected

- p. 160 'Maybe the als alternation': What kind of alternation is meant?

removed from the text

- p. 161 6.86a Does not work for me, better 'Ich breche das Brot' but even this is somehow strange. I prefer a resultative-XP (Ich breche XY in zwei Teile) or the prefix zer(Ich zerbreche den Stein). Similarly for example g. (Durch das Zerbrechen des Steins...). Although in the further examples (why does the brechen-example occur there again?).

changed example from *brechen* to *waschen*

- p. 161. brechen does not fit into the class of verbs listed under 'attested examples' as brechen is the only resultative verb (the other verbs are non-resultative).



Depends on the definition of ‘resultative’, a highly polysemous term in German linguistics. But anyway: the whole approach of this book is that the list of verbs for each diathesis is inductively produced. Whether or not the resulting verbs form a closely-knit semantic class or not is secondary.

- p. 161 6.86e/f einen Kristall

corrected (but later complete example removed)

- p. 162d I think the example is ok. Attested: Ich gewinne dir den Hauptpreis. 5 <https://www.wattpad.com/amp/1012317047>; 06.01.2022

I think that is exactly what I say in the text. No change

- p. 163 6.92a/b I think the examples are strange and I prefer the sentences without dative - pronouns.

I agree. The whole point about coreference has been removed. It was only tangentially important anyway.

- p. 163 ‘Er steht mir zur Seite. Er steht zu meiner Seite.’: Two distinct meanings; the first sentence either contains a Funktionsverbgefüge or an idiom (depending on the analysis).

I agree, changed the example to a less idiomatic expression.

- p. 163 ‘Ich falle vor deinen Füßen’: deine

corrected

- p. 164 ‘verbs are have an accusative arguments’: argument

corrected

- p. 164 Start the first of the further examples with a capital letter.

corrected

- p. 164 Although ‘Ich jage dir den Anwalt auf den Hals’ is acceptable, the sentence ‘Ich jage den Anwalt auf deinen Hals’ is not. The example is an idiom, I think.

I have added a note for this observation. thx.

- p. 165 ‘wegen seine Ehrlichkeit’: seiner

corrected

- p. 166 ‘Er gießt Wasser an die Blumen’: This example is somehow strange. Maybe you can use an attested sentence?

changed *an* to *auf*. That is attested frequently.

- p. 171 7.6b Why is the sentence marked as ungrammatical? The sentence is perfectly acceptable!

hmmm, interesting opinion. I cannot find any reasonable interpretation of what this sentence should mean. The intended meaning would be “er sorgt dafür, dass ich ihn wasche”, but in that meaning the usage of a reflexive pronoun is completely out for me. Or am I missing a different interpretation? I have added a bit more explanation about my proposed argument.

- p. 172 7.8b Punctuation mark is missing.

corrected

- p. 172 7.7b/7.8b In the right context, the sentences are all right.

that is exactly what I say in the text. The question marks are explicitly explained as meaning that there is something very peculiar going on in these constructions. No change.

- p. 173 7.12b The sentence is okay, e.g. ‘Ich habe dich hierher bemüht, weil...’

Again, that is the point of the question mark here. No change.

- p. 173 7.3.1 The combination of *ver-* and reflexive pronoun results in an erratic interpretation and is very productive in German (cf. Stiebels 1996). Further verbs: *verwählen*, *verlaufen*, *verfahren*, *verschreiben*, *verrechnen*, *verlesen*, *versprechen* + *sich*. Without *sich* a different interpretation result: *sich verschreiben* ‘write something wrong’ vs *etwas verschreiben* ‘prescribe’.

All possible combinations with preverbs like *ver-* are discussed extensively in Chapter 8.

- p. 174 ‘Die neugeborenen Katzen behaaren sich allmählich’: This is totally out!

this is an example from DWDS. I have added the reference.

- p. 175 ‘Die Krankheit äußert sich durch das Fieber’: More idiomatic without *das*.

changed object to *den Ausschlag*

- p. 176 7.21b I think the example is ok: *Das erste Zahnrad hat sich mit dem zweiten verklemmt*. Maybe you can find an attested example.

Indeed! I have been able to find an example and thus removed the note about the exceptionality of this verb.

- p. 176 7.22b The reflexive is not required, cf. *Heute treffe ich meine alten Lehrer*.

Indeed, *treffen* does not belong here. Example (and verb) removed from this section

- p. 176 The reference to the section below 7.22 is wrong. Similarly on page 179.

corrected

- p. 177 7.24b I disagree; what about a sentence like *Dieser Vorfall, den alle nur eine Einbildung gehalten haben, ereignete sich (aber) wirklich/tatsächlich*.

I agree. *zutragen* and *ereignen* are moved to the section without obligatory local phrase.

- p. 177 ‘Europa bückt sich dem Willen der USA’: You cannot use *bücken* here, take *beugen*.

Indeed. corrected

- p. 177 ‘In Scharen gesellt sich häufig dem Hausgeflügel zu. (DWDS)’: Usually, the source is not mentioned directly following the example but in a footnote. Be consistent please.

source added in footnote

- p. 178 ‘Mit dieser Aufgabe tue ich mir schwer’: *mich*

corrected

- p. 178 ‘Er langte sich ein Glas’: Does not work for me.

Example is from DWDS, I have added a reference.

- p. 178 7.27 Punctuation marks are missing.

corrected

- p. 180 7.32b *mein*

corrected

- p. 180 ‘Er hat sich bei/an ihm angebiedert’: *an* requires accusative, not dative

*an* removed

- p. 180 ‘Die Schülerin hat sich der Lehrerin eingeschmeichelt’: ungrammatical without *bei*

Indeed. Changed to an example with *anschmeicheln*.

- p. 181 ‘Die Tochter bequemte sich ihres Wunsches’: Does not work, better Die Tochter bequemte sich ihrem Wunsch zu entsprechen.

Indeed, this example is strange. I recategorised the verb *sich bequemen* because the construction with genitive was wrong.

- p. 181 ‘Mit welchem Ziel hätten wir uns dazu erdreisten können’: better sollen dann können

This is a corpus example. I added the reference (which I had forgotten)

- p. 181 7.34 I find both examples unacceptable.

Indeed. I cannot reconstruct where I found these examples. removed.

- p. 181f. 7.4.1 I do not think that the reflexive version entails a change of state (at least not in the mentioned example as you can say Er kniete sich stundenlang auf den Boden which is clearly an activity predicate and not an achievement/accomplishment predicate).

I have toned down the claim that I want to make as a tendency. Indeed: both seem possible but from some informal corpus research there seems to be a tendency as described in the text (and the example above would be atypical). However, as stated clearly in the text: this a fascinating topic that needs more research!

- p. 182 ‘Die Erde dreht’: Strange but better if you say: Die Erde dreht und dreht.

This is an interesting case and I have added a note highlighting this verb. Many speakers of German consider this ungrammatical, but it is clearly attested. More research is needed here!

- p. 182 ‘Ich habe hingekniet’: Odd, Ich habe mich hingekniet.

similar to the previous. I have added a corpus example. It is clearly attested, though often considered ‘wrong’

- p. 182 7.38a Why ,?’, the sentence is totally acceptable.

it depends. As I note, this is again an interesting example for which the acceptability is really unclear. No change.

- p. 183 ‘Ich entscheide für den Angriff’: Odd, entscheide mich is the only acceptable version

It’s odd, but clearly attested. I have added a corpus example

- p. 183 ‘Ich erstaune mich über das viele Geld’: Odd, only without reflexive pronoun

likewise, indeed odd, but attested. I have added a corpus example

- p. 183 7.43 sorgen and sich sorgen have different meanings

Indeed, I have added an additional sentence to the note dealing with this verb.

- p. 183 7.4.2 Have a look on Wiskandt (2021) for constraints on reflexive marking in combination with psych predicates in German.

Thanks for the tip! Included in Section on Reflexive Conversive.

- p. 185 ‘Er hat alles erspart’: Odd

I have replaced the examples with sentences from the DWDS dictionary

- p. 187 ‘also possible with “free” datives?’: Why ‘?’

That was a “note to self” to remind me to say something here. I forgot to formulate this point. I have decided simply to remove this.

- p. 187 Further examples below 7.54: Punctuations marks are missing

corrected

- p. 189 ‘Ich ordne die Pflanze einer Systematik unter’: I think einordnen (without unter) would be more idomatic. But you can use a different example: Ich ordne meine weiteren Pläne deinen Wünschen unter.

changed

- p. 190 7.65b: Odd

yes, indeed odd. There is something special going on in these constructions, viz. it seems only to be possible with certain semantic contexts that make the non-reflexive construction odd. I have added a note as to this point. More research needed!

- p. 191 Is the section on ‘Reciprocal alternations’ complete? I somehow have the feeling that something is missing here.

Yes indeed. This whole section was unfinished. Completed now.

- p. 191 7.66 Start with capital letters, punctuation marks are missing.

corrected

- p. 192 7.4.18/7.4.19 Punctuation marks are missing in the examples.

corrected

- p. 192 7.4.20 Is this the final text? Somehow this seems to be incomplete.

indeed. finished now.

- p. 193 Punctuation marks are (partially) missing in the further examples on the top of the page.

corrected

- p. 193 7.69b The example is strange, I prefer Bei diesem Buch handelt es sich um ein Linguistikbuch. The example listed under ‘further examples’ is acceptable as well.

changed

- p. 193 7.5.2 First sentence, repetition of an.

corrected

- p. 195 ‘Wir wollen das Problem nicht (noch mehr) komplizieren’: verkomplizieren (the same for the second sentence)

DWDS also lists *komplizieren*, so I will include both *komplizieren* and *verkomplizieren*

- p. 195 ‘Ich bessere die Straße’: Here you need the verb *ausbessern* or *verbessern* might also work.

This usage of *bessern* is from the DWDS dictionary. I have added an example from there. *verbessern* has a regular self-inflicting reflexive, not a reflexive anticausative, so it does not belong here. *ausbessern* does not seem to be possible at all with a reflexive pronoun, a quick search only gives examples from before 1800 (also interesting!).

- p. 196 7.77b Ungrammatical

Agree. I have changed the conclusion here. I now claim that benefactive ‘free’ datives are not possible with a reflexive anticausative.

- p. 196 ‘Der Paragraph fügt sich dem Gesetz hinzu’: Strange, it somehow induced agentivity on side of the Paragraph.

Agree. I removed the verb from this section.

- p. 196 ‘Der Bauplan erklärt sich dem Benutzer’: Strange but it improves if you add ‘von ganz alleine’.

nice improvement. changed.

- p. 197 ‘Ich nähre mich mit (von) Milch’: Here you need *ernähren*, also on page 199.

DWDS also lists *nähren* in this usage. no change.

- p. 198 ‘Ich entsetze mich bei dem Anblick’: über instead of bei



corrected

- p. 198 ‘Ich habe mich erfreut an der Musik’: erfreut should go to the end.

corrected

- p. 199 ‘Das Alter beschwert mich’: Odd

This diathesis with *beschweren* is indeed odd. I have added a note about this verb.

- p. 199 ‘Ich unterhalte das Publikum. Das Publikum unterhält sich mit mir’: Two completely different verb meanings. The same for the two examples with drücken.

*unterhalten*: changed examples to clearly evoke the intended meanings.  
*drücken*: indeed, differences are too large to consider them as alternates.  
moved verb to different category.

- p. 199 Check for missing punctuation marks.

checked

- p. 199 ‘Ich werde erheitert durch die gute Nachricht’: erheitert should go to the end.

example replaced

- p. 200 ‘Ich graue mich’: odd without vor-PP.

added

- p. 201 ‘verbs that hurt’: verbs cannot hurt, you probably mean the activity denoted by the verb.

rephrased

- p. 201 7.88c Why ‘\*’? I think it is ok.

as noted in the text: only in a very special interpretation. no change.

- p. 201 ‘Er verschläft sich’: Odd, but better if you say ‘Er verschläft sich um 10 Minuten’

There is a note about the old-fashioned nature of this construction. I removed the example from “further examples”.

- p. 201 7.89c das not den

no, the point is that this construction with an accusative is impossible. Explanation in the text extended to make this point clearer.

- p. 202 7.90 Why not earlier?

see above

- p. 203 7.95b Really? Is this attested?

Yes, I added an example from the internet. It is an English calque.

- p. 204 ‘Ich wage mich an der Aufgabe’: die

corrected

- p. 204 ‘Der Schauspieler versucht sich in der neuen Rolle’: Punctuation mark missing

corrected

- p. 204 ‘Ich behaupte mich in meine neue Stelle’: meiner neuen

corrected

- p. 204 7.98b Also an erratic verb (see above)

I’m not too much interested in such semantic classiffactions. no change here.

- p. 205 7.9.3 Why is not source for Early New High German given?

added

- p. 206 ‘Die Motten fressen von/an den Pullover’: dem

sentence removed

- p. 206 The two examples with *bedenken* are unacceptable!

‘Archaic’ is more like it. I have added real examples and noted that this is not contemporary German anymore.

- p. 207 ‘a discussion of term’: ‘the term’ or just delete ‘term’

corrected

- p. 208 8.2.1 Be more precise with elements can intervene between particle and verb (comes later in the book but should be mentioned here already).

added

- p. 209 8.3b Really attested? Strange example.

This usage is attested, though maybe the transitive structure is strange. I have added a different example from some online source.

- p. 211 8.6c Please explain what the examples show.

They are references in the text above the example. No change.

- p. 211 The contrast between *blühen* and *verblühen* is easily explained: *verblühen* denotes a change of state but *blühen* not (necessarily): *Die Blumen blühen schon seit drei Tage/\*Die Blumen verblühen schon seit drei Tagen*. See also your data in 8.25 on page 217 which point into the same direction. It might be worth relating the discussion of the data.

Such post-hoc semantic arguments are unlikely to help us really with the structure of the language, as I have tried to lay out in this book. Yes, I agree that in this case the prefix *ver-* does something like making it stative. However, this is completely idiosyncratic! The prefix *ver-* literally has dozens of other uses, and it is completely unclear how to predict which one applies with which verb. That is the real challenge. No change.

- p. 212 8.2.3 Begrünen is derived from the verb grünen and not from the adjective grün (although grünen is derived from the adjective). Similarly, versalzen is derived from salzen which is derived from Salz.

I changed both examples here. Actually, the derivation pathway is rather unclear, and I have added some more explanation in Section 8.6.2/3 about why I think these examples (Salz, grün) are interesting, although verbs like *salzen* and *grünen* are attested.

- p. 212 ‘to cause somebody to not have a weapon’: weapon

corrected

- p. 212 8.12b begraben is also used metaphorically Ich begrabe meine Pläne; in this use no PP is allowed.

Interesting, but I decided to ignore this detail.

- p. 213 8.15b On aufessen and the prefixation of other incremental verbs, see Fleischhauer & Czardybon (2016).

I am not that interested here in the semantic contribution of the preverb to the result, but in the different syntactic effects that the preverb might induce. The notion of ‘incremental’ verbs from that paper do not seem to have any predictive power for syntactic behaviour of verbs. No change.

- p. 214 ‘neither in without preverb’: delete in

corrected

- p. 214 Concerning 8.19: Be more precise with respect to the particle as ‘der arbeitende Student’ as well as ‘der mitarbeitende Student’ are possible. Similarly for 8.23 on page 216.

As discussed in Chapter 10, the *Partizip I* is not really of interest in the current context. Actually, as discussed extensively there, the two participles in German have a rather different status when it comes to diathesis. no change.

- p. 215 Further examples: One pair of examples illustrating fürchten might be enough.

agree. removed one.

- p. 215 I think abkühlen is derived from the verb kühlen and not directly from the adjective kühl. There also exists verbs like kränken, wachen, röten such that the prefixed verbs are not directly derived from the adjective but from the deadjectival verbs.

as discussed previously, I am not sure about the impact of those intermediate verbs. I have added some lines to explain this problem.

- p. 217 '*geschwundenen Vorräte*': *not ungrammatical: Gerne informieren wir Sie hiermit über eine besondere Aktion, damit Sie Ihre während der Pandemie geschwundenen Vorräte wieder auffüllen können.* (<https://www.apeval.ch/wallis/renommierte-raclettekase-hochqualitative-weine.html>; 06.01.2022) The same for die gefaulten Äpfel (various attestations at Google). Also: \*die gegangenen Gäste, e.g. Die eben gegangenen Gäste haben gar nicht bezahlt. This somehow questions the view expressed in 8.4.5

interesting examples. I agree about *geschwunden*. removed. However: *gefaulte* is definitely old: all examples are either from old sources (pre 1850) or backtranslations ([https://www.niederbayern-wiki.de/wiki/Gefaulte\\_Erdäpfel](https://www.niederbayern-wiki.de/wiki/Gefaulte_Erdäpfel)). I added a footnote. I have checked all others, and there is definitively something really interesting going on here, as they are possible with additional modifiers. I have added some more discussion in the text about this.

- p. 218 8.4.7 Here again are erratic verbs. Somehow you are missing semantic generalizations which might be easily possible.

again: there is no semantic generalisation! at least not in the sense that I would find interesting here. Yes, there are post-hoc similarities between verbs that are found in each one of the hundreds of classes that I propose in this book, and I incidentally remark on such semantic similarities. However, these semantic factors **never** appear to have an explanatory force, in that they can predict which verbs have which syntactic behaviour. No change.

- p. 219 8.28b The reflexive is optional: Ich sehe gerade ein Buch an.

good catch: this verb was also discussed in the chapter on reflexives as an example of ‘free’ reflexives. I added a link to that section.

- p. 219 ‘Ich übe mir den Tango an’: anüben does not exist.

It does, but it indeed seems to be old-fashioned. I have added a note about this verb.

- p. 221 ‘Ich verheirate Paul und Marie’: I prefer verheiraten mit.

It’s difficult to find corpus evidence on this. I just asked a few colleagues, and all preferred *und*. no change

- p. 221 ‘Der Sturm treibt die Wrackteile an’: Punctuation mark is missing.

corrected

- p. 221 8.35a The sentence is strange!

I agree, that’s why the comment is in a note. I played it down even more and changed the example to make it less strange.

- p. 221 8.63 Add Die Pflanze grünen

changed example, as discussed above.

- p. 222 I think verbessern is derived from the verb bessern not directly from the comparative.

I added this possibility

- p. 222 I do not think that the meaning of erbitten can be derived from the adjective bitter. According to the DWDS, it is early used figuratively and the literal meaning ‘bitter machen’ is rather rare. I also think that entrunden is derived from runden and not from rund.

I added a note about *bittern*. Interestingly, *verbittern* and *bitter* still exist, while *bittern* is lost long ago. I agree as to *entrunden*: removed from this section.

- p. 223 Beschädigen is derived from schädigen (Rauchen schädigt die Lunge) but not directly from Schaden.

Example changed to an unequivocal example of direct derivation from a nominal stem

- p. 223 ‘to cause not to have arms]’: Why ‘]’?

typo, corrected

- p. 223 ‘The prefix entincluds in’: an

corrected

- p. 223 8.42c in dem Kapitän rather than in den Kapitän

corrected

- p. 223 8.42 Wouldn’t is better to provide English paraphrases?

I decided throughout the book to only use English translations in the main text. All examples remain purely monolingual German. no change.

- p. 223 8.43 The verbs have to distinct meanings. The same for the attested verbs below 8.43.

I added a short note about this semantic shift.

- p. 224 ‘Er verfuttert den Pferden das Tiermehl’: verfüttern (or füttert X an Y) but futtern cannot be used.

changed to *verfüttern*

- p. 226 ‘to wonder:’ is missing

corrected

- p. 226 8.50c Punctuation mark is missing

corrected

- p. 226 ‘an accusative arguemnt’: argument

corrected

- p. 226 ‘Die Polizei hat den Dieb gegriffen’: ergriffen but you can say ‘Der Polizist hat die Kaffeetasse gegriffen’; greifen and eingreifen are different lexemes. The same is true of trinken and ertrinken.

I added a note about the (strong) semantic change in these examples, and I changed the example with *gegriffen*. Note that the DWDS dictionary explicitly lists *den Dieb greifen*, though I couldn’t find any actual example, so I changed it.

- p. 227 8.52b mir instead of mich

nope, corpus example say differently. I added some discussion about the uncertainty pertaining to the case with *behelfen*.

- p. 227 8.53 For a look at Stiebels (1996) for erratic verbs.

added a note with reference to the text.

- p. 229 ‘Ich gebe dem Buch einen Umschlag’: Might be ok in a context (technical use) but out of context the sentence is somehow strange as a book cannot be a recipient. If one accepts the sentence, it means ‘I am decorating the book with a cover’ or ‘I am producing a cover for it’.

example *umgeben* removed.

- p. 229 ‘Ich besinge dich mit einem Lied’: in rather than mit. (Der Schlottwitzer Heimatmusiker Hanskarl König hat ein neues Lied veröffentlicht. In diesem besingt er Sachsens Dampfisenbahnen. <https://www.saechsische.de/flashuette/flashuette-schlottwitzer-besingt-die-schmalspurbahnen-5578593-plus.html>; 07.01.2022) Also possible without PP (Die Klasse 4c besingt den Herbst <https://www.ggs-paffrath.de/201718-2/schuljahr-201516/die-klasse-4c-besingt-den-herbst-2/>; 07.01.2022).

changed

- p. 229 It is claimed that unprefixed steigen necessarily requires a location-PP but consider examples like Die Temperatur/Der Goldpreis/Das



Flugzeug steigt. For an intensive discussion of *steigen* cf. Löbner (1979) and Fleischhauer & Gamerschlag (2014).

This is an interesting observation about the verb *steigen*, and I have included a completely new subsection in Chapter 6 about this. I have trouble with including references to the works mentioned, because they do not discuss the difference between the meaning ‘to mount’ and ‘to rise’ for *steigen* and the correlated diathesis.

- p. 229 8.59a Mann instead of Man

corrected

- p. 230 ‘Ich bin durchgelaufen’: *durch* does not have a spatial meaning but means ‘without a pause’

changed to “der Kaffee”

- p. 230 ‘Der Gefangene bricht aus dem Gefängnis’: *bricht aus dem Gefängnis aus*; the same with *Ich ziehe aus dem Haus*, here you need *Ich ziehe aus dem Gefängnis aus*.

I changed both these example to clear up any confusion about the intended meaning of these verbs.

- p. 230 8.61b Why ‘\*’? The sentence is all right
- p. 230 8.61c/d Hunger with capital letter; the same in 8.62 for Hunger and Hund.
- p. 230 8.62c The sentence is not acceptable; the same for the sentence in d.

I have replaced the example, because movement verbs like *laufen* are problematic in different ways, that are not relevant at this point.

- p. 231 ‘Ich habe den Faden durchgezogen’: a *durch*-PP is missing and it is, if left out, implicit. You can only leave it out if it is inferable from the context.

I agree, this verb is not right in this section. removed.

- p. 232 ‘Ich schenke den Wein in das Glas’: *in das Glase in*

indeed, this usage is old-fashioned. I added note with corpus examples.

- p. 233 ‘effect of the addition of preverb’: of a/the preverb

corrected

- p. 232 ‘Die Aufgabe belästigt mich’: The example is odd and I think belästigen requires an animate subject argument.

changed to *Mücken*

- p. 235 8.8.7 I think the sentences in the further examples should be presented in a different order.

changed accordingly

- p. 8.78b Punctuation mark is missing.

corrected

- p. 237 8.79a wuchert not wuchern

corrected

- p. 237 ‘Ich laufe auf meinen neuen Schuhen’: in not auf

changed

- p. 237 ‘Das Brautpaar tanzt auf den Ball’: dem Ball; ‘Das Brautpaar hat den Ball angetanzt’: I think antanzen (at least in this use) does not exist.

it does (see the comment at the start of this chapter), but this example is probably indeed strange. I have removed this verb from this section.

- p. 238 Further examples of 8.8.10.3: A number of the examples occurs repeatedly (partially already on page 237).

They are different, but I have reordered and cleaned the list of examples.

- p. 238 ‘in which there is’: there

corrected

- p. 238 8.82a I find the first sentence strange, although the second one is fine.

agree. Moved *boxen* to a different section

- p. 239 8.84c: Does not work for me.

there is no “c” example here.

- p. 239 ‘Ich verschlampe meine Aufgaben’ and ‘Ich verzögere die Maßnahmen’: Punctuation marks are missing

corrected

- p. 240 8.89a The example is strange; maybe ‘Das Wasser spült unter der Straße entlang’, otherwise spülen is used as meaning ‘to clean dishes’.

indeed, both verbs are strange here. Removed.

- p. 240 8.90a The sentence is ungrammatical with the zu-PP. The same for Ich klage zu dir below. And also Ich lüge zu dir on page 243.

indeed, examples re-classified into different sections.

- p. 241 ‘into an accusative argument’: argument

corrected

- p. 241 8.92a das Unrecht

corrected

- p. 242 8.94d The sentence does not work, the only alternative to (a) is Ich strebe ein hohes Amt an.

indeed: *bestreben* replaced by *anstreben*.

- p. 243 8.97c/d: Both sentences are fine.

reformulated this section.

- p. 245 ‘Die Polizei jagte auf einen Verbrecher’: without auf

Indeed. This verb is completely wrongly placed here in this section.

- p. 245 ‘Ich füge eine Zollerklärung zu dem Paket’: Ich füge eine Zollerklärung dem Paket zu

with a different word order this maybe sounds better? It is definitively attested with a prepositional *zu* phrase, e.g. DWDS *zu diesen wertvollen Geschenken fügte er noch eine besondere Kostbarkeit*

- p. 247 ‘Ich male die Wand an mit einem Gemälde’: Ich male die Wand mit Farbe an; Gemälde is not possible and an should go to the end.

changed accordingly

- p. 247 8.106 is identical to 8.104

changed to a different example

- p. 247 ‘Ich besegle den See mit meinem Boot’: I am not sure whether besegeln exists; use an attested example please.

Duden includes *besegeln*, dozens of examples in DWDS. Changed orthography.

- p. 247 ‘Ich belege den Flur mit einem Teppich’: Does not work but use ‘Ich belege das Brot mit Käse’; like in other examples, the alternation affects the selectional restrictions which might also be worth mentioning in the volume. You do not need the last example on the page as it illustrated legen/belegen again.

*Teppich* example removed. Selectional restrictions are very interesting, but the current book is already long enough. That has to wait for subsequent research.

- p. 248 8.107b in not mit but than the referent of dich is the topic of the song.

changed the example to an attested example from the DWDS corpus.

- p. 248 ‘Ich verrauche das Schlafzimmer mit einer Zigarette’: No! What you mean is *verqualmen*.

actually, DWDS gives exactly this example with *verrauchen*, so I added a reference. *verqualmen* is an interesting example in different respects, I have added that verb in various places in the book. thanks.

- p. 248 ‘Ich stelle den Schrank im Korridor’: in den Korridor

corrected

- p. 248 ‘Er hat Feldsteinen in den Zugang gebaut’: Feldsteine

corrected

- p. 249 8.110a um den Arm or auf/über die Wunde but not um die Wunde

changed to *Arm*

- p. 251 The sentence after example 9.1 is incomplete.

No, but rephrased to make the sentence structure clearer.

- p. 251 9.2c in dem Teich

corrected

- p. 252 ‘it remain unclear’: remains

corrected

- p. 252 ‘There are some special context’: contexts

corrected

- p. 253 Rather than speaking of a comparison phrase it might be more accurate speaking of an equative construction since a (verbal) comparative

looks differently (e.g. Das Flugzeug ist teurer als das Boot; Das Flugzeug rast mehr als das Boot).

I agree. changed.

- p. 253 It is stated that adverbials like *gestern* have scope over the predicate but it is widely assumed that they do not modify the predicate but (semantically speaking) the entire situation and therefore have larger structures within their scope.

rephrased

- p. 254 9.10a The sentence also has the meaning ‘I bought a store and it (= the store) was empty’, cf. 9.12

that is the meaning of the paraphrase 9.10b. I rephrased the text to make this clearer.

- p. 254 ‘The preferred analysis of the resultative construction’: preferred by whom? References?

rephrased. The interpretation as a complex predicate is illustrated by the inclusion of such combinations as separate entries in dictionaries. Added links.

- p. 255 On the top of the page, it is argued against an analysis of ‘Der Duden’. The argumentation why the author’s analysis is preferred is missing. Please provide arguments supporting your analysis.

these arguments are presented elsewhere, as indicated in the text.

- p. 255 Section 10.2.8.]: delete ‘]’

done

- p. 255 9.17 & 9.18 Also *Das Buch kostet viel* vs. *Das Buch kostet (aber)*. See Gamerschlag (2014) for such verbs/verb uses.

Discussed in Chapter 5, but added a reference here.

- p. 256 9.19e *nimmt* instead of *benimmt*

*benahmen* also works. Listed in DWDS and numerous corpus examples. I replaced this example with a corpus example.

- p. 256 ‘similarly always needs’: need

corrected

- p. 256 9.20c: OK in context: Du führst dich heute aber wieder auf.

Conversational implicature of “bad” behaviour. I repeated this point once again here.

- p. 257 9.23b The sentence is ok, especially if you add nicht at the end.

Conversational implicature of “bad”. Added a sentence about this detail.

- p. 259 9.28e The sentence is ungrammatical.

Indeed. changed.

- p. 259 ‘Ich lache mich tot/kaput/schlapp’: Punctuation mark is missing.

corrected

- p. 259 ‘Ich arbiete mich tot’: arbeite

corrected

- p. 260 9.30a I prefer ist rather than hat.

added that option. That is not the point here.

- p. 260 ‘Ich koche den Reis kauptt’: Kaputt does not work here but you can use gar.

In culinary contexts *kaputtkochen* is perfectly fine, in the meaning *zerkochen*. no change.

- p. 261 ‘nominative with a obligatory’: an

corrected

- p. 261 ‘also note that connection’: the connection

corrected

- p. 261 9.34a schneide not scheine

corrected

- p. 262 9.35b Punctuation mark is missing.

corrected

- See also Gamerschlag (2014) for a discussion of similar data.

no, that paper is not about similar data as discussed in this section. The paper is relevant in other parts, and referenced there.

- p. 264 9.39c Not ungrammatical but a real reflexive!

a note about this possible explanation added.

- p. 264 9.41b I think such sentences are attested but with different arguments: Diese Maßnahme bindet zu viele Finanzmittel. But this might be a metaphorical use of binden.

I decided to ignore this detail.

- p. 265 ‘Ich steckt das Geld in meiner Tasche’: meine

corrected

- p. 265 9.7.7 There you use sattessen rather than sattsehen and I think it should be sattsehen.

corrected

- p. 266 ‘to a transitive verb lead’: leads



corrected

- p. 266 ‘as discusses’: as discussed; in the following line, the example is not done correctly.

corrected

- p. 266 ‘Ich fälle meine Hose kaputt’: I do not like the sentence, is this attested?

yes. I added an example.

- p. 267 line 3 ‘voll’ should be in italics; delete \* in front of ‘voll’

corrected

- p. 268 9.48b in instead of auf

changed

- p. 268 ‘Ich kritzle/schreibe Buchstaben in dem Buch’: das Buch

corrected

- p. 268 ‘Ich packe den Wagen voll (mit Einkäufe)’: Einkäufen

corrected

- p. 271 ‘The allomorphs without geshow show’: repetition

corrected

- p. 273 10.8b I prefer gelogen to go to the end.

changed

- p. 273 Weinen is mentioned as being a manner of speaking verb, is this really justified? I do not think that this is appropriate.

rephrased. It is a verb that can be used in a manner-of-speaking context.

- p. 275 ‘between participles as secondary predicate’: predicates

corrected

- p. 276 10.18c Strange

changed to *angekleidet*, I think that sounds more idiomatical.

- p. 276 ‘focus on slightly’: the slightly

changed

- p. 277 10.22a I think the sentence is ok, especially if you add den ganzen Tag.

I agree. However, this whole section has been completely rewritten and the comment is not applicable anymore. Also the following comments are not relevant anymore. I hope things are clearer now. Personally, I am very happy to have revised this section, as things have become clearer to me now as well.

- p. 277 Why is the bleiben construction not tense-oriented? I do not think that this is justified and haven’t found any conclusive argumentation in favor of this view. See also my comment on 10.22a
- p. 277 10.23b kind with capital K
- p. 278 10.26b I am not convinced: Das wurde zwar gestern repariert, aber es ist immer noch nicht ganz fertig, da noch ein Ersatzteil fehlt is not contradictory (in my view).
- p. 280 Please explain table 10.1 (there is no reference to the table in the body of the text). What is the claim behind the ‘+’ and ‘-’ signs? Is it claimed that some verbs lack a werden future? I cannot make sense of the table.

Added reference in text. The table is about the participles of the verbs listed. I have changed this in the table.

- p. 282 10.37b Ambiguous without bekommen, it can either means that his hair has been cut or that we has cutting. There is no ambiguity if bekommen is present.

That is exactly what I explain in the text. I don't see any way to make it even clearer than to say "There is a crucial difference here in who is doing the cutting, as disambiguated by the words in brackets."

- p. 282 10.39c Passive is also possible: Immer wenn ich durch den Wald fahre, wird mein Fahrrad schmutzig.

indeed, the subject is a 'patient'. Good observation! I have changed the text.

- p. 283 Line 1: translations of German verbs are missing

none of the light verbs is translated in the text. As noted in the introduction to this chapter, the meaning of the light verbs is mostly irrelevant.

- p. 283 'The light verbs': verb; translation is missing; also the translations below 10.41 are missing. Translations below 10.43 (page 284) are missing as well.

see explanation above.

- p. 283 'different kinds of construction': constructions

corrected

- p. 283 10a I think the second sentence is not acceptable, I prefer Ich finde, dass das Projekt gescheitert ist.

This construction is discussed extensively in the section references in the text about this example. no change.

- p. 284 10.46b Punctuation mark is missing

corrected

- p. 285 'Likewise, DWDS': provide a concrete reference

added

- p. 285 Denominal verbs of the type ölen are also discussed in Fleischhauer (2016).

It's a great dissertation, but I can't find the discussion of denominal verbs. The word 'denominal' is hardly used at all, and the verb *ölen* does not seem to occur. I really don't see a suitable reason to cite this otherwise excellent work.

- p. 286 It is mentioned that *geregnet* is from *Regen* but the participle is derived from the verb *regnen*.

I have extended the discussion to explain better what I mean.

- p. 287 'in the DWDS corpus only a few examples...': Be more precise on the numbers.

Numbers and links added.

- p. 287 10.54b I prefer *sein* over *haben*.

added corpus examples

- p. 288 'distinguished from meaning of': from the meaning; the same for 10.63a on page 291.

completely reformulated

- p. 291 'process leading the this state': to

corrected

- p. 291 10.64b Is the use of *haben* maybe a dialectal feature? It might be worth discussing this issue as I think *sein* is more common.

That is indeed an interesting discussion, but I will not expand on that in this book.

- p. 292 10.69c (second sentence) *sein* is possible as well. Is this regional variation? I clearly prefer *sein* although *haben* is (marginally) acceptable!

This part is completely rephrased and reformulated. The example was not right in various ways :-).

- p. 293 10.74b Also possible: *Sie haben den Saal gestürmt*.

Already discussed in Chapter 6 with *in* antipassives.

- p. 293 10.75b (second sentence): I prefer *sein*.
- p. 293 10.76a (second sentence): Odd

Indeed, this example was wrong. It has been completely removed and the text completely rewritten.

- p. 294 Concerning 10.77a it is mentioned that it seems to be old-fashioned. I disagree, this is quite common.

Interesting. DWDS only has old examples, but online (which I didn't check before) I find about equal cases with *sein* and with *haben*. I changed my claim in the text.

- p. 294 'Verbs verbs with an': repetition

corrected

- p. 294 'have an intransitive usage with a reflexive pronouns': pronoun

corrected

- p. 294 10.4.4 It is not always clear whether we are dealing with a perfect or a passive construction. It might be useful if the author could provide clear criteria to distinguish between the two construction types.

I have tried to make it clearer. Basically: in this section all examples with *sein* are passives.

- p. 295 'of the transitive (10.82a)': transitive verb

corrected

- p. 295 10.82c des Lärms

corrected

- p. 296 10.85a Please check the example again, the verb should be in the plural.

checked, but it is like this in the original.

- p. 296 10.85b sein not haben

no. There is a meaning ‘to obey’ that takes haben. Rather old-fashioned, but I have added a corpus example.

- p. 297 10.86b The two sentences illustrate two different verbs.

Typo, should both be *einziehen*

- p. 297 ‘Er ist in einer prekären Situation geraten’: eine prekäre

corrected

- p. 297 10.97a Punctuation mark is missing. In the second sentence, sein is also possible. This is mentioned on the next page (10.91b), why not earlier?

section completely reworked

- p. 299 10.93c aus seinem Zimmer

corrected (although this sentence is still ungrammatical)

- p. 299 10.95 Punctuation marks are missing.

added

- p. 300 Last sentence of further examples: Punctuation mark is missing.

added

- p. 302 ‘In some situations it is even possible to construction’: construct

corrected

- p. 306 ‘shows a parallel to the real passives’: show

corrected

- p. 306 ‘unpersönlicher Passiv’: unpersönliches

corrected

- p. 307 10.11 Why are imperatives used there?

no reason, I changed some examples to preclude this impression.

- p. 308 10.113 Auf and an require accusative: den not dem

corrected (BTW, *auf* and *an* are ‘Wechselpositionen’ so they don’t ‘require’ accusative...)

- p. 308 ‘allow for a impersonal’: an

corrected

- p. 309 10.117b des Protests; I think the sentence is ungrammatical without werden.

corrected. And yes, I agree about the ungrammaticality.

- p. 310 10.121a/b Both are very almost ungrammatical. In c. substitute die by diese.

I agree. About the (c) example: this is a quoted example, which I will not change.

- p. 311 ‘gehoren + Patrtizip’: gehören

corrected

- p. 312 10.124b The sentence is not ungrammatical but perfectly acceptable. In c, geöffnet should go to the end. The first sentence in c is also perfectly acceptable.

OK, I changed this all again. The discussion about the retention of the agent needs more research, and I have added some more examples for that.

- p. 312 10.125 (and further examples): punctuation marks are missing.

corrected

- p. 312 10.126b The sentence neither contains scheinen nur erscheinen.

right! I replaced the example with more suitable ones.

- p. 314 10.132 Missing space between als and ob. The sentence in b-d are not really acceptable.

Indeed, these examples are crude. I have removed the whole topic as it is not directly relevant anyway.

- p. 316 10.135a/b The second sentence in each example is odd.

This construction is odd. I have added corpus examples and explained some more that this might not be a real construction.

- p. 316 I disagree that 10.137b is old-fashioned, this is quite common.

agree, I removed that statement.

- p. 316 Below 10.137 \*\* instead of italics, should be changed.

typo, corrected

- p. 317 'A verb peculiar constructions': very peculiar construction

corrected

- p. 318 10.141b Start with capital letter.

corrected

- p. 319 10.148b Instead of mir one has to say an mich.



Oh, this is an interesting point, opening up a whole new topic. I decided to simply delete this paragraph and ignore all the problem boiling up. I leave this for another time.

- p. 319 '*Das Kind ist unter die Decke gelegt...*': *Why ?* The sentence is ok.

I don't think that they are OK. They need *worden* to be OK.

- p. 320 'Ich lege/setzen/stecken': setze/stecke

corrected

- p. 320 'Ich passe den Anzug': ungrammatical

removed

- p. 320 '\*Sein Mitarbeiter ist geschätzt.': The sentence is ok, especially if you add 'von allen Kollegen/Kunden'.

I changed the judgement from ungrammatical to questionable

- p. 320 'Das Auto ist (\*gebraucht) verbraucht.': Gebraucht is ok (= is is not new/it is used; cf. Gebrauchtwagen) but verbraucht is not ok.

example removed

- p. 320 '\*Meine Schätze sind gezeigt': Is ok, cf. Meine paar Schätze sind schnell gezeigt.

This is an interesting observation. That context has a prospective reading. My first intuition is that there is something different going on here. I added a note.

- p. 322 'Er hat sich gefürchtet gemacht': I think this is odd.

it is attested. I have added a corpus example.

- p. 323 Leirbukt: *delete*

corrected

- p. 323 10.155 abgenommen should go after the optional PP

changed

- p. 324 ‘Retention is much more widespread With’: with

corrected

- p. 324 ‘while a durative perfect’: time adverbial rather than perfect

reformulated

- p. 325 10.160 den Chef not die Chef

corrected

- p. 325 ‘there is an strong’: a

corrected

- p. 325 10.163b The sentence is ok and means ‘Yesterday, I did this and that’

This whole discussion is changed.

- p. 326 10.164b auf meiner Schulter

corrected

- p. 326 10.164c am Brennen; more natural is an example like Ich habe meinen Kaim gerade am Brennen. am Brennen haben is a Funktionsverbgefüge.

That construction is discussed elsewhere. The examples here are constructed to make everything parallel. No change.

- p. 327 10.166/167b von requires the dative von dem; in both sentences, I find von less acceptable than über.

changed to *amüsiert von*

- p. 327 See also the paper from Wiskandt (2021) on psych verbs and reflexive marking. ‘Er is amüsiert über den Witz’: odd; ‘Er ist enttäuscht über dein Benehmen’: I like von more; also deinem Benehmen

Wiskandt is not relevant here. changed to *amüsiert von* and *enttäuscht von*

- p. 328 ‘Ihre Großmut macht mich beschämt’: The sentence is strange, without machen ist much better: Ihr Großmut beschämt mich.

Added some real examples, but they are all very old.

- p. 329 10.173b Kunstwerk

corrected

- p. 330 10.177b why ?; I think the sentence is ok.

Interesting. still seems odd to me, but not impossible. no change.

- p. 331 10.182b The sentence is very strange.

exchanged example

- p. 332 ‘Man weiß sich dabei nicht gesichert. Sie wussten sich durch ihn gewahrt.’: Are these sentences attested?

Yes. I have inserted the real corpus examples. The first one is from Freud :)

- p. 333 ‘Ich sehe mich gezwungen...’: Strange sign at the end

corrected

- p. 334 10.190a/b schwillt not schwellt

corrected

- p. 335 10.191c Is this attested? Zufrieren with capital letter.
- p. 335 10.9.1 Some examples contain *am* others do not. Is this really compatible or are these two different constructions?

replaced example. This section is not about the *am* constructions. The example is just a reference to a related construction discussed elsewhere.

- p. 339 11.7c Why not the indicative form of the verb?

Typo, corrected.

- p. 339 ‘Both these construction’: constructions

corrected

- p. 341 11.10c The sentence is all right.

agree, this is one of the optional IPP verbs. changed the text slightly to reflect this.

- p. 342 Möglichkeitspassiv und Permissivpassiv are only vaguely distinct, might it be the case that animacy of the subject argument determines the interpretation? Can you provide clearer (semantic) test criteria for distinguishing the two readings?

Animacy is indeed important. I have completely rewritten this section and streamlined the different options, including (even more) test and criteria for the separation.

- p. 342 11.13b The sentence is very strange, I prefer ‘Der Berg lässt sich einfach/gut von Besuchern besteigen’; without such an adverb the sentence has a strong permissive flavor. But what about a sentence like: ‘Die Seelöwen lassen sich von den Besuchern füttern’ (a permissive as well as a possibility reading seems possible).

I see the easier interpretation with *einfach*, but I think the possibility reading is also clear without it. Think of another mountain that is closed. The *Seelöwen* example nicely shows the role of animacy. I have included other, hopefully even clearer, examples.

- p. 343 ‘causes to event to happen’: the event; the paragraph also contains two occurrences of passivkausativ without capital ‘P’. Further: ‘Besides

the different in role': difference.

done

- p. 343 11.18b ausziehen not auszeihen

corrected

- p. 343 11.18c The sentence is ok, cf. Der Vater lässt das Baby von seinem Sohn ausziehen/wickeln/baden/tragen. But I prefer the von-PP to be realized. Also true for 11.55c.

that is not the intended reading: this is about the 'endoreflexive' usage, as explained in detail in the full discussion below. no change

- p. 344 11.4.1 I am not sure whether the construction really expresses progressive aspect. One might also encounter examples like 'Ich tat dir das Buch zu deinem sechsten Geburtstag schenken'. Also I personally do not like the tun-construction.

I think I have described exactly this sentiment in the text. no change.

- p. 344 'in german orthography': German

corrected

- p. 344 11.20b What about Das Haus blieb monatelang unverkauft, trotz aller Bemühungen der Makler? I think such sentences are acceptable and show that bleiben and the infinitive do not form a single word.

The *un-* prefix is a sure sign of a depictive secondary predicate, as discussion in Chapter 10. Please note that *bleiben+Partizip* should be clearly differentiated from *bleiben+Infinitiv*, although they are of course related. And, whether or not this is a single word is really an uninteresting question. I just notice it, because more German speakers are very specific about their ideas of orthography.

- p. 345 11.23c Punctuation mark is missing.

corrected

- p. 346 11.24b Punctuation mark is missing.

corrected

- p. 346 11.4.6 In what sense is the object incorporated? I do not think that this is morphological incorporation, it might be pseudo-incorporation. The same is true of mentioning incorporation on pages 351 and 352. I also disagree with the analysis on page 397 concerning Haareschneiden.

This book is not about the details of incorporation, so I do not delve into differences between ‘pseudo’ or not. In general, objects without article that have generic reference are intended here. I decided not to include any more discussion of incorporation. no change.

- p. 348 11.28c also possible with zu

as explicitly stated in the text. no change.

- p. 348 11.30c The sentence Ich werden bestimmt von einer Biene gestochen werden, wenn ihr mir den Zucker nicht von den Händen waschen kann is all right. So, I disagree with the author’s judgement.

please read the footnote 24, which explains why this example is not useful.  
no change

- p. 352 (see Section 11.5.1: closing bracket is missing.

removed

- p. 352 11.45a übersieht not überseht

corrected

- p. 354 11.50b/c The participles should go to the end of the sentences.

Section completely deleted

- p. 355 11.51a The participle should go to the end of the sentence. The same holds for 11.53b - p. 356 11.54c I think the interpretation that she allows the dishes to be washed is possible.

Section completely remodelled

- p. 356 ‘the use if participle’: of the

corrected

- p. 357 ‘this appears only to a’: to be a

corrected

- p. 357 ‘Enzinger (2012: 33-)’: why -?

corrected. Should have been up to page 35

- p. 357 11.58b I think the permissive reading is the more natural one. Meaning, there is also a permissive reading.

section completely reworked and reformulated

- p. 360 ‘in this class verbs’: either delete verbs or write class of verbs

corrected

- p. 363 ‘of the lexical verb simply are simply retained’: delete the first occurrence of simply

corrected

- p. 363 11.75b Why ‘?’

removed

- p. 364 ‘Der Eintritt kostet mir 10 Euro’: mich

example removed

- p. 365 ‘Der Teller steht ihm auf den Tisch’: Ungrammatical, only ok without ihm.

changed accordingly

- p. 367 Paragraph after 12.1: already said earlier.

no, the phrasing is similar on purpose: his is about the 2. Status, indeed making a parallel to the discussion of the 1. Status as discussed in the previous chapter.

- p. 371: First sentence: Maybe a quantitative study would be interesting to support this claim.

I agree, but I know of none. I have softened my claim a bit.

- p. 371 12.9a Also possible: dass er rechtzeitig nach hause zu kommen verspricht.

well, that is one of the examples of the ‘not perfect’ correlation. See the discussion later in this chapter. No change

- p. 371 12.9b Also possible: dass der Film verspricht eine Sensation zu werden.

like above

- p. 372 12.13c ’\*^’: delete ‘^’

corrected

- p. 373 ‘Er hat noch ein Jahr zu leben’: Does this example really fit semantically into the category? Maybe just if it is interpreted as meaning: after a year, he will be killed.

good catch! Indeed, here is means ‘can’ not ‘must’. I have added some lines on this possibility. The monograph from Holl (2010) does not appear to mention this.

- p. 374 12.21a (second sentence) denkt not denken

corrected

- p. 374 12.21c (second sentence): Odd; the sentence in (d) is better than this one



well, this is the crucial sentence. As I explain in the text, it is slightly special, but attested. no change.

- p. 376 Below 12.25: Where do the numbers exactly come from? The sum is just 90%, what about the remaining 10%? How are the numbers calculated? What is the basis for their calculation?

I cite Diewald (2010: 214). Please check there for all these details. That is what citations are for. no change.

- p. 378 12.31 I think the following examples are ok: Von 13 bis 15 Uhr ist Ruhe zu halten/ Lärm und Ballspielen zu unterlassen. Ab hier ist Schritt/langsam zu fahren.

*Ruhe halten* and *etwas unterlassen* seem almost transitive, so they go into a different category. *langsam fahren* is a good suggestion, I even found some corpus examples. Thanks!

- p. 380 'This constructions is': construction

corrected

- p. 383 'Dieses glas': Glas

corrected

- p. 384 'Verbs without an accusative argument can used': can be used

corrected

- p. 384 'there actually appears to be quite good match': a quite good match

corrected

- p. 385 'Huge von Hofmannsthal': Hugo

corrected

- p. 388 'the bleiben+zu-Infinitiv construction': The

corrected

- p. 388 12.53b I prefer ‘für diese Ausstellung zu danken’

This is a corpus example. No change.

- p. 388 12.54c/d The examples contain Funktionsverbgefüge.

agree, but that doesn’t solve the question. no change

- p. 394 13.14a denke or denkt not denken

corrected

- p. 394 13.14d I prefer gedenken. With gedenken it means ‘He is planning to travel’, with denken it means ‘He believes he will travel’.

see the discussion in chapter 12 about this construction, as linked in the text. No change.

- p. 394 ‘A example of a light verb’: an

corrected

- p. 395 13.16b des Schälens not dem Schälens

corrected

- p. 395 13.16c dem Einkaufen not von dem Einkaufen

changed

- p. 395 13.4.1 There are also am-progressives with a definite direct object (at least in the area where I come from): Er ist die Kartoffeln am Lesen; Ich bin die Karroffeln am Kochen.

I believe you, but the literature says otherwise and I cannot find any good examples. No change for now.

- p. 396 ‘that that im progressive’: repetition

corrected

- p. 396 am schwimmen and am dampfen: should be with capital letter

These are direct citations, and I do not change those. no change.

- p. 397 13.4.4 It is claimed that the construction expresses that an activity is performed regularly/habitually but I am not sure that this is true. Is there any evidence to support this view? I think one can say: Während ich beim Arbeiten war, rief mich meine Frau fünf Mal an. This is clearly neither a habit nor a regularity.

That is adverbial modification, as explained at the start of the chapter and in the last paragraph of this section. no change

- p. 397 'I will not analyses': analyze

corrected

- p. 399 I am not convinced that 13.26 really represents an instance of a metonymical shift as you can say: Ich bin zum Massieren in den Massage-salon gegangen. In this sentence, Massieren cannot refer to the place of the action which is explicitly realized in the in-PP.

I completely agree that my explanation is insufficient, and I think I made that clear in the text. I simply do not know what to make of these examples, but I would like to leave them in because they deserve more investigation. no change

- p. 400 13.28a I am not convinced of the analysis of the example as you can say Er kommt am Mittwoch um 15 Uhr vom Einkaufen, dann kannst du ihn treffen.

Again, adverbial modification. Your example is almost exactly the example as given in (13.16c). I have added a note here to remind the reader of that discussion.

- p. 400 13.4.7 Kommen is usually analyzed as an inchoative Funktionsverb, see Fleischhauer & Hartmann (2021). It might be useful to adopt this kind of terminology for naming the constructions which, in my view, is just a Funktionsverbgefüge. Thus, I am not sure whether it should really be contained in a volume on alternations.

I have added an explicit section about distinguishing between *Funktionsverbgefüge* and the constructions in this chapter.

- p. 400 It is stated that the construction in 13.4.7 exemplifies different interpretations. This is an interesting observation and it represents what is called ‘families of light verb constructions’ in, for example, Fleischhauer (in press).

yep, I agree. But I don’t find the term ‘family’ very helpful here. The Wittgensteinian concept of ‘family resemblance’ is very broad, and I think we should be more concrete in grammatical analysis, e.g. Grammaticalisation pathways and Polysemy structure.

- p. 401 13.31a (second sentence) start with a capital letter

corrected

- p. 403 ‘Den habe ich immer am Hacken’: Hacken is not a verb but the noun Hacke (= Ferse).

Example removed

## References

[Link to the unpublished papers: [https://osf.io/ndr84/?view\\_only=da7049066f28464a82fa45e09fb101a6](https://osf.io/ndr84/?view_only=da7049066f28464a82fa45e09fb101a6)]

- Borik, Olga & Berit Gehrke. 2015. The syntax and semantics of pseudo-incorporation. Leiden: Brill.
- Fleischhauer, Jens. 2016. Degree gradation of verbs. Düsseldorf: Düsseldorf University Press.
- Fleischhauer, Jens. 2018. Animacy and affectedness in Germanic languages. *Open Linguistics* 4 (1): 566-588.
- Fleischhauer, Jens. in press. Stehen unter-Funktionsverbgefüge und ihre Familien. *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik*. [to appear 2022]
- Fleischhauer, Jens. under review. The syntactic expression of prospective aspect in German. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics*.
- Fleischhauer, Jens & Adrian Czardybon. 2016. The role of verbal prefixes and particles in aspectual composition. *Studies in Language* 40 (1): 176-203. [doi: 10.1075/sl.40.1.06hel]
- Fleischhauer, Jens & Thomas Gamerschlag. 2014. We are going through changes: How change of state verbs and arguments combine in scale composition. *Lingua* 141: 30-47. - [doi:10.1016/j.lingua.2013.01.006]

- Fleischhauer, Jens & Stefan Hartmann. 2021. The emergence of light verb constructions: A case study on German *kommen* ‘come’. In *Yearbook of the German Association of Cognitive Linguistics* - 9, 136-156. Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter.
- Gamerschlag, Thomas. 2014. Stative dimensional verbs in German. *Studies in Language* 38:2, 275-334.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1942. *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*, Part VI, Morphology. Ejnar Munksgaard, Copenhagen
- Löbner, Sebastian. 1979. *Intensionale Verben und Funktionalbegriffe*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Mittwoch, Anita. 1982. On the difference between eating and eating something: Activities versus accomplishments. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13 (1): 113-122.
- Pape-Müller, Sabine. 1980. *Textfunktionen des Passivs*. Niemeyer: Tübingen.
- Stiebels, Barbara. 1996. *Lexikalische Argumente und Adjunkte*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Van Hooste, Koen. 2018. *Instruments and Related Concepts at the Syntax-Semantics Interface*. Düsseldorf University Press: Düsseldorf.
- Van Valin, Robert. 2005. *Exploring the Syntax-Semantics Interface*. CUP: Cambridge.
- Van Valin, Robert & David Wilkins. 1996. The case for “Effector”: Case roles, agents and - agency revisited. In: M. Shibatani & S. Thompson (eds.). *Grammatical Constructions: Their - Form and Meaning*, 289-322. Oxford: OUP.
- Wiskandt, Niklas. 2021. Paul ärgert sich, nervt sich aber nicht. In G. Jelitto-Piechulik, M.
- Jokieli, F. Księżyk & D. Pelka (eds.). *Germanistische Forschungsperspektiven in Sprache und Literatur (Germanistische Werkstatt 11)*, 245-260. Opole: Uniwersytet Opolski.